Discordant Prenatal Phenotype and Karyotype of Monozygotic Twins Characterized by the Unequal Distribution of Two Cell Lines Investigated by Different Methods: A Review
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Monozygotic twins (MZ) are considered natural clones, but they are not necessarily phenotypically or genetically identical and a certain degree of discordance has been reported within MZ twin pairs. This phenomenon is most often due, but is not limited to, a postzygotic nondisjunction event leading to chromosomal mosaicism (Gilbert et al., 2002; Hall, 1996, 2003). Possible causes for genotypic differences also include an imbalance such as uniparental disomy, defects of imprinting or even twin-to-twin transfusion due to placental factors. Rohrer et al. (2004) have estimated that descriptions of two dozen cases of heterokaryotypic monochorionic twins discordant for Turner Syndrome had appeared in the literature so far, while Lewi et al. (2003) and Lewi et al. (2006) reported several cases of MZ twins with a discordant phenotype and a complete or partially discordant karyotype on different fetal tissues.

Since the advent of chorionic villus sampling (CVS) in the 1980’s (Brambati et al., 1984; Simoni et al., 1983) the advantage of a rapid definition of the chromosomal constitution of the placenta has been stressed to allow the patient to obtain a relatively early diagnosis of chromosome aneuploidies. One drawback of CVS is the well-known chance of confined placenta mosaicism, which is detected in about 1% to 2% of samples. In these cases chorionic villus sampling results can be a potentially misleading (Grati et al., 2006).

More recently, the introduction of quantitative fluorescence PCR (QF-PCR) seemed to be a step forward in the early diagnosis of major trisomies or monosomies. However, both CVS and QF-PCR have drawbacks which must be accounted for when dealing with monochorionic twins with a discordant phenotype (Cirigliano et al., 2001; Crane & Cheung., 1988; Hahneman & Vejerslev, 1997; Nicolini et al., 2004).

We report the case of a monochorionic diamniotic pregnancy in which first trimester nuchal translucency screening showed a major discordance between the fetuses and in which the QF-PCR and cytogenetic...
studies of CV seemed concordant but, in contrast, revealed different results when other tissues were analyzed. These latter studies led to the more accurate diagnosis of a mosaicism whose cell lines were unequally distributed between the twins.

**Clinical Data, Material and Methods**

A 32-year-old primigravida underwent transabdominal chorionic villus sampling (CVS) at 11+2 weeks of gestation owing to a cystic hygroma detected by ultrasound examination in one twin (Twin 1) of a monochorionic, biamniotic pregnancy (see Figure 1A — Twin 1, and Figure 1B — Twin 2). A single sample of CV was taken for cytogenetic analysis.

Parents were aged 32 and 35 years respectively, healthy and not consanguineous. Both family histories were unremarkable and the pregnancy was spontaneous, no ovarian stimulation or in vitro fertilization (IVF) was performed.

The pregnancy was terminated at 15 weeks gestation following a rapid worsening of the ultrasound picture of the affected twin (Twin 1). No abnormalities were noted in the other twin (Twin 2). At that time the patient was offered an amniocentesis (AF) from each sac because of the discordant phenotype of the two fetuses.

Chorionic villus tissue was isolated by removing maternal decidua. Rapid QF-PCR (quantitative fluorescence polymerase chain reaction) testing for aneuploidy was performed on DNA extracted using Instagene Gene Matrix (Biorad). Two multiplex PCR assays were performed. The first was for the analysis of markers on chromosomes 13, 18 and 21, co-amplified with the sex chromosome markers AMXY, HPRT and X22 (Figure 2A). A second assay included markers DX6803 and DX6809 (Figure 2B). The markers at polymorphic sites for the detection of X chromosome are listed in Table 1.

Both short-term preparations and long-term cultures from CVS were obtained by conventional methods (Simoni et al., 1983).

Fetal tissues and further placental samples were obtained after termination. Because of poor cellular growth and banding, FISH analysis was applied to
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both metaphase and interphase nuclei using probes DXZ1 (centromeric sequences) and KAL (region p21.3 of chromosome X), was performed on placental tissue and fibroblast of Twin 2.

Results

CVS QF-PCR showed a normal result with chromosomes 13, 18 and 21 and detected only a single X chromosome (Figure 2A and 2B).

The karyotype obtained by application of the direct method to 50 metaphase cells from the same sample showed a 45,X pattern. This result was confirmed by long-term preparations on 38 cell growth areas from two different cultures.

Cytogenetic analysis of the two samples of amniotic fluid revealed two different karyotypes: one 45,X and the other showing 46 chromosomes with a deletion of the entire short arm of one X chromosome. The analysis was performed on nine and ten clones from each sample.

After termination, karyotypes obtained from fetal skin fibroblasts of both fetuses confirmed the amniotic fluid analysis. FISH analysis, performed on Twin 2 because of the unsatisfactory quality of the preparations, confirmed the amniotic fluid karyotype whereas analysis of the placenta showed both cell lines. Probes DXZ1 (centromeric sequences) and KAL (region p21.3 of chromosome X) were used. The results are summarized in Table 2.

Discussion

Heterokaryotypic twinning appears to be a rare event. A likely hypothesis to explain the pathogenesis may be that of a postzygotic event in the very early embryonic period (Cheng et al., 2006) or as a postzygotic nondisjunction event leading to chromosomal mosaicism.

Furthermore, heterokaryotypic monozygous twins could be the consequences of a splitting of the conceptus after a mitotic nondisjunction.

Any diagnostic failure to uncover a discrepant karyotype between embryos that demonstrate a discordant phenotype might well have serious consequences in terms of counselling and management. In practice, most clinicians usually analyze only a single sample to obtain the fetal karyotype in monochorionic twins, whereas a dual sampling of both fetuses is carried out in dichorionic twins. In this way many cases of discordant chromosomal anomalies may have been missed.

Previously reported cases of discordant phenotype and karyotype may be grouped into three categories: discordance of sexual phenotype with mosaicism 46,XY/45,X or 45,X/46,XX (Chen et al., 2003; Shmid et al., 2000; Wachtel et al., 2000); discordance of autosomal trisomies or monosomies (Cheng et al., 2006; Lewi et al., 2003; Lewi et al., 2006; Nieuwint et al., 1999; Rogers et al., 1982); and, very rarely, unusual structural anomalies (Bourthoumieu et al., 2005).

In 2003, Chen et al. reported the case of a primigravida referred at the 14th week of gestation because of a twin pregnancy with a structurally abnormal cotwin who presented with a large cystic hygroma. Cytogenetic analysis of amniotic fluid revealed a 46,XX karyotype in the normal twin and a 45,X karyotype in the abnormal one while molecular studies revealed a monozygotic pregnancy.

After termination, skin fibroblasts from both twins were grown and the results of the cytogenetic analysis correlated well with that of the amniotic fluid.
Chromosome studies from the monochorionic diamniotic placenta showed a 45, X/46, XX mosaicism revealing the discrepancy between skin fibroblasts and chorionic cells for the normal fetus. The authors of this study suggested that early in the second trimester amniotic fluid (AF), compared to chorionic villi, offers an advantage by providing a more reliable genotype-phenotype correlation.

Our case, together with previously reported cases, suggests that first trimester, single site CVS of monochorionic twins even without phenotypic differences is not appropriate because it can miss mosaicisms and, thus, be misleading in cases of selective termination. Our case indeed revealed the coexistence of two cell lines that were undetectable by both cytogenetic and molecular analysis (QF-PCR) of CVS.

We do not have enough data to establish whether missing the second cell line in the first CVS analysis was due to sampling difficulty and could have been avoided by using multiple sampling.

Our case further shows that ultrasound and cytogenetic discordances do not necessarily exclude monozygosity. It is advisable that monochorionic twins should be evaluated with a molecular analysis to define the zygosity while karyotyping should be performed on amniocytes from both amniotic sacs.
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Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorionic Villi (single sample – monochorionic pregnancy)</td>
<td>Short-term culture: 50 metaphases</td>
<td>45,X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term cultures: 38 cell growth areas from 2 independent cultures</td>
<td>45,X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amniotic fluid</td>
<td>1° sample (Twin 1)</td>
<td>9 colonies from 2 independent cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2° sample (Twin 2)</td>
<td>10 colonies from 2 independent cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetal fibroblasts</td>
<td>1° sample (Twin1)</td>
<td>22 cell growth areas from 2 independent cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2° sample (Twin 2)</td>
<td>4 cell growth areas + 48 (nuclei + metaphases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Twin 1 — fetus with cystic hygroma; Twin 2 — fetus normal at ultrasound examination.


