Background and Objectives. The TEL/AML1 fusion is the most common genetic abnormality found in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemias (ALL). Although it is very difficult to identify by conventional cytogenetic techniques it can be readily detected using fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH). We carried out cytogenetic and FISH studies on 42 children with ALL in order to know the frequency of this translocation in our population, the incidence of TEL and/or AML1 gene alterations, and their correlation with clinical evolution and prognosis. In addition, we performed reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) in some cases, confirming the feasibility of FISH techniques in the detection of this translocation.

Design and Methods. Bone marrow samples were obtained from 42 childhood ALL patients. The copy number of AML1 and TEL genes were studied using fluorescent in situ hybridization with a dual color DNA probe specific for the AML1 and TEL genes.

Results. We found a frequency of TEL/AML1 fusion of 17% in our sample. Double TEL/AML1 fusion, lack of TEL signal and extra AML1 signals were frequent additional FISH abnormalities. Duplication of a chromosomal complement, deletion of chromosome 12p arm, and polysomies of chromosome 21 are plausible explanations for these additional FISH findings. However, a relatively high proportion of our cases (9.5%) presented specific amplification of AML1. A statistically significant difference in prognosis was found between patients with and without these additional AML1 or TEL FISH alterations (p<0.02), which could be related to the presence of specific karyotypes.

Interpretations and Conclusions. The frequency of TEL/AML1 fusion is similar to that found in other populations (17%). We found that FISH analysis of AML and TEL is related to the evolution of the disease. The absence of alterations in these genes revealed by FISH could be indicative of bad prognosis, while the presence of alterations is related to a good evolution. Our results suggest that interphase FISH analysis to search for alterations in AML and TEL genes could be extremely useful for complementing cytogenetic studies and for providing additional information about the possible outcome of the disease in patients with ALL.
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most common genetic abnormality in childhood ALL, being found in about 25% of cases. It also occurs in 3-4% of adult ALL cases. The translocation is associated with an early onset of the disease, a B-lineage immunophenotype, and a good prognosis.

Extra cytogenetic abnormalities, associated with the t(12;21), are frequently found. The most common structural and numerical aberrations are 12p rearrangements and trisomy 21, respectively. A double fusion signal, detected by FISH, is another common finding in patients with t(12;21). Deletions involving the untranslocated TEL allele, detected by cytogenetic and/or FISH techniques, are also often found in patients with TEL/AML1 fusion. Although deletions on the short arm of chromosome 12 are recurrent alterations found in a wide range of hematologic neoplasias, the leukemogenic role of the genes located there, TEL and p27, is unknown.

The AML1 gene is also involved in many chromosomal aberrations associated with hematologic disorders. More than 40 different patterns of translocations or rearrangements involving the 21q22 region have been described, and amplification of the 21q22 region in pediatric patients with ALL has also been detected by comparative genomic hybridization (CGH). Thus, the AML1 gene could have an important role in the 21q22 amplicon in childhood ALL.

The incidence of TEL-AML1 fusion ranges between 18 and 30% in B-lineage childhood ALL, and is similar in different populations. In marked contrast to these findings, a recent report has revealed a very low frequency (3%) of TEL-AML1 fusion in a Spanish population, thereby suggesting that geographic differences exist.

Here we present cytogenetic and FISH studies carried out on a series of 42 pediatric patients with ALL at presentation. In our Spanish series, we found a frequency of TEL-AML1 fusion similar to that previously described in American, European and Oriental populations. Furthermore, we identified a high frequency of additional abnormalities of AML1 and/or TEL genes that can be correlated with the prognosis of the disease.

Design and Methods

Patients
Bone marrow samples were obtained from 42 children diagnosed as having acute lymphoblastic leukemia between 1995 and 2001. All patients were classified according to the French-American-British (FAB) criteria and treated by standard protocols (most of them with the BFM95 protocol, the remaining with the BFM90 protocol).

Immunophenotypic studies
Flow cytometry immunophenotypic analysis was performed in all cases, using a variable panel of a large number of antibodies specific for the CD2, CD3, CD4, CD7, CD8, CD10, CD19, CD20, CD22, CD34, CD79, tdt and HLA-DR antigens and immunoglobulin κ light chains (Ig M and Ig S) (Dako A/S, Copenhagen, Denmark).

Conventional cytogenetics
Bone marrow samples were incubated in RPMI 1640 with 20% fetal calf serum for 1 day at 37°C. Cells were exposed to colcemid (0.1 µg/mL) for 1.5 h at 37°C and harvested routinely. Metaphase chromosomes were GTG-banded by a conventional trypsin-Giemsa technique and karyotyped according to the International System for Human Cytogenetic Nomenclature.

Fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH)
Chromosome spreads were prepared directly from the same samples used for conventional analysis and left overnight at room temperature. Slides were placed on a plate at 90°C for 10 min, dehydrated through a series of ethanol washes and denatured in the presence of the probe on a plate at 75°C for 1 min. The TEL/AML1 dual-color translocation FISH probe (Vysis, London, UK) was used for the detection of the TEL/AML1 rearrangement. At least 200 interphase nuclei were analyzed for each case. Positive and negative controls from the REH cell-line and five normal individuals, respectively, were used. Cell images were captured using a CCD camera (Photometrics SenSys camera) connected to a personal computer running the Chromofluor image analysis system (Applied Imaging Ltd.).

RNA preparation
Total RNA was prepared either by the guanidinium thiocyanate phenol-chloroform extraction method or by using the TRI REAGENT Kit (Molecular Research Centre, INC) according to the manufacturer's recommendations. One microgram of cell line RNA or 1-2 mg of patient RNA were reverse transcribed with 1.5 units of AMV Reverse Transcriptase (Promega Madison, USA). Following denaturation at 80°C for 5 min, the cDNA synthesis was carried out at 42°C for 60 min using random hexamers (Amersham Pharmacia Biotech Inc.) in a total volume of 40 µL. Subsequently, the cDNA was heated to 94°C for 10 min to inactivate the reverse transcriptase and was then stored at -20°C.
Table 1. Clinical and cytogenetic data from 42 children with ALL at diagnosis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>B markers</th>
<th>T markers</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sex/Age</th>
<th>Dx</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SunVul</th>
<th>Clinical data</th>
<th>Cytogenetic data</th>
<th>FISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/13</td>
<td>09/83</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1'159m</td>
<td>46.XX(i)(9;22)(q34;q11)/46,XXm</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/13</td>
<td>05/96</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18m</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>n n n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/10</td>
<td>05/96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18m</td>
<td>46, XX(i)(9;22)(q34;q11)</td>
<td>n n n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/6</td>
<td>06/96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44m</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>n n n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/4</td>
<td>09/98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>46,XX(i)(9;22)(q34;q11)/48-49,XX(i)(9;22)(q34;q11), t(9;23)(q34;q11), +8</td>
<td>n n n n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M/13</td>
<td>12/92</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1'65m</td>
<td>46,XY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/5.9</td>
<td>09/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/4</td>
<td>09/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12m+</td>
<td>46,XY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/6</td>
<td>09/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12m+</td>
<td>46,XY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/13</td>
<td>09/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12m+</td>
<td>46,XY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F/7</td>
<td>10/00</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M/3.6</td>
<td>01/97</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51m+</td>
<td>46,XY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/3.3</td>
<td>03/01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>46,XY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/4.8</td>
<td>03/01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M/10</td>
<td>01/95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1'0m</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M/13</td>
<td>12/92</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1'65m</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F/9</td>
<td>10/96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M/5</td>
<td>11/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/3.5</td>
<td>03/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/5.5</td>
<td>05/96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58m</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/13</td>
<td>04/97</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/4.6</td>
<td>11/98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/3.9</td>
<td>04/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M/5.3</td>
<td>08/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>f f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/12</td>
<td>02/01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8m+</td>
<td>47,XX(i)(12)(q11;q21),del(3)(q26),del(6)(q23), -10,11p+,12q+, -18, +21, +mar/46,XY</td>
<td>f f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/2</td>
<td>05/96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46m</td>
<td>+52-55,XX,.../46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/6</td>
<td>09/96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42m+</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/9</td>
<td>09/98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30m+</td>
<td>53-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/7</td>
<td>10/99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17m+</td>
<td>47,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/2.9</td>
<td>05/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10m+</td>
<td>45-57,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/9</td>
<td>05/99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22m+</td>
<td>47,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M/8</td>
<td>05/00</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>70-80,XX,.../46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M/4</td>
<td>01/00</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M/2.6</td>
<td>11/00</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>55,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/3</td>
<td>01/01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10m+</td>
<td>47,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/6</td>
<td>03/01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>53-57,XX,.../46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F/11.6</td>
<td>02/01</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/2.9</td>
<td>01/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/3.4</td>
<td>07/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>F/15</td>
<td>10/00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pre-B</td>
<td>M/15</td>
<td>12/95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F/13.7</td>
<td>01/99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26m+</td>
<td>46,XX</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND: no data; n: normal; f: fusion; +: extra signals; -: lack of signals; MAKA: major karyotype abnormalities.
Molecular detection of t(12;21)

After cDNA synthesis a PCR was performed to detect chimeric transcripts derived from the translocation t(12;21). All samples were analyzed using standardized primers, protocols and criteria. To verify the integrity of the isolated RNA and the correct synthesis of the cDNA, the ubiquitously expressed ABL gene was amplified in a separate PCR reaction. All assays were carried out using appropriate positive (cDNA from the REH cell line) and negative controls (cDNA from a healthy donor and H2O). The PCR was carried out in two steps. The first round of the PCR was performed with the external primers, and the second one with reverse internal primers. Amplification was performed with a 9700 Perkin Elmer Thermocycler (Perkin Elmer, Germany).

In the first round of PCR, 2 μL of cDNA were used. The PCR was carried out in a final volume of 20 μL with 15 PCR-Buffer (Reaction Buffer 10×-Biotools B & M labs, S.A. Spain), 1.5 mM MγCl2 (MgCl2 50 mM-Biotools B & M labs, S.A. Spain), 0.2 mM of each dNTP (Promega Madison, USA), 5 pmol of each primer (Gibco BRL), and 1 unit of DNA polymerase (Biotools B & M labs S.A., Spain). After an initial melting step (5 min at 94ºC), 30 amplification cycles of 30 s at 94ºC, 30 s at 60ºC and 50 s at 72ºC were performed, followed by an extension step of 7 min at 72ºC. One microliter of the first round PCR product was subjected to the second round of PCR, differing in the final volume (25 μL) and in the extension time (1 min at 72ºC). Twenty microliters of the final PCR products were analyzed on a 3% agarose gel (MetaPhor agarose) and visualized by ethidium bromide staining.

Comparative genomic hybridization (CGH)

CGH was performed according to Kallioniemi et al.,28 with some modifications. The tumor (test) and normal (reference) DNAs were labeled using the nick translation kit from Vysis. Six matched references were used to perform CGH for the patients and the normal and altered controls. Briefly, 200 ng of each labeled DNA were hybridized to normal male metaphase spread in the presence of 15 mg of Cot-1 DNA, for 3 days. After washes, chromosomes were counterstained with DAPI in an antifade solution.

Digital image analysis and interpretation of CGH results

Slides were analyzed with an Olympus AX60 epifluorescence microscope equipped with a CCD camera (Photometrics SenSys camera). A minimum of 15 metaphases per hybridization per case were analyzed using an image analysis system (Chromofluor image analysis system, Applied Imaging Ltd.) that could process three-color images (green for tumor DNA hybridization, red for normal reference DNA hybridization and blue for DNA counterstain). The green and red fluorescence intensities were calculated and the green-to-red ratio profiles along the chromosome axis were displayed. Ratios greater than 1.20 and less than 0.80 were taken to represent chromosomal gain and loss, respectively. Telomeric and heterochromatic regions were excluded from the analysis.29

Statistical analysis

We used the two-tailed Fisher’s exact test with a confidence interval of 95% to detect any significant associations between presence of abnormal FISH patterns and survival at the end of the report.
Results

Clinical data from the 42 pediatric patients are shown in Table 1. Thirty-six out of 42 samples had a B-immunophenotype and the remaining cases showed T-markers. The sex ratio was 1.6:1 (26 males and 16 females) and the patients’ age ranged between 2 and 15 years (mean 7 years). All patients achieved complete clinical remission, except cases 2 and 37. Currently, 13 patients remain in complete remission, 10 are being treated, 9 have died and 6 cases have been recently diagnosed (2001). We have no data for four cases.

A conventional cytogenetic study was carried out in 38 patients. The cytogenetic results are given in Table 1. Fourteen patients (37%) showed a normal karyotype, while 24 cases (63%) presented different numerical and/or structural abnormalities. The t(12;21) was not observed in any case. A complex karyotype, with three or more alterations, was detected in 29% (7/24) of the patients; moreover, hyperdiploid karyotypes without structural alterations accounted for 16.5% (4/24). In addition, a partial deletion of 12p was detected in case 15. A chromosome Ph', t(9;22)(q34;q11), was identified in three patients (cases 1, 3 and 5).

FISH and RT-PCR studies

The FISH study with TEL/AML1 probe was carried out on all 42 samples. The results are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Eighteen cases (43%) showed a normal pattern of hybridization (two red and two green signals), TEL/AML1 fusion was detected in 7 patients (17%) but only one case had TEL/AML1 fusion as the only FISH abnormality (case 19); 3 other cases showed additional deletion of the normal TEL allele (cases #20, 21 and 22) and 3 cases presented double TEL/AML1 fusion (cases #23, 24 and 25).

Seventeen out of 42 samples (40%) had no TEL/AML1 fusion but presented other FISH anomalies involving AM1 L1 or TEL signals. The most common abnormality was extra AM1 L1 signals observed in 15 patients; 12 samples showed only extra AM1 L1 signals and the other 3 had extra AM1 L1 copies and an additional TEL signal (cases #27 and 32), or lacked a TEL signal (case #36). The increase of AM1 L1 was associated with the gain of a chromosome 21 in 8 cases, but in the other four cases the patients presented a normal karyotype. The lack of a TEL signal without AM1 L1 abnormalities was detected in 2 samples (cases #41 and 42). The correlation between cytogenetic and FISH results is shown in Table 1.

We were able to perform a RT-PCR specific for the amplification of the TEL/AML1 fusion transcript in eight samples. The results were positive in two patients (cases #24 and 25) and negative in the other six patients (cases #6, 7, 12, 18, 30 and 40). These results are in agreement with those obtained by FISH.

CGH results

CGH study was performed in one patient for whom the cytogenetic and FISH results were not in concordance. This case had a normal karyotype but presented extra (4 or 5) signals of the AM1 L1 gene as revealed by FISH; CGH studies showed a specific amplification of the 21q22 region (case #38) (Figure 1D).

Clinical correlation

All patients with TEL/AML1 fusion achieved complete clinical remission; 3 cases presented a normal karyotype, 2 cases had single alterations and one had a complex karyotype (we obtained no cytogenetic results from case #20). In addition, one child died during the treatment of causes not related to the disease (case #21) and was excluded from the statistical analysis. On the other hand, we observed 17 cases with AM1 L1 and TEL alterations as revealed by FISH. All cases achieved complete clinical remission, except one child (case #37). Thirteen cases showed an abnormal karyotype with numerical and structural alterations; two presented a normal karyotype and two were without cytogenetic results.

So, 24 patients had abnormalities as revealed by FISH and only 2 of them (8.5%) have died during the course of their disease (cases 37 and 41) (Table 2). Eighteen cases showed a normal pattern of FISH hybridization. All these cases achieved complete
clinical remission, except one child (case #2). Of these patients, 55% remain in complete remission, while the other 7 children have died (39%). These were patients whose karyotype showed either the Ph' chromosome, numerical and structural alterations and/or complex karyotypes. We have no data about one case (case #11).

Association of FISH results with clinical features

We compared the clinical evolution of two groups of patients selected on the basis of normal or abnormal FISH pattern for the TEL and AML1 genes. There was a statistically significant association between presence/absence of these alterations as revealed by FISH and the children's survival (p < 0.02).

Discussion

The t(12;21) is an alteration commonly associated with childhood ALL and is correlated with a good prognosis. It results in a fusion of the TEL and AML1 genes. Both genes are usually involved in other translocations in different types of leukaemias, suggesting that they are deeply involved in the leukemogenesis process.

We performed a combined cytogenetic and FISH study on a group of ALL patients (42 children) in order to analyze the incidence of this translocation in our population and the correlation between the FISH and cytogenetic results. We found an incidence of TEL/AML1 fusion of 17% in our childhood cases. These results are consistent with those obtained by other groups in series of childhood ALL from USA, most European countries, Japan, Taiwan, and Brazil. Our results differ from those obtained by Garcia-Sanz et al. from another Spanish population, who found a low frequency (3%) of TEL/AML1 fusion in their series of 38 childhood ALL using FISH and RT-PCR. These different results could be better explained by technical rather than by true geographic differences.

In addition to these results, we found a high frequency of additional abnormalities involving TEL and/or AML1 in our series which can be explained in accordance with the cytogenetic results.

Patients with t(12;21)

We found 7 of the 42 children to be positive for the t(12;21). Conventional cytogenetic techniques revealed 3 cases with a normal karyotype (cases #21, 23 and 24), 2 cases with a single alteration (cases #19 and 22) and 1 case with a complex karyotype (case #25). One case yielded no cytogenetic data (case #20). Three of these 7 TEL/AML1 fusion-positive cases also showed deletions of the TEL allele that had not been detected by conventional cytogenetic techniques (cases #20, 21 and 22). Deletion of the TEL gene has frequently been found by other authors. McClean et al. suggested that this might result in a reduction of the presumed oncogenetic potential of the fusion gene, which could be abolished by loss of the normal TEL allele, providing a growth advantage to the cells containing the t(12;21). This could explain the high frequency of TEL allele deletions.

We also found three samples with double fusion signals. Two of these patients (cases #23 and 24) (Figure 1C) showed two fusion signals and two residual signals. These results could be explained by duplication of the der(12) and der(21) harboring the TEL/AML1 fusion or by triploidy following duplication of the abnormal complement. As the cytogenetic results of cases #23 and 24 were normal, it is probable that the altered line had a different division rate and, for this reason, all the analyzed metaphases were normal and the alterations were undetectable. In the third (case #25), the double fusion was the result of a duplication of the der(21)t(12;21) in a complex karyotype (Figures 1A-B). This was the only positive case in which a fusion with a complex karyotype was revealed by conventional cytogenetic techniques.

In two of the seven positive cases for which RNA was available, molecular study for the detection of the translocation t(12;21) confirmed the FISH results. In addition, six other cases were negative for the translocation by RT-PCR also in agreement with the FISH results. These results show a good correlation between both techniques for the diagnosis of t(12;21).

Patients with AML1 alterations

Fifteen out of the 42 children (35%) had extra copies of AML1. The most common origin of these gains is polysomy of chromosome 21, as we have demonstrated by conventional cytogenetics in 11 children and as has also been suggested by other authors. However, four of our patients had more than four copies of the AML1 gene without polysomy of chromosome 21; two patients (cases #38 and 39) had a normal karyotype and two patients (cases #37 and 40) had structural alterations different from t(12;21). In sample #38 the extra copies were located tandemly in a derivative chromosome 21 by a metaphase FISH study. A CGH study of this case showed specific amplification of the 21q22 region, confirming the results obtained by the FISH study. Thus, the increase in copy number of AML1 in these patients...
without polysomy of chromosome 21 could have occurred by intrachromosomal amplification. The increased number of copies of AML1, either as polysomies or as amplifications, indicates the importance of this gene in the leukemogenesis process.16,37

Patients with TEL alterations
We observed gains and deletions of TEL signals in five cases. Two of these cases presented gains of TEL and each one additionally also had an extra AML1 signal (cases 27 and 32). In case #32 this finding could be explained by the presence of hyperploidy with polysomy in chromosomes 12 and 21. Cytogenetic results were not obtained in the other case. On the other hand, we had three cases with deletions of TEL signal. These deletions had not been observed by conventional cytogenetics, which highlights the importance of FISH for complementing conventional studies.

Clinical implications
Some studies have suggested that the t(12;21) is a marker related to a good prognosis,6,33 although other authors have obtained different results.3,38 Harbott et al.39 published data suggesting that relapses occur later in t(12;21) positive patients, who have a longer median remission duration of up to 2 years after diagnosis. However, in all larger studies, a good prognosis could be demonstrated, whereas the percentage of treatment failures is higher in smaller studies.

In our series, most cases with the translocation t(12;21) remain alive (only one child positive for the fusion has died from complications arising from his treatment). The same occurred when the patients presented amplifications of AML1 or alterations of the TEL gene by FISH; they are currently alive and free of disease (91% of cases). In these cases, we usually observed normal cytogenetics, or single or numerical alterations. The identification of this type of alteration by interphase FISH could, therefore, be associated with a good evolution and prognosis. Conversely, 39% (7/18) of the patients with normal FISH died while they had the disease: three presented a Ph' chromosome and three others showed complex karyotypes with structural abnormalities. Thus, the absence of TEL and AML1 alterations revealed by FISH could be associated with a poor prognosis in childhood ALL because of the correlation with karyotypes linked to bad prognosis. A statistical analysis of normal FISH and abnormal groups showed significant differences (p < 0.02). In summary, we found a frequency of t(12;21) in children (17%) similar to that observed in other series. Our study comparing cytogenetic and FISH results showed that AML1 amplification is a frequent finding, related to polysomy of chromosome 21 in most cases; however, in 26.5% of children with AML1 amplification it is due to specific amplifications of this gene. Finally, we found that FISH analysis of AML and TEL is a characteristic that is closely related to the evolution of the disease. The absence of alterations in these genes revealed by FISH could be indicative of bad prognosis, while the presence of alterations is related to a good evolution. This is due to the type of cytogenetic alteration associated with these FISH results: Ph' chromosome and complex karyotypes in the case of normal FISH results, versus normal karyotypes, single or numerical alterations in the case of abnormal FISH results. Thus, our results suggest that interphase FISH analysis to search for alterations in AML and TEL genes could be extremely useful, a) for complementing cytogenetic studies, and b) for providing additional information about the possible outcome of the disease in patients with ALL.
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Potential implications for clinical practice

The availability of molecular methods to detect the most prognostic relevant chromosomal translocations in childhood ALL has suggested that genetic features of leukemic cells are used to define risk classification of the individual patient. Interphase FISH analysis of AMI1 and TEL gene abnormalities may be a very useful tool for this purpose.
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