Emerging roles for long noncoding RNAs in B-cell development and malignancy
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ABSTRACT

Long noncoding (lnc)RNAs have emerged as essential mediators of cellular biology, differentiation and malignancy transformation. LncRNAs have a broad range of possible functions at the transcriptional, posttranscriptional and protein level and their aberrant expression significantly contributes to the hallmarks of cancer cell biology. In addition, their high tissue- and cell-type specificity makes lncRNAs especially interesting as biomarkers, prognostic factors or specific therapeutic targets. Here, we review current knowledge on lncRNA expression changes during normal B-cell development, indicating essential functions in the differentiation process. In addition we address lncRNA deregulation in B-cell malignancies, the putative prognostic value of this as well as the molecular functions of multiple deregulated lncRNAs. Altogether, the discussed work indicates major roles for lncRNAs in normal and malignant B cells affecting oncogenic pathways as well as the response to common therapeutics.

1. Introduction

It is less than a decade ago that a genome wide long noncoding (lnc)RNA transcript expression profile has been reported for the first time (Cabili et al., 2011). Current annotations suggest the presence of 15,000 (GENCODE 26) to 60,000 (Iyer et al., 2015) lncRNA genes in the human genome. The majority of the lncRNAs (70%) are poorly conserved across species, i.e. they arose in the past 50 million years of evolution (Guttman et al., 2009; Hezroni et al., 2015). Only a few lncRNAs show high sequence conservation across species, e.g. XIST, PVT1, MIAT, NEAT1, MALAT1 and OIP5-AS (Ulitsky, 2016). Globally, lncRNA genes show higher sequence conservation than randomly selected genomic regions, this includes positional conservation as well as conservation of promoter regions, splice sites or the act of transcription itself (reviewed in (Ulitsky, 2016)). The biological significance of lncRNAs was proven for 50 out of 700 lncRNAs tested a significant proportion has been reported for the first time (Cabili et al., 2011). Current annotations suggest the presence of 15,000 (GENCODE 26) to 60,000 (Iyer et al., 2015) lncRNA genes in the human genome. The majority of the lncRNAs (70%) are poorly conserved across species, i.e. they arose in the past 50 million years of evolution (Guttman et al., 2009; Hezroni et al., 2015). Only a few lncRNAs show high sequence conservation across species, e.g. XIST, PVT1, MIAT, NEAT1, MALAT1 and OIP5-AS (Ulitsky, 2016). Globally, lncRNA genes show higher sequence conservation than randomly selected genomic regions, this includes positional conservation as well as conservation of promoter regions, splice sites or the act of transcription itself (reviewed in (Ulitsky, 2016)). The biological significance of lncRNAs was proven for 50 out of 700 lncRNAs tested a significant effect on cancer cell growth (Zhu et al., 2016). Thus, although the functional significance of the bulk of lncRNAs is unclear, a significant proportion of them have major biological functions.

LncRNAs may be transcribed from (eRNAs) or they may share a promoter with the neighboring coding gene (bidirectional). Despite having a similar architecture as mRNAs including being subject to splicing, polyadenylation and 5' capping, lncRNAs show characteristics that clearly distinguish them from mRNAs, such as a generally lower expression, a fewer number of exons and a much higher tissue specificity (Iyer et al., 2015; Derrien et al., 2012). The functional repertoire of lncRNAs appears to be broad, likely owing to their ability to interact with DNA, RNA and proteins or combinations thereof. Well described mechanisms include: (i) the modulation of three dimensional chromatin structure (e.g. Firre) (Hacisuleyman et al., 2014), (ii) scaffolding functions for proteins (e.g. MALAT1, NEAT1) (Hutchinson et al., 2007; Mao et al., 2011; Clemson et al., 2009), (iii) transcriptional gene regulation via interaction with DNA and/or proteins including epigenetic regulators (e.g. HOTAIR) (Rim et al., 2007) and transcriptional (co) factors (e.g. lincRNA-p21, GAS5) (Bao et al., 2015; Dimitrova et al., 2014; Kino et al., 2010), and (iv) posttranscriptional regulation affecting the stability of mRNAs or proteins (e.g. PVT1, GAS5) (Tseng et al., 2014; Hu et al., 2014) or competing with miRNA binding (competing endogenous RNAs, ceRNAs (Salmena et al., 2011); e.g. GAS5-miR-21) (Zhang et al., 2013).

In solid cancers, lncRNAs have been shown to contribute to all known cancer hallmarks, i.e. viability, proliferation, growth suppression, motility, immortality and angiogenesis (reviewed in (Schmitt et al., 2016)). LncRNA BCAR4 represents an excellent example of a lncRNA regulating gene expression through direct and indirect effects.
Mechanistically, BCAR4 directly interacts with the transcription factors SNIP1 and PNUTS (Xing et al., 2014). The interaction of BCAR4 with SNIP1 releases its inhibitory effects on p300 histone acetylase, thereby causing increased H3K18 acetylation at migration-specific target gene loci. BCAR4 bound PNUTS then interacts with the acetylated histones to induce the transcriptional machinery via activation of PP1 phosphatase. High BCAR4 expression thus results in increased cell motility which is in line with the correlation of high BCAR4 expression with advanced, metastatic breast cancer (Xing et al., 2014). Cancer cells may also become addicted to the expression of oncogenic lncRNAs. The melanoma-specific lncRNA SAMMSON is an example of a lncRNA exerting its function by binding to a protein and influencing its subcellular localization (Leucci et al., 2016). Mechanistically, SAMMSON increased mitochondrial metabolism by direct binding to p32, resulting in its mitochondrial localization (Leucci et al., 2016). Depletion of SAMMSON strongly decreased the viability of melanoma cells independently of mutational status (Leucci et al., 2016).

In recent years much progress has been made regarding the expression pattern of lncRNAs during different stages of B-cell development and in diverse B-cell derived malignancies. However, in contrast to solid cancers, a limited number of studies have addressed the consequences of deregulated lncRNA expression in B-cell malignancies. Here we provide an overview of the current knowledge on lncRNA expression changes in normal and malignant B cells, their potential clinical value as well as their molecular functions.

2. LncRNA expression in normal B cells

Multiple studies have analyzed lncRNA expression patterns in different stages of B-cell development in human (Bonnal et al., 2015; Casero et al., 2015; Petri et al., 2015; Ranzani et al., 2015; Tayari et al., 2016) and mouse (Brazao et al., 2016). In general, marked lncRNA expression changes were observed during B-cell development and maturation. Consequently, B-cell subsets can readily be distinguished using their lncRNA expression patterns. Transcriptome sequencing of ten T-cell and three B-cell subsets (Ranzani et al., 2015) showed that expression of individual lncRNAs is more often restricted to a single subset (71% of 4764 lncRNAs) than expression of protein coding genes (35% of 15,911 coding genes) or membrane proteins, which are commonly used for subset classification (40% of 1051 membrane proteins). Of note, lncRNAs that showed the highest cell-type specificity appeared to be absent in whole lymphoid tissue or peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) likely due to dilution of cell-type specific lncRNA transcripts in such heterogeneous cell samples (Ranzani et al., 2015). This is also reflected by the fact that studies assessing lncRNA expression patterns in specific B-cell subsets (Bonnal et al., 2015; Casero et al., 2015; Ranzani et al., 2015; Brazao et al., 2016) led to the identification of a large number of previously unannotated transcripts. In contrast to mRNA expression patterns, lncRNA expression patterns can distinguish cells committed to the B and T cell lineage already at the progenitor stage in bone marrow (Casero et al., 2015), indicating their importance in lineage commitment. At later stages of B-cell development and maturation lncRNA expression profiles can be highly similar between functionally distinct B cells such as follicular and marginal zone B cells in spleen (Brazao et al., 2016) and naive and memory cells in tonsils (Tayari et al., 2016). However, the strongly proliferative germinal center (GC) B cells showed a lncRNA profile that is very distinctive from other mature B-cell subsets (Casero et al., 2015; Tayari et al., 2016; Brazao et al., 2016).

To identify lncRNAs associated with cell fate-related genes at different B-cell development stages, a guilt-by-association analysis was done on 11 distinct B-cell subsets (Petri et al., 2015). Early B-cell development specific genes, expressed in preB1, preBII and immature B cells, such as RAG2, PPREB1, DNTT, LEFI, SMAD1 and MYB, were associated with LEFI-AS1, SMAD1-AS1, MYB-AS1 antisense transcripts, as well as with the intergenic transcript CTC-436K13.6. Mitotic cell cycle related genes such as KIF23, PLK4 and CENPE were specific for the proliferative stages of B-cell development, i.e. preB1, preBII, centroblasts and centrocytes, and associated with the lncRNAs OIPS-AS, MMF-AS1 and the bidirectional lncRNA CRNDE. CRNDE has previously been linked to cell cycle and proliferation (Esposti et al., 2016; Song et al., 2016; Meng et al., 2017; Shao et al., 2016). Expression of AID and SERPINA9, two genes specifically expressed in GC centroblasts and centrocytes, was associated with PVT1 and multiple uncharacterized lncRNAs, e.g. LINCO0487, LINCO0877, RP11-20387.2 and RP11-132N15.3. The latter one is located on 240 kb upstream of BCL6. RNA-seq of 11 murine B-cell subsets revealed 4516 differentially expressed lncRNAs (Brazao et al., 2016). Assessment of the histone H3K4 mono/trimethylation ratio of these differentially expressed lncRNAs revealed 192 promoter (high H3K4me3) and 702 enhancer (high H3K4me1) associated lncRNAs (eRNAs). Comparison with previous human studies (Bonnal et al., 2015; Casero et al., 2015; Petri et al., 2015) identified 228 eRNAs with a potential human ortholog based on positional conservation and 185 based on sequence conservation. Of note, the above-mentioned GC B cell associated lncRNA RP11-132N15.3 located downstream of BCL6 (Petri et al., 2015) has a murine ortholog showing both sequence and positional conservation. However, this lncRNA appears to be downregulated in murine GC B cells (Brazao et al., 2016), while being upregulated in human GC B cells (Petri et al., 2015), indicating that despite strong similarities a functional conservation is unlikely.

Thus, although most current studies are limited by inclusion of a restricted number of B-cell subsets (Bonnal et al., 2015; Casero et al., 2015; Petri et al., 2015; Tayari et al., 2016) or the use of microarrays preventing the identification of novel transcripts (Petri et al., 2015; Tayari et al., 2016), they provide a valuable overview of B-cell subset specific lncRNAs. Now, the field is open for studies that establish their roles in normal B-cell development.

3. Aberrant lncRNA expression in malignant B cells

lncRNA expression profiling studies in B-cell malignancies have been focused on classical Hodgkin lymphoma (cHL), diffuse large b-cell lymphoma (DLBCL), Burkitt lymphoma (BL) and around the transcription factor MYC. Comparison of lncRNA expression patterns of cHL cell lines to sorted GC B cells from healthy individuals (Tayari et al., 2016) revealed a total of 475 differentially expressed lncRNAs. The majority of them (74%) were downregulated, which may in part be a reflection of the lower degree of heterogeneity in cell lines compared to sorted B-cell subsets. In line with this, DLBCL cell lines also had a markedly lower number of expressed lncRNAs compared to sorted normal B cells and patient cases (Verma et al., 2015).

Re-analysis of RNA-seq data of 116 DLBCL cases, 30 DLBCL cell lines, 4 naive and 4 GC B cell subsets (Verma et al., 2015) revealed 2632 novel, multi-exonic lncRNAs. For approximately half of these, expression was restricted to DLBCL cases or to both DLBCL cases and cell lines. DLBCL cases display high heterogeneity in clinical behavior, mRNA expression and genomic aberrations (Karmali and Gordon, 2017) and this is also reflected in their lncRNA expression profiles, as most tumor-specific lncRNAs were found in only small subsets of cases (Verma et al., 2015). Interestingly, among the lncRNAs with increased levels in a subset of the DLBCL cases, 33 were located in recurrently amplified genomic regions, supporting a potential role for these lncRNAs in the pathogenesis of DLBCL. To further establish a relation between the identified lncRNAs and DLBCL biology, their co-expression with the transcriptional repressors BCL6 and EZH2, a component of the polycomb repressive complex 2 (PRC2), was assessed. A significant negative correlation with BCL6 or EZH2 expression was found for 323 and 431 lncRNAs, respectively. A significant proportion of these (> 40%) were also induced by EZH2 or BCL6 depletion, supporting the hypothesis that at least part of these lncRNAs are BCL6 or PRC2 target genes. Globally, the study showed that lncRNAs are an intrinsic part of...
tightly regulated networks in DLBCL; expression of 88% of the novel lncRNAs correlated significantly with at least one protein-coding gene (Verma et al., 2015). Unfortunately, the study was restricted to newly identified lncRNAs and excluded > 8000 previously annotated lncRNAs. A total of 465 novel lncRNAs could readily distinguish activated B cell (ABC) and germinal center B cell (GCB) DLBCL subtypes in unsupervised hierarchical clustering (Verma et al., 2015). As expected these lncRNAs did not show any overlap with the 156 annotated ABC/GCB specific lncRNAs identified in another study (Zhou et al., 2017). A subset of 17 of these 156 subtype specific lncRNAs was sufficient to distinguish the ABC and GCB subtypes with a specificity and sensitivity of approximately 90% and accordingly predicted treatment outcome (Zhou et al., 2017). CRNDE and MME-AS1, shown to be highly expressed in GC B cells (Petr et al., 2015), were among the lncRNAs with a significantly higher expression level in the GCB subtype DLBCL (Zhou et al., 2017). Other studies analyzed expression differences in DLBCL for selected lncRNA candidates based on known functions or altered expression in other cancer types. These studies identified increased levels of HOTAIR (Yan et al., 2016), HULC (Peng et al., 2016) and LUNAR1 (Peng and Feng, 2016) and decreased levels of lincRNA-p21 (Peng et al., 2017) in DLBCL tissues. Lastly, MALAT1 levels were increased in eight DLBCL cell lines compared to Epstein-Barr virus (EBV)-transformed lymphoblastoid cells (Li et al., 2017).

LncRNAs regulated by the well-known transcription factor MYC may have prevalent roles in the mediation of oncogenic MYC-induced effects. In two studies, the P493-6 B cell line carrying a tetracycline-repressible MYC allele was used to identify MYC-regulated lncRNAs. Using microarray and RNAseq these studies identified > 1200 (Winkle et al., 2015) and 534 (Hart et al., 2014) MYC-regulated lncRNAs. Re-analysis of these RNAseq data (Hart et al., 2014) by another group increased the number of MYC-regulated lncRNAs to 960 (Doose et al., 2015). In each study approximately half of the lncRNA loci were MYC-induced and the other half were MYC-repressed, similar to the pattern observed for protein coding mRNAs (Winkle et al., 2015). The comparison of MYC occupancy at MYC-responsive lncRNA and mRNA loci revealed an intriguing difference. Both, MYC-induced -and -repressed lncRNAs were enriched for MYC binding sites, while only the MYC-induced mRNAs showed enriched of MYC binding sites (Winkle et al., 2015). For mRNAs, this is in line with the hypothesis that MYC tends to further upregulate transcripts already active in a specific cell type (Lin et al., 2012; Nie et al., 2012). However, downregulated lncRNAs also seem to be actively repressed by MYC (Winkle et al., 2015). In a comparison of primary lymphoma cases with low (CLL) and high MYC levels (BL) the expected MYC-regulated pattern was observed for 54% of the differentially expressed lncRNAs (Winkle et al., 2015). Of the lncRNAs significantly up- or downregulated in BL cases compared to normal GC B cells (514 and 367 lncRNAs, respectively), 27% were identified as MYC-regulated lncRNAs (Doose et al., 2015). Further overlap of these lncRNAs with lincRNAs regulated in the hT-RPE-MycER model (retinal pigment epithelial cell line with MYC-ER fusion gene) defined a limited set of 13 common MYC-regulated lncRNAs. This small overlap is likely due to the difference in cell types, in line with previous reports describing a limited set of cell type common ‘core’ MYC target genes in the coding genome (Ji et al., 2011). One of these lncRNAs, termed MINCR (MYC-induced noncoding RNA), showed a significant correlation with MYC expression in BL cases as well as in MYC translocation positive DLBCL and FL cases (Doose et al., 2015). No clear correlation with MYC expression was observed in normal tissues or BL cell lines (Hart et al., 2016). MINCR was also identified as a MYC-regulated lncRNA in P493-6 cells (Winkle et al., 2015; Hart et al., 2014) and shown to have MYC binding sites (Winkle et al., 2015) Other annotated lncRNAs defined as MYC-induced based on multiple datasets (Winkle et al., 2015; Hart et al., 2014) include e.g. GASS, DANCRT, KTN1-AS1, MCM3AP-AS1 and OIP5-AS. As the specificity of MYC-regulation has been under debate (Lin et al., 2012; Nie et al., 2012; Lorenzin et al., 2016), disabling the nearby MYC binding sites using CRISPR-Cas9 technology may provide a more definitive answer on whether these and other MYC-induced and -repressed lncRNAs are directly regulated by MYC.

Thus although the number of profiling studies is limited, they clearly show that lncRNA expression patterns are deregulated in lymphoma. The candidate lncRNAs derived from these studies provide an excellent starting point for further studies aiming at identifying their function or assessing their potential clinical value.

4. LncRNAs with clinical value in B-cell malignancies

Reanalysis of microarray data of > 1000 DLBCL patients revealed a lncRNA signature (Sun et al., 2016) correlating with overall survival in DLBCL patients in two independent cohorts. High expression of MME-AS1, CSM2D-AS1, RP11-360F5.1, RP11-25K19.1, CTC-467M3.1 was associated with a favorable outcome, while high expression of SACS1-AS was associated with poor outcome. The six-lncRNA score remained a significant predictor of overall survival in multivariate analysis, together with age at diagnosis, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) levels and ECOG performance status (Sun et al., 2016). In line with the better prognosis of GCB DLBCL, the expression levels of MME-AS1, CSM2D-AS1 and CTC-467M3.1 was enhanced in GCB DLBCL, while expression of the risk associated lncRNA SACS1-AS was higher in ABC DLBCL (Zhou et al., 2017). These studies thus show that lncRNA expression patterns are potentially valuable biomarkers for prognosis.

High levels of MALAT1 in a group of 40 MCL patients predicted worse overall survival (Wang et al., 2016a). In contrast, a meta-analysis in multiple myeloma (MM) (n = 144) and DLBCL (n = 200 and 414) patients indicated a good prognostic potential of high MALAT1 expression levels (Wang et al., 2016b). Moreover, pre-treatment MALAT1 plasma levels were decreased in MM patients compared to healthy controls and the decrease was associated with advanced clinical stage (Istin et al., 2014). However, reduced MALAT1 levels were associated with a prolonged progression free survival in post-treatment bone marrow samples of MM patients (Cho et al., 2014). Further adding to the controversy, high expression levels of MALAT1 in mesenchymal stem cells present in the tumor microenvironment of MM patients was shown to be detrimental to disease progression (Li et al., 2014). In summary, the prognostic potential of MALAT1 remains inconclusive and requires further study in large patient cohorts using plasma, tumor cell and tumor microenvironment derived samples.

Low expression levels of lincRNA-p21 was an independent predictor of poor 5-year OS and PFS in a cohort of 105 DLBCL patients (Peng et al., 2017). In CLL patients, lincRNA-p21 plasma levels were decreased compared to healthy controls and this decrease was associated with advanced clinical stage (Istin et al., 2014). However, reduced MALAT1 levels were associated with a prolonged progression free survival in post-treatment bone marrow samples of MM patients (Cho et al., 2014). Further adding to the controversy, high expression levels of MALAT1 in mesenchymal stem cells present in the tumor microenvironment of MM patients was shown to be detrimental to disease progression (Li et al., 2014). In summary, the prognostic potential of MALAT1 remains inconclusive and requires further study in large patient cohorts using plasma, tumor cell and tumor microenvironment derived samples.

Low expression levels of lincRNA-p21 was an independent predictor of poor 5-year OS and PFS in a cohort of 105 DLBCL patients (Peng et al., 2017). In CLL patients, lincRNA-p21 plasma levels were decreased compared to healthy controls and this decrease was associated with advanced clinical stage (Istin et al., 2014). High HULC (Peng et al., 2016) and LUNAR1 (Peng and Feng, 2016) expression levels predicted worse OS and PFS in DLBCL cohorts of 147 and 87 patients, respectively. Furthermore, LUNAR1 is activated by NOTCH1 (Trimmerchi et al., 2014) and the presence of activating NOTCH1 mutations correlated with worse prognosis in CLL (Puente et al., 2011; Willander et al., 2013). High HOTAIR expression was shown to be a predictor of worse OS in 50 DLBCL patients, also as an independent predictor next to high International Prognostic Index (IPI) scores (Yan et al., 2016). However, in a DLBCL cohort of 164 cases, high HOTAIR expression levels correlated with better outcome, possibly due to the negative correlation between HOTAIR and MYC expression (Oh et al., 2016). MIAT expression was studied in 67 CLL cases (Sattari et al., 2016) and high expression was more often observed in aggressive types of CLL. Lastly, plasma levels of the lncRNA TUG1 were significantly decreased in MM and its downregulation correlated with advanced disease state (Istin et al., 2014).

Thus, lncRNAs are building up potential as valuable tools in the clinic, e.g. as prognostic indicators and biomarkers for disease.
5. Molecular functions of lymphoma associated lncRNAs

For multiple lncRNAs deregulated in lymphoma, functional studies have been performed to shed light on their precise involvement in oncogenic or tumor suppressive functions of these lncRNAs revolving around apoptosis and cell growth.

5.1. Apoptotic pathways

Functional FAS signaling is crucial for effective treatment response in lymphoma patients (Friesen et al., 1996; Friesen et al., 1999). Sensitivity to FAS ligands is regulated through alternative splicing, producing either the membrane bound FAS receptor (mFAS) or a soluble decoy receptor (sFAS). LncRNA FAS-AS1 was shown to be crucially involved in regulating this process by acting as a decoy for RNA binding motif protein 5 (RBM5). This prevents interaction of RBM5 with FAS pre-mRNA and leads to production of membrane-bound FAS (mFAS) and effective triggering of apoptosis upon binding to the FAS ligand. In lymphoma cells (bottom), FAS-AS1 transcription is shut down by polycomb repressive complex 2 (PRC2) enabling interaction of RBM5 with FAS pre-mRNA, which mediates exon 6 exclusion, leading to production of soluble (s)FAS and inhibition of apoptosis. DZNep and ibrutinib can both re-activate FAS-AS1 expression and sensitize cells to apoptosis. (B) Functional mechanisms of p53-induced lincRNA-p21 (red) and NEAT1 (blue). Interaction of LincRNA-p21 with heterogeneous nuclear ribonucleoprotein K (hnRNPK) results in (1) downregulation of p53-repressed target genes in tumor, thereby inducing apoptosis and (2) enhances p21 transcription in cis, resulting in G0/G1 cell cycle arrest. NEAT1 (blue) is essential for the formation of nuclear paraspeckles, which leads to activation of ATR signaling and thereby activates G2/M and inter-S phase checkpoints and promotes DNA repair. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
DNA repair response triggered by p53 may support cell survival and hamper the effects of genotoxic and p53-reactivation therapeutics. The formation of paraspeckles (i.e. nuclear substructures involved in RNA metabolism/translation regulation) is induced by replication stress and dependent on p53 activation as well as NEAT1 expression (Clemson et al., 2009; Adriaens et al., 2016). Interestingly, depletion of NEAT1 in cancer cell lines sensitized them to replication stress-inducing agents such as genomycin, doxorubicin and PARP inhibitors. Mechanistically, NEAT1 depletion compromised activation of DNA repair-promoting ATR signaling (Adriaens et al., 2016). Inhibition of ATR signaling in CLL and MCL cells that strongly depend on this pathway (i.e. ATMmut cells) increased chemosensitivity (Kwok et al., 2015; Menezes et al., 2015). Future work should address the precise role of NEAT1 in p53 and ATR signaling in normal and malignant B cells.

Knockdown of the lncRNA HULC in a DLBCL cell line resulted in increased apoptosis via downregulation of the anti-apoptotic BCL2 protein (Peng et al., 2016). HULC was previously shown to protect from apoptosis through transcriptional repression of the tumor suppressor EEF1E1 (P18/AIMP3), and subsequent prevention of the DNA-damage induced activation of p53 (Du et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2015).

5.2. Proliferation and growth

HOTAIR acts as a cofactor in PRC2-mediated repression via induction of H3K27me3 at specific gene loci (Rinn et al., 2007). Multiple lines of evidence suggest an important oncogenic role for PRC2 in lymphoma (reviewed in (Lund et al., 2014)): (1) The presence of recurrent activating EZH2 (i.e. the catalytic component of PRC2) mutations in GCB DLBCL, FL and BL leading to a global increase in H3K27me3 levels (Morin et al., 2010; Yap et al., 2011; Luning and Green, 2015); (2) the association of high EZH2 and H3K27me3 levels with aggressive clinicopathological features in both ABC and GCB DLBCL (Oh et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2015); and (3) accelerated MYC-driven lymphomagenesis by EZH2 activating mutations (Berg et al., 2014). In addition, increased HOTAIR expression has been observed in 23% of DLBCL cases (n = 164) and positively correlated with high EZH2 expression, but not with global H3K27me3 levels (Oh et al., 2014). This was used as an argument to support a specific rather than a global manner of H3K27me3 regulation by HOTAIR in DLBCL. Interestingly, increased HOTAIR correlated with low MYC levels (Oh et al., 2014). As MYC was previously shown to indirectly repress genes, including its own transcription, via EZH2 (Kaur and Cole, 2013) it is intriguing to speculate that HOTAIR may be involved in this autoregulatory process. Another study suggested an oncogenic role for HOTAIR in DLBCL by activation of NF-kB and phosphorylation of PI3K and AKT (Yan et al., 2016). Activation of NF-kB by HOTAIR was also described in murine cardiac muscle cell lines (Wu et al., 2016). All together these data support an important role for HOTAIR in the pathogenesis of lymphoma.

GAS5 was discovered as a transcript specifically expressed in growth-arrested cells (Schneider et al., 1988) and was shown to induce growth arrest in normal T lymphocytes (Mourtada-Maarabouni et al., 2008). Its expression is tightly regulated by mTOR, where high mTOR levels (i.e. growing cells) shut down GAS5 expression post-translationally (Smith and Steitz, 1998). mTOR signaling plays pivotal roles in B-cell differentiation (Xu et al., 2012) and the pathway is activated in B-cell malignancies (Karmali and Gordon, 2017; Limon and Fruman, 2012). Depletion of GAS5 in MCL cell lines and leukemic T cells inhibits the apoptotic response to multiple therapeutic compounds (Pickard and Williams, 2015), such as mTOR antagonists (Mourtada-Maarabouni and Williams, 2014) and demethylasenas (Mourtada-Maarabouni et al., 2008). The various molecular mechanisms described for GAS5 (Fig. 2) (reviewed in (Pickard and Williams, 2015)) are in line with its broad effects on cell growth: (1) GAS5 knockdown increased levels of CDK6, a protein involved in G1/S transition, thereby causing a more rapid cell cycle and increased proliferation (Liu et al., 2013; Lu et al., 2013); (2) GAS5 acts as a decoy for the glucocorticoid receptor, preventing transcription of target genes including the apoptosis inhibitors cIAP2 and SGK1 (Kino et al., 2010); (3) GAS5 downregulates miR-21, a known oncomiR in B-cell lymphoma (Medina et al., 2010), and miR-21 targets GAS5, thus forming a reciprocal feedback loop (Zhang et al., 2013), and (4) GAS5 downregulates MYC at the translational level via interaction with the translation initiation factor 4E (eIF4E) (Hu et al., 2014). The reported induction of GAS5 by MYC (Winkle et al., 2015; Hart et al., 2014) could indicate presence of a negative feedback loop to regulate MYC levels (Fig. 3). These studies showed that GAS5 is a potent tumor suppressor lncRNA acting as a master regulator of growth and apoptosis in B-cell lymphoma. PVT1 (located downstream of MYC) has been implicated in B-cell
lymphoma based on the association of several SNP allelics within the PVT1 locus with the risk on FL (Skibola et al., 2014), DLBCL (Bassig et al., 2015) and eHL (Enciso-Mora et al., 2010a). In addition, PVT1 is co-translocated with MYC to the immunoglobulin loci in many Bl cases (Zeidler et al., 1994) and in part of the DLBCL cases (Tsunumi et al., 2013). In MM, translocations of the PVT1 locus to non-immunoglobulin loci have been observed in 58% (7 of 12) of MM cases and 63% of MM cell lines (5 of 8) with 8q24 abnormalities (Nagoshi et al., 2012). In addition, PVT1 is frequently co-amplified in cancers with MYC copy number increase. In mice, amplification of a larger genomic region (i.e. Myc, Ptv1, Ccdc26 and Gsmdc) caused a greatly decreased tumor latency time compared to amplification of MYC alone (Tseng et al., 2014). Functional studies in other cancer types have revealed three possible modes of action for PVT1 (reviewed in (Colombo et al., 2015; Cui et al., 2016)).

First, PVT1 is the host gene for the miR-1204-1208 cluster and miR-1204 was found to be upregulated in B and T cells that highly express PVT1 (Huppi et al., 2008; Beck-Engeser et al., 2008). Ectopic expression of murine miR-1204 indirectly increased MYC levels in pre-B, but not in pro-B cells (Huppi et al., 2008). Second, PVT1 was shown to interfere with MYC phosphorylation at threonine 58, a modification that promotes MYC degradation (Tseng et al., 2014). This may result in a positive feedback mechanism, as PVT1 is induced by MYC (Winkle et al., 2015; Carramusa et al., 2007). Third, PVT1 was shown to be induced by TGF-β signaling, resulting in increased proliferation as well as further upregulation of TGF-β. This effect was dependent on the interaction of PVT1 with proliferation-associated protein NOP2 resulting in its stabilization (Wang et al., 2014). TGF-β signaling in non-Hodgkin lymphoma cells may lead to exhaustion of the T-cell effector response through upregulation of CD70 (Yang et al., 2014).

Knockdown of the MYC-regulated IncRNA MINCR caused a partial GO/G1 cell cycle arrest in hT-RPE-MycER cells (Doose et al., 2015). RNAseq analysis upon MINCR depletion revealed downregulation of a significant number of genes involved in cell cycle regulation. Several of these genes were directly regulated by MYC and their knockdown phenocopied the effects of MINCR knockdown in Bl cells (Doose et al., 2015). These data suggest that MINCR positively regulates MYC binding to promoter regions of important cell cycle regulators. The MINCR knockdown-induced effect on cell cycle arrest was observed in both MYC high and MYC low cells, suggesting that MINCR also mediates MYC-independent effects. MINCR knockdown affected a total of 1227 genes (Doose et al., 2015), suggesting a much broader function of this IncRNA (Fig. 3).

LUNAR1 was first described as a NOTCH1-induced IncRNA in T-ALL. The NOTCH1 enhancer element of LUNAR1 is located in the last intron of the downstream IGFR1 gene (Trimarchi et al., 2014). LUNAR1 was shown to positively regulate expression of IGFR1 in cis. Accordingly, LUNAR1 depletion decreased cell viability in T-ALL cell lines, while ectopic IGFR1 re-expression restored normal growth. This indicates that LUNAR1 mainly functions through the IGFR1 pathway (Trimarchi et al., 2014). Aberrant expression of both NOTCH1 (Wein et al., 2015) and IGFR1 (Liang et al., 2014) has been reported in eHL although LUNAR1 was not expressed in HL cell lines (Tayari et al., 2016). LUNAR1 was expressed in DLBCL cases (Peng and Feng, 2016), but not in primary CLL or Bl cases (Winkle et al., 2015). In DLBCL increased LUNAR1 levels were linked to cell cycle progression (Peng and Feng, 2016). As inhibition of IGFR1 in T-ALL (Trimarchi et al., 2014) and DLBCL (Stromberg et al., 2015) cell lines decreased cell viability, it would be interesting to determine whether LUNAR1 is involved in this phenotype.

MALAT1 is a proliferation and metastasis-inducing oncogene involved in many solid cancers (reviewed in (Yoshimoto et al., 2016)). MALAT1 has broad functions and acts through regulation of transcription and alternative splicing (Yoshimoto et al., 2016). Although high MALAT1 expression is described as a good prognostic factor in DLBCL patients (Wang et al., 2016a), its knockdown in DLBCL cell lines lead to decreased viability (Li et al., 2017). Specifically, MALAT1 knockdown caused increased apoptosis, cell cycle arrest and autophagy (Li et al., 2017). Mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) of MM patients consistently showed increased MALAT1 expression compared to MSCs of normal controls (Li et al., 2014). This was proposed to support tumor cell survival and bone destruction by regulating TGF-β bioavailability. This was achieved by interaction of MALAT1 with the Sp1 transcription factor, which was induced expression of LTBP3 (ca. 30 kb downstream of MALAT1) in cis (Li et al., 2014). LTBP3 regulates the bioavailability of TGF-β in the extracellular environment (Dabovic et al., 2002). Accordingly, MALAT1 levels strongly correlated with both LTBP3 and TGF-β levels in MM patient-derived MSCs (Li et al., 2014). Thus, this study is the first to reveal a significant role of IncRNA overexpression in the MSCs present in the microenvironment of the MM cells.

6. Conclusions and future perspectives

Clearly, evidence is accumulating that IncRNAs are significantly involved in B-cell development, lymphomagenesis and lymphoma cell biology. Their high cell type specific expression patterns makes them potentially novel biomarkers for different clinical applications in the coming years. In addition, modulation of IncRNAs might improve therapy response, for example by modulating FAS-AS1 levels through inhibition of EZH2 using DZNep or ibrutinib (Adriansen et al., 2016), and modulating GAS5 levels using demethylating agents (Khamas et al., 2012; Shi et al., 2015). In relation to novel or improved therapeutic approaches, IncRNAs situated in the p53 pathway or in the MYC pathway are also of particular interest.

Besides the above-discussed studies there are also other lines of evidence that point towards important roles for IncRNAs in lymphomagenesis. Firstly, GWAS studies revealed associations for SNPs within chromosomal regions referred to as ‘gene deserts’. Such SNPs may be associated with the functionality of IncRNAs as shown in a recent study linking 26% of investigated disease associated SNPs (n = 11,194) to IncRNA genes (Iyer et al., 2015). The most evident lymphoma associated SNPs are located in the PVT1 locus at 8q24 (Skibola et al., 2014; Bassig et al., 2015; Cerban et al., 2014; Enciso-Mora et al., 2010b; Crowther-Swanepoel et al., 2010). Secondly, the act of IncRNA transcription has recently been connected to recurrent genomic translocations introduced by AID and RAG1 involved in lymphomagenesis (affecting e.g. MYC, BCL-6, BCL-2). Specifically, it was shown that recurrent AID translocation hotspots are situated in genomic regions where convergent sense mRNA and antisense IncRNA transcription occurs (Meng et al., 2014; Qian et al., 2014). The antisense transcription was initiated from gene-overlapping super-enhancers. Notably, such convergent transcription also occurs at the PVT1 locus (Meng et al., 2014; Qian et al., 2014; Klein et al., 2011), possibly explaining its frequent involvement in genomic rearrangements in B cells (Zeidler et al., 1994; Tsunumi et al., 2013; Nagoshi et al., 2012). In addition, the IncRNA RP11-211G3.3.1-1 transcribed antisense of intron 1 of the BCL6 gene was shown to encompass the exact chromosomal breakpoint region in >87% of primary DLBCL cases (Lu et al., 2015). The GAS5 locus was also found to be amongst the AID-induced translocation hotspots (Klein et al., 2011). In a single DLBCL case the first exons of GAS5 were fused to the BCL6 gene, which resulted in increased BCL6 expression (Nakamura et al., 2008). Whether AID is responsible for translocations between different AID off-target (i.e. non-Ig) genes requires further investigation. Lastly, RAG1-induced breakpoints in pre-B-ALL were also enriched in enhancer regions showing convergent transcription (Heinaniemi et al., 2016). Thus, these studies support a significant role for IncRNA transcription in genome integrity in B cells.

A major factor hampering current IncRNA research is their limited evolutionary conservation (Ulitsky, 2016), which greatly restricts the use of available animal models to study their functions. In line with this, the best characterized IncRNAs are the most conserved ones, such as MALAT1, NEAT1, XIST and PVT1. In this respect, it would be of interest
to study the role of OIP5-AS in lymphoma as this lncRNA is conserved even in zebrafish (called ‘cyanor’). Its high expression observed in proliferating B cells (Petri et al., 2015), as well as its induction by MYC (Winkle et al., 2015; Hart et al., 2014) are typical features of proliferation-associated lncRNAs. Notably, OIP5-AS was shown to act as a sponge for HIF (Kim et al., 2008), a RNA-binding protein that plays an essential role in B-cell development (Diaz-Munoz et al., 2015) and regulates MYC (Mihailovich et al., 2015). The study of less conserved lncRNAs calls for the use of primary cells, humanized animal or primate models to improve our insights into their functions and interactions in vivo.

In the past decade vast advancements have been made regarding the toolbox for lncRNA research. Novel techniques such as global run-on (GRO)-sequencing (Gardini, 2017) give a detailed picture of nascent RNA transcription. In addition, lncRNA annotation databases are constantly growing (e.g. Broad institute human lncRNA catalog, LNCipedia) (Cabili et al., 2011; Volders et al., 2013), and ensure the integration of lncRNAs into systems biology, e.g. by assessment of co-expression networks with known proteins. In this regard, it is of utmost importance that raw as well as analyzed lncRNA expression datasets are made publically available to allow cross-comparisons. As lncRNA transcription is often directly linked to their functionality, the use of technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 or antisense oligonucleotides (ASOs) to achieve (co-)transcriptional knockdown should be preferred over conventional RNAi methods. lncRNA-protein interactions may be studied using either conventional protein-IP or novel lncRNA-IP techniques (e.g. ChiRIP, CHART, RAP) (Chu et al., 2012; Davis and West, 2014; Engertz et al., 2014). Lastly, RNA-FISH technology has been developed to visualize single lncRNA molecules in living cells (Cabili et al., 2015).

In conclusion, lncRNAs are quickly advancing as main players in the pathogenesis of B-cell malignancies. Some lncRNAs show potential as therapeutic targets, particularly those that are actively involved in the mediation of chemotherapeutic effects. To this end, efforts are made to develop small molecule inhibitors that specifically disrupt lncRNA-protein interactions (Pedram Fatemi et al., 2015). Furthermore, as antisense oligonucleotide-based therapies gradually make their way to the clinic (Adams et al., 2017), new ways to therapeutically target specific lncRNAs seem just a grasp away.
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