REVIEW

Tales from topographic oceans: topologically associated domains and cancer

Moray J Campbell

Division of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry, College of Pharmacy, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA

Correspondence should be addressed to M J Campbell: Campbell.1933@osu.edu**Abstract**

The 3D organization of the genome within the cell nucleus has come into sharp focus over the last decade. This has largely arisen because of the application of genomic approaches that have revealed numerous levels of genomic and chromatin interactions, including topologically associated domains (TADs). The current review examines how these domains were identified, are organized, how their boundaries arise and are regulated, and how genes within TADs are coordinately regulated. There are many examples of the disruption to TAD structure in cancer and the altered regulation, structure and function of TADs are discussed in the context of hormone responsive cancers, including breast, prostate and ovarian cancer. Finally, some aspects of the statistical insight and computational skills required to interrogate TAD organization are considered and future directions discussed.

Key Words

- ▶ topologically associated domain
- ▶ prostate cancer
- ▶ breast cancer
- ▶ ovarian cancer
- ▶ CTCF
- ▶ cohesin
- ▶ enhancer

Endocrine-Related Cancer
(2019) **26**, R611–R626

Topologically associated domains in gene regulation

The 3D organization of the nucleus

The seventeenth century development of microscopes enabled observation of biological structures, such as the eye of a fly, at a previously unprecedented level of detail. These observations led to Matthias Schleiden and Theodor Schwann in 1838 to spearhead the development of cell theory (reviewed in; [Franke 1988](#)), which proposed that cells were the basic unit of structure of all organisms, and that they were produced from preexisting cells. With ever-increasing microscopic power, cells were revealed to contain numerous sub-structures, both in the cytoplasm and the nucleus, and that indeed the nucleus was a functionally vital structure within the cell. For example, although there is considerable variability in the size, shape and longevity of cells in the human body, the nucleus they contain is remarkably consistent, being approximately

6 μ M in diameter, representing approximately 10% of the cell volume. Of course, of key importance, the nucleus contains the same genetic material.

Given its constant shape and ubiquitous nature, the nucleus has been the subject of intense study for the last several centuries, which led to the identification of sub-structures and organization. For example, analyses of the cells of sea urchin and other readily accessible model organisms revealed that the nucleus which had previously been perceived as a dark sea of unknown functions was in fact richly detailed with sub-features. These newly identified structures included the so-called 'A/B regions' which contained the so-called 'active' central part of the nucleus and the B inactive region at the periphery; the nucleolus; various 'speckled features' including the

olfactory region; and chromosomal territories. Thus, the nucleus actually contained structural components that were not static, but instead the chromosomes and other features moved on currents through the cell cycle and during differentiation. Determining how these nuclear structures and movements relate to gene regulatory processes has been a central research focus for much of the last 100 years.

Charting the topography of the nucleus was profoundly catalyzed by the publication in 2001 of the draft human genome (Olivier *et al.* 2001, Wolfsberg *et al.* 2001, Wright *et al.* 2001), which ushered in the genomics era of research. Genomic-centered research necessitated and was further catalyzed by the development of bioinformatics and statistical approaches, combined with sequencing technologies of ever-increasing precision and throughput. These statistical approaches, computational developments and technology advancements all combined to develop an unprecedented understanding of the content and structure of the nucleus, and the diversity and regulation of nucleic acids. Arising from these interdisciplinary efforts has been the concept called the 3D genome (reviewed in Gibcus & Dekker 2013, Rowley & Corces 2018, Spielmann *et al.* 2018).

Identification of topologically associated domains

Following on from the discovery of these physical structures within the nucleus and their movements, many workers focused on understanding gene regulation mechanisms with the goal to understand how genic features, such as gene enhancer regions bring about coordinated gene expression, and of which gene(s).

A well-studied and revealing gene regulatory scenario has been the analyses of the immunoglobulin (IgG) region that includes the beta and gamma-globin genes; β -globulin is initially transcribed in the fetal liver but becomes fully active during erythropoiesis in the adult bone marrow, whereas γ -globulin is strongly expressed in fetal liver and very lowly expressed in the adult bone marrow. The IgG region has become a well-examined model to investigate enhancer-gene regulation relationships, due to their essential functions and disruptions in various leukemias (reviewed in Unkeless 1989, Heijnen & van de Winkel 1997, Chenoweth *et al.* 2015). Initial studies reasoned that open chromatin sites within the locus, identified by DNAase hypersensitivity would be accessible to transcription factors and were used to identify the key features required for these dynamic gene expression patterns (Blom van Assendelft *et al.* 1989,

Hanscombe *et al.* 1991). Subsequently, studies by Fraser and colleagues extended this concept to reveal that enhancer-gene communication existed across large genomic distances (Dillon *et al.* 1997, Carter *et al.* 2002).

The concept of inter- and intra-chromosomal functional interactions was supported by earlier studies in sea urchin that had observed chromosomal co-segregation and physical contact in an ordered manner (Kojima 1960, Wang & Taylor 1979, Arceci & Gross 1980). Subsequently, non-homologous chromosomal contacts were identified in the ribosome, which includes ~300 genes in the nucleolus from five different chromosomes. Similarly, hundreds of olfactory genes from multiple chromosomes converge often in heterochromatic loci and are coordinately regulated (Gilad & Lancet 2003, Olender *et al.* 2016).

However, to catalog the potential for large-scale and dynamic interactions within and between chromosomes required new technologies and development of statistical approaches. Specifically, chromosome cross-talk was comprehensively addressed by the development of chromatin capture techniques (reviewed in Denker & de Laat 2016, Chang *et al.* 2018, Fu *et al.* 2019). These approaches leverage the possibility of capturing the physical proximity of widely spaced regions and applying next-generation sequencing technologies to define the location and extent of these associations.

In this manner, and with improvements in computational power and refinements to statistical modeling, ever more complex maps of chromatin loop formation were generated. In turn this gave rise to the concept that these loop structures were contained within topologically associated domains (TADs) (Dixon *et al.* 2012, Nora *et al.* 2012, de Laat & Duboule 2013). In parallel, other approaches revealed that lamin-associated domains (LADs) were also organized and were associated with movement of chromosomes to the outer lamina membrane of the nucleus. Remarkably, TAD structure appears to be essentially invariant across cells within a given organism, and in humans they range from ~100 kb to ~1 mb, and across cell types there are somewhere between 500 and 1500 TADs that can cover much of the genome. However, between cell types there is a significant variation in the activity of the contents of each TAD (reviewed in Roy *et al.* 2018, Krumm & Duan 2019, Wang *et al.* 2019).

There is evidence for TAD structure to be conserved between *Drosophila*, mice and humans. Indeed, TAD structure is highly conserved over syntenic chromosomal regions and it is tempting to speculate that over evolution this has influenced how evolutionary pressures have

selected genomic changes within and outside TADs as alterations are more common outside of TADs than inside, suggesting they are selected against when they occur (Harmston *et al.* 2017, Gong *et al.* 2018, Krefting *et al.* 2018).

The precise function and significance of TAD structure is still a topic of significant investigation but a consensus is that this is the unit of organization for the genome and has arisen as it gives a number of biological advantages. Namely, it allows for coordination of gene regulation programs and the integration of transcriptional signals (Dixon *et al.* 2016) (Fig. 1A). That is there are many more enhancers across the genome than there are genes to be regulated; it is estimated that there are potentially as many as ten enhancers for every gene and that these enhancers can be often exceedingly distal from target genes (Schmidl *et al.* 2014, Murakawa *et al.* 2016, Ron *et al.* 2017, Furlong & Levine 2018). By enclosing multiple genes within a regulatory TAD region, promiscuous regulation is limited, and also for those genes within the TAD coordinated regulation is more readily established. It has also emerged that TADs are hierarchical and contain smaller regions of looping within them (Hansen *et al.* 2018, Racko *et al.* 2019).

Thus, in general terms the TAD structure allows for the coordinated regulation of genes, although as with all complex biological phenomena, there is diversity in the level of organization and response. That is, the TAD structure is not the mammalian equivalent of a bacterial operon. There are strong examples of co-regulated genes within a TAD, and specific TADs are beginning to be characterized by investigators. For example, the regulation of ~1 Mb TAD on chr 5 containing the proto-cadherins has emerged as a well-investigated example (Dixon *et al.* 2012, Nora *et al.* 2012, Symmons *et al.* 2014, Jiang *et al.* 2017). Whilst these individual loci are informative, it is clear there remain areas of ambiguity in terms of how TADs are formed and regulated that suggest other mechanisms participate in gene regulation (Rodriguez-Carballo *et al.* 2017, Barutcu *et al.* 2018, Luo *et al.* 2018).

Therefore, the view has emerged that the TAD can be considered as the functional unit of the genome being strongly conserved between cell types. A significant focus of TAD research has been to establish what mechanisms drive TAD boundary formation, and how these processes are disrupted in diseases, including cancer.

Figure 1

TAD organization in health and disease. (A) In normal cells TADs are organized such that boundaries arise by the action of multi-protein complexes centered on CTCF and cohesin complexes. These act to insulate the contents of the TAD which range in size from 100 kb to 1–2 mb. Within a TAD, enhancers (in orange) regulate target genes through further looping events and exert positive and negative impacts on gene expression. Often these gene expression patterns are highly coordinated and governed by multiple enhancer interactions. (B) In cancer cells there are many examples of these processes being corrupted. There is good evidence that boundary function is altered (1) with loss and gain of boundaries and changing the TAD structure. Generally, it appears the cancer genome gains more TADs of shorter length. This change of TAD structure can change enhancer function (2, 3) such that previously insulated genes are subsequently regulated by new enhancers. This is further distorted by structural variations impacting boundary function (1) and enhancer responses (2,3). The coordinated gene regulation within a TAD also allows for emergent changes in epigenetic regulation (4). That is, mutations in epigenetic regulators such as EZH2 can modestly change the regulation of individual genes in a TAD, but the collective effect on all genes is pronounced if all the genes are on a pathway for example.

CCCTC-binding factor roles in TAD structure and genomic functions

Principal amongst the proteins that organize TAD boundaries and therefore define TAD structure is the DNA-binding factor CCCTC-binding factor (CTCF), which contains 11 zinc finger motifs and binds across the genome. Human CTCF was cloned by Filippova and colleagues in 1996 by examining regulatory sequences proximal to the *MYC* gene and used these regions as bait to identify binding proteins (Filippova *et al.* 1996). This revealed the significant relationship between CTCF and *MYC*, in which CTCF is able to repress *MYC* expression. Analyses of the multiple CTCF zinc finger motifs that revealed differential binding abilities and suggested significant dexterity in binding and function (Filippova *et al.* 2002). Of course, this intimate relationship with *MYC* directly implicated CTCF in cancer development and catalyzed an intense arena of subsequent investigation.

Again, the β -globin gene locus offered further clues to the function of CTCF binding identified sites and supported the concept that CTCF could regulate gene expression, but also act to insulate and therefore control regulation (Bell *et al.* 1999). These discoveries suggested that these CTCF functions maybe common and conserved through vertebrates and necessary for precise gene regulation. Subsequently, chromatin conformation capture (3C) technologies applied to the histocompatibility complex genes also revealed the coordination and insulation roles that were dependent on CTCF (Majumder *et al.* 2008, Majumder & Boss 2010). Chromatin immunoprecipitation and microarray approaches (ChIP-chip) initially demonstrated that at promoters, chromatin states and CTCF-binding sites were highly similar across cell types, whereas binding at enhancer regions was highly variable and correlated with cell type-specific gene expression (Heintzman *et al.* 2009, Smith *et al.* 2009).

These findings supported the concept that CTCF functions were in part dependent upon the genomic context of binding. Indeed, CTCF was shown to interact with numerous other proteins, and principal amongst these are members of the Cohesin complex (Wendt *et al.* 2008, Guo *et al.* 2012, Katainen *et al.* 2015). Cohesin-dependent TAD folding can bring distant enhancers into play with genes, and many known genomic-binding factors including the polycomb complex and YY1 all play a role in these functions (Donohoe *et al.* 2007). One process where CTCF has been extensively examined is during X inactivation (Donohoe *et al.* 2009), which has

revealed that CTCF also interacts with noncoding lncRNA including TSIX and XIST to bring about silencing in part mediated by the repressor YY1. Indeed, YY1 heterozygote mice have altered TSIX and XIST expression which was pheno-copied by knockdown of CTCF (Pugacheva *et al.* 2005, Spencer *et al.* 2011, Yang *et al.* 2015). Similarly, FIRR lncRNA plays a role in X-chromosome inactivation and shown to be dependent on NCOR2 and SHARP binding (McHugh *et al.* 2015). CTCF also demonstrates very significant flexibility in terms of the interactions it undergoes with a wide array of other proteins (Ghirlando & Felsenfeld 2016, Shin 2019). Furthermore, there are multiple CTCF isoforms ranging from 55 to 130 kD and can modify each other's behavior (Li *et al.* 2019b), and furthermore, they are the target of a variety of post-translational modifications (*et al.* 2012b, Holwerda & de Laat 2013, de Wit *et al.* 2015, Del Rosario *et al.* 2019). Analyses of CTCF genomic binding patterns and chromatin organization have identified several patterns of looping (Handoko *et al.* 2011) including active and repressive loops that are functionally dependent upon size.

Together these findings support models of diverse interactions between CTCF and its isoforms, other repressors and lncRNA in a manner that is heavily influenced by genomic context. The complexity of these interactions, and their potential genomic impact, is heightened by the discoveries that the human genome contains approximately 30,000–40,000 CTCF-binding sites (Sanyal *et al.* 2012, Narendra *et al.* 2015). Therefore, CTCF is biologically impactful as a result of the frequency and diversity of its genomic interactions.

In parallel to studies in cell models, transgenic murine studies have been undertaken and have revealed that homozygous CTCF deletion is embryonically lethal, whereas heterozygotes are viable but poor breeders. In CTCF heterozygote animals there is clear evidence for changes in TAD structure that impact enhancer promoter interactions (Splinter *et al.* 2006, Kemp *et al.* 2014). For example, one of phenotypes in these mice is disruption of glucose homeostasis due to loss of insulation around the *Pax6* locus (Tsui *et al.* 2012).

The boundary function of CTCF was conclusively demonstrated in 2015 by Narendra and colleagues by examining regulation on the *HOX* locus and established that CTCF insulates between regions of opposite *HOX* gene activity during development leading to activation of normally repressed members (Ing-Simmons *et al.* 2015, Narendra *et al.* 2015). In the context of this locus, CTCF insulates heterochromatin from euchromatin. More generally, it appears that TAD boundaries limit

spread of activity across the genome, and in this way limit transcriptional noise from bidirectional enhancers. More recently, genome-editing approaches have allowed incremental removal of CTCF-binding sites associated with the well-established *Sox9-Kcnj2* TAD on chr 11 of the murine genome. These approaches demonstrated consistent gene regulation, but subsequent gene inversions and repositioning of boundaries led to disease phenotypes suggesting that boundary erosion is required but not always sufficient for aberrant gene expression and phenotypic consequences (Despang *et al.* 2019). Therefore, the early proposition for TAD structure to limit the spread of repressive heterochromatin is probably not a universal function. Rather it now appears that the TAD structure constrains whatever is contained, be it active or repressive chromatin, and for aberrant transcriptional function other genomic distortion mechanisms may need to occur.

Mechanisms of TAD boundary formation

Although ChIP-Seq reveals that ~90% of TAD boundaries contain CTCF binding, there are many more CTCF-binding sites that are not contained within boundaries (Lobanikov & Zentner 2018, Zhang *et al.* 2018), and TAD boundary seems to be initiated and maintained by multiple proteins (Wang *et al.* 2012a, Marques *et al.* 2015, Huang *et al.* 2018). A caveat to this is that all these structures are identified in large bulk cell populations, and single-cell studies will need be applied (and technologies refined and developed) to address this issue accurately.

Although genetic and biochemical approaches have implicated different proteins in the formation of TAD boundaries, questions remain over how the protein complexes form, how are they guided, and how do they sustain boundary structure. Various models have been proposed to address this challenge including so-called 'handcuff' and 'extrusion' models (Dixon *et al.* 2016, Hansen *et al.* 2018, Racko *et al.* 2018). In the handcuff model CTCF and Cohesin have a common association, as is established with ChIA-Pet, which shows CTCF spanning TAD boundaries. That is, the Cohesin ring encircles chromatin fibers in a 30–40 nm ring and in this way, holds sister chromatids together.

Alternatively, a loop extrusion model has been proposed whereby DNA-binding complexes scan along DNA whilst also being tethered to an anchor CTCF site and do not close until it finds another CTCF motif in a convergent orientation. This process would explain why CTCF motif orientation at boundaries are convergent

(de Wit *et al.* 2015) and that loss of one CTCF motif interacting and TAD bounds shift to next one and in this manner gives a degree of inherent stability. However, this model is also incomplete. For example, fundamentally, it remains unknown what protein complex is able to scan large genomic distances of 100s of kb in opposite directions and what happens to the supercoils that would be arise in the wake.

Most likely, there is contribution from all these forces with looping from enhancer to promoter that is stabilized by protein complexes and topological changes trigger activation. Loops can be further coordinated in transcription factor hubs, which has been appreciated for several years. Pre-looped topologies give hubs that provide liquid phase transitions (Strom *et al.* 2017) to promote stabilize the hub. In this manner, the enhancer–promoter interactions have a higher diffusion rate and faster transcriptional responses.

Finally, it is interesting to note that TAD boundaries are often enriched for highly active housekeeping genes, and the nucleosome spacing is shorter resulting in greater stiffness (Hug *et al.* 2017). It is possible that changing the flexibility can impact boundary and the affinity of CTCF and that these physical properties help to illuminate CTCF-independent boundaries.

Disruption to TAD structure and CTCF in hormone-responsive cancers

Altered TAD structure and enhancer usage in hormone-responsive cancers

Given these important relationships between genomic organization and coordinate gene regulation, it is not surprising that disruption to TAD structure is strongly implicated in a wide variety of diseases. One of the clearest and earliest identified examples was of the *WNT6/IHH/EPHA4/PAX3* TAD on chr 2. Disruption and variation in boundary regions can result in the ectopic expression of these powerful developmental transcription factors in developing limb buds and leading to profound phenotypes in mice and humans (Lupianez *et al.* 2015, Koch 2016, Fabre *et al.* 2017, Wu *et al.* 2017, Cutrupi *et al.* 2018).

Similarly, epigenetic mechanisms can impact boundary formation. One of the earlier clues that de-regulated CTCF function was profoundly impactful was revealed through the altered DNA methylation at CTCF sites. Specifically, CpG methylation can impede CTCF binding and therefore remove insulator function

as a driver of myotonic dystrophy (Filippova *et al.* 2001, Lopez Castel *et al.* 2011).

Altered CTCF status and function is strongly associated with cancer (Filippova *et al.* 2002, Splinter *et al.* 2006, Kemp *et al.* 2014). Murine modeling of its actions revealed that hemizygous deletion predisposes to cancer (Kemp *et al.* 2014). Indeed, CTCF deletion is associated with deregulated and increased levels of CpG methylation, and therefore, directly links changes in CTCF function to both genomic and epigenomic disruption. Given the wide diversity of genomic and epigenomic alterations that occur in cancer, it is not surprising that they can combine with mechanisms that control TAD boundary formation and can act as cancer drivers (Fig. 1B). Loss of the cohesin complex member, RAD21, leads to reduced intra-TAD chromatin interactions, and as a result increases TAD volume (Fudenberg *et al.* 2016, Poterlowicz *et al.* 2017, Rodriguez-Carballo *et al.* 2017). Targeted disruption of CTCF leads changes TAD sizes and is antagonized by cohesin changes (Barutcu *et al.* 2018, Luo *et al.* 2018, Sima *et al.* 2019).

There are strong examples of so-called ‘enhancer hijacking’ in which genomic disruptions to TAD boundaries allows previously insulated enhancers access to neighboring genes and changes in expression (Northcott *et al.* 2014, Ryan *et al.* 2015, Cuartero & Merkenschlager 2018, Zimmerman *et al.* 2018, Haller *et al.* 2019, Martin-Garcia *et al.* 2019). This has been observed on chromosome 3 in AML where changes in CTCF expression weakens boundary and allows oncogenes to be regulated by nearby enhancers (Luo *et al.* 2018). Deletion of the CTCF motif at a boundary can shift the TAD structure and change gene regulation for example as has been shown for the HOX locus (Luo *et al.* 2018). Similar examples of such oncogenic hijacking of transcription factors is seen with NOTCH signaling in breast cancer (Petrovic *et al.* 2019), the nuclear receptor NR4A3 in acinic cell carcinomas (Haller *et al.* 2019) and in a similar manner, cyclin D highjacks enhancers from IgG locus in mantle cell lymphoma (Martin-Garcia *et al.* 2019). In other hijacking events a ~1.8 Mb TAD of chr 8 containing the MYC gene (Hyle *et al.* 2019) is extended to recruit enhancer regions that are themselves amplified in pediatric neuroblastoma (Zimmerman *et al.* 2018) by mechanisms that include insulator erosion. The net result is that enhancers associated with the lncRNA PVT1, downstream of MYC, are activated (Cho *et al.* 2018, Parolia *et al.* 2018, Ren *et al.* 2019). Pan-cancer approaches have identified altered regions containing enhancers that changed genes

expression and provided integrative framework to begin to classify these events (Weischenfeldt *et al.* 2017).

TADs are enriched for specific histone modifications such as H3K37me3, and mutations to EZH2 change its ability to govern this histone modification within a TAD. As a result, they occur more frequently than expected by chance, and therefore, a single mutation in an epigenetic regulatory protein can impact the regulation of multiple genes within a TAD. This has been demonstrated in lymphoma cells with wild-type or mutant EZH2, in EZH2 should normally target inactive TADs, and limit multiple genes to control differentiation but mutant EZH2 selectively target these genes and therefore disrupts this capacity (Donaldson-Collier *et al.* 2019).

Among hormone-responsive cancers there are examples of altered TAD regulation and structure. One of the most extensively studied is in the case of prostate cancer (PCa). In normal murine prostate development there is clear evidence that the developmental transcription factor, TBx18, is important for prostate development (Negi *et al.* 2019) and the use circularized chromosome conformation capture (4C) was used to find interacting regions that were stage and tissue specific in normal prostate development. In this manner, the authors were able to show enhancer interactions within a 1.5 Mb TAD on chr 9 that controlled TBx18 and reveal how dynamically these interactions change during differentiation.

To identify aggressive PCa phenotypes investigators in the Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) (Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network 2013, 2015) consortium and other groups (Fraser *et al.* 2017) have applied integrative genomic approaches. These and earlier studies (Tomlins *et al.* 2005) identified common translocations between TMPRSS2 and ETS genes in PCa (Tomlins *et al.* 2005, Sanda *et al.* 2017). The TMPRSS2 gene is androgen responsive, and its translocation leads to androgen-driven overexpression of the ETS transcription factor ERG, or other ETS family members, and acts as a cancer driver (Wang *et al.* 2011, 2014, Ulz *et al.* 2016). TMPRSS2:ERG fusions are being assessed as biomarkers (Tomlins *et al.* 2016) for precision medicine efforts that combine genomic information in algorithms to define disease state and predict treatment responses. This frequent translocation of ERG in prostate leads to significant changes in chromatin organization (Rickman *et al.* 2010, 2012).

Susan Clark and coworkers have focused on dissecting how this translocation and other events drive PCa. In the first instance they demonstrated changes in enhancer interactions as a result of the TMPRSS2 translocation that

may re-wire cancer signaling and lead to dysregulation of gene expression programs (Taberlay *et al.* 2014). Subsequently they used the chromatin conformation capture technique Hi-C to capture all genomic–genomic interactions in prostate models (PrEC, LNCaP, PC-3) coupled with analyses of CTCF boundaries, and other genomic histone modification data. In this manner, they were able to develop a highly textured annotation of epigenomic context and TAD associations in non-malignant and malignant cell models (Taberlay *et al.* 2016). This approach was able to demonstrate in PCa cell models that TAD boundaries were shifted, and new ones created, which overlapped with H3K4me3. That is, large TADs were divided into smaller TADs. As a result, 317 TADs were identified in PrEC whereas in the cancer cell models this increased to 622 (PC-3) and 1111 (LNCaP). Thus, it appears that larger TADs are normal and divided in cancer systems that most likely impact enhancer usage (Fig. 1B). There was also evidence that copy number variation impacts these structures. Finally, the anchor point associations of TADs correlated with changes in expression of adjacent genes, and remarkably these patterns of differential expression were identified both in cell lines and primary tumor data.

Other workers have begun to reveal the coordinated regulation of lncRNA and androgen receptor-regulated target genes were more likely within the same TAD, than different TADs (daSilva *et al.* 2018), again supporting the idea that TAD are organizational units in the cell.

In breast cancer, TAD mapping has been undertaken as part of analyses of RUNX1, and the impact of RUNX1 on TAD structure measured using Hi-C. Whilst RUNX1-binding sites were enriched at TAD boundaries, there was no significant change in the boundary structure from knockdown of RUNX1, which probably reflects the complex and stable nature of TAD boundaries. That is, they arise from many proteins interacting, but few of the protein alone can significantly change how they form (Barutcu *et al.* 2016).

Changes to CTCF function in hormone-responsive cancers

Across cancers, altered CTCF and its downstream consequences are much studied. Many workers in breast cancer have focused on mapping disease-associated enhancer access. For example, Luca Magnani and co-workers (Patten *et al.* 2018) have mapped enhancers from primary patient material and overlapped with GWAS-identified SNPs enriched in enhancers. They also

demonstrated relationships between CTCF-dependent boundaries, enhancer strength and correlation with changes in mRNA suggesting that the interplay between boundaries, enhancer access and gene expression are all measurable in primary tumors. Another approach has been to delete CTCF-binding sites within proximity to estrogen receptor alpha (ER α)-regulated target genes using genome editing and identified that some, but not all, ER α enhancer–gene relationships are altered (Korkmaz *et al.* 2019). These studies reflects those of others also in breast cancer where CTCF was shown to insulate the ER α pioneer factor, FOXA1 (Zhang *et al.* 2010) and to repress oncogenic signals downstream of ERB2 (Brix *et al.* 2019).

Indeed many ER α -regulated genes associate with CTCF and can be captured in association with enhancer regions that loop to the lamina associated with gene suppression (Fiorito *et al.* 2016) and associate with periodic expression through the cell cycle, and disruptions to these relationships associate with worse patient outcome (Yamamoto *et al.* 2014, Dominguez *et al.* 2016). Together these findings suggest that CTCF actions are a significant regulator of ER α responses (Chan & Song 2008) related to specific histology (Razavi *et al.* 2018) and overall outcomes.

In prostate cancer, CTCF sites associated with outcome identified by GWAS and CRISPR deletion of sites leads to increased gene expression of genes within loops and that FOXA1, AR and in same CTCF block (Taslim *et al.* 2012).

Workers have also examined how CTCF mutations and expression changes impacts the epigenome in ovarian cancer and established relationships to disease progression risks (Woloszynska-Read *et al.* 2011). Furthermore, the CTCF paralog, BORIS (Brother of the Regulator of Imprinted Sites) is altered in ovarian cancer and changes enhancer access and promotes invasive phenotypes (Hillman *et al.* 2019).

In pancreatic cancer a focus has been on the regulation of the PAX6 gene which is required for islet development, and it has been revealed that CTCF regulates the locus (Buckle *et al.* 2018), reflecting the phenotype of the CTCF heterozygote deletion in mice (Tsui *et al.* 2012). Pancreatic cancer has also been a cancer in which the interplay between CTCF and repression of MYC has been seen to be associated with progression and outcomes (Peng *et al.* 2019). Bioinformatic approaches have also been applied to integrate GWAS data with CTCF-binding sites and therefore identify a critical impact of a risk variant with altered boundary function and reduced expression of the putative anti-oncogene MFSD13A (Mei *et al.* 2019).

In testes the CTCF/BORIS regulation of gene programs is expressed in primary spermatocytes but then silenced by DNA methylation. Reactivation in cancer cells is apparent making it a cancer testes antigen gene expression and a potential target for immunotherapy (Martin-Kleiner 2012). Reactivation of BORIS can bind hTERT and increase expression in ovarian and testicular cancers (Renaud *et al.* 2011). Finally, in the pituitary the human growth hormone cluster has been investigated and shown long-range genomic interactions (Tsai *et al.* 2014, 2016), but it remains to be established how important this is in pituitary cancer.

A survey of CTCF and interacting components in hormone-responsive cancers

To complement this review TCGA data from the adrenal, breast, kidney, ovarian, pancreatic, parathyroid, prostate, testis and thyroid cancer cohorts have been examined to reveal the mutation, copy number variation and expression of CTCF and genes for the various interacting proteins (Fig. 2). By mutational status, breast, ovarian and adrenocortical tumors cluster together driven by common mutations to cohesin complex (e.g. SMC3) and other chromosomal structural proteins (e.g. NCAPH2 and

REC8). The lncRNA HOTTIP is also frequently mutated in these tumors. By contrast, kidney, parathyroid and testicular cancers are essentially free from mutation in any of the genes examined. CTCF is not commonly mutated.

This is somewhat echoed by changes in copy number variation with NCAPH2 and SMC1B showing copy number loss in ovarian and adrenal cancer. CTCF has common loss in ovarian and breast cancer, but gain in adrenal cancer. However, there are other clear differences, with kidney cancer for example showing clear copy number loss for SMC3 but not mutation. Notable gains in copy number included RAD21 and STAG1 in ovarian and RAD21 also in adrenal, testicular and breast cancers. STAG3 is also amplified in adrenal, kidney and testicular cancers. Similarly, STAG1 has loss of copy number variation and reduced expression uniquely in pheochromocytoma. These findings reflect an emerging appreciation of the role of STAG family members across cancers (Cheng *et al.* 2015, Mondal *et al.* 2019, Romero-Perez *et al.* 2019). Whilst not mutated in any of the cancer NCOR2 is highly amplified in adrenal cancer, as are HOTTIP, NCAPG2 and EZH2, which are all mutated in the same cancer. Expression changes also distinguish ovarian cancer with reduced expression of CTCF, NCAPH2 and upregulation of SMC4. These patterns are somewhat echoed by breast and

Figure 2

Mutation, copy number variation and expression of genes involved in boundary formation in hormone responsive cancers. Gene mutation, copy number variation and expression z-score pan-cancer data for breast (BRCA), ovarian (OV), pancreatic (PAAD), prostate (PRAD), thyroid (TH), pheochromocytoma (PCPG), testicular germ cell (TCG), adrenocortical cancers (ACC) were downloaded using the R platform for statistical computing using the cgdR package. The genes selected were chosen by the studies highlighted in the text, as well as choosing paralogs identified by Human Genome Nomenclature. Gene mutation and copy number variation data was normalized to the number of tumors within the cohort, and also normalized to gene length for the mutation data. The normalized mutation, copy number variation and expression were then visualized as a heatmap (pheatmap) using average Manhattan clustering.

kidney cancers. The amplification of NCOR2 in adrenal cancer is reflected by modest upregulation of the mRNA. Similarly, SMC1B has a modest gain of copy number in kidney cancer but strong mRNA upregulation.

Statistical and computational challenges in the analyses of TADs

Statistical and computational frameworks were essential for the capture, analyses and interpretation of chromatin conformation data, and the development of these frameworks finally enabled the genome wide analyses in Hi-C data (2012) (Dixon *et al.* 2012, Nora *et al.* 2012). These approaches apply complex genomic analyses and there are several areas where variance can impact the data interpretation, from wet-lab experimental parameters to dry-lab analyses. An ongoing challenge is to harmonize these techniques and analytical pipelines. These include cross-linking parameters, choice of restriction enzymes and library preparation. Similarly, the statistical approaches differ in their assumptions, for example how to model the distribution of the data, how to consider the impact of distance between events, and how best to determine differential TAD events (Mora *et al.* 2016, Stansfield *et al.* 2019).

There are multiple algorithms to identify TADs. For example, Dali and Blanchette (Dali & Blanchette 2017) recently compared seven algorithms. Interestingly, the requirements of RAM to run algorithms whilst significant (~20 Gb), depending on the resolution for example, 100 kb compared to 25 kb, is now such that once the raw read data are aligned, the analyses can be undertaken on most

desktop computers. Perhaps, the optimal resolution to consider TAD analyses is around 50 kb and requires 500 million reads. Naturally, with higher resolution, more TADs are predicted and the mean size decreases. Among most of the commonly used algorithms there ~75% sites convergence predicted in at least two tools e.g. with HiCseg (Levy-Leduc *et al.* 2014), TopDom (Shin *et al.* 2016). Tools probably are very conservative and underestimate by missing 25% of manually annotated TADs (Stansfield *et al.* 2019) (Table 1).

Of course, a challenge for the field in both wet-lab design and dry-lab analyses is that the work to-date is from bulk culture and there is a need to undertake single cell or purified cell populations to ensure that TAD structure is not an emergent property from cell population averaging. Recently, this issue has been addressed by complementary approaches in single cells using partition ~30 kb across a region of chromosome 21. Interestingly, this revealed TAD structure and associations with CTCF and cohesin preference; cohesin depletion did not impact structure at single cell suggesting its CTCF-cohesion that is important (Bintu *et al.* 2018). In parallel, others are optimizing single-cell approaches that combine Hi-C and imaging and suggest that there are areas of significant heterogeneity between cells in terms of genomic and allele-specific organization (Finn *et al.* 2019).

However, perhaps, the greatest challenge will be the data integration approaches, which will be designed, implemented and interpreted by bioinformatically trained researchers. We now stand approximately 50 years after the conception of bioinformatics (reviewed in Hogeweg 2011) and, in comparison to the 50-year widespread application of molecular biology (Weaver 1970, Danna & Nathans 1971,

Table 1 Representative computational packages for analyses of chromatin capture experiments. Each package is implemented in the R language for statistical computing and the focus of the data type and function of the analytical approach alongside the relevant publications are indicated.

Package	Focus	Function	Publication
sevenC	CTCF ChIP-Seq	Predicts chromatin loops from CTCF ChIP-Seq data	
diffloop	ChIA-PET and RNA-Seq	Identify differential chromatin topology between cell conditions and annotate with gene expression	Yang <i>et al.</i> 2015
R3Cseq	3C	Identify genomic loops between two fixed points	Yauy <i>et al.</i> 2018
CHiCAGO	Capture-Hi-C	Analyses of HiC data that are enriched for genomic features of interest	Zhang <i>et al.</i> 2018
HiTC	Hi-C	Normalization and visualization of Hi-C data, TAD detection	Zhang <i>et al.</i> 2010
multiHiCcompare	Hi-C	Normalization and visualization of Hi-C data, TAD detection	Tomlins <i>et al.</i> 2005
HiCRep HiCseg	Hi-C	Assess reproducibility in Hi-C data, and normalization and visualization of Hi-C data, TAD detection	Zimmerman <i>et al.</i> 2018
TopDom	Hi-C	Normalization and visualization of Hi-C data, TAD detection	Ulz <i>et al.</i> 2016

Saiki *et al.* 1988, Hunkapiller *et al.* 1991), it is far from clear that bioinformatics is on a trajectory to also become democratized. Currently, it is far from clear how the research community stands in terms of the widespread application of bioinformatics. The unprecedented insight generated by the large-scale biological meta-projects such as The Human Genome Project (Roberts *et al.* 2001), ENCODE (ENCODE Consortium Project 2007, Birney 2012), RoadMap Epigenome (Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium 2015), FANTOM (Sanli *et al.* 2013), IHEC (Bujold *et al.* 2016, Chen *et al.* 2016) and TCGA (Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network 2013) was achieved in large part through the success of the intensive data analytic initiatives within these projects. Unfortunately, at present, there is a worrying possibility that, given the ever-increasing computational and statistical requirements to map genomic topology, these remarkable achievements will themselves become islands of bioinformatically driven genomic insight in oceans of reductionist biology. This will profoundly impede dissection and exploitation of how TAD structure governs hormonal signaling and is corrupted in cancer.

Summary and future challenges

The visual density of the nucleus impeded early workers from appreciating the diversity of the structure–function relationships that were dynamically regulated across the life-cycle of the cell. Advancements in microscopy and the development of molecular biology techniques enabled significant developments in understanding, but the major catalyst for deciphering genomic organization and function was sequencing the human genome, and the development of statistical approaches and computational resources to undertake complex genomic analyses. This led to the first attempts to capture the 3D genome in 2012 and the identification of TADs (Dixon *et al.* 2012, Nora *et al.* 2012). Subsequently, it has become clear that the TAD structure is both biologically important and provides a major conceptual level for understanding genomic organization and gene regulation.

In terms of understanding how TAD structure can impact hormone-responsive cancers, there are both opportunities and challenges. The opportunity exists to integrate the understanding of TAD structure and organization into a comprehensive understanding of cancer and progression risks. For example, the choices of genomic bindings sites (cistrome) for either the ER α in breast cancer or the AR in prostate cancer are

highly diverse. Understanding is emerging of the forces that shape these cistromes and how they determine the magnitude and amplitude of transcriptional signals (transcriptome), but many questions remain. It is unclear how TAD structure truly determines these cistrome–transcriptome relationships, and which mechanisms distort these actions in cancer progression and therapy resistance. There are clear examples of TAD boundary erosion and enhancer hijacking, but it is largely unknown at the genome-wide level how germline variation, somatic structural variation and epigenomic mechanisms may each contribute to these processes of boundary erosion and determining enhancer promiscuity.

In many ways, this is a readily achievable research goal at least within cell models; 3D genomic approaches are well developed as are cistromic and transcriptomic methodologies. However, this now raises the prospect that hormone responsive cancer research will require 3D-cistrome-transcriptome data capture and analyses. Collectively, this is neither a trivial experimental challenge nor a financially modest endeavor. However, significant efforts have been made by leaders in the field to generate 3D genome browsers that will potentially enable more rapid assimilation of this information to the wider research community (Robinson *et al.* 2018, Wang *et al.* 2018, Yaury *et al.* 2018, Li *et al.* 2019a, Morita *et al.* 2019).

Transition into patient samples is always more challenging, but there is a realistic possibility that greater understanding in the basic biology of TAD structure and function and how germline variation, somatic structural variation and epigenomic mechanisms converge selectively on specific TAD will lead to a personalized prediction of individual risk of disease and progression. For example, analyses of peripheral blood cells will reveal germline interplay with TAD boundary structure, and analyses of circulating tumor cells will similarly reveal how these boundaries are distorted. Computational approaches can impute or predict TAD structure and intra-TAD configuration (Sauerwald *et al.* 2017, Matthews & Waxman 2018).

In turn, mathematical modeling of these approaches within a systems biology framework will allow predictive modeling of hormonal responsiveness, perhaps in the first instance for key cancer pre-disposing TADs such as the one on chr 8 containing MYC. It is highly likely that analyses of how germline variation, somatic structural variation and epigenomic mechanisms impacts TAD structure and in turn governs hormone signaling and will be essential to develop a more complete understanding

of how hormone responsive cancers arise in humans, propagate and respond to therapies.

Declaration of interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest that could be perceived as prejudicing the impartiality of this review.

Funding

This work was funded by the Prostate program of the Department of Defense Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs [W81XWH-14-1-0608] and from the National Cancer Institute (NCI) grant awarded to the OSUCCC The James, CCSG P30CA016058

References

- Arceci RJ & Gross PR 1980 Histone gene expression: progeny of isolated early blastomeres in culture make the same change as in the embryo. *Science* **209** 607–609. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7394523>)
- Barutcu AR, Hong D, Lajoie BR, McCord RP, van Wijnen AJ, Lian JB, Stein JL, Dekker J, Imbalzano AN & Stein GS 2016 RUNX1 contributes to higher-order chromatin organization and gene regulation in breast cancer cells. *Biochimica & Biophysica Acta* **1859** 1389–1397. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbaggm.2016.08.003>)
- Barutcu AR, Maass PG, Lewandowski JP, Weiner CL & Rinn JL 2018 A TAD boundary is preserved upon deletion of the CTCF-rich Firre locus. *Nature Communications* **9** 1444. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03614-0>)
- Bell AC, West AG & Felsenfeld G 1999 The protein CTCF is required for the enhancer blocking activity of vertebrate insulators. *Cell* **98** 387–396. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674\(00\)81967-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674(00)81967-4))
- Bintu B, Mateo LJ, Su JH, Sinnott-Armstrong NA, Parker M, Kinrot S, Yamaya K, Boettiger AN & Zhuang X 2018 Super-resolution chromatin tracing reveals domains and cooperative interactions in single cells. *Science* **362** eaau1783. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau1783>)
- Birney E 2012 The making of ENCODE: lessons for big-data projects. *Nature* **489** 49–51. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/489049a>)
- Blom van Assendelft G, Hanscombe O, Grosveld F & Greaves DR 1989 The beta-globin dominant control region activates homologous and heterologous promoters in a tissue-specific manner. *Cell* **56** 969–977. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674\(89\)90630-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674(89)90630-2))
- Brix DM, Tvingsholm SA, Hansen MB, Clemmensen KB, Ohman T, Siino V, Lambrugh M, Hansen K, Puustinen P, Gromova I, et al. 2019 Release of transcriptional repression via ErbB2-induced, SUMO-directed phosphorylation of myeloid zinc finger-1 serine 27 activates lysosome redistribution and invasion. *Oncogene* **38** 3170–3184. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41388-018-0653-x>)
- Buckle A, Nozawa RS, Kleinjan DA & Gilbert N 2018 Functional characteristics of novel pancreatic Pax6 regulatory elements. *Human Molecular Genetics* **27** 3434–3448. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddy255>)
- Bujold D, Morais DAL, Gauthier C, Côté C, Caron M, Kwan T, Chen KC, Laperle J, Markovits AN, Pastinen T, et al. 2016 The International Human Epigenome Consortium Data portal. *Cell Systems* **3** 496–499. e2. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2016.10.019>)
- Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network 2015 The molecular taxonomy of primary prostate cancer. *Cell* **163** 1011–1025. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.10.025>)
- Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, Weinstein JN, Collisson EA, Mills GB, Shaw KR, Ozenberger BA, Ellrott K, Shmulevich I, Sander C, Stuart JM, et al. 2013 The Cancer Genome Atlas Pan-Cancer analysis project. *Nature Genetics* **45** 1113–1120. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.2764>)
- Carter D, Chakalova L, Osborne CS, Dai YF & Fraser P 2002 Long-range chromatin regulatory interactions in vivo. *Nature Genetics* **32** 623–626. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng1051>)
- Chan CS & Song JS 2008 CCCTC-binding factor confines the distal action of estrogen receptor. *Cancer Research* **68** 9041–9049. (<https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-2632>)
- Chang P, Gohain M, Yen MR & Chen PY 2018 Computational methods for assessing chromatin hierarchy. *Computational & Structural Biotechnology Journal* **16** 43–53. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2018.02.003>)
- Chen L, Ge B, Casale FP, Vasquez L, Kwan T, Garrido-Martín D, Watt S, Yan Y, Kundu K, Ecker S, et al. 2016 Genetic drivers of epigenetic and transcriptional variation in human immune cells. *Cell* **167** 1398–1414.e24. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.10.026>)
- Cheng F, Liu C, Lin CC, Zhao J, Jia P, Li WH & Zhao Z 2015 A gene gravity model for the evolution of cancer genomes: a study of 3,000 cancer genomes across 9 cancer types. *PLOS Computational Biology* **11** e1004497. (<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004497>)
- Chenoweth AM, Trist HM, Tan PS, Wines BD & Hogarth PM 2015 The high-affinity receptor for IgG, FcγRI, of humans and non-human primates. *Immunological Reviews* **268** 175–191. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/imr.12366>)
- Cho SW, Xu J, Sun R, Mumbach MR, Carter AC, Chen YG, Yost KE, Kim J, He J, Nevins SA, et al. 2018 Promoter of lncRNA gene PVT1 is a tumor-suppressor DNA boundary element. *Cell* **173** 1398–1412. e22. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.03.068>)
- Cuartero S & Merkenschlager M 2018 Three-dimensional genome organization in normal and malignant haematopoiesis. *Current Opinion in Hematology* **25** 323–328. (<https://doi.org/10.1097/MOH.0000000000000436>)
- Cutrupi AN, Brewer MH, Nicholson GA & Kennerson ML 2018 Structural variations causing inherited peripheral neuropathies: a paradigm for understanding genomic organization, chromatin interactions, and gene dysregulation. *Molecular Genetics & Genomic Medicine* **6** 422–433. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/mgg3.390>)
- Dali R & Blanchette M 2017 A critical assessment of topologically associating domain prediction tools. *Nucleic Acids Research* **45** 2994–3005. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx145>)
- Danna K & Nathans D 1971 Specific cleavage of simian virus 40 DNA by restriction endonuclease of Hemophilus influenzae. *PNAS* **68** 2913–2917. (<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.68.12.2913>)
- daSilva LF, Beckedorff FC, Ayupe AC, Amaral MS, Mesel V, Videira A, Reis EM, Setubal JC & Verjovski-Almeida S 2018 Chromatin landscape distinguishes the genomic loci of hundreds of androgen-receptor-associated lncRNAs from the loci of non-associated lncRNAs. *Frontiers in Genetics* **9** 132. (<https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2018.00132>)
- de Laat W & Duboule D 2013 Topology of mammalian developmental enhancers and their regulatory landscapes. *Nature* **502** 499–506. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12753>)
- de Wit E, Vos ES, Holwerda SJ, Valdes-Quezada C, Verstegen MJ, Teunissen H, Splinter E, Wijchers PJ, Krijger PH & de Laat W 2015 CTCF binding polarity determines chromatin looping. *Molecular Cell* **60** 676–684. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2015.09.023>)
- Del Rosario BC, Kriz AJ, Del Rosario AM, Anselmo A, Fry CJ, White FM, Sadreyev RI & Lee JT 2019 Exploration of CTCF post-translational modifications uncovers Serine-224 phosphorylation by PLK1 at pericentric regions during the G2/M transition. *eLife* **8** e42341. (<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.42341>)
- Denker A & de Laat W 2016 The second decade of 3C technologies: detailed insights into nuclear organization. *Genes & Development* **30** 1357–1382. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.281964.116>)

- Despang A, Schöpflin R, Franke M, Ali S, Jerković I, Paliou C, Chan WL, Timmermann B, Wittler L, Vingron M, *et al.* 2019 Functional dissection of the Sox9-Kcnj2 locus identifies nonessential and instructive roles of TAD architecture. *Nature Genetics* **51** 1263–1271. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0466-z>)
- Dillon N, Trimborn T, Strouboulis J, Fraser P & Grosveld F 1997 The effect of distance on long-range chromatin interactions. *Molecular Cell* **1** 131–139. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S1097-2765\(00\)80014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1097-2765(00)80014-3))
- Dixon JR, Selvaraj S, Yue F, Kim A, Li Y, Shen Y, Hu M, Liu JS & Ren B 2012 Topological domains in mammalian genomes identified by analysis of chromatin interactions. *Nature* **485** 376–380. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11082>)
- Dixon JR, Gorkin DU & Ren B 2016 Chromatin domains: the unit of chromosome organization. *Molecular Cell* **62** 668–680. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2016.05.018>)
- Dominguez D, Tsai YH, Gomez N, Jha DK, Davis I & Wang Z 2016 A high-resolution transcriptome map of cell cycle reveals novel connections between periodic genes and cancer. *Cell Research* **26** 946–962. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/cr.2016.84>)
- Donaldson-Collier MC, Sungalee S, Zufferey M, Tavernari D, Katanayeva N, Battistello E, Mina M, Douglass KM, Rey T, Raynaud F, *et al.* 2019 EZH2 oncogenic mutations drive epigenetic, transcriptional, and structural changes within chromatin domains. *Nature Genetics* **51** 517–528. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0338-y>)
- Donohoe ME, Zhang LF, Xu N, Shi Y & Lee JT 2007 Identification of a Ctf cofactor, Yy1, for the X chromosome binary switch. *Molecular Cell* **25** 43–56. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2006.11.017>)
- Donohoe ME, Silva SS, Pinter SF, Xu N & Lee JT 2009 The pluripotency factor Oct4 interacts with Ctf and also controls X-chromosome pairing and counting. *Nature* **460** 128–132. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08098>)
- ENCODE Consortium Project, Birney E, Stamatoyanopoulos JA, Dutta A, Guigó R, Gingeras TR, Margulies EH, Weng Z, Snyder M, Dermitzakis ET, *et al.* 2007 Identification and analysis of functional elements in 1% of the human genome by the ENCODE pilot project. *Nature* **447** 799–816. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05874>)
- Fabre PJ, Leleu M, Mormann BH, Lopez-Delisle L, Noordermeer D, Beccari L & Duboule D 2017 Large scale genomic reorganization of topological domains at the HoxD locus. *Genome Biology* **18** 149. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-017-1278-z>)
- Filippova GN, Fagerlie S, Klenova EM, Myers C, Dehner Y, Goodwin G, Neiman PE, Collins SJ & Lobanenkov VV 1996 An exceptionally conserved transcriptional repressor, CTCF, employs different combinations of zinc fingers to bind diverged promoter sequences of avian and mammalian c-myc oncogenes. *Molecular & Cellular Biology* **16** 2802–2813. (<https://doi.org/10.1128/mcb.16.6.2802>)
- Filippova GN, Thienes CP, Penn BH, Cho DH, Hu YJ, Moore JM, Klesert TR, Lobanenkov VV & Tapscott SJ 2001 CTCF-binding sites flank CTG/CAG repeats and form a methylation-sensitive insulator at the DM1 locus. *Nature Genetics* **28** 335–343. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng570>)
- Filippova GN, Qi CF, Ulmer JE, Moore JM, Ward MD, Hu YJ, Loukinov DI, Pugacheva EM, Klenova EM, Grundy PE, *et al.* 2002 Tumor-associated zinc finger mutations in the CTCF transcription factor selectively alter its DNA-binding specificity. *Cancer Research* **62** 48–52.
- Finn EH, Pegoraro G, Brandao HB, Valton AL, Oomen ME, Dekker J, Mirny L & Misteli T 2019 Extensive heterogeneity and intrinsic variation in spatial genome organization. *Cell* **176** 1502–1515.e10. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2019.01.020>)
- Fiorito E, Sharma Y, Gilfillan S, Wang S, Singh SK, Satheesh SV, Katika MR, Urbanucci A, Thiede B, Mills IG, *et al.* 2016 CTCF modulates estrogen receptor function through specific chromatin and nuclear matrix interactions. *Nucleic Acids Research* **44** 10588–10602. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw785>)
- Franke WW 1988 Matthias Jacob Schleiden and the definition of the cell nucleus. *European Journal of Cell Biology* **47** 145–156.
- Fraser M, Sabelnykova VY, Yamaguchi TN, Heisler LE, Livingstone J, Huang V, Shiah YJ, Yousif F, Lin X, Masella AP, *et al.* 2017 Genomic hallmarks of localized, non-indolent prostate cancer. *Nature* **541** 359–364. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature20788>)
- Fu S, Zhang L, Lv J, Zhu B, Wang W & Wang X 2019 Two main stream methods analysis and visual 3D genome architecture. *Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology* **90** 43–53. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdb.2018.07.011>)
- Fudenberg G, Imakaev M, Lu C, Goloborodko A, Abdennur N & Mirny LA 2016 Formation of chromosomal domains by loop extrusion. *Cell Reports* **15** 2038–2049. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2016.04.085>)
- Furlong EEM & Levine M 2018 Developmental enhancers and chromosome topology. *Science* **361** 1341–1345. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau0320>)
- Ghirlando R & Felsenfeld G 2016 CTCF: making the right connections. *Genes & Development* **30** 881–891. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.277863.116>)
- Gibcus JH & Dekker J 2013 The hierarchy of the 3D genome. *Molecular Cell* **49** 773–782. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2013.02.011>)
- Gilad Y & Lancet D 2003 Population differences in the human functional olfactory repertoire. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **20** 307–314. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msg013>)
- Gong Y, Lazaris C, Sakellaropoulos T, Lozano A, Kambadur P, Ntziachristos P, Aifantis I & Tsigros A 2018 Stratification of TAD boundaries reveals preferential insulation of super-enhancers by strong boundaries. *Nature Communications* **9** 542. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03017-1>)
- Guo Y, Monahan K, Wu H, Gertz J, Varley KE, Li W, Myers RM, Maniatis T & Wu Q 2012 CTCF/cohesin-mediated DNA looping is required for protocadherin alpha promoter choice. *PNAS* **109** 21081–21086. (<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1219280110>)
- Haller F, Bieg M, Will R, Körner C, Weichenhan D, Bott A, Ishaque N, Lutsik P, Moskalev EA, Mueller SK, *et al.* 2019 Enhancer hijacking activates oncogenic transcription factor NR4A3 in acinic cell carcinomas of the salivary glands. *Nature Communications* **10** 368. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08069-x>)
- Handoko L, Xu H, Li G, Ngan CY, Chew E, Schnapp M, Lee CW, Ye C, Ping JL, Mulawadi F, *et al.* 2011 CTCF-mediated functional chromatin interactome in pluripotent cells. *Nature Genetics* **43** 630–638. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.857>)
- Hanscombe O, Whyatt D, Fraser P, Yannoutsos N, Greaves D, Dillon N & Grosveld F 1991 Importance of globin gene order for correct developmental expression. *Genes & Development* **5** 1387–1394. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.5.8.1387>)
- Hansen AS, Cattoglio C, Darzacq X & Tjian R 2018 Recent evidence that TADs and chromatin loops are dynamic structures. *Nucleus* **9** 20–32. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/19491034.2017.1389365>)
- Harmston N, Ing-Simmons E, Tan G, Perry M, Merkenschlager M & Lenhard B 2017 Topologically associating domains are ancient features that coincide with Metazoan clusters of extreme noncoding conservation. *Nature Communications* **8** 441. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00524-5>)
- Heijnen IA & van de Winkel JG 1997 Human IgG Fc receptors. *International Reviews of Immunology* **16** 29–55. (<https://doi.org/10.3109/08830189709045702>)
- Heintzman ND, Hon GC, Hawkins RD, Kheradpour P, Stark A, Harp LE, Ye Z, Lee LK, Stuart RK, Ching CW, *et al.* 2009 Histone modifications at human enhancers reflect global cell-type-specific gene expression. *Nature* **459** 108–112. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07829>)
- Hillman JC, Pugacheva EM, Barger CJ, Sribeja S, Rosario S, Albahrani M, Truskinovsky AM, Stableski A, Liu S, Loukinov DI, *et al.* 2019 BORIS expression in ovarian cancer precursor cells alters the CTCF cistrome and enhances invasiveness through *GALNT14*.

- Molecular Cancer Research [epub]. (<https://doi.org/10.1158/1541-7786.MCR-19-0310>)
- Hogeweg P 2011 The roots of bioinformatics in theoretical biology. *PLOS Computational Biology* **7** e1002021. (<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002021>)
- Holwerda SJ & de Laat W 2013 CTCF: the protein, the binding partners, the binding sites and their chromatin loops. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* **368** 20120369. (<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0369>)
- Huang J, Li K, Cai W, Liu X, Zhang Y, Orkin SH, Xu J & Yuan GC 2018 Dissecting super-enhancer hierarchy based on chromatin interactions. *Nature Communications* **9** 943. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03279-9>)
- Hug CB, Grimaldi AG, Kruse K & Vaquerizas JM 2017 Chromatin architecture emerges during zygotic genome activation independent of transcription. *Cell* **169** 216–228.e19. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2017.03.024>)
- Hunkapiller T, Kaiser RJ, Koop BF & Hood L 1991 Large-scale and automated DNA sequence determination. *Science* **254** 59–67. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1925562>)
- Hyle J, Zhang Y, Wright S, Xu B, Shao Y, Easton J, Tian L, Feng R, Xu P & Li C 2019 Acute depletion of CTCF directly affects MYC regulation through loss of enhancer-promoter looping. *Nucleic Acids Research* **47** 6699–6713. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkz462>)
- Ing-Simmons E, Seitan VC, Faure AJ, Flicek P, Carroll T, Dekker J, Fisher AG, Lenhard B & Merkenschlager M 2015 Spatial enhancer clustering and regulation of enhancer-proximal genes by cohesin. *Genome Research* **25** 504–513. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.184986.114>)
- Jiang Y, Loh YE, Rajarajan P, Hirayama T, Liao W, Kassim BS, Javidfar B, Hartley BJ, Kleofas L, Park RB, *et al.* 2017 The methyltransferase SETDB1 regulates a large neuron-specific topological chromatin domain. *Nature Genetics* **49** 1239–1250. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3906>)
- Katainen R, Dave K, Pitkänen E, Palin K, Kivioja T, Välimäki N, Gylfe AE, Ristolainen H, Hänninen UA, Cajuso T, *et al.* 2015 CTCF/cohesin-binding sites are frequently mutated in cancer. *Nature Genetics* **47** 818–821. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3335>)
- Kemp CJ, Moore JM, Moser R, Bernard B, Teater M, Smith LE, Rabaia NA, Gurley KE, Guinney J, Busch SE, *et al.* 2014 CTCF haploinsufficiency destabilizes DNA methylation and predisposes to cancer. *Cell Reports* **7** 1020–1029. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2014.04.004>)
- Koch L 2016 Chromatin: going a TAD out on a limb. *Nature Reviews. Genetics* **17** 717. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2016.140>)
- Kojima MK 1960 Acceleration of the cleavage of sea urchin eggs by vital staining with neutral red. *Experimental Cell Research* **20** 565–573. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-4827\(60\)90124-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-4827(60)90124-5))
- Korkmaz G, Manber Z, Lopes R, Prekovic S, Schuurman K, Kim Y, Teunissen H, Flach K, de Wit E, Galli GG, *et al.* 2019 A CRISPR-Cas9 screen identifies essential CTCF anchor sites for estrogen receptor-driven breast cancer cell proliferation. *Nucleic Acids Research* (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkz675>)
- Krefting J, Andrade-Navarro MA & Ibn-Salem J 2018 Evolutionary stability of topologically associating domains is associated with conserved gene regulation. *BMC Biology* **16** 87. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-018-0556-x>)
- Krumm A & Duan Z 2019 Understanding the 3D genome: emerging impacts on human disease. *Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology* **90** 62–77. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdb.2018.07.004>)
- Levy-Leduc C, Delattre M, Mary-Huard T & Robin S 2014 Two-dimensional segmentation for analyzing Hi-C data. *Bioinformatics* **30** i386–i392. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu443>)
- Li D, Hsu S, Purushotham D, Sears RL & Wang T 2019a WashU epigenome browser update 2019. *Nucleic Acids Research* **47** W158–W165. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkz348>)
- Li J, Huang K, Hu G, Babarinde IA, Li Y, Dong X, Chen YS, Shang L, Guo W, Wang J, *et al.* 2019b An alternative CTCF isoform antagonizes canonical CTCF occupancy and changes chromatin architecture to promote apoptosis. *Nature Communications* **10** 1535. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08949-w>)
- Lobanenkov VV & Zentner GE 2018 Discovering a binary CTCF code with a little help from BORIS. *Nucleus* **9** 33–41. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/19491034.2017.1394536>)
- Lopez Castel A, Nakamori M, Tome S, Chitayat D, Gourdon G, Thornton CA & Pearson CE 2011 Expanded CTG repeat demarcates a boundary for abnormal CpG methylation in myotonic dystrophy patient tissues. *Human Molecular Genetics* **20** 1–15. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddq427>)
- Luo H, Wang F, Zha J, Li H, Yan B, Du Q, Yang F, Sobh A, Vulpe C, Drusbosky L, *et al.* 2018 CTCF boundary remodels chromatin domain and drives aberrant HOX gene transcription in acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood* **132** 837–848. (<https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2017-11-814319>)
- Lupianez DG, Kraft K, Heinrich V, Krawitz P, Brancati F, Klopocki E, Horn D, Kayserili H, Opitz JM, Laxova R, *et al.* 2015 Disruptions of topological chromatin domains cause pathogenic rewiring of gene-enhancer interactions. *Cell* **161** 1012–1025. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.04.004>)
- Majumder P & Boss JM 2010 CTCF controls expression and chromatin architecture of the human major histocompatibility complex class II locus. *Molecular & Cellular Biology* **30** 4211–4223. (<https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.00327-10>)
- Majumder P, Gomez JA, Chadwick BP & Boss JM 2008 The insulator factor CTCF controls MHC class II gene expression and is required for the formation of long-distance chromatin interactions. *Journal of Experimental Medicine* **205** 785–798. (<https://doi.org/10.1084/jem.20071843>)
- Marques M, Hernandez RP & Witcher M 2015 Analysis of changes to mRNA levels and CTCF occupancy upon TFII-I knockdown. *Genomics Data* **4** 17–21. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gdata.2014.09.012>)
- Martin-Garcia D, Navarro A, Valdés-Mas R, Clot G, Gutiérrez-Abril J, Prieto M, Ribera-Cortada I, Woroniecka R, Rymkiewicz G, Bens S, *et al.* 2019 CCND2 and CCND3 hijack immunoglobulin light-chain enhancers in cyclin D1(-) mantle cell lymphoma. *Blood* **133** 940–951. (<https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2018-07-862151>)
- Martin-Kleiner I 2012 BORIS in human cancers -- a review. *European Journal of Cancer* **48** 929–935. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2011.09.009>)
- Matthews BJ & Waxman DJ 2018 Computational prediction of CTCF/cohesin-based intra-TAD loops that insulate chromatin contacts and gene expression in mouse liver. *eLife* **7** e34077. (<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.34077>)
- McHugh CA, Chen CK, Chow A, Surka CE, Tran C, McDonel P, Pandya-Jones A, Blanco M, Burghard C, Moradian A, *et al.* 2015 The Xist lncRNA interacts directly with SHARP to silence transcription through HDAC3. *Nature* **521** 232–236. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14443>)
- Mei S, Ke J, Tian J, Ying P, Yang N, Wang X, Zou D, Peng X, Yang Y, Zhu Y, *et al.* 2019 A functional variant in the boundary of a topological association domain is associated with pancreatic cancer risk. *Molecular Carcinogenesis* **58** 1855–1862. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/mc.23077>)
- Mondal G, Stevers M, Goode B, Ashworth A & Solomon DA 2019 A requirement for STAG2 in replication fork progression creates a targetable synthetic lethality in cohesin-mutant cancers. *Nature Communications* **10** 1686. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09659-z>)
- Mora A, Sandve GK, Gabrielsen OS & Eskeland R 2016 In the loop: promoter-enhancer interactions and bioinformatics. *Briefings in Bioinformatics* **17** 980–995. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbv097>)
- Morita M, Shimokawa K, Nishimura M, Nakamura S, Tsujimura Y, Takemoto S, Tawara T, Yokota H, Wemler S, Miyamoto D, *et al.* 2019

- ViBrism DB: an interactive search and viewer platform for 2D/3D anatomical images of gene expression and co-expression networks. *Nucleic Acids Research* **47** D859–D866. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky951>)
- Murakawa Y, Yoshihara M, Kawaji H, Nishikawa M, Zayed H, Suzuki H, Fantom C & Hayashizaki Y 2016 Enhanced identification of transcriptional enhancers provides mechanistic insights into diseases. *Trends in Genetics* **32** 76–88. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2015.11.004>)
- Narendra V, Rocha PP, An D, Raviram R, Skok JA, Mazzoni EO & Reinberg D 2015 CTCF establishes discrete functional chromatin domains at the Hox clusters during differentiation. *Science* **347** 1017–1021. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1262088>)
- Negi S, Bolt CC, Zhang H & Stubbs L 2019 An extended regulatory landscape drives Tbx18 activity in a variety of prostate-associated cell lineages. *Developmental Biology* **446** 180–192. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2018.11.023>)
- Nora EP, Lajoie BR, Schulz EG, Giorgetti L, Okamoto I, Servant N, Piolot T, van Berkum NL, Meisij J, Sedat J, *et al.* 2012 Spatial partitioning of the regulatory landscape of the X-inactivation centre. *Nature* **485** 381–385. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11049>)
- Northcott PA, Lee C, Zichner T, Stütz AM, Erkek S, Kawachi D, Shih DJ, Hovestadt V, Zapatka M, Sturm D, *et al.* 2014 Enhancer hijacking activates GF11 family oncogenes in medulloblastoma. *Nature* **511** 428–434. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13379>)
- Olender T, Keydar I, Pinto JM, Tatarsky P, Alkelai A, Chien MS, Fishilevich S, Restrepo D, Matsunami H, Gilad Y, *et al.* 2016 The human olfactory transcriptome. *BMC Genomics* **17** 619. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-016-2960-3>)
- Olivier M, Aggarwal A, Allen J, Almendras AA, Bajorek ES, Beasley EM, Brady SD, Bushard JM, Bustos VI, Chu A, *et al.* 2001 A high-resolution radiation hybrid map of the human genome draft sequence. *Science* **291** 1298–1302. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1057437>)
- Parolia A, Cieslik M & Chinnaiyan AM 2018 Competing for enhancers: PVT1 fine-tunes MYC expression. *Cell Research* **28** 785–786. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41422-018-0064-0>)
- Patten DK, Corleone G, Györfy B, Perone Y, Slaven N, Barozzi I, Erdős E, Saiakhova A, Goddard K, Vingiani A, *et al.* 2018 Enhancer mapping uncovers phenotypic heterogeneity and evolution in patients with luminal breast cancer. *Nature Medicine* **24** 1469–1480. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0091-x>)
- Peng WX, He RZ, Zhang Z, Yang L & Mo YY 2019 LINC00346 promotes pancreatic cancer progression through the CTCF-mediated Myc transcription. *Oncogene* [epub]. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41388-019-0918-z>)
- Petrovic J, Zhou Y, Fasolino M, Goldman N, Schwartz GW, Mumbach MR, Nguyen SC, Rome KS, Sela Y, Zapataro Z, *et al.* 2019 Oncogenic Notch promotes long-range regulatory interactions within hyperconnected 3D cliques. *Molecular Cell* **73** 1174–1190.e12. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2019.01.006>)
- Poterlowicz K, Yarker JL, Malashchuk I, Lajoie BR, Mardaryev AN, Gdula MR, Sharov AA, Kohwi-Shigematsu T, Botchkarev VA & Fessing MY 2017 5C analysis of the epidermal differentiation complex locus reveals distinct chromatin interaction networks between gene-rich and gene-poor TADs in skin epithelial cells. *PLOS Genetics* **13** e1006966. (<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1006966>)
- Pugacheva EM, Tiwari VK, Abdullaev Z, Vostrov AA, Flanagan PT, Quitschke WW, Loukinov DI, Ohlsson R & Lobanenko VV 2005 Familial cases of point mutations in the XIST promoter reveal a correlation between CTCF binding and pre-emptive choices of X chromosome inactivation. *Human Molecular Genetics* **14** 953–965. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddi089>)
- Racko D, Benedetti F, Dorier J & Stasiak A 2018 Transcription-induced supercoiling as the driving force of chromatin loop extrusion during formation of TADs in interphase chromosomes. *Nucleic Acids Research* **46** 1648–1660. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx1123>)
- Racko D, Benedetti F, Dorier J & Stasiak A 2019 Are TADs supercoiled? *Nucleic Acids Research* **47** 521–532. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky1091>)
- Razavi P, Chang MT, Xu G, Bandlamudi C, Ross DS, Vasan N, Cai Y, Bielski CM, Donoghue MTA, Jonsson P, *et al.* 2018 The genomic landscape of endocrine-resistant advanced breast cancers. *Cancer Cell* **34** 427–438.e6. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2018.08.008>)
- Ren X, Cao D, Yang L, Li X, Zhang W, Xiao Y, Xi Y, Li F, Li D & Pan Z 2019 High Expression of long non-coding RNA PVT1 predicts metastasis in Han and Uyghur patients with gastric cancer in Xinjiang, China. *Scientific Reports* **9** 548. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36985-x>)
- Renaud S, Loukinov D, Alberti L, Vostrov A, Kwon YW, Bosman FT, Lobanenko V & Benhattar J 2011 BORIS/CTCF-mediated transcriptional regulation of the hTERT telomerase gene in testicular and ovarian tumor cells. *Nucleic Acids Research* **39** 862–873. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkq827>)
- Rickman DS, Chen YB, Banerjee S, Pan Y, Yu J, Vuong T, Perner S, Lafargue CJ, Mertz KD, Setlur SR, *et al.* 2010 ERG cooperates with androgen receptor in regulating trefoil factor 3 in prostate cancer disease progression. *Neoplasia* **12** 1031–1040. (<https://doi.org/10.1593/neo.10866>)
- Rickman DS, Soong TD, Moss B, Mosquera JM, Dlabal J, Terry S, MacDonald TY, Tripodi J, Bunting K, Najfeld V, *et al.* 2012 Oncogene-mediated alterations in chromatin conformation. *PNAS* **109** 9083–9088. (<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1112570109>)
- Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium, Kundaje A, Meuleman W, Ernst J, Bilenky M, Yen A, Heravi-Moussavi A, Kheradpour P, Zhang Z, Wang J, *et al.* 2015 Integrative analysis of 111 reference human epigenomes. *Nature* **518** 317–330. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14248>)
- Roberts L, Davenport RJ, Pennisi E & Marshall E 2001 A history of the Human Genome Project. *Science* **291** 1195. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.291.5507.1195>)
- Robinson JT, Turner D, Durand NC, Thorvaldsdottir H, Mesirov JP & Aiden EL 2018 Juicebox.js provides a cloud-based visualization system for Hi-C data. *Cell Systems* **6** 256–258.e1. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2018.01.001>)
- Rodriguez-Carballo E, Lopez-Delisle L, Zhan Y, Fabre PJ, Beccari L, El-Idrissi I, Huynh THN, Ozadam H, Dekker J & Duboule D 2017 The HoxD cluster is a dynamic and resilient TAD boundary controlling the segregation of antagonistic regulatory landscapes. *Genes & Development* **31** 2264–2281. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.307769.117>)
- Romero-Perez L, Surdez D, Brunet E, Delattre O & Grunewald TGP 2019 STAG mutations in cancer. *Trends in Cancer* **5** 506–520. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trecan.2019.07.001>)
- Ron G, Globerson Y, Moran D & Kaplan T 2017 Promoter-enhancer interactions identified from Hi-C data using probabilistic models and hierarchical topological domains. *Nature Communications* **8** 2237. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02386-3>)
- Rowley MJ & Corces VG 2018 Organizational principles of 3D genome architecture. *Nature Reviews. Genetics* **19** 789–800. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-018-0060-8>)
- Roy SS, Mukherjee AK & Chowdhury S 2018 Insights about genome function from spatial organization of the genome. *Human Genomics* **12** 8. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40246-018-0140-z>)
- Ryan RJ, Drier Y, Whittom H, Cotton MJ, Kaur J, Issner R, Gillespie S, Epstein CB, Nardi V, Sohani AR, *et al.* 2015 Detection of enhancer-associated rearrangements reveals mechanisms of oncogene dysregulation in B-cell lymphoma. *Cancer Discovery* **5** 1058–1071. (<https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-15-0370>)
- Saiki RK, Gelfand DH, Stoffel S, Scharf SJ, Higuchi R, Horn GT, Mullis KB & Erlich HA 1988 Primer-directed enzymatic amplification

- of DNA with a thermostable DNA polymerase. *Science* **239** 487–491. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.2448875>)
- Sanda MG, Feng Z, Howard DH, Tomlins SA, Sokoll LJ, Chan DW, Regan MM, Groskopf J, Chipman J, Patil DH, *et al.* 2017 Association between combined TMPRSS2:ERG and PCA3 RNA urinary testing and detection of aggressive prostate cancer. *JAMA Oncology* **3** 1085–1093. (<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2017.0177>)
- Sanli K, Karlsson FH, Nookaew I & Nielsen J 2013 FANTOM: functional and taxonomic analysis of metagenomes. *BMC Bioinformatics* **14** 38. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-14-38>)
- Sanyal A, Lajoie BR, Jain G & Dekker J 2012 The long-range interaction landscape of gene promoters. *Nature* **489** 109–113. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11279>)
- Sauerwald N, Zhang S, Kingsford C & Bahar I 2017 Chromosomal dynamics predicted by an elastic network model explains genome-wide accessibility and long-range couplings. *Nucleic Acids Research* **45** 3663–3673. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx172>)
- Schmidl C, Renner K, Peter K, Eder R, Lassmann T, Balwiercz PJ, Itoh M, Nagao-Sato S, Kawaji H, Carninci P, *et al.* 2014 Transcription and enhancer profiling in human monocyte subsets. *Blood* **123** e90–e99. (<https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2013-02-484188>)
- Shin HY 2019 The structural and functional roles of CTCF in the regulation of cell type-specific and human disease-associated super-enhancers. *Genes & Genomics* **41** 257–265. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13258-018-0768-z>)
- Shin H, Shi Y, Dai C, Tjong H, Gong K, Alber F & Zhou XJ 2016 TopDom: an efficient and deterministic method for identifying topological domains in genomes. *Nucleic Acids Research* **44** e70. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkv1505>)
- Sima J, Chakraborty A, Dileep V, Michalski M, Klein KN, Holcomb NP, Turner JL, Paulsen MT, Rivera-Mulia JC, Trevilla-Garcia C, *et al.* 2019 Identifying cis elements for spatiotemporal control of mammalian DNA replication. *Cell* **176** 816–830.e18. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.11.036>)
- Smith ST, Wickramasinghe P, Olson A, Loukinov D, Lin L, Deng J, Xiong Y, Rux J, Sachidanandam R, Sun H, *et al.* 2009 Genome wide ChIP-chip analyses reveal important roles for CTCF in Drosophila genome organization. *Developmental Biology* **328** 518–528. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2008.12.039>)
- Spencer RJ, del Rosario BC, Pinter SF, Lessing D, Sadreyev RI & LEE JT 2011 A boundary element between Tsix and Xist binds the chromatin insulator ctcf and contributes to initiation of X-chromosome inactivation. *Genetics* **189** 441–454. (<https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.111.132662>)
- Spielmann M, Lupianez DG & Mundlos S 2018 Structural variation in the 3D genome. *Nature Reviews. Genetics* **19** 453–467. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-018-0007-0>)
- Splinter E, Heath H, Kooren J, Palstra RJ, Klous P, Grosveld F, Galjart N & de Laat W 2006 CTCF mediates long-range chromatin looping and local histone modification in the beta-globin locus. *Genes & Development* **20** 2349–2354. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.399506>)
- Stansfield JC, Cresswell KG & Dozmorov MG 2019 multiHiCompare: joint normalization and comparative analysis of complex Hi-C experiments. *Bioinformatics* **35** 2916–2923. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz048>)
- Strom AR, Emelyanov AV, Mir M, Fyodorov DV, Darzacq X & Karpen GH 2017 Phase separation drives heterochromatin domain formation. *Nature* **547** 241–245. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22989>)
- Symmons O, Uslu VV, Tsujimura T, Ruf S, Nassari S, Schwarzer W, Ettwiller L & Spitz F 2014 Functional and topological characteristics of mammalian regulatory domains. *Genome Research* **24** 390–400. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.163519.113>)
- Taberlay PC, Statham AL, Kelly TK, Clark SJ & Jones PA 2014 Reconfiguration of nucleosome-depleted regions at distal regulatory elements accompanies DNA methylation of enhancers and insulators in cancer. *Genome Research* **24** 1421–1432. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.163485.113>)
- Taberlay PC, Achinger-Kawecka J, Lun AT, Buske FA, Sabir K, Gould CM, Zotenko E, Bert SA, Giles KA, Bauer DC, *et al.* 2016 Three-dimensional disorganization of the cancer genome occurs coincident with long-range genetic and epigenetic alterations. *Genome Research* **26** 719–731. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.201517.115>)
- Taslim C, Chen Z, Huang K, Huang TH, Wang Q & Lin S 2012 Integrated analysis identifies a class of androgen-responsive genes regulated by short combinatorial long-range mechanism facilitated by CTCF. *Nucleic Acids Research* **40** 4754–4764. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks139>)
- Tomlins SA, Rhodes DR, Perner S, Dhanasekaran SM, Mehra R, Sun XW, Varambally S, Cao X, Tchinda J, Kuefer R, *et al.* 2005 Recurrent fusion of TMPRSS2 and ETS transcription factor genes in prostate cancer. *Science* **310** 644–648. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1117679>)
- Tomlins SA, Day JR, Lonigro RJ, Hovelson DH, Siddiqui J, Kunju LP, Dunn RL, Meyer S, Hodge P, Groskopf J, *et al.* 2016 Urine TMPRSS2:ERG plus PCA3 for individualized prostate cancer risk assessment. *European Urology* **70** 45–53. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2015.04.033>)
- Tsai YC, Cooke NE & Liebhaber SA 2014 Tissue specific CTCF occupancy and boundary function at the human growth hormone locus. *Nucleic Acids Research* **42** 4906–4921. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku139>)
- Tsai YC, Cooke NE & Liebhaber SA 2016 Long-range looping of a locus control region drives tissue-specific chromatin packing within a multigene cluster. *Nucleic Acids Research* **44** 4651–4664. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw090>)
- Tsui S, Gao J, Wang C & LU L 2012 CTCF mediates effect of insulin on glucagon expression. *Experimental Cell Research* **318** 887–895. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yexcr.2012.03.001>)
- Ulz P, Belic J, Graf R, Auer M, Lafer I, Fischereder K, Webersinke G, Pummer K, Augustin H, Pichler M, *et al.* 2016 Whole-genome plasma sequencing reveals focal amplifications as a driving force in metastatic prostate cancer. *Nature Communications* **7** 12008. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12008>)
- Unkeless JC 1989 Human Fc receptors for IgG. *International Reviews of Immunology* **5** 165–171. (<https://doi.org/10.3109/08830188909061983>)
- Wang YL & Taylor DL 1979 Distribution of fluorescently labeled actin in living sea urchin eggs during early development. *Journal of Cell Biology* **81** 672–679. (<https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.81.3.672>)
- Wang J, Cai Y, Shao LJ, Siddiqui J, Palanisamy N, Li R, Ren C, Ayala G & Ittmann M 2011 Activation of NF- κ B by TMPRSS2/ERG fusion isoforms through Toll-like receptor-4. *Cancer Research* **71** 1325–1333. (<https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-10-2210>)
- Wang H, Maurano MT, Qu H, Varley KE, Gertz J, Pauli F, Lee K, Canfield T, Weaver M, Sandstrom R, *et al.* 2012a Widespread plasticity in CTCF occupancy linked to DNA methylation. *Genome Research* **22** 1680–1688. (<https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.136101.111>)
- Wang J, Wang Y & Lu L 2012b De-SUMOylation of CCCTC binding factor (CTCF) in hypoxic stress-induced human corneal epithelial cells. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **287** 12469–12479. (<https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M111.286641>)
- Wang S, Kollipara RK, Srivastava N, Li R, Ravindranathan P, Hernandez E, Freeman E, Humphries CG, Kapur P, Lotan Y, *et al.* 2014 Ablation of the oncogenic transcription factor ERG by deubiquitinase inhibition in prostate cancer. *PNAS* **111** 4251–4256. (<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1322198111>)
- Wang Y, Song F, Zhang B, Zhang L, Xu J, Kuang D, Li D, Choudhary MNK, Li Y, Hu M, *et al.* 2018 The 3D Genome Browser: a web-based browser for visualizing 3D genome organization and long-range chromatin interactions. *Genome Biology* **19** 151. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-018-1519-9>)

- Wang DC, Wang W, Zhang L & Wang X 2019 A tour of 3D genome with a focus on CTCF. *Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology* **90** 4–11. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdb.2018.07.020>)
- Weaver W 1970 Molecular biology: origin of the term. *Science* **170** 581–582. (<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.170.3958.581-a>)
- Weischenfeldt J, Dubash T, Drinas AP, Mardin BR, Chen Y, Stütz AM, Waszak SM, Bosco G, Halvorsen AR, Raeder B, *et al.* 2017 Pan-cancer analysis of somatic copy-number alterations implicates IRS4 and IGF2 in enhancer hijacking. *Nature Genetics* **49** 65–74. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3722>)
- Wendt KS, Yoshida K, Itoh T, Bando M, Koch B, Schirghuber E, Tsutsumi S, Nagae G, Ishihara K, Mishiro T, *et al.* 2008 Cohesin mediates transcriptional insulation by CCCTC-binding factor. *Nature* **451** 796–801. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06634>)
- Wolfsberg TG, Mcentyre J & Schuler GD 2001 Guide to the draft human genome. *Nature* **409** 824–826. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/35057000>)
- Woloszynska-Read A, Zhang W, Yu J, Link PA, Mhawech-Fauceglia P, Collamat G, Akers SN, Ostler KR, Godley LA, Odunsi K, *et al.* 2011 Coordinated cancer germline antigen promoter and global DNA hypomethylation in ovarian cancer: association with the BORIS/CTCF expression ratio and advanced stage. *Clinical Cancer Research* **17** 2170–2180. (<https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-10-2315>)
- Wright FA, Lemon WJ, Zhao WD, Sears R, Zhuo D, Wang JP, Yang HY, Baer T, Stredney D, Spitzner J, *et al.* 2001 A draft annotation and overview of the human genome. *Genome Biology* **2** research0025. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2001-2-7-research0025>)
- Wu P, Li T, Li R, Jia L, Zhu P, Liu Y, Chen Q, Tang D, Yu Y & Li C 2017 3D genome of multiple myeloma reveals spatial genome disorganization associated with copy number variations. *Nature Communications* **8** 1937. (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01793-w>)
- Yamamoto S, Wu Z, Russnes HG, Takagi S, Peluffo G, Vaske C, Zhao X, Moen Volla HK, Maruyama R, Ekram MB, *et al.* 2014 JARID1B is a luminal lineage-driving oncogene in breast cancer. *Cancer Cell* **25** 762–777. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccr.2014.04.024>)
- Yang F, Deng X, Ma W, Berletch JB, Rabaia N, Wei G, Moore JM, Filippova GN, Xu J, Liu Y, *et al.* 2015 The lncRNA Firre anchors the inactive X chromosome to the nucleolus by binding CTCF and maintains H3K27me3 methylation. *Genome Biology* **16** 52. (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-015-0618-0>)
- Yauy K, Gatinois V, Guignard T, Sati S, Puechberty J, Gaillard JB, Schneider A & Pellestor F 2018 Looking for broken TAD boundaries and changes on DNA interactions: clinical guide to 3D chromatin change analysis in complex chromosomal rearrangements and chromothripsis. *Methods in Molecular Biology* **1769** 353–361. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-7780-2_22)
- Zhang Y, Liang J, Li Y, Xuan C, Wang F, Wang D, Shi L, Zhang D & Shang Y 2010 CCCTC-binding factor acts upstream of FOXA1 and demarcates the genomic response to estrogen. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **285** 28604–28613. (<https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M110.149658>)
- Zhang R, Wang Y, Yang Y, Zhang Y & Ma J 2018 Predicting CTCF-mediated chromatin loops using CTCF-MP. *Bioinformatics* **34** i133–i141. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty248>)
- Zimmerman MW, Liu Y, He S, Durbin AD, Abraham BJ, Easton J, Shao Y, Xu B, Zhu S, Zhang X, *et al.* 2018 MYC drives a subset of high-risk pediatric neuroblastomas and is activated through mechanisms including enhancer hijacking and focal enhancer amplification. *Cancer Discovery* **8** 320–335. (<https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-17-0993>)

Received in final form 23 August 2019

Accepted 9 September 2019

Accepted Preprint published online 9 September 2019