Machine learning discoveries of ASCL2-X synergy in ETC-1922159 treated colorectal cancer cells

shriprakash sinha

Independent Researcher; Orcid ID : orcid.org/0000-0001-7027-5788 104-Madhurisha Heights Phase 1, Risali, Bhilai-490006, India

Abstract

Achaete-scute complex homolog 2 (ASCL2) codes a part of the basic helix-loop-helix (BHLH) transcription factor family. WNTs have been found to directly affect the stemness of the tumor cells via regulation of ASCL2. Switching off the ASCL2 literally blocks the stemness process of the tumor cells and vice versa. In colorectal cancer (CRC) cells treated with ETC-1922159, ASCL2 was found to be down regulated along with other genes. A recently developed search engine ranked combinations of ASCL2-X (X, a particular gene/protein) at 2^{nd} order level after drug administration. Some rankings confirm the already tested combinations, while others point to those that are untested/unexplored. These rankings reveal which ASCL2-X combinations might be working synergistically in CRC. In this research work, I cover combinations of ASCL2 with WNT, transforming growth factor β (TGF β), interleukin (IL), leucine rich repeat containing G protein-coupled receptor (LGR), NOTCH, solute carrier family (SLC), SRY-box transcription factor (SOX), small nucleolar RNA host gene (SNHG), KIAA, F-box protein (FBXO), family with sequence similarity (FAM), B cell CLL/lymphoma (BCL), autophagy related (ATG) and Rho GTPase activating protein (ARHGAP) family.

Keywords: ASCL2, Porcupine inhibitor ETC-1922159, Sensitivity analysis, Colorectal cancer.

1. Introduction

1.1. Stemness and intestine

Stemness is a property by which the cells proliferate, regenerate, sustain, propogation. It is the property by which the cells are known to maintain distinctive aspects over their lineage. Stemness is a property that is observed in both normal and cancer stem cells.

 $^{^{\}star}$ ML dicoveries of ASCL2-X synergy in ETC-1922159 treated CRC cells

Email address: sinha.shriprakash@yandex.com (shriprakash sinha)

¹Aspects of unpublished work were presented in a poster session at (1) the recently concluded first ever Wnt Gordon Conference, from 6-11 August 2017, held in Stowe, VT 05672, USA.

Cancer stem cells show high self renewal, redundancy in self renewed pathways leading to pathological conditions, genomic instability due to altered DNA repair factors and epithelial mesenchymal transition as a measure of plasticity. Aponte and Caicedo [1] review the stemness in cancer cells in great detail.

The human intestine is broadly divided into small and large intestine for identification and study. The epithelium of the small intestine is composed of an array of villus and crypts (mountains and valleys for the uninitiated). The crypts are also termed as crypt of Lieberkuhn after his study of the intestine in this PhD thesis Lieberkuhn [2]. The large intestine or the colon, however does not contain the villi. The multiple types of cells available in the intestinal glands at the villus are : enterocytes for absorbing water and electrolytes, goblet cells for secreting mucus, enteroendocrine cells for secreting hormones, cup cells, tuft cells and at the crypt of the gland are : paneth cells for secreting anti-microbial peptides for maintenance of gastrointestinal tract and stem cells. These cells are not all present in the colon. The description of the functioning of the cells along the longitudinal axis from the histological perspective of the intestine has been explained elaborately in Potten et al. [3], Barker et al. [4], Clevers [5] and Noah et al. [6]. Briefly, the stem cells help in the production of the transit population of the progenitor cells that differentiate as they move towards the villus. Once the cells are committed for differentiation, they no longer have the property of stem cells.

The Wnt pathway is implicated in the control of stemness and cell fate in the intestine. A family of the WNT proteins, WNT10B, might be playing a crucial role in stemness. This is further confirmed by wet lab experiments in Reddy et al. [7], which show BVES deletion results in amplified stem cell activity and Wnt signaling after radiation. WNT10B has also been implicated in colorectal cancer Yoshikawa et al. [8].

1.2. Achaete-scute like 2 (ASCL2)

ASCL2 belongs to a family of ASCL genes that contain basic and helix-loop-helix domains in a conserved family of transcriptional regulators. ASCL2 is known to be genomically imprinted at the cluster location of chromosome 11p15.5. Genomic imprinting is the reversible epigenetic silencing of the parental specific inherited genes Schwienbacher et al. [9]. ASCL2 has been found to be maternally expressed and Miyamoto et al. [10] show the expression patterns of the human ASCL2 in the fetus at a stage between first and second trimesters and in the placental tissues. In addition, they demonstrate that the ASCL2 escapes genomic imprinting during the mentioned stages. In colorectal cancer, loss of this genomic imprinting (i.e silencing) has been found to cause overexpression of ASCL2 Cui et al. [11] & Stange et al. [12]. In intestinal neoplasia, ASCL2 is found to be a target of Wnt signaling Jubb et al. [13]. Jubb et al. [13] report that mutiple strategies have been chosen to repress the Wnt signaling pathway and found that expression of ASCL2 was repressed. Also, ASCL2 was found not to be imprinted in neoplasia and knockdown of ASCL2 led to cell cycle (G2/M) arrest which affects the expression of Survivin and cdc25b, which are both found to be highly expressed in colorectal cancer. Jubb et al. [13] further show that ASCL2 expression controls G2/M checkpoint and promotes proliferation by initiating the transcriptional regulation of Survivin and cdc25b which are targets of Wnt signaling. This is further proported by ASCL2 knockdown experiments in Zhu et al. [14].

1.3. Combinatorial search problem and a possible solution

In a recently published work Sinha [15], a frame work of a search engine was developed which can rank combinations of factors (genes/proteins) in a signaling pathway. Readers are requested to go through the adaptation of the above mentioned work for gaining deeper insight into the working of the pipeline and its use of published data set generated after administration of ETC-1922159, Sinha [16]. The work uses SVM package by Joachims [17] in https://www.cs.cornell.edu/people/tj/svm_light/svm_rank.html. I use the adaptation to rank 2nd order gene combinations.

2. Results & Discussion

2.1. ASCL2 related synergies

2.2. ASCL2 - WNT10B

ASCL2 has been found to play a major role in stemness in colon crypts and is implicated in colon cancer Zhu et al. [18]. Switching off the ASCL2 leads to a literal blockage of the stemness process and vice versa. At the downstream level, ASCL2 is regulated by TCF4/ β -catenin via non-coding RNA target named WiNTRLINC1 Giakountis et al. [19]. Activation of ASCL2 leads to feedforward transcription of the non-coding RNA and thus a loop is formed which helps in the stemness and is highly effective in colon cancer. At the upstream level, ASCL2 is known act as a WNT/RSPONDIN switch that controls the stemness Schuijers et al. [20]. It has been shown that removal of RSPO1 lead to decrease in the Wnt signaling due to removal of the FZD receptors that led to reduced expression of ASCL2. Also, low levels of LGR5 were observed due to this phenomena. The opposite happened by increasing the RSPO1 levels. After the drug treatment, it was found that ASCL2 was highly suppressed pointing to the inhibition of stemness in the colorectal cancer cells. Also, Schuijers et al. [20] show that by genetically disrupting PORCN or inducing a PORCN inhibitor (like IWP-2), there is loss of stem cell markers like LGR5 and RNF43, which lead to disappearance of stem cells and moribund state of mice. A similar affect can be found with ETC-1922159, where there is suppression of RNF43 and LGR5 that lead to inhibition of the Wnt pathway and thus the ASCL2 regulation. These wet lab evidences are confirmed in the relatively low ranking of the combination ASCL2-RNF43 via the inhibition of PORCN-WNT that leads to blocking of the stemness that is induced by ASCL2. Since ASCL2 is directly mediated by the WNT proteins, the recorded ASCL2-WNT10B combination showed low priority ranking of 497, 321 and 488 for laplace, linear and rbf kernels, respectively, thus indicating a possible connection between WNT10B and ASCL2 activation (data not shown in tabular format).

2.2.1. ASCL2 - TGFB

Zhang et al. [21] showed that overexpression of ASCL2 increased TGFB levels thus stimulating local cancer associated fibroblasts activation. This induced an immune-excluded microenvironment. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159,

TGFB family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2^{nd} order combination of TGFB family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 1 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 2 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 1. The table 1 shows rankings of TGFB family w.r.t ASCL2. TGFBR3 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 819 (laplce), 1072 (linear) and 1170 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment. Further, TGFB1 and TGFBRAP1 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

RANKING TGFB FAMILY VS ASCL2				
RANKING OF TGFB FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2				
	laplace	linear	rbf	
TGFBR3 - ASCL2	819	1072	1170	
TGFB1 - ASCL2	2210	2378	1754	
TGFBRAP1 - ASCL2	2467	1978	2738	

Table 1: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS TGFB family members.

One can also interpret the results of the table 1 graphically, with the following influences - • TGFB family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> TGFB-R3.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES TGFB family w.r.t ASCL2 TGFB-R3 ASCL2

Table 2: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and TGFB family members.

2.2.2. ASCL2 - IL

Evaluation of ASCL2 bound promoters by Murata et al. [22] in regenerating cells, showed that interleukin-11 receptor gene IL-11RA1 as a transcriptional target, and respective organoid cultures demonstrated IL-11 activity in intestinal stem cell regeneration. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, IL family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2nd order combination of IL family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 3 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 4 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 3. The table 3 shows rankings of IL family w.r.t ASCL2. IL17D - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 279 (laplace), 805 (linear) and 1318 (rbf). IL17RB - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 519 (laplace), 609 (linear) and 1026 (rbf). IL33 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 754 (laplace), 417 (linear) and 119 (rbf). IL1RL2 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1342 (laplace) and 1563 (rbf). ILF3 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1342 (laplace) and 1563 (rbf). ILF3 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1397 (laplace) and 1421 (linear). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment. Further, ILF3-AS1, IL17RD and ILF2 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

RANKING IL F.	AMILY VS	S ASCL2	2	
RANKING OF IL FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2				
	laplace	linear	rbf	
IL17D - ASCL2	279	805	1318	
IL17RB - ASCL2	519	609	1026	
IL33 - ASCL2	754	417	119	
IL1RL2 - ASCL2	1342	1860	1563	
ILF3 - ASCL2	1397	1421	1878	
ILF3-AS1 - ASCL2	1720	764	2113	
IL17RD - ASCL2	2444	2331	2263	
ILF2 - ASCL2	2683	2329	2154	

Table 3: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS IL family members.

One can also interpret the results of the table 3 graphically, with the following influences - \bullet IL family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> IL-17DR3/17RB/33/1RL2/F3.

2.2.3. ASCL2 - LGR

In gastric cancer, Kwon et al. [23] show that ASCL2 upregulates LGR5 expression at transcriptional level. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, LGR family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2^{nd} order combination of LGR family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 5 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 6 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 5.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES IL family w.r.t ASCL2 IL-17DR3/17RB/33/1RL2/F3 ASCL2

Table 4: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and IL family members.

The table 5 shows rankings of LGR family w.r.t ASCL2. LGR5 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 70 (laplace), 85 (linear) and 213 (rbf). LGR6 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 304 (laplace), 463 (linear) and 964 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment.

RANKING LGR FAMILY VS ASCL2			
RANKING OF LGR FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2			
	laplace	linear	rbf
LGR5 - ASCL2	70	85	213
LGR6 - ASCL2	304	463	964

Table 5: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS LGR family members.

One can also interpret the results of the table 5 graphically, with the following influences - • LGR family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> LGR-5/6.

UNEXPLORED COMBINA	TORIAL HYPOTHESES
LGR family w.r.t ASCL2	
LGR-5/6	ASCL2

Table 6: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and LGR family members.

2.2.4. ASCL2 - NOTCH

In spinous cells, based upon the ability of NOTCH/RBP-J to bind to the promoter region of ASCL2, Moriyama et al. [24] speculated that activation of NOTCH signaling promotes the expression of both the HES1 and ASCL2 genes. However, subsequent HES1 binding to the ASCL2 promoter interferes with NOTCH/RBP-J-induced ASCL2 expression, thus resulting in inhibition of ASCL2. In colorectal cancer cells treated

with ETC-1922159, NOTCH family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2^{nd} order combination of NOTCH family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 7 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 8 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 7. The table 7 shows rankings of NOTCH family w.r.t ASCL2. NOTCH1 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 748 (laplace) and 898 (rbf). NOTCH4 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1021 (laplace), 378 (linear) and 873 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment.

RANKING NOTCH FAMILY VS ASCL2			
RANKING OF NOTCH FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2			
	laplace	linear	rbf
NOTCH1 - ASCL2	748	1745	898
NOTCH4 - ASCL2	1021	378	873

Table 7: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS NOTCH family members.

One can also interpret the results of the table 7 graphically, with the following influences - \bullet NOTCH family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> NOTCH-1/4.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES NOTCH family w.r.t ASCL2 NOTCH-1/4 ASCL2

Table 8: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and NOTCH family members.

2.2.5. ASCL2 - SLC

Wang et al. [25] indicate that syncytin-1 interacts with the SLC1A5 receptor on cells. Varberg et al. [26] found that knockdown of ASCL2 down regulated syncytin-1 receptor SLC1A5. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, SLC family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2^{nd} order combination of SLC family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 9 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 10 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 9. The table 9 shows rankings of SLC family w.r.t ASCL2. SLC39A8 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 59 (laplace), 357 (linear) and 54 (rbf). SLC43A1 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 62 (laplace), 99 (linear) and 117 (rbf). SLC25A27 - ASCL2 shows low

ranking of 67 (laplace), 48 (linear) and 74 (rbf). SLC12A2 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 91 (laplace), 451 (linear) and 318 (rbf). SLC7A2 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 218 (laplace), 367 (linear) and 209 (rbf). SLC19A3 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 292 (laplace), 136 (linear) and 87 (rbf). SLC19A1 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 317 (laplace), 139 (linear) and 210 (rbf). SLC43A3 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 520 (laplace), 150 (linear) and 382 (rbf). SLC1A4 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 569 (laplace), 603 (linear) and 1301 (rbf). SLC25A26 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 601 (laplace), 1035 (linear) and 745 (rbf). SLC4A7 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 864 (laplace), 1185 (linear) and 915 (rbf). SLC28A3 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 904 (laplace), 739 (linear) and 366 (rbf). SLC39A10 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1208 (laplace), 458 (linear) and 909 (rbf). SLC25A35 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1309 (laplace) and 1009 (rbf). SLC28A2 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1363 (laplace), 625 (linear) and 876 (rbf). SLC2A11 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1442 (laplace), 1343 (linear) and 1351 (rbf). SLC25A38 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1493 (laplace) and 1068 (linear). SLC35G1 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1522 (laplace) and 1506 (linear). SLC17A9 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1528 (laplace) and 1414 (linear). SLC7A8 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1268 (linear) and 1001 (rbf). SLC41A1 -ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1152 (linear) and 1016 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment.

Further, SLC25A15, SLC25A14, SLC18B1, SLC5A6, SLC12A8, SLC25A40, SLC35F2, SLC25A19, SLC26A2, SLC35E3, SLC25A32, SLC38A5 and SLC6A6 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

	_						
RANKING OF SLC FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2							
	laplace	linear	rbf		laplace	linear	rbf
SLC39A8 - ASCL2	59	357	54	SLC43A1 - ASCL2	62	99	117
SLC25A27 - ASCL2	67	48	74	SLC12A2 - ASCL2	91	451	318
SLC7A2 - ASCL2	218	367	209	SLC19A3 - ASCL2	292	136	87
SLC19A1 - ASCL2	317	139	210	SLC43A3 - ASCL2	520	150	382
SLC1A4 - ASCL2	569	603	1301	SLC25A26 - ASCL2	601	1035	745
SLC4A7 - ASCL2	864	1185	915	SLC28A3 - ASCL2	904	739	366
SLC25A15 - ASCL2	1126	1621	1664	SLC39A10 - ASCL2	1208	458	909
SLC25A35 - ASCL2	1309	1703	1009	SLC28A2 - ASCL2	1363	625	876
SLC2A11 - ASCL2	1442	1343	1351	SLC25A38 - ASCL2	1493	1068	2084
SLC35G1 - ASCL2	1522	1506	1830	SLC17A9 - ASCL2	1528	1414	1753
SLC7A8 - ASCL2	1618	1268	1001	SLC25A14 - ASCL2	1726	2341	2174
SLC41A1 - ASCL2	1753	1152	1016	SLC18B1 - ASCL2	1762	1461	2062
SLC5A6 - ASCL2	1836	1606	2281	SLC12A8 - ASCL2	1860	1018	1799
SLC25A40 - ASCL2	1887	1987	1756	SLC35F2 - ASCL2	1894	1585	2288
SLC25A19 - ASCL2	1938	2108	1152	SLC26A2 - ASCL2	2148	1756	2496
SLC35E3 - ASCL2	2250	2656	1882	SLC25A32 - ASCL2	2358	1622	2552
SLC38A5 - ASCL2	2406	2344	2650	SLC6A6 - ASCL2	2505	2456	1815

RANKING SLC FAMILY VS ASCL2

Table 9: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS SLC family members.

One can also interpret the results of the table 9 graphically, with the following

influences - • SLC family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> SLC-39A8 / 43A1 / 25A27 / 12A2 / 7A2 / 19A3 / 19A1 / 43A3 / 1A4 / 25A26 / 4A7 / 28A3 / 39A10 / 25A35 / 28A2 / 2A11 / 25A38 / 35G1 / 17A9 / 7A8 / 41A1.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES

SLC family w.r.t ASCL2	
SLC-39A8/43A1/25A27/12A2/7A2/19A3/19A1/43A3/1A4/25A26	ASCL2
SLC-4A7/28A3/39A10/25A35/28A2/2A11/25A38/35G1/17A9/7A8/41A1	ASCL2

Table 10: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and SLC family members.

2.2.6. ASCL2 - SOX

Allan et al. [27] demonstrated that HIF1A activated a unique set of genes in oligodendrocyte progenitor cells (OPCs) through interaction with the transcription factor OLIG2 (which target ASCL2 and DLX3). These in turn, suppressed the oligodendrocyte regulator SOX10. ChIP-seq for HA-tagged ASCL2 in OPCs revealed that ASCL2 binds to upstream enhancers of SOX10 and reduce expression of SOX10 compared with control OPCs. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, SOX family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2nd order combination of SOX family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 11 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 12 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 11. The table 11 shows rankings of SOX family w.r.t ASCL2. SOX8 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 49 (laplace), 29 (linear) and 38 (rbf). SOX12 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 203 (laplace), 590 (linear) and 405 (rbf). SOX1 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 254 (laplace), 310 (linear) and 241 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment.

RANKING SOX FAMILY VS ASCL2			
RANKING OF SOX FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2			
	laplace	linear	rbf
SOX8 - ASCL2	49	29	38
SOX12 - ASCL2	203	590	405
SOX1 - ASCL2	254	310	241

Table 11: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS SOX family members.

One can also interpret the results of the table 11 graphically, with the following

influences - • SOX family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 - > SOX-8/12/1.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES SOX family w.r.t ASCL2 SOX-8/12/1 ASCL2

Table 12: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and SOX family members.

2.2.7. ASCL2 - SNHG

In colorectal cancer, Christensen et al. [28] show that SNHG16 is regulated by the WNT pathway. SNHG16 was found to be positively correlated to the expression of the WNT targets like ASCL2. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, SNHG family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2nd order combination of SNHG family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 13 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 14 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 13. The table 13 shows rankings of SNHG family w.r.t ASCL2. SNHG3 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 593 (laplace), 1415 (linear) and 1203 (rbf). SNHG15 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 915 (laplace) and 1491 (rbf). SNHG10 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 933 (laplace), 478 (linear) and 717 (rbf). SNHG17 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1108 (laplace) and 1388 (linear). SNHG16 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1398 (laplace) and 1011 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment.

Further, SNHG6, SNHG1, SNHG18, SNHG5, SNHG8 and SNHG7 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

One can also interpret the results of the table 13 graphically, with the following influences - \bullet SNHG family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> SNHG-3/15/10/17/16.

2.2.8. ASCL2 - KIAA

In colon cancer, Birkenkamp-Demtroder et al. [29] showed by immunofluorescence microscopy and western blotting that there was decreased protein expression of β -catenin and the WNT related stem cell marker ASCL2, upon KIAA1199 knockdown with construct KIAA1199-sh3303. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, KIAA family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2nd order combination of KIAA family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 15 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 16 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 15. The table 15 shows rankings of KIAA family w.r.t ASCL2. KIAA0101 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 73 (laplace), 350 (linear) and 178 (rbf). KIAA1524 - ASCL2 shows low

RANKING SNHG FAMILY VS ASCL2				
RANKING OF SNHG FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2				
laplace	linear	rbf		
593	1415	1203		
915	1888	1491		
933	478	717		
1108	1388	2096		
1398	1972	1011		
1582	2234	1728		
1700	1744	1413		
1730	2623	2302		
1769	1945	411		
2312	2167	1489		
2417	1034	2005		
	G FAMILY IG FAMILY laplace 593 915 933 1108 1398 1582 1700 1730 1769 2312 2417	G FAMILY VS AS IG FAMILY W.R.T A laplace linear 593 1415 915 1888 933 478 1108 1388 1398 1972 1582 2234 1700 1744 1730 2623 1769 1945 2312 2167 2417 1034		

NTT

Table 13: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS SNHG family members.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATO	ORIAL HYPOTHESES
SNHG family w.r.t ASCL2	
SNHG-3/15/10/17/16	ASCL2

Table 14: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and SNHG family members.

ranking of 227 (laplace), 208 (linear) and 229 (rbf). KIAA1324 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 370 (laplace), 218 (linear) and 52 (rbf). KIAA1586 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1065 (laplace), 936 (linear) and 793 (rbf). KIAA0586 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1189 (laplace) and 1304 (rbf). KIAA0020 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1406 (linear) and 955 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment.

Further, KIAA1244, KIAA1430, KIAA1257, KIAA1731 and KIAA1143 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment. One can also interpret the results of the table 15 graphically, with the following in-

	FAMILI	VS ASC	
RANKING OF KIAA	FAMILY	W.R.T AS	SCL2
	laplace	linear	rbf
KIAA0101 - ASCL2	73	350	178
KIAA1524 - ASCL2	227	208	229
KIAA1324 - ASCL2	370	218	52
KIAA1586 - ASCL2	1065	936	793
KIAA0586 - ASCL2	1189	1564	1304
KIAA1244 - ASCL2	1409	2640	2396
KIAA1430 - ASCL2	1727	2495	1372
KIAA1257 - ASCL2	1947	918	1673
KIAA1731 - ASCL2	2134	2263	1148
KIAA0020 - ASCL2	2156	1406	955
KIAA1143 - ASCL2	2567	1781	2705

RANKING KIAA FAMILY VS ASCL2

Table 15: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS KIAA family members.

fluences - • KIAA family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> KIAA-0101/1524/1324/1586/0586/0020.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES KIAA family w.r.t ASCL2 KIAA-0101/1524/1324/1586/0586/0020 ASCL2

Table 16: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and KIAA family members.

2.2.9. ASCL2 - FBXO

Through various in vivo and in vitro assays, Tan et al. [30] show that FBXO22 is the substrate recognition subunit of the SCF^{FBXO22} complex that polyubiquitylates KDM4A. They show that changes in FBXO22 levels can affect KDM4A protein levels. These then lead to changes in histone marks and changes in transcriptional levels of

KDM4A's target gene, ASCL2. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, FBXO family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2nd order combination of FBXO family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 17 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 18 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 17. The table 17 shows rankings of FBXO family w.r.t ASCL2. FBXO5 - ASCL2 show low rankings of 351 (laplace), 316 (linear) and 105 (rbf). FBXO4 - ASCL2 show low rankings of 1466 (laplace), 710 (linear) and 347 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment. Further, FBXO41 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

RANKING FBXO FAMILY VS ASCL2			
RANKING OF FBXO FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2			
	laplace	linear	rbf
FBXO5 - ASCL2	351	316	105
FBXO4 - ASCL2	1466	710	347
FBXO41 - ASCL2	1685	2323	1224

Table 17: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS FBXO family members.

One can also interpret the results of the table 17 graphically, with the following influences - \bullet FBXO family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 - > FBXO-0101/1524/1324/1586/0586/0020.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES FBXO family w.r.t ASCL2 FBXO-0101/1524/1324/1586/0586/0020 ASCL2

Table 18: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and FBXO family members.

2.2.10. ASCL2 - FAM

Liang et al. [31], via electrophoretic mobility shift assay, validated the regulatory role of ACSL1 and ASCL2 in the regulation of FAM13A. There are range of family with sequence similarity members. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, FAM family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently.

I was able to rank 2^{nd} order combination of FAM family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 19 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 20 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 19. The table 19 shows rankings of FAM family w.r.t ASCL2. FAM111B - ASCL2 show low rankings of 9 (laplace), 71 (linear) and 16 (rbf). FAM161A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 106 (laplace), 86 (linear) and 93 (rbf). FAM72D - ASCL2 show low rankings of 112 (laplace), 284 (linear) and 161 (rbf). FAM201A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 162 (laplace), 398 (linear) and 341 (rbf). FAM216A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 265 (laplace), 453 (linear) and 198 (rbf). FAM169A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 379 (laplace), 164 (linear) and 650 (rbf). FAM83D - ASCL2 show low rankings of 407 (laplace), 422 (linear) and 175 (rbf). FAM86A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 563 (laplace) and 1048 (rbf). FAM72A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 622 (laplace), 174 (linear) and 129 (rbf). FAM120C - ASCL2 show low rankings of 626 (laplace), 283 (linear) and 289 (rbf). FAM86C2P - ASCL2 show low rankings of 627 (laplace), 1279 (linear) and 1298 (rbf). FAM81A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 710 (laplace), 716 (linear) and 1124 (rbf). FAM227A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 717 (laplace), 327 (linear) and 254 (rbf). FAM86B1 - ASCL2 show low rankings of 757 (laplace), 1020 (linear) and 1466 (rbf). FAM96AP2 - ASCL2 show low rankings of 780 (laplace), 814 (linear) and 272 (rbf). FAM96A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 805 (laplace) and 1359 (linear). FAM98B - ASCL2 show low rankings of 889 (laplace), 951 (linear) and 277 (rbf). FAM117B - ASCL2 show low rankings of 1007 (laplace), 1114 (linear) and 867 (rbf). FAM131B - ASCL2 show low rankings of 1224 (laplace), 1289 (linear) and 295 (rbf). FAM221A - ASCL2 show low rankings of 1393 (laplace), 1158 (linear) and 1675. FAM86JP - ASCL2 show low rankings of 1249 (linear) and 884 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment. Further, FAM41 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

Further, FAM89A, FAM185A, FAM117A, FAM136A, FAM86C1, FAM173B, FAM149B1, FAM210B, FAM208B, FAM178A, FAM122B and FAM98A showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

One can also interpret the results of the table 19 graphically, with the following influences - • FAM family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> FAM-111B / 161A / 72D / 201A / 216A / 169A / 83D / 86A / 72A / 120C / 86C2P / 81A / 227A / 86B1 / 96AP2 / 96A / 98D / 117B / 131B / 221A / 86JP.

2.2.11. ASCL2 - BCL

In colorectal cancer cell lines, Legge et al. [32] show for the first time that BCL3 acts as a co-activator of β -catenin/TCF-mediated transcriptional activity. They demonstrate that targeting BCL3 expression reduced β -catenin/TCF-dependent transcription and the expression of LGR5 and ASCL2. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, BCL family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2^{nd} order combination of BCL family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 21 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored

RANKING OF FAM FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2							
	laplace	linear	rbf		laplace	linear	rbf
FAM111B - ASCL2	9	71	16	FAM161A - ASCL2	106	86	93
FAM72D - ASCL2	112	284	161	FAM201A - ASCL2	162	398	341
FAM216A - ASCL2	265	453	198	FAM169A - ASCL2	379	164	650
FAM83D - ASCL2	407	422	175	FAM86A - ASCL2	563	2194	1048
FAM72A - ASCL2	622	174	129	FAM120C - ASCL2	626	283	289
FAM86C2P - ASCL2	627	1279	1298	FAM81A - ASCL2	710	716	1124
FAM227A - ASCL2	717	327	254	FAM86B1 - ASCL2	757	1020	1466
FAM96AP2 - ASCL2	780	814	272	FAM96A - ASCL2	805	1359	1543
FAM98B - ASCL2	889	951	277	FAM117B - ASCL2	1007	2478	2553
FAM168A - ASCL2	1188	1114	867	FAM131B - ASCL2	1224	1289	295
FAM221A - ASCL2	1393	1158	1675	FAM89A - ASCL2	1669	2217	2076
FAM185A - ASCL2	1680	2182	2285	FAM117A - ASCL2	1706	1801	1367
FAM136A - ASCL2	1789	1209	2362	FAM86C1 - ASCL2	1966	2592	1775
FAM173B - ASCL2	2177	802	2511	FAM86JP - ASCL2	2209	1249	884
FAM149B1 - ASCL2	2258	2198	2667	FAM210B - ASCL2	2362	1063	1657
FAM208B - ASCL2	2435	1926	2393	FAM178A - ASCL2	2461	2208	2703
FAM122B - ASCL2	2691	2174	2504	FAM98A - ASCL2	2736	2741	2658

RANKING FAM FAMILY VS ASCL2

Table 19: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS FAM family members.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES	
FAM family w.r.t ASCL2	
FAM-111B/161A/72D/201A/216A/169A/83D/86A/72A/120C/86C2P	ASCL2
FAM-81A/227A/86B1/96AP2/96A/98D/117B/131B/221A/86JP	ASCL2

Table 20: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and FAM family members.

combinatorial hypotheses in table 22 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 21. The table 21 shows rankings of BCL family w.r.t ASCL2. BCL6B - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 240 (laplace), 235 (linear) and 172 (rbf). BCL11A - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 918 (laplace), 126 (linear) and 1248 (rbf). BCL11B - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1245 (laplace), 810 (linear) and 1175 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment. Further, BCL9, BCL2L12 and BCL7A showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

One can also interpret the results of the table 21 graphically, with the following influences - \bullet BCL family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> BCL-6B/11A/11B.

2.2.12. ASCL2 - ATG

In adult diffuse gliomas, Wang et al. [33] show that ASCL2 transcriptionally regulates the expression of ATG9B to maintain stemness properties. The established ASCL2-ATG9B axis demonstrate that it is crucial for maintaining the stemness phenotype and

RANKING BCL FAMILY VS ASCL2				
RANKING OF BCL FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2				
	laplace	linear	rbf	
BCL6B - ASCL2	240	235	172	
BCL11A - ASCL2	918	126	1248	
BCL11B - ASCL2	1245	810	1175	
BCL9 - ASCL2	1698	2296	2011	
BCL2L12 - ASCL2	2263	2071	2499	
BCL7A - ASCL2	2706	2444	2317	

Table 21: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS BCL family members.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES BCL family w.r.t ASCL2 BCL-6B/11A/11B ASCL2

Table 22: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and BCL family members.

tumor progression, thus revealing a potential autophagy inhibition strategy. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, ATG family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2nd order combination of ATG family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 23 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 24 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 23. The table 23 shows rankings of ATG family w.r.t ASCL2. ATG4C - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 334 (laplace), 638 (linear) and 939 (rbf). ATG10 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1439 (laplace) and 1166 (linear). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment. Further, ATG3 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

One can also interpret the results of the table 23 graphically, with the following influences - \bullet ATG family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> ATG-4C/10.

RANKING ATG FAMILY VS ASCL2			
RANKING OF ATG FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2			
	laplace	linear	rbf
ATG4C - ASCL2	334	638	939
ATG10 - ASCL2	1439	1166	2148
ATG3 - ASCL2	2172	2526	2010

Table 23: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS ATG family members.

UNEXPLORED COMBINA	TORIAL HYPOTHESES
ATG family w.r.t ASCL2	
ATG-4C/10	ASCL2

Table 24: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and ATG family members.

2.2.13. ASCL2 - ARHGAP

In breast cancer, Han et al. [34] identified a feedback loop that downregulated ARHGAP25, which can promote activation of the WNT/ β -catenin pathway. Because of this there is an increase in ASCL2 expression, which negatively regulates ARHGAP25 expression at transcriptional level and contributes to breast cancer progression. In colorectal cancer cells treated with ETC-1922159, ARHGAP family and ASCL2, were found to be down regulated and recorded independently. I was able to rank 2^{nd} order combination of ARHGAP family and ASCL2, that were down regulated.

Table 25 shows rankings of these combinations. Followed by this is the unexplored combinatorial hypotheses in table 26 generated from analysis of the ranks in table 25. The table 25 shows rankings of ARHGAP family w.r.t ASCL2. ARHGAP11A - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 31 (laplace), 10 (linear) and 15 (rbf). ARHGAP11B - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 306 (laplace), 640 (linear) and 270 (rbf). ARHGAP33 - ASCL2 shows low ranking of 1048 (laplace), 1007 (linear) and 535 (rbf). These rankings point to the synergy existing between the two components, which have been down regulated after the drug treatment. Further, ARHGAP19 showed high ranking and might not be synergistically working with ASCL2, before treatment.

One can also interpret the results of the table 25 graphically, with the following influences - \bullet ARHGAP family w.r.t ASCL2 with ASCL2 -> ARHGAP-11A/11B/33.

RANKING ARHGAP FAMILY VS ASCL2			
RANKING OF ARHGAP FAMILY W.R.T ASCL2			
	laplace	linear	rbf
ARHGAP11A - ASCL2	31	10	15
ARHGAP11B - ASCL2	306	640	270
ARHGAP33 - ASCL2	1048	1007	535
ARHGAP19 - ASCL2	1871	2288	2176

Table 25: 2nd order interaction ranking between ASCL2 VS ARHGAP family members.

UNEXPLORED COMBINATORIAL HYPOTHESES ARHGAP family w.r.t ASCL2 ARHGAP-11A/11B/33 ASCL2

Table 26: 2nd order combinatorial hypotheses between ASCL2 and ARHGAP family members.

3. Conclusion

Presented here are a range of multiple synergistic ASCL2 2nd order combinations that were ranked via a machine learning based search engine. Via majority voting across the ranking methods, it was possible to find plausible unexplored synergistic combinations of ASCL2-X that might be prevalent in CRC cells after treatment with ETC-1922159 drug.

Conflict of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Author's contributions

Concept, design, in silico implementation - SS. Analysis and interpretation of results - SS. Manuscript writing - SS. Manuscript revision - SS. Approval of manuscript - SS

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Mrs. Rita Sinha and Mr. Prabhat Sinha for supporting the author financially, without which this work could not have been made possible.

Source of Data

Data used in this research work was released in a publication in Madan et al. [35].

4. References

References

- [1] P. M. Aponte, A. Caicedo, Stemness in cancer: Stem cells, cancer stem cells, and their microenvironment, Stem cells international 2017 (2017).
- [2] J. N. Lieberkuhn, Dissertatio anatomico-physiologica de fabrica et actione intestinorum villorum tenuium hominis: iconibus aeri incisis illustrata, Ph.D. thesis, 1780.
- [3] C. S. Potten, G. Owen, D. Booth, Intestinal stem cells protect their genome by selective segregation of template dna strands, J Cell Sci 115 (2002) 2381–2388.
- [4] N. Barker, A. van Oudenaarden, H. Clevers, Identifying the stem cell of the intestinal crypt: strategies and pitfalls, Cell stem cell 11 (2012) 452–460.
- [5] H. Clevers, The intestinal crypt, a prototype stem cell compartment, Cell 154 (2013) 274–284.
- [6] T. K. Noah, B. Donahue, N. F. Shroyer, Intestinal development and differentiation, Experimental cell research 317 (2011) 2702–2710.
- [7] V. K. Reddy, S. P. Short, C. W. Barrett, M. K. Mittal, C. E. Keating, J. J. Thompson, E. I. Harris, F. Revetta, D. M. Bader, T. Brand, et al., Bves regulates intestinal stem cell programs and intestinal crypt viability after radiation, Stem Cells 34 (2016) 1626–1636.
- [8] H. Yoshikawa, K. Matsubara, X. Zhou, S. Okamura, T. Kubo, Y. Murase, Y. Shikauchi, M. Esteller, J. G. Herman, X. W. Wang, et al., Wnt10b functional dualism: β-catenin/tcf-dependent growth promotion or independent suppression with deregulated expression in cancer, Molecular biology of the cell 18 (2007) 4292–4303.
- [9] C. Schwienbacher, L. Gramantieri, R. Scelfo, A. Veronese, G. A. Calin, L. Bolondi, C. M. Croce, G. Barbanti-Brodano, M. Negrini, Gain of imprinting at chromosome 11p15: a pathogenetic mechanism identified in human hepatocarcinomas, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 97 (2000) 5445–5449.

- [10] T. Miyamoto, Y. Jinno, H. Soejima, K. Yun, K. Miura, M. Ishikawa, N. Niikawa, The human ascl2 gene escaping genomic imprinting and its expression pattern, Journal of assisted reproduction and genetics 19 (2002) 240–244.
- [11] H. Cui, I. L. Horon, R. Ohlsson, S. R. Hamilton, A. P. Feinberg, Loss of imprinting in normal tissue of colorectal cancer patients with microsatellite instability, Nature medicine 4 (1998) 1276–1280.
- [12] D. E. Stange, F. Engel, T. Longerich, B. Koo, M. Koch, N. Delhomme, M. Aigner, G. Toedt, P. Schirmacher, P. Lichter, et al., Expression of an ascl2 related stem cell signature and igf2 in colorectal cancer liver metastases with 11p15. 5 gain, Gut (2010) gut–2009.
- [13] A. Jubb, S. Chalasani, G. Frantz, R. Smits, H. Grabsch, V. Kavi, N. Maughan, K. Hillan, P. Quirke, H. Koeppen, Achaete-scute like 2 (ascl2) is a target of wnt signalling and is upregulated in intestinal neoplasia, Oncogene 25 (2006) 3445– 3457.
- [14] R. Zhu, Y. Yang, Y. Tian, J. Bai, X. Zhang, X. Li, Z. Peng, Y. He, L. Chen, Q. Pan, et al., Ascl2 knockdown results in tumor growth arrest by mirna-302b-related inhibition of colon cancer progenitor cells, PloS one 7 (2012) e32170.
- [15] S. Sinha, Machine learning ranking of plausible (un) explored synergistic gene combinations using sensitivity indices of time series measurements of wnt signaling pathway, Integrative Biology 16 (2024) zyae020.
- [16] S. Sinha, Sensitivity analysis based ranking reveals unknown biological hypotheses for down regulated genes in time buffer during administration of porcn-wnt inhibitor etc-1922159 in crc, bioRxiv (2017) 180927.
- [17] T. Joachims, Training linear svms in linear time, in: Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining, ACM, 2006, pp. 217–226.
- [18] R. Zhu, Y. Yang, Y. Tian, J. Bai, X. Zhang, X. Li, Z. Peng, Y. He, L. Chen, Q. Pan, et al., Ascl2 knockdown results in tumor growth arrest by mirna-302b-related inhibition of colon cancer progenitor cells, PloS one 7 (2012) e32170.
- [19] A. Giakountis, P. Moulos, V. Zarkou, C. Oikonomou, V. Harokopos, A. G. Hatzigeorgiou, M. Reczko, P. Hatzis, A positive regulatory loop between a wntregulated non-coding rna and ascl2 controls intestinal stem cell fate, Cell reports 15 (2016) 2588–2596.
- [20] J. Schuijers, J. P. Junker, M. Mokry, P. Hatzis, B.-K. Koo, V. Sasselli, L. G. Van Der Flier, E. Cuppen, A. van Oudenaarden, H. Clevers, Ascl2 acts as an r-spondin/wnt-responsive switch to control stemness in intestinal crypts, Cell stem cell 16 (2015) 158–170.

- [21] D. Zhang, Q.-Q. Ni, Q.-Y. Liang, L.-L. He, B.-W. Qiu, L.-J. Zhang, T.-Y. Mou, C.-C. Le, Y. Huang, T.-T. Li, et al., Ascl2 induces an immune excluded microenvironment by activating cancer-associated fibroblasts in microsatellite stable colorectal cancer, Oncogene 42 (2023) 2841–2853.
- [22] K. Murata, U. Jadhav, S. Madha, J. van Es, J. Dean, A. Cavazza, K. Wucherpfennig, F. Michor, H. Clevers, R. A. Shivdasani, Ascl2-dependent cell dedifferentiation drives regeneration of ablated intestinal stem cells, Cell stem cell 26 (2020) 377–390.
- [23] O.-H. Kwon, J.-L. Park, S.-J. Baek, S.-M. Noh, K.-S. Song, S.-Y. Kim, Y. S. Kim, Aberrant upregulation of ascl 2 by promoter demethylation promotes the growth and resistance to 5-fluorouracil of gastric cancer cells, Cancer science 104 (2013) 391–397.
- [24] M. Moriyama, A.-D. Durham, H. Moriyama, K. Hasegawa, S.-I. Nishikawa, F. Radtke, M. Osawa, Multiple roles of notch signaling in the regulation of epidermal development, Developmental cell 14 (2008) 594–604.
- [25] Q. Wang, Y. Shi, Q. Bian, N. Zhang, M. Wang, J. Wang, X. Li, L. Lai, Z. Zhao, H. Yu, Molecular mechanisms of syncytin-1 in tumors and placental development related diseases, Discover Oncology 14 (2023) 104.
- [26] K. M. Varberg, K. Iqbal, M. Muto, M. E. Simon, R. L. Scott, K. Kozai, R. H. Choudhury, J. D. Aplin, R. Biswell, M. Gibson, et al., Ascl2 reciprocally controls key trophoblast lineage decisions during hemochorial placenta development, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118 (2021) e2016517118.
- [27] K. C. Allan, L. R. Hu, M. A. Scavuzzo, A. R. Morton, A. S. Gevorgyan, E. F. Cohn, B. L. Clayton, I. R. Bederman, S. Hung, C. F. Bartels, et al., Non-canonical targets of hif1a impair oligodendrocyte progenitor cell function, Cell stem cell 28 (2021) 257–272.
- [28] L. L. Christensen, K. True, M. P. Hamilton, M. M. Nielsen, N. D. Damas, C. K. Damgaard, H. Ongen, E. Dermitzakis, J. B. Bramsen, J. S. Pedersen, et al., Snhg16 is regulated by the wnt pathway in colorectal cancer and affects genes involved in lipid metabolism, Molecular oncology 10 (2016) 1266–1282.
- [29] K. Birkenkamp-Demtroder, A. Maghnouj, F. Mansilla, K. Thorsen, C. Andersen, B. Øster, S. Hahn, T. F. Ørntoft, Repression of kiaa1199 attenuates wnt-signalling and decreases the proliferation of colon cancer cells, British journal of cancer 105 (2011) 552–561.
- [30] M.-K. M. Tan, H.-J. Lim, J. W. Harper, Scffbxo22 regulates histone h3 lysine 9 and 36 methylation levels by targeting histone demethylase kdm4a for ubiquitinmediated proteasomal degradation, Molecular and cellular biology 31 (2011) 3687–3699.

- [31] C. Liang, A. Li, S. H. A. Raza, R. Khan, X. Wang, S. Wang, G. Wang, Y. Zhang, L. Zan, The molecular characteristics of the fam13a gene and the role of transcription factors acsl1 and ascl2 in its core promoter region, Genes 10 (2019) 981.
- [32] D. N. Legge, A. P. Shephard, T. J. Collard, A. Greenhough, A. C. Chambers, R. W. Clarkson, C. Paraskeva, A. C. Williams, Bcl-3 promotes a cancer stem cell phenotype by enhancing β-catenin signalling in colorectal tumour cells, Disease Models & Mechanisms 12 (2019) dmm037697.
- [33] L.-H. Wang, Y. Yuan, J. Wang, Y. Luo, Y. Lan, J. Ge, L. Li, F. Liu, Q. Deng, Z.-X. Yan, et al., Ascl2 maintains stemness phenotype through atg9b and sensitizes gliomas to autophagy inhibitor, Advanced Science 9 (2022) 2105938.
- [34] S. Han, X. Jin, T. Hu, F. Chi, Arhgap25 suppresses the development of breast cancer by an arhgap25/wnt/ascl2 feedback loop, Carcinogenesis 44 (2023) 369– 382.
- [35] B. Madan, Z. Ke, N. Harmston, S. Y. Ho, A. Frois, J. Alam, D. A. Jeyaraj, V. Pendharkar, K. Ghosh, I. H. Virshup, et al., Wnt addiction of genetically defined cancers reversed by porcn inhibition, Oncogene 35 (2016) 2197.