Published in final edited form as:

DNA Repair (Amst). 2010 August 5; 9(8): 859–860. doi:10.1016/j.dnarep.2010.05.006.

Reply: Is There Any Genetic Instability in Human Cancer?

Edward J. Fox, Robert A. Beckman, and Lawrence A. Loeb

Department of Pathology Box 357705, School of Medicine, K-072 HSB, University of Washington

This letter is in response to the recent communication of Darryl K. Shibata and Michael R. Lieber arguing against the concept of a mutator phenotype in human cancer. The question is whether an increased mutation rate is required to account for the large numbers of mutations observed in cancer (i.e. a mutator phenotype) or whether normal mutation rates are sufficient [1]. They base their argument on the recent report of 33,000 genetic changes per genome between a tumor cell line and a paired nonneoplastic cell line [2]. They calculate that a tumor cell could divide once every day and, assuming a normal mutation rate of 10^{-9} , an individual might accumulate “60,000 mutations per haploid genome by middle age.” Calculations of this nature are highly speculative, in that estimates of all the relevant parameters can vary over several orders of magnitude.

Experimental estimates of the number of cell divisions in cancers have been understandably difficult to ascertain. Cell lines are the products of selection, and their division and mutation rates may not correlate with those exhibited by normal and malignant cells. Vogelstein and colleagues have proposed >5,000 generations as an estimate of the number of sequential cell divisions that might occur prior to the last clonal expansion in colon cancers [3,4] and Shibata and Lieber now suggest 20,000. While rapid sequential divisions and extensive tumor cell death are easy to visualize for tumors that line a body cavity such as the colon, it is much more difficult to visualize or substantiate in slow growing solid tumors encapsulated by normal tissue. Estimates of the number of cell divisions per human lifetime range as low as 150–200 cell generations per lifetime for non-stem cell compartments [5–7], compared to the 20,000 that are postulated by Shibata and Lieber.

More importantly, we are now in possession of solid estimates of mutation frequencies in normal human cells and in several solid cancers [8]. Roach et al., sequenced the whole genomes of a family of four, consisting of two siblings and their parents [9]. They found that only 70 mutations were identified between generations. They directly estimated a human intergeneration mutation rate of 1.1×10^{-8} per nucleotide position per haploid genome. (Based on 100 cell divisions, the mutation rate per cell generation would be 1×10^{-10} per nucleotide position compared to the 10^{-9} considered by Shibata and Lieber; with a larger number of cell divisions it would be even lower. Estimates of mutation rates in cultured cells range as low as 10^{-11} [10]). In contrast, genome-wide sequencing of breast, melanoma and lung cancer genomes each identified >20,000 clonal mutations per cancer genome [2,11,12]. A mutation load of >20,000 would therefore require an amount of proliferation equivalent to that of almost 300 human generations!

We agree with the statement of Shibata and Lieber that cancers arising within a human lifetime “take the fastest pathways”, since all possible mechanisms are likely in competition. If “the mutations that cause cancer are likely due to a few unlucky critical hits,” as they

---

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

assert, what is the most efficient and fastest way to obtain these critical hits? Extensive quantitative modelling has shown the most efficient trajectory for a tumor is to sustain an early mutator mutation, and that this is true irrespective of other complications such as lineage selection and expansion, and for nearly all reasonable parameter values [13–15]. These critical mutations represent a subset of the clonal sequence changes. Because these cells preferentially have an increased overall mutation rate, additional random mutations also occur as a consequence. Even when these random mutations are not drivers of carcinogenesis, they may contribute to plasticity in response to therapy.

The defining feature of the cancer genome is the extensive genomic heterogeneity generated during tumorigenesis, both within individual tumors and between different tumors of the same type. Shibata and Lieber rightly point out that the mutational heterogeneity between tumors complicates the usefulness of sequencing large numbers of cancer genomes. Furthermore, we argue that substantial mutational diversity also exists within individual tumors. Attempts to characterise the cancer genome through large-scale sequencing studies continue to ignore that it is the generation of mutational diversity itself (i.e. the expression of a mutator phenotype), combined with multiple rounds of selection, that generate the phenotypic plasticity required for tumorigenesis [16,17]. To use DNA sequencing for selecting individual cancer therapies (personalized medicine) or for predicting the likelihood of emergence of resistance, ultimately it may be necessary to quantify the heterogeneity of tumors by sequencing DNA from single cells or molecules.

References

1. Loeb LA. Mutator phenotype may be required for multistage carcinogenesis. *Cancer Res.* 1991; 51:3075–3079. [PubMed: 2039987]
2. Pleasance ED, Cheetham RK, Stephens PJ, McBride DJ, Humphray SJ, Greenman CD, Varella I, Lin ML, Ordóñez GR, Bignell GR, Ye K, Alipaz J, Bauer MJ, Beare D, Butler A, Carter RJ, Chen L, Cox AJ, Edkins S, Kokko-Gonzales PI, Gormley NA, Grocock RJ, Haudenschild CD, Hims MM, James T, Jia M, Kingsbury Z, Leroy C, Marshall J, Menzies A, Mudie LJ, Ning Z, Royce T, Schulz-Trieglaff OB, Spiridou A, Stebbings LA, Szajkowski L, Teague J, Williamson D, Chin L, Ross MT, Campbell PJ, Bentley DR, Futreal PA, Stratton MR. A comprehensive catalogue of somatic mutations from a human cancer genome. *Nature.* 2010; 463:191–196. [PubMed: 20016485]
3. Jones S, Chen WD, Parmigiani G, Diehl F, Beerenwinkel N, Antal T, Traulsen A, Nowak MA, Siegel C, Velculescu VE, Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B, Willis J, Markowitz SD. Comparative lesion sequencing provides insights into tumor evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2008; 105:4283–4288. [PubMed: 18337506]
4. Wang TL, Rago C, Silliman N, Ptak J, Markowitz S, Willson JK, Parmigiani G, Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B, Velculescu VE. Prevalence of somatic alterations in the colorectal cancer cell genome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2002; 99:3076–3080. [PubMed: 11867767]
5. Baca OG, Scott TO, Akporiaye ET, DeBlassie R, Crissman HA. Cell cycle distribution patterns and generation times of L929 fibroblast cells persistently infected with *Coxiella burnetii*. *Infect Immun.* 1985; 47:366–369. [PubMed: 3967922]
6. Baker FL, Sanger LJ, Rodgers RW, Jabboury K, Mangini OR. Cell proliferation kinetics of normal and tumour tissue in vitro: quiescent reproductive cells and the cycling reproductive fraction. *Cell Prolif.* 1995; 28:1–15. [PubMed: 7833382]
7. MITOPENCOURSEWARE, Cell, tissue and tumor kinetics. 2005. <http://ocw.mit.edu>
8. Fox EJ, Salk JJ, Loeb LA. Cancer genome sequencing--an interim analysis. *Cancer Res.* 2009; 69:4948–4950. [PubMed: 19509220]
9. Roach JC, Glusman G, Smit AF, Huff CD, Hubley R, Shannon PT, Rowen L, Pant KP, Goodman N, Bamshad M, Shendure J, Drmanac R, Jorde LB, Hood L, Galas DJ. Analysis of genetic inheritance in a family quartet by whole-genome sequencing. *Science.* 2010; 328:636–639. [PubMed: 20220176]

10. Cervantes RB, Stringer JR, Shao C, Tischfeld JA, Stambrook PJ. Embryonic stem cells and somatic cells differ in mutation frequency and type. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2002; 99:3586–3590. [PubMed: 11891338]
11. Pleasance ED, Stephens PJ, O'Meara S, McBride DJ, Meynert A, Jones D, Lin ML, Beare D, Lau KW, Greenman C, Varela I, Nik-Zainal S, Davies HR, Ordoñez GR, Mudie LJ, Latimer C, Edkins S, Stebbings L, Chen L, Jia M, Leroy C, Marshall J, Menzies A, Butler A, Teague JW, Mangion J, Sun YA, McLaughlin SF, Peckham HE, Tsung EF, Costa GL, Lee CC, Minna JD, Gazdar A, Birney E, Rhodes MD, McKernan KJ, Stratton MR, Futreal PA, Campbell PJ. A small-cell lung cancer genome with complex signatures of tobacco exposure. *Nature*. 2010; 463:184–190. [PubMed: 20016488]
12. Ding L, Ellis MJ, Li S, Larson DE, Chen K, Wallis JW, Harris CC, McLellan MD, Fulton RS, Fulton LL, Abbott RM, Hoog J, Dooling DJ, Koboldt DC, Schmidt H, Kalicki J, Zhang Q, Chen L, Lin L, Wendl MC, McMichael JF, Magrini VJ, Cook L, McGrath SD, Vickery TL, Appelbaum E, DeSchryver K, Davies S, Guintoli T, Lin L, Crowder R, Tao Y, Snider JE, Smith SM, Dukes AF, Sanderson GE, Pohl CS, Delehaunty KD, Fronick CC, Pape KA, Reed JS, Robinson JS, Hodges JS, Schierding W, Dees ND, Shen D, Locke DP, Wiechert ME, Eldred JM, Peck JB, Oberkfell BJ, Lolofie JT, Du F, Hawkins AE, O'Laughlin MD, Bernard KE, Cunningham M, Elliott G, Mason MD, Thompson DM Jr, Ivanovich JL, Goodfellow PJ, Perou CM, Weinstock GM, Aft R, Watson M, Ley TJ, Wilson RK, Mardis ER. Genome remodelling in a basal-like breast cancer metastasis and xenograft. *Nature*. 2010; 464:999–1005. [PubMed: 20393555]
13. Beckman RA, Loeb LA. Genetic instability in cancer: theory and experiment. *Semin Cancer Biol*. 2005; 15:423–435. [PubMed: 16043359]
14. Beckman RA, Loeb LA. Efficiency of carcinogenesis with and without a mutator mutation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2006; 103:14140–14145. [PubMed: 16966602]
15. Beckman RA. Mutator mutations enhance tumorigenic efficiency across fitness landscapes. *PloS*. 2009; 14:e5860.
16. Loeb LA, Springgate CF, Battula N. Errors in DNA replication as a basis of malignant changes. *Cancer Res*. 1974; 34:2311–2321. [PubMed: 4136142]
17. Nowell PC. The clonal evolution of tumor cell populations. *Science*. 1976; 194:23–28. [PubMed: 959840]