Environmental Pollution 241 (2018) 289–302

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Environmental Pollution

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/envpol

From Muller to mechanism: How LNT became the default model for cancer risk assessment☆

Edward J. Calabrese

Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Morrill I, N344, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, 01003, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 4 April 2018
Accepted 16 May 2018
Available online 22 May 2018

Key Words:
Ionizing radiation
Linear dose response
Threshold dose response
Mutation
Dose rate
Cancer risk assessment

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the historical and scientific foundations of the Linear No-Threshold (LNT) cancer risk assessment model. The story of cancer risk assessment is an extraordinary one as it was based on an initial incorrect gene mutation interpretation of Muller, the application of this incorrect assumption in the derivation of the LNT single-hit model, and a series of actions by leading radiation geneticists during the 1946–1956 period, including a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation (BEAR) I Genetics Panel (Anonymous, 1956), to sustain the LNT belief via a series of deliberate obfuscations, deceptions and misrepresentations that provided the basis of modern cancer risk assessment policy and practices. The reaffirming of the LNT model by a subsequent and highly influential NAS Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR) I Committee (NAS/NRC, 1972) using mouse data has now been found to be inappropriate based on the discovery of a significant documented error in the historical control group that led to incorrect estimations of risk in the low dose zone. Correction of this error by the original scientists and the application of the adjusted/corrected data back to the BEIR I (NAS/NRC, 1972) report indicates that the data would have supported a threshold rather than the LNT model. Thus, cancer risk assessment has a poorly appreciated, complex and seriously flawed history that has undermined policies and practices of regulatory agencies in the U.S. and worldwide to the present time.

© 2018 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

While a role of the environment in affecting the occurrence of cancer has long been known (e.g., the occurrence of testicular cancer in chimney sweeps) (Pott, 1775), transitioning this recognition of concern into an experimental science proved to be difficult as seen in the series of failures to induce skin cancer in animal models during the early years of the 20th century. Finally, after many failed attempts, in 1918 Japanese researchers made the experimental breakthrough by the repeated administration of coal tars to the ears of rabbits to produce papillomas and carcinomas (Yamagiwa and Ichikawa, 1918). This seminal finding paved the way for experimental research to assess possible environmental causes of cancer.

In a similar manner, researchers early in the 20th century began to explore whether it was possible to induce mutations in plants and animals (Campos, 2015). While it took nearly three decades, Muller (1927a) reported that X-rays induced gene mutations in fruit flies, narrowly beating three independent teams of botanists who likewise reported inducing transgenerational phenotypic changes with X-rays/radium.[1] Muller's findings, like that of the Japanese cancer researchers, quickly transformed the field. For his discovery, Muller received the Nobel Prize in 1946. The current paper clarifies the historical foundations of the LNT single-hit dose-response model, its unique dependence upon the gene mutation interpretation of Muller in 1927, and how this interpretation became accepted by the scientific community and regulatory agencies. Most importantly, it will be shown that: (1) Muller's claim that the X-ray-induced transgenerational phenotypic changes were due to gene mutations was an interpretation lacking convincing evidence; (2) the induced transgenerational phenotypic changes

☆ This paper has been recommended for acceptance by B. Nowack.

E-mail address: edwardc@schoolph.umass.edu.

[1] In January 1927, in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (Communicated January 14, 1927), Gager and Blakeslee (1927) were the first to report cases of gene mutations. Thus, Muller's July 1927 publication was the second to report the gene mutation phenomenon. Muller gained acclaim because he produced many mutations quickly. However, Gager and Blakeslee repeatedly reminded the field of their primacy. In his effort to secure scientific honors, Muller (1927a, 1928a) failed to cite the earlier work of Gager and Blakeslee (1927).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.05.051
0269-7491/© 2018 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

were due to chromosomal deletions and aberrations, not Muller's proposed gene "point mutations"; (3) these developments undermine the historical and scientific foundations of the LNT single-hit model since it was built upon Muller's gene mutation interpretation (see Calabrese, 2017a for a significantly expanded analysis of this issue); (4) Muller and other leading U.S. radiation geneticists would collude in a series of articles to promote acceptance of the LNT, making deliberate deceptions and misrepresentations of the scientific record; (5) the deceptive practices would infiltrate and culminate in the actions of the U.S. NAS BEAR I Genetics Panel that recommended adoption of the LNT model by regulatory and public health agencies in 1956 (Anonymous, 1956) (See Calabrese, 2015a, b, c); (6) the mouse data used to provide the experimental basis for the subsequent reaffirmation of the LNT for cancer risk assessment was similarly problematic, that is, the BEIR I NAS/NRC (1972) Committee used a flawed historical control group that significantly overestimated risk in the low dose zone, yielding a linear dose response (see Calabrese 2017b, c); (7) use of a corrected historical control value yields a threshold rather than the linear dose response and; (8) this new assessment indicates that the LNT has been flawed from the start, yet national and international regulations have continued to be based upon it (Calabrese, 2015a, 2017d).

2. Muller and mutation

Hermann J. Muller, a radiation geneticist at the University of Texas/Austin, truly burst upon the national and international scene following his presentation at the 5th International Genetics Congress in Berlin during September 1927. His highly anticipated presentation convincingly demonstrated to an eager and massive grouping of geneticists from around the world that X-rays could induce transgenerational phenotypic changes in *Drosophila* perhaps providing a mechanism for evolution. Muller claimed that these changes were the result of induced gene mutation, tiny genomic changes, with Muller coining the term "point mutation". Muller not only claimed to be the first to ever artificially induce gene mutation, he produced copious numbers of them. Muller's presentation drew especially great anticipation since his article in the journal *Science,* published about three months earlier, only discussed some of the new findings, inexplicably failing to show any data. Thus, Muller, with a flair for the dramatic, disproved the doubters and set himself on a path that 19 years later would result in another trip to Europe, Stockholm, to receive the Nobel Prize in Biology and Medicine.

Muller's stunning results soon inspired: (1) numerous laboratories to redirect their research to the assessment of ionizing radiation induced mutations (Campos, 2015); (2) the creation of the Genetics Society of America (GSA) (1931) a few years later, bringing zoologists and botanists who were researching genetics under one integrated professional society; (3) the concept of a Proportionality Rule that describes the linear dose response for the ionizing radiation induced mutation response (Muller, 1930a); (4) the interdisciplinary collaboration of leading physicists and radiation geneticists to create the first mechanism-based cancer risk assessment model (LNT single-hit model) using target theory (Timofeeff-Ressovsky et al., 1935) and (5) the discovery of chemically induced mutations by Charlotte Auerbach in the 1940s (Auerbach and Robson, 1946). The reach of Muller was long and influential, inspiring the focus of Carson (1962) in her seminal book *Silent Spring,* that is normally given credit for starting the environmental revolution of the late 1960s and 1970s and continuing to the present. Muller wrote a powerfully supportive review of *Silent Spring* in the New York Herald Tribune published on the Sunday prior to the book's publication four days later (Muller, 1962). Thus, the X-ray induced "gene" mutation findings of Muller and his leadership over the next 40 years would profoundly affect the environmental movement and the fields of genetic toxicology, cancer risk assessment and numerous medical, radiation and public health practices.

There is therefore little question that Muller had a major influence on the scientific community and the general public, originating from the belief that he had actually demonstrated that X-rays produce gene mutations in the fruit fly. While the above summary highlights some of the societal impact of Muller, there are important parallel concerns with Muller's scientific legacy. In brief, Muller (1927a) made the critical assumption that the numerous X-ray induced transgenerational/heritable phenotypic changes that he reported were the result of induced gene mutations. Muller knew that transgenerational/heritable phenotypic changes via X-ray-induced chromosomal aberrations was not a significant finding (Muller, 1928b). This had been reported previously and would not affect an understanding of basic biological themes such as evolution and its potential mechanism. This was why Muller (1927a) entitled his groundbreaking July 22, 1927 article in *Science* "The Artificial Transmutation of the Gene".

3. Point mutations vs gene deletions

Within three months of his presenting these findings at the Genetics Congress[2] in Berlin (September, 1927) (Muller, 1928a), Muller (1927b) would publically express concerns that some might think that all he had done was to shoot large holes (i.e., deletions) throughout the genome with the high doses of X-rays used, noting that such concerns/questions were initiated by his longtime friend, close colleague, collaborator and confidante, Edgar Altenburg, a professor of genetics at Rice University. Within this anticipatory defensive context, at the December 1927 AAAS meeting at Nashville, Tennessee and in an April 1928 presentation to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Muller (1928b) tried to discount the possibility that his reported transgenerational phenotypic changes were due principally to heritable chromosome changes, suggesting as proof observations of reverse mutations (e.g., X-ray-induced reversible changes in eye color – red to white). Patterson and Muller (1930) would subsequently publish a massive 82-page paper supporting his argument. This was proof enough for Muller that X-rays induced small mutations in genes rather than vast and large deletions as suggested by Altenburg. Muller used apparent reverse mutation findings to preempt potential challenges to his gene mutation interpretation. Muller argued further that the assumed point mutations closely mimicked the type of gene mutation changes underlying the mechanism of evolution as might be seen with spontaneous gene mutations, spending much of the next

[2] The proceedings of this Congress contains Muller's paper, which included the data used for the basis of the Nobel Prize in 1946. The Congress proceedings paper of Muller had substantial limitations, being somewhat sloppily written, having three experiments, each with important weaknesses. It also lacked a methods section and provided no references, including no acknowledgement of the report by Gager and Blakeslee (1927) that preceded his *Science* paper (Muller 1927a) for the reporting of ionizing radiation induced gene mutation by six months. The general substandard quality of the manuscript made me wonder whether the Nobel Prize paper of Muller from the Congress proceedings had ever been peer-reviewed. A July 8, 1946 letter from Muller to Altenburg (Muller 1946a) revealed that the manuscript that he read at the Congress was exactly the same as published in the subsequent proceedings. Thus, it is virtually certain that the Nobel Prize research of Muller was not peer-reviewed (Calabrese, 2018). However, Muller had been acculturated into the need for and process of peer-review by Thomas Hunt Morgan, his Ph.D. advisor at Columbia University. Morgan helped to create the *Journal of Experimental Zoology* in 1903, which had a modern peer-review process from the start. In fact, Muller would publish several articles in this journal by 1920 (Harrison, 1945). Thus, Muller was part of a culture of peer-review as a necessity and expectation. Yet, he avoided it for the seminal findings for which he would be honored with the Nobel Prize.

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8855983

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8855983

Daneshyari.com