www.bjcancer.com

Letter to the Editor

Chromosomal radiosensitivity in breast cancer patients with a known or putative genetic predisposition

CB Seymour^{*,1,2}, C Mothersill² and M Moriarty¹

¹Saint Lukes Institute of Cancer Research, Oakland, Highfield Road, Rathgar, Dublin 6, Ireland; ²Radiation and Environmental Science Centre, Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin 8, Ireland

British Journal of Cancer (2003) **89,** 954. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6601188 www.bjcancer.com © 2003 Cancer Research UK

Sir,

The paper by Baeyens *et al* (2002) is interesting and we would like to contribute to the discussion. The authors suggest that the lack of correlation observed between G2 and G0 chromosomal radiosensitivity, also observed by Scott *et al* (1994), could be attributable to different DNA damage processing mechanisms operating in the G0 and G2 phase of the cell cycle.

It is also possible that different radiation pathways are involved. The G2 assay was performed following a dose of 0.4 Gy. We and others have demonstrated that this is the dose where maximal indirect nontargeted radiation cell killing (the bystander effect) occurs (Seymour and Mothersill, 2000). In our experience this effect plateaus at this dose, and a dose-dependent cell killing then follows. G0 is a specific stage of the cell cycle, which in the past has been demonstrated to allow PLD repair, that is potentially lethal damage that would in fact be lethal were the cell not in G0 (Hall, 2000). The observed result with 3.5 Gy HDR (45% radiosensitive) compared with the G2 results for 0.4 Gy (43% radiosensitive) could be interpreted as suggesting that radiosensitivity is independent of direct radiation damage, and is rather a function of indirect effects. The lack of correlation between the end points (G2-HDR MN r = 0.04 and G2-LDR MN r = 0.05) could then be attributable to differences in bystander expression during different stages of the cell cycle. The effect of the low dose rate in increasing the radiosensitivity is difficult to explain in terms of conventional radiobiology, but an inverse dose rate effect is well documented in the literature (Geard et al, 1994). The role of genetic predisposition to cancer in determining G2 radiosensitivity is also interesting. Our group has shown genetic variation of bystanderinduced cell death (Mothersill et al, 2001), but our interpretation has been to link cancer proneness with lack of cell death following exposure of unirradiated cells to the medium harvested from irradiated cells. Clearly this is an interesting area awaiting clarification.

REFERENCES

- Baeyens A, Thierens H, Claes K, Poppe B, Messiaen L, De Ridder L, Vral A (2002) Chromosomal radiosensitivity in breast cancer patients with a known or putative genetic predisposition. Br J Cancer 87: 1379-1385
- Geard CR, Miller RC, Brenner DJ, Hall EJ (1994) Oncogenic transformation through the cell cycle and the LET dependent inverse dose rate effect. *Radiat Prot Dosim* 52 (1-4): 367-371
- Hall EJ (2000) Radiobiology for the Radiologist, 5th Edn. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins
- Mothersill C, Rea D, Wright EG, Lorimore SA, Murphy D, Seymour CB, O'Malley K (2001) Individual variation in the production of a 'bystander

signal' following irradiation of primary cultures of normal human urothelium. *Carcinogenesis* 22 (9): 1465-1471

- Scott D, Barber JBP, Spreadborough AR, Burrill W, Roberts SA (1999) Increased chromosomal radiosensitivity in breast cancer patients: a comparison of two assays. Int J Radiat Biol 75: 1-10
- Seymour CB, Mothersill C (2000) Relative contribution of bystander and targeted cell killing to the low-dose region of the radiation dose response curve. *Radiat Res* **153** (5 Part 1): 508-511

*Correspondence: Dr CB Seymour; E-mail: cseymour @rsc.iol.ie