

American Association for the Advancement of Science

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Publisher: Alvin W. Trivelpiece

Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

Deputy Editors: Philip H. Abelson (*Engineering and Applied Sciences*); John I. Brauman (*Physical Sciences*)

EDITORIAL STAFF

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

Assistant Managing Editors: Nancy J. Hartnagel, John E. Ringle

Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Ruth Kulstad

Associate Editors: Martha Collins, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Edith Meyers, Phillip D. Szuroni, David F. Voss

Letters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Deborah F. Washburn

This Week in Science: Ruth Levy Guyer

Contributing Editor: Lawrence I. Grossman

Chief Production Editor: Ellen E. Murphy

Editing Department: Lois Schmitt, *head*; Mary McDaniel, Barbara E. Patterson

Copy Desk: Lyle L. Green, Sharon Ryan, Beverly Shields, Anna Victoreen

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Assistant Production Manager: James Landry

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, James J. Olivarri, Eleanor Warner

Covers Editor: Grayce Finger

Manuscript Systems Analyst: William Carter

NEWS STAFF

News Editor: Barbara J. Culliton

News and Comment: Colin Norman, *deputy editor*; William Booth, Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Eliot Marshall, Marjorie Sun, John Walsh

Research News: Roger Lewin, *deputy editor*; Deborah M. Barnes, Richard A. Kerr, Gina Kolata, Jean L. Marx, Leslie Roberts, Arthur L. Robinson, M. Mitchell Waldrop

European Correspondent: David Dickson

BUSINESS STAFF

Associate Publisher: William M. Miller, III

Business Staff Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

Classified Advertising Supervisor: Karen Morgenstern

Membership Recruitment: Gwendolyn Huddle

Member and Subscription Records: Ann Ragland

Guide to Biotechnology Products and Instruments: Shauna S. Roberts

ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

Director: Earl J. Scherago

Traffic Manager: Donna Rivera

Traffic Manager (Recruitment): Gwen Canter

Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles

Marketing Manager: Herbert L. Burklund

Sales: New York, NY 10036: J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, IL 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16 St. (408-998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581); Damascus, MD 20872: Rick Sommer, 24808 Shrubbery Hill Ct. (301-972-9270); U.K., Europe: Nick Jones, +44(0)64752918; Telex 42513; FAX (0392) 31645.

Information for contributors appears on page XI of the 26 June 1987 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500.

Advertising correspondence should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO.

Cancer Phobia

For more than 10 years, the public has been subjected to a media barrage leading to widespread, misinformed fear of chemicals. Through the use of questionable evidence, many major substances have been labeled carcinogens. If data are adjusted to eliminate effects of cigarette smoking, there has been no overall increase in cancer due to other factors. The highly publicized cancer epidemic that was predicted earlier has not materialized.

With increasing use of synthetic chemicals, it was desirable to screen them for possible carcinogenicity by tests on shorter lived animals such as mice and rats. The general procedure is to subject the mice or rats to massive doses of the chemical to be tested, usually by feeding, gavage, or inhalation. Preliminary experiments determine a maximum tolerated dose. This amount, repeated over a 2-week period, usually leads to a noticeable but tolerated reduction in weight. A chronic dose regimen is then employed in experiments that last for the animal's lifetime. The levels used vastly exceed those to which humans are likely to be exposed.

Many of the experiments that have been cited as proving a potential carcinogenicity of a chemical for humans have been performed on inbred strains of mice that have a natural incidence of liver tumors. In humans, there are taboos against inbreeding, which often leads to genetic impairments. Thus the use of inbred mice, though convenient experimentally, is suspect. More important is the fact of high natural incidence of liver tumors in the test mice. The usual response of these animals to massive doses of a chemical is to develop an even higher incidence of liver tumors. When this happens, the chemical is labeled a potential carcinogen in humans. It so happens that in humans primary liver cancer is rare with the exception of alcoholics and those who have suffered from hepatitis. With these exceptions, incidence of liver cancer in the United States decreased substantially during the times when use of industrial chemicals expanded greatly. Thus extra liver tumors in a naturally tumorigenic mouse is of dubious relevance to humans.

Results from the massive doses are extrapolated linearly to low doses, and the assumption is made that humans are as sensitive as the most cancer prone of the species of animals tested. Use of a linear extrapolation to low doses implies that humans do not have repair mechanisms against injury.

Countless millions of animals have been sacrificed in testing chemicals. Comparatively little effort has been devoted to studying the mechanisms of chemical carcinogenesis. An important exception is work conducted at the Chemical Industry Institute of Toxicology (CIIT). The CIIT, which has achieved an excellent reputation among toxicologists for its careful work, has examined the detailed mechanisms of the interaction of formaldehyde with nasal passages of rats and has shown that the linear model is not correct in predicting nasal cancer in the rats. Rather, a more relevant measure is the extent of interaction of formaldehyde with the nasal DNA. The amount of binding of formaldehyde to DNA decreases much faster than the concentration of formaldehyde in the nasal passages and is a better predictor of carcinogenesis.

Another important study of CIIT has been an investigation of the mechanism of the carcinogenesis of branched-chain hydrocarbons in male rats. These hydrocarbons are key components of unleaded gasoline. The studies showed that the hydrocarbons interfere with the mechanism for excreting a low-molecular-weight protein by the male rat. Research at CIIT indicates that this may be the cause of kidney cancer in male rats exposed to gasoline. A similar mechanism with related cancer does not exist in female rats, in male or female mice, or in humans. This type of result calls into question the practice of the regulatory agencies in selecting for extrapolation to humans data from the most sensitive animal.

Animals differ by more than a factor of 1000 in the levels required for lethal response to dioxin. Rodents and humans are known not to be identical in their biochemistry. To attain a realistic estimate of the hazard—if any—presented by a chemical, specific information about its metabolism and physiological effects is needed. The two examples involving formaldehyde and hydrocarbons illustrate the power of an approach in which detailed mechanisms of chemical carcinogenicity are examined.—PHILIP H. ABELSON