

Is c-Myc Protein Directly Involved in DNA Replication?

G. P. Studzinski *et al.* (1) have proposed that c-myc protein is involved directly in mammalian DNA replication. This conclusion is based on their observations that polyclonal and monoclonal antibodies against c-myc protein inhibit both DNA synthesis and DNA polymerase activity in nuclei isolated from HL60 and ML-1 cells, human leukemic cell lines that contain high concentrations of c-myc protein. We have attempted to confirm and extend these observations by testing a variety of antibodies against human c-myc protein for their ability to interfere with simian virus 40 (SV40) DNA replication under conditions (in vitro) that allowed initiation of new replicons and continuation of DNA replication at the resulting forks (2). We have also measured the ability of these antibodies to inhibit DNA polymerase- α or - δ activity, or both, on DNase I-activated DNA primer templates.

Our findings (3) can be summarized as follows. (i) Antibodies to the c-myc protein supplied by G. Studzinski and R. Watt and antibodies developed independently in one of our laboratories were able to recognize human c-myc protein. However, the inhibitory activity for SV40 DNA replication and DNA polymerase activity was present only in the samples supplied by Studzinski and Watt. Therefore, the ability of antibody preparations from different laboratories to recognize c-myc protein did not correlate with their inhibitory activity. (ii) Inhibition of SV40 DNA replication and DNA polymerase activity by some c-myc antibody preparations could not be prevented by incubating the antibody preparations with an excess of c-myc protein (provided by Studzinski and Watt), in contrast with their previous report (1). (iii) The inhibitory activity against DNA synthesis was separated from the antibody activity against c-myc protein by two different methods. The antibody activity bound tightly to *Staphylococcus aureus* protein A, while the inhibitory activity did not. Second, antibodies were recovered in the flow-through during gel filtration with Sephadex G-50, while the inhibitory material remained in the column. (iv) Finally, using a protein A-Sepharose column in our laboratory, we purified monoclonal antibody B3, previously reported to be highly inhibitory of DNA synthesis (1),

from the corresponding hybridoma medium (supplied by R. Watt). B3 antibody purified in this way did not inhibit DNA polymerase activity, SV40 DNA replication, or DNA synthesis in nuclei isolated from HL60 cells; but it did react strongly with c-myc protein.

We conclude that the inhibition of DNA synthesis observed by Studzinski *et al.* (1) can be explained by contamination of their antibody preparations by an unidentified inhibitor of DNA polymerase- α or - δ , or both, instead of by a specific reaction with c-myc antibodies. Purified c-myc antibodies did not inhibit DNA synthesis at cellular or SV40 replication forks, did not inhibit DNA polymerase- α activity on a purified DNA substrate, and did not inhibit initiation of SV40 DNA replication in vitro.

While our results suggest that c-myc protein does not play a role in DNA synthesis at replication forks, they do not address the question of a role for c-myc in the initiation of cellular DNA replication. Our observations are consistent with those of Kaczmarek *et al.* (4), who found that injection of a monoclonal antibody against c-myc protein into the nuclei of cultured fibroblasts did not prevent their entry into S phase, whereas microinjection of an antibody against DNA polymerase- α did.

Note added in proof: Iguchi-Arigo *et al.* (5) have recently reported that c-myc protein binds specifically to a putative cellular origin of replication, and that plasmids that contain these sequences replicate when transfected into HL60 cells or incubated with HL60 extracts. The same laboratory has reported that c-myc could inefficiently substitute for SV40 T-antigen in initiating replication at either a functional or nonfunctional SV40 origin of replication (6). So far, we have not been able to reproduce these observations using a plasmid (pARS65, provided by H. Ariga) that contains one of these putative cellular origins or a plasmid containing the SV40 origin of replication. It has also been recently reported that a c-myc antisense oligodeoxynucleotide inhibits entry of cells into S phase (7) and that elevated c-myc expression facilitates SV40 replication in human lymphoma cells (8). These observations are consistent with the hypothesis that c-myc protein may have an indirect role in DNA replication, possibly by

regulating the level of gene products required for cell proliferation which, in turn, allows higher rates of SV40 DNA replication. In summary, a direct role of c-myc protein in DNA replication has not been demonstrated conclusively, and the function of this nuclear oncogene remains unclear.

CRISANTO GUTIERREZ

ZONG-SHENG GUO

WILLIAM BURHANS

MELVIN L. DEPAMPHILIS

Department of Cell and

Developmental Biology,

Roche Institute of Molecular Biology,

Nutley, NJ 07110

JAMES FARRELL-TOWT

GRACE JU

Department of Molecular Genetics,

Roche Research Center,

Nutley, NJ 07110

REFERENCES

1. G. P. Studzinski, Z. S. Brelvi, S. C. Feldman, R. A. Watt, *Science* **234**, 467 (1986).
2. R. S. Decker, M. Yamaguchi, R. Possenti, M. K. Bradley, M. L. DePamphilis, *J. Biol. Chem.* **262**, 10863 (1987).
3. C. Gutierrez, Z.-S. Guo, J. Farrell-Towt, G. Ju, M. L. DePamphilis, *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **7**, 4594 (1987).
4. L. Kaczmarek, M. R. Miller, R. A. Hammond, W. E. Mercer, *J. Biol. Chem.* **261**, 10802 (1986).
5. S. M. M. Iguchi-Arigo, T. Itani, Y. Kigi, H. Ariga, *EMBO J.* **6**, 2365 (1987).
6. S. M. M. Iguchi-Arigo, T. Itani, M. Yamaguchi, H. Ariga, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **15**, 4889 (1987).
7. R. Heikkilä *et al.* *Nature* **328**, 445 (1987); K. Yokoyama and F. Imamoto, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **84**, 7363 (1987); E. L. Wickstrom *et al.*, *ibid.* **85**, 1028 (1988).
8. M. Classon, M. Henriksson, J. Sümegi, G. Klein, M.-L. Hammaskjöld, *Nature* **330**, 272 (1987).

13 August 1987; accepted 7 March 1988

Response: After our report (1) of the inhibitory effect of antibodies to the bacterially expressed c-myc protein on DNA replication in nuclei isolated from human leukemic cells was published, I approached DePamphilis's group at Roche for help in further analysis of this effect. We sought this collaboration because this group had ongoing studies of SV40 replication, a system that permits initiation as well as elongation of DNA chains in vitro. We supplied the Roche group with stored samples of the antibodies and the myc protein that were used in the experiments that we reported (1), and the initial experiments were encouraging. Later it became clear that in this system the myc protein did not neutralize the replication-inhibitory effect of the antibodies and that after additional purification of the antibodies the activity inhibitory to the replication of SV40 DNA was dissociated from the immunoreactivity to c-myc. The Roche group has already published these results (2).

On learning of the results seen in the

SV40 system, we repeated our reported experiments using isolated HL60 nuclei (1). The *myc* protein, after approximately 1 year of storage, no longer neutralized the inhibitory effect of the antibodies. Gel electrophoretic analysis showed altered properties which indicated partial degradation of these protein samples. Further purification of the polyclonal antibody to the *c-myc* recombinant protein, which was used in our previously reported experiments, reduced, but did not abolish, its inhibitory effect on DNA synthesis in this system.

These findings clearly raise the possibility that a component of the preparation other than the *c-myc* antibody inhibited DNA synthesis in the SV40 system. However, it is

also possible that a deterioration of the samples during the prolonged storage has been responsible for the results of the Roche workers. In this context, it should be noted that in a more recent study antibodies to *c-myc* from another source were found to inhibit DNA replication of an autonomously replicating plasmid containing DNA sequences derived from mouse liver when they were cotransfected into HL60 cells, or in an in vitro replicating system employing HL60 nuclear extract (3). Another group has reported that elevated *c-myc* expression facilitates the simultaneous replication of SV40 DNA in human lymphoma cells (4), which can be due to indirect or direct effects on DNA replication. Thus, further work seems

necessary to resolve this issue in the light of these conflicting data.

GEORGE P. STUDZINSKI
University of Medicine and
Dentistry of New Jersey,
New Jersey Medical School,
185 South Orange Avenue,
Newark, NJ 07103-2757

REFERENCES

1. G. P. Studzinski, Z. S. Brelvi, S. C. Feldman, R. A. Watt, *Science* **234**, 467 (1986).
2. C. Gutierrez, Z.-S. Guo, J. Farrell-Towt, G. Ju, M. L. DePamphilis, *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **7**, 4594 (1987).
3. S. M. M. Iguchi-Arigo, T. Itani *et al.*, *EMBO J.* **6**, 2365 (1987); S. M. M. Iguchi-Arigo *et al.*, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **15**, 4889 (1987).
4. M. Classon *et al.*, *Nature* **330**, 272 (1987).

13 April 1988; accepted 18 April 1988

(Continued from page 1132)

ance of the new. An example is their offering of an adjustable-speed motor drive, based on solid-state power devices already in volume production, to counter the introduction of a sophisticated variable-speed drive based on an innovative new class of power devices. Although the newer devices were the lower cost alternative at equal volumes of production, they incurred higher initial costs because of low start-up volumes. Moreover, increasing production to sufficiently high volumes for competitiveness was threatened by the market share captured by the admittedly lower performing, but still satisfactory, Japanese product.

The close tie, or often the lack of distinction at all, between the engineers engaged in manufacturing and those engaged in development is one of the many factors that contribute to a rapid develop-

ment and manufacturing cycle. This short cycle in turn fits well with the exploratory approach to marketing. The Japanese company gets the product out fast, finds out what is wrong with it, and rapidly adjusts; this differs from the U.S. method of having a long development cycle aimed at a carefully researched market that may, in fact, not be there.

The intentness with which the Japanese learn what is going on in the rest of the world is legendary. They usually seem more willing than their U.S. counterparts to learn about and profit from what others have done. They appear generally to suffer less from the psychological aspects of the NIH syndrome, which often seems to debar U.S. engineers, raised and rewarded on individual creativity, from accepting the ideas of others. Less well known is the general openness of the Japanese to discuss what they themselves are doing. Japanese engineers, in our experience, are willing to talk and are

AAAS–Newcomb Cleveland Prize

To Be Awarded for an Article or a Report Published in *Science*

The AAAS–Newcomb Cleveland Prize is awarded to the author of an outstanding paper published in *Science*. The value of the prize is \$5000; the winner also receives a bronze medal. The current competition period began with the 5 June 1987 issue and ends with the issue of 27 May 1988.

Reports and Articles that include original research data, theories, or syntheses and are fundamental contributions to basic knowledge or technical achievements of far-reaching consequence are eligible for consideration of the prize. The paper must be a first-time publication of the author's own work. Reference to pertinent earlier work by the author may be included to give perspective.

Throughout the competition period, readers are invited to

nominate papers appearing in the Reports or Articles sections. Nominations must be typed, and the following information provided: the title of the paper, issue in which it was published, author's name, and a brief statement of justification for nomination. Nominations should be submitted to the AAAS–Newcomb Cleveland Prize, AAAS, Room 924, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, and **must be received on or before 30 June 1988**. Final selection will rest with a panel of distinguished scientists appointed by the editor of *Science*.

The award will be presented at a ceremony preceding the President's Public Lecture at the 1989 AAAS annual meeting to be held in San Francisco. In cases of multiple authorship, the prize will be divided equally between or among the authors.