

Exploiting homology? Reaction schematic showing the potential analogy between a ketene and CO_2 in reaction with olefins. The compounds are structurally homologous but whether they also react similarly remains to be shown.

clearly shown that the rate of reaction of CO_2 in a polymerization can be increased markedly, but the other half of the equation—the generation of truly competitive materials—must also be considered.

The CO /olefin copolymers recently introduced by Shell may offer a model here. These novel materials evolved from breakthroughs in catalyst design. They use new palladium-based catalysts to allow a perfectly alternating copolymerization of CO and olefins, generating poly(alkyl ketones). These materials, formed efficiently from inexpensive commodities, exhibit physical properties that may allow them to compete against existing thermoplastics used in engineering applications.

Could such scientific and commercial success also be achieved for a CO_2 -based

polymer? One area where scientific advances could lead to industrial breakthroughs is in the reaction of CO_2 with olefins to produce lactones and thus aliphatic polyesters. These polymers are widely used as degradable materials in medical implants and have also been promoted as environmentally degradable polymers for use in consumer packaging. Microbially generated hydroxybutyrate and hydroxyvalerate copolymers were originally developed by ICI/Zeneca. However, the high price of these microbial processes has greatly limited the marketability of the materials. A

joint venture between Cargill and Dow is currently attempting to reduce the cost of production of poly(lactic acid) by optimization of a microbial process for generation of the lactic acid monomer. An efficient CO_2 -based chain reaction polymerization might represent a more economical route to an aliphatic polyester than these microbial processes. An interesting possibility, but is it scientifically possible? The literature is mostly silent on this issue, although there is a brief mention (8) of the reaction of CO_2 with vinyl ethers and dienes to generate low molecular weight polyesters.

For the generation of lactones, CO_2 should behave as a ketene analog in a $2 + 2$ cycloaddition reaction (see the figure above). In my group, we have performed calculations that suggest that the reaction between

certain olefins and CO_2 to form a lactone may be thermally neutral. Given that ring formation is involved, the reaction would be entropically more favorable at higher pressures, where CO_2 becomes both reactant and solvent, thus removing the need for an additional organic solvent. The key unanswered questions here involve the nature of the catalyst required to perform such a reaction and the severity of the conditions required.

Polymer science has made great strides in learning to use CO as a monomer, leading to commercial products with improved performance and price. The development of similar processes that use CO_2 , an inexpensive, environmentally benign raw material, has lagged far behind. However, given the recent rapid improvement in the activity of catalysts used in copolymerization of CO_2 and cyclohexene oxide, we may be optimistic that we will one day see commercial CO_2 -based polymers.

References

1. S. Inoue, H. Koinuma, T. Tsuruta, *J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Lett.* **7**, 287 (1969).
2. S. Inoue, *Chemtech* (September, 1976), p. 588.
3. A. Rokicki and W. Kuran, *J. Macromol. Sci. Rev. Macromol. Chem.* **21**, 135 (1991).
4. M. S. Super and E. J. Beckman, *Trends Polym. Sci.* **5**, 236 (1997).
5. D. J. Darensbourg and M. W. Holtcamp, *Macromolecules* **28**, 7577 (1995).
6. M. S. Super, E. Berluche, C. Costello, E. J. Beckman, *ibid.* **30**, 368 (1997).
7. M. Cheng, E. B. Lobkovsky, G. W. Coates, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **120**, 11018 (1998).
8. K. Soga, M. Sato, S. Hosoda, S. Ikeda, *J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Lett.* **13**, 543 (1975); K. Soga, S. Hosoda, T. Tazuke, S. Ikeda, *ibid.*, p. 265.

PERSPECTIVES: CELL PROLIFERATION

Unlimited Mileage from Telomerase?

Titia de Lange and Ronald A. DePinho

If oncogene activation is akin to a jammed gas pedal and tumor suppressor inactivation to loss of the brakes, what then is telomerase activation in this hackneyed cancer-car analogy? Telomerase, the reverse transcriptase that maintains the ends of eukaryotic chromosomes, has long been stigmatized for its association with human cancer. This judgment has grown from the observations that, although most normal cells are devoid of telomerase's enzymatic activity and lack its main protein component (human telomerase reverse transcriptase, or hTERT),

nearly all human tumors express hTERT and have active telomerase (1, 2). New data confirm that telomerase is neither tumor suppressor nor oncogene, underscoring the unique role of telomeres in tumorigenesis.

In normal cells, insufficient telomerase activity and a finite store of telomeric DNA limit the number of divisions a cell can undergo before critical telomere shortening signals entry into replicative senescence, defined by a finite capacity for cell division (3, 4). As such, replicative senescence is believed to represent a prominent genetic roadblock on the way to cancer, one that can be avoided by activation of telomerase (4, 5) but that can also be detoured by oncogene activation (for example, Myc) or loss of tumor suppressor function (such as RB/p53) (6–8). However, cells that use Myc or loss of RB/p53 to

circumvent senescence will eventually experience rampant genome instability due to the loss of their telomeres and require a mechanism to maintain these essential elements (9). Thus, no matter which road the aspiring cancer cell travels, counteracting telomere shortening appears to be a key step. On the basis of the frequent activation of telomerase in human cancer, up-regulation of this enzyme is apparently the simplest way toward this end.

Thus, telomere erosion and the associated limitations in replicative life-span have been proposed as a potent tumor suppression mechanism, and telomerase was censured as a “bad” enzyme whose activity subverts our normally constrained somatic cells by providing the opportunity for boundless growth. Initial efforts to understand the mechanics underlying the telomerase-tumorigenesis connection seemed to yield more questions than answers. Is its activation essential for cancers to develop? Is telomerase really all that is needed for cellular immortalization, and will enforced somatic expression of telomerase lead to a cancer-prone condition?

T. de Lange is in the Laboratory for Cell Biology and Genetics, Rockefeller University, New York, NY 10021, USA. E-mail: delange@rockvax.rockefeller.edu. R. A. DePinho is at the Dana Farber Cancer Institute and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA. E-mail: ron_depinho@dfci.harvard.edu

Definitive answers to these questions have yet to emerge. However, the first major advance was provided a year ago with the finding that ectopic expression of hTERT in primary human cells could confer endless growth in culture (4, 5). Although the cells in question, human foreskin fibroblasts and retinal pigment epithelial cells (RPEs), normally ceased dividing after 40 to 80 population doublings, telomerase-positive derivatives able to maintain their telomeres progressed unimpeded beyond that usual life-span and have now been maintained in continuous growth for more than a year (10, 11). For practical purposes, these cells can be viewed as immortal—a characteristic illegitimately appropriated by many human cancers but normally preserved for the few cells that make up our germ line.

These studies received much attention as a potential cellular fountain of youth, with visions of an immediate impact on normal tissue and transplant repositories, while the popular press was distracted with speculations that telomerase could attenuate organismal aging and promote longevity in humans. A more guarded view (12) raised concerns that unscheduled telomerase expression in vivo may lead to an increase in cancer incidence by eliminating replicative senescence, hence obviating a potential tumor suppression mechanism.

The simple interpretation that hTERT expression alone can endow all cell types with unlimited growth potential has given way to a more complex story since the finding that immortalization of mammary epithelial cells and keratinocytes required not only hTERT expression, but also compromise in the RB pathway (13). Moreover, the observation that activated RAS and RAF signals can induce cellular senescence in pre-senescent primary fibroblast cultures well before telomeres have reached a critical length suggests that some physiological stimuli may be capable of acting dominantly to subvert the actions of hTERT (14, 15). Together, these findings raised concerns as to whether the life-extended hTERT-expressing fibroblasts and RPEs also had sustained additional genetic lesions. Two recent reports have gone a long way in addressing these important issues (10, 11). An extensive molecular and biological characterization of hTERT-immortalized fibroblasts and RPEs now indicates that they behave like their normal pre-senescent counterparts, harboring an intact RB pathway, functional DNA damage checkpoints, and normal karyotypes while lacking well-established hallmarks of neoplasia such as reduced serum requirements, anchorage-independent growth, and tumor formation in nude mice. The non-oncogenic nature of hTERT is in accord with the inability of this gene to sub-

stitute for the immortalizing oncoprotein Myc in the classical Myc/RAS cotransformation assay (16).

Why, then, are fibroblasts and RPEs different from mammary epithelial cells and keratinocytes? Part of the answer may lie in the simple fact that amounts of p16^{INK4a} [a critical inhibitor of the RB pathway and key mortality gene (17, 18)] are low in fibroblasts, thus perhaps making it easier for telomerase alone to bypass senescence in those cells. A more likely explanation, however, could relate to cell type-specific differences in the signaling responses activated upon adaptation to culture and how those responses ultimately affect mortality pathways, particularly those governed by

p16^{INK4a} and its surrogate pRB. These cell culture-based studies underscore the need to frame these questions in a more physiological context, in which the long-term consequences of broad somatic TERT transgenic expression can be monitored.

It is nevertheless reassuring to know that the hTERT gene is not behaving as a conventional oncogene and that its effects are restricted to telomere metabolism. But do these findings exonerate telomerase as a culprit in cancer? Should we view it now as a "good" enzyme that can be used ad libitum to manipulate the life-span of human cells? Can we look forward to the repair of human tissues and rejuvenation of stem cell populations based on telomerase therapy? If

NOTA BENE: CLIMATE VARIABILITY

The North Atlantic Oscillation

Ever since the 1997–98 El Niño dominated media attention because of its many, severe consequences around the globe (1, 2), the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) has become quite familiar, even to nonscientists (see page 950). This oscillation has a variable period of around 3 to 7 years. Warm tropical waters in the eastern tropical Pacific in its El Niño phase alternate with cold tropical waters during its La Niña phase. However, another climate oscillation, the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) (3, 4), is also receiving increasing attention in the climate research community.


The NAO is characterized by a north-south difference in pressure. A low-pressure region is centered near Iceland and a high-pressure region in the subtropics near the Azores. This pressure contrast drives the surface winds and wintertime storms from west to east across the North Atlantic. When the pressure is lower than normal near Iceland, it tends to be higher than normal near the Azores and vice versa; this out-of-phase relation defines the NAO index (see the figure).

The NAO's impact is more restricted than ENSO's. In North America, Europe, and North Africa, precipitation patterns and wintertime temperatures can be attributed to its phases (5). The NAO may well be more influential than ENSO in regions surrounding the North Atlantic, where its climate shifts can affect food production, energy consumption, and other economic factors. Changes in marine and terrestrial ecosystems have also been attributed to the NAO (6).

Since the mid-1970s, the NAO index has generally been very high (see the figure). During this time, winters have been relatively warm in Europe and cold in the

northwest Atlantic, and the Mediterranean has been particularly dry. This period may be about to end: The NAO index took a deep dive in 1996–97 (see the figure) (although it increased again in 1997–98, albeit to much lower values than in the early 1990s). Colder winters in Europe and wetter conditions in southern Europe may result, as in the 1940s and 1950s when the NAO index remained low.

These observations illustrate that decadal variability of the NAO is superimposed on interannual variability (see the figure) (5). The Atlantic climate patterns may hold clues for climate trends over long time periods and may help in identifying



Where will it go next? NAO index for 1864–1998 (Dec–Mar), updated from (4). See neit.cgd.ucar.edu/cas/climind/nao_winter.html.

the human impact on climate change (7). Unfortunately, the NAO's periodicities are less regular than those of ENSO, making prediction particularly difficult. Thus, while much progress has been made in understanding ENSO's mechanisms—most at least because of a large-scale integrated monitoring effort (1, 2)—the NAO remains comparatively poorly understood

telomerase does not conspire in the tortuous pathway of human tumorigenesis, why then is the enzyme activated in so many cancers? Although telomerase activity is associated with high proliferative rates in some cell types, such regulation fails to explain the appearance of hTERT in most cancers (19). After all, many normal human cell types do not express telomerase while they proliferate in vitro, but tumors derived from such cells do.

Could telomerase simply be a harmless by-product of one of the oncogenes causing malignant transformation? In this regard, it has recently emerged that the transcription of the hTERT gene is regulated directly by the immortalizing oncoprotein Myc (16,

20), whose up-regulation is an obligate feature of virtually all human cancers. Is telomerase just an innocent passenger driven by c-Myc but not lending any growth advantage to tumor cells? This view is made unlikely by the finding that inhibition of telomerase or experimental interference with telomere function arrests and often kills cells even if they are transformed (21–23). Thus, telomerase activity would appear to make an important contribution to the viability of transformed cells, but its action does not fit the usual roles ascribed to oncogenes and tumor suppressors.

Instead of gas pedal or brake, telomerase and more specifically telomeres may be best viewed as the gasoline tank. Gasoline is not

sufficient to drive or accelerate the car, nor does it affect the brakes, but when the gas is used up the car stops regardless of the status of its brakes or how hard one steps on the gas pedal. At times, other braking systems may operate early; such is the case with RAS-induced activation of the p16/Rb pathway or other oncogenic signals (14, 15). In those cases, telomerase introduction alone does not immortalize the cells, because they also must overcome the cell cycle arrest. That is, telomerase is not sufficient for transformation, but cells will have indefinite replicative capacity upon telomerase activation if there is a drive for proliferation and if nothing else arrests the cells.

The major remaining challenges are to determine whether shortening of somatic telomeres really constitutes a tumor suppressor mechanism in vivo and to assess the actual contribution of telomerase to cancer. Answers to these questions could emerge from several mouse models: the telomerase knockout mice (24, 25) and mice transgenic for telomerase in experimental settings where telomeres are limiting, in which it can be determined whether there is increased incidence of spontaneous or carcinogen-induced cancer. Ultimately, the definitive answer may have to come from the use of telomerase inhibitors in cancer patients. Although a complete understanding of the role of telomeres in cancer seems far off, the continued interest in telomerase should provide sufficient fuel to carry us to the end of this journey.

(4). An international effort is now under way to improve the monitoring network for the NAO (8), with a view to forecasting its long-term evolution (9).

What drives these climate fluctuations in the North Atlantic? The atmosphere, the ocean, and the coupled atmosphere-ocean system have all been auditioned as its main driving forces. Atmospheric changes are much more rapid than those of the more sluggish ocean; thus, the atmosphere generally has a short memory, whereas signals in the ocean can be propagated over years or even decades. Which of the two is the more influential in determining climate oscillations then becomes a question of time scales. The fundamental dynamics of the NAO are likely to arise from atmospheric processes: Its position and spatial structure are determined by the basic features of the basin-scale atmospheric circulation. Scenarios with long-term atmospheric forcing invoke, for example, a stratospheric influence (10). However, on decadal time scales, the oceanic influence is likely to be important. Model studies have shown that wind-driven ocean gyres may play a large role in linking the atmospheric and oceanic components of the system (11). Significant changes in convective activity in the Arctic Seas have been shown to correlate with long-term NAO trends. Coordinated changes in the formation rate, salinity and location of oceanic water masses are thus likely to play a role in the long-term evolution of North Atlantic variability (12). Further studies will be required to establish the dominant mechanism.

In order to identify long-term trends in the NAO, researchers have extended the record back in time. Records using instrumental records (5, 13) and tree rings (14) now go as far back as 1701. A proxy NAO index from ice accumulation records in Greenland for the past 350 years indicates that the NAO is an intermittent climate

phenomenon that goes through active and passive phases (15). It is not yet known whether there are fundamental NAO frequencies during active phases that would enhance predictability.

No regional climate system exists in isolation. So-called teleconnections (16) linking the NAO to other climate systems—the tropical Atlantic as well as climate systems further afield such as ENSO (17)—are thus another focus of research, as world climate is increasingly seen as one integrated system. Especially with enhanced monitoring networks, predicting future climate on an interannual or even decadal time scale may move from fiction to fact in the foreseeable future, not only in the Pacific but also in the North Atlantic.

References

1. M. J. McPhaden, *Science* **283**, 950 (1999).
2. J. Shukla, *ibid.* **282**, 728 (1998).
3. For information on the NAO, see www.sv.cict.fr/lsp/Stephen/NAO/index.html, a web site maintained by D. B. Stevenson from Météo-France.
4. Research into the NAO is conducted under the international research program Climate Variability and Predictability (CLIVAR). See www.dkz.de/clivar/vol2/pd1_new.html.
5. J. W. Hurrell, *Science* **269**, 676 (1995).
6. D. W. Sims and V. A. Quayle, *Nature* **393**, 460 (1998); M. C. Forchhammer, N. C. Stenseth, E. Post, R. Langvatn, *Proc. R. Soc. B* **265**, 341 (1998).
7. T. N. Palmer, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **79**, 1411 (1998).
8. For example, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is formulating a new program to fit in with CLIVAR, as a follow-up to the Atlantic Climate Change Program (ACCP).
9. S. M. Griffies and K. Bryan, *Science* **275**, 181 (1997); J. R. Davies, D. P. Rowell, C. K. Folland, *Int. J. Climatol.* **17**, 1263 (1997).
10. H. F. Graf et al., *J. Geophys. Res.* **103**, 11251 (1998).
11. M. Latif and T. P. Barnett, *J. Clim.* **9**, 2407 (1996).
12. R. Dickson, *Nature* **386**, 649 (1997).
13. P. D. Jones, T. Jonsson, D. Wheeler, *Int. J. Climatol.* **17**, 1433 (1997).
14. E. R. Cook, R. D. Darrigo, K. R. Briffa, *Holocene* **8**, 9 (1998).
15. C. Appenzeller, T. F. Stocker, M. Anklin, *Science* **282**, 446 (1998).
16. J. M. Wallace and D. S. Gutzler, *Mon. Weather Rev.* **109**, 784 (1981).
17. D. B. Enfield and D. A. Mayer, *J. Geophys. Res.* **102**, 929 (1997).

—JULIA UPPENBRINK

References and Notes

1. C. M. Counter, F. M. Botelho, P. Wang, C. B. Harley, S. Bacchetti, *J. Virol.* **68**, 3410 (1994).
2. N. W. Kim et al., *Science* **266**, 2011 (1994).
3. C. B. Harley, A. B. Futcher, C. W. Greider, *Nature* **345**, 458 (1990).
4. A. G. Bodnar et al., *Science* **279**, 349 (1998).
5. H. Vaziri and S. Benchimol, *Curr. Biol.* **8**, 279 (1998).
6. E. Hara, H. Tsurui, A. Shinozaki, S. Nakada, K. Oda, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **179**, 528 (1991).
7. J. Shay, O. Pereira-Smith, W. Wright, *Exp. Cell. Res.* **196**, 33 (1991).
8. H. Land, L. Parada, R. Weinberg, *Nature* **304**, 596 (1983).
9. C. M. Counter et al., *EMBO J.* **11**, 1921 (1992).
10. X.-R. Jiang et al., *Nature Genet.* **21**, 111 (1999).
11. C. P. Morales et al., *ibid.*, p. 115.
12. T. de Lange, *Science* **279**, 334 (1998).
13. T. Kiyono et al., *Nature* **396**, 84 (1998).
14. M. Serrano et al., *Cell* **88**, 593 (1997).
15. J. Zhu, D. Woods, M. McMahon, J. Bishop, *Genes Dev.* **12**, 2997 (1998).
16. R. Greenberg et al., *Oncogene* **18**, 1219 (1999).
17. M. Serrano, E. Gomez-Lahoz, R. DePinho, D. Beach, D. Bar-Sagi, *Science* **267**, 249 (1995).
18. M. Serrano et al., *Cell* **85**, 27 (1996).
19. C. W. Greider, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **95**, 90 (1998).
20. J. Wang, L. Xie, S. Allan, D. Beach, G. Hannon, *Genes Dev.* **12**, 1769 (1998).
21. J. Feng et al., *Science* **269**, 1236 (1995).
22. B. van Steensel, A. Smogorzewska, T. de Lange, *Cell* **92**, 401 (1998).
23. J. Karlseder, D. Broccoli, Y. Dai, S. Hardy, T. de Lange, *Science*, in press.
24. M. A. Blasco et al., *Cell* **91**, 25 (1997).
25. H. W. Lee et al., *Nature* **392**, 569 (1998).
26. R.A.D. is an American Cancer Society research professor. Work in the laboratories of T.d.L. and R.A.D. is supported by NIH grants CA76027 and HD 348880, respectively.