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ABSTRACT

We hypothesize that forms of antagonistic coevolution have forged strong links between positive selection at the molecular level and increased cancer risk. By this hypothesis, evolutionary conflict between males and females, mothers and foetuses, hosts and parasites, and other parties with divergent fitness interests has led to rapid evolution of genetic systems involved in control over fertilization and cellular resources. The genes involved in such systems promote cancer risk as a secondary effect of their roles in antagonistic coevolution, which generates evolutionary disequilibrium and maladaptation. Evidence from two sources: (1) studies on specific genes, including SPANX cancer/testis antigen genes, several Y-linked genes, the pem homebox gene, centromeric histone genes, the breast cancer gene \textit{BRCA1}, the angiogenesis gene \textit{ANG}, cadherin genes, cytochrome P450 genes, and viral oncogenes; and (2) large-scale database studies of selection on different functional categories of genes, supports our hypothesis. These results have important implications for understanding the evolutionary underpinnings of cancer and the dynamics of antagonistically-coevolving molecular systems.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Cancer is an evolutionary process at two levels: somatic selection of cancer genes and cells within individuals, and natural selection within populations of genes that predispose to cancer or help prevent it (Cairns, 1975; Graham, 1992; Greaves, 2000; Frank & Nowak, 2004). Analogies between the evolution of cancer cell lineages within the body and evolutionary change in populations via natural selection have been noted repeatedly in the scientific literature (e.g. Greaves, 2000), but there has recently been a surge in research that employs theory and methodology from evolutionary biology to address problems in the biology of cancer (e.g. Nunney, 1999, 2003; Maley & Forrest, 2001; Shibata, 2002; Weinstein & Ciszek, 2002; Michor et al., 2004, a, b; Frank, 2004, a, b; Frank & Nowak, 2004; Crespi & Summers, 2005).

One of the most exciting aspects of the emerging integration of molecular evolutionary biology and medicine is the use of powerful analytical and statistical methods from the field of molecular evolution to investigate the evolutionary histories of specific genes involved in cancer predisposition and progression. Examples of cancer genes shown to be subject to positive selection (selection for amino acid changes) include BRCA1, involved in hereditary breast cancer (Huttley et al., 2000; Fleming et al., 2003; Pavlicek et al., 2004), testis-specific SPANX genes, expressed in melanoma (Kouprina et al., 2004), the angiogenin gene, involved in the angiogenesis that facilitates tumour growth via recruitment of supportive vasculature (Zhang & Rosenberg, 2002), E-cadherin and VE-cadherin genes, coding for cell-adhesion proteins mediating cell–cell interactions between mother and foetus during development, as well as cellular interactions in many forms of cancer (De Marzo et al., 1999; Illyas, 2000; Hendrix et al., 2001; Hirohashi & Kanai, 2003; Summers & Crespi, 2005), and TRPV6, a calcium-transport gene associated with prostate cancer (Akey et al., 2004; Stajich & Hahn, 2005). Positive selection has also been inferred for a substantial number of oncogenes in humans, chimpanzees and mice by Clark et al. (2003) in their broad-scale survey of selection across different functional gene categories. These results are intriguing, because it is not obvious why there should be a connection between cancer and positive selection.

Several authors have suggested that evolutionary conflicts, such as maternal-foetal conflict over resource allocation (Haig, 1993), or male–female conflict over fertilization (Chapman et al., 2003) may have driven the positive selection of genes that are involved in the evolution and development of cancer (Zhang & Rosenberg, 2002; Kouprina et al., 2004; Kleene, 2005; Nielsen et al., 2005). Herein, we generalize these ideas to encompass diverse evolutionary situations involving antagonistic coevolution, which involves genetically-based conflict between parties with divergent fitness interests. Our main hypothesis is that antagonistic coevolution has led to rapid evolution in genetic, developmental and physiological systems of control over cellular resources, which creates evolutionary disequilibrium and organism-level maladaptation, manifested as increased cancer risk. We provide evidence bearing on this hypothesis from two sources: (1) molecular-evolutionary studies of positive selection (selection for amino acid changes that are inferred to be functional and adaptive) (Kreitman, 2000; Yang & Bielawski, 2000; Fay & Wu, 2003) on genes associated with cancer, and (2) large-scale database studies of positive selection on different functional categories of genes, some of which are cancer-related. We then discuss the evolutionary and clinical implications of our results, and provide suggestions for future integrative evolutionary-medical studies of carcinogenesis.

II. POSITIVE SELECTION IN THE EVOLUTION OF CANCER

Positive selection is often associated with antagonistic coevolution, driven by ongoing unresolved conflicts. These conflicts involve natural enemies such as hosts and parasites (e.g. Yeager & Hughes, 1999; Burrows et al., 2004; Sawyer, Emerman & Malik, 2004), but also males and females or eggs and sperm competing over control of fertilization (e.g. Vacquier, 1998; Wyckoff, Wang & Wu, 2000), sexually-antagonistic genes favoured when expressed in one sex but disfavoured when expressed in the other sex (Rice, 1996; Rice & Holland, 1997), genes expressed in mothers and foetal offspring (Trivers, 1974; Haig, 1993; Crespi & Semeniuk, 2004), intragenomic elements with different avenues of maximizing fitness (Summers, de Silva & Farwell, 2002; Burt & Trivers, 2006), and genomically-imprinted genes that are expressed when either paternally or maternally derived (Haig, 2000, 2004). In each of these situations, more or less mutually-dependent parties are in conflict over fitness-related resources, and the conflict is driven by reciprocal genetic or epigenetic change over an evolutionary time scale.

We suggest that the connection between positive selection at the molecular level and cancer is driven by the strong, ongoing selection generated by evolutionary conflict (see also Ewald, 2000; Huttley et al., 2000; Zhang & Rosenberg, 2002). By this hypothesis, most of the cancer genes that show evidence of positive selection have been subject to antagonistic coevolution, which varies in its dynamics and strength among lineages.

Why should antagonistically-coevolving genes be involved in the evolution of cancer? The genetic, developmental and physiological systems that are focal points for antagonistic coevolution, such as resource acquisition and use, cell replication, and tissue growth, are often critical components in the evolution of predisposition to cancer (Summers et al., 2002; Hernandez et al., 2003). Thus, strong selection in the context of antagonistic coevolution leads to evolutionary change in genes and traits related to conflict, and the pleiotropic effects of these changes may generate increased cancer risk. The negative fitness effects of cancer are selected against, but three factors, (1) the unrelenting nature of coevolutionary antagonism (Rice & Holland, 1997), (2) negative pleiotropic effects of strongly-selected alleles, and (3) weaker anticancer selection with increasing age
(Weinstein & Giszek, 2002), maintain the association between conflict-related genes and cancer. Genomic imprinting, the expression versus silencing of genes depending on their parent of origin (Haig, 2000, 2004), provides an epigenetic equivalent to this pleiotropic genetic system. Here, genetic conflict between mothers and offspring over resource allocation during embryonic development (Haig, 1993, 2000) has led to systems of gene expression that also amplify cancer risk when disrupted either naturally via mutation and epigenetic alteration (Feinberg, 2000; Ohlsson et al., 2003), or experimentally via the creation of androgenetic (exclusively paternal) cell lines (Hernandez et al., 2003).

As first described by Graham (1992) in his book *Cancer Selection*, strong selection in contexts other than antagonistic coevolution can also lead to increased cancer risk as a pleiotropic byproduct, although here the effects are expected to be less pronounced. For example, artificial selection for large size has led to greatly-increased cancer rates in some breeds of dogs (Graham, 1992; Leroi et al., 2003), and pediatric cancers of humans appear to be concentrated in two tissues, brain and bone, that have undergone rapid phenotypic changes in their developmental trajectories along the human lineage (Graham, 1992; Leroi, Koulopanou & Burt, 2003). In these cases, rapid evolution drives the genotype away from the optimum, increasing the risk of cancer as a result (Galis & Metz, 2003; Leroi et al., 2003). Such cases may typically be transitory, disappearing once the species or population has adapted to the changes, or they may lead to positive-feedback cycles of oncogene evolution, leading to improved tumour suppression, greater developmental precision and complexity, and further adaptive changes driving pleiotropic oncogene evolution (Graham, 1992). Antagonistic coevolution similarly leads to incessant pressure for positive genetic change, and little opportunity for adjustment to a new equilibrium because one does not exist over an evolutionary time scale. Hence, antagonistically-coevolving genes should be in a continual state of mild organism-level maladaptation, and may be particularly likely to contribute to the development of cancer as a result.

### III. EVIDENCE FOR LINKS BETWEEN POSITIVE SELECTION, CANCER GENES, AND ANTAGONISTIC COEVOLUTION

Our hypothesis predicts the frequent coincidence of positive selection on a gene, involvement of the gene in the risk or progression of cancer, and evidence that forms of antagonistic coevolution are involved in how gene regulation or function has diversified. Genes may be implicated in cancer in various ways, such as the presence of hereditary variants associated with risk, the generation of somatic variants that promote carcinogenesis, the development of changes in levels of gene expression, or the co-option by cancer cells of developmental pathways that evolved for other purposes (e.g. Kleene, 2005). Such effects may involve oncogenes that directly promote tumour growth, ‘gatekeeper’ tumour-suppressor genes that prevent or suppress incipient cancers, ‘caretaker’ genes that inhibit loss of genetic stability, or ‘landscaper’ genes that maintain the integrity of phenotypic interactions between and within types of tissues (Hanahan & Weinberg, 2000; Michor et al., 2004a; Michor et al., 2004b; Crespi & Summers, 2005). We expect that many cases of positive selection on such genes involve the genetic, epigenetic, or developmental breakdown of ‘tug-of-war’ systems, whereby conflict over cellular resources has led to the evolution of dynamic stalemates held at Nash equilibria by opposing selection (e.g. Haig, 1993). The human *IGF2* system provides the classic case of such tugs-of-war between mother and child during foetal development, and Haig (1993, 1999a,b) describes how some major pathologies of pregnancy, such as preeclampsia and gestational diabetes, may be driven by disruption of costly, coevolved stalemates. Other cases of positive selection may instead derive from strong divergent selection on aspects of life-history, such as developmental rates, lifespan, or tissue renewal or wound repair capacity, that are directly linked to the molecular-genetic systems containing oncogenes, tumour suppressors, and landscaper genes (e.g. Weinstein & Giszek, 2002; Chang et al., 2005; Hampton, 2005).

How common is the coincidence of positive selection, effects on cancer, and antagonistic coevolution? We present evidence from two approaches: (1) studies of positive selection on specific genes or gene families that are known to be directly related to cancer, and also are implicated in antagonistic coevolution, and (2) previous large-scale studies of positive selection across hundreds or thousands of genes that vary in function. The first approach links the three phenomena more or less directly, and the latter approach provides indirect evidence but helps to indicate where and how future studies might usefully proceed. We stress that because our hypothesis is novel and links three formerly-disparate processes, conclusive evidence for most cases must await future, targeted tests that integrate diverse data from molecular evolution, genetic conflict studies and carcinogenesis.

### IV. POSITIVELY-SELECTED GENES INVOLVED IN CANCER AND GENETIC CONFLICT

#### (1) SPANX cancer/testis genes

*SPANX* is a family of X-linked, primate-specific cancer/testis associated genes (CTAs), so called because their expression is almost exclusively limited to normal testis, where they are involved in spermatogenesis, and melanoma tumour cells, where they apparently promote cancer cell growth (Zendman, Ruitter & Muijen, 2003; Kourprina et al., 2004; Scanlan, Simpson & Old, 2004; Westbrook et al., 2004; Kalejs & Erenpreisa, 2005). Their normal functions are largely unknown, although some evidence suggests roles for these and other CTA genes in spermatozoa development and function, cell cycle regulation, and apoptosis (Zendman et al., 2003). *SPANX* gene expression is associated with aggressiveness of skin tumours, and these genes have been mapped to an X-chromosome location close to loci for
Several researchers have noted that Y-linked genes associated with sexual selection and sexual conflict are related to cancer (e.g. Hurst, 1994a, b, Kleene, 2005). Hurst (1994a, b) described how genes on the Y chromosome, such as Sy and $Z_y$, are subject to the same kind of intragenomic conflict between the paternal and maternal genomes of an embryo that characterizes imprinting growth factor genes such as IGF2 (Haig, 2004). This, in turn, is expected to generate antagonistic coevolution, and a variety of studies have found evidence of strong positive selection acting on both Sy and $Z_y$ (e.g. Whitfield, Lovell-Badge & Goodfellow, 1993; Tucker & Lundrigan, 1993; Jansa, Lundrigen & Tucker, 2003; Tucker, Adkins & Rest, 2003; Wildman et al., 2003). Both Sy and $Z_y$ are associated with prostate cancer (Tricoli & Bracken, 1993; Tricoli et al., 1993).

Other genes on the Y chromosome should also experience the effects of sexual conflict, and several of them have been linked to prostate cancer (e.g. Dasari et al., 2001). For example, DAZ (deleted in azoospermia), a Y-linked gene essential in spermatogenesis (Reynolds & Cooke, 2005), has been inferred to be subject to positive selection in humans and other primates (Bielawski & Yang, 2001; Wildman et al., 2003); moreover, Teng et al. (2002) and Becherini et al. (2004) found pronounced ethnic differences in the frequency of a functional SNP (single-nucleotide polymorphism) of DAZL, the autosomal homologue of DAZ, which are suggestive of positive selection. The DAZ gene exhibits deregulated expression in prostate cancer (Dasari et al., 2001, 2002), and we suggest that this link to cancer is driven by sexual conflict or sexual selection.

(3) Homebox genes

Homebox genes encode transcription factors that direct various crucial developmental processes, such as the patterning of body plans, the control of cell growth (Cillo et al., 1999) and the determination of stem cell fate (Landsorp, 1997). Altered homebox gene expression is found in many cancers, apparently due to deregulation of their roles in cell proliferation, differentiation, and migration (Cillo et al., 1999; Galis, 1999; Rao et al., 2002). Most homebox genes are highly conserved among species. However, the pem homebox gene, a member of the PEPB homebox subfamily, has been shown to evolve very rapidly in rodents, under the effects of positive selection, especially in the N-terminal region (Maiti et al., 1996; Sutton & Wilkinson, 1997; Wang & Zhang, 2004). This X-linked gene is expressed in primordial germ cells and placental membranes during embryogenesis, and reproductive tissues (testis and ovaries) during adulthood; it is also expressed in diverse cancer types, where it promotes tumour cell growth and interacts with the tumour-suppressor gene menin (Pitman et al., 1998; Rao et al., 2002). The function of the gene is unclear, but it appears to regulate placental development and the development of sperm and egg cells in some manner (Pitman et al., 1998; Rao et al., 2002), even though it is not essential for normal development in mice (Pitman et al., 1998).

We suggest that the pem gene has been subject to positive selection in the same context as other X-linked cancer/testis antigen genes such as SPANX: sexual selection, sexual antagonism, and possibly sex-chromosomal meiotic drive
(Wang & Zhang, 2004; Kleene, 2005). One of the few other X-linked homeobox genes known to be subject to positive selection, *OdsH*, affects levels of sperm production in *Drosophila*, although, like the *pm* gene, it is functionally nonessential (Sun et al., 2004). *OdsH* is also a ‘speciation’ gene that mediates the evolution of hybrid sterility in *Drosophila mauritiana* and its relatives (Ting et al., 1998; Sun, Ting & Wu, 2004). The similarities between cancer/testis antigen genes, and X-linked, testis-expressed homeobox genes such as *pm*, *OdsH*, and *TGIF1* (Wang & Zhang, 2004) suggest that the molecular changes accompanying speciation, especially those that affect male reproductive function (Civetta & Singh, 1995; Tsaur & Wu, 1997; Vacquier, 1998; Wyckoff et al., 2000; Swanson et al., 2003), engender increased cancer risk.

Numerous other homeobox genes have been shown to be subject to positive selection (Van de Peer et al., 2001; Clark et al., 2003 for HOXA5, A11, C4, C6, D4 and D10; Fares et al., 2003) and are aberrantly expressed in cancer cells (e.g. Boström et al., 2000; Naora et al., 2001; Miller et al., 2003a,b). These links between positive selection and cancer for HOX genes fit with Graham’s (1992) hypothesis that rapid morphological evolution increases cancer risk (see also Thaler, 1999; Galis & Metz, 2003; Kavanagh, 2003; Leroi et al., 2003). We hypothesize that positively-selected HOX genes will also show evidence of pleiotropic effects on morphogenesis and cancer risk, or antagonistic coevolution, upon further study.

(4) Centromeric histone genes

Histones that bind and structure DNA are in general among the most conserved of proteins, but some centromeric histones evolve very rapidly and have been demonstrated to be subject to strong positive selection in diverse animals and plants (Malik & Henikoff, 2002; Cooper & Henikoff, 2004; Talbert, Bryson & Henikoff, 2004). During meiosis, these centromeric histones form a crucial part of the cellular machinery distributing chromosomes to developing gametes. In females, only one of four products survives to be included in the egg nucleus, and this strong selection has apparently led to the recurrent evolution of ‘driving’ centromeric histone variants that gain preferential access to the developing oocyte (Henikoff, Ahmad & Malik, 2001; Malik & Henikoff, 2002; Talbert et al., 2004). This centromeric drive is, however, opposed by marked reductions in male fertility that stem from such disparities in centromere strength, which leads to antagonistic coevolution of drivers and suppressors, positive selection (Malik & Henikoff, 2001, 2002; Daniel, 2002; Cooper & Henikoff, 2004), and apparent strong effects on karyotype evolution and speciation (Borodin, 2001; Henikoff et al., 2001; Amor & Choo, 2002; Amor et al., 2004; O’Neill, Eldridge & Metcalfe, 2004).

Centromeric histones also play critical roles in the maintenance of genomic integrity across the cell cycle (e.g. Liang et al., 2004; Shah et al., 2004), and as such function as genomic ‘caretakers’ helping to prevent carcinogenesis. Moreover, some centromeric histones are overexpressed in tumours (e.g. Collins, Furuyama & Biggins, 2004; Atalay et al., 2005) and one of the positively-selected centromeric histones, *CENP-C*, generates aneuploid cells when subject to mitotic dysfunction (Jabs et al., 1993). Such aneuploidy is a hallmark of chromosomal instability, a major cause of cancer progression (Michor et al., 2004a,b). Selection for constant expansion of heterochromatin repeats, to facilitate the function of centromeres, may also lead to the retention of mechanisms of replication that foster instability of microsatellite repeats (Henikoff, 2000), another major contributor to carcinogenesis (e.g., Breivik, 2005). Considered together, this evidence suggests that centromeric drive can increase cancer risk via effects on genomic stability.

(5) Breast cancer genes

The *BRCA1* gene is a central component of pathways regulating the cell cycle, DNA repair, and cell replication (Deng & Brodie, 2000; Deng & Wang, 2003). This gene acts as a tumour suppressor, as loss of heterozygosity is found in familial breast and ovarian cancers, but it also exhibits crucial functions during development. Thus, human female *BRCA1* heterozygotes exhibit substantially lower birth mass than homozygotes (Jernström et al., 1998), null *BRCA1* mice die in early embryogenesis with severe growth defects, and the gene exhibits its greatest expression in the highly-proliferative terminal end buds of the breast epithelium in pubertal mice (Jernström et al., 1998; Deng & Brodie, 2000; Huttley et al., 2000).

Intragenomic conflict may play a role in generating a substantial proportion of the genetic variation associated with hereditary predisposition to breast cancer. The *BRCA1* gene contains a particularly high frequency of *Abu* repeat elements (129, making up approximately 42% of the sequence). These are classic ‘selfish genes’ that can increase in frequency through transposition (Miki, 1998; Kolomietz et al., 2002; Jurka, 2004). These elements are involved in a variety of rearrangements that have been identified in patients with an inherited predisposition to breast and ovarian cancer (Pavlicek et al., 2004 and references therein), as well as being directly involved in the evolution of other forms of cancer and additional diseases among primates (Martinez et al., 2001).

Positive selection has been inferred for exon 11 of *BRCA1* by Huttley et al. (2000), Yang & Nielsen (2002) and Fleming et al. (2003), and for the whole gene by Pavlicek et al. (2004) using a larger sample of eutherian mammals (see also Wildman et al., 2003; Huttley et al. (2000) and Yang & Nielsen (2002) also presented evidence for positive selection along the chimpanzee and human lineages. Deviations from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (Huttley et al., 2000) for extant *BRCA1* alleles, as well as inferences of recent allele ages (Slatkin, 2000; Slatkin & Rannala, 2000), provide evidence that strong selection is also ongoing at this locus in *BRCA1*, perhaps as a consequence of selection on patterns of codon usage.

Two related and non-exclusive evolutionary hypotheses may help explain the coincidence of positive selection and increased cancer risk for *BRCA1*. First, based on the
evidence that BRCA1 plays a central role in both DNA repair and cell proliferation in breast and brain tissue (Xu et al., 1999; Korhonen et al., 2003; Foulkes, 2004). We hypothesize that this gene mediates a tradeoff between DNA repair and cell proliferation rates (Breivik & Gaudernack, 2004; Breivik, 2005), analogous to the tradeoff of cancer risk with apoptosis and cellular senescence that mediates ageing (Campisi, 2005). The nature of this repair-proliferation tradeoff may vary among species, leading to the observed adaptive molecular evolution in the human and chimpanzee lineages driven by selection on such factors as lifespan, mating system, brain development, or breast development.

A diverse set of evidence suggests that the optimum for the tradeoff between DNA repair and cell proliferation rate varies between males and females. Thus, BRCA1 interacts with BRCA2 (Huttley et al., 2000), and many alleles at both BRCA1 and BRCA2 are associated with human breast cancer (Pavlicek et al., 2004). BRCA2, which is also involved in DNA repair and growth during early development, may be subject to sexually antagonistic selection in that in humans, alleles appear to affect foetal survival in a sex-dependent manner (Healey et al., 2000; see also Teare et al., 2004). de la Hoye et al. (2003) and Kotar et al. (2004) also present evidence for biased offspring sex ratios in women with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations, which may be due to sex differences in prenatal viability, or, perhaps, to ascertainment biases in sampling. Finally, BRCA1 genotype is known to affect birth mass of its female bearers (Jernström et al., 1998), and similar links between BRCA2 allele (truncation), sex ratio, birth mass and cancer have been found in mice (Connor et al., 1997; Friedman et al., 1998). This evidence from studies of viability, sex ratios, and birth mass are consistent with the hypothesis that BRCA1 and BRCA2 alleles exhibit sexually-antagonistic effects during human development due to repair-proliferation tradeoffs. By this hypothesis, genes for more-rapid proliferation (in rapid growth or wound-healing, for example) may be more favoured in one sex than another, ultimately as a result of sexual selection or other factors differing between the sexes; effects on cancer would then derive from disruption of the tradeoff via somatic mutation, leading to proliferation with less-effective DNA repair. This hypothesis is also consistent with the relatively high degree of positive selection on other genes involved in cell proliferation and DNA repair noted in Clark et al. (2003), but it requires targeted tests and elucidation of molecular mechanisms.

Second, relative breast size is considerably higher in humans than in other primates, and, indeed, breasts develop prematurely (prior to pregnancy) in nulliparous humans (Cant, 1981; Caro, 1987; Caro & Sellen, 1990). Whatever the selective pressures for increased breast size in the human lineage, which may include mate choice by males (Jasienska et al., 2004) and natural selection for fat reserves (Caro & Sellen, 1990; Pawlowski, 1999; Arieli, 2004), this rapid evolutionary increase in size may have selected for alleles promoting accelerated breast development, which have the pleiotropic effect of increased cancer risk. Similar considerations apply to other rapidly-evolved aspects of human morphology, such as brain size and bone growth (Graham, 1992; Leroi et al., 2003), and possibly the prostate (Hamilton, 1990). This hypothesis is also consistent with high BRCA1 expression in the rapidly-proliferating breast epithelium of pubertal mice (Jernström et al., 1998), and with Huttley et al.’s (2000) hypothesis that new alleles introduced at the BRCA1 locus disrupt coadapted gene complexes.

(6) Angiogenesis gene ANG

The angiogenin gene (ANG) has a critical role in tissue vascularization of the developing placenta and embryo, maternal immune tolerance of the foetus, and vascular and tissue homeostasis (Zhang & Rosenberg, 2002; Brion & Badet, 2003). This gene also exhibits elevated expression in many types of tumours, its expression levels are directly related to cancer progression, and ANG antagonists inhibit cancer growth (Zhang & Rosenberg, 2002).

Given its role in placental development, ANG may be subject to the parent-offspring conflicts over resource transfer that are an integral part of placentation and pregnancy (Haig, 1993, 1999a,b; Zhang & Rosenberg, 2002; Crespi & Semeniuk, 2004), with cancer as a side effect of the ‘tug-of-war’ over the levels of placental development. Indeed, invasive placentation shares many biochemical and physiological features with the development of cancer (Pearson, 1981; Adamson, 1987; Old, 2001; Zygmunt et al., 2003), and stimulation of blood vessel formation may be similar between these two processes. This hypothesis could be tested further by comparing ANG evolution in eutherian mammal lineages with invasive versus non-invasive placentation (Mossman, 1987), and via analysis of the functional effects of ANG mutants during placentation and carcinogenesis. ANG is also involved in reproductive functions (Ferrara, 2000), which suggest that it may also be subject to selection in the context of sexual antagonism.

Zhang & Rosenberg (2002) and Wildman et al. (2003) demonstrated elevated ratios of nonsynonymous to synonymous nucleotide substitution rates (dN/dS) in ANG in primates. Zhang & Rosenberg (2002) also showed that substitutions causing change in the protein charge occurred in regions likely to affect crucially the interaction of angiogenin with a variety of other proteins, including actin, angiostatin, elastase, heparin, plasminogen and RNase inhibitor. Hence, the substitutions under positive selection are likely to affect the activity of angiogenin in functionally important protein-protein interactions. Zhang & Rosenberg (2002) suggested that the positive selection they detected may be driven by conflicts between maternal and foetal interests, following arguments by Haig (1993).

(7) Cadherins

Cadherins are a multigene family of proteins that mediate homotypic cell–cell adhesion and signal transduction (Wheelock & Damsky, 1997; Gallin, 1998; Nollet, Kools & van Roy, 2000; King, Hittinger & Carroll, 2003; Wheelock & Johnson, 2003). They play fundamental roles during mammalian placentation and morphogenesis, as well and controlling tissue architecture and integrity, including the
organization of stem cell compartments (Nelson & Nusse, 2004). Cadherin expression is also closely associated with the development and metastasis of cancer; for example, vascular endothelial (VE) cadherin is highly expressed in aggressive melanomas, where it causes cells to adopt a vascular phenotype that mimics embryonic vascular networks (Hendris et al., 2001), and E-cadherin abnormalities are found in nearly all invasive human cancers (Mareel & Van Roy, 1998). VE-cadherin also enhances placental invasiveness, by causing invading cytotrophoblast (a developing placental cell type) to adopt the vascular phenotype of the maternal tissues in the spiral arteries that they replace (Zhou et al., 1997).

Summers & Crespi (2005) present evidence that three cadherin genes, E-cadherin, P-cadherin, and VE-cadherin, that are strongly expressed during placentation, have been subject to positive selection. By contrast, a ‘control’ cadherin that is not expressed in the placenta, H-cadherin, showed no evidence of selection. These results provide support for the hypothesis that the cadherin genes involved in maternal-foetal interactions have been subject to antagonistic co-evolution, possibly in the context of ‘green-beard’ mutations that result in ‘selfish’ alleles effecting their own increased reproduction but being subject to suppressing mutations by unlinked genes (Hamilton, 1964; Haig, 1996). More generally, ongoing maternal-foetal ‘tugs-of-war’ over resources (Haig, 1993, 1999 a, b) may have led to the evolution of genetic pathways, normally expressed in the invasive placenta and uterus, that are co-opted by cancer cells during somatic selection for proliferation and degradation of tissue integrity surrounding tumours (e.g. Bischof, Meisser & Campana, 2000; Lala et al., 2002).

Clark et al. (2003) provided evidence for positive selection on five additional cadherin genes, one of which, PCDH7, appears to be related to the development of some cancers (Yoshida et al., 1998). Similarly, Wildman et al. (2003) found evidence of positive selection on the cell-adhesion gene ICAM1 in some primates; aberrant expression of this gene is associated with breast cancer (Kammerer et al., 2004). ICAM1 is also intimately involved in maternal-foetal interactions during pregnancy, where it also plays an important role in pathological situations such as preclampsia, aberrant inflammatory reactions, and infection of the placenta with malarial parasites (Maubert, Guilbert & Deloron, 1997; Xiao et al., 1997; Oyama, 2001).

(8) Cytochrome P450 genes

The cytochrome P450 heme-thiolate enzymes comprise a gene superfamily with over 2700 genes known overall, including 57 from humans (Lewis, 2004). These enzymes are involved in two main functions: (1) synthesis and degradation of hormones (including steroids), lipids, prostaglandins, and vitamin D, and (2) metabolism of various ‘exogenous’ chemicals, including carcinogens and toxins, which can entail both detoxification and activation to harmful metabolites (Negishi et al., 1996; Lewis, Watson & Lake, 1998; Lewis, 2004). Much of the high diversity of this gene family, for the enzymes acting on exogenous substrates, apparently arose via evolutionary antagonism in the context of plant-animal metabolic coevolution (Gonzalez & Nebert, 1990; Nebert, 1997; Lewis et al., 1998). Such coevolution of exogenous chemicals with the enzymes that metabolize them, and the central role of cytochrome P450 enzymes in the metabolism of sex hormones such as testosterone and oestrogen, suggest that many of these enzymes should be subject to positive selection.

Some cytochrome P450 genes should, by our hypothesis, mediate cancer risk in the context of sexual selection, sexual conflict, local dietary adaptation (Nebert, 1997), or negative pleiotropic effects of detoxification (Negishi et al., 1996). Sexual conflict and sexual selection in particular may drive the evolution of genes involved in sex steroid metabolism via the extensive pleiotropic effects of hormones like testosterone and estrogen, and their effects in mediating the risk of cancer in reproductive tissues. For example, the development of cancers of the prostate (Taplin & Balk, 2004), breast (Rebeck et al., 1999; Giguere et al., 2001; Haiman et al., 2002; Suter et al., 2003) and ovary (Silva et al., 1997; Risch, 1998; Modugno, 2004) is strongly influenced by androgen levels and alleles at the androgen receptor gene, and such effects may differ in direction between the sexes (e.g. Ingles et al., 1997; Ferro et al., 2002). More generally, research on Drosophila species indicates that the expression of sexually antagonistic genes in the ‘wrong’ sex is pervasive and can impose significant fitness costs on adults (Chippindale, Gibson & Rice, 2001; Rice & Chippindale, 2001).

Wooding et al. (2002) found evidence of positive selection among human populations on CYP1A2, which metabolises oestrogens and other compounds such as caffeine, and exhibits polymorphisms and expression patterns related to prostate cancer (Weber, 1995; Sterling & Cutroneo, 2004). Similarly, adaptive molecular evolution has been inferred in rodent CYP2A4 and CYP2A5 genes, which are involved in steroid metabolism and the metabolism of exogenous compounds (Negishi et al., 1996); Gotoh (1992) also demonstrated that substrate-recognition regions of the CYP2 family gene exhibit relatively more non-synonymous than synonymous changes compared to other sites. Expression levels and polymorphisms of various CYP2 family genes, including CYP2A5, are associated with cancer risk in mice and humans (e.g. Chomarat et al., 1997; Wastl et al., 1998; Agundez, 2004). Clark et al. (2003) inferred positive selection on four CYP genes, two of which, CYP27A1 and CYP27B1, are associated with prostate, colon, and breast cancer, apparently via their roles in vitamin D metabolism (Kállay et al., 2002; Farhan, Wahala & Cross, 2003; Gross et al., 2004). Further studies should elucidate the apparent links between antagonistic coevolution and cancer risk for cytochrome P450 genes, which may be especially important given that over 90% of drugs in human clinical use are metabolized by genes in the CYP1, CYP2 and CYP3 gene families (Lewis, 2004), and approximately 40% of human P450-dependent drug metabolism is enacted by enzymes that are polymorphic (Ingelman-Sundberg, Oscarson & McLellan, 1999). Such links may also mediate the strong effects of recent evolutionary changes in the human diet on increased prostate and breast cancer risk (Coffey, 2001; Cordain et al., 2005; Michels, 2005).
(9) Genes in oncogenetic viruses

Viruses cause approximately 15% of cancers, via the effects of their own oncogenes or insertion into regions of DNA near host proto-oncogenes, leading to alterations of cell cycle control that favour viral replication (Eick & Hermeking, 1996; Slev & Potts, 2002). Many viruses also deactivate or degrade host systems for apoptosis such as p53, and indeed some anticancer adaptations may have evolved in the context of selection on hosts to induce suicide in virus-infected cells with corrupted control of proliferation (Vaux, Hacker & Strasser, 1994; Eick & Hermeking, 1996; LeGrand, 2001).

Virus-host interactions are by default subject to antagonistic coevolution where the virus causes acute disease or cancer. Positive selection on oncoviruses, apparently driven by immunogenicity or degree of virulence (Ewald, 1994; 2000) has been reported for Epstein Barr virus (Midgley et al., 2003; Burrows et al., 2004), papillomavirus (DeFilippis, Ayala & Villarreal, 2002; Chen et al., 2005), and human T cell leukemia virus (Salemi, Desmyter & Vandamme, 2000). Bannert & Kurth (2004) describe how various mobile retroelements similarly insert into host proto-oncogenes or tumour-suppressor genes and promote cancer, and they estimate that one-quarter of all human promotor retain sequences derived from such elements. As such, intragenomic conflict driven by endogenous genetic elements, including such ubiquitous elements as Alu repeats (Miki, 1998; Kolomietz et al., 2002), may substantially increase cancer risks (see also Summers et al., 2002).

Taken together, these data for Y-linked genes, SPANX, homeobox genes, centromeric histones, BRCA1, ANG, cadherins, cytochrome P450 genes, and viral genes provide considerable evidence for strong links between positive selection and the evolution of increased cancer risk, driven by antagonistic coevolution. We also note that at least three of the positively-selected genes discussed above, ANG, pem and OdH, have been shown to be non-essential in at least some species (Fitman et al., 1998; Zhang & Zhang, 2003; Sun et al., 2004), which is consistent with their hypothesized role in coevolutionary conflict because in some lineages one party may ‘win’.

V. LARGE-SCALE DATABASE STUDIES OF POSITIVE SELECTION

As part of their extensive survey testing for positive selection on 7645 genes using human-chimpanzee-mouse trios, Clark et al. (2003) listed the biological processes showing the strongest evidence for positive selection along the chimp and human lineages. For the chimpanzee lineage, the biological functions ‘Oncogenesis’ and ‘Other oncogenesis’ both exhibited some of the strongest evidence for selection (P<0.05 on average, across 240 genes). Overall, four (15%) of 27 tumour suppressor genes, and 10 (20%) of 51 oncogenes or oncogenesis genes in this data set exhibited P<0.05 for either the human or chimpanzee lineage, under their model 2.

Nielsen et al. (2005) analysed 13 731 genes to test for positive selection in the human and chimpanzee lineages in relation to gene function. They noted a large proportion of cancer-related genes among the 50 genes with the strongest inferred positive selection, including genes involved in tumour suppression, apoptosis and cell cycle control. Some of these genes also exhibited testis-specific expression, leading the authors to suggest that genetic conflict between selection for apoptosis-avoidance in the germ line, and anticancer selection in adults, has driven the observed positive selection (see also Waters, Shen & Glickman, 2000).

Their hypothesis is supported by the observation that some specific genetic pathways, such as Fas-mediated apoptosis, are involved in both control of cancer and spermatogenesis (Nielsen et al., 2005), by LeGrand’s (2001) arguments regarding the role of genetic conflict in the evolution of apoptosis, and by Kleene’s (2005) evidence that the genetic pathways of spermatogenesis may coincide with those used by cancer cells to increase their survival and replication. Nielsen et al. (2005) also found a striking excess of genes expressed in the testis among their positively-selected sample (P=0.002), and a similar trend for prostate-expressed genes (P=0.092, the fourth lowest P value in a list of 28 tissues).

Diller, Gilbert & Kocher (2002) used the draft human genome to discern areas of low nucleotide diversity (reduced genetic variation among individuals) that indicate recent (200 000 years before present or less) selective sweeps in the human lineage. They found evidence for selective sweeps for 89 genes, 13 of which (15%) are known to be associated with cancer (see Table 2 in Diller et al., 2002), and an additional three of which regulate apoptosis. Costas et al. (2005) conducted similar tests for selective sweeps in humans, finding notable evidence for a recent history of selection on four genes related to cancer, DCC, EGF, MADH2, and XRCC3, all of which also show some evidence of positive selection from Clark et al’s (2003) comparative study.

These large-scale database studies provide evidence that positive selection is common on genes involved in cancer. Future studies including more taxa and finer distinctions of gene function and tissue expression should clarify and refine these nascent patterns.

VI. DISCUSSION

We have presented a hypothesis linking positive selection, antagonistic coevolution, and cancer, which is supported by evidence from a wide range of genes in previous studies. Our main premise is that ongoing conflict between more or less antagonistic parties, such as competing males, females and males, mothers and offspring, intragenomic elements, and hosts and parasites, has led to the evolution of genes and molecular pathways that increase cancer risk. This increased risk is generated via tugs-of-war over resources, coevolutionary arms races, and antagonistic pleiotropy, which lead to evolutionary and developmental disequilibrium in genetic systems controlling cell proliferation and
apoptosis. The evidence for the hypothesis is circumstantial but extensive and diverse. Although many cancer-related genes are not positively-selected, and many positively-selected genes are unrelated to cancer, the coincidence of the two phenomena is striking, as was also noted by Nielsen et al. (2005) in his recent analysis of 13 731 genes in humans and chimpanzees. In many of the cases that we describe, the linkage clearly occurs in situations of antagonistic coevolution. For many other genes, further studies focused by the predictions of our hypothesis may reveal such evidence of ongoing conflicts, and targeted molecular studies may uncover the precise mechanisms whereby antagonistic coevolution and cancer are associated.

(1) Mechanisms linking antagonistic coevolution with cancer

Alleles may be associated with cancer in several different ways, with important implications for their evolutionary dynamics. First, a locus may exhibit polymorphism, with some alleles engendering higher cancer risk, as for BRCA1. Such polymorphisms may be the result of several processes: (1) continual allelic turnover driven by selection, with new alleles replacing others; (2) frequency-dependent selection related to genetic conflict, that balanced polymorphisms may be maintained by opposing selective pressures related to cancer and antagonism in various contexts, and that for local adaptations, links to cancer will be most pronounced in cases where the gene-environment association is recent or otherwise subject to effects causing disequilibrium.

Second, alleles may exhibit altered patterns of expression in cancerous versus normal tissues, upward or downward, to enhance the survival or reproduction of cancer cells, as for ANG, SPANX, cadherins, homeobox genes, and centromeric histone genes. For such cases, we hypothesize that antagonistic coevolution has led to the evolution of genetic and epigenetic (O'halloran et al., 2003) pathways that are readily coopted or subverted by cancer cells, because they allow for rapid cell proliferation or avoidance of control by tumour suppressors or the immune system. Such subversion is seen most clearly in virus-host coevolutionary interactions, for the linkages between invasive placentaion or embryonic development and cancer (Pearson, 1981, 1982; da Costa, 2001; Old, 2001; Lala et al., 2002; Zygmunt et al., 2003), and for the associations between gametogenesis and cancer (Kleene, 2005). Signal transduction, i.e., communication within and between cells; see also Krakauer & Pagel, 1996; Moller & Pagel, 1998) represents one of the main mechanisms mediating carcinogenesis; signal transduction genes have been strongly positively selected in the human and chimpanzee lineages (Clark et al., 2003), and modeling of this process using complex adaptive systems theory (Schwab & Pienta, 1997) is leading to novel insights regarding the somatic evolution of cancer. The key to analysing cases of altered expression of antagonistically-coevolving genes is to functionally link the expression changes to the primary evolved role of the gene, and to the cancerous phenotype, as many such changes may be irrelevant to cancer progression.

Third, some genes, such as BRCA1 and BRCA2, are characterized by mutations during the development of cancer. In such cases, codon sites that are under positive selection are likely to be exhibit functional importance for the protein (e.g. Fleming et al., 2003), and mutations at these sites are thus more likely to be associated with cancer. Indeed, identification of positively-selected sites in oncogenes and tumour-suppressor gene may be a useful guide to functional importance, at least as useful as comparing amino acid sites for conservation between taxa.

(2) Arenas of antagonistic coevolution

Our survey of positive selection in cancer-related genes suggests that specific forms of antagonistic coevolution are directly related to how such genes are involved in carcinogenesis. Thus, maternal-fetal conflict apparently leads to genetic programs in invasive placentaion that can be co-opted by somatically-evolving cancer cells lineages (Pearson, 1981; Adamson, 1987; Bischof et al., 2000; Old, 2001; Lala et al., 2002; Zygmunt et al., 2003), and rapid evolution of genes involved in placentaion (Crespi & Semeniuk, 2004) that exhibit antagonistic pleiotropy. Such effects may underlie positive selection on the ANG, ADAM and cadherin genes described above. Meiotic drive may lead to systems of cellular interaction during gametogenesis that involve conflict over cell proliferation and survival, as in CTA genes (Kleene, 2005), centromeric drive may indirectly contribute to chromosomal instability in cancer (Michor, 2005), and gestational drive (Haig, 1996) could lead to novel mechanisms of maternal-fetal physiological interaction. Male–female conflict may generate evolutionarily disequilibrium in hormonal regulation, especially involving testosterone and estrogen in their effects on reproductve tissues such as prostate, testis, ovary, and breast (e.g. Bleier et al., 1997; Silva et al., 1997; Risch, 1998; Edmondson, Monaghan & Davies, 2002), while intrasexual conflict, such as male–male competition, could lead to selection on growth factor genes such as IGF1 and IGF2 (Smith & Hurst, 1998) that fuel the growth of tumours (Giovannucci, 2003; Larsson, Girnita & Girnita, 2004). These aspects of sexual selection may be represented in the evolution of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes, and in the roles of insulin-like growth factors in promoting growth of prostate and breast cancers (Giovannucci, 2003; Pandini et al., 2005). Conflicts of genomic imprinting, between paternal and maternal genes, often involve enhancement or suppression of cell growth (Tycko & Morison, 2002; Hernandez et al., 2003). These conflicts have created in mammals a new avenue for mutation and
epigenetic alteration to promote cancer; indeed, loss of imprinting in growth-related genes drives the development of many forms of cancer (Feinberg, 2000; Ohlsson et al., 2003; Farrell, 2005). The molecular evolutionary dynamics of imprinted genes remains to be elucidated, but may involve selection on patterns of gene regulation and expression, rather than the amino acid substitutions that are the usual hallmark of positive selection (Smith & Hurst, 1998).

Host–parasite conflict, especially between viruses and vertebrates, may generate disequilibrium that impacts the evolution of cancer in two main ways. First, positive selection on viruses involves genes related to apoptosis, telomerase regulation, and cell proliferation, whereby these parasites target cellular machinery for programmed death or cellular senescence of infected cells (e.g. Eick & Hermeking, 1996; LeGrand, 2001). Second, increased selection imposed on hosts by viruses should foster the evolution of enhanced immune function (e.g. Slevec & Potts, 2002). Virally-impaired regulation of cell replication directly increases cancer risk, but over evolutionary time host–parasite coevolution could also reduce the incidence of cancer, by making cells more prone to apoptosis or by enhancing the suppression of cancer by immunosurveillance (Dunn, Old & Schreiber, 2004). In general, the dynamics of antagonistic coevolution between hosts and parasites (Ewald, 1994, 2000) may differ from those enacted during the evolution of a single species: for host and parasites there is less scope for constraining effects of mutual interests, unlike in pregnancy (Haig, 1993).

These hypotheses linking forms of antagonistic coevolution with mechanisms of carcinogenesis are speculative but they make clear predictions, which are testable via analyses of positive selection combined with studies of normal and disrupted physiological function.

(3) Purifying selection and positive selection

Thomas et al. (2003) tested for positive and purifying selection in 331 human genes implicated in disease and an appropriate set of non-disease genes, and they found that genes involved in disease in general, and cancer-related genes in particular, appear to be under stronger purifying selection than other genes. Two hypotheses may help explain the discordance between their findings and the results described above. First, Thomas et al. (2003) used a considerably less precise method for inferring selection; pairwise comparison between sequence data from the human and mouse genome projects, supplemented with some human–rodent genome comparisons. Such comparisons do not identify specific codons under selection, but rather provide a measure of the average form of selection across the entire gene for each between-species pairwise comparison. By contrast, the studies discussed above, where positive selection was inferred, used codon-specific and branch-specific methods to detect selection (e.g. Huttley et al., 2000; Summers & Crespi, 2005). Hence, strong purifying selection may be acting across most of the gene for cancer-related genes, and yet these genes may also have specific, functionally important regions that are under positive selection.

Second, many genes that are ultimately mutated within individuals over the course of a particular case of cancer progression are highly conserved across species (e.g. in BRCA1. Fleming et al., 2003; Pavlack et al., 2004). Such genes are essential (i.e., lethal in knockout experiments), and as such will be subject to strong purifying selection (Thomas et al., 2003), but they may still be involved in carcinogenesis because they commonly mutate during somatic selection. The evolution of cancer cell lineages within the body involves a large series of mutations that accrue cumulatively over a long period (Greaves, 2000). Many of these mutations occur during periods when the cancer cell lineages are in a destabilized, hypermutagenic state that characterizes the progression of many cancers (e.g. Breivik & Gaudernack, 2004; Frank & Nowak, 2004; Breivik, 2005). The early progression of cancer is likely to be driven by a small subset of genes relative to the total number that ultimately are mutated. We propose that genes that are under positive selection are likely to be an important component of this subset of genes that initiate cancer and drive clonal expansion, due to their capacities in the control of cell proliferation.

(4) Evolutionary and clinical implications

Our study has several important implications for the evolutionary biology of cancer. First, other genes that are known to be positively selected, and potentially subject to antagonistic coevolution, may usefully be screened for a role in elevating cancer risk, via hereditary variants, somatic mutation, or altered expression. Conversely, known oncogenes, tumour-suppressors and other cancer-related genes should be sequenced in a wide range of related species (and extensively within humans) and tested for positive selection, which may direct researchers to additional sites of functional importance and provide insight into the selective pressures driving the inferred molecular-evolutionary changes. Such analyses may involve testing for positive selection among species in cancer genes that are either fixed or polymorphic in humans (Loktionov, 2004; Zhu et al., 2004), testing for selective sweeps along the human lineage, and analysing the somatic molecular-evolutionary changes that typify cancer progression.

Second, rates and patterns of adaptive molecular change can be linked to physiological, developmental, behavioural and life-historical aspects of the phenotype, such as male and female lifespan, forms of placentation, and sexual selection and sexual conflict intensity, to infer the nature of the evolved linkages between phenotypic selection and the molecular mechanisms of cancer. The evidence that we have presented is necessarily correlative, as the genetic systems involved have yet to be deeply investigated by both molecular-evolutionary biologists and researchers studying cancer. It is only through such multidisciplinary analyses that the study of cancer will develop its own natural history, evolutionary underpinnings, and predictive understanding of how diverse forms
of selection drive molecular evolution both within and between organisms.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

(1) Application of evolutionary theory for intragenomic conflict and antagonistic coevolution to the microevolution of cancer-related genes suggests that such genes should often exhibit signatures of positive selection, with relatively high rates of amino acid substitution among species. Such positive selection at the molecular level can be driven by diverse forms of conflict between evolutionary agents, including parent-offspring conflict, maternal-foetal conflict, sexual conflict, sexual selection, and host–parasite conflict. These conflicts lead to evolutionary disequilibrium, molecular-level arms races, and tugs-of-war over cellular resources, which generate genetic, epigenetic, and developmental systems more vulnerable to the development of cancer.

(2) A large suite of genes exhibits three coincident features, (a) involvement in cancer, (b) positive selection among species, and (c) expression in arenas of evolutionary conflict, which taken together provide strong evidence for antagonistic coevolution driving cancer risk. These genes include SP4AX cancer/testis associated genes, Y-linked genes, some homeobox genes, centromeric histone genes, the breast cancer genes BRCA1 and BRCA2, the angiogenesis gene ANG, some cadherins, some cytochrome P450 genes, and some genes in oncogenetic diseases.

(3) Large-scale database studies of positive selection show that positive selection is commonly inferred for genes that are implicated in carcinogenesis, via their involvement in tumour suppression, apoptosis, and cell proliferation. These results demonstrate apparent generality to the links between antagonistic coevolution, cancer, and positive selection, and they suggest that signatures of selection, in genes potentially involved in evolutionary conflicts, may provide useful guides to identification of genes involved in cancer risk.

(4) Evolutionary-genomic approaches to the analysis of carcinogenesis, that include analyses at the levels of somatic selection, within-population selection, and among-species divergence, should provide novel insights into both cancer risk and the evolution of intragenomic conflicts.
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