

Propojení výuky oborů Molekulární a buněčné biologie a Ochrany a tvorby životního prostředí OPVK (CZ.1.07/2.2.00/28.0032)

Will an Aspirin a Day Keep Cancer Away?

Jocelyn Kaiser

Science 21 September 2012

Vol. 337 no. 6101 pp. 1471-1473

Marie Šoborová

The first hint of protective factor of aspirin

- ▶ In the late 1970s by a surgeon in Melbourne
- ▶ He wanted to figure out why his country had a relatively high rate of colorectal cancer.
- ▶ He and colleagues interviewed more than 700 cancer patients and comparable number of healthy people
- ▶ Conclusion => Australians' penchant for beer, fatty foods and red meat all seemed to predispose them to disease
- ▶ But they also found a surprising protective factor => people who regularly used aspirin were 40% less likely to develop colorectal cancer than those didn't take the drug

Studies from UK

- ▶ Offered the first evidence from placebo-controlled clinical trials that regularly taking low doses of aspirin wards off other types of cancer as well
- ▶ The studies found that death rates from several tumor types were as much as 37% lower.
- ▶ People who developed a cancer => taking aspirin seemed to slow the spread of tumors to other parts of the body
- ▶ „ *It's just about the first proof of principle that a simple compound of any kind can reduce the risk of several cancers*“

Studies from UK

- ▶ These reports have raised attractive possibility that aspirin could serve as the first anticancer drug for general population
- ▶ Debate about the risks and benefits
- ▶ Other suggestion => medical societies and policymakers should also consider aspirin's general cancer-fighting effects
- ▶ The research lost momentum in the past decade when one NSAID drug, Vioxx, was pulled off the market because of safety concerns
- ▶ What is the mechanism by which aspirin and other NSAIDs protect against cancer???

How does taking aspirin ward off cancer?

- ▶ Researchers still don't understand the mechanism
- ▶ Aspirin (acetylsalicylic acid) inhibits two forms of enzymes known as cyclooxygenases (COX) that convert arachidonic acid into lipids called prostaglandins
 - COX-1 protect the stomach lining
 - COX-2 involved in inflammation
- ▶ Researchers have concluded that aspirin prevents cancer mainly by blocking the activity of COX-2 (the same inflammation-driven responses that help tissue recovery from wound injury may also help tumors grow)
- ▶ Some new clinical studies of low-dose aspirin suggest that COX-2 isn't directly involved at all => low doses this drug doesn't block COX-2 but still impairs platelets via the COX-1 pathway

How does taking aspirin ward off cancer?

- ▶ Studies suggest that platelets blunt immune attack on cancer cells and help them take root in a new place
- ▶ Other experiments suggest that activated platelets can also stimulate the COX-2 pathway in adjacent cells => this would explain how aspirin could block early stages of colorectal cancer
- ▶ Drugs that target only COX-2 (Vioxx, Celebrex) unacceptably raised heart attack risk => efforts to make an alternative to standard aspirin haven't yet panned out

Comeback

- ▶ Aspirin and some other NSAIDs first bore out their promise in trials published starting in 2000 => people who had precancerous colon polyps removed and others genetically prone to colorectal cancer
- ▶ Epidemiological evidence has suggested that aspirin could have broader anticancer effects => it's not conclusive
- ▶ This evidence come from studies in which people answered questions about their past use of medications
- ▶ Hopes for aspirin fell in 2005
- ▶ Vioxx, Celebrex

Results

- ▶ First result => aspirin was taken daily => 37% fewer deaths from cancers after 5 years
 - Found that people who taken regularly aspirin had more stomach bleeds => these incidents were not fatal => people recovered and the bleeding risk went down after several years on aspirin
- ▶ Second result => people on aspirin who developed cancer were 36% less likely to have tumors that had spread
- ▶ Third result => remarkable consistency in the drop on cancers among aspirin users in epidemiologic studies and clinical trials

Chan and his suggest

- ▶ Chan is part of an international panel on cancer prevention that, in response to the Rothwell studies, plans to update its stance on aspirin published 3 years ago
- ▶ The panel suggest that people take low doses of aspirin daily starting around age 50 and stopping by age 70
- ▶ Also is important when doctors should screen patients for the ulcer-causing *Helicobacter pylori* bacterium => positive test => treating this people by antibiotics before putting them on aspirin (reduce the risk of bleeds)

U.S. researchers suggest

- ▶ It's time to update guidelines on the risks and benefits of daily aspirin use
- ▶ The group had endorsed its preventive prowess for heart attack and stroke => discounted its anticancer effects
- ▶ The potential to protect against both cancer and heart disease could tip the balance toward recommending aspirin for many more healthy adults
- ▶ Others are more cautious about recommending aspirin => only people with a particular genetic profile will see their cancer risk go down if they take aspirin

U.S. researchers suggest

- ▶ Researchers from Houston in Texas are also wary => they thought they could put aspirin in the drinking water => but they admitted that everybody needed a more personalized approach
- ▶ All may become clearer soon after reports on longer-term effects of aspirin on cancer risk => this will be crucial
- ▶ Thun says: „*We don't want to mess this up*“.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION 😊

Propojení výuky oborů Molekulární a buněčné biologie a Ochrany a tvorby životního prostředí OPVK (CZ.1.07/2.2.00/28.0032)

When lymphocytes run out of steam

Emmanuel Martin et al.

Nature 510; 288-292

Published 28 May 2014



Veronika Tesaříková

MBB2

- ▶ immune cells
- ▶ crucial part in protection against micro-organisms - viruses and bacteria
- ▶ T cells and B cells
- ▶ response is driven by antigen receptors on the cells' surface
- ▶ leads to rapid cell proliferation and immune protection
- ▶ Proliferation depends on metabolic adaptation

- ▶ children from several unrelated families
- ▶ developed a severe immunodeficiency at birth or at a very young age
- ▶ persistent infections with viruses such as Epstein-Barr and varicella zoster
- ▶ infections from bacteria such as pneumococcus
- ▶ patients might be suffering from an inherited immunodeficiency that compromises lymphocyte function

- ▶ Sequencing of DNA from the affected children
- ▶ all carried a mutation in *CTPS1* -> absence of this enzyme in the patients' lymphocytes
- ▶ CTPS1 is one of two forms of CTP synthase enzymes
- ▶ production of cytidine nucleotide triphosphate (CTP)
- ▶ required for cellular DNA and RNA synthesis

- ▶ normal lymphocytes express both CTPS1 and CTPS2
- ▶ CTPS1 is present at low levels - markedly expressed in activated lymphocytes
- ▶ CTPS2 is already expressed at high levels in non-activated lymphocytes
- ▶ Analyses of T and B cells from the CTPS1-deficient patients
- ▶ cells' capacity to synthesize DNA and proliferate following stimulation of the antigen receptor was severely compromised
- ▶ Intracellular levels of CTP were also very low

- ▶ defects were reproduced when CTPS1 expression was artificially reduced in normal lymphocytes
- ▶ when 3-deazauridine, a pharmacological inhibitor of CTPS enzymes, was used to suppress their activity
- ▶ defects were corrected when CTPS1 was introduced into cells of CTPS1-deficient patients by retrovirus-mediated gene transfer
- ▶ when CTP was added to the cells' culture medium.

- ▶ findings show that CTPS1 and its product, CTP, are required for lymphocytes to proliferate intensely during antigen-induced activation
- ▶ In the absence of CTPS1, antigen-stimulated lymphocytes do not produce sufficient quantities of CTP, causing defects in DNA synthesis and cell proliferation
- ▶ These effects explain in large part why CTPS1-deficient children develop life-threatening viral and bacterial infections

- ▶ even though CTPS2 is expressed in lymphocytes, it cannot replace CTPS1
- ▶ possible explanation for this is that CTPS1 is much more active than CTPS2
- ▶ possibly to modifications such as phosphorylation or co-factor binding that could influence the enzymes' activity
- ▶ differences between CTPS1 and CTPS2 remains to be clarified

- ▶ The data also raise the provocative possibility that pharmacological inhibitors of CTPS1 could be useful tools for treating human diseases associated with excessive or uncontrolled lymphocyte proliferation
 - ▶ transplant rejection
 - ▶ graft-versus-host disease
 - ▶ some forms of cancers such as leukaemia and lymphoma

- ▶ CTPS inhibitor 3-deazauridine has already been shown to display some therapeutic efficiency against leukaemic cells *in vitro*
- ▶ Although it probably also inhibited targets other than CTPS in these cells
- ▶ development of more-specific inhibitors of CTPS1 will help the further investigation of this possible therapeutic methods

Thank you for your attention.