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Abstract. Mismatches that arise during replication or genetic recombination or owing to damage to DNA by chemical agents are recognized by mismatch repair systems. The pathway has been characterized in detail in Escherichia coli. Several homologues of the genes encoding the proteins of this pathway have been identified in the yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae and in human cells. Mutations in the human genes hMSH2, hMLH1, hPMS1 and hPMS2 have been linked to hereditary nonpolyposis colon cancer (HNPPC) and to some sporadic tumours. Mismatch repair also plays an antirecombinogenic role and is implicated in speciation.
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1. Introduction

Faithful transmission of genetic information is of paramount importance for the survival of a cell. DNA polymerase, the key enzyme involved in DNA replication, despite its proofreading activity introduces one wrong nucleotide out of every million nucleotides in in vitro replication assays (Loeb and Kunkel 1982). It becomes immediately apparent that such an error rate could theoretically result in up to 10 mutations during each generation of a bacterium like Escherichia coli and approximately 3000 new mutations in a human cell following DNA synthesis during the S phase. However, the error rate observed in vivo is at least 1000-fold lower than that observed in vitro (Cheng and Loeb 1993). A number of mechanisms have evolved to ensure high-fidelity transmission of genetic material from one generation to the next since mutations can lead to genotypes that may be deleterious to the cell. In addition to their generation during DNA replication, mismatched nucleotides can also arise owing to physical damage of the DNA (Friedberg 1985). Such mispaired nucleotides in DNA are corrected by the mismatch repair system. To date, the best-defined mismatch repair pathway is the E. coli mutHLS pathway (Modrich 1991), and to a lesser extent the hex pathway of Streptococcus pneumoniae (Claverys and Lacks 1986). The mutHLS pathway, apart from ensuring fidelity of chromosome replication, also ensures fidelity of homologous genetic recombination by its antirecombinogenic role which prevents recombination between quasihomologous sequences (Modrich 1991; Radman and Wagner 1993; Selva et al. 1995). There have been scattered biochemical studies on mismatch repair in extracts of human (Holmes et al. 1990; Thomas et al. 1991), Drosophila (Holmes et al. 1990) and Xenopus (Varlet et al. 1990) cells. However, the observation that some hereditary colon cancer patients showed instability of microsatellite [(CA)n repeats] sequences in their DNA (Aaltenen et al. 1993) led to identification of the mismatch repair genes of humans and demonstration of a close link between this pathway and hereditary colon cancer. In this article, we discuss recent developments in this area.
2. Mismatch repair system in *E. coli*

As mentioned earlier, the best-defined mismatch repair pathway is the *E. coli* mutHLS pathway, which is dependent on the *mutL*, *mutS*, *mutH* and *mutU* (*uvrD*) gene products (Modrich 1991). The strand specificity that is required for mismatch repair is dictated by the status of adenine methylation at d(GATC) sites, which is a post-replication event. The GATC sequences in newly synthesized DNA are unmethylated and hence serve as a recognition signal for the ensuing mismatch repair. This methyl-directed excision reaction has been reconstituted in vitro (Lahue *et al.* 1989). The sequence of events that occur at the region of mismatch is shown in figure 1. Mismatch repair is initiated by recognition of mismatched bases by the MutS protein, followed by
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*Figure 1.* Schematic illustration of the methyl-directed mismatch repair pathway of *E. coli*. Following one round of DNA replication the newly synthesized daughter strands are unmethylated at adenine residues in GATC sites, which provides strand discrimination for repair. The mismatches generated by DNA polymerase during replication are recognized by the MutS protein. MutH, a latent endonuclease, recognizes a GATC site, and nicking by MutH at unmethylated GATC is activated by recruitment of MutL protein onto the MutS–DNA complex. The action of DNA helicase unwinds DNA from the nick, and excision of nucleotides is brought about by exonuclease I (Exo I) if the nick is 5' to the mismatch (as shown in the figure), or by exonuclease VII (Exo VII) or Rec J exonuclease if the nick is 3' to the mismatch. The gap in the DNA is then filled by DNA polymerase III and sealed by the action of DNA ligase.
recruitment of MutL in an ATP-dependent manner. Assembly of the MutS–MutL complex on the DNA leads to activation of a latent endonuclease activity of MutH which is dependent on hydrolysis of ATP by MutS. MutH cleaves DNA at unmethylated GATC. The incision by MutH is bidirectional in the sense that breakage of the phosphodiester bond in the unmethylated strand occurs at the GATC site present either 5′ or 3′ to the mismatch. The efficient repair reaction requires participation of DNA helicase II (uvrD gene product), DNA polymerase III, DNA ligase, the single-stranded-DNA binding protein (SSB) and any of the ssDNA exonucleases (ExoI, ExoVII or RecJ). Exonuclease I (with a 3′ → 5′ nucleolytic activity) participates if the incision occurs 3′ to the mismatch, while ExoVII or RecJ (with 5′ → 3′ nucleolytic activity) is involved when the incision occurs 5′ to the mismatch. The gap thus generated is repaired by DNA polymerase III in the presence of SSB and DNA ligase.

In contrast to the mismatch repair pathway in Gram-negative bacteria like E. coli, the mismatch repair system of Gram-positive bacteria such as S. pneumoniae lacks a MutH homologue and does not use dam methylation for strand discrimination. MutS and MutL homologues have been identified in S. pneumoniae: HexA and HexB respectively (Claverys and Lacks 1986).

The mutHLS pathway of E. coli corrects mismatches incorporated during replication. E. coli has evolved two other pathways to correct mismatches that arise owing to the action of chemical agents. The very short pathway (VSP) corrects G–T mismatches that are created by deamination of 5-methylcytosine residues to G–C pairs (Jones et al. 1987; Freidberg et al. 1995). This reaction involves five protein components. The Vsr protein specifically nicks the T-containing strand 5′ to the T in the sequence context of CT(A/T)GG and NT(A/T)GG, and this activity is stimulated by MutS and MutL (Hennecke et al. 1991). Excision and resynthesis is carried out by DNA polymerase I and DNA ligase. In addition to repairing G–T mismatches, the VSP system also corrects G–U mispairs although less efficiently.

The second pathway, which is dependent on the mutY gene product, corrects mismatches resulting from oxidative damage to guanine residues (Modrich 1991; Freidberg et al. 1995). At the nucleotide level, when dGTP is oxidized to 8-oxo-dGTP, the MutT protein degrades the 8-oxo-dGTP to prevent its incorporation into DNA. If, however, 8-oxo-dGTP is incorporated into DNA, it is removed by a reaction catalysed by the mutM gene product, Fpg glycosylase (Michaels et al. 1992). If the DNA containing 8-oxo-G survives all these protective mechanisms and goes through a round of replication, it results in G–C to T–A change in the second round of replication. To prevent such a change the A–8-oxo-G mispair is recognized by the MutY-dependent repair pathway. The MutY acts both as a glycosylase and as an apurinic/apyrimidinic lyase, creating a nick (Tsai-Wu et al. 1992). Excision and resynthesis are carried out by DNA polymerase I and DNA ligase. Interestingly, the MutY-dependent repair reaction also corrects A–G and A–C mispairs to C–G and G–C base pairs respectively, albeit to a lesser extent.

3. Mismatch repair system in yeast

The mismatch repair system was originally invoked to explain gene conversion events during genetic recombination in yeast. Mutations in Saccharomyces cerevisiae that resulted in a high frequency of post-meiotic segregation (pms) were traced to mutations inactivating a mismatch-repair-associated gene (Williamson et al. 1985; Bishop et al.
Five PMS genes, namely PMS1, PMS2, PMS3, PMS4 and PMS6, have been identified that affect mismatch repair. Mutations in all these genes increase the frequency of recombination between closely linked markers and decrease the number of gene conversion events relative to post-meiotic segregation events (Williamson et al. 1985; Jeyaprakash et al. 1994). Subsequently the PMS1 gene was shown to be homologous to the bacterial mutL gene (Kramer et al. 1989).

The E. coli mutS homologues in S. cerevisiae were first cloned by Kolodner and coworkers (Reenan and Kolodner 1992a). Using the degenerate-primer-directed PCR approach, they identified and cloned two mutS homologues, namely MSH1 and MSH2. Both appeared to be nucleus-encoded gene products. Transposon mutagenesis was used to decipher their probable functions. Mutations in MSH2 were shown to affect nuclear DNA mismatch repair. Haploid msh2 mutants showed an 85-fold increase in the rate of spontaneous mutation over that of the wild type. Homozygous msh2 diploids, upon sporulation, did not survive. Gene conversion events were also affected in msh2 mutants; there was a decrease in the ratio of gene conversion events leading to PMS. msh1 mutants showed the petite phenotype, indicating that MSH1 is probably involved in mitochondrial DNA metabolism. Analysis of mitochondrial DNA from such petite mutants revealed large-scale rearrangements. The MSH1 gene encodes a protein with a mitochondrial targeting sequence and the protein is localized in mitochondria (Reenan and Kolodner 1992b). Mitochondrial DNA in msh1/MSH1 strains accumulates point mutations more rapidly than in wild type (Nai-Wen Chi and Kolodner 1994). Purified MSH1 protein hydrolyses ATP and recognizes mismatches in a manner similar to MutS. They suggest that MSH1 plays a role in eliminating errors and homeologous recombination in mitochondrial genome.

4. Mismatch repair gene homologues and human colon cancer

While these developments were occurring in identification and cloning of mismatch repair genes in lower eukaryotes, researchers in the area of the genetics of human colon cancer were encountering a new and challenging puzzle. The DNA isolated from colorectal tumour samples and hereditary nonpolyposis colon cancer (HNPPCC) samples showed a phenomenon called microsatellite instability (Aaltonen et al. 1993; Thibodeau et al. 1993). The human genome contains repeats of mononucleotide, dinucleotide, trinucleotide and tetranucleotide sequences dispersed throughout the genome. When the PCR products of certain tumour samples were analysed, it was observed that alleles showed either expansion or deletion of (CA) repeats in the tumour. Such expansion or deletion of repeat sequences was suspected to arise from a defect in a factor responsible for maintenance of replication fidelity. Loss of function of this factor would cause replication slippage, resulting in such expansion or deletion of (CA) repeats. The association of RER+ (replication error) phenotype of microsatellites with HNPPCC and the observation that S. cerevisiae defective in mismatch repair genes manifest instability of dinucleotide repeats (Strand et al. 1993) suggested a link between HNPPCC and mismatch repair genes in humans. The microsatellite locus that was cosegregating with colon cancer was localized to chromosome 2 (Peltomaki et al. 1993).

Kolodner's group had earlier cloned the yeast homologue of E. coli mutS. The idea that some factor in the post-replication DNA repair process might be involved in the maintenance of repeat sequences in DNA immediately prompted Kolodner's group to
clone the human homologue of yeast MSH2. They again used PCR technology and were successful in obtaining the cDNA clone of hMSH2 (Fishel et al. 1993). Expression of hMSH2 in E. coli resulted in an increased rate of accumulation of mutations in the E. coli genome, thus establishing that expression of hMSH2 results in a strong mutator phenotype. A similar observation had been made earlier with expression of S. pneumoniae hexA in E. coli. The expression of a heterologous gene encoding a mismatch-recognizing gene product in E. coli resulted in impairment in the mismatch repair pathway since the heterologous proteins do not interact with the proteins of the native pathway such as MutL and MutH (Prudhomme et al. 1991). Under these circumstances mismatches remain uncorrected and hence a strong mutator phenotype results. The hMSH2 gene maps to human chromosome 2p22–21 near a locus implicated in HNPCC (Fishel et al. 1993). Final confirmation that this gene is responsible for colon cancer came from the demonstration that two of the tumour DNAs were found to have a T-to-C transition mutation at position –6 of the splice acceptor site of the intron, located at nucleotide position 2020 of the cDNA sequence.

In a parallel study Vogelstein and coworkers, who had earlier demonstrated close association of microsatellite instability with hereditary colon cancer, succeeded in identifying the hMSH2 gene as the candidate gene for HNPCC through positional cloning (Leach et al. 1993). They also showed that there were germline mutations in three HNPCC kindreds at codon positions 622 (proline → leucine), 265–314 (frame deletion) and 406 (arginine → stop). They also observed mutations in RER+ cell lines. In an accompanying paper, Vogelstein, Modrich and others demonstrated that mutation rate in (CA)n repeats in RER+ tumour cells is at least 100-fold higher than in RER− cells (Parsons et al. 1993). The RER+ cells were also shown to be defective in strand-specific mismatch repair.

The open reading frame (ORF) of hMSH2 cDNA contains 2802 nucleotides and encodes a protein of 934 amino acids. The region between amino acids 598 and 789 of the human protein is 85% identical to the corresponding region of the S. cerevisiae MSH2 protein. The evolutionary relationship among all the known MutS-related proteins indicates that hMSH2 is a member of a group of MutS homologues. Recently mutS gene homologues have been cloned from mouse and Xenopus (Varlet et al. 1994) and rat (Geeta Vani and Rao 1996).

The hMSH2 genomic locus has been cloned and shown to encompass a region of 73 kb with 16 exons (Kolodner et al. 1994). Availability of the nucleotide sequence of all the intron–exon junctions has enabled design of primer sets in the intron regions to study mutations both within the exon and in the intron–exon junctions.

HNPCC is classically divided into two syndromes. Only colorectal cancer is seen in the Lynch I subtype, while in the Lynch II subtype a variety of additional epithelial-derived tumours are seen. In a third type of syndrome called Muir–Torre syndrome, the disease is characterized by tumours of sebaceous glands and skin in addition to colorectal cancer. Analysis of DNA samples of two large HNPCC kindreds exhibiting features of the Muir–Torre syndrome has revealed inheritance of a frameshift mutation in the MSH2 gene in one family and a nonsense mutation in exon 12 of MSH2 in the other family (Kolodner et al. 1994).

Liu et al. (1994) also analysed 29 HNPCC kindreds for mutations in hMSH2. About 40% of them had germline mutations, which were point mutations, truncation, and in-frame and out-of-frame deletions. It is quite likely that the rest of the kindreds carry mutations in other genes of the mismatch repair pathway.
Linkage analysis also showed that in addition to hMSH2, localized to chromosome 2, being the candidate gene for HNPCC, a second locus on chromosome 3p21–23 is also associated with HNPCC (Lindblom et al. 1993). It was suspected that one of the other genes of the mismatch repair pathway might be localized to chromosome 3. This prediction proved to be correct. Bronner et al. (1994) and Papadopoulos et al. (1994) cloned this gene. It has shown to be a mutL homologue and was therefore named hMLH1. The hMLH1 cDNA clone contains an ORF of 2268 bp that encodes a protein of 756 amino acids, which has 41% identity with the yeast MLH1. This gene was localized to chromosome 3p 21.3–23 by FISH analysis. Missense mutations in hMLH1 were detected in DNA samples of HNPCC-affected individuals. Mutations in hMSH2 account for 60–65% and mutations in hMLH1 for 30% of all HNPCC patients.

The hMLH1 genomic locus on chromosome 3p has been cloned and shown to encompass 58 kb of DNA with 19 exons. Sequence information for all the intron–exon junctions has facilitated a PCR approach for analysing each of the hMLH1 exons for mutations (Kolodner et al. 1995).

Two additional mutL homologues, namely hPMS1 and hPMS2, have been isolated (Nicolaides et al. 1994). hPMS1 cDNA contains an ORF of 2796 nucleotides encoding a 932-residue protein, which has 27% identity with yeast PMS1. The hPMS2 cDNA has an ORF of 2586 bp encoding a protein of 862 amino acids, which has 32% identity with yeast PMS1. hPMS1 and hPMS2 are localized to chromosomes 2 (2q 31–33) and 7 (7p 22) respectively. Both hPMS1 and hPMS2 genes were found to be mutated in the germline of some of the HNPCC patients. These mutations account for 2–5% of all HNPCC cases.

In most HNPCC families, there is a germline mutation of one or more of the mismatch repair genes hMSH2, hMLH1, hPMS1 and hPMS2. The identification of the second allele in a tumour supports the idea that mutation in both the alleles of a mismatch repair gene probably triggers the onset of cancer.

The instability of microsatellite sequences has thus become a diagnostic tool for detection of possible mutations in the mismatch repair pathway genes. The human data are amply supported by the experiments of Strand et al. (1993), who showed that mutations in any one of the three yeast genes PMS1, MLH1 and MSH2 lead to 100–700-fold increases in poly(GT)-tract instability. In a control experiment they showed that mutations that eliminate the proofreading activity of DNA polymerase had no effect on stability of poly(GT) tracts.

A more direct evidence for the role of hMSH2 gene in genomic instability and tumorigenesis has come from the recent knockout experiments carried out by two groups of workers. de Wind et al. (1995) have generated embryonic stem (ES) cells and mice that are deficient in mMSH2 gene. The mutant ES cells showed a strong mutator phenotype, hyperrecombination and methylation tolerance. MSH2-deficient mice developed normally. However, many of the mutant mice developed lymphomas. In another, independent study, Reitmar et al. (1995) also developed homozygous MSH2-/- mice. These mice developed normally through two generations. Some of these mice developed lymphoid tumours which exhibited microsatellite instability. Both these reports provide a direct link between MSH2 defect and pathogenesis of cancer.

Microsatellite instability, which is a result of mutations in the genes of the mismatch repair pathway, does not explain the pathophysiology of cancer phenotypes. It is quite likely that mutations occur in some of the regulatory genes of the cell cycle, triggering oncogenesis. It is interesting to point out here that the type II TGF-β receptor is
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inactivated in colon cancer cells (Markowitz et al. 1995); the inactivation was caused by truncation of the 10 adenine repeats by one or two nucleotides within the coding region. TGF-β inhibits growth of multiple epithelial cell types, and hence a mutation in TGF-β receptor relieves this control mechanism and probably initiates tumorigenesis.

Knockout mice carrying disrupted PMS2 gene were susceptible to developing sarcomas and lymphomas like MSH2-deficient mice (Baker et al. 1995). Microsatellite instability was observed in testis, tail and the tumours that had developed. A striking phenotype of these mice was that the male mice were sterile and produced abnormal sperms. Cytological observation of the spermatocytes indicated that chromosomal synopsis was severely affected in these PMS2-deficient mice.

5. Mismatch recognition by hMSH2

The human MSH2 gene has been expressed in E. coli using the pET expression system with a histidine tag (Fishel et al. 1994a). The purified protein binds to single mismatches as well as multiple insertion/deletion loops. hMSH2 also binds to insertion/deletion loops containing (CA)n repeats (Fishel et al. 1994b). The E. coli MutS protein on the other hand does not recognize multiple insertion/deletion loops. It remains to be seen how these differences in recognition specificity are manifested at the level of protein–nucleic acid interaction. Even the mechanism of recognition of a single-base mismatch by the MutS family of proteins is a challenging problem particularly since there do not seem to be major alterations in the helical properties of DNA containing a mismatch from that of normal duplex DNA (Patel et al. 1984; Hare et al. 1986).

Native hMSH2 has been purified from human cells as a heterodimer, termed hMutSα, comprising hMSH2 and a 160-kDa protein also called G:T-binding protein [GTBP] (Drummond et al. 1995; Palombo et al. 1995). When these proteins were synthesized in vitro as individual polypeptides, neither of them showed any mismatch-binding activity. However, when synthesized together, the heterodimer formed showed mismatch-binding activity. Some preliminary studies have been carried out on the relative contribution of each of the two polypeptides in mismatch recognition. The present thinking is that a single-base mismatch and slipped intermediates in single-base runs are recognized by the hMSH2–p160/GTBP complex. On the other hand, slipped intermediates of two or more bases may be recognized by hMSH2 alone or as a heterodimer with a yet unidentified protein. There are no germline mutations in the gene that encodes GTBP in HNPCC cases, and the genomic instability seen in the GTBP mutants is less compared to defects in other genes (Papadopoulos et al. 1995). The alterations are predominantly in mononucleotide tracts. The human homologue of MutL has also been purified as a heterodimer, hMutLα, from human cells, and comprises hMLH1 and hPMS2 gene products (Li and Modrich 1995). In the yeast S. cerevisiae also, MLH1 acts in conjunction with PMS1 in facilitating repair of MSH2-bound mismatches. The involvement of hPMS1 in mismatch repair is not clear at present although mutation in the hPMS1 gene has been observed in a single patient with family history of colorectal cancer.

6. Other mutS homologues

Four additional mutS homologues have been identified in S. cerevisiae. Crouse and coworkers (New et al. 1993) have isolated the MSH3 gene, which shows high sequence
similarity with bacterial \textit{mutS}. The homology of \textit{MSH3} is more with mouse \textit{Rep3} ([Linton et al. 1989]) or human \textit{DUG} than with yeast \textit{MSH1} or \textit{MSH2}. Mouse \textit{Rep3} and the human \textit{DUG} genes ([Fuji and Shimada 1989]) are present next to the \textit{DHFR} gene in the respective genomes, and transcription is in opposite orientation from the same \textit{DHFR} promoter. The physiological role of the \textit{MSH3} gene product is not clear at present since disruption of this gene does not severely alter either the spontaneous mutation rates or post-meiotic segregation. Nothing much is known about the functions of \textit{Rep3} and \textit{DUG} genes also.

Another \textit{mutS} homologue, \textit{MSH4}, has been isolated from \textit{S. cerevisiae} by Ross-Macdonald and Roeder ([1994]). This gene appears to be meiosis-specific and is expressed during meiotic prophase prior to meiosis I chromosome segregation. \textit{MSH4} has been mapped to chromosome VI and encodes a protein of 878 amino acids. The amino acid sequence is 35\% identical with \textit{E. coli} MutS and 31–36\% identical with the other MutS homologues in yeast. The similarity is maximum in the C-terminal portion encompassing the ATP-binding domain and the DNA-binding motif. The \textit{MSH4} protein has amino acid substitutions, compared to other MutS homologues, in both the ATP-binding and the DNA-binding domains. Interestingly, the hydrophobic residues normally present in the DNA-binding domain of other MutS homologues are replaced by hydrophilic amino acids in \textit{MSH4}. \textit{msh4} null mutation has no effect on DNA mismatch repair. These mutants display normal levels of gene conversion and post-meiotic segregation. However, they show a reduction in crossing-over which results in an increase in nondisjunction of paired homologous chromosomes at meiosis I. These results have been interpreted as suggesting that \textit{MSH4} protein interacts with recombination intermediates, facilitating their resolution.

\textit{MSH5} is another gene isolated from \textit{S. cerevisiae} belonging to the \textit{mutS} family ([Hollingsworth et al. 1995]). It is different from \textit{MSH4} in sequence but is not involved in DNA mismatch repair, like \textit{MSH4}. The gene has an ORF of 2703 nucleotides and encodes a protein of 901 amino acids. Of all the \textit{mutS} homologues of \textit{S. cerevisiae}, \textit{MSH5} is most homologous to \textit{MSH2} and least to \textit{MSH4}. The phenotype of \textit{msh5} mutants is similar to that of \textit{msh4} mutants in that they show (i) no effect on mismatch repair, (ii) decreased spore viability, (iii) increased levels of chromosome nondisjunction, and (iv) decreased reciprocal exchange between homologous chromosomes. Gene conversion was, however, not affected in \textit{msh5} mutants. \textit{msh4} and \textit{msh5} diploid double mutants revealed that these two genes may belong to the same epistatic group. It has been suggested that \textit{MSH4} and \textit{MSH5} may interact to form heterodimers similar to human MutSz. Recently Kolodner and coworkers ([Kolodner et al. 1995]) have identified yet another MutS homologue in \textit{S. cerevisiae}, \textit{MSH6}. \textit{MSH6} is thought to dimerize with \textit{MSH2} protein. \textit{MSH6} protein may have a function similar to that of human p160/GTBP.

7. Microsatellite instability and sporadic cancer

Although initial studies were directed towards demonstrating a correlation between microsatellite instability and mutations in the mismatch repair genes of HNPC families, more recently microsatellite instability has been observed in many of the sporadic tumours of colorectal cancer, and those of lung (Merlo et al. 1984), breast ([Glebov et al. 1994]) and pancreas ([Han et al. 1993]). It is quite likely that these sporadic tumours have acquired somatic mutations similar to those inherited in HNPC. There
have been conflicting reports on the occurrence of mutations in the four mismatch repair genes \textit{MSH2}, \textit{MLH1}, \textit{PMS1} and \textit{PMS2} (Liu \textit{et al.} 1995). We have to wait for a much larger database of the analysis of mutations in these genes before we can ask questions regarding origin of these mutations in sporadic tumours.

It is now becoming very clear that tumorigenesis is a result of multigene defects. There could be two possibilities for the involvement of mismatch repair genes in the onset of cancer. First, because of the strong mutator phenotype of mutation in these genes, a loss of function of one of these genes might result in accumulation of mutations in oncogenes and tumour suppressor genes. This hypothesis is strongly favoured by Vogelstein and coworkers (Vogelstein and Kinzler 1994). Second, the loss of mismatch repair functions might cause mutations in some of the key genes involved in control of the cell cycle, as exemplified by the study of type II TGF receptor (Markowitz \textit{et al.} 1995).

8. Mismatch repair system and speciation

The mismatch repair system, in addition to having a key role in maintaining the integrity of DNA sequences in the genome, also plays an important role in providing a barrier to intermixing of genomes between two species. An excellent example of this phenomenon is seen in \textit{E. coli} and \textit{Salmonella typhimurium}. Although drug-resistance extrachromosomal elements can easily move between these two organisms, chromosomal transfer and recombination is very rare. In a classic paper, Radman and coworkers (Rayssiguer \textit{et al.} 1989) showed that this barrier could be removed by inactivating the mismatch repair genes. The barrier to homologous recombination is likely due to inhibition of branch migration (Worth \textit{et al.} 1994). There is evidence for the presence of a barrier by mismatch repair proteins to homologous recombination in \textit{S. cerevisiae} (Selva \textit{et al.} 1995). These experiments suggest that mismatch repair enzymes may function as potent inhibitors of interspecies recombination and slow down the rate of evolution (Matic \textit{et al.} 1995).

9. Conclusions and perspectives

In the last five years there have been many advances in identification of genes responsible for mismatch repair in eukaryotic cells. The biochemistry of mismatch repair has been elucidated and reconstituted \textit{in vitro} with purified components synthesized in \textit{E. coli} (Lahue \textit{et al.} 1989). Even the lower eukaryote \textit{S. cerevisiae} has evolved additional mismatch recognition proteins to tackle meiotic recombination events. The meiosis-specific MutS homologues have not been identified in animal systems yet but it is quite likely that they do exist. Although knockout experiments are giving some clues to the function of the mismatch repair genes, we have to wait for detailed biochemical analysis of the mismatch repair pathway in animal cells for a better understanding of the relative contribution of each of the homologues.

The most significant finding in this area over the last few years has been the demonstration of a close link between mismatch repair genes and hereditary colon cancer. Since we do find microsatellite instability in many of the sporadic cancers, a large database on the nature of mutations in the mismatch repair genes might help us in answering some of the questions relating to genetic predisposition of human populations to cancer.
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