SIGNIFICANCE OF GENETIC POLYMORPHISMS IN GLUTATHIONE S-TRANSFERASE MULTIGENE FAMILY AND LUNG CANCER RISK
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Abstract. A vast number of studies are focused on investigating genetic polymorphism in order to estimate genetic contribution to the development of cancer. Possible cancer susceptibility genes have been sought among oncogenes, tumor suppressor genes, DNA repair genes and genes encoding phase I and phase II enzymes. Large individual differences in the biotransformation of xenobiotics have been explained on the basis of genetic polymorphisms in some detoxifying enzymes, regardless of environmental and occupational exposure. Among these enzymes, glutathione S-transferases (GST) constitute a large multigene family of phase II enzymes involved in detoxification of potentially genotoxic chemicals. Five genetic polymorphisms of GST have been well documented. Total or partial deletions and (or) single nucleotide polymorphisms in alleles encoding GSTM1, GSTM3, GSTP1, GSTT1, GSTZ1 are associated with reduction of enzymatic activity toward several substrates of different GST isoenzymes. In addition, molecular epidemiology studies indicate that a single genetic polymorphism of glutathione S-transferase appears to be a moderate lung cancer risk factor. However, the risk is higher when interactions with more GST polymorphisms and other risk factors (e.g. cigarette smoking) occur. Individuals with decreased rate of detoxification, with "high risk" glutathione S-transferase genotypes have a slightly higher level of carcinogen-DNA adducts and more cytogenetic damages.
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INTRODUCTION

People living in industrialised countries are at risk of developing cancer, asthma, diabetes and cardiovascular diseases due to extensive exposure to environmental and occupational pollutants, which contribute to genetic material damage due to DNA mutations and DNA adduct formation. Mutations in oncogenes and tumor-suppressor genes result in uncontrolled cell growth and cancer. However, owing to individual susceptibility or resistance to carcinogens not everybody develops cancer. Therefore, the study of cancer risk must be evaluated with respect to genetic predisposition, and environmental and occupational exposure to carcinogens. The genetic predisposition results from differences in metabolism of genotoxic compounds and DNA repairing mechanisms. In fact, genetic differences in expression and activity of the xenobiotic metabolizing enzymes are due to the existence of polymorphic alleles encoding these enzymes. The influence of genetic polymorphism on proper or altered enzyme activity has been well documented for several enzymes engaged in activating (phase I), as well as in conjugating (phase II) exo- and endogenous xenobiotics [1]. Glutathione S-transferases (GST), a large group of dimeric enzymes play a critical role in the defence
against oxidative stress products and various electrophilic
compounds. GST, as phase II metabolic enzymes, catalyse
the conjugation of reduced glutathione with
potential genotoxic substances, especially those from
tobacco smoke. Many studies have demonstrated that
individual differences in GST activity are the result of
genetic polymorphism of these enzymes. Indeed, gluta-
thione S-transferases are products of the gene super-
family, some of them polymorphic due to deleted or
mutated alleles. Based on sequence homology and
chromosomal location, glutathione S-transferases
present in the human cytosolic fraction have been
divided into several classes: alpha (GSTA), mu
(GSTM), pi (GSTP), theta (GSTT), sigma (GSTS),
kappa (GSTK) and zeta (GSTZ) [2,3]. Within the
GSTs superfamily, five allelic variants in autosomal
gene locus have been well documented: GSTM1,
GSTM3, GSTP1, GSTT1 and GSTZ1. Table 1 presents
major alleles and chromosomal location of polymor-
phic glutathione S-transferases.

### Table 1. Genetic polymorphism of glutathione S-transferases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Known alleles</th>
<th>Nucleotide change</th>
<th>Amino acid change</th>
<th>Chromosome location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSTM1</td>
<td>GSTM1*0</td>
<td>gene deletion in intron 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1p13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTM1*A</td>
<td>C (exon 7, 534), wild type</td>
<td>Lys (codon 172)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTM1*B</td>
<td>G (exon 7, 534)</td>
<td>Asn (codon 172)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSTP1</td>
<td>GSTP1*A</td>
<td>A (exon 5, 313), wild type</td>
<td>Ile (codon 105)</td>
<td>11q13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTP1*B</td>
<td>G (exon 5, 313)</td>
<td>Val (codon 105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTP1*C</td>
<td>T (exon 6, 341)</td>
<td>Val (codon 105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTP1*D</td>
<td>A (exon 5, 313)</td>
<td>Ile (codon 105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSTZ1</td>
<td>GSTZ1*A</td>
<td>A (exon 3, 94)</td>
<td>Lys (codon 32)</td>
<td>14q24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTZ1*B</td>
<td>A (exon 3, 124)</td>
<td>Arg (codon 42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTZ1*C</td>
<td>G (exon 3, 94)</td>
<td>Lys (codon 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSTM3</td>
<td>GSTM3*A</td>
<td>wild type</td>
<td>Glu (codon 32)</td>
<td>1p13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTM3*B</td>
<td>3 bp deletion in intron 6</td>
<td>Gly (codon 42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSTT1</td>
<td>GSTT1*0</td>
<td>gene deletion</td>
<td></td>
<td>22q11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTT1*(positive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENETIC POLYMORPHISM IN GST GENES

Genes encoding GSTM isoforms were localised in 1p13.3
cromosome in the following sequence: 5'-GSTM4-
GSTM2-GSTM1-GSTM5-GSTM3-3' [4]. GSTM1 isoform
demonstrates genetic polymorphism through the exist-
ence of 3 enzyme encoding alleles: GSTM1*0 with partial
or total gene sequence deletion, GSTM1*A and
GSTM1*B, which differ in single base at 534 position
(C→G substitution). Catalytically active enzyme is encoded
by the GSTM1*A and GSTM1*B genes and the absence
of GSTM1 enzyme activity is caused by deletion of both
copies of the GSTM1 gene. Four possible phenotypes
have been distinguished, resulting from homo- and het-
erozygotic combination of the GSTM1*0, GSTM1*A and
GSTM1*B alleles encoding homo- and heterodimeric
enzymes: GSTM1 A, GSTM1 B, GSTM1 A,B, GSTM1
null [5,6]. Most studies are based on the assumption that
two positive alleles: GSTM1*A and GSTM1*B are equa-
ly protective against genotoxic compounds [1,7,8].
However, Perret et al. [9] found greater frequency of
GSTM1 A genotype among patients with pituitary tumors from the United Kingdom (34%) than in the control group (27%) which indicates a stronger protective role of GSTM1*B gene than GSTM1*A. A similar prevalence in frequency of GSTM1 A genotype in lung cancer individuals compared with the control group of North-West Mediterraneans may suggest a different catalytic activity of GSTM1 isoenzyme encoded by these two alleles. It is also considered that GSTM3 genetic polymorphism due to deletion of a 3 base-pair fragment in intron 6 and the presence of a recognition motif for transcription factor YY1 in GSTM3*B, appears to be strictly connected with GSTM1 gene. To-Figueras et al. [10] found prevalence of individuals with both GSTM1*A and GSTM3*B alleles, suggesting association of GSTM1*A with an increased frequency of GSTM3*B and linkage disequilibrium between both GSTM polymorphic genes. GSTM1 and GSTM3 genes are located in chromosome 1 cluster and it has been suggested that this disequilibrium linkage is also due to the low probability of recombination between both alleles. Another data showed that individuals with different GSTM1 genotypes vary in GSTM3 expression in lungs. To date, subjects with GSTM1*A and GSTM3*B genes seem to express more GSTM3 than those with GSTM1*0/GSTM3*A or GSTM1*B/GSTM3*A combined alleles, because GSTM3*A sequence is not recognized by transcription factor YY1 [11]. Genetic polymorphism of GSTP1 (11q13.3 chromosomal location) results from transition of G to A in exon 5, which causes isoleucine (Ile) to valine (Val) replacement at codon 105. Point mutation at exon 5 strongly affected GSTP1 enzyme efficiency because this substitution is located in the hydrophobic substrate-binding site. The isoforms encoded by GSTP1*A and GSTP1*B alleles show different catalytic activity toward carcinogenic electrophiles and Ile to Val replacement can cause reduction of activity of GSTP1 isoenzyme, which elevates cancer risk [3,12]. Exon 5 GSTP1 genetic polymorphism occurs in 3 existing genotypes: GSTP1*A/A (Ile/Ile), GSTP1*A/B (Ile/Val) and GSTP1*B/B (Val/Val). Another well-known genetic polymorphism of GSTP1 is connected with Ala to Val change at 114 codon [13-14]. On this basis, another nomenclature system for GSTP1 genetic polymorphism is suggested (Table 1) [16]. Genetic polymorphism of GSTT1 (chromosome location – 22q11.2) results from gene deletion. Therefore, in human population there are two distinct genotypes: GSTT1 positive with proper activity and GSTT1 null with lack of expression and elevated cancer risk [13,17]. Two polymorphic sites for glutathione S-transferase Z1 have been established within exon 3 of GSTZ1 gene, due to A to G transitions at 94 and 124 nucleotides. On this basis, three genotypes of GSTZ1 have been identified: GSTZ1*A (A94A124), GSTZ1*B (A94G124), GSTZ1*C (G94G124). These A to G point mutations at the encoding region of GSTZ1 cause changes in the amino acids sequence in codons 32 (Lys → Glu) and 42 (Arg → Gly), respectively. The analysis of the activity of recombinant GSTZ1 proteins towards different α-haloacids displayed that detoxification of dichloroacetate and R-2-chloropropionate by GSTZ1*A is higher than by GSTZ1*B and GSTZ1*C [2].

INDIVIDUAL AND ETHNIC VARIATIONS IN GST GENOTYPES

Glutathione S-transferases are widely distributed and expressed in many mammalian tissues in a tissue- and cell type-specific manner. Many studies have shown evidence of individual variations in GST expression in different tissues. The GSTM1*0 alleles are strictly connected with the lack of activity of GSTM1 isoenzyme due to total or partial deletion of these genes. In this respect, a correlation between genotype and phenotype of GSTM1 has been confirmed, because phenotyping assays showed lower activity of the enzyme in leukocytes of subjects lacking genes of GSTM1, as measured with trans-stilbene oxide (tSBO) as a substrate [18–21]. Genotype-derived differences have been observed also for GSTP1. Genotypes with mutated genes, namely: GSTP1*A*/B (Ile/Val) and GSTP1*B*/B (Val/Val) are considered to be strongly associated with susceptibility to different diseases, mainly to cancer, which is closely related to lower protection against carcinogenic compounds provided by enzymes. The individuals with GSTP1*B mutated alleles
have distinctly lower activity of GSTP1 in lung tissue than those with homozygotes GSTP1*A/A (Ile/Ile) [22]. The influence of GSTM1 genetic polymorphism on lung cancer risk probably depends on detoxification of carcinogens in the liver, where this form of glutathione S-transferase and GSTT1 isoenzyme is very abundant [8,23]. In people with GSTM1 null genotype, high concentration of bioactivated compounds may influence the lung through the bloodstream, after phase I detoxification enzymes have acted. Due to very low expression of GSTM1 isoform in the lung, the GSTM1 genotype has probably no substantial role in xenobiotic detoxification in this tissue. GSTM3 isoform, which is very common in the lung, seems to play the most critical role in the determination of lung cancer risk [20]. GSTP1 is also abundant in peripheral parts of the lung, mainly in alveoli, alveolar macrophages, respiratory bronchioles [3], human endometrium [24] and pancreas [25]. This isoenzyme is widely distributed in gastrointestinal tract, but less than GSTT1 [26].

Genetic polymorphism of GST strongly influences the activity and expression of the dimeric cytosol enzymes, which show distinct interindividual differences. A study on normal epithelial cells from subjects with or without bronchogenic carcinoma showed different expression levels of GST. The levels of GSTP1, GSTM3, GSTM1,2,4,5 and GSTT1 were significantly lower in normal bronchial epithelial cells from individuals with bronchogenic carcinoma, although only in the case of GSTP1 and GSTM3, the mRNA level was significantly different (6.11 mRNA/10^3 β-actin mRNA vs. 26.0 mRNA/10^3 β-actin mRNA and 0.09 mRNA/10^3 β-actin mRNA vs. 0.29 mRNA/10^3 β-actin mRNA, respectively) [27].

Glutathione S-transferases have a wide activity range towards different substrates, and usually GST isoenzymes have distinct but overlapping substrate specificity and catalytic efficiency. Because GST genetic polymorphism seems to be associated with increased risk for tobacco-related cancers, particularly lung [12] and bladder [28], several researchers have tried to explain the mechanisms of such relationships using in vivo biotransformation assays. Compounds, which are particularly biotransformed by GST, derive mainly from tobacco smoke, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and nitrosamines. The detoxification role of GSTM1 is mainly focused on arene oxides, including the ultimate carcinogenic form of benzo[a]pyrene (BP), BP-epoxide (7,8-epoxide) or BP-diol epoxide (7,8-diol-9,10-epoxide), the metabolites, which are derived from the activity of P450 monooxygenases and epoxide hydrolase. Glutathione S-transferase M1 also metabolises other carcinogenic epoxides, aflatoxin B1, 7,8-epoxide and tSBO, by conjugation with reduced glutathione [1,8,29–32]. GSTP1 and GSTM1 have a similar catalytic activity toward BP-epoxide and BP-diol epoxide, which is also detoxified by GSTA1 isoenzyme [29]. GSTT1 isoenzyme is of high toxicological interest as it catalyses the conjugation of a number of low-molecular-weight industrial chemicals: methyl, ethyl, propyl halomethanes, ethylene oxide [33], methylene dihalides [34], and benzene [35]. GSTT1 null individuals have lower GST activity toward cumene hydroperoxide, but with non-significant differences in peroxidation-dependent changes (MDA formation) in GSTT1 null, as well as GSTT1 positive individuals [36]. Combined nulled genotypes of GSTM1 and GSTT1 may cause individual susceptibility to a potent anticholinesterase inhibitor, tacrine hydrochloride, a drug used in the treatment of Alzheimer’s disease [32].

Genetically determined individual differences in metabolising different hazardous exogenous and endogenous compounds make people more or less likely to develop cancer. It is well known that three major human races (Caucasian, Mongoloid and Negroid) differ genetically in frequencies of alleles encoding polymorphic phase I and phase II enzymes. As ethnic differences in reactions to xenobiotics, and therefore, in the distribution of GSTM1 genotypes can also affect the risk of lung cancer, ethnic homogeneity of the studied populations appears to be very important in investigations. GSTM1 null genotype has the highest prevalence in Mongoloids, the lowest in Negroids, while GSTM1*0 Caucasian homozygotes have 50% of distribution. Similarly, polymorphisms in exon 5 GSTP1 and GSTM3 have quite different distribution patterns in the three ethnic groups. Table 2 shows distribution of GST genotypes in the three major races.
Table 2. Frequency of glutathione S-transferase genotypes in three major ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Frequency (range)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSTM1 A</td>
<td>GSTM1 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians</td>
<td>0.30–0.16</td>
<td>0.30–0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongoloids</td>
<td>0.44–0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroids</td>
<td>0.16–0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exon 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GSTP1*A/*A</th>
<th>GSTP1*A/*B</th>
<th>GSTP1*B/*B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians</td>
<td>0.38–0.54</td>
<td>0.34–0.51</td>
<td>0.05–0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongoloids</td>
<td>0.61–0.72</td>
<td>0.25–0.44</td>
<td>0.03–0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroids</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exon 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GSTP1*A/*A</th>
<th>GSTP1*A/*B</th>
<th>GSTP1*B/*B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians</td>
<td>0.82–0.75</td>
<td>0.25–0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongoloids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroids</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GSTM3*A/*A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GSTM3*A/*B</th>
<th>GSTM3*B/*B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians</td>
<td>0.65–0.58</td>
<td>0.05–0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroids</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GSTT1 null

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians</td>
<td>0.12–0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongoloids</td>
<td>0.39–0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroids</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EVIDENCE OF GST AS A CANCER SUSCEPTIBILITY GENES

Genetic polymorphism of GST has been investigated in many molecular epidemiological studies as a factor of susceptibility to cancer development in different types of malignancies. It has been suggested that individuals with GST deleted genes: GSTM1*0, GSTT1*0 and mutated genes: GSTP1*B (Ile105Val), GSTM3*A, leading to changes in GST catalytic activity, are more susceptible to genotoxic chemicals. Although there is no clear correlation between the development of cancer and hereditary GST genotype, the frequency of deleted or mutated alleles among ethnically different populations suggests that individuals carrying these defective genes have an increased risk of cancer at a number of sites, oral [16,50],

Table 3. Case-control studies involving glutathione S-transferase genotypes and lung cancer risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Lung cancer risk associations (OR, 95% CI)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>GSTM1 null 1.45 (0.90–2.32)</td>
<td>[54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Caucasians</td>
<td>GSTM1 null 1.10 (0.8–1.4)</td>
<td>[55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>GSTT1 null 1.50 (0.7–3.5)</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US African-Americans</td>
<td>GSTT1 null 1.20 (0.7–2.2)</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Caucasians</td>
<td>GSTP1*B/*B 1.90 (1.04–3.47)</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Caucasians</td>
<td>GSTP1*B/*B 1.18 (0.67–2.07)</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>GSTM1 null and GSTT1 null 3.41 (1.0–12.9)</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US African-Americans</td>
<td>GSTM1 null and GSTT1 null 1.4 (0.5–3.8)</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>GSTM1 null and GSTP1*B/*B 2.47 (1.15–5.32)</td>
<td>[14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Caucasians</td>
<td>GSTM1 null and GSTM3*A/*A 2.14 (1.08–4.25)</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gastric [51], colorectal [48,52], bladder [28], breast [53], and lung. However, single polymorphisms in GST genes have occurred to be a minor lung cancer risk factor, as presented in Table 3. In multianalysis of several case-control studies among Caucasians and Mongoloids with GSTM1 null genotype the odds ratio (OR) value was estimated at about 1.17 (95% confidence interval (CI): 0.98–1.40) [56], the result similar to that obtained in case-control studies performed in the USA, where GSTM1 null or GSTT1 null individuals were at a moderate risk of lung cancer [17,42]. However, when lung cancer patients from Finland were investigated, significantly higher distribution of GSTM1*0/*0 genotype compared with controls allowed estimating the risk of lung cancer at 1.5 (95% CI: 0.9–2.3) [54]. On the other hand, point mutations at 105 codon of GSTP1 gene appear to be strongly associated with the development of lung cancer. In an investigation of Norwegian lung cancer patients more individuals with both copies of mutated genes (GSTP1*B/*B genotype) were found in the group with cancer than in the control group, with OR of 1.9 (95% CI: 1.04–3.47) [12]. A single polymorphism, even if it modifies, may have little influence on general individual genetic susceptibility, which probably occurs as a result of allelism of several GST loci. This has been confirmed by studies concerning different GST genetic polymorphisms in potential co-operation in protection against carcinogens. Kelsey et al. [17] estimated adjusted odds ratio (OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7–1.6) for GSTM1 null lung cancer patients from Texas. However, when the data were stratified by ethnicity, no relationship was found between homozygous deletion of GSTM1 and lung cancer status for African-Americans with OR = 1.0 (95% CI: 0.5–1.8), while among Mexican-Americans the risk was twice as high (OR = 1.8, 95% CI: 1.0–3.3). A similar prevalence of GSTT1 null genotype was observed for the two ethnic groups with lung cancer. Although OR was 1.4 (95% CI: 0.9–2.3), no association was shown between the GSTT1 null genotype and overall lung cancer. The comparison of genetic polymorphism of two enzymes engaged in detoxification of PAHs, led to very interesting results. The risk of lung cancer was almost 3-fold higher (95% CI: 1.1–1.7) for individuals with both homozygous deletions, while in the patients with only one possible null genotype it was similar to that in the control group. As GSTM3 has been found to be polymorphic in humans, its frequency was also investigated. The distribution of GSTM3 genotypes showed no significant differences between controls and Catalonia patients with diagnosed cancer. However, GSTM3 genetic polymorphism analysed together with GSTM1 combined genotype (GSTM1 null and GSTM3*A/*A) appeared to increase the risk of lung cancer because of significant overrepresentation of lung cancer individuals with these alleles and with OR = 2.14 (95%CI: 1.08–4.25) [10]. Investigations of Japanese smokers with lung cancer showed no significant differences in GSTP1 genotype in comparison with the control group. When high cancer risk genotypes, GSTM1 null, GSTP1*A/*B or GSTP1*B/*B, were compiled, the risk of lung cancer was 2.58 (95% CI: 1.26–5.30) in male smokers, while among wild-type homozygous (GSTP1*A/*A) lung cancer patients with GSTM1 null genotype, it was about 1.17 (95% CI: 0.77–1.79) [14]. Lung cancer patients of Caucasian origin from Catalonia showed a similar distribution of GSTP1 genotypes to that found in the general population and in healthy smokers without any significant differences. To date, no association has been found between lung cancer risk and a combination of at-risk genotypes: GSTM1 null, GSTP1*A/*B and GSTT1 null, although the results of this study seem to confirm the hypothesis that GSTM1 null genotype has a slight, albeit consistent influence on the development of lung cancer with OR about 1.4 [15].

Lung cancer risk can be evaluated if additional factors, which strongly influence heterogeneity of the investigated individuals, are taken into account, such as: ethnic diversity, age, gender, histopathological type of cancer and occupational and environmental exposure, including the history of tobacco smoking.

The association between lung cancer susceptibility and deletion of both copies of GSTM1 genes was found to be similar in two investigated populations from Los Angeles: African-Americans (OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.72–2.00) and Caucasians (OR = 1.37, 95% CI: 0.91–2.06) in spite of a significantly lower frequency of GSTM1 null genotype in
the former group (0.27 versus 0.52) [42]. In another study the risk of lung cancer in Mexican-Americans with this genotype was almost twice as high as in Caucasians [17]. In several studies, the age and gender of the investigated subjects were also taken into consideration in order to estimate the risk of lung cancer. In most of them, the frequency of nulled or mutated GST alleles was more frequent among younger individuals, probably due to elimination of the older ones. Lung cancer risk for GSTM1 null in French male patients estimated by the crude OR was 1.3 (95% CI: 0.9–1.8). In addition, lung cancer risk was higher in younger subjects, under 60 years of age (OR = 1.6, 95% CI: 0.6–1.7). This age-related dependence showed similar tendency for each separate histological type of cancer [57]. Alexandrie et al. [18] have also found a much higher risk of lung cancer among Swedish lung cancer patients below 66. When the Norwegian patients were stratified according to age, the highest frequency of those with mutated Val allele (GSTP1*A/*B and GSTP1*B/*B genotypes) was found among patients below 50 years of age. Similar results of greater frequency of GSTM1 null genotype were obtained for patients under 56 years of age [12]. The percentage of GSTM1 null genotype was higher, although without statistical significance, among Chinese lung cancer females (70%) than in males (58%) and a greater frequency of this genotype was found in patients under 55 than in older ones (≥55 years old) (70% vs. 60%) [41].

Tobacco exposure is clearly associated with the development of lung cancer, and individual susceptibility to this type of cancer has been investigated in relation to ability to activate or detoxify carcinogens, such as PAHs present in cigarette smoke. In this context, many studies have tried to analyse in detail a hypothesis on the influence of tobacco smoking on lung cancer risk with association with polymorphism of GST. Some investigators have reported a stronger association between lung cancer risk and GSTM1 null, GSTP1*A/*B or GSTP1*B/*B genotype among heavy smokers [41,54]. However, several studies showed contradictory results of stronger association for low or moderate doses of smoking [12,55]. When the analysis of lung cancer susceptibility in relation to GSTM1 null genotype was restricted to smoking history in a population in Los Angeles, there was no significant difference in lung cancer risk between former and current smokers. Frequency of homozygous deletion of GSTM1 allele among smoking patients was significantly different between smokers with a history of less than 40 pack-years and with greater lifetime smoking (OR = 1.77, 95% CI: 1.11–2.82 vs. OR = 0.90, 95% CI: 0.56–1.44). The association between lung cancer and GSTM1 null among lighter smokers increased considerably in the case of squamous cell carcinoma patients with the value of OR = 4.06 (95% CI: 1.77–9.31) [42]. Similar results concerning association of GSTM1 genotype with the dose of smoking were obtained in a study of Chinese lung cancer patients. Lighter smokers (<37 pack-years) with lack of GSTM1 gene appeared to be more susceptible to lung cancer development (OR = 3.97, 95% CI: 0.95–16.52) than heavier smokers (≥37 pack-years) and only for the first group the frequency of GSTM1 genotypes was significantly different from that in hospital control individuals [58]. Another Chinese study showed prevalence of GSTM1 null lung cancer patients, who smoked heavier (>25 pack-years) over those with less smoking dose (≤25 pack-years), namely 73% vs. 56% without statistical significance [41]. To date, investigations among patients of Polish origin showed lack of GSTM1 and GSTT1 genotypes association with susceptibility to another smoking-related larynx cancer, because of prevalence of GSTM1 and GSTT1 nulled controls in comparison with cancer patients (57.7% vs. 49.1%, and 21.7% vs. 17.5%) [59].

Studies of French male lung cancer subjects also showed statistically insignificant dependence between smoking category and homozygous absence of GSTM1 allele. According to the histological type, slight differences were observed in the distribution of this genotype. The highest frequency was noted in patients with adenocarcinoma, which increased with the pack-years category, although only significantly higher OR was found for small cell carcinoma affecting the medium smoking category from 25 to 40 pack-years (OR = 7.2, 95% CI: 1.3–39.4) [57]. A study of Finnish lung cancer patients showed distinct but not statistically significant association between duration
of exposure to tobacco smoke and the risk of cancer. Smoking cancer patients were divided into two groups, depending on the smoking history, less than 40 pack-years and 40 or more pack-years, a higher prevalence of \textit{GSTM1(-)} genotype was found in heavier smokers with an OR of 3.96 (95% CI: 0.74–21.3) than in all lung cancer smokers (OR = 1.38, 95% CI: 0.58–3.32) [24]. Another study of Finnish male smokers showed that the risk of lung cancer significantly increased with longer period of smoking, manifesting a stronger association among \textit{GSTM1 null} individuals, but the relation between \textit{GSTM1} genotype and smoking was not statistically significant. The association between smoking duration and \textit{GSTM1 null} genotype was weaker among patients supplemented with 50 mg/day of $\alpha$-tocopherol for 5–8 years than in those without $\alpha$-tocopherol supplementation. Furthermore, supplementation of 20 mg $\beta$-carotene a day for the same period did not influence the relation between smoking period and lung cancer risk [60]. Investigations on a US population from Massachusetts have shown an increased risk of lung cancer only for light and medium smokers with \textit{GSTM1 null}, while for \textit{GSTM1 positive} individuals the risk of lung cancer rose with the increased number of pack-years. This suggests a negative relationship between the dose of smoking and lung cancer development among \textit{GSTM1 null} subjects [55]. Another study of Norwegian male lung cancer patients showed significant increase in the frequency of potential risk of cancer for genotypes: \textit{GSTP1*A/*B} and \textit{GSTP1*B/*B} and \textit{GSTM1 null} among individuals with short lifetime smoking or lower pack-years index [12].

Several investigators have tried to find a stronger association between GST genetic polymorphism and lung cancer development, taking into account histopathological type of lung cancer. However, several studies showed a similar risk of lung cancer regardless of the histopathological type. When investigating two lung cancer patient groups: African-American and Caucasian from Los Angeles, the strongest association between \textit{GSTM1 null} genotype and lung cancer risk was found for squamous cell carcinoma (OR = 1.57, 95% CI: 0.93–2.63) regardless of other types differentiated by histology (adenocarcinoma, small-cell carcinoma, other types combined) [42]. An investigation referring to GSTM1 polymorphism in Norwegian lung cancer patients showed similar over-representation of \textit{GSTM1 null} genotype among squamous cell carcinoma (OR = 1.7, 95% CI: 1.1–2.7) with increasing frequency for non-operable patients (OR = 3.9, 95% CI: 1.1–13.5) [30]. Another study on Norwegian male patients indicated an increased prevalence of \textit{GSTM1 null} or \textit{GSTP1*A/*B} and \textit{GSTP1*B/*B} in the group with squamous cell carcinoma, but not in adenocarcinoma group, when the patients were analysed according to the major histological tumor types [12]. Small, but statistically significant distribution of \textit{GSTM1 null} genotype was also observed among the UK individuals with squamous cell carcinoma, comparing with those with adenocarcinoma [21]. In Finnish individuals with this type of lung cancer, a statistically significant increase of \textit{GSTM1*0/*0} genotype was detected, with OR of 2.1 (95% CI: 1.2–3.8). Furthermore, among patients with adenocarcinoma, there was no statistically significant association between the lack of GSTM1 allele and lung cancer risk [13]. These results are opposite to those obtained in studies of French smoking lung cancer male patients, in which no relationship was observed between \textit{GSTM1 null} allele and squamous cell carcinoma. The frequency of homozygous deletion for the other two histopathological types of lung cancer was higher, with OR = 1.7 (95% CI: 0.9–3.2) for small cell carcinoma and OR = 2.0 (95% CI: 1.1–3.6) for adenocarcinoma. However, the differences in the distribution of \textit{GSTM1 null} genotype in all sub-groups of subjects based on histopathological diagnoses, were not statistically significant [57]. Similar over-representation of \textit{GSTM1(-)} genotypes was observed in Swedish individuals with adenocarcinoma and small cell carcinoma, while this deficient genotype was common among 72% of female squamous cell carcinoma (OR = 3.3, 95% CI: 1.2–9.7) [18]. The case-control study of Chinese lung cancer patients showed the greater frequency of \textit{GSTM1 null} genotype in the adenocarcinoma group than in controls (76.9% vs. 49.2%), with OR for this type of cancer 3.42 (95% CI: 1.23–9.51) [58]. When Japanese male smokers with lung cancer were investigated, the significantly elevated number of smoking patients with squamous cell carcinoma, carrying two
copies of GSTP1*B allele, was detected (7.2%) compared with smoking controls (1.6%). It should be noted that a slightly higher adjusted OR value for those with squamous cell carcinoma and with mutated or deleted genotypes: GSTM1 null, GSTP1*A/A or GSTP1*A/B was obtained (2.67, 95% CI: 1.09–6.55) [14].

GENE-CARCINOGEN INTERACTIONS
Glutathione S-transferases play a very important role in the protection against different hazardous agents, which may be responsible for the development of environmentally induced cancers. Since GSTM1 catalyses a large number of potential genotoxic compounds, several investigations have been undertaken to look into the effect of GSTM1 genetic polymorphism on the metabolism and toxicity of xenobiotics, in which DNA-adducts generation, cytogenetic damages and susceptibility to cancer development were observed. The individuals without false metabolizing enzyme expression are probably more susceptible to the development of different malignancies, especially after environmental and occupational exposure. Several investigators have focused on the correlation between cytogenetic damage and genetic polymorphism of phase I and phase II enzymes engaged in xenobiotics metabolism. As it is suggested that GST participate in the scavenging of PAH derivatives, it seemed important to find out whether GST polymorphic isoforms exerts any effect on DNA adduct levels, chromosomal aberration (CA) and changes in micronuclei (MN) caused by electrophilic substances [1]. A number of studies show significantly higher PAH-DNA adducts and higher levels of cytogenetic changes among lung cancer patients with deleted or mutated GST genes than among those with properly expressed enzymes. Norwegian lung cancer male patients with the lowest level of hydrophobic DNA adducts had a similar GSTP1 genotype frequency pattern as healthy controls. A study of PAH-DNA adducts in the US smokers in relation to the levels of antioxidant vitamins (E, C, A, β-carotene) and genetic polymorphism of GSTM1 showed no significant difference in PAH-DNA adducts in individuals with homozygous GSTM1 deletion compared to those with GSTM1 positive genotype. A negative association between PAH-DNA adducts and α-tocopherol and ascorbic acid levels measured in serum was found only among GSTM1 null persons, which may suggest a protective role of these two antioxidants against formation of PAH-DNA adducts in GSTM1 null individuals [61]. Matsui et al. [62] estimated the level of oxidative DNA damage in human breast cancer tissue by measuring 8-hydroxy-5′-deoxyguanosine (8-OhdG) as a result of hydroxyl radical interaction with DNA. Individuals with GSTP1*A/A genotype had significantly higher level of 8-OhdG and DNA damages in breast tissue, when compared to GSTP1*A/B and GSTP1*B/B genotypes (1.91 ± 0.79 vs. 2.43 ± 1.19).

Cytogenetic tests: CA, MN and sister chromatid exchanges (SCE), are often applied in exploring genetic polymorphisms of xenobiotic metabolising enzymes. Deleted or mutated encoding enzyme alleles are suspected genetic factors causing cytogenetic damages. When one of the genotoxins, diepoxybutane (DEB), a reactive metabolite of butadiene (BD), was studied, a significant increase in SCE frequency was observed among GSTT1 null individuals as compared to positive ones after DEB treatment, while no statistically significant changes in this test were obtained for GSTM1 null persons. There were no differences between GSTT1 null and GSTT1 positive individuals in chromosome aberrations test. Similar results were observed for two
GSTM1 genotypes [63]. However, in vivo 4-(methylnitrosoamino)-1-(3-bipiridy1)-1-butanone induced genotoxicity in cultured human lymphocytes showed that cells with GSTM1 null genotype had significantly increased CA compared with GSTM1 positive cells [31]. Hemoglobin adducts in acrylonitrile workers were investigated with regard to polymorphism of glutathione S-transferase M1 and T1. Biomonitoring of N-(cya-noethyl)valine (CEV), N-(hydroxyethyl)valine (HEV) and N-(methyl)valine (MV) showed no influence of this polymorphism on the adduct level in either GSTM1 positive or GSTM1 negative workers. GSTT1 null individuals have MV and HEV adduct levels, while there was no consistent effect of the GSTM1 and GSTT1 genotypes on CEV adduct levels induced by acrylonitrile exposure [33]. When genetic GST polymorphism, carcinogen-DNA adducts and the level of cytogenetic damages were investigated, occupational risk was also often taken into account. A study on the influence of genetic polymorphism of GSTM1 on anti-BPDE-DNA adduct levels in mononuclear white blood cells showed a higher risk of adduct formation in GSTM1 null workers of Caucasian origin exposed to high level of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. In the investigated coke-oven workers, the majority consisted of exposed workers with adduct levels exceeding the 95th percentile control value (4.4 adducts/10^8 nucleotides), which was significantly higher in GSTM1 null individuals with OR = 17.3 (95% CI: 3.78–78.6) [64]. A similar increase in PAH-DNA adducts in peripheral blood mononuclear cells among GSTM1 null coke-oven workers from Italy was found especially in smoking individuals with high PAH exposure. Surprisingly, the elevated level of PAH adducts was observed among GSTT1 positive workers in comparison with GSTT1 null subjects [65]. Another Italian investigation demonstrated that a higher occupational PAH dose exerted a greater effect of the polymorphic “high risk” GSTM1 genotype on the PAH-DNA adduct levels among coke-oven workers [66]. The formation of BPDE-DNA adducts as a result of B[a]P exposure was investigated in leukocytes of French male coke-oven workers. No significant difference in BPDE-DNA adduct levels was found between individuals with GSTT1 positive and GSTT1 null genotypes. In contrast, about 93% of GSTM1 null coke-oven workers had the level of BPDE adducts with a median of 1.6 adducts/10^8 nucleotides, while all of GSTM1 positive individuals did not show detectable BDPE-DNA adducts, namely <0.2 adducts/10^8 nucleotides [67]. A study of Swedish chimney sweeps showed no relationship between DNA adduct level and GSTT1 genetic polymorphism irrespective of their smoking status [68]. Investigations carried out in an aluminium plant in Sweden used 1-hydroxypyrene (1-OHP) as a biomarker of PAH exposure measured in urine. Individuals from the exposed and control groups had the highest 1-OHP levels, when carrying GSTM1 null and CYP1A1 Ile/Val genotypes. A possible impact of GSTM1 and GSTT1 genetic polymorphisms on 1-OHP urinary excretion was enhanced by smoking habit [69]. Aromatic DNA adduct levels were found to be slightly higher among Chinese coke-oven workers with GSTP1*B/*B genotype, compared with individuals carrying GSTP1*A/*A and GSTP1*A/*B genotypes, although it was not statistically significant [70]. When cytogenetic damages among workers under different occupational exposure were investigated, contradictory results were obtained. A cytogenetic study performed among workers from central Taiwan exposed to chromium compounds showed no influence of genetic polymorphism of GSTT1 and GSTM1 on SCE between the exposed and reference groups. Although a slightly increased frequency of SCE (7.1%) was found among chromium (Cr) workers with both deleted GSTM1 genes, a similar result was seen in the control group. To the contrary, mean SCE levels were slightly higher among GSTT1 positive workers and controls with a decrease of 3.5% in SCE among GSTT1 null workers and of 2.5% among controls with the same genotype. Among Cr exposed workers, the prevalence of nulled genotypes of GSTM1 and GSTT1 was higher than in the controls. The results showed that the frequency of GSTM1 null genotype was 77.1% in Cr workers and 60% in controls, while the distribution of double nulled GSTT1 was 62.9% for exposed individuals and 42.9% among controls [71]. GSTM1*0/*0 genotype was found to be associated with an increased level of chromosome damage in
investigated bus drivers from Copenhagen, but not in the postal workers [72]. No correlation between genetic polymorphism of GSTM1 and CA was found in Brazilian agricultural workers exposed to pesticides, probably due to very low frequencies of GSTM1 null genotype (33%) in this ethnic group [73]. Lucero et al. [74] observed no significant associations when analysing MN frequency in GSTM1 and GSTT1 polymorphisms of another group of agricultural workers from Spain. However, the GSTT1 null subject exposed to pesticides had higher proliferative indexes when compared to the control group.

Studies on individuals of Polish origin did not show statistically significant differences in PAH-DNA adducts in mononuclear white blood cells in adduct levels, regardless of genetic polymorphism of two GST isoforms. When the combined GSTP1 and GSTM1 genotypes among smokers, carriers of mutated GSTP1 alleles: GSTP1*A/*B or GSTP1*B/*B and GSTM1 null genotype were investigated, a significantly higher level of PAH adducts in summer were found as compared with GSTP1*A/*B or GSTP1*B/*B and GSTM1 positive individuals (5.60/10^8 nucleotides vs. 1.82/10^8 nucleotides). People with another combination of GST genes, GSTP1*A/*A and GSTM1 null genotype, have also significantly higher adducts (4.13/10^8 nucleotides) [75]. Another data, according to the investigation of polymorphic xenobiotic metabolising enzymes, and their possible effect on DNA aromatic adduct levels in healthy Polish female population, showed a lack of statistically significant differences between individuals with various genotypes. However, the highest level of DNA adducts was found among carriers of GSTM1 null/CYP1A1 Ile/Val genotypes (8.00/10^8 nucleotides) and individuals with GSTP1*A/*A/CYP1 Ile/Val genotypes (7.00/10^8 nucleotides), both measured in summer samples [76].

Certain isoenzymes of glutathione S-transferase may play a protective role as a part of the repair system after free-radical-induced lipid peroxidation, a possible mechanism of asbestos-related carcinogenesis. There have been a number of investigations on the role of GSTM1, GSTT1 and N-acetyltransferase (NAT2) in asbestos-associated pulmonary disorders. The risk for all (malignant and non-malignant) pulmonary disorders among patients with homzygous deletion of GSTM1 gene was at a moderate level (OR = 1.8, 95% CI: 0.3–3.4), which was lower for malignant diseases (OR = 2.3; 95% CI: 0.8–7.1), but frequencies observed for GSTM1 and GSTT1 genotypes were not significantly different. On the contrary, the distribution of NAT2 slow-acetylator genotypes was statistically higher in workers with malignant or non-malignant asbestos-induced diseases than in the control group; OR value for malignant mesothelioma was 3.8 (95% CI: 1.2–14.3). In addition, carrying a few potential risk genotypes increases the risk of malignant asbestos-associated pulmonary disorders, as the risk of mesothelioma in the investigated asbestos workers with this disease, i.e. NAT2 slow acetylators lacking the GSTM1 allele, was almost eightfold higher (OR = 7.8, 95% CI: 1.4–78.7) [77].

The complex interplay between the genes and environment has been in focus for several years, being a great challenge to scientists who try to understand and reduce the development of diseases in humans. There is substantial evidence that GST, strongly involved in occupational- and environmental-origin xenobiotic detoxification, are associated with lung cancer. Lack or altered enzymatic activity as a result of carrying deleted or mutated GST alleles due to DNA and cytogenetic damages, can lead to cancer development. Although GSTM1, GSTM3, GSTP1, GSTT1 genetic polymorphisms may contribute to the lung cancer risk, especially if more than single GST polymorphism and other risk factors (e.g. occupational exposure, smoking habit) occur, the role of GST in cancer susceptibility remains unclear. The clarification of inconsistent results will require carefully designed studies with sufficient sample sizes and consideration of multifunctional and complex etiology of cancer developing in the general population. The conducted investigations will be a crucial contribution to understanding of the potential role of polymorphic glutathione S-transferases in cancer prevention.
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