

An Ancient Approach of Understanding Cancer: Atavism Hypothesis

BARNALI MAJUMDAR

Department of Surgical Oncology, Dharamshila Narayana Superspeciality Hospital, New Delhi, India.



Article History

Published on: 20 May 2020

In cell biology, atavism may denote to the reversion of the evolutionary traits or the recurrence of early-life phylogenetical pathways, which lay encoded and dormant in every cell of the evolved multicellular species.¹ In a simple statement, the 'atavistic model' of cancer represents a reversion of these complex genetic evolutionary steps to the original life-form i.e. a self-sustaining single-celled phenotype.² Therefore, cancer might represent identity crisis of an individual cell in the hierarchy of a multicellular organism and requires only precise triggering factors to revert back to its aboriginal state.


In the Pre-Cambrian era before the evolution of complex organisms, the early life-forms existed as unicellular, asexual, immortal, non-specialized (not differentiated), exhibited genomic instability and executed simple fermentation (aerobic glycolysis or Warburg effect) for sustenance. They survived in an environment comprising of high radiation, free radicals, low oxygen and, low pH. Eons later, as the environment underwent conducive transitions, it instigated evolutionary changes in the early life-forms to explore the new oxygen-rich atmosphere. It is enthralling to note that in the present environment when a cell is exposed to direct and indirect carcinogens (similar to primitive extreme conditions), the cells attempt to revert back to early-life survival strategies which we term as 'malignant transformation'. The primitive cells, that endured and sustained in a nutrient-deprived and extreme environment, display striking similarities with the hallmark characteristics of a malignant cell.³⁻⁷ It appears as 'cancer' is nature's ancient encrypted code embedded in every cell as a life-boat, ensuring the survival of the cell when challenged with hostile conditions.

In the history of the evolution of unicellular to multicellular life-forms, certain key foundations for the proper functioning of the multicellular organisms were established. These include limitation of cell proliferation, programmed cell death, differentiation of cells and division of labour, resource allocation and transport,

CONTACT Barnali Majumdar ✉ barnali_bkm@yahoo.co.in 📍 Department of Surgical Oncology, Dharamshila Narayana Superspeciality Hospital, New Delhi, India.



© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Enviro Research Publishers.

This is an  Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12944/EDJ.02.01.01>

and maintenance of a homeostatic extracellular environment.⁸⁻¹⁰ The adaptive mutations which were essential for the survival of a free unicellular organism in an unstable environment, were no longer necessary, as a stable homeostatic environment was established for the cells within the multicellular organisms. Thus several genetic constraints, blocks, and check-points emerged to sustain the functioning of the advancing complex organisms. It is the suppression and downregulation of these genetic check-points that is frequently observed in the malignancies, theoretically supporting the atavistic model.¹¹⁻¹⁵

The link between evolution of multicellular organisms and increase in cancer genes is evident by a genomic phylostratigraphy study, in which two strong peaks of cancer-related protein domains were observed; one at the time of the origin of the earliest cells – the caretaker genes and the other around the time of the evolution of the multicellular metazoan organisms – the gatekeeper genes. It is intriguing to note that this phylogenetic progression emulates the ontogenetic progression of tumour development, wherein the mutations in the caretaker genes are thought to precede mutations in the gatekeeper genes.¹⁶ The RNA sequencing study of drug-resistant multiple myeloma cells revealed that the majority of the expressed genes were biased in age toward the most ancient genes.¹⁷ It is further observed that the ancient genes are capable of re-activating stress-induced mutational response leading to genomic instability in the somatic cells, signifying cancer as an atavistic recapitulation of the primitive cell's survival mechanism.¹⁸ The greatest comprehensive molecular evidence of the 'atavistic model' of the cancer was provided by the detailed transcriptome analysis of 3,473 tumour and 386 normal samples. The results indicate that the widespread-shift to preferential expression of genes conserved in primitive, unicellular organisms is a common feature of tumours.¹⁹

The atavistic model of cancer can introduce novel therapeutic strategies in the management of cancer. This model suggests that instead of targeting the strengths of cancer cells, i.e. the deeply embedded ancient capabilities (e.g. proliferation, survival in hypoxic, low pH conditions, etc.) one should pursue its weakness i.e. the recently-evolved capabilities (e.g. DNA repair mechanisms, adaptive immune system, etc.). For example, the most efficient ancient fundamental capability of a cell is proliferation. But there are multiple redundant and robust drivers for cellular proliferation existing from billions of years. Thus, targeting a single gene is inefficient. Drug cocktails are slightly more effective, nonetheless, the cancer cells have access to other redundant proliferative pathways through mutations. On the contrary, an enhanced adaptive immune response (density of T-cells), which is a relatively newer evolved capability of organisms, is correlated with a good prognosis of many tumours.²⁰ Thus, according to the atavistic model, immune therapy might prove to be a better treatment strategy in cancer management.

References

1. Israel L. Tumour progression: Random mutations or an integrated survival response to cellular stress conserved from unicellular organisms? *J Theor Biol.* 1996;178:375-80.
2. Vincent M. Cancer: A de-repression of a default survival program common to all cells? A life-history perspective on the nature of cancer. *Bioessays.* 2012;34(1):72–82.
3. Heining K. The deprivation syndrome is the driving force of phylogeny, ontogeny and oncogeny. *Rev Neurosci.* 2007;12:217–87.
4. Perez-Jimenez R, Ingles-Prieto A, Zhao ZM, Sanchez-Romero I, *et al.* Single-molecule paleoenzymology probes the chemistry of resurrected enzymes. *Nat StructMol Biol.* 2011;18:592–6.
5. Brock JJ, Logan GA, Buick R, Summons RE. Archean molecular fossils and the early rise of eukaryotes. *Science.* 1999;285:1033–6.
6. Gross J, Bhattacharyna D. Uniting sex and eukaryote origins in an emerging oxygenic world. *Biol Direct.* 2010;5:53.
7. Vander Heiden MG, Cantley LC, Thompson CB. Understanding the Warburg effect: the metabolic requirements of cell proliferation. *Science.* 2009;324(5930):1029–33.
8. Pfeiffer T, Bonhoeffer S. 2003 An evolutionary scenario for the transition to undifferentiated

- multicellularity. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* 2003;100:1095–1098.
9. Hynes RO. The evolution of metazoan extracellular matrix. *J. Cell Biol.* 2012;196:671–679.
 10. Aktipis CA, Boddy AM, Jansen G, Hibner U, Hochberg ME, Maley CC, Wilkinson GS. Cancer across the tree of life: cooperation and cheating in multicellularity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences.* 2015;370(1673):1–21.
 11. Pepper JW, Sprouffske K, Maley CC. Animal Cell Differentiation Patterns Suppress Somatic Evolution. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2007;3:e250.
 12. Almossalha LM, Bauer GM, Chandler JE, Gladstein S, Szleifer I, Roy HK, *et al.* The Greater Genomic Landscape: The Heterogeneous Evolution of Cancer. *Cancer Res.* 2016;76:5605–9.
 13. Chen H, Lin F, Xing K, He X. The reverse evolution from multicellularity to unicellularity during carcinogenesis. *Nat Commun.* 2015;6:1–9.
 14. Domazet-Lošo T, Tautz D. Phylostratigraphic tracking of cancer genes suggests a link to the emergence of multicellularity in metazoa. *BMC Biol.* 2010;8:66.
 15. Saánchez Alvarado A. Cellular Hyperproliferation and Cancer as Evolutionary Variables. *Curr Biol.* 2012;22:772–8.
 16. Domazet-Lošo T, Tautz D. Phylostratigraphic tracking of cancer genes suggests a link to the emergence of multicellularity in metazoa. *BMC biology.* 2010;8(1):66.
 17. Wu A, Zhang Q, Lambert G, Khin Z, Gatenby RA, Kim HJ, Pourmand N, Bussey K, Davies PC, Sturm JC, Austin RH. Ancient hot and cold genes and chemotherapy resistance emergence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 2015;112(33):10467–72.
 18. Cisneros L, Bussey KJ, Orr AJ, Miočević M, Lineweaver CH, Davies P. Ancient genes establish stress-induced mutation as a hallmark of cancer. *PLoS one.* 2017;12(4):e0176258.
 19. Trigos AS, Pearson RB, Papenfuss AT, Goode DL. Altered interactions between unicellular and multicellular genes drive hallmarks of transformation in a diverse range of solid tumors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 2017;114(24):6406–11.
 20. Lineweaver CH, Davies PC, Vincent MD. Targeting cancer's weaknesses (not its strengths): Therapeutic strategies suggested by the atavistic model. *BioEssays.* 2014;36(9):827–35.