International Journal of Pharma Professional's Research

CURRENT APPROACHES IN TARGETING CANCEROUS CELLS AND NOVEL ANTICANCER DRUG DESIGNING

Sahil Kumar[1*], Sachin Goyal[2], Minky Mukhija[3] and Rakesh K. Sindhu[4]

1. School of Pharmacy and Emerging Sciences, Baddi University of Emerging Sciences & Technology, Baddi, Distt. Solan (H.P.), India
2. LLR College of Pharmacy, Moga (Punjab), India
3. Ch. Devi Lal College of Pharmacy, Jagadhri, Yamunanagar (Haryana), India 135003
4. Chitkara College of Pharmacy, Chitkara University, Rajpura, Patiala, Punjab, India

ABSTRACT:

This review describes the current approaches in targeting cancerous cells and novel anticancer drug designing highlighting the identification and characterization of the biologically important lesions produced on DNA by important DNA-reactive drugs, molecular strategies to improve the sequence selectivity of existing groups of DNA-reactive drugs. The design of mechanism-based screens to identify new classes of drugs that react with DNA and associated targets the design of new drug classes based upon the identification of pharmacologically selective receptors on, or associated with DNA have also been described.

INTRODUCTION:

It is over 60 years since the first nitrogen mustards were used in cancer chemotherapy. Since then a structurally diverse group of DNA-reactive drugs has been discovered largely through cytotoxic screens. In virtually every case the molecular target was only tentatively identified as DNA after antitumor activity in animal model systems was demonstrated. On the basis of what is known concerning the molecular interactions of these compounds with DNA, three major groups of clinically important DNA reactive agents have been identified.[1] The three groups are the alkylating agents exemplified by Cytoxan, Cisplatin, and mitomycin C, the DNA strand breakage compounds such as bleomycin, and the intercalating agents typified by Adriamycin and actinomycin D. A fourth group typified by chromomycin, anthramycin, and CC-1065 are drugs that modify DNA in the minor groove of DNA. However, these compounds have yet to be proven to have clinical utility. Some of the discoveries that could be considered to be seminal in our present understanding of the molecular basis for antitumor activity of DNA-reactive compounds are the DNA intercalation model for acridine proposed by Lerman,[2] the in vitro inhibition of RNA polymerase produced by

complexation of actinomycin D with DNA demonstrated by Goldberg,[3] and the demonstration of interstrand DNA-DNA cross-linking by mitomycin C due to Szybalski.[4] More recent landmark discoveries are the identification by Liu[5] and Kohn[6] of the importance of topoisomerase II in mediating the antitumor activity of compounds such as adriamycin, and the contributions by various groups to understanding the molecular basis for the DNA sequence specificity of DNA-reactive drugs.[7-10]

What is clear **as** we approach the end of the 20th century is that structural tools such as X-ray crystallography, high-field NMR, and computational chemistry, alongside techniques from molecular biology such as DNA sequencing, DNA construction strategies, and gene cloning, have ushered in a new era in conception and design of new drugs. The availability of these tools together with the recently uncovered structural heterogeneity in DNA and restricted access of domains in eukaryotic genomes makes the human genome an attractive target for drug design. These are (1) identification and characterization of the biologically important lesions on DNA produced by clinically important DNA-reactive drugs, (2) molecular strategies to improve the sequence selectivity of existing groups of DNA-reactive drugs, (3) the design of mechanism-based pharmacological screens to identify new classes of drugs that react with DNA and associated targets, and (4) the design of new drug classes based upon the identification of pharmacologically selective receptors on, or associated with, DNA.

If we are successful in the design of new therapeutic classes that have improved selectivity for defined cellular receptors, these agents will have applications beyond treatment of cancer. For example, they may be useful in treating infectious diseases or genetic disorders that result from aberrant expression of cellular proteins.

I.Identification and Characterization of the Biologically Important Lesions Produced on DNA by Important DNA-Reactive Drugs.

Identification and characterization of the types of DNA modification produced by DNA-interactive drugs is a prerequisite for understanding the biochemical and biological responses induced by these agents. Since the majority of DNA-reactive drugs produce a variety of lesions on DNA, it is an important objective to determine which lesions are biologically important. In recent years studies aimed toward these goals have used both short (6-12 base pairs), intermediate (100-300 base pairs), and circular DNA fragments obtained through oligodeoxynucleotide synthesis, restriction enzyme digestions, and plasmid constructions, respectively. While this represents progress from studies with individual bases or nucleotides, it still stops short of the desired goal of using human chromatin as the target structure. The formidable analytical problems associated with analyzing whole human genomic DNA because of the large size of the molecular target argue strongly for designing plasmid systems that can be constructed in vitro and that then use the replication and transcription machinery of eukaryotic cells. In systems such as SV40 DNA the nucleosomal structure is retained and the circular DNA can be isolated free of nuclear DNA for subsequent analytical manipulation.[11] Using a combination of short oligomers for structural work,[12-14] restriction enzyme fragments for studies on DNA sequence specificity,[15-17] and plasmid systems[18] for in vivo experiments, considerable information relevant to the manner in which drugs may interact and modify DNA structure and function in human genomic DNA can be obtained. Thus it is now possible to gain structural and mechanistic data that allow the investigator to gain considerable insight into which are the biologically important lesions on DNA and how these cause the observed potent biological effects. Some examples of these approaches for DNA-reactive drugs that produce DNA strand breakage,

intercalate into DNA, or alkylate DNA are given below.

The oxidative mechanisms leading to DNA strand breakage by such drugs as bleomycin[19,20] and neocarzinostatin [21] are quite complex and some of the finer points for bleomycin remain controversial. However, the chemical products of such reactions are well described and co-workers designed a dodecamer with which they characterized the reaction of bleomycin with DNA.[22] The products of bleomycin-induced chemistry under a variety of conditions were determined by comparison with authentic standards. Longer DNA fragments have been used to determine other aspects of bleomycin reaction with DNA, such as the strand specificity of DNA breakage[23] and the effect of DNA methylation on sequence specificity. [24] The sequence specificity of bleomycin cleavage in SV40 DNA has also been compared in purified and intracellular systems. [25] Using a pLTL-1 plasmid containing a herpes simplex virus thymidine kinase gene grown in mouse mammary tumor cells, bleomycin and neocarzinostatin have both been demonstrated to cleave preferentially within regions of DNA that are actively transcribed following glucocorticoid induction.[26] While these experiments do not provide definitive answers to the mechanism of bleomycin cytotoxicity they provide a background for the design of even more exacting studies. Goldberg and co-workers have demonstrated for neocarzinostatin that mutational events can be directly related to the spectrum of damage produced on DNA.[27] This is an important example of how in vitro and in vivo data can be correlated.

The DNA-intercalation model proposed by Lerman[2] and confirmed by X-ray structure analysis for drugs such as Adriamycin[28] and actinomycin D[29] has long been accepted as a biologically important event in the cytotoxicity and antitumor activity of these compounds. However, it has always been disconcerting that the structure-activity relationships for

anthracyclines and other intercalators have never strongly supported this claim.[30] For some compounds, such as the anthracyclines, this has been rationalized by involving non-DNA related targets such as membranes and oxidative DNA damage mechanisms.[31] In reality, the truth may be somewhere in between. DNA per se may not be the ultimate target, but intercalation may serve as a mechanism for holding the drug "on location" until a critical event, such as a change in supercoiling catalyzed by a DNA topoisomerase, occurs. The intercalating agent that is intimately associated with the DNA molecule then interferes with this process at a critical step, resulting in protein-associated strand breaks in DNA.[6] Exactly how intercalating agents such as Adriamycin and m-AMSA interfere with topological processing is still unknown, but it is quite possible that topoisomerase II or the enzyme-DNA complex are the actual targets.[32] This observation may behoove medicinal chemists to examine other ternary systems (drug-DNA-protein) in order to understand more completely the biochemical and biological effects of drug-DNA interactions.

In some respects alkylation of DNA is the most challenging area in which to make correlations between DNA damage and its biochemical and biological consequences.[33] The complexity of these systems can at first appear to be overwhelming. Many alkylating agents produce a variety of lesions on DNA, some of which are chemically unstable and thus difficult to characterize. Virtually all covalently bonding drugs show some degree of DNA sequence selectivity that can be attributed to either the noncovalent (binding) interaction, the covalent (bonding) reaction, or a combination of these processes.[10] DNA repair recognition and subsequent repair of lesions can be variable, depending upon the adduct characteristics, tissue type, and transcriptional state of the damaged area.[34] Nevertheless progress is being made in unraveling these complexities by making "site-

directed adducts" in plasmids.[18] Different types of adducts are engineered into predetermined sites in the genome and chemically and enzymatically characterized. DNA repair recognition, DNA replication, transcriptional activity, phage survival, or mutagenesis can then each be examined separately. Although this may seem to be a considerable effort, it is probably the only viable way of unraveling the complexity of an otherwise intractable system. In this regard Essigmann and Lippard have provided important data on the construction and characterization of a Cisplatin adduct on DNA.[35,36] This area has been recently reviewed by Essigmann.[18]

There is still a large gap in our knowledge about the structure of the drug-DNA complex or adduct and its relationship to the biological response, e.g., cell death, mutagenicity. Considerably headway has been made at the structural end of the problem, but only in rare cases[27] has this provided insight into rationalizing the biological effects. There is an urgent need to develop biochemical systems that will extend our knowledge beyond DNA as the target for drug action.

II.Molecular Strategies To Improve the Sequence Selectivity of Existing Groups of DNA-Reactive Drugs.

Cellular and molecular selectivity are key aspects of drug action. For cytotoxic drugs such as DNA-reactive compounds selective uptake at the cellular level would appear to be crucial unless unique intracellular targets can be identified in, for example, cancer cells. Strategies for selective cellular retention are outside the scope of this article but include such mechanisms as targeting using monoclonal antibodies to tumor antigens.[37] At the intracellular level the ultimate selectivity of a DNA-reactive drug should be at the sequence level. In mammalian cells the DNA receptor is an elusive target.[38] Besides its large size (2.9310^9 base pairs), human nuclear DNA is largely covered with proteins" and the accessibility of potential drug binding regions may be dependent upon DNA processing events such as replication and transcription. The reactivity of open regions undergoing processing to DNA-binding proteins[40] and DNA-reactive drugs[41] may also be modulated by superhelical stress. These are certainly complicating factors in the design of more selective DNA-reactive drugs. However, this increased complexity could be an advantage since such factors may allow greater sequence selectivity to be achieved. In this section I will provide examples of how processes, such as transcription activity and DNA repair may lead to greater selectivity for drug action. The main focus will, however, be on the design of DNA-reactive drugs with increased sequence selectivity.

While nuclear DNA is generally cited as the target for all three classes of DNA-reactive drugs (intercalating agents, DNA-degradative drugs, or alkylating agents), competing targets such as mitochondrial DNA and cellular RNA may also be significant targets. For drugs that are A-T selective or whose binding to DNA is restricted by nucleosomal structure, mitochondrial DNA (which is A-T rich and relatively "naked") may be the preferred target. Mitochondrial DNA may also be the preferred target for drugs which are selectively taken up through the mitochondria membrane rather than nuclear membrane. Also the absence of DNA repair in mitochondria may predispose mitochondrial DNA to selective toxicity of DNA reactive compounds.[42,43]

Actively transcribed regions of DNA are the preferred target for a number of DNA-reactive molecules. The potent carcinogenic fungal toxin aflatoxin B_1 selectively reacts with such regions[37] and the DNA strand cleavage agents, bleomycin and neocarzinostatin, selectively cut within transcriptionally active regions.[26] Drugs or carcinogens that react selectively with single-stranded DNA would also be expected to have increased reactivity with actively transcribed or replicated regions of DNA.[44] Since actively transcribed regions of DNA are preferred targets for some DNA-reactive drugs, then agents such as

steroids that can selectively induce transcription[45] may increase the selectivity of DNA-reactive drugs for these regions. This may provide a rationale for the combined use of steroids and cytotoxic agents such as DNA-reactive drugs in hormone-responsive cancers. Where enzymes such as topoisomerase II are involved in modulating the superhelical density of transcriptionally active regions and are also a requirement for drug action, then this may significantly increase the selectivity of such agents.[46] Finally there is evidence from experiments with certain DNA-reactive drugs that nucleosomal structure[47] and superhelical density[41,48] may influence sequence selectivity. Consequently sequence selectivity data obtained on linear DNA molecules may not always be directly applicable to nuclear DNA.

When a defined sequence in DNA is considered as a possible drug receptor (see later), it has some properties that are in sharp contrast to the more conventional proteinaceous receptor molecules. For example, when covalently modified by a drug, DNA may be restored by very efficient repair processes,[49] whereas proteinaceous receptors must be resynthesized. It follows that cells deficient in DNA-repair processes may be particularly sensitive to DNA-reactive drugs. Indeed there is evidence that some cancer cells defective in DNA repair are more susceptible to cross-linking agents such as nitrosoureas than repair-proficient cells.[50] Even within the cell nucleus selective repair may take place in certain regions.[51] In repair-proficient cells it is possible to potentiate the cytotoxic effects of DNA-reactive drugs by combining alkylating agents with inhibitors of DNA repair.[52] In this case, selectivity of the cytotoxic effect for tumor cells may not necessarily be achieved. Poly(ADP)ribosylation of histone molecules is associated with DNA damage by agents that cause DNA strand breaks directly or as a consequence of repair.[53] Poly(ADP)ribosylation is believed to be important for the survival of cells with damaged DNA, although the exact role is not clear. The discovery that benzamide derivatives are selective inhibitors of poly(ADP)ribosylation provided a rationale for laboratory experiments to potentiate the effect of alkylating agents, and at least in vitro significant increases in the cytotoxic potency of nitrosoureas have been achieved.[54] However, the in vivo effectiveness of this strategy has yet to be demonstrated. The multifunctional aspects of poly(ADP)ribosylation in cellular processes and nonselective inhibition by benzamide derivatives such as 3-aminobenzamide at the high dosage levels used may complicate the picture for rational combination therapy.[55] Nevertheless the demonstration of potentiation of cytotoxic potency by DNA-repair-associated inhibitors argues for the search for other inhibitors that may be useful in combination chemotherapy with DNA-reactive drugs.

The site–size DNA sequence specificity is a critical feature of drugs that exert their selectivity by reaction with target sequences. Virtually all DNA-reactive drugs exert some degree of sequence selectivity, although in the case of highly reactive alkylating agents such as the nitrogen mustards, this may be very modest.[10] Other drugs such as CC-1065 show a surprising degree of sequence selectivity.[56] Sufficient DNA sequence specificity is achieved by proteins to permit their participation in the precise control of gene expression and other genetic events.[57] Therefore the ability to design and synthesize a nonpeptide small molecular weight molecule that would bind to a desired DNA sequence of reasonable site size (up to about 15-16 base pairs) would be a significant achievement in medicinal chemistry.

Before discussing the design of drugs that have improved chemotherapeutic selectivity by virtue of increased sequence specificity, it is instructive to examine how natural biological molecules such as proteins and oligonucleotides achieve sequence specificity for duplex DNA. The most familiar DNA recognition motif for proteins that bind

selectively to defined duplex DNA sequences is the "helix-turn-helix".[58] In this case, one helix of the protein is held in the major groove of DNA by the second helix that lies across the back side of the first. Direct readout of major groove information such as hydrogen-bonding patterns and Van der Waals contacts can be achieved by a complementary reading frame in the amino acid residues of the protein.[59] In some cases a sequence-dependent conformational change is required before the reading frames of the DNA and protein are brought into sync.[60] This has been termed "indirect readout" and in the case of the *trp* repressor results in specific hydrogen-bonding recognition of the phosphate backbone of DNA. So far the design and synthesis of nonprotein mimics of this form of sequence-specific recognition (i.e. taking place in the major groove or on the phosphate backbone) have not yet been achieved. Oligonucleotides can also bind to duplex DNA in a sequence-selective fashion. Pyrimidine oligonucleotides bind to duplex DNA sequence specifically at homopurine sites to form a "triple helix" structure[61] and RNA oligonucleotides can form a similar structure with a G-rich polypurine sequence.[61] Charge and stability problems of the oligonucleotides remain to be solved before these latter molecules can be used as drugs to attain selective pharmacological action in living cells. However, these are attractive ideas for cases in which high selectivity will be required (e.g. oncogene inactivation;).

Nonpeptide or nonoligomeric molecules that bind to DNA with sequence selectivity generally do so either by intercalation or by minor groove binding. While polyintercalators (i.e. molecules possessing two or more planar ring systems spaced by linkers to insert every two or more base pairs into DNA) can achieve a modest degree of sequence selectivity,[63] their inherently poor discrimination between A-T and G-C base pairs and the "site exclusion rule" prohibit their practical application as sequence-specific probes. Nonintercalating minor groove binding agents use

planar recognition words for sequence recognition within the minor groove of DNA.[64] In contrast to the direct sequence-specific complementarity of protein recognition of DNA, nonintercalating minor groove-binding agents generally "read" DNA sequence by indirect mechanisms such as groove geometry, secondary structure, and electrostatic interactions.[67] These processes inherently give rise to a lower sequence specificity, or more aptly termed, sequence selectivity, than direct hydrogen bonding or van der Waals interactions. Nevertheless A-T and G-C selective "words" do exist that discriminate based upon recognition features in the minor groove of DNA.[15,64] A variety of natural and synthetic products including netropsin, Hoechst 33258, SN6999, and CC-1065 exemplify the utilizing of planar, sometimes fused aromatic rings that can be sandwiched within the minor groove of DNA.[64] The compounds listed above are all A-T "words" and heroic efforts have been made to convert A-T words into G-C words by Lown and co-workers.[65] While some degree of success has been achieved, the converted A-T word does not have a high selectivity for G-C base pairs. Some natural minor groove G-C words also exist, i.e., chromomycin and the anthramycins. Chromomycin has a complex recognition motif for G-C base pairs involving a dimer of antibiotic molecules and magnesium ion.[66] Anthramycin covalently bonds to the exocyclic 2-amino group of guanine in a nondistortive but helix-stabilizing manner.[67] Consequently in either case the use of these recognition words is complicated by those features. For this problem to be addressed successfully we will have to await the discovery or design of a simple G-C word that is chemically compatible with the existing A-T words. "Sentences" can then be constructed of suitable phased A-T and G-C words to read any chosen sequence. Even with the availability of suitable A-T and G-C words, it remains to be seen whether the minor groove of DNA inherently has sufficient sequence specificity information to give rise to the

level of selectivity required to successfully read DNA. The lesson from Nature (i.e., protein–DNA interactions) would suggest the major groove is a better target.

At this time, any increase in selectivity of existing agents that react with DNA appears to depend upon either modulating the relative efficiency at which a target sequence is hit, or preferential inhibition of DNA repair in select cells, e.g. cancer cells. The relative efficiency of targeting a chosen cognate sequence vs other noncognate sequences is dependent upon the extent of sequence selectivity of the DNA-reactive drug and the relative frequency of occurrence of the chosen sequence in target cells and its accessibility to drug modification. These variables are attractive features for drug development. If the genomic target for drug reaction can be limited to functional domains such as transcriptionally or replicationally active regions, then the overall size of the target can be dramatically reduced. An alternative to the preferential inhibition of DNA repair in target cells as an approach to obtain improved selectivity is the design of less well rec-ognized and consequently excised lesions on DNA. Efforts will surely be made in these directions, but it is difficult to predict the possibilities for improvement at the therapeutic level.

III. The Design of Mechanism-Based Screens To Identify New Classes of Drugs That React with DNA and Associated Targets.

DNA-reactive compounds such as the bleomycins, Adriamycin, and actinomycin D were originally identified through in vitro cytotoxic screens using for example L-1210 leukemia cells. These drugs are representatives of just a handful of clinically useful drugs that were selected by cytotoxic screens and show in vivo antitumor activity. Most cytotoxic agents identified by these screens show little selective activity in vivo systems. The poor correlation between in vitro and in vivo activity has forced the drug discovery community to explore alternatives to cytotoxic screens. Two

major screening strategies have evolved; the *disease-oriented* screen and *mechanism-based screen*. The NCI has recently adopted a disease-oriented approach to attempt to identify more selective antitumor agents.[68] In this screening program compounds are tested against a large panel of human tumor cell lines derived from a broad spectrum of solid tumors. Compounds that only show activity in vitro in *select* tumor lines are then earmarked for in vivo screening. It is still too early to evaluate how effective this new strategy will be in identifying new classes of clinically useful antitumor agents. In principle, mechanism-based strategies can use DNA or a DNA-mediated process as the screening event. I will describe these strategies in more detail.

The mechanism-based screen identifies a specific target or process that when modulated is likely to produce a desired pharmacological response, e.g., antiviral or antitumor activity. A review of mechanism-based screens for the discovery of new DNA-reactive drugs has been published by Johnson et al.[69] A broad screen that is sensitive to virtually all of the known DNA-reactive drugs is the biochemical induction assay (BIA).[70] The BIA is a modification of the lysogenic phage induction assay in which repressor regulates expression of galactosidase from a lambda promotor fused to a lac Z gene in *Escherichia Coli*.[71] As a consequence of exposure to DNA-damaging agents the SOS response (DNA-repair pathway) is triggered, which leads to induction of expression of O-galactosidase. Bartus et a1.[70] have increased the sensitivity of this screen by construction of a subclone with an increased copy number of the galactosidase transcriptional unit. This has been shown to be a very effective prescreen for active cultures that can then be further examined by more specific mechanism-based screens.

Many potent DNA-reactive drugs can produce single or double strand breaks in DNA. These reactions are generally oxygen dependent and may also depend on the presence of metal ions such as

magnesium or copper. Other DNA-reactive compounds cause changes in the topological conformation of DNA by, for example, intercalation. By use of agrose gel electrophoresis of covalently closed circular DNA (cccDNA), these DNA strand breaks and topological changes can be sensitively detected,[72,73] e.g., conversion of cccDNA to nicked, circular, or linear forms that can be resolved by electrophoresis. DNA-reactive drugs that do not produce strand breaks or topological changes in DNA either spontaneously or in the presence of metals may still be detected by using thermal treatment (e.g., CC-1065).[74] By use of a combination of these chemical, physical, or enzymatic treatments, it is possible to detect and categorize most of the known DNA-reactive drugs. Rapid differentiation of potentially new activities from already existing compounds can be made at this stage.

Mechanism-based screens that depend upon yeast mutants that have decreased or increased activity of key proteins involved in DNA processes such as repair are very useful in identifying both new compounds as well as classifying activities.[75] Because yeasts are eukaryotic organisms they are genetically and biochemically nearer to mammalian cells than bacterial cells. However, they retain the advantages of short generation times and genetic manipulability of prokaryotic organisms. The array of DNA-repair mutants available that have been characterized biochemically provide excellent opportunities to design mechanism-based screens to select compounds that interact with DNA to produce defined lesions on DNA such as double strand breaks. Johnston et al.[72] have used a battery of DNA-repair-deficient mutants of *Saccharomyces cerevisia* to discriminate between various classes of DNA-reactive drugs.

More recently yeast mutants have been isolated that are defective in the expression of topoisomerase I.[76,77] These mutants are either resistant to camptothecin[77] or when carrying a plasmid that overproduces topoisomerase I[76] are

hypersensitive to camptothecin. These mutants have obvious roles in mechanism-based screens to discover other topoisomerase I inhibitors. With this principle in mind it should be possible to design other mechanism-based screens, providing the absence of enzyme does not prevent growth of the mutant. However, where the activity (e.g., topoisomerase I) is necessary to express the potent biological effects, it is overproduction rather than underproduction. of the protein that will give rise to increased sensitivity to the agent.[76] While there are a variety of topoisomerase II inhibitors, camptothecin is unique as a topoisomerase I inhibitor. Cytotoxic screens apparently do not select well for topoisomerase I inhibitors; therefore, the mechanism-based approach described here may be a more effective screen.

Compounds that modulate gene expression either in a positive or negative way would seem to have potential therapeutic utility for treatment of diseases where either the absence or overexpression of proteins results in deleterious effects. Molecular biologists have cloned eukaryotic transcriptional regulatory systems into plasmids that can be conveniently manipulated to determine the sequences that are involved in activation of the system.[78] The glucocorticoid-inducible LTL gene[79] has been used as a model target to evaluate preferential drug effects on gene expression.[80] With this system the possibility that bleomycin, neocarzinostatin, and actinomycin D would induce alterations in either transcription or posttranscriptional gene expression was assessed. Although no preferential effects were observed for these particular drugs, this would seem to be a useful model system. In a more sophisticated system, mutants in the transcriptional activation system might be used as a mechanism-based screen to select for DNA-reactive drugs that would affect DNA structure or conformation and annul the effect of the mutation on transcriptional activity. Similarly, compounds that increase recombinational events might be detected in a mechanism-based screen. Clearly the application

of molecular biology holds many attractive possibilities for detection of compounds with interesting biological properties.

IV. The Design of New Drug Classes Based upon the Identification of Pharmacologically Selective Receptors on, or Associated with, DNA.

The ultimate objective in any drug design program is the synthesis of a specific drug entity that binds with sufficient selectivity to a receptor resulting in a defined pharmacological response without adverse side effects. For the initiation of pharmacological events that originate on DNA, the receptor molecule might be DNA itself, a DNA-binding protein, or a protein–DNA complex.

A receptor in the strict pharmacological sense must have both cognitive and response features.[81] The majority of sequences on DNA are acceptors rather than true receptors, since they lack response characteristics[38] (except in a toxicological sense, e.g., mutation, deletion, etc.). Receptor sequences may, for example, be part of regulatory regions of DNA that are normal DNA-binding regions for proteins or even short oligonucleotides such as RNA. For example, the transcriptional factor SpI binds to GC boxes in the 21 base pair repeat region of DNA in the transcriptional regulatory regions of various genes.[82] Many other proximal and distal signal regions have been identified in cis-acting regulatory and transcriptional control regions.[83] Such sequences are potential receptor sequences for drugs that might modulate gene expression.

While the sequence-dependent microheterogeneity of DNA gives rise to a vast array of recognition features for sequence specific binding of proteins,[84] there are also a variety of unusual DNA structures that can form within AT- or GC-rich regions of DNA. For example, guanine-rich DNA sequences can form "four-stranded" complexes in which the strands run in a parallel fashion.[85]   Homopurine–homopyrimidine sequences [d(C-T)$_n$-d(A-G)$_n$] are proposed to form

a "triple-helical" structure (C:G:T).[86] G-rich strands occur at chromosome ends and form novel intramolecular structures.[87] It is believed that these unusual DNA structures are involved in such processes as meiosis (four-stranded complex)[85] transcriptional control (three-stranded complexes)[86] and chromosomal maintenance (G-rich strands).[87] These structures are also therefore potential receptors for selective drug action.

The chemical modification of DNA sequences that are specific DNA–protein binding sites could, in principle, lead to an increase or decrease in protein binding. It has been elegantly demonstrated that distamycin A or netropsin binding to a specific nonalternating AT sequence in the promotor region of the phage I leads to activation of transcription initiation.[88] This is because distamycin binding to DNA leads to an increase in RNA polymerase binding to the promotor region to form the "open" or active complex. This can be rationalized since distamycin produces a bending of the DNA helix in the spacer region (a region not contacted by the enzyme) that is also a requirement for formation of the RNA polymerase–promoter open complex. Consequently other sequence-specific DNA-binding drugs that modulate the structural or conformational forms of DNA binding protein regions might also be expected to increase or decrease protein binding and presumably the processes they control.

Altered forms of cellular proto-oncogenes have been implicated in the development of human cancer. [89] These transforming genes (oncogenes) are often found in solid tumors and leukemias. The *ras* oncogene is frequently associated with myeloid leukemias and various carcinomas.[90] This *ras* gene family encodes for 21kDa proteins that bind GTP (G-proteins).[91] Because the positions of oncogenic mutation are known for a number of *ras* genes, these seem possible selective targets for drug design. However, the single base substitutions that differentiate the normal cellular proto-oncogenes from their

oncogenic counterparts make selective targeting a formidable task. Conceivably the triple-strand approach (see above) may be useful if this principle can be broadened to accommodate mixed A-T and G-C sequences. Even so, the previously mentioned problems with using oligonucleotides as therapeutic agents still remain. As an alternative to targeting isolated unique DNA sequences, it may be possible to gain increased selectivity by targeting DNA structures and conformations which are the consequence of protein–DNA interactions. For example, the binding of RNA polymerase to DNA has been proposed to produce a kinked structure[92] that may be an optimal target for intercalators. The binding of topoisomerase II to DNA may create special receptor binding sites on DNA for intercalation agents such as *m*-AMSA.[32] Since these binding sites are *only created* as a consequence of protein binding to DNA, increased receptor selectivity may result.

While not directly a DNA target, the binding of drugs to the DNA recognition motifs of DNA-binding proteins such as zinc-fingers[93] or helix-turn-helix[58] motifs would be expected to modulate processes such as transcriptional control. Since a defined sequence duplex DNA molecule is the specific binding molecule for these proteins, it is an interesting, and as far as I am aware, untested idea to design surrogate duplex molecules that would compete for these sequence specific proteins. There are, of course, inherent problems in this approach such as duplex stability and cellular uptake. These however, are being addressed in the anti-sense area.[94,95] In a more complex case it might be possible to synthesize mechanism-based inhibitors of DNA-cleavage enzymes such as topoisomerases by designing modified duplex DNA molecules. This is particularly attractive where both the topoisomerase consensus sequence and the DNA-cleavage site within the region is also known.[96]

Conclusions

In this Perspective we have attempted to summarize some of the opportunities available to medicinal chemists through DNA and its associated drug targets. Modern techniques in structural chemistry (high-field NMR, X-ray crystallography, molecular modeling) and techniques and concepts from molecular biology provide new opportunities to reexamine the mechanism of action of existing compounds that are thought to interact with DNA, as well as select and design new drug classes. Many of the recent discoveries in molecular biology have yet to be applied to drug discovery. Although there are still tremendous voids in our understanding of how existing drugs that are thought to interact with DNA really do work, experiments can now be designed that can potentially narrow this gap. The therapeutic opportunities offered through DNA and associated targets are not limited to anticancer and antiviral diseases, but also include genetic disorders that result in over- or underexpression of gene products, gene therapy, and autoimmune diseases. Because DNA-reactive ligands can be carcinogens as well as chemotherapeutic agents, separation of these activities will be an important objective. Even in cases where a therapeutic product may not ultimately be forthcoming, the receptor-selective ligands designed and developed by medicinal chemists will likely be very useful as biochemical tools to unravel the complexities of processes such as transcriptional control in eukaryotic cells.

References

1. Gale, E. F., Cundliffe, E., Reynolds, P. E., Richmond, M.H., Waring, M.J., ''*The Molecular Basis of Antibiotic Action*'', 2nd edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1981; 258-401.

2. Lerman, L.S., ''*Structural considerations in the interaction of DNA and acridines*'', **Journal of Molecular Biology** 3; 1961; 18-30.

3. Goldberg, I.H., Rabinowitz, M. ''*Actionmycin D inhibition of*

deoxyribonucleic acid-dependent synthesis of ribonucleic acid'', **Science,** 136(3513); 1962; 315-316.

4. Iyer, V.N., Szybalski, W., ''*A Molecular Mechanism of mitomycin action: Linking of complementary DNA strands''*, **Proceedings of Natlional Academy of Sciences U.S.A.,** 50(2); 1963; 355-362.

5. Nelson, E.M., Tewey, K.M., Liu, L. F., ''*Mechanism of antitumor drug action: poisoning of mammalian DNA topoisomerase II on DNA by 4'-(9-acridinylamino)-methanesulfon-m-anisidide''*, **Proceedings of Natlional Academy of Sciences U.S.A.,** 81(5); 1984; 1361-1365.

6. Ross, W.E., Glaubiger, D.L., Kohn, K.W., ''*Protein-associated DNA breaks in cells treated with adriamycin or ellipticine''*, **Biochemica et Biophysica Acta,** 519(1); 1978; 23-30.

7. Dervan, P.B., ''*Design of sequence-specific DNA-binding molecules''*, **Science,** 232(4749); 1986; 464-471.

8. Kohn, K.W., Hartlev, J.A., Mattes, W.B., ''*Mechanisms of DNA sequence selective alkylation of guanine-N7 positions by nitrogen mustards''* **Nucleic Acids Research,** 15(24); 1987; 10531-10549.

9. Kopka, M.L., Yoon, C., Goodsell, D., Piura. P., Dickerson, R.E., ''*The molecular origin of DNA-drug specificity in netropsin and distamycin''*, **Proceedings of Natlional Academy of Sciences U.S.A.,** 82(5); 1985; 1376-1380.

10. Kshirsagar, T.A., Hurley, L.H., ''*A Facile Synthesis of 5-Mesyl-3-benzylbenz[e]indole: Implications for the Involvement of a p-Quinone Methide Intermediate''*, **Journal of Organic Chemistry,** 63(16); 1998; 5722-5724.

11. Hirt, B., ''*Selective extraction of polyoma DNA from infected mouse cell cultures''*, **Journal of Molecular Biology,** 26(2); 1967; 365-369.

12. Patel, D.J., Shapiro, L., Hare, D., ''*Nuclear magnetic resonance and distance geometry studies of DNA structures in solution''*, **Annual Review of Biophysics and Biophysical Chemistry,** 16; 1987; 423-454.

13. Harris, T.M., Stone, M.V., Harris, C.M., **Chemical Research in Toxicology,** 1; 1988; 79.

14. Neidle, S., ''*Topics in Nucleic Acid Structure''*, Neidle, S., Ed.; Halsted Press, New York, 1981; 177-198.

15. Hurley, L.H., Boyd, F.L., ''*Approaches towards the design of sequence specific drugs for DNA''* **Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry,** 22; 1987; 259-268.

16. Dabrowiak, J.C., ''*Sequence specificity of drug-DNA interactions''* **Life Science,** 32(26); 1983; 2915-2931.

17. Wilkins, R.J., ''*Sequence specificities in the interactions of chemicals and radiations with DNA''*, **Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry,** 64(2); 1984; 111-126.

18. Basu, A.K., Essigmann, J.M., ''*Site specifically modified oligonucleotides as probes for the structural and biological effects of DNA-damaging agents''*, **Chemical Research Toxicology,** 1; 1988; 1-18.

19. Stubbe, J., Kozarich, J.W., ''*Mechanisms of bleomycin induced DNA degradation''*, **Chemical Review,** 87(5); 1987; 1107-1136.

20. Hecht, S.M., **Accounts of Chemical Research**, 19; 1986; 383.

21. Chin, D.H., Zeng, C.H., Costello, C.F., Goldberg, I.H., ''*Sites in the diyne-ene bicyclic core of neocarzinostatin chromophore responsible for hydrogen abstraction from DNA''*, **Biochemistry,** 27(21); 1988; 8106-8114.

22. Sugiyama, M., Kilknskie, R.F., Hecht, S.M., Van der Marcel, G.A., Van Boom, J.M., **Journal of American Chemical Society,** 107; 1985; 7765.

23. Krishramoothy, C.R., Vanderwall, D.E., Kozarich, J.W., Stubbe, J., **Journal of**

American Chemical Society, 110; 1988; 2008.

24. Hertzberg, R.P., Caranfa, M.J., Hecht, S.M., **Biochemistry,** ''*DNA methylation diminishes bleomycin-mediated strand scission*'' 24; 1985; 5285-5289.

25. Grimwade, J.E., Cason, E.B., Beerman, T.A., ''*Site specificity of bleomycin cleavage in purified and intracellular simian virus 40 DNA*'', **Nucleic Acids Research**, 15(16); 1987; 6315-6329.

26. Beckmann, R.P., Agostino, M.J., McHugh, M.M., Sigmund, R.D., Beerman, T.A., ''*Assessment of preferential cleavage of an actively transcribed retroviral hybrid gene in murine cells by deoxyribonuclease I, bleomycin, neocarzinostatin, or ionizing radiation*'', **Biochemistry,** 26(17); 1987; 5409-5415.

27. Povirk, L.F., Goldberg, I.H., ''*Endonuclease-resistant apyrimidinic sites formed by neocarzinostatin at cytosine residues in DNA: evidence for a possible role in mutagenesis*'', **Proceedings of National Academic Science U.S.A.,** 82(10); 1985; 3182-3186.

28. Quigley, G.L., Wang, A.M.J., Ughetto, G., Van der Marel, G., Van Boom, J.H., Rich, A., ''*Molecular structure of an anticancer drug–DNA complex—daunomycin plus d(CpGpTpApCpG)*'', **Proceedings of National Academic Science U.S.A.,** 77; 1980; 7204-7208.

29. Takusagawo, F., Dabrow, M., Neidle, S., Beerman, H.M., **Nature,** 296; 1982; 466.

30. DiMarco, A., ''*Adriamycin (NSC 123127): mode and mechanism of action*'', **Cancer Chermotherapy Reports,** 6; 1975; 91.

31. Schwartz, H.S., ''*Molecular Aspects of Anti-cancer Drug Action*'', Neidle, S., Waring, M.J., Eds.; Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1983; 93-126.

32. Lock, R.B., Ross, W.E., ''*DNA topoisomerases in cancer therapy*'', **Anticancer Drug Design,** 2(2); 1987; 151-64.

33. Singer, B., Grunberger, D., ''*Molecular Biology of Mutagens and Carcinogens*'' Plenum Press, New York, 1983.

34. Irvine, R., Wogen, G., ''*Quantitation of aflatoxin B1 adduction within the ribosomal RNA gene sequences of rat liver DNA*'', **Proceedings of National Academic Science U.S.A.,** 81; 1983; 664-668.

35. Pinto, A.L., Naser, L.J., Essigmann, J.M., Lippard, S.J., ''Site specifically platinated DNA, a new probe of the biological activity of platinum anticancer drugs'', **Journal of American Chemical Society,** 108; 1986; 7405-7407.

36. Naser, L.J., Pinto, A.L., Lippard, S.J., Essigmann, J.M., ''*Chemical and biological studies of the major DNA adduct of cis-diammine dichloroplatinum (II), cis-[Pt(NH$_3$)$_2${d(GpG)}], built into a specific site in a viral genome*'', **Biochemistry,** 27; 1988; 4357-4367.

37. ''*Immunoconjugates: Antibody Conjugates in Radioimaging and Therapy of Cancer*'' Vogel, C.W., Ed.; Oxford University Press, New York, 1987.

38. Hurley, L.H., Boyd, F.L., ''*DNA as a target for drug action*'', **Trends in Pharmacological Science,** 9(11); 1988; 402-407.

39. Felsenfeld, G., McGhee, J.D., ''*Structure of the 30 nm chromatin fiber*'' **Cell**, 44, 1986; 375-377.

40. Gellert, M., Monzel, R., ''*New Frontiers in the Study of Gene Functions*'' Poste, G., Crooke, S. T., Eds.; Plenum Press, New York, 1987; 51-59.

41. Boles, T.C., Hogan, M.E., ''High-resolution mapping of carcinogen binding sites on DNA'', **Biochemistry,** 25(10); 1986; 3039-3043.

42. Clayton, D.A., Doda, J.N., Friedberg, E.C., ''*The absence of a pyrimidine dimer repair*

mechanism in mammalian mitochondria'', **Proceedings of National Academic Science U.S.A.,** 71(7); 1974; 2777-2781.

43. Segal-Bendirdjian, E., Couland, D., Roques, B.P., LePecq, J.B., ''*Selective loss of mitochondrial DNA after treatment of cells with dithercalinium (NSC 335153), an antitumor bis-intercalating agent*'', **Cancer Research,** 48; 1988; 4982-4992.

44. Muench, K.F., Misra, R.P., Humayun, M.Z., ''*Sequence specificity in aflatoxin B1--DNA interactions*'', **Proceedings of National Academic Science U.S.A.,** 80; 1983; 6-10.

45. Yamamoto, K.R., ''*Steroid receptor regulated transcription of specific genes and gene networks*'', **Annual Review of Genetics,** 19; 1985; 209-252.

46. Wang, J.C., ''DNA topoisomerases'', **Annual Review of Biochemistry,** 54; 1985; 73.

47. Low, C.W. L., Drew, H.R., Waring, M.J., ''Echinomycin and distamycin induce rotation of nucleosome core DNA'', **Nucleic Acids Research,** 14(17), 1986; 6785-6801.

48. Mirabelli, C.K., Huang, C.H., Crooke, S.T., ''*Role of deoxyribonucleic acid topology in altering the site/sequence specificity of cleavage of deoxyribonucleic acid by bleomycin and talisomycin*'', **Biochemistry,** 22(2); 1983; 300-306.

49. Friedberg, E.C. ''*DNA Repair*'' W.H. Freeman, Ed.; San Francisco, 1984.

50. Erickson, L.C., Laurent, G., Sharkey, N.A., Kohn, K.W. ''*DNA cross-linking and monoadduct repair in nitrosourea-treated human tumour cells*'', **Nature,** 288(5792); 1980; 727-729.

51. Hanawalt, P. **Cell,** 40; 1989; 359.

52. Collins, A.R.S., Squires, S., Johnson, R.T., ''*Inhibitors of repair DNA synthesis*'', **Nucleic Acids Research,** 10(4); 1982; 1203-1213.

53. Ueda, K., Hayaishi, O., ''ADP-ribosylation'', **Annual Review of Biochemistry,** 54; 1985; 73-100.

54. Berger, N.A., Berger, S.J., Gerson, S.L., ''*DNA repair, ADP-ribosylation and pyridine nucleotide metabolism as targets for cancer chemotherapy*'', **Anticancer Drug Design,** 2(2); 1987; 203-209.

55. Rankin, P.W., Jacobson, E.L., Benjamin, R.C., Moss, J., Jacobson, M.K., ''*Quantitative studies of inhibitors of ADP-ribosylation in vitro and in vivo*'', **Journal of Biological Chemistry,** 264(8); 1989; 4312-4317.

56. Hurley, L.H., Lee, C.S., McGovren, J.P., Mitchell, M., Warpehoski, M.A., Kelly, R.C., Aristoff, P.A., ''*Molecular basis for sequence-specific DNA alkylation by CC-1065*'', **Biochemistry,** 27(10); 1988; 3886-3892.

57. Ptashne, M., ''*A Genetic Switch*'', Cell Press and Blackwell Scientific Publications, Cambridge, MA, 1986.

58. Ohlendorf, D.H., Anderson, W.F., Lewis, M., Pabo, C.O., Matthews, B.W., ''*Comparison of the structures of cro and lambda repressor proteins from bacteriophage lambda*'', **Journal of Molecular Biology,** 169(3), 1983; 757-769.

59. McClarin, J.A., Frederick, C.A., Wang, B.C., Geene, P., Boyer, H.W., Grable, J., Rosenberg, J.M.,''*Structure of the DNA-Eco RI endonuclease recognition complex at 3 A resolution*'', **Science,** 1986, 234(4783), 1526-1541.

60. Otwinowski, Z., Schevitz, R.W., Zhang, R.G., Lawson, C.L., Joachimiak, A., Marmorstein, R.Q., Luisi, B.F., Sigler, P.B., ''*Crystal structure of trp repressor/operator complex at atomic resolution*'', **Nature,** 335(6188); 1988; 321-329.

61. Moser, H.E., Dervan, P.B., ''Sequence-specific cleavage of double helical DNA by

triple helix formation'', **Science,** 238, 1987; 645-650.

62. Cooney, M., Czernuszewicz, G., Postel, E.H., Flint, S.J., Hogan, M.E., ''*Site-specific oligonucleotide binding represses transcription of the human c-myc gene in vitro*'', **Science,** 241(4864); 1988; 456-459.

63. Wakelin, L.P.G., ''*Polyfunctional DNA intercalating agents*'', **Medicinal Research Review,** 6(3); 1986; 275-340.

64. Zimmer, C., Wahnert, U., ''*Nonintercalating DNA-binding ligands: specificity of the interaction and their use as tools in biophysical, biochemical and biological investigations of the genetic material*'', **Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology,** 47(1); 1986; 31-112.

65. Lee, M., Krowicki, K., Hartley, J.A., Pon, R.T., Lown, J.W., ''*Molecular recognition between oligopeptides and nucleic acids: influence of van der Waals contacts in determining the 3'-terminus of DNA sequences read by monocationic lexitropsins*'', **Journal of American Chemical Society,** 110; 1988; 3641-3649

66. Gao, Z., Patel, D.J., ''*Solution structure of the chromomycin-DNA complex*'', **Biochemistry,** 28; 1989; 751-762.

67. Hurley, L.H., Needham-VanDevanter, D.R., ''*Covalent binding antitumor antibiotics in the minor groove of DNA. Mechanism of action of CC-1065 and the pyrrolo(1,4) benzodiazepins*'', **Accounts of Chemical Research,** 19; 1986; 230-237.

68. Alley, M.C., Scudiero, D.A., Monks, A., Hursey, M.L., Czerwinski, M.J., Fine, D. L., Abbot, B.J., Mayo, J.G., Shoemaker, R.M., Boyd, M.R., ''*Feasibility of drug screening with panels of human tumor cell lines using a microculture tetrazolium assay*'', **Cancer Research,** 48; 1988; 589-601.

69. Johnson, R.K., Bartus, H.F., Hofmann, G.T., O'Leary Bartus, J., Mong, S.M., Faucette, L.F., McCabe, F.L., Chan, J.A., Mirabelli,

C.K., ''*In Vitro and In Vivo Models for Detection of New Antitumor Drugs*'', Proceedings of the 14th International Congress of Chemotherapy, Kyoto, 1985; 15-26.

70. Bartus, H.F., Mirabelli, C.K., Auerbach, J.I., Shatzman, A.R., Taylor, D.T., Roseberg, M., Crooke, S.T., ''*Improved genetically modified Escherichia coli strain for prescreening antineoplastic agents*'', **Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy,** 25; 1984; 622-625.

71. Elespuru, R.K., White, R.J., ''*Biochemical prophage induction assay: a rapid test for antitumor agents that interact with DNA*'', **Cancer Research,** 43; 1983; 2819-2830.

72. Mong, S., Strong, J.E., Busch, J.A., Crooke, S.T., ''*The use of covalently closed circular DNA for prescreening of antitumor compounds*'', **Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy,** 16; 1979; 398-405.

73. Scannell, R.T., Barr, J.R., Murty, V.S., Reddy, K.S., Hecht, S.M., ''*DNA strand scission by naturally occurring 5-alkylresorcinols*'', **Journal of American Chemical Society,** 110; 1988; 3650-3651.

74. Reynolds, V.L., Molineux, I.J., Kaplan, D., Swenson, D.H., Hurley, L.H., ''*Reaction of the antitumor antibiotic cc-1065 with DNA-location of the site of thermally induced strand breakage and analysis of DNA-sequence specificity*'', **Biochemistry,** 24, 1985; 6228-6237.

75. Mirabelli, C. K., Bartus, H., Bartus, J.O.L., Johnson, R.K., Mong, S.M., Sung, C. P., Crooke, S.T.J., **Antibiotics,** 38; 1985; 758.

76. Eng, W.K., Faucette, L., Johnson, R.K., Sternglanz, R., ''*Evidence that DNA topoisomerase I is necessary for the cytotoxic effects of camptothecin*'', **Molecular Pharmaceutics,** 1988; 34(6); 755-760.

77. Nitiss, J., Wang, J.C., ''DNA topoisomerase-targeting antitumor drugs can be studied in

yeast'', **Proceedings of Natlional Academic Science U.S.A.**, 85(20); 1988; 7501-7505.

78. Brown, D., ''*Gene expression in eukaryotes*'', **Science,** 211, 1981; 667-674.

79. Zaret, K.S., Yamamoto, K.R., ''*Reversible and persistent changes in chromatin structure accompany activation of a glucocorticoid-dependent enhancer element*'', **Cell,** 38(1); 1984; 29-38.

80. Beckmann, R.P., Beerman, T.A., ''*Use of an inducible hybrid viral gene as a model for evaluating drug effects on gene expression*'', **Molecular Pharmcology,** 35(4); 1989; 433-442.

81. Green, J.P., ''Polypharmic antagonists- a class of their own'', **Trends in Pharmacology Science,** 8(10); 1987; 377-379.

82. Kadonaga, J.T., Briggs, M.R., Tjian, R. ''*New Frontiers in the Study of Gene Function*'' Poste, G., Crook, S. T., Eds.; Plenum Press, New York, 1987; 87-98.

83. Freifelder, D. ''*Molecular Biology*'' 2nd edition, Jones & Bartlett Publ. Inc., Boston, 1987; 501-550.

84. Von Hippel, P.H., Berg, O.G., ''*On the specificity of DNA-protein interactions*'', **Proceedings of Natlional Academic Science U.S.A.**, 83(6); 1986; 1608-1612.

85. Sen, D., Gilbert, W., ''*Formation of parallel four-stranded complexes by guanine-rich motifs in DNA and its implications for meiosis*'', **Nature,** 334(6180); 1988; 364-366.

86. Johnston, B.H., ''*The S1-sensitive form of d(C-T)n.d(A-G)n: chemical evidence for a three-stranded structure in plasmids*'', **Science,** 241(4874); 1988; 1800-1804.

87. Moyzis, R.K., Buckingham, J.M., Cram, L.S., Dani, M., Deaven, L.L., Jones, M. D., Meyne, L., Ratliff, R.L., Wu, J.R., ''A highly conserved repetitive DNA sequence, (TTAGGG)n, present at the telomeres of human chromosomes'', **Proceedings of National Academic Science U.S.A.,** 85(18); 1988; 6622-6626.

88. Bruzik, J.P., Auble, D.T., deHaseth, P.L., ''*Specific activation of transcription initiation by the sequence-specific DNA-binding agents distamycin A and netropsin*'', **Biochemistry,** 26(3); 1987; 950-956.

89. Cairns J., ''The origin of human cancers'', **Nature,** 289(5796); 1981; 353–357.

90. Barbacid, M., ''Oncogenes and human cancer: cause or consequence?'', **Carcinogenesis,** 7(7), 1986; 1037-1042.

91. Gibbs, J.B., Sigal, I.S., Scolnick, E.M., **Trends in Biochemical Science,** 10(9); 1985; 350-353.

92. Sobell, H.M., ''*Molecular Actions and Targets for Cancer Chemotherapeutic Agents*'' Sartorelli, A.C., Lazo, J.S., Bertino, J.R., Eds.; Academic Press, New York, 1981; 119-135.

93. Rhodes, D., Klug, A., ''*Nucleic Acids and Molecular Biology*'' Volume 2, Eckstein, F., Lilley, D.M.J., Eds.; Springer-Verlag, West Berlin, 1988; 149-166.

94. Sun, J.S., Francois, J.C., Lavery, R., Saison-Behmoaras, T., Montenay-Garestier, T., Thuong, N.T., Helene, C., ''*Sequence-targeted cleavage of nucleic acids by oligo-alpha-thymidylate-phenanthroline conjugates: parallel and antiparallel double helices are formed with DNA and RNA, respectively*'', **Biochemistry,** 27(16); 1988; 6039-6045.

95. Van der Krol, A.R., Mol, J.N.M., Stuitje, A.R., ''*Modulation of expression by complementary RNA or DNA sequences*'', **Biotechniques**, 6; 1988; 958-997.

96. Bonven, B.J., Gocke, E., Westergaard, O., ''*A high affinity topoisomerase I binding sequence is clustered at DNAase I hypersensitive sites in Tetrahymena R-chromatin*'', **Cell,** 41(2); 1985; 541-551.