Letters to the Editor

**Progestosterone receptor gene polymorphism and risk for breast and ovarian cancer**

Sir,
McKenna et al (March, 1995) used Southern analysis to identify a germine *Taq* restriction fragment polymorphism (RFLP) in intron G of the human progesterone receptor (hPR) defined by two alleles, T1 and T2. The T2 allele contained an additional *Taq* restriction site relative to T1, and was recently characterized as a 306 bp Alu element insertion and named PROGINS (Rowe et al, 1995). No functional consequences of this intronic insertion have been reported, but McKenna et al (1995) suggested that the T2 allele is over-represented in patients with ovarian carcinoma. Twenty-four out of 67 (36%) German and Irish patients with ovarian cancer were homozygous or heterozygous for the T2 allele, in contrast to only 38 out of 184 (21%) control subjects.

To investigate this association in a Caucasian North-American population, we designed a PCR-based assay using forward (5'-GGC AGA AAG CAA AAT AAA AAG A-3') and reverse (5'-AAA GTA TTT TCT TGC TAA ATG TC-3') primers to amplify the region spanning the insertion. Leucocyte DNA was analysed from 96 patients with ovarian cancer and 68 patients with breast cancer treated at Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, USA, between 1985 and 1996, and 101 non-cancer female control subjects enrolled through outpatient clinics at the same hospital. The frequency of T2 genotypes in American control women is similar to that of the pooled Irish/German control subjects. However, we observe no increased frequency in women with the T2 genotype among cases of breast or ovarian cancer relative to controls subjects (Table 1), in contrast to the study by McKenna et al (1995).

In the absence of data that the insertion of an Alu element in intron G of the progesterone receptor gene has any consequences for gene function, we find little support for the hypothesis that the T2 allele increases risk for ovarian or breast cancer.

**Table 1** Distribution of hPR polymorphism in control, ovarian, and breast cancer groups

|       | T1/T1 (%) | T1/T2 (%) | T2/T2 (%) |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Control (n = 101) | 79 (78) | 18 (18) | 4 (4) |
| Ovarian cancer (n = 96) | 76 (79) | 15 (16) | 5 (5) |
| Breast cancer (n = 68) | 55 (81) | 12 (18) | 1 (1) |

T1/T1, homozygotes without the 306-bp insertion; T1/T2, heterozygotes with the insertion; T2/T2, homozygotes with the insertion.
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**Lymphagenesis and cancer metastasis**

Sir,
A recent article by Ohta et al (1997) examines the relationship between lung cancer metastasis and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) expression. The authors suggest that lymph node metastasis may be enhanced by an increase in the number of lymphatic vessels in the primary tumour. They refer to this process as ‘lymphagenesis’. Unfortunately, this term is often used to reference to lymphocyte proliferation or, in some cases, lymph fluid production and, thus, could be misleading in this context. We have suggested the use of the term lymphogenesis to describe the process of lymphatic vessel formation (Cann et al, 1995; van Netten et al, 1996). Another synonymous term, lymphangiogenesis, may be confused with both vascular systems because angiogenesis, first used by Hertig (1935), refers solely to blood vessel formation.

The majority of neovascular research in cancer has focused on angiogenesis. This is partly because of the use of certain techniques, such as corneal implantation or chorioallantoic membrane assays, in which blood vessels can be clearly distinguished and lymphatic vessels, although present, cannot. It is also because of the use of so-called ‘angiogenic’ markers (i.e. von Willebrand factor, CD31, CD34) that are not truly restricted to blood vessel endothelium but that are also present on lymphatic vessels (Miettinen et al, 1994; Appleton et al, 1996).

The process of lymphatic vessel development has gained increasing attention with the discovery of a new VEGF receptor, VEGFR3 (FLT4). VEGFR3 is expressed by lymphatic endothelial cells, some high endothelial venules (Kaipainen et al, 1995) and various tumour cell lines (Pajusola et al, 1992; Liu et al, 1997). Enhanced expression has also been observed in murine hepatic tumours (Karamysheva et al, 1996) and in lymph nodes containing metastatic adenocarcinoma (Kaipainen et al, 1995). The ligand for VEGFR3, VEGF-C, has been shown to be a specific inducer of lymphatic endothelial cell proliferation and chemotaxis (Oh et al, 1997). Thus, lymphogenesis may be a more important factor in the