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Commentary

What? Salt and hypertension? Again? If your attention drifted and you haven’t been able to follow the debate for the last 30 years, I’d highly recommend reading the 1998 Science article appropriately entitled “The (political) science of salt” (1). Both the original article and the heated responses it generated are more entertaining than a ringside seat at a Saturday night wrestling match. Why can’t we agree on whether dietary salt is good or bad for people (or neither)? Some have suggested that the difficulty lies in the fact that the general population should be subclassified as salt “responders” and “non-responders”. Another possibility, strengthened by the work of Ni et al. (2) in this issue of the JCI, is that additional hormonal factors modulate our salt sensitivity, making it a moving target. A tough nut to crack. Hormonal modulation of salt balance and blood volume is an indisputable truth in physiology. But does it play a critical role in hypertension? Genetic evidence certainly supports the possibility that it can. In humans, rare genetic disorders of salt transport in the kidney have been shown to be responsible for several forms of hyper- and hypotension including Liddle, Bartter, and Gitelman syndromes (reviewed in ref. 3). Nevertheless, there’s no clear evidence to date that the same genes that cause these disorders play a significant […]
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A tough nut to crack

Hormonal modulation of salt balance and blood volume is an indisputable truth in physiology. But does it play a critical role in hypertension? Genetic evidence certainly supports the possibility that it can. In humans, rare genetic disorders of salt transport in the kidney have been shown to be responsible for several forms of hyper- and hypotension including Liddle, Bartter, and Gitelman syndromes (reviewed in ref. 3). Nevertheless, there’s no clear evidence to date that the same genes that cause these disorders play a significant role in essential hypertension. But wait, maybe we just need to do a better job of subclassifying patients and regulating their diets when we do genetic screens. As an alternative and presumably simpler approach, animal models have been used. In the early 1960s, Dahl and colleagues reported that they had bred rats characterized by a salt-sensitive form of hypertension (4). These rats have been the subject of hundreds of research studies aimed at defining the genes and proteins responsible for salt-sensitivity. In spite of the fact that genetic heterogeneity and diet can be taken out of the equation with this approach, as of 3 years ago 24 chromosomal regions spread over 19 chromosomes had been found to contribute to hypertension in rats (5), with at least 8 of these regions having effects on blood pressure in the Dahl salt-sensitive strain. It now seems clear that although this approach still holds promise to uncover new targets in hypertension, it’s anything but simple. This is where the ability to knock-out genes in mice comes in handy. In the current issue, Ni et al. show that mice having an impaired ability to make γ-melanocyte-stimulating hormone (γ-MSH) exhibit salt-sensitive hypertension (2).

γ-MSH is a small peptide hormone that is clipped out of the middle of the larger protein precursor proopiomelanocortin (POMC) by prohormone convertase 2 (PC2) (Figure 1). Expression of POMC in the pituitary gland results in the release of several hormones, including the melanocortins, into the circulation while its expression in the hypothalamus and brainstem leads to production of melanocortinergic neurotransmitters. In normal mice, γ-MSH increases in the circulation when the animals are placed on a high-salt diet. In contrast, in PC2-knockout mice γ-MSH does not increase and the mice develop hypertension. Of course this alone would not constitute strong evidence for the role of γ-MSH since PC2 is involved in generating a lot of other peptide and protein hormones.
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The most important achievement of cancer immunology thus far may be the development of robust techniques for the identification of tumor antigens (1, 2). This work underlies our current understanding that cancer patients frequently generate specific cellular and humoral antitumor responses. Moreover, the expression of transformation-associated stress genes commonly provokes innate immune reactions (3). Together, these findings unveil a previously unsuspected breadth of immune recognition in tumor bearing hosts.

The characterization of cancer cell antigenicity has fueled efforts to delineate protective immune-effector mechanisms. The task is complicated by the dual role that immunity plays during cancer progression. Recent studies disclosed a marked increase in the incidence of spontaneous and chemically-induced tumors in immunodeficient mice compared to littermate controls (4). Since immunocompetent animals efficiently reject tumor transplants from immunodeficient hosts, the experiments support the idea that the immune system functions as an extrinsic tumor suppressor. Consistent with this concept, clinical-pathologic investigations established a strong association between the presence of dense intratumoral T cell infiltrates and favorable clinical outcomes in patients with malignant melanoma or carcinomas of the colon, kidney, and ovary (5, 6).

Other work indicates, though, that tumors may subvert the immune system to facilitate disease progression (7). Unresolved inflammation, whether due to infection, autoimmunity, or environmental agents, markedly increases the risk of cancer. Dysregulated cytokine production promotes cell proliferation and attenuates apoptosis. Phagocyte-derived reactive oxygen species damage DNA. Tumor cell invasion and metastasis exploit the normal cues for leukocyte migration. Collectively, these studies illustrate diverse ways in which the immune system sculpts the hallmarks of cancer (8).