was also decreased in group B ($P=0.015$). Results presented show that both granulocyte and monocyte phagocytic functions are altered in breast cancer patients early in the disease process, and are not caused by potentially myelosuppressive therapy [5]. Differences in these functions, which existed at the time of diagnosis, seem to be related to the progression of the disease and therefore could be of prognostic value.

1. Adler A, Stein JA, Ben-Efraim S. Immunocompetence, immuno-suppression, and human breast cancer. III. Prognostic significance of initial level of immunocompetence in early and advanced disease. *Cancer* 1980, 45, 2074–2083.
2. Ownby HE, Roi LD, Isenberg RR, Brennan MJ. Peripheral lymphocyte and eosinophil counts as indicators of prognosis in primary breast cancer. *Cancer* 1983, 52, 126–130.
3. Shukla HS, Hughes LE, Whitehead RH, Newcombe RG. Long-term follow-up of general immunocompetence in breast cancer. *Cancer Immunol Immunother* 1986, 21, 6–11.
4. Lukać J, Burck B, Kusić Z. Peripheral blood lymphocyte populations and phagocytic functions in patients with active alopecia acreata. *Acta Med Croatica* 1993, 47, 113–118.
5. Anaissie E, Bodey GP, Kantarjian H, *et al*. New spectrum of fungal infections in patients with cancer. *Rev Infect Dis* 1989, 11, 69–378.

0959-8049(94)00365-3

A New Model for the Interaction of EGF-like Ligands With Their Receptors: the New One-Two

W.J. Gullick

OVEREXPRESSION or mutation of the type 1 growth factor receptors and their ligands occurs frequently in human tumours, and in some cases is associated with prognosis and response to treatment. A deeper understanding of their mechanisms of activation would be useful in the design of receptor inhibitors.

For some years, the accepted model for interaction of epidermal growth factor (EGF) with its receptor has been that one ligand binds to a receptor monomer, and that this is followed by receptor dimerisation, forming a complex of two receptors and two ligands (2:2). I wish to consider a new model in which a single molecule of EGF binds to a receptor dimer (1:2).

Such a complex is necessarily asymmetric as EGF itself is asymmetric. This, therefore, requires that one face of the ligand binds to one site in the first receptor (site A) and, through another part of its surface, to a different site in the second receptor (site B). Is there any reason to believe that this could occur? Inspection of the primary sequence of the extracellular domain of the EGF receptor suggests a possible explanation in that this is composed of two related sequences, each containing a region rich in cysteine residues associated with another sequence. Experiments from Schlessinger and colleagues have demonstrated that the more C-terminal (domain III) of the non-

Correspondence to W.J. Gullick at the ICRF Oncology Unit, Hammersmith Hospital, London W12 0NN, U.K.
Received 1 Aug. 1994; accepted 24 Aug. 1994.

cysteine rich regions is largely responsible for ligand binding [1], but that mutations in the second N-terminal equivalent region (domain I) also, but less fundamentally, affect binding [2]. It is possible, therefore, that ligand binding occurs first to site A (domain III) in a monomer with moderate affinity, and that this is followed by dimerisation with a second receptor, but with the EGF binding to site B (domain I), thereby forming the high affinity complex.

What is the evidence in favour of this model? Mutational analysis of EGF suggests that substitution of either residue 41 [3] or 47 [4] prevents receptor recognition. However, these side chains are on opposite faces of the ligand [5]. In the 1:2 model, this would be predicted, but it is less easy to reconcile with the 2:2 structure. Secondly, in the closely related type 1 receptors, HER2 and HER3, NDF/Heregulin can be chemically cross-linked to either receptor in a heterodimer, suggesting that the ligand is in close proximity to each receptor molecule [6]. A precedent for this 1:2 complex is provided by the asymmetric structure of one molecule of growth hormone bound to two receptor proteins [7].

The principle evidence in favour of the 2:2 model is the stoichiometry of ligand binding determined by Weber and associates [8]. These measurements, despite being carefully performed, are, however, sensitive to small variations in specific activity of the iodinated EGF, and the accuracy of measurements of protein concentration by comparative Coomassie blue staining and autoradiography. The structure suggested here leads to some predictions which can be tested by experiment, which may help to resolve the issue. Binding of one ligand to a receptor heterodimeric complex would not, for instance, allow binding of another ligand. For example, EGF binding to a heterodimer of EGFR and HER3 would prevent binding of NDF/Heregulin and *vice versa*. A speculation arising from this model is that it is possible that the five different ligands, known to bind to the EGF receptor and the alpha and beta families of NDF/Heregulin (which differ in their C-terminal parts of the EGF-like element), may be able to stabilise different combinations of type 1 receptor heterodimers. I believe therefore that, for the moment, results of experiments performed on this highly interactive system of receptors should now be considered in the light of both models.

1. Lax I, Burgess WH, Bellot F, Ullrich A, Schlessinger J, Givol D. Localization of a major receptor-binding domain for epidermal growth factor by affinity labeling. *Mol Cell Biol* 1988, 8, 1831–1834.
2. Lax I, Fischer R, Ng C, *et al*. Noncontiguous regions in the extracellular domain of EGF receptor define ligand-binding specificity. *Cell Regulation* 1991, 2, 337–345.
3. Hommel U, Dudgeon TJ, Fallon A, Edwards RM, Campbell ID. Structure–function relationships in human epidermal growth factor studied by site-directed mutagenesis and ¹H NRM. *Biochemistry* 1991, 30, 8891–8898.
4. Dudgeon TJ, Cooke RM, Baron M, Campbell ID, Edwards RM, Fallon A. Structure-function analysis of epidermal growth factor: site directed mutagenesis and nuclear magnetic resonance. *FEBS Letts* 1990, 261, 392–396.
5. Cooke RM, Wilkinson AJ, Baron M, *et al*. The solution structure of human epidermal growth factor. *Nature* 1987, 327, 339–341.
6. Sliwkowski MX, Schaefer G, Akita RW, *et al*. Coexpression of erbB2 and erbB3 proteins reconstitutes a high affinity receptor for heregulin. *J Biol Chem* 1994, 269, 14661–14665.
7. Cunnigham BC, Ultsch M, de Vos AM, Mulkerrin MG, Clauser KR, Wells JA. Dimerisation of the extracellular domain of the human growth hormone receptor by a single hormone molecule. *Science* 1991, 254, 821–825.
8. Weber W, Bertics PJ, Gill GN. Immunoaffinity purification of the epidermal growth factor receptor. *J Biol Chem* 1984, 259, 14631–14636.