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Abstract

Studies of mutagenesis in many organisms indicate that the majority (over 90%) of mutations are recessive to wild type. If recessiveness represents the ‘default’ state, what are the distinguishing features that make a minority of mutations give rise to dominant or semidominant characters? This review draws on the rapid expansion in knowledge of molecular and cellular biology to classify the molecular mechanisms of dominant mutation. The categories discussed include (1) reduced gene dosage, expression, or protein activity (haploinsufficiency); (2) increased gene dosage; (3) ectopic or temporally altered mRNA expression; (4) increased or constitutive protein activity; (5) dominant negative effects; (6) altered structural proteins; (7) toxic protein alterations; and (8) new protein functions. This provides a framework for understanding the basis of dominant genetic phenomena in humans and other organisms.

(J Med Genet 1994;31:89-98)

The concepts of dominance and recessiveness (or recessivity), originally formulated by Mendel, are so fundamental to genetics that they are often taken for granted. But why are some diseases dominant and others recessive? This question is frequently ignored in textbooks of genetics, and it is surprisingly difficult to find much written on the subject. With the rapid accumulation of molecular data on diploid organisms as diverse as yeasts and humans, unifying themes are beginning to emerge. This review attempts to classify and elaborate these ideas, and collate some of the more useful references. I will first outline some definitions and concepts, and then give illustrative examples of different molecular mechanisms of dominance. Although I have focused on human disorders where possible, many additional lessons can be learned from the study of non-human systems.

Dominance, semidominance, and recessiveness

It should first be remembered that dominance is not an intrinsic property of a gene or mutant allele, but describes the relationship between the phenotypes of three genotypes: an allele may behave as a dominant, semidominant, or recessive depending both on its partner allele, and the character under consideration. Consider alleles A and B, with genotypes AA, AB, and BB. If a particular phenotypic character is observed in the AA and AB genotypes, but differs from BB, then allele A is dominant to allele B. When the AB phenotype is intermediate between or combines characters from both the AA and BB phenotypes, alleles A and B are semi- or codominant. Most wild type alleles are dominant over other alleles, as the wild type and heterozygote phenotypes are usually indistinguishable; thus most genetic diseases are recessive.

A potential source of confusion when considering dominance phenomena in human genetic disease, is that only the wild type and heterozygous mutant phenotypes are generally encountered. Examples of homozygous mutants both for relatively common disorders (thalassaemia, familial hypercholesterolaemia) and rarer conditions (achondroplasia, piebaldism) indicate that the phenotype of the homozygote usually tends to be more severe than the heterozygote, hence the wild type and mutant alleles are, strictly speaking, semidominant. The Huntington’s disease mutation provides an unusual instance of a mutant allele that is truly dominant to wild type in that homozygotes appear no more severely affected than heterozygotes (fig 1). Although it is interesting to speculate on the differences in mechanism giving rise to semidominance and complete dominance, there are insufficient molecular data to attempt a synthesis. The more simple, but perhaps more fundamental, question addressed in this review may be summarised as follows: what aspects of a mutant allele’s function cause it to affect the phenotype in the presence of a wild type allele? For simplicity I will use the term ‘dominant mutation’ to describe a mutant allele in this context.

Dominant mutations are much rarer than recessive ones

Although dominant disorders outnumber recessive by a ratio of nearly 4:1 in McKusick’s 1992 compilation, ascertainment in the human is undoubtedly biased in favour of mild dominantly inherited phenotypes. By contrast, it has long been known from systematic mutagenesis of a variety of diploid organisms that the majority of mutations are recessive to wild
type. For example, insertional inactivation by random integration of retroviral DNA into the mouse genome produces recessive and dominant phenotypes with a ratio of about 10–20:1.

The search for an explanation of the recessive behaviour of most mutations generated a lively debate in the 1930s between Sewall Wright, who believed that it arose intrinsically from the physiology of gene action, and RA Fisher, who proposed that the accumulation of modifier alleles at other loci was responsible. Fisher's theory has now generally lost favour, and Orr showed that in the alga Chlamydomonas, which is usually haploid (so that Fisherian selection cannot apply), most mutations nevertheless showed recessive behaviour when examined in a transiently diploid background, supporting Wright's theory. Indeed, diploidy may have evolved because it protects against recessive mutations. Thus it is dominance, rather than recessiveness, that demands special explanation; but why should the 'default' state of mutations be recessive?

The usual explanation is as follows. The most likely effects of a random gene mutation are that it will either be neutral (normal phenotype) or inactivating. If the latter, the question is whether the inactivation would be clinically manifest in the heterozygote (dominance or semidominance, specifically, haploinsufficiency, or only in the homozygote (recessiveness). In 1981 Kacser and Burns proposed a theory of metabolic fluxes to explain why most inborn errors of metabolism are recessive. Assuming that a metabolic pathway has many non-rate limiting steps, control of flux at any particular point in a pathway will be small. Hence, many pathways show a saturable relationship between enzyme level and metabolic flux, with fluxes fully saturated at wild type enzyme level; a 50% reduction in enzyme activity would therefore cause little reduction in flux below its saturation level.

Although this theory fits metabolic pathways well, it is not applicable to critical rate limiting steps of such pathways, nor to mutations causing qualitatively altered function, especially when structural or controlling/signalling proteins are involved. It is perhaps not surprising that most dominant mutants belong to one of these latter categories, and frequently involve developmental malformations.

An additional explanation for the rarity of dominant mutations is suggested by work on the nematode Caenorhabditis elegans. Recessive mutations at a series of loci termed smg may alter the behaviour of mutations at other loci from recessive to dominant (cryptic dominance). It seems that the wild type smg loci encode proteins that can recognise and selectively degrade many mutant mRNA species, forming part of a mutant surveillance system. The relevance of this finding to humans is not yet clear.

Finally, note that although the number of known recessive conditions in the human may considerably underestimate the total, the true figure is unlikely to approach the total number of genes. There is a growing list of murine genes for which targeted disruption is not associated with any phenotypic abnormality in transgenic mice. A similar situation applies to the mutational spectrum in C elegans, and it is noteworthy that dominant "gain of function" mutants exist at several loci for which the homozygous null phenotype is entirely normal.

Types of dominant mutation

In 1932, Muller suggested a classification of dominant mutations that is still widely quoted. He coined the terms amorph, hypomorph, and hypermorph to reflect quantitative changes to a pre-existing wild type character; antimorph to describe mutual antagonistic interaction with wild type; and neomorph for a new phenotype, not fully antagonised by wild type. His proposal, made when the molecular nature of mutation was still uncertain (and predating the identification of DNA as the genetic material by 12 years), was remarkable for its prescience. Unfortunately, later authors have sometimes tended to assume a one to one relationship between this classification, based on classical genetics, and underlying molecular mechanisms. While clear parallels exist, these are inexact (fig 2). As this review focuses on molecular mechanisms of dominance, I have avoided using Muller's terms to highlight the
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distinction between the genetic and molecular levels of analysis. The following classification seems to accommodate most situations, although some ambiguities and overlaps are inevitable.

1. Reduced gene dosage, expression, or protein activity: haploinsufficiency.

2. Increased gene dosage.

3. Ectopic or temporally altered mRNA expression.

4. Increased or constitutive protein activity.

5. Dominant negative effects.

6. Altered structural proteins.

7. Toxic protein alterations, not covered in other categories.

8. New protein functions.

Some examples of these mechanisms are shown in the table and are further discussed below. A general distinction can be made between category (1), which involves loss of function, and categories (2) to (8), which represent gain of function. Note that the latter, frequently used term encompasses a wide range of mechanisms, and is thus only applicable in a broad context. The table includes two other mechanisms that may give rise to a "dominant" pattern of inheritance, but in which the inherited mutation is not dominant at a cellular level. These involve recessive oncogenes and genomic imprinting, and are discussed briefly in a later section.

REDUCED GENE DOSAGE, EXPRESSION, OR PROTEIN ACTIVITY: HAPLOINSUFFICIENCY

For the minority of cases in which the abnormal phenotype results from inactivation of one of a pair of alleles, the term "haploinsufficiency" is used ("haplolethality" if early embryonic death occurs). Haploinsufficient loci are relatively unusual: a careful survey of the Drosophila genome showed only 56 loci associated with an altered phenotype when present as a single copy, of which four were lethal.23 However, such loci are more important than their rarity might suggest, for two reasons. First, mutation may arise from any mechanism producing loss of function: deletion, chromosome translocation, truncation caused by nonsense and frameshift mutation, and some promoter and splice site mutations and amino acid substitutions may all be responsible. Such variety will tend to increase the frequency with which the disease is observed. Second, dosage sensitive genes seem to be an intrinsically interesting group.26

Genes showing haploinsufficiency fall into two broad categories. A few code for tissue specific proteins synthesised in large quantities, for instance, type 1 collagen27 (but see also the section on structural mutations), globins, low density lipoprotein receptor,28 haem synthesis (porphyras),2 and Cl esterase inhibitor (hereditary angio-oedema).29 In the first two cases, the abnormal heterozygous phenotype may be because of the resulting imbalance with a matched component protein; in the latter three, because of interference with a rate limiting step of a metabolic pathway. Of particular note, levels of Cl esterase inhibitor associated with heterozygous deficiency are only 15 to 20% of normal, even during remission. This is because the normal inhibitor is "mopped up" relatively rapidly by complexing with plasma enzymes, and the rate at which this occurs is largely independent of inhibitor concentration (zero order kinetics).29 The quantitative deficiency is hence greater than the expected value of 50%.

A second category comprises regulatory genes working close to a threshold level for different actions. Examples in humans include PAX3 (Waardenburg syndrome),30,31 PAX6 (aniridia),32 GLI3 (Greig cephalopolysyndactyly, GCP),33,34 WT1 (Wilms' tumour/genitourinary abnormalities),35,36 RDS/peripherin (retinitis pigmentosa),37 and KIT (piebaldism).38 Such threshold dosage effects may be clinically manifest in only a subset of the tissues in which the gene is expressed (aniridia

---

### Table: Categories of mutation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of mutation</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Types of mutation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of function</td>
<td>Subunit imbalance</td>
<td>D, T, S, (M)</td>
<td>α and β globins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haploinsufficiency</td>
<td>Metabolic rate determining step</td>
<td>D, T, S, (M)</td>
<td>LDL receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental regulator</td>
<td>D, T, S, (M), (Tr)</td>
<td>PAX3, PAX6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain of function</td>
<td>Duplication</td>
<td>Dup</td>
<td>PMP-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene dosage</td>
<td>Amplification</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MDM2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altered temporal pattern</td>
<td>P, Tr, (D)</td>
<td>γ globin, MYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Ectopic mRNA expression</td>
<td>Altered tissue distribution</td>
<td>P, Tr</td>
<td>Ubx, Antp, MYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tRNA stability</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>lin-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constitutive activation</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CLN3, glp-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant negative</td>
<td>Disruption of dimer</td>
<td>M, (T)</td>
<td>KIT, p53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural protein</td>
<td>Competition for substrate</td>
<td>M, (T)</td>
<td>Ras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disruption of structure</td>
<td>M, S, (T)</td>
<td>Collagen, fibrillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic protein</td>
<td>Disruptive interaction</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rhodopsin, amyloidoses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New protein</td>
<td>Altered substrate specificity</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>α, antitrypsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exon shuffling</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>BCR/ABL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mechanisms</td>
<td>Recombinant antisense</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Retinoblastoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genomic imprinting</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Beckwith-Wiedemann syndrome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and GCPS are examples) and the phenotype may be sensitive to the genetic background. To understand the mechanisms of dosage sensitivity in this "regulatory" group requires a detailed knowledge of the molecular interactions involved, something not yet achieved for any human gene. However, simpler organisms provide some excellent model systems. For instance, sex determination in Drosophila requires the ability to distinguish between X:autosomal ratios of 1 in females and 0-5 in males. This may be achieved by titration of "numerator" X chromosome genes against "denominator" autosomal ones, possibly by competition of the cognate proteins for binding to a regulatory DNA sequence. Further insight may be gained by studies of morphogenic proteins, for example the Drosophila transcription factor dorsal (dl), which is distributed in a nuclear concentration gradient along the dorsalventral axis of the early embryo. Dosage dependent activation of different sets of downstream genes by dl correlates with the strength of the dl binding sites in their promoters: genes with high affinity dl binding are activated or repressed by dl at lower threshold levels. Correspondingly, female flies heterozygous for dl null mutations produce abnormal embryos that fail to develop mesoderm, which requires the highest level of dl activity.

**INCREASED GENE DOSAGE**

Application of Kacser and Burns’ principles predicts that an increase in gene dosage to three copies should affect the phenotype even less often than a reduction to one copy. Experimental analysis supports this: for example, the survey of aneuploidy in Drosophila previously mentioned identified only one triplo-lethal and one triplo-abornal locus. Nevertheless, cytogenetically visible trisomy in humans (which will usually encompass at least 40 to 50 genes) is usually associated with phenotypic abnormality, indicating that a significant minority of loci must be sensitive to 3 versus 2 dosage. It may be relevant that the increase in dosage at the mRNA and protein level can exceed the expected factor of 1.5; considerably greater rises are observed for some genes on chromosome 21 in Down’s syndrome. Although the distinctive phenotypes associated with certain trisomies may therefore be attributable to a small number of critical genes, few of these have been specifically identified. An exception is PMP-22, duplication of which is likely to be the principal cause of type I Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease. The PMP-22 region is also haploinsufficient, giving the different phenotype of dominant pressure palsies; however, the cellular mechanisms of these contrasting dosage effects are not understood.

Gene amplification in somatic cells to much higher copy numbers frequently occurs in certain neoplasias. A particularly clear example of how this causes a dominant phenotype is provided by the amplification of the MDM2 gene in sarcomas. MDM2 protein binds to and inactivates the tumour suppressor gene P53 (discussed further below), leading to escape from normal p53 regulated cellular growth control.47

**ECTOTIC OR TEMPORALLY ALTERED mRNA EXPRESSION**

This group is characterised by disturbance of the exquisite controls of mRNA expression that dictate the normal cellular distribution, temporal restriction, and absolute levels of mRNA. In principle, altered gene expression can arise in any gene or message that contains a regulatory domain, and the molecular pathology of such mutants is correspondingly diverse.46

A fairly specific illustration of loss of temporal regulation is provided by hereditary persistence of fetal haemoglobin (HPFH). Known causes include point mutation of the γ globin promoter, which alters binding of the erythroid transcription factor GATA-1, certain 3’ deletions encompassing the δ and β globin genes, and alterations of unidentified trans acting factors. The effect of all these mutations is to abrogate the normal switch from expression of γ to δ and β globin, which occurs around the time of birth. The resulting HPFH dominantly ameliorates the effects of β thalassaemia mutations.

An example of ectopic expression is provided by the contrabithorax (Cbx) mutations of Drosophila, which involve the ultrabithorax (Ubx) gene, normally expressed in the posterior part of the embryo with an anterior boundary in the third thoracic segment (T3). In Cbx mutants, which comprise insertions, inversions, and other chromosomal rearrangements, Ubx is also expressed in T2 and this results in the homeotic transformation of T2 into a T3 like structure. Similarly, dominant homeotic mutations of the Antennapedia gene occur because of ectopic expression: in one case studied in detail (Antp isoform), a chromosomal inversion results in the entire Antp coding region being placed under a new promoter. More commonly, the disease phenotype may reflect a combination of alterations in the temporal specificity, tissue distribution, and absolute level of mRNA expression. The primary abnormality usually lies at the level of transcription, but sometimes mRNA processing may be affected. Examples of transcriptional alterations include the following. Chromosomal translocations resulting from errors in recombine mediated gene rearrangement in lymphoid cells activate expression of transcription factors like MYC, causing B and T cell neoplasias. Promoter mutations in the Caenorhabditis sex determining gene her-1 (the only member of this pathway subject to transcriptional control) increase expression levels and result in partial transformation of XX worms into phenotypic males. Increased, ectopic expression of a chimeric mRNA encoding a normal protein accounts for the lethal yellow mutant at the mouse agouti locus. Control of expression at the level of mRNA
The molecular basis of genetic dominance

Processing is illustrated by the heterochronic (defining developmental time) C elegans gene lin-14. Dominant mutants, which cause the re-expression of early cell lineages at later developmental stages, delete the 3' untranslated region (UTR) of the mRNA and lead to raised protein levels. This 3'UTR may regulate export of the transcript from the nucleus, transcript stability, or translation. Splice site mutations of mRNA subject to differential splicing will alter the pattern of mature mRNA isoforms: this is observed at the WT1 locus.55-56

INCREASED OR CONSTITUTIVE PROTEIN ACTIVITY

At the protein level, increased activity may be caused by increased half life or by loss of normal inhibitory regulation (constitutive activity). One class of mutations conferring increased half life are those occurring in PEST sequences (rich in proline, glutamic acid, serine, and threonine),66 which act as recognition signals for proteolytic degradation: loss of these sequences by C-terminal truncation stabilises the protein. Examples of PEST deletions include mutations of the CLN3 gene of Schizosaccharomyces pombe (WHI-1/DAF-1 cell cycle mutants)56 and the gpl-1 gene of C elegans.67 gpl-1 is required for induction of germine proliferation and embryogenesis, and the gpl-1(q35) point mutation is particularly instructive, as it causes both semidominant (multivulva) and recessive (sterility/embryonic lethality) phenotypes. The former is attributable to stabilisation of the truncated protein owing to the PEST deletion, while the latter may result from counteracting destabilisation of the mutant mRNA.55

A paradigmatic example of constitutive protein activity is provided by the RAS genes: oncogenic point mutations prevent GTP hydrolysis, thus maintaining the protein in an activated state53,54 (fig 3A). Similarly, activating missense mutations at the 201Arg residue of the Gα protein (which stimulates adenyl cyclase) have been documented (as somatic mosaics) in five cases of McCune-Albright syndrome.57 Different point mutations in the adult skeletal muscle sodium channel α subunit gene SCN4A cause hyperkalaemic periodic paralysis52,53 and paramyotonia congentia,58 by interfering with normal voltage sensitive inactivation of the sodium current. In view of the differing effects of single and triple dosage of the PMP-22 gene described above, it is interesting that the phenotype associated with a heterozygous missense mutation (16Leu→Pro) resembles that of triple dosage, that is, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease.69 This suggests that the missense mutation may increase PMP-22 activity, but this has not yet been shown.

A particularly complex spectrum of mutations is encountered at the Drosophila locus Notch, which encodes a transmembrane receptor protein that transduces a variety of cellular signals, and includes an extracellular domain rich in epidermal growth factor (EGF) like repeats. Increased intrinsic activity is associated with some of the so called Abruptax mutations: these are missense, clustered in the EGF domain, and are thought to perturb the normal balance of homo- and heterodimeric protein interactions.80-81 Heterozygous null (loss of function) mutations of Notch give a different phenotype, and yet other mutants exist that have recessive or dominant negative effects82,83 (see below). Another interesting Drosophila locus is Toll. This encodes a transmembrane protein that provides an unusual example of two distinct activation mechanisms (fig 3B): 84,85 "Class I" mutants are missense and act constitutively, possibly owing to direct structural modulation of the protein. "Class II" mutants are truncations that retain the extracellular component: this activates wild type Toll by an undefined mechanism. Mutants in the class II group differ genetically from other categories of active protein mutants in that they are non-functional when heterozygous to a null.86 Such truncation mutants more commonly cause dominant negative effects, as described below.

DOMINANT NEGATIVE MUTATIONS

In the heterozygous state these mutants antagonise the activity of the remaining wild type allele, giving a phenotype approaching a null: when homozygous, or heterozygous to a null mutation, they are non-functional. Herskowitz87 drew attention to the value of these mutations in experimental studies and proposed a classification. The major group com-

---

Figure 3. Diagrammatic representation of four gene products, illustrating the complex relationship of point mutation to phenotype. The N-terminus is on the left. *Indicates a missense alteration, † a frameshift or nonsense mutation leading to truncation. (A) let-60 ras.66 Additional mutations documented in human tumour67 are denoted †*. (B) Toll.68 C Kit.69 Truncations of the tyrosine kinase domain may have mixed haploinsufficient and dominant negative effects. Mutations W mutations are shown in brackets. (D) PS3.80 Clusters of missense mutations are represented by black boxes. Four specific missense mutations tested in vitro for presence or absence of dominant negative effects81 are shown individually.
prises multimeric proteins dependent on oligomerisation for activity: the presence in a multimer of a mutant subunit with intact binding but altered catalytic domains can abrogate the function of the entire multimer. For example, if the protein normally dimersises, admixture of equal numbers of normal and mutant subunits will result in only 25% normal dimers, potentially causing a 75% reduction in activity. For monomeric proteins, dominant negative mutations could occur if substrate was limiting: a mutant able to bind the substrate, but not metabolise it, would have this effect. Mutations of polymeric structural proteins, sometimes classed as dominant negative, are discussed separately (next section).

Dominant negative effects have been described in many types of protein with signalling or transcriptional functions. A specific example is provided by the DNA binding activity of Drosophila dorsal, mentioned previously, which depends on dimerisation: most mutations are true recessives, but one particular mutant exerts a dominant negative effect. This is an Arg→Cys substitution that maps to the DNA binding domain but does not affect oligomerisation: it appears to act by abolishing the DNA binding of normal mutant heterodimers. Similarly the more severe phenotype associated with WT1 mutations in Denys-Drash syndrome, as compared with Wilms's tumour/genitourinary abnormalities, may be explained by the dominant negative behaviour of specific zinc finger mutations in the former condition: it is not yet certain this is mediated by WT1 dimers. Specific Abrahimtex missense mutations at the Drosophila Notch locus are dominant negative, as mentioned above.

A wider variety of mutations may cause dominant negative effects in the KIT proto-oncogene, manifested as white spotting (W) in the mouse and piebaldism in the human. KIT encodes a receptor tyrosine kinase and dimerisation, which occurs in response to ligand binding, is essential for activity. Whereas the piebald phenotype associated with complete KIT deletion is relatively mild in the heterozygote (haploinsufficiency), point mutations involving the intracellular tyrosine kinase domain cause severe disease (fig 3C). Truncations in the same domain tend to have a variable, intermediate phenotype: although partly the result of haploinsufficiency, a dominant negative effect is probably also contributing, as seen in an analogous truncation of the fibroblast growth factor receptor (FGF-R). The reovirus cell attachment protein provides a further example.

Dominant negative effects may be very important in neoplasia, a paradigm being the tumour suppressor P53: a wide variety of acquired mutations has been described, the many missense mutants being concentrated in four clusters (fig 3D). p53 oligomerises in vitro and can adopt two conformations, one active and the other inactive; wild type protein is normally in the active state. Cotranslation with certain missense mutants results in mixed oligomers that adopt the inactive conforma-

tion. Thus, although P53 is conventionally viewed as a “recessive” tumour suppressor gene, some mutants can deregulate p53 function in a dominant negative fashion. In contrast, no alteration in wild type activity is induced by a missense mutant associated with the Li-Fraumeni syndrome, suggesting that Li-Fraumeni p53 mutants may be relatively “weak” ones. Note that the p53 oligomerisation domain lies at the extreme C-terminus (fig 3D); prematurely truncated forms cannot bind wild type and therefore do not act in a dominant negative fashion.

A possible example of Herskowitz’s second class of dominant negative effect, involving a monomeric protein, is provided by certain point mutations in the RAS gene (fig 3A). A mutant protein able to bind the guanine nucleotide exchange factor, but not activated by it, will deplete the pool of this limiting factor available for activation of normal RAS.

Intriguingly, the dominant negative principle seems to have been exploited by certain naturally occurring regulatory systems, and representatives of both Herskowitz’s classes are known. Belonging to the first class is the negative regulation, by formation of inactive heterodimers, of the transcription factors MyoD and C-Jun by the proteins Id and JunB respectively. Id is a truncated helix loop helix protein that forms dimers with MyoD, but lacks the adjacent basic region required for DNA binding. Similarly, critical amino acid substitutions in JunB abolish its homodimerisation and DNA binding, but favour formation of inactive JunB-c-Jun heterodimers.

Herskowitz’s second class is the interferon activator IRF1 and its antagonist IRF2; IRF2 has enhanced DNA binding and displaces IRF1 from the interferon promoter, but is only weakly activating.
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TOXIC PROTEIN ALTERATIONS

The common thread to these mutations, which are usually missense, is that they cause structural alterations in mono- or oligomeric proteins. These disrupt normal function and lead to toxic precursors or waste products from side reactions that poison the cell. Dominant negative effects are excluded. There are clear parallels with the mutational mechanisms in true structural proteins, but the phenotypic effects of toxic mutants are more unpredictable.

One commonplace example is the sickle mutation (haemoglobin S, β6Glu→Val). (Although this shows largely recessive behaviour, coinheritance of a second mutation in cis (haemoglobin S Antilles, β23Val→Ile) causes sickling to manifest in the heterozygote97). Other examples include missense mutations of C elegans degenerins, mec-4 and deg-1, which cause specific neuronal cells to swell up, vacuolate, and lyse92; a point mutation in mouse tyrosinase-related protein-1 (Light mutant) that disrupts melanosome structure93; and various point mutations in rhodopsin associated with slow degeneration of rod photoreceptor outer segments.94 A particularly striking group comprises the dominantly inherited hereditary amyloidoses, a diverse collection of diseases associated with alterations in the structure of soluble proteins that increase stability of the protein and predispose to multimerisation. Proteins implicated include transthyretin, β amyloid precursor protein, gelsolin, cystatin C, prion protein, apolipoprotein AI, lysozyme, and fibrinogen.94-96

NEW PROTEIN FUNCTIONS

The creation of new, advantageous protein functions by mutation is the life blood of evolution, but occurs over a protracted timescale. Proteins with truly new functions are only rarely encountered in natural human mutation and are usually pathological. Two categories may be recognised; missense mutations with specific functional effects, and assortative shuffling of exons. In protein engineering, which seeks to accelerate the evolutionary process and develop proteins with new functions, the same principles apply in the design of new mutants.

The serine protease inhibitors (serpins), popular targets for protein engineering, provide perhaps the best natural example involving a missense mutation. A (358Met→Arg) substitution in α1 antitrypsin converts its activity to antithrombin, by altering the specificity of the active site.98 Another example, identified only in vitro, is a missense mutant protein (mex) that facilitates cellular uptake of mevalonate99; the wild type protein lacks this activity, but its normal function is unknown.

The juxtaposition of domains from different proteins to generate potentially new functions is best illustrated by the chimeric fusion proteins produced by some oncogenic chromosome translocations.53,54 The c-ABL/BCR fusion products in the 9;22 Philadelphia translocation provide the most well characterised example, distinct chimeric fusion proteins being associated with chronic myeloid and acute lymphatic leukaemia.100 These proteins have a higher tyrosine kinase activity than normal c-ABL, and may also differ in substrate specificity. The PAX3 gene provides another example. Haploinsufficiency causes Waardenburg syndrome (see above), but translocations to a specific region of chromosome 13 is associated with alveolar rhabdomyosarcoma.101

OTHER MECHANISMS OF DOMINANCE

In this section are summarised briefly a variety of other more obscure, but nevertheless interesting mechanisms of dominance acting at a cellular level.

Position effect variegation in Drosophila is the variable reduction in expression of a gene juxtaposed to heterochromatin by chromosome rearrangement. Variegating mutations are generally recessive in that they reduce expression only from the rearranged (cis) chromosome. The brown locus is unusual in that expression is also reduced from the normal (trans) allele. This dominant effect seems to depend on somatic pairing between the homologous chromosomes, but the mechanisms of this and other 'trans sensing' effects are still uncertain.102,103

The phenomenon of nucleolar dominance in wheat reflects the relative expression of tandem ribosomal DNA from allelic loci. Expression at an individual locus correlates with the number of upstream regulatory sequences. These appear to compete for binding to limiting amounts of an activating protein, so that the more repeats present, the greater the likelihood of activation.104

Segregation distortion loci subvert the normal pattern of 1:1 gametic segregation, leading to meiotic drive. This may occur either at meiosis, when some property of the general structure or size of a chromosome gives it a replication advantage on the spindle (chromosomal drive), or postmeiotically, when direct competition between the gametes occurs (genic drive).105 This may allow disadvantageous mutations to spread through the population, by virtue of close linkage to the drive locus. A well known example is the t complex of mouse.

Unlinked non-complementation occurs when heterozygous mutations occur at two genes coding for interacting proteins. Whereas the heterozygous state for either locus on its own is silent, concurrent mutations at both loci cause the phenotypic threshold to be exceeded, and the disease becomes manifest. Examples include the interaction of α and β tubulin mutations in Drosophila106 and, more speculatively, the enhanced severity of dystrophin mutations in trans to an abnormal allele for autosomal recessive Fukuyama congenital muscular dystrophy.107

An allied phenomenon, called negative complementation or metabolic interference, occurs when two alleles at the same locus interact to give a more severe phenotype in the compound
DOMINANT INHERITANCE, WITHOUT DOMINANCE AT A CELLULAR LEVEL

Although the vertical transmission of an abnormal character is usually assumed to imply dominance of the mutation at the cellular level, this is not always the case. In humans, two exceptions are sufficiently important to have been included in the table: recessive anticonsequences and imprinted loci.

Retinoblastoma provides the paradigmatic example of a phenotype that segregates in a dominant pattern, yet is the result of a mutation (in the RB1 gene) that is recessive at a cellular level. Cells carrying a heterozygous RB1 mutation are entirely normal, but a “second hit” somatic mutation of the normal allele in at least one retinal cell (a relatively likely event) causes retinoblastoma.109 Analogous putative “anticonsequences” or “tumour suppressors” have been cloned in several other dominantly inherited cancer syndromes, including Li-Fraumeni syndrome (P53), neurofibromatosis types 1 and 2, familial adenomatous polyposis (APC), and Von Hippel-Lindau disease. At the cellular level, evidence for a purely recessive mechanism of gene action is, however, less certain than with RB1, and varying contributions from haploinsufficient and dominant negative effects are possible, as discussed for P53 and APC.

Genomic imprinting may give rise to a complex pattern of dominant inheritance. If a gene is transcribed only from the chromosome originating from one of the two parents, the locus is effectively hemizygous. Mutation of the allele on the ‘active’ chromosome will completely inactivate the locus, whereas mutation of the allele on the other chromosome will have no phenotypic effect. Apparent dominant transmission of the disorder can occur, but this will show dependence on the sex of the transmitting parent. Representative pedigrees are provided by transgenic mutation of the mouse insulin-like growth factor-II gene,111 and in the human diseases Beckwith-Wiedemann syndrome112 and hereditary paranglioma.113

Perspectives on human genetic disease

Although this classification may initially appear to be an academic exercise, appreciation of these various mechanisms is helpful for thinking about disease processes. For example, perusal of the table and fig 3 indicates that a different mutational spectrum may be anticipated in different diseases, according to their cellular mechanism. A wide variety of mutations cause loss of function: disease genes with a high mutation rate will often be haploinsufficient and be involved in regulatory pathways as well as tumour suppressor genes. A search for constitutional chromosomal abnormalities (deletions, translocations), which provide such an invaluable resource for disease location and positional cloning,114 is much more likely to be successful in this group than in the “gain of function” categories. By contrast, acquired chromosomal abnormalities in neoplasia may often pinpoint specific oncogenes involved in “gain of function” transformation. The phenotype associated with missense mutations will usually be critically dependent on their exact position and nature, except in structural proteins; hence multiple, independent point mutations as a cause of dominant disease are most commonly encountered in such proteins.

In understanding mechanisms of cancer, the dominant negative effects illustrated for P53 may occur in other tumour suppressor genes. For instance, germline mutations of the APC gene cause familial adenomatous polyposis/Gardner’s syndrome, and somatic mutations occur in sporadic colon cancer. The amino acid sequence of APC predicts that it will form coiled coils, structural elements that permit oligomerisation.115,116 The majority of APC mutants, both germline and somatic, are missense117,118 and some could disrupt normal oligomers to give dominant negative effects. Analysis of the particular mutations present may therefore guide prognosis.

The mechanisms of dominance in conditions associated with unstable triplet repeats (for example, fragile X syndrome, myotonic dystrophy, and Huntington’s disease) are not yet clear, and probably heterogeneous, with effects owing to alterations in both mRNA expression and protein function. Although the (CGG)n expansion in the fragile X syndrome is associated with DNA methylation and absence of FMR-1 gene expression,119 in myotonic dystrophy, DMK alleles containing (CTG)n expansions may actually be overexpressed120 (although this is disputed121,122). Other potential variables are whether the expanded triplet lies in the coding or non-coding region of the protein, and the sequence of the repeat itself.123 Complete elucidation of the mechanisms of dominance associated with triplet repeat expansion may well yield some surprises.

Finally, an understanding of the molecular mechanism of a disease is a prerequisite for attempting gene therapy. Nearly all diseases currently targeted for gene therapy are recessive,114 in which the goal is simply to replace the missing product. It should be evident that most categories of dominant disease pose a formidable challenge to gene therapy, but already the “molecular engineers” are contemplating strategies to overcome these problems. Examples include antisense RNA therapy to antagonise selectively the action of dominant negative mutants; or conversely, the introduction of such mutants to counteract the effects...
increased mRNA expression or protein activity.

The idea for this review originated from a meeting of the Genetics Society ("Dominance and recessiveness revisited"). Edinburgh, 25 September 1992. I am very grateful to the organizer, Veronica van Heyningen, and all contributing speakers for putting together this stimulating meeting. I am also grateful to Professor Higgs, Peter Harper, William Readon, Sarah Slaney, and an anonymous referee who made helpful comments on the manuscript.
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