



## Chloride's Exciting Role in Neonatal Seizures Suggests Novel Therapeutic Approach

### Progressive NKCC1-Dependent Neuronal Chloride Accumulation During Neonatal Seizures.

Dzhala VI, Kuchibhotla KV, Glykys JC, Kahle KT, Swiercz WB, Feng G, Kuner T, Augustine GJ, Bacskai BJ, Staley KJ. *J Neurosci* 2010;30(35):11745–11761.

Seizures induce excitatory shifts in the reversal potential for GABA<sub>A</sub>-receptor-mediated responses, which may contribute to the intractability of electro-encephalographic seizures and preclude the efficacy of widely used GABAergic anticonvulsants such as phenobarbital. We now report that, in intact hippocampi prepared from neonatal rats and transgenic mice expressing Clomeleon, recurrent seizures progressively increase the intracellular chloride concentration ([Cl<sup>-</sup>]<sub>i</sub>) assayed by Clomeleon imaging and invert the net effect of GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor activation from inhibition to excitation assayed by the frequency of action potentials and intracellular Ca<sup>2+</sup> transients. These changes correlate with increasing frequency of seizure-like events and reduction in phenobarbital efficacy. The Na<sup>+</sup>-K<sup>+</sup>-2Cl<sup>-</sup> (NKCC1) cotransporter blocker bumetanide inhibited seizure-induced neuronal Cl<sup>-</sup> accumulation and the consequent facilitation of recurrent seizures. Our results demonstrate a novel mechanism by which seizure activity leads to [Cl<sup>-</sup>]<sub>i</sub> accumulation, thereby increasing the probability of subsequent seizures. This provides a potential mechanism for the early crescendo phase of neonatal seizures.

### Commentary

Inhibition in the central nervous system is dependent on chloride conductance through GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor-associated channels. When chloride channels open, the membrane potential is driven toward chloride's reversal potential, and because chloride's reversal potential is negative to the neuron's threshold for firing action potentials, it normally has an inhibitory effect. GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors have binding sites for both barbiturates and benzodiazepines, allowing them to enhance the inhibitory effect of GABA at this receptor; it is this mechanism of action that is responsible for the anticonvulsant activity of these agents.

Prolonged seizure activity reduces the efficacy of GABAergic antiepileptic drugs (AEDs) such as benzodiazepines and barbiturates. If postsynaptic GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor responsiveness was reduced, one would expect GABAergic agents to lose efficacy as well. Indeed, a gradual suppression of GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor responses occurs during *in vitro* kindling (1) and GABA receptor internalization during ongoing seizures and status epilepticus has been documented (2), accounting for pharmacoresistance to GABAergic agents in these settings.

One might also expect reduced inhibitory efficacy to result from intracellular buildup of chloride: prolonged neuronal activity results in elevated extracellular potassium concentrations, and this potassium is cleared in part by neuronal

transporters that bring potassium back into the cells. NKCC1 is one such transporter, and when this transporter brings potassium back into the cells, it imports chloride with it. The resultant elevation of intracellular chloride will reduce efficacy of GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor-mediated synaptic inhibition by making the chloride reversal potential less negative. However, in the mature nervous system, the KCC2 transporter will do its best to counteract this chloride buildup by extruding chloride and restoring normal homeostasis.

In the immature nervous system, however, the KCC2 transporter is not fully expressed. This makes the neonate more vulnerable to intracellular chloride buildup mediated by the NKCC1 transporter. Indeed, immature neurons have elevated baseline concentrations of intracellular chloride; as a result, neonatal GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor responses are not only less inhibitory, they may actually be excitatory (3, 4). The excitatory action of GABA-mediated chloride conductance is believed to contribute to the increased incidence of seizures in human neonates (5). There is a progressive developmental increase in expression of the chloride-extruding transporter KCC2 in the brain that eventually allows for the full expression of hyperpolarizing GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor responses; in the rat hippocampus, this occurs by the end of the second postnatal week (6).

Numerous experiments have been done examining the efficacy of barbiturates in neonatal seizure models *in vitro* and *in vivo*, with conflicting results (7, 8). The current paper by Dzhala and colleagues attempts to make sense of this controversial area of investigation. The authors propose that the differences in response to GABAergic AEDs may correlate with



timing of treatment relative to seizure onset and recurrence. They test the hypothesis that seizure duration and recurrence induce a progressive NKCC1-driven change in chloride reversal potential that underlies the reduction in inhibitory efficacy and seizure exacerbation over time. They therefore suggest that blocking the NKCC1 transporter may be an effective approach to reducing chloride accumulation, thereby suppressing GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor-mediated excitation, ameliorating the continued seizure activity, and restoring the efficacy of GABA-modulating AEDs.

The investigators performed extracellular electrophysiologic recordings from intact isolated hippocampi from neonatal rats. They also used transgenic CLM-1 mice expressing Clomeleon, which allowed for high-resolution two-photon chloride imaging of CA3 pyramidal cells and interneurons. Although their findings were at times contradictory, their conclusions seem valid and potentially important.

They first exposed the hippocampi to a GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor agonist and demonstrated an inhibitory effect, as evidenced by an overall suppression of spontaneous neuronal firing. This was somewhat surprising in light of numerous previous slice studies in which excitatory GABA responses have been demonstrated at this developmental stage. The authors suggest, based on their measurements of intracellular chloride concentration, that neurons at this stages are heterogeneous in this regard, with some having sufficiently elevated levels of chloride to produce excitatory GABA responses but most expressing inhibition.

The authors proceeded to monitor chloride levels in CA3 pyramidal cells expressing recurrent seizure discharges and demonstrated progressive increases in intracellular chloride concentration with recurrent seizures; this increase persisted for hours following termination of the final seizure, suggesting lowered seizure threshold persists during this time as a result of deficient GABA inhibition. They then showed that the reduction of barbiturate efficacy was also proportional to the number of preceding seizures, correlating with the increase in intracellular chloride.

It has previously been shown that prolonged seizure activity (status epilepticus) causes excitatory shifts in GABA reversal potential, reducing inhibitory efficacy of GABA (9). What this paper adds to the story is that this effect is progressive with recurrent seizures: the more seizures, the more intracellular chloride rises; and the more chloride rises, the more excitatory the GABA<sub>A</sub>-mediated response. Furthermore, this effect can persist for hours following recurrent seizures, reducing seizure threshold during that time as well.

The most impressive data in this paper are shown in Figure 9: after first demonstrating a baseline net inhibitory action of GABA agonist, GABA responses are elicited following an episode of status epilepticus, and the GABA agonist at this time point elicits an excitatory response and continues to do so for hours following seizure termination. When the experiment is performed in the presence of bumetanide, an NKCC1 antagonist, the baseline inhibitory effect of the GABA agonist is retained following status epilepticus, convincingly demonstrating an NKCC1-dependent mechanism for the seizure-induced enhanced hippocampal excitability mediated by reversal of GABA effect from inhibitory to excitatory.

Bumetanide is an FDA-approved diuretic that is available on the market. Its inhibitory effect at the NKCC1 transporter suggests possible additional utility in suppressing neonatal seizures, especially ongoing status epilepticus or recurrent clusters of seizures that have become refractory to GABA-modulating AED therapies. Regrettably, studies with other seizure models do not consistently find this agent to be efficacious in suppressing neonatal seizures (10, 11). And although bumetanide may help suppress acute prolonged seizures, such treatment has not been effective in preventing kindling epileptogenesis of secondary seizure foci (11). Nevertheless, the results of Dzhala et al. do suggest that barbiturate resistance may indeed be ameliorated by concurrent administration of bumetanide. Although many questions remain to be answered, the authors are to be commended for making a valiant effort to resolve the controversies regarding varying barbiturate efficacy in neonatal seizures and for suggesting a potential novel adjunctive therapy utilizing a clear mechanistic approach. Indeed, a better understanding of seizure mechanisms in different epilepsy syndromes provides the opportunity to craft improved therapeutic regimens.

by Lisa R. Merlin, MD

#### References

- Merlin LR, Wong RKS. Synaptic modifications accompanying epileptogenesis in vitro: Long-term depression of GABA-mediated inhibition. *Brain Res* 1993;627:330–340.
- Kapur J, Macdonald RL. Rapid seizure-induced reduction of benzodiazepine and Zn<sup>2+</sup> sensitivity of hippocampal dentate granule cell GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors. *J Neurosci* 1997;17:7532–7540.
- Cherubini E, Rovira C, Gaiarsa JL, Corradetti R, Ben-Ari Y. GABA mediated excitation in immature rat CA3 hippocampal neurons. *Int J Dev Neurosci* 1990;8:481–490.
- Ben-Ari Y. Excitatory actions of GABA during development: The nature of the nurture. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2002;3:728–739.
- Moshe SL, Albala BJ, Ackermann RF, Engel JJ. Increased seizure susceptibility of the immature brain. *Dev Brain Res* 1983;7:81–85.
- Rivera C, Voipio J, Payne JA, Ruusuvaara E, Lahtinen H, Lamsa K, Pirvola U, Saarna M, Kaila K. The K<sup>+</sup>/Cl<sup>-</sup> cotransporter KCC2 renders GABA hyperpolarizing during neuronal maturation. *Nature* 1999;397:251–255.
- Velisek L, Veliskova J, Patchewich Y, Ortiz J, Shinnar S, Moshe SL. Age-dependent effects of gamma-aminobutyric acid agents on flurothyl seizures. *Epilepsia* 1995;36:636–643.
- Quilichini PP, Diabira D, Chiron C, Milh M, Ben-Ari Y, Gozlan H. Effects of antiepileptic drugs on refractory seizures in the intact immature corticohippocampal formation in vitro. *Epilepsia* 2003;44:1365–1374.
- Khalilov I, Holmes GL, Ben-Ari Y. In vitro formation of a secondary epileptogenic mirror focus by interhippocampal propagation of seizures. *Nat Neurosci* 2003;6:1079–1085.
- Kilb W, Sinning A, Luhmann HJ. Model-specific effects of bumetanide on epileptiform activity in the in-vitro intact hippocampus of the newborn mouse. *Neuropharmacology* 2007;53:524–533.
- Nardou R, Ben-Ari Y, Khalilov I. Bumetanide, an NKCC1 antagonist, does not prevent formation of epileptogenic foci but blocks epileptic focus seizures in immature rat hippocampus. *J Neurophysiol* 2009;101:2878–2888.



# American Epilepsy Society

## *Epilepsy Currents Journal*

### Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

#### **Instructions**

The purpose of this form is to provide readers of your manuscript with information about your other interests that could influence how they receive and understand your work. Each author should submit a separate form and is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the submitted information. The form is in four parts.

#### **1. Identifying information.**

Enter your full name. If you are NOT the main contributing author, please check the box “no” and enter the name of the main contributing author in the space that appears. Provide the requested manuscript information.

#### **2. The work under consideration for publication.**

This section asks for information about the work that you have submitted for publication. The time frame for this reporting is that of the work itself, from the initial conception and planning to the present. The requested information is about resources that you received, either directly or indirectly (via your institution), to enable you to complete the work. Checking “No” means that you did the work without receiving any financial support from any third party – that is, the work was supported by funds from the same institution that pays your salary and that institution did not receive third-party funds with which to pay you. If you or your institution received funds from a third party to support the work, such as a government granting agency, charitable foundation or commercial sponsor, check “Yes”. Then complete the appropriate boxes to indicate the type of support and whether the payment went to you, or to your institution, or both.

#### **3. Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work.**


This section asks about your financial relationships with entities in the bio-medical arena that could be perceived to influence, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work. For example, if your article is about testing an epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) antagonist in lung cancer, you should report all associations with entities pursuing diagnostic or therapeutic strategies in cancer in general, not just in the area of EGFR or lung cancer.

Report all sources of revenue paid (or promised to be paid) directly to you or your institution on your behalf over the 36 months prior to submission of the work. This should include all monies from sources with relevance to the submitted work, not just monies from the entity that sponsored the research. Please note that your interactions with the work’s sponsor that are outside the submitted work should also be listed here. If there is any question, it is usually better to disclose a relationship than not to do so.

For grants you have received for work outside the submitted work, you should disclose support ONLY from entities that could be perceived to be affected financially by the published work, such as drug companies, or foundations supported by entities that could be perceived to have a financial stake in the outcome. Public funding sources, such as government agencies, charitable foundations or academic institutions, need not be disclosed. For example, if a government agency sponsored a study in which you have been involved and drugs were provided by a pharmaceutical company, you need only list the pharmaceutical company.

#### **4. Other relationships**

Use this section to report other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work.



# American Epilepsy Society

## Epilepsy Currents Journal

### Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

#### Section #1 Identifying Information

1. Today's Date: 2/14/2011
2. First Name Lisa Last Name Merlin Degree M.D.
3. Are you the Main Assigned Author?  Yes  No  
If no, enter your name as co-author \_\_\_\_\_
4. Manuscript/Article Title: **Chloride's exciting role in neonatal seizures suggests novel therapeutic approach**
5. Journal Issue you are submitting for: Epilepsy Currents 11.3

#### Section #2 The Work Under Consideration for Publication

Did you or your institution at any time receive payment or services from a third party for any aspect of the submitted work (including but not limited to grants, data monitoring board, study design, manuscript preparation, statistical analysis, etc.)?

Complete each row by checking "No" or providing the requested information. If you have more than one relationship just add rows to this table.

Type	No	Money Paid to You	Money to Your Institution*	Name of Entity	Comments**
1. Grant	X				
2. Consulting fee or honorarium	X				
3. Support for travel to meetings for the study or other purposes	X				
4. Fees for participating in review activities such as data monitoring boards, statistical analysis, end point committees, and the like	X				
5. Payment for writing or reviewing the manuscript	X				
6. Provision of writing assistance, medicines, equipment, or administrative support.	X				
7. Other	X				

\* This means money that your institution received for your efforts on this study.

\*\* Use this section to provide any needed explanation.

**Section #3 Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work.**

Place a check in the appropriate boxes in the table to indicate whether you have financial relationships (regardless of amount of compensation) with entities as described in the instructions. Use one line for each entity; add as many lines as you need by clicking the “Add” box. You should report relationships that were present during the 36 months prior to submission.

Complete each row by checking “No” or providing the requested information. If you have more than one relationship just add rows to this table.

Type of relationship (in alphabetical order)	No	Money Paid to You	Money to Your Institution*	Name of Entity	Comments**
1. Board membership	X				
2. Consultancy	X				
3. Employment	X				
4. Expert testimony	X				
5. Grants/grants pending	X				
6. Payment for lectures including service on speakers bureaus	X				
7. Payment for manuscript preparation.	X				
8. Patents (planned, pending or issued)	X				
9. Royalties	X				
10. Payment for development of educational presentations	X				
11. Stock/stock options	X				
12. Travel/accommodations/meeting expenses unrelated to activities listed.**	X				
13. Other (err on the side of full disclosure)	X				

\* This means money that your institution received for your efforts.

\*\* For example, if you report a consultancy above there is no need to report travel related to that consultancy on this line.

**Section #4 Other relationships**

Are there other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work?

  X   No other relationships/conditions/circumstances that present a potential conflict of interest.

     Yes, the following relationships/conditions/circumstances are present:

---

Thank you for your assistance.  
*Epilepsy Currents* Editorial Board