



The Devil Is in the Details: Stem Cells for the Treatment of Epilepsy

Differentiation and Functional Incorporation of Embryonic Stem Cell-Derived GABAergic Interneurons in the Dentate Gyrus of Mice With Temporal Lobe Epilepsy.

Maisano X, Litvina E, Tagliatela S, Aaron GB, Grabel LB, Naegele JR. *J Neurosci* 2012;32(1):46–61.

Cell therapies for neurological disorders require an extensive knowledge of disease-associated neuropathology and procedures for generating neurons for transplantation. In many patients with severe acquired temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE), the dentate gyrus exhibits sclerosis and GABAergic interneuron degeneration. Mounting evidence suggests that therapeutic benefits can be obtained by transplanting fetal GABAergic progenitors into the dentate gyrus in rodents with TLE, but the scarcity of human fetal cells limits applicability in patient populations. In contrast, virtually limitless quantities of neural progenitors can be obtained from embryonic stem (ES) cells. ES cell-based therapies for neurological repair in TLE require evidence that the transplanted neurons integrate functionally and replace cell types that degenerate. To address these issues, we transplanted mouse ES cell-derived neural progenitors (ESNPs) with ventral forebrain identities into the hilus of the dentate gyrus of mice with TLE and evaluated graft differentiation, mossy fiber sprouting, cellular morphology, and electrophysiological properties of the transplanted neurons. In addition, we compared electrophysiological properties of the transplanted neurons with endogenous hilar interneurons in mice without TLE. The majority of transplanted ESNPs differentiated into GABAergic interneuron subtypes expressing calcium-binding proteins parvalbumin, calbindin, or calretinin. Global suppression of mossy fiber sprouting was not observed; however, ESNP-derived neurons formed dense axonal arborizations in the inner molecular layer and throughout the hilus. Whole-cell hippocampal slice electrophysiological recordings and morphological analyses of the transplanted neurons identified five basic types; most with strong after-hyperpolarizations and smooth or sparsely spiny dendritic morphologies resembling endogenous hippocampal interneurons. Moreover, intracellular recordings of spontaneous EPSCs indicated that the new cells functionally integrate into epileptic hippocampal circuitry.

Commentary

Defects in GABA-mediated inhibition are associated with a large number of neurologic disorders, including epilepsy. Therefore, it is not surprising that cell replacement therapy is considered a potential option to replace lost or dysfunctional interneurons in the diseased brain. Previous studies demonstrated that interneuron progenitors derived from the embryonic medial ganglionic eminence (MGE) possess a unique ability to migrate long distances away from injection sites after transplantation into neonatal or adult brain (1). Following early postnatal transplantation, greater than 95% of these MGE-derived progenitors integrate as GABAergic interneurons that can selectively elevate GABA_A receptor-mediated inhibition to principal neurons (2) and dramatically suppress spontaneous seizures in a mouse model of pediatric epilepsy (3). These studies provided proof-of-principle that interneuron transplantation could have disease-modifying effects in the epileptic

brain and raised hope for an epilepsy cell therapy. Derivation of a transplantable mouse or human MGE cell line from which relatively pure and safe populations of interneurons can be produced in large quantities is a critical next step in this field.

Generation of an interneuron cell source first requires a thorough understanding of interneuron diversity and origin. Interneurons represent a broad class of GABAergic cells encompassing many subtypes, each with distinct morphologies, physiological properties, gene expression profiles, and connectivity patterns. Many of these subtypes have distinct spatial and temporal origins within the embryonic subpallium, and it is now well established that, at least in rodents, cortical interneurons are primarily generated in the medial or caudal ganglionic eminences (CGE) and preoptic area (4). Cell-type specification within these progenitor zones is tightly regulated by a combination of genes, transcription factor codes, and secreted molecules to produce distinct populations of interneurons. For example, most parvalbumin (PV), somatostatin (SST), and neuronal nitric oxide synthase (nNOS) subtypes arise from the MGE, and this region typically expresses the transcription factors *Dlx1/2*, *Nkx2.1*, and *Lhx6*. Whereas, vasoactive intestinal peptide (VIP), bipolar calretinin (CR), and reelin interneuron

Epilepsy Currents, Vol. 12, No. 6 (November/December) 2012 pp. 213–215
© American Epilepsy Society

OPEN ACCESS Freely available online



subtypes arise from the CGE and express the transcription factors *Dlx1/2*, *CoupTFII*, or the ionotropic serotonin receptor, 5HT3A. Knowledge of these transcription factors has fueled early efforts to generate MGE embryonic stem (ES) cell lines.

Here, Maisano and collaborators examined the differentiation of mouse ES-derived progenitor cells in the epileptic brain, with the goal of replacing hilar SST interneurons lost or damaged after status epilepticus. Similar to the *Lhx6*-green fluorescent protein (GFP) GFP cell line strategy described by Anderson and colleagues (5), the authors used a *Sox1*-GFP mouse cell line to generate progenitor cells directed toward a ventral forebrain fate. When grafted into the dentate gyrus of adult mice 2 weeks after pilocarpine injection, and analyzed 2 to 3 months later, *Sox1*-GFP-derived ES cells formed a heterogeneous group of cells that expressed a mature neuronal marker and included a proportion of interneurons. Of interest, transplanted progenitor cells survived in the adult hippocampus of pilocarpine-treated mice and were shown to exhibit mature firing properties; in addition, some received functional excitatory inputs. Important next steps include determining whether these cells have disease-modifying activity in this model, and more complete characterization of the entire graft-derived cell population. In terms of the latter, anatomic and physiological findings were only reported for a small group of cells that appeared to differentiate into mature interneurons and not for the remaining population of *Sox1*-GFP derived cells. Of these cells, nearly all displayed firing properties consistent with regular spiking non-pyramidal neurons, but fewer than 10% of these cells were immunoreactive for any of the standard interneuron neurochemical markers examined, and none were SST+. A low expression of the MGE-specific transcription factor *Nkx2.1* during differentiation in vitro, the relative absence of SST and PV interneuron subtypes in vitro and in vivo, and very limited migration after transplantation suggest that the *Sox1*-GFP ES-cell differentiation protocol may not recapitulate the native embryonic MGE environment. This is not altogether surprising as *Sox1* is a transcription factor restricted to neuroectoderm that is then expressed in probably all neural progenitors, and *Sox1*-GFP ES cell lines were previously shown to generate both neurons and glia (6, 7).

These studies, while an important step in stem cell biology, highlight a number of significant challenges that must be overcome to produce specific subsets of neurons for therapeutic purposes. These include inefficient and uncontrolled differentiation of ES cells into mixed cell populations, a relatively slow course of differentiation and development in vivo, and the tendency for ES cells to form tumors after transplantation. In this study, only one mouse developed an "apparent teratocarcinoma." However, tumor formation following grafting of ES cells may be more prevalent than initially realized, as a follow-up manuscript from this group revealed that cell grafts using an identical mouse *Sox1*-GFP ES-cell differentiation protocol resulted in tumors in nearly 90% of the host animals (8). Efforts to reduced tumorigenesis are ongoing (8, 9), and there are positive signs from human ES-cell protocols that enriched populations of GABAergic striatal projection neurons (10) or bipolar calretinin neurons (11) can be generated.

As the stem cell field advances, and additional cell lines emerge, the fundamental question remains whether transplantation of interneuron progenitors can suppress spontaneous seizures in an adult model of epilepsy. Temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE) with pharmaco-resistant seizures is a common epileptic disorder and presents unique challenges for any cell-based therapy. In rodents, the most widely used TLE models have relatively high seizure frequencies, which is advantageous from an experimental perspective. However, significant mortality, reported variability in seizure onset locations, and high sensitivity of some interneurons to repetitive seizures, and injury-induced homeostatic changes in circuit function might make it difficult to effectively "replenish" vulnerable interneuron subtypes in these animals. Whether acquired models of TLE in rodents represent the best system in which to test novel cell therapies is an open question. Nevertheless, it seems likely that a successful cell therapy for epilepsy will require generation of a highly pure population of transplantable GABA interneurons that migrate and integrate into the host circuitry. This study by Maisano and collaborators raises awareness for a more stringent characterization of ES-derived cells and provides an early step in the progression toward an interneuron-based cell therapy for epilepsy.

by Robert F. Hunt, PhD, and Scott C. Baraban, PhD

References

1. Wichterle H, Garcia-Verdugo JM, Herrera DG, Alvarez-Buylla A. Young neurons from medial ganglionic eminence disperse in adult and embryonic brain. *Nat Neurosci* 1999;2:461–466.
2. Alvarez-Dolado M, Calcagnotto ME, Karkar KM, Southwell DG, Jones-Davis DM, Estrada RC, Rubenstein JL, Alvarez-Buylla A, Baraban SC. Cortical inhibition modified by embryonic neural precursors grafted into the postnatal brain. *J Neurosci* 2006;26:7380–7389.
3. Baraban SC, Southwell DG, Estrada RC, Jones DL, Sebe JY, Alfaro-Cervello C, Garcia-Verdugo JM, Rubenstein JL, Alvarez-Buylla A. Reduction of seizures by transplantation of cortical GABAergic interneuron precursors into Kv1.1 mutant mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2009;106:15472–15477.
4. Gelman DM, Marín O, Rubenstein JLR. The generation of cortical interneurons. In: *Jasper's Basic Mechanisms of the Epilepsies*. 4th ed. (Noebels JL, Avoli M, Rogawski MA, Olsen RW, Delgado-Escueta AV, eds.) Bethesda, MD: National Center for Biotechnology Information; 2012:786–796.
5. Maroof AM, Brown K, Shi SH, Studer L, Anderson SA. Prospective isolation of cortical interneuron precursors from mouse embryonic stem cells. *J Neurosci* 2010;30:4667–4675.
6. Ying QL, Stavridis M, Griffiths D, Li M, Smith A. Conversion of embryonic stem cells into neuroectodermal precursors in adherent monoculture. *Nat Biotechnol* 2003;21:183–186.
7. Glavaski-Joksimovic A, Thonabulsombat C, Wendt M, Eriksson M, Palmgren B, Jonsson A, Olivius P. Survival, migration, and differentiation of *Sox1*-GFP embryonic stem cells in coculture with an auditory brainstem slice preparation. *Cloning Stem Cells* 2008;10:75–88.
8. Chung S, Shin B-S, Hedlund E, Pruszkak J, Ferree A, Kang UJ, Isacson O, Kim K-S. Genetic selection of *sox1*GFP-expressing neural precursors removes residual tumorigenic pluripotent stem cells and attenuates tumor formation after transplantation. *J Neurochem* 2006;97:1467–1480.



9. Germain ND, Hartman NW, Cai C, Becker S, Naegele JR, Grabel LB. Teratocarcinoma formation in embryonic stem cell-derived neural progenitor hippocampal transplants [published online ahead of print July 5, 2012]. *Cell Transplant*. PMID: 22776287.
10. Ma L, Hu B, Liu Y, Vermilyea SC, Liu H, Gao L, Sun Y, Zhang X, Zhang SC. Human embryonic stem cell-derived GABA neurons correct locomotion deficits in quinolinic acid-lesioned mice. *Cell Stem Cell* 2012;10:455–464.
11. Cambray S, Arber C, Little G, Dougalis AG, de Paola V, Ungless MA, Li M, Rodríguez TA. Activin induces cortical interneuron identity and differentiation in embryonic stem cell-derived telencephalic neural precursors. *Nat Commun* 2012;3:841 Abstract.



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: October 8, 2012
2. First Name Scott Last Name Baraban Degree PhD
3. Are you the Main Assigned Author? Yes No

If no, enter your name as co-author:

4. Manuscript/Article Title:
5. Journal Issue you are submitting for: Epilepsy Currents

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
2. Consulting fee or honorarium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
3. Support for travel to meetings for the study or other purposes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4. Fees for participating in review activities such as data monitoring boards, statistical analysis, end point committees, and the like	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
5. Payment for writing or reviewing the manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
6. Provision of writing assistance, medicines, equipment, or administrative support.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
7. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>				

* 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
2. Consultancy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
3. Employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4. Expert testimony	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
5. Grants/grants pending	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6. Payment for lectures including service on speakers bureaus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
7. Payment for manuscript preparation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
8. Patents (planned, pending or issued)	<input type="checkbox"/>				Patent pending: Transplantation of neural cells
9. Royalties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
10. Payment for development of educational presentations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
11. Stock/stock options	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
12. Travel/accommodations/meeting expenses unrelated to activities listed.**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
13. Other (err on the side of full disclosure)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

* 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?

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

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

Co-founder with Arnold Kriegstein, Arturo Alvarez-Buylla and John Rubenstein of Neurona Therapeutics.

Thank you for your assistance.
Epilepsy Currents Editorial Board