

Current Literature

In Basic Science



Runaway Dendrites: Blame the Older Siblings

Abnormalities of Granule Cell Dendritic Structure Are a Prominent Feature of the Intrahippocampal Kainic Acid Model of Epilepsy Despite Reduced Postinjury Neurogenesis.

 Murphy BL, Hofacer RD, Faulkner CN, Loepke AW, Danzer SC. *Epilepsia* 2012;53:193–199.

PURPOSE: Aberrant plastic changes among adult-generated hippocampal dentate granule cells are hypothesized to contribute to the development of temporal lobe epilepsy. Changes include formation of basal dendrites projecting into the dentate hilus. Innervation of these processes by granule cell mossy fiber axons leads to the creation of recurrent excitatory circuits within the dentate. The destabilizing effect of these recurrent circuits may contribute to hyperexcitability and seizures. Although basal dendrites have been identified in status epilepticus models of epilepsy associated with increased neurogenesis, we do not know whether similar changes are present in the intrahippocampal kainic acid model of epilepsy, which is associated with reduced neurogenesis. **METHODS:** In the present study, we used Thy1-YFP-expressing transgenic mice to determine whether hippocampal dentate granule cells develop hilar-projecting basal dendrites in the intrahippocampal kainic acid model. Brain sections were examined 2 weeks after treatment. Tissue was also examined using ZnT-3 immunostaining for granule cell mossy fiber terminals to assess recurrent connectivity. Adult neurogenesis was assessed using the proliferative marker Ki-67 and the immature granule cell marker calretinin. **KEY FINDINGS:** Significant numbers of cells with basal dendrites were found in this model, but their structure was distinct from basal dendrites seen in other epilepsy models, often ending in complex tufts of short branches and spines. Even more unusual, a subset of cells with basal dendrites had an inverted appearance; they completely lacked apical dendrites. Spines on basal dendrites were found to be apposed to ZnT-3 immunoreactive puncta, suggestive of recurrent mossy fiber input. Finally, YFP-expressing abnormal granule cells did not colocalize Ki-67 or calretinin, indicating that these cells were more than a few weeks old, but were found almost exclusively in proximity to the neurogenic subgranular zone, where the youngest granule cells are located. **SIGNIFICANCE:** Recent studies have demonstrated in other models of epilepsy that dentate pathology develops following the aberrant integration of immature, adult-generated granule cells. Given these findings, one might predict that the intrahippocampal kainic acid model of epilepsy, which is associated with a dramatic reduction in adult neurogenesis, would not exhibit these changes. Herein we demonstrate that hilar basal dendrites are a common feature of this model, with the abnormal cells likely resulting from the disruption of juvenile granule cell born in the weeks before the insult. These studies demonstrate that postinjury neurogenesis is not required for the accumulation of large numbers of abnormal granule cells.

Commentary

Temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE) is one of the most common intractable epilepsy syndromes encountered in the clinic. Hippocampal pathology in TLE patients includes loss of hilar cells and pyramidal neurons in CA1 and CA3, astro- and microgliosis, and architectural abnormalities of the dentate granule cells (DGCs). The latter comprises three main structural alterations. First is an abnormal localization of the DGC soma, resulting in dispersion of the granule cell layer and hilar ectopic DGCs. Second, the axonal projections of DGCs (termed “mossy fibers”) remodel abnormally as well, resulting in mossy fiber sprouting into the dentate inner molecular layer, where DGCs normally receive synaptic inputs (1). Third, many DGCs exhibit abnormal

dendritic trees with dendrites projecting into the hilus; these are known as hilar basal dendrites (HBDs) (2, 3).

Multiple animal models of TLE exist. These models are typically created by local or systemic administration of chemicals, toxins, or electrical stimulation to induce status epilepticus (4). Although they differ in the degree to which they recapitulate the aforementioned neuropathologic abnormalities, the presence of mossy-fiber sprouting seems to be a constant finding (5). The presence of HBDs, however, has only been examined and identified in a subset of TLE models to date, including those involving intraperitoneal application of either kainic acid (KA) or pilocarpine (2, 3). Of interest, in both of these animal models, the induction of epilepsy markedly increases DGC neurogenesis (6). Furthermore, only DGCs maturing during, or especially those generated after, the epileptogenic insult exhibit persistent HBDs (7–9).

The study by Murphy et al. aims to investigate whether HBDs might be present in the only known adult rodent model

Epilepsy Currents, Vol. 12, No. 6 (November/December) 2012 pp. 222–224
© American Epilepsy Society

OPEN ACCESS Freely available online



of TLE associated with reduced DGC neurogenesis: the mouse intrahippocampal KA model (10). In this model, nanomolar amounts of the ionotropic glutamate receptor agonist KA are unilaterally injected stereotactically into the dorsal hippocampus of adult mice, allowing the use of the contralateral hippocampus as a relative control. Soon after the injection, epileptiform discharges occur in the ipsilateral hippocampus, followed by discharges in the cortex, and then by convulsive status epilepticus that lasts for hours. Spontaneous seizures that originate in the ipsilateral hippocampus begin after a few weeks (11).

In the present study, the authors took advantage of the H line of Thy1–yellow fluorescent protein (YFP)–expressing mice. This line shows YFP expression in the soma and dendrites of subsets of hippocampal cells, including mature (more than 4 weeks old) DGCs, allowing precise characterization of dendritic structure with the use of confocal microscopy. Brains were examined by immunohistochemistry 2 weeks after KA injections. Initially, the authors validated their use of the model by confirming the appearance in the treated hippocampus of pathologic changes previously reported in this model. These abnormalities include granule cell dispersion, hypertrophy of DGC somata, and mossy-fiber sprouting; in addition, the changes were absent in the contralateral hippocampus, in naive animals, and in those that received intrahippocampal vehicle injection.

The authors next examined the dendritic structure of DGCs in the injected hippocampus, focusing on persistent HBDs. While none of the DGCs in the hippocampus contralateral to the KA injection exhibited HBDs, 20% of those in the ipsilateral side did. HBDs in other animal models of TLE tend to be thin and long, with limited branching; also, they are present in addition to the normal apical dendrites that DGCs commonly display. In mice experiencing intrahippocampal KA-induced seizures, HBDs conformed to this classical appearance, but 30% of DGCs with HBDs (6% of the total DGC population) exhibited what the authors called “tufted” HBDs. These are very short and thick dendrites that terminate in a rich arborization pattern. Furthermore, DGCs with tufted HBDs lacked apical dendrites.

HBDs have been proposed to participate in epileptogenesis by receiving excitatory synaptic inputs from DGC mossy fibers projecting to the hilus, thereby creating a source of recurrent excitation. The authors evaluated the possibility that tufted HBDs are also innervated by mossy fibers using immunohistochemistry for the zinc transporter ZnT-3, which is enriched in mossy-fiber terminals. They found that dendritic spines of both typical and tufted HBDs are in close apposition to ZnT-3 immunoreactive puncta. Although this finding is very suggestive of mossy fibers innervating HBDs in this model, definite proof of synapse formation will require more detailed anatomic (i.e., electron microscopy) or electrophysiological experiments.

The location of the DGCs with HBDs within the granule cell layer was examined, and the cells were found to be closer to the hilar border than DGCs without HBDs. Cells expressing calretinin, a marker of immature DGCs in mice, also exhibited disorganized dendritic processes in the ipsilateral hippocampus, while showing normal apical dendrites contralaterally. Both results, along with the finding that the majority of DGCs have normal dendritic trees, suggest that only DGCs at a

younger developmental stage are susceptible to development of persistent HBDs after the epileptogenic insult, as has been found after systemic KA- or pilocarpine-induced status epilepticus (7–9). Thus, although neurogenesis is decreased in this TLE model, DGCs that are still differentiating during KA injection, the “older siblings” of neural stem cell progeny that are probably suppressed by KA-induced damage to the germinal zone, are likely responsible for HBD formation rather than the preexisting population of mature DGCs generated in the perinatal period. Stronger evidence to support this idea should be relatively easy to obtain using conditional transgenic reporter mice or retroviral reporters to birth-date DGCs.

A main finding of this work, in addition to identifying HBDs in the intrahippocampal KA model, is that the HBDs may exhibit more varied morphologic characteristics such as the tufted appearance seen in DGCs with no apical dendrites. Along with previous studies, this report shows that HBDs and other pathologic characteristics of TLE are present in models associated with and in those without increased neurogenesis. The results also suggest that during the neural differentiation process, susceptibility periods exist during which epileptogenic insults may cause cells to acquire an abnormal structure. Delineating such susceptibility windows and the mechanisms underlying them could help in the development of preventive, as opposed to symptomatic, treatments for TLE.

The presence of HBDs and their innervation by mossy fibers are a possible pathway for increased auto/paracrine excitation of DGCs leading to overall hippocampal hyperexcitability. However, whether HBDs contribute to or are merely an epiphenomenon of the epileptogenic process in TLE remains to be determined. Future studies will need to focus on this question and, ideally, also compare the relative importance of recurrent mossy-fiber excitation of HBDs, DGC apical dendrites, and hilar ectopic DGCs in abnormal network function.

by Gustavo Patino, MD, and Jack M. Parent, MD

References

1. Tauck DL, Nadler JV. Evidence of functional mossy fiber sprouting in hippocampal formation of kainic acid-treated rats. *J Neurosci* 1985;5:1016–1022.
2. Buckmaster PS, Dudek FE. In vivo intracellular analysis of granule cell axon reorganization in epileptic rats. *J Neurophysiol* 1999;81:712–721.
3. Ribak CE, Tran PH, Spigelman I, Okazaki MM, Nadler JV. Status epilepticus-induced hilar basal dendrites on rodent granule cells contribute to recurrent excitatory circuitry. *J Comp Neurol* 2000;428:240–253.
4. Sharma AK, Reams RY, Jordan WH, Miller MA, Thacker HL, Snyder PW. Mesial temporal lobe epilepsy: Pathogenesis, induced rodent models and lesions. *Toxicol Pathol* 2007;35:984–999.
5. Sutula TP, Dudek FE. Unmasking recurrent excitation generated by mossy fiber sprouting in the epileptic dentate gyrus: An emergent property of a complex system. *Prog Brain Res* 2007;163:541–563.
6. Parent JM, Kron MM. Neurogenesis and epilepsy. In: *Jasper's Basic Mechanisms of the Epilepsies*. 4th ed. (Noebels JL, Avoli M, Rogawski MA, eds.) Bethesda, MD: National Center for Biotechnology Information (US); 2012. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK50785>. Accessed July 30th, 2012
7. Walter C, Murphy BL, Pun RY, Spieles-Engemann AL, Danzer SC. Pilocarpine-induced seizures cause selective time-dependent



- changes to adult-generated hippocampal dentate granule cells. *J Neurosci* 2007;27:7541–7552.
8. Jessberger S, Zhao C, Toni N, Clemenson GD Jr., Li Y, Gage FH. Seizure-associated, aberrant neurogenesis in adult rats characterized with retrovirus-mediated cell labeling. *J Neurosci* 2007;27:9400–9407.
 9. Kron MM, Zhang H, Parent JM. The developmental stage of dentate granule cells dictates their contribution to seizure-induced plasticity. *J Neurosci* 2010;30:2051–2059.
 10. Kralic JE, Ledergerber DA, Fritschy JM. Disruption of the neurogenic potential of the dentate gyrus in a mouse model of temporal lobe epilepsy with focal seizures. *Eur J Neurosci* 2005;22:1916–1927.
 11. Raedt R, Van Dycke A, Van Melkebeke D, De Smedt T, Claeys P, Wyckhuys T, Vonck K, Wadman W, Boon P. Seizures in the intrahippocampal kainic acid epilepsy model: Characterization using long-term video-EEG monitoring in the rat. *Acta Neurol Scand* 2009;119:293–303.



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 9, 2012
2. First Name Jack Last Name Parent Degree MD
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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Various Law Firms	Medico-legal work
5. Grants/grants pending	<input type="checkbox"/>		Yes	NIH, CURE, EF, AES	Grant Support
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
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"/>	Yes		NIH, ANA, AES, EF, Gordon Research Conference	Travel to meetings or grant reviews
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:

Thank you for your assistance.



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: 10/9/2012
2. First Name Gustavo Last Name Patino Degree MD, PhD
3. Are you the Main Assigned Author? Yes No

If no, enter your name as co-author: Jack Parent

4. Manuscript/Article Title: Runaway Dendrites: Blame the older siblings
5. Journal Issue you are submitting for: 12.6

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 checked="" 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"/>		X		
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
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:

Thank you for your assistance.
Epilepsy Currents Editorial Board