Immunoproteastasis: Can we harness it treat AD?

Todd E. Golde, M.D., Ph.D. Director, Center for Translational Research in Neurodegenerative Disease Director 1Florida ADRC Professor, Department of Neuroscience University of Florida College of Medicine <u>tgolde@mbi.ufl.edu</u>

Disclosures:

Current: Inventor on Patents/Patent Applications relating to GSMs, STLRs, Ab immunotherapy, and BRI peptides. Honorarium Alzheimer's Res and Therapy Co-Editor in Chief

A little bit of history



Dogma in the field for many years was a pro-inflammatory state would drive the AD cascade (inferred from systemic amyloidosis)







A Quiz: Amyloid, Oligomer or Virus?



Lysozyme Amyloid and Protofibrils AFM



A β Oligomers EM



Tobacco Etch Virus AFM



Potato Virus AFM



rAAV EM



Aβ Protofibrils AFM

A normal protein (self) folded into a protein aggregate becomes a danger associated molecular pattern (nonself) that can activate innate immunity like a virus or

center for translational research in neurodegenerative disease





A β and other amyloids (?) are DAMPs



Both fibrillar A β and α -synuclein activate innate immunity as assessed by Nanostring Gene Counter Arrays







Widespread Innate Immune Gene Upregulation in Neurodegenerative models of AD, PD, ALS, and FTD









Immunoproteostasis (Chakrabarty et al Neuron 2015)

- Aggregated proteins forming inclusions found in neurodegenerative proteinopathies activate the innate immune system
 - i.e., they are Danger Associated Molecular Patterns (DAMPs) that can activate both intra- and extracellular pattern recognition receptors (PRRs)
- In turn, innate immune activation can contribute to the degenerative cascade and cognitive dysfunction.
 - Best examples: HIV dementia, sepsis?
- Innate immune signaling can also regulate proteostasis of key pathogenic proteins linked to neurodegenerative disorders.
- I'd like to propose that we term this complex interplay between the innate immune system and the proteinopathy, *immunoproteostasis*.
- Emerging genetic data implicates genes in the immune systems in AD (e.g., TREM2) and PD.
- Outcomes of altered immunoproteostasis may be critically dependent on context: timing, duration and strength of the signals.



Selective Dopaminergic Cell Death by rAAV-IFN- γ



Chakrabarty P, et al. Interferon-gamma induces progressive nigrostriatal degeneration and basal ganglia calcification. Nat Neurosci. 2011;14(6):694-6.

Immunoproteostasis may contribute to pathology spread Golde et al JCI 2013



College of Medicine

αS IM injection reduces survival in M83+/+ Tg mice.



Sacino A N et al. PNAS 2014;111:10732-10737



©2014 by National Academy of Sciences

Can we harness immunoproteostasis to treat AD and other neurodegenerative Disorders

- Opportunities:
 - Potential for disease modification in later stages of disease –downstream of trigger
 - Efficacy in multiple diseases?
 - Possibility of cognitive effect in absence of disease modification
 - Lots of targets
 - Potential to genetically validate target in humans

Can we harness immunoproteostasis to treat AD and other neurodegenerative disorders

- Challenges:
 - Delicate balance between positive and negative effects of innate immune signaling on proteostasis, neurodegeneration and cognitive function
 - This balance may be contextually dependent on the nature, strength and timing of the Innate Immune Signals
 - Immunoproteostasis in mice may be different then in aged humans
 - Aging skews human brain towards a "proinflammatory" state in the apparent absence of underlying proteinopathy (Cribbs et al JNI 2012)
 - Potential for "untoward" systemic effects

Manipulating Innate Immune Activation States in the APP mouse brain studies in CRND8 mice (rAAV1)



- II-6 Chakrabarty et al FASEB yohet here cytokine
- INF- Wengkip relation from on horoir of regulars
- TNF Chake Barty et al Mol. Neurodegeneration 2011
- II-4 Chakrabarty et al Mol. Neurodegeneration 2012
- Il-10 Chakrabarty et al Neuron 2015

Systems Analysis of Nanostring Based RNA quantification data identify APOE as a possible factor in mediating the IL-10 phenotype



Chakrabarty et al Neuron 2015

APOE binds aggregated A β and impairs microglial phagocytosis



CXCL10 reduces A\beta loads



rAAV-IL-10 accelerates tauopathy in homozygous JNPL3 mice (in progress)



rAAV-TNF α Makes tau mice better??



Harnessing soluble Toll Like Receptors (sTLRs) as AD therapeutics?



•TLRs are cell surface or endosomal PRR that paly major roles in innate immune activation

•Select sTLRs might bind A β aggregates but also dampen inflammation.

•What will they do to pathology?

•In addition to sTLR 2,4,6 we tested sTLR5 as it's only known ligand is flagellin a fibrillar protein

•All of these TLRs are expressed at low levels the mouse and human brain but can be induced in AD/aging

rAAV2/1-sTLR-FcV5 transduction dramatically reduces A β plaque pathology and microgliosis



CRND P0 to 6 months (n >12 in all groups) + Preliminary Data (n= 4-5) an ~50 reduction of Aβ loads following Hippocampal rAAV delivery from 6 to 9 months

How is sTLR5 working? Direct Binding of $A\beta$

BLI determined binding affinity



- 10uM Abeta 42
- 5uM Abeta 42
- 2.5uM Abeta 42
- 1.25uM Abeta 42
- 0.625uM Abeta 42



A systems level approach may help (RNA seq data on SAGE SYNAPSE)



Funding Provided by the NIA/NIH Accelerating Medicine Partnership (U01 AG-01493)

Discordant DEG between AD and 20 month old CRND8 APP mice

	log FC	FC Log Fc		
	AD v C	FDR	Tg v Non Tg	FDR
DUSP1	0.56	0.000279964	-0.81	0.00000223
JUNB	0.29	0.073092398	-0.51	0.013088013
HAVCR2	-0.25	0.07683679	1.24	0.000338239
GUSB	-0.28	0.001435684	0.74	0.00000555
MLXIPL	-0.30	0.004527746	0.67	0.33775106
SELPLG	-0.31	0.056524677	0.44	0.025928842
MPEG1	-0.33	0.089103971	1.77	4.7E-39
PNPLA7	-0.36	0.000289267	0.46	0.028309628
NLRP3	-0.38	0.009241254	1.15	0.189043447
MMP19	-0.41	0.00102898	0.69	0.522921551
AIF1	-0.41	0.018854884	0.58	0.195938201
CAPN3	-0.41	0.012136044	0.64	0.060402145
LILRB4	-0.44	0.017139569	2.10	0.002516225
P2RY13	-0.50	0.004898898	0.82	0.000168063
CD22	-0.54	0.005084601	1.75	0.033218481
PLD4	-0.55	0.000312735	0.96	0.0000401
P2RY12	-0.72	0.004559564	0.58	0.002706418
CX3CR1	-0.89	0.000394162	0.98	4.27E-22

A systems level approach may help (RNA seq data on SAGE SYNAPSE) example 20 month old CRND8 APP mice

Gene	Name	p value	% Control
Prmt3	protein arginine N-methyltransferase 3	2.7917E-10	59%
Laptm5	lysosomal-associated protein transmembrane 5	2.42551E-09	251%
Hspb6	heat shock protein, alpha-crystallin-related, B6	2.79078E-09	204%
C4b	complement component 4B (Chido blood group)	7.42587E-09	384%
Gfap	glial fibrillary acidic protein	1.96049E-08	520%
463242	RIKEN cDNA 4632428N05 gene	2.58914E-08	193%
St14	suppression of tumorigenicity 14 (colon carcinoma	2.59738E-08	370%
Csf3r	colony stimulating factor 3 receptor (granulocyte)	3.38337E-08	227%
Gusb	glucuronidase, beta	3.48591E-08	162%
Cybrd1	cytochrome b reductase 1	5.57443E-08	298%
Lag3	lymphocyte-activation gene 3	5.58617E-08	340%
Trem2	triggering receptor expressed on myeloid cells 2	5.80413E-08	389%
Dap	death-associated protein	9.05299E-08	154%
Inpp5d	inositol polyphosphate-5-phosphatase D	9.42382E-08	172%
Cd68	CD68 antigen	2.07126E-07	330%
Ctsz	cathepsin Z	2.20427E-07	210%
Man2b	mannosidase 2, alpha B1	2.35119E-07	187%

N = 8 per group, Illumina High Seq 101 bp reads ~100 million reads per sample



Discordant gene expression changes between primary microglia treated with A β and old APP mice.

Primary Microglia				
Gene	P value	% Change		
ALOX5AP	2.8E-05	19%		
PTGS1	3.02E-05	22%		
CTSD	6.12E-06	34%		
IGF1	7.57E-06	35%		
CTSB	2.59E-05	36%		
SCARB1	7.38E-05	41%		
Ubiquilin2	0.000149	41%		
CX3CR1	8.73E-06	44%		
CD68	2.16E-05	47%		
APOE	1.65E-05	47%		
LAMP1	6.8E-06	51%		
C5AR1	5.42E-07	52%		
ADAM10	1.49E-05	53%		
GUSB	2.02E-05	55%		
STAT3	4.41E-05	66%		
JAK2	0.00011	<mark>343%</mark>		
TNFSF10	1.26E-05	<mark>345%</mark>		
IFIH1	0.000106	353%		
DDX58	3.87E-05	512%		
ZBP1	7.87E-05	1060%		

20 M CRND8 APP Mice					
P value	% Change				
NS	85%				
NS	114%				
0.002975	203%				
NS	157%				
NS	96%				
NS	87%				
		neuron			
0.000921	79%	enriched			
0.00108	184%				
3.14E-05	348%				
NS	114%				
NS	103%				
NS	180%				
NS	86%				
0.005787	180%				
NS	131%				
NS	78%				
NS	92%				
NS	96%				
NS	144%				
NS	159%				

Concluding Thoughts

- Converging Pathological, Biologic and Genetic Evidence implicates alterations in innate immunity in Alzheimer's disease and other Neurodegenerative Proteinopathies
- Preconceived concepts of how innate immunity alters phenotypes need to be tested empirically
- Clear potential to identify novel disease modifying targets/therapies
- But we may need systems level analysis to understand how a given manipulation alters the phenotype

Preconceived notions may not be correct



Concluding Thoughts (following my marching orders)

- Age: Yes
- Selective vulnerability: Yes
- Pathogenic interactions: Yes
- Sequence of events: More work to done
- Progression: More work to done
- Mixed pathology: Not AD specific
- Multiple clinical phenotypes: Certainly could play a role?
- Biomarkers: Needs more study?
- Risk factors: Yes Evidence For Genetic and Environmental
 - Why do the elderly often tank cognitively when the get an infection
- Translational potential: Yes, but a cautious approach is warranted



Acknowledgements

- Paramita Chakrabarty, Yona Levites, Andy Li, Awilda Rosario, Carolina Ceballos-Diaz, Brenda Moore, Pedro Cruz, Pritam Das (Mayo), Chris Janus, Benoit Giasson, Jada Lewis, Jacob Ayers, David Borchelt, Arun Srivastava, George Aslanadi, Nathan Price, Cory Funk, James Eddy, Nick McFarland, Edgar Rodriguez, Doris Deng, Maria Parianos, John Gutierrez, John Butterfield, Meghan Pardo, Christian Archer
- Funding: NIH/NIA (AMP, RO1, ADRC), Ellison Medical Foundation, Thome Medical Foundation, ALSA, BrightFocus, UF QSPA