

How to Successfully Apply Animal Studies in Experimental Allergic Encephalomyelitis to Research on Multiple Sclerosis

Lawrence Steinman, MD,¹ and Scott S. Zamvil, MD, PhD²

In their Point of View entitled "Experimental Allergic Encephalomyelitis: A Misleading Model of Multiple Sclerosis," Sriram and Steiner¹ wrote, "The most disappointing aspect of EAE [experimental allergic encephalomyelitis] as a potential model for MS is its almost total inability to point toward a meaningful therapy or therapeutic approach for MS." Actually, EAE has led directly to the development of three therapies approved for use in multiple sclerosis (MS): glatiramer acetate, mitoxantrone, and natalizumab. Several new approaches to MS are in clinical trials based on positive indications in preclinical work relying on EAE. New clues to the pathogenesis of MS and new potential surrogate markers for MS are shown from research involving EAE when it is critically coupled with actual findings in MS. There are pitfalls in overreliance on the EAE model, or on any animal model for any human disease. Nevertheless, over the past 73 years, the EAE model has proved itself remarkably useful for aiding research on MS.

Ann Neurol 2006;60:12–21

Any discussion of the pros and cons of the animal models of multiple sclerosis (MS), collectively known as experimental allergic encephalomyelitis (EAE), must address our present state of knowledge about MS. MS is a complicated disease, the cause and pathogenesis of which are incompletely understood. Though we have made progress in therapy of MS, treatment is imperfect. Current therapies reduce the frequency of relapse, somewhere between 33 and 66%, and delay disease progression to a modest extent in relapsing-remitting and secondary progressive MS.² There is no single test we can run to determine whether someone has "MS," and there is no surrogate marker for us to measure to assess whether MS is worsening. Whether MS is actually a single disease or whether it is primarily or initially an "immune disease," "an infectious disease," "an inflammatory disease," or a "degenerative disease," or a combination of all of these types are all questions with answers that are currently unknown. A few genetic factors have been associated with MS, most prominently genes of the major histocompatibility complex (MHC).³ A genetic basis for MS is clearly only part of the story because concordance in identical twins is less than even 50%. Many environmental factors have been associated with MS, although none can be considered definitively linked. Therefore, set in this context in

which nearly all of the major questions about human MS remain unanswered, this critique addresses how our understanding of MS has been aided by studies on a collection of animal models known as EAE, first described almost three quarters of a century ago. Given all these uncertainties about MS, it is remarkable that studies on EAE have culminated thus far in three MS therapies and have led to a better understanding of the biology of MS. Clever applications of the EAE model will be a valuable tool for understanding the pathology of MS, for making better biomarkers for its diagnosis and prognosis, and for creating ever improved and safe therapies for this disease. To study a disease such as MS, without support from available animal models, is to unnecessarily create obstacles in a task that is complicated enough.

A Brief History of Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis

In the 1930s, workers at Rockefeller University discovered an animal model, now known as EAE.⁴ The first experiments were aimed at understanding episodes of paralysis that sometimes accompany vaccination. Three years ago, on the 70th anniversary of the first publication on EAE, we wrote in the *Journal of Experimental Medicine* of Rockefeller University:

From the ¹Department of Neurology and Neurological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA; and ²Department of Neurology, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA.

Received May 2, 2006. Accepted for publication May 9, 2006.

Published online June 26, 2006 in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com). DOI: 10.1002/ana.20913

Address correspondence to Dr Steinman, Beckman Center for Molecular Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305.
E-mail: steinman@stanford.edu

One of the most enduring models of human disease now celebrates the seventieth anniversary of its publication in *The Journal of Experimental Medicine*. Thomas Rivers, working at the Hospital of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, along with his colleagues D.H. Sprunt and G.P. Berry, submitted the article entitled, "Observations on Attempts to Produce Disseminated Encephalomyelitis in Monkeys," on Feb. 21, 1933 (4). Rivers established this model to try to understand what caused neurological reactions to certain viral infections like smallpox and in some circumstances to vaccinations like rabies: the very first sentence of this landmark paper reads, "During convalescence from certain diseases notably smallpox, vaccinia and measles, and during or following vaccination against rabies, an occasional patient develops symptoms and signs referable to the central nervous system."⁵

Thus, the EAE model was initially constructed to understand acute disseminated encephalomyelitis, not MS. Acute paralysis was observed in the first reported models with inflammatory changes in the central nervous system. Later versions of more chronic EAE have been developed with pathology including demyelination and axonal damage and clinical events such as relapsing and remitting episodes of paralysis,⁶ all of which are features common to MS. We must remember then that EAE is a collection of various models reflecting features of acute disseminated encephalomyelitis, as well as MS. The relation between acute disseminated encephalomyelitis and MS remains an enigma itself.

Many refinements and variations have been developed in the past 75 years. Even the name EAE has evolved from experimental allergic encephalomyelitis to experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis. Researchers have developed numerous variations of EAE including models for optic neuritis,⁷ relapsing-remitting MS,⁸⁻¹⁰ and progressive MS.⁹ Some of these models reflect certain aspects of the pathology seen in MS including axonal degeneration together with demyelination.¹⁰ Researchers have constructed EAE models with essential genes, such as human leukocyte antigen (HLA) DR2 associated with susceptibility to MS, installed into mice as transgenes.^{11,12} Others have devised forms of EAE in nonhuman primates such as the marmoset that reflect essential aspects of the pathology of MS with high fidelity.¹³ Numerous mouse versions of EAE exist where important components of the immune system have been "knocked out" by homologous recombination.¹⁴ Thus, there is no single model of EAE that we refer to in this critique, rather, it is the ensemble of EAE models, which have been reported in more than 5,000 publications since 1933.

Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis for the Development of Approved Therapies of Multiple Sclerosis: Three Case Studies

Sriram and Steiner¹ wrote, "The most disappointing aspect of EAE as a potential model for MS is its almost total inability to point toward a meaningful therapy or therapeutic approach for MS." We take a position nearly diametrically opposite to that perspective: Indeed, six medications have received approval from the US Food and Drug Administration for treatment of MS, and three of them, glatiramer acetate, mitoxantrone and natalizumab, were developed after showing promise in EAE. Moreover, glatiramer acetate and natalizumab were invented after a set of logical and forward-looking experiments in the EAE model, which elucidated key targets in the pathogenesis of MS. Here, we review how experiments in EAE led to the development of three approved drugs for MS and how the model has been useful in helping us to understand the disease. Approved therapies that have been developed with the EAE model and new targets of interest developed using the EAE model are shown in the Figure.

Michael Sela and his colleagues Ruth Arnon and Dvora Teitelbaum¹⁵⁻¹⁷ first conceived glatiramer acetate in the early 1970s. They made a series of random copolymers based on the molar ratios of four amino acids, glutamate, alanine, tyrosine, and lysine, that are present in myelin basic protein. Sela and McDevitt¹⁸ had shown 5 years earlier that the antibody response to ordered copolymers of tyrosine and glutamate on a backbone of alanine and lysine was under strict genetic control linked to the MHC. McDevitt and Sela's work opened the field of the genetic control of the immune response. Their discovery that such control was linked to the MHC had widespread implications for immunology. More than just a coincidence, genes within the MHC are the most critical for imparting genetic susceptibility to MS. Moreover, the MHC HLA class I and class II gene products, HLA-A, -B, -DR, and -DQ, are the likely targets for glatiramer. Interactions of glatiramer with the MHC turned out to be critical in understanding its mechanism of action (see Fig).

In 1971, Sela and colleagues¹⁵ showed that the random copolymer composed of glutamate, tyrosine, alanine, and lysine, termed *Copolymer 1*, was able to suppress the induction of acute EAE. They then showed that Copolymer 1 blocked relapsing EAE in the guinea pig and EAE in the nonhuman primate.¹⁹⁻²¹ Initial clinical testing of glatiramer was undertaken in Jerusalem under the direction of Abramsky²² in patients with MS and acute disseminated encephalomyelitis. Clinical testing of glatiramer by Bornstein and colleagues²³ showed that glatiramer was effective in reducing relapses in relapsing-remitting MS. A pivotal trial leading to FDA approval, under the leadership of Johnson,²⁴ showed that relapses were reduced by 29% in patients




Fig. General scheme for pathogenesis of MS. T and B cell homing to the central nervous system is followed by inflammation mediated by antibodies, complement and the toxic effect of cytokines. Medications approved for multiple sclerosis (MS) that arose from studies on experimental allergic encephalomyelitis (EAE) are shown in black. Promising therapies for MS elucidated from a creative interplay of work in MS and in EAE are shown in red. ECM = extracellular matrix; IFN = interferon; IL = interleukin; MHC = major histocompatibility complex; TNF = tumor necrosis factor; VCAM = vascular cell adhesion molecule.

receiving daily injections. Glatiramer acetate, trademarked Copaxone from the original name Copolymer 1, was approved in 1996 for treatment of relapsing-remitting MS. Glatiramer acetate was thus first derived from a preclinical conception and invention in the acute EAE model, and was then taken through proof of concept in various acute and relapsing models of EAE. Success in the EAE model was followed by demonstration of clinical efficacy in relapsing-remitting MS. Glatiramer acetate currently is one of the most popular medications for treatment of relapsing-remitting MS, and more than 100,000 individuals with MS worldwide have received glatiramer acetate treatment.²⁵ It took a quarter of a century for the development of glatiramer from the publications of the first results in EAE to its approval for relapsing-remitting MS!

There are multiple mechanisms of action associated with glatiramer, and many of these mechanisms were first unveiled in the EAE model. Antigen-specific modulation of the immune response to myelin basic protein has been described.^{21,26} Modulation of the immune response with glatiramer leads to deviation of cytokine production in response to myelin basic protein from so-called Th1 cytokines such as γ interferon

to Th2 cytokine production.²⁶ Another mechanism of action centers on the random chemical structures inherent in this random copolymer that allow it to bind to molecular targets with a wide combinatorial array of peptides based on four amino acids. Glatiramer binds to MHC molecules derived from most genetic backgrounds.^{27–29} With its capacity to bind to a broad array of MHC molecules, glatiramer could compete with many proteins for these critical molecules responsible for presentation of antigen to T lymphocytes.

Given its widespread binding to diverse HLA molecules, it is not surprising that glatiramer may have non-specific effects on the immune system. Glatiramer has been shown not only to block EAE, but is active in preventing models of inflammatory bowel disease and even amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.^{30–32} This implies that the effect on MS may not even be specific for this disease, but that it may have a more general effect on immune modulation. Even though there are multiple potential mechanisms of action for glatiramer, and even though this drug may have potential uses in other diseases, the undisputed history of the development of glatiramer shows that it emanated from experiments on a treatment for EAE. One might reasonably conclude

that without EAE, there would not have been a glatiramer for treatment of MS.

Mitoxantrone was developed for treatment of MS, after promising results published in the mid-1980s in reversing paralysis in the EAE model. The first article on mitoxantrone in EAE described mitoxantrone as a novel “anthracenedione that has shown antineoplastic activity against a variety of experimental tumors.”³³ At the time, there was great interest in this class of drugs, because numerous cytotoxic agents, including azathioprine, had shown promise in MS.³⁴ Thus, mitoxantrone was tried in the EAE model in the rat. Ongoing paralysis was reversed, and the number and extent of perivascular lesions in brain was reduced after treatment with mitoxantrone. Given its promise in the EAE model, clinical development of mitoxantrone was taken forward in the clinic, leading to its approval for use in MS. FDA approval in 2000 for its use in secondary progressive MS and progressive or worsening relapsing-remitting MS was granted for reducing frequency of relapses and slowing clinical progression of disease. Success in the EAE model clearly spurred translation of this approach to the clinic in MS.^{35,36}

Natalizumab is yet another example of a drug that was developed directly from work in the EAE model. In the early 1990s, immunologists had developed the working hypothesis that there were specific “molecular addresses” for lymphocyte homing to various organs. Some referred to this as the “Zip Code Hypothesis” for lymphocyte homing. In collaboration with Yednock and colleagues³⁷ at a small biotechnology company, Athena Neurosciences, the Steinman laboratory at Stanford determined the precise molecule involved in lymphocyte adhesion to inflamed brains taken from rats with EAE.³⁸ Using an assay where frozen sections were cut on brains with EAE, the researchers bound human and rodent lymphocytes to the inflamed EAE sections. Monoclonal antibodies were then applied to these sections to see whether this lymphocyte binding could be blocked, and by inference, what molecules were involved in the association of lymphocytes to inflamed brain tissue. More than 20 monoclonal antibodies to most of the adhesion molecules known at that time were tried on these sections of EAE brain, and only monoclonal antibodies binding $\alpha 4$ or $\beta 1$ integrin molecules inhibited adhesion of lymphocytes to the inflamed blood vessels in the brain.³⁷

We then proceeded to test whether a monoclonal antibody to $\alpha 4\beta 1$ integrin could block paralysis induced by T-cell clones that recognized myelin basic protein. These clones caused clinical paralysis and brain inflammation in a classic acute EAE model. The antibody to $\alpha 4\beta 1$ integrin inhibited the development of paralysis when given at a dose of 4 to 6.4mg/kg in the Lewis rat. An article published in 1992 in *Nature* stated:

Previous work on alpha-4 beta-1-dependent cell adhesion has mainly involved studies with endothelium that has been grown and stimulated in culture. The in vitro section assay described here extends those observations by showing that alpha-4 beta-1 integrin is crucial for the adhesion of leukocytes to vessels that have been activated in vivo. Furthermore, in vivo administration of anti-alpha 4 integrin prevented paralysis associated with the pathogenic inflammation of EAE. Therapy based on inhibiting alpha-4 beta-1 integrin, or the ligand for this receptor on brain endothelium may prove effective in treating inflammatory disease in CNS.³⁷ From these experiments in EAE, it was recognized that blockade of $\alpha 4\beta 1$ integrin might be useful for MS. In 1995, pathologists demonstrated the vascular cell adhesion molecule-1, the binding partner for $\alpha 4\beta 1$ integrin, was expressed in MS lesions. Over the next 10 years, clinical development of a humanized monoclonal antibody to $\alpha 4\beta 1$ integrin showed that it had remarkable efficacy in blocking relapses of MS and even delaying disease progression.^{39,40} Phase 3 studies showed that over a 2-year period, injection of 300mg of monoclonal $\alpha 4\beta 1$ integrin reduced the relapse rate by two thirds. The dose was directly in the range shown to be effective in the experiments in EAE reported in 1992.³⁷ Indeed, the development of natalizumab was a tangible result of research in the EAE model.³⁸

Natalizumab has had a bipolar existence: It was approved in November 2004 for use after 1 year of data were available in the 2-year phase 3 clinical trial. Within 3 months, three cases of Progressive Multifocal Leukoencephalopathy (PML) were observed, with 2 deaths. The drug was voluntarily withdrawn. Unfortunately, PML does not occur in the animal species used in the EAE model, and this usually fatal complication was neither observed nor could it have been even tested in any EAE model or any available animal model for that matter. Investigators searched to see whether blockade of $\alpha 4\beta 1$ was associated with increased risk for infection to microbes such as cytomegalovirus and Borna virus. No increased risk for opportunistic infections with either of these viruses was observed. The EAE model has limitations, and it is not particularly useful for examining the issue of opportunistic infections, especially when the microbe in question has a species barrier.

It should also be mentioned that β interferons, the other major category of drugs approved for treatment of MS, have shown success when tested in EAE models.⁴¹ However, the β interferons were not developed initially because they showed promise in EAE, but rather because of the interest in development of antiviral therapies for MS. Therefore, we do not count the development of β interferons for therapy of MS as a triumph for applications of research on EAE. We do, however, consider the development of glatiramer, mi-

tozantrone, and natalizumab a direct consequence of research in the EAE model. So far, research on EAE has given three gifts of new therapies for treatment of MS.

Problems and Promise of Using Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis for Development of Therapies for Multiple Sclerosis

There is a long list of drugs that have shown promise in EAE models that are now being taken forward into the clinic. Other approaches including an orally available sphingosine inhibitor,⁴² statins,⁴³⁻⁴⁶ an orally available carboxamide,^{47,48} and a monoclonal antibody to IL-2 receptor⁴⁹⁻⁵¹ have shown great promise in phase 2 trials based first on success in the EAE model (see Fig).

Of course, there are numerous examples of drugs that are effective in EAE, only to fail when tested in MS. One conclusion from these negative studies is that EAE is a poor predictor of success in MS. One must, however, examine the process of drug development to realize that preclinical research in EAE is merely just "exploratory," whereas human clinical trials in MS undergo a rigorous "developmental" process, involving three phases of testing. Thus, once success is seen in EAE, one has to contend with issues such as formulation, dosing, and unforeseen toxicities when a drug is taken forward into clinical testing on humans. Given the high costs of clinical development of therapies in MS, one must make astute choices, usually on the first try, when translating preclinical results in EAE to clinical trials of MS. Each attempt at refining therapy in human clinical trials of MS is often prohibitively expensive, so second chances are undertaken only in rare circumstances. In the case of natalizumab, the dose of monoclonal antibody in which a successful outcome was achieved in EAE was precisely translated to success in human clinical trials. However, for other drugs, problems with selecting a correct dose and dose frequency have confounded development. The case of altered peptide ligands, known as APL, which have shown great promise in EAE, exemplifies this problem.

An APL from the region of myelin basic protein p83-99 showed promise in reducing relapse rates and reversing paralysis in preclinical studies of EAE.⁵²⁻⁵⁵ A version of this APL, known as NBI 5788, was designed and taken into clinical testing in patients with relapsing-remitting MS. This APL had an alteration in the main contact residues with human T-cell receptors recognizing this epitope of myelin basic protein. When NBI 5788 was given at a dosage of 50mg/week subcutaneously, it was associated with exacerbations in three MS patients in an open-label trial.⁵⁶ However, dosages of 5mg/week of this drug were associated with reduction in gadolinium-enhancing lesions on magnetic res-

onance imaging, and there was no evidence of disease exacerbations.⁵⁷ However, weekly dosing, at 5, 20, and 50mg, led to allergic-type hypersensitivity reactions. The basis for these hypersensitivity reactions, seen in MS patients in phase 2 clinical trials, was then investigated in the EAE model. In this new model of EAE, it was discovered that self-peptides of the myelin sheath could trigger fatal anaphylactic reactions in mice. The implications of this finding (ie, that even self-peptides were allergic) raised new and challenging questions. "A new version of horror autotoxicus,"⁵⁸ first described a century ago by Paul Ehrlich, was discovered from understanding a problem in a clinical trial of an MS drug. When dosing of NBI 5788 in phase 2b trials on relapsing-remitting MS was reduced to 5mg once a month instead of once a week to attempt to mitigate these hypersensitivity reactions, both the desirable activity in reducing magnetic resonance activity and the undesirable hypersensitivity reactions seen with APL disappeared.

Continued development of APL in humans would require further financial investment if this particular approach is to be pursued with different dosing schedules. Negative studies in humans, on novel drugs such as the APL, which so far have failed to translate into an approved drug for MS, may not be a fault of the EAE model per se, but rather a reality of the huge expenses required for development of new drugs. When going from animal to human studies, revisions in dosing and formulation may be required that are too expensive and time consuming to pursue, given competing priorities. It is worth noting that the EAE model was used to help understand one of the clinical complications of this approach, allergic-like hypersensitivity reactions to self-constituents, seen with administration of the APL.⁵⁸

Another area where the EAE model has been called into question has been its inefficiency in predicting how blockade of various cytokines would work in MS. In rheumatoid arthritis and Crohn's disease, we have seen the major triumph in therapy with the class of drugs known as tumor necrosis factor (TNF) blockers. This stunning advance in therapy led to the award of a Lasker Prize in Clinical Medicine to Profs Marc Feldmann and Taina Maini to honor their achievement for implementing this mode of therapy in rheumatoid arthritis and Crohn's disease. More than one million patients with rheumatoid arthritis and Crohn's disease have benefited from this approach.⁵⁹ However, TNF blockade has been associated with worsening of MS,⁵⁹⁻⁶¹ and a "black box" label has been placed on these drugs, warning against their use in MS.⁵⁹ Studies in EAE have been equivocal, where some published experiments have shown the virtues of TNF blockade with anti-TNF monoclonal antibodies and soluble TNF-receptor constructs⁶²⁻⁶⁴; in contrast, other pub-

Table. The Long and Winding Road from Proof of Concept in Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis to US Food and Drug Administration Approval: Ranging from a Quarter of a Century to More Than a Decade

Therapeutic	Year of Publication of Proof of Concept in EAE	Year of FDA Approval	Approved Indication
Glatiramer Acetate	1971	1996	Approved for RR-MS
Mitoxantrone	1987	2000	Approved for secondary progressive MS, worsening RR-MS
Natalizumab	1992	2004 2005 withdrawn 2006 reinstated	Approved for RR-MS

EAE = experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis; FDA = US Food and Drug Administration; RR-MS = relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis; MS = multiple sclerosis.

lications have demonstrated the virtues of TNF itself, thus highlighting the pitfalls of blockade.⁶⁵ One reason for this confusion is that a molecule such as TNF may have “janus-like effects,” giving benefit in some aspects of the disease, whereas imparting risk during other aspects of disease. TNF is a mediator of inflammation in human autoimmune diseases and in animal models,⁵⁹ as well as a mediator of repair, including oligodendrocyte growth, and a mediator of oligodendroglial death.^{66–68} Studies on EAE, which are often short term, must be carefully interpreted so that we pay attention to the “janus-like” propensity of cytokines: TNF blockade may be beneficial in inhibiting some inflammatory pathways, yet deleterious in blocking the maintenance and repair of cells in the nervous system. We have seen similar problems with glucocorticoids, which have virtues as antiinflammatory drugs, but have problems in inhibiting wound healing together with their numerous other unfortunate side effects.

Yes, the same molecule may have different effects in influencing different biochemical pathways. And yes, EAE has its limitations. Misinterpretation and over-interpretation of certain results from EAE experiments may lead to calamitous consequences. Translation of animal to human studies is filled with large uncertainties. But, this should not mean that we discard the EAE model because of our uncertainty and ignorance of biology. We are only 21st century medical scientists, after all. We must remain humble about our understanding of disease processes. Our predecessors in previous centuries appear to us now so quaintly ignorant. Even though we have sequenced the human genome, we need to know what the products of these genes are doing in health and in disease. We need ever more clever animal models to help us understand observations made in direct studies on human disease.

One of the exciting directions in the development of therapy for MS is consideration of various combinations of medications. The EAE model has demonstrated potential synergies between drugs such as statins and glatiramer, which combine in the EAE model to show efficacy when used at doses that are suboptimal

for these drugs when used alone.^{69,70} Other combinations of therapies might be tried in the EAE model, to search for synergies or unexpected adverse interactions.

Drug development is not only costly, it is remarkably slow. Rip Van Winkle could have a good sleep in the time intervals involved in drug development. The three drugs glatiramer, mitoxantrone, and natalizumab that first showed promise in EAE each took more than a decade before they were actually approved to treat MS. Drug development is a time consuming and expensive process (Table). The fault does not necessarily rest with EAE, but in the harsh reality of how difficult it is to develop a new drug for MS.

Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis Provides Insights to Understand Pathology, to Identify Surrogate Biomarkers and Therapeutic Targets

MS researchers are now using a variety of powerful tools to understand the pathology of MS. These technologies include gene, protein, and lipid microarrays, robotic sequencers for analysis of gene expression in MS tissue, and mass spectroscopy to detect minute amounts of proteins and lipids in MS brain lesions.^{71–73} Once genes, proteins, and lipids of interest have been identified in MS, then clever applications of the EAE model allow one to explore their biological roles. Take the case of osteopontin, first discovered as a major transcript in lesions of MS by the use of a robot to sequence gene transcripts isolated from lesion material.⁷⁴ No one had ever considered a role for osteopontin in MS brain, and from the name of the molecule, its main activity suggested that it involved bone and not brain. However, robotic sequencing of genes expressed in MS lesions indicated that osteopontin transcripts were highly elevated at the site of brain inflammation. Immunohistochemistry showed widespread expression of the protein in MS lesions. A mouse strain existed where the gene for osteopontin was deleted. It was discovered that when EAE was induced in this strain, disease was milder, disease progression was blunted, mortality was decreased, and the intensity of

inflammatory mediators such as γ interferon was reduced in myelin reactive T cells. Osteopontin, a cytokine-like molecule, was thus shown to have important immunomodulatory properties in EAE.⁷⁴

Researchers then explored whether osteopontin might play a role in the progression of MS. Three articles have now reported that osteopontin is elevated in blood before a relapse of MS.⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷ In MS, there is no surrogate marker to follow disease activity, which is akin to measurements of C-reactive protein in rheumatoid arthritis or C-peptide in type 1 diabetes mellitus. Research on the EAE model in conjunction with studies on human MS brain material may be leading to the discovery of the first surrogate marker in blood for MS.

There are many other examples where a clever interplay of studies on MS material combined with work on EAE has been illuminating. For example, B cells positive for CD20 are found in MS lesions, and immunoglobulin V gene transcripts are among the most highly expressed genes in lesions.^{78,79} In the marmoset model of EAE, CD20 cells are common in cortical lesions,⁸⁰ whereas in the mouse model of EAE, B cells are quite common.⁸¹ There is great interest in several aspects of the role of B cells. Researchers have used studies on EAE combined with parallel observations in MS to determine the nature of the immune response in the central nervous system in MS, and then to see whether such antibody responses may play a pathogenic role in MS. Studies on the biological roles of antibodies to myelin proteins⁸²⁻⁸⁴ and to lipids such as galactocerebroside and sphingomyelin^{73,85} have shown that not only are such antibodies present in the brains and spinal fluid of MS patients, but such antibodies are critical in worsening the severity of disease in EAE models.

Yet another example of understanding the pathogenesis of a molecule with an unknown role in MS comes from studies on cytokines in MS brain. IL-6 and IL-17 were first reported in MS lesions using transcriptional profiling with gene microarrays.⁸⁰ Studies in the EAE model have shown that IL-6 and IL-17 are critical in the pathogenesis of EAE.⁸⁶ IL-6 governs the production of a key set of regulatory T cells that modulate another subset of effector T cells producing IL-17.⁸⁶ Insights into MS will be understood only after dissection of the biology of these newly discovered molecules. The use of transgenics, genetic “knock-outs and knock-ins,” and application of gene silencing techniques of interfering RNA, all techniques that allow us to analyze the biology of molecules in unprecedented ways, can only be done in animals. Without cooperative studies between MS and various new and sophisticated versions of the EAE model, it would be difficult to understand the potential biological role of a myriad of new molecules that researchers are encountering in studies of specimens from MS patients.

Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis: Some of Its Pitfalls in Perspective

Despite what has been learned from studies of EAE that are then relevant to MS, it should be emphasized that MS researchers should not become overreliant on this model. We would like to emphasize that, unquestionably, the first place to learn about MS is to study materials from MS patients. One way to optimize research on EAE is to strive to make certain that somehow the hypothesis being tested can be tangibly linked to a corresponding molecule in a study of MS. Studies on EAE, despite their relative ease, are no substitute for research on bona fide specimens from MS patients. Research on critical tissues in MS patients including brain and spinal fluid are neglected because of the difficulties in obtaining them. The research community has to increase its activities in obtaining rapid autopsies from MS brain and for performing state-of-the-art investigations into the pathology on such specimens, including isolation of tissues for studies of gene expression and for analysis of neurochemistry.

Research on every human disease benefits from useful animal models to explore leads in pathobiology and to test potential new therapies in a preclinical setting. In diseases where specific molecules are known to play a decisive role, such as Huntington's disease, where expression of huntingtin with more than 35 polyglutamine repeats in this molecule leads to a fatal outcome, transgenic models are valuable in helping to understand the mechanisms underlying pathology and to develop new therapies. Transgenic models with β -amyloid proteins overexpressed in brain have been of inestimable value for studies on Alzheimer's disease, including approaches such as active and passive vaccination to β amyloid. With all its limitations, research on EAE has contributed greatly to our growing understanding of MS. Research on EAE has led to the development of three approved therapies for MS, and experiments are constantly demonstrating new targets for potential treatments of this disease, therapies that might ultimately prove successful in clinical trials if adequate resources were available for clinical development. It is simply not the case that research on EAE has been unable “to point toward a meaningful therapy or therapeutic approach for MS.”¹

It would be unwise to answer affirmatively to the following question that Sriram and Steiner¹ posed last year in *Annals*, “It would be interesting to ask the question of how one would approach the disease if animal models were unavailable, and the only recourse would be to examine the clues offered by our patients and from relevant genetic, imaging and epidemiologic studies in humans.” Why limit oneself in research on this complicated problem by excluding animal models that have been immensely useful?¹ We urge clever applications of animal models for MS, in the context of

trying to understand those critical clues that become available from clinical and pathological studies on patients with MS. Both Sriram and Steiner and we would likely agree that we must aggressively pursue those clues obtained from studies on MS patients, including ever more refined analysis of the affected target organ and its surrounding spinal fluid. However, we would disagree on the paths to use to analyze and understand the clues. We advocate here using all tools available to intelligently decipher the enigma of MS. The various EAE models will be invaluable in this arduous task.

References

1. Sriram S, Steiner I. Experimental allergic encephalomyelitis: a misleading model of multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol* 2005;58:939–945.
2. Ropper A. Selective treatment of multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:965–967.
3. Oksenberg JR, Hauser SL. Genetics of multiple sclerosis. *Neurol Clin* 2005;23:61–75.
4. Rivers TM, Sprunt DH, Berry GP. Observations on attempts to produce acute disseminated encephalomyelitis in monkeys. *J Exp Med* 1933;58:39–53.
5. Steinman L. Optic neuritis, a new variant of experimental encephalomyelitis, a durable model for all seasons, now in its seventieth year. *J Exp Med* 2003;197:1065–1071.
6. Zamvil S, Steinman L. The T lymphocyte in autoimmune encephalomyelitis. *Annu Rev Immunol* 1990;8:579–621.
7. Bettelli E, Pagany M, Weiner HL, et al. Myelin oligodendrocyte glycoprotein-specific T cell receptor transgenic mice develop spontaneous autoimmune optic neuritis. *J Exp Med* 2003;197:1073–1081.
8. Brown AM, McFarlin DE. Relapsing experimental allergic encephalomyelitis in the SJL/J mouse. *Lab Invest* 1981;45:278–284.
9. Lublin FD, Maurer PH, Berry RG, Tippet D. Delayed, relapsing experimental allergic encephalomyelitis in mice. *J Immunol* 1981;126:819–822.
10. Zamvil S, Nelson P, Trotter J, et al. T cell clones specific for myelin basic protein induce chronic relapsing EAE and demyelination. *Nature* 1985;317:355–358.
11. Madsen LS, Andersson EC, Jansson L, et al. A humanized model for multiple sclerosis using HLA-DR2 and a human T-cell receptor. *Nat Genet* 1999;23:343–347.
12. Ellmerich S, Mycko M, Takacs K, et al. High incidence of spontaneous disease in an HLA-DR15 and TCR transgenic multiple sclerosis model. *J Immunol* 2005;174:1938–1946.
13. Genain CP, Hauser SL. Experimental allergic encephalomyelitis in the New World monkey *Callithrix jacchus*. *Immunol Rev* 2001;183:159–172.
14. Steinman L. Some misconceptions about understanding autoimmunity through experiments with knockouts. *J Exp Med* 1997;185:2039–2041.
15. Teitelbaum D, Meshorer A, Hirshfeld T, et al. Suppression of experimental allergic encephalomyelitis by a synthetic polypeptide. *Eur J Immunol* 1971;1:242–248.
16. Teitelbaum D, Webb C, Meshorer A, et al. Protection against experimental allergic encephalomyelitis. *Nature* 1972;240:564–566.
17. Teitelbaum D, Webb C, Meshorer A, et al. Suppression by several synthetic polypeptides of experimental allergic encephalomyelitis induced in guinea pigs and rabbits with bovine and human basic encephalitogen. *Eur J Immunol* 1973;3:273–279.
18. McDevitt HO, Sela M. Genetic control of the antibody response. I. Demonstration of determinant-specific differences in response to synthetic polypeptide antigens in two strains of inbred mice. *J Exp Med* 1965;122:517–531.
19. Teitelbaum D, Webb C, Brec M, et al. Suppression of experimental allergic encephalomyelitis in Rhesus monkeys by a synthetic basic copolymer. *Clin Immunol Immunopathol* 1974;3:256–262.
20. Keith AB, Arnon R, Teitelbaum D, et al. The effect of Cop 1, a synthetic polypeptide, on chronic relapsing experimental allergic encephalomyelitis in guinea pigs. *J Neurol Sci* 1979;42:267–274.
21. Sela M. The concept of specific immune treatment against autoimmune diseases. *Int Rev Immunol* 1999;18:201–216.
22. Abramsky O, Teitelbaum D, Arnon R. Effect of a synthetic polypeptide (COP 1) on patients with multiple sclerosis and with acute disseminated encephalomyelitis. Preliminary report. *J Neurol Sci* 1977;31:433–438.
23. Bornstein MB, Miller A, Slagle S, et al. A pilot trial of Cop 1 in exacerbating-relmitting multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 1987;317:408–414.
24. Johnson KP, Brooks BR, Cohen JA, et al. Copolymer 1 reduces relapse rate and improves disability in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: results of a phase III multicenter, double-blind placebo-controlled trial. The Copolymer 1 Multiple Sclerosis Study Group. *Neurology* 1995;45:1268–1276.
25. Sela M. Immunomodulatory vaccines against autoimmune diseases. *Rejuvenation Res* 2006;9:126–133.
26. Duda PW, Schmied MC, Cook SL, et al. Glatiramer acetate (Copaxone) induces degenerate, Th2-polarized immune responses in patients with multiple sclerosis. *J Clin Invest* 2000;105:967–976.
27. Fridkis-Hareli M, Teitelbaum D, Gurevich E, et al. Direct binding of myelin basic protein and synthetic copolymer 1 to class II major histocompatibility complex molecules on living antigen-presenting cells—specificity and promiscuity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1994;91:4872–4876.
28. Fridkis-Hareli M, Strominger JL. Promiscuous binding of synthetic copolymer 1 to purified HLA-DR molecules. *J Immunol* 1998;160:4386–4397.
29. Ruiz PJ, DeVoss JJ, Nguyen LV, et al. Immunomodulation of experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis with ordered peptides based on MHC-TCR binding motifs. *J Immunol* 2001;167:2688–2693.
30. Aharoni R, Kayhan B, Arnon R. Therapeutic effect of the immunomodulator glatiramer acetate on trinitrobenzene sulfonic acid-induced experimental colitis. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2005;11:106–115.
31. Arnon R, Aharoni R. Mechanism of action of glatiramer acetate in multiple sclerosis and its potential for the development of new applications. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004;101:14593–14598.
32. Angelov DN, Waibel S, Guntinas-Lichius O, et al. Therapeutic vaccine for acute and chronic motor neuron diseases: implications for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2003;100:4790–4795.
33. Ridge SC, Sloboda AE, McReynolds RA, et al. Suppression of experimental allergic encephalomyelitis by mitoxantrone. *Clin Immunol Immunopathol* 1985;35:35–42.
34. Ellison GW, Myers LW. A review of systemic nonspecific immunosuppressive treatment of multiple sclerosis. *Neurology* 1978;28:132–139.
35. Lublin FD, Lavasa M, Viti C, Knobler RL. Suppression of acute and relapsing experimental allergic encephalomyelitis with mitoxantrone. *Clin Immunol Immunopathol* 1987;45:122–128.

36. Lublin FD. Therapeutic approaches to secondary progressive multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler* 2002;8:88–90.
37. Yednock T, Cannon C, Fritz L, et al. Prevention of experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis by antibodies against a4b1 integrin. *Nature* 1992;356:63–66.
38. Steinman L. Blocking adhesion molecules as therapy for multiple sclerosis: natalizumab. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2005;4:510–519.
39. Rudick RA, Stuart WH, Calabresi PA, et al. Natalizumab plus interferon beta-1a for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:911–923.
40. Polman CH, O'Connor PW, Havrdova E, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of natalizumab for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:899–910.
41. Yu M, Nishiyama A, Trapp BD, Tuohy VK. Interferon-beta inhibits progression of relapsing-remitting experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis. *J Neuroimmunol* 1996;64:91–100.
42. Brinkmann V, Davis MD, Heise CE, et al. The immune modulator FTY720 targets sphingosine 1-phosphate receptors. *J Biol Chem* 2002;277:21453–21457.
43. Stanislaus R, Singh AK, Singh I. Lovastatin treatment decreases mononuclear cell infiltration into the CNS of Lewis rats with experimental allergic encephalomyelitis. *J Neurosci Res* 2001;66:155–162.
44. Youssef S, Stuve O, Patorroyo J, et al. The HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor, atorvastatin, promotes a Th2 bias and reverses paralysis in CNS autoimmune disease. *Nature* 2002;420:78–84.
45. Greenwood J, Walters CE, Pryce G, et al. Lovastatin inhibits brain endothelial cell Rho-mediated lymphocyte migration and attenuates experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis. *FASEB J* 2003;17:905–907.
46. Vollmer T, Key L, Durkalski V, et al. Oral simvastatin treatment in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Lancet* 2004;363:1607–1608.
47. Brunmark C, Runstrom A, Ohlsson L, et al. The new orally active immunoregulator laquinimod (ABR-215062) effectively inhibits development and relapses of experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis. *J Neuroimmunol* 2002;130:163–172.
48. Polman C, Barkhof F, Sandberg-Wollheim M, et al. Treatment with laquinimod reduces development of active MRI lesions in relapsing MS. *Neurology* 2005;64:987–991.
49. Hayosh NS, Swanborg RH. Autoimmune effector cells. IX. Inhibition of adoptive transfer of autoimmune encephalomyelitis with a monoclonal antibody specific for interleukin 2 receptors. *J Immunol* 1987;138:3771–3775.
50. Rose JW, Watt HE, White AT, Carlson NG. Treatment of multiple sclerosis with an anti-interleukin-2 receptor monoclonal antibody. *Ann Neurol* 2004;56:864–867.
51. Bielekova B, Richert N, Howard T, et al. Humanized anti-CD25 (daclizumab) inhibits disease activity in multiple sclerosis patients failing to respond to interferon beta. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004;101:8705–8708.
52. Karin N, Mitchell D, Ling N, et al. Reversal of experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis by a soluble variant of a myelin basic protein epitope: T cell receptor antagonism and reduction of Interferon-gamma and TNF- α production. *J Exp Med* 1994;180:2227–2237.
53. Brocke S, Gijbels K, Allegretta M, et al. Treatment of experimental encephalomyelitis with a peptide analogue of myelin basic protein. *Nature* 1996;379:343–345.
54. Vergelli M, Hemmer B, Utz U, et al. Differential activation of human autoreactive T cell clones by altered peptide ligands derived from myelin basic protein peptide (87-99). *Eur J Immunol* 1996;26:2624–2634.
55. Gaur A, Boehme SA, Chalmers D, et al. Amelioration of relapsing experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis with altered myelin basic protein peptides involves different cellular mechanisms. *J Neuroimmunol* 1997;74:149–158.
56. Bielekova B, Goodwin B, Richert N, et al. Encephalitogenic potential of the myelin basic protein peptide (amino acids 83-99) in multiple sclerosis: results of a phase II clinical trial with an altered peptide ligand. *Nat Med* 2000;6:1167–1175.
57. Kappos L, Comi G, Panitch H, et al. Induction of a non-encephalitogenic Th2 autoimmune response in multiple sclerosis after administration of an altered peptide ligand in a placebo controlled, randomized phase II trial. *Nat Med* 2000;6:1176–1182.
58. Pedotti R, Mitchell D, Wedemeyer J, et al. An unexpected version of horror autotoxicus: anaphylactic shock to a self-peptide. *Nat Immunol* 2001;2:216–222.
59. Feldmann M, Steinman L. Design of effective immunotherapy for human autoimmunity. *Nature* 2005;435:612–619.
60. Lenercept MS Study Group. TNF neutralization in MS: results of a randomized, placebo-controlled multicenter study. The Lenercept Multiple Sclerosis Study Group and the University of British Columbia MS/MRI Analysis Group. *Neurology* 1999;53:457–465.
61. van Oosten BW, Barkhof F, Truyen L, et al. Increased MRI activity and immune activation in two multiple sclerosis patients treated with the monoclonal anti-tumor necrosis factor antibody cA2. *Neurology* 1996;47:1531–1534.
62. Ruddle NH, Bergman CM, McGrath KM, et al. An antibody to lymphotoxin and tumor necrosis factor prevents transfer of experimental allergic encephalomyelitis. *J Exp Med* 1990;172:1193–1200.
63. Selmaj K, Raine CS, Cross AH. Anti-tumor necrosis factor therapy abrogates autoimmune demyelination. *Ann Neurol* 1991;30:694–700.
64. Baker D, Butler D, Scallon BJ, et al. Control of established experimental allergic encephalomyelitis by inhibition of tumor necrosis factor (TNF) activity within the central nervous system using monoclonal antibodies and TNF receptor-immunoglobulin fusion proteins. *Eur J Immunol* 1994;24:2040–2048.
65. Liu J, Marino MW, Wong G, et al. TNF is a potent anti-inflammatory cytokine in autoimmune-mediated demyelination. *Nat Med* 1998;4:78–83.
66. Arnett HA, Mason J, Marino M, et al. TNF alpha promotes proliferation of oligodendrocyte progenitors and remyelination. *Nat Neurosci* 2001;4:1116–1122.
67. Kassiotis G, Kollias G. Uncoupling the proinflammatory from the immunosuppressive properties of tumor necrosis factor (TNF) at the p55 TNF receptor level: implications for pathogenesis and therapy of autoimmune demyelination. *J Exp Med* 2001;193:427–434.
68. Hovelmeyer N, Hao Z, Kranidioti K, et al. Apoptosis of oligodendrocytes via Fas and TNF-R1 is a key event in the induction of experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis. *J Immunol* 2005;175:5875–5884.
69. Stuve O, Youssef S, Weber M, et al. Immunomodulatory synergy by combination of atorvastatin and glatiramer acetate in treatment of CNS autoimmunity. *J Clin Invest* 2006;116:1037–1044.
70. Greenwood J, Steinman L, Zamvil SS. Statin therapy and autoimmune disease: from protein prenylation to immunomodulation. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2006;6:358–370.
71. Steinman L, Zamvil S. Transcriptional analysis of targets in multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2003;3:483–493.
72. Robinson WH, Utz PJ, Steinman L. Genomic and proteomic analysis of multiple sclerosis. *Curr Opin Immunol* 2003;15:660–667.

73. Kanter J, Narayana S, Ho P, et al. Lipid microarrays identify key mediators of autoimmune brain inflammation. *Nat Med* 2006;12:138–143.
74. Chabas D, Baranzini S, Mitchell D, et al. The influence of the pro-inflammatory cytokine, osteopontin, on autoimmune demyelinating disease. *Science* 2001;294:1731–1735.
75. Vogt MH, Lopatinskaya L, Smits M, et al. Elevated osteopontin levels in active relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol* 2003;53:819–822.
76. Vogt MH, Floris S, Killestein J, et al. Osteopontin levels and increased disease activity in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis patients. *J Neuroimmunol* 2004;155:155–160.
77. Comabella M, Pericot I, Goertsches R, et al. Plasma osteopontin levels in multiple sclerosis. *J Neuroimmunol* 2005;158:231–239.
78. Stuve O, Cepok S, Elias B, et al. Clinical stabilization and effective B-lymphocyte depletion in the cerebrospinal fluid and peripheral blood of a patient with fulminant relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Arch Neurol* 2005;62:1620–1623.
79. Pomeroy IM, Matthews PM, Frank JA, et al. Demyelinated neocortical lesions in marmoset autoimmune encephalomyelitis mimic those in multiple sclerosis. *Brain* 2005;128:2713–2721.
80. Lock C, Hermans G, Pedotti R, et al. Gene microarray analysis of multiple sclerosis lesions yields new targets validated in autoimmune encephalomyelitis. *Nat Med* 2002;8:500–508.
81. Sriram S, Solomon D, Rouse RV, Steinman L. Identification of T cell subsets and B lymphocytes in mouse brain EAE lesions. *J Immunol* 1982;129:1649–1651.
82. Genain CP, Cannella B, Hauser SL, Raine CS. Identification of autoantibodies associated with myelin damage in multiple sclerosis. *Nat Med* 1999;5:170–175.
83. von Budingen HC, Menge T, Hauser SL, Genain CP. Restrictive and diversifying elements of the anti-myelin/oligodendrocyte glycoprotein antibody response in primate experimental allergic encephalomyelitis. *Immunogenetics* 2006;58:122–128.
84. Warren KG, Catz I, Steinman L. Fine specificity of the antibody response to myelin basic protein in the central nervous system in multiple sclerosis: the minimal B cell epitope and a model of its unique features. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1995; 92:11061–11065.
85. Menge T, Lalive PH, von Budingen HC, et al. Antibody responses against galactocerebroside are potential stage-specific biomarkers in multiple sclerosis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2005; 116:453–459.
86. Bettelli E, Carrier Y, Gao W, et al. Reciprocal developmental pathways for the generation of Th17 and regulatory T cells. *Nature* 2006;441:235–238.