

Safety of neural stem cell therapy for traumatic brain injury

Abstract

Traumatic brain injuries (TBI) often result in disability in survivors. Unresolved inflammation and ongoing neurodegeneration are thought to underlie injury-induced disability. Central nervous system in mammals is incapable of self-repair and the reasons are poorly understood. Apart from rehabilitation, there is no therapeutic modality to mitigate disability after TBI. Human neural stem cells (NSCs) are attractive candidates as both modulators of inflammation and candidate for cell replacement. One agent to address two goals. Over the past two decades, several preclinical studies at academic institutions and academic-industry partnership clinical trials have contributed significantly to our knowledge base. However, such efforts are not yet relevant in the clinic. While it takes time to bring a preclinical product to clinic, certain members of the community set aside their medical training principles and rush to offer unproven, often hazardous cell therapies to desperate patients. Such behavior is distraction and this article focuses on an impediment to clinical application of human neural stem cells to mitigate TBI effects.

Keywords: traumatic brain injuries, nscs, firearm injury, ptbi, ipsc

Volume 3 Issue 1 - 2017

Gajavelli Shyam, Liz Quesada, Maria Lujan, Long Di

University of Miami, USA

Correspondence: Gajavelli Shyam, Miami Project to Cure Paralysis, University of Miami, 1095 NW 14th Terrace, LPLC3-25, Miami FL 33134, USA, Email sgajavel@med.miami.edu

Received: May 26, 2017 | **Published:** July 14, 2017

Introduction

Firearm injury is a serious public health problem in the United States (US) costing more than \$70-75 billion annually.^{1,2} Despite increasing incidence, timely neurosurgical intervention aided with improved neuroimaging and advances in acute trauma management have lowered the firearm fatality rate {Joseph, 2014 #42; Lin, 2012 #164; Young, 2008 #56}. Thus, among the estimated 5.3 million people living in the US with traumatic brain injury (TBI)-related disability, the proportion of gun-shot wound survivors has been rising steadily.³⁻⁸ Among head injuries, penetrating injuries (PTBI) are associated with the worst outcomes,^{9,10} and no effective restorative treatment beyond physical therapy is currently available to mitigate post-TBI disability.⁹⁻¹¹ There is an urgent need to explore additional treatment options to address long-term TBI related disabilities. Since the demonstration of ability to culture, expand human fetal neural stem *in vitro*, their genetic modification and engraftment in rodents post transplantation¹²⁻¹⁵ multiple insights into how embryonic transplant derived neurons integrate into adult circuits (Gotz 2016) and technical advances studies have supported clinically relevant studies in immuno compromised or immuno suppressed animal.^{16,17} Athymic rats with TBI (Haus 2016), or Parkinson disease (Snyder 2016) have been used with neural stem cells derived from induced human pluripotent stem cells to demonstrate the viability of the approach.

A variety of companies have derived and developed human fetal neural stem cells.¹⁸ Due to lack of uniform standards across the globe and varying extent of regulations of the cell therapy approach adverse reaction cases have been reported to date.¹⁹⁻²¹ Additional bad press for autologous stem cells came in 2017^{22,23} and the untimely termination of the Pathway Trial.^{24,25} In contrast, NSCs from other unrelated sources have been found to be safe.^{18,24,26-28} There are big differences between cells that produced tumors and those deemed safe. The tumorigenic potential of cells is highest in embryonic stem (ES) cells and diminishes in its progeny and is lowest in fetal neural stem cells.

However, there is a strong focus on inducible pluripotent stem cell (iPSC) derived NSCs due to the obvious advantage that it would be patient's own cells, hence rendering it an autologous intervention that circumvents need for immunosuppression. To lower the tumorigenic potential of iPSCs researchers have taken to thorough neuralization protocols and screening of any undifferentiated ES cells,²⁹ or pre-treating cells with known anti-cancer drugs such as gamma secretase inhibitors (SfN 2016 Okano Hideyuki). Data presented by Andres Persson at SfN 2016 suggests that astrocytes are the origin of brain tumors.³⁰ Taken together unlike the proneuronal cultures of fetal week 8-16 NSCs (give rise exclusively to neurons for several weeks post transplantation), the heterogeneity of iPSC or ES cells derived NSCs (give rise to multiple cell types following transplantation) may contribute to their tumor potential. The pretreatment of ES or iPSC derived NSCs with anti cancer drugs may mitigate the tumor incidence from such transplants. Stem cell tourism as defined by CRIM (<https://www.cirm.ca.gov/patients/stem-cell-tourism>) should be discouraged as the unregulated clinical use of cell therapy rampant all over the World^{18,31-34} is yet to provide a cure. The research scientists need to heed the advice given by academic scientist^{35,36} and not oversell their findings to lay public/private practices as this often fuels unregulated clinical applications.

Direct transplantation of hNSCs to replace damaged neural networks may be a viable approach in the treatment of severe TBI. According to "The International Society for Stem Cell Research and Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research/Office of Cellular, Tissue and Gene Therapies"³⁷ FDA guidelines, translation of cell transplantation approach in TBI requires evidence supporting: (1) lack of hNSCs tumorigenicity in TBI models, (2) cell dose dependence of behavior alterations in TBI, (3) best site and time for transplantation after TBI, and lastly (4) to the establishment of feasibility and scalability of the approach to both normal and TBI animals with longer gyrencephalic brains, such as pigs or primates.³⁷⁻³⁹

Conclusion

In conclusion while the NSC holds great promise, the final two steps described above hold key to application in a clinical setting. To help with this The International Society for Stem Cell Research (ISSCR) has presented its 2016 Guidelines for Stem Cell Research and Clinical Translation. These guidelines reflect the revision and extension of two previous sets of guidelines and demand rigor, oversight, and transparency in all aspects of practice, providing confidence to practitioners and the public that stem cell science can proceed efficiently and remain responsive to public and patient interests.^{40–42}

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Gold EM, Su D, López-Velázquez L, et al. Functional assessment of long-term deficits in rodent models of traumatic brain injury. *Regen Med*. 2013;8(4):483–516.
- Tasiogiorgos S, Economopoulos KP, Winfield RD, et al. Firearm Injury in the United States: An Overview of an Evolving Public Health Problem. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2015;221(6):1005–1014.
- Corrigan JD, Selassie AW, Orman JA. The epidemiology of traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2010;25(2):72–80.
- Faul M XL, Wald MM, Coronado VG. *Traumatic brain injury in the United States: emergency department visits, hospitalizations, and deaths*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Atlanta, Georgia; 2010.
- Gressot LV, Chamoun RB, Patel AJ, et al. Predictors of outcome in civilians with gunshot wounds to the head upon presentation. *J Neurosurg*. 2014;121(3):645–652.
- Jena AB, Sun EC, Prasad V. Does the declining lethality of gunshot injuries mask a rising epidemic of gun violence in the United States? *J Gen Intern Med*. 2014;29(7):1065–1069.
- Langlois JA, Rutland-Brown W, Wald MM. The epidemiology and impact of traumatic brain injury: a brief overview. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2006;21(5):375–378.
- Rosenfeld JV, Bell RS, Armonda R. Current concepts in penetrating and blast injury to the central nervous system. *World J Surg*. 2015;39(6):1352–1362.
- Khan MB, Kumar R, Irfan FB, et al. Civilian craniocerebral gunshot injuries in a developing country: presentation, injury characteristics, prognostic indicators, and complications. *World Neurosurg*. 2014;82(1–2):14–19.
- Pruitt B. Part 2: Prognosis in penetrating brain injury. *J Trauma*. 2001;51(Suppl 2):S44–86.
- Winn HR. *Youmans Neurological Surgery*. 6th ed. USA: Elsevier; 2011.
- Buc-Caron MH. Neuroepithelial progenitor cells explanted from human fetal brain proliferate and differentiate *in vitro*. *Neurobiol Dis*. 1995;2(1):37–47.
- Sabaté O, Horellou P, Vigne E, et al. Transplantation to the rat brain of human neural progenitors that were genetically modified using adenoviruses. *Nat Genet*. 1995;9(3):256–260.
- Brüstle O, Choudhary K, Karam K, et al. Chimeric brains generated by intraventricular transplantation of fetal human brain cells into embryonic rats. *Nat Biotechnol*. 1998;16(11):1040–1044.
- Flax JD, Aurora S, Yang C, et al. Engraftable human neural stem cells respond to developmental cues, replace neurons, and express foreign genes. *Nature biotechnology*. 1998;16:1033–1039.
- Haus DL, López-Velázquez L, Gold EM, et al. Transplantation of human neural stem cells restores cognition in an immunodeficient rodent model of traumatic brain injury. *Exp Neurol*. 2016;281:1–16.
- Spurlock MS, Ahmed AI, Rivera KN, et al. Amelioration of Penetrating Ballistic-Like Brain Injury Induced Cognitive Deficits after Neuronal Differentiation of Transplanted Human Neural Stem Cells. *J Neurotrauma*. 2017;34(11):1981–1995.
- Trounson A, McDonald C. Stem Cell Therapies in Clinical Trials: Progress and Challenges. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2015;17(1):11–22.
- Amariglio N, Hirshberg A, Scheithauer BW, et al. Donor-derived brain tumor following neural stem cell transplantation in an ataxia telangiectasia patient. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6(2):e1000029.
- Berkowitz AL, Miller MB, Mir SA, et al. Glioproliferative Lesion of the Spinal Cord as a Complication of “Stem-Cell Tourism”. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(2):196–198.
- Thirabanasak D, Tantiwongse K, Thorner PS. Angiomyeloproliferative lesions following autologous stem cell therapy. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2010;21(7):1218–1222.
- Kuriyan AE, Albin TA, Townsend JH, et al. Vision Loss after Intravitreal Injection of Autologous “Stem Cells” for AMD. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;376:1047–1053.
- Mandai M, Watanabe A, Kurimoto Y, et al. Autologous Induced Stem-Cell-Derived Retinal Cells for Macular Degeneration. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;376:1038–1046.
- Anderson AJ, Piltti KM, Hooshmand MJ, et al. Preclinical Efficacy Failure of Human CNS-Derived Stem Cells for Use in the Pathway Study of Cervical Spinal Cord Injury. *Stem Cell Reports*. 2017;8(2):249–263.
- Monuki ES, Anderson AJ, Blurton-Jones M, et al. Response to StemCells Inc. *Stem Cell Reports*. 2017;8(2):195–197.
- Mazzini L, Gelati M, Profico DC, et al. Human neural stem cell transplantation in ALS: initial results from a phase I trial. *J Transl Med*. 2015;13:17.
- Borlongan CV. Age of PISCES: stem-cell clinical trials in stroke. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10046):736–738.
- Kalladka D, Sinden J, Pollock K, et al. Human neural stem cells in patients with chronic ischaemic stroke (PISCES): a phase I, first-in-man study. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10046):787–796.
- Garitaonandia I, Gonzalez R, Christiansen-Weber T, et al. Neural Stem Cell Tumorigenicity and Biodistribution Assessment for Phase I Clinical Trial in Parkinson’s Disease. *Sci Rep*. 2016;6:34478.
- Snyder E. 13th Annual Christopher Reeve “Hot Topics” in Stem Cell Biology. In: *Society for Neuroscience*. San Diego, USA; 2016.
- Turner L, Knoepfler P. Selling Stem Cells in the USA: Assessing the Direct-to-Consumer Industry. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2016;19(2):154–157.
- Turner L. US stem cell clinics, patient safety, and the FDA. *Trends Mol Med*. 2015;21(5):271–273.
- Jiang L, Dong BH. Fraudsters operate and officialdom turns a blind eye: a proposal for controlling stem cell therapy in China. *Med Health Care Philos*. 2016;19(3):403–410.

34. Kashiwara H, Nakayama T, Hatta T, et al. Evaluating the Quality of Website Information of Private-Practice Clinics Offering Cell Therapies in Japan. *Interact J Med Res*. 2016;5(2):e15.
35. Knoepfler PS. When patients reach out, scientists should reach back carefully. *Nat Med*. 2016;22(3):230.
36. Temple SI, Studer L. Lessons Learned from Pioneering Neural Stem Cell Studies. *Stem Cell Reports*. 2017;8(2):191–193.
37. OCTGT C. *Guidance for Industry Preclinical Assessment of Investigational Cellular and Gene Therapy Products*. USA: Services, US Food and Drug Administration: 10903 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20993; 2013.
38. Bailey AM, Mendicino M, Au P. An FDA perspective on preclinical development of cell-based regenerative medicine products. *Nature biotechnology*. 2014;32(8):721–723.
39. Hyun I, Lindvall O, Ahrlund-Richter L, et al. New ISSCR guidelines underscore major principles for responsible translational stem cell research. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2008;3(6):607–609.
40. Daley GQ, Hyun I, Apperley JF, et al. Setting Global Standards for Stem Cell Research and Clinical Translation: The 2016 ISSCR Guidelines. *Stem Cell Reports*. 2016;6(6):787–97.
41. Kimmelman J, Heslop HE, Sugarman J, et al. New ISSCR guidelines: clinical translation of stem cell research. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10032):1979–1981.
42. Kimmelman J, Hyun I, Benvenisty N, et al. Policy: Global standards for stem-cell research. *Nature*. 2016;533(7603):311–313.