

# Neuroprotection as a treatment for glaucoma: Pharmacological and immunological approaches

M. SCHWARTZ

Department of Neurobiology, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot - Israel

**PURPOSE.** *Primary open-angle glaucoma is a chronic, progressive optic neuropathy associated with a gradual decline in visual functions, which may lead to blindness.*

**METHODS.** *In most cases, the optic neuropathy is associated with increased intraocular pressure. However, it is now generally accepted, that normalization of pressure, although necessary, is often not sufficient as a remedial measure. This is because of the existence of additional risk factors, some of which emerge as a consequence of the initial damage. This situation is reminiscent of the response to a traumatic axonal insult: some of the damage is immediate and is caused by the insult itself, while some is secondary and is caused by a deficiency of growth-supportive factors as well as by toxic factors derived from the damaged tissue. Accordingly, we have suggested that glaucoma may be viewed as a neurodegenerative disease and consequently is amenable to any therapeutic intervention applicable to these diseases.*

**CONCLUSIONS.** *There is evidence that neuroprotection can be achieved both pharmacologically and immunologically. Pharmacological intervention (e.g. by using selective alpha-2 adrenergic receptor agonists) neutralizes some of the effects of the nerve-derived toxic factors and possibly increases the ability of the remaining healthy neurons, at any given time, to cope with the stressful conditions. Immunological intervention boosts the body's own repair mechanisms for counteracting the toxicity of physiological compounds acting as stress signals. Eur J Ophthalmol 2001; 11 (Suppl 2): S7-S11*

**KEY WORDS.** *Autoimmunity, Glaucoma, Neuroprotection*

## INTRODUCTION

Glaucoma is a neurodegenerative disease of the optic nerve and is a leading cause of blindness. The pathogenesis of optic nerve neuropathy in glaucoma is still a matter of debate. Increased intraocular pressure (IOP) is probably the most frequently encountered risk factor in primary open-angle glaucoma, leading to the widely held view that increased IOP plays a central role in the initiation and development of glaucomatous neuropathy by increasing the mechanical forces on the lamina cribrosa of the optic nerve head. However, it is a common experience that the disease may continue to progress even if the IOP is reduced and kept within the normal range. This suggests that me-

chanical compression is probably not the only reason for the optic nerve damage (1-5).

Recent experimental and clinical evidence have indicated that glaucomatous neuropathy is also associated with other risk factors known to contribute to neurodegeneration in the acutely or chronically injured central nervous system (CNS). Included among these are optic nerve head ischaemia, inhibition of neurotrophic factor transport, and the presence of secondary risk factors such as an increase in the excitatory neurotransmitter glutamate or in nitric oxide synthase. These findings led us to suggest that glaucoma should be viewed as a neurodegenerative disease (6), and that its treatment, in addition to lowering the IOP, should therefore include neuroprotective therapy (6-9). Neuro-

protection can be achieved by counteracting risk factors, increasing the resistance of cells to the stressful conditions, or both. There is a danger, however, that interference with the physiological response, though possibly beneficial at the site of pathology, may nevertheless be harmful to the normal tissue, leading to undesirable side effects. A more favourable approach from the clinical point of view, therefore, is to harness and augment the tissue's own defence machinery.

Among the toxic risk factors triggered by the degenerating nerve itself is an uncontrolled increase in the amounts of certain biochemical compounds, with harmful consequences for the tissue. One such compound is the excitatory amino acid glutamate, which normally acts as a major neurotransmitter but is neurotoxic when its physiological levels are exceeded. Glutamate was found to be increased in the vitreous of glaucomatous patients, as well as in animal models of glaucoma and of crush-injured optic nerves (10–12). Similarly, the retinas of damaged optic nerves of both human patients and animal models were found to contain increased concentrations of nitric oxide (13), a compound whose toxicity is evident from the fact that inhibition of the enzymes which mediate its increase arrests or at least slows down the degeneration. The presence of these biochemical compounds in abnormally high amounts may cause the death of neighbouring neurons that were not destroyed or damaged by high IOP or any other primary insult. Also, as discussed in the next section, it should be noted that even if the environmental toxicity is not severe enough to cause cell death directly, it may nevertheless lead to death because of the toxicity-enhanced susceptibility of any spared neurons to glutamate and other toxic mediators, or the lower ability of these neurons to tolerate even normal IOP.

Attempts to halt the spread of damage have included neutralizing the mediators of toxicity, inhibiting signal transduction associated with death signals, and increasing the resistance of vulnerable neurons to the injurious conditions. None of these approaches, however, makes use of the system whose chief function is to maintain and protect the organism, namely the immune system. There are several reasons why the very system best qualified for the job has not been called upon. First, in most neurodegenerative diseases (such as Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease or glaucoma), the active process takes place in the CNS,

an immune-privileged site where any immune activity has long been considered harmful. Secondly, according to common wisdom, adaptive intervention by the immune system is needed only in cases of damage associated with pathogens, and pathogens are not involved in the spread of damage in neurodegenerative diseases. Thirdly, some beneficial effect on the post-injury spread of damage has been obtained with anti-inflammatory drugs, leading in many cases to oversimplified conclusions about the role of immune activities in the injured CNS (14–18).

For all of the above reasons, the immune system possesses a bad reputation as a potential source of therapy in the CNS. This would explain why exploitation of adaptive immunity was, until recently, not seriously considered as a worthwhile approach in the attempt to stop the spread of damage.

### **Beneficial autoimmunity in the damaged CNS**

Using rat models of partially crush-injured optic nerves and contused spinal cords, in which degeneration progresses both laterally and longitudinally, we recently observed that a well-controlled adaptive immune response is beneficial in slowing down the post-traumatic spread of damage. The immune response was mediated by T-cells directed against a CNS-associated self-antigen, such as myelin basic protein (MBP) (19–22), myelin oligodendrocyte protein (MOG), or proteolipid protein (PLP), or against peptides (encephalitogenic or non-encephalitogenic) derived from these proteins (23). T-cells directed against encephalitogenic cryptic epitopes were as effective as those directed against non-encephalitogenic cryptic epitopes (19,23) in displaying neuroprotection, indicating that the observed neuroprotection was not related to the virulence of the autoimmune response. The response could be achieved either by active immunization with the proteins (or peptides) or by passive transfer of T-cells activated by them (22). On the basis of these findings, we suggested that autoimmune T-cells can protect CNS neurons from the post-injury spread of damage. We further showed that the neuroprotective autoimmunity is not primarily the result of an experimental manipulation but is an endogenous response that is awakened by the damaged neurons, although apparently not strongly enough to be effective (24). It thus appears that this T-cell-mediated autoimmune response

is a physiological mechanism whereby the body attempts to cope with trauma-related nerve damage to the nervous system, but – presumably because of an evolutionary trade-off – the recruited autoimmune response, in its natural state, is neither timely nor effective (25–28).

The beneficial autoimmunity can, in principle, gain access to the damaged tissue at any time, since even the healthy CNS is receptive to surveillance by T-cells, which – unlike immunoglobulins or macrophages – are not restricted by the blood-brain barrier.

The way in which the T-cell-mediated immune response exerts its neuroprotective effect is not yet fully understood. Like most of the activities of adaptive immune cells, the activity is likely to be antigen-dependent. Thus, in order to exert their neuroprotective activity the T-cells need to be reactivated at the site of injury. Our recent demonstration of antigen-dependent production of neurotrophic factors by T-cells points to neurotrophin production as a possible facilitator of the protection provided by the T-cells (29). As a source of neurotrophins, T-cells have certain advantages over neuronal cells: (i) because of their mobility, T-cells can be recruited to supply areas that run short of neurotrophins due to damage; (ii) the amount of neurotrophin production by T-cells is determined by reactivation through signals coming from the tissue, a feature unique to immune cells; and (iii) the type of neurotrophin produced may also be affected by the nature and/or intensity of the stress signals.

### **Exploitation of T-cell-mediated autoimmunity for the treatment of degenerative diseases**

The finding of autoimmune neuroprotection of nerve cell bodies and fibres in the hostile environment of the injured rat spinal cord or optic nerve leads us to believe that this beneficial activity will prove to be a feature of other degenerative events as well. In searching for ways to boost such a response, one should be aware that it must be well controlled to avoid exceeding the risk threshold and inducing an autoimmune disease.

Any self protein, being a potential antigen for immunization, has sites that are immunodominant, and thus encephalitogenic, and sites that are immunosilent. The dominance varies among individuals, depending on the nature of the protein and the genetic

background of the species, strains or individuals with respect to the major histocompatibility complex. Accordingly, the chances of finding a consensus sequence among individuals with respect to a ‘silent’ (i.e. safe) epitope are very small.

We have recently observed that the known Copolymer-1 (Cop-1), a synthetic antigen consisting of 4 amino acids, which serves as a drug for multiple sclerosis patients, can serve as a safe antigen (30,31). Passive and active immunization with the oligopeptide, reduces the damage caused by mechanical insult to the optic nerve or by intravitreally injected glutamate. The protection from glutamate toxicity has far-reaching implications since glutamate is a common mediator in many CNS disorders, including glaucoma, and thus the above active or passive immunization may be of therapeutic value in reducing its toxicity and thereby protecting nerves from further degeneration. The success of immunization with Cop-1 in reducing the neuronal losses resulting from optic nerve insult, whether to the axons or directly to the cell bodies, encouraged us to study the effects of Cop-1 immunization in a rat model of glaucoma. Our recent results, using a rat model of ocular hypertension, showed that active immunization with Cop-1, leads to a significant reduction in retinal ganglion cell loss resulting from an increase in IOP (31).

The fact that immunization with Cop-1 protects retinal ganglion cells from death in a rat model of high IOP even under conditions where the pressure is reduced and then kept low, is potentially of great advantage from the clinical point of view. This is because even a pressure reduced to normal is not necessarily safe for patients with glaucoma, in whom the remaining neurons are more vulnerable than normal ones. Moreover, reduction of the IOP to what might be considered safe in such patients, i.e. to 12 mm Hg, might not be feasible. Thus, under conditions where the pressure is reduced but is still higher than the patient’s retinal ganglion cells can tolerate, additional protective long-term therapy is needed.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Recent findings in our laboratory have shown that CNS insults, whether mechanically or biochemically induced, evoke a T-cell-dependent beneficial response,

which we interpret as providing versatile backup protection when the specific local mechanisms for buffering of potentially toxic physiological compounds are unequal to the task. Active immunization with myelin-associated self-antigens appears to be a way to enhance this endogenous response, and thus represents a promising strategy for boosting physiological mechanisms of protection. Self-antigens, however, can induce an autoimmune disease in susceptible individuals, whereas Cop-1, the copolymer recently tested in our laboratory is known to be a 'safe' antigen. If anything, it will suppress autoimmune disease onset. Thus, vaccination with Cop-1 essentially simulates vaccination with self-antigens, but in a safe way.

It seems reasonable to assume that immunization, if successful, will provide a more global, multi-facto-

rial, and long-lasting protection than the local buffering system can supply. This is especially important in the case of chronic CNS disorders such as glaucoma since, at any given time, there are neurons at different stages of health, vulnerability and amenability to neuroprotective intervention. Since Cop-1 is a safe drug, it can be adapted immediately as a therapeutic protocol for glaucoma.

Reprint requests to:  
Michal Schwartz, PhD  
Department of Neurobiology  
The Weizmann Institute of Science  
76100 Rehovot  
Israel  
michal.schwartz@weizmann.ac.il

---

## REFERENCES

1. Yoles E, Schwartz M. Potential neuroprotective therapy for glaucomatous optic neuropathy. *Surv Ophthalmol* 1998; 42: 367-72.
2. Sugrue MF. The pharmacology of antiglaucoma drugs. *Pharmacol Ther* 1989; 43: 91-138.
3. Brubaker RF. Delayed functional loss in glaucoma. Lil Edward Jackson Memorial Lecture. *Am J Ophthalmol* 1996; 121: 473-83.
4. Liesegang TJ. Glaucoma: changing concepts and future directions. *Mayo Clin Proc* 1998; 71: 689-94.
5. Quigley HA. Neuronal death in glaucoma. *Prog Retin Eye Res* 1999; 18: 39-57.
6. Schwartz M, Belkin M, Yoles E, Solomon A. Potential treatment modalities for glaucomatous neuropathy: Neuroprotection and neuroregeneration. *J Glaucoma* 1996; 5: 427-32.
7. Osborne NN, Chidlow G, Nash MS, Wood JP. The potential of neuroprotection in glaucoma treatment. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 1999; 10: 82-92.
8. Schwartz M, Yoles E. Cellular and molecular basis of neuroprotection: Implications for optic neuropathies. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol* 2000; 11: 107-11.
9. Weinreb RN, Levin LA. Is neuroprotection a viable therapy for glaucoma? *Arch Ophthalmol* 1999; 117: 1540-4.
10. Yoles E, Schwartz M. Elevation of intraocular glutamate levels in rats with partial lesion of the optic nerve. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1998; 116: 906-10.
11. Brooks DE, Garcia GA, Dreyer EB, Zurakowski D, Franco-Bourland RE. Vitreous body glutamate concentration in dogs with glaucoma. *Am J Vet Res* 1997; 58: 864-67.
12. Dreyer EB, Zurakowski D, Schumer RA, Podos SM, Lipton SA. Elevated glutamate levels in the vitreous body of humans and monkeys with glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1996; 114: 299-305.
13. Neufeld AH, Hernandez MR, Gonzalez M. Nitric oxide synthase in the human glaucomatous optic nerve head. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1997; 115: 497-503.
14. Bethea JR, Castro M, Keane RW, Lee TT, Dietrich WD, Yezierski RP. Traumatic spinal cord injury induces nuclear factor-kappaB activation. *J Neurosci* 1998; 18: 3251-60.
15. Constantini S, Young W. The effects of methylprednisolone and the ganglioside GM1 on acute spinal cord injury in rats. *J Neurosurg* 1994; 80: 97-111.
16. Hirschberg DL, Schwartz M. Macrophage recruitment to acutely injured central nervous system is inhibited by a resident factor: A basis for an immune-brain barrier. *J Neuroimmunol* 1995; 61: 89-96.
17. Popovich PG, Whitacre CC, Stokes BT. Is spinal cord injury an autoimmune disease? *Neuroscientist* 1998; 4: 71-6.
18. Rapalino O, Lazarov-Spiegler O, Agranov E, et al. Implantation of stimulated homologous macrophages results in partial recovery of paraplegic rats. *Nat Med* 1998; 4: 814-21.
19. Moalem G, Leibowitz-Amit R, Yoles E, Mor F, Cohen IR, Schwartz M. Autoimmune T cells protect neurons from

- secondary degeneration after central nervous system axotomy. *Nat Med* 1999; 5: 49-55.
20. Moalem G, Monsonogo A, Shani Y, Cohen IR, Schwartz M. Differential T cell response in central and peripheral nerve injury: Connection with immune privilege. *FASEB J* 1999; 13: 1207-17.
  21. Hauben E, Nevo U, Yoles E, et al. Autoimmune T cells as potential neuroprotective therapy for spinal cord injury. *Lancet* 2000; 355: 286-7.
  22. Hauben E, Butovsky O, Nevo U, et al. Passive or active immunization with myelin basic protein promotes recovery from spinal cord contusion. *J Neurosci* 2000; 20: 6421-30.
  23. Fisher J, Yoles E, Levkovitch-Verbin H, Kay JF, Ben-Nun A, Schwartz M. Vaccination for neuroprotection in the mouse optic nerve: Implications for optic neuropathies. *J Neurosci* 2001; 21: 136-42.
  24. Yoles E, Hauben E, Palgi O, et al. Protective autoimmunity is a physiological response to CNS trauma. *J Neurosci* 2001; 21: 3740-8.
  25. Cohen IR, Schwartz M. Autoimmune maintenance and neuroprotection of the central nervous system. *J Neuroimmunol* 1999; 100: 111-4.
  26. Schwartz M, Cohen IR, Lazarov-Spiegler O, Moalem G, Yoles E. The remedy may lie in ourselves: Prospects for immune cell therapy in central nervous system protection and repair. *J Mol Med* 1999; 77: 713-7.
  27. Schwartz M, Moalem G, Leibowitz-Amit R, Cohen IR. Innate and adaptive immune responses can be beneficial for CNS repair. *Trends Neurosci* 1999; 22: 295-9.
  28. Schwartz M, Cohen IR. Autoimmunity can benefit self-maintenance. *Immunol Today* 2000; 21: 265-8.
  29. Moalem G, Gdalyahu A, Shani Y, et al. Production of neurotrophins by activated T cells: Implications for neuroprotective autoimmunity. *J Autoimmun* 2000; 15: 331-45.
  30. Kipnis J, Yoles E, Porat Z, et al. T cell immunity to Copolymer-1 confers neuroprotection on the damaged optic nerve: Possible therapy for optic neuropathies. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2000; 97: 7446-51.
  31. Schori H, Kipnis J, Yoles E, et al. Vaccination for protection of neurons against glutamate cytotoxicity and ocular hypertension: Implications for glaucoma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2001; 98: 3398-403.