

## EDITORIAL

## HIGHLIGHT



## Blood–brain barrier models derived from individual patients: a new frontier

An Editorial Highlight on 'An isogenic blood–brain barrier model comprising brain endothelial cells, astrocytes, and neurons derived from human induced pluripotent stem cells'

Jianming Xiang,\* Anuska V. Andjelkovic,\*† Michael M. Wang‡§¶ and Richard F. Keep\*§

\*Department of Neurosurgery, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

†Department of Pathology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

‡Department of Neurology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

§Molecular & Integrative Physiology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

¶Department of Veterans Affairs, VA Ann Arbor Healthcare System, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Read the highlighted article [‘An isogenic blood–brain barrier model comprising brain endothelial cells, astrocytes, and neurons derived from human induced pluripotent stem cells’ on page 874.](#)

In this issue of Journal of Neurochemistry, Canfield *et al.* (2017) used human-induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) to derive endothelial cells, astrocytes, and neurons. Co-culture of those cells resulted in a human blood–brain barrier (BBB) model with excellent permeability characteristics, with transendothelial electrical resistances (TEERs) and passive permeabilities close to those found *in vivo*. This study continues the groundbreaking work from the laboratories of Eric Shusta and Sean Palecek on using iPSCs to model the BBB (Lippmann *et al.* 2011, 2012, 2014). Very importantly, in this study, the authors also showed that such models can be derived from a single patient. Thus, provided the model is reproducible across patients, this approach raises the possibility of examining how genetic mutations in a patient change BBB and neurovascular unit (endothelial and perivascular cells; neurovascular unit, NVU) function both in normal and stressed, disease-like, conditions. Alterations in BBB/NVU function may impact the course of neurological diseases and the delivery of therapeutics. In addition, studies of cells derived from patients with genetic mutations may provide insight into the mechanisms that normally regulate the human BBB/NVU.

With a few exceptions (e.g. the effects of glucose transporter type 1 deficiency syndrome in humans; Leen *et al.* 2014), our knowledge of the effects of mutations on BBB function have been derived from targeted mutations, usually gene deletions, in mice. Thus, for example, mouse

knockout studies showed the importance of p-glycoprotein as an efflux transporter at the BBB (Schinkel *et al.* 1994) and claudin-5 in regulating BBB permeability (Nitta *et al.* 2003). Such studies have greatly advanced the field, but there are some caveats. First, much less is known about the BBB implications of the gene variants that naturally occur in humans. An exception is the p-glycoprotein polymorphisms in relation to antidepressant usage (Breitenstein *et al.* 2015). A second, broader, issue relates to whether there are species differences in BBB function. Thus, for example, differences have been reported between ATP binding cassette transporter activity and expression at the BBB between species (Uchida *et al.* 2011). Species differences at the BBB/NVU are an understudied area, and they may be one underlying difficulty in modeling human neurological diseases in rodents.

The human BBB/NVU model developed by Canfield *et al.* (2017) is, therefore, an important resource. Currently, human BBB/NVU studies rely on limited amounts of tissue for

Received December 19, 2016; revised manuscript received January 11, 2017; accepted January 16, 2017.

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Richard F. Keep, R5018 Biomedical Science Research Building, University of Michigan, 109 Zina Pitcher Place, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-2200, USA.  
E-mail: rkeep@umich.edu

Abbreviations used: ABC, ATP binding cassette; BBB, blood–brain barrier; iPSCs, induced pluripotent stem cells; NVU, neurovascular unit; TEER, transendothelial electrical resistance.

primary culture (e.g. epilepsy resections), commercial cells with sparse documentation as to source, or human immortalized cell lines (Helms *et al.* 2016). The mostly commonly used cell line, hCMEC3/D3, while useful for many studies, has a TEER an order of magnitude less than the model presented by Canfield *et al.* (2017) (Helms *et al.* 2016). Even primary cultures with human brain endothelial cells generally have much lower TEER values. The use of iPSCs also has an advantage in scaling; i.e. these cells can be grown in much greater quantities compared to primary cultures. Combining the iPSC approach with high efficiency gene editing (CRISPR/CAS9) would also, in principle, permit study of a large array of human variants even if samples are not available from patients. The same approaches could also permit the generation of isogenic controls for patient derived iPSCs.

One important element that is absent from the BBB model developed by Canfield *et al.* (2017) is the pericyte. These cells have an important impact on BBB function (Armulik *et al.* 2010) and Shusta and his collaborators have previously described a BBB model using primary pericytes that had very high TEERs (Lippmann *et al.* 2014). The use of human iPSCs to produce brain pericytes would be a major addition to the model. Also, while the model has excellent passive permeability properties, the BBB has important additional properties. How well this iPSC-derived model recapitulates the *in vivo* BBB with respect to transporters, transcytosis and the metabolic barrier remains to be fully elucidated. The addition of pericytes and physiological shear stress may have an impact on those barrier properties.

In conclusion, great strides are being made in the development of human iPSC-derived BBB/NVU models. Such models will help in our understanding of the human BBB/NVU, the impact of genetic mutations and disease states and whether there are species differences in BBB/NVU function. Such modeling may also allow an understanding of how to tailor therapeutic dosing to an individual patient.

### Acknowledgements and conflict of interest disclosure

Richard Keep is a former editor of the Journal of Neurochemistry. The other authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

### References

- Armulik A., Genove G., Mae M. *et al.* (2010) Pericytes regulate the blood-brain barrier. *Nature* **468**, 557–561.
- Breitenstein B., Bruckl T. M., Ising M., Muller-Myhsok B., Holsboer F. and Czamara D. (2015) ABCB1 gene variants and antidepressant treatment outcome: a meta-analysis. *Am. J. Med. Genet. B Neuropsychiatr. Genet.* **168b**, 274–283.
- Canfield S. G., Stebbins M. J., Morales B. S., Asai S. W., Vatine G. D., Svendsen C. N., Palecek S. P. and Shusta E. V. (2017) An isogenic blood–brain barrier model comprising brain endothelial cells, astrocytes, and neurons derived from human induced pluripotent stem cells. *J. Neurochem.* **140**, 874–888.
- Helms H. C., Abbott N. J., Burek M. *et al.* (2016) In vitro models of the blood-brain barrier: an overview of commonly used brain endothelial cell culture models and guidelines for their use. *J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.* **36**, 862–890.
- Leen W. G., Taher M., Verbeek M. M., Kamsteeg E. J., Van De Warrenburg B. P. and Willemsen M. A. (2014) GLUT1 deficiency syndrome into adulthood: a follow-up study. *J. Neurol.* **261**, 589–599.
- Lippmann E. S., Weidenfeller C., Svendsen C. N. and Shusta E. V. (2011) Blood-brain barrier modeling with co-cultured neural progenitor cell-derived astrocytes and neurons. *J. Neurochem.* **119**, 507–520.
- Lippmann E. S., Azarin S. M., Kay J. E., Nessler R. A., Wilson H. K., Al-Ahmad A., Palecek S. P. and Shusta E. V. (2012) Derivation of blood-brain barrier endothelial cells from human pluripotent stem cells. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **30**, 783–791.
- Lippmann E. S., Al-Ahmad A., Azarin S. M., Palecek S. P. and Shusta E. V. (2014) A retinoic acid-enhanced, multicellular human blood-brain barrier model derived from stem cell sources. *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 4160.
- Nitta T., Hata M., Gotoh S., Seo Y., Sasaki H., Hashimoto N., Furuse M. and Tsukita S. (2003) Size-selective loosening of the blood-brain barrier in claudin-5-deficient mice. *J. Cell Biol.* **161**, 653–660.
- Schinkel A. H., Smit J. J., Van Tellingen O. *et al.* (1994) Disruption of the mouse *mdr1a* P-glycoprotein gene leads to a deficiency in the blood-brain barrier and to increased sensitivity to drugs. *Cell* **77**, 491–502.
- Uchida Y., Ohtsuki S., Katsukura Y., Ikeda C., Suzuki T., Kamiie J. and Terasaki T. (2011) Quantitative targeted absolute proteomics of human blood-brain barrier transporters and receptors. *J. Neurochem.* **117**, 333–345.