

Controversies in Experimental Dermatology

Section Editor: Ralf Paus, Hamburg

How realistic is cutaneous gene therapy?

Hengge UR, Taichman LB, Kaur P, Rogers G, Jensen TG, Goldsmith LA, Rees JL, Christiano AM. How realistic is cutaneous gene therapy? Exp Dermatol 1999; 8: 419–431. © Munksgaard, 1999

U. R. Hengge, L. B. Taichman,
P. Kaur, G. Rogers,
T. G. Jensen, L. A. Goldsmith,
J. L. Rees and A. M. Christiano

Recent progress with innovative, experimental gene therapy approaches in animals, and recent improvements in our understanding and manipulation of stem cells, gene expression and gene delivery systems, have raised plenty of hopes in essentially all branches of clinical medicine that hitherto untreatable or poorly manageable diseases will soon become amenable to treatment. Few other organ systems have received such enthusiastic reviews in recent years as to the chances and prospects of gene therapy as the skin, with its excellent accessibility and its pools of – seemingly – readily manipulated epithelial stem cells (cf. Cotsarelis et al., Exp Dermatol 1999; 8: 80–88).

However, as in other sectors of clinical medicine, the actual implementation of general gene therapy strategies in clinical practice has been faced with a range of serious difficulties (cf. Smith, Lancet 1999; 354 (suppl 1): 1–4; Lattime & Gerson (eds.), Gene Therapy of Cancer, Academic Press, San Diego, 1999). Thus, it is critically important to carefully distinguish unfounded hype from justified hope in this embryonal area of dermatologic therapy, to discuss in detail what can be realistically expected from cutaneous gene therapy approaches in the next few years, and importantly, what kind of promises should not be made to our patients at this time.

Viewpoint 1

Gene therapy is a new field of biotechnology that deals with treating diseases with DNA. While early gene therapy was confined to hematopoietic cells, the skin has rapidly become a major organ for genetic manipulations due to its accessibility and immunological properties. Both skin fibroblasts and epidermal keratinocytes have been employed as targets. In order to appreciate its value, it is important to recall the different scen-

arios in which skin gene therapy can be helpful (Fig. 1).

First, the skin can serve to synthesize various proteins that have therapeutic value, either systemically or locally. In this regard, the first systemic corrective genetic approach was performed in 1987 with transduced fibroblasts or transduced autologous lymphocytes from adenosine-deaminase-deficient humans for severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID) syndrome using retroviral vectors (1, 21). At the same time, human epidermal grafts were obtained from human growth hormone-transduced keratinocytes (20), or from human apolipoprotein E (apo E)-transfected keratinocytes grafted onto athymic rats (9). In these studies, the formation of a differentiated epidermis with genetically modified keratinocytes and the continuous production of therapeutic

Skin as a bioreactor Skin as a metabolic sink Skin as a vaccination organ Skin treatment

Figure 1. Various scenarios for skin gene therapy.

proteins that gained access to the bloodstream have been demonstrated. Soon thereafter, hemophilia B was phenotypically corrected in dogs using retroviral vectors (10, 14).

Rosenberg and colleagues (25) were the first to perform a clinical gene-marking trial in stage IV melanoma patients. Subsequently, gene therapy of cancer in several animal models showed promising results, using IL-6, IL-2 and IFN- γ (29).

Furthermore, skin gene therapy can be used for the local treatment of genetically determined skin diseases (genodermatoses). In this regard, the increasing knowledge of genetic mutations has helped to understand a substantial number of skin diseases involving the basement membrane, and thus has allowed the development of gene therapy strategies. Recent examples of corrective skin gene therapy approaches include the assembly of hemidesmosomes in reconstructed epithelia from junctional epidermolysis bullosa patients (33), and the generation of a functional epidermal barrier in lamellar ichthyosis (4).

Second, the skin can be used to detoxify metabolic products, if the necessary enzymes are synthesized ("metabolic sink") (23). For example, enzymes such as ornithine-delta-aminotransferase can be produced in the skin, and can serve to clear hyperornithinemia which causes gyrate atrophy (28).

Third, the skin has potent immunization potential. This property was realized when *in vivo* gene transfer became possible through the introduction of the "gene gun", which allowed the transfer of genes coated onto fine gold particles into a variety of mammalian tissues and cells both *in vitro* and *in vivo* (13). Subsequently, the direct injection of naked plasmid DNA was established, thereby eliminating the need of expensive technical devices (12, 36). Potent cytotoxic T cell and humoral immune responses can be generated, exploiting antigen processing and presentation in the skin and muscle. Direct transfection of antigen-presenting Langerhans cells has been shown to vigorously stimulate immune responses (5). In addition, proteins which are produced in keratinocytes can be phagocytosed and presented in the MHC class I pathway and lead to CTL priming (7).

It has also been found that the balance between a T_{h1} - and a T_{h2} -type immune response can be influenced by choosing the organ that is employed for vaccination (e.g. skin vs muscle) and the method of gene transfer (direct injection vs gene gun) (32). In particular, injection of plasmid DNA led to a T_{h1} -immune response (IgG_{2a}), whereas particle bombardment created a predominant T_{h2} -type response (IgG₁) (8, 32). These intrinsic differences need to be kept in mind when gene therapy strategies are designed. For example, Balb/c mice




Figure 2. *In vivo* and *ex vivo* gene transfer.

Table 1. Achievements and progress in gene therapy

Improved transduction rate by pseudotyping
Vector targeting to certain tissues (target cell recognition)
Vector targeting to epidermal layers (K14, K10)
Bicistronic expression
Reduced immunogenicity of virus vectors
Phenotypic correction of disease

are susceptible to leishmaniasis, a parasitic infection associated with a T_{H2} predominance. By direct intradermal injection of a surface glycoprotein cDNA (gp-63 cDNA), a T_{H1} -type immune response is induced, which can prevent the disease (34). In addition, the administration of cytokines and co-stimulatory molecules can further influence the type of the immune response (31). Recently, the epidermal route of genetic immunization has been compared with muscular administration (11). Higher rates of seroconversion, higher antibody titers and increased cytotoxic T-lymphocytes have been detected following the epidermal mode of immunization.

Two basic approaches can be pursued to transfer genes in gene therapy (Fig. 2) (13). The *ex vivo* approach introduces genes while cells or tissues are being propagated in culture. This approach is complicated and requires laborious culturing, but allows the transfer of genes into large numbers of early progenitor/putative stem cells, which can be selected for the presence of the introduced gene. This approach has generally been used with retroviral vectors. In contrast, the *in vivo* gene transfer (i.e. gene gun, direct injection) is straightforward, but is not practical for larger skin areas or persistent expression, since stem cells are generally not transfected. In essence, the *ex vivo* setting is suitable for corrective, long-lasting gene transfer, whereas the *in vivo* techniques are being used for immunization, where transient expression is desired.

Various refinements have been achieved in vector technology and application procedures (Table 1). The advantages of plasmid DNA for immunization purposes were soon recognized, such as repetitive administration without adverse immune responses. Large gene products can be synthesized from plasmids, which is possible neither with viral transfer (due to limited capacity) nor with recombinant protein technology (due to difficulties in maintaining native conformation and glycosylation). Whereas recombinant protein is expensive and unpredictable, DNA production is cost-effective and nucleic acids can be obtained in large amounts. Consequently, several attempts have been made to facilitate gene transfer by simply applying the genetic remedy topically to the skin. To-

wards this end, liposomes, adenovirus, retrovirus, puncturing, jet injection, scratching or tape-stripping have proven the innovative capacity of skin researchers, but have not gone beyond proof of principle.

The novel utilization of the integument for gene therapy is due to the recently discovered characteristic of keratinocytes and Langerhans cells to take up DNA. Plasmid DNA is a large, highly negatively charged molecule and usually is found in the nucleus and mitochondria. At this point, it is still obscure how and why keratinocytes (and various other cells) take up DNA and translate it into the corresponding protein. Current experiments aim to identify DNA-binding molecules on the cell membrane, which might help to understand the mechanism of uptake. Such an understanding will ultimately offer the potential to optimally exploit this ability. This understanding will also enable researchers to more comprehensively evaluate safety aspects and biocompatibility issues associated with this technology.

Very recently, the therapy of tumors in estab-

Table 2. Examples of skin gene therapy

<i>Clinical application</i>	
Metastatic melanoma	Rosenberg et al. 1990 (25); Nabel et al. 1993 (22), Klatzmann et al. 1998 (15); Sun et al. 1998 (30); Schreiber et al. 1999 (26)
Hemophilia B	Lu et al. 1993 (17)
Head and neck squamous cell carcinoma	Wollenberg et al. 1999 (37)
<i>Corrective skin gene therapy of epidermis</i>	
Junctional epidermolysis bullosa	Vailly et al. 1998 (33), Seitz et al. (27)
Lamellar ichthyosis	Choate et al. 1996 (4)
<i>Correction of systemic deficits using skin cells</i>	
Adenosine deaminase	Palmer et al. 1987 (23)
Human growth hormone	Morgan et al. 1987 (20)
Apolipoprotein E	Fenjves et al. 1989 (9)
Mucopolysaccharidosis type VII (β -glucuronidase)	Moullier et al. 1993 (21)
Fabry's disease (α -galactosidase)	Medin et al. 1996 (19)

Table 3. Challenges for the next decade(s)

Tissue and cell-cycle-specific targeting
Longevity of expression/correction (manipulation of stem cells)
<i>In vivo</i> regulation of gene expression (tetracycline repressor/ecdysone)
Control of immune responses
Excisional repair of transdominant negative mutations
Correction of entire diseased organ (<i>in vivo</i> selection)
Topical application ("gene cream")
Safety and biocompatibility
Public acceptance

lished tumor models has directly compared protein and DNA-induced therapy (24). Treatment with IL-12 cDNA showed similar antitumor effects, but exhibited fewer side effects than treatment with IL-12 protein. This important study is the first to show the clinical equivalence of plasmid DNA with protein in cancer therapy and revealed significantly less toxicity for the DNA approach.

Since the first therapeutic experiments in the late 1980s, more than 250 additional clinical gene therapy trials were approved and more than 2000 patients were treated worldwide through the end of 1996 (Table 2 and ref. 18). The majority of the trials aimed to treat cancer employ suicide genes or immunization strategies. Since melanoma is one of the most immunogenic tumors, it represented a favorable target for gene-modified cancer vaccines (Table 2). Based on animal tumor models, a number of clinical protocols have been developed to treat cancer patients with irradiated allogeneic or autologous melanoma cells modified with various cytokine genes such as IL-2, IL-4, IL-7, IL-12, GM-CSF, IFN- γ or co-stimulatory molecules like B7.1 and B7.2 (13).

Whereas the therapy with irradiated genetically modified tumor cells is widely accepted from a safety standpoint, the utilization of plasmid DNA is currently being discussed controversially due to potential secondary effects resulting from long-term, low level expression eventually leading to tolerance or autoimmunity. Towards this end, several clinical trials have confirmed the safety of naked DNA in humans. Besides therapeutic and prophylactic vaccinations against HIV and malaria (3, 35), plasmid DNA was evaluated for immunization against CEA-expressing colon carcinoma (6), and for the treatment of arterial occlusive disease of the myocardium and leg (16).

Despite the successes, several challenges exist which have not yet been resolved (Table 3). While transferred vectors persisted, the expression of the transgene was gradually inactivated. Moreover, control of highly regulated genes seems critical, since (e.g.) transfer of the CD40 ligand into bone marrow led to constitutive expression, causing lymphoma in animal models (2).

Under critical evaluation cutaneous gene therapy has passed its infancy, and has demonstrated proof of principle. Several technical limitations in the transfer from the culture flask to the experimental animal model and, finally, onto the clinical stage have yet to be mastered. Cutaneous gene therapy certainly merits appreciation, when the relatively small number of laboratories, the limited financial support and its young age (about 12 years) are taken into consideration. The most significant progress has been achieved with DNA im-

munization, which allows the endogenous production of proteins from tumors and infectious agents and elicits potent antitumor or antiinfective immunity. Skin gene therapy has not yet cured humans, but has achieved beneficial clinical responses and has prolonged lives.

Especially for genetic vaccination, skin gene therapy will become a clinical reality in due course.

Ulrich R. Hengge

Dept. of Dermatology
University of Essen, Hufelandstr. 55
D-45147 Essen, Germany
e-mail: ulrich.hengge@uni-essen.de

References

1. Blaese R M et al. *Science* 1995; 270: 475–480.
2. Brown M P et al. *Nat Med* 1998; 4: 1253–1260.
3. Calarota S et al. *Lancet* 1998; 351: 1320–1325.
4. Choate K A et al. *Nat Med* 1996; 2: 1263–1267.
5. Condon C et al. *Nat Med* 1996; 2: 1122–1128.
6. Conry R M et al. *Hum Gene Ther* 1996; 7: 755–772.
7. Corr M et al. *J Exp Med* 1996; 184: 1555–1560.
8. Feltquate D M et al. *J Immunol* 1997; 158: 2278–2284.
9. Fenjves E S et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1989; 86: 8803–8807.
10. Gerrard A J et al. *Nat Genet* 1993; 3: 180–183.
11. Haynes J R et al. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses* 1994; 10: 43S–45S.
12. Hengge U R et al. *Nat Genet* 1995; 10: 161–166.
13. Hengge U R, Schadendorf D. Modification of melanoma cells via ballistic gene delivery for vaccination. In: Lasic, Templeton (eds). *Gene Therapy: Therapeutic Mechanisms and Strategies*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1998, in print.
14. Kay M A et al. *Science* 1993; 262: 117–119.
15. Klatzmann D et al. *Hum Gene Ther* 1998; 9: 2585–2594.
16. Losordo D W et al. *Circulation* 1998; 98: 2800–2804.
17. Lu D R et al. *Sci China B* 1993; 36: 1342–1351.
18. Marcel T, Grausz J D. *Hum Gene Ther* 1997; 8: 775–800.
19. Medin J A et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1996; 93: 7917–7922.
20. Morgan J R et al. *Science* 1987; 237: 1476–1479.
21. Moullier P et al. *Nat Genet* 1993; 4: 154–159.
22. Nabel G J et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1993; 90: 11307–11311.
23. Palmer T D et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1987; 84: 1055–1059.
24. Rakhmilevich A L et al. *J Immunother* 1999; 22: 135–144.
25. Rosenberg S A et al. *N Engl J Med* 1990; 323: 570–578.
26. Schreiber S et al. *Hum Gene Ther* 1999; 10: 983–993.
27. Seitz C S et al. *Gene Ther* 1999; 6: 42–47.
28. Sullivan D M et al. *Gene Ther* 1997; 4: 1036–1044.
29. Sun W H et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1995; 92: 2889–2893.
30. Sun Y et al. *Gene Ther* 1998; 5: 481–490.
31. Tighe H et al. *Immunol Today* 1998; 19: 89–97.
32. Torres C A et al. *J Immunol* 1997; 158: 4529–4532.
33. Vailly J et al. *Gene Ther* 1998; 5: 1322–1332.
34. Walker P S et al. *Hum Gene Ther* 1998; 9: 1899–1907.
35. Wang R et al. *Science* 1998; 282: 476–480.
36. Wolff J A et al. *Science* 1990; 247: 1465–1468.
37. Wollenberg et al. *Hum Gene Ther* 1999; 10: 141–147.

Viewpoint 2

It's been five years since many of us promised our patients and families with severe inherited skin disorders that by now, clinical trials for genetic therapies in a number of diseases would be well underway.

Yet on the eve of the millennium, despite the fact that the molecular bases for a wide range of genodermatoses have been worked out in breathtaking detail, we are still promising our patients a genetic remedy "within five" years.

Haven't we been here before?

Have we unknowingly offered false hope?

We were deeply sincere five years ago when we made these statements.

So, why has the reality not lived up to the promise?

Many of the patient advocacy organizations have begun to ask these very same questions to the scientists and clinicians who comprise their Scientific Advisory Boards.

Where's the gene therapy?

In response to this challenge, one advocacy group, DEBRA, the Dystrophic Epidermolysis Bullosa Research Organization of America, Inc., together with its international counterpart, has organized a Visioning Meeting in the Fall of 1999. The concept behind this meeting is to ask the really difficult questions of its scientists, and using invited expert gene therapists from other fields as moderators, to formulate a plan for where we would like to be in 2005. It promises to be quite the event, and as a DEBRA board member and an Editor of this Journal, I hope to communicate the essence of the proceedings, perhaps as a follow-up to this Controversies.

And hard questions they shall be.

Among the most challenging are the following...

Have we chosen rational disease targets and manageable genes?

One of the cruel paradoxes of gene therapy for inherited skin disorders is that the diseases we find the most compelling are the ones that offer the greatest clinical and technical challenges. For example, recessive dystrophic epidermolysis bullosa (EB) would certainly come to mind as a disorder in need of gene therapy. The molecular basis is unequivocally established, and it ranks among the most devastating of all genodermatoses. Yet, the gene, type VII collagen, is among the largest in the literature, making delivery in size-restricted vectors a challenge. Further, in the milieu of scar tissue in dystrophic EB, where would we even locate a stem cell for grafting?

Or consider Herlitz junctional EB (HJEB). Again, the neonatal lethal course of the disease compels us to search for a therapy. However, is a disease with such extensive internal involvement really a rational target for gene delivery? Could we possibly hope to rescue a phenotype as pleiotropic as HJEB? Further, could we expect to reconstitute functional laminin or collagen trimers in a temporally appropriate and cell-type specific fashion in order to effect and regulate a gene delivery strategy? In as short a window of therapeutic opportunity as a few weeks?

Might the milder forms of these diseases offer more rational targets? For example, would EB simplex or dominant dystrophic EB be better immediate targets, by selective inhibition of the mutant alleles? Or, would GABEB offer a better alternative for working out a paradigm for gene delivery, since type XVII at least offers a smaller and more manageable gene? Clearly, choosing both a disorder where patients are less severely affected together with a relatively small gene and clever delivery strategy might optimize the chances for success.

Have we identified the best strategies for prevention and treatment relative to the underlying types and combinations of mutations?

The major goals of managing genetic disease are no different than those for an acquired disease: prevention where possible, and treatment when not.

For genodermatoses, the prevention side of the equation has recently reached the forefront of disease prevention in the form of the availability of preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD) for HJEB. In this procedure, following *in vitro*-fertilization, single-cell DNA diagnosis is performed from 8-cell embryos and only the healthy or carrier embryos are transferred back to the mother to establish a pregnancy (see Review Article by McGrath & Handyside in *Exp Dermatol* 1998: 7: 65-72). PGD offers diagnosis prior to pregnancy, thereby obviating the need for termination altogether. It is truly the ultimate step in disease prevention as we know it.

On the treatment side, we need to keep in mind that alternative strategies to total gene replacement may offer more efficacious therapeutic approaches. For example, the use of homologous recombination for gene correction is being explored. Antisense and ribozyme technologies for gene inhibition may be applicable for the dominant disorders. And finally, methods of delivery are

constantly being refined. *Ex vivo* versus *in vivo*. Grafting versus gene gun. The list goes on and changes daily. However, because of the accessibility of the skin and the long-established methods for culture of cells and grafting, we should find ourselves well-positioned when vectors and enabling technologies become available.

And importantly, where is the field of EB relative to the rest of genetic diseases in terms of progress toward gene therapy?

This is the good news! We are not alone in skin disorders in promising our patients gene therapies. In fact, geneticists in almost every field of medicine have made similar promises. No one could have anticipated the obstacles that have plagued the cystic fibrosis clinical trials for example – for more than five years. No one could have predicted that the NIH would take a step back and invest heavily in vectorology for gene delivery – one of the most precarious of the technical stumbling blocks. No one could have anticipated the difficulties faced by many investigators in maintaining long term *in vivo* gene delivery. Many disciplines, dermatology included, are still working furiously to find the elusive stem cell.

As a field, we are exactly where we should be – with the molecular bases of our target disorders

well in hand, hard at work in our laboratories, and poised for action as the vector and delivery technology evolves.

What we have learned then, in five years, is that there is a great deal of insight and understanding needed after we've worked out the genes in meticulous detail.

What we have learned is that Nature does not yield her secrets easily, and that getting genes into the skin is not going to be as easy as we had anticipated.

Our hopes were as high as those of the patients we serve.

We share their disappointment, although these five years have not been without heroic efforts on our part. We believe, nonetheless, that the future looks brighter than ever.

Perhaps by choosing the right course for the right horse, this time we can live up to the reality of "within five years".

Angela M. Christiano
Depts of Dermatology and
Genetics & Development
Columbia University
New York, NY 10032
e-mail: amc65@columbia.edu

Commentary 1

The question posed by the title of these reviews, "How realistic is cutaneous gene therapy?" is somewhat misleading because it presupposes that cutaneous gene therapy is one entity with one outcome, when in fact cutaneous gene therapy is a collection of therapeutic approaches that have gene transfer to skin and its cells as a common element. As Ulrich Hengge correctly points out, cutaneous gene transfer encompasses a variety of approaches including viral and nonviral methods for *ex vivo* and *in vivo* gene transfer.

It has been my experience that a more fruitful examination of cutaneous gene therapy can be obtained if one divides applications in 2 groups, those requiring transient expression of the therapeutic gene and those requiring long term expression.

Short term transgene expression is useful for such applications as DNA vaccination whether for cancer immunization or for prevention of an infectious disease. For these applications, as Hengge explains, cutaneous gene therapy is well advanced.

Nonviral methods for gene transfer are relatively simple and achieve consistent short term expression. A number of clinical gene trials using nonviral gene transfer to skin as a route of vaccination are underway and there is solid evidence from preclinical studies to be optimistic of the outcome.

Long term expression is another story. Long term transgene expression would be needed to treat inherited skin diseases and systemic diseases amenable to correction by a cutaneous source of secreted gene product. For long term expression, the only feasible method for gene transfer is the use of a retroviral vector because of its capacity for integration into the host chromosome. Long term expression has been difficult to achieve, but several inroads into this problem have been made.

First, modification of the promoter within a retroviral vector has helped to enhance and perhaps prolong expression (1, 2). However, in none of these studies have data been presented directly showing enhanced or prolonged transcription from the putative transcriptional initiation site. Without

direct examination of promoter activity in the *in vivo* tissue, it is difficult to rule out other factors such as differences in grafting techniques or enhanced transduction of stem cells.

A second inroad has been the successful transduction of keratinocyte stem cells in culture. This was pointed out in two recent studies (3, 4). However, the importance of efficient stem cell transduction (5) has not been fully appreciated. Efforts to improve *in vivo* performance through modification of the enhancer/promoter complex may not be effective if only a small number of stem cells are successfully transduced. Even if the promoter regulating the transgene is highly active, if only a small percentage of stem cells in the tissue are transduced, transgene expression levels in the grafted animal will be low.

There is an additional problem underlying many studies of long term expression, and this relates to difficulties in securing stable grafts in immunocompromised animals. Long term expression studies require that *ex vivo* modified cells be accommodated for extended periods of time in an *in vivo* environment. We are now able to achieve long term grafts of human keratinocytes and fibroblasts routinely in athymic mice for observation periods as long as 40 weeks, but this capability did not come easily. It required considerable commitment of time and resources as well as the collaborative efforts of scientists in other labs to optimize raft cultures and grafting procedures. It has been our experience that when grafts are unstable, that is, they undergo contraction, or are invaded by mouse epithelial cells, or become inflamed, transgene expression is also unstable and is likely to be lost. We do not know the mechanism underlying this instability but a lack of sustained expression in an unstable graft poses a particularly difficult set of results to interpret. Investigators attempting to study long term *in vivo* expression will need to develop methods for securing stable grafts in a routine way.

In his review, Dr Hengge notes that there are no *in vivo* gene transfer methods that achieve long term expression. This was correct at the time of writing, but most recently a paper from our laboratory has appeared (6) describing direct, *in vivo* transduction of interfollicular and follicular kera-

tinocytes with high titer retroviruses with long term, sustained transgene expression. The ability to transduce epidermis and hair follicles directly may enable corrective gene transfer without the necessity for surgical placement of *ex vivo* modified autologous cells and the attendant complications that follow such a procedure. We believe this to be an important advance for cutaneous gene therapy.

Angela Christiano poses a more difficult question than feasibility of cutaneous gene therapy. Dr Christiano asks what genodermatoses could we realistically hope to treat, including the severe, widespread, crippling disorders such as recessive dystrophic EB or Herlitz junctional EB, or the milder forms such as EB simplex. This is a more difficult question because the milder forms, though more amenable to therapy, are less likely to require intervention, while the more severe forms are overwhelming in their need for intervention, but are unlikely to be ameliorated in a significant way by a gene-based therapy.

This is truly a dilemma for which there is no simple answer. I would think we aim for the more severe forms in our research goals, but in practice we treat the less severe forms, at least in initial therapy trials. We need to explain this to patient advocacy groups. Although these groups are anxious for relief, they have shown a generosity of spirit, a strong desire to understand their affliction, and are likely to be more accepting of our limitations than we are.

Lorne B. Taichman

Dept of Oral Biology & Pathology

SUNY at Stony Brook

Stony Brook, NY 11794-8702

e-mail: ltaichma@epo.som.sunysb.edu

References

1. Page S M, Brownlee G G. *Gene Ther* 1998; 5: 394.
2. Deng H et al. *Nature Biotechnology* 1997; 15: 1388.
3. Kolodka T M et al. *Proc Natl Acad USA* 1998; 95: 4356.
4. Mather M B et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1996; 93: 10371.
5. Quesenberry P J et al. (eds.). *Stem Cell Biology and Gene Therapy*. Wiley-Liss, New York, 1998.
6. Ghazizadeh et al. *Gene Ther* 1999; 6: 1267.

Commentary 2

Much has been said about the suitability of skin as an ideal vehicle for gene therapeutic approaches utilizing genetically manipulated keratinocytes to introduce foreign gene products for local or systemic delivery to the body. The feasibility of this approach has begun to be addressed experimentally and resulted in the identification of important problems as discussed in Viewpoints 1 & 2. One of the recurring issues that I want to discuss is the requirement for stem cell transduction to achieve lasting therapy, a view that I subscribe to while keeping an open mind about the feasibility of doing so efficiently and without losing these cells to differentiation during *ex vivo* manipulation.

The questions pertaining to the manipulation of keratinocyte stem cells for cutaneous gene therapy are “Can we isolate these cells?”; “Can we transduce them efficiently?”; “Can we maintain stem cell properties during these manipulations?”; “Will we achieve lasting therapy when we have overcome all these hurdles?”

Speaking from experience, at present it is certainly possible to obtain small numbers of stem cells using cell sorting techniques. It would be highly desirable to develop methods such as panning or magnetic selection that would permit the isolation of larger numbers of these cells, since currently it is clear that stem cells have a limited lifespan in culture making *ex vivo* expansion difficult. However, studies aimed at defining factors involved in self-renewal of stem cells may provide a means of achieving controlled expansion and transduction of these cells – after all, stem cells cycle and return to quiescence *in vivo*.

Alternatively, let us consider whether we need to go to the trouble of isolating stem cells to transduce them? Data from many laboratories show that cells can be cultured transduced en masse and transplanted onto mice, giving rise to fully formed epithelia (1–5). Kolodka et al. (5) provide compelling evidence that transplanted human keratinocytes transduced with retroviral vectors show continued expression for almost a year *in vivo*. The question then is whether the frequency of stem cells transduced in mass cultures (i.e. without purification of stem cells) is sufficient for therapeutic purposes. To this end, it is worth noting a study by Wang et al. (6) who reported that grafting a piece of tail skin from a transgenic mouse producing human growth hormone (hGH) under the control of the K14 promoter, onto a normal recipient resulted in secretion of this hormone, but not at physiological levels, despite expressing hGH in all

basal keratinocytes. This is where the development of better vectors will have a major role to play in gene therapeutic approaches.

To live up to the challenge of “Controversies in Dermatology”, I would like to put a twist on our assumptions that stem cells must be transduced for long-lived therapy. This seems a reasonable notion given that, *in vivo*, other proliferative cells are short-lived, and if one assumes a stem cell is inherently a unique and irreplaceable cell. However, it appears that even K10 positive keratinocytes which have initiated differentiation are capable of proliferating for several months in culture (7), and indeed revert phenotypically to transit amplifying cells expressing high levels of $\alpha_6\beta_4$ integrin (Li & Kaur, unpublished data).

I would like to speculate that, although stem cells are indeed unique and special *in vivo*, the epidermis may be a more plastic tissue than suspected, should the demand arise. What I am suggesting is that a stem cell is only a stem cell in the right milieu composed of neighboring transit amplifying cells and underlying connective tissue with a role for both endogenous and external regulating factors, such as growth factors and extracellular matrix components. It may then be possible for us to culture keratinocytes from a patient, genetically modify these and graft them back – with re-establishment of stem cells, transit amplifying cells and their differentiated progeny *in situ*! This plasticity model also provides an explanation for the observation that manipulation of cells *in vitro* and regrafting them results in reformation of a normal epithelium. It is also completely in line with our own recent data which indicates that stem cells are not the only cells capable of forming an epidermis (Li & Kaur, unpublished data).

It may just be a fantasy, but wouldn't it be a great outcome for gene therapy if there was no requirement for stem cell isolation or manipulation? Wouldn't it be incredible if the epidermis was a unique tissue in terms of its plasticity and great potential for growth? This would truly make the epidermis an ideal candidate for gene therapy. Of course, experimentation to elucidate the facts is required to determine the appropriate way to proceed.

Pritinder Kaur
Division of Hematology
Hanson Ctr. for Cancer Res
Inst. of Medical and Vet. Sci.
Adelaide, SA 5000, Australia
e-mail: pritinder.kaur@imvs.sa.gov.au

References

1. Garlick J A et al. *J Invest Dermatol* 1991; 97: 824–829.
2. Garlick J A, Taichman L B. *Arch Oral Biol* 1993; 38: 903–910.
3. Mathor M B et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1996; 93: 10371–10376.
4. Mackenzie I C. *J Invest Dermatol* 1997; 109: 377–383.
5. Kolodka T M et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1998; 95: 4356–4361.
6. Wang X et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1997; 94: 219–226.
7. Li A. et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1998; 95: 3902–3907.

Commentary 3

The increasingly rapid advances in our knowledge of skin are exciting to observe and a major spin-off over the last 10–15 years is the development, in principle, of methods for cutaneous gene therapy. Their application is in two main directions. One is to use the skin as a therapeutically useful bioreactor to secrete normal products and replace defective proteins in a range of genetic disorders, and the other is more focused, the treatment of genetic conditions of the skin.

Ulrich Hengge gives a comprehensive survey of the cutaneous gene therapy literature in the broad perspective and reviews the many possible ways, *ex vivo* or *in vivo*, systemic and local, of utilizing the skin route for a range of therapies. Animal models of cutaneous gene therapy are abundant in the literature but significant human trials have not yet occurred.

The skin is the largest organ in the body with both keratinocytes and fibroblasts as major components. It would appear to have enormous potential especially via the remarkably versatile keratinocyte that normally manufactures and secretes a wide range of proteins, from cytokines to basement membrane components. The skin is more readily monitored than other organs and its use, as a kind of pseudo-liver (“metabolic sink”) would seem to be particularly powerful.

Problems lie in the targeting of genes to epidermal stem cells and vectors for the stable transfection of keratinocytes are essential for optimal therapy. Retroviral vectors are efficient, but could carry unpredictable consequences for the phenotype. Plasmids can be used, but transfection is inefficient. Hence, much research needs to be done to deal with these problems including the control of expression of the transgene. Nonetheless, we should remain optimistic that there will be some degree of success in the next few years and a longer-term possible solution is discussed later.

Angela Christiano confronts the BIG chal-

lenges of the genodermatoses, especially the diverse EB group, and as she points out, promises of therapies made to patients have not been fulfilled. Equally, therapies for genetic diseases in general such as cystic fibrosis, have been disappointing. For the genodermatoses, the strikingly-rapid delineation of the molecular causes of the bullous diseases plus the equally-rapid development of DNA manipulation, stem cell identification and DNA delivery systems placed investigative dermatologists into an optimistic (but reasonable) attitude that treatment modes would be around the corner. The negative press also may have subdued the enthusiasm of funding providers and that needs to be addressed.

One can agree with Angela Christiano that Herlitz junctional EB (JEB), for example, could be a difficult choice for therapy because of the potential multiplicity of defective components in the basal lamina that need correction. Using keratinocytes from a JEB patient, groups in Nice and Rome have demonstrated re-expression of laminin 5 with repair of hemidesmosomes and adhesion at the culture level, but this is still a long way from treatment regimes that might require correction of even more than one gene.

The immediate future exists in the development of vectors for delivery into autologous keratinocytes of a range of possible gene element(s) – be it a ribozyme to remove defective gene function, or replacing the defective gene with a normal one.

Effective therapy requires permanency through stem cells and stable gene insertions. Perhaps the real long-term future for all gene therapy, genodermatoses included, could reside in the relatively recent revelation that in enucleated oocytes, adult somatic chromatin can be dedifferentiated to pluripotentiality and reprogrammed to produce clones of an animal (1, 2).

What could be around the corner is a revol-

utionary method for the correction of mutations in keratinocytes *per se*, or the insertion of a desirable gene for other genetic reasons. It would be an *ex vivo*, cell therapy procedure and would involve biopsy and keratinocyte expansion in culture, dedifferentiation, homologous recombination with the normal gene, followed by reprogramming to the keratinocyte lineage and grafting to the patient.

Of course, we don't yet have the defined conditions for dedifferentiation *in vitro* that simulate what can be achieved in oocytes, and we don't know what degree of dedifferentiation would be adequate to carry out the scenario proposed. However, on present indications of known factors (e.g. LIF), the answers will surely eventuate, possibly quite rapidly. Biological factors of the opposite kind, that act in directing the differentiation of embryonic stem cells to primitive ectoderm, are already being isolated (3).

Finally, "the prevention better than therapy" argument is a sensible one, and the single-cell pre-implantation diagnostic technique on very early embryos is a striking advance. However, surely the difficulties here are the identification of possible carriers for testing by this procedure and the acceptability, on medical and ethical grounds, of obligatory *in vitro*-fertilization to those patients potentially at risk.

George Rogers
Dept of Animal Sci, Waite Campus
University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA 5064
Australia
e-mail: grogers@waite.adelaide.edu.au

References

1. Wilmut et al. Nature 1997: 385: 810–813.
2. Wakayama et al. Nature 1998: 394: 369–374.
3. Rathjen, J. et al. J Cell Sci 1999: 112: 601–612.

Commentary 4

Epidermal gene therapy is indeed worth considering. However, especially when it comes to treatment of localized skin diseases, substantial hurdles were described, such as dominant mutations and a need for regulated expression. But then, will it be less problematic to use epidermal gene therapy to treat systemic disorders, such as metabolic diseases?

Sustained epidermal gene expression requires gene transfer into stem cells. Several studies have suggested that this might be possible (1–5), and the advances in characterization of these cells and in defining their location in the skin (6) will probably further enhance the possibilities of specific stem cell targeting.

Epidermal gene therapy with the purpose of achieving sustained gene expression has mostly been based on the use of retroviral vectors. Delivery of retroviral vectors directly to the skin (*in vivo* gene therapy) has been difficult to achieve, and therefore retrovirally mediated gene transfer into the skin has been performed *ex vivo* followed by grafting. Because of the technical difficulties and expenses associated with these procedures, methods allowing *in vivo* delivery followed by long term expression will be of great value. Chimeric viral vector systems that incorporate the favorable

attributes of two different viral vectors, such as the efficient *in vivo* transduction properties of adenoviral vectors and the stable integration of retroviral vectors, might be a solution to these problems. Combination of viral and non-viral gene transfer methods, such as the use of plasmovirus (7), should also be considered.

Why consider epidermal gene therapy of metabolic diseases?

The skin is the largest organ in the body. Epidermal keratinocytes have a high metabolic capacity, they can readily be cultivated *in vitro* and trans-

Table 1.

Neo-organ	Metabolic sink
apoE	Ornithine aminotransferase
apoA1	Adenosine aminotransferase
Factor VIII	Phenylalanine hydroxylase
Factor IX	Ornithine transcarbamylase
Human growth hormone	LDL-receptor
Transferrin	
Insulin	
Erythropoietin	

planted back onto patients. The blood supply to the skin is considerable (8.5% of the cardiac output), it can be regulated, and it can exceed the demand at least 10 fold. For safety reasons, the skin is also very attractive, since genetically modified cells can be easily removed.

Two scenarios can be visualized, either the production of medically relevant proteins in keratinocytes that secrete them into the circulation epidermis as a “*neo-organ*” (8), or production of enzymes that can detoxify the body for toxic substances accumulating in certain disorders the “*metabolic sink approach*” (9) (Table 1).

For each application it is important to investigate in detail the molecular mechanisms. Consider the delivery of a protein to the circulation. What are the transport barriers? The efficiency of synthesis and secretion varies substantially among different proteins. The transport across the basement membrane probably depends on the size and the hydrophobicity of the protein. Also, the stability of the protein in the circulation is important to consider.

For the “metabolic sink” approach the situation is even more complicated.

As illustrated by the attempts to clear ornithine from the skin (10), the metabolic capacity of an epidermal graft depends not only on the amount of enzyme produced in the cells, but also on parameters such as co-factor supply, regional substrate concentrations and clearance of downstream

metabolites. In fact, genetic manipulation at several points along the metabolic pathway will probably be necessary to achieve clinical success.

In spite of the challenges associated with gene therapy of skin diseases, there are no indications so far that systemic metabolic diseases will be a more straightforward target for epidermal gene therapy than classical genodermatoses.

Thomas G. Jensen
Department of Human Genetics
University of Aarhus
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark
e-mail: thomas@humgen.au.dk

References

1. Mathor M B et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1996; 93(19): 10371–10376.
2. Deng H et al. Nat Biotechnol 1997; 13: 1388–1391.
3. Kolodka T M et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1998; 95(8): 4356–4361.
4. Levy L et al. Gene Ther 1998; 5: 913–922.
5. White S J et al. Hum Gene Ther 1998; 9(8): 1187–1195.
6. Jensen U B, Lowell S, Watt F M. Development 1999; 126(11): 2409–2418.
7. Noguez-Hellin P et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1996; 93(9): 4175–4180.
8. Fenjves E S et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1989; 86(22): 8803–8807.
9. Fenjves E S et al. Hum Gene Ther 1997; 8(8): 911–917.
10. Jensen T G et al. Hum Gene Ther 1997; 8(17): 2125–2132.

Commentary 5

The start of Molecular Pathology was in 1949 with the finding of a difference in the electrophoretic mobility of normal hemoglobin and sickle cell hemoglobin (HbS). In 1957, a valine for glutamic acid substitution in the beta-chain was determined to cause HbS with its abnormal physical properties. Sickle cell anemia is a serious disease and occurs in 0.15% of American blacks; 8% of American blacks are carriers. Yet, 50 years after determining the basis of the disease there is still no molecular therapy.

Bone marrow transplantation works. A ribozyme-based method for treatment has passed the proof of concept phase, but, still no magic bullet for a common and important disease. An interesting approach to therapy is using azacytidine or hydroxyurea to increase hemoglobin F, decreasing

sickling and helping the disease. Sickle cell anemia is a powerful example that knowing the molecular cause does not rapidly lead to a molecular cure. Learning patience is hard.

Blackboard schemes of therapy should not lead to hyperbole and resulting hubris – this is the Faustian trap which has caught many well-intentioned scientists. One should not be surprised that many viral based vectors will lead to antibodies which may interfere with the treatment. Raising false hope can be even more destructive to the patient and their families than the ignorance of a disease.

These are some of the issues that require more consideration (1, 2).

- *Dominant Negative Mutations*: a serious issue – a little of a “bad molecule” can interfere with

large amounts of a normal molecule, especially a problem with some cytokeratin mutations.

- *Stem Cell Targets*: if a gene is integrated into the more differentiated cells, repeated therapy is needed. This is not the end of the world – most drugs for most conditions require continued, albeit, intermittent administration. Stem cells may not be the real or the desired target – their turnover may be too low. Introduction into a cell like a transient amplifying cell may be better.
- *Change the mutations*: with point mutations there are drugs which can change the transcription of a nonsense or termination codon into a functional codon with therapeutic effect.
- *Regulate the molecule*: this approach is not valued as much as it should be. With the whole human genome available for transcription, there is the basis for increasing fetal, embryonic or geriatric transcripts which can change the physiology of the cell and its internal and secreted products. Growth factors such as TGF-beta and retinoids can change the ratio and transcription of specific gene products.

The important lesson is to not limit your thinking by considering “gene therapies” to mean only introducing genes. Think of changing the transcription of messengers, think inducing genes, which are not normally expressed at sufficient

quantities to be therapeutic. Such changes may be using old style, low molecular weight drugs, antisense and triplex nucleotides, ribozymes and the like.

Hope – molecular biology gives hope for preventing serious diseases by diagnosis in the preimplantation stage as discussed by Dr Christiano, a powerful methodology.

If we fall prey to being mesmerized by molecular wizardry and scientific paraphernalia and lose the ability to think about attacking genetic diseases in all the ways possible, we have not benefited fully from the new technologies. The real new therapies will be elegant and use all of the molecular knowledge we have obtained about the skin and its genes. Let's continue working – patients are counting on us to fulfill our promises.

Lowell A. Goldsmith

Dean, University of Rochester

School of Medicine and Dentistry

Rochester, New York 14642 USA

e-mail: Lowell-Goldsmith@URMC.Rochester.edu

References

1. Lu B et al. *J Invest Dermatol* 1997; 108: 803–808.
2. Lu B et al. *Proc Assoc Am Physicians* 1996; 108: 165–172.

Commentary 6

Remember the last of those nasty computer viruses, Melissa: one click on the attachment and all those post-doc-man-years of hard work disappeared, as it gobbled its way through your hard drive, lost for eternity. Well, there is a far more pernicious virion that has been spreading through the biomedical community for at least 10 years.

Seemingly invisible to the collective immune system, this destructive little creature, unblemished by logical assault, or rational drug design, has now spread to the lay public, grant givers, fund-raisers, and patient groups. This is the virus of gene therapy, and to understand its destructive force, to fathom its epidemiology, we need to understand its symbiosis with that icon of 20th-century biology, genetics.

Genetics has had two golden periods in the present century. The first being the re-discovery of Mendel's work, and the subsequent resolution of the treatment of what we would now call Mendel-

ian disorders and complex (or let us say Gaussian traits) in the synthesis, by Fisher and others, that is now quantitative genetics. Then there is an interlude of say 50 years, broken only by Crick and Watson's discovery, before the technical outpourings of the last 2 decades, allowing the tracking of disease-associated genes. The technical facility of reverse genetics, together with the insights into the use of polymorphisms between subjects to track disease, by David Botstein and others, have provided disease researchers with a golden period of essentially molecular natural history: “molecular case reports” as Bert Vogelstein remarked of a major genetics journal.

The achievements of this approach, are either over-hyped beyond recognition – understandably, perhaps – or even more curiously underplayed. And the reasons for this latter aspect belie the problems of gene therapy. Thus, the importance of gene identification of Mendelian disorders, prog-

nosis, classification, clinical bootstrapping in terms of syndrome identification and diagnostic acumen, or prenatal diagnosis and preventative intervention, are perhaps overlooked in the mad dash for therapy, and the delusion of the generic approach to medical science. Let me explain.

The strength of positional cloning and of much human genetics has been that, essentially, it has been a black box approach. Anonymous markers cosegregating with a phenotype can be tracked. Genes for a disease can be found in the complete absence of knowledge of pathophysiological mechanisms: a revolutionary concept that should still make us sit up and stare. Yet, progress from here is less generic, and here lies the hubris.

Genetics has wedded itself to big science, a form of physics envy, and wishes to drive its ambitious project forward in two directions, gene therapy, and the genetic elucidation of complex disease. Both projects remain at present triumphs of marketing over substance. It is as though everybody has started to believe those opening sentences of their own grant applications.

Yet history suggests that the golden period of physics ended with the transition to big science, and that the most interesting areas of the hard sciences have been relocated to former intellectual backwaters. Such will be the fate of this new biology. Whereas positional cloning has enjoyed the generic nature of its activity – just show a pedigree to a human geneticist, who cares less about context or how you spell the name of the disease – there is no logical process to proceed to therapy from gene identification. Medicine remains a branch of applied biology, opportunists standing on the backs of medicinal chemistry.

This isn't to deny a role for gene-based therapy. I think there will be such niches, and these avenues of opportunity should be exploited. It is just that, at present, the subject shares the intellectual finesse of somebody, who, aware of Pasteur's elucidation of the infectious nature of disease, seeks to preempt the next century of discovery by having "discovered, that most microbes are heat sensitive" announces – by press release closely followed by stock market flotation – that man's fight with infectious disease is over. Delivery of destruction, friendly fire, acceptability, limited collateral damage, to use military terms, or even biological plausibility are all given short shrift!

So how do we go forward? First a little realism. Impact factors, and glossy covers don't match the recent (albeit incremental) successes of phototherapy, topical immunosuppression or the rediscovery of the infectious nature of some forms of eczema. Second, in English at least, the political use of the word revolution comes from Galileo's use of the same word to describe the motion of the planets. Science needs to remain a revolutionary activity: forget grand strategies, 5-year plans, post genome-integrative projects to ensure full employment of geneticists. *Think small*. As the poet and mystic William Blake understood, if you want to do good, do it in the study of those "minute particulars".

Jonathan L. Rees
Dept of Dermatology, Medical School
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Framlington Place
Newcastle, NE2 4HH
UK
e-mail: jonathan.rees@newcastle.ac.uk