

Received Date : 28-Jun-2016

Revised Date : 22-Jul-2016

Accepted Date : 23-Aug-2016

Article type : Commentary

The pathogenesis of pemphigus: controversy *versus* complexity

Di Enzo G¹, Borradori L^{4,5}, Muller EJ^{2,3,4,5}

¹Laboratory of Molecular and Cell Biology, Istituto Dermatologico dell'Immacolata, IDI-IRCCS, Rome, Italy.

²Molecular Dermatology and Stem Cell Research, Department of Clinical Research, Medical Faculty, University of Bern, 3008 Bern, Switzerland

³Institute of Animal Pathology, Vetsuisse Faculty, Bern, Switzerland

⁴DermFocus, Vetsuisse Faculty, Bern, Switzerland

⁵Department of Dermatology, University Hospital of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Corresponding author:
Giovanni Di Enzo
Laboratory of Molecular and Cell Biology
Istituto Dermatologico dell'Immacolata, IDI-IRCCS
Via Monti di Creta 104
00167, Rome, Italy
E-mail: g.dizenzo@idi.it

Life is highly complex and, as quantum physics would predict, follows the rule of “everything is possible with varying probabilities”. Accordingly, science may be sometimes as confusing as political debates, where the same matter is addressed in different and misleading ways even in the absence of a real controversy. The Viewpoint by Ahmed et al. provides a paradigmatic example of a debate about two theories for pemphigus pathogenesis, i.e. “Monopathogenic vs. multipathogenic explanations of

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/exd.13176

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

pemphigus pathophysiology”, both being possible but occurring with variable probabilities (1).

The readers should consider as take home message the following points:

1. Heterogeneity in pemphigus. Two major types of pemphigus have been described, *pemphigus vulgaris* (PV) and *pemphigus foliaceus* (PF). The vast majority of patients with PV and PF have mucous and/or cutaneous lesions (2) associated with IgG auto-antibodies (Abs) against desmoglein (Dsg) 3 and/or Dsg1. The profile of anti-Dsg1 and anti-Dsg3 autoAbs mostly correlates with the clinical phenotype, determining occurrence of cutaneous and/or mucous membrane lesions. However, in up to 5-10% of cases, particularly in PV patients, this is not the case, thus indicating variations to a common theme. Furthermore, in over the last decade the pemphigus group of diseases is has turned out to be more heterogeneous than originally thought, encompassing different entities with overlapping and immunopathological features.

2. The clinical phenotype is determined by multiple factors. As observed in many immune-mediated and other diseases, the clinical phenotype in a given patient is affected by a variety of modifying factors, including gene polymorphisms, epigenetic makeup, defects in structural proteins, immune response molecules, signaling molecules, as well as environmental and exogenous factors, such as drugs. Their impact on the phenotype should always be kept in mind in such a complex biological system as the human body. In addition, autoAb titers, their predominant IgG subclasses and recognized epitopes and antigens also influence disease expression. These observations support that additional physiological factors (e.g. shown in case of EGFR deletion (3)) do modulate the clinical phenotype (4).

3. Pemphigus can be caused by anti-Dsg without non-Dsg autoAbs (the monopathogenic theory). Evidence that anti-Dsg1 and/or anti-Dsg3 autoAbs alone are sufficient for cell-cell dissociation *in vitro* and *in vivo* is indisputable and compelling. Among others, the phenotype of PV patients with Dsg3 without Dsg1 autoAbs is recapitulated by the monospecific anti-Dsg3 Ab AK23 alone (s1); after passive transfer into neonatal or adult mice, it consistently induces hair follicle and/or palate blisters, and when combined with anti-Dsg1 autoAbs, it provokes PV-like skin lesions (3, 5, 6, s2, s3). Similar results were reported with distinct cloned human Dsg3 autoAbs (7) (Table 1). In this context, the seemingly alternate phenotypes of Dsg mutations or deletion in human or mice, argued by authors of the multipathogenic theory, are not a strong argument. Mutations in a given gene induce a variety of phenotypes depending - among others - on the site of mutation and genetic background Furthermore, in our hands, Dsg3 knockout mice exhibit hair follicle and palate blisters like described above for PV/AK23 (unpublished). This said, the reader should not be mistaken! The authors of the monopathogenic hypothesis, a virtual theory animating this debate, support that autoAbs to Dsg3/Dsg1 alone are sufficient. However, they do not claim exclusivity of the antigenic target.

There is one query against the “Dsg3/Dsg1 autoAb alone are sufficient” which seems compelling and stands on top of the list: “Epidermal integrity “does not ”primarily depend on the desmosomal expression of Dsg1 and Dsg3”. This query only point to ~~is only~~ “half of the story”. The idea that loss of transadhesion between Dsg molecules in desmosomes would be sufficient for blister induction has long evolved. Demonstrated multiple times (e.g. 3, 5, 6, s2, s3), the initial event of loss of transadhesion between Dsg3 molecules, certainly pathogenic, is not enough. Only when coupled with altered signal transduction mediated by Dsg3 cadherin receptors, to which autoAbs preferentially bind, will desmosomes start to lose their cohesive grip.

Cadherins receptors are now widely acknowledged to survey a variety of signaling networks, including a mitochondrial cross talk, to dictate cell fate (7). Hence, in particular PV is not about loss of adhesion or adhesion of Dsg1 and Dsg3 in desmosomes in the first place but about altered signal transduction upon ~~anti-Dsg3~~ autoAb binding to Dsg3 receptors. It is without any question that these signal alterations can be mimicked by a variety of other factors which alone or together with Dsg autoAbs recapitulate or enhance the disease.

4. Pemphigus ~~can be caused/enhanced by~~ requires both autoAbs to Dsgs and non-Dsgs antigens (the multipathogenic theory). Autoimmune diseases are often characterized by a vast number of autoantigens which are not associated with pathogenicity. Different approaches, including cloning of pemphigus autoAbs from affected patients (unpublished), have allowed to characterize - besides pathogenic and non-pathogenic anti-Dsg autoAbs (7) additional Abs of different specificities and Ig isotype (such as IgA). However, most of these autoAbs, including those targeting keratinocyte mitochondria (9), do not possess acantholytic potential on their own but may act synergistically with anti-Dsg3 antibodies to increase acantholysis. It has also been claimed that antibodies targeting keratinocyte mitochondria contribute to the process of acantholysis (Table1). One interesting exception are autoAbs to other desmosomal cadherins such as the desmocollins which can cause a pemphigus-like disease in humans without anti-Dsg autoAbs (8, s4). The observation that there are patients with a clinical pemphigus phenotype but lacking anti-Dsg autoAbs as well as Abs of other known specificity, such as anti-desmocollins, raises the question about the pertinence of a debate on ~~about~~ a monopathogenic or multipathogenic theory.

5. Is it worth the debate? The statement that the “*individual authors may or may not support one view or the other*” found in the footnote of the Viewpoint of Ahmed et al well summarizes how the matter is challenging. The wealth of available data discussed in this viewpoint indeed convinces us of the extraordinary biological complexity of the pathogenesis of pemphigus making a scientific debate futile. For educational purposes, it is sometimes necessary to talk about major concepts (pemphigus pathogenesis is induced by autoAb against Dsgs) rather than exciting exceptions (other antigens and additional factors), paying the price in terms of loss of complexity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DG acknowledges the support of the Italian Ministry of Health (Ricerca Finalizzata grant n. RF2309790) and EM from the Swiss National Science Foundation grant #31003A_135689 and Martha Stiftung Zürich. DG, BL and MEJ wrote the paper.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors state no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed AR, Carrozzo M, Caux F, Cirillo N, Dmochowski M, Alonso AE, Gniadecki R, Hertl M, López-Zabalza MJ, Lotti R, Pincelli C, Pittelkow M, Schmidt E, Sinha AA, Sprecher E, Grando SA. Monopathogenic vs. multipathogenic explanations of pemphigus pathophysiology. *Exp Dermatol* 2016 Jun 15 doi: 10.1111/exd.13106.
2. Schmidt E, Dahnrich C, Rosemann A, Probst C, Komorowski L, Saschenbrecker S, Schlumberger W, Stocker W, Hashimoto T, Brocker EB, Recke A, Rose C, Zillikens D. Novel ELISA systems for antibodies to desmoglein 1 and 3: correlation of disease activity with serum autoantibody levels in individual pemphigus patients. *Exp Dermatol* 2010; 19: 458-463.
3. Sayar BS, Ruegg S, Schmidt E, Sibilia M, Siffert M, Suter MM, Galichet A, Muller EJ. EGFR inhibitors erlotinib and lapatinib ameliorate epidermal blistering in pemphigus vulgaris in a non-linear, V-shaped relationship. *Exp Dermatol* 2014; 23: 33-38.
4. Sinistro A, Calabresi V, Lupi F, Sera F, Frezzolini A, Ruffelli M, De Pità O, Camaioni D, Cianchini G, Di Zenzo G. The pathogenic activity of anti-desmoglein autoantibodies parallels disease severity in rituximab-treated patients with pemphigus vulgaris *Eur J Dermatol* 2015; 25: 578-585.
5. Luyet C, Schulze K, Sayar BS, Howald D, Muller EJ, Galichet A. Preclinical studies identify non-apoptotic low-level caspase-3 as therapeutic target in pemphigus vulgaris. *PLoS ONE* 2015; 10: e011980.
6. Schulze K, Galichet A, Sayar BS, Scothern A, Howald D, Zymann H, Siffert M, Zenhausern D, Bolli R, Koch PJ, Garrod D, Suter MM, Muller EJ. An adult passive transfer mouse model to study desmoglein 3 signaling in pemphigus vulgaris. *J Invest Dermatol* 2012; 132: 346-355.
7. Di Zenzo G, Amber KT, Beyza BS, Müller EJ, Borradori L. Immune response in pemphigus and beyond: progresses and emerging concepts. *Semin Immunopathol* 2016; 38: 57-74.
8. Mao X, Nagler AR, Farber SA, Choi EJ, Jackson LH, Leiferman KM, Ishii N, Hashimoto T, Amagai M, Zone JJ, Payne AS. Autoimmunity to desmocollin 3 in pemphigus vulgaris. *Am J Pathol* 2010; 177: 2724-2730.
9. Grando SA. The mitochondrion is a common target of disease pathophysiology in pemphigus and pemphigoid. *Exp Dermatol* 2015; 24: 655-656.

Table 1. Survey of Dsg and non-Dsg autoAbs with pathogenic activity in pemphigus

Antigens	Pathogenic antibodies (mAb)	References
Dsg3	2 murine mAbs (AK23, AK19)	s1
Dsg3	8 murine mAbs (NAK1,2,4,7,8,9,10,11)	s7
Dsg3	2 human mAbs ((D3)3c/9; (D31)2/28)	s8
Dsg3	1 human mAb (PVMAB786)	s9
Dsg3	4 human mAbs (PVE 4-8, PV2 4.2, PV2 3.2, PV2-VH1-69)	s10
Dsg3	1 human mAb (F779)	s11
Dsg3	3 human mAbs (PVA224, PVB28, PVB124)	s12
Dsg1	2 human mAbs ((D31)2/29, (D1)11/10)	s8
Dsg1	2 human mAbs (3-07/1e 3-30/3h)	s13
Dsg1	1 human mAb (F24-9)	s14
Desmocollin 3	Polyclonal AutoAbs and 1 murine mAb (U114, Progen)	8, s4
Pemphaxin	Polyclonal AutoAbs amplify the activity of anti-Dsg AutoAbs	s5
α 9-acetylcholine receptor	Polyclonal AutoAbs amplify the activity of anti-Dsg AutoAbs	s6
Anti-mitochondrial antibodies	Polyclonal AutoAbs amplify the activity of anti-Dsg AutoAbs	s15

SUPPLEMENTAL REFERENCES

s1. Tsunoda K, Ota T, Aoki M, Yamada T, Nagai T, Nakagawa T, Koyasu S, Nishikawa T, Amagai M. Induction of pemphigus phenotype by a mouse monoclonal antibody against the amino-terminal adhesive interface of desmoglein 3. *J Immunol* 2003; 170: 2170-2178.

s2. Williamson L, Raess NA, Caldelari R, Zakher A, de Bruin A, Posthaus H, Bolli R, Hunziker T, Suter MM, Muller EJ. Pemphigus vulgaris identifies plakoglobin as key suppressor of c-Myc in the skin. *EMBO J* 2006; 25: 3298-3309.

s3. Spindler V, Rotzer V, Dehner C, Kempf B, Gliem M, Radeva M, Hartlieb E, Harms GS, Schmidt E, Waschke J. Peptide-mediated desmoglein 3 crosslinking prevents pemphigus vulgaris autoantibody-induced skin blistering. *J Clin Invest* 2013; 123: 800-811.

s4. Rafei D, Muller R, Ishii N, Llamazares M, Hashimoto T, Hertl M, Eming R. IgG autoantibodies against desmocollin 3 in pemphigus sera induce loss of keratinocyte adhesion. *Am J Pathol* 2011; 178: 718-723.

s5. Nguyen VT, Ndoeye A, Grando SA. Pemphigus vulgaris antibody identifies pemphaxin. A novel keratinocyte annexinlike molecule binding acetylcholine. J Biol Chem 2000: 275: 29466-29476.

s6. Nguyen VT, Ndoeye A, Grando SA. Novel human alpha9 acetylcholine receptor regulating keratinocyte adhesion is targeted by Pemphigus vulgaris autoimmunity. Am J Pathol 2000: 157: 1377-1391.

s7. Kawasaki H, Tsunoda K, Hata T, Ishii K, Yamada T, Amagai M. Synergistic pathogenic effects of combined mouse monoclonal anti-desmoglein 3 IgG antibodies on pemphigus vulgaris blister formation. J Invest Dermatol 2006: 126: 2621-2630.

s8. Payne AS, Ishii K, Kacir S, Lin C, Li H, Hanakawa Y, Tsunoda K, Amagai M, Stanley JR, Siegel DL. Genetic and functional characterization of human pemphigus vulgaris monoclonal autoantibodies isolated by phage display. J Clin Invest 2005: 115: 888-99.

s9. Yeh SW, Cavacini LA, Bhol KC, Lin MS, Kumar M, Duval M, Posner MR, Ahmed AR. Pathogenic human monoclonal antibody against desmoglein 3. Clin Immunol 2006: 120: 68-75.

s10. Yamagami J, Payne AS, Kacir S, Ishii K, Siegel DL, Stanley JR. Homologous regions of autoantibody heavy chain complementarity-determining region 3 (H-CDR3) in patients with pemphigus cause pathogenicity. J Clin Invest 2010: 120: 4111-4117.

s11. Cho MJ, Lo AS, Mao X, Nagler AR, Ellebrecht CT, Mukherjee EM, Hammers CM, Choi EJ, Sharma PM, Uduman M, Li H, Rux AH, Farber SA, Rubin CB, Kleinstein SH, Sachais BS, Posner MR, Cavacini LA, Payne AS. Shared VH1-46 gene usage by pemphigus vulgaris autoantibodies indicates common humoral immune responses among patients. Nat Commun 2014: 5: 4167.

s12. Di Zenzo G, Di Lullo G, Corti D, Calabresi V, Sinistro A, Vanzetta F, Didona B, Cianchini G, Hertl M, Eming R, Amagai M, Ohyama B, Hashimoto T, Sloostra J, Sallusto F, Zambruno G, Lanzavecchia A. Pemphigus autoantibodies generated through somatic mutations target the desmoglein-3 cis-interface. J Clin Invest 2012: 122: 3781-3790.

s13. Ishii K, Lin C, Siegel DL, Stanley JR. Isolation of pathogenic monoclonal anti-desmoglein 1 human antibodies by phage display of pemphigus foliaceus autoantibodies. J Invest Dermatol 2008: 128: 939-948.

s14. Yamagami J, Kacir S, Ishii K, Payne AS, Siegel DL, Stanley JR. Antibodies to the desmoglein 1 precursor proprotein but not to the mature cell surface protein cloned from individuals without pemphigus. J Immunol 2009: 183: 5615-5621.

s15. Chen Y, Chernyavsky A, Webber R J, Grando S A, Wang P H. Critical Role of the Neonatal Fc Receptor (FcRn) in the Pathogenic Action of Antimitochondrial Autoantibodies Synergizing with Anti-desmoglein Autoantibodies in Pemphigus Vulgaris. J Biol Chem 2015: 290: 23826-23837.