

NEWS AND COMMENTARY

Communicating RNA

Commenting on communicator RNA

S Pascolo

Gene Therapy (2011) 18, 943–944; doi:10.1038/gt.2011.122; published online 18 August 2011

Har­king back to the ‘RNA world’ that is con­sid­ered to be the begin­ning of life about 4.2 billion years ago,^{1,2} RNA (ribo­nu­cleic acid) mol­e­cules recap­it­u­late all bio­log­ical ac­tiv­i­ties nec­es­sary for life: con­tain­ment of ge­netic in­for­ma­tion (for ex­am­ple, mes­sen­ger RNA (mRNA)), reg­u­la­tion of gene ex­pres­sion (small-in­ter­fer­ing RNA and mi­cro RNA), scaf­fold­ing of tri-di­men­sional struc­tures (for ex­am­ple, trans­fer RNA), en­zy­matic ac­tiv­i­ties (for ex­am­ple, ri­bosom­ic RNA), stor­age of en­ergy (for ex­am­ple, ad­e­nine and gu­a­nine in their tri­phos­phate form) and pro­tec­tion of an or­gan­ism’s in­te­grity by stim­u­lat­ing host de­fence me­chan­isms (im­mu­no­stim­u­lat­ing RNA).

Another fun­damental fea­ture of plu­ricel­lular liv­ing is com­mu­ni­ca­tion be­tween cells. The pres­ence of abun­dant and highly effi­cient RNases in the in­ter­cel­lular space and body fluids has led sci­en­tists to con­sid­er im­prob­able the ex­is­tence of func­tional ex­tra­cel­lular naked RNA in or­gan­isms. This no­tion should, how­ever, be chal­lenged in the light of sev­eral pieces of ex­per­i­men­tal data, in­clud­ing those pre­sented by Diken *et al.*³ in the July 2011 issue of *Gene Ther­apy*. The au­thors doc­u­ment that naked mRNA in­jected into the lymph nodes of mice is taken up by pha­go­cytic cells through macropinocytosis. This can be recap­it­u­lated *in vitro* using hu­man and mice pha­go­cytes, such as den­dritic cells or mac­ro­phages. Sim­ilar phe­nom­ena were doc­u­mented more than 20 years ago when Wolff *et al.*⁴ re­ported that in­tra­der­mal in­jec­tion of naked mRNA in mice re­sulted in local pro­tein ex­pres­sion and when Gil­boa and col­leagues⁵ re­ported that co-in­cu­ba­tion (so called ‘passive pulsing’) of mRNA with hu­man den­dritic cells re­sulted in the pre­sen­ta­tion of ma­jor his­to­com­pat­i­bil­ity

com­plex (MHC)-as­so­ci­ated pep­tides de­rived from the an­ti­gen en­coded by the mRNA. We fur­ther doc­u­mented that re­sident cells in mouse and hu­man der­mis take up locally in­jected naked mRNA in a sat­u­rable and cal­cium-de­pendant way.⁶ In these pre­vious works, it could be shown that the uptake pro­cess is ac­tive: RNA mol­e­cules do not simply dif­fuse through mem­branes but are pha­go­cytosed and trans­ported to the cytosol in an (as yet) un­known way. Thus, mRNA mol­e­cules pre­judged as very labile in the RNase-con­tam­inated ex­tra­cel­lular milie­u are sur­pris­ingly func­tional af­ter pen­e­trat­ing local cells ad­jacent to the site of their deliv­ery.

To date, no ex­per­i­men­tal data are avail­able to ex­plain the ca­pac­ity of ex­ogenous RNA to sur­vive and then pen­e­trate cells be­fore being de­graded by RNases. Un­der­lying this un­ex­pected ob­ser­va­tion could be the pyrimidine-specificity of ex­tra­cel­lular RNases,⁷ which may lead to re­la­tive sta­bil­ity of purine-rich RNA and of RNA mol­e­cules with pyrimidine bases pro­tec­ted within three-di­men­sional struc­tures. Al­ter­na­tively, cat­ionic pro­teins such as anti-viral pep­tides (for ex­am­ple, LL37) even­tu­ally pre­sent in the in­ter­cel­lular milie­u could com­plex and sta­bilise the in­jected mRNA be­fore it is de­graded by RNases.⁸

Up to now, cross pre­sen­ta­tion has been thought to rely on the uptake of ex­ogenous an­ti­gens in the form of pro­tein. Al­though this format may be ap­pro­pri­ate for MHC class II an­ti­gen pre­sen­ta­tion, it is not op­ti­mal for the pre­sen­ta­tion of ther­a­peu­ti­cally re­levant en­do­genous MHC class I-as­so­ci­ated pep­tides.⁹ In­deed, the set of MHC class I-as­so­ci­ated pep­tides made from en­do­genous, that is in­tra­cel­lularly trans­lated pro­teins can be dis­tinct (though over­lap­ping) from the set made from ex­ogenous pro­teins.¹⁰ As shown in the study by Diken *et al.*,³ pha­go­cytes such as an­ti­gen-pre­sen­ting cells (APCs) are par­tic­u­larly effi­cacious in taking up RNA from the ex­tra­cel­lular space. This would allow APCs to

cross pre­sent through the MHC class I path­way ex­ogenous an­ti­gens ex­pressed af­ter uptake of ex­tra­cel­lular mRNA, either in­jected or re­leased from dy­ing cells. Pha­go­cytosis by APCs of mRNA re­leased by neigh­bour­ing cells that die be­cause of in­fec­tion or en­do­genous dys­func­tion (chro­mosomal dam­age for ex­am­ple), may be of im­por­tance for the MHC class I pre­sen­ta­tion of an­ti­gens de­rived from vi­ruses that cannot in­fect APCs¹¹ and tu­mor-specific an­ti­gens, re­spec­tively. No data are yet avail­able to quan­tify the re­la­tive im­por­tance of pro­tein uptake ver­sus mRNA uptake for im­mune (cross-) pre­sen­ta­tion.

Further­more, it can be en­vi­saged that the spontaneous uptake of re­com­bi­nant naked mRNA by pha­go­cytes *in vitro* as well as by pha­go­cytes (for ex­am­ple, lymph node-re­sident den­dritic cells³) and other cells (for ex­am­ple, skin fibro­blasts⁶) *in vivo* at a site of in­jec­tion, re­flects an an­ces­tral bio­log­ical me­chanism that uses naked RNA as a com­mu­ni­cator be­tween cells. As RNA is chem­ically very sta­ble com­pared with double-stranded DNA or pro­teins at ac­idic pH for ex­am­ple, it could have been the ideal com­mu­ni­cator be­tween neigh­bour­ing or even dis­tant cells at early times of evo­lu­tion. Be­yond im­mune cross-pre­sen­ta­tion as men­tioned above, it can be spec­u­lated that specific (selective or in­duced) or non-specific (cell death) re­lease of naked RNA (mi­cro RNA or mRNA for ex­am­ple) by cells and uptake by neigh­bour­ing cells could be a very con­trolled and pre­cisely coded path­way for in­ter­cel­lular com­mu­ni­ca­tion. Al­though the ca­pac­ity of sorted RNA con­tained in exo­somes to serve as a com­mu­ni­cator be­tween neigh­bour­ing as well as dis­tant cells and tis­sues is pre­sently at­tract­ing much at­ten­tion,^{12,13} our knowl­edge about the ex­is­tence and phys­io­log­ical re­lev­ance of naked RNA as a local com­mu­ni­cator RNA is in its in­fancy.

After uptake by macropinocytosis as shown by Diken *et al.*,³ trans­loca­tion of

Dr S Pascolo is at the Department of Oncology, University Hospital of Zurich, Haeldeliweg 4, 8044 Zurich, Switzerland.
E-mail: steve.pascolo@ifiz.uni-tuebingen.de

large RNA molecules from endosomes to the cytosol has to be achieved. Disruption of the endosome's membranes, encapsulation into exosome structures followed by release and re-uptake or selective export of RNA across the endosomal membrane could be proposed as mechanisms. Further work is required to determine the mechanisms actually involved.

The unexpected capacity of injected naked mRNA to be internalised and efficiently translated by local cells including APCs and then to prime specific immune responses, has started the hunt for what may well turn out to be to a wealth of biologically important roles for naked communicator RNA (CoRNA).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest.

- 1 Crick FH. The origin of the genetic code. *J Mol Biol* 1968; **38**: 367–379.
- 2 North G. Back to the RNA world—and beyond. *Nature* 1987; **328**: 18–19.
- 3 Diken M, Kreiter S, Selmi A, Britten CM, Huber C, Türeci O *et al*. Selective uptake of naked vaccine RNA by dendritic cells is driven by macropinocytosis and abrogated upon DC maturation. *Gene Therapy* 2011; **18**: 702–708.
- 4 Wolff JA, Malone RW, Williams P, Chong W, Acsadi G, Jani A *et al*. Direct gene transfer into mouse muscle *in vivo*. *Science* 1990; **247** (4949 Part 1): 1465–1468.
- 5 Nair SK, Boczkowski D, Morse M, Cumming RI, Lyerly HK, Gilboa E. Induction of primary carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA)-specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes *in vitro* using human dendritic cells transfected with RNA. *Nat Biotechnol* 1998; **16**: 364–369.
- 6 Probst J, Weide B, Scheel B, Pichler BJ, Hoerr I, Rammensee HG *et al*. Spontaneous cellular uptake of exogenous messenger RNA *in vivo* is nucleic acid-specific, saturable and ion dependent. *Gene Therapy* 2007; **14**: 1175–1180.
- 7 Probst J, Brechtel S, Scheel B, Hoerr I, Jung G, Rammensee HG *et al*. Characterization of the ribonuclease activity on the skin surface. *Genet Vaccines Ther* 2006; **4**: 4.
- 8 Ganguly D, Chamilos G, Lande R, Gregorio J, Meller S, Facchinetti V *et al*. Self-RNA-antimicrobial peptide complexes activate human dendritic cells through TLR7 and TLR8. *J Exp Med* 2009; **206**: 1983–1994.
- 9 Parvanova I, Rettig L, Knuth A, Pascolo S. The form of NY-ESO-1 antigen has an impact on the clinical efficacy of anti-tumor vaccination. *Vaccine* 2011; **29**: 3832–3836.
- 10 Schirmbeck R, Reimann J. Alternative processing of endogenous or exogenous antigens extends the immunogenic, H-2 class I-restricted peptide repertoire. *Mol Immunol* 2002; **39**: 249–259.
- 11 Freigang S, Egger D, Bienz K, Hengartner H, Zinkernagel RM. Endogenous neosynthesis vs cross-presentation of viral antigens for cytotoxic T cell priming. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2003; **100**: 13477–13482.
- 12 Eldh M, Ekstrom K, Valadi H, Sjostrand M, Olsson B, Jernas M *et al*. Exosomes communicate protective messages during oxidative stress; possible role of exosomal shuttle RNA. *PLoS One* 2010; **5**: e15353.
- 13 Zomer A, Vendrig T, Hopmans ES, van Eijndhoven M, Middeldorp JM, Pegtel DM. Exosomes: fit to deliver small RNA. *Commun Integr Biol* 2010; **3**: 447–450.