<image/> Windows       Name       Multimedia       My Workspace       Primal Pictures		Wolters Kluwer
<form>          genes         genes         whene         Market of Ma</form>	OVID <sup>®</sup> My Account Ask1	the Virtual Desk at the Library Help Logoff
<page-header>         The series          <ul> <li></li></ul></page-header>	Search Journals Books Multimedia My Workspace Primal Pictures	
Transplation Tr		Coards Becults
Transplantation Ibase: Volume (1)(1): 53 January 1960, pp 165-107 Cocypiets of 1960 by Lightroat, Vittam's Vittam's Vittam's Vittam's Vittam's Vittam's Vittam's Vittam's PERPHERAL MONITORING OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT ALLOANTIGEN PRESENTATION PATHWAYS IN CLINICAL HEART TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS 1 PATHWAYS IN CLINICAL HEART TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS 1 Pathwark, Vittam' Vittam's Vitt		Search Results
<ul> <li>http:://document/11/j.12.anaury 1996. pp 405-497</li> <li>comprise C-1996. Upplocited Willing Willing Comprise C-1996. Upplocited Willing C-1996. Uppl</li></ul>	Transplantation	Article Tools
1055: 0047-037       Accession: 0007990-199601150-00031         (Intel Communications: Immunohology) <ul> <li>Prixe Preview</li> <li>Final Preview&lt;</li></ul>	Issue: Volume 61(1), 15 January 1996, pp 165-167 Copyright: © 1996 by Lippincott Williams & Wilkins Publication Type: [Brief Communications: Immunobiology]	Complete Reference
Beref Communications: Immunohology    Pereinformation  P	ISSN: 0041-1337 Accession: 00007890-199601150-00033	
PERFIRENCE MONITORING OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT ALLOANTIGEN PRESENTATION         ATHWAYS IN CLINICAL HEART TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS 1        Image: Control of Con	[Brief Communications: Immunobiology]  Previous Article   Table of Contents   Next Article >	
<ul> <li>The Market Process in Learning M.B. (2) Data is the Construction of the M.S. (2) Balk. Aggle H.M.M. (2) Class, Frank H.J. (2) Weinary. William?</li> <li>The Market Process in Learning M.B. (2) Data is the Construction of Internal Medicine I and Thoras Center, University Megatal Leiden, Leiden</li></ul>	PERIPHERAL MONITORING OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT ALLOANTIGEN PRESENTATION	🖌 Email Jumpstart
<ul> <li>The start will end and the product of the product of</li></ul>	van Resouw. Nicole M $^{2,3}$ . Vaeseen Lenard M R $^{2}$ . Daane Cornelis R $^{2}$ . Lutte Nicolet H D M $^{2}$ . Balk. Angle H M M $^{4}$ . Class. Frans	🖨 Fmail Article Text
Author Information         Bigstimute Idential Method Method file and Thoras Center, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, and Department         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Leiden, Leiden, the Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, and Examus University Rotterdam.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Leiden, Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, and Examus University Hospital         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Leiden, Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Dr. Makewaterptien 40, NL 3015 GD Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.         Immunohammatology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Rotterdam Oijkrigt, Rotterdam, Rotterdam, Status, Status Status, Statu	H.J. <sup>5</sup> ; Weimar, Willem <sup>2</sup>	Save Article Text
of Immunohematology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Raterdam-Dijkzigt, and Ersamus University Rotterdam. <sup>1</sup> <sup>3</sup> Department of Immunohematology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Leiden. <sup>1</sup> <sup>3</sup> Adreas compondence 1:: N. N. van Besour, Department of Internal Meckrine I, Koom Bd299, University Hospital Raterdam Dijkzigt, Dr Molewaterplein 40, NL 3015 GD Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Raceword IN way 1995. Accepted 14 July 1995. Acc	Author Information Department of Internal Medicine I and Thorax Center, University Hospital Rotterdam-Dijkzigt, Rotterdam, and Department	🔀 Add to My Projects
<ul> <li>Thorac Center, University Hospital Rotterdam-Diplagit.</li> <li><sup>™</sup>Thorac Center, University Hospital Rotterdam-Diplagit.</li> <li><sup>™</sup>Department of Immunohematology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Leiden.</li> <li><sup>™</sup>Address correspondence to: NLA van Besoux, Pepatrement of Internal Medicine I, Boom Bd299, University Hospital</li> <li>Received IW, vi 1995.</li> <li>Accepted 14 July 1995.</li> <li>Abstract</li> <li>Reparation of differential response to alloantigens presented by the different and infere 2 pathway angle of differential response that the response to alloantigens presented by the different on Infere 2 pathway. Inter a differential response to alloantigene presenting cells (Indirect route), In contrast, the latter routes in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (RPAC) of heart transplantation, comparable proportion of PBMC samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondelyled do one plene cells (Indirect route), In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a enominal antigne and persisted different transplantation and out of a signe presenting cells (Indirect route), and persisted differe transplantation, comparable proportion of PBMC samples reacted in subleb tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant receiptent.</li> <li>The divert presentation of the receiptent T cells by doon APC (AdPC), for the indirect pathway, doom APC measuring indirect presentation pathway involves a flence activation of the percels. Thise Thelpre cells may respond is not a subleb tool for Medicales are thread too at alloantepent APC (APC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by receiptents MHC cast II modicules, and fhally presented at the cell starts of the APC too</li></ul>	of Immunohaematology and Blood Bank, University Hospital Leiden, Leiden, the Netherlands	Export All Images to PowerPoint
<ul> <li>Bod balance of memory and balance balance</li></ul>	<sup>4</sup> Thorax Center, University Hospital Rotterdam-Dijkzigt. <sup>5</sup> Department of Immunohomatalogy and Riced Rack, University Hespital Leidon	
Rotterdam-Dijcigi, Dr Molewaterpien 40, NL-3015 CD Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Received 14 July 1995: Accepted 14 July 1995: Abstract The base been reported that the response to allontigens presented by the direct and indirect pathway may be of differential relevance after human kidney transplantation. Accordingly, we monitored these routes in peripheral blood monouclear cells (PBMC) of heart transplantations from before transplantation. Accordingly, we monitored these routes in peripheral blood monouclear cells (PBMC) of heart transplantations of PBMC samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted donor spleen cells (Indirect route). In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persited after transplantation of PBMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antige-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of allonatigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the Immunological status of heart transplant recipients. The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. This pathway is identical to the perspecting allonedigens, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MMC restorted, alloppide-specific regonder cells. This pathway is identical to the persentation on annial antigers greated at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MMC restorted, alloppide-specific regonder cells. This pathway is identical to the perspecific to nonsulan attiger, a set. text associal to allore setting indecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MMC restorted, alloppide-specific regonder cells. This pathway is identical to the persentation ontainal antiger, a set. text associal registers (SMC) for the indirect pathway. When bells	<sup>3</sup> Address correspondence to: N.M. van Besouw, Department of Internal Medicine I, Room Bd299, University Hospital	Find Citing Articles
Accepted 14 July 1995. Abott Tat Abstract Abstract Abstract Abstract Abstract Abstract Accepted 14 July 1995. Abott this perpendent that the response to alloantigens presented by the direct and indirect pathway may be of differential relevance after human kidney transplantation. Accordingly, we monitored these routes in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of heattransplantation, comparable proportions of PBMC samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted door spleen cells (Indirect route), In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, complete door spleen cells (Indirect route), In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed uphyphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients. The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allog aft repiction is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may repond to alloantigens, presenting cells door APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, door MAC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), usbequity processed in the cell surface of the rAPC to seff.MAC- responder is not a suitable population to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy voluncers (1), in real transplant cell to the attrice pathway, door MAC molecules are internalized by recipient APC reportions. The development of allohy and the approxes adirect pathway, borned the cell transplant recipients, bitch and the receivent for monitoring the inspanse is definent to the presence of T helper cells in the relieved to the rAPC to seff.MAC- responder so as unable tool for measuring indirect presentation pathway involves a direct activation of pib	Rotterdam-Dijkzigt, Dr Molewaterplein 40, NL-3015 GD Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Received 1 May 1995.	Similar
Abstract       Request Permissions         It has been reported that the response to alloantigens presented by the differential relevance after human kidney transplantation. Accordingly, we monitored these routes in peripheral biodd mononuclear cells (PBMC) of heart transplantation from before       360 Link         Outline       0.00000000000000000000000000000000000	Accepted 14 July 1995.	About this Journal
It has been reported that the response to alloanigens presented by the       360 Link         direct and indirect pathway may be of differential relevance after human kidney       1         transplantation. Accordingly, we monitored these routes in peripheral blood       0         monouclear cells (PBMC) of heart transplantation is attempt to find a correlation       0         with the clinical status of the patients.       0         Both before and after transplantation, comparable proportions of PBMC       - Abstract         samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted door spleen cells       - Footnotes         (direct route). In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a       - Monotice         nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of       PBMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the         occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting       cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as         responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of       alloantigens, estimated to an televelopment of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft         rejection is dependent on the presented of the recipient T cells by doon APC (dAPC).       in alloantigens presenting cells/APC (v) is eithert APC         (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipients?       MHC         Cass I molecules, and finally presented at th	Abstract	Request Permissions
transplantation. Accordingly, we monitored these routes in peripheral blod mononuclear cells (PBK) of heart transplant patients from before transplantation and up to 2 years thereafter in an attempt to find a correlation with the clinical status of the patients. Both before and after transplantation, comparable proportions of PBMC samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted donor spleen cells (direct route). In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of PBMC samples responding was significantly suppresed, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant edipients The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presending was are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into petides which are bound by recipients APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into petides which are bound by recipients APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into petides which are bound by recipients APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blod mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy vonantes. Mere the allows. Mere t	It has been reported that the response to alloantigens presented by the direct and indirect pathway may be of differential relevance after human kidney	360 Link
<ul> <li>transplantation and up to 2 years thereafter in an attempt to find a correlation with the clinical status of the patients.</li> <li>Both before and after transplantation, comparable proportions of PBMC samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted donor spleen cells (direct route), but never to donor cells depleted for antigen-presenting cells (indirect route). In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of PBMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients.</li> <li>The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by a singen presenting cells (APC ') via either the direct pathway (reviewed by Savegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct attivation of the recipient T cells by doorn APC (APC). For the indirect pathway (reviewed by Savegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct attivation of the recipient T cells by doorn APC (APC). For the indirect pathway (reviewed by Savegh) (1). The direct pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxid(TET).</li> <li>Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral biod mononuclear cells (BMC) of healthy volumeers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy doons, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway was not different from that co</li></ul>	transplantation. Accordingly, we monitored these routes in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of heart transplant patients from before	Outline
<ul> <li>Both before and after transplantation, comparable proportions of PBMC</li> <li>samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted donor spleen cells</li> <li>(direct route), but never to donor cells depleted for antigen-presenting cells</li> <li>(indirect route), in contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of PBMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder to not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients.</li> <li>The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by a singer) (1). The direct pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by door APC (dAPC).</li> <li>For the indirect pathway, door MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC).</li> <li>For the indirect pathway, oron MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC).</li> <li>So th presentation antigens, e.g., tetanus toxold(TET).</li> <li>Both presentation and antigens, e.g., tetanus toxold(TET).</li> <li>Both presentation and antigens, e.g., tetanus toxold(TET).</li> <li>Both presentation ant indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chonic rejection was reported (3,4). In</li> </ul>	transplantation and up to 2 years thereafter in an attempt to find a correlation with the clinical status of the natients	Abstract     Footnotes
samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted door spleen cells (direct route), but never to doorn cells depleted for antigen-presenting cells (indirect route), in contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of PBMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients. The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells/APC <sup>-</sup> ) via either the direct or the indirect pathway (reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient AHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presented vin the off to molecule to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chroin rejection was reported (3,4). In	Both before and after transplantation, comparable proportions of PBMC	REFERENCES     IMAGE CALLERY
(indirect route). In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of PPMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as a responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients.	samples reacted in mixed lymphocyte culture to nondepleted donor spleen cells (direct route), but never to donor cells depleted for antigen-presenting cells	• IMAGE GALLERT
nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of PBMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients. The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC <sup>-</sup> ) via either the direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	(indirect route). In contrast, the latter route could easily be activated by a	
Cocurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients. The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC <sup>+</sup> ) via either the direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Saregh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient S MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	nominal antigen and persisted after transplantation, although the proportion of PBMC samples responding was significantly suppressed, irrespective of the	
cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as responder is not a suitable tool for measuring indirect presentation of alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients. The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC *) via either the direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	occurrence of rejection. Consequently, complete removal of antigen-presenting	
The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC *) via either the direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	cells from the stimulator population in a mixed lymphocyte culture with PBMC as	
of heart transplant recipients. The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC *) via either the direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	alloantigens, and therefore not relevant for monitoring the immunological status	
The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC *) via either the direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	of heart transplant recipients.	
rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC *) via either the direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	The development of alloreactive effector cells participating in allograft	
direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient T cells by donor APC (dAPC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	rejection is dependent on the presence of T helper cells. These T helper cells may respond to alloantigens presented by antigen-presenting cells(APC *) via either the	
Pathway involves a direct activation of the recipient 1 cetic by donor APC (APC). For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC (rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	direct or the indirect pathway(reviewed by Sayegh) (1). The direct presentation	
(rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	For the indirect pathway, donor MHC molecules are internalized by recipient APC	
class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	(rAPC), subsequently processed into peptides which are bound by recipient's MHC	
presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET). Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	class II molecules, and finally presented at the cell surface of the rAPC to self-MHC- restricted, allopeptide-specific responder cells. This pathway is identical to the	
Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) of healthy volunteers (2). In renal transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	presentation of nominal antigens, e.g., tetanus toxoid(TET).	
transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	Both presentation pathways were found to be able to induce an alloresponse by	
different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response to antigens presented via the indirect pathway. When the latter reactivity was detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	transplant recipients with stable graft function, the direct pathway was not	
detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	different from that of healthy donors, whereas these patients showed no response	
	detected, a correlation with acute or chronic rejection was reported (3,4). In	

addition, it was demonstrated that the indirect pathway was more sensitive to immunosuppression than the direct route of alloantigen presentation (4,5).

In the present study, we monitored the presence of both antigen presentation pathways in PBMC of human cardiac transplant recipients, by measuring the proliferative response of their cells to alloantigens in mixed lymphocyte cultures (MLC). PBMC were collected longitudinally from the time of transplantation to 2 years thereafter. The presentation pathways were investigated in an attempt to find a correlation with the immunological status of the patients and possibly to obtain a relevant tool to monitor the effect of tapering of immunosuppression on the donor-directed immune response.

PBMC were isolated from heparinized blood by density gradient centrifugation using Ficoll-Paque (Pharmacia Biotech AB, Uppsala, Sweden). The PBMC were collected from the interphase, washed twice with HBSS (Gibco BRL, Scotland, UK), and frozen at -140°C until use. Spleen cells were obtained by mechanical dissociation of small pieces of spleen through a sieve of stainless steel in RPMI 1640-DM supplemented with 4 mM l-glutamine, 100 IU/ml penicillin, 100µg/ml streptomycin (all from Gibco, Paisley, Scotland), and 10% pooled heat-inactivated human AB serum (i.e., culture medium). DNase (10µg/ml, Boehringer Mannheim GmbH, Germany) was added to prevent aggregation of cells. Subsequently, the cell suspension was filtrated through a 70-µm cell strainer (Falcon, Franklin Lakes, NJ) and washed. Thereafter, the cells were centrifuged over a Ficoll-Paque density gradient and stored at-140°C.

To test the response to alloantigens presented via the direct or the indirect presentation route, we stimulated PBMC from the transplant recipient with spleen cells derived from the heart donor (direct route) or with donor spleen cells depleted for dAPC (indirect route). The response to TET (RIVM, Bilthoven, the Netherlands) served as positive control for the indirect presentation pathway.

To remove all dAPC,  $10^7$  donor spleen cells (in 3.5 ml) were incubated with 125  $\mu$ l of anti-CD14 (monocytes/macrophages; MY4, Coulter Immunology, Hialeach, FL), 75  $\mu$ l of anti-CD19 (B-cells; Leu-12, Becton Dickinson, San Jose, CA), and 75  $\mu$ l of anti-HLA-DR (dendritic cells; Becton Dickinson) in HBSS and 1% pooled heatinactivated human AB serum. After an incubation period of gentle shaking for 30 min at 4°C, the cells were washed in HBSS. Thereafter, the cells were incubated with 210  $\mu$ l of washed Dynabeads (M-450 sheep anti-mouse IgG, Dynal, Oslo, Norway) for 30 min of gentle shaking at 4°C. Subsequently, the dAPC were retained by a magnet and the nonadherent cells were transported to another tube. This depletion procedure was repeated twice before the nonadherent cells were processed further. The APC-depleted cells were washed with HBSS and were counted with trypan blue to determine the vitality before testing.

For MLC and TET stimulation, 100  $\mu$ l of a PBMC suspension of 5×10<sup>5</sup> cells/ml in culture medium was added in triplicate wells in a round-bottom 96-well plate (Costar, Cambridge, MA) to 100  $\mu$ l of (a) 5×10<sup>4</sup> irradiated (60 Gy) spleen cells derived from the donor; (b) 5×10<sup>4</sup> irradiated (60 Gy) dAPC-depleted spleen cells; (c) TET at 7.5 lf/ml final concentration; (d) phytohemagglutinin M (1:100 final dilution; Difco Laboratories, Detroit, MI) to control the viability of the cells; and(e) culture medium. After 6 days of incubation at 37°C in a humidified atmosphere of 5% CO<sub>2</sub> in

air, cell proliferation was measured by incorporation of [<sup>3</sup>H]thymidine (0.5  $\mu$ Ci/well) added during the last 8 hr of culture. The mean counts per minute (cpm) were determined and cell proliferation was considered significant when the ratio of the cpm obtained in the presence of antigen to the cpm in the absence of antigen was higher than 2(stimulation index >2).

The frequency of IL-2-producing T helper lymphocytes (HTL) was determined using the limiting dilution analysis assay (slightly modified) of Schanz et al. (6). In brief, 24 replicates of graded number PBMC responder cells were titrated in fourstep double dilutions starting from  $5 \times 10^4$  to 6250 cells/well and stimulated with  $5 \times 10^4$  irradiated (30 Gy) spleen cells depleted or not depleted for APC. After 3 days of culture, 100 µl of the culture supernatant were harvested to test for IL-2 in a bioassay using the IL-2-dependent CTLL-2 cell line as indicator system.

The results of the MLC and TET stimulation are shown in Table 1. Most PBMC samples taken before heart transplantation (HTx) reacted to both nondepleted donor spleen cells (88%) and TET (75%), but never to spleen cells depleted for dAPC. Similarly, after HTx, 75% (45/60) of the PBMC samples did respond to spleen cells not depleted for dAPC, but not to the depleted population, independent of time after transplantation or occurrence of rejection (ISHLT grade 3 or more)(7). In



http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com/sp-3.15.1b/ovidweb.cgi?QS2=434f4e1a73d37e8c00586f3002aa... 02-06-2015

contrast, the response to TET changed both after HTx compared with before HTx, and during the posttransplantation follow-up period. During the first year after HTx, only 13% (6/47) of the PBMC samples reacted to TET, which is significantly less than before HTx(P-0.001). During rejection and nonrejection episodes, no significant difference in the TET response was observed (P=0.33). Also, no difference between the first and the second year after HTx was found with regard to the TET response of samples taken during rejection. In contrast, in periods without rejection, a trend was observed in time after HTx, i.e., the TET response was more frequently observed during the second year (27%) compared with the first year (9%) after transplantation(P=0.15).

These results suggest that later after transplantation the response to nominal antigens tends to normalize, possibly as a consequence of the reduction of the immunosuppressive load given to the patient. The results obtained with the nominal antigen, TET, are in agreement with those found by Shearer's group (4.5), and Gallon et al.(8), who demonstrated that T helper cell responses to indirectly presented antigens are more sensitive to cyclosporine than responses to direct allogeneic stimulation. In contrast to Shearer's group (2-5), who found comparable positive responses both to indirectly presented nominal antigens and indirectly presented alloantigens in PBMC from kidney transplant recipients and healthy controls, we did not find any indirect response to alloantigens. Our results were confirmed by an unpublished study of PBMC from healthy persons which did not react to an APC-depleted stimulator population in MLC, while positive responses were found after stimulation with TET (F.H.J. Claas, Immunohematology and Blood Bank, Leiden, personal communication, 1995). Although, the present study was different from that of Shearer's group with respect to the organ transplanted and the immunosuppressive regimen, we think that the different results are due to the different methods used for APC depletion. Depletion of APC by plastic and nylon wool adherence may be incomplete, resulting in responses to suboptimal concentrations of dAPC, while the response was ascribed to alloantigens indirectly presented by rAPC. Dendritic cells are known as very potent APC, inducing MLC responses at low stimulator to responder ratios (1 dendritic cell to 1000 T cells)(9). Accordingly, a slight contamination of the stimulator population with dendritic cells can already induce T cell proliferation in an MLC. The reported correlation of dAPCdepleted MLC responses with clinical events may rather be associated with the presence of a few remaining dAPC in the tests than with the measurement of the indirect presentation route. We have checked for the efficiency of the depletion by FACS analysis and by performing two-way MLC with two depleted stimulator populations. After depletion, 0% CD14<sup>+</sup>, <1% CD19<sup>+</sup>, and <1% HLA-DR<sup>+</sup> were detected by analysis on FACS and in none of the cases was a response found in the two-way MLC (stimulation index <=2). From the present study, it is clear that no responses to alloantigens in MLC can occur in the absence of dAPC.

An explanation for the positive responses of PBMC to the nondepleted cells and the negative responses of PBMC to the dAPC-depleted population, however, remains that the direct presentation pathway is responsible for the strong proliferative responses seen in vitro by a high frequency of T cell precursors responding to allogeneic MHC molecules (10). The MLC used may not be sensitive enough for a detectable response to alloantigens presented via the indirect pathway to antigenspecific T cells that may be present at low frequencies. This was also reported by Watschinger et al.(11), who indicated that T cells primed in vivo by a vascularized cardiac allograft are able to proliferate in vitro to specific peptides but only when presented by APC, which were preincubated with the allopeptide. Therefore, we used a limiting dilution analysis assay to determine the HTL frequencies. This assay is thought to be more sensitive than MLC to measure responses to directly and indirectly presented antigens. We tested 4 pre-HTx samples, because the highest responses were expected at that point in time (2). All PBMC reacted clearly to their nondepleted donor cell population (57, 33, 77, and 56 HTL/10<sup>6</sup> cells), while responses after APC depletion were nondetectable or very low (6, 0, 17, and 0 HTL/10<sup>6</sup> cells, respectively). However, interference of backward stimulation (i.e., IL-2 production of stimulator spleen cells in response to PBMC), as described by Schanz et al. (6), could have played a role in case of low HTL responses. To avoid backward stimulation, generally, B cell lines are used as stimulator cells in the HTL assay, but these cell lines are not relevant for monitoring the indirect alloantigen presentation pathway, since they are excellent direct stimulators. Accordingly, like the MLC, the HTL assay with the APC-depleted cells as stimulator is not usable to measure responses of PBMC to indirectly presented alloantigens.

In summary, no difference in response of PBMC to alloantigens presented via the direct presentation pathway was detected before or after HTx, irrespective of the occurrence of rejection, and a reaction to indirectly presented alloantigens was never found. However, the response to TET remained detectable after HTx, although in significantly less cases, but again irrespective of rejection. We conclude

that monitoring the direct and indirect alloantigen presentation routes in PBMC is not useful as a tool for monitoring the immunological status of heart transplant recipients.

Acknowledgments. We thank Dr L.P. de Waal for helpful discussion and critical reading of the manuscript.

## Back to Top

## Footnotes

This work was supported by grant 92.094 from the Netherlands Heart Foundation. [Context Link]

Abbreviations: APC, antigen-presenting cells; dAPC, donor antigen-presenting cells; HTL, IL-2 producing T helper lymphocytes; HTx, heart transplantation; MLC, mixed lymphocyte culture; PBMC, peripheral blood mononuclear cells; rAPC, recipient antigen-presenting cells; TET, tetanus toxoid. [Context Link]

## Back to Top

## REFERENCES

1. Sayegh MH, Watschinger B, Carpenter CB. Mechanisms of T cell recognition of alloantigen. The role of peptides. Transplantation 1994; 57: 1295. Ovid Full Text 360 Link Bibliographic Links [Context Link]

2. Via CS, Tsokos GC, Stocks NI, Clerici M, Shearer GM. Human in vitro allogeneic responses. Demonstration of three pathways of T helper cell activation. J Immunol 1990; 144: 2524. 360 Link Bibliographic Links [Context Link]

 Schulick RD, Weir MB, Miller MW, Cohen DJ, Bermas BL, Shearer GM. Longitudinal study of in vitro CD4+ T helper cell function in recently transplanted renal allograft patients undergoing tapering of their immunosuppressive drugs. Transplantation 1993; 56: 590. 360 Link | Bibliographic Links | [Context Link]

4. Muluk SC, Clerici M, Via CS, Weir MR, Kimmel PL, Shearer GM. Correlation of in vitro CD4+ T helper cell function with clinical graft status in immunosuppressed kidney transplant recipients. Transplantation 1991; 52: 284. Ovid Full Text 360 Link Bibliographic Links [Context Link]

5. Clerici M, Shearer GM. Differential sensitivity of human T helper cell pathways by in vitro exposure to cyclosporin A. J Immunol 1990; 144: 2480. 360 Link Bibliographic Links [Context Link]

6. Schanz U, Roelen DL, Bruning JW, Kardol MJ, Van Rood JJ, Claas FHJ. The relative radioresistance of interleukin-2 production by human peripheral blood lymphocytes: consequences for the development of a new limiting dilution assay for the enumeration of helper T lymphocyte precursor frequencies. J Immunol Methods 1994; 169: 221. 360 Link | Full Text | Bibliographic Links | [Context Link]

7. Billingham ME, Cary NRB, Hammond ME, et al. A working formulation for the standardization of nomenclature in the diagnosis of heart and lung rejection: Heart Rejection Study Group. J Heart Transplant 1990; 9: 587. 360 Link | Bibliographic Links | [Context Link]

 Gallon L, Watschinger B, Murphy B, Akalin E, Sayegh MH, Carpenter CB. The indirect pathway of allorecognition. The occurrence of self-restricted T cell recognition of allo-MHC peptides early in acute renal allograft rejection and its inhibition by conventional immunosuppression. Transplantation 1995; 59: 612. Ovid Full Text 360 Link Bibliographic Links [Context Link]

9. Steinman RM, Inaba K. Stimulation of the primary mixed leukocyte reaction. CRC Crit Rev Immunol 1985; 5: 331. [Context Link]

 Sharrock CEM, Man S, Wanachiwanawin W, Batchelor JR. Analysis of the alloreactive T cell repertoire in man. Transplantation 1987; 43: 699. Ovid Full Text 360 Link Bibliographic Links [Context Link]

11. Watschinger B, Gallon L, Carpenter CB, Sayegh MH. Mechanisms of allorecognition. Recognition by in vivo-primed T cells of specific major histocompatibility complex polymorphisms presented as peptides by responder antigen-presenting cells. Transplantation 1994; 57: 572. Ovid Full Text | 360 Link | Bibliographic Links [Context Link]

IMAGE GALLERY	
Select All	Export Selected to PowerPoint
Name         Nam         Name         Name	
back to top	Previous Article   Table of Contents   Next Article ▶

© 2015 Ovid Technologies, Inc. All rights reserved. OvidSP\_UI03.15.01.102, SourceID 66680

About Us Contact Us Terms of Use