

Special Section: State of the Field: Advances in Neuroimaging from the 2017 Alzheimer's Imaging Consortium

## Molecular imaging: What is right and what is an illusion?

William E. Klunk\*

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

### Abstract

Over the past 40 years, brain molecular imaging has evolved from measuring cerebral metabolism with fluorodeoxyglucose, to neuroreceptor imaging, to imaging pathological protein deposits. In the early going, the characteristics of successful molecular imaging radiotracers were defined, and a detailed “Process” was developed for the collection of basic pharmacodynamic and pharmacokinetic data. These data are essential for the interpretation of in vivo imaging data and for defining the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of new tracers. This perspective discusses the use of this “Process” in the development of the amyloid  $\beta$  positron emission tomography radiotracer, Pittsburgh Compound-B, and discusses some of the current controversies and difficulties in the field of tau positron emission tomography in the context of human data that preceded completion of this radiotracer characterization process—which still remains to be completed. As a field, we must decide which data are valid and which are artifacts and determine that when the artifacts are so overwhelming, the data are merely an illusion.

© 2018 The Author. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the Alzheimer's Association. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

### Keywords:

Positron emission tomography; Amyloid; Tau; Radiotracer development; Illusion

Fifty years before AIC-2017 and a decade before the first fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (PET) studies were performed, the recent Rock & Roll Hall of Fame inductee, Graeme Edge of “The Moody Blues” wrote a poem called “Morning Glory” that became a part of their iconic album “Days of Future Past.” Some of Edge’s words apply well to the current state of molecular imaging—a field with a brief history and many still active in the field have been around for most of it (and for the music of the late 60s). The poem reflects on how the moon changes our perception of colors, and the pertinent part for this

perspective goes something like, “...red is gray and yellow white, but we decide which is right...and which is an illusion” [1]. The field of PET radiotracer development fashioned a “Process” long ago to help us make these decisions [2]. This perspective reflects on the advantages of following that “Process” and the pitfalls of forgetting it.

Fifteen years, before the presentations highlighted in this special issue, the first Pittsburgh Compound-B (PiB) data were presented at AIC-2002 (Stockholm). It was thought-provoking to pull out that old presentation and flip through it in preparation for writing this perspective. Ninety percent of the presentation was preclinical technical data reflecting the culmination of more than a decade of work, describing the “Process” for the development of a novel class of amyloid  $\beta$  (A $\beta$ ) radiotracers including (1) criteria for acceptance of a good A $\beta$  PET tracer; (2) structure-activity relationships for the binding of benzothiazole derivatives to postmortem Alzheimer’s disease (AD) and control brains; (3) correlations with brain A $\beta$  load measured biochemically; (4) pharmacokinetics in

GE Healthcare holds a license agreement with the University of Pittsburgh based on the technology described in this manuscript. Dr. Klunk is a co-inventor of PiB and, as such, has a financial interest in this license agreement. GE Healthcare provided no grant support for this study and had no role in the design or interpretation of results or preparation of this manuscript.

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: 412-246-6460; Fax: 412-246-6465.

E-mail address: [klunkwe@upmc.edu](mailto:klunkwe@upmc.edu)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dadm.2018.01.004>

2352-8729/© 2018 The Author. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of the Alzheimer's Association. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

primates; (5) two-photon studies in mice; (6) receptor/enzyme pharmacology; and (7) toxicology. A human image was shown only briefly in one slide as an advertisement for what was then aptly called a “Hot Topics” presentation later in the week at the main conference (then called the International Conference on Alzheimer’s Disease) by Henry Engler of Uppsala University (where the first human PiB study was performed 5 months earlier on February 14, 2002). It would be 18 months before the first manuscript on PiB imaging in an expanded cohort was published in January 2004 [3]—a manuscript that included more “Process” data such as autoradiographic data from postmortem human brain, time-activity curves from gray and white matter of AD and control subjects, and a lengthy discussion of the potential limitations of the new technology. In turn, these promising preliminary results were soon followed by a fully quantitative pharmacokinetic study using arterial blood data that included metabolite analyses in humans [4] that were complemented by metabolite analyses in rodent and postmortem human brain tissues [5]. These detailed, dynamic human PiB PET data sets clearly showed reversible binding of PiB and pinpointed when equilibrium was reached in the brain. These data were then used as the foundation for characterization of simpler, shorter scanning protocols without need for arterial lines and the use of 20-minute acquisition protocols using standardized uptake value ratios with cerebellar gray matter as the reference region [6]. An understanding was gained of the tradeoffs between the convenience of the shortened studies and the complete data sets from the longer dynamic studies. No large-scale human studies had yet been initiated at this point, but I think we had a good grasp on “which was right and which was an illusion” when it came to interpreting PiB PET data because of this careful developmental “Process.” For example, we knew very early that there was substantial, nonspecific white matter retention of PiB that was equivalent in both AD and controls and that had to be excluded from the analyses of gray matter retention. We also knew there was substantial specific PiB retention in the striatum, contrary to what many believed at the time. Within a couple of years, postmortem correlative data began to appear that showed gray matter PiB retention correlated closely with A $\beta$  load measured immunohistochemically and biochemically [7,8]. By late 2008, the FDA adopted postmortem correlation studies as the prescribed pathway to the approval of A $\beta$  PET tracers for clinical use—a pathway that has been successfully traversed by three A $\beta$  tracers: florbetapir (Amyvid), flutemetamol (Vizamyl), and florbetaben (Neuraceq) [9–11]. By 2010, A $\beta$  PET imaging was being included as a secondary outcome in trials of anti-amyloid passive immunotherapy [12], a practice that has now become routine. This use of A $\beta$  imaging has shown a (probably too) weak reduction of A $\beta$  load by at least two immunotherapies that have failed to meet their clinical endpoints [13–15] and has shown some impressive reductions in A $\beta$  load with aggressive immunotherapy that,

at the highest dose, appeared to nearly normalize A $\beta$  load and perhaps slow cognitive decline in prodromal and mild AD patients [16].

If you found the preceding paragraph boring at points... well, you should have. That’s even without getting into the unsuccessful, yet instructive, decade before 2002 during which we struggled to develop A $\beta$  radiotracers based on Congo red. It was during that struggle that we developed the acceptance criteria later used to judge subsequent A $\beta$  PET tracers based on Thioflavin-T [17]. The intent of the preceding paragraph was to show that the development of a good molecular imaging radiotracer is a long, often slow, and technically tedious “Process.” I do not pretend that the “Process” described above was perfect. It was not. There were steps that were skipped. For example, no one has ever completed an in vivo blocking study in which an A $\beta$  radiotracer is displaced by excess unlabeled compound—mainly due to the high number of A $\beta$  binding sites and the difficulty obtaining approval for the administration of such high doses of unlabeled compound to humans and the lack of a good animal model [18,19]. The most important point of the preceding paragraph is that there was a relatively standard “Process” for the development of what most would agree ultimately turned out to be a successful group of radiotracers. That “Process” and the fundamental rules upon which it is based existed long before the idea of using PET to assess A $\beta$  burden [2]. Although increasingly ignored, the “Process” continues to apply today and will continue to apply in the future, and discarding it will (and has) lead to more false starts and backtracking than might be necessary.

I wonder if the success of the A $\beta$  PET radiotracers may have actually led to the “Process” being pushed aside. Once the field believed we could accurately image A $\beta$  deposition—a belief that did not always come easily in the early days—it found the notion that we could accurately image tau burden much easier to believe. So easy, perhaps, that tau-PET tracers were rushed into relatively large-scale use. Personal experience proved that reviewers were hungry to see tau PET included in grant proposals even before any detailed information was in the literature. It was not long until problems arose and the “Process” was remembered—at least by some. I can vividly remember one of the most experienced (i.e., “old”) and respected PET scientists who was around since the beginning of molecular imaging lamenting about “what happened to the ‘Process?’” at a recent Human Amyloid Imaging meeting when commenting on some of the difficulties in developing and employing tau-PET radiotracers. Could it be that too many steps of the “Process” had been skipped? And could this be leading to some of the difficulty the field has experienced in deciding “which is right and which is an illusion” in the tau-PET literature? Let us look at some examples. To be fair, although the majority of these examples focus on [F-18]AV-1451 (AKA: flortaucipir), this is only a reflection of the fact that this was the first and most widely used tau-PET tracer and is not meant to detract from

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8680268>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8680268>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)