



Letter to the Editor

Response to “H1N1 hemagglutinin-specific HLA-DQ6-restricted CD4+ T cells can be readily detected in narcolepsy type 1 patients and healthy controls”



We read with great interest the publication by Schinkelshoek et al. (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019) reporting on T cell reactivity to Hemagglutinin pHA₂₇₅₋₂₈₇ and Hypocretin/orexin HCRT₅₆₋₆₈ and HCRT₈₇₋₉₉ peptides. The authors failed to discuss a publication by Luo et al. published a day after submission of their own publication (Luo et al., 2018a). This same work had been published in BioRxiv (Luo et al., 2018b) together with an informative Genome Wide Association (GWAS) paper in 5500 narcolepsy subjects (Ollila et al., 2018), and discussed in Liblau et al. (Liblau, 2018), a companion editorial to the cited Latorre et al. paper (Latorre et al., 2018). In this work, we found that homologous HCRT₅₄₋₆₆ and HCRT₈₆₋₉₇ sequences had to be C-amidated (HCRT_{NH2}), as in secreted active peptides, to be recognized by CD4⁺ T cells as an autoantigen. We also found increased reactivity to pHA₂₇₃₋₂₈₇ and HCRT_{NH2} in narcolepsy patients and common CDR3 α and CDR3 β TCR sequences with tetramers derived from both peptides, suggesting that homology predicts cross reactivity. One of the most common cross-reactive CDR3 β sequence was a TRBV4-2 bearing CAS-SQETQGRNYGYTF CDR3 motif. This is of significance considering that our GWAS data implicate a narcolepsy susceptible variant rs1008599 that is also an eQTL increasing usage of TRBV4-2 bearing CDR3 β (Ollila et al., 2018; Sharon et al., 2016). We concluded that there is strong probability of molecular mimicry with this sequence. As the work of Schinkelshoek et al. (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019) is relevant to this publication, but does not cite or agree with our conclusion, we offer a brief comment below.

Schinkelshoek et al. (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019) adds useful pHA₂₇₅₋₂₈₇, HCRT₅₆₋₆₈ and HCRT₈₇₋₉₉ crystallographic information confirming projected register for these peptides when bound to DQ602, further pointing out similarities of TCR facing residues across these complexes. The work also adds TCR sequencing data for clones derived

from DQ602 pHA₂₇₅₋₂₈₇ tetramers in six subjects, 4 narcolepsy and 2 controls. Among this data, the authors found one TCR α / β CDR3 pair 3 times in one patient and one TCR α CDR3 found 3 times in another but with different TCR β s). The authors also conducted cross cultures of these HA restricted clones with hypocretin peptides, and obtaining nothing, concluded that there no evidence for molecular mimicry.

We believe that such conclusion was premature based on the small number of TCR clones (33 unique CDR3s, 17 α and 16 β) identified and the low frequency of cross-reacting TCRs we found. In our work, we sequenced thousands (Table 1) of individual DQ602 pHA₂₇₃₋₂₈₇ tetramer positive cells (rather than 33) in more than 14 patients and 11 controls subjects, both narcolepsy and controls and found only a small number of frequently used CDR3s that were common to both pHA₂₇₃₋₂₈₇ and HCRT_{NH2}. As in Schinkelshoek et al. (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019), we found that V17-J34 sequences were common in pHA₂₇₅₋₂₈₇ tetramers notably V17-CATDAYNTDKLIF-J34. Further, the paratope motifs SQR/SQG motifs encompassing the CDR3 β s that we reported as a common pHA₂₇₃₋₂₈₇ responsive motif is also found frequently in their CDR3 β sequences as predicted (Luo et al., 2018a). Comparing the few CDR3 sequences obtained by the authors with our own data (Table 1 sequences with zero and one mismatch as computed by Levenstein distance metric (Navarro, 2001)), it is clear that sequences retrieved by Schinkelshoek et al. are shared with pHA₂₇₅₋₂₈₇ as expected, although in one case a sequence similar to that we retrieved with HCRT_{NH2} is obtained. In contrast, no sharing is found with nucleoprotein sequence NP₁₇₋₃₁, a control PR8 sequence without homology with HCRT_{NH2}. With our extended data, we could clearly shows that common CDR3 α and CDR3 β sequences are found in T cell clones recognizing both HCRT_{NH2} and pHA₂₇₃₋₂₈₇ but not control NP₁₇₋₃₁, something that would not have been possible to see with the

Table 1

Sharing of 33 TCR sequences of Schinkelshoek et al. (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019) with data from Luo et al. (Luo et al., 2018a).

Shared sequences	Zero mismatch				One mismatch			
	CDR3 α		CDR3 β		CDR3 α		CDR3 β	
	Unique	Total	Unique	Total	Unique	Total	Unique	Total
HA ₂₇₅₋₂₈₇	0.21% (1/344)*	0.07% (3/1452)*	0% (0/349)	0% (0/1343)	1.5% (5/344)	0.67% (10/1452)	0% (0/349)	0% (0/1343)
HCRT _{NH2}	0.11% (1/901)**	0.03% (1/3065)**	0% (0/916)	0% (0/2881)	0% (0/901)	0% (0/3065)	0% (0/916)	0% (0/2881)
NP ₁₇₋₃₁	0% (0/399)	0% (0/1706)	0% (0/381)	0% (0/1837)	0% (0/399)	0% (0/1706)	0% (0/381)	0% (0/1837)

Sequence from Schinkelshoek et al. (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019): * = CDR3 α TRAV 21*01 CATDAYNTDKLIF TRAJ34*01, **CDR3 α = TRAV25*01 CAGDAGNNRK-LIW TRAJ38*01.

very limited depth of TCR sequencing results obtained by Schinkelshoek et al. (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019).

It could be argued that the homology of epitope sequence explains sharing sequences for cognate TCRs independent of mimicry being involved in causing narcolepsy. However, as we argue in our publication, although rare, the V β 4–2 is the most commonly HCRT_{NH2} ($n = 7$) /pHA_{273–287} ($n = 2$) shared sequence. The other commonly shared cross-reactive sequences use V α and V β chains (TRBV15 and TRAV26–1) where cis QTL SNPs could not be detected (Sharon et al., 2016), which could explain why they are not present in our GWAS. Our genetic association data is therefore suggestive of causality considering that V β 4–2 is only used on 0.7% of the repertoire. Furthering the validity of our analysis method is the fact the top TCR α chain recognizing HCRT_{NH2} across narcolepsy cases and controls was a J α 24 bearing CDR3 α sequence CAVETDSWGKLF, and that a major SNP rs1154155 predisposing to narcolepsy maps to this segment and is also rarely used (0.8%).

In conclusion, our analysis of the Schinkelshoek et al. publication (Schinkelshoek et al., 2019) is in line with our own data (Luo et al., 2018a). We however argue that mimicry could not be detected by these authors because of the very small number of clones sampled in the study. We also acknowledge that experiments demonstrating actual TCR cross reactivity of pHA_{273–287} and HCRT_{NH2} using transferred Jurkat cell will be useful complement tetramer data, as observing common TCR α and TCR β sequences after culture does not directly demonstrate functionality and activation. We however argue that mimicry is a low probability event, and that once it has occurred, epitope

spreading would lead HCRT_{NH2} specific reactivity (often using J24) taking over the destructive process. HA sequences other than pHA_{273–287} are also involved, considering narcolepsy existed prior to 2009, but was also seasonally regulated.

References

- Latorre, D., et al., 2018. T cells in patients with narcolepsy target self-antigens of hypocretin neurons. *Nature* 562 (7725), 63–68.
- Liblau, R.S., 2018. Put to sleep by immune cells. *Nature* 562 (7725), 46–48.
- Luo, G., et al., 2018a. Autoimmunity to hypocretin and molecular mimicry to flu in type 1 narcolepsy. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 115 (52) E12323–E12332.
- Luo, G., et al., 2018b. Autoimmunity to hypocretin and molecular mimicry to flu antigens in Type 1 narcolepsy. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/378109>. p. 378109.
- Navarro, G., 2001. A guided tour to approximate string matching. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 33 (1), 31–88.
- Ollila, H.M., et al., 2018. Narcolepsy risk loci are enriched in immune cells and suggest autoimmune modulation of the T cell receptor repertoire. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/373555>. (373555).
- Schinkelshoek, M.S., et al., 2019. H1N1 hemagglutinin-specific HLA-DQ6-restricted CD4+ T cells can be readily detected in narcolepsy type 1 patients and healthy controls. *J. Neuroimmunol.* 332, 167–175.
- Sharon, E., et al., 2016. Genetic variation in MHC proteins is associated with T cell receptor expression biases. *Nat. Genet.* 48 (9), 995.

Emmanuel Mignot*, Aditya Ambati, Guo Luo
 Stanford Center For Sleep Sciences and Medicine, Dept of Psychiatry and
 Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, USA
 E-mail address: mignot@stanford.edu (E. Mignot).

* Corresponding author.