

Mechanisms of Anticholinesterase Interference with Tau Aggregation Inhibitor Activity in a Tau-Transgenic Mouse Model.

[Riedel G](#)¹, [Klein J](#)², [Niewiadomska G](#)³, [Kondak C](#)¹, [Schwab K](#)⁴, [Lauer D](#)⁴, [Magbagbeolu M](#)⁴, [Steczkowska M](#)³, [Zadrozny M](#)³, [Wydrych M](#)³, [Cranston A](#)¹, [Melis V](#)¹, [Santos RX](#)¹, [Theuring F](#)¹, [Harrington CR](#)¹, [Wischik CM](#)¹.

Author information

Abstract

BACKGROUND:

Symptomatic treatments of Alzheimer's disease (AD) with cholinesterase inhibitors and/or memantine are relatively ineffective and there is a need for new treatments targeting the underlying pathology of AD. In most of the failed disease-modifying trials, patients have been allowed to continue taking symptomatic treatments at stable doses, under the assumption that they do not impair efficacy. In recently completed Phase 3 trials testing the tau aggregation inhibitor leuco-methylthioninium bis(hydromethanesulfonate) (LMTM), we found significant differences in treatment response according to whether patients were taking LMTM either as monotherapy or as an add-on to symptomatic treatments.

METHODS:

We have examined the effect of either LMTM alone or chronic rivastigmine prior to LMTM treatment of tau transgenic mice expressing the short tau fragment that constitutes the tangle filaments of AD. We have measured acetylcholine levels, synaptosomal glutamate release, synaptic proteins, mitochondrial complex IV activity, tau pathology and choline acetyltransferase immunoreactivity.

RESULTS:

LMTM given alone increased hippocampal acetylcholine (ACh) levels, glutamate release from synaptosomal preparations, synaptophysin levels in multiple brain regions and mitochondrial complex IV activity, reduced tau pathology, partially restored choline acetyltransferase (ChAT) immunoreactivity in the basal forebrain and reversed deficits in spatial learning. Chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine was found to reduce or eliminate almost all these effects, apart from a reduction in tau aggregation pathology. LMTM effects on hippocampal ACh and synaptophysin levels were also reduced in wild-type mice.

CONCLUSION:

The interference with the pharmacological activity of LMTM by a cholinesterase inhibitor can be reproduced in a tau transgenic mouse model and, to a lesser extent, in wild-type mice. Long-term pretreatment with a symptomatic drug alters a broad range of brain responses to LMTM across different transmitter systems and cellular compartments at multiple levels of brain function. There is, therefore, no single locus for the negative interaction. Rather, the chronic

neuronal activation induced by reducing cholinesterase function produces compensatory homeostatic downregulation in multiple neuronal systems. This reduces a broad range of treatment responses to LMTM associated with a reduction in tau aggregation pathology. Since the interference is dictated by homeostatic responses to prior symptomatic treatment, it is likely that there would be similar interference with other drugs tested as add-on to the existing symptomatic treatment, regardless of the intended therapeutic target or mode of action. The present findings outline key results that now provide a working model to explain interference by symptomatic treatment.

Copyright© Bentham Science Publishers; For any queries, please email at epub@benthamscience.net.

KEYWORDS:

Acetylcholinesterase inhibitor (AChEI); Alzheimer's disease; Drug interaction; Hydromethylthionine; Mouse model; Synaptic proteins; Tau aggregation inhibitor; Tauopathy

PMID:

32091331

DOI:

[10.2174/1567205017666200224120926](https://doi.org/10.2174/1567205017666200224120926)

Mechanisms of Anticholinesterase Interference with Tau Aggregation Inhibitor Activity in a Tau-Transgenic Mouse Model

Gernot Riedel¹, Jochen Klein², Grazyna Niewiadomska³, Constantin Kondak^{1,2}, Karima Schwab⁴, Dilyara Lauer⁴, Mandy Magbagbeolu⁴, Marta Steczkowska⁵, Maciej Zadrozny⁵, Malgorzata Wydrych⁵, Anna Cranston¹, Valeria Melis¹, Renato X. Santos¹, Franz Theuring⁴, Charles R. Harrington^{1,6} and Claude M. Wischik^{1,6*}

Affiliations:

¹ School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition, University of Aberdeen, Foresterhill, Aberdeen, AB25 2ZD, UK

² Department of Pharmacology and Clinical Pharmacy, Goethe University Frankfurt, 60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

³ Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology, 3 Pasteur Street, 02-093 Warsaw, Poland

⁴ Charite - Institute of Pharmacology, Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Hessische Str. 3-4, 10115 Berlin, Germany

⁵ Mossakowski Medical Research Center, Warsaw, Poland

⁶ TauRx Therapeutics Ltd., Singapore 068805, Singapore

*Address correspondence to this author at TauRx Therapeutics Ltd., 395 King Street, Aberdeen AB24 5RP, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 1224 440905; Email: cmw@taurx.com

Running title: Anticholinesterase interference with LMTM

Abstract: Background: Symptomatic treatments of Alzheimer's disease (AD) with cholinesterase inhibitors and/or memantine are relatively ineffective and there is a need for new treatments targeting the underlying pathology of AD. In most of the failed disease-modifying trials, patients have been allowed to continue taking symptomatic treatments at stable doses, under the assumption that they do not impair efficacy. In recently completed Phase 3 trials testing the tau aggregation inhibitor leuco-methylthionium bis(hydromethanesulfonate) (LMTM), we found significant differences in treatment response according to whether patients were taking LMTM either as monotherapy or as add-on to symptomatic treatments.

Methods: We have examined the effect of either LMTM alone or chronic rivastigmine prior to LMTM treatment of tau transgenic mice expressing the short tau fragment that constitutes the tangle filaments of AD. We have measured acetylcholine levels, synaptosomal glutamate release, synaptic proteins, mitochondrial complex IV activity, tau pathology and choline acetyltransferase immunoreactivity.

Results: LMTM given alone increased hippocampal acetylcholine (ACh) levels, glutamate release from synaptosomal preparations, synaptophysin levels in multiple brain regions and mitochondrial complex IV activity, reduced tau pathology, partially restored choline acetyltransferase (ChAT) immunoreactivity in basal forebrain and reversed deficits in spatial learning. Chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine was found to reduce or eliminate almost all these effects, apart from reduction in tau aggregation pathology. LMTM effects on hippocampal ACh and synaptophysin levels were also reduced in wild-type mice.

Conclusion: The interference with pharmacological activity of LMTM by a cholinesterase inhibitor can be reproduced in a tau transgenic mouse model and, to a lesser extent, in wild-type mice. Long-term pretreatment with a symptomatic drug alters a broad range of brain responses to LMTM across different transmitter systems and cellular compartments at multiple levels of brain function. There is therefore no single locus for the negative interaction. Rather, the chronic neuronal activation induced by reducing cholinesterase function produces compensatory homeostatic downregulation in multiple neuronal systems. This has the effect of reducing a broad range of treatment responses to LMTM associated with reduction in tau aggregation pathology. Since the interference is dictated by homeostatic responses to prior symptomatic treatment, it is likely that there would be similar interference with other drugs tested as add-on to existing symptomatic treatment, regardless of the intended therapeutic target or mode of action. The present findings outline key results that now provide a working model to explain interference by symptomatic treatment.

Keywords: Tau aggregation inhibitor, hydromethylthionine, mouse model, Alzheimer's disease, tauopathy, acetylcholinesterase inhibitor (AChEI), drug interaction, synaptic proteins.

1. INTRODUCTION

The only treatments currently available for Alzheimer's disease (AD) are symptomatic. The most widely used of these are the acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (AChEIs) which work by chronically increasing the levels of acetylcholine (ACh) in the synaptic cleft. In experimental models, cholinergic function is associated primarily with selective attention [1-3], and is not particularly sensitive to more broadly based measures of functional impairment/improvement (reviewed in [4, 5]). Similar considerations apply to memantine which also modulates brain function in a non-specific manner [6, 7]. The therapeutic benefits of these treatments are relatively short-lasting [8], with fewer than 30% of patients continuing on AChEIs 12 months after initiation [9-11]. A substantial proportion of AD patients are in any case not treated, ~44% in the US [12] and ~77% in UK [13]. In France, reimbursement for these drugs has been withdrawn because of "insufficient medical benefit and dangerousness because of side effects" [14]. The low medical use and patient adherence are due to low perceived efficacy and side effects, with rate of decline after temporary symptomatic improvement no different from that occurring in the absence of treatment [8]. Hence it is agreed generally that a major unmet medical need exists to develop a treatment able to slow the progression of AD. A Lancet Neurology Commission report [15] noted that "... no treatment is yet available to halt or reverse the underlying pathology of established AD. Indeed, an effective therapy for AD is perhaps the greatest unmet need facing modern medicine." The last new treatment to have been approved for AD was in 2003 for memantine [16]. From 2002 to 2012, there have been 289 clinical trials at Phase 2 or Phase 3, with an overall failure rate of 99.6% [17]. There have been 19 further trial failures since 2012 targeting various aspects of pathological processing of β -amyloid [18].

Despite the limitations of available symptomatic treatments, almost all late-stage clinical trials currently ongoing or recently completed aiming to test new therapeutic approaches have been conducted in patient populations where the majority of subjects continue taking symptomatic treatments [18]. This is determined, in part, by ethical concerns that patients participating in potentially lengthy clinical trials would be denied access to any treatment if randomised to the placebo arm. A further consideration is the unproven assumption that symptomatic treatments do not interfere with treatments targeting the underlying pathology because their modes of action are different. We show in the present report that this assumption is incorrect.

Leuco-methylthioninium bis(hydromethanesulfonate) (LMTM; USAN name hydromethylthionine mesylate) is being developed as a treatment targeting pathological aggregation of tau protein in AD [19]. The methylthioninium (MT) moiety can exist in oxidised (MT^+) and reduced (LMT) forms. LMTM is a stabilised salt of LMT which has much better pharmaceutical properties than the oxidised MT^+ form [20, 21]. We have reported recently that LMT rather than MT^+ is the active species blocking tau aggregation *in vitro* [22]. LMT blocks tau aggregation *in vitro* in cell-free and cell-based assays [20, 22], and reduces tau aggregation pathology and associated behavioural deficits in tau transgenic mouse models *in vivo* at clinically relevant doses [23]. LMT also disaggregates the paired helical filaments (PHFs) isolated from AD brain tissues converting the tau protein into a form which becomes susceptible to proteases [20, 24].

The MT moiety also has a range of other potentially beneficial properties. It has been known for some time that at low concentrations (10 – 100 nM) it enhances mitochondrial activity by acting as a supplementary electron carrier in the electron transfer chain. The MT moiety undergoes redox cycling catalysed by complex I using NADH as co-factor whereby it accepts electrons which are subsequently transferred to complexes III and IV [25-27]. It is able also to induce mitochondrial biogenesis and to activate Nrf2-mediated oxidative stress response elements *in vivo* [28]. Other activities include neuroprotective effects in the brain by inhibiting microglial activation and increasing autophagy [29]. The MT moiety has been shown to increase the clearance of pathological tau *in vivo* via enhancement of autophagy at the 10 – 20 nM concentration range [30]. Therefore, in addition to dissolution of AD tau aggregates, LMTM has numerous complementary actions that address many of the pathways currently advocated as having potential for the treatment of AD [31, 32].

Although LMTM given orally produces brain levels sufficient for activity *in vitro* and *in vivo* [21], it had minimal apparent efficacy if taken as an add-on to symptomatic treatments in two large Phase 3 clinical trials [33, 34]. In subjects receiving LMTM as monotherapy, however, treatment produced marked slowing of cognitive and functional decline, reduction in rate of progression of brain atrophy measured by MRI and reduction in loss of glucose uptake measured by FDG-PET [33, 34]. In recent analyses that include steady state plasma concentration data, consistent concentration-dependent treatment effects have been found for LMTM as monotherapy and as add-on therapy, but reduced by about half as add-on [35].

In this report, we provide a preliminary summary of results from a large body of ongoing work addressing the unexpected differences in treatment effects for monotherapy and add-on therapy that were seen in two large clinical trials of LMTM. We have back-translated the clinical experimental design into a preclinical context and report that similar differences in neuropharmacological activity can be reproduced in a well-characterised tau transgenic mouse model (Line 1, “L1”; [36]). The purpose of the present report is to provide an initial overview of results to date which show that chronic pretreatment with a cholinesterase inhibitor reduces the pharmacological effects of LMTM at multiple brain levels and systems, including networks, transmitters, cellular compartments and intracellular pathways. This report will be followed in due course by more detailed reports for each of the experimental paradigms we have examined. However, the results already available provide support for a general working hypothesis to explain the mechanisms responsible for anticholinesterase interference with tau aggregation inhibitor activity in the brain.

Our findings suggest that homeostatic mechanisms downregulate multiple neuronal systems at different levels of brain function to compensate for the chronic pharmacological activation induced by symptomatic treatments. Compared with LMTM given alone, the effect of this downregulation is to reduce neurotransmitter release, levels of synaptic proteins, mitochondrial function and behavioural benefits if LMTM is given against a background of chronic prior exposure to acetylcholinesterase inhibitor. Therefore, the interference in the pharmacological activity of LMTM first seen clinically has a clear neuropharmacological basis that can be reproduced in a tau transgenic mouse model. The homeostatic effects we have identified are likely to have more general relevance for the conduct of disease-modifying trials in AD that need not be restricted to tau aggregation inhibitors.

2. METHODS

2.1. Features of the Tau Transgenic Mouse Model Used for Interference Studies

In the L1 mouse model, which forms the basis of the present studies, there is over-expression of a three-repeat tau fragment encompassing residues 296 – 390 of the 2N4R tau isoform under the control of the Thy 1 promotor in an NMRI mouse strain [36]. This fragment corresponds to the segment of tau first identified within the proteolytically stable core of the PHF [37, 38] and recently confirmed by cryo-electronmicroscopy [39]. The site of action of LMT is located within the core tau unit of the PHF [20, 22]. In the L1 mouse, the core tau unit is fused with a signal sequence that directs the protein to the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) where it initiates aggregation. Tau aggregation remains at the oligomer stage and spreads in an age-dependent fashion from medial temporal lobe structures into isocortex, mimicking the spread of tau pathology in the human brain [36]. Cognitive impairment appears from 3 months onwards and is reversed by treatment with LMT salts at a dose of 15 mg/kg/day given by oral gavage. This cognitive improvement is accompanied by a decrease in tau pathology [23].

2.2. Experimental Paradigms

In what follows, we summarise some of the key results obtained so far for the AChEI, rivastigmine. Similar experiments with memantine are still ongoing. Although donepezil is more widely used clinically than rivastigmine (in UK, for example, see <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/prescription-cost-analysis>), initial experiments showed that donepezil is too toxic at therapeutic doses in mice to permit chronic administration.

The treatment schedule used to study the negative interaction between symptomatic treatments and LMTM was designed to model the clinical situation in which subjects are first treated chronically with a cholinesterase inhibitor or memantine before receiving LMTM (see Fig. (1)). After five weeks of daily gavaging with vehicle or rivastigmine, combination treatment proceeded in some groups while others remained on monotherapy.




Fig. (1). Treatment regime outline used in this study to mimic previous clinical trials. While there has been no inclusion of placebo control in the clinical trials, we have included a vehicle group gavaged with saline throughout. In addition, a 5-week monotherapy was typically followed by a 6-week combo-treatment of either vehicle + LMTM or rivastigmine + LMTM followed by tissue harvest. Drugs were administered as a daily oral cocktail.

Wild-type and L1 female mice ($n = 7-16$ for each group) were pre-treated with rivastigmine (0.1 or 0.5 mg/kg/day) or vehicle for 5 weeks by gavage. For the following 6 weeks, LMTM (5 and 15 mg/kg) or vehicle were added to this daily treatment regime, also administered by gavage (Fig. (1)). Animals were then sacrificed for immunohistochemical and other tissue analyses, as described in [36]. Although 5 mg/kg/day in mice corresponds approximately to 8 mg/day in humans in terms of C_{max} levels of parent MT in plasma, this dose is at the threshold for effects on pathology and behaviour. The higher dose of 15 mg/kg/day is generally required for LMTM to be fully effective in the L1 mouse model [23]. This may relate to the much shorter half-life of MT in mice (4 hours) compared to humans (37 hours in elderly humans).

2.3. Immunohistochemistry of Presynaptic Proteins

Tissue was harvested from intracardiac perfused subjects, right hemispheres were used for paraffin sectioning at different levels, according to stereotaxic coordinates [40], for specific staining of synaptic proteins in regions of interest: medial septum, vertical or horizontal limb of the diagonal band of Broca, nucleus basalis of Meynert, nucleus accumbens, striatum, primary motor cortex, visual cortex and hippocampal CA1. Primary antibodies to synaptic proteins were purchased from Cell Signaling (α -synuclein), Biogen (SNAP25), abcam (syntaxin) and Synaptic Systems (VAMP2, and synaptophysin 1). For immunohistochemistry, the protocols described were used [41, 42]. Sections were analysed using a Zeiss Axiovert 135 microscope by an investigator blinded to genotype and treatment details. Images were saved in jpg format and labelling was measured as integrated density in 8-bit images using the ImageJ tool (version 1.48v, NIH, USA). Data are presented as Z-score transformations without units.

2.4. Tau and ChAT Immunohistochemistry

The brains of five animals from each treatment group were cut coronally through the forebrain for anti-tau (paraffin sections of 6 μ m thickness) and anti-ChAT (frozen sections of 40 μ m thickness) immunohistochemistry. Tau mAb, raised against and recognizing truncated tau(2N4R)297-391 (TauRx Therapeutics Ltd.), was used as the primary antibody (1:100) with goat anti-mouse IgG-horseradish peroxidase (HRP) (AP124P; Merck) as the secondary antibody (1:100). Staining was visualised using 3,3'-diaminobenzidine (DAB; Sigma; 0.025%) as chromogen. Images of anti-tau stained sections were taken at 100 \times magnification by using a Nikon Eclipse Ni-E microscope equipped with a DSRi2 camera and NIS Elements BR4.30.00 image capture software (Nikon, Japan). Two representative sections of each mouse brain were imaged and the areas and densities of the setting regions of interest in the vertical limb of the diagonal band of Broca for anti-tau were measured by the software. The staining intensity was defined as 0 for white and 255 for black and the intensity of specific staining was expressed as the mean intensity of pixels in the region of interest. The measured values were expressed as relative optical intensity (ROI).

For immunohistochemical determination of ChAT, mAb AP144P (Merck; 1:200) was used followed by rabbit anti-goat-HRP secondary antibody (AP106P; Merck; 1:100) and visualized using DAB. For the analysis

of cholinergic neurons, packing density sections were imaged using a Nikon Eclipse Ni-E microscope and NIS-Elements software. ChAT-immunoreactive (ChAT-ir) neurons were counted in the vertical limb of the diagonal band of Broca (VDB) identified in accordance with the Mouse Brain Stereotaxic Atlas [40]. Regions of interest were outlined using the software's X-Y plotting system that measures the square area (mm²) of the marked frame, and ChAT-ir neurons were counted at 400x magnification. Cell counts per section were then corrected using Abercrombie's formula [43], and the packing density of cholinergic neurons was calculated as a function of the rostrocaudal level and of location within the VDB by using the cell counts divided by area of the marked frame in each analyzed section. The number of ChAT-ir neurons was counted in two sections per mouse in VDB of five mice from each treatment group.

2.5. Brain Mitochondrial Complex IV Activity

Total brain homogenates from 12-17 animals of 13 treatment groups (Fig. 1) were used to extract proteins and specific cytochrome-*c* oxidase (complex IV) activity was measured using a commercially available kit (abcam, #ab109911) and normalized to the activity of citrate synthase, determined using a commercially available kit (BioVision, #K318-100) as an index of mitochondrial enrichment in the preparations.

2.6. Acetylcholine Measurement in Hippocampus

Animals were treated with LMTM (5 mg/kg/day for 2 weeks, gavage) after prior treatment for 2 weeks with or without rivastigmine (0.5 mg/kg/day subcutaneous Alzet minipump). Levels of ACh were measured in hippocampus via indwelling microdialysis probes and HPLC analysis of the extracellular fluid. After the experiment, brains were harvested and histologically assessed for correct cannula placement [44].

2.7. Statistical Analyses

Data are presented as group averages and standard errors of mean and were analysed using parametric statistics, with alpha set to 0.05.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Features of the Tau Transgenic Mouse Model

Features of the L1 mouse model that have emerged in the course of the present studies include a prominent loss of neuronal immunoreactivity for ChAT in the basal forebrain region, and a corresponding reduction in AChE activity in the cortex and hippocampus. There is also an approximate 50% reduction in glutamate release from brain synaptosomal preparations in L1 mice compared with wild-type mice. In these respects, therefore, L1 mice also model the neurochemical impairments in cholinergic [45, 46] and glutamatergic [47] function that are characteristic of AD.

Underlying these impairments in neurotransmitter function, the L1 mouse model shows a disturbance in integration of synaptic proteins. Quantitative immunohistochemistry for multiple synaptic proteins in the basal forebrain (vertical diagonal band of Broca selected as a representative example) shows that there is normally a high degree of correlation in levels of proteins of the SNARE complex (SNAP-25, syntaxin, VAMP2) and the vesicular glycoprotein synaptophysin and α -synuclein in wild-type mice. All these correlations are lost in L1 mice (Table 1). New correlations appeared between synaptophysin and VAMP2, and syntaxin and synapsin. Therefore, synaptic vesicular protein levels are no longer linked quantitatively to the proteins of the SNARE complex or α -synuclein. This suggests that the tau oligomer pathology of the L1 mice interferes with the functional integration between vesicular and membrane-docking proteins in the synapse.

Table 1. Positive correlations between levels of a range of presynaptic proteins in basal forebrain (vertical diagonal band of Broca as a representative example) measured immunohistochemically in (A) wild-type mice or (B) tau transgenic L1 mice. n = 9 per genotype. Significance of correlations, by linear regression analysis, are denoted as: *, $p < 0.05$; **, $p < 0.01$; —, no significance at $p = 0.05$.

A Wild-type mice					
	α -Synuclein	SNAP25	Syntaxin	VAMP2	Synaptophysin
α -Synuclein					
SNAP25	*				
Syntaxin	—	**			
VAMP2	—	*	*		
Synaptophysin	—	**	*	—	
Synapsin	—	—	—	—	—

B L1 mice					
	α -Synuclein	SNAP25	Syntaxin	VAMP2	Synaptophysin
α -Synuclein					
SNAP25	—				
Syntaxin	—	—			
VAMP2	—	—	—		
Synaptophysin	—	—	—	*	
Synapsin	—	—	*	—	—

3.2 Effects of Treatment with LMTM and Rivastigmine in Wild-Type Mice

In wild-type mice, there was a significant, 2-fold increase in basal ACh levels in hippocampus following LMTM treatment, and a 30% reduction when mice received LMTM after chronic treatment with rivastigmine (Fig. (2A)). There was also an increase in mean synaptophysin levels measured in hippocampus, visual cortex, diagonal band and septum following LMTM treatment alone and a statistically significant reduction of the same magnitude when LMTM was given against a background of prior treatment with rivastigmine (Fig. (2B)).





Fig. (2). Treatment effects of LMTM alone or following chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine in wild-type mice. Hippocampal levels of ACh (A), measured by high performance liquid chromatography as described previously [44], or synaptophysin levels for hippocampus, visual cortex, diagonal band of Broca and septum (B) are shown (total n = 25). Data expressed as mean values + SE (**, $p < 0.01$; ***, $p < 0.001$). Photomicrographs (C) show representative images of synaptophysin labelling in hippocampal CA1 in respective groups. Scale bar, 100 μm .

3.3 Effects of Treatment with LMTM and Rivastigmine in Tau Transgenic L1 Mice

In tau transgenic L1 mice, LMTM alone produced significant increases in ACh release in the hippocampus, in glutamate release from brain synaptosomal preparations (not shown here), in synaptophysin levels, in mitochondrial complex IV activity and in spatial cognition (water maze, data not shown). None of these effects were seen when LMTM was preceded by chronic rivastigmine. Indeed, in the case of SNARE complex proteins (Fig. (3A)) and α -synuclein (Fig. (3B)), the reduction produced by the combination was to levels below the Z scores of the control group.

A SNAP25



B α -Synuclein





Fig. (3). Treatment effects of LMTM alone or following chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine in tau transgenic L1 mice. Photomicrographs of hippocampal CA1 sections for labelled for SNAP25 as one of the SNARE proteins (A) and for α -synuclein (B) in respective treatment groups. Scale bar, 100 μ m. Quantitative data for (C) SNARE complex proteins (SNAP25, syntaxin and VAMP2) and (D) α -synuclein expressed as the mean + SE for hippocampus, visual cortex, diagonal band of Broca and septum. (*, $p < 0.05$; ***, $p < 0.001$; ****, $p < 0.0001$).

LMTM given alone produced significant enhancement of complex IV activity in brain mitochondria from tau transgenic L1 mice. Chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine eliminated this effect (Fig. (4)).




Fig. (4). Treatment effects of LMTM alone or following chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine in tau transgenic L1 mice on complex IV activity, normalized to citrate synthase activity. Data are expressed as mean + SE. (*, $p < 0.05$).

In contrast to the effects on neurotransmitter release, synaptic protein levels and mitochondrial complex IV activity, chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine has no effect on the primary action of LMTM as a tau aggregation inhibitor. As expected, immunoreactivity against the core tau unit of the PHF measured by optical density is elevated in tau transgenic L1 mice, and this was reduced following treatment with LMTM (Fig. (5A)). Conversely, counts of ChAT-positive neurons were reduced in L1 mice, but these were only partially restored by treatment with LMTM (Fig. (5B)). Although the effect on tau immunoreactivity persisted in L1 mice when LMTM was given following prior chronic treatment with rivastigmine, interference in ChAT-reactivity was still evident.




Fig. (5). Treatment effects of LMTM alone or following chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine in tau transgenic L1 mice. Values are compared with vehicle-treated wild-type mice for levels of tau

immunoreactivity (relative optical intensity, ROI) (**A**) and number of neurons immunoreactive for choline acetyltransferase (**B**) in vertical diagonal band of Broca. Data are expressed as mean + SE. (*, $p < 0.05$; **, $p < 0.01$; ***, $p < 0.001$; ****, $p < 0.0001$).

4. DISCUSSION

The results presented here demonstrate that the reduction in pharmacological activity of LMTM when given as an add-on to a symptomatic treatment in humans can be reproduced both in wild-type mice and in a tau transgenic mouse model. Therefore, it is based on neuropharmacological mechanisms that have the effect of altering how the brain responds to LMTM. The results imply that the differences in clinical response to LMTM as monotherapy or add-on therapy are likely to be explained by differences in the underlying neuropharmacology of LMTM in these two contexts [33, 34]. Alternative explanations based on the presumption that patients who are prescribed symptomatic treatments are somehow different from untreated patients fail for a number of reasons. The minor and variable differences in baseline severity between these two patient groups have been shown not to account for differences in treatment response [33, 34]. Apparent differences in rate of decline in treated and untreated MCI patients in the ADNI program [48] disappear when severity at baseline is accounted for in the analysis [33]. The presumption that untreated patients do not really have AD, or have a different form of AD, is also inconsistent with baseline neuroimaging data from subjects participating in the Phase 3 trials [33].

Table 2. Treatment effects of LMTM (5 or 15 mg/kg/day) given alone or following chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine (0.1 or 0.5 mg/kg/day) in wild-type and L1 mice. Arrows indicate scale and direction of change (red arrows signify treatment effects which reached statistical significance, those in black were directional); =, indicates no effect; and n/a signifies that results are not available yet.

	Effects in wild-type mice		Effects in Line 1 mice	
	LMTM alone	Rivastigmine + LMTM	LMTM alone	Rivastigmine + LMTM
ACh release	↑	↓	↑	↓
Glutamate release	=	n/a	↑	n/a
SNARE complex	=	=	=	↓
Synaptophysin	↑	↓	↑	↓
α-Synuclein	=	=	=	↓
Mitochondrial complex IV	=	=	↑	↓
Spatial cognition	=	=	↑	↓
ChAT-positive neurons	=	=	↑	↓
Tau labelling	n/a	n/a	↓	↓

The results we now report demonstrate that there are two classes of effect produced by LMTM treatment in wild-type and tau transgenic mice (Table 2): those that are subject to dynamic modulation by prior exposure to cholinesterase inhibitor and those that are not. In tau transgenic mice, the treatment effects that can be modulated include increase in ACh release in the hippocampus, changes in synaptic proteins, increase in mitochondrial complex IV activity and reversal of behavioural impairment (not shown). The only treatment effect that is not subject to pharmacological modulation is the primary effect on tau aggregation pathology. The two classes of LMTM treatment effect are summarised in Fig. (6).




Fig. (6). Summary schema of likely treatment effects of LMT that are subject to dynamic modulation by chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine (riva). Particular attention is afforded to changes in mitochondrial metabolism, presynaptic proteins and to tau aggregation inhibitor activity. Combined treatment with AChEI does not impair LMT effects on tau aggregation pathology (blue arrows). By contrast, the combination prevents the increases in synaptic proteins, glutamate (Glu) release and increased complex IV activity within the mitochondrial electron transport chain (ETC) that are observed following treatment with LMTM alone (white arrows). LMT also induces mitochondrial biogenesis and activates Nrf2-mediated oxidative stress response elements that can protect against damaging reactive oxygen species (ROS) (green and red arrows).

Effects that are subject to pharmacological modulation are themselves of two types: those which are augmented by the effect on tau aggregation pathology and those which are also seen in wild-type mice. Of the outcomes we have measured, the positive treatment effects of LMTM given alone in wild-type mice are restricted to an increase in ACh levels in hippocampus, and an increase in synaptophysin levels in multiple brain regions. Therefore, LMTM treatment is able to activate neuronal function at therapeutically relevant doses in wild-type mice lacking tau aggregation pathology (Table 2). Although it has been reported that MT is a weak cholinesterase inhibitor [49, 50], this is unlikely to be the mechanism responsible for the increase in ACh levels because rivastigmine did not potentiate but decreased the effect of LMTM on ACh levels. The increase in ACh and synaptophysin levels might theoretically be explained by an increase in presynaptic mitochondrial activity, since MT is known to enhance mitochondrial complex IV activity [25], and mitochondria have an important role in homeostatic regulation of presynaptic function [51]. Direct measurement of complex IV activity in wild type mice, however, did not show any increase following LMTM treatment. The activating effects of LMTM on ACh levels were also not associated with improvement in spatial recognition memory in wild-type mice (not shown).

Chronic pretreatment with rivastigmine suppressed the cholinergic activation in the hippocampus and reduced synaptophysin levels more generally in the brain of wild-type mice. This effect is clearly not dependent on the effects of LMTM on tau aggregation pathology, since there is no pathology in wild-type mice. Rather, they point to a generalised homeostatic downregulation that counteracts the effect of combining two drugs which each have activating effects on neuronal function. Presumably, the primary mechanism that would normally protect against excessive levels of ACh in the synaptic cleft would be an increase in AChE activity.

Since rivastigmine produces chronic impairment of this control system, alternative pathways are downregulated in order to preserve homeostasis in cholinergic and other neuronal systems. The LMTM-induced effects are subject to this dynamic downregulation in the context of chronic stimulation by a cholinesterase inhibitor.

Although qualitatively similar, the effects of LMTM given alone are much more prominent and more broad-ranging in tau transgenic L1 mice. The most likely explanation for this is that LMTM combines an inhibitory effect on tau oligomers together with inherent neuronal activating effects. The reduction in tau oligomer levels following LMTM treatment facilitates a more pronounced activation of synaptic function and release of neurotransmitters such as ACh and glutamate. Likewise, LMTM reverses the spatial memory deficit seen in tau transgenic L1 mice [23]. The negative effects seen when LMTM is introduced on a chronic rivastigmine background appears simply to reflect the reversal of the activation seen with LMTM alone.

A deleterious effect of tau oligomers on the function of synaptic proteins is readily understandable as being the result of direct interference with docking of synaptic vesicles, membrane fusion and release of neurotransmitter. In tau transgenic L1 mice, synaptic vesicular protein levels are no longer linked quantitatively either to the proteins of the SNARE complex or to α -synuclein, implying a loss of functional integration between vesicular and membrane-docking proteins at the synapse. The consequence of this was seen directly as an impairment in glutamate release from synaptosomal preparations from tau transgenic mice, and a restoration of normal glutamate release following treatment with LMTM.

The mechanisms responsible for the mitochondrial effects of LMTM are more complex. The MT moiety is thought to enhance oxidative phosphorylation by acting as an electron shuttle between complex I and complex IV [25]. The MT moiety has a redox potential of approximately 10 mV, midway between the redox potential of complex I (-0.4 V) and complex IV (+0.4 V). However, LMTM has no effect on complex IV activity in brain mitochondria isolated from wild-type mice. By contrast, a strong effect was seen in tau transgenic L1 mice. This suggests that tau oligomers interfere with mitochondrial function. It has been shown recently that C-terminally truncated tau protein is bound both to the mitochondrial outer membrane and also enters the intermembrane space of mitochondria [52]. Truncated PHF-tau protein isolated from brain tissues of AD patients forms SDS-resistant complexes with the voltage-dependent anion-selective channel protein (VDAC; formerly porin) in the mitochondrial outer membrane, and also with ATP synthase subunit 9 and core protein 2 of complex III in the intermembrane space [53]. These binding interactions are likely to be deleterious on the function of the electron transport chain in mitochondria and the effect of LMTM in reducing tau oligomer accumulation in and around mitochondria may contribute to the activation of complex IV seen in L1 mice. It is not known how homeostatic downregulation resulting from rivastigmine treatment might affect mitochondrial function. Mitochondria are known to be important homeostatic regulators of synaptic function via buffering of Ca^{2+} levels and ATP generation [51].

It is striking that the positive effects of LMTM and their reversal or suppression by pretreatment with anticholinesterase can be seen across different transmitter systems and cellular compartments at multiple levels of brain function. This implies that there is no single locus responsible for the interference in the LMTM treatment response. Rather, the negative interaction appears to be part of a generalised homeostatic downregulation in multiple neuronal systems that compensate for the chronic pharmacological activation resulting from blockade of acetylcholinesterase. Likewise, preliminary data available for memantine pretreatment show similar elimination of effects of LMTM on spatial learning deficits (neurobiological studies are still ongoing). This is not unexpected, since the interference with the effects of LMTM treatment seen clinically is very similar for the two drug classes.

More generally, it appears unlikely that the interference affecting LMTM treatment is specific to LMTM. Any treatment that has an activating effect on synaptic function, whether by reducing primary pathology or by another mechanism, is likely to be subject to similar interference, since it is driven primarily by the pre-existing symptomatic treatment. Thus if reduction in amyloid load results in synaptic activation, as has been proposed [54], then it is likely that symptomatic treatments will also interfere with the ability to demonstrate this effect clinically. A further consideration is whether the homeostatic downregulation that we have demonstrated would operate in the same way if LMTM treatment were primary and symptomatic treatment were added at a later date. The experiments we have conducted to date were designed to mimic the clinical situation in which LMTM is added in patients already receiving symptomatic treatments. If homeostatic downregulation is determined by the treatment that comes first, as we suspect, it is quite possible that the treatment effects of LMTM would dominate, and that the response to add-on symptomatic treatment could be

reduced to some extent. This remains to be tested experimentally in the tau transgenic L1 mouse model and, potentially, within the context of a clinical trial of LMTM monotherapy.

5. CONCLUSION

Homeostatic control systems play an important role in the brain. Such systems are well understood and well documented in many neurophysiological contexts. It is therefore not surprising that treatment interventions designed to boost neuronal function induce homeostatic controls that limit the extent of neuronal over-activation. In the case of cholinergic function, excessive activity is highly deleterious and results clinically in tremor and convulsions. It should also not be surprising that chronic stimulation of the brain by symptomatic treatments alters the way in which it responds to other interventions. Indeed, it would be surprising if this were not the case, and the widespread presumption that symptomatic treatments do not have the potential to interfere with novel treatment approaches is itself counterintuitive. We have demonstrated in two large Phase 3 clinical trials, supported now by a substantial body of preclinical research, that symptomatic treatments do indeed interfere with the treatment effects of a drug that would have been expected *a priori* to act via an entirely unrelated mechanism. Our experience to date with LMTM has led us to the view that it is necessary to conduct disease-modifying trials as placebo-controlled monotherapy interventions. For such trials, the treatment effects need to be large enough to be demonstrable over a period of at least 12 months, as is the case for LMTM. Alternative approaches that include rescue therapy introduce confounding effects in the analysis and reduce power. Long trials seeking to demonstrate small effects against a background of ongoing symptomatic treatment run the risk of simply contributing to the very high failure rates of AD trials to date.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors have made a substantial, direct and intellectual contribution to the work, and approved it for publication.

HUMAN AND ANIMAL RIGHTS

No humans were used in this study. Experiments on animals were carried out in accordance with the European Communities Council Directive (63/2010/EU) with local ethical approval, a project license under the UK Scientific Procedures Act (1986), and in accordance with the German Law for Animal Protection (Tierschutzgesetz) and the Polish Law on the Protection of Animals.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Not applicable.

FUNDING

This study was sponsored entirely by TauRx Therapeutics Ltd. The sponsor was involved in the design of the study; in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; and in the writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data and had final responsibility for submission of the report for publication.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

CRH and CMW are employees and officers of TauRx Therapeutics Ltd. and are inventors on patents relating to LMTM and tau-aggregation inhibitors that are owned by WisTa Laboratories Ltd., an affiliate of TauRx Therapeutics Ltd.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sarter M, Lustig C, Blakely RD, Koshy Cherian A. Cholinergic genetics of visual attention: Human and mouse choline transporter capacity variants influence distractibility. *J Physiol (Paris)* 110: 10-8 (2016).
- [2] Botly LC, De Rosa E. Cholinergic influences on feature binding. *Behav Neurosci* 121: 264-76 (2007).
- [3] Botly LC, De Rosa E. A cross-species investigation of acetylcholine, attention, and feature binding. *Psychol Sci* 19: 1185-93 (2008).
- [4] Robinson L, Platt B, Riedel G. Involvement of the cholinergic system in conditioning and perceptual memory. *Behav Brain Res* 221: 443-65 (2011).
- [5] Klinkenberg I, Blokland A. The validity of scopolamine as a pharmacological model for cognitive impairment: A review of animal behavioral studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 34: 1307-50 (2010).
- [6] Ding Z, Brown JW, Rueter LE, Mohler EG. Profiling attention and cognition enhancing drugs in a rat touchscreen-based continuous performance test. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 235: 1093-105 (2018).
- [7] Gastambide F, Cotel MC, Gilmour G, O'Neill MJ, Robbins TW, Tricklebank MD. Selective remediation of reversal learning deficits in the neurodevelopmental MAM model of schizophrenia by a novel mGlu5 positive allosteric modulator. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 37: 1057-66 (2012).
- [8] Courtney C, Farrell D, Gray R, Hills R, Lynch L, Sellwood E, *et al.* Long-term donepezil treatment in 565 patients with Alzheimer's disease (AD2000): randomised double-blind trial. *Lancet* 363: 2105-15 (2004).
- [9] Singh G, Thomas SK, Lingala V. Treatment persistency with rivastigmine and donepezil in a large state medicaid program. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 53: 1269-70 (2005).
- [10] Raina P, Santaguida P, Ismaila A, Patterson C, Cowan D, Levine M, *et al.* Effectiveness of cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine for treating dementia: evidence review for a clinical practice guideline. *Ann Int Med* 148: 379-97 (2008).
- [11] Mauskopf JA, Paramore C, Lee WC, Snyder EH. Drug persistency patterns for patients treated with rivastigmine or donepezil in usual care settings. *J Managed Care Pharm* 11: 231-9 (2005).
- [12] Koller D, Hua T, Bynum JPW. Treatment patterns with antidementia drugs in the United States Medicare Cohort Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 64: 1540-8 (2016).
- [13] Martinez C, Jones RW, Rietbrock S. Trends in the prevalence of antipsychotic drug use among patients with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias including those treated with antidementia drugs in the community in the UK: a cohort study. *BMJ Open* 3: e002080 (2013).
- [14] Krolak-Salmon P, Dubois B, Sellal F, Delabrousse-Mayoux JP, Vandell P, Amieva H, *et al.* France will no more reimburse available symptomatic drugs against Alzheimer's disease. *J Alzheimers Dis* 66: 425-7 (2018).
- [15] Winblad B, Amouyel P, Andrieu S, Ballard C, Brayne C, Brodaty H, *et al.* Defeating Alzheimer's disease and other dementias: a priority for European science and society. *Lancet Neurol* 15: 455-532 (2016).
- [16] Lanctôt KL, Rajaram RD, Herrmann N. Therapy for Alzheimer's disease: how effective are current treatments? *Ther Adv Neurological Disord* 2: 163-80 (2009).
- [17] Cummings J, Morstorf T, Zhong K. Alzheimer's disease drug-development pipeline: few candidates, frequent failures. *Alzheimers Res Therapy* 6: 37 (2014).
- [18] Panza F, Lozupone M, Logroscino G, Imbimbo BP. A critical appraisal of amyloid- β -targeting therapies for Alzheimer disease. *Nat Rev Neurol* 15: 73-88 (2019).

- [19] Wischik CM, Schelter BO, Wischik DJ, Storey JMD, Harrington CR. Modeling prion-like processing of tau protein in Alzheimer's disease for pharmaceutical development. *J Alzheimers Dis* 62: 1287-303 (2018).
- [20] Harrington CR, Storey JMD, Clunas S, Harrington KA, Horsley D, Ishaq A, *et al.* Cellular models of aggregation-dependent template-directed proteolysis to characterize tau aggregation inhibitors for treatment of Alzheimer's disease. *J Biol Chem* 290: 10862-75 (2015).
- [21] Baddeley TC, McCaffrey J, Storey JMD, Cheung JKS, Melis V, Horsley D, *et al.* Complex disposition of methylthionium redox forms determines efficacy in tau aggregation inhibitor therapy for Alzheimer's disease. *J Pharmacol Exptl Therapeutics* 352: 110-8 (2015).
- [22] Al-Hilaly YK, Pollack SJ, Rickard JE, Simpson M, Raulin A-C, Baddeley T, *et al.* Cysteine-independent inhibition of Alzheimer's disease-like paired helical filament assembly by leuco-methylthionium (LMT). *J Mol Biol* 430: 4119-31 (2018).
- [23] Melis V, Magbagbeolu M, Rickard JE, Horsley D, Davidson K, Harrington KA, *et al.* Effects of oxidized and reduced forms of methylthionium in two transgenic mouse tauopathy models. *Behav Pharmacol* 26: 353-68 (2015).
- [24] Wischik CM, Edwards PC, Lai RYK, Roth M, Harrington CR. Selective inhibition of Alzheimer disease-like tau aggregation by phenothiazines. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 93: 11213-8 (1996).
- [25] Atamna H, Mackey J, Dhahbi JM. Mitochondrial pharmacology: electron transport chain bypass as strategies to treat mitochondrial dysfunction. *Biofactors* 38: 158-66 (2012).
- [26] Atamna H, Nguyen A, Schultz C, Boyle K, Newberry J, Kato H, Ames BN. Methylene blue delays cellular senescence and enhances key mitochondrial biochemical pathways. *FASEB J* 22: 703-12 (2008).
- [27] Gureev AP, Shaforostova EA, Popov VN, Starkov AA. Methylene blue does not bypass Complex III antimycin block in mouse brain mitochondria. *FEBS Lett* 593: 499-503 (2019).
- [28] Stack C, Jainuddin S, Elipenahli C, Gerges M, Starkova N, Starkov AA, *et al.* Methylene blue upregulates Nrf2/ARE genes and prevents tau-related neurotoxicity. *Hum Mol Genet* 23: 3716-32 (2014).
- [29] Zhao MF, Liang F, Xu HD, Yan W, Zhang JM. Methylene blue exerts a neuroprotective effect against traumatic brain injury by promoting autophagy and inhibiting microglial activation. *Mol Med Rep* 13: 13-20 (2016).
- [30] Congdon EE, Wu JW, Myeku N, Figueroa YH, Herman M, Marinec PS, *et al.* Methylthionium chloride (methylene blue) induces autophagy and attenuates tauopathy *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *Autophagy* 8: 609-22 (2012).
- [31] Schirmer RH, Adler H, Pickhardt M, Mandelkow E. "Lest we forget you -- methylene blue ...". *Neurobiol Aging* 32: 2325.e7-.e16 (2011).
- [32] Oz M, Lorke DE, Petroianu GA. Methylene blue and Alzheimer's disease. *Biochem Pharmacol* 78: 927-32 (2009).
- [33] Wilcock GK, Gauthier S, Frisoni GB, Jia J, Hardlund JH, Moebius HJ, *et al.* Potential of low dose leuco-methylthionium bis(hydromethanesulphonate) (LMTM) monotherapy for treatment of mild Alzheimer's disease: cohort analysis as modified primary outcome in a phase 3 clinical trial. *J Alzheimers Dis* 61: 435-57 (2018).
- [34] Gauthier S, Feldman HH, Schneider LS, Wilcock GK, Frisoni GB, Hardlund JH, *et al.* Efficacy and safety of tau-aggregation inhibitor therapy in patients with mild or moderate Alzheimer's disease: a randomised, controlled, double-blind, parallel-arm, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 388: 2873-84 (2016).
- [35] Schelter BO, Shiells HC, Baddeley TC, Rubino CM, Ganesan H, Hammel J, *et al.* Concentration-dependent activity of hydromethylthionine on cognitive decline and brain atrophy in mild to moderate Alzheimer's disease. *J Alzheimers Dis*: 72: 931-46 (2019).
- [36] Melis V, Zabke C, Stamer K, Magbagbeolu M, Schwab K, Marschall P, *et al.* Different pathways of molecular pathophysiology underlie cognitive and motor tauopathy phenotypes

- in transgenic models for Alzheimer's disease and frontotemporal lobar degeneration. *Cell Mol Life Sci* 72: 2199-222 (2015).
- [37] Wischik CM, Novak M, Thøgersen HC, Edwards PC, Runswick MJ, Jakes R, *et al.* Isolation of a fragment of tau derived from the core of the paired helical filament of Alzheimer disease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 85: 4506-10 (1988).
- [38] Wischik CM, Novak M, Edwards PC, Klug A, Tichelaar W, Crowther RA. Structural characterization of the core of the paired helical filament of Alzheimer disease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 85: 4884-8 (1988).
- [39] Fitzpatrick AWP, Falcon B, He S, Murzin AG, Murshudov G, Garringer HJ, *et al.* Cryo-EM Cstructures of tau filaments from Alzheimer's disease. *Nature* 547: 185-90 (2017).
- [40] Paxinos G, Franklin KBJ (2012) *The mouse brain in stereotaxic coordinates*, Academic Press, New York.
- [41] Niewiadomska G, Komorowski S, Baksalerska-Pazera M. Amelioration of cholinergic neurons dysfunction in aged rats depends on the continuous supply of NGF. *Neurobiol Aging* 23: 601-13 (2002).
- [42] Schwab K, Frahm S, Horsley D, Rickard JE, Melis V, Goatman EA, *et al.* A protein aggregation inhibitor, leuco-methylthioninium bis(hydromethanesulfonate), decreases α -synuclein inclusions in a transgenic mouse model of synucleinopathy. *Front Mol Neurosci* 10: 447 (2018).
- [43] Abercrombie M. Estimation of nuclear population from microtome sections. *Anat Rec* 96: 239-47 (1946).
- [44] König M, Berlin B, Schwab K, Frahm S, Theuring F, Wischik CM, *et al.* Increased cholinergic response in α -synuclein transgenic mice (h- α -synL62). *ACS Chem Neurosci* 10: 1915-22 (2019).
- [45] Mesulam MM. Cholinergic circuitry of the human nucleus basalis and its fate in Alzheimer's disease. *J Comp Neurol* 521: 4124-44 (2013).
- [46] Pepeu G, Grazia Giovannini M. The fate of the brain cholinergic neurons in neurodegenerative diseases. *Brain Res* 1670: 173-84 (2017).
- [47] Revett TJ, Baker GB, Jhamandas J, Kar S. Glutamate system, amyloid beta peptides and tau protein: functional interrelationships and relevance to Alzheimer disease pathology. *J Psychiat Neurosci* 38: 6-23 (2013).
- [48] Schneider LS, Insel PS, Weiner MW, for the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. Treatment with cholinesterase inhibitors and memantine of patients in the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. *Arch Neurol* 68: 58-66 (2011).
- [49] Deiana S, Harrington CR, Wischik CM, Riedel G. Methylthioninium chloride reverses cognitive deficits induced by scopolamine: comparison with rivastigmine. *Psychopharmacology* 202: 53-65 (2009).
- [50] Pfaffendorf M, Bruning TA, Batink HD, van Zwieten PA. The interaction between methylene blue and the cholinergic system. *Br J Pharmacol* 122: 95-8 (1997).
- [51] Devine MJ, Kittler JT. Mitochondria at the neuronal presynapse in health and disease. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 19: 63-80 (2018).
- [52] Cieri D, Vicario M, Vallese F, D'Orsi B, Berto P, Grinzato A, *et al.* Tau localises within mitochondrial sub-compartments and its caspase cleavage affects ER-mitochondria interactions and cellular Ca^{2+} handling. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1864: 3247-56 (2018).
- [53] Wischik CM, Lai RYK, Harrington CR (1997) Modelling prion-like processing of tau protein in Alzheimer's disease for pharmaceutical development. In *Brain Microtubule Associated Proteins: Modifications in Disease*, Avila J, Brandt R, Kosik KS, eds. Harwood Academic Publishers, Amsterdam, pp. 185-241.
- [54] Marsh J, Alifragis P. Synaptic dysfunction in Alzheimer's disease: the effects of amyloid beta on synaptic vesicle dynamics as a novel target for therapeutic intervention. *Neural Regen Res* 13: 616-23 (2018).