



Published in final edited form as:

J Physiol. 2019 September ; 597(17): 4427–4428. doi:10.1113/JP278461.

CrossTalk rebuttal

Alex Smith¹, Alan Verkman¹

¹Departments of Medicine and Physiology, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, 94143, USA.

The two novel and controversial aspects of the glymphatic hypothesis are: (i) convective fluid transport in brain parenchyma; and (ii) a major role for AQP4 in CSF/ISF exchange under normal physiological conditions. In their cross-talk article, Iliff and Simon (2019) agree that these are the main areas of controversy. Regarding (i), it seems we are now largely in agreement that transport in grey matter is best described by non-directional, parenchymal diffusion coupled to fast solute transport in the perivascular spaces. The direction and rate of solute transport in the perivascular spaces remain to be determined. Recent studies demonstrate pulsation-driven, directional solute transport in the subarachnoid space around pial vessels (Bedussi *et al.*, 2018); however, this transport appears to occur in a separate compartment from that within the leptomeningeal vessel sheath which facilitates solute transport into and out of the brain (Pizzo *et al.*, 2018).

Substantial differences of opinion remain with respect to (ii), the role of AQP4 in brain fluid transport. Conventional thinking makes it difficult to understand how a water-selective transporter in a mammalian cell membrane could facilitate directional, hydrostatically driven transport of fluid, which consists of both solutes and water (Smith *et al.*, 2015). Experimental observations on the effect of AQP4 deletion on transport of cisternally injected solutes from CSF into brain parenchyma are highly variable among labs; indeed, this variability exceeds any purported effects of AQP4 deletion (Smith *et al.*, 2017, Mestre *et al.*, 2018). Given the uncertainty in experimental results, and the lack of a plausible mechanism of how AQP4 could be the rate-limiting step for solute movement from subarachnoid space to parenchyma (Jin *et al.*, 2016), we consider the proposed role of AQP4 in ‘glymphatic’ solute influx at best conjectural.

The glymphatic hypothesis assumes that solute clearance following direct parenchymal injection is driven by CSF influx from the subarachnoid space, but in our arguably more plausible model (Smith & Verkman, 2019) this is not the case. Iliff and Simon (2019) cite studies in which AQP4 deletion retards clearance of solutes following injection of relatively large, 0.5–1.0 μ l solution volumes into mouse striatum. These injections displace a substantial fraction of striatal interstitial fluid, having total volume of 1.0–1.5 μ l, such that

Author Contribution: Alex Smith: Conception or design of the work; Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; Final approval of the version to be published; Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work Alan Verkman: Conception or design of the work; Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; Final approval of the version to be published; Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work

Author Conflict: No competing interests declared

Publisher's Disclaimer: Disclaimer: This is a confidential document.

fluid convection during the injection determines solute distribution. Effects of AQP4 deletion under these conditions cannot provide evidence for AQP4-dependent parenchymal convection from arteries to veins under normal physiological conditions. Because AQP4 deletion causes multiple structural and functional alterations in the brain, including increased extracellular volume (Yao *et al.*, 2008) and impaired reabsorption of exogenous fluid (Papadopoulos *et al.*, 2004), various nonglymphatic mechanisms can explain any apparent effect of AQP4 deletion on solute clearance.

Funding:

N/A: Alex J Smith, N/A please use the list from our crosstalk paper

References

- Bedussi B, Almasian M, de Vos J, VanBavel E & Bakker EN (2018). Paravascular spaces at the brain surface: Low resistance pathways for cerebrospinal fluid flow. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab* 38, 719–726 [PubMed: 29039724]
- Iliff JJ & Simon MA (2019) The glymphatic system supports convective exchange of cerebrospinal fluid and brain interstitial fluid that is mediated by perivascular aquaporin-4 *J Physiol xxx*
- Jin BJ, Smith AJ & Verkman AS (2016). Spatial model of convective solute transport in brain extracellular space does not support a “glymphatic” mechanism. *J Gen Physiol* 148, 489–501 [PubMed: 27836940]
- Mestre H, Hablitz LM, Xavier AL, Feng W, Zou W, Pu T, Monai H, Murlidharan G, Castellanos Rivera RM, Simon MJ, Pike MM, Pla V, Du T, Kress BT, Wang X, Plog BA, Thrane AS, Lundgaard I, Abe Y, Yasui M, Thomas JH, Xiao M, Hirase H, Asokan A, Iliff JJ & Nedergaard M (2018). Aquaporin-4-dependent glymphatic solute transport in the rodent brain. *Elife* 7, e40070 [PubMed: 30561329]
- Papadopoulos MC, Manley GT, Krishna S & Verkman AS (2004). Aquaporin-4 facilitates reabsorption of excess fluid in vasogenic brain edema. *FASEB J* 18, 1291–1293. [PubMed: 15208268]
- Pizzo ME, Wolak DJ, Kumar NN, Brunette E, Brunnquell CL, Hannocks MJ, Abbott NJ, Meyerand ME, Sorokin L, Stanimirovic DB & Thorne RG (2018). Intrathecal antibody distribution in the rat brain: surface diffusion, perivascular transport and osmotic enhancement of delivery. *J Physiol* 596, 445–475. [PubMed: 29023798]
- Smith AJ, Jin BJ & Verkman AS (2015). Muddying the water in brain edema? *Trends Neurosci* 38, 331–332. [PubMed: 25980601]
- Smith AJ, Yao X, Dix JA, Jin BJ & Verkman AS (2017). Test of the ‘glymphatic’ hypothesis demonstrates diffusive and aquaporin-4-independent solute transport in rodent brain parenchyma. *Elife* 6, e27679 [PubMed: 28826498]
- Smith AJ & Verkman AS (2019) Going against the flow: Interstitial solute transport in brain is diffusive and aquaporin-4 independent *J Physiol xxx*
- Yao X, Hrabetova S, Nicholson C & Manley GT (2008). Aquaporin-4-deficient mice have increased extracellular space without tortuosity change. *J Neurosci* 28, 5460–5464 [PubMed: 18495879]