

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	Evasion of Host Immunity During <i>Fasciola hepatica</i> Infection
Copyright Year	2020
Copyright Holder	Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature
Corresponding Author	Family Name Flynn Particle Given Name Robin J. Suffix Division Department of Infection Biology, Institute of Infection and Global Health Organization University of Liverpool Address Liverpool, UK Email rjflynn@liverpool.ac.uk
Author	Family Name Musah-Eroje Particle Given Name Mayowa Suffix Division School of Veterinary Medicine and Science Organization University of Nottingham Address Nottingham, UK
Abstract	<p><i>Fasciola hepatica</i>, the common liver fluke, causes infection of livestock throughout temperate regions of the globe. This helminth parasite has an indirect lifecycle, relying on the presence of the mud snail to complete its transition from egg to definitive host (Beesley et al., <i>Transbound Emerg Dis</i> 65:199–216, 2017). Within the definitive host, the parasite excysts in the intestine forming a newly excysted juvenile (NEJ) and migrates via the peritoneal cavity to the liver. Disease resulting from infection can be acute or chronic depending on the host and the number of parasites present. Sheep may succumb to a fatal acute infection if the challenge of metacercariae is great enough. However, in cattle chronic disease is the most likely outcome with parasites surviving for long periods of time. Annual losses are estimated to be in the region of US\$ 2000 million to the agricultural industry (Beesley et al., <i>Transbound Emerg Dis</i> 65:199–216, 2017). Management of the disease depends heavily on chemotherapy with triclabendazole being the drug of choice, consistent use for over 20 years has resulted in drug-resistant strains emerging worldwide (Beesley et al., <i>Int J Parasitol</i> 47:11–20, 2017). A more sustainable approach to control would be through vaccination and indeed a lead candidate has been identified, cathepsin L1. Despite these promising results the parasite continues to confound our own and host efforts to generate long-lasting and effective immunity. In this brief review we focus our attention on those mechanisms that the parasite</p>

utilises to circumvent the innate based defense mechanisms within the host.

Keywords *Fasciola hepatica* - Immune evasion - Helminth - Immunomodulatory -
(separated by '-') Cathepsin - Innate immunity

Evasion of Host Immunity During *Fasciola hepatica* Infection 2 3

Robin J. Flynn and Mayowa Musah-Eroje 4

Abstract 5

Fasciola hepatica, the common liver fluke, causes infection of livestock throughout temperate regions of the globe. This helminth parasite has an indirect lifecycle, relying on the presence of the mud snail to complete its transition from egg to definitive host (Beesley et al., *Transbound Emerg Dis* 65:199–216, 2017). Within the definitive host, the parasite excysts in the intestine forming a newly excysted juvenile (NEJ) and migrates via the peritoneal cavity to the liver. Disease resulting from infection can be acute or chronic depending on the host and the number of parasites present. Sheep may succumb to a fatal acute infection if the challenge of metacercariae is great enough. However, in cattle chronic disease is the most likely outcome with parasites surviving for long periods of time. Annual losses are estimated to be in the region of US\$ 2000 million to the agricultural industry (Beesley et al., *Transbound Emerg Dis* 65:199–216, 2017). Management of the disease depends heavily on chemotherapy with triclabendazole being the drug of choice, consistent use for over 20 years has resulted in drug-resistant strains emerging worldwide (Beesley et al., *Int J Parasitol* 47:11–20, 2017). A more sustainable approach to control would be through vaccination and indeed a lead candidate has been identified, cathepsin L1. Despite these promising results the parasite continues to confound our own and host efforts to generate long-lasting and effective immunity. In this brief review we focus our attention on those mechanisms that the parasite utilises to circumvent the innate based defense mechanisms within the host.

Key words *Fasciola hepatica*, Immune evasion, Helminth, Immunomodulatory, Cathepsin, Innate immunity

1 Immunity to *F. hepatica* 24 AU3

F. hepatica immunity in ruminant hosts mirrors to large extent the response seen to Schistosome species. During experimental infection there is a brief phase of lymphocyte proliferation accompanied by IFN- γ production; thereafter a prolonged phase of IL-4 and initial antibody production follows. Coinciding with onset of patency there is a switch toward an anergic phenotype [3–5].

After emerging with the intestine invading NEJs must be sensed by the innate pattern recognition receptor (PRR) network. Evidence from murine models would suggest that the production

of canonical type-2 cytokines IL-25, IL-33, and TSLP are essential at this juncture in initiating the first wave of innate immune responses. Eosinophilia is a core characteristic of the antihelminth response with multiple studies suggesting a sliding scale of importance in helminth clearance. In nematode infection eosinophilia is known to be nonessential in nematode infections for the expulsion of parasites [6]. Swartz et al. have shown that eosinophils play no role in *S. mansoni* infection parameters such as egg deposition, worm burdens, liver enzymes, and granuloma size or number [7]. In *F. hepatica* infection Bossaert et al. showed that eosinophil counts were significantly elevated in infected cattle within 4 weeks of infection and remained so during the course of a 16 week infection period [8]. Zhang et al. demonstrated the presence of biphasic eosinophilia in *F. hepatica* infected sheep, with the peaks occurring at weeks 4 and 9–10 postinfection [9]. The importance of eosinophilia was again demonstrated by Chauvin et al., who demonstrated a positive relationship between the total eosinophil count and the infective dose administered to sheep, signifying a correlation between immune response and intensity of infection [10]. Importantly their role in protective immunity is well supported; Doy et al. suggested a role for eosinophils in resistance developed in immune rats [11]. Immune rats facing a challenge infection showed an increase in eosinophils within the *lamina propria* of the small intestine. Van Milligen et al. described an ex vivo model of the rat gut during infection, in immune rats [12]. Again, eosinophil counts were elevated in the *lamina propria* of immune rats. When NEJs migrated into the mucosa of immune rats they were found to be coated with both IgG1 and IgG2a antibodies and eosinophils. Later work [13] showed that eosinophils were essential for protection in the same model. The presence of parasite-specific antibody would make ADCC the most likely method of killing NEJs. This work is supported by studies of various species placing ADCC at the center of protective immunity against *F. hepatica* NEJs in cattle [14, 15].

Macrophages elicited by helminth infection have been shown to diverge from the normal paradigm of classically activated—nitric oxide producing—antibacterial cells. Gordon summarized and outlined the mechanisms by which parasitic helminths can interact with M Φ , causing their alternative activation [16]. Alternatively activated M Φ (AAM Φ) are denoted by their production of polyamines, proline, and IL-10. The differential regulation of L-arginine by M Φ has allowed workers to distinguish between these two populations of cells. AAM Φ metabolize L-arginine (Arg-1) using the enzyme arginase. AAM Φ induced by parasite infections have been shown to express a unique panel of markers: the mannose receptor along with a number of unique molecules such as intelectins, resistin-like molecules (RELM), chitinases, or chitinase-like proteins [17]. To date AAM Φ have been found in infections with a wide variety of

parasites including *S. mansoni* [18], *Taenia crassiceps* [19], 82
F. hepatica [20], *Litomosoides sigmodontis* and *Nippostrongylus bra-* 83
siliensis [21], *Brugia malayi* [22], and *H. polygyrus* [23]. Numer- 84
ous studies have shown that AAMΦ regulate the type-2 immune 85
response in various helminth infections and help to limit immuno- 86
pathology. However, the protective role of AAMΦ was shown by 87
Anthony et al. (2005) using *H. polygyrus* [23]. Infection of mice 88 AU4
revealed an accumulation of AAMΦ into the intestine and sur- 89
rounding these worms. Moreover, drug abbreviation of infection 90
giving rise to immunity magnified this sterilizing immune response 91
and macrophage depletion demonstrated that AAMΦ were central 92
to curative response. Importantly, administration of an arginase-1 93
inhibitor demonstrated a direct effect of AAMΦ on worm viability 94
measured via cytochrome oxidase. A direct effect of AAMΦ on 95
F. hepatica viability has yet to be shown but roles in directing or 96
contributing to the Th2 response during infection is well estab- 97
lished in multiple species [24–26]. 98

2 Mechanisms of Immune Evasion

99

Given the depth of information that is known about innate effector 100
mechanisms, there is a corresponding trend for our knowledge 101
regarding specifics of immune evasion to arise from study of the 102
interactions between *F. hepatica* and the innate leukocytes. From 103
herein we will discuss and explore the nature of these interactions 104
and where known their function effects. One of the first in vitro 105
studies of Immunomodulation resulting from *F. hepatica* infection 106
was recorded in 1985 [27]. They reported that the ability of 107
lymphocytes, from infected sheep, to proliferate was reduced even 108
when stimulated with the mitogen, ConA. Similar interactions 109
between leukocytes and excretory–secretory (ES) products were 110
observed by Jefferies et al. [28–30]. They studied the effect of ES 111
products on both human and ovine neutrophils and found that ES 112
products caused neutrophils to polarize, migrate and induced mor- 113
phological changes going from spherical to elongated type cells. 114
They also demonstrated an ability of ES to reduce the oxidative 115
burst of sheep and human neutrophils in response to PMA in a dose 116
dependent manner. This work was one of the first to suggest that 117
the parasite is capable of modulating aspects of the immune system 118
to evade damage or destruction. ES products are a complex of 119
multiple secreted proteins, both actively and passively. Refining 120
the molecules within ES and defining their mode of action has 121
become paramount to understanding parasite evasion and includ- 122
ing key molecules in future vaccination plans. Below we discuss two 123
major classes of parasite modulators, enzymatic and nonenzymatic 124
modulators, giving an overview of the major details we have 125
gleaned from studies to date. 126

3 Enzymatic Modulators

127

3.1 Cathepsins

The cathepsin cysteine protease family, containing cathepsin L1 (CLI) are the most clearly defined molecules from *F. hepatica* with immunomodulation capabilities. Early after the initial identification of CLI, Carmona et al. [31] demonstrated that *F. hepatica* CLI could prevent eosinophil mediated ADCC killing of NEJs. CLI was capable of cleaving antibody at the Fc-Fab junction, thus preventing cell attachment. Prowse et al. [32] demonstrated again CLI directly modulates the expression of CD4 on lymphocytes by cleaving the receptor enzymatically. This effect could be reversed in the presence of a specific cathepsin inhibitor. Thus, at a direct level CLI modulates immune function through its enzyme activities. Brady et al. [33] had earlier described a model of coinfection where *F. hepatica* would suppress mechanisms of defense that were specifically directed at *Bordetella pertussis*. This resulted in a loss of bacterial specific IFN- γ production and a delay in clearance of bacteria from the lungs. In follow up work, O'Neill et al. [34] demonstrated that injection of CLI would have the same negative effect on *B. pertussis* immune responses as a *F. hepatica* infection. By use of knockout mice, they were able to show that this suppression was partially mediated by IL-4. In IL-4^{-/-} mice IFN- γ levels were elevated in comparison to wild-type mice following injection of CLI, but still were significantly lower than in controls. Administration of a cathepsin enzyme inhibitor revealed that enzyme activity was required for the full suppressive effect. The enzymatic nature of *F. hepatica* CLI was shown to suppress septic shock in vivo by Donnelly et al. [35]. Moreover, CLI acted on TRIF and not surface bound TLR4 and use of both chemical inhibition and an active-site mutant CLI confirmed reliance on protease activity. The requirement for active CLI was again demonstrated in DCs [36], where CLI caused partial maturation of DCs in vitro. A downstream functional effect was detectable in terms of attenuated Th17 responses when CLI-exposed DCs were used. Indicating there might be multiple routes to deviation from a Th1 or Th17 response that the parasite can use.

128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162

3.2 Peroxiredoxin

A second class of enzymes derived from ES products has also been well documented for their roles in host immunomodulation. Peroxiredoxin (formerly Thioredoxin Peroxidase) is a 2-cys redox enzyme which can traditionally protect DNA from redox damage [37]. It is weakly recognised by the host with antibodies against Prx declining into chronic infection [37]. This in itself may parallel the period of infection when Prx is most potent, at the point during which macrophage recruitment during NEJ invasion is highest. The effect of Prx on macrophages, resulting in AAM Φ , has been demonstrated in multiple species. In mice, Prx causes strong

163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172

induction of arginase-1, FIZZ1 and Ym1 [20] while in ruminants it was shown that arginase-1 and IL-10 were upregulated by Prx [38]. In ruminants acidic mammalian chitinase (AMCase) was also identified as being upregulated following Prx exposure. While chitinases are ancient enzymes known to degrade chitin, commonly found in arthropods, there are no chitin-substrates in *F. hepatica*—which raises the question of its function. Importantly, Prx was shown to cause AAMΦ independent of IL-4/IL-13 which indicated a mechanism for the parasite to by-pass canonical type-2 signalling. Furthermore, when neutralized by immunization prior to infection it was revealed that Ym1, indicating AAMΦ in the peritoneal cavity, was reduced as was the subsequent IL-4 response [39], ultimately indicating a role for Prx-induced AAMΦs propagating a type-2 immune environment. While the enzymatic function of Prx is essential for its function, the precise mechanism by which it establishes the AAMΦ phenotype remains unknown and may yet present a viable route to *F. hepatica* control.

4 Nonenzymatic Modulators

Recently a number of parasite modulators have emerged that do not rely on enzymatic activity to polarize or subvert host immune effector mechanisms. However a common feature among these immunomodulators is their homology to host proteins with immune functions.

4.1 HDM

F. hepatica helminth defense molecule (FhHDM) was initially identified through a proteomic screen and phylogenetic analysis confirmed that it shares structural similarities with human LL-37, an antimicrobial peptide [40]. Initial characterization suggested that FhHDM could bind to LPS and block septic shock in vivo. Further details on the mechanism of action of FhHDM revealed FhHDM bound to lipids in the membrane was internalized and subsequently blocked antigen presentation on the MHC-II complex [41]. During the internalization phase it was shown that lysosomal acidification was blocked and this resulted in decreased inflammasome activation and subsequent IL-1β secretion [42]. The consequence of blocking antigen presentation within infection might allow for evasion of adaptive responses during infection; however IL-1β has more recently been shown to suppress the protective responses against intestinal *Trichuris muris* [43]. Thus, it is possible that while inhibiting antigen presentation benefits *F. hepatica* survival a benefit of blocking IL-1β remains to be uncovered.

4.2 TLM

TLM, TGF-like molecule, was first described from a screen of the *F. hepatica* genome. It presented with restricted expression, being highly expressed within the NEJ stage and low levels of expression within the adults. Initial experiments demonstrated that TLM retained similar qualities to TGF signalling in other worms and promoted viability and motility in vitro. Sulaiman et al. [15] later demonstrated that effects of TLM were not parasite restricted. Solid-phase binding assays demonstrated that TLM could indeed bind host TGF receptor complexes and resulted in activation of host STAT signalling. Phenotyping of macrophages exposed to TLM demonstrated a deviation from the AAMΦ spectrum with a significant increase in markers associated with a regulatory response including PD-1 and CTLA4. Ultimately, preexposure to TLM resulted in a reduction in macrophage-mediated ADCC killing of the NEJ parasite. This presents a clear pathway from stage-specific secretion of a modulator through to a host tissue specific.

5 Summary

We present here a brief overview of some of the best characterized modulators, enzymatic and nonenzymatic, their modes of actions and phenotypic effects. Recent evidence would suggest that our attention should shift to components of the tegumental coat. In recent studies the crude tegumental coat has been shown to inhibit mast cells [44] and DCs [45] in driving Th1 responses. Interestingly some of the effects of tegumental antigens have shown to be both mannose receptor dependent and independent [46, 47], indicating that the composition of the tegumental antigen is complex and will require much further study. Elucidating the mechanisms of action of *F. hepatica* evasion molecules will benefit vaccine development and future biotherapeutics.

Acknowledgments

Funding: BBSRC Awards BB/M018369/1, BB/L011530/1, BB/M018520/1 to RJF and a University of Nottingham Vice-Chancellor Scholarship to MME.

References

<p>252 253 254 255 256 257</p>	<p>1. Beesley NJ, Caminade C, Charlier J, Flynn RJ, Hodgkinson JE, Martinez-Moreno A, Martinez-Valladares M, Perez J, Rinaldi L, Williams DJL (2017) Fasciola and fasciolosis in ruminants in Europe: identifying research needs. <i>Transbound Emerg Dis</i> 65:199–216</p>	<p>2. Beesley NJ, Williams DJL, Paterson S, Hodgkinson J (2017) Fasciola hepatica demonstrates high levels of genetic diversity, a lack of population structure and high gene flow: possible implications for drug resistance. <i>Int J Parasitol</i> 47(1):11–20</p>	<p>216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 258 259 260 261 262 263</p>
--	--	---	---

- 264 3. Flynn RJ, Mulcahy G (2008) The roles of
265 IL-10 and TGF-beta in controlling IL-4 and
266 IFN-gamma production during experimental
267 *Fasciola hepatica* infection. *Int J Parasitol* 38
268 (14):1673–1680
- 269 4. Flynn RJ, Mulcahy G, Elsheikha HM (2010)
270 Coordinating innate and adaptive immunity in
271 *Fasciola hepatica* infection: implications for
272 control. *Vet Parasitol* 169(3–4):235–240
- 273 5. Sachdev D, Gough KC, Flynn RJ (2017) The
274 chronic stages of bovine *Fasciola hepatica* are
275 dominated by CD4 T-cell exhaustion. *Front*
276 *Immunol* 8:1002
- 277 6. Grecis RK (1997) Th2-mediated host protec-
278 tive immunity to intestinal nematode infec-
279 tions. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond Ser B Biol Sci*
280 352(1359):1377–1384
- 281 7. Swartz JM, Dyer KD, Cheever AW,
282 Ramalingam T, Pesnicka L, Domachowski JB,
283 Lee JJ, Lee NA, Foster PS, Wynn TA, Rosen-
284 berg HF (2006) *Schistosoma mansoni* infec-
285 tion in eosinophil lineage-ablated mice. *Blood*
286 108(7):2420–2427
- 287 8. Bossaert K, Jacquinet E, Saunders J, Farnir F,
288 Losson B (2000) Cell-mediated immune
289 response in calves to single-dose, trickle, and
290 challenge infections with *Fasciola hepatica*. *Vet*
291 *Parasitol* 88(1–2):17–34
- 292 9. Zhang WY, Moreau E, Hope JC, Howard CJ,
293 Huang WY, Chauvin A (2005) *Fasciola hepatica*
294 and *Fasciola gigantica*: comparison of cellular
295 response to experimental infection in sheep.
296 *Exp Parasitol* 111(3):154–159
- 297 10. Chauvin A, Moreau E, Boulard C (2001)
298 Responses of *Fasciola hepatica* infected sheep
299 to various infection levels. *Vet Res* 32(1):87–92
- 300 11. Doy TG, Hughes DL, Harness E (1978) Resis-
301 tance of the rat to reinfection with *Fasciola*
302 *hepatica* and the possible involvement of intes-
303 tinal eosinophil leucocytes. *Res Vet Sci* 25
304 (1):41–44
- 305 12. Van Milligen FJ, Cornelissen JB, Hendriks IM,
306 Gaasenbeek CP, Bokhout BA (1998) Protec-
307 tion of *Fasciola hepatica* in the gut mucosa of
308 immune rats is associated with infiltrates of
309 eosinophils, IgG1 and IgG2a antibodies
310 around the parasites. *Parasite Immunol* 20
311 (6):285–292
- 312 13. Van Milligen FJ, Cornelissen JB, Bokhout BA
313 (1999) Protection against *Fasciola hepatica* in
314 the intestine is highly correlated with eosino-
315 phil and immunoglobulin G1 responses against
316 newly excysted juveniles. *Parasite Immunol* 21
317 (5):243–251
- 318 14. Duffus WP, Franks D (1980) In vitro effect of
319 immune serum and bovine granulocytes on
juvenile *Fasciola hepatica*. *Clin Exp Immunol* 320
41(3):430–440 321
15. Sulaiman AA, Zolnierczyk K, Japa O, Owen JP,
322 Maddison BC, Emes RD, Hodgkinson JE,
323 Gough KC, Flynn RJ (2016) A Trematode
324 parasite derived growth factor binds and exerts
325 influences on host immune functions via host
326 cytokine receptor complexes. *PLoS Pathog* 12
327 (11):e1005991 328
16. Gordon S, Taylor PR (2005) Monocyte and
329 macrophage heterogeneity. *Nat Rev Immunol*
5(12):953–964 330 331
17. Nair MG, Guild KJ, Artis D (2006) Novel
332 effector molecules in type 2 inflammation: les-
333 sons drawn from helminth infection and
334 allergy. *J Immunol* 177(3):1393–1399 335
18. Herbert DR, Holscher C, Mohrs M,
336 Arendse B, Schwegmann A, Radwanska M,
337 Leeto M, Kirsch R, Hall P, Mossman H,
338 Claussen B, Forster I, Brombacher F (2004)
339 Alternative macrophage activation is essential
340 for survival during schistosomiasis and down-
341 modulates T helper 1 responses and immuno-
342 pathology. *Immunity* 20(5):623–635 343
19. Terrazas LI, Montero D, Terrazas CA, Reyes
344 JL, Rodriguez-Sosa M (2005) Role of the pro-
345 grammed Death-1 pathway in the suppressive
346 activity of alternatively activated macrophages
347 in experimental cysticercosis. *Int J Parasitol* 35
348 (13):1349–1358 349
20. Donnelly S, O'Neill SM, Sekiya M, Mulcahy G,
350 Dalton JP (2005) Thioredoxin peroxidase
351 secreted by *Fasciola hepatica* induces the alter-
352 native activation of macrophages. *Infect*
353 *Immun* 73(1):166–173 354
21. Nair MG, Gallagher IJ, Taylor MD, Loke P,
355 Coulson PS, Wilson RA, Maizels RM, Allen JE
356 (2005) Chitinase and fizz family members are a
357 generalized feature of nematode infection with
358 selective upregulation of Ym1 and Fizz1 by
359 antigen-presenting cells. *Infect Immun* 73
360 (1):385–394 361
22. Nair MG, Cochrane DW, Allen JE (2003)
362 Macrophages in chronic type 2 inflammation
363 have a novel phenotype characterized by the
364 abundant expression of Ym1 and Fizz1 that
365 can be partly replicated in vitro. *Immunol*
366 *Lett* 85(2):173–180 367
23. Anthony RM, Urban JF Jr, Alem F, Hamed
368 HA, Rozo CT, Boucher JL, Van Rooijen N,
369 Gause WC (2006) Memory T(H)2 cells induce
370 alternatively activated macrophages to mediate
371 protection against nematode parasites. *Nat*
372 *Med* 12(8):955–960 373
24. Pesce JT, Ramalingam TR, Mentink-Kane
374 MM, Wilson MS, El Kasmi KC, Smith AM,
375 Thompson RW, Cheever AW, Murray PJ,
376 377

377 Wynn TA (2009) Arginase-1-expressing
378 macrophages suppress Th2 cytokine-driven
379 inflammation and fibrosis. *PLoS Pathog* 5(4):
380 e1000371

381 25. Pesce JT, Ramalingam TR, Wilson MS,
382 Mentink-Kane MM, Thompson RW, Cheever
383 AW, Urban JF Jr, Wynn TA (2009) Retnla
384 (relmalpha/fizz1) suppresses helminth-
385 induced Th2-type immunity. *PLoS Pathog* 5
386 (4):e1000393

387 26. Ramalingam TR, Pesce JT, Mentink-Kane
388 MM, Madala S, Cheever AW, Comeau MR,
389 Ziegler SF, Wynn TA (2009) Regulation of
390 helminth-induced Th2 responses by thymic
391 stromal lymphopoeitin. *J Immunol* 182
392 (10):6452–6459

393 27. Oldham G, Williams L (1985) Cell mediated
394 immunity to liver fluke antigens during experi-
395 mental *Fasciola hepatica* infection of cattle.
396 *Parasite Immunol* 7(5):503–516

397 28. Jefferies JR, Barrett J, Turner RJ (1996)
398 Immunomodulation of sheep and human lym-
399 phocytes by *Fasciola hepatica* excretory-
400 secretory products. *Int J Parasitol* 26
401 (10):1119–1121

402 29. Jefferies JR, Corbett E, Barrett J, Turner RJ
403 (1996) Polarization and chemokinesis of
404 ovine and human neutrophils in response to
405 *Fasciola hepatica* excretory-secretory products.
406 *Int J Parasitol* 26(4):409–414

407 30. Jefferies JR, Turner RJ, Barrett J (1997) Effect
408 of *Fasciola hepatica* excretory-secretory pro-
409 ducts on the metabolic burst of sheep and
410 human neutrophils. *Int J Parasitol* 27
411 (9):1025–1029

412 31. Carmona C, Dowd AJ, Smith AM, Dalton JP
413 (1993) Cathepsin L proteinase secreted by *Fas-*
414 *ciola hepatica* in vitro prevents antibody-
415 mediated eosinophil attachment to newly
416 excysted juveniles. *Mol Biochem Parasitol* 62
417 (1):9–17

418 32. Prowse RK, Chaplin P, Robinson HC, Spithill
419 TW (2002) *Fasciola hepatica* cathepsin L sup-
420 presses sheep lymphocyte proliferation in vitro
421 and modulates surface CD4 expression on
422 human and ovine T cells. *Parasite Immunol*
423 24(2):57–66

424 33. Brady MT, O'Neill SM, Dalton JP, Mills KH
425 (1999) *Fasciola hepatica* suppresses a protec-
426 tive Th1 response against *Bordetella pertussis*.
427 *Infect Immun* 67(10):5372–5378

428 34. O'Neill SM, Mills KH, Dalton JP (2001) *Fas-*
429 *ciola hepatica* cathepsin L cysteine proteinase
430 suppresses *Bordetella pertussis*-specific inter-
431 feron-gamma production in vivo. *Parasite*
432 *Immunol* 23(10):541–547

35. Donnelly S, O'Neill SM, Stack CM, Robinson
433 MW, Turnbull L, Whitchurch C, Dalton JP
434 (2010) Helminth cysteine proteases inhibit
435 TRIF-dependent activation of macrophages
436 via degradation of TLR3. *J Biol Chem* 285
437 (5):3383–3392

438 36. Dowling DJ, Hamilton CM, Donnelly S, La
439 Course J, Brophy PM, Dalton J, O'Neill SM
440 (2010) Major secretory antigens of the hel-
441 minth *Fasciola hepatica* activate a suppressive
442 dendritic cell phenotype that attenuates Th17
443 cells but fails to activate Th2 immune
444 responses. *Infect Immun* 78(2):793–801

445 37. Sekiya M, Mulcahy G, Irwin JA, Stack CM,
446 Donnelly SM, Xu W, Collins P, Dalton JP
447 (2006) Biochemical characterisation of the
448 recombinant peroxiredoxin (FhePrx) of the
449 liver fluke, *Fasciola hepatica*. *FEBS Lett* 580
450 (21):5016–5022

451 38. Flynn RJ, Irwin JA, Olivier M, Sekiya M, Dal-
452 ton JP, Mulcahy G (2007) Alternative activa-
453 tion of ruminant macrophages by *Fasciola*
454 *hepatica*. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 120
455 (1–2):31–40

456 39. Donnelly S, Stack CM, O'Neill SM, Sayed AA,
457 Williams DL, Dalton JP (2008) Helminth
458 2-Cys peroxiredoxin drives Th2 responses
459 through a mechanism involving alternatively
460 activated macrophages. *FASEB J* 22
461 (11):4022–4032

462 40. Robinson MW, Donnelly S, Hutchinson AT,
463 To J, Taylor NL, Norton RS, Perugini MA,
464 Dalton JP (2011) A family of helminth mole-
465 cules that modulate innate cell responses via
466 molecular mimicry of host antimicrobial pep-
467 tides. *PLoS Pathog* 7(5):e1002042

468 41. Robinson MW, Alvarado R, To J, Hutchinson
469 AT, Dowdell SN, Lund M, Turnbull L,
470 Whitchurch CB, O'Brien BA, Dalton JP, Don-
471 nelly S (2012) A helminth cathelicidin-like pro-
472 tein suppresses antigen processing and
473 presentation in macrophages via inhibition of
474 lysosomal vATPase. *FASEB J* 26
475 (11):4614–4627

476 42. Alvarado R, To J, Lund ME, Pinar A,
477 Mansell A, Robinson MW, O'Brien BA, Dalton
478 JP, Donnelly S (2017) The immune modula-
479 tory peptide FhHDM-1 secreted by the hel-
480 minth *Fasciola hepatica* prevents NLRP3
481 inflammasome activation by inhibiting endoly-
482 somal acidification in macrophages. *FASEB J*
483 31(1):85–95

484 43. Alhallaf R, Agha Z, Miller CM, Robertson
485 AAB, Sotillo J, Croese J, Cooper MA, Masters
486 SL, Kupz A, Smith NC, Loukas A, Giacomini
487 PR (2018) The NLRP3 Inflammasome sup-
488 presses protective immunity to gastrointestinal
489

- 490 Helminth infection. Cell Rep 23
491 (4):1085–1098
- 492 44. Vukman KV, Adams PN, Metz M, Maurer M,
493 O'Neill SM (2013) *Fasciola hepatica* tegumental
494 coat impairs mast cells' ability to drive Th1
495 immune responses. J Immunol 190
496 (6):2873–2879
- 497 45. Vukman KV, Adams PN, O'Neill SM (2013)
498 *Fasciola hepatica* tegumental coat antigen sup-
499 presses MAPK signalling in dendritic cells and
500 up-regulates the expression of SOCS3. Parasite
501 Immunol 35(7–8):234–238
46. Aldridge A, O'Neill SM (2016) *Fasciola hepatica*
502 tegumental antigens induce anergic-like T
503 cells via dendritic cells in a mannose receptor-
504 dependent manner. Eur J Immunol 46
505 (5):1180–1192
47. Ravida A, Aldridge AM, Driessen NN, Heus
507 FA, Hokke CH, O'Neill SM (2016) *Fasciola*
508 *hepatica* surface coat glycoproteins contain
509 Mannosylated and phosphorylated N-glycans
510 and exhibit immune modulatory properties
511 independent of the mannose receptor. PLoS
512 Negl Trop Dis 10(4):e0004601
513

Uncorrected Proof

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 8 456807_1_En

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's response
AU1	Please check whether the author names and affiliations are correct.	
AU2	Reference citations in Abstract have been expanded as per style. Please cite references [1, 2] in the main body text.	
AU3	Please check the hierarchy of the section headings and confirm if correct.	
AU4	Please note that "Anthony et al. (2005)" year mismatch in Ref. [23]. Kindly check and provide appropriately.	

Uncorrected Proof