

# The Symmetrical Immune Network Theory and a New HIV Vaccine Concept

Geoffrey W. Hoffmann<sup>1</sup>

**The symmetrical immune network theory is based on Jerne's network hypothesis. An improved version of the theory is presented. The theory is characterized by symmetrical stimulatory, inhibitory and killing interactions between idiotypic and antiidiotypic immune system components. In this version killing is ascribed to IgM antibodies, while IgG antibodies are stimulatory. In the symmetrical immune network theory T cells make specific T cell factors, that have a single V region, and are cytophilic for non-specific accessory cells (A cells, including macrophages and monocytes) and play a role in the system switching between stable steady states. A recurring theme in the theory is the concept of co selection. Co-selection is the mutual positive selection of individual members from within two diverse populations, such that selection of members within each population is dependent on interaction with (recognition of) one or more members within the other population. Prior to exposure to an antigen, antigen-specific and antiidiotypic T cells are equally diverse. This equality is a form of symmetry. Immune responses with the production of IgG involve co selection of the antigen-specific and antiidiotypic classes with the breaking of this diversity symmetry, while induction of unresponsiveness involves co-selection without the breaking of diversity symmetry. The theory resolves the famous I-J paradox of the 1980s, based on co selection of helper T cells with some affinity for MHC class II and suppressor T cells that are anti-anti-MHC class II. The theory leads to three experimentally testable predictions concerning I-J. The theory includes a model for HIV pathogenesis, and suggests that polyclonal IgG from many donors given in immunogenic form may be an effective vaccine for protection against infection with HIV. Surprisingly, a mathematical model that simulates the autonomous dynamics of the system is the same as one that models a previously described neural network.**

---

<sup>1</sup>Network Immunology Inc., 3311 Quesnel Drive, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6S 1Z7.

The symmetrical network theory<sup>1-4</sup> is the best developed version of immune network theory. The theory is based on Jerne's network hypothesis.<sup>5</sup> In this paper the basic aspects of this theory are reviewed, together with an improvement to the theory. The theory leads to a novel and simple HIV vaccine concept.

Many papers published in the 1970s and 1980s reported that T cells make molecules that were called specific T cell factors, and that are involved in the regulation of the production of antibodies by B cells. For example, Toshitada Takemori and Tomio Tada showed rigorously that specific T cell factors are able to exert a potent specific inhibitory effect on the production of antibodies.<sup>6</sup> They found that specific T cell factors have a molecular weight in the 35,000 to 60,000 dalton range, in contrast to IgG antibodies, that have a molecular weight of about 150,000. Specific T cell factors play a central role in the symmetrical network theory, and for the sake of brevity I will call them tabs. Each tab is postulated to have just one V region, in contrast to IgG molecules, that each have two V regions.

Most immunologists currently play little heed to the data supporting the existence of tabs. The main reason is that suppressor tabs were found to express a serological marker<sup>7</sup> called I-J, and there was no gene for I-J at the site in the mouse MHC where I-J had been mapped.<sup>8</sup> The reasoning has been "There is no gene for I-J, therefore I-J does not exist, therefore molecules that express I-J determinants do not exist." However, as discussed below, the I-J paradox can be resolved in the context of the symmetrical immune network theory, and the data demonstrating both the existence of I-J and the existence of tabs stands.

### **The symmetrical immune network theory**

The symmetrical immune network theory is based firstly on symmetrical interactions between antigen-specific cells their specific products on the one hand, and cells and molecules with complementary specificities, called antiidiotypic cells and molecules. There are three types of symmetrical interactions in the theory. Firstly symmetrical stimulation, which follows from the idea that stimulation involves cross-linking of receptors. For example, an antigen-specific antibody has the ability to cross-link the specific receptors of an antiidiotypic cell, and an antiidiotypic antibody has the ability to cross-link the receptors of an antigen-specific cell. Symmetrical inhibition is based on the postulate that tabs have only one V region. Then antigen-specific tabs are able block the receptors of antiidiotypic cells, and antiidiotypic tabs are able to block the receptors of antigen-specific cells. There is also a stimulatory role for tabs in the theory.

Tabs bind to a receptor on non-specific accessory cells including macrophages (A cells),<sup>9</sup> and this receptor is postulated to be at least divalent. In this form antigen-specific tabs can stimulate antiidiotypic lymphocytes, and antiidiotypic tabs can stimulate antigen-specific cells. Symmetric killing involves antigen-specific IgM antibodies plus complement killing antiidiotypic cells and antiidiotypic IgM antibodies killing antigen-specific cells.<sup>10</sup> Killing by IgM is postulated to be more important than killing by IgG. This postulate is new, and is based on the fact that each IgM antibody has ten V regions as opposed to two in the case of IgG, and therefore antigen-specific IgM antibodies bind to a wider spectrum of antiidiotypic cells than is the case for antigen-specific IgG antibodies. Complement mediated killing by IgM is furthermore more efficient than complement mediated killing by IgG, since a single IgM molecule bound to a cell surface suffices to fix complement, while at least two IgG molecules bound next to each other are needed to fix complement.<sup>11</sup>

Cross-linking the receptors of B cells causes the B cells to proliferate,<sup>12</sup> and they need a second signal to differentiate into antibody producing cells, as reviewed in reference 2. Activation of T cells to proliferate is also dependent on a second signal cytokine.<sup>13</sup> In the theory it is postulated that A cells can be activated by antigen cross-linking antigen-specific tabs bound to A cell surfaces, and that the activated A cells secrete the cytokines needed for T cell proliferation and B cell differentiation.

The phenomena of how the system can respond to increasing doses of antigen has been a challenge for theorists since Avrion Mitchison showed that small or large doses of an antigen can cause smaller immune responses than intermediate doses of antigen.<sup>14</sup> Low dose tolerance is a paradox in the context of clonal selection without taking account of network interactions. In the context of the absence he symmetrical network theory we can explain low and high dose tolerance as follows.

In the case of too little priming antigen, there is arming of the A cell with antigen-specific tabs, but little if any activation of the A cell by antigen. The A cells armed with antigen-specific tabs stimulate antiidiotypic cells, that secrete antiidiotypic tabs. The A cell is then armed with a mixture of antigen-specific tabs and antiidiotypic tabs, and is a catalyst for the mutual stimulation of the antigen-specific and antiidiotypic T cell populations. The system goes to a relatively unresponsive state characterized by high levels of antigen-specific and antiidiotypic T cells and tabs. The same happens for a super-optimal amount of antigen, since the activation of the A cell by antigen is inhibited by excess antigen-specific tabs, that on the A cells can again stimulate the production of antiidiotypic

tabs and the proliferation of antiidiotypic T cells. Elevated and stable levels of antigen-specific and antiidiotypic T cells correspond to inhibition by antigen-specific and antiidiotypic tabs, and the suppressed state for the antigen. In summary, if the A cell is activated, the system switches to the secretion of antibodies and immunity to the antigen, while if the A cell is not activated, it switches to a non-responsive or suppressed state for the antigen.

### **Co-selection in immune responses**

Co-selection is a term that I have introduced to denote the mutual positive selection of individual members from within two diverse populations, such that selection of members within each population is dependent on interaction with (recognition of) one or more members within the other population.<sup>4</sup> Co-selection is a recurring theme in the symmetrical immune network theory. In the case of the reaction to a foreign antigen, there are two fundamentally different types of co-selection, namely co-selection without symmetry breaking and co-selection with symmetry breaking. Before being exposed to the antigen, the system is in a symmetrical virgin state with respect to the antigen. I will now describe how tolerance induction involves co-selection without symmetry breaking, while the immune response involves co-selection with symmetry breaking.

In the case of tolerance induction, symmetry is not broken because the antigen quickly becomes less important than antigen-specific and the antiidiotypic tabs on the surface of the A cells. The antigen only triggers the process. It causes co-selection of antigen-specific T cells and antiidiotypic T cells, taking the system to elevated levels of both, without any preference of one over the other. The resulting symmetry of the unresponsive state includes symmetry with respect to the diversity of antigen-specific and antiidiotypic T cells; they are equally diverse. A subsequent challenge with the antigen floods the A cell with antigen-specific and antiidiotypic tabs, and increasing the number of antigen-specific and antiidiotypic T cells equally, maintaining the symmetry of the system, while inhibiting the activation of the A cell by the antigen. This highly symmetric state remains symmetric and unresponsive to the antigen.

The induction of immunity with memory involves the production of IgG antibodies, which together with IgM antibodies rapidly clear the system of the antigen. At this stage the antigen-specific IgG antibodies are typically very diverse, but they have an average shape that is complementary to the shape of the antigen, and in aggregate they preferentially stimulate antiidiotypic cells with receptors that resemble the shape of the antigen. We again have co-selection of an antigen-specific and an antiidiotypic

population, but this is co-selection with symmetry breaking, because while the antigen-specific population is diverse, the antiidiotypic cells are selected on the basis of having receptors with complementarity to as many antigen-specific cells as possible. The latter constraint results in the antiidiotypic population having very limited diversity compared with that of the antigen-specific population, and that is the asymmetric aspect. Mutual stimulation of the antigen-specific and antiidiotypic populations results in elevated levels of both populations, but the symmetry is broken with regard to amount of diversity in the two populations, and this asymmetry means that the antigen-specific population is not as tightly regulated. Challenge with the antigen then results in the relatively homogeneous antiidiotypic cells on the A cells being a very strong stimulus for antigen-specific B cells, and causes a strong secondary IgG response.

#### **The Oudin and Cazenave paradox**

Oudin and Cazenave found that antibodies to multiple determinants on an antigen can express common idiotypes.<sup>15</sup> The antigen was also found to induce antibodies that are not specific for the antigen at all. None of this makes sense without invoking network regulation. It can however be understood as the result of co-selection of antigen-specific and antiidiotypic clones with symmetry breaking as described above and as shown in Fig. 1. Stimulation by the antigen leads to co-selection of (a) anti-A and anti-B idiotypes and (b) antiidiotypes that are both anti-anti-A and anti-anti-B. The antiidiotypic V regions (b) are then homogeneous and emerge as the strongest antigens in the system, and with the result that they select clones (c) that are both anti-anti-anti-A and anti-anti-anti-B. All of the clones (c) express the idiotypic defined by the antiidiotypic reagent (b), and some but not all of them will have anti-A or anti-B specificity, or both, or neither.

#### **Classic suppressor T cells**

In many cases when T cells from a mouse that has been primed with an antigen are combined with naïve cells in a recipient mouse, the mouse is suppressed for the antigen.<sup>16</sup> This is the classic suppressor T cell phenomenon, in which the suppressor T cells express the CD8 marker,<sup>17,18</sup> and is not to be confused with the more recently described Treg cells.<sup>19</sup> The data supporting the existence of these suppressors is readily understood in terms of co-selection of antigen-specific cells and antiidiotypic T cells that are present in the naïve and suppressed populations, via cells adsorbed to A cells. This type of suppression is important, but these suppressor T cells typically express I-J, and again due to the I-J paradox their very existence is currently questioned by many immunologists. They are barely mentioned in

current immunology textbooks,<sup>20</sup> in spite of having been described in many papers. We therefore now need to turn to I-J, and describe how the paradox can be resolved in the context of the symmetrical network theory.

### **The I-J phenomenon**

The I-J phenomenon in the mouse maps to the MHC class II region of the major histocompatibility complex. The MHC class II genes are  $A_\alpha$ ,  $A_\beta$ ,  $E_\beta$  and  $E_\alpha$ , in that order. In 1976 two groups, one in Japan, the other at Stanford University, independently discovered a new phenomenon<sup>7,21</sup> called I-J. Mice were immunized with lymphoid cells from strains that differed or were believed to differ in part of their MHC. The mice made antibodies that bound specifically to suppressor tabs<sup>7</sup> and to suppressor T cells.<sup>21</sup> These were called anti-I-J antibodies. So the tabs and suppressor T cells that play a role in suppressing immune responses express I-J shapes, as defined by the anti-I-J antibodies. Careful experiments using many strains of mice seemed to show that I-J is encoded within the MHC of the mouse between the  $E_\beta$  and  $E_\alpha$  genes.

From the perspective of the symmetrical immune network theory, this was exciting, because the phenomenon of suppression was clearly important, suppression seemed to be mediated by tabs, and tabs play a central role in the symmetrical network theory. Furthermore, I-J was not a fly-by-night finding. About 1000 papers were published with I-J in the title.

However, in 1982 a problem emerged. DNA sequencing revealed that there was no gene that could encode I-J gene in the MHC class II region where I-J had been mapped.<sup>8,22</sup> This was the I-J paradox. Much effort was devoted to resolving this problem, but the solution was slow in coming. With time, many immunologists threw out the baby with the bathwater. In spite of thousands of papers on antigen-specific suppression mediated by T cells in mixing experiments, and the many papers on suppressor tabs that express I-J, these findings were relegated by many immunologists to history.

This reaction was and is however inappropriate. When we have a paradox, it is telling us that we are not understanding something. It does not mean we should throw out a huge amount of information and call it all nonsense. As long as the original papers that defined I-J stand, we need to persist with trying to find a solution.

A partial solution to the I-J paradox came with the findings that the I-J phenotype of suppressor T cells depends on the MHC environment of the T cells during ontogeny.<sup>23,24</sup> In the context of network theory, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that I-J determinants are V region

determinants on suppressor T cells, that are selected such that the V regions have complementarity to helper T cell idiotypes, that in turn are selected to have some complementarity to MHC class II. In other words, I-J are anti-anti-MHC class II determinants. Then there is the question of whether the topology of connections between anti-MHC class II helper T cells and anti-anti-MHC class II suppressor T cells is divergent as shown in Fig. 2a, or convergent as shown in Fig. 2b. In the context of the symmetrical network theory, suppressor T cells can be expected to have high network connectance, which is more consistent with the topology of Fig. 2b than that of Fig. 2a. Since the interaction between the helper T cells and the suppressor T cells is symmetrical, the suppressor T cell population is co-selected with the helper T cell population, with each suppressor T cell being selected on the basis of having V regions with complementarity to as many helper T cells as possible. At the same time, the helper T cells are selected to have complementarity not only to MHC class II, but also to the suppressor T cell V regions. The helper T cell repertoire is then stabilized by the suppressor T cells and vice versa. For a given set of MHC class II antigens, there can be more than one combination of mutually stabilizing helper T and suppressor T cell populations. This part of the network is analogous to a tent, in which the suppressor T cell centre-pole is stabilized by the helper T cell canvas, and vice versa.

It follows that mice that are genetically identical can express different I-J phenotypes. The initial conditions during embryogenesis can be expected to play a role in determining the nature of the I-J shapes that emerge, helping to ensure that the offspring of mice with a given I-J phenotype have the same I-J phenotype.

While MHC class II has a particularly strong impact on the repertoire of helper T cells, non-polymorphic self antigens can reasonably be expected to also play a role in the selection of the helper T cell repertoire and that of the co-selected suppressor T cells. We cannot expect to see the impact of such non-polymorphic self antigens in the types of experiments that show the impact of the polymorphic MHC self antigens.

This resolution of the I-J paradox leads to a simple experimentally testable prediction as follows. In an extension of work by Binz and Wigzell,<sup>25</sup> Anwyl Cooper-Willis and I found that the immune response of a mouse of strain A to immunization with lymphoid cells of a strain B is complementary to the immune response of the strain B to immunization with lymphoid cells of the strain A. We called this second symmetry.<sup>26</sup> Consider the case that the strains A and B differ only in their MHC genes. Then the B strain antigens to which the A mice respond include

1. Conventional MHC<sup>B</sup> antigens

2. B strain anti-A receptors
3. I-J<sup>B</sup> receptors = anti-anti-B

and the A strain antigens to which the B strain mice respond include

1. Conventional MHC<sup>A</sup> antigens
2. A strain anti-B receptors
3. I-J<sup>A</sup> receptors = anti-anti-A

The immune response of strain A to strain B cells (“A anti-B”) then includes

1. anti-MHC<sup>B</sup>
2. anti-anti-A
3. anti-I-J<sup>B</sup> = anti-anti-anti-B

and the immune response of strain B to strain A cells (“B anti-A”) includes

1. anti-MHC<sup>A</sup>
2. anti-anti-B
3. anti-I-J<sup>A</sup> = anti-anti-anti-A

Absorption of the A anti-B serum with strain B lymphoid cells removes the anti-MHC<sup>B</sup> and anti-I-J<sup>B</sup>, leaving anti-anti-A. Then anti-I-J<sup>A</sup> antibodies are predicted to bind specifically to the remnant anti-anti-A present in A anti-B serum absorbed with B strain lymphoid cells, and anti-I-J<sup>B</sup> antibodies are likewise predicted to bind specifically to the anti-anti-B present in B anti-A serum that has been absorbed with A strain cells.

#### **A model for HIV pathogenesis**

The symmetrical network theory includes a model for HIV pathogenesis based on the additional postulate<sup>4</sup> that HIV-specific helper T cells are preferentially infected by HIV. This was published in 1994, and eight years later, in 2002, the postulate was validated in a paper by Douek *et al.*<sup>27</sup> HIV is therefore under the same selection pressure as the suppressor T cells. Those HIV variants are selected that bind to the receptors of the largest number of helper T cell specific receptors. So with time, HIV looks more and more like the suppressor T cell centre-pole. Immunity against HIV is then also immunity against the centre-pole, and immunity against this central regulating component destabilizes the system. There is competition between the suppressor T cells and HIV for co-selection of helper T cells. The helper T cells are no longer so precisely co-selected by the original suppressor T cell clones, the number of these helper T cells decreases, and the system becomes immuno-compromised.

Tracy Kion and I found that mice immunized with foreign lymphocytes make anti-HIV antibodies, namely both anti-gp120 and anti-p24 antibodies,<sup>28</sup> even though they have never been exposed to HIV. This makes no sense without taking into account immune network ideas, and it can be rationalized in the context of our theory. The suppressor T cell



V regions are a homogeneous and hence potent antigenic stimulus. The alloimmune mice make anti-I-J antibodies, that cross-react with HIV because of the similarity between HIV and the suppressor T cell centre-pole. This theory predicts that anti-I-J antibodies bind to HIV.

The theory also predicts that immunization of a strain A mouse with IgG from a mouse of strain B, that differs from strain A only in MHC class II, will result in the production of anti-I-J<sup>B</sup> antibodies, and immunization of a strain B mouse with IgG from a mouse of strain A that differs only in the MHC will result in the production of anti-I-J<sup>A</sup>.

#### **IgG dimers in pooled human plasma**

We now consider an intriguing IgG phenomenon. Immunologists usually think of a person having millions of different IgG molecules. But how different from each other are the shapes of the various IgG molecules in one person, and how different are the shapes of your IgG molecules from mine?

In pools of normal human IgG from up to thousands of persons, IgG dimers can be observed using electron microscopy. These dimers are joined to each other by V-V binding, with two V regions of one IgG bound to the two V regions of a second IgG. Donald Tankersley, Sue Preston and J. S. Finlayson made a plot of the percentage of dimers as a function of the logarithm of the number of donors of the IgG.<sup>29</sup> They obtained a remarkable straight line as shown in Fig. 3. With a single donor, only about 1% of the IgG forms dimers. For 23 donors, this increases to only 2.9%. But there are a very large number of possible V-V pairings with 23 donors, so why is the percentage of dimers so low?

The term “quasi-species” was coined by Manfred Eigen in the context of the origin of life problem to describe an ensemble of closely related molecules.<sup>30</sup> I suggest that Figure 3 can be understood in terms of normal serum IgG being a quasi-species, namely an ensemble with closely related V regions, rather than an ensemble of random shapes. The simplest model to explain this would be that IgG molecules are also co-selected with helper T cells, just as suppressor T cells and HIV are. Then polyclonal human IgG V regions mimic suppressor T cell V regions, and the suppressor T cell V regions also mimic HIV.

#### **An HIV vaccine concept**

Since in our theory the spectrum of V regions in polyclonal human IgG is similar to the spectrum of HIV shapes, polyclonal human IgG may be effective as a vaccine against the full spectrum of HIV variants.

The idea that something other than HIV or some component thereof may be effective as a vaccine against the virus is not new. In 1991 E. J. Stott

reported the paradoxical finding that macaque monkeys can be protected from SIV infection by immunization with human cells, without any SIV being present in the inoculum.<sup>31</sup> The mean titre of antibodies to the human cells in the immunized animals was highly correlated with the probability of being protected.

The complete set of self antigens in mice, monkeys and humans are quite similar, in light of the fact that the totality of our genomes are similar. The relationship of mouse IgG to mouse self antigens is analogous to the relationship of human IgG to human self antigens. So in a proof of concept experiments, mice are immunized with mouse IgG, and macaque monkeys are immunized with macaque IgG. In both cases we expect to see the production of anti-anti-self antibodies that bind to HIV, which is selected to be anti-anti-self. The full spectrum of self antigens in macaques is similar to the full spectrum of self antigens in humans, and simian immunodeficiency virus is similar in many ways to HIV. This HIV vaccine concept therefore makes the following predictions:

1. Immunization of mice with a mouse version of the vaccine, namely polyclonal mouse IgG from multiple strains of mice, given in immunogenic form via an immunogenic route, will result in the production of antibodies that bind to multiple HIV strains and multiple HIV proteins.
2. Immunization of macaque monkeys with a macaque version of the vaccine, namely polyclonal macaque IgG obtained from multiple out-bred macaques, given in immunogenic form via an immunogenic route, will result in the production of antibodies that bind to multiple HIV strains, and to multiple HIV proteins, and also antibodies that bind to multiple SIV strains and multiple SIV proteins. These monkeys are predicted to then be protected against infection with multiple strains of SIV.
3. Immunization of humans with small amounts of pooled human polyclonal IgG in immunogenic form via an immunogenic route will cause the production of anti-HIV antibodies and protect against infection with HIV.

### **Immune responses include anti-foreign and anti-anti-self components**

Every antigen has two types of determinants, namely determinants that are more similar to the repertoire of self components than they are complementary to that set, and determinants that are less similar to the set of self components than complementary to that set. We can call the former “self-similar” and the latter “foreign”. As described above, the foreign components can be expected to induce an anti-anti-foreign response,

that includes anti-foreign antibodies. The self-similar determinants will stimulate a modified set of anti-self helper T cells, that then co-select a modified set of anti-anti-self suppressor T cells and anti-anti-self IgG clones. So as a general rule, immune responses include both anti-foreign and anti-anti-self aspects.

The anti-anti-self component of the IgG response to pooled polyclonal IgG may constitute a second mode of action for this vaccine against HIV. This is because HIV-specific helper T cells are preferentially infected with HIV. The modified set of helper T cells may be sufficiently different from the naturally occurring sets of helper T cells, such that they are not so readily infected by the virus. This mode of action could account for the Stott paradox mentioned above.

### **A mathematical model that includes IgM and T cells**

I now describe a mathematical model that simulates the autonomous kinetics of the central components of the system, without including the antigen. Firstly, an appropriate model for a large number  $N$  clones of interacting IgM producing B cells has the form

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = 1 - x_i \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_{ij} x_j \quad (1)$$

The number of IgM secreting cells with specificity  $i$  is  $x_i$ . The first term on the right simulates a constant influx of cells of specificity  $i$  from the bone marrow. For simplicity this is taken to be the same for all  $N$  clones, and is given the value 1 based on an appropriate scaling of the variable  $x_i$ . The other term simulates killing of the B cells of clone  $i$  by IgM molecules that have specificity complementary to that of clone  $i$ . The  $\beta_{ij}$  matrix is symmetric, with the connectance  $C$  being the fraction of non-zero terms, and we consider the case that the matrix is otherwise random. This is a qualitatively unusual differential equation, in that for the system to have a stable steady state it needs a minimal level of complexity. High  $C$  and high  $N$  correspond to a high level of complexity for this system, while low  $C$  and low  $N$  correspond to a low level of complexity.<sup>3</sup> When this system is stable, it has a single attractor, meaning it converges to the same stable steady state regardless of initial conditions. The threshold level of connectance for the system to be stable decreases with  $N$  approximately as  $N^{-0.7}$ . This corresponds to the system being stable providing each clone interacts with approximately at least two other clones.<sup>3</sup>

We now add natural death to the equation, together with the inhibition by tabs of IgM killing in the case of specificities for which there is a high level of T cells. Natural death is modeled by adding a term  $-x_i$  in the differential equation. In the case of specificities for which there is a high level of T cells, the inhibition of complement plus IgM mediated killing depends on both the level of the clone  $i$  and the level of clones that have complementarity to clone  $i$ . In this mathematical model the subscript  $i$  refers to a shape  $i$ , and there are IgM cells that have V regions with shape  $i$ , and there are also T cells with V regions with shape  $i$ , in addition to T cells and IgM molecules with V regions that have complementarity to the shape  $i$ . The catalyst role of the A cell in the mutual stimulation of T cells means that on a short time scale the system evolves towards the level of T cells for each specificity being kept at approximately the level of T cells with complementary specificities. The role of tabs as inhibitors of IgM killing is then modeled with a term that depends on  $x_i^2$ , since  $x_i^2$  models the amount of mutual stimulation of the two sets of T cells via the A cell. The model for the IgM network including natural death and inhibition of killing by T cells is then

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = 1 - x_i - \frac{x_i \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_{ij} x_j}{1 + \alpha x_i^2} \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a constant. The stable states of this system are obtained by setting the left hand side equal to zero, giving a cubic equation in  $x_i$ , with  $\sum_{j=1}^N \beta_{ij} x_j$  as a parameter. For a given value of the parameter, the cubic equation can have three solutions, of which two are stable steady states for  $x_i$ , and the system as a whole can have up to  $2^N$  stable steady states. The differential equation (2) simulates the autonomous dynamics of the system, without attempting to include the antigen. The switching caused by the antigen activating the A cell to produce second signal lymphokines is not explicitly included in this mathematical model, and can be understood within the same framework as explained in words as above.

#### **Regulation by IgG and IgM in the mathematical model**

When there is an immune response with the production of IgG, the IgG stimulates T cells with V regions that are complementary to the IgG. These

T cells make tabs that bind to A cells and stimulate T cells with V regions that are similar to those of the IgG. In this way, a combination of antigen and antigen-specific IgG down-regulates the immune response to the antigen, and terminates it. In the mathematical model, this takes place by IgG and the antigen together effectively causing an increase in the  $\alpha x_i^2$  term and a decrease in IgM mediated killing, limiting the extent to which symmetry is broken.

Niels Jerne and Claudia Henry showed that administration of IgG antibody specific for sheep red blood cells (SRBC) one to two hours prior to immunization of mice with SRBC results in a profound suppression of the immune response to the SRBC.<sup>32</sup> The IgG antibodies together with the antigen constitute a dual stimulus, causing co-selection of antigen-specific and antiidiotypic T cells, leading to the suppressed state with elevated levels of both. The idiotypic-antiidiotypic symmetry is broken less than in the case of only the antigen being administered, and the system goes to a relatively suppressed state. Jerne and Henry also showed that IgM specific for SRBC given just prior to SRBC causes an enhanced immune response.<sup>32</sup> This can be ascribed to the IgM killing antiidiotypic T cells, and thus assisting in the breaking of symmetry between antigen-specific and antiidiotypic cells.

Another example is the secondary immune response of Syrian hamsters to SRBC.<sup>33</sup> While the half-life of passively administered IgG is generally found to be about 20 days or more, the half-life of antigen-specific serum IgG in this secondary response is paradoxically less than a day. In the context of our model, the IgG produced in the primary immune response is of limited diversity, which is consistent with the fact that the dominant antigen of SRBC is a carbohydrate. The IgG then selects antiidiotypic T cells, and there is co-selection of these together with antigen-specific T cells. While the system does not go to a suppressed state, the very rapid quenching of the secondary immune response indicates that following the primary response a precise symmetry is nevertheless established between antigen-specific and antiidiotypic clones, such that when the secondary immune response occurs, antigen-specific and antiidiotypic antibodies are produced in equal amounts, and are rapidly cleared by each other.

#### **On the analogy with the brain**

There has been a powerful interplay between the development of immune system theory and neural network theory. In his original network hypothesis paper Jerne emphasized the similarity between the immune system and the brain.<sup>5</sup> These similarities include the large number and diversity of cells, permitting appropriate responses to be made to an enormous variety of stimuli. In both cases the cells are functionally connected to each other as a

network. Both systems exhibit memory, which can last for years. This aspect distinguishes the immune system and the brain from all other physiological systems. In both systems the acquired memories are not passed on to subsequent generations, even though it would be advantageous for this to be the case. Furthermore, both systems have a profound sense of self. I previously utilized the similarity between the immune system and the brain to formulate a neural network model in which neurons exhibit hysteresis.<sup>34</sup> This system of  $N$  neurons has close to  $2^N$  stable steady states, and is capable of learning through interacting with its environment without changes in synaptic connection strengths.<sup>35</sup> Surprisingly, even though the immune system and the brain consist of very different components, the equation for the autonomous dynamics of the neural network model is identical to the one that simulates the autonomous dynamics of the symmetrical immune network, namely equation (2). This suggests that the number of adaptive biological dynamical systems that exhibit both a large number of stable steady states and have the ability to learn is severely limited, and nature has found two different ways to construct systems that are based on one differential equation.

### **Conclusion**

The constraint of finding explanations for phenomena that do not make sense in the context of basic clonal selection, meaning clonal selection without taking account of idiotypic network interactions, is a powerful constraint for the formulation of a theory of regulation of the adaptive immune system. In this paper we have shown that an improved version of the symmetrical immune network theory resolves important paradoxes, including low dose tolerance, the Oudin-Cazenave paradox and the I-J paradox. A lot of data on suppressor T cells and tabs is currently being neglected, buried in forgotten literature. Immunologists will benefit from revisiting these phenomena and addressing the question of whether the symmetrical network theory provides the best way for understanding the adaptive immune system. This is particularly important in light of the fact that the theory has potential for the development of a preventive HIV vaccine.

## References

1. Hoffmann, G. W. A network theory of the immune system. *Eur. J. Immunol.*, **5**, 638-647 (1975).
2. Hoffmann, G. W. Incorporation of a non-specific T cell dependent helper factor into a network theory of the regulation of the immune response. In *Theoretical Immunology* G. I. Bell, A. S. Perelson and G. H. Pimbley, Jr. Eds., Marcel Dekker, New York, 571-602 (1978).
3. Hoffmann, G. W. The application of stability criteria in evaluating network regulation models. In *Regulation of Immune Response Dynamics*, C. DeLisi, J. R. J. Hiernaux Eds., CRC Press, Boca Raton Florida, 137-162 (1982).
4. Hoffmann, G. W. Co-selection in immune network theory and in AIDS pathogenesis. *Immunol. Cell Biol.*, **72**, 338-346 (1994).
5. Jerne, N. K. Towards a Network Theory of the Immune System. *Ann. Immunol. (Inst. Pasteur)*, **125C**, 373-389 (1974).
6. Takemori, T. & Tada, T. Properties of antigen-specific suppressive T cell factor in the regulation of antibody response of the mouse. I. In vivo activity and immunochemical characterization. *J. Exp. Med.* **142**, 1241-1253 (1975).
7. Tada, T., Taniguchi, M. & David, C. S. *J. Exp. Med.* **144**, 713-725 (1976). Properties of the antigen-specific suppressive T-cell factor in the regulation of antibody response of the mouse. IV. Special subregion assignment of the gene that codes for the suppressive T-cell factor in the H-2 histocompatibility complex. *J. Exp. Med.* **144**, 713-725 (1976).
8. Steinmetz M. *et al.* A molecular map of the immune response region from the histocompatibility complex of the mouse. *Nature* **300**, 35-42 (1982).
9. Evans, R., Grant, C. K., Cox, H. Steel, K. & Alexander, P. Thymus-derived lymphocytes produce an immunologically specific macrophage-arming factor. *J. Exp. Med.*, 136, 1318-1322. *J. Exp. Med.* **136**, 1318-1322 (1972).
10. Cooper-Willis, A. & Hoffmann, G. W. Symmetry of effector function in the immune system network. *Mol. Immunol.* **20**, 865-870 (1983).
11. Borsos, T. & Rapp, H. J. Complement fixation on cell surfaces by 19S and 7S antibodies. *Science* **150**, 505-506 (1965)
12. Fanger, M. W., Hart, D. A., Wells J. V. & Nisonoff, A. Requirement for cross-linkage in the stimulation of transformation of rabbit peripheral lymphocytes by antiglobulin reagents. *J. Immunol.* **105**, 1484-1492 (1970)
13. Sprent, J., Zhang, X., Sun, S., Tough, D. T cell proliferation in vivo and the role of cytokines. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* **355**, 317-322 (2000).
14. Mitchison, N. A. Induction of immunological paralysis in two zones of dosage. *Proc. Royal Soc. London B* **161**, 275-292 (1964).
15. J. Oudin & P. A. Cazenave, Similar Idiotypic Specificities in Immunoglobulin Fractions with Different Antibody Functions or Even without Detectable Antibody Function *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (USA)* **68**, 2616-2620 (1971).
16. Tada, T. & Takemori, T. Selective roles of thymus-derived lymphocytes in the antibody response. I. Differential suppressive effect of carrier-primed T cells on hapten-specific IgM and IgG antibody responses. *J. Exp. Med.* **140**, 239-252 (1974).


17. Cantor, H. & Boyse, E. A. Functional subclasses of T lymphocytes bearing different Ly antigens *J. Exp. Med.* **141**, 1376-1389 (1975).
18. Reinherz, E. L. & Schlossman, S. F. Differentiation and function of human T lymphocytes *Cell*, **19**, 821-827 (1980).
19. Sakaguchi, S. Sakaguchi, N., Asano, M., Itoh, M. & Toda, M.. Immunologic self-tolerance maintained by activated T cells expressing IL-2 receptor  $\alpha$ -chains (CD25). Breakdown of a single mechanism of self-tolerance causes various autoimmune diseases. *J. Immunol.* **155**, 1151-1164 (1995).
20. Kuby Immunology, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, T. J. Kindt, R. A. Goldsby, B. A. Osbourne, Freeman and Company, New York (2007).
21. Murphy, D. B., Herzenberg, L. A., Okumura, K., Herzenberg, L. A. & McDevitt, H. O. A new I sub-region (I-J) marked by a locus (Ia-4) controlling surface determinants on suppressor T lymphocytes. *J. Exp. Med.* **144**, 699-712 (1976).
22. Kronenberg, M. *et al.* RNA transcripts for I-J polypeptides are apparently not encoded between the I-A and I-E subregions of the murine major histocompatibility complex. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **80**, 5704-5708 (1983).
23. Uracz, W., Asano, Y., Abe, R. & Tada, T. I-J epitopes are adaptively acquired by T cells differentiated in the chimaeric condition. *Nature* **316**, 741-745 (1985).
24. Flood, P. M., Benoist, C., Mathis, D. & Murphy, D. B. Altered I-J phenotype in E $\alpha$  transgenic mice. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **83**, 8308-8312 (1986).
25. Binz, H. & Wigzell, H. Shared idiotypic determinants on B lymphocytes and T lymphocytes reactive against the same antigenic determinants. I. Demonstration of similar or identical idiotypes on IgG molecules and T cell receptors for alloantigens. *J. Exp. Med.* **142**, 197-211 (1975).
26. Hoffmann, G. W., Cooper-Willis, A. & Chow, M. A new symmetry: A anti-B is anti-(B anti-A), and reverse enhancement. *J. Immunol.* **137**, 61-68 (1986).
27. Douek, D. C. *et al.*, HIV preferentially infects HIV-specific CD4<sup>+</sup> T cells. *Nature* **417**, 95-98 (2002).
28. Kion, T. A. & Hoffmann, G. W. Anti-HIV and anti-anti-MHC antibodies in alloimmune and autoimmune mice. *Science* **253**, 1138-1140 (1991).
29. Tankersley, D. L., Preston, M. S., & Finlayson, J. S. Immunoglobulin G dimer: an idio-type-anti-idio-type complex. *Mol. Immunol.* **25**, 41-48 (1988).
30. Eigen, M. Selforganization of matter and the evolution of biological macromolecules. *Naturwissenschaften* **58**, 465-523 (1971).
31. Stott E. J. Anti-cell antibody in macaques. *Nature* **353**, 393 (1991).
32. Jerne, N. K. & Henry, C. Competition of 19S and 7S antigen receptors in the regulation of the primary immune response. *J. Exp. Med.* **128**, 133-152 (1968).
33. Erb, P., Lazàry, S., Loeffler, H. Primary and secondary immune response kinetics in the Syrian hamster. *Int. Arch. Allergy* **42**, 362-372 (1972).
34. Hoffmann, G. W. A neural network model based on the analogy with the immune system. *J. Theoret. Biol.* **122**, 33-67 (1986).



35. Hoffmann, G. W., Benson, M. W., Bree, G. M., Kinahan, P. E. A teachable neuron network based on an unorthodox neuron. *Physica* **22D**, 233-246 (1986).


**Author Information** The author declares a competing financial interest. Correspondence should be addressed to the author at [hoffmann@networkimmunologyinc.com](mailto:hoffmann@networkimmunologyinc.com).

**Figure 1.** A co-selection model that accounts for the Oudin-Cazenave paradox. The antigen-specific set  $\alpha A$  (anti-A) and  $\alpha B$  (anti-B) includes clones that are specific for various antigenic determinants of the antigen, here A and B, while the  $\alpha\alpha A$  and  $\alpha\alpha B$  anti-idiotypic set is selected to have specificity for as many antigen-specific clones as possible. The emergent antiidiotypic set is the strongest antigen in the system, and induces clones that by definition are  $\alpha\alpha\alpha A$  and  $\alpha\alpha\alpha B$ . These include clones that are anti-A or anti-B, clones that are both anti-A and anti-B, and clones that are neither anti-A nor anti-B.




**Figure 2.** Network topologies for clones that relate directly or indirectly to MHC class II self antigens. **a.** A divergent topology. **b.** A convergent topology that is the basis for accounting for the I-J paradox.

**a**



**b**



**Figure 3.** The fraction of IgG dimers in pooled IgG from many donors, as a function of the logarithm of the number of donors. Adapted from Tankersley, Preston and Finlayson.<sup>29</sup>

