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Idebenone treatment in patients with OPA1-mutant dominant optic atrophy
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Sir, Last year we reported our experience on idebenone therapy in patients with Leber’s hereditary optic neuropathy (Carelli et al., 2011), presenting results similar with those obtained by the Rescue of Hereditary Optic Disease Outpatient Study (Klopstock et al., 2011). We now report, for the first time, on the administration of idebenone in seven consecutive patients with dominant optic atrophy carrying OPA1 mutations in an open-label trial.

Dominant optic atrophy is one of the most frequent hereditary optic neuropathies, characterized by degeneration of retinal ganglion cells leading to loss of central vision, and is currently considered untreatable (Carelli et al., 2004; Yu-Wai-Man et al., 2011). The majority of patients with dominant optic atrophy carry heterozygous mutations in the OPA1 gene (Alexander et al., 2000; Delettre et al., 2000), which encodes for a mitochondrial dynamin-like GTPase mainly involved in fusion of the mitochondrial inner membrane, control of apoptosis and maintenance of mitochondrial DNA and oxidative phosphorylation (Landes et al., 2010).

Clinical expression of dominant optic atrophy is mostly limited to optic neuropathy with variable severity (Carelli et al., 2004; Yu-Wai-Man et al., 2011), ranging from severe congenital optic atrophy to mild cases (Barboni et al., 2010). Visual loss affects central vision with colour perception defects and temporal optic disc atrophy because of early involvement of the papillomacular bundle. The natural history of dominant optic atrophy is a relentless and slowly progressive visual loss, which may stabilize usually without spontaneous recovery of vision (Kjer, 1959; Votruba et al., 1998; Carelli et al., 2004; Yu-Wai-Man et al., 2011). A subgroup of patients presents a multi-system disease, defined as dominant optic atrophy ‘plus’, involving the central and peripheral nervous system and skeletal muscle (Yu-Wai-Man et al., 2010).

We previously documented that OPA1 mutations leading to haploinsufficiency induce defective complex I-driven ATP synthesis (Zanna et al., 2008), suggesting a common pathogenic mechanism with Leber’s hereditary optic neuropathy, a mitochondrial optic neuropathy due to mutations in mitochondrial DNA-encoded complex I subunits (Carelli et al., 2009). Thus, we prospectively enrolled and treated with idebenone (Mnesis, Takeda Italia, 45 mg capsules) seven consecutive patients with dominant optic atrophy with OPA1 haploinsufficiency mutations, under the off-label regulations in Italy (Table 1). For this pilot study, we obtained the informed consent of the patients and the approval of the internal review board at the University of Bologna. Daily dosage was
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Table 1 Demographic and genetic data of patients treated with idebenone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Idebenone dosage (mg/day)</th>
<th>OPA1 mutations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>c.984 + 3 A&gt;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>c.2708_11delTTAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>c.2815 delC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>c.112_129del18 + c.992 T&gt;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>c.2708_11delTTAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>c.2708_11delTTAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>c.2708_11delTTAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Ophtalmological data of dominant optic atrophy patients at baseline and after treatment with idebenone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Subjective recovery</th>
<th>Visual acuity</th>
<th>Colour vision</th>
<th>Visual field threshold (MD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>First follow-up</td>
<td>Second follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OD</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>(7.4 ± 1.1 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD = mean deviation; OD = right eye; OS = left eye.

270 mg in children, and ranged between 540 and 675 mg in adults. One patient received 1000 mg/day of a different brand (Idebenone Smart Powders, 500 mg capsules). Patients were treated and followed for at least 1 year.

All patients underwent ophthalmological examination, including visual acuity measurement (in decimals), Humphrey quantitative visual field testing, colour test (by Ishihara plates) and retinal nerve fibre layer thickness and optic disc area measurements by optical coherence tomography, as previously reported (Savini et al., 2010, 2012). Patients were examined at baseline, at ~7 months (mean ± standard deviation: 7.4 ± 4.1 months) and after at least 1 year (mean ± standard deviation: 16.4 ± 4.3 months) from start of idebenone treatment. Visual acuity before baseline was retrospectively retrieved from clinical charts.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed a normal distribution of the data. Repeated-measures ANOVA, along with Tukey-Kramer multiple comparisons test, was used for baseline and post-treatment measurements comparison. Statistical significance was assumed for P-value < 0.05.

Demographic and genetic data are summarized in Table 1, whereas clinical results on therapeutic follow-up are shown in Table 2. Overall, mean visual acuity ± standard deviation) improved in both eyes at the last evaluation compared with baseline. In OD (right eye), visual acuity increased from 0.22 ± 0.16 to 0.29 ± 0.19 at the first follow-up and to 0.31 ± 0.21 at the second follow-up (ANOVA, P = 0.034), with a statistically significant difference (P < 0.05) only between baseline and the second follow-up. In OS (left eye), visual acuity increased from 0.23 ± 0.19 to 0.28 ± 0.21 at the first follow-up and 0.28 ± 0.21 at the second follow-up (ANOVA, P = 0.014), with a statistically significant difference (P < 0.05) between baseline and both follow-up.

Five patients (mean age: 23 ± 15 years) reported bilateral subjective improvement of visual function. A gain in visual acuity was measured bilaterally in four of these five patients, whereas Patient 3 showed only improvement in colour discrimination (Table 2). All five patients showed improvement of the Humphrey quantitative visual field mean defect (Table 2 and Fig. 1), although this was statistically significant only in the left eye. The mean defect improved in the right eye from −3.9 ± 2.1 to −2.8 ± 1.3 dB at the second follow-up (P = 0.087) and in the left eye from −4.5 ± 1.3 to −3.1 ± 1.9 dB (P = 0.010). The other two patients (mean age: 42 ± 1 years) did not report any subjective improvement, but objective measurements showed improvement of some visual functions, such as visual field in Patient 1, and visual acuity and colour discrimination in Patient 2.

According to the clinical charts all patients had a childhood onset of visual impairment. However, a more precise temporal definition of onset was difficult. Visual acuity before baseline had progressively declined in the five patients who experienced visual improvement with therapy: from 0.4 ± 0.18 to 0.29 ± 0.14 in the right eye and from 0.42 ± 0.18 to 0.29 ± 0.19 in the left eye (mean interval of time between measurement and baseline: 2.4 ± 0.9 years). The two patients without visual improvement had no visual acuity decline before baseline, possibly because their visual acuity loss had been already severe since infancy.
Figure 1  Full threshold visual fields (greyscale and total deviation) and visual acuity of the seven patients, described in Tables 1 and 2, before and after 1 year of therapy.
Mean retinal nerve fibre layer thickness did not change from baseline (right eye: 62.2 ± 4.5 μm) to last examination (63.3 ± 6.0 μm, P > 0.05). The baseline retinal nerve fibre layer thickness was lower in patients that did not recover (58.0 ± 9.9 in right eye and 60.5 ± 6.4 in left eye) compared with those who recovered visual functions (65.2 ± 5.3 in right eye and 65.4 ± 6.5 in left eye). Moreover, optic nerve head analysis showed that the optic disc area was larger in patients who recovered vision (1.9 ± 0.4 in right eye and 1.8 ± 0.2 in left eye versus 1.5 ± 0.1 in right eye and 1.6 ± 0.1 in left eye).

This pilot open trial on patients with OPA1-mutant dominant optic atrophy documents, for the first time, the occurrence of some improvement of visual function after idebenone treatment. We observed improvement of colour vision, shrinkage of the central scotoma at Humphrey quantitative visual field and increase of visual acuity in five of seven idebenone-treated patients. Older patients with worst baseline visual acuity and Humphrey quantitative visual field, associated with thinner retinal nerve fibre layer and smaller optic disc, failed to achieve visual improvement with therapy. The improvement of visual function occurred after at least 6 months of idebenone administration and, in two cases, was further consolidated after 1 year of therapy. Three of the four patients carrying the recurrent c.2708_11delTTAG microdeletion displayed the best recovery of visual function among the seven treated. The fourth patient, carrying the same mutation, did not subjectively perceive any change in his vision, but showed small improvement of visual acuity and colour vision.

Idebenone was recently shown to ameliorate visual function in patients with Leber’s hereditary optic neuropathy (Carelli et al., 2011; Klopstock et al., 2011), promoting recovery of visual acuity after the profound loss of central vision that follows the acute phase. Idebenone is a benzoquinone that directly transfers electrons to complex III, bypassing complex I (Geromel et al., 2002; Haefeli et al., 2011). Idebenone also has anti-oxidant properties (Geromel et al., 2002), which may correct increased production of reactive oxygen species, a well-established consequence of complex I dysfunction (Carelli et al., 2004, 2009). Studies on a model of OPA1-mutant Drosophila showed increased production of reactive oxygen species and partial rescue of the clinical phenotype by treatment with anti-oxidants, further supporting the use of idebenone in patients with OPA1-mutant dominant optic atrophy (Yarosh et al., 2008).

Albeit encouraging, this study has limitations. First, the cohort of patients is small. Second, idebenone was given at different dosages. Third, improvement of visual functions was based on intra-individual comparisons between baseline and ~1 year follow-up, rather than being compared with an untreated group. However, the clinical history of dominant optic atrophy in our patients, before idebenone treatment, showed a mean visual acuity decline in five cases and no progression in the two most severe cases, demonstrating the absence of spontaneous visual recovery in these patients. To the best of our knowledge, only one reported patient, with a unique OPA1 mutation affecting exon 5b and a subacute Leber’s hereditary optic neuropathy-like optic neuropathy, experienced recovery of visual function (Cornille et al., 2008). In a recently reported large case series of Australian patients with dominant optic atrophy, a few of them apparently presented some visual improvement (Cohn et al., 2008). The authors of this study cast doubt that this could merely reflect the limits of retrospective collection of patients.

In conclusion, although preliminary, the results of this study are encouraging, documenting some improvement of visual function in patients with dominant optic atrophy after idebenone therapy. Double-blind, placebo-controlled and randomized trial with idebenone in dominant optic atrophy will be necessary to consolidate these results.
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