

## **UC Davis**

### **UC Davis Previously Published Works**

#### **Title**

How clinical trials of myasthenia gravis can inform pre-clinical drug development

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5rv9960j>

#### **Authors**

Punga, Anna Rostedt

Kaminski, Henry J

Richman, David P

et al.

#### **Publication Date**

2015-08-01

#### **DOI**

10.1016/j.expneurol.2014.12.022

Peer reviewed



# HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

*Exp Neurol.* Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 August 01.

Published in final edited form as:

*Exp Neurol.* 2015 August ; 270: 78–81. doi:10.1016/j.expneurol.2014.12.022.

## How Clinical Trials of Myasthenia Gravis Can Inform Pre-Clinical Drug Development

Anna Rostedt Punga, MD, PhD<sup>a</sup>, Henry J. Kaminski, MD<sup>b</sup>, David P. Richman, MD<sup>c</sup>, and Michael Benatar, MBChB, DPhil<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institute of Neuroscience, Department of Clinical Neurophysiology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

<sup>b</sup>Department of Neurology, George Washington University, Washington DC, USA

<sup>c</sup>Department of Neurology, University of California Davis School of Medicine, Davis, CA, USA

<sup>d</sup>Department of Neurology, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, FL, USA

### Abstract

Pre-clinical evaluations often provide the rationale for therapeutic assessments in humans; however, in many diseases an agent found successful in animal models does not show efficacy in human subjects. Our contention is that the approach of rigorous, clinical trials can be used to inform how preclinical assessments should be performed. Clinical trials in humans are carefully designed investigations executed with consideration of critical methodological issues, such as pre-specified entrance criteria and validated, outcome measures coupled with power analysis to identify sample size. Blinding of evaluators of subjective measures and randomization of subjects are also critical aspects of trial performance. Investigative agents are also tested in subjects with active disease, rather than prior to disease induction as in some pre-clinical assessments. Application of standard procedures, including uniform reporting standards, would likely assist in reproducibility of pre-clinical experiments. Adapting methods of clinical trial performance will likely improve the success rate of therapeutics to ultimately achieve human use.

### Keywords

myasthenia gravis; clinical trials; therapeutic development; preclinical assessment; animal models

### Introduction

The armamentarium of immune suppressive agents used in the treatment of autoimmune myasthenia gravis (MG) has largely emanated from the transplant literature and experience

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Address correspondence to Henry J. Kaminski, MD Department of Neurology, George Washington University, 2150 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington DC 200037, HKaminski@mfa.gwu.edu.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

with the use of these drugs in the treatment of other autoimmune disorders.(Sieb, 2014) At first glance, this may seem surprising given that most common antigenic targets of the autoimmune response in MG are well known and the availability of a well-studied animal models of MG either experimental autoimmune myasthenia gravis (EAMG) produced by immunization with the acetylcholine receptor (AChR) or muscle specific tyrosine kinase (MuSK) or passive transfer of autoantibody (PTMG).(Baggi, et al., 2012, Berrih-Aknin and Le Panse, 2014) With the exception of the C5 complement inhibitor eculizumab (Howard, et al., 2013), which was originally found to be effective in PTMG rat,(Zhou, et al., 2007) none of the therapies currently used for treatment of MG emerged from pre-clinical work in animal models. Upon closer inspection, however, it is clear that there are limitations to EAMG as a tool for pre-clinical assessment of potential therapeutic agents, and these issues will be discussed in greater detail elsewhere in this special issue. Here we focus on how experience from clinical trials in patients with MG might be used to enhance the utility of the EAMG rodent models for pre-clinical evaluation of therapeutics prior to their advancement into human clinical trials.

## Trial Design

Human clinical trials are carefully designed experiments with significant attention to important methodological issues. For example, eligibility criteria are defined in order to yield an appropriate study population; treatment allocation is randomly assigned; primary and secondary outcome measures and endpoints are pre-specified; outcomes are assessed by an evaluator blinded to treatment assignment; and due consideration is given to the sample size needed to demonstrate the minimal clinically important difference in outcome in order to ensure that the trial has adequate power to detect the treatment effect of interest. The rigor of pre-clinical therapeutic studies in EAMG rodent models would benefit from attention to these methodological issues.

## Eligibility Criteria

Because human MG has clinical and pathophysiological heterogeneity that is influenced by age and gender.(Berrih-Aknin, et al., 2014) clinical trials for MG typically restrict enrollment to individuals in a specified age range, although, generally, they are open to both sexes. Animal investigations typically utilize rodents that are in early adulthood and utilize only one sex. Two year old rats have been found to be resistant to development of weakness produced by active immunization with AChR.(Hoedemaekers, et al., 1997). Old, female rats demonstrated greater loss of AChR than male counterparts but still did not show weakness compared to young rats. The effects appear to result from the properties of the neuromuscular junction rather than age-related changes of the immune system. To align the preclinical studies to those in MG the National Institutes of Health, has recommended that preclinical studies be carried out in animals of both sexes (Clayton and Collins, 2014).

Eligibility criteria for human MG clinical trials typically exclude patients with purely ocular disease as well as those with impending or actual myasthenic crisis, and require that patients have some minimal degree of weakness (e.g. Quantitative MG score of at least 12 points). A similar approach might be adopted in the rodent models, requiring that immunized animals develop some minimal degree of weakness (e.g. grade II). It may be far more difficult, for

example, to demonstrate a clinical effect in terms of improved strength, in animals that do not have at least grade II weakness prior to administration of the potential therapeutic agent.

### **Randomization**

The principal goal of randomization is to control for potential confounding factors. Some might argue that the potential for confounding factors is low given that the animals used all have the same genetic background, are all housed in the same animal facilities and are exposed to the same environmental factors, thereby mitigating the need for randomization. Experience from the animal model literature in other diseases, however, provides strong evidence for the presence of confounders (e.g. gender, litter effects, gene copy number in genetic models of disease),(Scott, et al., 2008) and supports the contention that treatment allocation should always be randomized.(Benatar, 2007)

### **Blinded Assessment of Outcome**

Clinical trials routinely incorporate procedures to ensure that the evaluator responsible for assessing outcome is blinded to treatment allocation. The absence of blinding, especially for outcome measures that include a subjective component, introduces the potential for bias. While the potential for bias similarly exists in pre-clinical therapeutic studies, much less attention has historically been paid to the importance of blinding. However, it can be argued that investigators and laboratory personnel will have similar potential for having a priori expectations for certain results, and therefore blinded assessments should be performed for any potentially subjective outcome measures.

### **Sample Size, Power and Reproducibility**

Sample size calculation is an essential ingredient to ensure that clinical trials are adequately powered. Estimating sample size is predicated upon specification of the primary outcome measure and determination of the minimal clinically important difference that would be interpreted as evidence of a therapeutic effect. Such considerations are uncommon in pre-clinical therapeutic studies, with rationalizations, such as cost considerations, used to justify underpowered studies. Recognition of the potential for false positive and false negative results in small studies should serve as a rallying cry to ensure that pre-clinical therapeutic studies are adequately powered. Statistical methods should be appropriate to the data being analyzed and caution should be taken to avoid interim analyses that have not been pre-specified. Every effort should be made to publish both positive and negative results so that publication bias does not skew our collective perspective on the potential utility of putative therapies. In the same way that federal regulations require pre-registration of human therapeutic studies (e.g. on [clinicaltrials.gov](http://clinicaltrials.gov)) and journal editors refuse to publish unregistered trials, a similar approach (e.g. [preclinicaltrials.gov](http://preclinicaltrials.gov)) might help to minimize the potential for publication bias. Lastly, positive pre-clinical studies should be reproduced by independent investigators, especially given the demonstrated variability of animal experiments among laboratories.(Landis, et al., 2012)

## Timing of Therapeutic Intervention

Unlike MG in humans, which appears to arise spontaneously, EAMG requires induction either via passive administration of antibody from MG patients or rodents with EAMG, or via active immunization with antigen (AChR or MuSK), usually in combination with adjuvant. Canine MG does mimic human MG in that it arises spontaneously, but its use as a preclinical therapeutic model has been limited by the 90 percent remission rate in untreated dogs (Shelton and Lindstrom, 2001).

Depending on the animal species, EAMG may require single dose (rats) or repeated immunization (mice). (Baggi, et al., 2012, Christadoss, et al., 2000) In the animal models, therefore, the question arises of when to initiate treatment. Historically, many studies have initiated therapy following immunization but prior to the emergence of clinical disease. This approach more closely reflects disease prevention than treatment of established disease, and does not mirror the clinical context, in which it is not possible to initiate treatment prior to the onset of MG. Therapeutic efficacy in the pre-clinical model, therefore, is perhaps more likely to translate into human efficacy if investigative drugs are administered to animals with EAMG after the appearance of clinical manifestations of disease.

## Outcome Measures and Biomarkers

MG clinical trials have historically relied upon measures of muscle strength and fatigue such as the Quantitative Myasthenia Gravis (QMG) scale. (Jaretzki, et al., 2000) More recently, however, with the growing awareness of the fluctuating nature of myasthenic manifestations and increasing emphasis on patient reported outcome measures, there has been a shift towards using outcome measures such as the MG Quality of Life-15, the MG-Composite and the MG Activities of Daily Living scales that incorporate, or rely entirely, upon patient self-report. (Benatar, et al., 2012, Wolfe, et al., 2008) Importantly, such outcome measures are not feasible for use in pre-clinical animal therapeutic studies, which instead typically rely upon grades of disease severity for measuring outcome and response to treatment. Some laboratories utilize quantitative assessments, such as force transducers to assess forelimb grip strength or hang time measures, which determine the time a mouse can hang suspended from a cage lid (Karachunski, et al., 1995, Kusner, et al., 2014). Such quantitative measures mimic aspects of the quantitative MG score. Monitoring of animal weight, as an outcome measure is used in EAMG, but is compromised by the potential for a lack of disease specificity. Animal models have the distinct advantage of access to muscle and lymphoid organs for comprehensive analysis, which can provide objective and quantitative signals of efficacy of an intervention. The disparity between outcomes used in pre-clinical studies and human therapeutic trials may adversely impact how well therapeutic efficacy in pre-clinical studies translates into positive human trial outcomes and effective treatments for patients with MG.

While it may remain challenging to harmonize the outcome measures used in pre-clinical studies with those used in human clinical trials, the potential exists to develop biomarkers of disease progression or disease severity that might be shared across the spectrum of pre-clinical and clinical therapeutic development. (Kaminski, et al., 2012, Lassere, 2008, Lathia,

2002) While antibody titers against the AChR, MuSK and other neuromuscular junction antigenic targets serve a useful role as diagnostic biomarkers they have not found application as markers of disease progression or in monitoring response to treatment. Electrophysiological parameters, such as increased jitter on single fiber electromyography, similarly have a role in aiding diagnosis, but the limited availability of the necessary expertise has rendered outcome measures such as these impractical for use in multi-center clinical trials. There is, therefore, an urgent need for biomarkers of disease progression as well as pharmacodynamic biomarkers that might better support therapeutic development in both the pre-clinical and clinical arenas.(Benatar, et al., 2012)

## Pre-Clinical Model Validation

The availability of several drugs that have proven efficacy in humans with MG may provide an opportunity to validate pre-clinical models for their predictive therapeutic value. This could be accomplished through an evaluation of existing drugs in pre-clinical models. A lack of efficacy of these drugs in a pre-clinical model would call into question the value of such models for evaluating novel therapeutics. By contrast, demonstrating that these drugs are effective in a pre-clinical model would lend support to the approach of using that model for testing new drugs.

There are, however, a number of noteworthy caveats relevant to the validation of pre-clinical models and the use of EAMG and PTMG as determinants of go/no-go decisions for further clinical development of any therapeutic. First, rodent and human immune systems differ and therefore, clear appreciation of the drug target and its engagement in humans versus mice and rats must be considered. If the mechanism of action of a drug is such that it targets a component of the human immune system that is not shared with rodents, then efficacy in the human may not be a useful tool for validating the pre-clinical model.

Other issues to consider include the pharmacodynamic properties and toxicity of a therapeutic, which are likely to differ between rodents and humans. This in turn may make it appear that an agent lacks efficacy in a preclinical model because of rapid clearance, poor absorption, a large volume of distribution, or adverse effects. Further, immunosuppressive agents have time to efficacy of months to over a year. Given that rodents' lifespans differ profoundly from humans, efficacy evaluations may not be possible. Investigators need to consider these points in utilizing effective human therapeutics to validate pre-clinical models. Equally important, each of these differences between rodents and humans should be carefully considered in deciding whether an experimental therapeutic should be tested in rodents and the implications of the results – positive or negative – for translation into human studies.

## Implications of Disease Heterogeneity for Pre-Clinical Model Development

The heterogeneity of MG calls for a diversity of pre-clinical models. An extreme example is the distinction between AChR antibody and MuSK antibody positive MG. There would be little biological basis, for example, in testing a novel therapeutic in an animal model based on immunization with the AChR if the intended human MG population were patients with MuSK myasthenia. More challenging, however, is whether ocular MG, for example, might

require a pre-clinical model that specifically models extraocular muscle pathology rather than generalized MG. Even within the realm of more homogeneous patient populations, however, there would be value in having available an array of pre-clinical models relevant to the patient population of interest. Demonstrating therapeutic efficacy in more than one pre-clinical model would provide greater confidence that the pharmacological agent would likely be of therapeutic value to patients with MG.

## Uniform Reporting Requirements

The focus of NINDS recommendations for preclinical research standards emphasized uniform reporting of experimental methods and results.(Landis, et al., 2012) This expectation aligns with what has become standard for clinical trials in the last decade with the expectation of compliance with the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guidelines, which had as its genesis the great variation in how human therapeutic trials were documented in publications.(CONSORT., Accessed September 30, 2014) The reporting consists of a 25-item checklist and a diagram that illustrates the progression of each individual through a clinical trial. For animal experiments that have an expectation to move a therapeutic agent towards human trials, similar standards should be developed. Within this context, common data element development should be considered for further consistency of reporting.

## Conclusion

Future pre-clinical therapeutic studies in the PTMG or EAMG rodent models would greatly benefit from deeper attention to study design with the goal of closer resemblance to the rigor of human clinical trials. Due to the fluctuating nature of myasthenic symptoms and heterogeneous disease subtypes, the optimal goal is to develop more specific models, outcome measures and biomarkers that take these clinical features into account also in the pre-clinical setting.

## Acknowledgments

The work arises from a workshop sponsored by the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and the Myasthenia Gravis Foundation of America held in Rockville, MD on September 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 2014 dedicated to development of Standards for Preclinical Efficacy Evaluations for Myasthenia Gravis. The authors appreciate the efforts of the sponsors and Linda L. Kusner in organizing the conference.

## ABBREVIATIONS

<b>MG</b>	myasthenia gravis
<b>AChR</b>	acetylcholine receptor
<b>MuSK</b>	muscle specific kinase
<b>EAMG</b>	experimentally acquired myasthenia gravis
<b>PTMG</b>	passive transfer myasthenia gravis

## References

- Baggi F, Antozzi C, Toscani C, Cordiglieri C. Acetylcholine receptor-induced experimental myasthenia gravis: what have we learned from animal models after three decades? *Arch Immunol Ther Exp (Warsz)*. 2012; 60:19–30. [PubMed: 22159475]
- Benatar M. Lost in translation: treatment trials in the SOD1 mouse and in human ALS. *Neurobiol Dis*. 2007; 26:1–13. [PubMed: 17300945]
- Benatar M, Sanders DB, Burns TM, Cutter GR, Guptill JT, Baggi F, Kaminski HJ, Mantegazza R, Meriggioli MN, Quan J, Wolfe GI. The Task Force On MG Study Design Of The Medical Scientific Advisory Board Of The Myasthenia Gravis Foundation Of A. Recommendations for myasthenia gravis clinical trials. *Muscle Nerve*. 2012; 45:909–917. [PubMed: 22581550]
- Berrih-Aknin S, Frenkian-Cuvelier M, Eymard B. Diagnostic and clinical classification of autoimmune myasthenia gravis. *J Autoimmun*. 2014; 48–49:143–148.
- Berrih-Aknin S, Le Panse R. Myasthenia gravis: A comprehensive review of immune dysregulation and etiological mechanisms. *J Autoimmun*. 2014; 52C:90–100. [PubMed: 24389034]
- Christadoss P, Poussin M, Deng C. Animal models of myasthenia gravis. *Clin Immunol*. 2000; 94:75–87. [PubMed: 10637092]
- Clayton JA, Collins FS. Policy: NIH to balance sex in cell and animal studies. *Nature*. 2014; 509:282–283. [PubMed: 24834516]
- CONSORT. Transparent Reporting of Trials.
- Hoedemaekers A, Graus Y, Van Breda Vreismann P, De Baets M. Age- and sex-related resistance to chronic experimental autoimmune myasthenia gravis (EAMG) in Brown Norway rats. *Clin Exp Immunol*. 1997; 107:189–197. [PubMed: 9010275]
- Howard JF Jr, Barohn RJ, Cutter GR, Freimer M, Juel VC, Mozaffar T, Mellion ML, Benatar MG, Farrugia ME, Wang JJ, Malhotra SS, Kissel JT. Group, MG Study Group. A Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled Phase II study of eculizumab in patients with refractory generalized myasthenia gravis. *Muscle Nerve*. 2013; 48:76–84. [PubMed: 23512355]
- Jaretzki A 3rd, Barohn RJ, Ernstoff RM, Kaminski HJ, Keesey JC, Penn AS, Sanders DB. Myasthenia gravis: recommendations for clinical research standards. Task Force of the Medical Scientific Advisory Board of the Myasthenia Gravis Foundation of America. *Neurology*. 2000; 55:16–23. [PubMed: 10891897]
- Kaminski HJ, Kusner LL, Wolfe GI, Aban I, Minisman G, Conwit R, Cutter G. Biomarker development for myasthenia gravis. *Ann NY Acad Sci*. 2012; 1275:101–106. [PubMed: 23278584]
- Karachunski PI, Ostlie N, Bellone M, Infante AJ, Conti-Fine BM. Mechanisms by which the I-ABM12 mutation influences susceptibility to experimental myasthenia gravis: a study in homozygous and heterozygous mice. *Scand J Immunol*. 1995; 42:215–225. [PubMed: 7631155]
- Kusner LL, Ciesielski MJ, Marx A, Kaminski HJ, Fenstermaker RA. Survivin as a potential mediator to support autoreactive cell survival in myasthenia gravis: a human and animal model study. *PLoS one*. 2014; 9:e102231. [PubMed: 25050620]
- Landis SC, Amara SG, Asadullah K, Austin CP, Blumenstein R, Bradley EW, Crystal RG, Darnell RB, Ferrante RJ, Fillit H, Finkelstein R, Fisher M, Gendelman HE, Golub RM, Goudreau JL, Gross RA, Gubitza AK, Hesterlee SE, Howells DW, Huguenard J, Kelner K, Koroshetz W, Krainc D, Lazic SE, Levine MS, Macleod MR, McCall JM, Moxley RT 3rd, Narasimhan K, Noble LJ, Perrin S, Porter JD, Steward O, Unger E, Utz U, Silberberg SD. A call for transparent reporting to optimize the predictive value of preclinical research. *Nature*. 2012; 490:187–191. [PubMed: 23060188]
- Lassere MN. The Biomarker-Surrogacy Evaluation Schema: a review of the biomarker-surrogate literature and a proposal for a criterion-based, quantitative, multidimensional hierarchical levels of evidence schema for evaluating the status of biomarkers as surrogate endpoints. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2008; 17:303–340. [PubMed: 17925313]
- Lathia CD. Biomarkers and surrogate endpoints: how and when might they impact drug development? *Dis Markers*. 2002; 18:83–90. [PubMed: 12364814]



- Scott S, Kranz JE, Cole J, Lincecum JM, Thompson K, Kelly N, Bostrom A, Theodoss J, Al-Nakhala BM, Vieira FG, Ramasubbu J, Heywood JA. Design, power, and interpretation of studies in the standard murine model of ALS. *Amyotroph Lat Scler*. 2008; 9:4–15.
- Shelton GD, Lindstrom JM. Spontaneous remission in canine myasthenia gravis: implications for assessing human MG therapies. *Neurology*. 2001; 57:2139–2141. [PubMed: 11739846]
- Sieb JP. Myasthenia gravis: an update for the clinician. *Clin Experiment Immunol*. 2014; 175:408–418.
- Wolfe GI, Barohn RJ, Sanders DB, McDermott MP. Muscle Study G. Comparison of outcome measures from a trial of mycophenolate mofetil in myasthenia gravis. *Muscle Nerve*. 2008; 38:1429–1433. [PubMed: 18949779]
- Zhou Y, Gong B, Lin F, Rother RP, Medof ME, Kaminski HJ. Anti-C5 antibody treatment ameliorates weakness in experimentally acquired myasthenia gravis. *Journal of immunology*. 2007; 179:8562–8567.

### Highlights

- Preclinical evaluations should mimic human trials with pre-established inclusion and exclusion criteria, blinding, and randomization
- Biomarker discovery would benefit by linkage of human trials and experimental animal models
- Validation of animal models could be performed by testing existing human therapies.
- Uniform reporting guidelines are needed for investigators to consistently describe experimental procedures and results

**Table 1****Recommendations for Preclinical Assessment based on Human Studies**

- 
- Inclusion of males and females
  - Power calculations to ensure adequacy of sample size
  - Use of appropriate statistical methods; avoid unplanned interim analyses
  - Treatment initiation after the appearance of clinical disease
  - Assessment of the influence of age on therapeutic response
  - Improvement by 2 weakness grades
  - Randomized allocation to treatment groups
  - Blinded assessments of all outcome measures
  - Use of quantitative (i.e. more objective) outcome measures
  - Biomarker development for preclinical and clinical trials
  - Replication of positive pre-clinical findings in a second (independent) laboratory
  - Preclinical model validation using therapies known to be effective in human MG
- 

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript