Parkinson's Disease:

Diagnostic Criteria, Clinical Trial Challenges, and Therapeutic Innovations

NGENŪ CRO

Introduction

Parkinson's Disease (PD) is a progressive neurodegenerative disorder that affects dopamine-producing neurons in the substantia nigra, a region of the brain responsible for movement control.

First identified by Dr. James Parkinson in 1817, Parkinson's Disease manifests primarily through motor symptoms such as tremors, rigidity, bradykinesia, and postural instability. Additionally, PD patients often experience non-motor symptoms, including cognitive decline, mood disorders, sleep disturbances, and autonomic dysfunction.

The understanding of PD has evolved since its first description by James Parkinson. Initially termed "shaking palsy," early medical approaches were limited to symptomatic treatment with little understanding of the underlying pathology. The mid-20th century brought significant advancements with the discovery of dopamine's role in PD, leading to the development of dopamine replacement therapies such as Levodopa. Subsequent research identified Lewy bodies—abnormal aggregates of protein that develop inside nerve cells—as a hallmark of PD pathology. Genetic research has further uncovered several gene mutations associated with familial forms of PD, enhancing our understanding of its etiology.

iNGENŪ CRO

Book a Discovery Call to learn how iNGENū can deliver high-quality, cost-efficient, FDA-compliant research for your next clinical trial

Why Choose iNGENū CRO?

iNGENū is the FDA-centric Australian CRO championing disruptive, innovative biotech firms. We are physician-led, providing access to the full spectrum of clinical and non-clinical research services.

Local Trials, Global Approvals

Australian expertise combined with direct FDA submission capabilities, offering a streamlined path for global approval.

Disciplined, Cost-Efficient Execution

Every dollar is strategically allocated, eliminating unnecessary costs while maintaining the highest quality.

Australian Headquartered, Asia-Pacific Reach

Access high-quality trials in the Asia-Pacific region, enhancing speed and scalability.

Expertise From the Start

Engage directly with our team of highly qualified doctors and PhD scientists from the outset.

Ready to discuss your Clinical Trial?
For further information on how iNGENū can assist you to conduct your clinical trial, book a Discovery Call with one of our Advisors.

Evolution of Understanding

Historical Perspectives

The understanding of Parkinson's Disease has evolved since its first description by James Parkinson. Initially termed "shaking palsy," early medical approaches were limited to symptomatic treatment with little understanding of the underlying pathology.

The mid-20th century brought significant advancements with the discovery of dopamine's role in Parkinson's Disease, leading to the development of dopamine replacement therapies such as Levodopa.

Subsequent research identified Lewy bodies — abnormal aggregates of protein that develop inside nerve cells — as a hallmark of PD pathology.

Genetic research has further uncovered several gene mutations associated with familial forms of PD, enhancing our understanding of its etiology.

Contributing Factors

Biological Factors

- The primary biological factor in PD is the degeneration of dopaminergic neurons in the substantia nigra. Genetic mutations such as LRRK2, PARK7, PINK1, and SNCA have been implicated in the disease, particularly in familial cases. Age is a significant risk factor, with incidence increasing markedly after the age of 60.

Psychological Factors

- The chronic nature of PD and its impact on daily functioning can lead to psychological challenges, including depression, anxiety, and cognitive decline. These symptoms can exacerbate the disease's overall burden, affecting both patients and caregivers.

Environmental Factors

- Environmental influences such as exposure to pesticides, heavy metals, and head trauma have been associated with an increased risk of developing PD. Rural living, with higher exposure to agricultural chemicals, is another environmental risk factor.

Prevalence, Trends, and Market Analysis

Prevalence Statistics

Parkinson's Disease affects approximately 1 million individuals in the United States. The prevalence of PD has been steadily increasing, driven in part by the aging population.

From 2013 to 2023, the prevalence of PD has shown an upward trend, with a significant rise in diagnosed cases. This trend is expected to continue, with projections suggesting a 20% increase in PD cases over the next decade.

According to the Parkinson's Foundation, by 2030, nearly 1.2 million Americans are projected to be living with PD, highlighting the growing burden of the disease on healthcare systems and society at large.

Market for Treatment

The global Parkinson's disease treatment market was valued at USD 4.28 billion in 2021 and is projected to grow at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 12.1% from 2022 to 2030, driven by an increasing geriatric population at high risk of PD, the significant burden of PD in Western countries, and a robust pipeline of disease-modifying therapies.

In 2020, approximately 9.4 million people worldwide had PD, with prevalence rates increasing with age, affecting around 1% of those over 60 and 5% of those over 85. The aging global population, projected to include over 1.5 billion individuals aged 80 and above by 2050, further fuels market growth.

Ongoing research and development are leading to the introduction of novel therapies and drug formulations that aim to provide better symptom control and improve patients' quality of life. Key pharmaceutical developments include NeuroDerm's ND0612 and Luye Pharma Group's LY03003, addressing moderate-to-severe PD. The high treatment costs, averaging USD 10,043 to USD 12,491 annually per patient in the U.S., are mitigated by favorable healthcare policies and reimbursement in developed countries. Additionally, the introduction of new drugs like Nuplazid (pimavanserin), which addresses psychosis associated with PD, has already started to reshape the treatment landscape.

Key Drugs for Parkinson's Disease with Highest Earning Potential

Although there is some overlap with the most commonly prescribed FDA-approved drugs, focusing on earning potential provides insights into economic performance and strategic market positioning.

1. Levodopa

- Levodopa remains the cornerstone of Parkinson's disease treatment, with an estimated annual revenue of $1.2 billion in 2023. Marketed under various brand names and by multiple manufacturers, it is the most widely prescribed medication for PD. Levodopa is a dopamine precursor that crosses the blood-brain barrier and is converted to dopamine. Levodopa's market share continues to dominate due to its unmatched efficacy in symptom control, though ongoing research aims to develop formulations that reduce side effects and improve patient adherence.

2. Pramipexole

- Sold under brand names like Mirapex by Boehringer Ingelheim, Pramipexole generated approximately $0.8 billion in revenue in 2023. As a dopamine agonist, pramipexole mimics dopamine's effects in the brain, making it a crucial therapy for PD. Its market share is significant due to its effectiveness in reducing motor fluctuations and improving overall motor function. The projected market for pramipexole is expected to grow as new extended-release formulations enhance patient convenience and adherence, and as the aging population increases the demand for effective PD treatments.

3. Ropinirole

- Ropinirole, marketed by GlaxoSmithKline as Requip, generated $0.7 billion in 2023. It has been discontinued in its immediate-release and some extended-release forms due to declining demand from generic alternatives. Despite this, ropinirole remains crucial for Parkinson's disease treatment with its available extended-release options, maintaining a significant market share due to its efficacy and flexible dosing.

4. Rasagiline

- Generating $0.5 billion in revenue in 2023, Rasagiline, marketed by Teva Pharmaceuticals as Azilect, is a selective MAO-B inhibitor. Valued for its neuroprotective properties and improvement of PD symptoms, its market share is expected to grow as studies explore its potential to slow disease progression, impacting long-term treatment strategies and patient outcomes.

5. Safinamide

- Safinamide, marketed by Newron Pharmaceuticals under the brand name Xadago, had an annual revenue of $0.3 billion in 2023. As an MAO-B inhibitor with glutamate release inhibition properties, it offers a unique treatment option for Parkinson's disease. Although it currently has a smaller market share, its adoption is expected to grow as it provides an alternative for patients with inadequate symptom control or side effects from other medications.

Therapeutic Claims for Parkinson's Disease

1. Symptomatic Relief of Motor Symptoms
2. Reduction of Motor Complications
3. Management of Non-Motor Symptoms
4. Potential Disease Modification
5. Improvement in Quality of Life
6. Specific Symptom Management:

- **Parkinson's Tremor**
- **Parkinson's Stiffness (Rigidity)**
- **Parkinson's Dementia**
- **Parkinson's Agitation**

Specific Symptom Management: Parkinson's Tremor

Levodopa

- **Claim:** Reduces tremor effectively in PD patients.
- **Mechanism:** Levodopa is a precursor to dopamine, a neurotransmitter that is significantly reduced in Parkinson's Disease. When administered, Levodopa crosses the blood-brain barrier and is converted into dopamine. This increase in dopamine levels helps replenish the diminished neurotransmitter, thus improving motor control and significantly reducing tremors.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Reduction in tremor severity as measured by the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) Part III.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Improvement in overall motor function, quality of life assessments using PDQ-39, and reduction in "off" time.

Dopamine Agonists (e.g. Pramipexole, Ropinirole)

- **Claim:** Help reduce tremor in both early and advanced stages of PD.
- **Mechanism:** Dopamine agonists mimic the effects of dopamine by directly stimulating dopamine receptors in the brain. Unlike Levodopa, they do not need to be converted into dopamine and are less likely to cause motor complications such as dyskinesias over the long term. Pramipexole and Ropinirole bind to dopamine receptors, promoting improved motor control and reducing tremor.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Decrease in tremor amplitude and frequency as assessed by UPDRS Part III.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Enhanced motor function, increased "on" time without troublesome dyskinesia, and improvements in patient-reported outcomes such as the Parkinson's Disease Questionnaire.

Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS)

- **Claim:** Significantly reduces tremor that is resistant to medication.
- **Mechanism:** DBS involves the surgical implantation of electrodes into specific areas of the brain, such as the subthalamic nucleus or the globus pallidus. These electrodes are connected to a pulse generator implanted under the skin in the chest. The device sends electrical impulses to the brain regions involved in motor control, modulating abnormal neural activity and reducing tremor.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Significant reduction in tremor severity and frequency measured by UPDRS Part III.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Improvement in motor function, reduction in medication dosage, enhanced quality of life, and assessment of adverse events and complications related to the procedure.

Anticholinergics (e.g. Trihexyphenidyl, Benztropine)

- **Claim:** Decrease tremor, particularly in younger patients.
- **Mechanism:** Anticholinergic drugs work by blocking the action of acetylcholine, a neurotransmitter that can become imbalanced in PD. In PD, there is often an overactivity of acetylcholine relative to dopamine due to the loss of dopaminergic neurons. By inhibiting acetylcholine, these drugs help restore a better balance between acetylcholine and dopamine, thereby reducing tremor.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Reduction in tremor severity (UPDRS Part III).
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Improvements in daily functioning and activities of daily living scales, assessment of cognitive side effects, and overall patient satisfaction and quality of life improvements.

Specific Symptom Management: Parkinson's Stiffness (Rigidity)

Levodopa

- **Claim:** Alleviates stiffness and rigidity in PD patients.
- **Mechanism:** Levodopa is converted to dopamine in the brain, replenishing the diminished neurotransmitter levels in patients with Parkinson's Disease. This increase in dopamine helps improve motor function, including reducing stiffness and rigidity.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Improvement in rigidity scores as measured by the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) Part III.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Overall motor function improvement, quality of life assessments (e.g., PDQ-39), and reduction in the time patients experience motor symptoms.

Muscle Relaxants (e.g., Baclofen)

- **Claim:** Provide relief from muscle stiffness and spasms.
- **Mechanism:** Baclofen acts on the central nervous system by binding to GABA-B receptors, which inhibits the release of excitatory neurotransmitters. This action reduces muscle tone and relieves muscle stiffness and spasms.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Reduction in muscle tone and spasms as measured by the Modified Ashworth Scale.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Improvement in UPDRS Part III scores, reduction in muscle-related discomfort and pain, and enhanced ability to perform daily activities.

Dopamine Agonists

- **Claim:** Reduce stiffness in early and advanced PD stages.
- **Mechanism:** Dopamine agonists directly stimulate dopamine receptors in the brain, mimicking the action of dopamine. By activating these receptors, dopamine agonists help alleviate stiffness and improve overall motor control.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Reduction in rigidity as assessed by UPDRS Part III.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Increased "on" time without troublesome dyskinesia, improvements in daily activities and quality of life (PDQ-39), and patient-reported outcomes on stiffness and mobility.

Physical Therapy

- **Claim:** Improves flexibility and reduces muscle stiffness.
- **Mechanism:** Physical therapy involves targeted exercise and stretching routines designed to enhance mobility, flexibility, and overall motor function. Techniques such as resistance training, aerobic exercises, and specific stretching regimens help reduce stiffness and improve muscle function.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Improvement in flexibility and reduction in muscle stiffness as measured by specific physical therapy assessments and UPDRS Part III.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Enhanced range of motion, improved balance and coordination, better performance in activities of daily living (ADLs), and patient-reported outcomes on physical function and quality of life.

Specific Symptom Management: Parkinson's Dementia

Cholinesterase Inhibitors (e.g., Rivastigmine)

- **Claim:** Improve cognitive function and slow cognitive decline in PD patients with dementia.
- **Mechanism:** Cholinesterase inhibitors, such as Rivastigmine, increase acetylcholine levels in the brain by inhibiting the enzyme acetylcholinesterase, which breaks down acetylcholine. This boost in acetylcholine helps improve communication between neurons, thereby enhancing cognitive function.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Improvement in cognitive function as measured by the Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive Subscale (ADAS-Cog) or the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE).
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Enhancements in daily living activities assessed by the Alzheimer's Disease Cooperative Study-Activities of Daily Living (ADCS-ADL) scale, global impression of change as measured by the Clinical Global Impression of Change (CGIC), and improved quality of life (QoL) using scales like the Parkinson's Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39).

Memantine

- **Claim:** May help improve cognitive symptoms in PD dementia.
- **Mechanism:** Memantine regulates glutamate activity, which can protect neurons from excitotoxicity—a process that damages or kills nerve cells due to excessive stimulation by neurotransmitters such as glutamate. By modulating this activity, Memantine helps to stabilize cognitive functions and slow the progression of dementia symptoms.

Memantine (cont.)

- **Primary Endpoint:** Changes in cognitive function measured by scales such as the ADAS-Cog or MMSE.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Functional improvements assessed by the ADCS-ADL scale, reduction in neuropsychiatric symptoms evaluated using the Neuropsychiatric Inventory (NPI), and overall global functioning improvements using the CGIC.

Behavioral Interventions

- **Claim:** Help manage cognitive symptoms and improve daily functioning.
- **Mechanism:** Behavioral interventions involve cognitive training and structured routines designed to support cognitive health. These interventions can include memory exercises, problem-solving tasks, and activities that promote mental engagement and social interaction. The aim is to enhance cognitive reserves and mitigate the impact of cognitive decline.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Cognitive performance improvement assessed by cognitive tests such as the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) or MMSE.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Enhancements in daily functioning evaluated using scales like the ADCS-ADL, reduction in caregiver burden measured by the Zarit Burden Interview, and improvements in patient-reported outcomes on quality of life and satisfaction.

Specific Symptom Management: Parkinson's Agitation

Antipsychotics (e.g., Quetiapine, Clozapine)

- **Claim:** Reduce agitation and psychotic symptoms in PD patients.
- **Mechanism:** Antipsychotics modulate neurotransmitter activity, particularly dopamine and serotonin. Quetiapine and Clozapine have been found effective in managing psychosis and agitation without significantly worsening motor symptoms. They work by blocking dopamine receptors (D2) and affecting serotonin receptors (5-HT2A), which helps to calm agitation and psychotic symptoms.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Reduction in agitation levels as measured by the Neuropsychiatric Inventory (NPI) agitation subscale.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Improvement in overall psychiatric symptoms measured by the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS), enhanced quality of life (PDQ-39), and assessment of adverse effects such as sedation or worsening of motor symptoms.

SSRIs and SNRIs (e.g., Sertraline, Venlafaxine)

- **Claim:** Treat underlying depression and anxiety, which can reduce agitation.
- **Mechanism:** Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs) like Sertraline and Serotonin-Norepinephrine Reuptake Inhibitors (SNRIs) like Venlafaxine increase serotonin and/or norepinephrine levels in the brain. These neurotransmitters help stabilize mood and alleviate symptoms of depression and anxiety, which can contribute to reducing agitation.

SSRIs and SNRIs (cont.)

- **Primary Endpoint:** Reduction in depression and anxiety symptoms measured by the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS) or the Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI).
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Decrease in agitation levels measured by the NPI agitation subscale, improvement in overall mood and quality of life (PDQ-39), and patient-reported outcomes on mood stabilization.

Behavioral Therapy

- **Claim:** Reduce agitation through non-pharmacological means.
- **Mechanism:** Behavioral therapy involves techniques such as environmental modifications, establishment of routines, and caregiver education. These strategies help manage agitation by creating a stable and supportive environment, reducing triggers for agitation, and teaching caregivers effective ways to respond to agitation.
- **Primary Endpoint:** Reduction in agitation levels as measured by the NPI agitation subscale.
- **Secondary Endpoints:** Improvement in caregiver burden assessed by the Zarit Burden Interview, enhanced quality of life for both patients and caregivers, and increased patient engagement in daily activities.

ICD-11 Code for Parkinson's Disease

ICD-11 Code for Parkinson's Disease: 8A00.0

The ICD-11 criteria for PD require the presence of bradykinesia, which must be accompanied by at least one of the following:

1. **Muscular rigidity**
2. **4-6 Hz resting tremor**
3. **Postural instability not caused by primary visual, vestibular, cerebellar, or proprioceptive dysfunction**

These criteria emphasize the core motor symptoms of PD, ensuring a focus on the most prominent and diagnostic features of the disease.

The cardinal manifestations of PD include:

- **Bradykinesia:** Slowness of movement, which is a primary and essential feature for diagnosis.
- **Tremor:** Typically, a resting tremor, which can be present in one or more limbs.
- **Rigidity:** Stiffness and resistance to movement in the muscles.
- **Postural Instability:** Impaired balance and coordination, often leading to falls.

These motor symptoms are accompanied by a range of non-motor manifestations that significantly impact the quality of life for individuals with PD. These include:

Non-Motor Manifestations:

- **Autonomic Dysfunction:** This can involve various bodily functions, including blood pressure regulation (leading to orthostatic hypotension), bowel and bladder control, sweating, and sexual function.
- **Neuropsychiatric Features:** These encompass a range of symptoms such as depression, anxiety, cognitive impairment, and hallucinations or psychosis.

Evolution Over Time

The diagnostic criteria for PD have evolved significantly over the years. Early descriptions by James Parkinson in 1817 focused on the observable motor symptoms, which he termed "shaking palsy." As medical science advanced, the understanding of PD's pathophysiology and symptomatology broadened. The introduction of the ICD system in the mid-20th century provided a standardized method for diagnosing and classifying diseases, including PD.

DSM-5 Code and Impact of ICD and DSM on Clinical & Research Perspectives

DSM-5 Code for Parkinson's Disease

While the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) primarily addresses psychiatric conditions, it includes criteria for diagnosing neurocognitive disorders associated with PD. Specifically, PD dementia is categorized under the DSM-5 code 331.82.

Diagnostic Criteria (DSM-5-TR):

1. **Presence of Cognitive Decline:** Evidence of significant cognitive decline from a previous level of performance in one or more cognitive domains (complex attention, executive function, learning and memory, language, perceptual-motor, or social cognition).
2. **Interference with Independence:** The cognitive deficits interfere with independence in everyday activities (e.g., requiring assistance with complex tasks such as paying bills or managing medications).
3. **Exclusion of Delirium and Other Mental Disorders:** The cognitive deficits do not occur exclusively in the context of delirium and are not better explained by another mental disorder (e.g., Major Depressive Disorder, Schizophrenia).

Impact on Clinical & Research Perspectives

Clinical Perspective:

- The refined diagnostic criteria have improved the accuracy of PD diagnosis, enabling earlier and more precise identification of the disease. This has facilitated timely intervention, optimized treatment plans, and improved patient outcomes. Clinicians are better equipped to distinguish PD from other parkinsonian syndromes and neurodegenerative disorders, reducing misdiagnosis and ensuring appropriate care for patients.

Research Perspective:

- Standardized diagnostic criteria have enhanced the quality and consistency of PD research. Researchers can more accurately identify and classify study participants, leading to more reliable and generalizable findings.

Challenges and Future Directions:

- Despite these advancements, diagnosing PD remains challenging due to the heterogeneity of symptoms and disease progression. Future revisions of the ICD and DSM may further incorporate biomarkers and neuroimaging findings to enhance diagnostic accuracy.

Epidemiology

1. Age

- Age is the most significant risk factor for PD. The prevalence of PD increases dramatically with age, particularly in individuals over 60. Studies have shown that approximately 1% of people aged 60 and above have PD, and this number rises to about 5% in those aged 85 and older. The aging global population is a major driver of the increasing prevalence of PD. With advances in healthcare leading to longer life expectancies, the number of individuals at risk for PD continues to grow.

2. Racial Group

- PD affects various racial and ethnic groups differently, with the highest prevalence observed among Caucasians. Research indicates that Caucasians are more likely to develop PD compared to African Americans and Asians. The reasons behind these racial differences are not entirely understood, but they may involve a combination of genetic, environmental, and lifestyle factors.

3. Geographic Location

- Higher rates of PD are reported in industrialized countries, particularly in North America and Europe. This may be due to better diagnostic capabilities, higher awareness of the disease, and potentially greater exposure to environmental risk factors such as industrial chemicals and pollutants. In contrast, lower prevalence rates are observed in certain Asian and African countries, although this might also be influenced by underdiagnosis and limited healthcare infrastructure.

4. Genetic Predisposition

- Genetics plays a crucial role in the development of PD, especially in familial cases where the disease appears to run in families. Several genes have been identified that are associated with an increased risk of PD. The most notable include:
  - LRRK2 (Leucine-Rich Repeat Kinase 2)
  - SNCA (Alpha-Synuclein)
  - PARK7 (DJ-1), PINK1 (PTEN-Induced Putative Kinase 1), and PARK2 (Parkin)
- Although genetic mutations account for a minority of cases, they provide valuable insights into PD's mechanisms and potential therapeutic targets. The interplay between genetic predisposition and environmental factors is an area of active research.

5. Gender Differences

- PD is more common in men than women, with a male-to-female ratio of approximately 1.5:1.
- One explanation for this gender disparity involves hormonal differences, particularly the neuroprotective effects of estrogen. Estrogen may have protective effects on dopaminergic neurons, which are affected in PD. Studies suggest that estrogen can enhance dopamine production and protect neurons.
- Additionally, men may be more exposed to environmental risk factors, such as occupational exposure to toxins, which could contribute to the higher prevalence of PD in males.

INGENŪ CRO

Pivotal Endpoints in Parkinson's Disease Clinical Trials

In the context of Parkinson's Disease, understanding and identifying pivotal endpoints is crucial for the effective assessment of treatment outcomes in clinical trials and practice.

1. Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) / MDS-UPDRS:

The UPDRS and its revised version, the MDS-UPDRS, are comprehensive tools used to measure the severity of Parkinson's symptoms. They assess motor and non-motor experiences of daily living, motor examination, and motor complications.

Challenge:

The UPDRS/MDS-UPDRS involves subjective assessments by clinicians, which can lead to variability in scoring.

2. "Off" Time Reduction:

Measures the amount of time during which PD medications are not effectively controlling symptoms.

Challenge: Patients must accurately report their "off" times, which can be challenging and inconsistent.

3. Quality of Life (QoL) Measures:

Tools like the Parkinson's Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39) assess the impact of PD and its treatment on patients' quality of life.

Challenge: QoL assessments rely on patients' subjective perceptions.

4. Non-Motor Symptoms:

Assessed using scales such as the Non-Motor Symptoms Scale (NMSS), covering sleep, autonomic function, etc.

Challenge: Non-motor symptoms vary widely among patients and can be less consistently reported.

5. Cognitive Function:

Evaluated using tools like the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) or Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE).

Challenge: Cognitive function can fluctuate due to various factors.

INGENŪ CRO

Addressing Key Challenges in Determining Endpoints in PD Clinical Trials

1. Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale / MDS-UPDRS: The UPDRS/MDS-UPDRS involves subjective assessments by clinicians, which can lead to variability in scoring.

Solution:

- Implement comprehensive standardized training programs for all raters to ensure consistency in scoring.
- Use digital tools and standardized assessment protocols to reduce variability.

2. "Off" Time Reduction: Patients must accurately report their "off" times, which can be challenging and inconsistent.

Solution:

- Utilize wearable devices that monitor symptoms continuously.
- Implement electronic diaries with prompts to remind patients to log their symptoms in real-time.

3. Quality of Life (QoL) Measures: Assessments rely on patients' subjective perceptions, which can be influenced by various factors.

Solution:

- Pair subjective measures like PDQ-39 with objective clinical assessments to provide a more comprehensive evaluation.
- Ensure consistent administration of QoL questionnaires at specified intervals to track changes over time.

4. Non-Motor Symptoms: Non-motor symptoms vary widely among patients and can be less consistently reported.

Solution:

- Conduct regular, systematic assessments using validated tools like the NMSS. Utilize structured interviews and checklists.
- Encourage patients to maintain diaries documenting their non-motor symptoms to capture daily variations.

5. Cognitive Function: Cognitive function can fluctuate due to various factors, including medication effects and disease progression.

Solution:

- Conduct repeated cognitive assessments to account for variability and obtain a reliable measure of cognitive function over time.
- Use longitudinal tracking of cognitive performance with tools like MoCA and MMSE to monitor changes and trends. Longitudinal tracking involves monitoring cognitive performance over an extended period. This method helps to capture the trajectory of cognitive decline or improvement, providing valuable insights into the long-term effects of interventions and the natural progression of the disease.

Five Most Commonly Prescribed FDA-Approved Treatments for PD

Drug Name	Year of Approval	Sponsor	Mechanism of Action	Therapeutic Effects
Levodopa	1970	Various	Dopamine precursor	Improves motor symptoms by increasing dopamine levels in the brain.
Pramipexole	1997	Boehringer Ingelheim	Dopamine agonist	Mimics dopamine to stimulate dopamine receptors, reducing motor symptoms.
Ropinirole	1997	GlaxoSmithKline	Dopamine agonist	Activates dopamine receptors to decrease motor symptoms and improve movement.
Rasagiline	2006	Teva Pharmaceuticals	MAO-B inhibitor	Inhibits the breakdown of dopamine, enhancing and prolonging its effect.
Safinamide	2017	Newron Pharmaceuticals	MAO-B inhibitor and glutamate release inhibitor	Reduces "off" time and improves motor control by inhibiting MAO-B and modulating glutamate release.

Approved Product Analysis: Levodopa

Geriatric Patients

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Young: 21-22 years, Elderly: 69-76 years	Bioavailability of levodopa in young and elderly healthy subjects	N/A	N/A	N=16 (8 young: 21-22 years, 8 elderly: 69-76 years)	Absolute bioavailability similar; 55% increase in AUC in elderly subjects
Young: < 65 years, Elderly: ≥ 65 years	Correlation between age and AUC of levodopa in Parkinson's patients	N/A	N/A	N=40	28% increase in AUC in elderly patients (≥ 65 years) compared to young patients (< 65 years)
Young: < 65 years, Elderly: ≥ 65 years	Cmax of levodopa in Parkinson's patients	N/A	N/A	N=40	24% increase in Cmax in elderly patients (≥ 65 years) compared to young patients (< 65 years)
Young: 23-64 years, Elderly: 65-76 years	AUC of carbidopa following IV administration in young and elderly subjects	N/A	N/A	N=34 (10 elderly: 65-76 years, 24 young: 23-64 years)	29% increase in AUC in elderly subjects, not clinically significant
Young and Elderly patients	Safety and effectiveness of immediate-release carbidopa-levodopa tablets (Sinemet®) in elderly patients	N/A	N/A	N/A (almost half of patients > 65 years)	No overall differences in safety or effectiveness; potential greater sensitivity to adverse reactions in some elderly individuals

Approved Product Analysis: Pramipexole

Studies in Patients with Early Parkinson's Disease

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Early Parkinson's (not receiving levodopa)	Effectiveness of MIRAPEX in early Parkinson's patients (not receiving concomitant levodopa)	UPDRS (Parts II, III)	7-week escalation, 6-month maintenance	N=335	UPDRS II: +1.9 (MIRAPEX) vs. -0.4 (placebo); UPDRS III: +5.0 (MIRAPEX) vs. -0.8 (placebo)
Early Parkinson's (not receiving levodopa)	Effectiveness of MIRAPEX in early Parkinson's patients (not receiving concomitant levodopa)	UPDRS (Parts II, III)	6-week escalation, 4-week maintenance	N=264	UPDRS II: +1.8 (MIRAPEX) vs. +0.3 (placebo); UPDRS III: +4.2 (MIRAPEX) vs. +0.6 (placebo)

Studies in Patients with Advanced Parkinson's Disease

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Advanced Parkinson's (receiving levodopa)	Effectiveness of MIRAPEX in advanced Parkinson's patients (receiving concomitant levodopa)	UPDRS (Parts II, III), daily diaries	7-week escalation, 6-month maintenance	N=360	UPDRS II: +2.7 (MIRAPEX) vs. +0.5 (placebo); UPDRS III: +5.6 (MIRAPEX) vs. +2.8 (placebo); "Off" hours per day: 4 (MIRAPEX) vs. 6 (placebo); Levodopa dose reduction in 76% (MIRAPEX) vs. 54% (placebo)

Approved Product Analysis: Ropinirole

Trials in Patients with Early Parkinson's Disease (without L-dopa)

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Parkinson's patients (Hoehn & Yahr Stage I-IV)	Proportion of patients experiencing a decrease (compared with baseline) of at least 30% in the UPDRS motor score	UPDRS Motor Score, Hoehn & Yahr Scale	12 weeks	N=63 (41 REQUIP, 22 placebo)	71% responders (REQUIP) vs. 41% responders (placebo); 30% difference from placebo; Mean baseline UPDRS motor score: 18.6 (REQUIP), 19.9 (placebo)
Early Parkinson's patients (without L-dopa)	Mean percent reduction from baseline in the UPDRS motor score	UPDRS Motor Score	6 months	N=241 (116 REQUIP, 125 placebo)	Baseline UPDRS motor score: 17.9 (REQUIP), 17.7 (placebo); Mean change from baseline: -22% (REQUIP), +4% (placebo); 26% difference from placebo

Trial in Patients with Advanced Parkinson's Disease (with L-dopa)

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Parkinson's patients (Hoehn & Yahr II-IV, on L-dopa)	Proportion of responders (defined as patients who were able both to achieve a decrease (compared with baseline) of at least 20% in their L-dopa dosage and a decrease of at least 20% in the proportion of the time awake in the "off" condition	% Responders, Patient Diaries	6 months	N=149 (95 REQUIP, 54 placebo)	% Responders: 28% (REQUIP) vs. 11% (placebo); 17% difference from placebo; Mean daily L-dopa reduction: 19.4% (REQUIP) vs. 3% (placebo); Mean "off" time reduction: 1.5 hours (REQUIP) vs. 0.9 hours (placebo); Baseline "off" hours: 6.4 (REQUIP) vs. 7.3 (placebo)

Approved Product Analysis: Rasagiline

Monotherapy Use of AZILECT

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Early Parkinson's patients (not on dopaminergic therapy)	Change from baseline in the total score of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS), [mentation (Part I) + activities of daily living (ADL) (Part II) + motor function (Part III)]	UPDRS Total Score (Parts I, II, III)	26 weeks	N=404 (138 placebo, 134 rasagiline 1 mg/day, 132 rasagiline 2 mg/day)	Baseline UPDRS score: 24.5 (placebo), 24.7 (1 mg/day), 25.9 (2 mg/day); Change from baseline: +3.9 (placebo), +0.1 (1 mg/day), +0.7 (2 mg/day); p-value vs. placebo: 0.0001 for both doses

Trial in Patients with Advanced Parkinson's Disease (treated with Levodopa, experiencing motor fluctuations)

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Parkinson's patients	Change in the mean number of hours that were spent in the "OFF" state at baseline compared to the mean number of hours that w ere spent in the "OFF" state during the treatment period (Study 1)	Patient Diaries recording • "ON" with no dyskinesia • "ON" without troublesome dyskinesia • "ON" with troublesome dyskinesia • "OFF"	26 weeks	N=472 (159 placebo, 164 rasagiline 0.5 mg/day, 149 rasagiline 1 mg/day)	Baseline "OFF" time: 6.0 hours (placebo, 0.5 mg/day), 6.3 hours (1 mg/day); Change from baseline: -0.9 hours (placebo), -1.4 hours (0.5 mg/day), -1.9 hours (1 mg/day); p-value vs. placebo: 0.0199 (0.5 mg/day), <0.0001 (1 mg/day)
Parkinson's patients	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- effects on the activities of daily living (ADL) subscale of the UPDRS performed during an "OFF" period (Study 1)	UPDRS ADL subscale score while "OFF" (Part II)	26 weeks	N=472 (159 placebo, 164 rasagiline 0.5 mg/day, 149 rasagiline 1 mg/day)	Baseline: 15.5 (placebo), 15.8 (0.5 mg/day), 15.5 (1 mg/day); Change from baseline: +0.68 (placebo), -0.60 (0.5 mg/day), -0.68 (1 mg/day)
Parkinson's patients	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- motor subscale of the U PDRS performed during an "ON" Period (Study 1)	UPDRS Motor subscale score while "ON" (Part III)	26 weeks	N=472 (159 placebo, 164 rasagiline 0.5 mg/day, 149 rasagiline 1 mg/day)	Baseline: 20.8 (placebo), 21.5 (0.5 mg/day), 20.9 (1 mg/day); Change from baseline: +1.21 (placebo), -1.43 (0.5 mg/day), -1.30 (1 mg/day)
Parkinson's patients	Change in the mean number of hours that were spent in the "OFF" state at baseline compared to the mean number of hours that w ere spent in the "OFF" state during the treatment period (Study 2)	Patient Diaries recording • "ON" with no dyskinesia • "ON "without troublesome dyskinesia • "ON" with troublesome dyskinesia • "OFF"	18 weeks	N=687 (229 placebo, 231 rasagiline 1 mg/day), 227 COMT inhibitor)	Baseline "OFF" time: 5.5 hours (placebo), 5.6 hours (1 mg/day); Change from baseline: -0.4 hours (placebo), -1.2 hours (1 mg/day); p-value vs. placebo: 0.0001 (1 mg/day)
Parkinson's patients	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- effects on the activities of daily living (ADL) subscale of the UPDRS performed during an "OFF" period (Study 2)	UPDRS ADL subscale score while "OFF" (Part II)	18 weeks	N=687 (229 placebo, 231 rasagiline 1 mg/day), 227 COMT inhibitor)	Baseline: 18.7 (placebo), 19.0 (1 mg/day); Change from baseline: -0.89 (placebo), -2.61 (1 mg/day)
Parkinson's patients	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- motor subscale of the UPDRS performed during an "ON" Period (Study 2)	UPDRS Motor subscale score while "ON" (Part III)	18 weeks	N=687 (229 placebo, 231 rasagiline 1 mg/day), 227 COMT inhibitor)	Baseline: 23.5 (placebo), 23.8 (1 mg/day); Change from baseline: -0.82 (placebo), -3.87 (1 mg/day)

Approved Product Analysis: Safinamide

Adjunctive Treatment in Patients with Parkinson's Disease Experiencing OFF Time on a Stable Dose of Levodopa

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Parkinson's patients (experiencing "OFF" time, treated with carbidopa/ levodopa and other PD medications)	Change from baseline in total daily "ON" Time without troublesome dyskinesia (Study 1)	Patient Diaries	24 weeks	N=645 (212 placebo, 217 XADAGO 50 mg, 216 XADAGO 100 mg)	Baseline "ON" time: 9.3 ± 2.2 hours (placebo), 9.4 ± 2.2 hours (50 mg), 9.6 ± 2.5 hours (100 mg); Change from baseline: +0.50 hours (50 mg, p=0.0356), +0.53 hours (100 mg, p=0.0238)
Parkinson's patients (experiencing "OFF" time, treated with carbidopa/ levodopa and other PD medications)	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- Change in mean daily "OFF" time (Study 1)	Change in mean daily "OFF" time	24 weeks	N=645 (212 placebo, 217 XADAGO 50 mg, 216 XADAGO 100 mg)	Baseline "OFF" time: 5.3 ± 2.1 hours (placebo), 5.2 ± 2.0 hours (50 mg), 5.2 ± 2.2 hours (100 mg); Change from baseline: -0.55 hours (50 mg, p=0.0049), -0.57 hours (100 mg, p=0.0037)
Parkinson's patients (experiencing "OFF" time, treated with carbidopa/ levodopa and other PD medications)	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- Reduction in Uniform Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) Part III (motor examination) (Study 1)	UPDRS Part III	24 weeks	N=645 (212 placebo, 217 XADAGO 50 mg, 216 XADAGO 100 mg)	Baseline UPDRS Part III: 28.6 ± 12.0 (placebo), 27.3 ± 12.8 (50 mg), 28.4 ± 13.5 (100 mg); Change from baseline: -1.75 (50 mg, p=0.0212), -2.48 (100 mg, p=0.0011)

Adjunctive Treatment in Patients with Parkinson's Disease Experiencing OFF Time on a Stable Dose of Levodopa

Population	Endpoint	Scales Used	Time Point	Sample Size	Magnitude of Improvement
Parkinson's patients (experiencing "OFF" time, treated with carbidopa/ levodopa and other PD medications)	Change from baseline in total daily "ON" Time without troublesome dyskinesia (Study 2)	Change in mean total daily "ON" time	24 weeks	N=543 (273 placebo, 270 XADAGO 100 mg)	Baseline "ON" time: 9.1 ± 2.5 hours (placebo), 9.3 ± 2.4 hours (100 mg); Change from baseline: +0.99 hours (100 mg, p<0.001)
Parkinson's patients (experiencing "OFF" time, treated with carbidopa/ levodopa and other PD medications)	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- Change in mean daily "OFF" time (Study 2)	Change in mean daily "OFF" time	24 weeks	N=543 (273 placebo, 270 XADAGO 100 mg)	Baseline "OFF" time: 5.36 ± 2.00 hours (placebo), 5.35 ± 1.98 hours (100 mg); Change from baseline: -1.06 hours (100 mg, p<0.001)
Parkinson's patients (experiencing "OFF" time, treated with carbidopa/ levodopa and other PD medications)	Secondary Measures of Effectiveness- Reduction in Uniform Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) Part III (motor examination) (Study 2)	UPDRS Part III	24 weeks	N=543 (273 placebo, 270 XADAGO 100 mg)	Baseline UPDRS Part III: 23.03 ± 12.75 (placebo), 22.33 ± 11.79 (100 mg); Change from baseline: -1.70 (100 mg, p=0.005)

Insights into Parkinson's Disease Drug Development Failures

In the quest to develop effective treatments for Parkinson's Disease (PD), numerous drug candidates have undergone clinical trials, with varying degrees of success. Despite the rigorous research and promising early-phase results, many of these drugs have failed to achieve the desired outcomes in later stages of testing. Understanding the reasons behind these failures is crucial for guiding future research and development efforts.

Name of Drug	Clinical Trial Identifier	Reason for Termination / Drug Failure
Levodopa	GDCT0227772	• Though this trial was completed, it did not achieve its efficacy endpoint. • The Accordion Pill did not show statistical superiority in reducing "off" time compared to Sinemet. • Although it was generally well-tolerated and exhibited a safety profile consistent with known Carbidopa/Levodopa formulations, the treatment did not demonstrate the expected improvements over the immediate-release version.
Pramipexole	NCT00321854	• The trial did not meet its primary endpoint of demonstrating a significant improvement in motor symptoms compared to the delayed treatment group. • The findings suggested that early initiation of Pramipexole did not provide a substantial advantage over delayed treatment in newly diagnosed PD patients.
Ropinirole	NCT01929317	• Though this trial achieved its efficacy endpoints, the trial was terminated due to unknown reasons.
Rasagiline	NCT00256204	**1 mg/day Dose:** The 1 mg/day dose of Rasagiline met its primary endpoint by showing a statistically significant slowing in the progression of PD symptoms as measured by the UPDRS scores. **2 mg/day Dose:** The 2 mg/day dose did not demonstrate a statistically significant benefit in slowing disease progression compared to placebo, failing to meet the primary endpoint. • The mixed results of the ADAGIO study, with only the lower dose showing efficacy, raised questions about the dose-response relationship and the potential disease-modifying effects of Rasagiline.
Safinamide	NCT00643045	• The trial did not meet its primary endpoint. Safinamide failed to show a statistically significant improvement in UPDRS Part III scores compared to placebo. • This outcome highlights the challenges in finding effective add-on therapies for early-stage PD and underscores the need for further research and refinement in treatment strategies.

INGENŪ CRO

Common Failure Points in Clinical Trials for Parkinson's Disease

1. Motor Fluctuations and Dyskinesias

Motor symptoms, such as bradykinesia, rigidity, and tremors, can vary within a single day and across different days. These fluctuations can confound the assessment of treatment efficacy. Dyskinesias, which are often a side effect of long-term Levodopa use, further complicate the clinical picture. Accurately capturing these variations requires frequent and detailed monitoring, often through patient diaries or wearable technology.

2. Non-Motor Symptoms

Non-motor symptoms, including cognitive impairment, mood disorders, sleep disturbances, and autonomic dysfunction, are integral to PD but are less predictable and harder to quantify than motor symptoms. These symptoms significantly impact the quality of life but are often underrepresented in clinical trial endpoints. Ensuring that trials adequately address and measure non-motor symptoms is essential for a comprehensive evaluation of potential therapies.

3. Heterogeneity of Disease Progression

PD progression varies widely among patients, with some experiencing rapid decline and others showing slower progression. This heterogeneity poses a challenge in clinical trials, as it can dilute the perceived efficacy of a treatment if not properly accounted for in the study design. Stratifying patients based on disease stage and progression rate is necessary to obtain more accurate and meaningful results.

4. Patient Adherence

Maintaining patient adherence to treatment protocols and follow-up schedules is crucial but challenging, especially in long-term studies. The complexity of medication regimens, side effects, and the burden of frequent assessments can lead to dropout rates that undermine the integrity of the trial. Strategies to enhance adherence include simplifying dosing regimens, providing patient education, and employing digital health tools for reminders and monitoring.

Statistical and Methodological Flaws

1. Small Sample Sizes

Many PD clinical trials suffer from small sample sizes, limiting the statistical power and generalizability of the findings. Recruiting sufficient numbers of participants is challenging due to the lower prevalence of PD compared to other conditions, and the strict inclusion criteria often required.

2. Short Duration

The slow progression of PD necessitates long-term studies to adequately assess the efficacy and safety of interventions. However, many trials are of short duration, often due to funding constraints and the logistical complexities of long-term follow-up. This limitation can result in an incomplete understanding of the long-term benefits and risks of a treatment.

3. Selection Bias

Selection bias occurs when the participants enrolled in a trial are not representative of the broader PD population. This can happen due to stringent inclusion and exclusion criteria or geographic and socioeconomic factors that affect access to trial sites. Ensuring a diverse and representative sample is crucial for the external validity of the trial results.

4. Placebo Effect

The placebo effect is notably strong in PD clinical trials, particularly for treatments targeting motor symptoms. Patients often experience significant improvements in symptoms due to the expectation of benefit, which can confound the assessment of the actual treatment effect. Rigorous trial designs, such as double-blind and crossover studies, are necessary to mitigate this effect.

Safety Concerns

Parkinson's Disease is a complex neurodegenerative disorder that presents significant challenges in terms of safety and treatment management. Understanding the safety concerns associated with PD treatments and the standard of care options is crucial for healthcare providers to optimize patient outcomes and quality of life.

Key Safety Concerns

1. Motor Complications:

Long-term use of Levodopa, the most effective treatment for PD, often leads to motor complications such as dyskinesias (involuntary movements) and motor fluctuations (variations in motor performance). Dyskinesias can significantly impair the quality of life and are challenging to manage. Motor fluctuations, including "off" periods when the medication's effects wane, are also common and difficult to predict.

Management Strategies:

- Medication Adjustments: Adjusting the timing and dosage of Levodopa can help manage motor complications. Using extended-release formulations can provide more stable blood levels of the medication.
- Adjunctive Therapies: Adding other medications, such as dopamine agonists (e.g., Pramipexole, Ropinirole), MAO-B inhibitors (e.g., Rasagiline), or COMT inhibitors (e.g., Entacapone), can smooth out motor fluctuations and reduce dyskinesias.

2. Non-Motor Complications:

Non-motor symptoms can be exacerbated by PD medications, posing additional safety concerns.

Management Strategies:

- Regular Monitoring: Continuous monitoring of cognitive function and mood is essential. Antidepressants or cognitive enhancers like Donepezil can be used to manage these symptoms.
- Autonomic Dysfunction: Managing orthostatic hypotension may need medications like Fludrocortisone or Midodrine, while urinary issues can be addressed with anticholinergics or bladder relaxants.
- Sleep Management: Melatonin or clonazepam can help with sleep disturbances, particularly REM sleep behavior disorder.

3. Psychiatric Symptoms:

Dopamine agonists can cause psychiatric side effects, including hallucinations, impulse control disorders, and psychosis.

Management Strategies:

- Dose Adjustment: Reducing the dose or discontinuing the dopamine agonist can alleviate psychiatric symptoms.
- Antipsychotic Medications: Atypical antipsychotics like Quetiapine or Clozapine can be used to manage psychosis without significantly worsening motor symptoms.

Standard of Care Treatment Options

1. Levodopa:

- Levodopa, usually combined with Carbidopa (to prevent peripheral breakdown), remains the gold standard for PD treatment. It effectively improves motor symptoms but requires careful management to minimize motor complications over time.

2. Dopamine Agonists:

- Drugs like Pramipexole, Ropinirole, and Rotigotine mimic dopamine effects in the brain and are used in early PD or as adjuncts to Levodopa in advanced stages. They are beneficial for reducing motor fluctuations but have a higher risk of psychiatric side effects.

3. MAO-B Inhibitors:

- Rasagiline and Selegiline inhibit the breakdown of dopamine, thereby enhancing its availability in the brain. These drugs are used as monotherapy in early PD or as adjunctive therapy in advanced stages to prolong Levodopa's effects.

4. COMT Inhibitors:

- Entacapone and Tolcapone inhibit the COMT enzyme that breaks down dopamine, extending the duration of Levodopa's effects. These are typically added to Levodopa therapy to manage motor fluctuations.

5. Anticholinergics:

- Drugs like Benztropine and Trihexyphenidyl are used to manage tremors and rigidity in younger PD patients. However, they are less commonly used due to their side effects, including cognitive impairment and urinary retention.

6. Amantadine:

- Amantadine provides modest benefits for PD symptoms and is particularly useful for managing dyskinesias. It has a unique mechanism involving dopamine release and NMDA receptor antagonism.

7. Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS):

- DBS is a surgical treatment option for patients with advanced PD who have not responded adequately to medication. It involves implanting electrodes in specific brain areas to modulate neural activity. DBS can significantly reduce motor symptoms and medication requirements but carries surgical risks.

8. Non-Pharmacological Treatments:

- **Physical Therapy:** Crucial for maintaining mobility and function.
- **Speech Therapy:** Addressing speech and swallowing difficulties.
- **Occupational Therapy:** Assisting with daily living activities to improve quality of life.

INGENŪ CRO

Enhancing Clinical Trial Protocols for Parkinson's Disease

Improving the protocols for Parkinson's Disease clinical trials is crucial to enhance the chances of FDA approval and improve patient outcomes. This involves addressing regulatory insights, optimizing trial design, ensuring patient safety, and incorporating innovative approaches.

1. Enhance Recruitment & Retention:

To ensure the generalizability of trial results, it is crucial to recruit a diverse and representative patient population.

Implementing strategies such as flexible scheduling, transportation assistance, and frequent patient engagement through regular updates and reminders can improve retention rates.

2. Use Advanced Biomarkers and Imaging Techniques:

Incorporating biomarkers into trial protocols can provide objective measures of disease progression and treatment efficacy.

Advanced imaging techniques help visualize the effects of treatment on dopaminergic neurons and other relevant brain areas, providing robust evidence of efficacy.

3. Adaptive Trial Designs:

Adaptive designs can improve the efficiency of clinical trials and increase the likelihood of demonstrating treatment efficacy.

The Parkinson's Disease Study Group has successfully used adaptive trial designs in PD research. For instance, trials can start with a broader patient population and then focus on specific subgroups.

4. Incorporate Digital Health Technologies:

Wearable devices can track movements, sleep patterns, and physiological parameters, offering comprehensive insights into patients' daily lives.

Telemedicine can facilitate remote monitoring and reduce the burden on participants, making adherence easier.

5. Enhance Data Quality and Statistical Analysis:

Ensuring the accuracy and completeness of data is vital by standardizing data collection methods and using electronic data capture (EDC) systems to minimize errors.

Utilizing advanced statistical methods can help analyze complex datasets and identify significant treatment effects.

6. Regulatory Compliance and Early Engagement with the FDA:

Engaging with the FDA early in the trial design process can provide valuable guidance on regulatory requirements and expectations.

Regular updates to the FDA through interim reports can also keep the regulatory body informed of the trial's progress.

Notable Key Opinion Leaders in Parkinson's Disease Research

Name	Specialty	Designation	Location	Brief Bio
Andrew H Evans (MBBS, FRACP)	Neurology	Director, The Royal Melbourne Hospital	Victoria, Australia	Andrew H. Evans is currently a Consultant Neurologist and the Director of Movement Disorders Service at the Royal Melbourne Hospital in Melbourne, Australia. Dr. Evans has been recognized for his contributions to neurology with various awards, including the Movement Disorder Society's Junior Award for Excellence. Dr. Evans has significantly contributed to the understanding and treatment of movement disorders, particularly Parkinson's disease. Additionally, he is an active educator and mentor, helping to train the next generation of neurologists.
Victor S C Fung (MBBS, FRACP)	Neurology	Director, Westmead Hospital	New South Wales, Australia	Victor S. C. Fung is currently a Consultant Neurologist at Westmead Hospital in Sydney, Australia, and a Clinical Associate Professor at the University of Sydney. Dr. Fung has been honored with several awards, including the Movement Disorder Society's Junior Award for Excellence in Clinical Research and the Australian and New Zealand Association of Neurologists' Leonard Cox Award. Dr. Fung is a leading expert in movement disorders, with a focus on Parkinson's disease and dystonia.
Richard Gordon (PhD)	Toxicology; Neurology	Professor, University of Queensland	Queensland, Australia	Richard Gordon is currently a Professor in the School of Biomedical Sciences at the University of Queensland, Australia, and a Principal Research Fellow at the Queensland Brain Institute. Dr. Gordon has received numerous awards, including the Australian Research Council (ARC) Future Fellowship and the University of Queensland's Vice-Chancellor's Research Excellence Award. Dr. Gordon is renowned for his pioneering research in neurodegenerative diseases, particularly in understanding the molecular mechanisms underlying Parkinson's disease and Alzheimer's disease. His work has led to significant advancements in identifying potential therapeutic targets and developing innovative treatment strategies.
Girish Nair (MBBS, FRACS)	Neurosurgery	Neurosurgeon, The Royal Melbourne Hospital	Victoria, Australia	Girish Nair is currently a Consultant Neurosurgeon at the Royal Melbourne Hospital and an Honorary Clinical Associate Professor at the University of Melbourne. Dr. Nair is renowned for his expertise in complex spinal surgery and brain tumor surgery. Dr. Nair has received several accolades, including the prestigious Brain Foundation Research Grant and the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons Foundation for Surgery Fellowship.
Hugo Morales-Briceno (MD, FRACP)	Neurology	Neurologist, Westmead Hospital	New South Wales, Australia	Hugo Morales-Briceno is currently a Consultant Neurologist at Westmead Hospital in Sydney, Australia, and a Clinical Lecturer at the University of Sydney. Dr. Morales-Briceno has received several awards, including the Movement Disorder Society of Australia and New Zealand (MDSANZ) Clinical Research Award and the Royal Australasian College of Physicians' Fellowship. Dr. Morales-Briceno is highly regarded for his expertise in movement disorders, including Parkinson's disease and dystonia. His research has focused on improving diagnostic techniques and therapeutic interventions for movement disorders.

References

- Chaudhuri, K. R., Martinez-Martin, P., Schapira, A. H., et al. (2006). International multicenter pilot study of the first comprehensive self-completed nonmotor symptoms questionnaire for Parkinson's disease: The NMSQuest study. *Movement Disorders, 21*(7), 916-923.
- Goetz, C. G., Tilley, B. C., Shaftman, S. R., et al. (2008). Movement Disorder Society-sponsored revision of the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS): Scale presentation and clinimetric testing results. *Movement Disorders, 23*(15), 2129-2170.
- Mollenhauer, B., Locascio, J. J., Schulz-Schaeffer, W., et al. (2011). Alpha-synuclein and tau concentrations in cerebrospinal fluid of patients presenting with parkinsonism: A cohort study. *Lancet Neurology, 10*(3), 230-240.
- Nasreddine, Z. S., Phillips, N. A., Bédirian, V., et al. (2005). The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 53*(4), 695-699.
- Peto, V., Jenkinson, C., Fitzpatrick, R., & Greenhall, R. (1995). The development and validation of a short measure of functioning and wellbeing for individuals with Parkinson's disease. *Quality of Life Research, 4*(3), 241-248.
- Parkinson's Disease. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.parkinson.org/
- Parkinson's Disease Information. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.nia.nih.gov/health/parkinsons-disease
- Parkinson's Disease Treatment Market. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/parkinsons-disease-treatment-market
- Parkinson's Progression Markers Initiative (PPMI). (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.ppmi-info.org/

iNGENū CRO

The Australian CRO championing innovative biotech firms for global success.
Delivering high-quality, FDA-compliant clinical research.

If you would like further information on how iNGENū CRO can assist you to conduct your clinical trial, please contact Dr Sud Agarwal or Adam Moodie:

Dr Sud Agarwal
Chief Executive Officer
BSc (Hons), MB ChB FANZCA DDU
dr.sudhanshu@ingenucro.com

Adam Moodie
Director, Scientific Engagement
BSc
adam.moodie@ingenucro.com

Unit 22, 456 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, 3004

www.ingenuCRO.com