


Author's Accepted Manuscript

Optimizing therapy early in multiple sclerosis: an evidence-based view

Tjalf Ziemssen, Nicola De Stefano, Maria Pia Sormani, Bart Van Wijmeersch, Heinz Wiendl, Bernd C. Kieseier



PII: S2211-0348(15)00106-6
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.msard.2015.07.007>
Reference: MSARD294

To appear in: *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders*

Received date: 5 March 2015

Revised date: 1 June 2015

Accepted date: 15 July 2015

Cite this article as: Tjalf Ziemssen, Nicola De Stefano, Maria Pia Sormani, Bart Van Wijmeersch, Heinz Wiendl and Bernd C. Kieseier, Optimizing therapy early in multiple sclerosis: an evidence-based view, *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.msard.2015.07.007>

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 galley 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.

[Title] Optimizing therapy early in multiple sclerosis: an evidence-based view

[Short title] MS treatment optimization

Tjalf Ziemssen^a, Nicola De Stefano^b, Maria Pia Sormani^c, Bart Van Wijmeersch^d, Heinz Wiendl^e, Bernd C. Kieseier^{f,*}

^aDepartment of Neurology, MS Center Dresden, Center of Clinical Neuroscience, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden University of Technology, Fetscherstr. 74, 01307 Dresden, Germany. E-mail address: Tjalf.Ziemssen@uniklinikum-dresden.de.

^bDepartment of Medicine, Surgery and Neuroscience, University of Siena, Viale Bracci 2, Siena 53100, Italy. E-mail address: destefano@unisi.it.

^cDepartment of Health Sciences, University of Genoa, Via Balbi, 5, 16126 Genoa, Italy. E-mail address: mariapia.sormani@unige.it.

^dBiomedical Institute at Hasselt University and Rehabilitation & MS-Centre Overpelt, Agoralaan Gebouw A, 3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium. E-mail address: bart.vanwijmeersch@uhasselt.be.

^eDepartment of Neurology, University of Münster, Albert-Schweitzer-Campus 1, Building A10 (previously Domagkstr. 13), 48149 Münster, Germany. E-mail address: heinz.wiendl@ukmuenster.de.

^fDepartment of Neurology, Heinrich-Heine-University, Moorenstrasse 5, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany. E-mail address: bernd.kieseier@uni-duesseldorf.de.

*Correspondence to: Department of Neurology, Heinrich-Heine-University, Moorenstrasse 5, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany. Tel.: [+49-211-81-17079]; fax: [+49-211-81-18485]. E-mail address: [bernd.kieseier@uni-duesseldorf.de] (B. C. Kieseier)

Word count (excluding references, figures and tables): 5,126

Number of references: 164

Abstract (word count: 168)

Therapies that target the underlying pathology of multiple sclerosis (MS), including focal and diffuse damage, may improve long-term disease control. Focal damage (inflammatory lesions) manifests clinically mainly as relapses, whereas diffuse damage (neurodegeneration and brain volume loss) has been more closely associated with disability progression and cognitive decline. Given that first-line therapies such as beta-interferon and glatiramer acetate, which are primarily directed against inflammation, might fail to adequately control disease activity in some patients, it has been recommended to switch these patients early to a therapy of higher efficacy, possibly targeting both components of MS pathology more rigorously. This review provides an overview of the efficacy of EU-approved disease-modifying therapies on conventional MS outcome measures (relapses, disability progression and paraclinical magnetic resonance imaging endpoints) in addition to brain volume loss, a measure of diffuse damage in the brain. In addition, the evidence supporting early treatment optimization in patients with high disease activity despite first-line therapy will be reviewed and an algorithm for optimal disease control will be presented.

Keywords (max. 6): MS therapies; treatment algorithm; switching therapy; outcome measures; optimizing treatment; breakthrough disease activity

Accepted manuscript

1. Changing the course of multiple sclerosis: the need for early treatment optimization


Multiple sclerosis (MS) is a chronic inflammatory demyelinating disease with complex underlying pathological processes, including focal and diffuse damage.^{1,2} Focal white matter (WM) lesions are considered the classic hallmark of MS, but recent imaging and histopathological studies have shown that focal lesions are also present in the gray matter and play a crucial role in MS pathogenesis.¹⁻⁵ Diffuse damage can occur independently of focal lesions and is frequently observed in normal-appearing tissue.^{6,7} Neurodegeneration, which is part of the diffuse pathology of MS, begins early in the disease course and contributes to ongoing disease activity, but may not always be clinically evident.^{1,4,7} Whereas axonal and neuronal damage in the early stages of the disease are likely to be driven by inflammation, neurodegeneration observed in the later, progressive stages may primarily be explained by intrinsic, inflammatory-independent mechanisms.^{8,9} Profound alterations in the gray matter and normal-appearing WM have been associated with progressive loss of brain volume.⁴ While focal damage (inflammatory lesions) may manifest clinically as relapses,¹⁰ diffuse damage (neurodegeneration and brain volume loss [BVL]) has been associated with disability progression.^{6,11,12} Targeting both focal inflammatory and diffuse neurodegenerative damage in relapsing–remitting MS (RRMS) earlier may prevent the accumulation of irreversible neurological damage and reduce the risk of disability progression.

The widely used first-line therapies beta-interferon (IFN β) and glatiramer acetate (GA) have only demonstrated partial efficacy in the treatment of MS.¹³⁻¹⁶ Some patients experience significant disease activity despite IFN β or GA treatment,¹⁶⁻¹⁹ indicating the need for an alternative therapeutic strategy. Thus, it seems crucial to identify non-responders to first-line therapies early on, in order to switch patients to a more potent therapy early in their disease course. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) measures, including BVL, have been found to play an important role in predicting long-term disability, and may, thus, help to identify treatment non-response early.²⁰⁻²⁴ It has been suggested previously that the clinical course of MS consists of two major phases: one early, inflammatory phase and one later, progressive, inflammatory-independent phase.²⁵ Irreversible, pathological damage occurs in the early phase of MS and significantly contributes to disability progression.^{26,27} Once patients enter the progressive phase, permanent damage has already accumulated and it becomes difficult to improve outcomes.²⁶ Considering the early window of opportunity to influence the accumulation of irreversible long-term damage,^{25,26} early switching to a high-efficacy therapy that targets both focal and diffuse pathology may impact favorably on long-term outcomes.^{19,28} Early treatment has been shown to be associated with a reduction in disability progression in patients with RRMS and a reduction in the risk of developing clinically defined MS in patients with clinically isolated syndrome.²⁹⁻³² Thus, optimizing therapy early by addressing key aspects of disease activity and worsening, including relapses, disability progression, MRI lesions and BVL, may most effectively delay disease progression and modify the course of this disabling disease.

The expansion of the treatment landscape in MS over the last few years has increased the complexity of treatment decisions. Recommendations and algorithms can help to maximize the benefit of each available therapy; however, there is currently no consensus algorithm available, with most of the recently published recommendations being regional.³³⁻³⁶ Most guidelines currently used in clinical practice are driven by the labels of the therapies. Current disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) approved in the EU for the treatment of RRMS include IFN β , GA, teriflunomide, dimethyl fumarate (DMF), fingolimod, natalizumab, and alemtuzumab.

In this review, we will discuss the therapies used for treatment-naive patients and patients with active disease despite first-line treatment, based on their use in current clinical practice (Fig. 1). To collect the available data for each of the therapies and evidence for early treatment optimization, we searched PubMed (the US National Library of Medicine [NLM]'s medline and pre-medline database by the National Institutes of Health [NIH] and National Center for Biotechnology Information [NCBI]) as well as a number of congress libraries (e.g, the American Academy of Neurology [AAN] and the European Committee for Treatment and Research in Multiple Sclerosis [ECTRIMS]) using search terms such as 'Phase III trials', 'real-world evidence' and 'early treatment optimization' along with the individual drug names. In addition, we retrieved the most recent versions of the summaries of product characteristics of the individual therapies from the European Medicines Agency (EMA) website. We will review here the efficacy of the different therapies in terms of four key measures of disease activity (relapses, disability progression, MRI lesions, and BVL) as well as their safety, and we will discuss the current evidence that might help in the process of treatment optimization in MS, focusing on switching early to a high-efficacy therapy in patients with breakthrough disease activity.

Fig. 1 Treatment algorithm for first- and second-line therapies based on their use in current clinical practice [single-column-fitting image; colour required in online and print version]



DMF, dimethyl fumarate; EMA, European Medicines Agency; GA, glatiramer acetate; IFN, interferon.

1.1 Treatment options for treatment-naïve patients

1.1.1. IFN β and GA

IFN β and GA are first-line therapies for the treatment of RRMS based on their established efficacy and safety profiles.^{14,15,37,38} It is evident that in some patients IFN β and GA do not adequately control MS disease activity.^{15,17–19,39} Given the limited evidence supporting switching between different IFNs and/or GA^{16,40–42} and the lack of consistent disability reduction with long-term treatment with IFNs,^{43–45} cycling between IFNs and GA may not be advisable. Thus, patients with breakthrough disease activity on first-line therapies seem to benefit more from a switch to a therapy with higher efficacy. Cycling among IFNs or GA seems primarily plausible for safety or tolerability reasons. In addition, switching therapy from IFN to GA should also be considered in cases where neutralizing antibodies to IFN develop, which may impact the efficacy of the drug.^{46,47}

1.1.2. Teriflunomide

Teriflunomide, a once-daily oral agent, is approved (14 mg/day) in the EU for the treatment of adult patients with RRMS.⁴⁸ Teriflunomide primarily targets the inflammatory component of the disease through selective inhibition of dihydroorotate dehydrogenase, a key mitochondrial enzyme required for de novo pyrimidine synthesis, leading to a reduction in proliferation of activated T and B lymphocytes.⁴⁹

The efficacy of teriflunomide was assessed in two placebo-controlled Phase III trials, TEMSO (Teriflunomide Multiple Sclerosis Oral) and TOWER (Teriflunomide Oral in people With relapsing multiple sclerosis),^{50,51} and in the active comparator Phase III trial, TENERE (Teriflunomide and Rebif®).⁵² Teriflunomide resulted in a significant reduction in annualized relapse rates (ARRs) and the risk of 3-month confirmed disability progression compared with placebo in TEMSO and TOWER.^{50,51} Teriflunomide's effect on 6-month confirmed disability progression was not significant in TEMSO and not reported in TOWER.^{50,51,53} In the 2-year TEMSO trial, teriflunomide significantly reduced the number of gadolinium-enhancing (Gd+) T1 lesions and unique active lesions (i.e. Gd+ T1 and new or enlarging T2 lesions).^{50,54} Neither T1 nor T2 lesions were reported in TOWER.⁵¹ In TEMSO, teriflunomide was associated with a beneficial effect on WM loss, whereas global BVL was not significantly reduced.^{50,54} In the 2-year TENERE trial, treatment with teriflunomide did not result in a significant reduction in relapse rates compared with subcutaneous (SC) IFN β -1a.⁵² Relapse rate was, however, not the primary endpoint in this trial.⁵² Disability and MRI outcomes have not been reported for TENERE.⁵²

Subgroup analyses of pooled data from TEMSO and TOWER have demonstrated consistent efficacy with teriflunomide across a number of subgroups, stratified by baseline demographics, clinical, and MRI disease characteristics,⁵⁵ confirming the suitability of teriflunomide as first-line treatment for MS, irrespective of baseline characteristics.

Treatment with teriflunomide is generally well tolerated, with predominantly mild to moderate adverse events (AEs) and only rare serious AEs.⁴⁸ Common AEs include hair thinning, diarrhea, alanine aminotransferase elevation, nausea, and headache.^{48,49} Hair thinning may influence the patient's preference, in particular that of women, who might be reluctant to use teriflunomide. Due to an increased risk of hepatotoxicity with teriflunomide, routine monitoring of liver function is required.⁴⁸ Also, blood pressure measurements and complete blood cell counts should be performed before and during treatment.⁴⁸ In addition, it should be noted that teriflunomide should not be given to patients who wish to become pregnant, as it has been associated with an increased risk of major birth defects when administered during pregnancy.⁴⁸ Teriflunomide is labeled as 'Pregnancy Category X' by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which means that women of childbearing age must have a negative pregnancy test before starting the drug and must use effective birth control during treatment.⁵⁶ Overall, teriflunomide has demonstrated a manageable safety and tolerability profile in clinical trials, which is, however, based on

relatively small patient numbers and limited long-term data.^{49,57} A good long-term safety profile has been established for the parent compound leflunomide in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis.⁵⁸ It can be assumed that teriflunomide may exhibit a similar profile to leflunomide; however, at present such data have not been established in relevant numbers for this drug.

Based on the Phase III trial data, including the subgroup analyses, teriflunomide is used as a first-line treatment option (see also Table 1).. Given its convenient oral route of administration and once daily application, patients may prefer teriflunomide over injectables, which may further influence treatment decisions.

1.1.3. Dimethyl fumarate

DMF, an orally administered agent, is approved (240 mg twice daily) in the EU for the treatment of adult patients with RRMS.⁵⁹ The mechanism of action (MoA) of DMF has not been fully elucidated, but may include anti-inflammatory and cytoprotective aspects reported to be mediated via the nuclear factor (erythroid-derived 2)-like 2 transcriptional pathway, which is involved in the cellular response to oxidative stress.⁶⁰

The efficacy and safety of DMF was assessed in the 2-year, placebo-controlled, Phase III trials, DEFINE (Determination of the Efficacy and safety of oral Fumarate IN rElapsing–remitting MS) and CONFIRM (COMparator and aN oral Fumarate In Relapsing–remitting Multiple sclerosis).^{61,62} In both trials, DMF resulted in a significant reduction in ARR, the number of Gd+ T1 lesions, and the number of new or enlarging T2 lesions vs. placebo.^{61,62} A significant effect on 3-month confirmed disability and BVL was observed in DEFINE but not in CONFIRM.^{61–64} DMF did not significantly reduce 6-month confirmed disability progression in either trial.^{61,62}

Although GA was included as a reference comparator in CONFIRM, the trial was not designed or powered to demonstrate statistical superiority or non-inferiority of DMF vs. GA.⁶² A post-hoc analysis of the CONFIRM study comparing the efficacy of DMF and GA did not demonstrate the superiority of DMF.⁶⁵ A post-hoc analysis of DEFINE and CONFIRM demonstrated higher efficacy of DMF in newly diagnosed patients compared with the placebo group,⁶⁶ and in treatment-naïve patients compared with patients previously treated with DMTs.⁶⁷ Subgroup analyses of DEFINE and CONFIRM have also shown that treatment with DMF is effective on relapse rates across a broad range of patients with RRMS, stratified by various baseline demographics and disease characteristics.^{68,69}

DMF is generally well tolerated in patients with RRMS; the most frequently reported AEs include flushing and gastrointestinal events, which tend to start early in the course of treatment.⁵⁹ The use of DMF has also been associated with lymphopenia, a potential risk factor of progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy (PML), a rare but in some cases fatal disease, caused by reactivation of the polyomavirus John

Cunningham virus (JCV).⁷⁰⁻⁷² Especially persistent lymphopenia may increase the risk for PML in patients treated with DMF,⁷³ but the real MoA by which PML occurs in these patients is not yet fully understood. Two cases of fatal PML in patients receiving DMF have recently been reported; one with and one without severe lymphopenia.^{71,74-76} Thus, regular monitoring of lymphocyte levels may be advisable for early identification of patients treated with DMF who may be at risk of PML.⁵⁹ In addition, complete blood count assessments of renal and hepatic function before and during treatment are also recommended.⁵⁹ Although more than 100,000 patients have already been treated with DMF,⁷⁷ its clinical use is limited to shorter-term application; clearly, more long-term experience is needed to confirm and further characterize its safety profile.

Overall, DMF may be recommended as a first-line treatment that can be used as an alternative treatment to injectable DMTs and teriflunomide (see also Table 1). Patients may prefer DMF over injectables due to its oral administration; however, the twice-daily dosing may pose adherence issues that may impact real-life efficacy in the long term.⁷⁸

1.2 Guidance on when to switch therapy in patients with breakthrough disease activity

Making decisions on when to switch therapy is challenging, due to the lack of a standardized definition of treatment non-response.^{22,79,80} Given that relapse activity is a key clinical parameter, a switch in therapy may be recommended at the earliest sign of relapse activity, irrespective of its severity. However, as current DMTs are unable to fully suppress relapse activity, it may not be advisable to switch therapy based on relapse criteria only. MRI activity has increasingly been proposed as a surrogate marker to provide early information on the likelihood of future treatment failure, which can inform treatment decisions before clinical relapses or disability progression occur.⁸¹ New, active, clinically silent lesions on MRI are 5–10-times more frequently observed than clinical relapses.⁸² Several studies have shown that MRI performed after 6–12 months of treatment is able to predict a subsequent lack of response to IFN β , even in the absence of clinical activity,⁸³⁻⁸⁵ and MRI disease activity has also been reported as a valid surrogate marker for clinical activity in relapsing MS.^{20,86-88} Scoring systems combining MRI and clinical markers have been shown to predict long-term treatment non-response^{20,22,24,89} and may be suitable for the early identification of treatment non-responders in clinical practice in the future.

Other biomarkers, such as the presence of neutralizing antibodies, may also help in identifying treatment non-responders early. High and persistent neutralizing antibody titers have been shown to reduce the efficacy of IFN β .^{46,47}

1.3 Treatment options for patients with active disease despite first-line treatment

1.3.1. Fingolimod

Fingolimod, a once-daily oral agent, is approved (0.5 mg/day) in the EU for adult patients with RRMS who experience high disease activity despite treatment with at least one DMT, or have rapidly evolving severe RRMS.⁹⁰ Fingolimod is a sphingosine 1-phosphate receptor modulator that prevents the egress of autoreactive lymphocytes from lymph nodes, thereby reducing their infiltration into the central nervous system (CNS).⁹¹ Preclinical evidence suggests that fingolimod may also have direct effects on the CNS.⁹¹

The efficacy and safety of fingolimod was assessed in three Phase III trials, including the 2-year placebo-controlled trials, FREEDOMS (FTY720 Research Evaluating Effects of Daily Oral therapy in Multiple Sclerosis) and FREEDOMS II, and the 1-year active-comparator trial, TRANSFORMS (TRial Assessing injectable interferon versus FTY720 Oral in Relapsing–remitting Multiple Sclerosis).^{92–94} Fingolimod significantly reduced ARR compared with placebo in FREEDOMS and FREEDOMS II^{92,93} and IFN β -1a intramuscular (IM) in TRANSFORMS.⁹⁴ A significant effect on 3- and 6-month confirmed disability progression vs. placebo was only observed in FREEDOMS.^{92–94} MRI lesion activity, including Gd+ T1 lesions and new or enlarging T2 lesions, was significantly reduced across all three trials.^{92–94} Fingolimod also demonstrated a significant and consistent effect on BVL across the Phase III trials.^{92–94}

In addition, post-hoc analyses of the Phase III trials demonstrated that fingolimod is also highly effective in patients with high disease activity despite first-line treatment, in line with its EU label indication.^{95–99}

The TRANSFORMS extension trial provided evidence for the use of fingolimod as an early efficacy switch therapy: switching treatment from IFN β -1a IM to fingolimod was associated with a beneficial effect on relapse rate, MRI lesion activity, and BVL.¹⁰⁰ The benefit of switching therapy to fingolimod in patients with high disease activity despite first-line treatment has been further confirmed by real-world evidence (RWE). Data obtained from the ongoing, international MSBase (Multiple Sclerosis dataBase) Registry showed a significant reduction in relapse rates and more favorable disability outcomes when patients switched from an injectable DMT to fingolimod rather than to another injectable.^{101,102} In the ongoing observational study, PANGAEA (Post-Authorization Noninterventional German sAFety of GilEnyA in RRMS patients), switching to fingolimod from previous DMTs in routine clinical practice in Germany resulted in a beneficial effect on relapse rates and disability progression.¹⁰³

Fingolimod has demonstrated a consistent and well-characterized safety and tolerability profile in clinical trials, which has been confirmed in the real world.^{90,103–107} The main safety observations with fingolimod treatment are its short-term effects on the heart following the first dose, including a transient, and mostly asymptomatic, reduction in heart rate and the risk of atrioventricular conduction delays.^{90,108} In pooled data from the Phase III trials, these effects were found to be transient and mostly benign, with < 1% of patients

reporting symptomatic bradycardia,¹⁰⁸ which has been further confirmed by RWE.^{103,109} Administration of fingolimod therefore requires first-dose blood pressure and electrocardiogram (ECG) monitoring for a period of 6 hours.⁹⁰ Further monitoring procedures of complete blood counts, assessments of hepatic function, and ophthalmological evaluations, are required before and/or during treatment with fingolimod.⁹⁰ Recently, a case of PML was reported in a clinically asymptomatic patient treated with fingolimod for more than 4 years without previous exposure to immunosuppressive drugs, including natalizumab.¹¹⁰ Given the current understanding of the MoA of fingolimod and the overall experience with fingolimod (> 114,000 patients treated for more than 195,000 patient-years¹¹¹), the causal relationship between fingolimod and the occurrence of PML in this patient remains unclear at this present stage, but raises the possibility that in rare cases PML may occur in patients treated with fingolimod.

In summary, the well-established safety profile of fingolimod along with the extensive clinical experience in both clinical trial and real-world settings make it an attractive efficacy switch option. Its convenient oral route of administration and once-daily application may also influence patient preference and treatment decisions.

1.3.2. Natalizumab

Natalizumab is approved (300 mg, administered intravenously every 4 weeks) in the EU for adult patients with RRMS who experience high disease activity despite treatment with IFN β or GA, or who have rapidly evolving RRMS.¹¹² Natalizumab is a monoclonal antibody that targets the $\alpha 4$ -integrin component of adhesion molecules found on immune cells, which has been suggested to interfere with their migration into the CNS.¹¹³ Thus, natalizumab's MoA is mainly based on its anti-inflammatory properties.^{112,113}

The efficacy of natalizumab was assessed in the 2-year placebo-controlled Phase III trial, AFFIRM (NAtalizumab Safety and EFFicacy in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis), and the combination Phase III trial, SENTINEL (Safety and Efficacy of Natalizumab in Combination with Interferon Beta-1a in Patients with Relapsing Remitting Multiple Sclerosis).^{114,115} In AFFIRM, natalizumab significantly reduced relapse rates, 3- and 6-month confirmed disability progression, and the number of Gd+ T1 and new or enlarging T2 lesions on MRI.¹¹⁴ However, no early and consistent reduction in BVL over 2 years was observed with natalizumab treatment compared with placebo; BVL was only reduced from Year 1 to Year 2.¹¹⁶ While the 2-year trial, SENTINEL, demonstrated that natalizumab added to IFN β -1a IM resulted in a significant reduction in relapse rates compared with IFN β -1a IM treatment alone,¹¹⁵ there are, so far, no prospective, randomized clinical trials comparing natalizumab monotherapy with any other DMT.

The 5-year interim data of the 10-year ongoing TOP (TYSABRI Observational Program) study further confirmed natalizumab's robust effect on ARR and disability progression in a post-marketing setting.¹¹⁷ A number of observational studies provide evidence for the beneficial effect of natalizumab in patients with

suboptimal response to IFN β or GA,^{118–124} suggesting that natalizumab may be an effective efficacy switch option.

Natalizumab has a well-established safety profile,^{125,126} but post-marketing data for patients with more than 6 years of exposure are limited.¹²⁷ One major safety concern associated with natalizumab treatment is the risk of PML and thus, patients need to be instructed together with their caregivers on early signs and symptoms of PML.¹¹² Risk factors for developing PML include anti-JCV antibody-positivity, prior immunosuppressant use, and prolonged natalizumab exposure (> 24 months).¹²⁸

Natalizumab may be recommended as an efficacy switch option for JCV antibody-negative patients. It is recommended that anti-JCV antibody-negative patients should be retested, given the false-negative rate of about 2–3% and the potential of seroconversion.^{129,130} When making treatment decisions, the long-term use of therapies also needs to be taken into consideration. Thus, in JCV antibody-positive patients (~40–60% of patients¹³¹), prolonged use of natalizumab for more than 24 months should be considered carefully, due to the increased risk of PML.¹²⁵ As of December 2014, 517 cases of natalizumab-associated PML have been reported in > 132,600 patients, with a mortality of 23%.¹³² Frequent MRI assessments are recommended in order to detect early subclinical signs of PML, which might be associated with a better clinical outcome.¹³³ Some studies have reported that the discontinuation of natalizumab is associated with rebound of disease activity, which may complicate patient management when switching therapy from natalizumab;¹²⁵ these observations remain controversial, since rebound was not seen in other cohorts.¹³⁴ More data are clearly warranted on how to switch over from natalizumab to other therapies, and over what periods of time.¹²⁵

Overall, natalizumab can be recommended as an efficacy switch option dependent on clinical practice, e.g. the patient's JCV-antibody status might influence treatment decisions. In an observational study that used JCV serology to determine therapy, natalizumab was found to have increased efficacy on time to relapse or Gd+ lesions compared with fingolimod.¹³⁵ Additional RWE demonstrated that, in patients with active MS during treatment with first-line therapies, switching to natalizumab is more effective than switching to fingolimod in reducing relapse rate and short-term disability burden.¹³⁶

1.3.3. Alemtuzumab

Alemtuzumab is approved (12 mg/day administered by intravenous infusion for 5 consecutive days initially and for 3 consecutive days 1 year later) in the EU for adult patients with RRMS with active disease defined by clinical or imaging features.¹³⁷ Alemtuzumab is a humanized monoclonal antibody directed against CD52, a cell-surface protein highly expressed on T and B lymphocytes.¹³⁸ The binding of alemtuzumab to CD52 results in the depletion of T and B lymphocytes from the circulation through

antibody-dependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity, complement-dependent cytotoxicity and induction of apoptosis.¹³⁸

The efficacy of alemtuzumab was assessed in the 2-year, active comparator Phase III trials CARE-MS I (Comparison of Alemtuzumab and Rebif[®] Efficacy in Multiple Sclerosis, Study One) and CARE-MS II (Study Two).^{139,140} Alemtuzumab was compared with IFN β -1a SC in treatment-naïve patients in CARE-MS I and in patients with ≥ 1 relapse on IFN β or GA in CARE-MS II.^{139,141} Both trials demonstrated superiority for alemtuzumab over IFN β -1a SC regarding reductions in relapse rate, MRI lesion activity (including the number of Gd+ T1 and new or enlarging T2 lesions) and BVL.^{139,141} An improvement in 6-month confirmed disability progression was observed in CARE-MS II but not in CARE-MS I, and 3-month confirmed disability progression was not reported for either trial.^{139,141} Alemtuzumab's beneficial effect observed in patients with suboptimal response to IFN β or GA in CARE-MS II suggests that alemtuzumab may be a suitable efficacy switch option.

The most common side effects reported with alemtuzumab treatment are infusion-associated symptoms including rash, headache, influenza-like symptoms, and, less frequently, transient recurrence of previous MS symptoms.^{137,142} Alemtuzumab has also been associated with serious AEs, in particular secondary autoimmune disorders, such as thyroid disease and immune thrombocytopenia, arising months or years following treatment.^{137,142} Thus, treatment with alemtuzumab requires extensive monitoring, including complete blood counts and thyroid function tests, and a high level of vigilance from the patient and physician.^{137,142} The ongoing, open-label extension studies of CARE-MS I and CARE-MS II revealed no unexpected AEs 4 years after initiation of alemtuzumab treatment;^{143,144} however, the long-term safety profile needs to be characterized in clinical trials as well as in a post-marketing setting.

Overall, the efficacy data from clinical trials, in particular CARE-MS II, suggest that alemtuzumab may be a suitable switch option for patients with suboptimal treatment response on first-line therapies. Even though alemtuzumab has been indicated as first-line therapy for patients with active MS according to the EMA label,¹³⁷ it is commonly used as a second- or third-line therapy in clinical practice. When discussing treatment options with patients, the risk of secondary autoimmunity with alemtuzumab needs to be considered.

Table 1 Overview of evidence supporting the treatment positioning of the more recently approved DMTs^a.

	Teriflunomide 48,50–52,54,55,145	DMF ^{61–64,66–71,77}	Fingolimod ^{90,93,9} 4,98,100,102,103,111,14 6	Natalizumab 77,112,114–124,128	Alemtuzumab 137,139,141,142,147
Positioning	For treatment-naïve patients and mild/moderate disease activity		For patients with (highly) active disease (despite first-line treatment)		
Efficacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to moderate efficacy • Homogenous efficacy on clinical disease activity across subgroups stratified by baseline demographics, clinical, and MRI characteristics • No proven efficacy vs. active comparator • No significant reduction in global BVL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High efficacy in newly diagnosed patients • More effective in treatment-naïve patients than in patients previously treated with ≥ 1 DMT • No proven efficacy vs. active comparator • Inconsistent effect on BVL across clinical trials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High efficacy in patients with disease activity despite prior DMT use • High efficacy in patients who switched from IFNs or GA to fingolimod (RCT, RWE) • Proven efficacy against active comparator (IFN β-1a IM) • Early and consistent effect on BVL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High efficacy in patients with suboptimal response on IFN β or GA (RWE) • No proven efficacy vs. active comparator (as monotherapy) • No early and consistent effect on BVL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High efficacy in patients with ≥ 1 relapse on IFN β or GA • Proven efficacy vs. active comparator (IFN β-1a SC) • Effect on BVL vs. active comparator (IFN β-1a SC)
Total number of patients treated worldwide (estimate)	• 30,000 (data cut-off August 2014)	• 138,535 (data cut-off December 2014)	• ~104,700 (data cut-off August 2014)	• 138,043 (data cut-off December 2014)	• 1,486 (data cut-off October 2014, clinical trials only ^b)
Total patient-years of exposure (estimate)	• > 6,800 (data cut-off August 2014, clinical trials only ^b)	• 112,096 (data cut-off December 2014)	• 172,500 (data cut-off August 2014)	• 404,299 (data cut-off December 2014)	• 6,483 (data cut-off October 2013, clinical trials only ^b)
Primary safety/tolerability concerns and monitoring required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally well tolerated, with routine monitoring of liver function required due to a risk of hepatotoxicity • Should be avoided during pregnancy as it may cause major birth defects • Hair thinning is a commonly reported side effect that may influence patient preference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most common AEs include flushing and GI events, which tend to begin early in the course of treatment • DMF has been associated with prolonged lymphopenia, which may increase the risk of PML 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fingolimod has been associated with a transient, mostly asymptomatic decrease in heart rate treatment initiation, requiring monitoring over the first 6 h following the first dose • Vigilance for symptoms and signs of infection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natalizumab has been associated with an increased risk of PML in patients who are JCV antibody-positive, requiring monitoring for early signs and symptoms of PML 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alemtuzumab has been associated with an increased risk in secondary autoimmunity (especially thyroid disease, idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura, and, seldom, Good pasture syndrome), requiring extensive monitoring for early signs of autoimmune disease
Convenience/ease of use	• Convenient oral administration,	• Convenient oral administration,	• Convenient oral administration,	• Intravenous infusion over	• Intravenous infusion over

	once-daily	but twice-daily dosing may pose adherence issues	once-daily	approximately 1 hour every 4 weeks	2 treatment courses (5 consecutive days initially and 3 consecutive days 1 year later)
--	------------	--	------------	------------------------------------	--

AE, adverse event; BVL, brain volume loss; DMF, dimethyl fumarate; DMT, disease-modifying therapy; GA, glatiramer acetate; GI, gastrointestinal; IFN, interferon; IM, intramuscular; JCV, John Cunningham virus; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; PML, progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy; RCT, randomized controlled trial; RWE, real-world evidence; SC, subcutaneous.

^a IFNs and GA, whose treatment positioning has been well established, have not been included here; ^b Post-marketing data not available.

2. Improving treatment decision-making

2.1. Four key measures of disease activity

Considering the complex pathological processes underlying MS and the heterogeneity of the disease, composite measures may be able to provide a more complete assessment of disease activity. In the previous sections, we reviewed the efficacy of MS therapies based on the four key measures of disease activity that reflect the focal and diffuse damage occurring in MS. A direct comparison of efficacy endpoints among different trials would not be valid due to different study designs (e.g. different study populations or different time points), and has therefore been avoided. Currently, only clinical relapses, disability progression and MRI lesion activity, but not BVL, are commonly used outcome measures in routine clinical practice in MS. The current clinical and MRI assessments have been associated with various limitations and may not be able to detect all aspects of disease activity,^{148–150} e.g. disability progression, measured using the Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS), is not very sensitive in the mid and upper range of scores, mainly focuses on ambulation status, and lacks adequate cognitive and visual components.¹⁵⁰ Measurements of BVL are able to detect subtle pathological changes that are not captured by the other three measures. BVL begins early in MS and has been shown to correlate with measures of disability and cognitive impairment.^{12,151–155} It is also considered an overall marker of neurodegeneration and has been shown to predict long-term disability progression and cognitive decline.^{21,153,156–158} It has recently been reported that treatment effects on disability progression correlate with treatment effects on BVL,²³ supporting the use of BVL, alone or in combination with MRI lesions, as a surrogate marker of disability progression in MS. While the clinical relevance of BVL in MS has been widely accepted, BVL measurements have not yet been integrated into routine clinical practice, due to lack of standardization, software availability, and lack of reimbursement for post-image acquisition processing.¹⁵⁹ However, some effort has recently been made towards the definition of pathological cut-offs of BVL rates that could be used in clinical practice.¹⁶⁰

Composite measures that have been used in MS in the past are based on the conventional outcome measures. The composite measure ‘freedom from disease activity’, also known as ‘no evidence of disease

activity' (NEDA) is defined as no relapse activity, no EDSS disability progression, and no new MRI lesions (T1 Gd+ and/or active T2 lesions).^{161,162} These outcome measures may not be able to provide a complete assessment of the underlying pathology in MS; thus, the inclusion of additional measures in the definition of NEDA, such as BVL, could potentially provide a more comprehensive and balanced assessment of the focal and diffuse damage occurring in MS.^{163,164} The routine assessment of additional outcome measures, such as cognitive impairment and patient-reported outcomes (e.g. health-related quality of life), may provide further information on the ongoing disease activity in MS. Inclusion of these measures in NEDA may further enhance our understanding of disease progression and may help to identify treatment non-response to allow physicians to switch to more effective therapies earlier.

3. Conclusion

Optimizing treatment early in MS may prevent the accumulation of irreversible neurological damage and reduce the risk of disease progression. When optimizing treatment and defining a treatment regimen, it is important to consider the four key measures of disease activity: relapses, MRI lesions, disability progression, and BVL. In addition, the MoA, benefit:risk profiles, real-world effectiveness, specific safety concerns, risks associated with long-term use, and the overall perceived burden of the therapies should also be taken into account when making treatment decisions.

Based on the evidence-based considerations, IFN β , GA, teriflunomide, and DMF have been suggested for use in treatment-naïve patients, and fingolimod, natalizumab, and alemtuzumab in patients with active disease despite first-line treatment. The proposed treatment algorithm (Fig. 1) may help to guide treatment decisions when considering optimizing therapy early in patients with breakthrough disease activity despite first-line treatment. Switching patients early to a high-efficacy therapy that targets both focal and diffuse damage may impact the course of the disease and achieve long-term disease control. Additional measures of disease activity may enable physicians to gain a more accurate view of disease progression and give them the opportunity to make treatment decisions earlier.

Acknowledgments

Editorial assistance was provided by Dr. Katrin Male and Niamh McMahon of Health Interactions and was funded by Novartis Pharma AG.

Disclosures

Prof. Ziemssen has received reimbursements for participation in scientific advisory boards from Bayer Healthcare, Biogen Idec, Novartis Pharma AG, Merck Serono, Teva, Genzyme, and Synthon. He has also received speaker honorarium from Bayer Healthcare, Biogen Idec, Genzyme, Merck Sharp & Dohme,

GlaxoSmithKline, Novartis Pharma AG, Teva, Sanofi Aventis, and Almirall. He has also received research support from Bayer Healthcare, Biogen Idec, Genzyme, Novartis Pharma AG, Teva, and Sanofi Aventis. Prof. De Stefano has received honoraria for consulting services, speaking, and travel support from Schering, Biogen Idec, Teva, Novartis Pharma AG, Genzyme, and Merck Serono S.A. He serves on advisory boards for Merck Serono S.A. and Novartis Pharma AG, and has received research grant support from the Italian MS Society (AISM), Merck Serono S.A., and Novartis Pharma AG. Prof. Sormani has received consultation fees from Novartis Pharma AG, Biogen Idec, Teva, Merck Serono, Genzyme, F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd, and Synthon. Prof. Van Wijmeersch has received speaker fees, advisory honoraria, and research funding support from Bayer (Schering), Biogen Idec, Genzyme/Sanofi, Merck Serono, Novartis Pharma AG, and Teva. Prof. Wiendl has received speaking, consulting and/or research support for activities with Bayer Healthcare, Biogen Idec/Elan, Genzyme/Sanofi, Schering, EMD Serono, Teva Neuroscience, OmniaMed, Medac, Lundbeck, Novo Nordisk; grants and research contracts from Bayer Vital, Biogen Idec, Merck Serono, Novartis Pharma AG, Novo Nordisk, and Genzyme/Sanofi-Aventis. Prof. Kieseier has received honoraria for lecturing, travel expenses for attending meetings, and financial support for research from Almirall, Bayer HealthCare, Biogen Idec, Genzyme/Sanofi Aventis, Grifols, Merck Serono, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma Europe, Novartis Pharma AG, F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd, Talecris, and Teva.

Accepted manuscript

References

1. Filippi M, Rocca MA, Barkhof F, et al. Association between pathological and MRI findings in multiple sclerosis. *Lancet Neurol* 2012; 11:349-360.
2. Markovic-Plese S & McFarland HF. Immunopathogenesis of the multiple sclerosis lesion. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep* 2001; 1:257-262.
3. Lucchinetti CF, Popescu BF, Bunyan RF, et al. Inflammatory cortical demyelination in early multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2011; 365:2188-2197.
4. Kutzelnigg A & Lassmann H. Pathology of multiple sclerosis and related inflammatory demyelinating diseases. *Handb Clin Neurol* 2014; 122:15-58.
5. Smirniotopoulos JG, Murphy FM, Rushing EJ, et al. Patterns of contrast enhancement in the brain and meninges. *Radiographics* 2007; 27:525-551.
6. Kutzelnigg A, Lucchinetti CF, Stadelmann C, et al. Cortical demyelination and diffuse white matter injury in multiple sclerosis. *Brain* 2005; 128:2705-2712.
7. Filippi M & Rocca MA. MRI evidence for multiple sclerosis as a diffuse disease of the central nervous system. *J Neurol* 2005; 252 (Suppl. 5):16-24.
8. Dutta R & Trapp BD. Mechanisms of neuronal dysfunction and degeneration in multiple sclerosis. *Prog Neurobiol* 2011; 93:1-12.
9. Lassmann H & van Horssen J. The molecular basis of neurodegeneration in multiple sclerosis. *FEBS Lett* 2011; 585:3715-3723.
10. Brück W. The pathology of multiple sclerosis is the result of focal inflammatory demyelination with axonal damage. *J Neurol* 2005; 252 (Suppl. 5):v3-v9.
11. Sanfilippo MP, Benedict RH, Sharma J, et al. The relationship between whole brain volume and disability in multiple sclerosis: a comparison of normalized gray vs. white matter with misclassification correction. *Neuroimage* 2005; 26:1068-1077.
12. De Stefano N, Airas L, Grigoriadis N, et al. Clinical relevance of brain volume measures in multiple sclerosis. *CNS Drugs* 2014; 28:147-156.
13. Shirani A, Zhao Y, Karim ME, et al. Association between use of interferon beta and progression of disability in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *JAMA* 2012; 308:247-256.
14. Kremenutzky M, Morrow S, Rush C. The safety and efficacy of IFN-beta products for the treatment of multiple sclerosis. *Expert Opin Drug Saf* 2007; 6:279-288.
15. Johnson KP, Brooks BR, Cohen JA, et al. Copolymer 1 reduces relapse rate and improves disability in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: results of a phase III multicenter, double-blind placebo-controlled trial. The Copolymer 1 Multiple Sclerosis Study Group. *Neurology* 1995; 45:1268-1276.
16. Gajofatto A, Bacchetti P, Grimes B, et al. Switching first-line disease-modifying therapy after failure: impact on the course of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler* 2009; 15:50-58.

17. Río J, Nos C, Tintoré M, et al. Assessment of different treatment failure criteria in a cohort of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis patients treated with interferon beta: implications for clinical trials. *Ann Neurol* 2002; 52:400-406.
18. Killestein J & Polman CH. Determinants of interferon β efficacy in patients with multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2011; 7:221-228.
19. Bermel RA, You X, Foulds P, et al. Predictors of long-term outcome in multiple sclerosis patients treated with interferon β . *Ann Neurol* 2013; 73:95-103.
20. Río J, Castelló J, Rovira A, et al. Measures in the first year of therapy predict the response to interferon beta in MS. *Mult Scler* 2009; 15:848-853.
21. Popescu V, Agosta F, Hulst HE, et al. Brain atrophy and lesion load predict long term disability in multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2013; 84:1082-1091.
22. Sormani MP & De Stefano N. Defining and scoring response to IFN- β in multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2013; 9:504-512.
23. Sormani MP, Arnold DL, De Stefano N. Treatment effect on brain atrophy correlates with treatment effect on disability in multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol* 2014; 75:43-49.
24. Sormani M, Río J, Tintore M, et al. Scoring treatment response in patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler* 2013; 5:605-612.
25. Leray E, Yaouanq J, Le Page E, et al. Evidence for a two-stage disability progression in multiple sclerosis. *Brain* 2010; 133:1900-1913.
26. Freedman MS. Multiple sclerosis therapeutic strategies: Use second-line agents as first-line agents when time is of the essence. *Neurol Clin Pract* 2011; 1:66-68.
27. Gold R, Wolinsky JS, Amato MP, et al. Evolving expectations around early management of multiple sclerosis. *Ther Adv Neurol Disord* 2010; 3:351-367.
28. Río J, Comabella M, Montalban X. Predicting responders to therapies for multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2009; 5:553-560.
29. Jacobs LD, Beck RW, Simon JH, et al. Intramuscular interferon beta-1a therapy initiated during a first demyelinating event in multiple sclerosis. CHAMPS Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 2000; 343:898-904.
30. Comi G, Filippi M, Barkhof F, et al. Effect of early interferon treatment on conversion to definite multiple sclerosis: a randomised study. *Lancet* 2001; 357:1576-1582.
31. Comi G, Martinelli V, Rodegher M, et al. Effect of glatiramer acetate on conversion to clinically definite multiple sclerosis in patients with clinically isolated syndrome (PreCISE study): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2009; 374:1503-1511.
32. Kappos L, Traboulsee A, Constantinescu C, et al. Long-term subcutaneous interferon beta-1a therapy in patients with relapsing-remitting MS. *Neurology* 2006; 67:944-953.
33. Multiple Sclerosis Therapy Consensus Group (MSTCG), Wiendl H, Toyka KV, et al. Basic and escalating immunomodulatory treatments in multiple sclerosis: current therapeutic recommendations. *J Neurol* 2008; 255:1449-1463.

34. Correale J, Abad P, Alvarenga R, et al. Management of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis in Latin America: practical recommendations for treatment optimization. *J Neurol Sci* 2014; 339:196-206.
35. Freedman MS, Selchen D, Arnold DL, et al. Treatment optimization in MS: Canadian MS Working Group updated recommendations. *Can J Neurol Sci* 2013; 40:307-323.
36. Río J, Comabella M, Montalban X. Multiple sclerosis: current treatment algorithms. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2011; 24:230-237.
37. Reder AT, Ebers GC, Traboulsee A, et al. Cross-sectional study assessing long-term safety of interferon-beta-1b for relapsing-remitting MS. *Neurology* 2010; 74:1877-1885.
38. Ford C, Goodman AD, Johnson K, et al. Continuous long-term immunomodulatory therapy in relapsing multiple sclerosis: results from the 15-year analysis of the US prospective open-label study of glatiramer acetate. *Mult Scler* 2010; 16:342-350.
39. Pereira VC, Malfetano FR, Meira ID, et al. Clinical response to interferon beta and glatiramer acetate in multiple sclerosis patients: a Brazilian cohort. *Arq Neuropsiquiatr* 2012; 70:774-779.
40. Prosperini L, Borriello G, De Giglio L, et al. Management of breakthrough disease in patients with multiple sclerosis: when an increasing of Interferon beta dose should be effective? *BMC Neurol* 2011; 11:26.
41. Carrá A, Onaha P, Luetic G, et al. Therapeutic outcome 3 years after switching of immunomodulatory therapies in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis in Argentina. *Eur J Neurol* 2008; 15:386-393.
42. Caon C, Din M, Ching W, et al. Clinical course after change of immunomodulating therapy in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Eur J Neurol* 2006; 13:471-474.
43. Katrych O, Simone TM, Azad S, et al. Disease-modifying agents in the treatment of multiple sclerosis: a review of long-term outcomes. *CNS Neurol Disord Drug Targets* 2009; 8:512-519.
44. Ebers GC, Traboulsee A, Li D, et al. Analysis of clinical outcomes according to original treatment groups 16 years after the pivotal IFNB-1b trial. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2010; 81:907-912.
45. Shirani A, Zhao Y, Karim ME, et al. Interferon beta and long-term disability in multiple sclerosis. *JAMA Neurol* 2013; 70:651-652.
46. Kappos L, Clanet M, Sandberg-Wollheim M, et al. Neutralizing antibodies and efficacy of interferon beta-1a: a 4-year controlled study. *Neurology* 2005; 65:40-47.
47. Sorensen PS, Ross C, Clemmesen KM, et al. Clinical importance of neutralising antibodies against interferon beta in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Lancet* 2003; 362:1184-1191.
48. Sanofi-Aventis Groupe. AUBAGIO SmPC, Nov 2014. Available at: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/EPAR_-_Product_Information/human/002514/WC500148682.pdf. Accessed February 2015.
49. Bar-Or A, Pachner A, Menguy-Vacheron F, et al. Teriflunomide and its mechanism of action in multiple sclerosis. *Drugs* 2014; 74:659-674.

50. O'Connor P, Wolinsky JS, Confavreux C, et al. Randomized trial of oral teriflunomide for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2011; 365:1293-1303.
51. Confavreux C, O'Connor P, Comi G, et al. Oral teriflunomide for patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis (TOWER): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2014; 13:247-256.
52. Vermersch P, Czlonkowska A, Grimaldi LM, et al. Teriflunomide versus subcutaneous interferon beta-1a in patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis: a randomised, controlled phase 3 trial. *Mult Scler* 2014; 20:705-716.
53. US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Medical Review: Aubagio (teriflunomide). 25 August 2012. Available at: www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2012/202992Orig1s000MedR.pdf. Accessed February 2015.
54. Wolinsky JS, Narayana PA, Nelson F, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging outcomes from a phase III trial of teriflunomide. *Mult Scler* 2013; 19:1310-1319.
55. Olsson TP, Comi G, Freedman MS, et al. Patients free of clinical MS activity in TEMSO and TOWER: pooled analyses of two Phase 3 placebo-controlled trials. *AAN* 2014; P3.164.
56. Genzyme Corporation. AUBAGIO Prescribing Information, Oct 2014. Available at: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2014/202992s0011bl.pdf. Accessed February 2015.
57. Leist TP, Freedman MS, Benamor M, et al. Pooled safety data from four placebo-controlled teriflunomide studies. *AAN* 2014; P2.203.
58. van Riel PL, Smolen JS, Emery P, et al. Leflunomide: a manageable safety profile. *J Rheumatol Suppl* 2004; 71:21-24.
59. Biogen Idec Ltd. Tecfidera SmPC, Dec 2014. Available at: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/EPAR_-_Product_Information/human/002601/WC500162069.pdf. Accessed February 2015.
60. Burness CB & Deeks ED. Dimethyl fumarate: a review of its use in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *CNS Drugs* 2014; 28:373-387.
61. Gold R, Kappos L, Arnold DL, et al. Placebo-controlled phase 3 study of oral BG-12 for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2012; 367:1098-1107.
62. Fox RJ, Miller DH, Phillips JT, et al. Placebo-controlled phase 3 study of oral BG-12 or glatiramer in multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2012; 367:1087-1097.
63. Arnold DL, Gold R, Kappos L, et al. Effects of delayed-release dimethyl fumarate on MRI measures in the Phase 3 DEFINE study. *J Neurol* 2014; 261:1794-1802.
64. Miller D, Fox RJ, Phillips JT, et al. Effects of BG-12 on magnetic resonance imaging outcomes in CONFIRM (Comparator and an Oral Fumarate in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis), a randomized, placebo-controlled, phase 3 study. *ENS* 2012; O259.
65. Fox RJ, Miller DH, Phillips JT, et al. Placebo-controlled phase 3 study of oral BG-12 or glatiramer in multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2012; 367:1087-1097 (Supplementary Appendix).

66. Gold R, Giovannoni G, Phillips JT, et al. Efficacy and safety of delayed-release dimethyl fumarate in patients newly diagnosed with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS). *Mult Scler* 2015; 21:57-66.
67. Hutchinson M, Gold R, Fox RJ, et al. Clinical efficacy of BG-12 (dimethyl fumarate) for relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis according to prior therapy: an integrated analysis of the Phase 3 DEFINE and CONFIRM studies. *ECTRIMS* 2013; P563.
68. Hutchinson M, Fox RJ, Miller DH, et al. Clinical efficacy of BG-12 (dimethyl fumarate) in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: subgroup analyses of the CONFIRM study. *J Neurol* 2013; 260:2286-2296.
69. Bar-Or A, Gold R, Kappos L, et al. Clinical efficacy of BG-12 (dimethyl fumarate) in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: subgroup analyses of the DEFINE study. *J Neurol* 2013; 260:2297-2305.
70. Tan CS & Koralnik IJ. Progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy and other disorders caused by JC virus: clinical features and pathogenesis. *Lancet Neurol* 2010; 9:425-437.
71. Multiple Sclerosis Society News. Case of PML confirmed in someone taking Tecfidera. Oct 2014. Available at: <http://www.mssociety.org.uk/ms-news/2014/10/case-pml-confirmed-someone-taking-tecfidera>. Accessed February 2015.
72. Calabrese LH, Molloy E, Berger J. Sorting out the risks in progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2015; 11:119-123.
73. Bomprezzi R. Dimethyl fumarate in the treatment of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: an overview. *Ther Adv Neurol Dis* 2015; 8:20-30.
74. Sheremata W, Brown AD, Rammohan KW. Dimethyl fumarate for treating relapsing multiple sclerosis. *Expert Opin Drug Saf* 2015; 14:161-170.
75. Nieuwkamp DJ, Murk JL, van Oosten BW, et al. PML in a patient without severe lymphocytopenia receiving dimethyl fumarate. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372:1474-1476.
76. Rosenkranz T, Novas M, Terborg C. PML in a patient with lymphocytopenia treated with dimethyl fumarate. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372:1476-1478.
77. Biogen Idec. Personal communication. February 2015.
78. CMEcorner.com. Clinical Insights in Neurology: Focus on Multiple Sclerosis – Issue 4. Clinical Advances in Relapsing-Remitting MS: The Role of Oral Disease-Modifying Therapies. Available at: <http://www.cme-corner.com/wp/clinical-insights-in-neurology-focus-on-multiple-sclerosis-issue-4>. Accessed February 2015.
79. Coyle PK. Switching therapies in multiple sclerosis. *CNS Drugs* 2013; 27:239-247.
80. Prosperini L, Capobianco M, Giannì C. Identifying responders and nonresponders to interferon therapy in multiple sclerosis. *Degener Neurol Neuromuscul Dis* 2014; 4:75-84.
81. Dobson R, Rudick RA, Turner B, et al. Assessing treatment response to interferon- β : is there a role for MRI? *Neurology* 2014; 82:248-254.

82. Miller DH, Grossman RI, Reingold SC, et al. The role of magnetic resonance techniques in understanding and managing multiple sclerosis. *Brain* 1998; 121 (Pt 1):3-24.
83. Prosperini L, Gallo V, Petsas N, et al. One-year MRI scan predicts clinical response to interferon beta in multiple sclerosis. *Eur J Neurol* 2009; 16:1202-1209.
84. Durelli L, Barbero P, Bergui M, et al. MRI activity and neutralising antibody as predictors of response to interferon beta treatment in multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2008; 79:646-651.
85. Tomassini V, Paolillo A, Russo P, et al. Predictors of long-term clinical response to interferon beta therapy in relapsing multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol* 2006; 253:287-293.
86. Sormani MP, Li DK, Bruzzi P, et al. Combined MRI lesions and relapses as a surrogate for disability in multiple sclerosis. *Neurology* 2011; 77:1684-1690.
87. Sormani MP, Bonzano L, Roccatagliata L, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging as a potential surrogate for relapses in multiple sclerosis: a meta-analytic approach. *Ann Neurol* 2009; 65:268-275.
88. Sormani MP & Bruzzi P. MRI lesions as a surrogate for relapses in multiple sclerosis: a meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Lancet Neurol* 2013; 12:669-676.
89. Sormani M, Signori A, Stromillo M, et al. Refining response to treatment as defined by the Modified Rio Score. *Mult Scler* 2013; 19:1246-1247.
90. Novartis Pharma GmbH. GILENYA SmPC, Sep 2014. Available at: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/EPAR_-_Product_Information/human/002202/WC500104528.pdf. Accessed February 2015.
91. Chun J & Hartung HP. Mechanism of action of oral fingolimod (FTY720) in multiple sclerosis. *Clin Neuropharmacol* 2010; 33:91-101.
92. Kappos L, Radue EW, O'Connor P, et al. A placebo-controlled trial of oral fingolimod in relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 362:387-401.
93. Calabresi PA, Radue EW, Goodin D, et al. Safety and efficacy of fingolimod in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis (FREEDOMS II): a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2014; 13:545-556.
94. Cohen JA, Barkhof F, Comi G, et al. Oral fingolimod or intramuscular interferon for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 362:402-415.
95. Cohen JA, Barkhof F, Comi G, et al. Fingolimod versus intramuscular interferon in patient subgroups from TRANSFORMS. *J Neurol* 2013; 260:2023-2032.
96. Devonshire V, Havrdova E, Radue EW, et al. Relapse and disability outcomes in patients with multiple sclerosis treated with fingolimod: subgroup analyses of the double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled FREEDOMS study. *Lancet Neurol* 2012; 11:420-428.
97. Khatri BO, Pelletier J, Kappos L, et al. Effect of prior treatment status and reasons for discontinuation on the efficacy and safety of fingolimod vs. interferon β -1a intramuscular: Subgroup analyses of the Trial Assessing Injectable Interferon vs. Fingolimod Oral in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis (TRANSFORMS). *Mult Scler Relat Disord* 2014; 3:355-363.

98. Bergvall N, Sfikas N, Chin P, et al. Efficacy of fingolimod in pre-treated multiple sclerosis patients with disease activity: pooled analyses of FREEDOMS and FREEDOMS II. *AAN* 2014; P3.174.
99. Comi G. Position and practical use of fingolimod in Europe. *Clin Exp Neuroimmunol* 2014; 5:19-33.
100. Khatri B, Barkhof F, Comi G, et al. Comparison of fingolimod with interferon beta-1a in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: a randomised extension of the TRANSFORMS study. *Lancet Neurol* 2011; 10:520-529.
101. Jokubaitis VG, Li V, Kalincik T, et al. Fingolimod after natalizumab and the risk of short-term relapse. *Neurology* 2014; 82:1204-1211.
102. He A, Spelman T, Jokubaitis V, et al. Comparison of switch to fingolimod or interferon beta/glatiramer acetate in active multiple sclerosis. *JAMA Neurol* 2015; 72:405-413.
103. Ziemssen T, Diaz-Lorente M, Fuchs A, et al. 24-month interim results of PANGAEA: A 5 year registry study evaluating long-term safety, efficacy and pharmaco-economic data of German multiple sclerosis patients on fingolimod therapy. *AAN* 2014; P3.152.
104. Cohen JA, von Rosenstiel P, Gottschalk R, et al. Long-term safety of fingolimod: interim evaluation of data from the LONGTERMS trial. *AAN* 2014; P2.210.
105. Kappos L, Cohen J, Collins W, et al. Fingolimod in relapsing multiple sclerosis: An integrated analysis of safety findings. *Mult Scler Relat Disord* 2014; 3:494-504.
106. Singer BA. Fingolimod for the treatment of relapsing multiple sclerosis. *Expert Rev Neurother* 2013; 13:589-602.
107. Sanford M. Fingolimod: a review of its use in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Drugs* 2014; 74:1411-1433.
108. DiMarco JP, O'Connor P, Cohen JA, et al. First-dose effects of fingolimod: Pooled safety data from three phase 3 studies. *Mult Scler Relat Disord* 2014; 3:629-638.
109. Hughes B, Cascione M, Freedman MS, et al. First-dose effects of fingolimod after switching from injectable therapies in the randomized, open-label, multicenter, Evaluate Patient Outcomes (EPOC) study in relapsing multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler Relat Disord* 2014; 3:620-628.
110. Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada. Case of PML reported in patient treated with Gilenya®. 19 February 2015. Available at: <https://beta.mssociety.ca/research-news/article/case-of-pml-reported-in-patient-treated-with-gilenya>. Accessed February 2015.
111. Novartis International AG. Novartis Q4 and FY 2014 condensed financial report – supplementary data. Available at: <http://www.novartis.com/downloads/investors/financial-results/quarterly-results/2015-01-interim-financial-report.pdf>. Accessed February 2015.
112. Biogen Idec Ltd. TYSABRI SmPC, Dec 2014. Available at: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/EPAR_-_Product_Information/human/000603/WC500044686.pdf. Accessed February 2015.
113. Coyle PK. The role of natalizumab in the treatment of multiple sclerosis. *Am J Manag Care* 2010; 16 (Suppl. 6):S164-S170.

114. Polman CH, O'Connor PW, Havrdova E, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of natalizumab for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2006; 354:899-910.
115. Rudick RA, Stuart WH, Calabresi PA, et al. Natalizumab plus interferon beta-1a for relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med* 2006; 354:911-923.
116. Miller DH, Soon D, Fernando KT, et al. MRI outcomes in a placebo-controlled trial of natalizumab in relapsing MS. *Neurology* 2007; 68:1390-1401.
117. Butzkueven H, Kappos L, Pellegrini F, et al. Efficacy and safety of natalizumab in multiple sclerosis: interim observational programme results. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2014; 85:1190-1197.
118. Río J, Tintoré M, Sastre-Garriga J, et al. Change in the clinical activity of multiple sclerosis after treatment switch for suboptimal response. *Eur J Neurol* 2012; 19:899-904.
119. Belachew S, Phan-Ba R, Bartholomé E, et al. Natalizumab induces a rapid improvement of disability status and ambulation after failure of previous therapy in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Eur J Neurol* 2011; 18:240-245.
120. Castillo-Trivino T, Mowry EM, Gajofatto A, et al. Switching multiple sclerosis patients with breakthrough disease to second-line therapy. *PLoS One* 2011; 6:e16664.
121. Prosperini L, Gianni C, Leonardi L, et al. Escalation to natalizumab or switching among immunomodulators in relapsing multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler* 2012; 18:64-71.
122. Putzki N, Yaldizli O, Mäurer M, et al. Efficacy of natalizumab in second line therapy of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: results from a multi-center study in German speaking countries. *Eur J Neurol* 2010; 17:31-37.
123. Putzki N, Kollia K, Woods S, et al. Natalizumab is effective as second line therapy in the treatment of relapsing remitting multiple sclerosis. *Eur J Neurol* 2009; 16:424-426.
124. Putzki N, Yaldizli O, Bühler R, et al. Natalizumab reduces clinical and MRI activity in multiple sclerosis patients with high disease activity: results from a multicenter study in Switzerland. *Eur Neurol* 2010; 63:101-106.
125. Planas R, Martin R, Sospedra M. Long-term safety and efficacy of natalizumab in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: impact on quality of life. *Patient Relat Outcome Meas* 2014; 5:25-33.
126. Rudick R, Goodman A, Kappos L, et al. Six-year natalizumab safety and efficacy data from the STRATA study. *ECTRIMS* 2013; P593.
127. O'Connor P, Goodman A, Kappos L, et al. Long-term safety and effectiveness of natalizumab redosing and treatment in the STRATA MS Study. *Neurology* 2014; 83:78-86.
128. Bloomgren G, Richman S, Hotermans C, et al. Risk of natalizumab-associated progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy. *N Engl J Med* 2012; 366:1870-1880.
129. Outteryck O, Zephir H, Salleron J, et al. JC-virus seroconversion in multiple sclerosis patients receiving natalizumab. *Mult Scler* 2013; Epub ahead of print.
130. Gorelik L, Lerner M, Bixler S, et al. Anti-JC virus antibodies: implications for PML risk stratification. *Ann Neurol* 2010; 68:295-303.

131. Berger JR, Houff SA, Gurwell J, et al. JC virus antibody status underestimates infection rates. *Ann Neurol* 2013; 74:84-90.
132. Multiple Sclerosis Research. Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry. A blog for people with MS and their families. ClinicSpeak: natalizumab PML update - Q4 2014. Available at: <http://multiple-sclerosis-research.blogspot.com/2015/01/clinicspeak-natalizumab-pml-update-q4.html>. Accessed February 2015.
133. Nicholas JA, Racke MK, Imitola J, et al. First-line natalizumab in multiple sclerosis: rationale, patient selection, benefits and risks. *Ther Adv Chronic Dis* 2014; 5:62-68.
134. Fernández O. Best practice in the use of natalizumab in multiple sclerosis. *Ther Adv Neurol Disord* 2013; 6:69-79.
135. Carruthers RL, Rotstein DL, Healy BC, et al. An observational comparison of natalizumab vs. fingolimod using JCV serology to determine therapy. *Mult Scler* 2014; 20:1381-1390.
136. Kalincik T, Horakova D, Spelman T, et al. Switch to natalizumab versus fingolimod in active relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol* 2015; 77:425-435.
137. Genzyme Therapeutics Ltd. LEMTRADA SmPC, March 2014. Available at: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/EPAR_-_Product_Information/human/003718/WC500150521.pdf. Accessed February 2015.
138. Freedman MS, Kaplan JM, Markovic-Plese S. Insights into the Mechanisms of the Therapeutic Efficacy of Alemtuzumab in Multiple Sclerosis. *J Clin Cell Immunol* 2013; 4:1000152.
139. Cohen JA, Coles AJ, Arnold DL, et al. Alemtuzumab versus interferon beta 1a as first-line treatment for patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: a randomised controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2012; 380:1819-1828.
140. Coles AJ, Fox E, Vladoic A, et al. Alemtuzumab more effective than interferon β -1a at 5-year follow-up of CAMMS223 clinical trial. *Neurology* 2012; 78:1069-1078.
141. Coles AJ, Twyman CL, Arnold DL, et al. Alemtuzumab for patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis after disease-modifying therapy: a randomised controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2012; 380:1829-1839.
142. Coles AJ. Alemtuzumab treatment of multiple sclerosis. *Semin Neurol* 2013; 33:66-73.
143. Hartung HP, Arnold DL, Cohen JA, et al. Efficacy and safety of alemtuzumab in patients with relapsing-remitting MS who relapsed on prior therapy: four-year follow-up of the CARE-MS II study. *ACTRIMS-ECTRIMS* 2014; P043.
144. Coles AJ, Arnold DL, Cohen JA, et al. Efficacy and safety of alemtuzumab in treatment-naive patients with relapsing-remitting MS: four-year follow-up of the CARE-MS I study. *ACTRIMS-ECTRIMS* 2014; P090.
145. Leist TP, Freedman MS, Kappos L, et al. Pooled safety analyses from the teriflunomide clinical development program. *ACTRIMS-ECTRIMS* 2014; P097.
146. Havrdová E, Kappos L, Cohen JA, et al. Clinical and magnetic resonance imaging outcomes in subgroups of patients with highly active relapsing–remitting multiple sclerosis treated with fingolimod

(FTY720): results from the FREEDOMS and TRANSFORMS phase 3 studies. *ACTRIMS-ECTRIMS* 2011; P473.

147. Miller T, Habek M, Coles AJ, et al. Analysis of data from RRMS alemtuzumab-treated patients in the clinical program to evaluate incidence rates of malignancy. *ACTRIMS-ECTRIMS* 2014; P868.

148. Lavery AM, Verhey LH, Waldman AT. Outcome measures in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: capturing disability and disease progression in clinical trials. *Mult Scler Int* 2014; 2014:262350.

149. Lublin FD, Reingold SC, Cohen JA, et al. Defining the clinical course of multiple sclerosis: the 2013 revisions. *Neurology* 2014; 83:278-286.

150. Balcer LJ. Clinical outcome measures for research in multiple sclerosis. *J Neuroophthalmol* 2001; 21:296-301.

151. Amato MP, Hakiki B, Goretti B, et al. Association of MRI metrics and cognitive impairment in radiologically isolated syndromes. *Neurology* 2012; 78:309-314.

152. Zivadinov R, Havrdová E, Bergsland N, et al. Thalamic atrophy is associated with development of clinically definite multiple sclerosis. *Radiology* 2013; 268:831-841.

153. Deloire MS, Ruet A, Hamel D, et al. MRI predictors of cognitive outcome in early multiple sclerosis. *Neurology* 2011; 76:1161-1167.

154. Bermel RA & Bakshi R. The measurement and clinical relevance of brain atrophy in multiple sclerosis. *Lancet Neurol* 2006; 5:158-170.

155. De Stefano N, Giorgio A, Battaglini M, et al. Assessing brain atrophy rates in a large population of untreated multiple sclerosis subtypes. *Neurology* 2010; 74:1868-1876.

156. Minneboo A, Jasperse B, Barkhof F, et al. Predicting short-term disability progression in early multiple sclerosis: added value of MRI parameters. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2008; 79:917-923.

157. Horakova D, Dwyer MG, Havrdova E, et al. Gray matter atrophy and disability progression in patients with early relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: a 5-year longitudinal study. *J Neurol Sci* 2009; 282:112-119.

158. Filippi M, Preziosa P, Copetti M, et al. Gray matter damage predicts the accumulation of disability 13 years later in MS. *Neurology* 2013; 81:1759-1767.

159. Projects in Knowledge. Chapter 2: MRI and New Imaging Technologies in Multiple Sclerosis. In: Cohen BA, Pelletier D, editors. *Living Medical eTextbook. Neurology: Multiple Sclerosis Edition*. 2013. Available at: <http://lmt.projectsinknowledge.com/Activity/index.cfm?showfile=b&i=8&jn=2023&sj=2023.02>. Accessed February 2015.

160. De Stefano N, Stromillo ML, Giorgio A, et al. Establishing pathological cut-offs of brain atrophy rates in multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; Epub ahead of print.

161. Havrdova E, Galetta S, Hutchinson M, et al. Effect of natalizumab on clinical and radiological disease activity in multiple sclerosis: a retrospective analysis of the Natalizumab Safety and Efficacy in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis (AFFIRM) study. *Lancet Neurol* 2009; 8:254-260.

162. Giovannoni G, Cook S, Rammohan K, et al. Sustained disease-activity-free status in patients with relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis treated with cladribine tablets in the CLARITY study: a post-hoc and subgroup analysis. *Lancet Neurol* 2011; 10:329-337.

163. De Stefano N, Sprenger T, Freedman MS, et al. Including threshold rates of brain volume loss in the definition of disease activity-free in multiple sclerosis using fingolimod phase 3 data. *ACTRIMS-ECTRIMS* 2014; P290.

164. Bevan CJ & Cree BA. Disease activity free status: a new end point for a new era in multiple sclerosis clinical research? *JAMA Neurol* 2014; 71:269-270.

Highlights:

- MS treatment may not adequately control disease activity
- Optimizing treatment in MS earlier may prevent accumulation of irreversible damage
- Assessing all key outcome measures may provide a more accurate view of MS
- Various factors need to be considered when making treatment decisions in MS

Accepted manuscript