

Conor Fearon, MB, PhD,<sup>1</sup>  Anthony E. Lang, MD, FRCPC,<sup>1</sup> and Alberto J. Espay, MD, MSc<sup>2\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Edmond J. Safra Program in Parkinson's Disease, Morton and Gloria Shulman Movement Disorders Clinic, Toronto Western Hospital—UHN, Division of Neurology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, and <sup>2</sup>UC Gardner Neuroscience Institute and Gardner Family Center for Parkinson's Disease and Movement Disorders, Department of Neurology, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA

## References

1. Horsager J, Andersen KB, Knudsen K, et al. Brain-first versus body-first Parkinson's disease: a multimodal imaging case-control study. *Brain* 2020;143(10):3077–3088. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awaa238>
2. Breen DP, Halliday GM, Lang AE. Gut-brain axis and the spread of  $\alpha$ -synuclein pathology: vagal highway or dead end? *Mov Disord* 2019;34(3):307–316. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.27556>
3. Svensson E, Horváth-Puhó E, Thomsen RW, et al. Vagotomy and subsequent risk of Parkinson's disease. *Ann Neurol* 2015;78(4):522–529. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24448>
4. Killinger BA, Madaj Z, Sikora JW, et al. The vermiform appendix impacts the risk of developing Parkinson's disease. *Sci Transl Med* 2018;10(465):1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aar5280>
5. van de Berg WDJ, Hepp DH, Dijkstra AA, Rozemuller JAM, Berendse HW, Foncke E. Patterns of  $\alpha$ -synuclein pathology in incidental cases and clinical subtypes of Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2012;18(Suppl 1):S28–S30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8020\(11\)70011-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-8020(11)70011-6)

## Cell Therapy for Huntington's Disease: Learning from Failure

We write in response to the editorial by Albin and Kordower,<sup>1</sup> “A Failed Future,” which offers a perspective on

© 2021 The Authors. *Movement Disorders* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

\*Correspondence to: Dr. Anne E. Rosser, Brain Repair And Intracranial Neurotherapeutics (BRAIN) Unit, Neuroscience and Mental Health Research Institute, Cardiff University, Hadyn Ellis Building, Maindy Road, Cardiff CF24 4HQ3, United Kingdom; E-mail: [rosserae@cf.ac.uk](mailto:rosserae@cf.ac.uk)

**Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures:** Stem Cells for HD has received funding for meetings from the California Institute of Regenerative Medicine, The European Huntington's Disease Network, and the Cure Huntington's Disease Initiative. A.E.R. performed the blinded video rating of Unified Huntington's Disease Rating Scale motor for the Multicentric Intracerebral Grafting in Huntington's Disease study. M.B., R.A.-B., J.M.C., V.W., A.L.P., W.G., L.T., and S.G. have no conflicts of interest to declare.


**Received:** 23 November 2020; **Revised:** 7 December 2020; **Accepted:** 8 December 2020

Published online in Wiley Online Library ([wileyonlinelibrary.com](http://wileyonlinelibrary.com)). DOI: 10.1002/mds.28503

the Multicentric Intracerebral Grafting in Huntington's Disease (MIG-HD) fetal cell transplantation study in Huntington's disease (HD).<sup>2</sup> Although MIG-HD did not achieve a positive clinical outcome, Albin and Kordower's critique of that study provides critical points of interpretation that we believe incorrect. In particular, we reject their categorical rejection of cell therapy as a regenerative treatment option for HD on the basis of a single phase II study of fetal cell transplantation. Indeed, Albin and Kordower highlight the confounds potentially caused by protocol changes during MIG-HD that emphasize the exploratory nature of this trial. Cell therapy has advanced substantially since MIG-HD was initiated; we now have fuller understanding of the cellular phenotypes and interactions that go awry in HD and thus a clearer understanding of cell-based strategies that might be used in its treatment. We suggest that Albin and Kordower make unwarranted predictions of future failure—effectively “throwing out the baby with bath water”—based on an overly broad interpretation of MIG-HD, leading them to a conclusion that is neither justified nor cognizant of the current science and does a disservice to current work in the field.

MIG-HD focused on achieving neural circuit reconstruction through transplanting striatal precursors isolated from fetal ganglionic eminence. It built on preclinical data and previous pilot human studies,<sup>3</sup> which constituted proof of concept that transplants can improve function and that this may not require every element of pathology to be addressed, something borne out in Parkinson's disease transplant studies where pathology also exists outside the key central nervous system target of cell therapy.<sup>4</sup> The limitations of fetal-derived donor cells stimulated research to derive candidate therapeutic progenitors (glial as well as neuronal<sup>5</sup>) from human pluripotent stem cells. Such cell products vary in their intended functions and therapeutic goals (eg, cell replacement, neuroprotection) with numerous reports of significant functional benefits (eg, Reidling and colleagues<sup>6</sup>). It is uninformative to lump these different products, targets, and therapeutic aims together and misleading to dismiss them all on the basis of a single phase II study initiated 2 decades ago.

We believe a more productive approach is to formulate an honest, comprehensive appraisal of foreseeable challenges to develop a rational road map for moving forward. There should be due consideration of the limitations of MIG-HD and previous studies, leading to new perspectives on the design and implementation of clinical trials of cell therapies in HD (as reviewed in Bachoud-Lévi and colleagues<sup>7</sup>). Indeed, publication and informed analysis of such negative data are precisely how we may best ensure future success. To facilitate this, we established Stem Cells for HD (SC4HD; <https://www.sc4hd.org/>), a global consortium of experts working in various areas of cell therapy. The group invites external peer review and is developing evidence-based guidance documents for the establishment of best practices in the field. We believe that this is the right process by which to assess whether the complex, but potentially powerful, strategy of cell-based therapies can have a place in the treatment of HD. ●

Anne E. Rosser, MB BChir, PhD,<sup>1,2\*</sup>  
 Monica Busse, BSc(Med), MSc (Med), PhD,<sup>3</sup>   
 Romina Aron Badin, PhD,<sup>4,5</sup> Josep M. Canals, PhD,<sup>6,7,8</sup>  
 Vicki Wheelock, MD,<sup>9</sup> Anselme L. Perrier, PhD,<sup>4,5</sup>  
 William Gray, MB, BCh, BAO, MD, FRCSI, FRCS(SN),<sup>1,10</sup>  
 Leslie Thompson, PhD,<sup>11</sup> and  
 Steven Goldman, MD, PhD<sup>12,13</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Brain Repair And Intracranial Neurotherapeutics (BRAIN) Unit, Neuroscience and Mental Health Research Institute, Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom, <sup>2</sup>Brain Repair Group, School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom, <sup>3</sup>Centre for Trials Research, Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom, <sup>4</sup>Commissariat à l'énergie atomique, Direction de la Recherche Fondamentale, Institute of Biology François Jacob, Molecular Imaging Research Center, Fontenay-aux-Roses, France, <sup>5</sup>Université Paris-Saclay, Commissariat à l'énergie atomique, CNRS, Neurodegenerative Diseases Laboratory (UMR9199), Fontenay-aux-Roses, France, <sup>6</sup>Laboratory of Stem Cells and Regenerative Medicine, Department of Biomedical Sciences, Production and Validation Center of Advanced Therapies (Creatio), Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Institute of Neurosciences, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, <sup>7</sup>Networked Biomedical Research Centre for Neurodegenerative Disorders, Barcelona, Spain, <sup>8</sup>August Pi i Sunyer Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBAPS), Barcelona, Spain, <sup>9</sup>Department of Neurology, University of California Davis Health, Sacramento, California, USA, <sup>10</sup>Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Wales, Cardiff, United Kingdom, <sup>11</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Behavior and Neurobiology and Behavior, Sue and Bill Gross Stem Cell Center, University of California, Irvine, California, USA, <sup>12</sup>Center for Translational Neuromedicine, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, New York, USA, and <sup>13</sup>Faculty of Health and Medical Science, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

## References

- Albin RL, Kordower JH. A failed future. *Mov Disord* 2020;35:1299–1301.
- Bachoud-Lévi AC. On behalf of Multicentric Intracerebral Grafting in Huntington's Disease Group. Human fetal cell therapy in Huntington's disease: a randomized, multicenter, phase II trial. *Mov Disord* 2020;35(8):1323–1335. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.28201>
- Bachoud-Lévi AC, Perrier AL. Regenerative medicine in Huntington's disease: current status on fetal grafts and prospects for the use of pluripotent stem cell. *Rev Neurol (Paris)* 2014;170(12):749–762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurol.2014.10.007>
- Barker RA, Drouin-Ouellet J, Parmar M. Cell-based therapies for Parkinson disease—past insights and future potential. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2015;11(9):492–503. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2015.123>
- Khakh BS, Beaumont V, Cachepe R, Munoz-Sanjuan I, Goldman SA, Grantyn R. Unravelling and exploiting astrocyte dysfunction in Huntington's disease. *Trends Neurosci* 2017;44:202–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2017.05.002>
- Reidling JC, Relaño-Ginés A, Holley SM, et al. Human neural stem cell transplantation rescues functional deficits in R6/2 and Q140 Huntington's disease mice. *Stem Cell Rep* 2018;10(1):58–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stemcr.2017.11.005>
- Bachoud-Lévi A-C, Massart R, Rosser AE. Cell therapy in Huntington's disease: taking stock of past studies to move the field forward. *Stem Cells* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1002/stem.3300>. Online ahead of print.

## Reply to: “Cell Therapy for Huntington's Disease: Learning from Failure”

We are pleased that our editorial provoked discussion of research priorities in Huntington disease (HD).<sup>1</sup> Rosser et al, however, misrepresent our comments. Rosser et al allege a “categorical rejection of cell therapy as a regenerative treatment option for HD on the basis of a single phase II study of foetal cell transplantation.”<sup>2</sup> This statement indicates that we regard MIG-HD as a definitive test of the value of cell transplantation. As was stated clearly in our editorial, one of our major criticisms of the MIG-HD study is that it failed to test the efficacy of engrafting fetal tissues and could not inform discussion of whether the general approach of cell therapy for HD is appropriate. Indeed, after more than 30 years of cell replacement strategy experiments, we were left with a clinical trial in which no graft survival was evident.

Our skepticism about the value of cell transplantation for HD rests on HD being a multifocal neurodegeneration and the slender preclinical evidence base for these kinds of interventions. Rosser et al cite Reidling et al as an example of promising preclinical data, but the results of this work underscore our concerns.<sup>3</sup> These were well-executed experiments using the R6/2 transgenic fragment and Q140 knock-in murine genetic models. R6/2 has been the test bed for numerous potential therapies, some translated to clinical trials, and all translated interventions without success in trials. How does success in a model without predictive validity support proceeding to clinical experiments? Q140 may be a better model. The conventional but crude behavioral outcome measures employed, however, are not likely to be informative of what happens in humans. To reinforce one of our points, regardless of the source of cells engrafted, the benefits of grafting will have to be substantial to compensate for the risks of surgeries. There should be substantial and convincing preclinical evidence of benefits before proceeding to trials. Newer therapeutic approaches designed to address the root pathology of HD, mutant huntingtin expression, have outpaced cell replacement therapy for HD. These newer approaches have a far greater chance of addressing all major symptomatic features of HD, including cognitive and behavioral deficits. HD participants undergoing cell transplantation experiments will be ineligible for other clinical trials.

Rosser et al describe a consortium aimed at developing “best practices in the field.” We suggest moving the focus away from relatively narrow technical considerations to critical thinking about the justification for these kinds of experiments. ●

© 2021 The Authors. *Movement Disorders* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of International Parkinson and Movement Disorder Society

**Key Words:** Huntington disease; cell therapy

\***Correspondence to:** Dr. Roger L. Albin, MD, 5023 BSRB, 109 Zina Pitcher Place, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-2200; E-mail: ralbin@med.umich.edu

**Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures:** nothing to report.

**Received:** 23 December 2020; **Accepted:** 28 December 2020

Published online in Wiley Online Library  
 (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/mds.28500