TITLE

A Systematic Approach to Identify Neuroprotective Interventions for Motor Neuron Disease

AUTHORS

The Writing Committee for Repurposing Living Systematic Review – Motor Neuron Disease (ReLiSyR-MND)

Charis Wong[1,2,3], Jenna M. Gregory[1,3,4], Jing Liao[1], Kieren Egan[1], Hanna M. Vesterinen[1], Aimal Ahmad Khan[5], Maarij Anwar[5], Caitlin Beagan[6], Fraser Brown[1,2], John Cafferkey[7], Alessandra Cardinali[1,3,8], Jane Yi Chiam[5], Claire Chiang[6], Victoria Collins[6], Joyce Dormido[9], Elizabeth Elliott[1,2,3], Peter Foley[1,2], Yu Cheng Foo[5], Lily Fulton-Humble[4], Angus B. Gane[6], Stella A. Glasmacher[1,2], Áine Heffernan[8], Kiran Jayaprakash[1,2], Nimesh Jayasuriya[6,10], Amina Kaddouri[5], Jamie Kiernan[5], Gavin Langlands[11], Danielle Leighton[1,3,12], Jiaming Liu[5], James Lyon[10], Arpan R. Mehta[1,2,3,8], Alyssa Meng[13], Vivienne Nguyen[5], Na Hyun Park[10], Suzanne Quigley[1,2], Yousuf Rashid[5], Andrea Salzinger[1,8], Bethany Shiell[6], Ankur Singh[6], Tim Soane[14], Alexandra Thompson[5], Olaf Tomala[5], Fergal M. Waldron[4,15], Bhuvaneish T. Selvaraj[1,2,3,8], Jeremy Chataway[16,17,18], Robert Swingler[3], Peter Connick[1,2], Suvankar Pal[1,2,3], Siddharthan Chandran[1,2,3,8], Malcolm R. Macleod[1]

[1]Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, [2]Anne Rowling Regenerative Neurology Clinic, University of Edinburgh, UK, [3]Euan MacDonald Centre for Motor Neuron Disease Research, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, [4]Institute of Medical Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK, [5]Edinburgh Medical School, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, [6]University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, [7]Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, NHS Lothian, Edinburgh, UK, [8]UK Dementia Research Institute at University of Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh bioQuarter, Chancellor's Building, 49 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, UK, [9]NHS Borders and Midlothian, UK, [10]NHS Lothian, Edinburgh, UK, [11]NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow, UK, [12]School of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK, [13]Centre for Discovery Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, [14]NHS Forth Valley, Larbert, UK, [15]Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, [16]Queen Square Multiple Sclerosis Centre, Department of Neuroinflammation, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, Faculty of Brain Sciences, University College London, London, UK, [17]National Institute for Health Research, University College London Hospitals, Biomedical Research Centre, London, UK, [18]Medical Research Council Clinical Trials Unit at UCL, Institute of Clinical Trials and Methodology, University College London, London, UK

Corresponding Author:

Malcolm R. Macleod

Address: Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

Email: malcolm.macleod@ed.ac.uk

Word count: 3434 words

ORCID iD

Charis Wong 0000-0002-8488-037X

Jenna M. Gregory 0000-0003-3337-4079

Jing Liao 0000-0002-9591-8070

Kieren Egan 0000-0002-1639-4281

Fraser Brown 0000-0002-8314-4936

John Cafferkey 0000-0001-6926-9508

Peter Foley 0000-0001-7039-2976

Nimesh Jayasuriya 0000-0002-0688-3161

Gavin Langlands 0000-0002-8972-4798

Danielle Leighton 0000-0003-2015-7198

Arpan R. Mehta 0000-0002-5715-5025

Na Hyun Park 0000-0003-4674-6767

Fergal M. Waldron 0000-0003-2622-0776

Bhuvaneish T. Selvaraj 0000-0001-7299-0910

Jeremy Chataway 0000-0001-7286-6901

Peter Connick 0000-0002-3892-8037

Suvankar Pal 0000-0003-4276-639X

Siddharthan Chandran 0000-0001-6827-1593

Malcolm R. Macleod 0000-0001-9187-9839

ABSTRACT

Background

Motor neuron disease (MND) is an incurable progressive neurodegenerative disease with limited treatment options. There is a pressing need for innovation in identifying therapies to take to clinical trial.

Objectives

Here we detail a systematic, structured, and unbiased evidence-based approach to guide selection of drugs for clinical evaluation in the Motor Neuron Disease – Systematic Multi-arm Adaptive Randomised Trial (MND-SMART, clinicaltrials.gov registration number: NCT04302870), an adaptive platform trial.

Methods

We conducted a two-stage systematic review and meta-analysis to identify potential neuroprotective interventions. In stage one, we identified drugs from the clinical literature tested in at least one study in MND or in two or more cognate diseases with potential shared pivotal pathways (Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, Parkinson's disease, or multiple sclerosis). We scored and ranked 66 drugs thus identified using a predefined framework evaluating safety, efficacy, study size and quality of studies. In stage two, we conducted a systematic review of the MND preclinical literature describing efficacy of these drugs in animal models, multicellular eukaryotic models and human induced pluripotent stem cell studies; 17 of these drugs were reported to improve survival in at least one preclinical study. An expert panel then shortlisted and ranked 22 drugs considering stage one and stage two findings, mechanistic plausibility, safety and tolerability, findings from previous clinical trials in MND, and feasibility for use in clinical trials.

Results

Based on this process, the panel selected memantine and trazodone for testing in MND-SMART.

Discussion

For future drug selection, we will incorporate automation tools, text-mining and machine learning techniques to the systematic reviews and consider data generated from other domains, including high-throughput phenotypic screening of human induced pluripotent stem cells.

Keywords

Motor neuron disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, systematic review, evidence synthesis, clinical trials

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:

- We described a systematic, evidence-based approach towards drug repurposing in motor neuron disease (MND), specifically for Motor Neuron Disease – Systematic Multi-arm Adaptive Randomised Trial (MND-SMART), a phase III multi-arm multi-stage clinical trial in MND.
- Systematic reviews of clinical studies in neurodegenerative diseases and MND preclinical studies provided a robust evidence base to inform expert panel decisions on drug selection for clinical trials.
- Providing a contemporary evidence base using traditional systematic reviews is challenging given their time-consuming and labour-intensive nature.
- Incorporation of machine learning and automation tools for systematic reviews, and data from experimental drug screening can be helpful for future drug selection.

INTRODUCTION

Motor neuron disease (MND), also known as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), is a progressive neurodegenerative disease with a median survival of 2-3 years.[1] Despite many promising preclinical studies and 125 phase II and phase III trials reported between 2008 and 2019, riluzole remains the only globally approved disease-modifying treatment, prolonging survival by an average of two to three months.[2] Edavarone and masitinib have both emerged as potentially promising candidates in clinical trials, but treatment effects are modest and neither drug has received approval in Europe.[3 ,4] In a long-term multi-centre prospective cohort study, edaravone showed no significant disease-modifying effect.[5] Previously, decisions to evaluate drugs in MND have been informed by preclinical studies, typically using mouse models, such as the $SOD1^{G93A}$ mouse, despite known limitations in the extent to which such models recapitulate human pathology,[6] and concerns of the reproducibility of findings from such models.[7] Clinical trials in MND are further complicated by the challenges of designing and delivering trials in a rapidly progressive, heterogeneous, disabling and fatal disease with a lack of reliable and sensitive outcome measures or biomarkers.[2]

Over the same period there have, however, been rapid technical advances in MND genomics, human induced pluripotent stem cells and gene-editing, which have enabled better understanding of underlying pathophysiology (including potential shared pathways across neurodegenerative diseases), and the development of more sophisticated disease models. In parallel, drug repurposing (testing a drug already used or tested for other indications) has been successfully adopted in many diseases and can significantly reduce development time and cost, with the added benefit of the availability of prior safety data to guide selection.[8] In relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis for instance, dimethyl fumarate, cladribine,[9], alemtuzumab,[10 ,11] and rituximab[12] provide examples of successful repurposing as disease-modifying treatments.

Systematic review has been recommended to have a key role in planning new research studies.[13] We previously used a strategy based on systematic review to identify repurposed interventions for secondary progressive multiple sclerosis (MS). This involved a two-stage systematic review and meta-analysis assessing clinical and preclinical data to identify putative therapeutic interventions[14] and led to the Multiple Sclerosis – Secondary Progressive Multi-Arm Randomisation Trial (MS-SMART), a phase IIb multi-arm randomised controlled trial.[15 ,16] The three drugs selected for MS-SMART were based in part on their availability for investigator-led clinical trials and did not show efficacy, but two of the top seven drugs thus identified, ibudilast (ranked first), and lipoic acid, have since shown promise in phase II studies in secondary progressive MS.[17 ,18]

Noting similarities between MS and MND as neurodegenerative diseases with limited treatment options, in 2014 we embarked on a similar strategy to identify candidate oral neuroprotective agents in MND. In parallel, we developed the multi-arm multi-stage Motor Neuron Disease – Systematic Multi-Arm Adaptive Randomised Trial (MND-SMART, clinicaltrials.gov registration number: NCT04302870) to provide a more efficient pipeline to evaluate drugs in MND than conventional

standalone two-arm trials.[19 ,20] Here we describe the development and implementation of a systematic, structured, and unbiased evidence-based approach to inform the selection of potential oral neuroprotective agents for clinical evaluation in MND-SMART. Specifically, the purpose here is not to provide a contemporary summary of existing evidence, but to describe the process through which clinical trial drugs were selected.

METHODS

The work was guided by a systematic review protocol. Over the duration of the project and given the novelty of this approach, this protocol was updated in the light of accumulating experience, and the complete record of the protocol, including the changes made, is available at Open Science Framework.[21]

Overview

The overall drug selection strategy is characterised in Figure 1. We used systematic review to identify publications describing clinical trials or reports of the clinical use of drugs in MND and in four other neurodegenerative diseases which we considered might share pivotal pathways: Alzheimer's disease (AD), Parkinson's disease (PD), Huntington's disease (HD) and MS. For MS, we excluded studies of relapsing-remitting disease since we were interested in drugs tested in the progressive phase where neurodegeneration is a major feature. We annotated publications for the drugs tested and diseases studied, taking forward drugs described in at least one MND publication or in publications in at least two other diseases. We scored each drug using a predefined framework evaluating efficacy, safety, study size and quality. In parallel, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of the preclinical MND and frontotemporal dementia (FTD; because of pathological overlap with MND) literature for these drugs. We summarised evidence from both reviews for each drug and presented these to an expert panel consisting of clinical and academic neurologists with expertise in MND, clinical trials, pharmacology/drug selection, and preclinical models of MND.

Systematic review of clinical evidence

The MS-SMART drug selection process used the same strategy, except we selected drugs tested at least once in MS or in at least two other conditions. The protocol for and results from this search, conducted in September 2011, has been published.[14] That search involved three online databases (PubMed, ISI Web of Knowledge and EMBASE) using the terms "multiple sclerosis" OR "Alzheimer's disease" OR "Huntington's disease" OR "Parkinson's disease" OR "motor neuron disease" OR "amyotrophic lateral sclerosis". On 13 December 2013, we updated the search using the same terms but with limitations for PubMed to clinical trials, and date of record creation after 01/07/2011; for ISI Web of Knowledge to Document type "Clinical trial" and publication years: 2011, 2012 and 2013; for EMBASE: previous search string AND ("case series" or "case report" or "cohort study"), with limits: human studies, full text studies from 2011; and we also contacted the Cochrane Neuromuscular review group to obtain a list of interventions tested in MND/ALS. The protocol of this update was

stored locally; in the light of increasing recognition of the importance of making systematic review protocols available, the protocol was published without amendment in September 2019.[22]

Two reviewers (MM and KE) independently screened title and abstracts of publications identified in the new search against the inclusion and exclusion criteria shown in Table 1**Error! Reference source not found.**, with discrepancies resolved by discussion. We included case reports, uncontrolled case series, non-randomised parallel group studies, crossover studies, and randomised controlled trials with any report of safety or efficacy. We extracted basic information from each publication including author, year of publication, intervention tested and disease.

For all candidate interventions which had not been excluded based on feasibility or plausibility, we extracted further information on safety, efficacy, quality of study and study size from publications to a Microsoft Access database and scored these against a predefined metric (Tables 2 and 3). For each drug, we calculated an overall drug score by taking the product of the mean score in each domain for safety, efficacy, quality, study size and multiplying this by $\log_{10}$(1+number of publications). We then ranked drugs according to these scores.

Systematic review of preclinical evidence

In parallel, we performed a systematic review of the preclinical literature (date of search 6th April 2016), focussing on publications describing the candidate interventions which had not been excluded on the basis of feasibility or plausibility, and using our previously published systematic review protocol.[23] We evaluated data from all *in vivo* models of MND and FTD including (i) mammalian models (mouse and rat), (ii) organisms with a central nervous system (*Drosophila, Caenorhabditis elegans* and Zebrafish) and (iii) multicellular eukaryotic models such as yeast. We also include data from studies using human induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) derived from people with MND.

Patient and public involvement

The MND-SMART group has consulted people with MND, their families and carers via a patient and public involvement advisory group throughout the development of the trial. The group recommended using liquid investigational medicinal product formulations to enable patients with swallowing difficulties including those using gastrostomy to participate and remain in the trial. This was taken into consideration by the expert panel during the drug selection process.

Expert panel review

A panel of six independent experts consisting of neurologists with expertise in translational neurology, clinical MND research, meta-analysis and clinical trials reviewed all data. The panel rated drugs as “green” (most favourable), “amber” (less favourable) and “red” (least favourable) based on biological plausibility; safety profile; and ranking by drug score from clinical literature. Drugs rated “red” for any criteria were excluded, along with drugs which had been tested in more than three previous trials in MND. Next, the panel ranked shortlisted drugs considering also preclinical evidence and practical

issues such as availability in oral liquid formulation, and restricted availability without prescription (to discourage off-protocol self-medication from study participants). As this approach might not cover novel drugs or pathways that have yet to be tested clinically in neurodegenerative diseases, the panel were given flexibility to consider emerging evidence for hitherto unconsidered drugs.

RESULTS

Clinical systematic review and initial screening of candidate interventions

The PRISMA diagram for the clinical review is shown in Figure 2. Literature search in August 2011 of PubMed, ISI Web of knowledge and EMBASE, and Cochrane list of clinical trials in MS for MS-SMART identified 29500 publications. 12893 duplicates were removed, and 15232 publications did not meet the inclusion criteria. 1375 publications were included from this initial search.

In the updated search in December 2013 a further 3124 publications were identified from PubMed, ISI Web of Knowledge, EMBASE and Cochrane databases. 541 duplicates were removed, and 2322 publications did not meet the inclusion criteria. 261 publications were included.

Based on information contained in the Title and Abstract of these 1636 included publications we identified 595 interventions, of which 139 met our criteria of being described in at least one MND publication or in publications in two other diseases, in a total of 884 publications. On full text screening, 266 of these 884 publications did not meet our inclusion criteria.A further 50 interventions described in 90 publications were were excluded because it became apparent at full text screening that the intervention has not been tested either in MND or in at least two of the other diseases.. The remaining 66 interventions (528 publications) were scored against our predefined criteria and ranked (Table 4). During preparation of this manuscript, we discovered that a publication describing the effect of N-acetyl cysteine in MND had been included in error, as no data were available for N-acetyl cysteine monotherapy.[24]

Preclinical systematic review

We identified 14195 publications. After removing duplicates, two independent researchers screened Title and Abstract of 7586 unique publications, with differences reconciled by a third reviewer. 396 studies were included. 330 studies reported effects on survival of the model organism and were included in the meta-analysis. Of the 66 longlisted interventions from the clinical review, 20 had been tested in in vivo models reporting an endpoint of survival (Table 5), and of these 17 had at least one report of improved survival. Because survival was reported in a single paper for 11 of these 20 interventions, we did not conduct a meta-analysis.

Shortlisted candidate drugs for clinical trial

The expert panel met in 2017 and considered the clinical and preclinical research summaries for each of these 66 drugs, shortlisting 22 for further consideration. An evidence summary was compiled for each of these drugs including the following information: (1) If they had been tested in 3 or more *in vivo*

MND studies, (2) the number of clinical trials in people with MND, (3) the putative target pathway, (4) feasibility for delivery via enteral tube (noting that swallowing is commonly affected in MND), (5) detailed safety information including common side effects, rare but serious side effects and requirements for monitoring, (6) published clinical studies in MND, and (7) clinical trials registered on clinicaltrials.gov. The expert panel met on 9th January 2017 and discussed the evidence for each drug. 11 drugs were excluded in the first round. Following a second round of discussions, four other drugs were excluded. Reasons for exclusion are detailed in Table 6.

The seven candidate drugs remaining were memantine, acetyl-l-carnitine, simvastatin, ciclosporin, melatonin, fluoxetine and N-acetyl cysteine. The evidence for each final shortlisted drug is summarised in Tables 7 and 8. The panel also considered emerging evidence relating to trazodone, and following due consideration recommended memantine and trazodone as the first two investigational medicinal products for MND-SMART.

DISCUSSION

Since drugs have undergone rigorous safety and pharmacokinetic testing, drug repurposing — the use of an established drug in a novel therapeutic indication — reduces costs and barriers to clinical development. Our experience of the successful application of a systematic approach to selecting neuroprotective drugs for repurposing in MS clinical trials[14] encouraged us to use a similar approach in MND. The first part of the review assessed clinical data in MND and in other neurodegenerative diseases with potential shared pathophysiological pathways. This allowed for the identification of drugs with good central nervous system penetrance and the potential for efficacy and safety in patients with neurodegenerative diseases. However, drug selection based on clinical data alone is biased towards those tested in conditions where large well-designed randomised controlled trials have been performed and where the mechanism of action may be particular to that condition. Notably, two of our top five ranked drugs were cholinesterase inhibitors licensed for Alzheimer's disease, a mechanism less relevant to MND. It was therefore important that we augment this approach with expert opinion and with preclinical data in MND and frontotemporal dementia models to provide mechanistic relevance. Taken together we have compiled evidence from clinical and preclinical data and used this to inform the selection of potential oral neuroprotective agents for clinical evaluation in people with MND. Through sequential systematic review and meta-analysis, we identified a short list of 22 candidate interventions selected from an initial set of 595 drugs.

While some identified drugs demonstrate a good safety profile and have a relevant putative target pathway in MND, others have less favourable side effects profiles or a requirement for close therapeutic monitoring (e.g. clozapine) which necessitates a higher threshold of evidence before testing in clinical trial. This highlights another advantage of our approach, in that it allows the identification of interventions that warrant further rigorous preclinical testing ("cislation"[25]) in *in vivo* or *in vitro* models of ALS, with a view to providing more robust information for efficacy to support their inclusion in future clinical trials.

Following rounds of discussion, the expert panel identified memantine as a drug to be tested in MND-SMART. Memantine is a non-competitive N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor antagonist used in the treatment of moderate to severe Alzheimer's disease. It was shown to significantly delay disease progression and improve survival in mouse models carrying a high copy number of $SOD1^{G93A}$. [26] Memantine has been previously tested in three MND clinical trials. A phase II double-blind placebo-controlled study of 63 patients powered to evaluate safety and tolerability did not identify any increase in adverse events.[27] There was a trend towards improvement in patients treated with memantine 20 mg/day, but no significant difference in ALSFRS-R. In a 5-month randomised double-blind study of 24 participants with ALS, there was significant slowing of spinal motor neuron loss as demonstrated on motor unit estimation testing in the high dose group (10 mg twice daily) compared to low dose (5 mg twice daily).[28] Adverse events were not reported. In a single-arm pilot study of 19 ALS patients, patients treated with riluzole and memantine had reduction in rate of ALSFRS decline and reduced CSF tau levels without any increase in adverse events.[29]

We also asked the expert panel to consider other drugs for which relevant data had only become available after the searches described here had been performed. Trazodone was nominated for consideration through this route. Trazodone is an atypical serotonin antagonist and reuptake inhibitor antidepressant. An unbiased drug screen found that trazodone inhibited Protein Kinase RNA-like endoplasmic reticulum kinase (PERK), which is pivotal to stress granule formation, a common feature of neurodegenerative diseases.[30] Inhibition of PERK was found to be beneficial in a fly model of ALS as well as in an *in vitro* neuronal assay of TDP-43 injury.[31] Furthermore, trazodone has been shown to modulate the ER-stress response resulting in an improvement in survival in animal models of prion disease and FTD.[30] and to be involved in mitochondrial energy metabolism and fatty acid synthesis in animal models of Huntington's disease, and may prevent mitochondrial dysfunction in MND.[32] In a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled crossover phase II trial in 31 patients with FTD, trazodone was found to improve cognition as assessed by the neuropsychiatric inventory.[33] In trials of trazodone in Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease, although there was no improvement in cognition, symptoms of sleep disturbance and depression were alleviated and adverse events were not increased.[34 ,35]

Limitations of this approach

The main challenge in this approach to drug selection is the ambition to base drug choice on the most contemporary evidence. Systematic reviews are time consuming, as evidenced by the interval between our updated search (2013) and expert committee consideration (2017). Furthermore, drugs with promising data in some domains would be excluded if they have been tested in only one disease other than MND; or if they have not been tested clinically despite overwhelming preclinical evidence. We excluded combination therapies, but it may be – as in the treatment of various cancers[36] and infections[37 ,38] – that engagement with multiple targets is required to achieve a substantial disease-modifying effect.

Finally, some have claimed that the literature-based systematic review approach to drug selection is intrinsically flawed because it does not take into account disease specific pathophysiology (which may be largely unknown).[39] While the three drugs tested in MS-SMART were not effective,[15] we note that two other drugs on the final MS-SMART shortlist - ibudilast[17] and lipoic acid[18] - have since shown promise in independent phase II trials. Lipoic acid has been identified again as a favourable candidate drug in a further, independent review in 2020.[40] We sought to address this issue here by considering, in addition to clinical information, data from in vivo and in vitro research. Although much successful drug repurposing has been opportunistic and serendipitous, we recognise that future efforts should include consideration of our mechanistic understanding of neurodegenerative diseases and should systemically incorporate additional target and pathway-based information.[8]

Future approaches to drug selection in MND-SMART

Ongoing rounds of drug selection for MND-SMART exploit innovations in automating literature searches, screening, and annotation, with these algorithms trained using the human efforts in the work reported here. These techniques show substantial improvements in efficiency in other fields.[41] Using the Systematic Review Facility (SyRF) (https://syrf.org.uk)[42] we have enabled a 'living' systematic review with automatic search, citation screening, identification of disease and drug, and selection of drugs meeting our criteria for the range of diseases in which studies have been performed. Because of similarities between MND and frontotemporal dementia we have included this as an additional disease of interest. Further details are extracted from full text publications of shortlisted drugs by a combination of machine and human work enabled through the SyRF platform, with human monitoring of machine decisions. The incorporation of machine learning and text mining techniques substantially reduces the human effort required and makes this approach feasible in the context of timely drug selection for adaptive clinical trials.

Complementing our literature-based approach, our current platform incorporates data from additional domains, including in house *in vitro* high throughput screening using human induced pluripotent stem cell culture; pathway and network analysis; and mining of drug and trial databases. We have also sought a broader range of inputs to our expert committee such that it now includes those with experience and expertise in managing people with MND and their symptoms, and of clinical trials, translational and clinical neurology, systematic reviews, experimental drug screening, pharmacology, chemistry, and drug discovery.

CONCLUSIONS

We describe our experience in conducting a systematic, structured, unbiased and evidence-based approach to the selection of candidate drugs for evaluation in a clinical trial in MND by combining review of clinical and preclinical literature, and expert panel input. The first two drugs selected are memantine and trazodone. For future selection, we will incorporate machine learning and text mining to our systematic reviews and data from our drug discovery platform.

FUNDING

For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. MND-SMART is funded by grants from MND Scotland, My Name'5 Doddie Foundation (DOD/14/15) and specific donations to the Euan MacDonald Centre. The Chandran lab is supported by the UK Dementia Research Institute, which receives its funding from UK DRI Ltd, funded by the UK Medical Research Council, Alzheimer's Society and Alzheimer's Research UK. E.E is a clinical academic fellow jointly funded by MND Scotland (MNDS) and the Chief Scientist Office (CSO) (217ARF R45951). A.R.M. was a Lady Edith Wolfson Clinical Fellow, jointly funded by the Medical Research Council (MRC) and the Motor Neurone Disease Association (MR/R001162/1). A.Salzinger is funded by Marie Sklodowska-Curie actions Innovative Training Network (ITN). B.T.S is funded by Rowling fellowship.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

In the last 3 years, J. Chataway has received support from the Efficacy and Evaluation (EME) Programme, a Medical Research Council (MRC) and National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) partnership and the Health Technology Assessment (HTA) Programme (NIHR), the UK MS Society, the US National MS Society and the Rosetrees Trust. He is supported in part by the NIHR University College London Hospitals (UCLH) Biomedical Research Centre, London, UK. He has been a local principal investigator for a trial in MS funded by the Canadian MS society. A local principal investigator for commercial trials funded by: Actelion, Novartis and Roche; and has taken part in advisory boards/consultancy for Azadyne, Janssen, Merck, NervGen, Novartis and Roche.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Project management: Suvankar Pal, Siddharthan Chandran, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

Project administration: Charis Wong, Jenna M. Gregory, Jing Liao, Kieren Egan, Hanna M. Vesterinen, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

Conceptualisation: Jenna M. Gregory, Kieren Egan, Hanna M. Vesterinen, Siddharthan Chandran, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

Systematic searching, screening, annotation and data extraction: Charis Wong, Jenna M. Gregory, Jing Liao, Kieren Egan, Hanna M. Vesterinen, Aimal Ahmad Khan, Maarij Anwar, Caitlin Beagan, Fraser Brown, John Cafferkey, Alessandra Cardinali, Jane Yi Chiam, Claire Chiang, Victoria Collins, Joyce Dormido, Elizabeth Elliott, Peter Foley, Yu Cheng Foo, Lily Fulton-Humble, Angus B. Gane, Stella A. Glasmacher, Áine Heffernan, Kiran Jayaprakash, Nimesh Jayasuriya, Amina Kaddouri, Jamie Kiernan, Gavin Langlands, Danielle Leighton, Jiaming Liu, James Lyon, Arpan R. Mehta, Alyssa Meng, Vivienne Nguyen, Na Hyun Park, Suzanne Quigley, Yousuf Rashid, Andrea Salzinger, Bethany Shiell, Ankur Singh, Tim Soane, Alexandra Thompson, Olaf Tomala, Fergal M. Waldron, Suvankar Pal, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

Data curation: Charis Wong, Jenna M. Gregory, Jing Liao, Kieren Egan, Hanna M. Vesterinen, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

Data analysis: Charis Wong, Jenna M. Gregory, Jing Liao, Kieren Egan, Hanna M. Vesterinen, and

Malcolm R. Macleod.

Methodology: Charis Wong, Jenna M. Gregory, Jing Liao, Kieren Egan, Hanna M. Vesterinen, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

Software and programming: Jing Liao.

Visualisation: Charis Wong.

In vitro drug screening: Alessandra Cardinali, and Bhuvaneish T. Selvaraj.

Expert panel: Jeremy Chataway, Robert Swingler, Peter Connick, Suvankar Pal, Siddharthan Chandran, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

Writing - original draft: Charis Wong and Jenna M. Gregory.

Writing - review & editing: Charis Wong, Jenna M. Gregory, Jing Liao, John Cafferkey, Arpan R. Mehta, Jeremy Chataway, Robert Swingler, Suvankar Pal, Siddharthan Chandran, and Malcolm R. Macleod.

All authors have read and approved the manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data are provided in supplementary material.

REFERENCES

1. Westeneng HJ, Debray TPA, Visser AE, et al. Prognosis for patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: development and validation of a personalised prediction model. *Lancet Neurol* 2018;**17**(5):423-33.
2. Wong C, Stavrou M, Elliott E, et al. Clinical trials in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: a systematic review and perspective. *Brain Commun* 2021;**3**(4):fcab242.
3. European Medicines Agency. Refusal of the marketing authorisation for Alsitek (masitinib). In: Agency EM, ed., 2018.
4. European Medicines Agency. Withdrawal assessment report Radicava (International non-proprietary name: edaravone). Procedure No. EMEA/H/C/004938/0000. In: Use EMACfMPfH, ed. Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2019.
5. Witzel S, Maier A, Steinbach R, et al. Safety and Effectiveness of Long-term Intravenous Administration of Edaravone for Treatment of Patients With Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. *JAMA Neurol* 2022.
6. van den Berg LH, Sorenson E, Gronseth G, et al. Revised Airlie House consensus guidelines for design and implementation of ALS clinical trials. *Neurology* 2019;**92**(14):e1610-e23.
7. Perrin S. Preclinical research: Make mouse studies work. *Nature* 2014;**507**(7493):423-5.
8. Pushpakom S, Iorio F, Eyers PA, et al. Drug repurposing: progress, challenges and recommendations. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2018.
9. Giovannoni G. Cladribine to Treat Relapsing Forms of Multiple Sclerosis. *Neurotherapeutics* 2017;**14**(4):874-87.
10. The Lancet. Alemtuzumab for multiple sclerosis. *The Lancet* 2012;**380**(9856):1792.
11. 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. *The Lancet* 2012;**380**(9856):1829-39.
12. Salzer J, Svenningsson R, Alping P, et al. Rituximab in multiple sclerosis: A retrospective observational study on safety and efficacy. *Neurology* 2016;**87**(20):2074-81.
13. Chalmers I, Bracken MB, Djulbegovic B, et al. How to increase value and reduce waste when research priorities are set. *Lancet* 2014;**383**(9912):156-65.
14. Vesterinen HM, Connick P, Irvine CM, et al. Drug repurposing: a systematic approach to evaluate candidate oral neuroprotective interventions for secondary progressive multiple sclerosis. *PloS one* 2015;**10**(4):e0117705.
15. Chataway J, De Angelis F, Connick P, et al. Efficacy of three neuroprotective drugs in secondary progressive multiple sclerosis (MS-SMART): a phase 2b, multiarm, double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet Neurology*.
16. Connick P, De Angelis F, Parker RA, et al. Multiple Sclerosis-Secondary Progressive Multi-Arm Randomisation Trial (MS-SMART): a multiarm phase IIb randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial comparing the efficacy of three neuroprotective drugs in secondary progressive multiple sclerosis. *BMJ open* 2018;**8**(8):e021944.
17. Fox RJ, Coffey CS, Conwit R, et al. Phase 2 Trial of Ibudilast in Progressive Multiple Sclerosis. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2018;**379**(9):846-55.
18. Spain R, Powers K, Murchison C, et al. Lipoic acid in secondary progressive MS: A randomized controlled pilot trial. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm* 2017;**4**(5):e374.
19. MND-SMART. MND-SMART Clinical trials for MND. Secondary MND-SMART Clinical trials for MND. www.mnd-smart.org.
20. Mehta AR, Chataway J, Pal S, et al. Trials for neurodegenerative diseases: time to innovate. *Lancet Neurol* 2021;**20**(12):984.
21. Macleod M, Wong C. ReLiSyR MND. Secondary ReLiSyR MND 2019. https://osf.io/UBMHE/.
22. Egan K VH, Macleod MR. A novel strategy to identify candidate drugs for clinical trial in Motor Neuron disease. 2019.
23. Gregory JM, Waldron FM, Soane T, et al. Protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental models of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Evidence-based Preclinical Medicine* 2016;**3**(2):e00023.
24. Vyth A, Timmer JG, Bossuyt PM, et al. Survival in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, treated with an array of antioxidants. *J Neurol Sci* 1996;**139 Suppl**:99-103.
25. Macleod M, Mohan S. Reproducibility and Rigor in Animal-Based Research. *ILAR Journal* 2019;**60**(1):17-23.
26. Wang R, Zhang D. Memantine prolongs survival in an amyotrophic lateral sclerosis mouse model. *European Journal of Neuroscience* 2005;**22**(9):2376-80.

27. de Carvalho M, Pinto S, Costa J, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of memantine for functional disability in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis : official publication of the World Federation of Neurology Research Group on Motor Neuron Diseases* 2010;**11**(5):456-60.
28. Chan K, R T, G B, et al. C82 a randomized, double-blind, dose-ranging study of memantine in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. 22nd International Symposium on ALS/MND. *Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis* 2011;**12**(supp1):48.
29. Levine TD, Bowser R, Hank N, et al. A pilot trial of memantine and riluzole in ALS: correlation to CSF biomarkers. *Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis : official publication of the World Federation of Neurology Research Group on Motor Neuron Diseases* 2010;**11**(6):514-9.
30. Halliday M, Radford H, Zents KAM, et al. Repurposed drugs targeting eIF2α-P-mediated translational repression prevent neurodegeneration in mice. *Brain* 2017;**140**(6):1768-83.
31. Kim HJ, Raphael AR, LaDow ES, et al. Therapeutic modulation of eIF2alpha phosphorylation rescues TDP-43 toxicity in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis disease models. *Nat Genet* 2014;**46**(2):152-60.
32. Lauterbach EC. Neuroprotective effects of psychotropic drugs in Huntington's disease. *Int J Mol Sci* 2013;**14**(11):22558-603.
33. Lebert F, Stekke W, Hasenbroekx C, et al. Frontotemporal dementia: a randomised, controlled trial with trazodone. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord* 2004;**17**(4):355-9.
34. Werneck AL, Rosso AL, Vincent MB. The use of an antagonist 5-HT2a/c for depression and motor function in Parkinson' disease. *Arq Neuropsiquiatr* 2009;**67**(2B):407-12.
35. Camargos EF, Quintas JL, Louzada LL, et al. Trazodone and cognitive performance in Alzheimer disease. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2015;**35**(1):88-9.
36. Bayat Mokhtari R, Homayouni TS, Baluch N, et al. Combination therapy in combating cancer. *Oncotarget* 2017;**8**(23):38022-43.
37. Schmid A, Wolfensberger A, Nemeth J, et al. Monotherapy versus combination therapy for multidrug-resistant Gram-negative infections: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Scientific Reports* 2019;**9**(1):15290.
38. Arts EJ, Hazuda DJ. HIV-1 antiretroviral drug therapy. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med* 2012;**2**(4):a007161-a61.
39. Fox RJ. Feast or famine in multiple sclerosis therapeutics. *The Lancet Neurology*.
40. Cunniffe N, Vuong KA, Ainslie D, et al. Systematic approach to selecting licensed drugs for repurposing in the treatment of progressive multiple sclerosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2021;**92**(3):295-302.
41. Bannach-Brown A, Przybyla P, Thomas J, et al. Machine learning algorithms for systematic review: reducing workload in a preclinical review of animal studies and reducing human screening error. *Systematic reviews* 2019;**8**(1):23.
42. Bahor Z, Liao J, Currie G, et al. Development and uptake of an online systematic review platform: the early years of the CAMARADES Systematic Review Facility (SyRF). *BMJ Open Sci* 2021;**5**(1):e100103.

TABLES

Table 1: Eligibility criteria for clinical systematic review.

Inclusion criteria
- Publications reporting qualitative or quantitative data provided on either safety or efficacy of an orally delivered intervention in people with motor neuron disease / amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, Huntington's disease or multiple sclerosis - Studies reporting change in clinical status (including death, tracheostomy free survival, relapse frequency, disability progression, behavioural symptoms), or changes in biomarkers (including magnetic resonance imaging, blood, cerebrospinal fluid and muscle strength)
Exclusion criteria
- Isolated reporting of non-pharmacological interventions such as acupuncture, aromatherapy, physiotherapy or exercise - Articles reporting the use of interventions already licensed for clinical use in MND such as riluzole - Articles on levodopa treatment for Parkinson's disease - Studies reporting different modes of intervention delivery other than oral administration - Publications reporting secondary analysis of previously published clinical trial data - Protocols for clinical trials - Preventative studies - Reviews - Studies on healthy volunteers - Studies in patients with relapsing-remitting MS - Studies reporting combination treatments including where an oral and a non-oral intervention are administered - Publications where disease type is not specified to be in keeping with the included diseases (studies of vascular dementia, mild cognitive impairment and dementias other than Alzheimer's disease are excluded - Studies on patients with parkinsonism are excluded as this do not imply Parkinson's disease exclusively) - Publications describing studies where multiple drugs were tested in a cohort without any data on individual drugs

Table 2: Scoring metric for clinical review

Safety Score [S] “not described”: 1 point “SUSARs (Suspected Unexpected Serious Adverse Reactions) or mortality observed”: 1 point “SAEs (Serious Adverse Events) only”: 2 points “AEs (Adverse events) only”: 3 points “No adverse effects reported”: 4 points
Efficacy Score [E] ***Efficacy score is assigned based on primary outcome measure, and where this is not identified, on the mean efficacy score for all outcomes reported in each publication.*** “not presented”: 1 point “definite (i.e. statistically significant) worsening”: 1 point “neutral”: 2 points “non-significant improvement”: 3 points “significant improvement”: 4 points
Quality Score [Q] Study quality was assessed using a combination of criteria taken from a risk of bias tool developed through a Delphi process, GRADE and CAMARADES methods as shown in Table 3. Once each publication has been scored they are sorted in quartiles of study quality based on the total number of checklist items scored, with the lowest quartile scoring 1 point and the highest quartile scoring 4 points.
Study size score [SS] “1-10 patients”: 1 point “11-100 patients”: 2 points “101-1000 patients”: 3 points “>1000 patients”: 4 points

Table 3: Scoring method for evaluation of study quality in clinical systematic review.

	CAMARADES	**Delphi**	**GRADE**
Binary response items : *Yes (1 point); No (0 points)*			
Peer reviewed publication	X		
Statement of potential conflicts of interest	X		
Sample size calculation	X	X	
Random allocation to group	X	X	X
Allocation concealment	X		X
Blinded assessment of outcome		X	
Tertiary response items: *Yes (1 point); No (0 points); Not clear (0.5 points)*			
Were the groups similar at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators?		X	
Were the eligibility criteria specified?		X	
Were point estimates and measures of variability presented for the primary outcome measures?		X	
Was there intention to treat analysis?		X	
Complete accounting of patient and outcome events			X
Non-selective outcome reporting		X	
No other limitations			X
Can we be confident in the assessment of outcome?			X
Quinary response items: *N/A; Definitely yes (1 point); Probably yes (0.75 points); Probably no (0.25 points); Definitely No (0 points)*			
Was selection of treatment and control groups drawn from the same population?			X
Can we be confident that patients received the allocated treatment?			X
Can we be confident that the outcome of interest was not present at start of the study?			X
Did the study stratify on variables associated with the outcome of interest or did the analysis take this into account?			X
Can we be confident in the assessment of the presence or absence of prognostic factors?			X
Was the follow up of cohorts adequate?			X
Were co-interventions similar between groups?			X

Table 4: Longlisted interventions ranked by drug score from clinical review

Intervention	Number of Publications	Quality Score	Efficacy Score	Safety Score	Study Size Score	Drug score
Rivastigmine	29	3.34	3.33	2.1	2.62	90.62
Memantine	51	3.02	2.87	2.2	2.47	80.7
Vitamin D3	11	3.27	3.01	3.36	2.18	78.08
Donepezil	41	3.1	2.72	2.51	2.24	76.99
Pramipexole	14	3.07	3.04	2.43	2.64	70.41
Galantamine	12	2.75	2.85	2.67	2.5	58.29
Amantadine	59	2.37	3	2.36	1.9	56.53
Dextromethorphan/ quinidine	3	4	3.33	2.33	3	56.19
Selegiline	21	3	2.59	2.1	2.38	51.98
4-Aminopyridine	10	3.2	2.76	2.5	2.1	48.28
Acetyl-L-Carnitine	10	2.9	2.64	2.5	2.3	45.83
Simvastatin	5	3.6	2.27	2.8	2.4	42.73
Lamotrigine	6	4	2.25	2.33	2.33	41.41
Bromocriptine	13	2.92	2.4	2.54	1.92	39.21
Clozapine	6	3	2.9	2.5	2	36.8
Gabapentin	9	2.67	2.4	2.44	2.33	36.46
Creatine	12	2.67	2.14	2.33	2.42	35.87
Ginkgo biloba	3	3.67	2.61	3.67	1.67	35.21
Minocycline	11	2.45	2.27	2.64	2.18	34.54
Vitamin E	9	3.33	2.1	2	2.44	34.25
Levetiracetam	6	3	3.33	2.17	1.83	33.57
Atomoxetine	4	3.25	2.5	3.25	1.75	32.3
Coenzyme Q10	9	3.33	2.16	1.89	2.33	31.67
Tacrine	10	3.3	2.81	1.8	1.8	31.26
Olanzapine	5	2.4	3.47	2.6	1.6	26.93
Estrogen	9	3	2.66	1.67	2	26.57
Nimodipine	5	3	2.35	2.2	2.2	26.55
Riluzole	17	2.41	2.35	1.76	2.06	25.88
Ciclosporin	9	2.78	1.93	2.11	2.22	25.15
Dextromethorphan	7	2.29	2.4	2.71	1.86	24.97
Naltrexone	8	2.5	2.22	2.62	1.75	24.29
Theophylline	2	4	3.25	2.5	1.5	23.26
Valproate	9	2.56	2.33	2	1.89	22.53
Fluoxetine	6	2.67	2.42	2.33	1.67	21.18
Levamisole	3	2.67	2.78	2.33	2	20.81
Melatonin	8	2	2.11	2.75	1.88	20.81
Celecoxib	2	4	2	1.5	3	17.18
3,4-Diaminopyridine	6	2.83	2.4	2.17	1.33	16.62
Milacemide	4	3	1.75	2.25	2	16.51

N-acetyl cystine	1	3	3	3	2	16.26
Tranylcypromine	2	2.5	2.5	3.5	1.5	15.66
Aspirin	4	2.75	2	1.75	2.25	15.14
Ursodeoxycholic acid	1	4	2	3	2	14.45
Tolbutamide	2	3	2.5	2	2	14.31
Imipramine	2	3.5	2	2	2	13.36
Lithium	12	2.42	2.19	1.5	1.5	13.29
Modafinil	2	4	3.33	1	2	12.72
Omega 3 Fatty Acid	2	2.5	1.75	3	2	12.52
Octacosanol	2	2.5	2	3.5	1.5	12.52
Indinavir	2	3.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	11.27
Sodium phenylbutyrate	1	4	2	2	2	9.63
Tilorone	1	4	2	2	2	9.63
lipoic acid	2	2.5	2	2	2	9.54
Isoprinosine	4	3	1.75	1.25	2	9.17
Tetrahydrocannabinol	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2	7.51
Topiramate	1	4	1	2	3	7.22
Haloperidol	2	3	2.33	1	1.5	5.01
Amino acid mixture	5	1.6	2	1	2	4.98
Rolipram	2	1.5	2	3	1	4.29
Alsamin	1	2	3.5	1	2	4.21
Pentoxifylline	3	2	1.61	1	2	3.88
Verapamil	1	2	2	1	2	2.41
IGF-1	1	2	1	1	3	1.81
Propranolol	1	1	3	1	2	1.81
Fluvoxamine	2	1	3	1	1	1.43
Amitriptyline	1	1	1	3	1	0.9

Table 5: Summary of preclinical studies evaluating the effect of interventions longlisted from the clinical review on survival outcomes. All listed studies used mouse models. LogMSR = log(median survival in treatment group/median survival in control group)

Publication	**Drug**	**Total number of animals**	**Median survival in treatment group**	**Median survival in control group**	**logMSR**
Kira 2006	Acetyl-L-Carnitine	20	270	240	0.1178
Barneoud 1999	Aspirin	38	150	155	-0.0328
Tanaka 2011	Bromocriptine	69	40	35	0.1335
Drachman 2002	Celecoxib	55	139	119	0.1554
Karlsson 2004	Ciclosporin	13	144	130	0.1023
Keep 2001	Ciclosporin	11	24	12	0.6931
Turner 2003	Clozapine	16	140	132	0.0588
Andreassen 2001	Creatine	24	155	135	0.1382
Kaddurah-Daouk 2000	Creatine	13	169	144	0.1601
Klivenyi 2004	Creatine	22	150	125	0.1823
Choi 2008	Estrogen	70	135	127	0.0611
Koschnitzky 2014	Fluoxetine	34	139	132	0.0517
Gurney 1996	Gabapentin	17	140	139	0.0072
Gurney 1996	Gabapentin	38	175	165	0.0588
Ferrante 2001	Ginkgo Biloba	20	136	125	0.0843
Fornai 2008	Lithium	20	146	117	0.2214
Gill 2009	Lithium	55	124	127	-0.0239
Pizzasegola 2009	Lithium	20	119	129	-0.0807
Dardiotis 2013	Melatonin	28	143	143	0.0000
Weishaupt 2006	Melatonin	50	137	131	0.0448
Zhang 2013	Melatonin	30	145	137	0.0568
Wang 2005	Memantine	21	130	122	0.0635
Keller 2011	Minocycline	32	147	138	0.0632
Kriz 2002	Minocycline	29	364	336	0.0800
Van Den Bosch 2002	Minocycline	14	155	130	0.1759
Zhang 2003	Minocycline	20	140	130	0.0741
Zhu 2002	Minocycline	20	135	127	0.0611
Andreassen 2000	N-acetyl cysteine	30	134	129	0.0380
Jaarsma 1998	N-acetyl cysteine	28	251	239	0.0490
Yip 2013	Omega 3	32	182	182	0.0000
Petri 2006	Sodium Phenylbutyrate	26	139	127	0.0903
Ryu 2005	Sodium Phenylbutyrate	40	145	127	0.1325
Crochemore 2009	Valproate	11	140	140	0.0000
Rouaux 2007	Valproate	36	115	110	0.0445
Sugai 2004	Valproate	17	295	265	0.1072

Gianfocaro 2013	Vitamin D	100	126	124	0.0160

Table 6: Drugs excluded following expert panel review and reasons for exclusion.

	Drug	**Reason for exclusion**
Excluded after Round 1	Bromocriptine	Unfavourable safety profile
	Gabapentin	>3 previous clinical trials in MND
	Creatine	>3 previous clinical trials in MND
	Clozapine	Unfavourable safety profile
	Minocycline	>3 previous clinical trials in MND
	Valproate	>3 previous clinical trials in MND
	Celecoxib	Unfavourable safety profile
	Aspirin	Poor biological plausibility
	Ginkgo biloba	Poor biological plausibility
	Lithium	>3 previous clinical trials in MND
	Amino acid mixture	>3 previous clinical trials in MND
Excluded after Round 2	Estrogen	Aggregate judgment of data presented
	Vitamin D3	
	Omega 3	
	Sodium phenylbutyrate	

Table 7: Number of publications of clinical studies and participants according to type of disease for the final seven shortlisted drugs. AD: Alzheimer's disease; HD: Huntington's disease; MND: Motor neuron disease; MS: Multiple sclerosis; PD: Parkinson's disease.

Drug	**Number of publications**						**Number of participants**					
	MND	**AD**	**HD**	**MS**	**PD**	**Total**	**MND**	**AD**	**HD**	**MS**	**PD**	**Total**
Acetyl-L-carnitine	0	9	1	0	0	**10**	0	1224	10	0	0	**1234**
Ciclosporin	2	0	0	7	0	**9**	110	0	0	1092	0	**1202**
Fluoxetine	0	0	1	2	3	**6**	0	0	30	51	32	**113**
Melatonin	1	4	0	0	3	**8**	3	273	0	0	64	**340**
Memantine	1	32	2	1	15	**51**	63	11912	39	116	809	**12939**
N-acetyl cysteine	0	1	0	0	0	**1**	0	47	0	0	0	**47**
Simvastatin	0	3	0	1	1	**5**	0	469	0	307	12	**788**

Table 8: Summary of previous MND clinical trials for final shortlisted drugs. RCT: Randomised controlled trial; N: number of participants. AE: Adverse events; AR: Adverse reactions; ALC: Acetyl-l-carnitine; ALSFRS: Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Functional Rating Scale; MMT: Manual Muscle Testing; MN: Motor neuron; MRSI: Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy Imaging; MUNE: Motor unit number estimate; NAC: N-acetyl cysteine; SD: Standard deviation; SUSAR: Suspected Unexpected Severe Adverse Reaction.

Drug	**Publication**	**RCT**	**Number of participants (active arm: placebo arm)**	**Duration**	**Primary Outcome Measure**	**Efficacy results**	**Safety results**
Memantine	*De Carvalho 2010*	Y	63 (32:31)	12 months	ALSFRS and safety	Equivocal (underpowered)	No increase in AEs
	Levine 2010	N	20 (20:0)	18 months	Safety and tolerability	ALSFRS decline of -0.73 points/month (pre-treatment rate -1.07/month)	AE: Nausea in 1 participant.
	Chan 2011	N	24 (24:0)	5 months	MUNE, MRSI, ALSFRS-R and MMT	MUNE: Significant slowing of MN loss (-12.4 ± 3.7/month in run-in phase to -5.3 ± 2.2/month in treatment phase; mean ± SD, p=0.03). Other outcomes equivocal.	AE: similar between run-in and treatment phases
Acetyl-l-carnitine (ALC)	*Beghi 2013*	Y	82 (42:40)	12 months	Proportion of patients no longer self-sufficient	Significantly less treated participants loss self-sufficiency (80.9% ALC vs 97.5% placebo, p=0.0296)	No significant difference in AEs.
Simvastatin	Nil						
Ciclosporin	*Appel 1988*	Y	74 (36:38)	48 weeks	Appel ALS rating scale	Progression to 22 points equivocal in treated and untreated patients (relative risk of ciclosporin 0.991, p=0.485) In subgroup of male patients with symptoms ≤18 months, relative risk of progression was 0.302, p=0.0205.	Significant number of expected ARs: hirsutism, headache, flushing, nausea and vomiting, tremor, anorexia and gum hyperplasia. No SUSARs.
Melatonin	*Weishaupt 2006*	N	31 (31:0)	12 months	Safety	ALSFRS presented without any quantitative	No AEs reported or observed.

						analysis	
Fluoxetine	Nil						
N-acetyl cysteine	*Louwerse 1995*	Y	110 (54:56)	12 months	Survival	Non-significant trend towards improvement in survival (hazard ratio 0.74 in NAC group compared to placebo, 95% confidence interval, 0.41 to 1.33; log rank test, P=0.31)	No safety data reported

Figure legends

Figure 1: Diagram illustrating two-stage systematic review approach to inform identification and selection of putative treatments to take forward to clinical trial.

Figure 2: PRISMA diagram for clinical systematic review. Ti/Ab: Title/Abstract


PubMed; Web of Knowledge; EMBASE; Cochrane
Clinical studies
MND; Alzheimer's; Parkinson's; Huntington's; Multiple Sclerosis
In vivo studies
MND
hIPSC studies
MND
Screen for inclusion
Screen for inclusion
Screen for inclusion
List of drugs with a composite score comprised of efficacy, safety and sample size
List of drugs
List of drugs
An intervention is deemed a drug of interest if it has been tested in a study involving MND patients or 2 or more studies in other neurological conditions.
Filter on Drug of Interest
List of potential therapies to be tested in clinical trials in MND patients
Stage 1: Clinical Systematic Review
Stage 2: Preclinical Systematic Review


MS-SMART literature review (August 2011)
PubMed 10969 publications
ISI web of knowledge and EMBASE 15911 publications
Cochrane 2620 publications
Combined search 29500 publications
Duplicates: 12893 publications
Failure to meet inclusion criteria: 15232 publications
Inclusion criteria met: 1375 publications
Literature search and review update (Dec 2013)
PubMed 1223 publications
ISI web of knowledge 1159 publications
EMBASE 449 publications
Cochrane 293 publications
Combined updated search 3124 publications
Duplicates: 541 publications
Failure to meet inclusion criteria: 2322 publications
Inclusion criteria met: 261 publications
Included from Aug 2011 search: 1375 publications
Included publications from combined search 2011 and 2013: 595 interventions, 1636 publications
0 studies in MND & studied in <2 other conditions on Ti/Ab screen: 456 interventions, 752 publications
≥ 1 study in MND OR studies in ≥ 2 other conditions on Ti/Ab screen: 139 interventions, 884 publications
Failure to meet inclusion criteria on full text screening: 266 publications
0 studies in MND & studied in <2 other conditions on full text screen: 50 interventions, 90 publications
Systematic evaluation of interventions
1 study in MND: 9 interventions 9 publications
1 study in MND & ≥1 other conditions: 12 interventions 162 publications
≥2 studies in MND +/- other conditions: 18 interventions 155 publications
0 studies in MND & studies in ≥ 2 other conditions: 27 interventions 202 publications
66 interventions, 528 publications ("long list")