

Terminology for Preparations of Botulinum Neurotoxins

What a Difference a Name Makes

Alberto Albanese, MD

THE MARKET FOR BOTULINUM NEUROTOXINS IS BECOMING as crowded in the United States as in Europe. Last year, following approval of a second type A botulinum neurotoxins, the US Food and Drug Administration announced generic (or nonproprietary) name changes for all of the versions of injectable botulinum neurotoxins, and added a boxed warning on the labels of these potential biological weapons to describe the spread of the toxin and the attendant, possibly life-threatening effects.¹

The botulinum neurotoxins marketed in the United States are now named onabotulinumtoxinA (brand name Botox), rimabotulinumtoxinB (Myobloc), abobotulinumtoxinA (Dysport), and incobotulinumtoxinA (Xeomin), which was recently approved in the US market (TABLE). With this recent entry, 3 type A and 1 type B brands of botulinum neurotoxins are available in the United States. The new generic names have not yet been adopted by other regulatory agencies. For example, the European Medicines Agency retains the official denomination of botulinum toxin for all products of botulinum neurotoxins.

These almost unpronounceable new names meet the World Health Organization's criteria for nonproprietary names in that they are "distinctive in sound and spelling and should not be liable to confusion with other names in common use."² The most important benefit of change in terminology is a gain in identity for different botulinum neurotoxins, which is expected to improve their usage in clinical practice. The 4 products have significant differences in terms of manufacturing (including purification and complexing), potency, and dosing (Table). A significant degree of medical expertise is required to switch patients from one formulation to another. The new naming acknowledges that botulinum neurotoxins are produced by different biological manufacturing processes, are obtained by different isolation and purification techniques, and are derived from different *Clostridium* batches. Differences in the products' molecular structures and formulations may affect their local migration from the injection site and potency charac-

teristics, which in turn may influence their efficacy, safety profile, and antigenic potential.

All products of botulinum neurotoxins are approved for the treatment of cervical dystonia and most are approved for other indications, including strabismus, blepharospasm, hemifacial spasm, spasticity, axillary hyperhidrosis, and facial wrinkles. There are appreciable geographic differences in labeling across countries and notably within Europe. Given the wide number of indications for medical use, injections of botulinum neurotoxins are targeted to different body regions and tissues (eg, in the tiny oculomotor muscles, in large spastic limb muscles, in the sweat glands, or in the skin).

The American Academy of Neurology has published guidelines for usage of botulinum neurotoxins for autonomic disorders, pain, movement disorders, and spasticity.³⁻⁵ These evidence-based reviews are based largely on trials comparing products of botulinum neurotoxins with placebo because there are no head-to-head comparisons on the efficacy and safety of different products of botulinum neurotoxins in patients with autonomic disorders, pain, or spasticity. For dystonia, there is only one trial comparing incobotulinumtoxinA with onabotulinumtoxinA in patients with cervical dystonia⁶; this information is insufficient due to limitations inherent to the noninferiority design of the trial and lack of comparisons in other dystonia types.

The implementation of these guidelines is limited by lack of consensus on standard methods for injecting botulinum neurotoxins and on training requirements for clinicians who administer this treatment. Factors such as dilution ratios, number of injections at each site, and targeting procedure (visual, electromyographic, or ultrasound-guided) vary considerably among centers and influence clinical outcome. Long-term safety and efficacy data suggest that all products of botulinum neurotoxins are safe and retain their efficacy with repeated treatments over several years, but also reveal differences among brands.⁷

Author Affiliation: Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano, Italy.

Corresponding Author: Alberto Albanese, MD, Istituto Neurologico Carlo Besta, Via G. Celoria, 11, 20133 Milano, Italy (alberto.albanese@unicatt.it).

Table. Marketed Brands of Botulinum Toxins

	Generic Name			
	OnabotulinumtoxinA	RimabotulinumtoxinB	AbobotulinumtoxinA	IncobotulinumtoxinA
Brand name	Botox	Myobloc/Neurobloc ^a	Dysport	Xeomin
Manufacturer	Allergan Inc (United States)	Solstice Neurosciences (United States)	Ipsen (France)	Merz Pharmaceuticals GmbH (Germany)
Serotype	A	B	A	A
Specific activity, U/ng	20	75-125	40	167
Packaging, U/vial	100	2500, 5000, or 10 000	500	100
Constituents and excipients	Hemagglutinin, human albumin, saccharose, sodium chloride	Hemagglutinin, human albumin solution 0.05%, sodium chloride, sodium succinate	Hemagglutinin, human albumin 20% solution, lactose	Human albumin, saccharose
pH	7.4	5.6	7.4	7.4
Complex size, kDa	900	700	900	150
Preparation	Vacuum dried	Solution (5000 U/mL)	Lyophilized	Lyophilized
Storage of packaged product	-5°C or 2°C-8°C	2°C-8°C	2°C-8°C	Room temperature
Storage once reconstituted	2°C-8°C for 24 h	For a few hours	2°C-8°C for several hours	2°C-8°C for 24 h

^aMyobloc is the brand name in Canada, the United States, and Korea. Neurobloc is the brand name in the European Union, Norway, and Iceland.

The availability of multiple products of botulinum neurotoxins type A may bring to the United States a number of practical problems already observed in Europe. Switching between one brand of botulinum neurotoxins with another occurs regularly in different European centers, mainly because of restricted availability and labeling differences. Due to overlapping indications, hospital managers may choose to purchase only one formulation of botulinum neurotoxins. If patients move from one center to another, in which physicians preferentially use a toxin brand different from the one the patient previously received, variations in outcome may be perceived. Each product of botulinum neurotoxins is measured with proprietary units that are considered to be noninterchangeable.⁸ With the only possible exception of the asserted equivalence of incobotulinumtoxinA and onabotulinumtoxinA units for patients with cervical dystonia,⁶ there is no unique dose ratio to allow switching from one toxin brand to another even for a single indication.⁹

Another practical problem is that patients may receive injections of multiple products of botulinum neurotoxins (for example, if they are independently treated by different specialists). For instance, some patients with cervical dystonia who receive treatment with one product of botulinum neurotoxins in a neurological practice may receive a separate treatment with a different product of botulinum neurotoxins for a cosmetic indication. Simultaneous treatment with different brands of botulinum neurotoxins, particularly if it occurs in close time intervals, may facilitate the onset of an immune reaction to botulinum neurotoxins, leading to loss of clinical efficacy.¹⁰

The new terminology introduced by the US Food and Drug Administration is a welcome innovation that is expected to reduce errors and misinterpretation and should be of ben-

efit for patients who receive treatments with botulinum neurotoxins. This initial step should be followed by new consensus on clinical usage and comparative trials to provide the missing evidence necessary to develop new and comprehensive practice parameters.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: The author has completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest and none were reported.

REFERENCES

1. US Food and Drug Administration. FDA gives update on botulinum toxin safety warnings; established names of drugs changed. <http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/ucm175013.htm>. Accessibility verified December 3, 2010.
2. World Health Organization. *Guidelines on the Use of International Nonproprietary Names (INNs) for Pharmaceutical Substances*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1997.
3. Naumann M, So Y, Argoff CE, et al; Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Assessment: Botulinum neurotoxin in the treatment of autonomic disorders and pain (an evidence-based review): report of the Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology*. 2008;70(19):1707-1714.
4. Simpson DM, Blitzer A, Brashear A, et al; Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Assessment: Botulinum neurotoxin for the treatment of movement disorders (an evidence-based review): report of the Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology*. 2008;70(19):1699-1706.
5. Simpson DM, Gracies JM, Graham HK, et al; Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Assessment: Botulinum neurotoxin for the treatment of spasticity (an evidence-based review): report of the Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology*. 2008;70(19):1691-1698.
6. Benecke R, Jost WH, Kanovsky P, Ruzicka E, Comes G, Grafe S. A new botulinum toxin type A free of complexing proteins for treatment of cervical dystonia. *Neurology*. 2005;64(11):1949-1951.
7. Bentivoglio AR, Fasano A, Ialongo T, Soleti F, Lo Fermo S, Albanese A. Fifteen-year experience in treating blepharospasm with Botox or Dysport: same toxin, two drugs. *Neurotox Res*. 2009;15(3):224-231.
8. Albanese A. Discussion of unique properties of botulinum toxins. *Toxicon*. 2009;54(5):702-708.
9. Chapman MA, Barron R, Tanis DC, Gill CE, Charles PD. Comparison of botulinum neurotoxin preparations for the treatment of cervical dystonia. *Clin Ther*. 2007;29(7):1325-1337.
10. Dressler D, Hallett M. Immunological aspects of Botox, Dysport and Myobloc/NeuroBloc. *Eur J Neurol*. 2006;13(suppl 1):11-15.

Table. Performance Metrics for Virtual Prosthesis Testing (continued)

	Amputee Participants					Control Participants				
	1	2	3	4	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	Mean (SD)
Four Degrees of Freedom: Knee F/E, Femoral Rotation, Ankle DF/PF, and I/E Tibial Rotation ^c										
Classification accuracy, %										
Overall	90.0	88.0	83.0	86.0	86.8 (3.0)	83.0	92.0	88.0	92.0	88.8 (4.3)
Hip/knee	76.5	90.5	85.0	92.3	86.1 (7.1)	94.3	99.8	99.0	99.0	98.0 (2.5)
Ankle	94.8	90.8	76.5	77.3	84.8 (9.3)	87.8	84.4	76.4	82.5	82.8 (4.8)
Motion completion time, s ^b										
Overall	3.45	3.96	2.36	2.83	3.15 (0.70)	2.65	2.32	2.18	1.89	2.26 (0.32)
Hip/knee	2.97	4.15	1.69	2.64	2.86 (1.02)	1.56	2.09	1.68	1.41	1.69 (0.29)
Ankle	3.97	3.73	2.97	3.11	3.44 (0.48)	3.73	2.55	2.77	2.52	2.89 (0.57)
Motion completion percentage, %										
Overall	87.5	83.3	87.5	83.3	85.4 (2.4)	100.0	100.0	91.7	87.5	94.8 (6.3)
Hip/knee	91.7	91.7	83.3	100.0	91.7 (6.8)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0 (0.0)
Ankle	83.3	75.0	91.7	66.7	79.2 (10.8)	100.0	100.0	83.3	75.0	89.6 (12.5)

Abbreviations: DF/PF, dorsiflexion/plantar flexion; F/E, flexion/extension; I/E, internal/external.

^aNine repetitions of each motion.

^bTrials were terminated after 15 seconds if unsuccessful.

^cThree repetitions of each motion.

rics, particularly for overall motion completion percentage for amputees (TABLE).

Comment. Although neural control of a single DOF at the knee during non-weight-bearing situations has been shown previously,³ this is to our knowledge the first demonstration of neural control of a knee and ankle. Real-time ankle control was unexpected using only EMG signals measured from thigh muscles. These results suggest that targeted muscle reinnervation may not be required to achieve non-weight-bearing control of sagittal plane knee and ankle movements. This is a preliminary study with few participants, and testing was completed in a virtual environment. We are currently modifying powered knee and ankle prostheses^{3,4} to implement our neural control algorithms. Whether these findings will apply when tested on physical prostheses remains to be tested.

Levi J. Hargrove, PhD
l-hargrove@northwestern.edu
Ann M. Simon, PhD
Robert D. Lipschutz, CP
Suzanne B. Finucane, MS, PTA
Todd A. Kuiken, MD, PhD
Center for Bionic Medicine
Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Author Contributions: Dr Hargrove had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: Hargrove, Simon, Lipschutz, Finucane, Kuiken.

Acquisition of data: Hargrove, Simon, Lipschutz, Finucane.

Analysis and interpretation of data: Hargrove, Simon.

Drafting of the manuscript: Hargrove, Simon.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Lipschutz, Finucane, Kuiken.

Statistical analysis: Hargrove.

Obtained funding: Kuiken.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Hargrove, Simon, Lipschutz, Finucane.

Study supervision: Hargrove.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: All authors have completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest and none were reported.

Funding/Support: This work was supported by the Telemedicine and Advanced Technology Research Center (TATRC) under award W81XWH-09-2-0020. The TATRC is an office at the headquarters of the US Army Medical Research and Materiel Command; fosters research on health informatics, telemedicine and mobile health, medical training systems, and computational biology; and promotes and manages science and engineering in other key portfolios.

Role of the Sponsor: The sponsor had no role in the design and conduct of the study; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data; or in the preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript.

Online-Only Material: The video and interactive feature are available at <http://www.jama.com>.

1. Kuiken TA, Li G, Lock BA, et al. Targeted muscle reinnervation for real-time myoelectric control of multifunction artificial arms. *JAMA*. 2009;301(6):619-628.
2. Ziegler-Graham K, MacKenzie EJ, Ephraim PL, Travison TG, Brookmeyer R. Estimating the prevalence of limb loss in the United States: 2005 to 2050. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2008;89(3):422-429.
3. Ha KH, Varol HA, Goldfarb M. Volitional control of a prosthetic knee using surface electromyography. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*. 2011;58(1):144-151.
4. Au S, Berniker M, Herr H. Powered ankle-foot prosthesis to assist level-ground and stair-descent gaits. *Neural Netw*. 2008;21(4):654-666.
5. Hitt JK, Sugar TG, Holgate M, Bellman R. An active foot-ankle prosthesis with biomechanical energy regeneration. *J Med Device*. 2010;4(1):011003.
6. Netter F. *Atlas of Human Anatomy*. 5th ed. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier; 2010.

CORRECTION

Table Error: In the Commentary entitled "Terminology for Preparations of Botulinum Neurotoxins: What a Difference a Name Makes," published in the January 5, 2011, issue of *JAMA* (2011;305[1]:89-90), in the table, in column 4, under "AbobotulinumtoxinA," the second to last line of the table should be "2°C-8°C" instead of "Room temperature." This article has been corrected online.