Inherited retinal degenerations: clinical characterization on the road to therapy

Talib, M.

7.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Partly adapted from: Talib M[1], Boon CJF[1,2] . Retinal dystrophies and the road to treatment: clinical requirements and considerations.

Asia Pac J Ophthalmol 2020;9(3):159-179

1 Department of Ophthalmology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands
2 Department of Ophthalmology, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

The aim of this thesis was to clinically characterize several subsets of inherited retinal dystrophies (IRDs) for which gene therapy is under development, to study the disease progression, and to assess any genotype-phenotype correlations where possible. The relevance of these findings is pertinent to clinical practice, in order to inform patients on the specifics of their prognosis. Moreover, the emergence of gene-based therapeutic trials for these genes underscores the importance of these findings, and adds an urgency to their elucidation. This chapter elaborates on the primary findings of this thesis, placing them in a broader perspective, and discussing their clinical implications and future relevance.

IRDs comprise a collection of degenerative diseases characterized by the usually progressive and sometimes stationary dysfunction of rods and/or cones. With a prevalence of 1:3000 individuals,[1, 2] IRDs are not particularly rare. However, due to their genetic heterogeneity, with over 200 disease genes identified to date, each genetic subtype may be exceedingly rare. These diagnoses have a profoundly distressing impact on patient's lives, progressively affecting their mobility, professional functioning, and independence. Patients are often uncertain of their prognosis, questioning if and when they will go blind, and whether they will pass this disease onto their children. Children or adolescents diagnosed with IRD need to be informed on their prognosis, in order to make sound decisions on life planning such as future career paths. Special lighting, magnification requirements, and other requirements need to be tended to at their home, school, or professional environment, or they may need to visit a special needs school altogether.

The evolution of gene-based therapeutic trials

Due to the monogenic nature of most IRDs, as well as the relative immune privilege of the eye, its accessibility, and the ability to non-invasively monitor its function and structure, the eye is a particularly suitable target for investigational gene therapy. The blood-retinal barrier restricts the degree of vector dissemination outside the eye, and limits immune responses to the viral vector and gene product. Another advantage of the eye over other organs, is the lack of cell division in most retinal cells. Thus, the viral vector DNA does not have to integrate into the host cell genome in order to remain available in daughter cells after cell division, and the risk of malignancy is reduced.

Autosomal recessive disorders are characterized by loss of function or even (near) absence of the protein produced encoded by the gene. Therefore, for autosomal recessive disorders, gene therapy can be based "simply" on gene augmentation or replacement through the delivery of the normal gene. However, in autosomal dominant disease, such as *RHO*-associated RP, the phenotype is typically the result of gain-of-function mutations, where one gene copy expresses a normally functioning protein, and the other gene copy expresses a detrimental protein that needs to be suppressed. For autosomal dominant disease, therapeutic intervention generally focuses on the suppression or inactivation on the gain-of-function gene.

Important advances have been made with the turn of the millennium in the development of (gene) therapies that aim to slow or (temporarily) halt the disease progression in IRDs, or even to restore some visual function. The first successful gene therapy was applied in patients with *RPE65*-RD.[3] Several trials have found compelling results in other IRD subtypes, such as choroideremia,[4, 5] and *RPGR*-associated IRD,[6] and many other trials are ongoing (Table 1) or in the basic experimental or preclinical phase.[7, 8] However, an imbalance exists between the rapid advances in (gene) therapy development and the available literature on the clinical disease course and the phenotypic spectrum for each specific gene of interest. The dawn of therapeutic intervention, which accelerated at the turn of the millennium, has led to ongoing and planned gene therapy trials for a plethora of autosomal recessive and X-linked IRD subtypes (Table 1), and long-term results are available for several gene therapy forms.[3, 9-12] One such viral gene supplementation trial has already led to the market approval of voretigene neparvovec (Luxturna®) by the United States Food and Drug Administration.[13] For autosomal dominant IRD subtypes, preclinical gene therapy studies are focusing on gene suppression or gene silencing along with gene replacement or supplementation approaches.[14] Other therapeutic approaches, using e.g. antisense oligonucleotides or clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats/Cas9 (CRISPR/Cas9), have also shown promising results.[15, 16] Conversely, until relatively recently, longitudinal studies on the detailed clinical characteristics and disease progression were scarce for several IRD subtypes that are potentially eligible for gene therapy. Prospective phenotyping studies have thus far been even rarer in these often relatively small patient populations. However, such information is crucial in determining the window of therapeutic opportunity, patient eligibility criteria, and clinical endpoints in ongoing and future trials to assess treatment efficacy.

In order to bridge the existing gaps in our knowledge on several IRD subtypes, retrospective data were obtained from medical records in the Delleman Archive on hereditary eye diseases at the Amsterdam UMC, Academic Medical Center in Amsterdam, and through a nationwide collaboration within the RD5000 Consortium,[17] and an international collaboration with the University of Ghent in Belgium, within the framework of the European Reference Network dedicated to Rare Eye Diseases (ERN-EYE).

1.1 Primary findings and clinical implications

1.1.1 Clinical perspectives in CRB1-associated retinal dystrophies

With the ongoing development of human *CRB1* gene therapy,[7, 8, 18] we described the phenotypic and genotypic characteristics of *CRB1*-associated retinal dystrophies (**Chapter 2**). Earlier studies from literature had mostly been case reports, case series, or genetic studies with only brief descriptions of the clinical phenotype, providing limited detail.[19-33]

The Dutch retrospective cohort is the largest described to date, which allowed for statistical analysis and robust results on clinical signs and course of visual decline, which were further validated in a

Belgian population, although the phenotypic and genotypic variability was higher in the Belgian population.[34] Furthermore, in the Belgian population, a larger proportion of patients had a more severe diagnosis of LCA or EOSRD, as compared to the Dutch population, where most patients had RP. While the classic RP features, such as optic disc pallor, vascular attenuation, and bone-spicule-like pigmentation, were commonly found in *CRB1*-RP, certain characteristics outline a specific and typical *CRB1*-associated phenotype, such as hyperopia, nanophthalmos, a shallow anterior chamber, peri-arteriolar preservation of the RPE, optic disc drusen, and Coats'-like exudative vasculopathy.[27, 28, 32, 34-45] Furthermore, our studies highlighted the need to monitor this patient group for the risk of developing acute angle-closure glaucoma. In the Dutch cohort, we found optic disc drusen in the genetic isolate only, which prompted the suggestion of a potential genotype-phenotype correlation. However, in the Belgian cohort, optic disc drusen and hamartomas were found in patients with several different genotypes. Coats'-like exudative vasculopathy had been described before in *CRB1*-assocatied disease,[38, 42, 45-48] and the large studies in Chapter 2 have shown cohort-wide prevalence of these vasculopathies in 10% of Dutch RP-patients, and 13% of Belgian patients.

It should be noted that, while these features together form a "typical" *CRB1*-associated phenotype, each feature may be found in other IRD subtypes as well. Optic disc drusen have been described e.g. in Usher syndrome,[49] albeit to a much rarer degree, and hyperopia has been a classic feature of *BEST1*-associated phenotypes,[50, 51] where it can also be associated with angle-closure glaucoma.[52] Mutations in *MFRP* are associated with RP along with nanophthalmos, optic disc drusen, and foveoschisis.[53-56] Aside from its association with *CRB1*,[19, 34, 57, 58] an initial or concurrent diagnosis of uveitis has also been described in association with *PRPF31*,[57] *RP1*,[57] Stargardt disease,[59] and Usher syndrome.[57, 60] While the exact mechanism of uveitis in RP remains unknown, several explanations have been suggested for the association between uveitis and RP. Circulating immune complexes have been detected in 43.5% of patients in a study, along with reduced levels of complement C3 and C4.[61] A B-lymphocyte-mediated auto-immune response against retinal S-antigen, which is present in rod photoreceptors, has been shown in some RP patients, showing a low-level auto-immune responsiveness in RP.[62] An as of yet unidentified genetic or auto-immune factor - or a combination thereof - may play a role.

An interesting recurrent finding is the Coats'-like exudative vasculopathy, which has a strong association with *CRB1*. In one case, it has been described in an RP patient from a pedigree where an *RPGR* ORF15 mutation segregated with disease, and where no other genes were tested.[63] It has also been reported in a single case of *RHO*-associated RP, where no *CRB1* mutations were found.[64] Otherwise, it has not been associated with another IRD gene, although it has regularly been described in genetically undifferentiated case reports or series,[65-67] particularly in older studies where genetic analysis had not been performed.[68] In some studies where the associated gene had not been identified, other features, such as perivascular retinal sparing,[65] or nanophthalmos,[69]

point towards an association with *CRB1*. Vasoproliferative retinal lesions have been reported in association with Usher syndrome type I or II, based on the presence of RP and congenital hearing impairment, but not on genetic analysis.[70, 71] Few other reports, again lacking genetic analysis, have found Coats'-like vasculopathy in RP thought to be X-linked or autosomal dominant, based on pedigree analysis.[72, 73] The underlying mechanism of Coats'-like exudative vasculopathy includes an abnormal vascular permeability, which may be an element of *CRB1*-RDs. The CRB1 protein is crucial in the regulation of the number and size of Müller glia cells.[74] Since Müller cells function as regulators of the tightness of the blood-retinal barrier,[75] this may in some way relate to the vascular abnormalities seen some patients with *CRB1*-RDs.

Another distinctive finding we that frequently observed in the Dutch and Belgian *CRB1*-RD patient cohorts, was thickening of the inner retina on SD-OCT, which was in line with earlier reports,[26, 27, 35, 37, 42, 46, 76-78] although some other studies have reported retinal thinning.[23, 40, 79, 80] Mouse studies have shown retinal thickening to be caused by proliferating retinal progenitor cells, resulting in an increase in the number of rod photoreceptors, Müller cells, and bipolar cells,[81] or by ectopic photoreceptors.[82] In both studies, loss of both Crb1 and Crb2 proteins has been postulated to play a role in the retinal thickening mechanism. Some other studies have suggested inner retinal thickening to be due to a remodeling process in association with loss of the outer nuclear layer,[83, 84] which could hinder efficacy of gene therapy. However, we found no correlation between outer retinal thinning and inner retinal thickening.

A crucial aspect of the *CRB1*-associated phenotype, is the (dis)organization of the normal retinal layers (lamination), and the degree of preservation of the external limiting membrane, which is assumed to include the Crumbs (CRB) complex and thus is at least in part *CRB1* gene therapy's target. The CRB complex plays a role in the adhesion between photoreceptors and Müller cells, between Müller cells,[85] and also between photoreceptors.[86, 87] Reports on the laminar structure have varied, with some describing loss of lamination,[22, 26] and others reporting normal lamination.[30, 88] Reasonably well-preserved lamination was a frequent observation in our cohorts, with 91% and 41% of the Dutch and Belgian patients with available SD-OCT scans, respectively.[34] This again confirmed a generally more severe phenotype in the Belgian *CRB1* cohort.

Findings of *CRB1*-associated disease do not only involve the retina, but also other ocular structures, pointing to a role of protein CRB1 in the ocular development, as has been suggested before in *BEST1*-associated disease.[51, 89] In the retina, Crumbs proteins have a crucial role in the retinal vascular development,[90] in the photoreceptor-to-photoreceptor adhesion, and photoreceptor-to-Müller cell adhesion.[82] Müller cells span throughout the entire neuroretina, from the Müller cell endfeet at the inner limiting membrane beyond the external limiting membrane into the Müller cell apical villi, and they are responsible for the structural stabilization of the retina.[91] They are essential for the survival of photoreceptors and neurons. Furthermore, they take up neurotransmitters, such as

glutamate and GABA, and thus are involved in regulating the synaptic activity in the inner retina. As for the role of Crumbs proteins outside of the retina, current knowledge remains limited. The findings in this thesis of cataracts, hyperopia, a shallow anterior chamber, and the associated risk of angle-closure glaucoma,[34] indicate that the CRB1 protein has a role greater than adhesion between photoreceptors and Müller cells, and that it also has at least a developmental role outside of the retina, in the ocular structure. In *Drosophila*, crumbs proteins are involved in the development and organization of epithelial cells.[92] Further research is necessary in mammalian eyes in order to elucidate the role of the Crumbs complex outside of the retina.

The only truly robust genotype-phenotype correlation that we were able to elucidate, is the link between the p.Ile167_Gly169del mutation in *CRB1*, either in homozygous or compound heterozygous form, and an isolated maculopathy. This association was observed in both Dutch and Belgian populations, and has been described in British patients as well.[93] In fact, this mutation has been present in at least one allele in all patients with *CRB1*-associated maculopathy described so far, and also in cases of *CRB1*-associated foveal retinoschisis.[80]

A striking degree of interfamilial variability was observed in both cohorts, even in the Dutch genetic isolate, where most patients had RP with variable visual results, as some patients became blind at a relatively early age, while others maintained ambulatory vision well into the later decades of life, and one patient had a cone-rod dystrophy, with macular atrophy and barely any (mid-) peripheral retinal changes. While interindividual variability in *CRB1*-associated IRDs has been described,[21] the particularity here is that this variability occurred despite the same homozygous mutation, and the same origin from a village with a comparatively high degree of consanguinity.[94, 95] This may indicate the involvement of genetic and possibly environmental modifiers, which have been implicated before in several IRD subtypes.[96, 97] Although IRDs are monogenic, the retina is a complex tissue involving numerous proteins in order to survive and function normally, that may influence the phenotypic outcome of monogenic diseases considerably.[98] Mouse studies may give direction on possible research on genetic modifiers in human *CRB1*-RDs.[99]

1.1.2 Clinical perspectives in RPGR-associated retinal dystrophies

As several human gene therapy trials for *RPGR*-associated RP emerge (NCT03116113; NCT03252847; NCT 03316560),[100, 101] and the initial results from the first human *RPGR* gene therapy trial show a promising safety and efficacy profile,[6] we have also focused on the clinical and genotypic characteristics of *RPGR*-associated IRDs. Some findings corroborated some earlier literature: we found an association between the ORF15 mutational hotspot and a cone- or cone-rod dystrophy (COD/CORD) phenotype, particularly if the mutation was at the 3' end of ORF15.[102-105] Symptom onset was in the first decade of life in RP. In COD/CORD, the median age at symptom onset was 23 years, approximately 10 years later than some earlier reports of COD/CORD,[106] although reports have varied, some describing a much later symptom onset.[107] Our study showed a

particularly high variability in the age at symptom onset in COD/CORD, followed by rapid decline of visual acuity, and a probability of being blind, defined by the World Health Organization as a best-corrected visual acuity of <20/400, at the age of 40 of 55%, as opposed to 20% in RP patients. Cystoid macular edema, an otherwise relatively common finding in RP, was not observed at any point during follow-up in our cohort of *RPGR*-RD patients, in line with other studies of *RPGR*-RD.[107, 108]

We described a particularly apparent intrafamilial variability in 2 families that comprised patients of RP and CORD phenotypes within the same family.[102] A pivotal factor here is time, as in later disease stages, both RP and CORD progressed to panretinal dysfunction and became indistinguishable from each other in some cases. Still, this variability in the early disease stage is striking. An earlier report has even shown variability in a pair of dizygotic twins, one with RP and the other with CORD,[109] as well as in other siblingships.[110]

A prominent finding in all subtypes of *RPGR*-associated IRD, was myopia, in line with previous literature.[111, 112] Mild, moderate, or high myopia was present in 84% of male patients with *RPGR* mutations and 73% of female carriers. Patients became more myopic with increasing age. Our study in male patients showed high myopia to be an evident risk factor for visual acuity loss in all IRD subtypes, and for visual field loss in RP. While *RPGR* mutations have been shown to coincide with the highest degree of myopia in IRDs,[50] to our knowledge, our study was the first to elucidate the quantitative effect of myopia on disease progression in *RPGR*-RDs. Other studies have followed, confirming the link between myopia and more severe retinal degeneration.[108] Refractive errors are not uncommon in IRDs,[50] and in some cases, the location and function of the protein product has been postulated to explain the refractive error. While mutations in some genes such as *RPGR* are associated with (high) myopia, other genes (e.g. *CRB1* and *BEST1*) are associated with hyperopia. The protein RPGR is located in the connecting cilium of the photoreceptor, the transport area between the inner and outer segment. Several genes that encode connecting cilium proteins have been linked to myopia, such as *RP1* and *RP2*, although this does not apply to all connecting cilium proteins.[113, 114] A study on induced refractive errors in a chick model has implicated a range of photoreceptor-related proteins involved in the development of myopia or hyperopia, and these implicated proteins were primarily linked to photoreceptor dystrophies, such as CNGB1, RS1, RPE65, and RLBP1.[115] The study unfortunately did not shed light on RPGR, and further studies are needed.

An important finding in this thesis was the phenotypic spectrum in female carriers of *RPGR* mutations.[116] Like in affected males, myopia had a deleterious effect on visual acuity. Visual symptoms were relatively common, being present in 40% of subjects, and complete expression of a disease, i.e. RP or CORD was found in 23% of subjects. Likewise, some earlier studies have identified *RPGR* mutations in disease-affected female patients,[112, 117-120] some of whom were

presumed to have sporadic or autosomal dominant RP.[121] This sheds light on multiple essential questions: Why do some female carriers develop disease and others don't, and can we predict either outcome? And what implications do these findings hold in the clinical and genetic counselling of female carriers? Regarding the first matter, random X-inactivation and variable mosaicism could account for the phenotypic variation observed among female individuals in our study,[122] or skewed X-inactivation,[123, 124] as the relatively family-based aggregation of affected female carriers makes random X-inactivation unlikely as a sole factor. In symptomatic female carriers of choroideremia, another X-linked IRD, severely skewed X-inactivation has indeed been demonstrated.[125] Genetic modifiers may also play a role. It is not yet possible to predict which female carrier will develop disease, although the phenotype in other heterozygotes from the same family may be predictive.[116] Presence of the tapetal-like reflex does not hold predictive value, and is not associated with symptoms or pigmentary retinal changes. Regarding the counselling of female carriers of *RPGR* mutations, it is vital that clinicians convey the risk of developing disease, while acknowledging that a complete disease expression does not occur in most heterozygotes.

When looking at genotype-phenotype correlations, we found a robust correlation between *RPGR*-ORF15 mutations and the COD/CORD phenotype. Mutations in the ORF15 region were associated with a higher degree of myopia, which, to our knowledge, has not been described before. In male RP patients, an *RPGR*-ORF15 mutation signified a higher hazard (twice as high) of reaching low vision or severe visual impairment than a mutation in exon 1-14.[102, 126] Also, *RPGR*-ORF15 mutations were associated with higher myopia, a significantly thinner central retina, and a significantly faster visual field decline. Previous literature, however, has shown the opposite finding of more severe disease in patients with mutation in exon 1-14 than those with mutations in *RPGR*-ORF15.[127, 128] This discrepancy may be explained by the higher degree of clinical variability in patients with mutations in *RPGR*-ORF15,[116] which may lead to skewed findings in one population compared to the next. Peculiarly enough, in female heterozygotes, mutations in *RPGR*-ORF15 were associated with a less severe phenotype, which is the opposite of our finding in men.[116] Previous literature on genotype-phenotype correlations in female subjects is limited, but has shown the opposite effect, with worse visual function in female subjects with *RPGR*-ORF15 than those with mutations in exon 1-14.[129] Genetic and/or environmental modifiers may again play a role in this clinical variability. Some proteins, such as RPGRIP1L and CEP290, have been shown to biochemically interact with RPGR,[97, 128] but additional research on such potential modifiers is needed.

1.1.3 Clinical perspectives in choroideremia

Choroideremia is a rare X-linked IRD caused by mutations in the *CHM* gene. It has been proposed that this dystrophy primarily affects the retinal pigment epithelium, and secondarily the photoreceptors and choroid.[130] Advances in gene therapy have resulted in multiple human gene therapy trials worldwide (Table 1), which have recently reached phase III.[4, 11, 12, 131-133] These advances prompted several studies on the associated phenotype and long-term clinical course. Symptoms of

choroideremia are usually noticed in the 1st or 2nd decade of life, and the degeneration usually starts in the midperiphery, after which it gradually extends centripetally towards the periphery and the fovea.[134-137] Prolonged relative sparing of foveal structure and function accounts for the long-term preservation of visual acuity, which usually remains until the 5th decade of life. This striking feature of foveal sparing, which is also typical for e.g. late-onset Stargardt disease and central areolar choroidal dystrophy,[138, 139] remains of unknown etiology. One study investigated the kinetics of the progression of macular atrophy in several macular diseases, and found nearly identical patterns across several IRD subtypes and age-related macula degeneration, suggesting a disease-independent mechanism.[139] One proposed mechanism has been the metabolic difference between different macular regions in susceptibility to atrophy of rods and cones, RPE, and choroid.[140] Our longitudinal clinical study in a cohort of choroideremia patients showed a stable plateau of good vision until the 5th decade of life, and generally a turning point in the visual acuity decline from the 4th decade of life onward.[134] Outer retinal tubulations, which have been associated with age-related macular degeneration and various other degenerative conditions,[141] were found in the majority of choroideremia patients (76%) in our study. This is in line with some previous studies where their incidence was reported between 69-94%[142-146], although smaller numbers have been reported as well.[147] They have also been demonstrated in symptomatic carriers, where they colocalized with areas of RPE atrophy and severe hypo-autofluorescence.[125] Outer retinal tubulations presumably result from the rearrangement of degenerating photoreceptors,[148] and areas containing them may be prone to surgical complications, such as macular hole formation as a result of subretinal injection of gene therapy vector solution. Moreover, areas containing outer retinal tubulations in choroideremia patients reportedly lack visual sensitivity despite the concomitant presence of viable cone inner segments in that same area.[147] This may guide in assessing which retinal areas of a particular patient are amenable to (gene) therapy. Choroideremia patients in general are at risk of developing a macular hole, the surgery of which seems to be effective in achieving anatomic closure.[149, 150] No clear genotype-phenotype correlations have been established in choroideremia.[151]

1.1.4 Clinical perspectives in LRAT-associated retinal dystrophies

In light of emerging therapeutic options, we also focused on an extremely rare IRD subtype: *LRAT*-associated IRDs. Having previously only been described in a small number of case reports or series,[33, 152-156] *LRAT*-associated IRDs are estimated to account for less than 1% of IRD cases, usually exhibiting Leber congenital amaurosis, early onset severe IRD, or retinitis punctata albescens. Therefore, our retrospective study in 13 patients - to our knowledge the largest series described in literature so far - is an important contribution to the limited literature available earlier.[157] Even more so, as we further broadened the phenotypic spectrum by describing a subset of patients with relatively preserved vision into mid- and late adulthood.[157] As our series consisted largely of patients from a genetic isolate, carrying the same homozygous c.12del *LRAT* mutation, we were able to elucidate the intrafamilial variability, with some patients carrying an RP phenotype and others a CORD phenotype. We also provided a comparison to the patient from outside the genetic

isolate, who had an overall more severe phenotype of panretinal dysfunction. The c.12del mutation in the genetic isolate is predicted to lead to severe protein truncation, and no residual protein function.[155] It is therefore unlikely that the specific protein change is the most prominent cause of the relatively slow disease course in these patients, as opposed to the early blindness described in literature.[33, 153] Genetic and/or environmental modifiers, that somehow affect the residual protein function, may be at play. However, it remains elusive why this mutation is associated with a relatively mild phenotype.[155, 157]

LRAT encodes lecithin retinol acyltransferase (LRAT), one of the retinoid cycle proteins. Protein LRAT forms a complex with RPE65 to act as the isomerol hydrolase in the regeneration of visual pigment in the retinoid cycle. Having this closely connected biological function, both *LRAT*-RD and *RPE65*-RD have been targeted in a single treatment phase I trial investigating the safety and efficacy of oral QLT091001, a synthetic chromophore 11-cis-retinal.[158, 159] This study enrolled patients with Leber congenital amaurosis due to mutations in *RPE65* or *LRAT*. While mouse studies have shown phenotypic similarities between *Rpe65*(-/-) and *Lrat*(-/-) mice, human studies comparing these phenotypes are lacking. In our study, we compared our clinical findings and earlier literature in *LRAT*-RD patients to the available literature on *RPE65*-RD, and this assessment demonstrated that there is a degree of phenotypic variability, with considerable overlap in this spectrum. To further substantiate any conclusion drawn from our study, a natural history study would ideally include extensive phenotyping of patients with *LRAT*-RDs and *RPE65*-RDs in the same study.

1.1.5 Clinical perspectives in RHO-associated retinal dystrophies

Autosomal dominant IRDs, which are caused by mutations in the *RHO* gene in up to 30-40% of cases,[160] present another challenge for gene therapy development. After all, the dominant disease is usually the result of a deleterious "gain-of-function" mechanism, e.g. where the altered gene product adversely affects the normal gene product from the wild-type allele. Mere gene supplementation would not suffice in slowing the disease process that is caused by a toxic gain-of-function mutant protein, and the gain-of-function effect leading to disease would have to be diminished. For *RHO*-associated RP, momentous advances have been made, with knockdown-and-replacement strategies,[161] CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing,[14, 162] and antisense oligonucleotides.[163] "Simple" gene augmentation could still provide some therapeutic benefit in *RHO*-associated RP, even when the disease is caused by a dominant-negative effect.[164]

Considering these advances, we aimed to establish a detailed clinical profile and natural history in a large cohort of patients with *RHO*-associated RP. We found an appreciable difference in disease progression between patients with sectorial RP (25% of our cohort) and those with generalized RP, as visual acuity decline was relatively stationary in the sectorial form, with the first case of blindness occurring after the 8th decade of life. In previous literature, an initial sectorial RP phenotype has

relatively rarely been reported to progress to the generalized form.[165] In our study, we did not find patients with sectorial RP whose phenotype progressed to generalized RP, although we were restricted by the limited availability of follow-up full-field fundus photographs in our retrospective study design.

In the general *RHO*-RP population (sectorial and generalized forms), best-corrected visual acuity generally remained well-preserved, with a median age of reaching mild visual impairment of 72 years. Based on visual fields, the median ages to reaching low vision and blindness were 52 and 79 years, respectively. This is in line with previous studies, that have shown that *RHO*-associated RP is a slowly progressive disease where patients generally maintain a good central visual function,[166-169] as opposed to e.g. *RPGR*-associated or *CRB1*-associated RP. This points to a particularly lengthy window of therapeutic opportunity for ongoing and future (gene) therapy trials. On the other hand, the slow disease progression may complicate ways to clearly show a potential effect in a treatment trial, as it may take several years for a change in the natural disease course to become apparent. Some studies have referred to the sectorial disease phenotype as a "class B" phenotype, defined by an altitudinal (hemifield) loss of photoreceptor function.[166, 170, 171] The degree of light exposure of the retina has been suggested to play a role in the retinal degeneration, and has been hypothesized due to the altitudinal degeneration mostly affecting the inferior retinal hemisphere.[165, 172, 173] In support of this theory, animals with *RHO*-RP, including the RHO^{P23H} mouse and rat,[174, 175] and the RHO^{T4R} dog,[176] that have been reared in complete darkness, have shown slower retinal degeneration. Mice that remain in red-tinted cages that filter short-wavelength light (<600 nm) have been shown to maintain a thicker photoreceptor layer and higher amplitudes of electroretinography responses than mice in non-tinted cages.[177] However, this effect has not been proven in humans, and would be challenging to prove in a clinical trial setting. Thus, it remains a controversial claim.

Over 150 mutations have been reported in *RHO*. Several studies have been performed in the $Rho^{P23H/+}$ mouse, as the p.(Pro23His) mutation is historically the first *RHO* mutation discovered, and one of the most common mutations in patients in the United States of America.[178] To our knowledge, this mutation has not been reported in European studies, including ours. In our Dutch cohort, 37% of patients had the p.Glu181Lys mutation. With regard to genotype-phenotype correlations, we found an association between the mild sectorial RP form, and mutations that correspond to the extracellular domain (i.e. the intradiscal domain). This is in line with previous literature, which has suggested milder phenotypes in association with mutations in the extracellular domain,[170, 171] particularly in comparison to mutations in the transmembrane domain.[179] However, we still found variation in the phenotype, e.g. sectorial versus generalized RP, in patients with identical genotypes, such as the p.Glu181Lys mutation. Conversely, mild and sectorial phenotypes have been reported in association with mutations in other domains.[180, 181] Extreme intrafamilial variability in the *RHO*-RP phenotype has been reported.[182] In fact, both RP and congenital stationary night blindness have

been reported in the same family carrying the c.337G>A (p.Glu113Lys) mutation,[183] which was not present in the Dutch and Belgian patients cohorts that we have described.

1.1.6 Clinical heterogeneity and potential modifiers in retinal dystrophies

A recurring finding in nearly all IRD subtypes, including the ones studied in this thesis, is clinical *heterogeneity*. The same gene or even the same mutation may cause different phenotypes, and a nearly identical phenotype may be caused by different genes. The presence of a genetic isolate in our cohort of *CRB1*-RDs, consisting of patients carrying the same homozygous p.Met1041Thr mutation, provided the opportunity to investigate not only genotype-phenotype correlations, but also the intrafamilial variability. While the phenotype was generally severe, and some hallmark features of *CRB1*-RDs were elucidated, one 41-year old patient had a mild CORD phenotype, while age-matched relatives had advanced RP. Even more variability was observed in our cohort of *LRAT*-RDs, again consisting largely of a genetic isolate. Similarly, in 2 families of *RPGR*-RD, some had RP while others had CORD. This last finding should be nuanced by the idea that different IRDs may not be entirely different entities, but members of a continuum. Advanced stages of CORD may be indistinguishable from RP, and it may prove difficult to retrieve early medical records in a retrospective setting. Nonetheless, variable degrees of intrafamilial variability were evident in several cohorts,[34, 35, 157] and patients at roughly similar ages may still have different phenotypes (CORD or RP).[102]

Environmental and genetic modifiers, such as heterozygous mutations in other IRD genes or single nucleotide polymorphisms,[47, 184, 185] may have a role, and may influence the degree of severity. In male patients with *RPGR*-RP, several single nucleotide polymorphisms (the minor allele (N) of I393N in *IQCB1* and the common allele (R) of R744Q in *RPGRIP1L*) have been significantly associated with more severe disease.[128] Another study has suggested an interaction between RPGRIP1L and RPGR proteins in photoreceptors, and indicated that *RPGRIP1L* could be a modifier in *RPGR*-associated IRD.[97] Some studies have described an "additive" effect of a heterozygous mutation in a potential modifier gene, in patients with homozygous or compound heterozygous mutations in the causative gene.[186] Such additional heterozygous mutations have been proposed to contribute to an increased disease severity. For example, additional heterozygous missense mutations in either *CRX* or *CRB1* have been shown in several patients with *AIPL1*-associated LCA, who had a much more severe disease phenotype than affected family members without these additional genetic factors at a comparable age.[185] A similar effect of a *GUCY2D* variant was found in patients with *RPE65*-LCA,[185] even in a siblingship.[187] In *PRPH2*-associated autosomal dominant macular dystrophy, the disease has been shown to be more severe in those with concurring heterozygous mutations in *ROM1*, than in affected family members without an additional *ROM1* mutation.[188] An earlier case report described a mother and daughter with *PROM1*-associated IRD, with a more severe phenotype in the daughter, who had profound macular chorioretinal atrophy and who also displayed pathognomonic features of Stargardt disease (flecks), while the mother had a

mild phenotype with some outer retinal thinning and relative macular sparing.[189] Further genetic analysis identified a heterozygous *ABCA4* variant in the daughter, but not in the mother, which was postulated to account for the more severe phenotype. In Usher syndrome, several genetic modifiers have been proposed: An additional heterozygous mutation in the *PDZD7* gene was found in a patient who had an earlier onset and more severe RP than her affected sister, who did not have a *PDZD7* mutation and who displayed a much milder retinal disease.[96] However, in another family, a heterozygous *PDZD7* mutation was found in an *USH2A* patient with a mild phenotype.[96] Altogether, evidence for genetic interaction between *PDZD7* and Usher syndrome genes have been found in at least 4 families.[96]

Besides mutations in other genes, minisatellite repeats (MSR) have been implicated as a cause for phenotypic variability, through the regulation of gene expression.[190] In *PRPF31*-associated RP, an autosomal dominant RP, some patients become blind, while others maintain good vision and remain asymptomatic.[191] One study identified a difference in the number of MSR1 copies (3 versus 4) between patients from the same family, who had considerable differences in disease severity.[190] The 4-copy-MSR1 allele, found in asymptomatic patients, was shown to have a protective effect. Another genetic modifier identified in *PRPF31*-RP is *CNOT3*,[192] a gene otherwise not associated as a monogenic cause of IRD. *CNOT3* was expressed at low levels in those with mild disease, but in high levels in those with severe disease.[192]

In mice with *Nr2e3*-associated IRD, disease expression has been shown to be modified by the *Nr1d1* gene, and the *in vivo* delivery of this modifier gene even led to a histological, functional and molecular restoration of the retina in these mice.[193] This study suggests that in some IRD subtypes, the modifier gene may even be a target for therapy.

In *CRB1*-RDs, no genetic modifiers have been found yet in human patients. In mouse studies, an interaction between CRB1 and CRB2 proteins has evidenced a disease-modifying role of CRB2,[82, 194, 195] where a loss of CRB2 protein aggravates the phenotype from RP to LCA.[85] This provides a compelling lead for future genotyping studies in human patients with *CRB1*-RDs. For choroideremia, *RHO*-RP, *LRAT*-RD, specific genetic modifiers remain to be identified.

In conclusion, while IRDs are typically monogenic diseases, rare cases of putative digenic inheritance have been reported,[196, 197] or suggested,[198] and the retina and RPE are complex tissues, whose survival and function depends on the proteins encoded by more than 18.000 genes for each tissue.[98] Further analysis of any concomitant heterozygous variants in other genes tested in patients with e.g. *CRB1*-associated IRD, may provide clues regarding differences in phenotypic expression and disease severity.

1.2 Current patient management

Before the advances made in gene therapy studies in this millennium, the management of IRD patients consisted of the regular follow-up and monitoring of disease progression, genetic and prenatal counselling, low vision aids where needed, and potential enrolment in a clinical trial. For patients who are blind due to outer retinal degeneration, but have maintained the inner retinal structure and an intact optic nerve, 2 retinal prostheses, the Argus II epiretinal prosthesis system and the Alpha IMS (first generation) and Alpha AMS (second generation) subretinal prostheses, may aid in gaining some mobility or performing specific daily tasks. However, they require careful pre-operative screening and expectation management, counselling, and a comprehensive post-operative rehabilitation program at a specialized center.[199, 200] The two most studied epiretinal implants, the Argus II and alpha-IMS/AMS, have shown performance results that can overall be considered similar, despite large differences in implant design.[201] While most patients with a retinal prosthesis show an improvement in mobility and orientation tasks, approximately one third experiences measurable visual acuity improvement.[202] Reading speed can be improved in a subset of patients, although single-letter recognition may still take up to several minutes.[203] Pre-operative counselling should comprise the advice that the output from the prosthesis is an entirely new type of functional vision rather than the recovery of previous vision.[204] Due to the guarded benefit, and the frequent visits and intensive rehabilitation required to achieve it, patient selection and expectation management are key.

The recent approval of voretigene neparvovec (Luxturna®), a prescription gene therapy for *RPE65*-RD, has marked the dawn of a new era: the availability of an IRD treatment in order to preserve and improve retinal function. However, for other IRD forms, therapeutic options, if applicable, are being investigated in a clinical trial setting, or are in an earlier preclinical investigative phase.

Associated ocular conditions, such as CME, should be monitored for development and treated. CME has been treated with different modalities. Topical and oral carbonic anhydrase inhibitors have shown morphological improvement with reduction of the CME,[205] although the effect on visual acuity has been inconsistent between studies and remains inconclusive.[206-210] One study has found that CME in the outer nuclear layer showed a better response to treatment with topical or oral carbonic anhydrase inhibitors than CME in the inner nuclear layer, where CME in IRD is commonly found.[211] An intravitreal dexamethasone implant (Ozurdex®) has shown improvement of visual acuity and edema resolution,[205, 212] while intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide showed anatomical improvement without improvement in visual acuity.[213, 214] When using steroids, the development of cataract, and perhaps more importantly, elevation of intraocular pressure should be closely monitored in these patients, who are at an increased risk of developing both.[34] Intravitreal injection of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) has shown inconsistent results with resolution of CME in some studies,[215, 216] and no effect in other studies.[217] No evident visual acuity improvement was established with the use of anti-VEGFs.[216] Intravenous immunoglobulin therapy

has been reported in the treatment of concomitant CME and uveitis in 1 patient, and has shown complete resolution of CME at 4 months and 1 year.[218] Octreotide has been postulated to have a role in the treatment of uveitis-associated CME,[219] and has been successful in reducing CME and stabilizing visual acuity in dominant cystoid macular dystrophy.[220] A study with a small sample has shown that octreotide leads to some improvement in visual acuity in those with post-surgical CME, but not to a change in retinal thickness or angiographic leakage.[221] Its effect on CME in retinitis pigmentosa has not been reported to date.

Treatment options for Coats'-like exudative vasculopathy have included laser photocoagulation or cryotherapy. This can lead to regression of the exudates and to improved or stabilized vision,[63, 67, 72, 222, 223] but it has also been complicated by a vitreous hemorrhage requiring vitrectomy.[67] In the case of an exudative retinal detachment, treatment with vitrectomy and endolaser has been described, with the aim of salvaging the eye and maintaining any remaining vision.[73, 224] More recently, the intravitreal injection of conbercept, a new anti-VEGF, has been described in RP patients with exudative retinal detachment due to Coats'-like exudative vasculopathy.[225] This led to complete resolution of the subfoveal serous detachment and improvement of the visual acuity. In a patient with *RHO*-associated RP and Coats'-like exudation, along with treatment-resistant CME, the intravitreal injection of a dexamethasone implant (Ozurdex®) led to resolution of the exudation, along with a reduction in the CME, and maintenance of a well-preserved visual acuity.[64] All these case reports appear too meagre to establish a clear guideline for the treatment of CME in the context of IRDs.

1.3 Implications of natural history studies for gene therapy trials

The findings in this thesis have several implications for ongoing and future gene therapy trials. Crucial factors in the design of a (gene) therapy trial, are the determination of:

a) a window of therapeutic opportunity;

b) patient eligibility criteria;

c) disease symmetry between eyes and the suitability of the contralateral eye as the untreated control; and

d) defining endpoints for the evaluation of clinical efficacy.

1.3.1 Window of opportunity

The window of therapeutic opportunity refers to the time span within which potential treatments may still prevent disease or positively modify the natural history. As gene therapy uses viral vectors that need to infect viable retinal cells, the window of opportunity closes when no viable photoreceptors remain, and no useful vision remains to be rescued. In a trial setting, the therapy is ideally applied in an early or intermediate disease stage, when enough vision remains to be rescued, and the natural disease progression is fast enough for a therapeutic effect to be detected, i.e. a change in the rate of disease progression. However, in treatment settings, intervening as

early as possible in the disease course may provide the best protective effect. In our cohort of patients with *CRB1*-RP, the median ages for reaching visual acuity-based low vision, severe visual impairment, and blindness were 18, 32, and 44 years, respectively. Thus, the window of therapeutic opportunity spans the first 3 decades of life, and could be expanded in some patients to the 4th decade of life. In *CRB1*-LCA or EOSRD, intervention would ideally be much earlier, within the 1st decade of life, as any remaining useful vision usually degenerates in this period. In contrast, the window of opportunity is considerably broader in patients with *RHO*-RP. In *RPGR*-RDs, the window of opportunity depends on the phenotype intended to treat in the trial: patients with COD/CORD have a 55% likelihood of being blind at the age of 40, as opposed to 20% in patients with RP. Patients with mutations in the ORF15 region had a higher risk of becoming blind at an earlier age, and would thus also require earlier therapeutic intervention, according to our study.

It should be noted that in our studies, we based our estimation of the window of opportunity primarily on the visual acuity decline and the degeneration of the central macula. Indeed, subretinal gene therapy trials have targeted the central macula.[6, 11, 13, 226] However, in our study of choroideremia, visual field constriction was reported by 70% of patients to be their most debilitating symptom. Therefore, addressing the preservation of the peripheral retina remains an important consideration for the near future. Therapeutic approaches that target the peripheral retina as well as the central retina, such as intravitreal antisense oligonucleotides,[15] may have to consider much earlier intervention in diseases where the peripheral retina degenerates first.

In *RPGR*- and *RHO*-associated IRDs, the presence of a hyperautofluorescent ring on fundus autofluorescence imaging may aid in determining which retinal area is most likely to benefit from a subretinal gene therapy injection, as this ring signifies the transitional zone between degenerated retina and relatively preserved – and thus rescuable – retina. In *RPGR*-RP, this ring was present in 47% of patients with *RPGR*-RP and 71% of patients with *RPGR*-COD/CORD. While the hyperautofluorscent ring provides useful information on the location of the transitional zone between atrophic and relatively preserved retina, it is unknown whether it has additional value in determining the likelihood of benefit from therapeutic intervention.

1.3.2 Patient eligibility criteria

Patient eligibility criteria for inclusion in a future trial are largely dependent on the window of therapeutic opportunity, and thus the patient age and remaining visual function. The presence of CME may render the macula more susceptible to the formation of a secondary macular hole, when subretinal injection of a viral vector in gene therapy increases the retinal stretching.[227] Even if such a complication would not occur, the natural fluctuation in the extent of CME and the visual acuity may confound any potential therapeutic effect. On the other hand, successful gene augmentation via gene therapy may also have a beneficial effect on the resolution of CME. Patients with *CRB1*-RDs should be assessed for the risk of developing acute angle-closure glaucoma, and a prophylactic

peripheral iridotomy or, if appropriate, cataract extraction may be warranted to reduce this risk prior to enrolment in a clinical trial that requires frequent mydriasis.

An extremely important point for consideration is the a priori amenability of the retina to (gene) therapy. A point of concern, particularly in some patients with *CRB1*-RD, would be the retinal disorganization, which would indicate a limited availability of viable cells for the viral vector to infect and/or the inability for the gene to function due to structural disintegration. Therefore, the degree of laminar disorganization was an area of focus in our retrospective and prospective studies. In the baseline report of our prospective study, the retinal laminar organization was preserved in 24% and showed only mild coarsening without disorganization in 38% of patients, indicating an amenability of the retina for gene therapy in 64% of patients. In the other 38% of patients, the retinal laminar organization was relatively disorganized, indicating a decreased amenability.

In choroideremia, the lengthy preservation of central visual function and initial (relative) sparing of the fovea afford a broad window of therapeutic opportunity for gene therapy.[4, 134, 137] Outer retinal tubulations, when present, may provide clues of areas retaining viable photoreceptors and remaining visual function, as they have been found to be present around areas of surviving retina.[134] Full-thickness macular holes have sporadically been described in choroideremia,[149, 150] and although successful closure may be achieved surgically, these patients may be at a higher risk of iatrogenic damage during subretinal injection in a gene therapeutic setting.

Gene therapy trials for male patients with *RPGR*-associated RP may take the additional detrimental effect of the associated high myopia into consideration when assessing patient eligibility and when interpreting safety and efficacy data, as we have found that high myopia is associated with worse visual function and a thinner retina.[102] This high myopia may thus be a complicating factor in the rescue of the remaining photoreceptors.

In our study in female heterozygous carriers of *RPGR* mutations we have shown that most of these individuals are mildly affected or asymptomatic, and treatment in these patients may not be necessary. However, in this study, we also found that 40% of female heterozygotes may experience variable degrees of visual symptoms, and 23% of cases express a full RP or CORD phenotype as in affected males, suggesting that *RPGR* gene therapy may also be a treatment option in significantly affected female heterozygotes in future clinical trial phases. Similarly, a study in a smaller series of female heterozygotes has found a subset of severely affected cases with a phenotype indistinguishable from the pattern found in male patients, and has found that these patients may be considered for *RPGR* gene therapy.[228]

Thus far, subretinal gene augmentation therapy trials have treated the posterior pole/macular region,[3, 4, 9, 10] while patients with RP or choroideremia may experience visual field constriction as a major problem. Indeed, our study has surveyed patient-reported visual complaints and their effects

on daily life, and has found that most choroideremia patients (70%) reported peripheral visual field constriction as the most disabling symptom.[134] In these patients, expectation management prior to enrollment in a clinical gene therapy trial is crucial, as the peripheral rods responsible for the visual field are not targeted through conventional subretinal gene therapy that mainly targets the posterior pole. Intravitreal gene therapy administration may theoretically provide a better outcome in the peripheral visual function these patients, although it currently holds a higher risk of inflammation and systemic biodistribution,[229-231] and a lower degree of efficacy than subretinal administration in the eyes of primates.[232] Should intravitreal gene therapy administration develop a better profile in the future, intervention would ideally happen at a much earlier stage, as rods degenerate already in the earlier disease stages, while central cone function and visual acuity may remain preserved for many years.

There appears to be no or minimal usefulness of gene therapy in cases of extensive atrophy of the photoreceptors, RPE, and choriocapillaris including the posterior pole of the eye. In these patients, stem cell-based therapeutic options may provide more benefit. Examples include the intravitreal or subretinal administration of induced pluripotent stem cells or retinal progenitor cells.[233] These studies are in the early stages: one phase I/II clinical trial on human embryonic stem cell-derived RPE cells has been completed in age-related macular degeneration and Stargardt disease,[234] and has shown an acceptable safety profile and some possible improvement in visual function. Clinical trials using induced patient-derived gene therapy corrected pluripotent stem cells may be expected,[226, 235] but are yet to be initiated. In patients with advanced chorioretinal atrophy, stem cells may need to differentiate into multiple cell types, not including not only the photoreceptors, but also the RPE and choriocapillaris. The injected cells then have to successfully convert into each mature and functional cell structure individually, and organize into a structurally and functionally intact unit. To facilitate proper insertion of cells in the subretinal space, scaffolds may be used.[236, 237] While these challenges complicate the treatment options for these patients, *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies have shown some promising results.[235, 238]

1.3.3 Interocular symmetry

As most retinal (gene) therapy studies have treated one eye, usually the worse-seeing eye, inter-eye symmetry within the same patient is an important aspect. Interocular symmetry enables the use of the contralateral eye as an ideal untreated control. A high degree of inter-eye symmetry has been confirmed in most IRD subtypes of interest for ongoing and future gene- and cell-based therapy trials.[34, 35, 102, 137, 157, 166, 169, 239-242] In cases of asymmetry in our studies, which we defined as a between-eye difference of >15 ETDRS letters, an underlying reason, such as more severe cataract or amblyopia, could usually be determined. Interocular symmetry, or lack thereof, should be determined prior to enrollment in an interventional trial, and investigators should aim to identify a potential cause of significant asymmetry.

1.3.4 Defining endpoints for evaluation of treatment efficacy

For many IRD subtypes, it has proven to be challenging to define clinical endpoints for the evaluation of treatment efficacy. A thorough understanding and quantification of important parameters in the natural disease course is crucial, as this may help define the most appropriate efficacy endpoints. Using the most appropriate endpoint may be pivotal in the process of market approval of gene therapy by regulatory bodies. In order to be an expeditious efficacy endpoint for a treatment aimed at slowing disease progression, a parameter would have to be expected to show significant decline within the clinical trial period, and a faster decline than any expected test-retest variability. Visual acuity, a measure of central cone function, usually shows significant decline over several decades of life, but may remain relatively stable over the course of a few years, while the duration of a clinical treatment trial is usually not much longer than two years. Visual acuity survival curves in *CRB1*-RP in the Dutch cohort have shown a relative plateau during the 2nd decade of life. Meanwhile, the visual acuity decline rate was 0.03 logMAR per year, corresponding to 7.2% per year. Similar rates were demonstrated in the decline of the visual field area. In order to calculate how long a trial should last in order for a true treatment effect to be detected, test-retest variability in the visual function values should be determined in the study population. The estimated time needed to detect a significant change may be longer than the trial period in most patients, but longitudinal prospective studies must further investigate this. In patients with *RPGR*-RP, visual acuity did not show any significant decline before the age of 20 years in our study,[102] indicating that in these young patients, visual acuity is not a sensitive marker for change. However, it would be a judicious safety marker, as any significant visual acuity decline may be for instance an indicator of iatrogenic damage to the retina.

Several studies have indicated that the ellipsoid zone width and ellipsoid zone area on SD-OCT may be sensitive biomarkers for disease progression,[240, 243] even within a time span of 2 years of follow-up.[244-246] In our study of *RHO*-RP, we found similar results for ellipsoid zone width. Several challenges accompany this particular biomarker: while this biomarker appears to be useful for instance in *RHO*-RP or *RPGR*-RDs, in *CRB1*-RDs, the ellipsoid zone disintegration will probably be at a too advanced stage to be able to sensitively detect a significant change in decline rate. Moreover, regulatory bodies such as the United States Food and Drug Administration and the European Medicines Agency, have not yet approved structural biomarkers as defining parameters for the approval of a therapy for retinal disease.[247] For such structural biomarkers to serve as surrogate endpoints, their reliability, as well as their strong correlation to direct measures of the patient's visual function (e.g. visual acuity) should be established. In our prospective study on *CRB1*-RD, the ellipsoid zone width did not maintain its significant correlation with visual acuity after correction for multiple testing. The thickness of the photoreceptor and RPE complex (i.e. as measured from the external limiting membrane to the RPE at the fovea), however, did correlate with visual acuity. Its rate of decline (-0.6%/year), however, was much slower than that of the EZ

band width (-3.8%/year), which means that the expected time needed to detect a treatment effect is much longer.

Looking back at the *RPE65* gene therapy trial that led to market approval of Luxturna®, useful endpoints have included the full-field stimulus testing,[13] which we have also employed in our prospective natural history study of *CRB1*-RD. Full-field stimulus testing is a psychophysical measure to determine the maximum retinal sensitivity in the full field, and chromatic stimuli can be added to determine whether this sensitivity is rod-mediated, cone-mediated, or mediated by a combination of the two.[248, 249] It may be employed in patients with non-detectable dark-adapted and light-adapted responses on the electroretinogram, and is therefore particularly helpful in patients who are (nearly) blind. Another useful endpoint in studies leading to marked approval of voretigene neparvovec (Luxturna®) was the multi-luminance mobility test (MLMT). This is a navigation course, where patients must maneuver past obstacles at different levels of environmental illumination, ranging from 1 lux (a moonless night) to 400 lux (a brightly lit office). It provides a reliable measure of functional vision, that is meaningful with regard to the patient's daily life. While this may be an impractical measure in natural history studies, it has proven useful in interventional trials, and its validity has been demonstrated in a non-trial setting.[250] Other mobility courses and artificial platforms for mobility and for the simulation of daily activities have been developed, such as The StreetLab and HomeLab platforms designed by the Institut de la Vision (Paris).[251]

In gene therapy trials, primary outcome measures should ideally focus not only on the objective improvement in visual acuity and other visual and structural parameters, but also on the efficacy of treatments to significantly improve parameters that are important of patients' daily lives, such as level of independence, quality of life, and other patient-reported outcomes (PRO). PRO tools, focusing on quality of life, monitor aspects such as physical and emotional well-being, and independence. PRO tools that focus on visual functioning questionnaires rate the difficulties patients have in performing vision-related tasks of daily living. Many PRO tools include a combination of these approaches, such as the "Impact of Vision Impairment" questionnaire.[252] Selecting a visual functioning questionnaire may be challenging, as no standardized questionnaires have been established thus far for such quality of life and social functioning aspects for this specific population with severe visual impairment due to IRDs.

Furthermore, a recent report of the National Eye Institute/Food and Drug Administration workshop on age-related macular degeneration and inherited retinal diseases has addressed the need to focus not only on *visual function*, but also on *functional vision*.[247] While visual function performance is tested using single parameters, e.g. visual acuity or visual field testing, in a controlled environment, functional vision tests aim to mimic real-world settings in a simulated environment. One such functional vision domain is mobility and orientation, and daily living at home environments and reading/occupational needs are the other main domains. The French

Institut de la Vision has developed the companies "Streetlab" and "Homelab" to simulate an urban environment and a living environment, respectively, designed to evaluate task performance in visually impaired patients in the context of consultancy and training. Functional vision testing has been performed in studies of retinal prostheses,[253, 254] and several gene therapy trials for IRDs assess patients' reading speed performance (Table 1).

1.4 Emerging therapies and future perspectives

Prior to the emergence of gene therapeutic trials, no evidence-based treatment options existed for IRDs that led to a clinically measurable improvement in visual function. The development of therapies for rare diseases has historically been challenging due to small patient populations for trials, and the challenges in post-approval marketing.

The great advances in gene therapy in the last two decades have led to market approval of voretigene neparvovec (Luxturna®) subretinal gene therapy for *RPE65*-associated early-onset IRD/LCA. This success, along with other advances in gene therapy development, have led to a spectacular expansion in the field of retinal gene therapy. Subretinal gene therapy is under development for *CRB1*-RDs,[7] and clinical trials are ongoing for *RPGR*-associated RP, choroideremia, achromatopsia (associated with *CNGB3* and *CNGA3*), Stargardt disease (associated with *ABCA4*), X-linked retinoschisis (associated with *RS1*) and several other entities (Table 1), are in the pipeline.[7, 255]

1.4.1 Gene replacement and gene silencing

Gene transfer to the target cells in the retina may happen through viral vectors, mostly adenoviruses, lentiviruses, or adeno-associated viruses (AAV), the latter representing the most efficient and stable gene transfer in most IRD forms.[18, 256] AAV vectors are currently the most used viral vectors in gene therapy, due to the extensive experience with AAV, and their excellent safety profile: in the retina, the risk for immunogenicity is low,[257] and they have low inflammatory and low retinal toxicity potential.[257, 258] Furthermore, they do not integrate their genome into the host-cell genome,[258] thus eliminating the risk of iatrogenic activation of oncogenes. Virtually all AAV serotypes are able to infect the RPE, and serotypes 2, 5, and 7-9 are able to infect photoreceptors.[259] Drawbacks of AAV vectors include their small size, which leads to a limited transgene capacity of up to 4.2 kb. In contrast, the larger lentivirus vectors have a transgene capacity of up to 10 kb.[260] However, they integrate their genome into the host-cell genome with great efficiency, although it has been shown that they do not preferentially integrate their genome in the vicinity of oncogenes.[261] Although the potential of viral vectors has been demonstrated repeatedly, nonviral gene delivery systems have been investigated as well. These transfer methods, using for instance nanoparticles, liposomes, or naked plasmid DNA, are cheaper and easier to produce, and have a lower risk of inducing an immune response. However, as of yet, they have not shown promising potential for safe gene delivery, due to e.g. lack of persistent transgene expression (naked DNA and nanoparticles), or the potential for retinal toxicity (liposomes).[262, 263]

While gene replacement or supplementation should be sufficient in autosomal recessive IRDs, in which a lack of gene expression leads to a deficit in the gene product, (additional) gene silencing is necessary in autosomal dominant IRDs. In autosomal dominant RPs, the gene mutations often lead to mutant gene expression resulting in altered protein products that impair normal function of the wild-type protein, leading to a toxic effect. In such cases, gene therapy is aimed at repairing or silencing the mutated gene, and gene supplementation in the case of additional haplo-insufficiency.

Such gene silencing has been proposed through the use of allele-specific inhibitors that induce the degeneration of the mutated messenger RNA (mRNA).[264] Another approach is the suppression of both the mutated and wild-type allele, and their replacement by a wildtype non-silenced allele.[265] Both strategies can be mediated for instance by small RNA inhibitors or ribozymes,[266-268] each with their own set of advantages and disadvantages,[269] such as a need for repeated injections.

1.4.2 Antisense oligonucleotides

Antisense oligonucleotides (AONs) consist of small DNA or RNA molecules that are able to modulate splicing after binding to pre-mRNA. Preclinical studies using e.g. fibroblasts from affected patients, and animal studies have shown promising results for *CEP290*-LCA,[270] and for *RHO*-RP.[163] AONs can be administered "naked" through intravitreal injections, or through subretinal injections with an adenoviral-associated viral vector, and have shown minimal toxic or immunological adverse effects.[271] As naked AONs are small-sized molecules, they may be able to reach their destination cells, the photoreceptors, more easily after intravitreal injections. This approach would require repeated injections throughout life, while a subretinal injection of an AAV-mediated AON may give a considerably more durable therapeutic benefit. However, intravitreal AONs target the entire retina, and the need for a vitrectomy and its associated complications is circumvented. A recent phase I/II trial investigating the effect of intravitreal AONs in the treatment of 10 patients with *CEP290*-associated LCA found no serious adverse events, and a clinically meaningful improvement in vision, defined in the study as 0.3 logMAR, in 5 patients.[15] These encouraging results are followed up in a phase II/III trial, the ILLUMINATE study (NCT03913143).

1.4.3 Gene editing: CRISPR/Cas9

An exciting potential alternative to gene replacement strategies is the therapeutic approach of gene editing. In gene editing, the genome can be altered by inducing double-stranded DNA breaks, single-stranded DNA breaks, or specific base changes in the DNA at target sites to correct the deleterious gene mutation. This can be achieved using several methods, such as zinc finger nucleases, meganucleases, and, more recently, clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR) CRISPR-associated protein 9 (Cas9).[272] CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing is a fast, cheap and relatively efficient method to edit the genome and repair genetic mutations, typically by inducing double-stranded breaks. CRISPR is guided by RNA sequences, and multiple guide

RNA sequences may be packaged into one targeted delivery system (e.g. a viral vector). Thereby, CRISPR has the unique ability to target more than one genetic location.[273]

CRISPR/Cas9-based therapies have been used successfully in mouse models for instance *PDE6B*,[274] *CEP290*,[275] and *RHO*.[162, 276] In mouse models of *RHO*-RP, CRISPR/Cas9 has been used in a mutation-independent "ablate-and-replace" technique. Moreover, CRISPR/Cas9 has been used to generate accurate mouse models for RP and LCA.[277, 278]

Drawbacks of the CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing system include concerns on its accuracy and the potential of off-target effects.[279] Additionally, its efficiency may vary. In induced pluripotent stem cells of a patient with *RPGR*-RP, CRISPR-Cas9 was applied to correct the gene mutation and convert it to the wild-type allele.[280] This succeeded in 13% of *RPGR* gene copies, which still spectacularly exceeds previous gene correction rates of 1-3%, which used e.g. transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENs).[281] Furthermore, it is a large-sized system that cannot be packaged into a single viral vector, and typically a dual vector system is employed.[16]

The challenges associated with the CRISPR/Cas9 approach have driven the exploration of alternative precision gene editing approaches. One such approach is the recently published prime editing strategy,[282] which can alter DNA with single-nucleotide precision, potentially with greater safety, and with great versatility. It combines Cas9-mediated RNA-guided DNA breakage (or nicking) with reverse transcriptase-mediated DNA synthesis at the same target site. Different types of mutations, including insertions and deletions, can be corrected. It has been proposed that it can correct up to 89% of pathogenic human variants that have been described in the ClinVar archive of genetic variants in any part of the genome, which spectacularly broadens the range of mutations that can be corrected. The promising *in vitro* results of prime editing remain to be replicated *in vivo*.

1.4.4 Stem cell-based strategies

When retinal cells have already died, genetic therapies to correct mutated genes in the affected target cells appear useless as an isolated therapeutic approach. In these cases, replacement of these dead cells by new functional cells may prove to be a viable future treatment option.[226, 238] Human embryonic stem cells have been investigated as a treatment for several retinal disorders, and have shown some visual improvement in IRD rat models.[283, 284] In humans, a phase 1/2 trial transplanting human embryonic stem cells to the subretinal space in patients with Stargardt's disease or atrophic age-related macular degeneration has shown some modest visual improvement in more than half of the treated eyes.[234] However, the use of human embryonic stem cells as a therapy has raised ethical concerns, as well as concerns over immunological responses and/or the need for immunosuppression.

Fibroblast-derived induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) are derived from the patient, and have been used in the treatment of several mouse and rat models of IRD, where they have led to potential preservation of the visual function.[285, 286] Concerns regarding the use of iPSCs as a treatment modality include immunogenicity,[287] and tumor formation due to incompletely differentiated iPSCs.[288] A safer and particularly exciting application of iPSCs, has been in the generation of retinal organoids,[289] where they aid in the examination of underlying disease mechanism and in the in-vitro study of treatment options, such as in *CRB1*-RDs.[18] In autologous IPSC-based cultured retinal cells of patients with IRDs, the genetic defect may be corrected *in vitro*, using for instance AAV-based gene replacement or gene editing techniques,[235] in preparation for subretinal administration. A key challenge may be not only to achieve a correct anatomical integration of such stem cells into the retina after surgical administration, but certainly also subsequent cellular function and interaction, leading to genuine functional improvement that matters to the patients.[226, 238, 290] Another important aspect when considering cell transplantation for advanced IRD is the fact that such cases do not only have photoreceptor atrophy, but also atrophy of the photoreceptor's 'nursing cells', the RPE and choriocapillaris. After all, the photoreceptor-RPE-Bruch's membrane-choriocapillaris interface normally forms a closely connected and inter-dependent functional unit. This means that administration of such a combination of cells, possibly using cell sheets and/or a cell-carrying scaffold, may be mandatory to achieve a (close to) normal cellular interaction for a durable and functionally relevant treatment effect.

Bone-marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells have been used in intravitreal injections in phase I clinical trials for IRD patients, and in commercial "stem cell clinics" in the United States, where resulting vision-threatening complications, such as vitreous hemorrhage and rhegmatogenous retinal detachment, and blindness have been reported in patients with IRD and with age-related macular degeneration.[291, 292]

1.4.5 Optogenetics

In patients who are blind due to photoreceptor degeneration while still retaining a relatively intact inner retina, optogenetics may be a tool to re-introduce light perception. Optogenetics is a strategy whereby a gene encoding a photosensitive protein (an opsin) is introduced in inner retinal cells, i.e. retinal ganglion cells and bipolar cells, with the aim of sensitizing these inner retinal cells to light in the absence of photoreceptors.[293] It thus provides an alternative visual cycle to improve retinal activity. Opsins may have a microbial origin (type 1), such as channelrhodopsins or halorhodopsins, which function as light-gated ion channels, or an animal origin (type 2), such as melanopsin or rhodopsin. Preclinical data have suggested that blind patients with preservation of the photoreceptor nuclei, as visible on OCT, may be eligible for functional photoreceptor restoration through optogenetics.[294]

1.4.6 Nutritional approaches to the treatment of IRD

Several trials have investigated the safety and efficacy of oral supplementation of compounds thought to slow down the loss of visual function and photoreceptor degeneration. One such compound is QLT091001 (QLT), or synthetic 9-cis-retinyl acetate, a stable synthetic precursor which is converted to 9-cis retinal in the human body.[158] This replaces the missing 11-cis retinal in the retinas of patients with *RPE65*-RD or *LRAT*-RD, who lack 11-cis-retinal, and ultimately starts the phototransduction cascade upon photo-activation. A phase Ib trial of QLT091001 in patients with *LRAT*-RD and *RPE65*-RD has shown a meaningful improvement in visual acuity and visual field area in a large subset of patients, albeit temporarily in most patients, along with a favorable safety profile.[158, 159]

For Stargardt disease, orphan drug status was given to soraprazan,[295] a proton potassium-competitive acid-blocker which was developed for use in dyspepsia. Based on experimental data, this drug is expected to enter the retina, attach to the lipofuscin deposits, and partially eliminate the damaging lipofuscin.[296] As of yet, no clinical reports on its efficacy have been published, although a clinical trial is ongoing (EudraCT number: 2018-001496-20).

Likewise, deuterium-enriched vitamin A has been shown to slow down the biosynthesis of A2E, a lipofuscin component, in rodents.[297] It has therefore been suggested to have a potential protective effect in Stargardt disease and Best vitelliform macular dystrophy, although clinical data on this specific vitamin A type have not yet been reported. Otherwise, the supplementation of regular vitamin A is not recommended in Stargardt disease, as animal studies have found that high doses of vitamin A may accelerate the rate of lipofuscin deposition in the macula,[298] and may thus expedite vision loss. However, in RP, vitamin A palmitate supplementation has been associated with a potentially slower rate of cone amplitude loss on the electroretinogram in small patient samples,[299] but this is a subject of considerable controversy.

In a mouse model of RP, orally administered N-acetylcysteine led to long-term preservation of cone function.[300] A recently published phase I clinical trial investigating oral N-acetylcysteine has shown improvement in visual acuity and macular sensitivity in patients with moderately advanced RP.[301]

1.5 Expectation management in interventional clinical trials

While the advances of the last 2 decades have propelled research forward towards clinical application, with exciting new treatment possibilities for IRD patients, expectations should be managed and critically reconsidered. Gene supplementation therapy is notably costly to develop, to test, and to implement, and of the several gene replacement therapy trials that have been performed in the *RPE65*-RD population, only one has led to considerable long-term success and market approval to date: voretigene neparvovec (Luxturna®), priced at approximately US $850.000. While the bench-

to-bedside success of this first commercially available retinal gene therapy has further energized patient and research communities alike, the long term effects of the therapy on visual function in the other *RPE65*-gene therapy trials have been more guarded.[9, 10] For example, it has been found that retinal degeneration may continue, and the longevity of interventional therapy will be limited if the degree of photoreceptor degeneration has exceeded a certain limit prior to treatment.[302] Indeed, in most patients, retinal degeneration will have progressed to intermediate or advanced stages at the time of intervention. While any degree of visual restoration and/or preservation is a revolutionary move forward in an otherwise untreatable disease entity, FDA documents have revealed that approximately half of treated patients met the FDA criteria for minimally meaningful improvement.[303] The other half did not achieve the criteria for meaningful improvement, and 2 patients had permanent vision loss, due to injection-related macular thinning in one patient, and irreversible optic nerve atrophy due to increased intraocular pressure in the other patient, who received ocular steroids for the treatment of a *Staphylococcus* infection.[303] These results may be particularly disappointing to the patient, having undergone the surgical procedure and a period of recovery and frequent hospital visits.

In choroideremia, the first in-human gene therapy, which started in Oxford, UK in 2011, has led to a median gain in visual acuity of 4.5 letters in the treatment cohort, versus a visual acuity loss of 1.5 letters in the untreated eye at the 2-year post-treatment point, with 6/14 treated eyes gaining >5 letters of visual acuity improvement. In some patients, this vision improvement was sustained at up to 5 years of follow-up.[131] Most visual acuity gain was observed in patients with advanced disease and reduced baseline visual acuity, while in those with a good baseline visual acuity, this baseline visual acuity was maintained for 5 years in most patients. Nonetheless, complications arose in 2/14 patients (14%) – surgery-related retinal thinning and incomplete vector dosing in one patient, and postoperative inflammation in the other. In these patients, visual acuity loss was observed in the treated eye. This has led to the prolongation of the post-operative immune suppression regimen. Moreover, surgical techniques in these trials have since been refined, e.g. by incorporating the aid of intra-operative OCT.[304] Several other in-human choroideremia gene therapy trials used the same gene vector as the Oxford group.[12, 132, 305] Visual acuity results have been variable, with considerable visual acuity gain in some patients, visual acuity loss in others, usually due to intra-operative complications, and minor changes or maintenance of baseline visual acuity in most patients. As in the trial performed in Oxford, one other study found improvement in mean retinal sensitivity on microperimetry in most treated eyes,[305] while the other 2 studies found no significant post-treatment changes in mean retinal sensitivity.[12, 132]

The irreversibility of disease in cell populations that have already degenerated should be stressed to any potential participants in gene therapy trials. In the case of subretinal gene therapy that only targets the posterior pole, the treatment effect will be confined largely to the macula. Therefore, it should be explained to patients that peripheral visual field preservation is not expected when this is not the targeted area.

Issues regarding the cost of gene therapy remain a point of concern. As gene therapies for orphan indications, defined as diseases affecting fewer than 200.000 people in the United States, target specific genetic entities, and thus pertain to small patient populations, they remain among the most expensive drugs.

These considerations indicate that clinicians and researchers should exert caution not to oversell the capacities of investigative (gene) therapeutic strategies to patients, in whom hope for improvement and fear of further visual decline without treatment will be important factors in their decision whether or not to take part in a clinical trial. Therefore, in the context of informed consent, it is evident that eligible patients – who may already be small in number – are to be informed well on the risks of intervention, its investigative nature and thus uncertain outcome, and on the lengthy post-intervention trajectory.

1.6 Concluding remarks

New treatment opportunities emerge for IRDs at an exceedingly rapid pace, offering hopeful perspectives to many IRD patients worldwide. Given these developments, and the need to approve effective treatments for clinical use, prospective natural history studies are of eminent importance. However, this thesis has shown that retrospective studies, despite their inherent limitations, can provide robust and useful information on important disease characteristics, variability, and course of many years. National collaborations, such as the RD5000 consortium in the Netherlands, or international collaborations, as within the European context of ERN-EYE, are important to further strengthen the outcome of such studies in these relatively small patient populations. For example, access to large databases such as the Delleman archive for hereditary eye diseases at the Amsterdam University Medical Centers/Academic Medical Center in Amsterdam, have provided the unique opportunity to ascertain large sample sizes, and to assemble some of the largest retrospective cohorts described to date. Indeed, prospective studies will not be able to provide all the answers on disease progression and visual survival, and they will still have limitations, such as a limited capacity to include many patients, and a limited study duration. On the other hand, the limitations of retrospective research are well-described and include the lack of standardization of patient visits, interval censoring, and a limited availability of multimodal imaging. Improvement of phenotyping and genetic characterization remain of critical importance. Ongoing and future prospective studies should be geared at further assessing the rate of disease progression through different visual function parameters and biomarkers on multimodal retinal

imaging, and at investigating correlations between these measures. In the end, retrospective and prospective studies have the powerful capacity to augment each other. Such studies are pivotal for well-balanced decision making on patient eligibility for treatments, and endpoint selection to test treatment efficacy.

Table 1. An overview of ongoing or recently completed human gene therapy trials for inherited retinal degenerations

Route of administration/ vector	Target gene	Disease group	Study phase	Primary outcome measure*	Secondary outcome measure*	Clinicaltrials.gov number	Sponsor
Adeno-associated virus gene replacement therapy							
Subretinal AAV8-RPGR	*RPGR*	RP	2/3	Dose limiting toxicities; treatment emergent AE; MP	BCVA; MP; OCT (EZ); FAF; VF	NCT03116113	NightstaRx Ltd (now Biogen)
Subretinal rAAV2tYF-GRK1-RPGR	*RPGR*	RP	1/2	AE, abnormal clinically relevant hematology/ chemistry parameters	BCVA; perimetry; retinal structure by imaging; QoL questionnaire	NCT03316560	Applied Genetic Technologies Group
Subretinal AAV-RPGR	*RPGR*	RP	1/2	Adverse events	Visual function; retinal function; QoL questionnaire	NCT03252847	MeiraGTx UK II Ltd
Subretinal AAV2-REP1	*CHM*	CHM	2 (completed)	BCVA	Macular FAF; MP; AE	NCT02553135	Univ. of Miami, USA
Subretinal AAV2-REP1	*CHM*	CHM	1/2 (completed)	Ocular and systemic AE	Goldmann VF; MP; ERG; full-field scotopic threshold; SD-OCT; FAF; fundus photography	NCT02077361	Univ. of Alberta, Canada
Subretinal AAV2-REP1	*CHM*	CHM	1/2	Safety and tolerability	Not mentioned	NCT02341807	Spark Therapeutics; Children's Hospital of Philadelphia; Univ. of Pennsylvania, USA; Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary
Subretinal AAV2-REP1	*CHM*	CHM	2	Treatment emergent AE	BCVA; FAF; OCT (EZ); MP	NCT03507686 (GEMINI TRIAL)	NightstaRx Ltd (now Biogen)
Subretinal AAV2-REP1	*CHM*	CHM	2	BCVA	MP; FAF	NCT02407678 (REGENERATE TRIAL)	Univ. of Oxford; Moorfields Eye Hospital, UK; University College London, UK

Subretinal AAV2-REP1	*CHM*	CHM	3	BCVA	FAF; OCT; MP; contrast sensitivity; color vision; reading performance; QoL questionnaire	NCT03496012 (STAR TRIAL)	NightstaRx Ltd (now Biogen)
Subretinal rAAV2.REP1	*CHM*	CHM	1/2 (completed)	BCVA	MP; OCT; FAF	NCT01461213	Univ. of Oxford, UK; multicenter***
Subretinal rAAV2.REP1	*CHM*	CHM	2 (completed)	BCVA	AE; FAF; MP; contrast sensitivity; color vision	NCT02671539 (THOR TRIAL)	Univ. of Tubingen, Germany
Subretinal rAAV2.REP1	*CHM*	CHM	Observational	AE	BCVA; FAF; EZ on OCT; MP	NCT03584165 (SOLSTICE TRIAL)	NightstaRx Ltd (now Biogen); multicenter
Subretinal rAAV2-CBSB-hRPE65	*RPE65*	LCA	1	Ocular examination; toxicity	Visual function	NCT00481546	Univ. of Pennsylvania; NEI
Subretinal AAV2-hRPE65v2, voretigene neparvovec-rzyl	*RPE65*	LCA	1/2	Safety and tolerability	Visual function	NCT00516477	Spark Therapeutics
Subretinal tgAAV76 (rAAV 2/2.hRPE65p.hRPE65)	*RPE65*	Severe early-onset IRD	1/2 (completed)	Intraocular inflammation	Visual function	NCT00643747	UCL, Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Targeted Genetics Corporation
Subretinal rAAV2-CB-hRPE65	*RPE65*	LCA	1/2 (completed)	Ocular and non-ocular AE	VF in central 30°; BCVA	NCT00749957	Applied Genetic Technologies Corp; Oregon Health and Science Univ.; Univ. of Massachusetts, Worcester, USA
Subretinal rAAV2-hRPE65	*RPE65*	LCA	1 (completed)	Ocular and systemic safety	Visual function	NCT00821340	Hadassah Medical Organization

Table 1. Continued

Subretinal AAV2-hRPE65v2, voretigene neparvovec-rzyl	*RPE65*	LCA	3	MLMT	FST white light; MLMT; BCVA	NCT00999609	Spark Therapeutics, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, University of Iowa, USA
Subretinal AAV2-hRPE65v2, voretigene neparvovec-rzyl	*RPE65*	LCA	1/2	Safety and tolerability	BCVA; VF; pupillary light response; mobility testing; FST; contrast sensitivity	NCT01208389	Spark Therapeutics
Subretinal rAAV2/4.hRPE65	*RPE65*	LCA or severe early-onset IRD	1/2 (completed)	Drug safety evaluation	Different efficacy parameters and immune parameters; global ERG; patient efficacy questionnaire, far and near BCVA; color vision, pupillometry, MP, DA	NCT01496040	Nantes University Hospital
Subretinal AAV RPE65	*RPE65*	RD	1/2 (completed)	AE	Visual function; retinal function; QoL questionnaire	NCT02781480	MeiraGTx UK II Ltd
Subretinal SAR422459	*ABCA4*	STGD	1/2 (study discontinued; not for safety reasons)	AE; ocular safety (BCVA; IOP; MP; static and kinetic VF; OCT; ERG)	BCVA; MP; static and kinetic VF; OCT; FAF	NCT01367444	Sanofi
Subretinal rAAV.hCNGA3	*CNGA3*	ACHM2	1/2	AE	Visual function; patient reported outcomes; retinal imaging	NCT02610582	STZ eyetrial; University Hospital Tuebingen; Ludwig-Maximillians – Univ of Munich
Subretinal AGTC-402	*CNGA3*	ACHM2	1/2	AE	BCVA; light discomfort testing; color vision	NCT02935517	Applied Genetic Technologies Corp

Subretinal AAV-CNGA3	*CNGA3*	ACHM2	1/2	AE	BCVA; MP; perimetry; QoL questionnaire	NCT03758404	MeiraGTx UK II Ltd
Subretinal AAV-CNGA3	*CNGB3*	ACHM3	1/2	AE	Visual function; retinal function; QoL questionnaire	NCT03001310	MeiraGTx UK II Ltd; EMAS Pharma; Syne Qua Non Limited
Subretinal rAAV2tYF-PR1.7-hCNGB3	*CNGB3*	ACHM3	1/2	AE	BCVA; light discomfort testing; color vision	NCT02599922	Applied Genetic Technologies Corp; NEI
Subretinal AAV2/8-hCARp.hCNGB3 and AAV2/8-hG1.7p.coCNGA3 (follow-up)	*CNGB3* and *CNGA3*	ACHM2 and ACHM3	1/2	AE	Visual function; retinal function; QoL questionnaire	NCT03278873	MeiraGTx UK II Ltd; Syne Qua Non Limited; EMAS Pharma
Subretinal AAV2/5-hPDE6B	*PDE6B*	RP	1/2	Ocular and non-ocular AE	Mobility test; VF; reading speed; NEI-VFQ-25	NCT03328130	Horama S.A.
Subretinal CPK850	*RLBP1*	RP	1/2	AE, SAE, deaths, DA	DA; static VF; contrast sensitivity; MP; multifocal and full-field ERG; reading speed; eye dominance; mobility test; NEI-VFQ-25; low-luminance questionnaire	NCT03374657	Novartis Pharmaceuticals
Subretinal rAAV2-VMD2-hMERTK	*MERTK*	RP	1	Ocular safety	ETDRS BCVA; FST	NCT01482195	Fowzan Alkuraya; King Khaled Eye Specialist Hospital; King Faisal Specialist Hospital & Research Center

Table 1. Continued

Subretinal SAR421869	*MYO7A*	USH1B	1/2	AE	Visual function	NCT01505062	Sanofi
Antisense oligonucleotides							
Intravitreal QR-1123	*RHO*	RP	1/2	Ocular and non-ocular AE	BCVA; low-luminance BCVA; DAC perimetry; static VF; MP, SD-OCT; FST; FAF; contrast sensitivity; color vision; serum levels of QR-1123	NCT04123626	ProQR Therapeutics
Intravitreal QR-110	*CEP290*	LCA	1/2 (completed), phase 2/3 started	Ocular AE	Non-ocular AE; ophthalmic examination findings; BCVA; infrared imaging; OCT; vital safety parameters; serum level parameters	NCT03140969; NCT03913130; NCT03913143	ProQR Therapeutics
Intravitreal QR-421a	*USH2A*	RP	1/2	Ocular and non-ocular AE	DAC perimetry; static VF; EZ area/width; BCVA; low luminance BCVA; MP; ERG; FAF; serum levels/ clearance/half-time	NCT03780257	ProQR Therapeutics

CRISPR-based genome editing medicine							
Subretinal AGN-151587	*CEP290*	LCA	1/2	AE; dose limiting toxicities	Maximum tolerated dose; mobility course score; BCVA; pupillary response; FST; macula thickness; contrast sensitivity; MP; color vision; QoL score; kinetic VF; gaze tracking	NCT03872479	Allergan; Editas Medicine, Inc.

Optogenetic treatment methods were not included in this table.

*As noted on clinicaltrials.gov. Accessed January 17th 2020.

AAV = adeno-associated viral vector. ACHM = achromatopsia. AE = adverse events. BCVA = best-corrected visual acuity. DA = dark adaptation. DAC = dark-adapted chromatic. ERG = electroretinogram. ETDRS = Early Treatment of Diabetic Retinopathy Study. EZ = ellipsoid zone. FAF = fundus autofluorescence. FST = full-field light sensitivity threshold testing. IOP = intra-ocular pressure. IRD = inherited retinal degeneration. MLMT = multi-luminance mobility testing. MP = microperimetry. NEI = National Eye Institute. NEI-VFQ-25 = National Eye Instittute – Visual function questionnaire 25 items. OCT = optical coherence tomography. rAAV = recombinant adeno-associated viral vector. SAE = serious adverse events. STGD = Stargardt disease. RP = retinitis pigmentosa. RPGR = retinitis pigmentosa GTPase Regulator. USH = Usher Syndrome. VF = visual fields. QoL = quality of life. UK = United Kingdom.

***Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust; Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, University College, London; Manchester University NHS Foundation trust; Univ. of Manchester; Univ. Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Univ. of Southampton, UK.

REFERENCES

1. Hamel C. Retinitis pigmentosa. Orphanet J Rare Dis 2006;1:40.
2. Hartong DT, Berson EL, Dryja TP. Retinitis pigmentosa. Lancet 2006;368:1795-809.
3. Maguire AM, Simonelli F, Pierce EA, et al. Safety and Efficacy of Gene Transfer for Leber's Congenital Amaurosis. N Engl J Med 2008;358:2240-8.
4. MacLaren RE, Groppe M, Barnard AR, et al. Retinal gene therapy in patients with choroideremia: initial findings from a phase 1/2 clinical trial. Lancet 2014;383:1129-37.
5. Cehajic Kapetanovic J, Barnard AR, MacLaren RE. Molecular Therapies for Choroideremia. Genes (Basel) 2019;10:738.
6. Cehajic-Kapetanovic J, Xue K, Martinez-Fernandez de la Camara C, et al. Initial results from a first-in-human gene therapy trial on X-linked retinitis pigmentosa caused by mutations in RPGR. Nat Med 2020;26:354-9.
7. Pellissier LP, Quinn PM, Alves CH, et al. Gene therapy into photoreceptors and Muller glial cells restores retinal structure and function in CRB1 retinitis pigmentosa mouse models. Hum Mol Genet 2015;24:3104-18.
8. Quinn PM, Pellissier LP, Wijnholds J. The CRB1 Complex: Following the Trail of Crumbs to a Feasible Gene Therapy Strategy. Front Neurosci 2017;11:175.
9. Bainbridge J, Mehat M, Sundaram V, et al. Long-Term Effect of Gene Therapy on Leber's Congenital Amaurosis. N Engl J Med 2015;372:1887-97.
10. Jacobson SG, Cideciyan AV, Roman AJ, et al. Improvement and Decline in Vision with Gene Therapy in Childhood Blindness. N Engl J Med 2015;372:1920-6.
11. Edwards TL, Jolly JK, Groppe M, et al. Visual Acuity after Retinal Gene Therapy for Choroideremia. N Engl J Med 2016;374:1996-8.
12. Lam BL, Davis JL, Gregori NZ, et al. Choroideremia Gene Therapy Phase 2 Clinical Trial: 24-Month Results. Am J Ophthalmol 2019;197:65-73.
13. Maguire AM, Russell S, Wellman JA, et al. Efficacy, Safety, and Durability of Voretigene Neparvovec-rzyl in RPE65 Mutation-Associated Inherited Retinal Dystrophy: Results of Phase 1 and 3 Trials. Ophthalmology 2019;126:1273-85.
14. Giannelli SG, Luoni M, Castoldi V, et al. Cas9/sgRNA selective targeting of the P23H Rhodopsin mutant allele for treating retinitis pigmentosa by intravitreal AAV9.PHP.B-based delivery. Hum Mol Genet 2018;27:761-79.
15. Cideciyan AV, Jacobson SG, Drack AV, et al. Effect of an intravitreal antisense oligonucleotide on vision in Leber congenital amaurosis due to a photoreceptor cilium defect. Nat Med 2019;25:225-8.
16. Yu W, Wu Z. In Vivo Applications of CRISPR-Based Genome Editing in the Retina. Front Cell Dev Biol 2018;6:53.
17. van Huet RA, Oomen CJ, Plomp AS, et al. The RD5000 database: facilitating clinical, genetic, and therapeutic studies on inherited retinal diseases. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2014;55:7355-60.
18. Quinn PM, Buck TM, Mulder AA, et al. Human iPSC-Derived Retinas Recapitulate the Fetal CRB1 CRB2 Complex Formation and Demonstrate that Photoreceptors and Muller Glia Are Targets of AAV5. Stem Cell Reports 2019;12:906-19.

19. Murro V, Mucciolo DP, Sodi A, et al. Retinal capillaritis in a CRB1-associated retinal dystrophy. Ophthalmic Genet 2017:1-4.
20. Morarji J, Lenassi E, Black GC, Ashworth JL. Atypical presentation of CRB1 retinopathy. Acta Ophthalmol 2016;94:e513-4.
21. Ghofrani M, Yahyaei M, Brunner HG, et al. Homozygosity Mapping and Targeted Sanger Sequencing Identifies Three Novel CRB1 (Crumbs homologue 1) Mutations in Iranian Retinal Degeneration Families. Iran Biomed J 2017;21:294-302.
22. Kousal B, Dudakova L, Gaillyova R, et al. Phenotypic features of CRB1-associated early-onset severe retinal dystrophy and the different molecular approaches to identifying the disease-causing variants. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2016;254:1833-9.
23. Hasan SM, Azmeh A, Mostafa O, Megarbane A. Coat's like vasculopathy in leber congenital amaurosis secondary to homozygous mutations in CRB1: a case report and discussion of the management options. BMC Res Notes 2016;9:91.
24. Vamos R, Kulm M, Szabo V, et al. Leber congenital amaurosis: first genotyped Hungarian patients and report of 2 novel mutations in the CRB1 and CEP290 genes. Eur J Ophthalmol 2016;26:78-84.
25. Wolfson Y, Applegate CD, Strauss RW, et al. CRB1-Related Maculopathy With Cystoid Macular Edema. JAMA Ophthalmol 2015;133:1357-60.
26. Kuniyoshi K, Ikeo K, Sakuramoto H, et al. Novel nonsense and splice site mutations in CRB1 gene in two Japanese patients with early-onset retinal dystrophy. Doc Ophthalmol 2015;130:49-55.
27. Cordovez JA, Traboulsi EI, Capasso JE, et al. Retinal Dystrophy with Intraretinal Cystoid Spaces Associated with Mutations in the Crumbs Homologue (CRB1) Gene. Ophthalmic Genet 2015;36:257-64.
28. Srilekha S, Arokiasamy T, Srikrupa NN, et al. Homozygosity Mapping in Leber Congenital Amaurosis and Autosomal Recessive Retinitis Pigmentosa in South Indian Families. PLoS One 2015;10:e0131679.
29. Jalkh N, Guissart C, Chouery E, et al. Report of a novel mutation in CRB1 in a Lebanese family presenting retinal dystrophy. Ophthalmic Genet 2014;35:57-62.
30. Tsang SH, Burke T, Oll M, et al. Whole exome sequencing identifies CRB1 defect in an unusual maculopathy phenotype. Ophthalmology 2014;121:1773-82.
31. Jonsson F, Burstedt MS, Sandgren O, et al. Novel mutations in CRB1 and ABCA4 genes cause Leber congenital amaurosis and Stargardt disease in a Swedish family. Eur J Hum Genet 2013;21:1266-71.
32. Yzer S, Leroy BP, De Baere E, et al. Microarray-based mutation detection and phenotypic characterization of patients with Leber congenital amaurosis. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2006;47:1167-76.
33. den Hollander AI, Lopez I, Yzer S, et al. Identification of novel mutations in patients with Leber congenital amaurosis and juvenile RP by genome-wide homozygosity mapping with SNP microarrays. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2007;48:5690-8.
34. Talib M, van Schooneveld MJ, van Genderen MM, et al. Genotypic and Phenotypic Characteristics of CRB1-Associated Retinal Dystrophies: A Long-Term Follow-up Study. Ophthalmology 2017;124:884-95.
35. Mathijssen IB, Florijn RJ, van den Born LI, et al. Long-term follow-up of patients with retinitis pigmentosa type 12 caused by CRB1 mutations: A Severe Phenotype With Considerable Interindividual Variability. Retina 2017;37:161-72.

36. Paun CC, Pijl BJ, Siemiatkowska AM, et al. A novel crumbs homolog 1 mutation in a family with retinitis pigmentosa, nanophthalmos, and optic disc drusen. Mol Vis 2012;18:2447-53.
37. Zenteno JC, Buentello-Volante B, Ayala-Ramirez R, Villanueva-Mendoza C. Homozygosity mapping identifies the Crumbs homologue 1 (Crb1) gene as responsible for a recessive syndrome of retinitis pigmentosa and nanophthalmos. Am J Med Genet A 2011;155a:1001-6.
38. Henderson RH, Mackay DS, Li Z, et al. Phenotypic variability in patients with retinal dystrophies due to mutations in CRB1. Br J Ophthalmol 2011;95:811-7.
39. Riveiro-Alvarez R, Vallespin E, Wilke R, et al. Molecular analysis of ABCA4 and CRB1 genes in a Spanish family segregating both Stargardt disease and autosomal recessive retinitis pigmentosa. Mol Vis 2008;14:262-7.
40. Simonelli F, Ziviello C, Testa F, et al. Clinical and molecular genetics of Leber's congenital amaurosis: a multicenter study of Italian patients. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2007;48:4284-90.
41. Bernal S, Calaf M, Garcia-Hoyos M, et al. Study of the involvement of the RGR, CRPB1, and CRB1 genes in the pathogenesis of autosomal recessive retinitis pigmentosa. J Med Genet 2003;40:e89.
42. Jacobson SG, Cideciyan AV, Aleman TS, et al. Crumbs homolog 1 (CRB1) mutations result in a thick human retina with abnormal lamination. Hum Mol Genet 2003;12:1073-8.
43. Lotery AJ, Malik A, Shami SA, et al. CRB1 mutations may result in retinitis pigmentosa without para-arteriolar RPE preservation. Ophthalmic Genet 2001;22:163-9.
44. Lotery AJ, Jacobson SG, Fishman GA, et al. Mutations in the CRB1 gene cause Leber congenital amaurosis. Arch Ophthalmol 2001;119:415-20.
45. den Hollander AI, Heckenlively JR, van den Born LI, et al. Leber congenital amaurosis and retinitis pigmentosa with Coats-like exudative vasculopathy are associated with mutations in the crumbs homologue 1 (CRB1) gene. Am J Hum Genet 2001;69:198-203.
46. Aleman TS, Cideciyan AV, Aguirre GK, et al. Human CRB1-associated retinal degeneration: comparison with the rd8 Crb1-mutant mouse model. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2011;52:6898-910.
47. Coppieters F, Casteels I, Meire F, et al. Genetic screening of LCA in Belgium: predominance of CEP290 and identification of potential modifier alleles in AHI1 of CEP290-related phenotypes. Hum Mutat 2010;31:E1709-66.
48. Galvin JA, Fishman GA, Stone EM, Koenekoop RK. Evaluation of genotype-phenotype associations in leber congenital amaurosis. Retina 2005;25:919-29.
49. Edwards A, Grover S, Fishman GA. Frequency of photographically apparent optic disc and parapapillary nerve fiber layer drusen in Usher syndrome. Retina 1996;16:388-92.
50. Hendriks M, Verhoeven VJM, Buitendijk GHS, et al. Development of Refractive Errors-What Can We Learn From Inherited Retinal Dystrophies? Am J Ophthalmol 2017;182:81-9.
51. Boon CJ, Klevering BJ, Leroy BP, et al. The spectrum of ocular phenotypes caused by mutations in the BEST1 gene. Prog Retin Eye Res 2009;28:187-205.
52. Othman MI, Sullivan SA, Skuta GL, et al. Autosomal dominant nanophthalmos (NNO1) with high hyperopia and angle-closure glaucoma maps to chromosome 11. Am J Hum Genet 1998;63:1411-8.
53. Weng CY, Barnett D. Nanophthalmos-Retinitis Pigmentosa-Foveoschisis-Optic Disc Drusen Syndrome (MFRP). Ophthalmol Retina 2018;2:1162.

54. Zenteno JC, Buentello-Volante B, Quiroz-Gonzalez MA, Quiroz-Reyes MA. Compound heterozygosity for a novel and a recurrent MFRP gene mutation in a family with the nanophthalmos-retinitis pigmentosa complex. Mol Vis 2009;15:1794-8.
55. Crespi J, Buil JA, Bassaganyas F, et al. A novel mutation confirms MFRP as the gene causing the syndrome of nanophthalmos-renititis pigmentosa-foveoschisis-optic disk drusen. Am J Ophthalmol 2008;146:323-8.
56. Ayala-Ramirez R, Graue-Wiechers F, Robredo V, et al. A new autosomal recessive syndrome consisting of posterior microphthalmos, retinitis pigmentosa, foveoschisis, and optic disc drusen is caused by a MFRP gene mutation. Mol Vis 2006;12:1483-9.
57. Hettinga YM, van Genderen MM, Wieringa W, et al. Retinal Dystrophy in 6 Young Patients Who Presented with Intermediate Uveitis. Ophthalmology 2016;123:2043-6.
58. Verhagen F, Kuiper J, Nierkens S, et al. Systemic inflammatory immune signatures in a patient with CRB1 linked retinal dystrophy. Expert Rev Clin Immunol 2016;12:1359-62.
59. Bax NM, Lambertus S, Cremers FPM, et al. The absence of fundus abnormalities in Stargardt disease. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2019;257:1147-57.
60. Benson MD, MacDonald IM. Bilateral uveitis and Usher syndrome: a case report. J Med Case Rep 2015;9:60.
61. Heredia CD, Huguet J, Cols N, et al. Immune complexes in retinitis pigmentosa. Br J Ophthalmol 1984;68:811-4.
62. Reid DM, Campbell AM, Forrester JV. EB-virus transformed human lymphocytes from uveitis and retinitis pigmentosa patients secrete antibodies to retinal antigens. J Clin Lab Immunol 1988;26:107-11.
63. Demirci FY, Rigatti BW, Mah TS, Gorin MB. A novel RPGR exon ORF15 mutation in a family with X-linked retinitis pigmentosa and Coats'-like exudative vasculopathy. Am J Ophthalmol 2006;141:208-10.
64. Patil L, Lotery AJ. Coat's-like exudation in rhodopsin retinitis pigmentosa: successful treatment with an intravitreal dexamethasone implant. Eye (Lond) 2014;28:449-51.
65. Jain S, Gupta S, Kumar V. Ultra-widefield imaging in Coats'-type retinitis pigmentosa. Indian J Ophthalmol 2018;66:997-8.
66. Jiang Y, Lim J, Janowicz M. Cholesterol Crystals Secondary to Coats-Like Response With Retinitis Pigmentosa. JAMA Ophthalmol 2017;135:e173132.
67. Ghassemi F, Akbari-Kamrani M. Retinitis Pigmentosa Associated with Vasoproliferative Tumors and Coats-like Fundus. J Ophthalmic Vis Res 2013;8:268-70.
68. Pruett RC. Retinitis pigmentosa: clinical observations and correlations. Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc 1983;81:693-735.
69. Urgancioglu B, Ozdek S, Hasanreisoglu B. Coats'-like retinitis pigmentosa variant and nanophthalmos. Can J Ophthalmol 2007;42:877-8.
70. Murthy R, Honavar SG. Secondary vasoproliferative retinal tumor associated with Usher syndrome type 1. J aapos 2009;13:97-8.
71. Kiratli H, Ozturkmen C. Coats-like lesions in Usher syndrome type II. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2004;242:265-7.
72. De Salvo G, Gemenetzi M, Luff AJ, Lotery AJ. Cystoid macular oedema successfully treated by cryotherapy in retinitis pigmentosa with Coats'-like retinal exudation. Eye (Lond) 2011;25:821-2.

73. Bansal S, Saha N, Woon WH. The management of "coats' response" in a patient with x-linked retinitis pigmentosa-a case report. ISRN Surg 2011;2011:970361.
74. van de Pavert SA, Sanz AS, Aartsen WM, et al. Crb1 is a determinant of retinal apical Muller glia cell features. Glia 2007;55:1486-97.
75. Tout S, Chan-Ling T, Hollander H, Stone J. The role of Muller cells in the formation of the blood-retinal barrier. Neuroscience 1993;55:291-301.
76. Al Sulaiman H, Schatz P, Nowilaty SR, et al. Diffuse retinal vascular leakage and cone-rod dystrophy in a family with the homozygous missense c.1429G>A (p.Gly477Arg) mutation in CRB1. Retin Cases Brief Rep 2020;14:203-10.
77. Shah N, Damani MR, Zhu XS, et al. Isolated maculopathy associated with biallelic CRB1 mutations. Ophthalmic Genet 2017;38:190-3.
78. Khan AO, Aldahmesh MA, Abu-Safieh L, Alkuraya FS. Childhood cone-rod dystrophy with macular cystic degeneration from recessive CRB1 mutation. Ophthalmic Genet 2014;35:130-7.
79. Bujakowska K, Audo I, Mohand-Said S, et al. CRB1 mutations in inherited retinal dystrophies. Hum Mutat 2012;33:306-15.
80. Vincent A, Ng J, Gerth-Kahlert C, et al. Biallelic Mutations in CRB1 Underlie Autosomal Recessive Familial Foveal Retinoschisis. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2016;57:2637-46.
81. Pellissier LP, Alves CH, Quinn PM, et al. Targeted ablation of CRB1 and CRB2 in retinal progenitor cells mimics Leber congenital amaurosis. PLoS Genet 2013;9:e1003976.
82. Quinn PM, Alves CH, Klooster J, Wijnholds J. CRB2 in immature photoreceptors determines the superior-inferior symmetry of the developing retina to maintain retinal structure and function. Hum Mol Genet 2018;27:3137-53.
83. Aleman TS, Cideciyan AV, Sumaroka A, et al. Inner retinal abnormalities in X-linked retinitis pigmentosa with RPGR mutations. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2007;48:4759-65.
84. Aleman TS, Cideciyan AV, Sumaroka A, et al. Retinal laminar architecture in human retinitis pigmentosa caused by Rhodopsin gene mutations. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2008;49:1580-90.
85. Quinn PM, Mulder AA, Henrique Alves C, et al. Loss of CRB2 in Müller glial cells modifies a CRB1-associated retinitis pigmentosa phenotype into a Leber congenital amaurosis phenotype. Hum Mol Genet 2019;28:105-23.
86. Alves CH, Pellissier LP, Wijnholds J. The CRB1 and adherens junction complex proteins in retinal development and maintenance. Prog Retin Eye Res 2014;40:35-52.
87. Spaide RF, Curcio CA. Anatomical correlates to the bands seen in the outer retina by optical coherence tomography: literature review and model. Retina 2011;31:1609-19.
88. McKay GJ, Clarke S, Davis JA, et al. Pigmented paravenous chorioretinal atrophy is associated with a mutation within the crumbs homolog 1 (CRB1) gene. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2005;46:322-8.
89. Toto L, Boon CJ, Di Antonio L, et al. Bestrophinopathy: A Spectrum of Ocular Abnormalities Caused by the c.614T>C Mutation in the BEST1 Gene. Retina 2016;36:1586-95.
90. Son S, Cho M, Lee J. Crumbs proteins regulate layered retinal vascular development required for vision. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 2020;521:939-46.
91. Reichenbach A, Bringmann A. Glia of the human retina. Glia 2020;68:768-96.

92. Tepass U, Theres C, Knust E. crumbs encodes an EGF-like protein expressed on apical membranes of Drosophila epithelial cells and required for organization of epithelia. Cell 1990;61:787-99.
93. Khan KN, Robson A, Mahroo OAR, et al. A clinical and molecular characterisation of CRB1-associated maculopathy. Eur J Hum Genet 2018;26:687-94.
94. Mathijssen IB, Henneman L, van Eeten-Nijman JM, et al. Targeted carrier screening for four recessive disorders: high detection rate within a founder population. Eur J Med Genet 2015;58:123-8.
95. van Soest S, van den Born LI, Gal A, et al. Assignment of a gene for autosomal recessive retinitis pigmentosa (RP12) to chromosome 1q31-q32.1 in an inbred and genetically heterogeneous disease population. Genomics 1994;22:499-504.
96. Ebermann I, Phillips JB, Liebau MC, et al. PDZD7 is a modifier of retinal disease and a contributor to digenic Usher syndrome. J Clin Invest 2010;120:1812-23.
97. Khanna H, Davis EE, Murga-Zamalloa CA, et al. A common allele in RPGRIP1L is a modifier of retinal degeneration in ciliopathies. Nat Genet 2009;41:739-45.
98. Li M, Jia C, Kazmierkiewicz KL, et al. Comprehensive analysis of gene expression in human retina and supporting tissues. Hum Mol Genet 2014;23:4001-14.
99. Markand S, Saul A, Tawfik A, et al. Mthfr as a modifier of the retinal phenotype of Crb1(rd8/rd8) mice. Exp Eye Res 2016;145:164-72.
100. Cehajic Kapetanovic J, McClements ME, Martinez-Fernandez de la Camara C, MacLaren RE. Molecular Strategies for RPGR Gene Therapy. Genes (Basel) 2019;10:674.
101. Giacalone JC, Andorf JL, Zhang Q, et al. Development of a Molecularly Stable Gene Therapy Vector for the Treatment of RPGR-Associated X-Linked Retinitis Pigmentosa. Hum Gene Ther 2019;30:967-74.
102. Talib M, van Schooneveld MJ, Thiadens AA, et al. Clinical and genetic characteristics of male patients with RPGR-associated retinal dystrophies: A Long-Term Follow-up Study. Retina 2019;39:1186-99.
103. Demirci FY, Rigatti BW, Wen G, et al. X-linked cone-rod dystrophy (locus COD1): identification of mutations in RPGR exon ORF15. Am J Hum Genet 2002;70:1049-53.
104. Ebenezer ND, Michaelides M, Jenkins SA, et al. Identification of novel RPGR ORF15 mutations in X-linked progressive cone-rod dystrophy (XLCORD) families. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2005;46:1891-8.
105. Zahid S, Khan N, Branham K, et al. Phenotypic conservation in patients with X-linked retinitis pigmentosa caused by RPGR mutations. JAMA Ophthalmol 2013;131:1016-25.
106. Thiadens AA, Phan TM, Zekveld-Vroon RC, et al. Clinical course, genetic etiology, and visual outcome in cone and cone-rod dystrophy. Ophthalmology 2012;119:819-26.
107. Thiadens AA, Soerjoesing GG, Florijn RJ, et al. Clinical course of cone dystrophy caused by mutations in the RPGR gene. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2011;249:1527-35.
108. Kurata K, Hosono K, Hayashi T, et al. X-linked Retinitis Pigmentosa in Japan: Clinical and Genetic Findings in Male Patients and Female Carriers. Int J Mol Sci 2019;20:1518.
109. Walia S, Fishman GA, Swaroop A, et al. Discordant phenotypes in fraternal twins having an identical mutation in exon ORF15 of the RPGR gene. Arch Ophthalmol 2008;126:379-84.
110. Ruddle JB, Ebenezer ND, Kearns LS, et al. RPGR ORF15 genotype and clinical variability of retinal degeneration in an Australian population. Br J Ophthalmol 2009;93:1151-4.

111. Parmeggiani F, Barbaro V, De Nadai K, et al. Identification of novel X-linked gain-of-function RPGR-ORF15 mutation in Italian family with retinitis pigmentosa and pathologic myopia. Sci Rep 2016;6:39179.
112. Koenekoop RK, Loyer M, Hand CK, et al. Novel RPGR mutations with distinct retinitis pigmentosa phenotypes in French-Canadian families. Am J Ophthalmol 2003;136:678-87.
113. Littink KW, Pott J-WR, Collin RWJ, et al. A Novel Nonsense Mutation in CEP290 Induces Exon Skipping and Leads to a Relatively Mild Retinal Phenotype. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2010;51:3646-52.
114. Walia S, Fishman GA, Jacobson SG, et al. Visual acuity in patients with Leber's congenital amaurosis and early childhood-onset retinitis pigmentosa. Ophthalmology 2010;117:1190-8.
115. Riddell N, Faou P, Murphy M, et al. The retina/RPE proteome in chick myopia and hyperopia models: Commonalities with inherited and age-related ocular pathologies. Mol Vis 2017;23:872-88.
116. Talib M, van Schooneveld MJ, Van Cauwenbergh C, et al. The Spectrum of Structural and Functional Abnormalities in Female Carriers of Pathogenic Variants in the RPGR Gene. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2018;59:4123-33.
117. Kousal B, Skalicka P, Valesova L, et al. Severe retinal degeneration in women with a c.2543del mutation in ORF15 of the RPGR gene. Mol Vis 2014;20:1307-17.
118. Rozet JM, Perrault I, Gigarel N, et al. Dominant X linked retinitis pigmentosa is frequently accounted for by truncating mutations in exon ORF15 of the RPGR gene. J Med Genet 2002;39:284-5.
119. Al-Maskari A, O'Grady A, Pal B, McKibbin M. Phenotypic progression in X-linked retinitis pigmentosa secondary to a novel mutation in the RPGR gene. Eye (Lond) 2009;23:519-21.
120. Jacobson SG, Buraczynska M, Milam AH, et al. Disease expression in X-linked retinitis pigmentosa caused by a putative null mutation in the RPGR gene. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 1997;38:1983-97.
121. Birtel J, Gliem M, Mangold E, et al. Next-generation sequencing identifies unexpected genotype-phenotype correlations in patients with retinitis pigmentosa. PLoS One 2018;13:e0207958.
122. Lyon MF. X-chromosome inactivation and human genetic disease. Acta Paediatr Suppl 2002;91:107-12.
123. Plenge RM, Hendrich BD, Schwartz C, et al. A promoter mutation in the XIST gene in two unrelated families with skewed X-chromosome inactivation. Nat Genet 1997;17:353-6.
124. Plenge RM, Tranebjaerg L, Jensen PK, et al. Evidence that mutations in the X-linked DDP gene cause incompletely penetrant and variable skewed X inactivation. Am J Hum Genet 1999;64:759-67.
125. Syed R, Sundquist SM, Ratnam K, et al. High-resolution images of retinal structure in patients with choroideremia. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2013;54:950-61.
126. Andreasson S, Breuer DK, Eksandh L, et al. Clinical studies of X-linked retinitis pigmentosa in three Swedish families with newly identified mutations in the RP2 and RPGR-ORF15 genes. Ophthalmic Genet 2003;24:215-23.
127. Yang L, Yin X, Feng L, et al. Novel mutations of RPGR in Chinese retinitis pigmentosa patients and the genotype-phenotype correlation. PLoS One 2014;9:e85752.
128. Fahim AT, Bowne SJ, Sullivan LS, et al. Allelic heterogeneity and genetic modifier loci contribute to clinical variation in males with X-linked retinitis pigmentosa due to RPGR mutations. PLoS One 2011;6:e23021.
129. Comander J, Weigel-DiFranco C, Sandberg MA, Berson EL. Visual Function in Carriers of X-Linked Retinitis Pigmentosa. Ophthalmology 2015;122:1899-906.

130. Tolmachova T, Anders R, Abrink M, et al. Independent degeneration of photoreceptors and retinal pigment epithelium in conditional knockout mouse models of choroideremia. J Clin Invest 2006;116:386-94.
131. Xue K, Jolly JK, Barnard AR, et al. Beneficial effects on vision in patients undergoing retinal gene therapy for choroideremia. Nat Med 2018;24:1507-12.
132. Dimopoulos IS, Hoang SC, Radziwon A, et al. Two-Year Results After AAV2-Mediated Gene Therapy for Choroideremia: The Alberta Experience. Am J Ophthalmol 2018;193:130-42.
133. Fischer MD, Ochakovski GA, Beier B, et al. Changes in retinal sensitivity after gene therapy in choroideremia. Retina 2020;40:160-168.
134. van Schuppen SM, Talib M, Bergen AA, et al. Long-term follow-up of patients with choroideremia with scleral pits and tunnels as a novel observation. Retina 2018;38:1713-24.
135. Hariri AH, Velaga SB, Girach A, et al. Measurement and Reproducibility of Preserved Ellipsoid Zone Area and Preserved Retinal Pigment Epithelium Area in Eyes With Choroideremia. Am J Ophthalmol 2017;179:110-7.
136. Hariri AH, Ip MS, Girach A, et al. Macular spatial distribution of preserved autofluorescence in patients with choroideremia. Br J Ophthalmol 2019;103:933-7.
137. Jolly JK, Xue K, Edwards TL, et al. Characterizing the Natural History of Visual Function in Choroideremia Using Microperimetry and Multimodal Retinal Imaging. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2017;58:5575-83.
138. Westeneng-van Haaften SC, Boon CJ, Cremers FP, et al. Clinical and genetic characteristics of late-onset Stargardt's disease. Ophthalmology 2012;119:1199-210.
139. Bax NM, Valkenburg D, Lambertus S, et al. Foveal Sparing in Central Retinal Dystrophies. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2019;60:3456-67.
140. Bird AC, Bok D. Why the macula? Eye (Lond) 2018;32:858-62.
141. Goldberg NR, Greenberg JP, Laud K, et al. Outer retinal tubulation in degenerative retinal disorders. Retina 2013;33:1871-6.
142. Aleman TS, Han G, Serrano LW, et al. Natural History of the Central Structural Abnormalities in Choroideremia: A Prospective Cross-Sectional Study. Ophthalmology 2017;124:359-73.
143. Sun LW, Johnson RD, Williams V, et al. Multimodal Imaging of Photoreceptor Structure in Choroideremia. PLoS One 2016;11:e0167526.
144. Xue K, Oldani M, Jolly JK, et al. Correlation of Optical Coherence Tomography and Autofluorescence in the Outer Retina and Choroid of Patients With Choroideremia. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2016;57:3674-84.
145. Charng J, Cideciyan AV, Jacobson SG, et al. Variegated yet Non-Random Rod and Cone Photoreceptor Disease Patterns in RPGR-ORF15-associated Retinal Degeneration. Hum Mol Genet 2016;25:5444-59.
146. Jain N, Jia Y, Gao SS, et al. Optical Coherence Tomography Angiography in Choroideremia: Correlating Choriocapillaris Loss With Overlying Degeneration. JAMA Ophthalmol 2016;134:697-702.
147. Tuten WS, Vergilio GK, Young GJ, et al. Visual Function at the Atrophic Border in Choroideremia Assessed with Adaptive Optics Microperimetry. Ophthalmol Retina 2019;3:888-99.
148. Zweifel SA, Engelbert M, Laud K, et al. Outer retinal tubulation: a novel optical coherence tomography finding. Arch Ophthalmol 2009;127:1596-602.
149. Zinkernagel MS, Groppe M, MacLaren RE. Macular hole surgery in patients with end-stage choroideremia. Ophthalmology 2013;120:1592-6.

150. Talib M, Koetsier LS, MacLaren RE, Boon CJF. Outcome of Full-Thickness Macular Hole Surgery in Choroideremia. Genes (Basel) 2017;8:187.
151. Heon E, Alabduljalil T, Iii DB, et al. Visual Function and Central Retinal Structure in Choroideremia. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2016;57:377-87.
152. Thompson DA, Li Y, McHenry CL, et al. Mutations in the gene encoding lecithin retinol acyltransferase are associated with early-onset severe retinal dystrophy. Nat Genet 2001;28:123-4.
153. Senechal A, Humbert G, Surget MO, et al. Screening genes of the retinoid metabolism: novel LRAT mutation in leber congenital amaurosis. Am J Ophthalmol 2006;142:702-4.
154. Vallespin E, Cantalapiedra D, Riveiro-Alvarez R, et al. Mutation screening of 299 Spanish families with retinal dystrophies by Leber congenital amaurosis genotyping microarray. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2007;48:5653-61.
155. Littink KW, van Genderen MM, van Schooneveld MJ, et al. A homozygous frameshift mutation in LRAT causes retinitis punctata albescens. Ophthalmology 2012;119:1899-906.
156. Dev Borman A, Ocaka LA, Mackay DS, et al. Early onset retinal dystrophy due to mutations in LRAT: molecular analysis and detailed phenotypic study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2012;53:3927-38.
157. Talib M, van Schooneveld MJ, van Duuren RJG, et al. Long-Term Follow-Up of Retinal Degenerations Associated With LRAT Mutations and Their Comparability to Phenotypes Associated With RPE65 Mutations. Transl Vis Sci Technol 2019;8:24.
158. Koenekoop RK, Sui R, Sallum J, et al. Oral 9-cis retinoid for childhood blindness due to Leber congenital amaurosis caused by RPE65 or LRAT mutations: an open-label phase 1b trial. Lancet 2014;384:1513-20.
159. Scholl HP, Moore AT, Koenekoop RK, et al. Safety and Proof-of-Concept Study of Oral QLT091001 in Retinitis Pigmentosa Due to Inherited Deficiencies of Retinal Pigment Epithelial 65 Protein (RPE65) or Lecithin:Retinol Acyltransferase (LRAT). PLoS One 2015;10:e0143846.
160. Ferrari S, Di Iorio E, Barbaro V, et al. Retinitis pigmentosa: genes and disease mechanisms. Curr Genomics 2011;12:238-49.
161. Cideciyan AV, Sudharsan R, Dufour VL, et al. Mutation-independent rhodopsin gene therapy by knockdown and replacement with a single AAV vector. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2018;115:E8547-e56.
162. Tsai YT, Wu WH, Lee TT, et al. Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats-Based Genome Surgery for the Treatment of Autosomal Dominant Retinitis Pigmentosa. Ophthalmology 2018;125:1421-30.
163. Murray SF, Jazayeri A, Matthes MT, et al. Allele-Specific Inhibition of Rhodopsin With an Antisense Oligonucleotide Slows Photoreceptor Cell Degeneration. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2015;56:6362-75.
164. Mao H, James T, Jr., Schwein A, et al. AAV delivery of wild-type rhodopsin preserves retinal function in a mouse model of autosomal dominant retinitis pigmentosa. Hum Gene Ther 2011;22:567-75.
165. Ramon E, Cordomi A, Aguila M, et al. Differential light-induced responses in sectorial inherited retinal degeneration. J Biol Chem 2014;289:35918-28.
166. Sumaroka A, Cideciyan AV, Charng J, et al. Autosomal Dominant Retinitis Pigmentosa Due to Class B Rhodopsin Mutations: An Objective Outcome for Future Treatment Trials. Int J Mol Sci 2019;20:5344.
167. Wang J, Xu D, Zhu T, et al. Identification of two novel RHO mutations in Chinese retinitis pigmentosa patients. Exp Eye Res 2019;188:107726.

168. Roshandel D, Rafati M, Khorami S, et al. Rhodopsin gene mutation analysis in Iranian patients with autosomal dominant retinitis pigmentosa. Int Ophthalmol 2019;39:2523-31.
169. Coussa RG, Basali D, Maeda A, et al. Sector retinitis pigmentosa: Report of ten cases and a review of the literature. Mol Vis 2019;25:869-89.
170. Jacobson SG, McGuigan DB, 3rd, Sumaroka A, et al. Complexity of the Class B Phenotype in Autosomal Dominant Retinitis Pigmentosa Due to Rhodopsin Mutations. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2016;57:4847-58.
171. Cideciyan AV, Hood DC, Huang Y, et al. Disease sequence from mutant rhodopsin allele to rod and cone photoreceptor degeneration in man. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1998;95:7103-8.
172. Paskowitz DM, LaVail MM, Duncan JL. Light and inherited retinal degeneration. Br J Ophthalmol 2006;90:1060-6.
173. Athanasiou D, Aguila M, Bellingham J, et al. The molecular and cellular basis of rhodopsin retinitis pigmentosa reveals potential strategies for therapy. Prog Retin Eye Res 2018;62:1-23.
174. Naash ML, Peachey NS, Li ZY, et al. Light-induced acceleration of photoreceptor degeneration in transgenic mice expressing mutant rhodopsin. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 1996;37:775-82.
175. Organisciak DT, Darrow RM, Barsalou L, et al. Susceptibility to retinal light damage in transgenic rats with rhodopsin mutations. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2003;44:486-92.
176. Iwabe S, Ying GS, Aguirre GD, Beltran WA. Assessment of visual function and retinal structure following acute light exposure in the light sensitive T4R rhodopsin mutant dog. Exp Eye Res 2016;146:341-53.
177. Orlans HO, Merrill J, Barnard AR, et al. Filtration of Short-Wavelength Light Provides Therapeutic Benefit in Retinitis Pigmentosa Caused by a Common Rhodopsin Mutation. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2019;60:2733-42.
178. Dryja TP, McGee TL, Reichel E, et al. A point mutation of the rhodopsin gene in one form of retinitis pigmentosa. Nature 1990;343:364-6.
179. Oh KT, Oh DM, Weleber RG, et al. Genotype-phenotype correlation in a family with Arg135Leu rhodopsin retinitis pigmentosa. Br J Ophthalmol 2004;88:1533-7.
180. Shah SP, Wong F, Sharp DM, Vincent AL. A novel rhodopsin point mutation, proline-170-histidine, associated with sectoral retinitis pigmentosa. Ophthalmic Genet 2014;35:241-7.
181. Napier ML, Durga D, Wolsley CJ, et al. Mutational Analysis of the Rhodopsin Gene in Sector Retinitis Pigmentosa. Ophthalmic Genet 2015;36:239-43.
182. Abdulridha-Aboud W, Kjellstrom U, Andreasson S, Ponjavic V. Characterization of macular structure and function in two Swedish families with genetically identified autosomal dominant retinitis pigmentosa. Mol Vis 2016;22:362-73.
183. Reiff C, Owczarek-Lipska M, Spital G, et al. The mutation p.E113K in the Schiff base counterion of rhodopsin is associated with two distinct retinal phenotypes within the same family. Sci Rep 2016;6:36208.
184. Miyadera K, Kato K, Boursnell M, et al. Genome-wide association study in RPGRIP1(-/-) dogs identifies a modifier locus that determines the onset of retinal degeneration. Mamm Genome 2012;23:212-23.
185. Zernant J, Külm M, Dharmaraj S, et al. Genotyping Microarray (Disease Chip) for Leber Congenital Amaurosis: Detection of Modifier Alleles. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2005;46:3052-9.

186. de Castro-Miro M, Tonda R, Escudero-Ferruz P, et al. Novel Candidate Genes and a Wide Spectrum of Structural and Point Mutations Responsible for Inherited Retinal Dystrophies Revealed by Exome Sequencing. PLoS One 2016;11:e0168966.
187. Silva E, Dharmaraj S, Li YY, et al. A missense mutation in GUCY2D acts as a genetic modifier in RPE65-related Leber Congenital Amaurosis. Ophthalmic Genet 2004;25:205-17.
188. Poloschek CM, Bach M, Lagreze WA, et al. ABCA4 and ROM1: implications for modification of the PRPH2-associated macular dystrophy phenotype. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2010;51:4253-65.
189. Lee W, Paavo M, Zernant J, et al. Modification of the PROM1 disease phenotype by a mutation in ABCA4. Ophthalmic Genet 2019;40:369-75.
190. Rose AM, Shah AZ, Venturini G, et al. Transcriptional regulation of PRPF31 gene expression by MSR1 repeat elements causes incomplete penetrance in retinitis pigmentosa. Sci Rep 2016;6:19450.
191. Audo I, Bujakowska K, Mohand-Said S, et al. Prevalence and novelty of PRPF31 mutations in French autosomal dominant rod-cone dystrophy patients and a review of published reports. BMC Med Genet 2010;11:145.
192. Venturini G, Rose AM, Shah AZ, et al. CNOT3 is a modifier of PRPF31 mutations in retinitis pigmentosa with incomplete penetrance. PLoS Genet 2012;8:e1003040.
193. Cruz NM, Yuan Y, Leehy BD, et al. Modifier genes as therapeutics: the nuclear hormone receptor Rev Erb alpha (Nr1d1) rescues Nr2e3 associated retinal disease. PLoS One 2014;9:e87942.
194. Alves CH, Boon N, Mulder AA, et al. CRB2 Loss in Rod Photoreceptors Is Associated with Progressive Loss of Retinal Contrast Sensitivity. Int J Mol Sci 2019;20:4069.
195. Pellissier LP, Lundvig DM, Tanimoto N, et al. CRB2 acts as a modifying factor of CRB1-related retinal dystrophies in mice. Hum Mol Genet 2014;23:3759-71.
196. Liu YP, Bosch DG, Siemiatkowska AM, et al. Putative digenic inheritance of heterozygous RP1L1 and C2orf71 null mutations in syndromic retinal dystrophy. Ophthalmic Genet 2017;38:127-32.
197. Dryja TP, Hahn LB, Kajiwara K, Berson EL. Dominant and digenic mutations in the peripherin/RDS and ROM1 genes in retinitis pigmentosa. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 1997;38:1972-82.
198. Kariminejad A, Bozorgmehr B, Najafi A, et al. Retinitis pigmentosa, cutis laxa, and pseudoxanthoma elasticum-like skin manifestations associated with GGCX mutations. J Invest Dermatol 2014;134:2331-8.
199. Ho AC, Humayun MS, Dorn JD, et al. Long-Term Results from an Epiretinal Prosthesis to Restore Sight to the Blind. Ophthalmology 2015;122:1547-54.
200. Edwards TL, Cottriall CL, Xue K, et al. Assessment of the Electronic Retinal Implant Alpha AMS in Restoring Vision to Blind Patients with End-Stage Retinitis Pigmentosa. Ophthalmology 2018;125:432-43.
201. Stronks HC, Dagnelie G. The functional performance of the Argus II retinal prosthesis. Expert Rev Med Devices 2014;11:23-30.
202. Ahuja AK, Behrend MR. The Argus II retinal prosthesis: factors affecting patient selection for implantation. Prog Retin Eye Res 2013;36:1-23.
203. da Cruz L, Coley BF, Dorn J, et al. The Argus II epiretinal prosthesis system allows letter and word reading and long-term function in patients with profound vision loss. Br J Ophthalmol 2013;97:632-6.
204. Farvardin M, Afarid M, Attarzadeh A, et al. The Argus-II Retinal Prosthesis Implantation; From the Global to Local Successful Experience. Front Neurosci 2018;12:584.

205. Veritti D, Sarao V, De Nadai K, et al. Dexamethasone Implant Produces Better Outcomes than Oral Acetazolamide in Patients with Cystoid Macular Edema Secondary to Retinitis Pigmentosa. J Ocul Pharmacol Ther 2020;36:190-7.
206. Huang Q, Chen R, Lin X, Xiang Z. Efficacy of carbonic anhydrase inhibitors in management of cystoid macular edema in retinitis pigmentosa: A meta-analysis. PLoS One 2017;12:e0186180.
207. Cox SN, Hay E, Bird AC. Treatment of chronic macular edema with acetazolamide. Arch Ophthalmol 1988;106:1190-5.
208. Genead MA, Fishman GA. Efficacy of sustained topical dorzolamide therapy for cystic macular lesions in patients with retinitis pigmentosa and usher syndrome. Arch Ophthalmol 2010;128:1146-50.
209. Ikeda Y, Hisatomi T, Yoshida N, et al. The clinical efficacy of a topical dorzolamide in the management of cystoid macular edema in patients with retinitis pigmentosa. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2012;250:809-14.
210. Liew G, Moore AT, Webster AR, Michaelides M. Efficacy and prognostic factors of response to carbonic anhydrase inhibitors in management of cystoid macular edema in retinitis pigmentosa. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2015;56:1531-6.
211. Strong SA, Hirji N, Quartilho A, et al. Retrospective cohort study exploring whether an association exists between spatial distribution of cystoid spaces in cystoid macular oedema secondary to retinitis pigmentosa and response to treatment with carbonic anhydrase inhibitors. Br J Ophthalmol 2019;103:233-7.
212. Srour M, Querques G, Leveziel N, et al. Intravitreal dexamethasone implant (Ozurdex) for macular edema secondary to retinitis pigmentosa. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2013;251:1501-6.
213. Ozdemir H, Karacorlu M, Karacorlu S. Intravitreal triamcinolone acetonide for treatment of cystoid macular oedema in patients with retinitis pigmentosa. Acta Ophthalmol Scand 2005;83:248-51.
214. Scorolli L, Morara M, Meduri A, et al. Treatment of cystoid macular edema in retinitis pigmentosa with intravitreal triamcinolone. Arch Ophthalmol 2007;125:759-64.
215. Yuzbasioglu E, Artunay O, Rasier R, et al. Intravitreal bevacizumab (Avastin) injection in retinitis pigmentosa. Curr Eye Res 2009;34:231-7.
216. Artunay O, Yuzbasioglu E, Rasier R, et al. Intravitreal ranibizumab in the treatment of cystoid macular edema associated with retinitis pigmentosa. J Ocul Pharmacol Ther 2009;25:545-50.
217. Melo GB, Farah ME, Aggio FB. Intravitreal injection of bevacizumab for cystoid macular edema in retinitis pigmentosa. Acta Ophthalmol Scand 2007;85:461-3.
218. Ediriwickrema LS, Chhadva P, Rodger DC, et al. Intravenous immunoglobulin in the treatment of juvenile retinitis pigmentosa-associated cystoid macular edema and uveitis. Retin Cases Brief Rep 2018;12:242-6.
219. Missotten T, van Laar JA, van der Loos TL, et al. Octreotide long-acting repeatable for the treatment of chronic macular edema in uveitis. Am J Ophthalmol 2007;144:838-43.
220. Hogewind BF, Pieters G, Hoyng CB. Octreotide acetate in dominant cystoid macular dystrophy. Eur J Ophthalmol 2008;18:99-103.
221. Shah SM, Nguyen QD, Mir HS, et al. A randomized, double-masked controlled clinical trial of Sandostatin long-acting release depot in patients with postsurgical cystoid macular edema. Retina 2010;30:160-6.
222. Sarao V, Veritti D, Prosperi R, et al. A case of CRB1-negative Coats-like retinitis pigmentosa. J aapos 2013;17:414-6.

223. Kan E, Yilmaz T, Aydemir O, et al. Coats-like retinitis pigmentosa: Reports of three cases. Clin Ophthalmol 2007;1:193-8.
224. Lee SY, Yoon YH. Pars plana vitrectomy for exuduative retinal detachment in coats-type retinitis pigmentosa. Retina 2004;24:450-2.
225. Chu X, Du W, Xu M, et al. Intravitreal conbercept combined with laser photocoagulation for exudative retinal detachment in a patient with Coats-like retinitis pigmentosa. Ophthalmic Genet 2019;40:1-3.
226. MacLaren RE, Bennett J, Schwartz SD. Gene Therapy and Stem Cell Transplantation in Retinal Disease: The New Frontier. Ophthalmology 2016;123:S98-s106.
227. Xue K, Groppe M, Salvetti AP, MacLaren RE. Technique of retinal gene therapy: delivery of viral vector into the subretinal space. Eye (Lond) 2017;31:1308-16.
228. Nanda A, Salvetti AP, Clouston P, et al. Exploring the Variable Phenotypes of RPGR Carrier Females in Assessing their Potential for Retinal Gene Therapy. Genes (Basel) 2018;9:643.
229. Dalkara D, Byrne LC, Klimczak RR, et al. In vivo-directed evolution of a new adeno-associated virus for therapeutic outer retinal gene delivery from the vitreous. Sci Transl Med 2013;5:189ra76.
230. Reichel FF, Peters T, Wilhelm B, et al. Humoral Immune Response After Intravitreal But Not After Subretinal AAV8 in Primates and Patients. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2018;59:1910-5.
231. Seitz IP, Michalakis S, Wilhelm B, et al. Superior Retinal Gene Transfer and Biodistribution Profile of Subretinal Versus Intravitreal Delivery of AAV8 in Nonhuman Primates. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2017;58:5792-801.
232. Dias MS, Araujo VG, Vasconcelos T, et al. Retina transduction by rAAV2 after intravitreal injection: comparison between mouse and rat. Gene Ther 2019;26:479-90.
233. Tang Z, Zhang Y, Wang Y, et al. Progress of stem/progenitor cell-based therapy for retinal degeneration. J Transl Med 2017;15:99.
234. Schwartz SD, Regillo CD, Lam BL, et al. Human embryonic stem cell-derived retinal pigment epithelium in patients with age-related macular degeneration and Stargardt's macular dystrophy: follow-up of two open-label phase 1/2 studies. Lancet 2015;385:509-16.
235. Burnight ER, Gupta M, Wiley LA, et al. Using CRISPR-Cas9 to Generate Gene-Corrected Autologous iPSCs for the Treatment of Inherited Retinal Degeneration. Mol Ther 2017;25:1999-2013.
236. Kamao H, Mandai M, Ohashi W, et al. Evaluation of the Surgical Device and Procedure for Extracellular Matrix-Scaffold-Supported Human iPSC-Derived Retinal Pigment Epithelium Cell Sheet Transplantation. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2017;58:211-20.
237. Galloway CA, Dalvi S, Shadforth AMA, et al. Characterization of Human iPSC-RPE on a Prosthetic Bruch's Membrane Manufactured From Silk Fibroin. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2018;59:2792-800.
238. Singh MS, Park SS, Albini TA, et al. Retinal stem cell transplantation: Balancing safety and potential. Prog Retin Eye Res 2019;75:100779.
239. Bellingrath JS, Ochakovski GA, Seitz IP, et al. High Symmetry of Visual Acuity and Visual Fields in RPGR-Linked Retinitis Pigmentosa. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2017;58:4457-66.
240. Tee JJL, Yang Y, Kalitzeos A, et al. Natural History Study of Retinal Structure, Progression, and Symmetry Using Ellipzoid Zone Metrics in RPGR-Associated Retinopathy. Am J Ophthalmol 2019;198:111-23.

241. Tee JJL, Yang Y, Kalitzeos A, et al. Characterization of Visual Function, Interocular Variability and Progression Using Static Perimetry-Derived Metrics in RPGR-Associated Retinopathy. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2018;59:2422-36.
242. Seitz IP, Zhour A, Kohl S, et al. Multimodal assessment of choroideremia patients defines pre-treatment characteristics. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2015;253:2143-50.
243. Tee JJL, Carroll J, Webster AR, Michaelides M. Quantitative Analysis of Retinal Structure Using Spectral-Domain Optical Coherence Tomography in RPGR-Associated Retinopathy. Am J Ophthalmol 2017;178:18-26.
244. Birch DG, Locke KG, Wen Y, et al. Spectral-domain optical coherence tomography measures of outer segment layer progression in patients with X-linked retinitis pigmentosa. JAMA Ophthalmol 2013;131:1143-50.
245. Sujirakul T, Lin MK, Duong J, et al. Multimodal Imaging of Central Retinal Disease Progression in a 2-Year Mean Follow-up of Retinitis Pigmentosa. Am J Ophthalmol 2015;160:786-98.e4.
246. Takahashi VKL, Takiuti JT, Carvalho-Jr JRL, et al. Fundus autofluorescence and ellipsoid zone (EZ) line width can be an outcome measurement in RHO-associated autosomal dominant retinitis pigmentosa. Graefes Arch Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2019;257:725-31.
247. Csaky K, Ferris F, 3rd, Chew EY, et al. Report From the NEI/FDA Endpoints Workshop on Age-Related Macular Degeneration and Inherited Retinal Diseases. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2017;58:3456-63.
248. Roman AJ, Cideciyan AV, Aleman TS, Jacobson SG. Full-field stimulus testing (FST) to quantify visual perception in severely blind candidates for treatment trials. Physiol Meas 2007;28:N51-6.
249. Collison FT, Fishman GA, McAnany JJ, et al. Psychophysical measurement of rod and cone thresholds in stargardt disease with full-field stimuli. Retina 2014;34:1888-95.
250. Chung DC, McCague S, Yu ZF, et al. Novel mobility test to assess functional vision in patients with inherited retinal dystrophies. Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2018;46:247-59.
251. Lombardi M, Zenouda A, Azoulay-Sebban L, et al. Correlation Between Visual Function and Performance of Simulated Daily Living Activities in Glaucomatous Patients. J Glaucoma 2018;27:1017-24.
252. Lamoureux EL, Pallant JF, Pesudovs K, et al. The Impact of Vision Impairment Questionnaire: an evaluation of its measurement properties using Rasch analysis. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2006;47:4732-41.
253. Dagnelie G, Christopher P, Arditi A, et al. Performance of real-world functional vision tasks by blind subjects improves after implantation with the Argus(R) II retinal prosthesis system. Clin Exp Ophthalmol 2017;45:152-9.
254. Stingl K, Schippert R, Bartz-Schmidt KU, et al. Interim Results of a Multicenter Trial with the New Electronic Subretinal Implant Alpha AMS in 15 Patients Blind from Inherited Retinal Degenerations. Front Neurosci 2017;11:445.
255. Cideciyan AV, Sudharsan R, Dufour VL, et al. Mutation-independent rhodopsin gene therapy by knockdown and replacement with a single AAV vector. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2018;115:E8547-E56.
256. Ziccardi L, Cordeddu V, Gaddini L, et al. Gene Therapy in Retinal Dystrophies. Int J Mol Sci 2019;20:5722.
257. Hareendran S, Balakrishnan B, Sen D, et al. Adeno-associated virus (AAV) vectors in gene therapy: immune challenges and strategies to circumvent them. Rev Med Virol 2013;23:399-413.
258. Daya S, Berns KI. Gene therapy using adeno-associated virus vectors. Clin Microbiol Rev 2008;21:583-93.
259. Day TP, Byrne LC, Schaffer DV, Flannery JG. Advances in AAV vector development for gene therapy in the retina. Adv Exp Med Biol 2014;801:687-93.

260. Kumar M, Keller B, Makalou N, Sutton RE. Systematic Determination of the Packaging Limit of Lentiviral Vectors. Human Gene Therapy 2001;12:1893-905.
261. Sakuma T, Barry MA, Ikeda Y. Lentiviral vectors: basic to translational. Biochem J 2012;443:603-18.
262. Conley SM, Cai X, Naash MI. Nonviral ocular gene therapy: assessment and future directions. Curr Opin Mol Ther 2008;10:456-63.
263. Peeters L, Sanders NN, Braeckmans K, et al. Vitreous: a barrier to nonviral ocular gene therapy. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2005;46:3553-61.
264. Liang Y, Fotiadis D, Maeda T, et al. Rhodopsin signaling and organization in heterozygote rhodopsin knockout mice. J Biol Chem 2004;279:48189-96.
265. Farrar GJ, Kenna PF, Humphries P. On the genetics of retinitis pigmentosa and on mutation-independent approaches to therapeutic intervention. Embo j 2002;21:857-64.
266. O'Neill B, Millington-Ward S, O'Reilly M, et al. Ribozyme-based therapeutic approaches for autosomal dominant retinitis pigmentosa. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2000;41:2863-9.
267. Gorbatyuk M, Justilien V, Liu J, et al. Preservation of photoreceptor morphology and function in P23H rats using an allele independent ribozyme. Exp Eye Res 2007;84:44-52.
268. Kiang AS, Palfi A, Ader M, et al. Toward a gene therapy for dominant disease: validation of an RNA interference-based mutation-independent approach. Mol Ther 2005;12:555-61.
269. Kurz D, Ciulla TA. Novel approaches for retinal drug delivery. Ophthalmol Clin North Am 2002;15:405-10.
270. Garanto A, Chung DC, Duijkers L, et al. In vitro and in vivo rescue of aberrant splicing in CEP290-associated LCA by antisense oligonucleotide delivery. Hum Mol Genet 2016;25:2552-63.
271. Rowe-Rendleman CL, Durazo SA, Kompella UB, et al. Drug and gene delivery to the back of the eye: from bench to bedside. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2014;55:2714-30.
272. Suzuki K, Tsunekawa Y, Hernandez-Benitez R, et al. In vivo genome editing via CRISPR/Cas9 mediated homology-independent targeted integration. Nature 2016;540:144-9.
273. Cong L, Ran FA, Cox D, et al. Multiplex genome engineering using CRISPR/Cas systems. Science 2013;339:819-23.
274. Vagni P, Perlini LE, Chenais NAL, et al. Gene Editing Preserves Visual Functions in a Mouse Model of Retinal Degeneration. Front Neurosci 2019;13:945.
275. Maeder ML, Stefanidakis M, Wilson CJ, et al. Development of a gene-editing approach to restore vision loss in Leber congenital amaurosis type 10. Nat Med 2019;25:229-33.
276. Latella MC, Di Salvo MT, Cocchiarella F, et al. In vivo Editing of the Human Mutant Rhodopsin Gene by Electroporation of Plasmid-based CRISPR/Cas9 in the Mouse Retina. Mol Ther Nucleic Acids 2016;5:e389.
277. Zhong H, Chen Y, Li Y, et al. CRISPR-engineered mosaicism rapidly reveals that loss of Kcnj13 function in mice mimics human disease phenotypes. Sci Rep 2015;5:8366.
278. Arno G, Agrawal SA, Eblimit A, et al. Mutations in REEP6 Cause Autosomal-Recessive Retinitis Pigmentosa. Am J Hum Genet 2016;99:1305-15.
279. Fu Y, Foden JA, Khayter C, et al. High-frequency off-target mutagenesis induced by CRISPR-Cas nucleases in human cells. Nat Biotechnol 2013;31:822-6.
280. Bassuk AG, Zheng A, Li Y, et al. Precision Medicine: Genetic Repair of Retinitis Pigmentosa in Patient-Derived Stem Cells. Sci Rep 2016;6:19969.

281. Yang L, Guell M, Byrne S, et al. Optimization of scarless human stem cell genome editing. Nucleic Acids Res 2013;41:9049-61.
282. Anzalone AV, Randolph PB, Davis JR, et al. Search-and-replace genome editing without double-strand breaks or donor DNA. Nature 2019;576:149-57.
283. Lund RD, Wang S, Klimanskaya I, et al. Human embryonic stem cell-derived cells rescue visual function in dystrophic RCS rats. Cloning Stem Cells 2006;8:189-99.
284. Lu B, Malcuit C, Wang S, et al. Long-term safety and function of RPE from human embryonic stem cells in preclinical models of macular degeneration. Stem Cells 2009;27:2126-35.
285. Carr AJ, Vugler AA, Hikita ST, et al. Protective effects of human iPS-derived retinal pigment epithelium cell transplantation in the retinal dystrophic rat. PLoS One 2009;4:e8152.
286. Li Y, Tsai YT, Hsu CW, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of human-induced pluripotent stem cell (iPS) grafts in a preclinical model of retinitis pigmentosa. Mol Med 2012;18:1312-9.
287. Zhao T, Zhang ZN, Rong Z, Xu Y. Immunogenicity of induced pluripotent stem cells. Nature 2011;474:212-5.
288. Pera MF. Stem cells: The dark side of induced pluripotency. Nature 2011;471:46-7.
289. Quinn PM, Buck TM, Ohonin C, et al. Production of iPS-Derived Human Retinal Organoids for Use in Transgene Expression Assays. Methods Mol Biol 2018;1715:261-73.
290. Scruggs BA, Jiao C, Cranston CM, et al. Optimizing Donor Cellular Dissociation and Subretinal Injection Parameters for Stem Cell-Based Treatments. Stem Cells Transl Med 2019;8:797-809.
291. Kuriyan AE, Albini TA, Townsend JH, et al. Vision Loss after Intravitreal Injection of Autologous "Stem Cells" for AMD. N Engl J Med 2017;376:1047-53.
292. Satarian L, Nourinia R, Safi S, et al. Intravitreal Injection of Bone Marrow Mesenchymal Stem Cells in Patients with Advanced Retinitis Pigmentosa; a Safety Study. J Ophthalmic Vis Res 2017;12:58-64.
293. Simunovic MP, Shen W, Lin JY, et al. Optogenetic approaches to vision restoration. Exp Eye Res 2019;178:15-26.
294. Busskamp V, Picaud S, Sahel JA, Roska B. Optogenetic therapy for retinitis pigmentosa. Gene Ther 2012;19:169-75.
295. Antoniu S. Fresh from the designation pipeline: orphan drugs recently designated in the European Union (September – November 2013). Expert Opinion on Orphan Drugs 2014;2:311-5.
296. Julien S, Schraermeyer U. Lipofuscin can be eliminated from the retinal pigment epithelium of monkeys. Neurobiol Aging 2012;33:2390-7.
297. Kaufman Y, Ma L, Washington I. Deuterium enrichment of vitamin A at the C20 position slows the formation of detrimental vitamin A dimers in wild-type rodents. J Biol Chem 2011;286:7958-65.
298. Radu RA, Yuan Q, Hu J, et al. Accelerated accumulation of lipofuscin pigments in the RPE of a mouse model for ABCA4-mediated retinal dystrophies following Vitamin A supplementation. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2008;49:3821-9.
299. Berson EL, Weigel-DiFranco C, Rosner B, et al. Association of Vitamin A Supplementation With Disease Course in Children With Retinitis Pigmentosa. JAMA Ophthalmol 2018;136:490-5.
300. Lee SY, Usui S, Zafar AB, et al. N-Acetylcysteine promotes long-term survival of cones in a model of retinitis pigmentosa. J Cell Physiol 2011;226:1843-9.
301. Campochiaro PA, Iftikhar M, Hafiz G, et al. Oral N-acetylcysteine improves cone function in retinitis pigmentosa patients in phase I trial. J Clin Invest 2020;130:1527-41.

302. Gardiner KL, Cideciyan AV, Swider M, et al. Long-Term Structural Outcomes of Late-Stage RPE65 Gene Therapy. Mol Ther 2020;28:266-78.
303. Darrow JJ. Luxturna: FDA documents reveal the value of a costly gene therapy. Drug Discov Today 2019;24:949-54.
304. Cehajic Kapetanovic J, Patricio MI, MacLaren RE. Progress in the development of novel therapies for choroideremia. Expert Rev Ophthalmol 2019;14:277-85.
305. Fischer MD, Ochakovski GA, Beier B, et al. Changes in retinal sensitivity after gene therapy in choroideremia. Retina 2020;40:160-8.