Genotypic and phenotypic analysis of 173 patients with extremely rare pathogenic mutations who applied for experimental antisense oligonucleotide treatment

Stanley T. Crooke¹, Tracy Cole¹, Jeffrey B. Carroll^{1,3}, Joseph G. Gleeson^{1, 2, 4} Laurence Mignon¹, Julie Douville¹, Wendy Chung⁵, Jennifer Bain⁶, Elizabeth Berry-Kravis⁷, Nelson Leung⁸, Scott Demarest⁹, Emily McCourt⁹, Andy Watt¹⁰, Berit Powers¹⁰, and Cedrik Tekendo-Ngongang¹

- 1. n-Lorem Foundation, Carlsbad, CA 92010
- 2. Dept Neurosciences, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92039
- 3. Dept Neurology, University of Washington, Seattle WA 9810
- 4. Rady Children's Institute for Genomic Medicine, San Diego, CA 92123
- 5. Boston Childrens Hospital, Boston, MA
- 6. Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, NY
- 7. Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL 60612
- 8. Mayo Clinic-Rochester, Rochester, MN
- 9. Children's Hospital Colorado, Aurora, CO 80045
- 10. Ionis Pharmaceuticals, Carlsbad, CA 92008

ABSTRACT

Recent advances in "omics" technologies allow for the identification of an increasing number of individuals with diseases caused by nano-rare mutations. These difficult-to-diagnose individuals are uniquely disadvantaged and pose significant challenges to healthcare systems and society. Despite having diseases caused by actionable single gene mutations, in many cases, there is no commercial path for treatments for such small patient populations. Since antisense oligonucleotide (ASO) technology has proven to be suited to address the needs of a portion of these patients, the n-Lorem Foundation is establishing an industrialized approach that couples detailed genotypic and phenotypic data to the immediate potential for ASO therapy. In this manuscript we have leveraged our experience in assessing the causality of nano-rare genetic variants and associated proximal molecular pathological events to attempt a correlation between detailed genetic data with patient specific phenotypic observations in 173 nano-rare individuals from diverse age groups evaluated for experimental ASO therapy. We found that the time required to achieve a molecular diagnosis varies from 1 month to 36 years, with the mean and median times from symptom onset to diagnosis estimated to be 4.32 years and 2 years, respectively. Amongst submitted cases there is a significant bias toward neurological diseases, with diverse genes and functional families involved and a marked preponderance of mutations in ion channel genes. The variability in phenotypic expression associated with nano-rare variants in genes such as *GNAO1, H3F3A, GBE1, UBTF,* or *PACS1* clearly supports previous observations that phenotypes associated with same variants in the same

gene can vary. We also observe that different, but functionally equivalent variants can result in both similar (e.g., *TARDBP*) and different phenotypes (e.g., *GNAO1*). Despite the relatively small size of the patient population investigated, this first compilation of its kind allows a variety of insights into the genotype and phenotype relationships in nano-rare conditions. Moreover, we show that our unique patient population presents a remarkable opportunity to apply "modern omics" approaches to begin to understand the various homeostatic, compensatory, and secondary effects of these genetic variants on the networks that result in expression of their unique phenotypes.

To provide a more detailed description of the processes involved to provide a personalized antisense medicine, we have included nonclinical and clincal data on four exemplary patients who display disease in three different organs, the CNS, the eye and the kidney and are treated with ASOs of different designs. In contrast to traditional drug development, each patient presents unique genomic, ASO design, clinical treatment and management and evaluation challenges.

INTRODUCTION

Advances in genetic sequencing, transcriptomics, single cell RNA sequencing and a variety of other "omics" and the publication of multiple whole genome association (WGA) databases have transformed biomedical research. Moreover, these databases continue to evolve with the addition of new information[1-3]. Basic insights include the estimate that the average human genome has tens of million single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) distributed non-randomly across and within various genes. There are also multiple types of mutations in addition to SNPs, and a fraction of these mutations are associated with pathology. The proliferation of multiple genomic databases and the continued expansion of genomic information provide excellent tools for cross-species comparisons, phenotype-genome and disease-genome relationships and sub-population comparisons[4]. Despite this broad progress, there are few, if any, databases that can link genomic and other "omic" characteristics to the phenotypes of specific patients[5-7]. Without such linkages, it is difficult to correlate individual patient genomics and phenotypes to large population studies. Nor is it possible to couple genomic and phenotypic characteristics with traditional prospective epidemiological studies[8]. Further, only by coupling genomic and phenotypic data, is it possible to consider personalized treatments for individual patients.

Patients with diseases caused by extremely rare mutations pose particularly difficult challenges to today's healthcare systems [9]. Nano-rare patients are defined as individuals with genetic diseases caused by mutations with a known worldwide prevalence of $\langle 30 \rangle$ [9, 10]. Though the precise prevalence of nano-rare mutations is unknown and will remain unknown until population-wide genomic sequencing of newborns is implemented, based on estimates derived from the Undiagnosed Disease Network (UDN), these patients may number in the millions [11]. According to the UDN, it is estimated that the average time from symptom onset to diagnosis is 8 years for patients with difficult to diagnose diseases and it is estimated that the vast majority of nano-rare

patients are never diagnosed. However, no systematic study of these patients has been reported [12, 13].

Because nano-rare mutations are, by definition, the rarest of genetic diseases, patients with these mutations are uniquely disadvantaged. Many, if not most, nano-rare patients have syndromes that have not previously been identified and, based on our initial experience, some patients are truly unique, i.e., they have mutations that are novel to them. Further, nano-rare patients who have a previously identified syndrome typically harbor an extremely rare mutation that may result in different signs and symptoms from the more common causal mutation. These patients are isolated and often unable to identify an expert who can make a diagnosis or provide even a rudimentary prognosis. In the search for a diagnosis, nano-rare patients are typically mis-referred, misdiagnosed and mis-treated while the disease progresses. Moreover, at least today, there is no commercial path for treatments for patient populations this small. However, nano-rare patients have one distinct advantage: they have diseases caused by identifiable and understandable mutations in single genes (monogenic).

n-Lorem is a non-profit foundation initiated in January 2020 with the mission of taking advantage of antisense technology to discover, develop, manufacture and provide experimental antisense oligonucleotide (ASO) treatments to appropriate nano-rare patients for free for life[12]. Importantly, we have established a clear path from case submission to n-Lorem through treatment of accepted patients (Supplemental Fig. 1). Our goal is to industrialize the processes that result in the exposure of nano-rare patients to experimental ASOs. This means that each step that leads to the selection of an ASO for each patient must be of the highest quality possible and the clinical exposure of each patient must be managed professionally by individuals experienced in conducting clinical trials. It is also vital that those responsible for managing patients exposed to personalized ASOs be aware of clinical results reported for other ASOs of the same chemical class, especially with a focus on any novel safety observations. Further, innovative approaches to evaluate the performance of the individualized ASO in each patient must be created and implemented to assure an unbiased assessment of the value of personalized ASO treatments across the population of treated patients. Finally, given the estimates of the total number of nano-rare mutations, any solution implemented must be scalable and supported by the necessary infrastructure to assure effective clinical management of treated patients.

Antisense technology is ideally suited to address the needs of a meaningful fraction of nano-rare patients. Given that ASOs are genetic medicines, once the causative mutation is identified, its molecular pathologic effects characterized, and the patient's phenotype defined, ASO discovery efforts for that patient can begin. As most nano-rare patients experience a long odyssey to diagnosis during which their disease progresses, the efficiency and rapidity of ASO discovery are critical. The technology is versatile because multiple post-RNA binding mechanisms have been identified and validated [14-19]. Arguably, the greatest advantage of ASOs is that, within a chemical class, all of these medicines are similar as they differ only in sequence. Thus, optimized ASOs share pharmacokinetic (PK) and pharmacodynamic (PD) properties such as distribution to and within organs and cells, distribution half-life, elimination half-life, potency, and types of adverse events. The aforementioned properties are the subject of scores of primary manuscripts and reviews,

including databases that integrate safety observations from all controlled clinical trials for the broadly used chemical classes of ASOs [20-23].

Three major chemical classes of ASOs have been thoroughly studied in humans. Phosphorothioate (PS) 2′methoxyethyl (MOE) ASOs have been evaluated in controlled clinical studies in many thousands of patients. Similarly, PS 2′-MOE N-Acetylgalactosamine (GalNAc) ASOs that enhance productive delivery to hepatocytes have been studied in tens of thousands of patients. Finally, PS 2′ constrained ethyl (cEt) ASOs and their GalNAc counterparts have been evaluated in hundreds of patients. Consequently, for ASOs of these chemical classes, it is possible to pre-define the appropriate route, approximate therapeutic dose, dose frequency and potential adverse events [9, 10, 12]. However, even with the rapidity and efficiency of ASO technology, it would not be possible to initiate a personalized ASO discovery program and hope to initiate dosing of a patient within 15-18 months were it not for the special guidance of well understood chemical classes, issued by the FDA [10, 24, 25] (Supplemental Fig. 2).

After processing 173 individual patient applications, we performed a data cut-off and analyzed this body of information. The purposes of this manuscript are to determine which patients are amenable to ASO treatment, establish ASO discovery and development processes, and define methods used to evaluate the clinical effects of the ASOs on individual patients. Importantly, the characteristics of this, the largest cohort of patients nano-rare mutations reported to date and the results of ASO treatment of some of these patients will be reported. To provide added granularity, we summarize the nonclinical and clinical data from four exemplary patients with nano-rare mutations that manifest in different organs.

METHODS

FDA nonclinical guidance

The FDA's nonclinical guidance for personalized ASOs allows ASOs of thoroughly understood chemical classes to progress rapidly from *in vitro* testing to experimental use in humans after a single three-month good laboratory practice (GLP) toxicology study in a single species. The exposure of patients to experimental ASOs with such limited nonclinical data demands that each step in the process towards treatment be of the upmost quality. This begins with patient selection, based on complex risk/benefit assessment, through clinical exposure and evaluation of the performance of the ASO using the highest possible quality clinical outcome measures.

Organs, chemical classes and routes of administration

Currently, n-Lorem accepts applications for patients who exhibit phenotypes resulting from a mutation in a gene that is expressed in the liver, kidney, central nervous system (CNS) or eye that is causal of the signs and symptoms currently displayed by the patient. With each of these organs, there is meaningful clinical experience and well-defined sub-organ pharmacokinetic/

pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) properties[15, 26-28]. Genetic targets in all four organs have been shown to respond to low doses and the therapeutic margins are high, thereby enhancing the potential for safe and well-tolerated administration of experimental ASOs. For targets in the central nervous system, PS/PO 2′-MOEASOs are administered intrathecally (IT), approximately every 3 months. For targets in the liver PS 2′-MOE GalNAc ASOs are administered subcutaneously (SQ), approximately monthly. ASOs directed to the kidney are administered SQ approximately monthly. For targets in the eye, either PS 2'-MOE or PS 2'cEt are administered intravitreally (IVT) every 3 or 6 months.

Quality processes

Research physicians can access an application for treatment on the n-Lorem website [\(www.nlorem.org\)](http://www.nlorem.org/) and submit on behalf of their patients. Upon receipt, the application is blinded as to patient identity and a team of medical geneticists, physicians and antisense experts review the application. Among the items considered are whether the organ and cell type that is primarily affected is in one of the organs discussed above, the reported prevalence of the mutation, and whether an antisense approach that can potentially benefit the patient can be identified. In addition, the current phenotype and rate of disease progression are assessed. Once sufficient information is acquired, a formal presentation of the patient and recommended actions is made to the Access to Treatment Committee (ATTC), a panel of individuals with expertise in diseases of the relevant organs, clinical care, clinical trials of experimental agents. The ATTC then adds its perspective before a final decision is made about whether to develop an experimental ASO to treat this patient. Our goal is to present each patient to the ATTC within six weeks of receipt of the application. The median and mean time from receipt of application to the ATTC presentation are 56.3 days and 51.5 days, respectively (Fig. 1a).

Discovery and development of an optimal ASO

Given the limited nonclinical information available before initiating clinical treatment, it is essential that the individualized medicine derives from a thorough ASO design and screening process. Of course, screening processes differ depending on the organ involved and the degree to which molecular mechanisms resulting in ASO-induced phenotypes in the organ are understood. As experience is gained and mechanistic understanding advanced, screening approaches have evolved and become more efficient (Table 1). Today, the organ system that is least well understood is the CNS, meaning that screening for these intrathecally administered ASOs is the most cumbersome and requires that several hundred ASOs be evaluated *in vitro* and 20 or more be assessed in rodent tolerability studies.

Once an optimal ASO has been identified, it must be manufactured under good manufacturing practices (GMP), administered at least two dose levels for 13 weeks in the appropriate species, and then formulated in sterile vials. Each of these steps consumes time and involves multiple organizations in addition to n-Lorem. Our goal is to complete the entire process within 15-18 months (Supplemental Fig. 2). However, because the demand has substantially exceeded

expectations, and despite our rapid growth, the median and mean times for acceptance of application to first dose are 23 months and 25 months, respectively. More than 50% of our patients present with heterozygous mutations in genes that encode proteins with essential functions, necessitating the design of allele-selective RNase H1 ASOs. Applications that require alleleselective ASOs for CNS diseases are often more challenging and may require more extensive screening and time.

Assessment of ASO performance

Although clinical trials for single patient studies exist, these are typically cross-over designs in which a patient is treated for a period of time with a placebo or a reference agent, then with the experimental agent[29]. However, the long duration of action of modern ASOs, the severity of and the rate of progression of diseases in nano-rare patients obviate such designs. We, therefore, have created a new approach. Prior to initiating an effort to identify an optimal ASO for a particular patient, we work with the investigator and patient or parent to define primary, secondary and exploratory treatment goals. Validated clinical measures are selected to evaluate the status and rate of progression of symptoms in the patient during the time required to discover and develop the optimal ASO and thus provide each patient's recent specific history. The treatment goals and clinical measures are reviewed and approved by a group of relevant experts, i.e. the Study Treatment Assessment and Review (STAR) committee. During treatment with the experimental ASO, the status and rate of progression of each agreed treatment goal are assessed and then compared to pre-treatment (recent patient-specific history) values. Obviously, as each study is, in effect, a first-in-human study, the primary objective of the trial is to assess safety and tolerability. Importantly, each study in a nano-rare patient has clear therapeutic goals as well, which are defined in the investigational new drug application (IND) for that ASO and patient. Adverse events are monitored by a Drug Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) and learnings from all individualized clinical studies will, over time, aid in further characterizing and improving personalized ASOs.

Criteria to define a symptom as different from the symptom complex common to other patients with the equivalent mutation in the same gene

The diversity of mutations, genes and mutation-induced phenotypes makes defining a symptom as different from the phenotype common to a particular mutation in a specific gene complex, but important. In Table 2, we identify any symptom in a specific patient expressed in an organ other than the organ affected in shared phenotype as different, e.g., gastrointestinal (GI) symptoms in a patient who expresses a mutation with the primary phenotype being neurodegeneration. We also define as different from the shared mutationally caused phenotype any qualitatively different symptom in the organ that is affected in other patients who express the mutation, e.g., seizures that occur in a patient with a mutation that results in a common phenotype of progressive loss of muscle strength.

RESULTS

Overall results

Demographics

Of the 173 applications submitted as of January 2, 2023, 78 were accepted for potential treatment with an experimental ASO. Fourteen applications were on hold for a variety of reasons, including the need for more extensive genomic sequencing (Fig. 2a). Often, patients have only undergone whole exome sequencing and long read whole genome sequencing is often required for ASO drug discovery and development. Another common deficiency is a lack of definitive evidence about the nature of the mutation. For example, a patient who presented with a mutation in the *MAPK8IP3,* gene that encodes an adaptor protein involved in late endosomal movement along the microtubule network, has required more than a year of research to determine that the mutation is a toxic gainof-function (TGoF) (manuscript in preparation). Another common challenge is to unequivocally demonstrate that the mutation posited to be the pathogenic mutation is indeed causative.

We are working with investigators to reduce the fraction of incomplete applications. Fifty-seven applications were declined, with the most common cause being a lack of an antisense approach to the mutation (Fig. 2b). The ages of patients ranged from infants to >65 years of age. Importantly, 48 patients who applied for treatment are >18 years old and the age distribution of applications accepted for potential ASO treatment was similar (Fig. 2c). That many of these patients had mutations with long latencies is an important observation discussed in a later section. The organs affected were heavily weighted to the CNS for both total applications and accepted cases (Fig. 2d). Obviously, nano-rare mutations are expressed in the other organs, so the preponderance of CNS applications simply reflects a lag in engaging those communities of physicians and patients. For applications accepted, the post-RNA binding mechanisms of action (Fig. 2e) for which ASOs were designed (Fig. 2f) reflected the nature of the mutations and the available options in ASO strategies. Approximately 68% of patients required an allele-selective RNase H1 ASO.

As shown in Supplemental Figure 2, our goal is to initiate dosing within 18 months of acceptance of the application. To date, that goal has not been achieved. The median and mean time from acceptance to initial dose are 23 and 25 months, but these are not meaningful statistics as they represent the first 8 INDs approved by the FDA. That said, two factors contributed to the delays; first, the total number of cases accepted has greatly exceeded our expectations, requiring substantial growth in staff and facilities to meet the demand. Second, because many patients have heterozygous mutations in essential genes, a large number of allele-selective PS 2'-MOE ASOs, a process which is more time-consuming than discovering non-allele selective ASOs.

Diagnostic journey

The patients reported here present the first opportunity to directly assess the time from symptom onset to diagnosis for the fraction of nano-rare patients who actually achieve a diagnosis. We have sufficient data to determine the time required to achieve a diagnosis for 102 patients. The range in time was 1 month to 36 years. The mean and median times from symptom onset to diagnosis were

4.32 years and 2 years (Fig.1b). This reflects the enormous challenges that the rarity of these mutations imposes on taking the obligatory first step toward treatment, achieving a genetic diagnosis, the identification of the mutation responsible for the patient's phenotype. The mean and median times to diagnosis are of less value than the enormous range in times to diagnosis in demonstrating how idiosyncratic the diagnostic journeys are for nano-rare patients.

Genotypes/phenotypes

In Table 2, we present the classes of genes with nano-rare mutations represented in the 173 patients who applied for treatment. Cases that had multiple genes associated with the same process or pathway are listed. Forty-four cases are so unique that no other cases were found to be able to group them. To our knowledge, this is the first compilation of extremely rare monogenic pathogenic mutations, but it has significant limitations. First, the number of evaluable patients is still small. Second, applications are heavily weighted toward genes with known functions in the CNS, and we cannot exclude selection bias based on perceptions about the limitations of antisense technology. Nevertheless, the information is valuable, and the value will increase as new iterations of the table representing much larger numbers of patients are published in the coming years.

Diverse genes and functional families are represented. Given the preponderance of CNS diseases, it is not surprising that mutations in many ion channel genes are significantly represented. Also of note are mutations that affect endosomal trafficking along microtubules in axons. Not surprisingly, multiple steps in neurotransmitter function are represented. Multiple nucleic acid binding and chaperone proteins, transcription factors and proteins involved in endoplasmic reticulum and Golgi functions are also represented. The large number of patients with mutations in *TARDBP* probably represents selection bias introduced by a very active patient advocacy group. We compiled detailed genotypic information and molecular causes for selected mutations and genes for further phenotypic analysis (Supplemental Table 1).

This is the first report coupling genotype to phenotype for these extremely rare mutations and it supports identifying each patient associated with genotype to enable epidemiological follow up and potential treatment. As expected, the organs affected and phenotypes vary widely for different mutations in the same gene, often result in divergent phenotypes, and the age at symptom onset varies. On the other hand, mutations in genes with similar functions such as ion channels, or genes involved in endosomal migration along microtubule networks often appear to result in similar phenotypes (data not shown).

Phenotypes associated with the same mutation in the same gene can vary

While it is well known that different mutations in the same gene can result in widely divergent phenotypes, in Table 3, we asked how phenotypes vary in patients with the same mutation in the same gene. For example, (Table 3a) the phenotypes of two patients with the same mutation in the guanine nucleotide binding alpha protein O1 (*GNAO1*-c.607G>A, p.G203R)[29, 30], displayed a similar phenotype except that one patient experienced some severe vision issues while the other

did not. Given that the patients are similar in age, it is unlikely that age would have contributed to these differences. The phenotypes of three patients with the same mutation in the coiled-coil-helixcoiled-coil-helix domain-containing protein 10 (*CHCHD10*), a gene that encodes a protein required for normal mitochondrial function[31] and associated with a range of syndromes including Parkinson's disease, (PD), Alzheimer's disease (AD), cerebellar ataxia, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) or frontal temporal dementia (FTD)[32], are compared in Table 3b. All three patients had equivalent pathogenic variants that resulted in mixed gain and loss function and presented with upper limb weakness between the ages 46 and 63 years. Aside from the variation in onset of symptoms and slight variances in muscle groups affected, the syndromes were quite similar.

Arguably more impressive and interesting is the diversity of phenotypes associated with mutations in Histone variant 3F3 (*H3F3.3A or B*) (Table 3c). Though the coding sequences of *H3F3A* and *B* are identical, they have unique regulatory components that result in differential expression in various tissues. H3.3 marks actively transcribed genes and somatic mutations have been known for some time to cause a variety of CNS malignancies. However, germ-line mutations in these genes are associated with progressive neurological dysfunction and, to date, no malignancies have been reported[33]. The mutations associated with neurodegeneration are missense in the coding region and thought to locally derange critical post-translational modifications. However, the range of phenotypes observed in the 46 patients identified with these mutations is enormous. The core phenotype consists of global developmental delay, hypomyelination, callosal anomalies, cortical atrophy and craniofacial abnormalities, but not all patients express these traits. Other manifestations include a variety of motor dysfunctions, oculomotor abnormalities and congenital defects in many organs. Though our two patients express equivalent mutations and had many overlapping features, they also differed, with one individual experiencing a more severe phenotype with seizures, developmental regression, movement disorders, and structural brain anomalies in addition to core features[33].

Similarly, the two patients with identical phosphofurin acidic cluster sorting protein 1 (*PACS1*) mutations shared common features, but one patient displayed GI dysfunctions, dysmorphic features and seizures which resolved when they were toddlers (Table 3d). The two patients with identical phosphofurin acidic cluster sorting protein 2 (*PACS2*) mutations displayed syndromes that differed significantly (Table 3e). Three patients with equivalent complex mutations in the 1,4 alpha-glucan branching enzyme 1 (*GBE1*) gene also showed meaningful phenotypic differences (Table 3f) as did equivalent mutations in the upstream binding transcription factor (*UBTF*) gene (Table 3g). A final example (Table 3h) is calcium channel, voltage-dependent, P/Q type, alpha-1A subunit (*CACNA1A*), a gene that encodes a voltage dependent calcium channel expressed primarily in the brain. Mutations in this gene result in severe disorders that include severe epilepsy and movement disorders. Two patients of approximately the same age with the same toxic gain of function mutation share many elements of the expected phenotype, but one patient expressed significantly more problems with movement, while the other had more severe epilepsy.

Different, but functionally equivalent, mutations can result in similar phenotypes

Our data also present the opportunity to more thoroughly evaluate whether different mutations with shared molecular pathological effects, e.g., TGoF, in the same gene result in similar phenotypes (Table 4). The best example of this are the missense mutations in the gene that encodes the TAR DNA Binding Protein 43 (*TARDBP* gene and TDP43 protein). A number of these patients display similar clinical features, but a few patients present with slight variations in phenotype.

TDP43 is a particularly instructive example of a protein whose effects may be driven by multiple roles due to specific domains that serve different functions, including interactions with other proteins. The many domains that constitute TDP43 include a nuclear localization and nuclear export domain, two RNA binding domains and c-terminal domains that are essential for homodimer formation and the potential to form toxic aggregates[34] and most mutations are localized to the c-terminal domain. These result in a loss of function in nuclear RNA metabolic processes and a toxic gain of function in the cytoplasm associated with toxic aggregates in stress granules and other sites. Given the pleiotropic roles of the protein and the multiple pathogenic effects of toxic aggregates in the cytoplasm, one would expect mutations to cause diverse phenotypes and be involved in multiple diseases and that is exactly what has been observed in the literature and in our patients. However, to a large extent, different, but functionally equivalent mutations in the same gene result in different phenotypes (Table 5, Supplemental Table 1).

In Supplemental Table 2, we list the genotypes and phenotypes for all patients with sufficient information. To our knowledge, this is the first compilation of genotypes coupled to phenotypes of patients with extremely rare mutations that also can identify specific patients. This table is meant to serve as a resource should other patients with the same or different mutations in any of these genes be identified. Importantly, for any mutation and gene accepted, we may have an ASO that targets that mutation, or a common SNP, which could be beneficial to others with the same mutation. We plan to publish this information and update it regularly.

ASO mechanisms vary depending on the nature of the mutation

The appropriate post-RNA binding mechanism for each patient is summarized in Table 5. The assessment of the feasibility of ASO treatment of a mutation, the whether the target tissue is appropriate, and the prevalence of the pathogenic mutation and the risk/benefit of treatment are all considered in the decision to accept or reject an application for treatment. The integration of the various types of analyses enables an informed decision about whether to treat a patient and what ASO strategy is appropriate.

Full characterization of the mutation, proof that the mutation is truly causative, assessment of the proximal molecular pathological event, detailed phenotypic assessment, prevalence of mutation, organ affected, severity of disease, and rate of progression are considered to determine the benefit/risk of experimental ASO treatment of each patient. All the information available and the recommendation to treat or not are presented to and discussed with the ATTC. We believe that this detailed process is essential to maximize benefit and minimize risk.

Exemplary patients

To provide more tangible information to better define the patient-by-patient process that leads to ASO treatment and early patient-specific clinical data, we present four exemplary patients: two patients with primary disease manifestations in the CNS who require allele-selective ASOs, a patient with retinal disease and one with renal amyloidosis. These individuals also demonstrate the complexity of the genetics and clinical syndromes of nano-rare patients. For patients with CNS disease, we typically dose IT quarterly, for liver or kidney disease, SQ monthly and for the eye, IVT quarterly to semi-annually. Using current methods and ASO designs, the design and identification of allele-selective RNase H1 active ASOs is more challenging because the ASO must be potent, allele-selective and well tolerated. To design an allele-selective ASO, one must identify non-pathogenic SNPs and screen ASOs around each SNP to select ASOs that selectively reduce the pathogenic mutant RNA and protein (for review see, 14-18).

KIF1A **Patient**

A female *KIF1A p*atient who has a *de novo* heterozygous c.914C>T variant in kinesin 1A (*KIF1A*). *KIF1A,* which is expressed primarily in the CNS, produces an essential microtubule motor protein that is responsible for anterograde movement of cargo-laden vesicles in neurons [35]. While most pathogenic variants occur in the motor domain, pathogenic variants are rarely are reported in other domains. Variants in *KIF1A* can cause a spectrum of neurological phenotypes that include movement disorders, epilepsy, painful neuropathy, developmental delays and intellectual disability [35, 36]. The patient demonstrated global developmental delays, progressive spasticity and peripheral neuropathy, and seizures. The patient's spasticity contributed to many falls prior to treatment, and progressed from being largely ambulatory to requiring a wheelchair most of the time. The patient had difficulty with expressive language and speech fluency and articulation frequently displayed irritability.

The patient has been treated with an allele-selective RNase H1 ASO, PS/PO 2'-MOE "gapmer" ASO (Table 6) designed to a non-pathogenic polymorphism in *KIF1A* (Fig. 3a) that was evaluated *in vitro* using patient iPSc-derived neurons. The ASO that was selected exhibited a good potency, safety and tolerability profile, and displayed a high degree of allele selectivity (Fig. 3b). Nonclinical development study results are presented in Supplemental materials (Supplemental Material – Detailed methods and results for exemplary patients) [37, 38].

Treatment was initiated at 20 mg IT and the dose-escalated gradually up to a dose of 100 mg. The patient has been treated for ~15 months with no ASO-related serious adverse events, ASO-related adverse event, nor any emergent changes in the composition of the cerebrospinal fluid or other standard laboratory tests. The primary treatment goal to reduce the frequency and severity of seizures assessed and reported by caregivers in a seizure diary. The frequency and severity of seizures declined significantly beginning after the second dose and has been maintained throughout the treatment period (Fig 4a). Further, it was reported that the patient is more alert and present with treatment, and this is reflected by an overall improvement in the patient's quality of

life [39]. Of note, the specific domains of change demonstrate the dimensions of improvement. For example the patient is better able to express needs, shows more enjoyment in activities, has more energy, is in a better mood, shows less signs of anxiety, and shows less aggression since being treated with the ASO (Supplemental Table 4). While mobility only shows minor improvement on the clinically assessed six-minute walk test — rapidly recovered the ability to walk and demonstrated a dramatic reduction in falls even though the patient was much more mobile and ambulatory [39]. Additionally, reported by caregivers that there has been a significant decrease in pain—appearing to wear off near the end of the time between doses. Lastly, after \sim 12 months of treatment, caregivers were asked to rate the severity of the patient at study start, and after one year of treatment, and to rate the improvement of the patient (see Supplemental Material for additional details). Both rated the patient as having 'much improved' and being 'moderately ill' after one year of treatment as compared to 'severely ill' or 'markedly ill' at study initiation (Supplemental Table 5).

SCN2A **Patient**

A male child patient when treatment was initiated had a heterozygous c.5645G>A toxic gain of function mutation in the sodium voltage-gated channel alpha subunit 2 (*SCN2A*) gene. The *SCN2A* gene encodes the alpha subunit of Nav 1.2, a neuronal voltage-gated sodium channel [38-40][40- 42]. Various types of pathological mutations have been reported throughout the *SCN2A* gene and the severity of disease appears to correlate with the type of mutation, with toxic gain of function mutations causing the most severe forms, namely infantile epileptic encephalopathy [40]. The patient presented with severe, intractable seizures at birth that have been quite consistent throughout life. Despite treatment with as many as 10 anti-epileptic medications, had consistently experienced 20-40 seizures per month, and had to receive rescue medication (nasal midazolam and/or rectal diazepam) weekly, to be admitted to the hospital to gain seizure control approximately twice yearly. At the initiation of treatment, in addition to severe, poorly controlled seizures, the patient was non-verbal, developmentally delayed and considered to suffer from autism spectrum disorder. The patient had an overall Adaptive Behavioral Composite score of 44 on the Vineland 3 Adaptive Behavior Scale (severe impairment) and age equivalent skills that ranged from 8 months to 5 years old with most in the 1-2 year age range. The patient struggled with irritability, behavioral problems, extreme sensory sensitivities and sensory seeking behaviors, as well as, intermittent pain and the manifestations of disease were progressing. Supplemental Table 6 shows the concomitant medications with which that patient was treated during ASO treatment. Importantly, the patient was treated with phenytoin and cenobamate, both sodium channel blocking agents and this substantially complicated ASO treatment and evaluation as the antisense medicine is designed to reduce the level of *SCN2A* encoded sodium channels. Since sodium channel activity must be tightly regulated and seizures can be caused by either excess or reduced sodium channel activity, as the ASO dose was increased, adjustment of the doses of the small molecule sodium channel blockers was required.

This patient requires an allele-selective ASO, as loss-of-function (LoF) mutations in *SCN2A* can lead to autism spectrum disorder and intellectual disability. Multiple non-pathogenic SNPs were

identified in the patient's *SCN2A* gene to which ASOs were designed, from which an ASO was selected as it was potent, highly allele-selective, and did not stimulate innate immunity (Table 6, Fig 3c). Nonclinical development study results are presented in Supplemental materials (Supplemental Material – Detailed methods and results for exemplary patients). The first IT dose was at 20 mg, followed by 40 mg one month later, and after a thorough assessment of safety and tolerability the dose was gradually escalated to 60 mg two months after the second dose, and lastly to 80 mg three month after the third dose. The patient has been treated for \sim 8 months, with no ASO-related serious adverse events or adverse events, nor any emergent changes in the composition of the cerebrospinal fluid or other standard laboratory tests. The primary treatment goal is to reduce the frequency and severity of seizures, with a secondary goal to improve behavior and developmental delays. A significant, ASO-dose-dependent reduction in the frequency and severity of seizures (Fig. 4b) was observed. In fact, after the 40 mg dose, the patient was seizure free for a month for the first time in his life. However, as mentioned above, the concomitant administration of phenytoin and cenobamate complicate ASO treatment and assessment. After the 60 and 80 mg doses of ASO, the phenytoin was reduced as phenytoin is associated with significant adverse events. Even after the reduction of the phenytoin dose, significant improvement in seizure activity continued and the patient experienced short (up to 2 weeks) seizure free periods, with seizures appearing to increase toward the end of the dosing period. This is consistent with the known pharmakinetics/pharmacodynamics properties of IT administered ASOs and reflects a reduction in the concentration of the ASO in CNS tissues [15]. Dosing continues with the objective of identifying the optimal ASO dose and dose frequency and reducing or eliminating the administration of phenytoin.

Although formal assessment of cognitive and behavioral symptoms will be conducted after 1 year of ASO treatment, caregivers independently reported encouraging observations in sensory and repetitive behaviors. Specifically, one instance was reported where the patient was exhibiting less obsession about picking up a small object from the ground. Such behaviors prior to treatment were compulsive and repetitive.

FLVCR1 **Patient**

A female child patient who is compound heterozygous for two pathogenic mutations. The patient has a missense mutation (c1193A>G) that may be inherited and a maternally inherited, approximately 3 kb ISG20L2 pseudogene inserted in intron 8 of the feline leukemia virus subgroup C cellular receptor choline and heme transporter 1 (*FLVRCR1*) gene. This insertion introduces a novel 3' splice site upstream of exon 9 that results in incorporation of a non-functional pseudoexon creating an early termination signal that truncates the protein after exon 8 which is not subject to nonsense mediated decay. The *FLVCR1* gene encodes a ubiquitously expressed heme exporter located in the plasma membrane and responsible for regulating the pool of cytoplasmic heme [43]. Inherited pathological mutations have been reported in several of the membrane spanning regions of the protein and these result in accumulation of heme in the cytoplasm, increasing oxidative

stress and death of a number of cell types. Impaired proprioception and nociception are thought to result from degeneration of ganglionic neurons [44] while the loss of vision is due to retinal cell death. Mutations in *FLVCR1* have also been reported to be associated with other syndromes, including hematological diseases [43].

At presentation, the patient with gross motor delays, frequent injuries and insensitivity to pain in their extremities. As a result of the pain insensitivity, the patient continues to experience frequent infections, recurrent osteomyelitis and required amputation of digits. The child was found to have retinitis pigmentosa. Visual acuity has steadily declined, visual fields have narrowed, nyctalopia has worsened and, in recent years, having experienced intermittent exotropia in the right eye. At initiation of treatment, the patients' visual acuity was 20/150 in the right eye and 20/200 in the left eye with visual field restriction. The patient was observed to have cystoid macular edema and an electroretinogram (ERG) demonstrated a flat ERG in both eyes.

Though the patient clearly has severe nociceptive dysfunction, concluding that preserving the remaining visual acuity was the most important treatment goal, because the patients lack of proprioception would prevent the patient from being able to use braille. Further, the presence of two pathological mutations in this patient's *FLVRC1* gene complicated the choice of ASO design. To address the missense mutation, an allele-selective RNase H1 ASO is the correct design, while correcting the pseudo-exon inclusion requires a fully 2′ modified ASO designed to prevent use of the abnormal 3′ splice site. Since preserving the remaining functional FLVCR1 protein is essential, an ASO designed to prevent inclusion of the pseudo-exon was selected as the better approach. Accordingly, ASOs designed to obstruct the ectopic 3′ splice site were designed resulting in the selection of the lead ASO (Table 6) and this resulted in a 1.5-fold reduction of the RNA containing the pseudo-exon relative to the WT RNA (Fig. 3d). Nonclinical development study results are presented in Supplemental materials (Supplemental Material – Detailed methods and results for exemplary patients) [38, 45, 46].

The primary treatment goal for this patient is to reduce or stabilize the loss of visual acuity. To maximize safety, treatment was initiated in the more affected eye at an IVT dose of 60 micrograms on day 1, and dose-escalated to 120 micrograms on day 85 and 120 micrograms on Day 185. As the first two doses were well tolerated, treatment of the less affected eye was initiated at 120 micrograms on Day 185 as well. To date, the safety and tolerability profile of the ASO has been unremarkable. It is too early to assess any improvement in vision at this point.

SAA **Patient**

A male patient who has biopsy-proven serum amyloid a (*SAA*) amyloidosis in the kidney. Genetic testing for familial periodic fever syndromes have been negative; however, a variant chr11: 18290751 A>T (hg19) encoding for a missense mutation in *SAA1* (NM_199161.5):c.101A>T(p.D34V) was identified in both siblings [47]. The mutation is thought to exacerbate the misfolding, precipitation, and aggregation of *SAA*. The patient has chronic kidney disease stage 3A with an estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) of 52 ml/min/1.73 m² losing 5-6 ml/min/1.73m² per year for the last 2 years. The patients proteinuria was averaging 3.5 g/d but recently had decreased (Table 7). Renal biopsy demonstrated amyloid deposits. SAA levels were normal and no elevation of pro-inflammatory mediators was found.

As the primary treatment goal is to reduce the rate of deterioration of renal function by reducing the plasma level of the non-essential protein SAA, non-allele-selective GalNAc PS 2′-MOE Gapmers were designed to hundreds of sites in *SAA* pre-mRNA and screened at 4000 nanomole in A431 cells. The most potent ASOs were evaluated in dose response experiments in the same cells (Fig. 3e), and the leads were then subjected to additional in silico and *in vitro* evaluations to identify potential off-targets and to exclude ASOs that are innate immune stimulatory and the optimal ASO selected (Table 6). Nonclinical development study results are presented in Supplemental materials (Supplemental Material – Detailed methods and results for exemplary patients) [38].

The primary analytes to be measured clinically are eGFR, serum creatinine, serum albumin, urinary protein levels and plasma SAA levels. Treatment was initiated SQ at 40 mg and has been dose-escalated to 80 mg to date. The patient has received the first four doses and values of key analytes are shown in Table 7. The first four doses have been well tolerated with no adverse events. Though there is insufficient data to definitively determine if the ASO is limiting further erosion of renal function, it is encouraging that after 4 months there is no decline in any of the relevant renal perimeters.

DISCUSSION

Patients with extremely rare mutations constitute a tragedy of which we were largely unaware until the development of relatively inexpensive genomic sequencing. Though the scientific community is learning more about these individuals every day, our knowledge remains fragmented and primitive. For example, though the UDN has reported that average time from symptom onset to diagnosis in "undiagnosed" patients is perhaps as long as eight years [11], we now have sufficient data to report the median and mean times from symptom onset to diagnosis for patients expressing nano-rare mutations as 2 and 4.32 years, respectively. That the range was quite large, emphasizes how idiosyncratic the journey to diagnosis is for these patients. We suspect that numerous factors result in the enormous variation in time. Certainly, the age at which symptom onset occurs, the severity of the phenotype, the similarity of the phenotype to previously described syndromes and

the organs affected are important considerations. However, circumstances such as proximity to a medical school, the level of research interest in the gene, the level of commitment of patients and parents to obtaining a diagnosis and the socio-economic level of the family affected play significant roles as well. Importantly, the patients who achieved a diagnosis and applied for treatment by n-Lorem are, we suspect, a tiny fraction of patients with ASO-targetable nano-rare mutations. Often, patients or parents persisted in pursuit of a diagnosis by contacting multiple physicians and scientists in various academic institutions and, in many cases, they had to pay for genomic sequencing and other basic research. Irrespective of the factors contributing to delays in diagnosis, the costs to society of this inefficiency are enormous, including those of care, the impact of incorrect diagnoses or inappropriate treatment and the loss in productivity of the affected families. Of similar concern is the inequity of the diagnostic process. Clearly, wealthier families have the means to pursue diagnosis and treatment that are unavailable to those less advantaged. Rather than discuss the various negative effects of the inequality of the delivery of health care, our position is simple: it is wrong.

We have also had several patients/parents who paid investigators to conduct the basic research necessary to make a genomic diagnosis and characterize the mutation who were unable to find a research physician at an academic center who was willing to treat the patient with an experimental ASO. This is despite the multiple personalized medicine centers being established. Tragically, this set of barriers to effective care could be eliminated by simply introducing genomic sequencing as a part of routine newborn evaluation protocols. Were this reform adopted, other tests currently performed to identify specific genetic diseases could likely be discontinued, reducing the net cost to the health care system.

At n-Lorem, we have combined more than three decades of experience in antisense technology with decades of experience in drug development to establish systems that maximize quality at each step. The process begins with the complex and challenging risk/benefit evaluation necessary to assess which patients are appropriate candidates for personalized ASO treatment to the creation of novel approaches to assessing the performance of each experimental ASO and the aggregate benefit to patients achieved in an industrialized approach. Of particular importance is the challenge of identifying an optimal ASO for each patient. ASOs are complex bioactive molecules and the difference between an optimal vs sub-optimal ASO can be significant. We have published how we identify optimal ASOs and the procedures described are the product of having studied millions of ASOs and, in our view, represent the minimum acceptable process [9, 10]. We believe that if the processes we have published, including evaluating the recommended number of ASOs at each step, and the ASOs are dosed appropriately, severe adverse events (SAEs) should be rare, but should unexpected SAEs occur, it is vital that they must be managed professionally. This includes meeting regulatory requirements. For example, the FDA requires that reports be filed within 15 days of notification of the event. While notification of the FDA is mandated by regulations and vital, given the level of interest and the number of investigators and institutions focused on treating nano-rare patients with ASOs, it is also critically important to disseminate information about the SAE to all relevant audiences as rapidly as possible. Finally, particularly if the same ASO is to be provided to another patient, any new SAE should be included in an updated informed consent document.

To our knowledge, this is the first effort to correlate detailed genetic data with individual phenotypic observations in nano-rare patients. Though we report only a small number of these patients, the data are already sufficient to enable a variety of insights. We also believe that our effort is the first industrialized approach that couples detailed genotypic and phenotypic data to the immediate potential for treatment. We have demonstrated that the efficiency of antisense technology coupled to the special guidance for ASOs issued by the FDA makes it possible to mount an individualized ASO discovery program and move rapidly and inexpensively to treatment. This is an important step that should incentivize disease-focused patient advocacy groups to consider broadening their investment strategy to include grants to treat some patients today. This effort is enabled by decades of advances in basic research and in drug discovery technologies, demonstrating in a direct manner, the value of such investments. It is also important to note that only the combination of a novel, more efficient drug discovery platform, a novel nonprofit model and the active commitment and cooperation of the FDA to help these desperate patients makes this possible. We believe there is potential value in considering what has been accomplished to date as a model that could help solve other challenging health delivery issues.

As mutations occur throughout the genome, it is as expected that pathogenic mutations were observed in diverse gene families and that genes that encode proteins with critical functions at key junctions in biological networks are over-represented and result in more diverse and severe phenotypes. Our experience is significantly biased by the preponderance of applications to treat patients with neurological diseases. Not surprisingly, in the CNS, mutations in ion channels, proteins involved in endosomal migration along axonal microtubules, and mutations in proteins involved in signaling, are well represented. Additionally, mutations in proteins involved in transcription, RNA processing and translation are associated with diverse serious illnesses. We also observe that mutations of all types are represented. We also extend the observation that, for more common rare diseases, the pattern of one or two common mutations accounting for most patients and a plethora of extremely rare mutations accounting for many other patients are common. That said, the frequency of the involvement of some gene families is notable. Mutations in genes that encode ion channels account for 26 patients in this cohort. This attests to the importance of ion channels in the CNS. One would expect mutations in ion channels to be significant contributors to diseases in any organ that must rhythmically depolarize and repolarize cell such as the heart. Though many of the ion channels in this cohort are primarily expressed in the CNS, it will be of interest to follow these patients to see if other organs are affected as the disease progresses. We also observe that many patients with mutations in ion channels experience gastrointestinal (GI) and genitourinary (GU) issues, posing the question whether some of these patients could have autonomic dysfunctions. If genomic sequencing were performed on all newborns, these patients would present remarkable opportunities to perform molecular epidemiological studies that could result in a step-by-step understanding of how a single mutation alters the molecular phenotype over time and answer why some patients experience earlier or later onset of symptoms, to say nothing of the opportunity to treat many of these patients early in their disease or pre-symptomatically.

While it is perhaps not too surprising that equivalent mutations in the same gene may result in phenotypes shared by patients with the same mutation and in manifestations that differ from the

shared phenotype in some patients, and that some patients may display differences in phenotype. Clearly, our database supports a more thorough assessment of such differences and the opportunity to perform additional studies and follow up to better understand the molecular mechanisms that underly the clinical observations. Perhaps some differences in phenotypes may be explained by variations in the stage of the syndrome or the age or sex of the patients, but most cannot be explained in such a manner. Consequently, most of these unique patients present a remarkable opportunity to apply "modern omics" and other approaches to begin to understand the various homeostatic, compensatory and secondary effects of these mutations on the networks that result in expression of their unique phenotypes. Comparison of the "omics" of the unique patients to those who express only the shared phenotype could add substantial new insights. For those patients who are amenable to ASO treatment it will also be of interest to learn which elements of the phenotypes respond and in what order.

The 4 exemplary patients described above provide an opportunity to present (primarily in supplemental materials) the detailed data derived from ASO discovery and development activities performed by n-Lorem, collaborators and the network of clinical research organizations (CROs) we have established that we consider the minimum necessary to assure that each patient is treated with an optimal ASO. The specific patients selected epitomize the diversity of nano-rare patients and some of the challenges they present. Both the *KIF1A* and *SCN2A* patients required alleleselective RNase H1 ASOs. The identification of potent, safe allele-selective ASOs is more challenging than the process involved to provide non-allele selective ASOs. This requires the identification of non-pathogenic SNPs that can be used to design ASOs with potential allele selectivity. As the number of non-pathogenic SNPs varies and the more SNPs, the greater the likelihood of identifying an attractive ASO, while a limited number of SNPs may make the process less likely to succeed. To achieve allele selectivity, we screen multiple ASOs that "tile" the SNP and the primary reason allele selectivity can be achieved is the effect of the sequence of the ASO/RNA heteroduplex on the site specific cleavage pattern of RNase H1[49]. Narrowing the sequence space typically results in less potent ASOs and a greater propensity to identify innate immune active ASOs. Thus, the overall ASO discovery process takes more time and has a lower probability of success. The preliminary evidence of benefit with two allele-selective ASOs administered intrathecally is cautiously encouraging, but our experience is not extensive enough to begin to estimate an overall probability of success.

The complex mutations in the *FLVCR1* case exemplify another challenge: the biological effects of many mutations can be extremely complicated and a number of our patients have multiple pathogenic mutations. Given that the FLVCR1 protein is essential, the choice between the option of enhancing the overall expression of *FLVCR1* by addressing the abnormal splice was straightforward, but the choice to treat the eyes with IVT dosing rather than the nociception issues with an IT ASO had to be made in the context of the clinical presentation of the patient. Why not treat the patient both IVT and IT? In our opinion, our experience is still too limited to expose a child to both IVT and IT treatment. On the other hand, the *SAA* patient represented a straightforward opportunity from the antisense perspective, particularly as Ionis has two commercially approved ASOs that treat another form of renal amyloidosis, TTR amyloidosis. The family history puts in stark relief the damage done to families by many nano-rare mutations and

the WGS results demonstrate a unique pathogenic variant that causes aggregation of SAA even in the absence of excess SAA production present in this family.

These patients also highlight the importance of the versatility of antisense technology, the complexity of nano-rare patients and the need to individuate therapeutic decisions based on the phenotype and needs of each patient. To be able to design ASOs to take advantage of different post-RNA binding mechanisms is vital to treating a broad range of mutations and molecular pathologic challenges. It is also important that PS ASOs are approximately equipotent in the cytosol and nucleus [50, 51]. To be able to administer PS ASOs by multiple routes of administration enhances the diversity of patients that can be treated and supports the option of local treatment such as in the eye or CNS which reduces the potential for systemic toxicities. Finally, to select different chemical classes of ASOs, such as GalNAc PS ASOs to selectively target RNAs in specific types of cells, such as hepatocytes, enhances both potency and safety. The therapeutic complexity of nano-rare patients also emphasizes the importance of senior judgement, the value of advisory groups such as the ATTC and the need to focus on the most significant needs of each patient. In traditional drug discovery and development, one focuses on populations of patient while at n-Lorem each decision must be made in the context of the individual patient.

This study has significant limitations, beginning with the relatively small number of patients represented, but we expect the number of patients to increase significantly in the coming years. An even greater limitation is the relatively short treatment periods in patients summarized in this manuscript. Obviously, this issue will be resolved in the next few years. Nonetheless, to have evidence of suggestive benefit in more than one patient is cautiously encouraging. There are also obvious selection biases. The relative preponderance of neurological disease does not, in our opinion, reflect the total population with nano-rare mutations. We ascribe this anomaly to the emotional impact of neurological diseases and consequent energetic patient advocacy groups, plus our inability to engage the inborn errors of metabolism, kidney and eye disease communities. We suspect that there also may be selection bias evident in the types of mutations submitted based on a broad understanding of the limitations of ASO technology. We hope to correct this imbalance in the near term by more effectively engaging these communities. Though we have confirmed many mutations and phenotypes, to a large extent we rely on the information provided by the research physicians who submitted the applications for treatment. Perhaps less apparent, but quite important is the challenge of acquiring consistent phenotypic data. Our data indicate that there is significant variability in the elements of phenotype that are reported depending on the particular interests of the treating physician. For example, in many of our patients with mutations in ion channels there are suggestions of autonomic dysfunction such as chronic GI distress, thermal regulation and nystagmus that are not identified in many applications. The wide variation in how terms used to describe phenotypes, severity, rates of progress and levels of disability make data analyses challenging. In the coming year, we plan to introduce standard terminology for phenotypes and other relevant parameters and questionnaires designed to prompt submitting physicians to consider element of phenotypes commonly overlooked.

This manuscript adds to the evidence that significant reforms in healthcare are needed if the needs of patients with extremely rare mutations are to be addressed in any meaningful way. Certainly, the most urgently needed reform is to introduce genomic sequencing into newborn evaluation

protocols and to couple the genetic observations to long term epidemiological studies. However, if the maximum number of patients are to be treated today, insurers including Medicare and Medicaid must seize the opportunity to save lives and health care dollars by supporting diagnosis and treatment. The National Institutes of Health and other funding agencies need to work with patient advocacy groups to assure that the limited funds available for the care of nano-rare patients is used effectively to treat those who can be treated today, while simultaneously investing in research to identify more effective treatments in the future.

Importantly, this manuscript emphasizes that nano-rare patients are unique experiments of nature in which a single variable, a single mutation, causes a profound change in phenotype. The unique coupling of full genomic and phenotypic characterization with rapid intevervention with an ASO designed to affect the genetic cause of the syndromes presents an unparalleled opportunity to 1) better understand genotype-phenotype relationships, 2) how individual humans respond to mutations from the clinical to molecular level, and 3) how the effect of treatments that alter the expression of the cause of the syndrome affects the expression of various clinical manifestaions of the molecular pathological processes. Treatment of pediatric patients also provides the opportunity to assess the "plasticity" of the developing CNS, as developmental delays are arrested and, in some cases, reversed. Longer term, by combining analyses using various "omics" tools with genomic sequencing at birth, the opportunity to perform molecular epidemiological studies may provide novel insights into health and disease in human subjects.

FIGURES

Figures 1. Times to diagnosis and decisions on applications for treatment. a. Time from submission of application to n-Lorem to treatment decision. b. Time from symptom onset to diagnosis

Figures 2. Characteristics of patients who submitted applications and antisense approaches for accepted patients. a. Total submissions and initial decision. b. Reasons for declined cases. c. Age distribution for submissions. d. Organs affected for accepted cases. e. Types of mutations for accepted cases. f. ASO strategy for accepted cases.

Figures 3. ASO design and dose-response curves for ASOs for exemplary patients a. Schematic representation of an allele selective ASO designed to a SNP trans of the pathogenic mutation. b. Dose response analysis of nL-KIF1-001 in patient ipsc-derived neurons. c. Dose response analysis of nL-SCN2-001 in patient ipsc-derived neurons. d. Dose response analysis of nL-FLVC-001 in patient ipsc-derived neurons. e. Dose response analysis of nL-SAA1-001 in A431 cells.

Figures 4. Seizure frequency over time post-ASO in two patients with previously intractable seizures. a. Seizure count over time in the KIFA patient . b. Seizure count over time in the SCN2A patient . Dose adjustments of rescue seizure medications are noted in green; DS = dose skip, $DR =$ dose reduction, $PM(A)$ – afternoon, PM –(C) - evening, AM – morning; Rescue medications noted in orange include phenytoin (P) or clonazepam (C). Phenytoin levels in blue are given in micrograms per mililiter.

TABLES

- **1. Current n-Lorem Process To Discover And Develop Optimal RNase H1 ASOs for CNS Diseases.**
- **2. Functional Classification of Genes Submitted.**
- **3. Genotype Phenotype Correlations.** a. *GNAO1* patients with equivalent mutaitons. b. *CHCHD10* patients with equivalent mutations. c. *H3F3A* patients with equivalent mutations. d. *PACS1* patients with equivalent mutations. e. *PACS2* patients with equivalent mutations. f. *GBE1* patients with equivalent mutations. g. *UBTF* patients with equivalent mutations. h. *CACNA1A* patietns with equivalent mutations.
- **4. Comparison of the Phenotypes of Patients with Different Mutations in the Same Gene.** *TARDBP* different, but functionally equivalent mutations.
- **5. Genes.** Types of Mutations and Antisense Strategies for Accepted Patients.
- **6. ASOs Used to Treat the Exemplary Patients.** Color code for ASO chemical modifications: black = unmodified deoxyribose $(2 H; DNA)$; orange = 2 methoxyethyl (MOE). Unmarked backbone linkages = phosphorothioate (PS); linkages marked with o $=$ normal phosphodiester (PO). mC $=$ 5-methylcytosine
- **7. Renal performance parameters prior to and during treatment with experimental ASO treatment of an** *SAA1* **patient -.** GFR in mL/min/1.73m2 values per CDK Stage: Stage G1 (normal or high) GFR = 90; Stage G2 (mildly decreased) GRF: 60 to 89; Stage G3a (mildly to moderately decreased) GFR: 45 to 59; Stage G3b (moderately to severely decreased) GRF:30 to 44; Stage G4 (severely decreased) GRF: 15 to 29; Stage G5 (kidney failure) GFR<15

SUPPLEMENTAL FIGURES

- **1. Optimal timeline for ASO drug discovery, development, and manufacturing**.
- **2. Overview of Quality Processes**

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

- **1. Different mutations in the same gene**.
- **2. Further detail of mutations from Table 2 relevant for phenotype assessment.**
- **3. Mutations not amenable to ASO therapy.**
- **4. Quality of life questionnaire for a KIF1A patient. Detailed assessment of the different domains overtime.**
- **5. Clinical Severity and Improvement as assessed for a patient with KIF1A.**
- **6. Concomitant medications for a SCN2A patient during experimental ASO treatment.**

Investigator Network

All investigators who submitted the 173 applications that n-Lorem had received at the time of data cut off and evaluated are members of the 'n-Lorem Investigator Network' and are listed below.

Shneider, Neil M.D., Ph.D., Columbia University - Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons Department of Neurology and the Center for Motor Neuron Biology and Disease

Lanpher, Brendan C. M.D., Mayo Clinic

Chung, Wendy M.D., Ph.D., Chief, Department of Pediatrics Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School

Berry-Kravis, Elizabeth M.D., Ph.D., Professor, Departments of Pediatrics, Neurological Sciences, Anatomy and Cell Biology, Director, RUSH Pediatric Neurosciences F.A.S.T. Center for Translational Research, Rush University Medical Center

Evrony, Gilad D. M.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor, New York University

Russell, Bianca E. M.D., FAAP, FACMG, Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Program Director, Clinical Genetics, Department of Human Genetics, Division of Clinical Genetics, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA

Minassian, Berge A. M.D., Chief of Pediatric Neurology, University of Texas Southwestern

Yu, Timothy M.D., Ph.D. Attending Physician, Division of Genetics and Genomics. Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School

Srivastava, Siddharth M.D., Assistant, Department of Neurology, Assistant Professor of Neurology, Harvard Medical School

Hildebrandt, Friedhelm M.D., Professor of Pediatrics at Harvard Medical School and Chief of the Division of Nephrology of Boston Children's

Numis, Adam M.D., Associate Professor, Neurology, Assistant Professor of Neurology and Pediatrics · University of California, San Francisco Benioff Children's Hospital

Dagli, Aditi M.D., Pediatric Genetics, Orlando Health Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children Division of Genetics

Viehoever, Amy R. M.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

Gropman, Andrea M.D., FAAP, FACMG, FANA, Principal investigator, Urea Cycle Disorders Consortium (UCDC) and UCDC imaging consortium

Poduri, Annapurna M.D., MPH, Neurology, Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School

Larson, Austin M.D., Assistant Professor, Pediatrics-Clinical Genetics and Metabolism · University of Colorado, Clinical Genetics and Genomics

Darras, Basil T. M.D., Professor of Neurology; Institution. Boston Children's Hospital; Department. Neurology

Bharatendu Chandra, MBBS, Assistant Professor, Stead Family Department of Pediatrics, Division of Medical Genetics and Genomics, University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine

Porter, Brenda M.D., Ph.D., Professor of Neurology and of Pediatrics. Neurology & Neurological Sciences. Practices at Stanford Medicine Children's Health

Konersman, Chamindra G. M.D., Director, multidisciplinary Neuromuscular MDA Clinic at Rady Children's Hospital-San Diego

Moufawad El Achkar, Christelle M.D., Instructor in Neurology; Institution. Boston Children's Hospital; Department. Neurology

Grunseich, Christopher M.D., Staff Clinician in the Neurogenetics Branch, NINDS

Yukaitis, Christopher M.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor in the Department of Neurology at Boston Children's Hospital/Harvard Medical School

Zaidman, Craig M.D., Professor of Neurology, Professor of Pediatrics. Division of Neuromuscular Medicine, Institute of Clinical and Translational Sciences, Washington University in St Louis School of Medicine

Calame, Daniel M.D., Ph.D., Instructor, Baylor College of Medicine

De Vivo, Darryl C. M.D., Sidney Carter Professor of Neurology, Professor of Pediatrics, and Director Emeritus (1979-2000) of the Pediatric Neurology, Columbia University Medical Center in New York City

Shahani, Dave N. M.D., Child Neurologist & Epileptologist. Cook Children's Health Care System

Michelson, David J. M.D., Head, Pediatrics, Neurology Division, Pediatrics, Neurology Division. School of Medicine. Assistant Professor, Pediatrics, Neurology Division, Loma Linda University Children's Hospital

Holder, Deborah M.D., Director, Epilepsy Program, Epilepsy Monitoring Unit and EEG Lab, Children's Hospital of Los Angeles

Segal, Devorah M.D., Ph.D., Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Neurology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine, Associate Director, Neurofibromatosis Program, NYU Langone Health

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) . **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.05.24310862;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.05.24310862) this version posted August 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint

Eichler, Florian M.D., Physician Investigator (Cl) Neurology, Mass General Research Institute, Professor of Neurology, Harvard Medical School, Associate Neurologist, Massachusetts General Hospital

Bhoj, Elizabeth J. K. M.D., Ph.D., Attending physician with the Division of Human Genetics at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP)

McCourt, Emily M.D., The Ponzio Family Chair for Pediatric Ophthalmology, Chief of Pediatric Ophthalmology Children's Hospital Colorado, Associate Professor University of Colorado

Tiongson, Emmanuelle M.D., Associate Program Director of the Child Neurology Residency Program at Children's Hospital Los Angeles

Anderson, Eric J. M.D., Pediatric hematologist/oncologist at Rady Children's Hospital-San Diego, Clinical Professor in pediatric hematology/oncology, UC San Diego School of Medicine

Hisama, Fuki M. M.D., Academic. Professor, Medical Genetics. Adjunct Professor, Neurology, University of Washington Division of Medical Genetics

Evrony, Gilad M.D., Ph.D., Center for Human Genetics & Genomics, Assistant Professor, Department of Pediatrics, Assistant Professor, Department of Neuroscience and Physiology, NYU Langone Health

Costain, Gregory M.D., Ph.D., Physician-Scientist, The Hospital for Sick Children & University of Toronto

Acsadi, Gyula M.D., Ph.D., Chief of Pediatric Neurology, Connecticut Children's Medical **Center**

Heather N. Hayenga, Ph.D., Assistant Professor at University of Texas, Dallas

Chong, Hey Jin M.D., Ph.D., Associate professor of pediatrics at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine

Horacio Kaufmann, M.D., Professor of Neurology, Medicine and Pediatrics, NYU Langone Medical Center

Chao, Hsiao-Tuan M.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Departments of Pediatrics-Neurology, Molecular and Human Genetics, and Neuroscience, Texas Children's Hospital

Butler, Ian J. M.D., Professor, McGovern Medical School at The University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston (UTHealth)

Helbig, Ingo M.D., Pediatric neurologist, Division of Neurology, Director of Genomic Science, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP)

Dowling, James M.D., Ph.D., Division of Neurology, Genetics and Genome Biology Program, Hospital for Sick Children, Departments of Pediatrics and Molecular Genetics, University of Toronto

Kim-McManus, Olivia M.D., UCSD Associate Clinical Professor, Rady Children's Hospital Dept of Neurosciences, Division of Pediatric Neurology, Epilepsy & Clinical Neurophysiology

Duis, Jessica M.D., Associate Professor, Pediatrics-Clinical Genetics and Metabolism, Children's Hospital Colorado

Jen, Joanna M.D., Ph.D., Director, Integrative Headache Medicine of New York; Assistant Clinical Professor of Neurology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

Bonkowsky, Joshua Leitch M.D., Ph.D., Professor of Pediatric Neurology (Pediatrics) and of Neurology, University of Utah Health

Fink, John Kane M.D., Neurology, Geriatric Medicine Health Care Provider, University of Michigan Ann Arbor

Day, John West M.D., Ph.D., Professor of Neurology and Pediatrics, and Director of the Neuromuscular Division, Stanford School of Medicine

Granadillo De Luque, Jorge Luis M.D., Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, Division of Genetics and Genomic Medicine, Institute of Clinical and Translational Sciences

Baker, Joshua D.O., Attending Physician, Genetics, Genomics and Metabolism, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago

Izumi, Kosuke M.D., Ph.D., Clinical geneticist and genetics researcher at The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

Wang, Leo H. M.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor at University of Washington - School of Medicine

Laux, Linda C. M.D., Associate Division Head, Neurology; Section Head, Epilepsy Center; Lorna S. and James P. Langdon Chair in Pediatric Neurology

Dasouki, Majed M.D., Clinical Geneticist, Adventhealth Medical Group Genomics, Personalized Health, Orlando

Saenz, Margarita M.D., Associate Professor of Clinical Practice, Pediatrics-Clinical Genetics and Metabolism · University of Colorado (University Hospital) Program

Pilapil, Mariecel M.D., Pediatrician at Cohen Children's Medical Center

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) . **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.05.24310862;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.05.24310862) this version posted August 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint

Williams, Matthew FRCR, Ph.D., Faculty of Medicine, Department of Surgery & Cancer, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust. London, England

Bock, Matthew M.D., Medical Director, Pediatric Heart Failure & Transplantation at Rady Children's Hospital-San Diego, Loma Linda University Pediatric Cardiology International Heart Institute

Jones, Melissa M.D., Pediatric Neurology, Houston area Pediatric Neurology

Cudkowicz, Merit M.D., MSC, Director, Sean M. Healey & AMG Center for ALS, Chief of Neurology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Director and Julieanne Dorn Professor of Neurology, Harvard Medical School

Kruer, Michael M.D., Associate Research Professor, Neurology & Child Health, Phoenix Children's Hospital, University of Arizona College of Medicine

Kruer, Michael M.D., Associate Research Professor, Neurology & Child Health, Phoenix children's Hospital, university of Arizona College of Medicine

Muriello, Michael M.D., Assistant Professor in the Department of Pediatrics, Medical College Wisconsin

Hirano, Michio M.D., Chief of the Neuromuscular Division, Co-Director of the CUMC Muscular Dystrophy Association clinic, Director, H. Houston Merritt Center for Muscular Dystrophy and Related Diseases, Columbia University Irving Medical Center

Velinov, Milen M.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor, Director of Division of Genetics, Department of Pediatrics, Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson School

Tekin, Mustafa M.D., Professor of Human Genetics, Interim Chair, Dr. John T. Macdonald Dept. of Human Genetics, Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami

Leung, Nelson M.D., Consultant and Physician, Divisions of Nephrology and Hypertension and Hematology at Mayo Clinic

Mencacci, Niccolò Emanuele M.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Neurology (Movement Disorders), Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

Devinsky, Orrin M.D., Neurologist Director of the NYU Comprehensive Epilepsy Center, Lead Investigator Cannabidiol Trials for Epilepsy, Founder FACES, Epilepsy.com, SUDEP Registry, New York University Langone

Abreu, Nicolas J. M.D., Assistant Professor of Neurology, NYU Langone Medical Center, NYUMC · Department of Neurology

Gissen, Paul Ph.D., Clinical Professor, Pediatric Metabolic Medicine, UCL GOS Institute of Child Health (GOS ICH)

Yang, Paul M.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor in Ophthalmic Genetics and Ocular Immunology at the Casey Eye Institute, Oregon Health Sciences University

Greenwood, Robert M.D., Professor of Neurology and Pediatrics at University of North Carolina (UNC), Chapel Hill

Smigiel, Robert M.D., Ph.D., Professor, Clinical Geneticist, Department of Pediatrics, Division of Neonatology, Wroclaw Medical University

Kayani, Saima M.D., Pediatric Neurologist, Assistant Professor at UT Southwestern Medical **Center**

Demarest, Scott M.D., Associate Professor, Pediatrics-Neurology, Children's Hospital Colorado and Associate Professor, Pediatrics-Neurology, The University of Texas School of Medicine

Hussain, Shaun M.D., Pediatric Epilepsy Specialist, UCLA Mattel Children's Hospital

Borooah, Shyamanga MBBS, MRCP (UK), MRCSEd, FRCOphth, Ph.D., Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology at the Shiley Eye Institute, UCSD

Nelson, Stanley M.D., Professor and Vice Chair of Human Genetics and Professor of Psychiatry within the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA

Wolf, Steven M.D., Pediatric Neurologist, Pediatric Neurology at Hawthorne; Pediatric Neurology Manhattan, Boston Children's Health Physicians at Marie Fareri Children's Hospital

Feyma, Timothy M.D., Pediatric Neurologist, Gillette Children's (St. Paul Minnesota)

Lotze, Timothy M.D., Professor of Pediatrics and Neurology, Baylor College of Medicine

Gertler, Tracy M.D., Ph.D., Attending Physician, Neurology; Founders' Board Chair in Neurocritical Care, Assistant Professor of Pediatrics (Neurology), Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago

Keane, Virginia M.D., Attending Physician at Mount Washington Pediatric Hospital, Mount Washington Pediatric Hospital

Kimonis, Virginia M.D., Professor of Pediatrics, Chief, Division of Genetics & Metabolism, University of California-Irvine Medical Center

Gallentine, William D.O., Clinical Professor of Neurology at Stanford University School of Medicine

Ortiz-Gonzalez, Xilma M.D., Ph.D., Attending Pediatric Neurologist in the Division of Neurology at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP)

Acknowledgments

Individuals: The authors gratefully acknowledge Rosanne Crooke, Ph.D., Sarah Glass, Ph.D., Frank Bennett, Ph.D., for broad contributions to the advancement of n-Lorem and for the helpful editorial comments. Also, Kim Butler for outstanding administrative support. We also acknowledge many others at n-Lorem who contribute specific analyses used in this manuscript.

Institutions: The authors thank all of the physicians, patients, and families who have submitted applications to n-Lorem.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethics Committees / Institutional Review Boards: Informed consent was obtained from all patients involved prior to study start. All patients treated in this manuscript were treated under FDA approved INDs and after approval from each Institutional Review Board(s) (IRB).

Ethics committee/IRB of Mayo Clinic Institutional Review Boards gave ethical approval in IRB Application # 22-005092 for this work

Ethics committee/IRB of Children's Hospital Colorado gave ethical approval in IRB Application # 22-2313 for this work.

Ethics committee/IRB of Columbia University Medical Center gave ethical approval in IRB Application # AAAU1165 for this work.

Ethics committee/IRB of Rush University Medical Center gave ethical approval in IRB Application # irbm-006-002 for this work.

REFERENCES

- 1. Boycott, K.M., et al., *Seven years since the launch of the Matchmaker Exchange: The evolution of genomic matchmaking.* Hum Mutat, 2022. **43**(6): p. 659-667.
- 2. Borri, A., et al., *Characterizing Fractal Genetic Variation in the Human Genome from the Hapmap Project.* International Journal of Neural Systems, 2022. **32**(06): p. 2250028.
- 3. Whalen, S., et al., *Navigating the pitfalls of applying machine learning in genomics.* Nature Reviews Genetics, 2022. **23**(3): p. 169-181.
- 4. Hutchins, J.R.A., *Chapter 4 - Genomic databases*, in *Genome Plasticity in Health and Disease*, D.A. Forero and G.P. Patrinos, Editors. 2020, Academic Press. p. 47-62.
- 5. Themistocleous, A.C., et al., *Investigating genotype–phenotype relationship of extreme neuropathic pain disorders in a UK national cohort.* Brain Communications, 2023. **5**(2).
- 6. Langhammer, F., et al., *Genotype-phenotype correlations in RHOBTB2-associated neurodevelopmental disorders.* Genetics in Medicine, 2023. **25**(8): p. 100885.
- 7. Wright, C.F., et al., *Genomic Diagnosis of Rare Pediatric Disease in the United Kingdom and Ireland.* N Engl J Med, 2023. **388**(17): p. 1559-1571.
- 8. Mahmood, S.S., et al., *The Framingham Heart Study and the epidemiology of cardiovascular disease: a historical perspective.* Lancet, 2014. **383**(9921): p. 999-1008.
- 9. Crooke, S.T., *A call to arms against ultra-rare diseases.* Nature Biotechnology, 2021. **39**(6): p. 671-677.
- 10. Crooke, S.T., *Addressing the Needs of Patients with Ultra-Rare Mutations One Patient at a Time: The n-Lorem Approach.* Nucleic Acid Therapeutics, 2022. **32**(2): p. 95-100.
- 11. Cope, H., et al., *Missed diagnoses: Clinically relevant lessons learned through medical mysteries solved by the Undiagnosed Diseases Network.* Mol Genet Genomic Med, 2020. **8**(10): p. e1397.
- 12. Crooke, S.T., *Meeting the needs of patients with ultrarare diseases.* Trends in Molecular Medicine, 2022. **28**(2): p. 87-96.
- 13. Kirk Lamoreaux; Sebastien Lefebvre, M.S.D.S.L.W.E.T.H., *The Power of Being Counted*. 2022: Online. p. 1-33.
- 14. Crooke, S.T., et al., *Antisense technology: A review.* J Biol Chem, 2021. **296**: p. 100416.
- 15. Crooke, S.T., et al., *Antisense drug discovery and development technology considered in a pharmacological context.* Biochem Pharmacol, 2021. **189**: p. 114196.
- 16. Crooke, S.T., et al., *The Interaction of Phosphorothioate-Containing RNA Targeted Drugs with Proteins Is a Critical Determinant of the Therapeutic Effects of These Agents.* Journal of the American Chemical Society, 2020. **142**(35): p. 14754-14771.
- 17. Crooke, S.T., T.A. Vickers, and X.-H. Liang, *Phosphorothioate Modified Oligonucleotide-Protein Interactions.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2020. **In press**.
- 18. Crooke, S.T., et al., *RNA-Targeted Therapeutics.* Cell Metab, 2019. **29**(2): p. 501.
- 19. Crooke, S.T., et al., *Cellular uptake and trafficking of antisense oligonucleotides.* Nat Biotechnol, 2017. **35**(3): p. 230-237.
- 20. Crooke, S.T., et al., *Integrated Safety Assessment of 2'-O-Methoxyethyl Chimeric Antisense Oligonucleotides in NonHuman Primates and Healthy Human Volunteers.* Mol Ther, 2016. **24**(10): p. 1771-1782.

- 21. Crooke, S.T., et al., *The Effects of 2'-O-Methoxyethyl Oligonucleotides on Renal Function in Humans.* Nucleic Acid Ther, 2018. **28**(1): p. 10-22.
- 22. Crooke, S.T., et al., *The Effects of 2'-O-Methoxyethyl Containing Antisense Oligonucleotides on Platelets in Human Clinical Trials.* Nucleic Acid Ther, 2017. **27**(3): p. 121-129.
- 23. Crooke, S.T., et al., *Integrated Assessment of the Clinical Performance of GalNAc3- Conjugated 2'-O-Methoxyethyl Chimeric Antisense Oligonucleotides: I. Human Volunteer Experience.* Nucleic Acid Ther, 2019. **29**(1): p. 16-32.
- 24. Administration, U.S.F.a.D., *Nonclinical Testing of Individualized Antisense Oligonucleotide Drug Products for Severely Debilitating or Life-Threatening Diseases Guidance for Sponsor-Investigators*, C.f.D.E.a.R. (CDER), Editor. 2021.
- 25. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, C.f.D.E.a.R.C., Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH), *Patient-Focused Drug Development: Selecting, Developing, or Modifying Fit-for Purpose Clinical Outcome Assessments*, C.f.B.E.a.R.C. Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH), Editor. 2022. p. 1-57.
- 26. Graham, M.J., et al., *In vivo distribution and metabolism of a phosphorothioate oligonucleotide within rat liver after intravenous administration.* J Pharmacol Exp Ther, 1998. **286**(1): p. 447-58.
- 27. Jafar-Nejad, P., et al., *The atlas of RNase H antisense oligonucleotide distribution and activity in the CNS of rodents and non-human primates following central administration.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2021. **49**(2): p. 657-673.
- 28. Donner, A.J., et al., *Characterization of the Activity and Distribution of a 2'-O-Methoxyethyl-Modified Antisense Oligonucleotide in Models of Acute and Chronic Kidney Disease.* Nucleic Acid Ther, 2018. **28**(5): p. 297-306.
- 29. Duan, N., R.L. Kravitz, and C.H. Schmid, *Single-patient (n-of-1) trials: a pragmatic clinical decision methodology for patient-centered comparative effectiveness research.* Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 2013. **66**(8, Supplement): p. S21-S28.
- 30. Marcé-Grau, A., et al., *GNAO1 encephalopathy: further delineation of a severe neurodevelopmental syndrome affecting females.* Orphanet J Rare Dis, 2016. **11**: p. 38.
- 31. Ruan, Y., et al., *CHCHD2 and CHCHD10 regulate mitochondrial dynamics and integrated stress response.* Cell Death & Disease, 2022. **13**(2): p. 156.
- 32. Zhang, M., et al., *Mutation analysis of CHCHD10 in different neurodegenerative diseases.* Brain, 2015. **138**(Pt 9): p. e380.
- 33. Bryant, L., et al., *Histone H3.3 beyond cancer: Germline mutations in* $\langle i \rangle$ *Histone 3 Family 3A and 3B</i> cause a previously unidentified neurodegenerative disorder in 46 patients.* Science Advances, 2020. **6**(49): p. eabc9207.
- 34. de Boer, E.M.J., et al., *TDP-43 proteinopathies: a new wave of neurodegenerative diseases.* J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry, 2020. **92**(1): p. 86-95.
- 35. Nair, A., et al., *KIF1A-Associated Neurological Disorder: An Overview of a Rare Mutational Disease.* Pharmaceuticals (Basel), 2023. **16**(2).
- 36. Pennings, M., et al., *KIF1A variants are a frequent cause of autosomal dominant hereditary spastic paraplegia.* Eur J Hum Genet, 2020. **28**(1): p. 40-49.

- 37. A. Ziegler, J.C., J. M. Bain, T. T. Sands, R. J. Fee, D. Uher, C.H. Kanner, J. Montes, S. Glass, J. Douville, L. Mignon, J.G. Gleeson, S.T. Crooke, W.K. Chung, *N of 1 treatment of an allele specific gapmer antisense oligonucleotide for KIF1A associated neurological disorder.* Nature Medicine, 2024: p. submitted.
- 38. Prakash, T.P., et al., *Targeted delivery of antisense oligonucleotides to hepatocytes using triantennary N-acetyl galactosamine improves potency 10-fold in mice.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2014. **42**(13): p. 8796-807.
- 39. Sanders, S.J., et al., *Progress in Understanding and Treating SCN2A-Mediated Disorders.* Trends Neurosci, 2018. **41**(7): p. 442-456.
- 40. Zeng, Q., et al., *SCN2A-Related Epilepsy: The Phenotypic Spectrum, Treatment and Prognosis.* Frontiers in Molecular Neuroscience, 2022. **15**.
- 41. Wolff, M., A. Brunklaus, and S.M. Zuberi, *Phenotypic spectrum and genetics of SCN2Arelated disorders, treatment options, and outcomes in epilepsy and beyond.* Epilepsia, 2019. **60 Suppl 3**: p. S59-s67.
- 42. Chiabrando, D., et al., *Mutations in the Heme Exporter FLVCR1 Cause Sensory Neurodegeneration with Loss of Pain Perception.* PLoS Genet, 2016. **12**(12): p. e1006461.
- 43. Rajadhyaksha, A.M., et al., *Mutations in FLVCR1 cause posterior column ataxia and retinitis pigmentosa.* Am J Hum Genet, 2010. **87**(5): p. 643-54.
- 44. N. Leung, T.K., E.D. McPhail, S. Dasari, L. Nosková, A. Hnízda, K. Hodaňová , M. Živná, S.H. Nasr, J. Sikora, S.T. Crooke, A. Bleyer, S. Kmoch, *First report of Hereditary AA amyloidosis caused by a missense mutation in the N-terminal region of the SAA1 gene.* Kidney International, In process.
- 45. Lima, W., H. Wu, and S.T. Crooke, *The RNase H Mechanism*, in *Antisense Drug Technology - Principles, Strategies, and Applications*, S.T. Crooke, Editor. 2008, CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL. p. 47-74.
- 46. Liang, X.H., W. Shen, and S.T. Crooke, *Specific Increase of Protein Levels by Enhancing Translation Using Antisense Oligonucleotides Targeting Upstream Open Frames.* Adv Exp Med Biol, 2017. **983**: p. 129-146.
- 47. Liang, X.H., Sun, H., Nichols, J.G., and Crooke, S.T., *RNase H1-dependent antisense oligonucleotides are robustly active in directing RNA cleavage in both the cytoplasm and the nucleus.* Molecular Therapy, 2017. **25**(9): p. 2075-2092.

Shortest time to decision = 3 days Longest time to decision $= 183$ days

Time range: 1 month – 36 years
Figure 2.

Figure 4 a. Seizure frequency in KIF1A patient

Figure 4 b. Seizure frequency in a SCN2A patient

Table 1.

Table 3a.

Table 3b.

Table 3c.

Table 3d.

Table 3e.

Table 3f.

Table 3g.

Table 3h.

Table 4.

Table 5.

Table 6. ASOs used to treat the exemplary patients

Table 7: Laboratory analytes over time following treatment of SAA1 patient.

Supplemental Figure 1.

Supplemental Figure 2.

Supplemental Table 1 (1 of 8).

Supplemental Table 1 (2 of 8).

Supplemental Table 1 (3 of 8).

Supplemental Table 1 (4 of 8).

Supplemental Table 1 (5 of 8).

Supplemental Table 1 (6 of 8).

Supplemental Table 1 (7 of 8).

Supplemental Table 1 (8 of 8).

Supplemental Table 2 (1 of 7).

Supplemental Table 2 (2 of 7).

Supplemental Table 2 (3 of 7).

Supplemental Table 2 (4 of 7).

Supplemental Table 2 (5 of 7).

Supplemental Table 2 (6 of 7).

Supplemental Table 2 (7 of 7).

Supplemental Table 3.

Supplemental Table 4.

Supplemental Table 5.

Clinical Severity and Improvement as assessed by parents and physician for a KIF1A patient

Question posed for the Clinical Global Impressions – Severity: Considering your total clinical experience with this patient population, how ill is the patient at this time? Question posed for the Clinical Global Impressions – Improvement: Rate total improvement whether or not, in your judgment, it is due entirely to drug treatment. Compared to his/her condition at admission to the project (screening) how much has he /she changed?

Supplemental Table 6. Concomitant medications for a SCN2A patient while on ASO treatment.

Supplemental Material – Detailed Methods and Results for Exemplary Patients

KIF1A Patient

Nonclinical Method

ASO design and *in vitro* screen

The ASO was designed to bind the reference sequence at positions hg38:Chr2: 240737833 to 240737853 which is in cis with the *KIF1A* pathogenic variant (Figure 3A and Table 6). This approach supports differential binding to the RNA by the ASO and reduction of the pre-mRNA and mRNA from the pathogenic allele, while sparing the pre-mRNA from the reference allele by RNase H1.

In vitro potency and allele-selectivity were determined following a dose response of nL-KIF1-001 in iPSC-derived neurons from the patient's fibroblasts using free uptake at concentrations of 0.6 μ M, 2.5 μ M, 10 μ M, and 40 μ M for 16 hours followed by 1-week maintenance in ASO-free media. Cells were harvested and RNA isolated using RNA easy 96 well kit at Qiagen (Valencia, CA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The expression of each allele was then measured using tagged probes (wild type or reference transcript" tagged in green and "pathogenic transcript" tagged in red). *KIF1A* mRNA was quantified using quantitative RT-PCR (TaqMan) assay on an Applied Biosystems 7900H Fast Real-Time PCR system at ThermoFisher Scientific (Waltham, MA).

A bioinformatic analysis was performed to predict complementarity of the nL-KIF1-001 sequence to human putative primary transcripts. Human primary putative transcripts identified as partially complementary to nL-KIF1-001 with 1-, or 2-base mismatches, or 3-base mismatches with 17 matches in a row and expressed in the central nervous system were considered potential "off target" genes. These potential "off targets" effects were confirmed by PCR analysis in appropriate cell lines.

Finally, the potential for ASOs to activate innate immunity was tested in an *in vitro* assay using BJAB cells (EBV-negative, B lymphoma cell line, ACC 757) measuring expression levels of CCL22 as a surrogate measure of inflammatory response in BJAB cells and comparing with benchmark ASOs of known proinflammatory profile.

Toxicology studies

8-week single ICV dose tolerability study with nL-KIF1-001 in mice

Four C57/BL6 female mice/group were assigned to treatment groups receiving a single ICV injection of phosphate buffered saline or nL-KIF1-001 at 0.7 mg. Terminal sacrifice was performed on day 56. The assessment of tolerability was based on mortality, clinical observations, body weight, and acute and delayed functional observation evaluation. In addition, brain and thoracic spinal cord were evaluated by standard histopathology, along with microglial cell activation (Aif1

and Cd68 mRNA evaluation and IBA1 immunohistochemistry), astrocyte reactivity (GFAPmRNA evaluation), and neuronal degeneration (calbindin immunohistochemistry). This study was conducted at Ionis Pharmaceuticals Carlsbad, CA.

8-week single IT dose tolerability study with nL-KIF1-001 in rats

Four Sprague Dawley (Crl:CD(SD)) male rats/group were assigned to treatment groups receiving a single IT injection of PBS or nL-KIF1-001 at 3 mg. Terminal sacrifice was performed on day 56, and the assessment of tolerability was as described for mice. This study was conducted at Ionis Pharmaceuticals Carlsbad, CA.

A 13-week repeat dose toxicology study of nL-KIF1-001 by IT injection in rats

10 Sprague Dawley (Crl:CD(SD)) rats/sex/group were assigned to treatment groups receiving artificial CSF or nL-KIF1-001 at 0.3 and 1 mg/dose on days 1, 29, 57 and 85. Terminal sacrifice was performed on day 92, one week after the last dose on day 85.

The assessment of toxicity was based on mortality, clinical signs, body weights, food consumption, functional observation battery, ophthalmology, clinical pathology parameters (hematology, coagulation and clinical chemistry), gross necropsy findings, and histopathological examination of the brain, spinal cord, dorsal root ganglia, liver, kidney, heart and spleen. This study was conducted at Charles River Laboratories (Senneville, Canada).

Manufacturing and formulation of nL-KIF1-001

nL-KIF1-001 was manufactured by ChemGenes Corporation Wilmington, MA according to good manufacturing processes (GMP). As quality control, multiple release tests were performed, including tests for appearance (lyophilized white to off-white cake), identity (within 2 Da of expected mass of 7070.0 Da), identification (synthesis report matches expected sequence), purity (determined as 98.2% pure by high-performance liquid chromatography), moisture content (reported as 0.71%), sodium content (5.75%), bacterial endotoxin (0.032 EU/mg) pH (7.46), bioburden (total aerobic microbial count and total yeasts and mold counts less than 100 CFU/g each). nL-KIF1-001 was reconstituted in Elliott's B Solution and filtered through a 0.22 µm polyvinylidene fluoride membrane by the Columbia research pharmacy at concentrations required to meet dose level requirements. The dose was administered in a volume of 10 to 14 mL. Prior to dosing, the formulated nL-KIF1-001 was kept at room temperature for no longer than 4 hours.

Clinical Methods

Study design

The ASO was administered intrathecally; the starting dose was 20 mg, and the dose was escalated by 20 mg at the discretion of the physician. To date, the actual dosing days and doses have been as follows: 20 mg on Days 1 and 31; 40 mg on Day 59; 60 mg on Days 115 and 206, then quarterly dosing at 60 mg-100 mg depending on the clinical effects observed.

Treatment goals and assessments

Prior to initiating treatment, treatment goals and the clinical tests to be evaluated were selected in consultation with the principal investigator, then baseline data were collected during the time the ASO was being developed. The primary treatment goal was to reduce the severity and frequency of the seizure disorder and was assessed by comparing the frequency and severity of seizures during the period immediately pretreatment to those parameters following treatment with the ASO. Seizure assessment included evaluation of the number of seizure spikes within overnight EEG and the number of average daily seizures recorded by the parent/caregiver via seizure diary. A minimum of 7 days of seizure count was collected after each dose.

The secondary treatment goal, to improve mobility by reducing spasticity, was assessed by comparing mobility and average number of falls recorded in the pre-treatment time period versus post-dose. Mobility was evaluated in the clinic via the 6-mintue walk test. The patient had to complete the test without ankle-foot orthosis (AFOs), i.e., barefoot, with the caregiver or physical therapist walking alongside the patient for safety. The number of falls was recorded each day by the parent/caregiver in a fall diary. Additionally, the parent/caregiver also noted if the patient used the wheelchair all day.

Effects on developmental delays and cognitive abilities were assessed throughout the study via the Differential Abilities Scales-II, a normed battery of cognitive and achievement tests that provides insight into how a child processes information.

A quality-of-life questionnaire was answered by the parent/caregiver; the questionnaire uses a 5 point Likert scale across 6 domains: Physical Health, Positive Emotions, Negative Emotions, Social Interaction, Leisure and Outdoors, and Independence. The answer choices on this scale ranged from "Never" to "Very often," with the responses being quantified on a linear scale from 0 to 100. The time period to consider for the assessment was the month prior. A comparison of these ratings of quality of life at two timepoints (Baseline, before dosing began (9/26/2022), and Clinic evaluation 6, after the 6th dose (8/14/2023)) indicate marked improvements across all 6 domains in less than a year of dosing.

Two additional assessments, the Gross Motor Function Measure and the 9-hole peg test, were added in the middle of the study, as the patient gained fine motor skills and was able to perform those tests. Those are to be assessed every 6 months moving forward.

Lastly, one year after treatment initiation, the parents and the physician were asked to rate the patient's disease severity at study start and after one year of treatment and to assess improvement after one year of treatment.

SCN2A Patient

Nonclinical Method

ASO design and *in vitro* screen

To prevent the use of the mutant 3′ splice site and thus promote normal splicing, more than 300 PS full MOE ASOs were designed to bind near the abnormal 3′ splice site The ASO selected was

designed to bind the pre-m-RNA sequence at positions hg38:Chr2: 165375115 to 165375135 (Figure 4a and Table 6).

Manufacturing and formulation of nL-SCN2-001

nL-SCN2-001 was manufactured by Avecia Nitto Denko (Cincinnati, OH) as described above.

Clinical Methods

Treatment goals and assessments

The primary treatment goal, to reduce the frequency and/or severity of the seizures, is compared to a baseline as described above.

The secondary treatment goal, to improve behavior, cognitive ability and language are compared to baseline using a battery of different tests.

- Adaptive behavior: Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scale Version 3 (Vineland-3) change in Growth Scale Value (GSV) scores for all subdomains.
- Irritability and aberrant behavior: Aberrant Behavior Checklist Community Edition, (ABC-C); Repetitive Behaviors Scale – Revised (RBS-R).
- Sensory dysfunction: Short Sensory Profile- 2 (SSP-2).
- Cognitive and functional abilities: Bayley Scales of Infant Development-4 (BSID-4).
- Language and communication: Observer-Reported Communication Ability (ORCA).

FLVCR1 Patient

Nonclinical Methods

ASO design and *in vitro* screen

Oligonucleotides were designed to block usage of the mutant 3′ splice acceptor site in *FLVCR1* and thus promote increased expression of a wild type FLVCR1 transcript and protein (Centa et al. 2020; Toonen et al. 2017). More than 300 uniform 2′-MOE (full PS) ASOs were designed and evaluated as above.

Toxicology studies

As rodents are a poor model for intravitreal administration, the *in vivo* tolerability of nL-FLVC-001 used the ICV and IT routes of administration to evaluate local tolerability in the CNS as described above for nL-KIF1-001 as a surrogate for the retinal tissue. Although the routes of administration in the CNS rodent studies are not representative of the patient exposure, the relative tolerability profile by the central routes of administration allows for the comparison to other PS MOE ASOs that have entered development and are considered to inform the local tolerability in neuronal cell types as described above.

A 13-week repeat dose toxicology study of nL-FLVC-001 by IVT injection in non-human primates

3 female monkeys/group were assigned to treatment groups receiving PBS or nL-FLVC-001 at 150 and 450 µg/dose. Doses were administered on days 1, 43 and 85 for the PBS and 150 µg/dose levels, and on days 1 and 43 for the 450 μ g/dose level. Terminal sacrifice was performed on day 92, one week after the last dose on day 85.

The assessment of toxicity was based on mortality, clinical signs, gross ocular examination, body weights, food consumption, intraocular pressure (IOP), ophthalmology, electroretinography (ERG), clinical pathology parameters (hematology, coagulation and clinical chemistry), gross necropsy findings, organ weights, and detailed histopathological examination of the eye. This study was conducted at the Korea Institute of Toxicology (Daejeon, Republic of Korea).

Manufacturing and formulation of nL-FLVC-001

nL-FLVC-001 was manufactured in a GMP facility by ChemGenes Corporation (Wilmington, MA) and was then formulated by Argonaut Manufacturing Services (Carlsbad, CA) as 0.5 mL 10 mg/mL sterile solution in PBS as described above.

Clinical Methods

Study design

This patient is losing sight in both eyes, but the right eye has progressed to 20/20. Consequently, the plan was to dose the right eye first to assure safety, then treat both eyes. Dosing is IVT quarterly beginning at 60mc, then120mcg with a maximum dose of 200mcg.

Treatment goals and assessments

The main treatment goal is to slow or stabilize the visual and retinal degeneration, and this is being assessed by a battery of tests to look at eye structure (optical coherence tomography, fundus photos and fundus autofluorescence), and eye function (full field stimulus threshold, visual field testing and best corrected visual acuity), and via an overall vision related quality-of-life. A gait analysis performed in different light conditions replicating real-life situations is an exploratory outcome to determine how well she can find her way in a room.

SAA1 Patient

Nonclinical Methods

ASO design and *in vitro* screen

More than 450 ASOs were initially designed as non-allele-selective, PS 2'-MOE GalNAc gapmers. The GalNAc moiety enhances delivery to hepatocytes via binding to ASPGR, as the main source of SAA1 protein is hepatocytes [\(Prakash et al., 2014\)](https://parexel-my.sharepoint.com/personal/tarun_balani_parexel_com/Documents/Documents/n-Lorem/SAA1%20Pre-IND%20BD%20v4.0%20(1).docx#Prakash2014). *In vitro* screening was performed as described above except that more than 20 lead unconjugated ASOs were then conjugated to GalNAc and evaluated in hepatocytes.

Toxicology studies

4-week twice weekly SC administration tolerability study with unconjugated nL-SAA1-001

Four mice/group were dosed with PBS or 50 mg/kg ASO twice weekly for 4 weeks. Terminal sacrifice was performed on day 39. The assessment of tolerability was based on mortality, clinical observations, body weight, serum chemistry parameters and liver, kidney and spleen histopathology evaluation. This study was conducted at Ionis Pharmaceuticals (Carlsbad, CA).

5-week once weekly SC administration study with nL-SAA1-001 and mouse surrogate in CD-1 mice

Six male animals/group were assigned to treatment groups receiving weekly SC doses of PBS (with a loading dose on Day 4), nL-SAA1-001 at 50 and 80 mg/kg/week. In addition, four male animals/group received ION-1095368, the mouse-specific *Saa1* ASO, at 1, 5, and 10 mg/kg/week. Terminal sacrifice was performed on Day 40, approximately 96 hours after final dosing on Day 36. The assessment of tolerability and toxicity was based on mortality, clinical observations, body weight, clinical pathology parameters, organ weight, and histopathology evaluation. This study was conducted at Ionis Pharmaceuticals (Carlsbad, CA).

A 13-week repeat dose toxicology study of nL-SAA1-001 by SC injection in CD-1 mice

Ten mice/sex/group were assigned to treatment groups receiving weekly SC doses of saline, nL-SAA1-001 at 10, 30 and 60 mg/kg/week, and ION-1095368, the mouse-specific *SAA1* ASO, at 10 mg/kg/week. Terminal sacrifice was performed on Day 94, approximately 48 hours after final dosing on Day 92.

The assessment of toxicity was based on mortality, clinical signs, body weights, food consumption, clinical pathology parameters (hematology, coagulation and clinical chemistry), gross necropsy findings, and histopathological examination. This study was conducted at the Korea Institute of Toxicology (Daejeon, Republic of Korea).

Manufacturing and formulation of nL-SAA1-001

nL-SAA1-001 was manufactured in a GMP facility by ChemGenes Corporation (Wilmington, MA) and was then formulated by Argonaut Manufacturing Services (Carlsbad, CA) as 1 mL 20 mg/mL ready to use sterile solution in PBS as described above).

Clinical Methods

Treatment goals and assessments

The primary treatment goal to improve kidney function and delay the need for dialysis is assessed via laboratory tests of liver and kidney function, and via biomarker analysis of SAA protein and *SAA* mRNA comparing pre- to post-dose values. Performance status of the patients is assessed with the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status scale and quality of life is measured using the Linear Analog Scale Assessment (LASA). The patient was dosed monthly SQ with the disease shown in Table 7.

Supplemental Materials - Results from Exemplary Patients

KIF1A Patient

Nonclinical Results

In vitro results

The dose response analysis demonstrated an IC50 of 8 μ M. There was no significant reduction of the mRNA level from the WT allele at any concentration tested, highlighting the high selectivity of nL-KIF1-001 for the pathogenic transcript over wildtype (Figure 3B). The lead ASO had no significant off target effects and was not innate immunostimulatory in the BJAB assay.

GLP Toxicology results

Observations in the GLP toxicology study were similar to those reported for other PS/PO 2′- MOE gapmers (Collotta D, et. al. Front Pharmacol. 2023; Henry, S.P. & Danis R.P., (2001) Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy).

Clinical Results

Safety

The safety profile of this ASO was unremarkable, with most adverse events being mild and not related to study drug.

Treatment goals

Treatment goals were achieved as discussed in the primary manuscript. These results were further supported by the parent narrative.

Parent narrative supporting benefits of the study drug:

- *Her tremor is almost gone, meaning she can now hold a baseball.*
- *She no longer falls because of her disease, now she may fall because she is so excited to do something.*
- *She sings.*
- *The pain in her hands and feet resolve with treatment but comes back close to the next dose; hopefully we can fine-tune the dose, so she does not have pain.*
- *She is able to make it through the day without a nap.*
- *In our KAND situation, 'moderately ill' in the scheme of average KAND patients is huge considering our daughter's prognosis and rate of regression at time at first dose. The elements of tremor, engagement, and the fact that she's out of her chair are epic, certainly not moderate, but other challenges of KAND (primarily worsening vision, reflux, etc.) that*

weren't necessarily "targets" of the ASO, as we understood, are continuing to follow the course of disease. So those elements of disease offset the massive improvements in mobility, fine motor, speech, and independence that this ASO has so incredibly provided for her. (This references their rating of "moderately ill" after one year on treatment on the Clinical Impression – Severity)

- *Every movement has more purpose.*

SCN2A Patient

Nonclinical Results

In vitro results

The dose response analysis showed that nL-SCN2-001 had an IC50 of 2.6 μ M for the pathogenic transcript. Importantly, there was no significant effect noted on the wildtype mRNA levels and the allele-selectivity was estimated to be 42-fold for the pathogenic transcript over the wildtype (Figure 3C). The lead ASO was found to have no significant off targets and was negative for innate immune activation in the BJAB assay.

Toxicology studies

Results from the GLP toxicology study were consistent with previous reports for ASOs of this chemical class (Collatta et.al., et. al. Front Pharmacol. 2023; Henry, S.P., et.al., 2008).

Clinical Results

Safety

The safety profile of this ASO was unremarkable, with all adverse events being mild and not related to study drug.

Treatment goals

Treatment goals and results are discussed in the primary manuscript.

FLVCR1 Patient

Nonclinical Results

In vitro results

The dose response analysis showed that nL-FLVC-001 had an IC50 of 3.2 μ M and an EC50 of \sim 10 μ M, leading to $>$ 1.5-fold (compared to control) downregulation of the pseudogene insertion

containing transcript at the highest dose tested and >1.5-fold (compared to control) upregulation of wild type *FLVCR1* (Figure 3D)*.* Results of other *in vitro* studies were similar to those observed with the other exemplary ASOs

Toxicology studies

As rodents are a poor model for intravitreal administration, the non-GLP studies used the intracerebroventricular and intrathecal routes to evaluate local tolerability in the CNS as a surrogate for the retinal tissue. Although the routes of administration in the CNS rodent studies are not representative of the patient exposure, the relative tolerability profile by the central routes of administration allows for the comparison to other MOE ASOs that have entered development and are considered to inform the local tolerability in neuronal cell types. The results of these studies were similar to those reported for the other exemplary ASOs.

Results of the GLP IVT toxicology study were similar to those reported for other ASOs of this chemical class (Henry, S.P. & Danis R.P., (2001) Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy).

Clinical results

Safety

The safety profile of this ASO was unremarkable.

SAA1 Patient

Nonclinical Results

In vitro results

The dose response analysis showed that the unconjugated version of nL-SAA1-001 had an IC50 of 0.15 µM in A431 cells (Figure 3E). Results of other *in vitro* tests were similar to the other exemplary ASOs.

Toxicology results

Results of toxicology studies were similar to those reported for other GalNAc conjugated PS ASOs (Collatta et.al., et. al. Front Pharmacol. 2023)

Clinical Results

Safety

The safety profile of this ASO has been unremarkable.

Treatment goals

The results of treatment goals are discussed in the primary manuscript.