Comparison between the Onabotulinum Toxin and the Abobotulinum Toxin in the Treatment of Facial Wrinkles Using Different Dosing Ratios: A Split-Face Study

Chesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of master degree in Dermatology, Venereology, and Andrology

By

Ahmed Ibrahim ElHodhod

M.B.,B.Ch. Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Hanan Mohamed El Kahky

Professor of Dermatology, Venereology, and Andrology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Samar Abdallah Mohamed Salem

Professor of Dermatology, Venereology, and Andrology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine

Ain Shams University

2014





First, and foremost, my deepest gratitude and thanks should be offered to "ALLAHI", the Most Kind and Most Merciful, for giving me the strength to complete this work.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Hanan Mohamed El Kahky**, Professor of Dermatology, Venereology, and Andrology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for her continuous support and guidance for me to present this work. It really has been an honor to work under her generous supervision.

I acknowledge with much gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Samar Abdallah Mohamed Salem**, Professor of Dermatology, Venereology, and Andrology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her great supervision and unlimited help to provide all facilities to accomplish this work.

Ahmed Obrahim El-Hodhod

List of Contents

Subject	Page No.
List of Abbreviations	i
List of Tables	ii
List of Figures	vii
Introduction	1
Aim of the Study	3
Review of Literature	
- Wrinkles	4
• Epidemiology	5
 Classification and Grading 	6
Histopathology	8
• Etiopathogenesis	
• Treatment approaches	
- Botulinum Toxin	42
• History	41
Biosynthesis	46
 Mechanism of action 	51
• Therapeutic indications	59
• Clinical pharmacology	63
Patients and Methods	79
Results	92

List of Contents (Cont...)

Subject	Page No.
Discussion	146
Summary	165
Conclusion	172
Recommendations	173
References	174
Appendices	I
Arabic Summary	

List of Abbreviations

ABO : Abobotulinum

BTX : Botulinum toxin

CGRP : Calcitonin gene-related peptide

GAGs : Glycosaminoglycans

ONA : Onabotulinum

SVP2 : Synaptic Vesicle Protein-2

TCA : Trichloroacetic acid

VAMP : Vesicle associated membrane proteins

List of Tables

Eable No.	Citle	Page No.
Table (1):	Illustrating P-values and their signif	ficance93
Table (2):	Comparison between group A and I regarding their age and gender	-
Table (3):	Comparison of the time to improve the forehead horizontal lines betteright side (ONA-treated) and the (ABO-treated) among group A (ABO: ONA; 2.5: 1.0 U) on static p	ween the left side patients
Table (4):	Comparison of the time to improve the forehead horizontal lines betteright side (ONA-treated) and the (ABO-treated) among group A (ABO: ONA; 2.5: 1.0 U) on posture	ween the left side patients dynamic
Table (5):	Comparison of the time to improve the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group A patient ONA; 2.5: 1.0 U) on static posture.	the right de (ABO-ts (ABO:
Table (6):	Comparison of the time to improve the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group A patient ONA; 2.5: 1.0 U) on dynamic postu	the right de (ABO-ts (ABO:
Table (7):	Comparison of the time to improve the forehead horizontal lines between right side (ONA-treated) and the (ABO-treated) among group B (ABO: ONA; 3.0: 1.0 U) on static process.	ween the left side patients

Eable No	. Eitle	Page No.
Table (8):	Comparison of the time to improvement forehead horizontal lines between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group B patients (AB 3.0: 1.0 U) on dynamic posture	the right e (ABO-O: ONA;
Table (9):	Comparison of the time to improve the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group B patients ONA; 3.0: 1.0 U) on static posture.	the right e (ABO- s (ABO:
Table (10):	Comparison of the time to improve the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group B patients ONA; 3.0: 1.0 U) on dynamic posture	the right e (ABO- s (ABO:
Table (11):	Comparison of the duration of improf the forehead horizontal lines bet right side (ONA-treated) and the (ABO-treated) among group A (ABO: ONA; 2.5: 1.0 U) on static po	ween the left side patients
Table (12):	Comparison of the duration of improve the forehead horizontal lines between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group A patients (AB 2.5: 1.0 U) on dynamic posture	the right e (ABO-O: ONA;
Table (13):	Comparison of the duration of improf the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group A patients ONA; 2.5: 1.0 U) on static posture.	the right e (ABO-s (ABO:

Eable No	. Eitle	Page No.
Table (14):	Comparison of the duration of improf the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group A patients ONA; 2.5: 1.0 U) on dynamic posture.	the right e (ABO-s (ABO:
Table (15):	Comparison of the duration of improf the forehead horizontal lines betright side (ONA-treated) and the (ABO-treated) among group B (ABO: ONA; 3.0: 1.0 U) on static po	ween the left side patients
Table (16):	Comparison of the duration of improve the forehead horizontal lines between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group B patients (AB 3.0: 1.0 U) on dynamic posture	the right e (ABO-O: ONA;
Table (17):	Comparison of the duration of improf the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group B patients ONA; 3.0: 1.0 U) on static posture.	the right e (ABO-s (ABO:
Table (18):	Comparison of the duration of improf the crow's feet wrinkles between side (ONA-treated) and the left side treated) among group B patients ONA; 3.0: 1.0 U) on dynamic posture.	the right e (ABO-s (ABO:
Table (19):	Comparison between the right side treated) and the left side (ABO-treated) the forehead regarding the sew wrinkles among group A (ABO: O 1.0 U) patients on static posture	eated) of erity of NA; 2.5:

Cable No.	Eitle	Page No.
Table (20):	Comparison between the right treated) and the left side (ABC) the forehead regarding the wrinkles among group A (ABO) 1.0 U) patients on dynamic posture.	o-treated) of severity of ONA; 2.5:
Table (21):	Comparison between the right (ONA-treated) and the left (ABO-treated) regarding the wrinkles among group A (ABO: 1.0 U) patients on static posture	crow's feet severity of ONA; 2.5:
Table (22):	Comparison between the right (ONA-treated) and the left (ABO-treated) regarding the wrinkles among group A (ABO 1.0 U) patients on dynamic postur	crow's feet severity of ONA; 2.5:
Table (23):	Comparison between the right treated) and the left side (ABC) the forehead regarding the wrinkles among group B (ABO) 1.0 U) patients on static posture	o-treated) of severity of ONA; 3.0:
Table (24):	Comparison between the right treated) and the left side (ABC) the forehead regarding the wrinkles among group B (ABO) 1.0 U) patients on dynamic posture.	o-treated) of severity of ONA; 3.0:
Table (25):	Comparison between the right (ONA-treated) and the left (ABO-treated) regarding the wrinkles among group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patients on static posture	crow's feet severity of ONA; 3.0:

Eable No.	Citle	Page No.
Table (26):	Comparison between the right of (ONA-treated) and the left of (ABO-treated) regarding the swrinkles among group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patients on dynamic posturo	row's feet everity of ONA; 3.0:
Table (27):	Comparison of group A (ABO: Of U) patient's satisfaction regal improvement in the right side (ON and left side (ABO-treated) of the horizontal lines.	ording the NA-treated) ne forehead
Table (28):	Comparison of group A (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction reg improvement in the right (ONA-teleft (ABO-treated) crow's feet write the comparison of group A (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction reg improvement in the right (ONA-teleft (ABO-treated) crow's feet write the comparison of group A (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction reg improvement in the right (ONA-teleft) patient (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction reg improvement in the right (ONA-teleft) patient (ONA-teleft) pat	garding the reated) and
Table (29):	Comparison of group B (ABO: ON U) patient's satisfaction regard improvement in the right side (ON and left side (ABO-treated) of the horizontal lines.	ording the NA-treated) ne forehead
Table (30):	Comparison of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft (ABO-treated) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft (ABO-treated) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient's satisfaction regimprovement in the right (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the satisfaction of group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering the group B (ABO: 1.0 U) patient (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering (ONA-tileft) crow's feet writering (ONA-tileft)	garding the reated) and

List of Figures

Figure No	. Eitle	Page No.
Figure (1):	A picture illustrating the stucture progenitor 150 kDa botulinum neumolecule	rotoxin
Figure (2):	A picture illustrating the cleavage progenitor 150 kDa botulinum neu molecule	rotoxin
Figure (3):	A picture illustrating the normal mechanism of botulinum neurinhibiting the release of acetylcholine	s the rotoxin
Figure (4):	A picture illustrating the molecular of different botulinum neurotoxin ser	•
Figure (5):	Digital photographs of patient no group B at days 0, 7, 30, and 120 injection from left to right. Row Forehead static, B-Forehead dynamic Crow's feet static, D-Lt. Crow'dynamic, E-Rt. Crow's feet static, Crow's feet dynamic.	O post- vs: A- c, C-Lt. s feet , F-Rt.
Figure (6):	Syringe used for injection	84
Figure (7):	Unilateral injecting points for for horizontal lines and crow's feet	
Figure (8): 7	The Merz photonumerical scales for for horizontal lines and crow's feet	
Figure (9):	Digital photographs of patient no group A at days 0, 7, 30, and 120 injection from left to right) post-

List of Figures (Cont...)

Figure No.	Eitle	Page	No.
Figure (10):	Digital photographs of a patient n group A at days 0, 7, 30, and 12 injection from left to right	0 post-	94
Figure (11):	Digital photographs of a patient n group B at days 0, 7, 30, and 12 injection from left to right	0 post-	95
Figure (12):	Digital photographs of a patient no group B at days 0, 7, 30, and 12 injection from left to right	0 post-	96
Figure (13):	Brow elevation evident in the photo crow's feet wrinkles on static postays 0, 30, and 120.	sture at	145

Introduction

large body of research has documented that, in our society, physical appearance has a significant impact on how individuals are perceived by others, and also that it is intrinsically linked to body image, self-esteem and confidence. Thus, it was concluded that an attractive physical appearance can be expected to result in an improved psychological well-being and an improved social functioning (*Finn et al., 2003*). This explains why, throughout history and across virtually all cultures, individuals have always desired and sought to improve and enhance their physical appearance (*Dessy et al., 2011*).

The face is the central focus of the perception of beauty and attractiveness. Thus, it is the facial appearance that represents the corner stone of the world wide aesthetic concern (*Finn et al.*, 2003).

When the effects of aging on the face are addressed, the main topic of the discussion is always the wrinkles (*Zimbler et al.*, 2001). In addition, facial wrinkles can send an emotional miscues and hence cause a negative impact on the individual's both societal impressions and self-esteem (*Finn et al.*, 2003). Nowadays, medical advances have provided an increasing number of surgical and minimally invasive treatment options available to smooth these lines (*Fagien*, 1999).

One of the most important modalities available for smoothening of the facial wrinkles is the botulinum toxins injection. Botulinum toxins represent the foundation of the minimally invasive aesthetic facial treatments. It began with the use of botulinum toxin to smooth the glabellar frown lines and then expanded to include other facial areas such as the forehead horizontal lines and the crow's feet wrinkles (*Carruthers et al.*, 2007).

There are eight serotypes of the toxin. The two most common commercial preparations authorized for cosmetic use worldwide are the Onabotulinumtoxin A, approved by the US FDA in 2002 and commercially known as Botox, and the Abobotulinumtoxin A, approved by the US FDA in 2009 and commercially known as Dysport (*Hexsel et al.*, 2012).

Botulinum toxin A is a zinc-dependant endopeptidase composed of a light (50kDa) and a heavy (100 kDa) chains linked by disulfide bond (*Aoki*, 2005). Onabotulinumtoxin A and Abobotulinumtoxin A differ in the carrier protein attached to the 150-kDa botulinum toxin A molecule. Although Onabotulinumtoxin A contains a 900-kDa carrier protein attached to the toxin, a 750-kDa carrier exists in Abobotulinumtoxin A (*Lowe et al.*, 2006).

Few studies were found to compare the characteristics of these two formulations of botulinum toxin A regarding their equivalent doses (*Lowe et al.*, *2010*), with no previous comparison of 3.0: 1.0 U and 2.5: 1.0 U dosing ratio of Abobotulinum toxin A: Onabotulinum toxin A in treatment of facial wrinkles.