Current Standard of Care and Rationale of alpha-Lipoic (LA), for Adjunctive Therapy in the Management of Multiple Sclerosis

This treatise has been prepared based on deep investigation with the use of an AI to facilitate identifying reliable and useful research. The information, sources and conclusions have not been verified and may contain errors.

The management of relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis (RRMS) is centered on the use of FDA-approved disease-modifying therapies (DMTs), including interferon-beta preparations, glatiramer acetate, fingolimod, dimethyl fumarate, teriflunomide, natalizumab, ocrelizumab, and cladribine. These agents have demonstrated efficacy in large randomized controlled trials, with pooled rate ratios for annualized relapse rate (ARR) of 0.65 (95% CI 0.56 to 0.76) and hazard ratios for time to disability progression of 0.70 (95% CI 0.55 to 0.87) compared to best supportive care.[1][2] The primary goals of RRMS management are to reduce relapse frequency, slow disability progression, and minimize MRI-based disease activity, thereby preserving neurological function and quality of life.

Adjunctive therapies, including dietary supplements and antioxidants such as lipoic acid (LA), have garnered interest due to their potential immunomodulatory and neuroprotective effects. The rationale for considering LA as adjunctive therapy is based on preclinical evidence demonstrating its ability to inhibit lymphocyte migration into the central nervous system, downregulate proinflammatory cytokines, and stabilize the blood-brain barrier.[3][4][5] However, the integration of LA into clinical practice requires robust evidence of efficacy and safety, particularly in terms of clinically meaningful outcomes such as relapse rate, disability progression, and patient-reported quality of life.

Efficacy of Lipoic Acid as Adjunctive Therapy in RRMS

Clinical Outcomes: Relapse Rate and Disability Progression

The evidence for the efficacy of lipoic acid as adjunctive therapy in RRMS is derived from a limited number of randomized controlled trials (RCTs), systematic reviews, and meta-analyses. The most directly relevant RCT is a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial involving 52 RRMS patients aged 18–50 years with Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS) ≤5.5, who received 1200 mg/day of LA for 12 weeks.[6][7] This study demonstrated significant reductions in several inflammatory cytokines, including interferon-γ (INF-γ), intercellular adhesion molecule-1 (ICAM-1), transforming growth factor-β (TGF-β), and interleukin-4 (IL-4), compared to placebo. However, there were no significant changes in EDSS scores between groups ($p = 0.09$), and relapse rates were not reported as an outcome.[6][7] Thus, while LA exhibited immunomodulatory effects, it did not demonstrate improvement in disability progression or provide evidence for reduction in relapse rate.

A pilot study by Riccio et al. investigated a multi-component nutritional intervention, including LA, in RRMS and primary progressive MS (PPMS) patients over six months.[8] Although serum matrix metalloproteinase-9 (MMP-9) levels decreased by 51% in RRMS patients, no significant changes in neurological signs or disability progression were observed. The study was not designed to isolate the effect of LA, nor did it report relapse rates as a primary outcome.

The most comprehensive synthesis of dietary interventions in MS is provided by the Cochrane systematic review, which included 41 full-text articles examining 30 trials, some of which involved antioxidant supplements such as LA.[9] Among six trials of antioxidant supplementation

versus placebo, there may be little to no difference in relapse rates (risk ratio 0.98, 95% CI 0.59 to 1.64; 4 studies, 345 participants; low-certainty evidence) and very uncertain evidence regarding change in disability progression (mean difference in EDSS -0.19, 95% CI -0.49 to 0.11; 6 studies, 490 participants; very low-certainty evidence).[9] The review did not identify any high-quality RCTs specifically evaluating LA as adjunct to DMTs in RRMS with clinical endpoints of relapse rate or disability progression.

A systematic review by Xie et al. summarized both preclinical and clinical studies of LA in MS, noting that patients with MS showed relatively stable EDSS scores and better walking performance with few adverse events after oral administration of LA.[10] However, the heterogeneity of included studies, differences in MS stage, and trial duration limit the ability to draw firm conclusions regarding clinical efficacy in RRMS, especially as adjunct to DMTs.

Preclinical studies in experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis (EAE) models consistently demonstrated that LA reduced the number of infiltrating immune cells in the CNS and decreased clinical disability scores.[4][5] However, these findings have not translated into robust clinical efficacy in RRMS populations.

MRI Activity and Patient-Reported Outcomes

The effect of adjunctive LA on MRI-based disease activity, such as new or enlarging lesions and gadolinium enhancement, has not been directly evaluated in RCTs involving RRMS patients. The available clinical trials have focused on biomarker outcomes rather than MRI endpoints. For example, the RCT by Khalili et al. did not assess MRI outcomes.[6][7] A systematic review by Xie et al. noted stable EDSS scores and improved walking performance but did not report pooled data on MRI-based disease activity.[10]

The only trial reporting a significant reduction in brain atrophy was conducted in secondary progressive MS (SPMS), where a two-year, double-blind RCT of LA (1200 mg/day) in 51 patients reported a 68% reduction in annualized percent change brain volume (PCBV) compared to placebo (−0.21 vs −0.65, 95% CI 0.157–0.727, p = 0.002).[11][12] However, this finding is not directly generalizable to RRMS populations, and no RCTs in RRMS have reported significant effects of LA on new T2 lesions, gadolinium enhancement, or other MRI markers of active inflammation.

Patient-reported outcomes and quality of life measures have been infrequently and inconsistently assessed in clinical trials of LA in RRMS. The available studies have focused on surrogate biomarkers rather than validated instruments such as the Multiple Sclerosis Quality of Life-54 (MSQOL-54) or the Short Form-36 (SF-36).[6][7][8][10] The Cochrane review found very low-certainty evidence for any difference in global impression of deterioration between antioxidant supplementation and placebo (risk ratio 0.99, 95% CI 0.50 to 1.93; 2 studies, 190 participants; low-certainty evidence).[9] Thus, there is insufficient high-quality evidence to conclude that LA improves patient-reported outcomes or quality of life in RRMS.

Guideline Recommendations and Practical Dosing Considerations

Guideline Position and Consensus

Current multiple sclerosis management guidelines, including those from the American Academy of Neurology (AAN), the National Multiple Sclerosis Society (NMSS), and the European Committee for Treatment and Research in Multiple Sclerosis (ECTRIMS), do not recommend or specifically comment on the use of lipoic acid as adjunctive therapy in RRMS.[9][12][10] The absence of recommendation is rooted in the current state of clinical evidence, which remains insufficient to support routine use of LA as an adjunct to DMTs in RRMS. Expert reviews and consensus statements uniformly advise caution, noting that the only vitamin with sufficient evidence to support routine supplementation in MS is vitamin D.[12] For other supplements, including LA, most human trials have been small or nonblinded, limiting their generalizability.

Table 2 from Evans et al published in JAMA Neurology provides a summary of evidence for other dietary supplement use in multiple sclerosis, including lipoic acid.[12] This table highlights the lack of robust clinical evidence for LA and other supplements in MS management.

Dosing, Duration, and Monitoring

The most commonly studied oral dosage of LA in MS clinical trials is 1200 mg/day, typically administered as a single daily dose.[6][7][12][13][11] In the RCT by Khalili et al., 52 RRMS patients received 1200 mg/day of LA for 12 weeks, resulting in significant improvements in total antioxidant capacity and reductions in several proinflammatory cytokines, but no significant changes in disability progression or relapse rate.[6][7] Another pilot study explored a range of doses (600 mg twice daily, 1200 mg once daily, and 1200 mg twice daily) over 14 days, finding that higher doses produced greater peak serum LA levels and more pronounced reductions in serum MMP-9 and sICAM-1, but also greater inter-individual variability in pharmacokinetics.[13] The 1200 mg/day dose is also supported by studies in SPMS, where it was used for up to two years without major safety concerns.[11][12]

The duration of LA therapy in RRMS clinical trials has generally ranged from 12 weeks to 14 days in pilot studies, with longer-term data available from SPMS trials extending up to two years.[11][12][6][7][13] Given the absence of robust efficacy data for clinical outcomes in RRMS, the duration of LA therapy should be individualized, with consideration for ongoing monitoring and reassessment of benefit and tolerability. There is no established upper limit (UL) for LA intake, and no consensus on the optimal duration for adjunctive use in RRMS.[12]

Monitoring considerations for LA therapy in RRMS are informed by its safety profile and potential for drug interactions. LA is generally well tolerated, with mild gastrointestinal symptoms (nausea, dyspepsia) being the most commonly reported adverse effects at doses up to 1200 mg/day.[12][10][6][7][13] Rare but clinically relevant risks include hypoglycemia and renal toxicity, particularly in patients with diabetes or pre-existing renal impairment.[12][11][14] LA can potentiate the effects of hypoglycemic agents, increasing the risk of hypoglycemia, and may theoretically interact with nephrotoxic drugs.[12] No hepatotoxicity has been reported in MS patients receiving LA, in contrast to other supplements such as epigallocatechin-3-gallate (EGCG).[12]

Given these considerations, monitoring should include periodic assessment of blood glucose levels in patients at risk for hypoglycemia, especially those with diabetes or on hypoglycemic medications. Renal function should be monitored in patients with known renal impairment or those receiving concomitant nephrotoxic drugs. Routine laboratory monitoring is not required for all patients, but should be considered in those with relevant comorbidities or risk factors.[12] There is no evidence from the available literature of clinically significant pharmacokinetic or pharmacodynamic interactions between LA and standard DMTs for RRMS.[12][10][15][16][13]

Safety Profile, Subgroup Effects, and Long-Term Risks

Short- and Long-Term Safety and Drug Interactions

Lipoic acid is generally well tolerated in patients with MS, including those with RRMS. In randomized controlled trials, oral administration of LA at doses of 1200 mg/day for up to 12 weeks has not been associated with serious adverse events.[6][7][13] The most commonly reported side effects are mild gastrointestinal symptoms, such as nausea and dyspepsia.[12][10][17] Longer-term data are available from studies in SPMS, where LA at 1200 mg/day for two years was associated with a significant reduction in brain atrophy and no major safety concerns, although the population studied was not exclusively RRMS.[11][12]

Potential serious adverse effects, although rare, include hypoglycemia and renal toxicity. LA has been reported to lower blood glucose levels, which may be clinically relevant in patients with diabetes or those on hypoglycemic agents.[12][17] Renal toxic effects have also been described, though these are uncommon and typically associated with high doses or pre-existing renal impairment.[11][14] There is no evidence from the cited literature of hepatotoxicity with LA in MS patients.[12][17]

Analysis of spontaneous reporting systems, including the Italian Phytovigilance System and WHO-VigiBase, provides additional perspective on rare and unpredictable adverse reactions to LA-containing supplements. Over an 18-year period, 116 reports concerning 212 adverse reactions to LA were collected, with skin and gastrointestinal disorders being the most frequently reported. Notably, 38.8% of reports were classified as serious, with insulin autoimmune syndrome (IAS) being the most frequently reported serious event. Other important medical events included angioedema, anaphylactic shock, and hepatic reactions.[18] A recent case series described four biopsy-proven cases of neural epidermal growth factor-like 1 (NELL1)-associated membranous nephropathy following LA supplementation, with a fifth suspected case. All cases were associated with high-grade proteinuria, and remission was achieved after discontinuation of LA and supportive therapy.[14]

A meta-analysis of 71 randomized placebo-controlled clinical studies, encompassing 4749 subjects across a range of indications, found that alpha-lipoic acid supplementation was not associated with an increased risk of any treatment-emergent adverse event, even in subgroups with severe renal impairment, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, or neurological disorders.[17] However, most included studies were of shorter duration than two years, and the meta-analysis did not specifically address MS populations or the unique risks associated with chronic immunomodulatory therapy.

Subgroup Analyses and Special Populations

Current published evidence does not identify any specific subgroups of RRMS patients—whether defined by age, comorbidities, or type of DMT—who may benefit more or less from adjunctive LA supplementation.[6][7][10][12][16][13][9][19] No clinical trial or systematic review has reported differential effects of LA in RRMS based on age or sex. Mechanistic studies have suggested possible sex- and disease-stage-related differences in the immunomodulatory response to LA, but these findings do not translate into clinical outcome data or provide evidence for differential benefit in RRMS subgroups.[16]

The safety profile of LA is generally favorable, but certain comorbidities may influence risk. LA can potentiate hypoglycemic agents and has been associated with rare cases of hypoglycemia and renal toxicity.[12][17][11][14] These risks are most relevant for RRMS patients with diabetes or renal impairment, who may be more susceptible to adverse effects. However, no clinical trial has specifically evaluated LA in RRMS patients with these comorbidities, nor has any study reported differential efficacy or safety in such subgroups.

The integration of LA with standard DMTs has not been systematically studied in RRMS. Most clinical trials of LA have allowed patients to continue their usual DMTs, but have not stratified results by DMT type or assessed interactions with specific agents.[6][7][8][13] Mechanistic studies suggest that LA's anti-inflammatory and antioxidant properties may be complementary to the immunomodulatory effects of DMTs, but there is no clinical evidence of synergistic or antagonistic interactions.[15][16][9]

Real-World Data, Cost-Effectiveness, and Clinical Recommendations

There are no published real-world observational studies or registry data specifically addressing adjunctive LA use in RRMS, including off-label prescribing patterns and patient outcomes.[9][10][19][12] The literature is dominated by preclinical studies, small RCTs, and systematic reviews, with a notable absence of large-scale observational cohorts, registry analyses, or pharmacoepidemiologic studies that would capture real-world utilization, safety, or effectiveness of LA in RRMS populations.

The cost-effectiveness of adjunctive LA in RRMS compared to standard care alone has not been directly evaluated in any published health economic analyses or cost-effectiveness studies.[9][10][1][2][20] The economic burden of MS is substantial, and cost-effectiveness analyses have been extensively conducted for DMTs such as interferon-beta and glatiramer acetate, with incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) often exceeding commonly accepted willingness-to-pay thresholds.[1][2][20] In contrast, there are no published cost-effectiveness analyses or health economic evaluations of LA as adjunctive therapy in RRMS. The absence of such analyses reflects the lack of robust clinical efficacy data for LA in RRMS, as well as the absence of guideline recommendations for its use.

Clinical Recommendations and Research Gaps

Based on the current literature, lipoic acid has demonstrated immunomodulatory and neuroprotective effects in preclinical models and biomarker studies, but there is insufficient evidence from RCTs or meta-analyses to support its use as adjunct therapy to standard DMTs in RRMS for improving relapse rate, disability progression, MRI activity, or patient-reported outcomes.[6][9][10][19][12][7][13][11] The most relevant RCT in RRMS showed immunomodulatory effects but did not demonstrate improvement in disability scores or report relapse rates.[6][7]

Systematic reviews, including the ***Cochrane review, conclude that antioxidant supplementation, including LA, does not have a proven impact on clinical outcomes in MS, and specifically in RRMS, the evidence is insufficient and of low certainty.***[9][10][19] ***No current United States or international MS management guidelines recommend lipoic acid as adjunct therapy for RRMS, reflecting the lack of robust clinical evidence for its efficacy***.[9][12][10]

LA is generally well tolerated at doses up to 1200 mg/day, with mild gastrointestinal symptoms being the most common adverse effect. Rare but clinically relevant risks include hypoglycemia and renal toxicity, particularly in patients with diabetes or renal impairment.[12][11][17][14] There are no documented pharmacokinetic or pharmacodynamic interactions between LA and standard DMTs, and the immunomodulatory effects of LA are mechanistically complementary to those of established therapies.[15][16][13]

The practical considerations for dosing, duration, and monitoring of LA as adjunctive therapy in RRMS are informed by small randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews, which support the use of 1200 mg/day orally for up to 12 weeks, with longer-term safety data available from SPMS studies.[6][7][12][13][11] Monitoring should focus on blood glucose and renal function in at-risk patients, and clinicians should be aware of potential drug interactions, particularly with hypoglycemic agents.[12][11][17][14] There is no evidence of clinically significant interactions with standard DMTs, and the immunomodulatory effects of LA are mechanistically complementary.[15][16][13]

There is no evidence identifying RRMS subgroups who benefit more or less from LA, and no real-world or cost-effectiveness data to inform clinical decision-making.[9][10][19][12][1][2][20] The integration of LA into routine clinical practice for RRMS cannot be justified on the basis of current evidence.

In conclusion, LA should be considered investigational in RRMS, with its use reserved for clinical trials or individualized care after thorough discussion of the evidence and uncertainties. The standard of care for RRMS remains FDA-approved DMTs, with vitamin D supplementation recommended to avoid deficiency. Clinicians should remain informed about ongoing research and counsel patients on the current evidence base, safety considerations, and regulatory status of dietary supplements such as LA.[9][10][19][12]

Further large-scale, well-designed randomized controlled trials are needed to clarify the role of LA in RRMS, including its efficacy, safety, impact on MRI activity and patient-reported outcomes, subgroup effects, and cost-effectiveness. Until such data are available, LA should not be considered a recommended adjunctive therapy for RRMS according to current clinical guidelines and expert consensus.

References

1. Clinical Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness of Beta-Interferon and Glatiramer Acetate for Treating Multiple Sclerosis: Systematic Review and Economic Evaluation. Melendez-Torres GJ, Auguste P, Armoiry X, et al. Health Technology Assessment (Winchester, England). 2017;21(52):1-352. doi:10.3310/hta21520.
2. Effectiveness and Cost-Effectiveness of Interferon Beta and Glatiramer Acetate in the UK Multiple Sclerosis Risk Sharing Scheme at 6 Years: A Clinical Cohort Study With Natural History Comparator. Palace J, Duddy M, Bregenzer T, et al. The Lancet. Neurology. 2015;14(5):497-505. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(15)00018-6.
3. Lipoic Acid Affects Cellular Migration Into the Central Nervous System and Stabilizes Blood-Brain Barrier Integrity. Schreibelt G, Musters RJ, Reijerkerk A, et al. Journal of Immunology (Baltimore, Md. : 1950). 2006;177(4):2630-7. doi:10.4049/jimmunol.177.4.2630.
4. Neuroprotective Effects of A-Lipoic Acid on Long-Term Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis. Li B, Tan GJ, Lin HQ, et al. European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences. 2018;22(19):6517-6528. doi:10.26355/eurrev_201810_16066.
5. A-Lipoic Acid Enhances Endogenous Peroxisome-Proliferator-Activated Receptor-Γ to Ameliorate Experimental Autoimmune Encephalomyelitis in Mice. Wang KC, Tsai CP, Lee CL, et al. Clinical Science (London, England : 1979). 2013;125(7):329-40. doi:10.1042/CS20120560.

6. Does Lipoic Acid Consumption Affect the Cytokine Profile in Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Randomized Clinical Trial. Khalili M, Azimi A, Izadi V, et al. Neuroimmunomodulation. 2014;21(6):291-6. doi:10.1159/000356145.
7. Effect of Lipoic Acid Consumption on Oxidative Stress Among Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. Khalili M, Eghtesadi S, Mirshafiey A, et al. Nutritional Neuroscience. 2014;17(1):16-20. doi:10.1179/1476830513Y.0000000060.
8. Anti-Inflammatory Nutritional Intervention in Patients With Relapsing-Remitting and Primary-Progressive Multiple Sclerosis: A Pilot Study. Riccio P, Rossano R, Larocca M, et al. Experimental Biology and Medicine (Maywood, N.J.). 2016;241(6):620-35. doi:10.1177/1535370215618462.
9. Dietary Interventions for Multiple Sclerosis-Related Outcomes. Parks NE, Jackson-Tarlton CS, Vacchi L, Merdad R, Johnston BC. The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2020;5:CD004192. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004192.pub4.
10. Role of Lipoic Acid in Multiple Sclerosis. Xie H, Yang X, Cao Y, et al. CNS Neuroscience & Therapeutics. 2022;28(3):319-331. doi:10.1111/cns.13793.
11. Lipoic Acid in Secondary Progressive MS: A Randomized Controlled Pilot Trial. Spain R, Powers K, Murchison C, et al. Neurology(R) Neuroimmunology & Neuroinflammation. 2017;4(5):e374. doi:10.1212/NXI.0000000000000374.
12. Use of Vitamins and Dietary Supplements by Patients With Multiple Sclerosis: A Review. Evans E, Piccio L, Cross AH. JAMA Neurology. 2018;75(8):1013-1021. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2018.0611.
13. Lipoic Acid in Multiple Sclerosis: A Pilot Study. Yadav V, Marracci G, Lovera J, et al. Multiple Sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England). 2005;11(2):159-65. doi:10.1191/1352458505ms1143oa.
14. Lipoic Acid Supplementation Associated With Neural Epidermal Growth Factor-Like 1 (NELL1)-associated Membranous Nephropathy. Spain RI, Andeen NK, Gibson PC, et al. Kidney International. 2021;100(6):1208-1213. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2021.10.010.
15. Lipoic Acid Modulates Inflammatory Responses of Monocytes and Monocyte-Derived Macrophages From Healthy and Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis Patients. Fiedler SE, Spain RI, Kim E, Salinthone S. Immunology and Cell Biology. 2021;99(1):107-115. doi:10.1111/imcb.12392.
16. Lipoic Acid Stimulates cAMP Production in Healthy Control and Secondary Progressive MS Subjects. Fiedler SE, Yadav V, Kerns AR, et al. Molecular Neurobiology. 2018;55(7):6037-6049. doi:10.1007/s12035-017-0813-y.
17. Safety Evaluation of A-Lipoic Acid Supplementation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Placebo-Controlled Clinical Studies. Fogacci F, Rizzo M, Krogager C, et al. Antioxidants (Basel, Switzerland). 2020;9(10):E1011. doi:10.3390/antiox9101011.
18. Assessment of Adverse Reactions to A-Lipoic Acid Containing Dietary Supplements Through Spontaneous Reporting Systems. Gatti M, Ippoliti I, Poluzzi E, et al. Clinical Nutrition (Edinburgh, Scotland). 2021;40(3):1176-1185. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2020.07.028.
19. Over-the-Counter Anti-Oxidant Therapies for Use in Multiple Sclerosis: A Systematic Review. Plemel JR, Juzwik CA, Benson CA, et al. Multiple Sclerosis (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England). 2015;21(12):1485-95. doi:10.1177/1352458515601513.
20. Societal Economic Burden of Multiple Sclerosis and Cost-Effectiveness of Disease-Modifying Therapies. Simoens S. Frontiers in Neurology. 2022;13:1015256. doi:10.3389/fneur.2022.1015256.