sight-threatening condition, for which there are no current therapeutic options.

The size and the scope of our article were limited by the nature of a retrospective chart review, which only allows analysis of follow-up that occurred within the defined time frame. Additional factors limiting the scope and length of the study included (1) the logistical and financial complexity involved in following up patients in two geographically separated states; (2) the differences in available equipment in the two institutions; and (3) the importance of sharing a potential new treatment with the ophthalmic community sooner rather than later.

The retrospective chart review process was begun while the senior author was at the University of Florida, and because he moved from Florida to Massachusetts, the analysis was carried out in Massachusetts, and appropriate Institutional Review Board approval from the Massachusetts site was published in the article.

The valproic acid treatment regimen analysed retrospectively in the charts of the seven patients is detailed in the article. Prospective follow-up was not carried out, nor is it allowed under the mandate of a retrospective chart review. To clarify, the treatment of patients with valproic acid has not been stopped for any of the patients who tolerated it well (most of the patients). Our retrospective chart review reported on in the BJO article captured a relatively short period for a slowly progressive condition such as RP, and we recognise that the most rigorous validation of a therapy will be a well-designed clinical trial. A prospective, multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled clinical trial is in the final stages of preparation[3] in the USA, and we will be registering this clinical trial very soon at the US clinical trials website, http://www.clinicaltrials.gov.

On a separate note, as part of our current clinical practice in Massachusetts, several RP patients new to our practice have been treated with valproic acid; our clinical impressions of these new patients are similar to what was reported in our article.

There is mounting evidence that valproic acid may have potent neuroprotective properties and have other beneficial effects,[4–6] and we have an intensive programme of in vitro and in vivo experiments (including mice models of RP) under way. The results of our experiments in the context of retinal degenerative conditions have been reported at recent meetings.[7–11] We are planning to submit these data as articles to peer-reviewed journals.

Our work has been motivated by the spirit of translational research, with the goal of more quickly identifying a promising therapeutic approach and stimulating scientific interest and further research, based on preclinical data and unexpectedly positive vision function observed in a clinical setting. Repurposing drugs such as valproic acid, which have been shown to be safe, is an economical and time-efficient way to quickly bring new treatments to patients.

Christine M Clemson,[1] Radouil Tzekov,[1] Jenna M Checchi,[1] Mark Krebs,[2] Shalesh Kaushal[1]

[1]Department of Ophthalmology, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, Massachusetts, USA; [2]University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

Correspondence to Dr Shalesh Kaushal, Department of Ophthalmology, Eye Center, University of Massachusetts Medical School, 281 Lincoln Street, Worcester, MA 01605, USA; shalesh.kaushal@umassmemorial.org

Competing interests None.

Ethics approval Ethics approval was provided by the University of Massachusetts Medical School IRB.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; not externally peer reviewed.

Accepted 20 September 2010
Published Online First 28 October 2010

Br J Ophthalmol 2011;**95**:153–154.
doi:10.1136/bjo.2010.195768

REFERENCES

1. **van Schooneveld MJ,** van den Born LI, van Genderen M, *et al*. The conclusions of Clemson *et al* concerning valproic acid are premature (letter). *Br J Ophthalmol* Published Online First: 22 October 2010. doi:10.1136/bjo.2010.194373.
2. **Clemson CM,** Tzekov R, Krebs M, *et al*. Therapeutic potential of valproic acid for retinitis pigmentosa. *Br J Ophthalmol* Published Online First: 20 July 2010. doi:10.1136/bjo.2009.175356.
3. http://www.umassmed.edu/valproic_acid_shown_to_halt_vision_loss_in_patients.aspx.
4. **Monti B,** Polazzi E, Contestabile A. Biochemical, molecular and epigenetic mechanisms of valproic acid neuroprotection. *Curr Mol Pharmacol* 2009;**2**:95–109.
5. **Suuronen T,** Nuutinen T, Ryhanen T, *et al*. Epigenetic regulation of clusterin/apolipoprotein J expression in retinal pigment epithelial cells. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2007;**357**:397–401.
6. **Yasuda S,** Liang MH, Marinova Z, *et al*. The moodstabilizers lithium and valproate selectively activate the promoter IV of brain-derived neurotrophic factor in neurons. *Mol Psychiatry* 2009;**14**:51–9.
7. **Kaushal S,** Noorwez SM, Tzekov R, *et al*. The effect of valproic acid in mouse models of RP. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:E-Abstract 3735.
8. **Noorwez SM,** Kaushal S. Dose-dependent differential effect of HDAC inhibitors on yields of folded P23H and WT rhodopsin. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:E-Abstract 5979.
9. **Upadhyay SJ,** Hossain JA, Krebs MP, *et al*. Effect of HDAC inhibitors on oxidative apoptosis of RPE cells. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:E-Abstract 496.
10. **Peters GB III,** Banzon T, Maminishkis A, *et al*. Valproic acid decreases retinal thickness in AMD patients and increases fluid absorption across human retinal pigment epithelium in vitro. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2010;51:E-Abstract 4957.
11. **Noorwez S,** Kaushal S. *Dose-Dependent Differential Effect of HDAC Inhibitors on Yields of Folded Rhodopsin. XIX Biennial Meeting of the International Society of Eye Research (ISER)*, Montreal, Canada. Abstract 797.

CORRECTIONS

doi:10.1136/bjo.2006.109660corr2

M A Elgohary, McCluskey PJ, Towler HMA, *et al*. Outcome of phacoemulsification in patients with uveitis. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2007;**91**:916–21. In the previous issue, we listed a correction to the DOI of this article under the DOI: 10.1136/bjo.2006.109660corr1. The correct DOI is 10.1136/bjo.2006.109660; this is the DOI that the article was published with and the correction in the previous issue can be disregarded.

doi:10.1136/bjo.2007.114801

M A Elgohary, McCluskey PJ, Towler HMA, *et al*. Outcome of phacoemulsification in patients with uveitis. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2007;**91**:916–21. This article was published in triplicate online first under the above DOI. The correct DOI is 10.1136/bjo.2006.109660; this is the DOI that the article was published with.

doi:10.1136/bjo.2006.112128

Oliveira-Neto MP, Mattos M, Benchimol E, *et al*. Blepharo-conjunctivitis due to Leishmania (Viannia) Braziliensis cutaneous infection: report of two cases in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Br J Ophthalmol* 10.1136/bjo.2006.112128. This article has been withdrawn.

doi:10.1136/bjo.2009.158089corr1

A A Fawzi, N G Lee, D Eliott, *et al*. Retinal findings in patients with Alport Syndrome: expanding the clinical spectrum. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2009;**93**:1606–1611. For case number 9 in table 1 "Family History – No" should say "Family History – Yes".

doi:10.1136/bjo.2008.151597corr1

M Maia, M E Farah, E B Rodrigues, *et al*. Subretinal Brilliant Blue G migration during internal limiting membrane peeling. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2009;**93**:1687. The order of the authors in this article was published incorrectly; the correct order is: Malerbi FK, Maia M, Farah ME, Rodrigues EB.