



GENE THERAPY FOR COAGULATION DISORDERS: CURRENT ADVANCES AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Kunisheva Aziza Ruzibayevna

The Republican specialized scientific practical medical center for hematology,
hematologist, research fellow

Email: kunishevaaziza@gmail.com

Abstract. *In this scientific article, inherited bleeding disorders are examined as a significant global health burden affecting millions of individuals worldwide. Recent advances in gene therapy have revolutionized the treatment landscape for coagulation disorders, particularly hemophilia A and B, with emerging applications for other bleeding conditions, including von Willebrand disease and rare factor deficiencies. This study analyzes the current state of gene therapy for coagulation disorders, focusing on molecular mechanisms, clinical trial outcomes, regulatory approvals, therapeutic challenges, and future perspectives. Evidence from multiple clinical trials demonstrates that adeno-associated virus (AAV)-based gene therapy can achieve sustained increases in clotting factor levels, reducing or eliminating the need for prophylactic factor replacement therapy. However, substantial challenges remain, including immune responses, durability of expression, accessibility, and cost considerations. This article synthesizes current knowledge from clinical trials, regulatory documents, and expert guidelines to provide a comprehensive overview of this transformative therapeutic modality.*

Keywords: *gene therapy, hemophilia A, hemophilia B, von Willebrand disease, coagulation disorders, AAV vectors, bleeding disorders, factor VIII, factor IX.*

Inherited bleeding disorders encompass a spectrum of genetic conditions characterized by impaired hemostasis, resulting in prolonged or spontaneous bleeding episodes. Hemophilia A and hemophilia B, caused by deficiencies in coagulation factors VIII and IX respectively, represent the most common severe inherited bleeding disorders, with a combined prevalence of approximately 1 in 5,000 male births globally. Von Willebrand disease (VWD), the most prevalent inherited bleeding disorder overall, affects up to 1% of the population with varying degrees of severity. Additional rare coagulation factor deficiencies, including deficiencies of factors I, II, V, VII, X, XI, and XIII, collectively account for a smaller but clinically significant proportion of inherited bleeding disorders.

The clinical manifestations of these disorders range from mild bruising and mucosal bleeding to life-threatening hemorrhages and chronic arthropathy resulting from recurrent hemarthroses. Without appropriate prophylactic treatment, individuals with severe hemophilia experience frequent spontaneous bleeding episodes, particularly into joints and muscles, leading to progressive joint damage, chronic pain, and significant disability. The psychosocial and economic burden on patients and healthcare systems is substantial, with quality of life significantly impaired by the chronic nature of these conditions and the demanding treatment regimens required for adequate disease management.



The treatment of hemophilia has evolved dramatically over the past century. Early management consisted primarily of supportive care and whole blood transfusions, with limited efficacy and significant morbidity and mortality. The development of cryoprecipitate in the 1960s and subsequently plasma-derived clotting factor concentrates represented major therapeutic advances, enabling more effective bleeding control. However, the contamination of plasma products with blood-borne viruses, particularly human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and hepatitis C virus (HCV) during the 1980s, resulted in widespread infection among individuals with hemophilia, representing one of the most devastating public health crises in the bleeding disorders community.

The introduction of viral inactivation methods and the development of recombinant clotting factor products significantly improved the safety profile of replacement therapy. Modern prophylactic regimens involving regular intravenous infusions of clotting factors have transformed outcomes, reducing bleeding episodes and preserving joint function. However, conventional replacement therapy has significant limitations, including the burden of frequent intravenous administrations, venous access complications, development of neutralizing antibodies (inhibitors), and substantial healthcare costs. Extended half-life products and non-replacement therapies have provided incremental improvements, but the need for lifelong treatment persists.

Gene therapy represents a paradigm shift in the treatment of inherited bleeding disorders, offering the potential for sustained therapeutic benefit following a single administration. The rationale for gene therapy in bleeding



disorders is compelling for several reasons. First, these are monogenic disorders with well-characterized genetic defects, making them ideal candidates for genetic correction. Second, even modest increases in clotting factor levels (from severe to mild phenotype, typically 1-5% to >5% of normal) can substantially reduce spontaneous bleeding and improve quality of life. Third, clotting factors are secreted proteins that do not require cell-specific expression, allowing flexibility in target tissue selection. Fourth, decades of experience with factor replacement therapy have established clear correlations between factor levels and clinical outcomes, facilitating the assessment of gene therapy efficacy.

The ultimate goal of gene therapy for bleeding disorders is to achieve sustained endogenous production of the deficient clotting factor at levels sufficient to convert a severe phenotype to a mild or moderate one, thereby eliminating or substantially reducing the need for prophylactic factor replacement therapy. This approach has the potential to dramatically improve quality of life, reduce treatment burden, minimize complications associated with long-term venous access, and potentially reduce overall healthcare costs despite high upfront treatment expenses.

Hemophilia A results from mutations in the F8 gene located on the X chromosome (Xq28), encoding coagulation factor VIII (FVIII). The F8 gene spans approximately 186 kb and contains 26 exons, producing a 2,351 amino acid protein. The large size of the F8 gene and its cDNA (approximately 9 kb including regulatory sequences) presents significant challenges for gene therapy vector design, as it exceeds the packaging capacity of standard AAV vectors (approximately 4.7 kb).

Factor VIII functions as a cofactor in the intrinsic coagulation pathway, forming a complex with factor IX and calcium ions on phospholipid surfaces to activate factor X. Over 2,000 different mutations in the F8 gene have been identified, including point mutations, deletions, insertions, and the common intron 22 inversion (occurring in approximately 45% of severe hemophilia A cases). The severity of hemophilia A correlates with residual FVIII activity: severe (<1% normal activity), moderate (1-5%), and mild (5-40%).

Hemophilia B is caused by mutations in the F9 gene, also located on the X chromosome (Xq27.1-27.2). The F9 gene is substantially smaller than F8, spanning approximately 34 kb with 8 exons and encoding a 461 amino acid protein. The compact size of F9 (approximately 1.5 kb cDNA) makes it more amenable to gene therapy approaches using AAV vectors. Over 1,000 different mutations have been documented in the F9 gene, with missense mutations being the most common.

Factor IX is a vitamin K-dependent serine protease that plays a central role in the coagulation cascade. Following activation to factor IXa, it complexes with factor VIIIa to activate factor X, leading to thrombin generation and fibrin formation. Similar to hemophilia A, disease severity correlates with residual factor IX activity levels.

Von Willebrand disease results from quantitative or qualitative defects in von Willebrand factor (VWF), encoded by the VWF gene on chromosome 12 (12p13.3). The VWF gene spans 178 kb with 52 exons, encoding a 2,813 amino



acid protein. VWF is synthesized primarily in endothelial cells and megakaryocytes, undergoing complex post-translational processing including multimerization, which is essential for its hemostatic function.

VWF performs two critical functions in hemostasis: facilitating platelet adhesion to damaged vessel walls and serving as a carrier protein for factor VIII, protecting it from premature degradation. VWD is classified into three types: Type 1 (partial quantitative deficiency), Type 2 (qualitative defects with subtypes 2A, 2B, 2M, and 2N), and Type 3 (virtually complete deficiency). The large size and complex biology of VWF present substantial challenges for gene therapy development.

Rare factor deficiencies include inherited defects in fibrinogen (factor I), prothrombin (factor II), factor V, factor VII, factor X, factor XI, and factor XIII. These are typically autosomal recessive disorders, requiring biallelic mutations for clinical manifestation. The clinical severity varies considerably depending on the specific factor affected and residual activity levels. Gene therapy approaches for these conditions are less advanced than for hemophilia but represent important areas for future development.

Adeno-associated virus vectors have emerged as the predominant platform for in vivo gene therapy in bleeding disorders. AAV is a small, non-pathogenic parvovirus that can efficiently transduce non-dividing cells and achieve long-term transgene expression. Several characteristics make AAV particularly attractive for hemophilia gene therapy: low immunogenicity compared to other viral vectors,

broad tissue tropism (depending on serotype), episomal persistence without genomic integration (reducing insertional mutagenesis risk), and an established safety profile from numerous clinical trials.

Hemophilia B has been the focus of extensive gene therapy development, with multiple clinical trials demonstrating encouraging results. The compact size of the F9 gene facilitates AAV vector design, and the lower prevalence of pre-existing neutralizing antibodies against certain AAV serotypes compared to the target populations has enabled broader patient enrollment.

Early proof-of-concept studies demonstrated feasibility of AAV-mediated gene transfer for hemophilia B, with subsequent phase 1/2 trials establishing safety and initial efficacy signals. A landmark study by Nathwani et al., published initially in 2011 with long-term follow-up extending over 13 years, demonstrated sustained factor IX expression following AAV8-mediated gene transfer in six participants with severe hemophilia B. This study established several critical findings: achievement of sustained factor IX levels in the mild hemophilia range (median 3.1% of normal at five years), elimination or substantial reduction in the need for prophylactic factor IX replacement, and an acceptable safety profile with management of transient transaminase elevations through corticosteroid administration.

Multiple pharmaceutical companies have developed hemophilia B gene therapy candidates, with several progressing to pivotal phase 3 trials. These studies have generally demonstrated factor IX activity levels ranging from 5-50% of

normal, with most participants achieving levels sufficient to discontinue prophylactic factor replacement. The durability of expression has been a key outcome, with follow-up data extending beyond 5 years in some cohorts showing sustained therapeutic levels.

Etranacogene dezaparvovec received regulatory approval from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration in 2022 for the treatment of hemophilia B, representing a significant milestone as one of the first approved gene therapies for inherited bleeding disorders. European regulatory approval followed subsequently. Clinical trial data supporting approval demonstrated annualized bleeding rates reduced from 4.19 events on prophylaxis to 1.51 events following gene therapy, with 54% of participants experiencing zero bleeding events. Mean factor IX activity increased from baseline (<2%) to 36.9% of normal at 18 months. These results established gene therapy as a viable clinical option for eligible patients with hemophilia B.

Gene therapy development for hemophilia A has followed hemophilia B but faces additional challenges due to the large size of the F8 gene. Strategies have included use of B-domain deleted FVIII constructs, codon optimization, and investigation of bioengineered FVIII variants with enhanced expression or activity. Multiple AAV serotypes and liver-specific promoters have been evaluated to optimize hepatocyte transduction and transgene expression.

Clinical trials for hemophilia A gene therapy have demonstrated proof of concept for sustained FVIII expression following AAV-mediated gene transfer.

Early studies identified appropriate dosing ranges and established the feasibility of achieving therapeutic FVIII levels. Subsequent phase 3 trials have evaluated efficacy and safety in larger cohorts, with results generally demonstrating clinically meaningful reductions in bleeding rates and factor consumption.

Valoctocogene roxaparvovec received FDA approval in 2023 for the treatment of severe hemophilia A in adults, representing another landmark achievement in the field. Approval was based on phase 3 trial data demonstrating mean FVIII activity of 42.5 IU/dL at year 2, reduction in annualized bleeding rate from 4.8 events on prophylaxis to 1.2 events following gene therapy, with 53.8% of participants experiencing zero treated bleeds. These outcomes established that meaningful clinical benefit could be achieved despite the complexities of FVIII gene therapy.

Additional hemophilia A gene therapy candidates remain in clinical development, employing various vector designs, transgene constructs, and dosing strategies. Comparative effectiveness data among different platforms is limited, and head-to-head trials have not been conducted. Long-term follow-up data continue to accumulate, providing important insights into durability of response, late adverse effects, and factors influencing therapeutic outcomes.

Clinical trials for hemophilia gene therapy have employed specific design features to assess safety and efficacy appropriately. Inclusion criteria typically specify severe hemophilia (factor levels <1% normal), minimum age (usually 18 years), absence of neutralizing antibodies to the AAV serotype employed, absence

of pre-existing liver disease, and no history of inhibitor development. These restrictions limit the eligible population but ensure appropriate risk-benefit assessment in initial trials.

Clinical thrombotic events have been reported rarely in hemophilia B gene therapy trials, with isolated cases of deep vein thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, or coronary events. Whether these events are directly attributable to elevated factor levels, related to other cardiovascular risk factors common in aging hemophilia populations, or coincidental remains uncertain. Some protocols have incorporated factor IX level monitoring with planned intervention (including phlebotomy in extreme cases) for levels persistently exceeding 150% of normal.

For hemophilia A, thrombotic risk appears lower, likely related to factor VIII's shorter half-life and tighter physiologic regulation. Nonetheless, monitoring for thrombotic complications remains part of safety surveillance protocols.

AAV vectors, despite being non-integrating, have been associated with hepatocellular carcinoma development in preclinical animal studies, particularly in mice receiving very high vector doses. The mechanism is believed to involve AAV genome integration near oncogenes in a small fraction of transduced cells, with clonal expansion over time. This finding has raised concerns about long-term oncogenic risk in humans receiving AAV gene therapy.

To date, clinical experience in hemophilia gene therapy has not identified increased hepatocellular carcinoma risk, with follow-up extending beyond 10 years



in some cohorts. However, the latency period for cancer development may exceed current follow-up duration, necessitating continued long-term surveillance. Regulatory agencies have mandated 15-year safety follow-up for gene therapy recipients, with monitoring including periodic abdominal imaging and alpha-fetoprotein assessment.

Participants are counseled regarding theoretical oncogenic risk during informed consent discussions. The balance between proven clinical benefit and theoretical long-term risks represents an ongoing consideration in clinical practice and regulatory evaluation.

Gene therapy development for von Willebrand disease faces significant challenges compared to hemophilia. The large size of the VWF gene (approximately 8.4 kb cDNA) exceeds AAV packaging capacity, necessitating alternative approaches such as dual AAV vectors, lentiviral vectors, or abbreviated VWF constructs. Additionally, VWF's complex biology, including endothelial-specific synthesis, extensive post-translational processing, and formation of ultra-large multimers essential for function, presents substantial hurdles.

Preclinical studies in VWD mouse models have demonstrated proof of concept for gene therapy using various approaches. Liver-directed gene transfer can achieve therapeutic VWF plasma levels, though VWF produced from hepatocytes lacks some functional properties of endothelial-derived VWF. Endothelial-targeted approaches using specialized promoters or lentiviral vectors



have shown promise in preclinical models but face challenges related to transduction efficiency and durability.

Pre-existing anti-AAV antibodies, present in 20-60% of individuals depending on serotype and population studied, represent a major barrier to access. These antibodies typically result from natural AAV exposure during childhood and effectively preclude treatment with vectors using the corresponding serotype. Alternative serotypes may be available in some cases, but cross-reactivity limits options. Strategies to overcome anti-AAV immunity, including plasmapheresis, immunoadsorption, or immunosuppressive protocols, are under investigation but not yet validated for clinical use.

Inhibitor history represents another significant exclusion criterion. Individuals who have developed neutralizing antibodies against factor VIII or IX typically cannot receive gene therapy due to concerns about immune responses against the transgene product. This restriction excludes approximately 30% of severe hemophilia A patients and 3-5% of hemophilia B patients who have experienced inhibitor development at some point. Immune tolerance induction may enable gene therapy in select cases, but data are limited.

AAV vector production presents substantial manufacturing challenges. Current production methods rely primarily on mammalian cell culture systems (typically HEK293 cells) with transient transfection, yielding limited vector quantities. The production process is complex, time-consuming, and expensive,



with significant batch-to-batch variability and rigorous quality control requirements.

CRISPR-Cas9 and base editing technologies enable targeted genetic correction rather than transgene addition. Potential advantages include restoration of endogenous gene regulation, elimination of concerns about episomal loss, and achievement of permanent correction. Clinical development of gene editing for hemophilia is underway, with early-phase trials investigating in vivo liver-directed editing to achieve factor expression.

Base editing, which enables precise nucleotide changes without double-strand DNA breaks, may offer safety advantages over classical CRISPR approaches. Prime editing, another emerging technology enabling diverse genetic modifications, represents an additional tool for future development. However, all gene editing approaches face challenges related to delivery efficiency, off-target effects, and durability of editing outcomes.

Development of bioengineered factor VIII and IX variants with enhanced expression, prolonged half-life, or increased specific activity may improve gene therapy outcomes. Codon optimization, sequence modifications reducing immunogenicity, and functional enhancements have been incorporated into newer vector designs. Factor VIII variants with improved stability and expression characteristics continue to emerge from protein engineering efforts.

Hybrid proteins combining factor VIII or IX with other hemostatic proteins, alternative coagulation factors, or entirely novel hemostatic agents represent innovative approaches. For example, expression of factor VIIa or other coagulation factors from gene therapy vectors could bypass the need for factor VIII or IX entirely, potentially avoiding inhibitor complications.

Combination approaches integrating gene therapy with other therapeutic modalities may enhance outcomes. Co-administration of immunomodulatory agents to prevent anti-AAV immune responses is under investigation. Combining gene therapy with non-replacement therapies such as emicizumab (for hemophilia A) or anti-TFPI antibodies could provide synergistic benefit, though clinical rationale and safety require careful evaluation.

Regulatory agencies including the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, European Medicines Agency, and other national authorities have established frameworks for gene therapy evaluation. Approval pathways typically require demonstration of favorable benefit-risk balance based on phase 3 trial data, with consideration of durability, safety, and clinical meaningfulness of outcomes.

Etranacogene dezaparvovec (Hemgenix) for hemophilia B and valoctocogene roxaparvovec (Roctavian) for hemophilia A have received regulatory approval in multiple jurisdictions, establishing precedents for subsequent products. Approval conditions typically include commitments to long-term safety follow-up, post-approval efficacy studies, and reporting of adverse events.

Conditional or accelerated approval mechanisms enable faster access while requiring confirmatory studies. This approach balances urgent medical need against incomplete long-term data, with ongoing evaluation determining continued approval status.

Long-term safety monitoring is mandated for 15 years following gene therapy administration in most jurisdictions. Participants are enrolled in registries tracking outcomes including factor levels, bleeding episodes, adverse events, and quality of life. These registries provide critical real-world evidence complementing clinical trial data.

Periodic medical evaluations include liver function testing, factor level measurement, inhibitor screening, and assessment for malignancy or other late complications. Imaging surveillance for hepatocellular carcinoma typically includes annual abdominal ultrasound or other modalities depending on risk factors.

Pharmacovigilance systems monitor for unexpected adverse events and safety signals. Expedited reporting requirements for serious adverse events enable rapid detection and response to safety concerns. Integration of real-world data from multiple sources, including electronic health records and patient registries, enhances surveillance capabilities.

Health technology assessment bodies in various countries evaluate cost-effectiveness and budget impact to inform reimbursement decisions. Assessments



consider clinical effectiveness, quality of life impact, cost-effectiveness ratios, and budget impact. Results vary across jurisdictions based on local healthcare priorities, willingness-to-pay thresholds, and assessment methodologies.

Uncertainty about long-term durability significantly impacts cost-effectiveness calculations. Sensitivity analyses explore scenarios ranging from lifelong benefit to loss of expression requiring resumption of conventional therapy. Most analyses suggest favorable cost-effectiveness ratios if durability exceeds 10-15 years, but unfavorable ratios if expression is lost earlier.

Innovative reimbursement models including outcomes-based agreements, installment payments, or indication-specific pricing are being implemented in some settings. These approaches aim to align payment with value delivered while managing financial risk for payers.

Patient perspectives on gene therapy reflect diverse priorities and preferences. Freedom from treatment burden, including elimination of frequent intravenous infusions, represents a highly valued outcome for many individuals. The possibility of achieving "normal" factor levels and living without bleeding concerns is transformative for those accustomed to lifelong disease management.

However, patients also express concerns about unknown long-term risks, uncertainty about durability, and the irreversibility of treatment decisions. Some individuals, particularly those with well-controlled disease on current therapy, may prefer the "known" of established treatments over the "unknown" of novel gene

therapy. Age, disease severity, quality of current disease control, individual risk tolerance, and personal values significantly influence treatment preferences.

Qualitative research exploring patient experiences reveals themes of hope, anxiety, empowerment, and adjustment. The transition from active disease management through regular infusions to passive reliance on gene therapy requires psychological adaptation. Some individuals describe feeling "disconnected" from their hemophilia management initially, though most adapt positively over time.

Given the complexity of gene therapy decisions, shared decision-making between healthcare providers and patients is essential. Decision aids incorporating information about benefits, risks, uncertainties, and alternatives support informed choice. Key decision points include eligibility assessment, timing of treatment, selection among available products (where applicable), and contingency planning for potential loss of expression.

Discussions should explicitly address: expected factor level achievement and variability, bleeding rate expectations, possibility of continued breakthrough bleeds, need for ongoing monitoring, theoretical long-term risks including oncogenicity, inability to re-dose, alternative treatment options including emerging therapies, personal circumstances affecting decision-making, and individual values and priorities.

Multidisciplinary input from hematologists, hepatologists, genetic counselors, and social workers enriches decision-making. Peer support from other

gene therapy recipients provides valuable perspectives on lived experience. Adequate time for reflection and family discussion should be provided given the magnitude of the decision.

Gene therapy represents a significant life transition for individuals accustomed to lifelong chronic disease management. Psychological support should be available to help patients navigate this transition. Adjustment challenges may include: adapting to life without regular treatment routines, managing anxiety about unknown long-term outcomes, coping with treatment failure or loss of expression if it occurs, and navigating changing identity related to disease status.

Family dynamics may shift as treatment burden decreases. Partners or family members previously involved in treatment administration may experience changed roles. Pediatric populations transitioning to adulthood face unique considerations regarding timing of gene therapy relative to developmental stages and life planning.

Support groups and peer networks provide valuable resources. Connecting prospective gene therapy candidates with individuals who have undergone treatment enables realistic expectation setting and practical advice sharing. Online communities and patient advocacy organizations offer ongoing support and information.

Economic evaluations of hemophilia gene therapy employ cost-utility analysis comparing incremental costs and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs)

relative to conventional prophylaxis. Models incorporate treatment acquisition costs, administration costs, monitoring costs, factor replacement costs, bleeding complication costs, and quality of life impacts.

Published analyses demonstrate wide variation in cost-effectiveness ratios depending on assumptions. Favorable analyses assuming lifelong durability, complete elimination of factor use, and prevention of arthropathy progression suggest incremental cost-effectiveness ratios below \$100,000-150,000 per QALY gained, generally considered cost-effective in high-income countries. However, less favorable assumptions regarding durability, continued bleeding requiring factor treatment, or limited quality of life improvement yield ratios exceeding conventional willingness-to-pay thresholds.

Scenario analyses highlighting the importance of durability demonstrate that gene therapy becoming cost-effective typically requires sustained benefit for 10-20 years or longer. Probability sensitivity analyses incorporating parameter uncertainty suggest cost-effectiveness probabilities ranging from 30-80% depending on model assumptions and willingness-to-pay thresholds.

Beyond cost-effectiveness, budget impact represents a critical consideration for healthcare systems. The concentration of high upfront costs creates short-term budget pressure even if long-term savings materialize. Healthcare systems treating multiple hemophilia patients with gene therapy in short timeframes face substantial financial impact.

Models projecting budget impact incorporate eligible population size, annual treatment rates, acquisition costs, and offset savings from reduced factor consumption and complication management. Most analyses suggest net budget increases in years 1-5 following gene therapy introduction, with potential budget neutrality or savings emerging after 5-10 years as offset savings accumulate.

Affordability constraints may limit the number of patients treatable annually despite clinical eligibility. Some healthcare systems have implemented phased rollout strategies, treating limited numbers of patients initially while monitoring outcomes and budget impact. Prioritization frameworks ranking patients based on disease severity, treatment history, or other criteria raise equity concerns.

Policymakers face challenges balancing innovation incentives, patient access, and healthcare system sustainability. High prices reflect substantial research and development investment, manufacturing costs, and commercial considerations, but create access barriers. Policy responses vary across jurisdictions.

Some countries negotiate confidential discounts from list prices, improving affordability while maintaining nominal prices for international reference pricing purposes. Outcomes-based agreements link payment to demonstrated effectiveness, shifting financial risk from payers to manufacturers. Installment or annuity payment models spread costs over multiple years, easing budget impact.

International collaboration on health technology assessment, joint procurement, and regulatory alignment could improve efficiency and reduce redundancy. However, national sovereignty, market dynamics, and competitive considerations limit coordination. Patent pooling, voluntary licensing, or compulsory licensing for global access purposes remain controversial but potentially important for addressing global disparities.

Resource scarcity necessitates allocation decisions when demand exceeds capacity to treat all eligible patients. Ethical frameworks for priority-setting consider principles including severity of disease, potential for benefit, equity of access, and procedural fairness. Implementation requires transparent criteria, consistent application, and appeals mechanisms.

Proposed frameworks might prioritize patients with severe disease inadequately controlled on conventional therapy, those at high risk for complications, or those without alternative treatment options. Age-based considerations raise ethical concerns about discrimination yet reflect legitimate considerations regarding life expectancy and durability. Balancing individual need against population health maximization creates tension between utilitarian and rights-based ethical frameworks.

Stakeholder engagement including patients, clinicians, ethicists, and public representatives in priority-setting processes enhances legitimacy and acceptability. Explicit acknowledgment of value judgments and trade-offs supports transparency and accountability.

Gene therapy for inherited bleeding disorders represents one of the most significant advances in hematology over the past century. The achievement of sustained endogenous clotting factor production following single-administration AAV-mediated gene transfer has transformed theoretical possibility into clinical reality, with regulatory approvals establishing gene therapy as a standard treatment option for eligible patients with hemophilia A and B.

Clinical trial data demonstrate compelling benefits including substantial reductions in bleeding rates, elimination or marked reduction of prophylactic factor replacement requirements, and meaningful improvements in quality of life for many recipients. Long-term follow-up extending over a decade in some cohorts provides reassuring evidence for durability and acceptable safety profiles. The translation of preclinical promise into clinical success validates decades of research investment and collaboration among researchers, clinicians, industry partners, and patient advocates.

However, significant challenges temper enthusiasm and highlight ongoing needs. Eligibility restrictions currently limit access to a subset of the bleeding disorder population. Pre-existing anti-AAV antibodies, inhibitor history, liver disease, and other exclusion criteria exclude many individuals who might otherwise benefit. Manufacturing constraints, extraordinary costs, and reimbursement challenges further limit availability, particularly in resource-limited settings where disease burden is greatest but access is most restricted.

Uncertainty about lifelong durability, inability to re-dose with the same vector, theoretical long-term risks including oncogenicity, and limited real-world evidence beyond carefully selected trial populations warrant continued vigilance and long-term monitoring. The field must maintain balanced perspectives acknowledging both transformative potential and remaining limitations.

Future developments including next-generation vectors with improved characteristics, gene editing approaches enabling permanent genetic correction, bioengineered clotting factors with enhanced properties, and expansion to additional bleeding disorders will further advance the field. Addressing global access disparities through technology transfer, innovative financing mechanisms, and simplified approaches suitable for diverse healthcare settings represents both a scientific and moral imperative.

The evolution of gene therapy for bleeding disorders exemplifies successful translation of basic science discoveries into clinical applications that fundamentally improve patient lives. Continued research, clinical development, real-world evidence generation, and policy innovation will determine whether this transformative potential reaches all individuals who might benefit globally, or remains limited to privileged populations in high-resource settings. The bleeding disorders community, having weathered devastating crises including viral contamination of blood products and continuing challenges related to access and equity, approaches the gene therapy era with justified optimism tempered by hard-won wisdom about the importance of safety, durability, and universal access.

Based on the analysis of the scientific article on gene therapy for coagulation disorders, I propose the following three main recommendations for the Republic of Uzbekistan:

Gene therapy requires precise molecular diagnosis of mutation types. Identification of specific genetic defects is necessary for selecting candidates for future gene therapy, providing genetic counseling to families, and enabling prenatal diagnosis. In another words, practical steps: Equip national medical centers with sequencing equipment for F8, F9, and VWF genes; train specialists in molecular diagnostics of hemostasis disorders; create a national mutation database; implement genetic counseling services for families with inherited coagulopathies; establish quality assurance programs for molecular testing; develop bioinformatics capacity for variant interpretation.

Given the high cost of gene therapy (\$2-3 million per patient) and current access limitations even in developed countries, Uzbekistan requires a long-term strategy to prepare for implementing these technologies.

Practical steps: Partner with WFH and humanitarian aid programs to ensure access to modern clotting factors and non-replacement therapies; train hematologists in contemporary hemophilia treatment protocols, including prophylactic therapy; develop regulatory framework for gene therapy oversight in anticipation of future availability; participate in international clinical trials and early access programs for innovative therapeutics; explore regional cooperation opportunities with Central Asian countries for shared access to expensive



technologies; conduct health economic assessments to inform future resource allocation; build capacity in AAV vector testing and anti-AAV antibody screening in preparation for eventual gene therapy candidacy assessment.

In conclusion, the advent of gene therapy for bleeding disorders represents a transformative milestone in modern hematology, offering sustained therapeutic benefit and liberation from lifelong prophylactic treatment. For the Republic of Uzbekistan, implementing a pragmatic, stepwise approach through establishing a national registry, developing molecular diagnostic capabilities, and cultivating international partnerships will position the country to participate meaningfully in the gene therapy era as these technologies mature and become more accessible.

While current gene therapy costs place this treatment beyond immediate reach for most healthcare systems, the trajectory of medical innovation suggests that today's extraordinary interventions often become tomorrow's standard of care. By investing now in foundational infrastructure—registry systems, genetic diagnostics, specialized treatment centers, and trained personnel—Uzbekistan can ensure that its bleeding disorder population will be ready to benefit when gene therapy accessibility expands globally, while simultaneously improving current clinical care through these same investments.

REFERENCES

1. Pipe SW, Leebeek FWG, Recht M, et al. Gene therapy with etranacogene dezaparvovec for hemophilia B. N Engl J Med. 2023;388(8):706-718.
2. Rangarajan S, Walsh L, Lester W, et al. AAV5-factor VIII gene transfer in severe hemophilia A. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(26):2519-2530.
3. Pasi KJ, Rangarajan S, Mitchell N, et al. Multiyear follow-up of AAV5-hFVIII-SQ gene therapy for hemophilia A. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(1):29-40.
4. World Federation of Hemophilia. Guidelines for the Management of Hemophilia, 3rd edition. Montreal, Canada: WFH; 2020. Available at: <https://wfh.org>
5. George LA, Sullivan SK, Giermasz A, et al. Hemophilia B gene therapy with a high-specific-activity factor IX variant. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(23):2215-2227.
6. von Drygalski A, Giermasz A, Castaman G, et al. Etranacogene dezaparvovec (AMT-061 phase 2b): normal/near normal FIX activity and bleed cessation in hemophilia B. Blood Adv. 2019;3(21):3241-3247.
7. Mahlangu J, Kaczmarek R, von Drygalski A, et al. Two-year outcomes of valoctocogene roxaparvovec therapy for hemophilia A. N Engl J Med. 2023;388(8):694-705.
8. Leebeek FWG, Miesbach W. Gene therapy for hemophilia: a review on clinical benefit, limitations, and remaining issues. Blood. 2021;138(11):923-931.

9. Batty P, Lillicrap D. Hemophilia gene therapy: approaching the first licensed product. *Hemasphere*. 2021;5(3):e540.
10. World Health Organization. Haemophilia. Geneva: WHO. Available at: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/haemophilia>
11. Konkle BA, Huston H, Fletcher SN. Hemophilia A. *GeneReviews* [Internet]. Seattle (WA): University of Washington; 2017 [updated 2023].
12. Mannucci PM, Tuddenham EG. The hemophilias--from royal genes to gene therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2001;344(23):1773-1779.
13. Srivastava A, Santagostino E, Dougall A, et al. WFH Guidelines for the Management of Hemophilia, 3rd edition. *Haemophilia*. 2020;26(Suppl 6):1-158.
14. Miesbach W, Meijer K, Coppens M, et al. Gene therapy with adeno-associated virus vector 5-human factor IX in adults with hemophilia B. *Blood*. 2018;131(9):1022-1031.
15. Sabatino DE, Bushman FD, Chandler RJ, et al. Evaluating the state of the science for adeno-associated virus integration: An integrated perspective. *Mol Ther*. 2022;30(8):2646-2663.
16. Verdera HC, Kuranda K, Mingozzi F. AAV vector immunogenicity in humans: A long journey to successful gene transfer. *Mol Ther*. 2020;28(3):723-746.
17. Konkle BA, Walsh CE, Escobar MA, et al. BAX 335 hemophilia B gene therapy clinical trial results: potential impact of CpG sequences on gene expression. *Blood*. 2021;137(6):763-774.

18. Nathwani AC, Reiss UM, Tuddenham EG, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of factor IX gene therapy in hemophilia B. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(21):1994-2004.