



WTS Number: 678750



Request Date: 2/11/11 2:42 PM

Conf Number: 214295

Requester: Timothy Jones

Sterne Kessler Goldstein & Fox
1100 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20005

RUSH

Company Phone: 202-371-2600

Delivery: Email

Requester Phone: 202-772-8789

Instructions:

Fax: 202-371-2540

Requester Email: Tjones@skgf.com

Send-To Email: Tjones@skgf.com

Reference: 2286.0030002

2)Ratner et al., J. Fam. Pract. 47(2):118-125 (1998);

Med
Q
7J8163
F2

0094-3509

An outreach service of the Kurt F. Wendt Library, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Email: wts@engr.wisc.edu | Web: http://www.wisc.edu/techsearch | Phone: (608) 262-5917

Requester assumes responsibility for copyright compliance.

Refer Off Campus

THE JOURNAL OF FAMILY PRACTICE

July 1998

Volume 47 Number 1



■ Accuracy of Physician Billing

■ The Future of Family Practice in Managed Care Organizations

■ Evaluation and Management of Unintended Weight Loss in the Elderly

■ A Randomized Trial of Preconception Risk Identification

■ High Prevalence of Obesity in Practice Populations

POEMS

PATIENT-ORIENTED EVIDENCE THAT MATTERS

■ Riboflavin for Migraine Prophylaxis

■ New Oral Therapy for Childhood Asthma

■ Treating Depression in Older Ambulatory Patients



APPLETON & LANGE
A Simon & Schuster Company

***** 3-DIGIT 537
JFP 01001353 GSI #
UNIV OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
HLTH SCI LIBRARY-SERIALS
1305 LINDEN DR
MADISON WI 53706-1523

004/017/0000

THE JOURNAL OF FAMILY PRACTICE

Editorial Office

The Journal of Family Practice
1650 Pierce St
Denver, CO 80214
Telephone: (303) 202-1543
Fax: (303) 202-5136
E-mail: paul.nutting@aspn.amc.org

Editor

Paul A. Nutting, MD, MSPH

Associate Editors

Frank M. Reed, MD
Colleen M. Conry, MD
B. Ned Calonge, MD

Editorial Assistant

Karen Gerdes

Publisher

Appleton & Lange
Communications and
Continuing Education Group
107 Elm Street, PO Box 120041
Stamford, CT 06912-0041
Telephone (203) 406-4500
FAX (203) 406-4603

Vice President and Group Publisher

Martin J. Zittel (203) 406-4615

Managing Editor

Patricia Delano (203) 406-4625

Senior Editor

Maria T. Vlasak (203) 406-4651

Art Designer

Gretchen J. Bruno

Production Manager

Patricia K. Fogle (203) 406-4620

Advertising Coordinator

Nancy Graves (203) 406-4621

Circulation Coordinator

Carol Harms (203) 406-4622

Permissions/Reprint Sales

(203) 406-4616

Greenwich Media Services

Richard Zittel (203) 869-5806

Manager of Custom Communications

Denise Jansson (203) 406-4524

Archival Services

The Journal of Family Practice is indexed in the following: Index Medicus, Current Contents (Clinical Medicine), Science Citation Index, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, EMBASE/Excerpta Medica, International Pharmaceutical Abstracts, PsycINFO/Psychological Abstracts and the Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature. The Journal is also available in microform from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Copyright

This publication is protected by copyright. No part of it may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without written permission of the Publisher.

Permissions Policy

Authorization to photocopy articles in this publication for internal or personal use, or for the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Appleton & Lange to libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transactional Reporting Service, provided that a fee of \$3.00 per article is paid directly to:

CCC
222 Rosewood Dr
Danvers, MA 01923
Telephone (508) 750-8400
FAX (508) 750-4744
0094-3509/97/ + \$3.00/ + 0

This consent does not apply to other kinds of copying, such as copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. Such permission requests, and other inquiries, should be addressed to the Publisher.

Reprints

Authorized reprints may be purchased in quantities of 100 or more. For smaller quantities, back issues may be purchased at the single copy rate. For prices and ordering information, contact Reprints Coordinator, Appleton & Lange, PO Box 120041, Stamford, CT 06912-0041; telephone (203) 406-4616; FAX (203) 406-4603.

Editorial and Advertising Policy

Statements and opinions expressed in articles and communications herein are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the Editor, Publisher, or any organizations endorsing this journal. Neither the Editor, Publisher, nor organizations endorsing this journal guarantee, warrant, or endorse any product or service advertised in this journal, nor do they guarantee any claim made by the manufacturer of such product or service.

Cover Photo

George Shelley @ 1997/The Stock Market

A Comparison of the Efficacy of Fluticasone Propionate Aqueous Nasal Spray and Loratadine, Alone and in Combination, for the Treatment of Seasonal Allergic Rhinitis

Paul H. Ratner, MD; Julius H. van Bavel, MD; Bruce G. Martin, DO; Frank C. Hampel, Jr., MD; William C. Howland, III, MD; Paula R. Rogenes, PhD; Ronald E. Westlund; Brian W. Bowers, PharmD; and Cindy K. Cook
San Antonio, Austin, and New Braunfels, Texas; and Research Triangle Park, North Carolina

BACKGROUND. Intranasal corticosteroids and oral antihistamines are both effective in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis, although the therapeutic value of administering the two types of agents concurrently has rarely been evaluated. This study was designed to compare the efficacy, safety, and impact on quality of life of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray (FP ANS), loratadine, FP ANS plus loratadine, and placebo (an aqueous nasal spray plus tablet) in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis during the mountain cedar allergy season in south central Texas.

METHODS. Six hundred patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis were treated for 2 weeks with either FP ANS 200 µg once daily, loratadine 10 mg once daily, the FP ANS and loratadine regimens combined, or placebo in a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, double-dummy, parallel-group study.

RESULTS. Clinician- and patient-rated total and individual nasal symptom scores after 7 and 14 days of therapy and overall evaluations were significantly lower ($P < .001$) in the FP ANS and FP ANS plus loratadine groups compared with the loratadine only and placebo groups. Loratadine was not statistically different from placebo in clinician and patient symptom score ratings nor in overall clinician and patient evaluations. FP ANS plus loratadine and FP ANS monotherapy were comparable in efficacy in almost all evaluations; for some patient-rated symptoms the combination was found superior. Mean score changes in the Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire from baseline to day 14 showed significantly greater improvement ($P < .001$) in quality of life in the FP ANS group than in the group of patients receiving loratadine only or placebo, and no significant benefit was demonstrated in the FP ANS plus loratadine group over the FP ANS monotherapy group. No serious or unusual drug-related adverse events were reported. Combining loratadine with FP ANS did not alter the adverse events profile or frequency.

CONCLUSIONS. In the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis, FP ANS is superior to loratadine and placebo, and adding loratadine to FP ANS does not confer meaningful additional benefit.

KEY WORDS. Rhinitis, allergic, seasonal; loratadine; antihistamine; fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray [non-MeSH]. (*J Fam Pract* 1998; 47:118-125)

Intranasally administered corticosteroids and nonsedating, second-generation oral antihistamines currently form the core of pharmacotherapy for seasonal allergic rhinitis.^{1,2} Both treatments have been shown to alleviate or significantly reduce the rhinorrhea, sneezing, and nasal itching characteristics of allergic rhinitis.³ While intranasal corticosteroids reduce nasal blockage more effectively than oral antihistamines,¹ antihista-

mines tend to have a more pronounced effect on eye symptoms.^{1,2} The choice of one mode of pharmacotherapy over the other is generally based on patient preference, with the goal of achieving the most effective control of rhinitis symptoms with the fewest side effects.

One currently available intranasal corticosteroid preparation, fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray (FP ANS) (Flonase Nasal Spray, 0.05% w/v; Glaxo Wellcome Inc, NC), was developed to provide a high ratio of local anti-inflammatory to systemic activity.^{4,7} In clinical trials of 2 to 4 weeks' duration comparing FP ANS with oral antihistamines, FP ANS demonstrated significantly greater effectiveness than loratadine,^{8,11} terfenadine,^{12,14} astemizole,¹⁵ and cetirizine¹⁶ in relieving nasal symptoms of rhinitis.

Drouin and colleagues¹⁷ have suggested that the concomitant administration of an intranasal corticosteroid regimen with an oral antihistamine regimen

Submitted, revised, May 7, 1998. From *Sylvania Research, San Antonio, Texas (P.H.R.); Allergy Associates of Austin Diagnostic Clinic (J.H.V.) and HealthQuest Research (W.C.H.), Austin, Texas; Southwest Allergy and Asthma Research Center, San Antonio, Texas (B.G.M.); and Central Texas Health Research, New Braunfels (F.C.H.); Glaxo Wellcome Inc, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina (R.E.W., B.W.B., P.R.R., C.K.C.). Requests for reprints should be addressed to Paul H. Ratner, MD, Sylvania Research, 7711 Louis Pasteur Drive, Suite 406, San Antonio, TX 78229.*

This material may be protected by Copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)

theoretically should result in greater relief of both nasal and ocular rhinitis symptoms than is achievable with either regimen alone. Although several clinical trials have evaluated the efficacy of intranasal beclomethasone dipropionate in combination with an oral antihistamine,¹⁷⁻¹⁹ and one study has investigated an FP ANS-cetirizine combination,²⁰ there have been no studies to date evaluating a combination of FP ANS and loratadine. The purpose of the present study was to compare the efficacy, safety, and impact on quality of life of FP ANS, loratadine, FP ANS combined with loratadine, and placebo over a 2-week period in the treatment of nasal symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis due to mountain cedar pollen.

METHODS

PATIENTS

Male and nonpregnant female outpatients, aged 12 years or older, were eligible for the study if they had moderate to severe seasonal allergic rhinitis diagnosed according to four criteria: (1) positive (a 2+ reaction, scored on a scale of 0 to 4, defined as a wheal diameter at least 3 mm greater than diluent control) skin test reaction to mountain cedar (*Juniperus ashei*) allergen within 12 months; (2) appearance of the nasal mucosa consistent with a diagnosis of seasonal allergic rhinitis; (3) a history of seasonal onset and offset of symptoms for at least two previous mountain cedar pollen seasons; and (4) moderate to severe symptoms of rhinitis evidenced by patient diary card ratings during a run-in. Patients were ineligible for the study if they had received, before the screening visit, treatment with loratadine within 1 week, astemizole within 6 weeks, cromolyn sodium within 2 weeks, over-the-counter or prescription medications that could affect rhinitis symptomatology (eg, nasal decongestants) within 72 hours, or inhaled, intranasal, or systemic corticosteroids within 1 month. Patients could not have either a septal deviation (>50% blockage) or a nasal polyp that could obstruct penetration of an intranasal spray. Patients were not included if they had a history of nasal septal surgery or nasal septal perforation. Patients were excluded if they had clinically significant physical examination findings at screening, had evidence of candidal infection, or were pregnant or lactating. Patients were also excluded if they had any condition or impairment that might affect their ability to complete the study or provide informed consent.

STUDY DESIGN

The protocol for this double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group comparative trial was approved by an institutional review board for each of the five study sites. All patients or their guardians gave written informed consent. This study was a double-dummy design in which patients randomized to active oral

medication received both a placebo nasal spray and active oral medication, and patients randomized to active nasal spray received both the active nasal spray and placebo oral medication. At the screening visit, clinicians evaluated potential study candidates by rating their nasal symptoms (sneezing, nasal blockage, rhinorrhea, and nasal itching) according to a visual analog scale, ranging from 0 (absent) to 100 (severe),²¹ and by completing the following: a medical history, skin testing for allergy to mountain cedar allergen (if not done within previous 12 months), a physical examination, clinical laboratory tests, pregnancy test, and an examination of the nose and oropharynx for evidence of *Candida*. Patients who had symptoms began the 7- to 30-day run-in period immediately after screening, and patients who were free of symptoms were instructed to record their allergy symptoms associated with mountain cedar as soon as they began, so that the run-in period could be initiated.

During the run-in period and throughout the study, patients used the visual analog scale described above to rate their nasal symptoms daily on diary cards. Symptoms were rated in the evening to represent symptoms for the entire day. To qualify for enrollment, the total nasal symptom score (derived by adding individual symptom scores for nasal blockage, rhinorrhea, sneezing, and nasal itching for the day) was required to be at least 200 of a possible 400 on 4 of the 7 days immediately preceding enrollment.

Patients who met this criterion were randomly assigned on day 0 (baseline) to receive one of four regimens for 14 days: FP ANS 200 µg (two 50-µg sprays per nostril) plus one placebo capsule (to match the loratadine dosing form) once daily at 8 AM; placebo nasal spray (two sprays per nostril) plus one encapsulated loratadine 10-mg tablet once daily at 8 AM; FP ANS 200 µg (two 50-µg sprays per nostril) plus one encapsulated loratadine 10-mg tablet once daily at 8 AM; placebo spray (two sprays per nostril) plus one placebo capsule once daily at 8 AM. The formulation of loratadine used for encapsulation was Claritin tablets (Schering Corporation, Kenilworth, NJ). Dissolution testing confirmed that active capsules were comparable with unencapsulated tablets.

EFFICACY ANALYSIS

Patients recorded their nasal symptoms and use of study medication daily on diary cards throughout the treatment phase. Nasal symptoms were assessed by the clinician on day 0 (before the first dose of drug was administered), day 7, and day 14. During the treatment period, patients were not permitted to use any other medication that might affect rhinitis symptoms. At every clinic visit, clinicians recorded the occurrence of adverse events (defined as any untoward medical occurrence, drug-related or not), recorded concomitant medications used, checked compliance by diary

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.