ABPI COMPENDIUM OF DATA SHEETS AND SUMMARIES OF PRODUCT CHARACTERISTICS 1999–2000

With The Code of Practice for the Pharmaceutical Industry

Datapharm Publications Limited
12 Whitehall, London SW1A 2DY

than weekly intervals. For maintenance doses of prednisolone, or its equivalent, of 10 mg daily or less, the decrements in dose should not be greater than 1 mg per day, at not less than weekly intervals. For maintenance doses of prednisolone in excess of 10 mg daily, it may be appropriate to employ cautiously larger decrements in dose at weekly intervals.

Some patients feel unwell in a non-specific way during the withdrawal phase despite maintenance or even improvement of the respiratory function. They should be encouraged to persevere with the Rotahaler and withdrawal of systemic steroid continued, unless there are objective signs of adrenal insufficiency.

Patients weaned off oral steroids whose adrenocortical function is impaired should carry a steroid warning card indicating that they may need supplementary systemic steroid during periods of stress, e.g. worsening asthma attacks, chest infections, major intercurrent illness, surgery, trauma, etc.

Replacement of systemic steroid treatment with inhaled therapy sometimes unmasks allergies such as allergic rhinitis or eczema previously controlled by the systemic drug. These allergies should be symptomatically treated with antihistamine and/or topical preparations, including topical steroids.

Treatment with Becotide Rotacaps should not be stopped abruptly.

As with all inhaled corticosteroids, special care is necessary in patients with active or quiescent pulmonary tuberculosis.

Pregnancy: There is inadequate evidence of safety in human pregnancy. Administration of corticosteroids to pregnant animals can cause abnormalities of fetal development including cleft palate and intra-uterine growth retardation. There may therefore be a very small risk of such effects in the human fetus. It should be noted, however, that the fetal changes in animals occur after relatively high systemic exposure. Because beclomethasone dipropionate is delivered directly to the lungs by the inhaled route it avoids the high level of exposure that occurs when corticosteroids are given by systemic routes.

The use of beclomethasone dipropionate in pregnancy requires that the possible benefits of the drug be weighed against the possible hazards. It should be noted that the drug has been in widespread use for many years without apparent ill consequence.

Lactation: No specific studies examining the transference of beclomethasone dipropionate into the milk of lactating animals have been performed. It is reasonable to assume that beclomethasone dipropionate is secreted in milk, but at the dosages used for direct inhalation there is low potential for significant levels in breast milk.

The use of beclomethasone dipropionate in mothers breast feeding their babies requires that the therapeutic benefits of the drug be weighed against the potential hazards to the mother and baby.

Side-effects: Systemic effects of inhaled corticosteroids may occur, particularly at high doses prescribed for prolonged periods. These may include adrenal suppression, growth retardation in children and adolescents, decrease in bone mineral density, cataract and glaucoma.

Candidiasis of the mouth and throat (thrush) occurs in some patients, the incidence increases with doses greater than 400 micrograms beclomethasone dipropionate per day. Patients with high blood levels of *Candida precipitins,* indicating a previous infection, are more likely to develop this complication. Some patients may find it helpful to rinse their mouth thoroughly with water after using the Rotahaler. Symptomatic candidiasis can be treated with topical anti-fungal therapy whilst still continuing with the treatment.

In some patients inhaled beclomethasone dipropionate may cause hoarseness or throat irritation. It may be helpful to rinse the mouth out with water immediately after inhalation.

As with other inhalation therapy, paradoxical bronchospasm may occur with an immediate increase in wheezing after dosing. This responds to a fast-acting inhaled bronchodilator. The preparation should be discontinued immediately, the patient assessed and, if necessary, alternative therapy instituted.

Hypersensitivity reactions including rashes, urticaria, pruritus and erythema, and oedema of the eyes, face, lips and throat, have been reported.

Overdosage: Acute. Inhalation of the drug in doses in excess of those recommended may lead to temporary suppression of adrenal function. This does not necessitate emergency action being taken. In these patients treatment with beclomethasone dipropionate by inhalation should be continued at a dose sufficient to control asthma; adrenal function recovers in a few days and can be verified by measuring plasma cortisol.

Chronic. Use of inhaled beclomethasone dipropionate in daily doses in excess of 1,500 micrograms over prolonged periods may lead to adrenal suppression. Monitoring of adrenal reserve may be indicated. Treatment with inhaled beclomethasone dipropionate should be continued at a dose sufficient to control asthma.

Pharmaceutical precautions To keep the Rotacaps capsules in good condition it is important that they are stored in a dry place below 30°C where they will not be exposed to extremes of temperature. A convenient supply may be carried in the special container for the Rotahaler device. The Rotacaps capsules should be inserted into the Rotahaler immediately prior to use to avoid softening. Failure to observe this instruction may affect the delivery of the drug. The Rotacaps must only be used in the Rotahaler.

Legal category POM.

Package quantities Becotide Rotacaps 100 micrograms, 200 micrograms and 400 micrograms are supplied in packs of 112.

Further information Nil.

Product licence numbers
Becotide Rotacaps 100 micrograms 10949/0061
Becotide Rotacaps 200 micrograms 10949/0062
Becotide Rotacaps 400 micrograms 10949/0063

FLIXONASE* AQUEOUS NASAL SPRAY

Presentation Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray is an aqueous suspension of microfine fluticasone propionate (0.05% w/w) for topical administration to the nasal mucosa by means of a metering, atomising spray pump. Each 100 mg of spray delivered by the nasal adaptor contains 50 micrograms of fluticasone propionate.

Other ingredients: Microcrystalline cellulose, sodium carboxymethylcellulose, dextrose, polysorbate 80, purified water, benzalkonium chloride and phenylethylalcohol.

Uses Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray is indicated for the prophylaxis and treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis including hayfever, and perennial rhinitis. Fluticasone propionate has potent anti-inflammatory activity but when used topically on the nasal mucosa has no detectable systemic activity.

Dosage and administration Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray is for administration by the intranasal route only.

Adults and children over 12 years of age: For the prophylaxis and treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis and perennial rhinitis: two sprays into each nostril once a day, preferably in the morning. In some cases two sprays into each nostril twice daily may be required. The maximum daily dose should not exceed four sprays into each nostril.

Elderly: The normal adult dosage is applicable.

Children under 12 years of age: For the prophylaxis and treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis and perennial rhinitis in children aged 4 to 11 years a dose of one spray into each nostril once daily is recommended. In some cases one spray into each nostril twice daily may be required. The maximum daily dose should not exceed two sprays into each nostril.

For full therapeutic benefit regular usage is essential. The absence of an immediate effect should be explained to the patient as maximum relief may not be obtained until after 3 to 4 days of treatment.

Contra-indications, warnings, etc
Contra-indications: Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray is contra-indicated in patients with hypersensitivity to any of its ingredients.

Precautions: Infections of the nasal airways should be appropriately treated but do not constitute a specific contra-indication to treatment with Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray.

The full benefit of Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray may not be achieved until treatment has been administered for several days.

Care must be taken while transferring patients from systemic steroid treatment to Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray if there is any reason to suppose that their adrenal function is impaired.

Although Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray will control seasonal allergic rhinitis in most cases, an abnormally heavy challenge of summer allergens may in certain instances necessitate appropriate additional therapy, particularly to control eye symptoms.

Pregnancy: There is inadequate evidence of safety in human pregnancy. Administration of corticosteroids to pregnant animals can cause abnormalities of fetal development, including cleft palate and intra-uterine growth retardation. There may therefore be a very small risk of such effects in the human fetus. It should be noted, however, that the fetal changes in animals occur after relatively high systemic exposure; direct intranasal application ensures minimal systemic exposure.

As with other drugs the use of Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray during human pregnancy requires that the possible benefits of the drug be weighed against the possible hazards.

Lactation: The secretion of fluticasone propionate in human breast milk has not been investigated. Subcutaneous administration of fluticasone propionate to lactating laboratory rats produced measurable plasma levels and evidence of fluticasone propionate in the milk. However, following intranasal administration to primates, no drug was detected in the plasma, and it is therefore unlikely that the drug would be detectable in milk. When fluticasone propionate is used in breast feeding mothers the therapeutic benefits must be weighed against the potential hazards to mother and baby.

Side-effects: Extremely rare cases of nasal septal perforation have been reported following the use of intranasal corticosteroids, usually in patients who have had previous nasal surgery.

As with other nasal sprays, dryness and irritati the nose and throat, unpleasant taste and smel epistaxis have been reported.

Hypersensitivity reactions including skin rash oedema of the face or tongue have been reporte

There have also been rare reports of anaphy anaphylactoid reactions and bronchospasm.

Overdosage: There are no data available on the e of acute or chronic overdosage with Flixo Aqueous Nasal Spray. Intranasal administrati 2 mg fluticasone propionate twice daily for s days to healthy human volunteers had no effe hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis fun inhalation or oral administration of high dos corticosteroids over a long period may lea suppression of HPA function.

Pharmaceutical precautions Shake gently before Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray should be s below 30°C.

Legal category POM.

Package quantities Flixonase Aqueous Nasal Spray is supplied in an amber glass bottle fitted with a metering, atomising pump, nasal adaptor and a dust cover. Each bottle provides approximately 120 metered sprays, when used as recommended.

Further information Nil.

Product licence number 10949/0036

FLIXOTIDE* ACCUHALER*

Qualitative and quantitative composition Flixotide Accuhaler is a moulded plastic device containing a foil strip with 60 regularly placed blisters each containing a mixture of microfine fluticasone propionate (50 micrograms, 100 micrograms, 250 micrograms or 500 micrograms) and larger particle size lactose.

Pharmaceutical form Multi-dose dry powder inhalation device.

Clinical particulars
Therapeutic indications: Fluticasone propionate given by inhalation offers preventative treatment for asthma. At recommended doses it has a potent glucocorticoid anti-inflammatory action within the lungs, with a lower incidence and severity of adverse effects than those observed when corticosteroids are administered systemically. In the majority of patients it has no effect on adrenal function or reserve at recommended doses.

Adults: Prophylactic management in:

Mild asthma: Patients requiring intermittent symptomatic bronchodilator asthma medication on a regular daily basis.

Moderate asthma: Patients with unstable or worsening asthma despite prophylactic therapy or bronchodilator alone.

Severe asthma: Patients with severe chronic asthma and those who are dependent on systemic corticosteroids for adequate control of symptoms. On introduction of inhaled fluticasone propionate many of these patients may be able to reduce significantly, or to eliminate, their requirement for oral corticosteroids.

Children: Any child who requires prophylactic medication, including patients not controlled on currently available prophylactic medication.

Posology and method of administration: Flixotide Accuhaler is for oral inhalation use only. Flixotide Accuhaler is suitable for many patients, including those who cannot use a metered-dose inhaler successfully.

Patients should be made aware of the prophylactic nature of therapy with Flixotide Accuhaler and that it should be taken regularly even when they are

Corporate Intellectual Property

By EPOline ONLY

European Patent Office
D-80298 München
Germany

GlaxoSmithKline Services Unlimited
980 Great West Road
Brentford
Middlesex
TW8 9GS
Tel: +44 (0)20 8047 5000
www.gsk.com

Direct tel +44(0) 1438 76 4024
Direct fax +44 (0)20 8047 6894

14th January 2010

Our ref: JLM/OPP10171

Dear Sirs,

European Patent No: 1 519 731B1
Proprietor: CIPLA Ltd.

This is an opposition to European Patent No. EP 1 519 731 B1, in the name of CIPLA Ltd. The Opponent is Glaxo Group Limited. We attach the following Documents:

(i) Statement of Grounds of Opposition; and
(ii) Documents D1-D3 as listed in the Statement of Grounds of Opposition.

Instructions for the deduction of the Opposition Fee from Account No. 28050015 in the name of GlaxoSmithKline are included with the online submission via Epoline. Please deduct the correct amount if the indicated amount is incorrect.

In the event that the Opposition is deemed inadmissible, or that the EPO considers that the Patent should be maintained, Oral Proceedings under A116 are hereby requested.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Jen L Le Mière
Patent Counsel

Enc: Statement of Grounds of Opposition
D1, EP 0 780 127 A1
D2, Dykewicz journal article
D3, ABPI datasheet, Flixonase

Diagnosis and Management of Rhinitis: Complete Guidelines of the Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters in Allergy, Asthma and Immunology

Mark S Dykewicz, MD,‡ Stanley Fineman, MD, MBA,§ *Editors*

David P Skoner, MD,¶¶ *Chair, Workgroup on Rhinitis*

Richard Nicklas, MD‖; Rufus Lee, MD; Joann Blessing-Moore, MD¶; James T Li, MD, PhD**; I Leonard Bernstein, MD††; William Berger, MD, MBA‡‡; Sheldon Spector, MD§§; and Diane Schuller, MD,|||| *Associate Editors*

This document contains complete guidelines for diagnosis and management of rhinitis developed by the Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters in Allergy, Asthma and Immunology, representing the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology, the American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology and the Joint Council on Allergy, Asthma and Immunology. The guidelines are comprehensive and begin with statements on clinical characteristics and diagnosis of different forms of rhinitis (allergic, non-allergic, occupational rhinitis, hormonal rhinitis [pregnancy and hypothyroidism], drug-induced rhinitis, rhinitis from food ingestion), and other conditions that may be confused with rhinitis. Recommendations on patient evaluation discuss appropriate use of history, physical examination, and diagnostic testing, as well as unproven or inappropriate techniques that should not be used. Parameters on management include use of environmental control measures, pharmacologic therapy including recently introduced therapies and allergen immunotherapy. Because of the risks to patients and society from sedation and performance impairment caused by first generation antihistamines, second generation antihistamines that reduce or eliminate these side effects should usually be considered before first generation antihistamines for the treatment of allergic rhinitis. The document emphasizes the importance of rhinitis management for comorbid conditions (asthma, sinusitis, otitis media). Guidelines are also presented on special considerations in patients subsets (children, the elderly, pregnancy, athletes and patients with rhinitis medicamentosa); and when consultation with an allergist-immunologist should be considered.

Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1998;81:478–518.

CONTRIBUTORS: Donald W Aaronson, MD; Allen D Adinoff, MD; James N Baraniuk, MD; Robert J Dockhorn, MD; William Dolen, MD; Howard M Druce, MD; Marianne Frieri, MD, PhD; Morton P Galina, MD; Leon Greos, MD; Alfredo A Jalowayski, PhD; Craig F La Force, MD; Eli O Meltzer, MD; Robert M Naclerio, MD; Keith M Phillips, MD; Gordon Raphael, MD; Michael Schatz, MD; Michael J Schumacher, MBBS; Howard J Schwartz, MD; Tommy C Sim, MD; Chester T Stafford, MD; William W Storms, MD; Michael J Tronolone, MD; Michael J Welch, MD; Chester C Wood, MD; and Robert S Zeiger, MD, PhD

PRINCIPAL REVIEWERS: Jean A Chapman, MD; Robert A Nathan, MD; John Santilli, Jr, MD; Michael Schatz, MD; and Betty B Wray, MD

This document was developed by the Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters in Allergy, Asthma and Immunology, representing the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology (AAAAI), the American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology (ACAAI) and the Joint Council on Allergy, Asthma and Immunology. The AAAAI and the AACAAI have jointly accepted responsibility for establishing these practice parameters. Because this document incorporated the efforts of many participants, no single individual, including those who served on the Joint Task Force, is authorized to provide an official interpretation of this document by the AAAAI or ACAAI. Any request for information about or an interpretation of this document by the AAAAI or ACAAI should be directed to the Executive Offices of the AAAAI, ACAAI and the Joint Council on Allergy, Asthma and Immunology.

* This parameter was developed with Dr. Nicklas in his private capacity and not in his capacity as a medical officer with the Food and Drug Administration. No official support or endorsement by the Food and Drug Administration is intended or should be inferred.

‡ Division of Allergy and Immunology, Department of Internal Medicine, Saint Louis University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri; § Department of Pediatrics, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia; ¶¶ Departments of Pediatrics & Otolaryngology, Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; ‖ Department of Medicine, George Washington Medical Center, Washington, DC; ¶ Departments of Medicine & Pediatrics, Stanford University Medical Center, Palo Alto, California; ** Department of Medicine, Mayo Clinic & Medical School, Rochester, Minnesota; †† Departments of Medicine & Environmental Health, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, Ohio; ‡‡ Department of Pediatrics, Division of Allergy and Immunology, University of California College of Medicine, Irvine, California; §§ Department of Medicine, University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California; |||| Department of Pediatrics, Pennsylvania State University, Milton S. Hershey Medical College, Hershey, Pennsylvania.

The Joint Task Force has made an intense effort to appropriately acknowledge all contributors to this parameter. If any contributors are inadvertently excluded, the Task Force will insure that appropriate recognition of such contributions is subsequently made.

INTRODUCTION

Rhinitis may be caused by allergic, non-allergic, infectious, hormonal, occupational and other factors. All too often, important causes of rhinitis go unrecognized by both physicians and patients. This leads to suboptimal control of the disease.

Rhinitis is a significant cause of widespread morbidity. Although sometimes mistakenly viewed as a trivial disease, symptoms of rhinitis may significantly impact the patient's quality of life, by causing fatigue, headache, cognitive impairment and other systemic symptoms. Appropriate management of rhinitis may be an important component in effective management of co-existing or complicating respiratory conditions, such as asthma, sinusitis, or chronic otitis media. The cost of treating rhinitis and indirect costs related to loss of workplace productivity resulting from the disease are substantial. The estimated cost of allergic rhinitis based on direct and indirect costs is 2.7 billion dollars for the year 1995, exclusive of costs for associated medical problems such as sinusitis and asthma. Allergic rhinitis, the most common form of rhinitis, affects 20 to 40 million people in the United States annually, including 10% to 30% of adults and up to 40% of children.

This document reviews clinically relevant information about pathogenesis and provides guidelines about diagnosis and management of rhinitis syndromes. Throughout the document, summary statements that articulate key points precede supporting text and relevant citations of evidence-based publications.

DEFINITION OF RHINITIS

1. Rhinitis is defined as inflammation of the membranes lining the nose, and is characterized by nasal congestion, rhinorrhea, sneezing, itching of the nose and/or postnasal drainage.

Rhinitis can be defined as a heterogeneous disorder characterized by one or more of the following nasal symptoms: sneezing, itching, rhinorrhea, and/or nasal congestion. Rhinitis frequently is accompanied by symptoms involving the eyes, ears, and throat. Post-nasal drainage may also be present frequently.

Reference

1. Druce HM. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. In: Middleton EJ, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book Inc, 1998: 1005–1016.

DIFFERENTIAL DIAGNOSIS OF RHINITIS

2. Rhinitis should be classified by etiology as allergic or nonallergic.

Allergic rhinitis is a very common cause of rhinitis. However, since approximately 50% of patients with rhinitis do not have allergic rhinitis, other potential causes must also be ruled out.[1–3] The following outline lists different forms of allergic and non-allergic rhinitis, and conditions that may mimic rhinitis.

I. Allergic rhinitis
   - A. Seasonal
   - B. Perennial
   - C. Episodic
   - D. Occupational (may also be non-allergic)

II. Non-allergic rhinitis
   - A. Infectious
     1. Acute
     2. Chronic
   - B. NARES syndrome (Nonallergic rhinitis with eosinophilia syndrome)
   - C. Perennial nonallergic rhinitis (Vasomotor rhinitis)
   - D. Other rhinitis syndromes
     1. Ciliary dyskinesia syndrome
     2. Atrophic rhinitis
     3. Hormonally-induced
        - A. Hypothyroidism
        - B. Pregnancy
        - C. Oral contraceptives
        - D. Menstrual cycle
     4. Exercise
     5. Drug-Induced
        - A. Rhinitis medicamentosa
        - B. Oral contraceptives
        - C. Anti-hypertensive therapy
        - D. Aspirin
        - E. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
     6. Reflex-Induced
        - A. Gustatory rhinitis
        - B. Chemical or irritant-induced
        - C. Posture reflexes
        - D. Nasal cycle
        - E. Emotional factors
     7. Occupational (may be allergic)

III. Conditions that may mimic symptoms of rhinitis
   - A. Structural/mechanical factors
     1. Deviated septum/septal wall anomalies
     2. Hypertrophic turbinates
     3. Adenoidal hypertrophy
     4. Foreign bodies
     5. Nasal tumors
        - A. Benign
        - B. Malignant
     6. Choanal atresia
   - B. Inflammatory/immunologic
     1. Wegener's granulomatosis
     2. Sarcoidosis
     3. Midline granuloma
     4. Systemic lupus erythematosus
     5. Sjogren's syndrome
     6. Nasal polyposis
   - C. Cerebrospinal fluid rhinorrhea

References

1. Lieberman P. Rhinitis. In: Bone RC, ed. Current practice of medicine. vol 2. Philadelphia: Churchill Livingstone 1996; VII:5.1–VII:5.10.
2. Mygind N, Anggard A, Druce HM. Definition, classification, and terminology [of rhinitis]. In: Mygind N, Weeke B, eds. Allergic and vasomotor rhinitis. Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1985;15.
3. Sibbald B, Rink E. Epidemiology of seasonal and perennial rhinitis: clinical presentation and medical history. Thorax 1991;46:895–901.

Allergic Rhinitis

3. Allergic rhinitis affects 20 to 40 million people in the United States annually, including 10% to 30% of adults and up to 40% of children.

4. **The severity of allergic rhinitis ranges from mild to seriously debilitating.**
5. **The cost of treating allergic rhinitis and indirect costs related to loss of workplace productivity resulting from the disease are substantial. The estimated cost of allergic rhinitis based on direct and indirect costs is 2.7 billion dollars for the year 1995, exclusive of costs for associated medical problems such as sinusitis and asthma. Rhinitis is also a significant cause of lost school days.**
6. **Risk factors for allergic rhinitis include: (1) family history of atopy; (2) serum IgE > 100 IU/mL before age 6; (3) higher socioeconomic class; (4) exposure to indoor allergens such as animals and dust mites; (5) presence of a positive allergy skin prick test.**

Rhinitis is reported to be a very frequent disease, although data regarding the true prevalence of rhinitis are difficult to interpret. Most population surveys rely upon physician-diagnosed rhinitis for their data, and this may give rise to a much lower reporting of rhinitis. Some population studies have been done with questionnaires administered to the subjects followed in many cases by telephone interviews to try to make a specific diagnosis of rhinitis. These studies may reflect a more accurate prevalence of rhinitis but probably still underreport this disease.[1–7]

Most epidemiologic studies have been directed towards seasonal allergic rhinitis, or hay fever, since this symptom complex with its reproducible seasonality is somewhat easier to identify in population surveys. Perennial allergic rhinitis is more difficult to identify because its symptom complex may overlap with chronic sinusitis, recurrent upper respiratory infections, and vasomotor rhinitis.

The prevalence of rhinitis in various epidemiologic studies ranges from 3% to 19%. Studies suggest that seasonal allergic rhinitis (hay fever) is found in approximately 10% to 20% of the population.[2,8–10] One study showed a prevalence of physician-diagnosed allergic rhinitis in 42% of 6-year-old children.[3] Overall, allergic rhinitis affects 20 to 40 million individuals in the United States annually.[11,12]

In childhood, males with allergic rhinitis outnumber females, but the gender ratio becomes approximately equal in adults and may even favor females. Surveys of medical students have resulted in a higher prevalence of rhinitis, but this may be related to the survey technique.[1,6,8]

Allergic rhinitis develops before age 20 in 80% of cases. Studies have shown that the frequency of allergic rhinitis increases with age until adulthood and that positive immediate hypersensitivity skin tests are significant risk factors for the development of new symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis.[1,8,13] There is a greater chance of a child developing allergic rhinitis if both parents have a history of atopy, than if only one parent is atopic. Children in families with a bilateral family history of allergy generally develop symptoms before puberty; those with a unilateral family history tend to develop their symptoms later in life or not at all.[5,10]

There tends to be an increased prevalence of allergic rhinitis in higher socioeconomic classes, in non-whites, in some polluted urban areas, and in individuals with a family history of allergy. Allergic rhinitis is more likely in first-born children. Studies in children in the first years of life have shown that the risk of rhinitis was higher in those youngsters with early introduction of foods or formula, heavy maternal cigarette smoking in the first year of life, exposure to indoor allergens such as animals and dust mite, higher serum IgE levels (>100 IU/mL before age 6), and parental allergic disorders.[3]

Seasonal allergic rhinitis is apparently becoming more common. One study showed that the prevalence of hay fever increased from 4% to 8% in the 10 years from 1971 to 1981.[14] In another study, atopic skin test reactivity increased from 39% to 50% in during an 8-year period of evaluation.[15]

The impact on society is tremendous.[16] The severity of allergic rhinitis ranges from mild to seriously debilitating. The cost of treating allergic rhinitis and indirect costs related to loss of workplace productivity resulting from the disease are substantial. The estimated cost of allergic rhinitis based on direct and indirect costs is 2.7 billion dollars for the year 1995, exclusive of costs for associated medical problems such as sinusitis and asthma. The total direct and indirect cost estimates for allergic rhinitis have been reported to be $5.3 billion for 1996. This figure included the higher indirect costs associated with increased loss of productivity, which, in turn, was related to extensive over-the-counter antihistamine use. Such treatment can cause drowsiness and impair cognitive and motor function (see summary statement #34).

Rhinitis is also a significant cause of lost school attendance, resulting in more than 2 million absent school days in the US annually. In children, there is evidence that symptoms of allergic rhinitis can impair cognitive functioning, which can be further impaired by the use of first generation antihistamines.[17]

References

1. Hagy GW, Settipane GA. Prognosis of positive allergy skin tests in an asymptomatic population. J Allergy 1971;48: 200.
2. Druce HM. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. In: Middleton EJ, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book Inc, 1998:1005–1016.
3. Wright AL, Holberg CJ, Martinez FD, et al. Epidemiology of physician-diagnosed allergic rhinitis in childhood. Pediatrics 1994;94(6):895–901.
4. Aberg N, Engstrom I. Natural history of allergic diseases in children. Acta Pediatr Scan 1990;79:206–211.
5. Aberg N, Engstrom I, Lindberg U. Allergic diseases in Swedish school children. Acta Paediatr Scan 1989;78: 246–252.
6. Fougard T. Allergy and allergy-like symptoms in 1,050 medical students. Allergy 1991;46:20–26.

7. Aberg B, Hesselmar B, Eriksson B. Increase of asthma, allergic rhinitis and eczema in Swedish school children between 1979 and 1991. Clin Exp Allergy 1995;25:815–819.
8. Settipane RJ, Hagy GW, Settipane GA. Long-term risk factors for developing asthma and allergic rhinitis: a 23-year follow-up study of college students. Allergy Proc 1994;51:21–25.
9. Varyonen E, Kalimo K, Lammintausta K. Prevalence of atopic disorders among adolescents in Turku, Finland. Allergy 1992;47:243–248.
10. Smith JM. A five-year prospective survey of rural children with asthma and hay fever. J Allergy 1971;47:23–31.
11. Fireman P. Allergic rhinitis. In: Fireman P, Slavin RG, eds. Atlas of allergies. Philadelphia, PA: JB Lippincott, 1991:9.2–9.18.
12. McMenamin P. Costs of hay fever in the United States in 1990. Ann Allergy 1994;73:35–39.
13. Tang RB, Tsai LC, Hwang B, et al. The prevalence of allergic disease and IgE antibodies to house dust mite in school children in Taiwan. Clin Exp Allergy 1990;20:33–38.
14. Linna O, Kokkonen J, Lukin M. A 10-year prognosis for childhood allergic rhinitis. Acta Pediatr 1992;81: 100–102.
15. Sibbald B, Rink E, O'Souza M. Is the prevalence of atopy increasing? Br J Gen Pract 1990;40:338–340.
16. Ross RN. The costs of allergic rhinitis. Am J Managed Care 1996;2:285–290.
17. Vuurman EF, van Veggel LM, Uiterwijk MM, et al. Seasonal allergic rhinitis and antihistamine effects on children's learning. Ann Allergy 1993;71: 121–126.

7. The symptoms of allergic rhinitis result from a complex allergen-driven mucosal inflammation resulting from an interplay between resident and infiltrating inflammatory cells, and a number of inflammatory mediators and cytokines. Sensory nerve activation, plasma leakage and congestion of venous sinusoids also contribute.

The nasal mucosa is designed to humidify and clean inspired air. The actions of epithelium, vessels, glands, and nerves are carefully orchestrated to perform these functions.[1] Dysfunction of any of these structures may contribute to the symptoms of allergic and nonallergic rhinitis.[2]

References

1. Raphael GR, Baraniuk JN, Kaliner MA. How and why the nose runs. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1991;87: 457–467.
2. Baraniuk JN. Neural control of the upper respiratory tract. In: Kaliner MA, Barnes PJ, Kunkel GK, Baraniuk JN, eds. Neuropeptides in respiratory medicine. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc 1995;79–123.

8. Allergic rhinitis may be characterized by early and late phase responses. Each type of response is characterized by sneezing, congestion and rhinorrhea, but congestion predominates in the latter.

Atopic subjects inherit the tendency to develop IgE-mast cell-TH_2 lymphocyte immune responses. Exposure to low concentrations of dust mite fecal proteins, cockroach, cat, dog and other danders, pollen grains, or other allergens for prolonged periods of time leads to the presentation of the allergen by antigen presenting cells (APC) to CD4+ lymphocytes that release IL3, IL4, IL5, GM-CSF and other cytokines. These promote IgE production against these allergens by plasma cells, mast cell proliferation and infiltration of airway mucosa, and eosinophilia.

Early or immediate allergic response. With continued allergen exposure, increasing numbers of IgE-coated mast cells move into the epithelium, recognize the mucosally-deposited allergen, and degranulate.[1] Mast cell products include preformed mediators such as histamine, tryptase (a mast cell specific marker), chymase (in "connective tissue" mast cells only), kininogenase (generates bradykinin), heparin, and other enzymes. Newly formed mediators include prostaglandin D_2 and the cysteinyl-leukotrienes LTC_4, LTD_4, and LTE_4. These mediators stimulate vessels to leak and produce edema plus watery rhinorrhea; stimulate glands to exocytose their mucoglycoconjugates and antimicrobial substances; and dilate arteriole-venule anastomoses to cause sinusoidal filling and occlusion of nasal air passages. Sensory nerves are stimulated that convey the sensations of nasal itch and congestion, and initiate systemic reflexes such as sneezing paroxysms. Release of these mast cell mediators and induction of these reactions occur within minutes of allergen exposure, and are termed the early or immediate allergic response.[2] While most subjects experience sneezing and copious rhinorrhea after allergen exposure, some subjects have sensations of nasal congestion as their predominant symptom.

Late phase response. The mast cells mediators, including the cytokines, are thought to act upon post-capillary endothelial cells to promote VCAM and E-selectin expression that permits circulating leukocytes to stick to the endothelial cells. Chemoattractants, such as IL-5 for eosinophils, promote the infiltration of the superficial lamina propria of the mucosa with some neutrophils and basophils, many eosinophils, and, at later time points, T lymphocytes and macrophages.[3,4] Over the course of 4 to 8 hours, these cells become activated and release their mediators, which in turn activate many of the proinflammatory reactions of the immediate response. This late occurring inflammatory reaction is termed the "late phase response". While this reaction may be clinically similar to the immediate reaction, congestion tends to predominate.[5] Eosinophil products such as major basic protein, eosinophil cationic protein, hypochlorate, leukotrienes and others are thought to damage the epithelium and other cells, an inflammatory response that promotes the tissue damage of chronic allergic reactions.

TH_2 lymphocytes are thought to play a critical role in promoting the allergic response by releasing their combination of IL3, IL4, IL5, and other cytokines that promote IgE production, eosinophil chemoattraction and survival in tissues, and mast cell recruitment.[6] Cytokines released from TH_2 lymphocytes, mast cells, eosinophils, basophils and epithelial cells may circulate to the hypothalamus and promote the fatigue, malaise, irritabil-

ity, and neurocognitive deficits that commonly afflict those suffering from allergic rhinitis. Glucocorticoids are effective at reducing the release of these cytokines during late phase responses.[7]

Priming response. When allergen challenges are given repeatedly, the amount of allergen required to induce an immediate response decreases.[8] This "priming" effect is thought to be due to the influx of inflammatory cells during ongoing, prolonged allergen exposure and repeated late phase responses. This response is clinically important, since exposure to one allergen (eg, early spring tree pollen) may promote the more exaggerated later responses to another allergen (eg, late spring grass pollen). This priming effect demonstrates the importance of knowing the full spectrum of allergens to which a patient responds, the seasons of their allergic responses, and highlights the need to initiate effective anti-inflammatory therapies before pollen seasons and allergen exposures so that the inflammatory allergic phase will not occur.

References

1. Naclerio RM. Allergic rhinitis. N Engl J Med 1991;325:860–869.
2. Mygind N, ed. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis clinical aspects. Philadelphia: Saunders, PA, 1993.
3. Naclerio RM, Proud D, Togias AG, et al. Inflammatory mediators in late antigen-induced rhinitis. N Engl J Med 1985;313:65–70.
4. Bascom R, Pipkorn U, Lichtenstein LM, Naclerio RM. The influx of inflammatory cells into nasal washings during late response to antigen challenge: effect of corticosteroid pretreatment. Am Rev Respir Dis 1988; 138:406–412.
5. Skoner DP, Doyle WJ, Boehm S, Fireman P. Late phase eustachian tube and nasal allergic responses associated with inflammatory mediator elaboration. Am J Rhinol 1988;2:155–161.
6. Durham SR, Sun Ying M, Varney VA, et al. Cytokine messenger RNA expression for IL-3, IL-4, IL-5 and granulocyte/macrophage-cloning-stimulating factor in the nasal mucosal after local allergen provocation: relationship to tissue eosinophilia. J Immunol 1992;148:2390–2394.
7. Sim TC, Reece LM, Hilsmeier KA, et al. Secretion of chemokines and other cytokines in allergen-induced nasal responses: inhibition by topical steroid treatment. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1995;152:927–933.
8. Connell JT. Quantitative intranasal pollen changes. III. The priming effect in allergic rhinitis. J Allergy 1969;50: 43–44.

Seasonal and Perennial Allergic Rhinitis

9. Symptoms of allergic rhinitis may occur only during specific seasons, may be perennial without seasonal exacerbation, perennial with seasonal exacerbation, or may occur sporadically after specific exposures.

10. Seasonal allergic rhinitis is caused by an IgE-mediated reaction to seasonal aeroallergens. Typical seasonal aeroallergens are pollens and molds. The length of seasonal exposure to these allergens is dependent on geographic location.

11. Perennial allergic rhinitis is caused by an IgE-mediated reaction to perennial environmental aeroallergens. These may include dust mites, molds, animal allergens, or certain occupational allergens, as well as pollen in areas where pollen is prevalent perennially.

12. Allergic rhinitis often coexists with allergic conjunctivitis.

Symptoms of allergic rhinitis may include paroxysms of sneezing, nasal pruritus (itching) and congestion, clear rhinorrhea and palatal itching. In severe cases, mucous membranes of the eyes, eustachian tube, middle ear and paranasal sinuses may be involved. This produces conjunctival irritation (itchy, watery eyes), redness and tearing, ear fullness and popping, itchy throat, and pressure over the cheeks and forehead. Malaise, weakness and fatigue may be present. The coincidence of other allergic syndromes such as atopic eczema or asthma, and a positive family history of atopy, point toward an allergic etiology. Around 20% of cases are accompanied by symptoms of asthma.[1]

When all the typical rhinitis symptoms are not expressed, the diagnosis is more difficult to make. Chronic nasal obstruction alone may be the major symptom of perennial rhinitis due to ongoing inflammation and late-phase allergic reactions.[2] Distinct temporal patterns of symptom production may aid diagnosis. Symptoms of rhinitis which occur whenever the patient is exposed to a furry pet suggest IgE-mediated sensitivity to that pet. Patients who are exquisitely sensitive to animal proteins may develop symptoms of rhinitis and asthma when entering a house or laboratory even though the animal is no longer present. Exposure to airborne allergens in the workplace may produce symptoms only at work with symptom-free periods away from work. Seasonal and perennial forms of allergic rhinitis often coexist in the same individual. Symptoms may be chronic and persistent and patients may present with secondary complaints of mouth-breathing, snoring, or symptoms of sinusitis.[3]

Seasonal allergic rhinitis symptoms typically appear during a defined season in which aeroallergens are abundant in the outdoor air. Familiarity with the pollinating season of the major trees, grasses and weeds of the locale makes the syndrome easier to diagnose.[4,5] Certain outdoor mold spores also display seasonal variation, with highest levels in the summer and fall months.[6] Tree (eg, birch, oak, maple, mountain cedar), grass, and weed (eg, ragweed) pollens, and fungi ("molds": Alternaria, Aspergillus, Cladosporium) are common seasonal allergens. Priming effects, increases in sensory nerve irritability, and mucosal infiltration by activated eosinophils, mast cells, and TH_2 lymphocytes have been identified. Hyperresponsiveness to irritant triggers such as tobacco smoke, noxious odors, changes in temperature, and exercise may persist beyond the actual pollen season.

In studies of allergic seasonal rhinitis, a correlation between the daily pol-

len count and overall daily symptom score and medication score has been found. The symptoms on any particular day will be influenced by exposure on that day but also on previous days due to the priming phenomenon. As a consequence, at the end of the pollen season, it is usual to observe a decline in symptoms which is slower than that of the pollen counts themselves.[7] Individual sensitivity will also influence the intensity of symptoms. In highly sensitive individuals, many symptoms occur with pollen counts of 15 to 75 pollen grains/m^3 per 24 hours, whereas in the less sensitive, 4 to 10 times this exposure may be necessary to provoke equivalent symptoms.[8] The levels of pollen counts that cause symptoms may vary with an individual's degree of sensitivity and with different pollens.[9]

In perennial allergic rhinitis the responsible allergens are present in the environment throughout the year, and are usually indoor. Chronic exposure to dust mites (*Dermatophagoides pteronyussinus, D. farinae*), cockroach, perennial molds, cat, dog and other danders leads to persistent tissue edema and infiltration with eosinophils, mast cells, TH_2 lymphocytes, and macrophages.[10] Chronic allergen exposure with unremitting recruitment of inflammatory cells often requires corticosteroids for control. In some subjects, nasal congestion and mucus production (post-nasal drip) symptoms predominate, and sneezing and watery rhinorrhea may be minimal.

References

1. Evans III R. Epidemiology and natural history of asthma, allergic rhinitis, and atopic dermatitis. In: Middleton E, Jr, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy: principles and practice. 4th edition. St. Louis: Mosby, 1993:1109–1136.
2. Skoner DP, Doyle WJ, Boehm S, Fireman P. Late phase eustachian tube and nasal allergic responses associated with inflammatory mediator elaboration. Am J Rhinol 1988;2:155–161.
3. Lucente FE. Rhinitis and nasal obstruction. Otolaryngol Clin North Am 1989;22:307–318.
4. Jelks M. Allergy plants that cause sneezing and wheezing, Tampa: Worldwide Publications, 1986.
5. Lewis WH, Vinay P, Zenger VE. Airborne and allergic pollen of North America, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.
6. Platts-Mills TAE, Hayden ML, Chapman MD, Wilkins SR. Seasonal variation in dust mite and grass pollen allergens in dust from the houses of patients with asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1987;79:781–791.
7. Brostrom G, Moller CA. A new method to relate symptom scores with pollen counts. A dynamic model for comparison of treatments of allergy. Grana 1990;28:123–128.
8. Taudorf E, Moseholm L. Pollen count, symptom and medicine score in birth pollinoses. A mathematical approach. Int Arch Allergy Appl Immunol 1988; 86:225–233.
9. Solomon WR, Platts-Mills TAE. Aerobiology and inhalant allergens. In: Middleton EJ, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book Inc, 1998;367–403.
10. Bradding P, Feather IH, Wilson S, et al. Immunolocalization of cytokines in the nasal mucosa of normal and perennial rhinitis subjects. J Immunol 1993; 151:3853–3865.

Non-Allergic Rhinitis

13. Nonallergic rhinitis is characterized by sporadic or persistent perennial symptoms of rhinitis that do not result from IgE-mediated immunopathologic events. Examples of nonallergic rhinitis are infectious rhinitis, hormonal rhinitis, vasomotor rhinitis, nonallergic rhinitis with eosinophilia syndrome (NARES), certain types of occupational rhinitis, and gustatory and drug-induced rhinitis.

The differential diagnosis of nonallergic rhinitis is extensive.[1] The mechanisms in each are poorly understood. Nonallergic rhinitis with inflammatory cells present in the mucosa can be classified by inflammatory cell type.

Nonallergic rhinitis with eosinophilia syndrome (NARES) is characterized by nasal congestion and prominent nasal eosinophilia. (see summary statement #15) The mechanism of the eosinophil infiltration is not known. Eosinophilia is also prominent when nasal polyps are present, but again the mechanism of eosinophil recruitment is not known. Subjects with aspirin sensitivity have nasal eosinophilia. Aspirin and other nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) block cyclooxygenase activity, and shunt arachidonic acid to the 5-lipoxygenase pathway that increases production of the potent proinflammatory cysteinyl leukotrienes (LTC_4, LTD_4, and LTE_4).[2]

Neutrophilic infiltrates usually indicate the presence of bacterial rhinosinusitis, especially when humoral immunodeficiency or ciliary dysmotility are present. LTB_4, IL8, bacterial products, and complement fragments may contribute to their recruitment and activation. Neutrophilic infiltrates may also be present in rhinoviral and other viral rhinitis syndromes. Early in rhinovirus infections there is an increase in vascular permeability that is likely due to bradykinin. Later, there may be an increase in glandular secretion, particularly of locally synthesized secretory IgA.

There are several causes of nonallergic rhinitis without inflammation/inflammatory cells. Endocrine changes of hypothyroid and hyperthyroid disease, and pregnancy can lead to unremitting nasal congestion. Damage to sympathetic nerves, as in Horner's syndrome, can ablate sympathetic vasoconstrictor tone and lead to unopposed vasodilatory parasympathetic reflexes and chronic nasal congestion. Overuse of topical-adrenergic agonists/nasal decongestants also leads to chronic nasal congestion ("rhinitis medicamentosa").

Vasomotor rhinitis is unrelated to allergy, infection, structural lesions, systemic disease, or drug abuse. (see summary statement #16) Although the term vasomotor implies increased neural efferent traffic to the blood vessels supplying the nasal mucosa, this has never been proven. Subjects with vasomotor rhinitis fall into two general groups: "runners" who have "wet" rhinorrhea, and "dry" subjects with predominant symptoms of nasal congestion and blockage to airflow, and

minimal rhinorrhea. These reactions can be provoked by nonspecific irritant stimuli such as cold dry air, perfumes, paint fumes, and cigarette smoke. Subjects with predominantly rhinorrhea (sometimes referred to as cholinergic rhinitis) appear to have enhanced cholinergic glandular secretory activity, since atropine effectively reduces their secretions.[3] Subjects with predominantly nasal congestion and blockage may have nociceptive neurons that have heightened sensitivity to innocuous stimuli.

Emotional factors such as stress and sexual arousal are known to have an effect on the nose, probably due to autonomic stimulation.[4]

References

1. Mygind N, Naclerio RM, eds. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. Philadelphia, PA: 1993.
2. Christie PE, Tagari P, Ford-Hutchinson AW, et al. Urinary leukotriene E4 concentrations increase after aspirin challenge in aspirin sensitive subjects. Am Rev Respir Dis 1991;143: 1025–1102.
3. Stjarne P, Lundblad L, Lundberg JM, Anggard A. Capsaicin and nicotine sensitive afferent neurons and nasal secretion in healthy human volunteers and in patients with vasomotor rhinitis. Br J Pharmacol 1989;96:693–701.
4. Eiser N. The hitch-hikers guide to nasal airway patency. Respir Med 1990; 84:179–183.

Infectious Rhinitis

14. Infectious rhinitis may be acute or chronic. Acute infectious rhinitis is usually due to one of a large number of viruses, but secondary bacterial infection with sinus involvement is a common complication. Symptoms of chronic infectious rhinosinusitis include mucopurulent nasal discharge, facial pain and pressure, olfactory disturbance, and post-nasal drainage with cough.

Acute rhinitis is usually associated with a viral upper respiratory infection, but may follow trauma.[1] Symptoms of acute viral rhinitis include rhinorrhea, nasal obstruction, and fever. Initially, viral rhinitis is characterized by clear, watery rhinorrhea that is accompanied by sneezing and nasal obstruction. Edema of the nasal mucosa produces occlusion of the sinus ostia with resulting facial pain or of the eustachian tube with resulting ear fullness. The nasal drainage may become cellular and cloudy due to the presence of organisms, white blood cells and desquamated epithelium. Responsible viruses include rhinoviruses, respiratory syncytial virus, parainfluenza, influenza and adenoviruses. Unless there is bacterial superinfection, the condition is self-limiting and usually resolves within 7 to 10 days. Acute bacterial rhinitis may occur de novo or may follow viral rhinitis. Nasal obstruction, cloudy drainage, vestibular crusting and facial pain occur. Not all patients report fever. Bacteria frequently recovered from nasal or sinus cultures include *Streptococcus pneumoniae,* group-A beta-hemolytic *Streptococci* and *Hemophilus influenzae.*[2] In patients with immunodeficiency, HIV positivity, or acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), mycobacterial, fungal, and other opportunistic organisms may be involved.

The symptoms of allergic rhinitis are frequently confused with infectious rhinitis when patients complain of a constant cold. Purulent nasal drainage may be present in either infectious or non-infectious rhinitis. Symptoms persisting longer than two weeks should prompt a search for causes other than infection. Foreign body rhinitis should be considered in the differential diagnosis, especially in children. Symptoms may be acute or chronic, unilateral or bilateral, and the nasal discharge may be blood-stained or foul-smelling.

Exacerbations of rhinitis symptoms with predominant clear rhinorrhea in patients with a known history of allergic rhinitis may prove to be a diagnostic difficulty. The distinction between active infection and allergy should be made. When the history or physical examination is not diagnostic, a nasal smear may be obtained to aid in differentiation.

There is controversy about whether chronic infectious rhinitis (diagnosed after 8 to 12 weeks of symptoms) can exist in the absence of chronic sinusitis. Symptoms of chronic infectious rhinosinusitis can include nasal congestion, predominantly purulent nasal discharge, facial pain, and pressure, olfactory disturbances and post-nasal drainage with cough.[3]

Allergy, mucociliary disturbance and immune deficiency may predispose certain individuals to the development of chronic infection.[4,5] Mucociliary abnormalities may be congenital, as in primary ciliary dyskinesia,[6] Young's syndrome,[7] or cystic fibrosis, or secondary to infection. Similarly, immune deficiency may be congenital or acquired.

References

1. Noble SL, Forbes RC, Woodbridge HB. Allergic rhinitis. Am Fam Physician 1995;51:837–846.
2. Gwaltney JM, Scheld M, Sande MA, Sydnor A. The microbial etiology and antimicrobial therapy of adults with acute community-acquired sinusitis: a fifteen-year experience at the University of Virginia and review of other selected studies. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90:457–462.
3. Kaliner MA, Osguthorpe JD, Fireman P, et al. Sinusitis: bench to bedside. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;99: S289–S847.
4. MacKay IS, Cole P. Rhinitis, sinusitis and associated chest disease. In: MacKay IS, Null TR, eds. Scott-Brown's otolaryngology. vol. 4. Rhinology. London: Butterworths. 1987; 61–92.
5. Lund VJ, Scadding GK. Immunologic aspects of chronic sinusitis. Can J Otolaryngol 1991;105:181–185.
6. Afzelius BA. A human syndrome caused by immotile cilia. Science 1976;193:317–319.
7. Young D. Surgical treatment of male infertility. J Reprod Fertil 1970;23: 541–542.

Non-Allergic Rhinitis Without Eosinophilia

15. Nonallergic, noninfectious rhinitis, generally termed vasomotor rhinitis, comprises a heterogeneous group of patients with

chronic nasal symptoms that are not immunologic or infectious in origin and usually not associated with nasal eosinophilia. Most of these patients develop rhinitis in response to environmental conditions, such as cold air, high humidity, strong odors and inhaled irritants.

The term vasomotor rhinitis has been used loosely to describe patients with perennial rhinitis whose symptoms are intensified by changes in temperature or relative humidity, alcohol, odors such as bleach, perfume or solvents, bright lights or hot spicy foods, and irritants such as tobacco smoke, dusts and automotive emission fumes. This disorder is not due to allergy or infection, nor is it associated with nasal eosinophilia. The symptoms are variable, consisting mainly of nasal obstruction and increased secretion. Sneezing and pruritus are less common. Although the term vasomotor implies increased neural efferent traffic to the blood vessels supplying the nasal mucosa, this has never been proven. Some investigators prefer to use the descriptive term "nonallergic" or "idiopathic" rhinitis that does not imply known pathophysiology.

Reference

1. Druce HM. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. In: Middleton EJ, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book Inc, 1998: 1005–1016.

Non-allergic Rhinitis with Eosinophilia Syndrome

16. **The nonallergic rhinitis with eosinophilia syndrome (NARES) is characterized by nasal eosinophils in patients who have perennial symptoms and occasionally loss of sense of smell. These patients lack evidence of allergic disease as demonstrated by lack of clinically significant positive skin tests and/or specific IgE antibodies in the serum.**

In the NARES syndrome, individuals experience perennial symptoms of sneezing paroxysms, profuse watery rhinorrhea and nasal pruritus and occasional loss of smell.[1,2] Patients are typically middle-aged and have a characteristic perennial course but with paroxysmal episodes. Nasal smears reveal eosinophils during symptomatic periods. Patients lack evidence of allergic disease as determined by skin testing or by serum levels of IgE antibody to specific allergens. It is difficult to assess the prevalence of this syndrome in the general population. The etiology of the syndrome is obscure, but may be an early stage of aspirin sensitivity.[3]

References

1. Jacobs RL, Freedman PM, Boswell RN. Non-allergic rhinitis with eosinophilia (NARES syndrome): clinical and immunologic presentation. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1981;67:253.
2. Mullarkey MF. Eosinophilic nonallergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;82:941–949.
3. Moneret-Vautrin DA, Shieh V, Wayoff M. Non-allergic rhinitis with eosinophilia syndrome (NARES)—a precursor of the triad. Ann Allergy 1990; 64:513–518.

Occupational Rhinitis

17. **Occupational rhinitis refers to rhinitis arising in response to airborne substances in the workplace, which may be mediated by allergic or nonallergic factors, eg, laboratory animal antigen, grain, wood dusts, and chemicals. It often coexists with occupational asthma.**

Occupational rhinitis may be defined as sneezing, nasal discharge and/or congestion caused by exposure to an airborne agent present in the workplace. Triggering substances may be irritants, such as tobacco smoke, cold air, formaldehyde, hair sprays, or chemicals acting apparently through non-immunologic mechanisms. Alternatively, occupational exposure may involve IgE-mediated reactions triggered by allergens such as laboratory animals (rats, mice, guinea pigs, etc.), animal products, grain (bakers and agricultural workers), coffee beans, wood dusts (particularly hard woods such as mahogany, western red cedar, iroko), latex, chemicals (eg, acid anhydrides, platinum salts, glues), mites, mold spores, pollen, psyllium, enzymes, and a litany of other substances. This disorder frequently coexists with occupational asthma. Occupational rhinitis may precede development of occupational asthma.

Symptoms may occur acutely at work after intermittent exposure or more chronically at work after continuous exposure. Occupational rhinitis should be suspected in patients with nasal symptoms which are temporally related to exposure at work and which improve away from the workplace. For occupational allergens, skin testing may confirm sensitivity, if appropriate reagents are available. The most specific diagnostic test for occupational rhinitis is a challenge with the suspected agent, either naturally in the workplace setting or in a medical setting. Optimally, in addition to symptom scores, such a challenge could include pre-challenge and post-challenge measures of nasal airway resistance using anterior rhinomanometry.

The optimal management of occupational rhinitis is avoidance of the occupational trigger, either by modifying the workplace, use of filtering masks, or removing the patient from the adverse exposure. If this is impossible, pharmacologic therapy as discussed in earlier sections should be instituted, recognizing that chronic use of medication will probably be required for adequate relief and prevention of symptoms. Strategies to prevent or reduce symptoms may include the daily use of anti-inflammatory intranasal corticosteroids or the administration of antihistamines and/or intranasal cromolyn immediately prior to allergen exposure. It is also important to institute avoidance measure for non-occupational allergens that may contribute to rhinitis symptoms.

References

1. Murphy EE, Slavin RS. Occupational rhinitis: when to suspect, what to do. J Respir Dis 1995;16:135–142.

2. Lund VJ, Aaronson D, Bousquet J and The International Rhinitis Management Working Group. International Consensus Report on the Diagnosis and Management of Rhinitis. Allergy 1994;49(Suppl 19):1–34.
3. Druce HM. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. In: Middleton EJ, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book Inc, 1998: 1005–1016.

Hormonal Rhinitis

18. Causes of hormonal rhinitis include pregnancy and hypothyroidism. Although symptoms of rhinitis, in particular nasal congestion, may occur during pregnancy, most notably from the second month to term, these symptoms usually disappear rapidly after delivery. Other causes of rhinitis such as allergic rhinitis, infectious rhinitis and rhinitis medicamentosa are also common during pregnancy.

Pregnancy,[1] puberty, the use of oral contraceptives, hypothyroidism,[2] or conjugated estrogens can be associated with nasal obstruction and/or hypersecretion. Evidence linking thyroid disease directly with nasal pathology is limited.[2] Increased nasal secretion in hypothyroidism has been reported on an anecdotal basis. The frequency of rhinitis symptoms was unclear. Symptoms of hypothyroidism such as lethargy, constipation, and cold intolerance, should be sought. No clear data exist which indicate that thyroid replacement treatment alone leads to resolution of an associated rhinitis.

During pregnancy, rhinitis symptoms, especially congestion, often develop during the second month and persist to term, but usually disappear shortly after delivery.[2] These symptoms are likely related to hormone-induced intranasal vascular engorgement and mucosal hypersecretion.[3] However, non-hormonal causes of rhinitis such as allergic rhinitis, vasomotor rhinitis, rhinitis medicamentosa and sinusitis are more common causes of rhinitis in pregnancy.

References

1. Mabry RL. Rhinitis in pregnancy. South Med J 1986;79:965–971.
2. Incaudo GA, and Schatz M. Rhinosinusitis associated with endocrine conditions: hypothyroidism and pregnancy, In: Schatz M, Zeigler RS, Settipane GA, eds. Nasal manifestations of systemic diseases, Providence: Oceanside, 1991.
3. Georgitis JW. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. Current concepts and treatment. Immunol Allergy Clin North Am 1987;7:211–234.

Drug-Induced Rhinitis

19. Drug-induced rhinitis may be caused by a number of medications, including ACE (angiotensin-converting enzyme) inhibitors, reserpine, guanethidine, phentolamine, methyldopa and prazosin, as well as beta blockers, chlorpromazine, aspirin, other NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) and oral contraceptives. Rhinitis medicamentosa commonly refers to the over-use of nasally inhaled vasoconstrictor (decongestant) agents such as the OTC (over-the-counter) products, oxymetazoline or phenylephrine. Repeated use of cocaine may also produce rhinitis.

Medications may induce symptoms of nasal congestion and/or rhinorrhea.[1] Antihypertensive medications are most frequently incriminated. Reserpine was thought to be the major cause of nasal obstruction, but guanethidine, phentolamine, methyldopa, ACE inhibitors (angiotensin-converting enzyme) and prazosin (alpha receptor antagonist) have been implicated. Other antihypertensive drugs from varied pharmacologic classes have been documented to have similar side effects. Oral contraceptives, chlorpromazine and beta blockers have also been implicated.[2] Aspirin and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agents (NSAIDs) may produce rhinorrhea. The rhinorrhea may be isolated, or part of a complex involving hyperplastic rhinosinusitis, nasal polyposis and asthma. Drugs of abuse, such as cocaine, should also be considered potential causes of rhinitis. Nasal irritation and inflammation may produce a rhinitis picture before the end-stage effects, such as nasal septal perforation, occur.[3]

The repetitive use of topical alpha-adrenergic nasal decongestant sprays for more than 5 to 7 days may induce rebound nasal congestion upon withdrawal. These agents include over the counter products containing oxymetazoline or phenylephrine. Also, patients may develop tachyphylaxis, due to the need for more frequent doses to provide adequate decongestion. Prolonged usage may lead to a hypertrophy of the nasal mucosa termed "rhinitis medicamentosa". The nasal mucosa is often beefy-red, appears inflamed, and shows areas of punctate bleeding and scant mucus. This condition may be caused by down regulation of the nasal mucosal alpha-adrenergic receptors. Similar consequences may occur with prolonged use of other vasoconstrictor agents such as cocaine.

Management of rhinitis medicamentosa is discussed in text for summary statement #48.

References

1. Druce HM. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. In: Middleton EJ, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book Inc, 1998:1005–1016.
2. Ammar-Kohdja A. Influence des contraceptifs oraux sur la muqueuse nasale. Revue de Laryngologie Otologie Rhinologie 1971;92:40–42.
3. Dax EM. Drug dependence in the differential diagnosis of allergic respiratory disease. Ann Allergy 1990;64: 261.

Rhinitis from Food Ingestion

20. Rhinitis may occur after ingestion of foods or alcoholic products. This may be due to vagally mediated mechanisms, nasal vasodilation, food allergy and/or other undefined mechanisms. Food allergy is a rare cause of rhinitis without associated gastrointestinal, dermatologic or systemic manifestations.

Foods can provoke rhinitis symptoms by a variety of different mechanisms.[1,2] Ingested food allergens rarely produce isolated IgE mediated rhinitis without involvement of other organ systems. Urticarial rash, facial or lip swelling, or bronchospasm, strongly suggest an IgE mediated reaction.[3] Symptoms which promptly follow eating foods or food additives may suggest a causal etiology, but this may or may not be IgE-mediated. In adults, food skin tests may be appropriate in occasional cases if a careful history suggests food-related rhinitis symptoms, particularly if rhinitis symptoms are associated with other systemic symptoms. Although a variety of opinions have been expressed in the literature,[1–10] there is little or no credible data available to justify routine performance of food skin tests in the evaluation of rhinitis in adults. In the evaluation of rhinitis in children where the history may be more difficult to interpret and food allergy is more common, there is greater justification to consider performance of limited food skin testing. Beer, wine and other alcoholic drinks may produce symptoms by nasal vasodilation. The syndrome of copious watery rhinorrhea occurring immediately after ingestion of foods, particularly hot and spicy foods, has been termed "gustatory rhinitis" and is vagally mediated.[10]

References

1. Metcalfe DD. The diagnosis of food allergy: theory and practice. In: Spector S, ed. Provocative challenge procedures: bronchial, oral, nasal and exercise. vol. 2. Boca Raton: CRC Press. 1983:119–125.
2. Bock SA, Lee WY, Remigio LK, May CD. Studies of hypersensitivity reactions to food in infants and children. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1978;62: 327–334.
3. Atkins FM, Steinberg SS, and Metcalfe DD. Evaluation of immediate adverse reactions to foods in adult patients. I. Correlation of demographic, laboratory, and prick skin test data with response to controlled oral food challenge. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1985;75:348.
4. Hendrick DJ, Davies RJ, D'Souza MF, Pepys J. An analysis of skin prick reactions in 656 asthmatic patients. Thorax 1975;30:2–8.
5. Foucard T. Allergy and allergy-like symptoms in 1050 medical students. Allergy 1991;46:20–26.
6. Novembre E, de Martino M, Vierucci A. Foods and respiratory allergy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;81: 1059–1065.
7. Pastorello E, Ortolani C, Luraghi MT, et al. Evaluation of allergic etiology in perennial rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1985; 55:854–856.
8. Pelikan Z, Pelikan-Filipek M. Bronchial response to the food ingestion challenge. Ann Allergy 1987;58: 164–172.
9. Heiner DC. Respiratory diseases and food allergy. Ann Allergy 1984;53: 657–664.
10. James JM, Bernhisel-Broadbent J, Sampson HA. Respiratory reactions provoked by double-blind food challenges in children. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1994;149:59–64.
11. Raphael GD, Hauptschein-Raphael M, Kaliner M. Gustatory rhinitis: a syndrome of food-induced rhinorrhea. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1989;83: 110–115.

Other Conditions that May Be Confused with Rhinitis

21. Signs and symptoms suggestive of rhinitis can be produced by other conditions including: nasal septal deviation, tumors, adenoidal hypertrophy, hypertrophy of the nasal turbinates.

Nasal obstruction may be caused by congenital or acquired anatomic abnormalities, which may mimic symptoms of rhinitis. Reduced air flow through the nasal passages in infants may be due to congenital choanal atresia. The most common acquired anatomic cause of nasal obstruction in infants and children is adenoidal hypertrophy.

Nasal septal deviation, and nasal turbinate or adenoidal hypertrophy many block flow of nasal secretions, leading to rhinorrhea or postnasal drip, as well as causing nasal blockage.

Although comparatively rare, both benign and malignant tumors may cause rhinitis symptoms.[1] Lesions may occlude the nasal airway, often unilaterally and invariably. Rapidly growing nasal malignancies may cause nasal obstruction early in the disease. Lesions arising in the maxillary sinus present intranasally in the late stages of the disease, after the tumor has penetrated the medial wall of the antrum. Bleeding may occur, as well as hyposmia or anosmia, pain and otalgia. Prolonged occupational exposure to chemicals such as nickel, wood or leather dusts, chromate, formaldehyde and chlorophenol, have been associated with hypertrophic rhinosinusitis, metaplasia and carcinoma. Refractory clear rhinorrhea may be due to CSF leak even in the absence of trauma or recent surgery.

Nasal mastocytosis presents with symptoms of rhinorrhea and nasal congestion without pruritus.[2] Patients with nasal mastocytosis display an especially pale mucosa, which contains increased numbers of mast cells, and few eosinophils. Skin tests and other tests for IgE-mediated disease are negative.

Primary atrophic rhinitis occurs in elderly patients who report nasal congestion and a constant bad smell (ozena) in the nose.[3] This persistent condition is characterized by progressive atrophy of the nasal mucosa and underlying bone of the conchae.[4] Thick crusts form that produce the characteristic foul odor. The nasal cavities are enlarged and squamous metaplasia of the surface epithelium is detectable. Patients report associated headaches and chronic sinusitis. The syndrome should be separated from secondary atrophic rhinitis, developing as a direct result of chronic granulomatous nasal infections, chronic sinusitis, radical nasal surgery, trauma and irradiation. The incidence of atrophic rhinitis in developed countries has declined, but the disease is still prevalent in Eastern Europe, Greece, Egypt, India, and China. The etiology of primary atrophic rhinitis has not yet been established. Theories include infection with *Klebsiella ozaenae*[5] and other bacteria. Despite the sensation of congestion, rhinomanometric studies have shown no evidence of increased resistance to airflow.

Systemic immunologic and non-immunologic diseases may affect the nose. In uremia and diabetes, ischemia may cause an anterior rhinitis. Others include Wegener's granulomatosis, sarcoidosis, relapsing polychondritis and midline granuloma.[6] In certain syndromes, the systemic symptoms may be absent or undetected when patients present with nasal complaints. Infections such as tuberculosis, syphilis, leprosy, sporotricosis, blastomycosis, histoplasmosis, and coccidiomycosis also may cause granulomatous nasal lesions. These are usually ulcerative, and crust formation may lead to nasal obstruction or bleeding. Rhinoscleroma is a rare chronic granulomatous disease associated with the bacterium *Klebsiella rhinoscleromatis.* Rhinoscleroma is endermic to Eastern Europe and Central America, but is now increasing in incidence in the US. Symptoms include purulent nasal discharge, crusting and nodule formation producing nasal obstruction.

References

1. Komisar A. Nasal obstruction due to benign and malignant neoplasms. Otolaryngol Clin North Am 1989;22: 351–365.
2. Connell JT. Nasal mastocytosis [Abstract]. J Allergy 1969;43:182.
3. Zohar Y, Talmi YP, Strauss M, et al. Ozena revisited. J Otolaryngol 1990; 19:345–349.
4. Goodman WS, deSouza FM. Atrophic rhinitis. In: English GM, ed. Otolaryngology. Philadelphia: JB Lippincott, 1987;2:1–11.
5. Ferguson JL, McCaffrey TV, Kern EB, et al. Effects of Klebsilla ozaenae on ciliary activity in vitro: implications in the pathogenesis of atrophic rhinitis. Otolarygol Head Neck Surg 1990;102: 207.
6. Falkoff RJ. Nasal manifestations of systemic disease, Providence: Oceanside, 1991.

Nasal Polyps

22. Nasal polyps may occur in conjunction with chronic rhinitis or sinusitis and may contribute significantly to the patient's symptoms. Nasal polyps should always be considered in the differential diagnosis of patients who present with invariant nasal congestion and its sequelae. Allergy as a cause of nasal polyps has not been established but nasal polyps may occur in conjunction with allergic rhinitis.

Nasal polyps present as invariable nasal obstruction and may occur in association with chronic allergic rhinitis or sinusitis. They may occur in association with cystic fibrosis in children[1] and adults,[2] asthma and as part of aspirin idiosyncracy[3] (acetylsalicylic acid sensitivity, sinusitis and asthma), but they most commonly occur alone. Allergy does not appear to predispose to polyp formation, but mast cell reactions and eosinophil activation with subsequent inflammation seem to be important and may explain why corticosteroids are therapeutically effective. Between 10% and 15% of patients with allergic rhinitis also have nasal polyps.[4]

References

1. Stern RC, Boat TF, Wood RE. Treatment and prognosis of nasal polyps in cystic fibrosis. Am J Dis Child 1982; 136:1067–1070.
2. DiSant'Agnese PA, David PB. Cystic fibrosis in adults: 75 cases and a review of 232 cases in the literature. Am J Med 1979;66:121–132.
3. Stevenson DD, Simon RA. Sensitivity to aspirin and nonsteroidal anti inflammatory drugs. In: Middleton E, Jr, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy: principles and practice. 4th edition. St. Louis: Mosby, 1993:1747–1766.
4. Fireman P. Allergic rhinitis. In: Fireman P, Slavin RG, eds. Atlas of allergies, ed 2. London: Mosby-Wolfe, Times Mirror International Publishers Limited, 1996:141–159.

EVALUATION OF RHINITIS

History

23. Full evaluation of the patient with rhinitis should include a determination of the pattern, chronicity, and seasonality of symptoms (or lack thereof), response to medications, presence of coexisting conditions, occupational exposure, a detailed environmental history and identification of precipitating factors.

A careful history will usually suggest the diagnosis of rhinitis (Table 1). A thorough general medical history should be followed by questions specific to rhinological symptoms, including information on environmental and occupational factors and family history. Allergic rhinitis can occur at any age, including infancy, and the physician should note the onset of symptoms. Most patients with allergic rhinitis develop their symptoms prior to the age of 20 years.[1,2] The frequency of symptoms should be noted and whether they are daily, episodic, seasonal or perennial. The duration and severity of the symptoms should also be mentioned, and whether the severity has increased, decreased, or remained the same over a period of time.

Presentation of allergic rhinitis may vary considerably. Some patients present primarily with symptoms of sneezing and rhinorrhea whereas others present with nasal blockage with little or no itching or sneezing.

Symptoms may be perennial, with or without seasonal exacerbations. In evaluating the patient, it is important to obtain a detailed account of when and where the symptoms arise. Common seasonal allergens include tree, grass and weed pollens, and airborne molds. In seasonal allergic rhinitis, there is a distinct relation between timing of pollen release at various geographic locations and the appearance of symptoms.

It is important to ask about the association of acute symptoms with exposure to specific allergens such as mites during house cleaning, episodic exposures to animals or mold spores, which are present in increased amounts during harvesting, mowing, or leaf raking. Perennial allergens, such as dust mites, cockroaches, pet danders and mold spores can cause chronic symptoms.

Frequently, unsuspected occupational allergens can stimulate an IgE-mediated response, and inquiries should be made about this and poten-

Table 1. Important Historical Points in the Evaluation of Rhinitis

- Symptoms: magnitude, duration, timing in relation to exposure (ie, early and/or late-phase allergic reactions), effects on daily living
- Triggers/seasonality
- Environment, including home, job and school or day care for children
- History of other allergic symptoms (eg, asthma, conjunctivitis, eczema)
- Past medical history, including trauma
- Feeding history in young children
- Past treatment experience
- Current treatment
- Family history, including allergic diseases
- Review of systems

tial exposures to irritants in the workplace. (see Summary Statement #17)

Consistent obstruction on the same side suggests a polyp, foreign body, structural problem, or rarely, a tumor. Hyposmia and anosmia are most often associated with nasal polyps or severe disease. Symptoms related to blockage of the airways include: frequent sore throats, dryness of the mouth and oropharynx, a nasal quality to the voice and snoring. An allergic salute may be characterized by an upward or sideways thrust of the palm of the hand against the tip of the nose when watery rhinorrhea and itching are significant, resulting in a transverse crease in the skin of the lower third of the external nose. If sneezing is present, it often occurs in paroxysms.

The allergens, irritants and weather conditions that precipitate or aggravate symptoms should be detailed. Perennial symptoms more commonly occur when there are indoor pets, dust mites or mold spores present throughout the year. Moisture favors the growth of mites and molds. Mattresses, pillows, upholstered furniture, curtains and carpets are frequent sources of dust mites. House plants and stored paper goods favor mold growth. There is a direct relationship between the amount of pollen exposure and severity of symptoms.[3] As the season progresses, there is a gradual increase in severity of symptoms in relation to the pollen count due to immunologic enhancement of sensitivity or "priming."[4] Certain foods can induce rhinitis symptoms as has been confirmed by double blind challenges.[5] Irritants can potentiate the symptoms of allergic rhinitis. Emotional upsets can also exacerbate rhinitis symptoms. In an allergic individual, an upper respiratory infection can either mimic allergies or worsen or prolong the effects of allergies or other non-specific irritants.[6,7] Hormonal factors or medications/drugs, such as antihypertensives or cocaine, can be responsible for a persistent rhinitis. A positive family history makes it more likely that an allergy will develop,[8] but the pattern of inheritance seems to be polygenic and a negative family history by no means rules out the diagnosis of allergic rhinitis. The level of response to previous medication trials is also important to assess. For example, a favorable response to antihistamines would support a diagnosis of allergy, while such a response to intranasal corticosteroids could support any of a number of diagnoses, including rhinitis due to allergy, or the NARES syndrome.

References

1. Haahtela R, Heiskala M, Slonemi I. Allergic disorders and immediate skin test reactivity in Finnish adolescents. Allergy 1980;35:433–441.
2. Hagy GW, Settipane GA. Bronchial asthma, allergic rhinitis and allergy skin tests among college students. J Allergy 1969;44:323.
3. Norman PS. Allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1985;75:531–548.
4. Connell JT. Quantitative intranasal pollen changes. III. The priming effect in allergic rhinitis. J Allergy 1969;50: 43–44.
5. Bock SA. Prospective appraisal of complaints of adverse reactions to foods in children during the first 3 years of life. Pediatrics 1987;79: 683–688.
6. Lemanske RF, Dick EC, Swenson C, et al. Rhinovirus upper respiratory infection increases airway hyperreactivity and late asthmatic reactions. J Clin Invest 1989;83:1–10.
7. Doyle WJ, Skoner DP, Seroky JT, et al. Effect of experimental rhinovirus 39 infection on the nasal response to histamine and cold air challenges in allergic and non-allergic subjects. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1994;93:534–542.
8. Van Arsdel PP Jr, Motulsky AG. Frequency and hereditability of asthma and allergic rhinitis in college students. Acta Genet 1959;9:101–114.

Taking History of Impact on Quality of Life

24. Symptoms of rhinitis may significantly impact the patient's quality of life, by causing fatigue, headache, cognitive impairment and other systemic symptoms. An assessment of the degree to which these symptoms interfere with the patient's ability to function should be made.

The "individuals subjective assessment of his/her physical, physiologic and social well being"[1] is the cornerstone of evaluating the effect of the various therapies provided by physicians. In rhinitis, it is not only the clinical outcome—relief of sneezing, itching, rhinorrhea or congestion—or the effect on measures of nasal patency studies which define success of treatment, but also it is the functional impact of the treatment on the patients daily life which defines successful treatment. Diseases have a variety of impacts on patients in addition to making them feel ill. They also interfere in a variety of ways with carrying out ones day to day responsibilities. In patients with rhinitis, loss of sleep and concomitant fatigue, headache, poor concentration, repeated nose blowing, itchy watery eyes and general irritability all impact negatively on their ability to carry out physical, social and work/school responsibilities effectively.

There are several surveys which have been used to measure the out-

comes of treatment on a variety of diseases. The Medical Outcomes Study Short Form Healthy Survey (SF-36) has been used to measure the outcomes on specific functions such as physical and role functioning and on emotional well being. On the other hand specific rhinitis questionnaires, such as the Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire (RQLQ), have been validated in the measurement of the effects of treatment of nasal disease on important parameters of every day living.[2,3]

Another look at the Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire reveals that a questionnaire specifically designed for 12 to 17-year old patients is necessary to determine significant quality of life impacts of different therapies for this age group.[4]

Another quality of life study evaluated the impact of the relief of rhinorrhea on moods and daily activities in patients with non-allergic rhinitis. This study revealed that patients treated with topical ipratropium had substantially greater improvement in mood than those on placebo.[5]

Finally, one must note that numerous studies have demonstrated that better health outcomes occurred in patients who adhere to treatment recommendations as compared to those who are not compliant with recommended drug regimens.[6] This fact is worrisome in evaluating the results of clinical drug trials which require patients to be compliant with drug administration and do not make allowances for the non-compliant patient.

Allergic rhinitis, particularly when perennial, can cause restrictions on the physical, psychological, and social well-being of patients. In one study that used the SF-36 questionnaire to evaluate the quality of life in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis, values for patients with moderate to severe perennial allergic rhinitis were significantly different from those for healthy subjects for 8 of 9 variables.[7] Indeed, patients with allergic rhinitis had decreased physical and social functioning, energy, mental health, and general health perception. They had increased physical and emotional limitations and experience of pain.

References

1. Coons SJ, Kaplan RM. Assessing health related quality of life; application to drug therapy. Clin Therap 1992; 14:850–858.
2. Juniper EF, Guyatt GH. Development and testing of a new measure of health status for clinical trials in rhinoconjunctivitis. Clin Exp Allergy 1991;21: 77–83.
3. Juniper EF, Guyatt GH, Archer B, et al. Aqueous beclomethasone dipropionate in the treatment of ragweed pollen-induced rhinitis; further exploration of "as needed" use. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;92:66–72.
4. Juniper EF, Guyatt GH, Dolovich J. Assessment of quality of life in adolescents with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: development and testing of a questionnaire for clinical trials. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;93:413–423.
5. Georgitis JW, Banov C, Boggs PB, et al. Ipratropium bromide nasal spray in non-allergic rhinitis, efficacy, nasal cytological response and patient evaluation on quality of life. Clin Exp Allergy 1994;24:1049–1055.
6. Horwitz R, Horwitz SM. Adherence to treatment and health outcomes. Arch Intern Med 1993;153:1863–1868.
7. Bousquet J, Bullinger M, Fayol C, et al. Assessment of quality of life in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis with the French version of the SF-36 health status questionnaire. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1994;94:182–188.

Physical Examination

25. An examination of the nose should be performed in patients with a history of rhinitis. This should include examination of the nasal passageways, secretions, turbinates, septum, and determination of whether nasal polyps are present.

Examination of the nose is indicated in all cases of rhinitis (Table 2). This is accomplished with a nasal speculum with appropriate lighting, otoscope with nasal adapter, rigid Hopkins rod or flexible nasopharyngoscope.[1] Use of the latter procedure may be limited in the pediatric population. If it is used, the middle meatus should also be examined, if possible, to evaluate bony or mucosal crowding with obstruction of the sinus ostia. The presence of mucopurulent material in this region is suggestive of sinusitis. "Cobblestoning" of the pharynx with lymphoid tissue may be seen. A nasal speculum should be inserted gently, since the septum may be tender. Elevating the end of the nose with the other hand provides a better view of the nasal passage.

On physical examination, the patient with rhinitis may appear quite uncomfortable and distressed with mouth breathing. On nasal examination, the typical mucosa of the allergic patient appears pale and swollen, with a bluish-gray appearance when the mucosal edema is severe. Occasionally, the mucosa can be hyperemic. The mucosa is usually reddened in acute infections and with overuse of topical medications. Mucosal appearance may not distinguish between allergic and non-allergic rhinitis, because non-allergic rhinitis may also present with mucosal pallor, edema or hyperemia.

The quantity and quality of nasal secretions should be noted. With allergic rhinitis, there may be watery mucus on the epithelial surface or on the floor of the nasal passage. With abnormal mucociliary clearance or total nasal obstruction, thick secretions can be seen pooling in the floor of the nose.

An examination of the nasal cavity may identify polyps, tumors, foreign bodies, or septal deflections. Unlike the nasal turbinates with which they are often confused, polyps appear glistening, mobile, and opaque and are insensitive to touch.[3] Nasal polyps may be differentiated from severely edematous mucosa by applying a small amount of a topical vasoconstrictor such as phenylephrine to the mucosa, and reexamining the mucosa 5 to 10 minutes later. Nasal polyps will not shrink in size after topical vasoconstrictor has been applied, unlike edematous mucosa. Crusting on an inflamed mucosa may suggest atrophic rhinitis or a systemic disease such as sarcoidosis. The presence of a septal perforation should raise the possibility of cocaine abuse, previous surgery or,

Table 2. Elements of Physical Examination and Procedures to Consider in Patients With Rhinitis

- General observations: facial pallor, "allergic shiners", mouth breathing, and nasal crease, evidence of systemic disease (e.g. nail clubbing).
- Growth percentiles for children.
- Eyes: evidence for conjunctivitis, Dennie-Morgan lines (accentuated lines or folds below the margin of the inferior eyelid).
- Nose: presence or absence of external deformity, nasal mucosal swelling, nasal polyps, deviated septum, septal perforation, discharge (noting color and consistency), blood. Consider examining the nasopharynx using indirect mirror visualization or fiberoptic endoscope
- Ears: Consider pneumatic otoscopy to look for abnormalities of tympanic membranes, including abnormal mobility patterns, retraction, air-fluid levels, bubbles behind tympanic membrane; consider tympanometry to confirm the presence or absence of effusion and middle ear under- or over-pressures.
- Mouth: Observe for malocclusion or high arched palate associated with chronic mouth breathing, tonsilar hypertrophy, lymphoid "streaking" in the oropharynx, pharyngeal postnasal discharge, halitosis, and pain upon mouth occlusion suggestive of temporomandibular joint syndrome.
- Neck: Lymphadenopathy, thyroid enlargement.
- Chest: Signs of asthma.
- Skin: Eczema, skin dryness, dermographism.
- Other relevant organ systems.

again, systemic granulomatous diseases.

In allergic rhinitis associated with conjunctivitis, the palpebral conjunctivae may be injected with watery discharge and puffiness of the eyelids. Subconjunctival edema may be present. With chronic or severe acute allergic rhinitis, a transverse crease is often seen across the bridge of the nose, particularly in children, as a result of rubbing of the nose to relieve nasal obstruction and itching. The characteristic gesture in which the patient elevates the tip of the nose with the palm of the hand to relieve itching and obstruction has acquired the name "the allergic salute." Allergic "shiners" (infraorbital dark skin discoloration),[3] and facial pallor may be present. The eyes and periorbital region also should be examined for evidence of Dennie-Morgan lines (accentuated lines or folds below the margin of the inferior eyelid) and cataracts, particularly if atopic dermatitis is present.

With prolonged nasal obstruction and constant mouth breathing in childhood, an individual may have elevation of the upper lip, an overbite (dental malocclusion) and a high arched palate.[4] The tympanic membranes should be examined for evidence of associated middle-ear disease, including middle-ear effusion and tympanic membrane retraction or immobility.[5] This may provide evidence of allergen-induced Eustachian tube dysfunction.[6] The examination should also focus on the possible involvement of the sinuses. Evidence of associated allergic diseases, such as asthma and atopic dermatitis, should be sought. Examination of the lungs may reveal wheezing or a persistent cough, since there are often accompanying symptoms and signs of asthma when allergic rhinitis is present.[7] In the evaluation of patients with rhinitis it may be necessary to rule out involvement of any other relevant organ system.

References

1. Rohr A, Hassner A, Saxon A. Rhinopharyngoscopy for the evaluation of allergic-immunologic disorders. Ann Allergy 1983;50:380–384.
2. Slavin RG. Nasal polyps and sinusitis. In: Middleton E Jr, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th ed. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, 1998:1024–1035.
3. Marks MB. Significance of discoloration in the lower orbitopalpebral grooves in allergic children (allergic shiners). Ann Allergy 1963;21:26–32.
4. Bresolin D, Shapiro CG, Shapiro PA, et al. Facial characteristics of children who breathe through the mouth. Pediatrics 1984;73:622–625.
5. Badhwar AK, Druce HM. Allergic rhinitis. Med Clin North Am 1992;76:789–803.
6. Skoner DP, Doyle WJ, Chamovitz A, Fireman P. Eustachian tube obstruction (ETO) after intranasal challenge with house dust mite. Arch Otolaryngol 1986;112:840–842.
7. Noble SL, Forbes RC, Woodbridge HB. Allergic rhinitis. Am Fam Physician 1995;51:837–846.

Testing for Specific IgE

26. The demonstration of specific IgE antibodies to known allergens by skin testing or in-vitro tests (as delineated in the "Parameters for Diagnostic Testing"[1]) is of particular importance in determining whether the patient has allergic rhinitis and for identifying specific allergens for which avoidance measures and/or allergen immunotherapy are warranted.

A careful history is the most important step toward the diagnosis of allergic disease. Skin testing to allergens is indicated to provide evidence of an allergic basis for the patient's symptoms, to confirm suspected causes of the patient's symptoms, or to assess the degree of sensitivity to a specific allergen. The simplicity, ease and rapidity of performance, low cost, and high sensitivity of these tests makes them favorable for use in patients with rhinitis. Quality control measures and proper performance of skin testing are vital to produce accurate and reproducible results. The number of skin tests that are necessary may vary depending on the age, potential allergen exposures, and area of the country. To properly interpret skin tests or in vitro tests for specific IgE, it is essential to know which aeroallergens are present locally, are clinically important and have allergenic cross-reactivity with botanically related species (see "Practice Parameter for Allergy Diagnostic Testing").

Reference

1. Bernstein IL, Storms WW. Practice parameters for allergy diagnostic testing. Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Asthma. The American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology and the American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1995; 75:543.

Special Diagnostic Techniques

27. In selected cases, special techniques such as fiberoptic nasal endoscopy and/or rhinomanometry may be useful in evaluating patients presenting with rhinitis symptoms. These tests may require special expertise for appropriate administration and interpretation. Patients with nasal disease require appropriate examination for associated diseases, such as sinusitis and otitis media.

History and routine physical examination are usually sufficient for a definitive diagnosis of rhinitis. Patients with upper airway complaints may initially report symptoms suggestive of rhinitis. When symptoms or physical findings are atypical, complications or other conditions are suspected, or when symptoms do not respond appropriately to therapy, endoscopy may be indicated. Traditional examination of the nasal cavity consists of inspection with a nasal speculum following mucosal decongestion; mirrors are used for examination of the nasopharynx and larynx. Unfortunately, it is not possible to view many of the important recessed structures of the upper airway by these methods. A more complete upper airway examination can easily be performed endoscopically, using either the rigid Hopkins instruments or the flexible fiberoptic endoscope. Radiologic imaging techniques, such as plain films, computed tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) have limited use in the evaluation of patients with uncomplicated rhinitis which responds well to therapy.

Upper Airway Endoscopy. Upper airway endoscopy (rhinolaryngoscopy) is the most useful diagnostic procedure in an evaluation for anatomic factors causing upper airway symptoms. Endoscopy provides a clear view of the nasal cavity and allows for detailed examination of the middle meatus, superior meatus, sphenoethmoidal recess, and posterior nasopharynx, as well as structures of the oropharynx and larynx.[1,2] The procedure is usually performed in the office following decongestion and topical anesthesia. Some children may require sedation. Analysis of videotaped fiberoptic upper airway endoscopy has also been used as a research technique to measure cross sectional area of the nasal cavity.[3]

Imaging Techniques. The primary goals of radiologic imaging of the upper airway are to provide an accurate reproduction of the regional anatomy and to establish the presence and extent of anatomic disease. This information may assist in planning medical therapy and provide an anatomic guide to facilitate subsequent surgical treatment.[3]

Standard radiographs. Although standard radiographs have traditionally been the most frequently used radiologic modality for evaluating disease of the upper airway and paranasal sinuses, they are not indicated in the evaluation of patients with uncomplicated rhinitis. The Caldwell (anterior-posterior) and Waters views best demonstrate the frontal and maxillary sinuses. The lateral view is the best choice for visualization of the sphenoid sinus. These projections are not useful for demonstration of structures of the nasal cavity, and are of limited use in demonstration of structures of the nasopharynx, oropharynx, and larynx. Lateral views are sometimes used for evaluation of the soft tissues of the nasopharynx, adenoids, oropharynx, and larynx, but are generally not needed when endoscopy is available.

Computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging. Computerized tomographic scanning (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) using coronal sections for imaging of sinuses frequently identify turbinate congestion, concha bullosa, polyps and septal deviation as causes of nasal airway obstruction. Although CT and MRI have been used to validate acoustic rhinometry (see below) as a method, they are expensive and may not correlate well with functional obstruction.

High resolution computed tomography can demonstrate disease that is not shown on routine x-ray films. It can also delineate pathologic variations and demonstrate anatomic structures inaccessible by physical examination or endoscopy. Because of its superb contrast resolution, CT is an excellent method for examining the complex anatomy of the upper airway, particularly the ostiomeatal complex. The capability of CT to display bone, soft tissue, and air facilitates accurate definition of regional anatomy of the nose and paranasal sinuses. The main indications for the CT are chronic sinusitis not responding to appropriate medical therapy, acute recurrent sinusitis, abnormal diagnostic nasal endoscopic examination and persistent facial pain.[4] In some centers, a limited CT study including only 4 to 5 views can be performed as a cost effective alternative to sinus radiographs.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) provides better imaging of soft tissue than CT, but it is less suited to imaging the bony anatomy of this region. Because bone and air yield similar signal intensities on MRI, precise definition of the ostiomeatal air passages and their bony perimeter is difficult. Furthermore, in the patient with extensive inflammatory disease, the signal intensity of this pathologic process is indistinguishable from the appearance of the normal mucosa in the edematous phase of the nasal cycle. These factors limit the MRI evaluation of underlying anatomy in a patient with upper airway disease. MRI is useful, however, in evaluation of upper airway malignancies.

Aerodynamic methods for estimation of nasal airway obstruction. Resistance to air flow through the nose

(or conductance, the inverse of resistance) may be measured by rhinomanometry. Rhinomanometry objectively measures functional obstruction to airflow in the upper airway, although the technique has not been fully standardized. Subjective perception of nasal stuffiness may correlate only loosely with measured nasal airway resistance,[5] but rhinomanometry may be used in the assessment of the severity of symptoms. In addition, rhinomanometry may provide objective information on results of therapeutic interventions. The objective information obtained from rhinomanometry may be particularly important when it is suspected that occupational exposure results in nasal symptoms including nasal congestion. Rhinomanometry is not a substitute for careful endoscopy of the nose because significant pathology in the nose can occur with nasal airway resistance values in the normal range.

Rhinomanometry may be used to assess the severity of anatomical abnormalities that are causing airway obstruction in the nose, including nasal valve abnormalities, septal deviation, and polyposis. This application requires measurements before and after treatment with a potent intranasal decongestant agent.

Other indications for rhinomanometry include the evaluation of patients with obstructive sleep apnea.[6]

Acoustic Rhinometry. Acoustic rhinometry depends on reflection of acoustic signals from structures in the nasal cavity.[7–9] It is currently not a technique used in the routine evaluation of patients with rhinitis. It produces an image that represents variations in the cross sectional dimensions of the nasal cavity and closely approximates nasal cavity volume and minimal cross sectional area. It also allows identification of the distance of the minimal cross section area of the nasal cavity from the naris. Changes in nasal geometry measured by acoustic rhinometry during histamine challenge testing have been documented[10,11] and the results of parallel determinations by acoustic rhinometry and rhinomanometry are comparable.[11] However, nasal airway resistance cannot be easily computed from the acoustic rhinometry data.

Nasal Provocation Testing. Identification of sensitivity of the nose to a particular aeroallergen can be usually based on a history of symptoms of allergic rhinitis provoked by exposure to the allergen and confirmed by skin testing. Nasal provocation testing with allergen is unnecessary unless more stringent criteria are needed to incriminate the suspected allergen. For example, nasal provocation testing with allergen may be required for confirmation of sensitivity to allergens in the workplace. Testing of sensitivity to allergens requires that responses to incremental doses of allergens are assessed.[12] Single dose allergen provocation measures nasal reactivity to allergens, not sensitivity. Since nasal reactions to instillation of placebo materials may occur, response to diluent must be measured before provocation with allergens.

Nasal sensitivity/hyperresponsiveness to histamine and methacholine has been found in allergic rhinitis[13–15] and vasomotor rhinitis.[16] Although this may be a marker for these diseases, the clinical utility of nasal provocation testing with histamine or methacholine may be limited to trials of the efficacy of drugs and allergen immunotherapy on nasal irritability, because of a considerable overlap between allergic and nonallergic patients in their sensitivity to these agents.

References

1. Stafford CT. The clinician's view of sinusitis. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 1990;103:870–875.
2. Dolen WK, Selner JC. Endoscopy of the upper airway. In: Middleton E, Reed CE, Ellis EF, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th ed. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, 1998:1017–1023.
3. Zinreich SJ. Radiologic diagnosis of the nasal cavity and paranasal sinuses. In: Druce HM, ed. Sinusitis: pathophysiology and treatment. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1993.
4. Bingham B, Shankar L, Hawke M. Pitfalls in computed tomography of the paranasal sinuses. J Otolaryngol 1991; 20:414–418.
5. Naito K, Cole P, Fraschetti J, Humphrey D. Nasal patency: subjective and objective. Am J Rhinol 1989;3:93–97.
6. Anch AM, Remmers JE, Bunce H, III. Supraglottic airway resistance in normal subjects and patients with occlusive sleep apnea. J Appl Physiol 1982; 53:1158–1163.
7. Grymer LF, Hilberg O, Pedersen OF, Rasmussen TR. Acoustic rhinometry: values from adults with subjective normal nasal patency. Rhinology 1991;29: 35–47.
8. Fisher EW, Lund VJ, Scadding GK. Acoustic rhinometry in rhinological practice: discussion paper. J Royal Soc Med 1994;87:411–413.
9. Pedersen OF, Berkowitz R, Yamagiwa M, Hilberg O. Nasal cavity dimensions in the newborn measured by acoustic reflections. Laryngoscope 1994;104: 1023–1028.
10. Kano S, Pedersen OF, Sly PD. Nasal response to inhaled histamine measured by acoustic rhinometry in infants. Pediatr Pulmonol 1994;17: 312–319.
11. Austin CE, Foreman JC. Acoustic rhinometry compared with posterior rhinomanometry in the measurement of histamine- and bradykinin-induced changes in nasal airway patency. Br J Clin Pharmacol 1994;37:33–37.
12. Schumacher MJ, Pain MCF. Nasal challenge testing in grass pollen hay fever. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1979; 66:202–208.
13. Birchall MA, Phillips I, Fuller RW, Pride NB. Intranasal histamine challenge in normality and nasal rhinitis. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 1993; 109:450–456.
14. Majchel AM, Proud D, Friedhoff L, et al. The nasal response to histamine challenge: effect of the pollen season and immunotherapy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90:85–91.
15. Hilberg O, Grymer LF, Pederson OF. Nasal histamine challenge in nonallergic and allergic subjects evaluated by acoustic rhinometry. Allergy 1995;50: 166–173.
16. Hallen H, Juto JE. Correlation between subjective and objective assessment of nasal hyperreactivity. Orl J Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec 1994;56:51–54.

Nasal Cytology

28. Nasal cytology may aid in differentiating allergic rhinitis and

NARES from other forms of rhinitis, eg, vasomotor, infectious rhinitis, if the correct procedure is followed and the appropriate stains are utilized.

Visualization of large numbers of eosinophils may be helpful in narrowing the differential diagnosis between allergic rhinitis and non-allergic rhinitis with eosinophilia from other types of rhinitis. The presence of neutrophils may support a diagnosis of infectious rhinosinusitis, but secretion neutrophilia is not uncommon in apparently normal subjects.[1] There is lack of expert consensus about whether nasal cytology should be routinely performed in the evaluation of rhinitis.

Reference

1. Malmberg H. Symptoms of chronic and allergic rhinitis and occurrence of nasal secretion granulocytes in university students, school children and infants. Allergy 1979;34:389–394.

Total Serum IgE, Blood Eosinophil Counts

29. Neither total serum IgE nor total circulating eosinophil counts are routinely indicated in the diagnosis of rhinitis.

Serum total IgE has been measured in individuals with a variety of disease conditions.[1] It has often been used as a screening test for allergy. Adults and children with allergic rhinitis and asthma tend to have more elevated total serum total IgE levels.[2] In spite of its wide use, however, it is neither very sensitive nor very specific. There is considerable overlap in total IgE levels between atopic and nonatopic individuals, making the test results difficult to interpret in many instances.[3–7] In general, between 35% to 50% of individuals with allergic rhinitis have normal total IgE levels, while as many as 20% of nonatopic individuals have elevated total IgE levels. In one study of 244 individuals with allergic rhinitis, the specificity and sensitivity of total serum IgE determinations using a cutoff level of 200 IU/mL were 85% and 50% respectively.[8] A similar result was also observed in a study with pediatric patients.[9] Although significant elevations (greater than 50 IU/mL in infants or greater than 200 IU/mL in older children and adults) may correlate with the presence of atopy, a variety of nonatopic conditions can also be associated with these elevated levels of serum total IgE.[1] Recently, there have been several investigations done to evaluate the association respiratory symptoms with serum total IgE and skin-test reactivity.[10–12] The overall results of these studies revealed a poor correlation, especially with allergic rhinitis. Although serum IgE levels may have the advantage of providing some index of overall allergy and can identify the individuals who are least "allergic," they have the disadvantage of measuring all types of IgE, not all of which appear relevant to the respiratory symptoms and skin-test reactivity. Hence, there is still no convincing evidence to support the routine use of total serum IgE measurement in patients suspected of having allergic rhinitis and other related atopic diseases.

The routine measurement of total circulating eosinophil counts in the diagnosis of allergy is subject to similar limitations as for serum total IgE.[13]

References

1. Ownby DR. Clinical significance of IgE. In: E. Middleton Jr, CE Reed, EF Ellis, eds. Allergy: principles and practice, 5th ed. St. Louis: Mosby, 1998: 770–782.
2. Johnson EE, Irons JJ, Patterson R, Roberts M. Frequency of elevated serum IgE concentrations in eczema with and without respiratory allergy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1974;54:94.
3. Grundbacher FJ. Causes of variation in serum IgE levels in normal populations. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1974; 56:104.
4. Henderson LL, Swedlund HA, Van Dellen RG, et al. Evaluation of IgE tests in an allergy practice. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1971;48:361.
5. Marsh DG, Bias WB, Ishizaka K. Genetic control of basal serum immunoglobulin level and its effect on specific reaginic sensitivity. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1974;71:3588.
6. Haahtela T, Suoniemi I, Jaakonmaki I, et al. Relationship between serum IgE concentration and occurrence of immediate skin test reactions and allergic disorders in young people. Allergy 1982;37:597.
7. Klink M, Cline MG, Halonen M, et al. Problems in defining normal limits for serum IgE. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;85:440.
8. Wittig HJ, Belloit J, De Fillippi I, Royal G. Age-related serum immunoglobulin E levels in healthy subjects and in patients with allergic disease. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1980;66:305.
9. Ownby DR, Anderson JA, Jacobs GL, et al. Development and comparative evaluation of a multiple-antigen RAST as a screening test for inhalant allergy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1984;73:466.
10. Burrows B, Sears MR, Flannery EM, et al. Relations of bronchial responsiveness to allergy skin test reactivity, lung function, respiratory symptoms, and diagnoses in thirteen-year-old New Zealand children. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:548.
11. Sears MR, Burrows B, Flannery EM, et al. Relation between airway responsiveness and serum IgE in children with asthma and in apparently normal children. N Engl J Med 1991;325: 1067.
12. Sherrill DL, Lebowitz MD, Halonen M, et al. Longitudinal evaluation of the association between pulmonary function and total serum IgE. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1995;152:98.
13. Mygind N, Dirksen A, Johnsen NJ, Weeke B. Perennial rhinitis: an analysis of skin testing, serum IgE, and blood and smear eosinophilia in 201 patients. Clin Otolaryngol 1978;3: 189–196.

Unproven or Inappropriate Diagnostic Techniques

30. Cytotoxicity testing, provocative and neutralization testing carried out by either intracutaneous or subcutaneous injection or sublingual administration, and measurement of specific and non-specific IgG4 are controversial, unproven and/or not appropriate for diagnostic use in evaluation of rhinitis.

Those techniques summarized below are considered controversial or unproven because they have not been subjected to validation by accepted standards of scientific evaluation or are

not appropriate for diagnostic use in IgE-mediated disease. The techniques are cytotoxicity testing, provocative and neutralization testing carried out by either intracutaneous or subcutaneous injection or sublingually and measurement of specific and nonspecific IgG4.

I. Cytotoxicology Testing

Leukocytotoxic testing is based on the claim that the addition of specific allergen in vitro to whole blood or to serum leukocyte suspensions will result in reduction in white blood cell count or death of the leukocytes. In 1960, Bryan and Bryan[1] published the first of a series of articles describing the method. Hence, this has also been called Bryan's Test. The test is performed by removing the buffy coat from whole blood and the cells are then added to a mixture containing sterile distilled water and serum. The suspension is then applied to a microscope slide containing dried antigen within a ring of petrolatum jelly. A control slide is used containing a mixture of the patient's cells, serum and water. The slides are examined at intervals up to 2 hours for any changes in the appearance of the leukocytes or a decrease in motility. These changes are claimed to be the consequence of an allergic reaction, and the test is used for diagnosis of both food and inhalant allergy.

The test has never been proven effective by controlled studies nor has a scientific basis for its use been demonstrated. The results of numerous published control trials indicate that the procedure is not effective for diagnosis of food or inhalant allergy. In serum-leukocyte preparations from patients sensitive to a variety of specific allergens, there are no consistent differences between leukocytes exposed to allergens to which the patients are clinically sensitive and those exposed to allergens to which the patients are not sensitive.[2,3] In a controlled study of the cytotoxic effect of specific allergens on white cells and plasma suspensions, tests did not correlate with atopic reactions to foods or with other untoward reactions to foods (headache, diarrhea, fatigue), and the test was dependent on subjective interpretation and inconsistent end results when repetitive results were performed on the same patient. In a double-blind controlled study,[4] a similar cytotoxic test afforded no reliable help in establishing the diagnosis of food allergy because positive cytotoxic effects were frequently obtained to foods that produced no clinical symptoms, and negative cytotoxic reactions were obtained to foods that did produce clinical symptoms.

The test is not performed under standardized conditions and the interpretation of changes is entirely subjective. Leukocytotoxic changes in IgE-mediated hypersensitivity have not been confirmed. Therefore, there is no proof that cytotoxic testing is a valid technique for diagnosing inhalant allergy and a number of controlled trials have indicated that this test is ineffective for diagnostic purposes.[5]

II. Provocation–Neutralization testing (Intracutaneous or subcutaneous)

Intracutaneous or subcutaneous provocation neutralization testing is claimed to be a method of diagnosing allergic disease.[6] In this technique, an intracutaneous or subcutaneous injection of antigen is administered in increasing concentrations to elicit symptoms that correspond to the patient's complaints. As soon as symptoms appear, weaker dilutions of the same antigen are injected at intervals until a dose is found that relieves the provoked symptoms. The patient is observed for 10 minutes after each dilution and all symptoms are recorded. The symptoms can take many forms including drowsiness, chills and muscle pain. Thus, there are 2 phases to the process, provocation and neutralization. A modification of the provocative intracutaneous test to diagnose inhalant allergy was developed using wheal size. However, the principle of provoking and neutralizing symptoms remained the basis for the procedure. One double-blind study of 61 atopic subjects was unable to confirm and reproduce the validity of results from subcutaneous provocative-neutralization testing.[7] A study of symptoms, chest auscultation and peak expiratory flow rates in 20 asthmatic children after provocation skin testing found no correlation of these measurements with skin tests.[8] No attempts at scientific establishment of the possible mechanisms involved have been published. Moreover, from what is known about IgE-mediated reactions, there is no immunologic basis for a therapeutic response to a neutralizing dose of allergenic extract. Therefore, there is no rationale or immunologic basis for subcutaneous or intracutaneous provocation and neutralization testing to be used as a method for the diagnosis of allergic disease in patients with rhinitis.[9]

III. Provocation–Neutralization Testing (Sublingual)

Sublingual antigen administration has been advocated as a technique for the diagnosis of food induced respiratory symptoms.[8] The method consists of placing drops of an allergenic extract in various dilutions under the tongue of the patient and waiting 10 minutes for the appearance of symptoms and any symptom is interpreted as a positive test. When the symptoms occur, a neutralizing dose is administered which is usually drops of a more dilute solution of the same extract. Symptoms are expected to disappear in approximately the same temporal sequence in which they appeared. Two separate controlled studies carried out by the Food Allergy Committee of the American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology revealed that sublingual provocative testing did not discriminate between placebo controls and allergenic extracts.[10,11] Another study evaluated this technique with 5 physicians, all of whom had been using this method of testing for at least 7 years.[12] The technique was performed according to a double-blind protocol and there was no distinction of reactions between placebo and active extracts. Another study obtained similar negative results.[13] Therefore, there are no controlled clinical studies indicating that sublingual antigen administration

has diagnostic efficacy for human atopic disease. Moreover, there are no known immunologic mechanisms that can account for the neutralizing effects of dilute solutions of allergenic extracts.

IV. Specific and Non-Specific IgG4

Measurement of nonspecific and specific IgG4 has been advocated as a diagnostic test for clinical allergy. Because of controversial and inconclusive scientific evidence,[14–18] the measurement of IgG4 should not be part of the diagnosis of patients with allergic nasal disease.[19]

References

1. Bryan WTK, Bryan MP. The application of in vitro cytotoxic reactions to clinical diagnosis of food allergy. Laryngoscope 1960;70:810.
2. Chambers VV, Hudson BH, Glaser J. A study of the reactions of human polymorphonuclear leukocytes to various antigens. J Allergy 1958;29:93.
3. Lieberman P, Crawford L, Bjelland J, et al. Controlled study of the cytotoxic food test. JAMA 1974;231:728.
4. Benson TE, Arkins JA. Cytotoxic testing for food allergy: evaluations of reproducibility and correlation. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1976;58:471.
5. Lowell FC. Some untested diagnostic and therapeutic procedures in clinical allergy [Editorial]. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1975;56:168–169.
6. Lee CH, Williams RI, Binkley EL. Provocative inhalant testing and treatment. Arch Otolaryngol 1969;90:173.
7. Crawford LV, Lieberman P, Harfi HA, et al. A double-blind study of subcutaneous food testing sponsored by the Food Allergy Committee of the American Academy of Allergy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1976;57:236.
8. Bronsky EA, Burkley DP, Ellis EF. Evaluation of the provocative skin test technique [Abstract]. J Allergy 1971; 47:104.
9. Morris DL. Use of sublingual antigen in diagnosis and treatment of food allergy. Ann Allergy 1971;27:289.
10. Breneman JC, et al. Report of the Food Allergy Committee on the sublingual method of provocative testing for food allergy. Ann Allergy 1973;31:382.
11. Breneman JC, et al. Final report of the Food Allergy Committee of the American College of Allergists on the clinical evaluation of sublingual provocation testing method for diagnosis of food allergy. Ann Allergy 1974;33: 164.
12. Kailin EW. "Relieving" therapy for antigen exposure. JAMA 1971;217:78.
13. Lehman CW. A double-blind study of sublingual provocative food testing: A study of its efficacy. Ann Allergy 1980;45:144.
14. Gwynn CM, Ingram J, Almosawi T, Stanworth DR. Bronchial provocation tests in atopic patients with allergen-specific IgG4 antibodies. Lancet 1982; 1:254.
15. Lee TH, Durham SR, Merrett J, Merrett TG, Kay AB. Allergen-specific IgG4 in bronchial asthma. Lancet 1982;2:1048.
16. Homburger HA, Mauer K, Sachs MI, et al. Serum IgG4 concentrations and allergen-specific IgG4 antibodies compared in adults and children with asthma and nonallergic subjects. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1986;77:427.
17. Stanworth DR. Immunochemical aspects of human IgG4. Clin Rev Allergy 1983;1:183.
18. Perelmutter L. IgG4 and the immune system. Clin Rev Allergy 1983;1:267.
19. American Academy of Allergy and Immunology. Measurement of specific and nonspecific IgG4 levels as diagnostic and prognostic tests for clinical allergy. Position statement. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:652–654.

MANAGEMENT OF RHINITIS

Environmental Control Measures

31. Avoidance of inciting factors, eg, allergens, irritants, medications, is fundamental to the management of rhinitis. Triggers should be identified and avoidance measures instituted.

General Considerations

There are five major categories of IgE-dependent triggers for allergic rhinitis: pollens, molds, house dust mites, animals and insect allergens. In patients sensitive to multiple allergens, it is important to institute avoidance measures for all relevant allergens. This may improve tolerance to unavoidable exposure to aeroallergens, eg, pollens. Although sensitive immunochemical techniques permit direct quantitation of actual changes in allergen level, the effectiveness of environmental control procedures is judged primarily by patient symptoms and medication scores.[1,2]

Clinical Science

Pollens. Pollen triggering allergic rhinitis is principally derived from wind-pollinated (anemophilus) trees, grasses and weeds though insect-pollinated (entemophilus) plants may produce symptoms if encountered at close range. Pollen allergens are quickly eluted from pollen grains on contact with ocular or respiratory mucosa. Similar allergens may be found on fragments derived from other portions of the plant. Pollen allergens, possibly eluted from pollen grains and passively borne on plant debris and soil particles, can be found on air sampling even when pollen grains are no longer being recovered. Pollens responsible for symptoms vary widely with locale, climate and introduced plantings. In temperate regions of North America, tree pollen generally predominates in early to mid-spring, grasses in late spring and early summer, and weeds from late summer until early fall. The dose of pollen allergen necessary to elicit symptoms exhibits considerable variability depending on level of allergic sensitization and degree of extant allergic nasal mucosal inflammation ("priming"). Reducing pollen exposure is important in the effective management of allergic rhinitis.

Windows and doors must be kept closed and air conditioning used, if necessary, on indoor cycle (closed vents) to keep the home or vehicle comfortable.[3] Indoor pollen levels are increased by window or attic fans. Though remaining entirely indoors is impractical, it is helpful to reduce outdoor exposure during periods of high pollen counts. Activities involving extended time out-of-doors, such as camping trips, may need to be avoided during offending pollen seasons. In general, limiting outdoor activity on sunny, windy days with low humidity is also advisable whereas such activities may be well-tolerated following a gentle, sustained rain. Because the in-

terplay of different weather factors (eg, wind currents, sunshine, rain, humidity) is complex, it is not possible to reliably predict levels of outdoor aeroallergens from the influence of a single weather factor.[4] A shower or bath following outdoor activity removes pollen from the hair and skin and avoids contamination of bedding. In highly sensitive patients whose symptoms are triggered by very low pollen levels, effective allergen avoidance may necessitate severely curtailing outdoor activity. Medications and allergen immunotherapy are required in such patients.

Molds. Molds or fungi are ubiquitous and important allergens. These saprophytic organisms exist in great numbers outdoors but also may heavily contaminate indoor environments. Most mold allergens are encountered through inhalation of spores although fragments of hyphal elements may also contribute. Though displaying a poorly defined summer-early autumn seasonal pattern in the northern US, mold spores are recovered on outdoor air sampling year-round in the southern US except during periods of snow cover. Outdoor molds grow on both viable and decaying vegetation, and are strongly influenced by local vegetation. Abundant mold is also found in soil and is released when the earth is disturbed by plowing, excavation, etc. Harvesting activities are also associated with increased mold counts. Mold spore levels are affected by temperature, wind, rain and humidity. Some fungi require the action of water droplets for spore release. High levels of these spores appear during rainy weather and with dew formation at night. "Wet weather" molds include Fusarium, Phoma and Cephalosporium. Other common allergenic molds, such as Alternaria and Cladosporium, are released by wind as humidity falls. Rain or high humidity lowers "dry release" mold spore counts, but counts rise rapidly when the rainy period ends.[4]

Like pollens, avoidance of outdoor molds consists of remaining in a closed environment as much as practical. Air conditioning on indoor cycle is helpful[4] though air conditioning units may be heavily contaminated with mold. Mold exposure is increased by walking in uncut fields and may reach very high levels with activities such as mowing or threshing. Working with compost, silage or dry soil commonly triggers symptoms in mold sensitive patients as does raking leaves. The latter activities may also involve exposure to resuspended pollens and insect debris. Face masks are recommended for such outdoor activities though their value is limited by entrainment of air around the edges of the mask. Also, they offer no protection for the eyes.

Many factors influence the amount of indoor mold, including age and construction of the dwelling, presence of a basement or crawl space, type of heating system, and use of humidifiers and air conditioning. Damp homes, basements, cold outside walls and window moldings provide favorable conditions for mold growth as do sinks, shower stalls, non-refrigerated vegetable storage areas and garbage pails. Fungicides to kill and retard mold growth, such as Clorox® or Lysol®, should be used in these locations. Mold spores also are present in carpeting, bedding and upholstered furniture and are reduced by dust mite avoidance measures. Console humidifiers and cool mist vaporizers may be reservoirs for mold and are best avoided by mold sensitive patients. If employed, such equipment must be kept scrupulously clean. If the home is constructed over a crawl space, a plastic vapor barrier over exposed soil and keeping foundation vents open will reduce moisture and mold. If a basement is damp or tends to flood, carpeting and furnishing the basement should be avoided, a dehumidifier employed at all times and any standing water evacuated as quickly as possible. Chemical and physical measures to control indoor mold will usually fail if relative humidity and condensation are not reduced.

House dust mites. The fecal residue of dust mites, belonging to the genus *Dermatophagoides,* is the major source of allergen in house dust. Their principal food source is exfoliated human skin scale. Consequently, mites exist in reservoirs of skin scale: bedding, fabric covered furniture, soft toys and carpeting.[1] Aside from availability of food, the major factors influencing mite growth are temperature and humidity. To replicate, a relative humidity of 50% or greater (absolute humidity of >8 g/kg) is required.[5] Recent changes in home construction and housecleaning methods including more energy-efficient buildings with reduced ventilation and increased humidity, wall-to-wall carpeting, wider use of furnished basements, central heat, and use of cool water detergents for laundering bedding all favor dust mite growth.

Vigorous measures are required to reduce dust mite allergen. Ordinary vacuuming and dusting have little effect.[6] To achieve effective reduction in mite allergen, the bedroom and main living areas (eg, family room) should be simply furnished without carpets. Whenever feasible, mite-sensitive patients should avoid vacuuming or making beds. If vacuuming is required, use a vacuum cleaner with an efficient double filtration system. Patients who do their own cleaning should wear a face mask while cleaning and for 10 to 15 minutes afterward. Better still, housecleaning should be carried out while the patient is not at home. There is no evidence that electrostatic purifiers and conflicting evidence that HEPA air purifiers reduce symptoms in dust mite allergy.[7,8] At most, such filters are of modest benefit.[9] Likewise, cleaning heating ducts is of no demonstrated value. On the other hand, air conditioning reduces mite numbers by lowering indoor humidity. Humidifier use should be minimized.

All mattresses, box springs and pillows in the patient's bedroom must be encased in zippered, allergen-proof encasings. Vinyl encasings are effective, but cloth encasings with semi-permeable plastic backing are more comfortable and durable. If a mattress is old, replacement should be considered but even new "hypoallergenic" mattresses

and pillows must be encased since mite colonization occurs within weeks. Bedclothes should be washed in hot water (greater than 130 degrees F) at least every 2 weeks to remove mite allergen and kill mite ova. Quilts and comforters should be avoided or covered with an allergen-proof duvet. Stuffed toys that cannot be washed should be eliminated or replaced with a washable toy. Avoid storing items under beds.

Mites may be abundant in fabric covered furniture and presently, no effective means exist in the US for eliminating mites in upholstered furniture. Plastic, leather or wood furniture is best. When fabric upholstered furniture cannot be avoided, a 3% tannic acid solution can be used to denature mite and other allergens on these furnishings. This solution does not kill mites, however, so mite allergen reaccumulates rapidly and requires retreatment.[1]

Since thorough vacuuming removes only surface dirt and mite allergen, carpeting is best removed from the bedroom and replaced with smooth finish wood, tile or vinyl flooring.[6] If this is impractical, one may consider treating carpets with Acarosan®, a special carpet treatment containing benzyl benzoate.[10] However, the effects of treatment do not appear to be maintained for long periods and are not dramatic.[11] If Acarosan® is used, it should be repeatedly brushed into the carpet over 12 hours followed by careful vacuuming to remove all powder. Efficacy of allergen removal and need for re-treatment can be ascertained with a kit (Acarex®) that measures guanine, a fecal excretion product of dust mites, in house dust. Carpeting installed over a concrete slab is a particularly potent source of mite allergen and is best avoided, if possible. Acarosan® and other treatments may not control mite allergen in carpets that are damp from seepage or condensation.[12]

Animal allergens. Because of the popularity of indoor pets, cats, dogs and other domestic animals are important causes of allergic rhinitis. All warm-blooded animals, including birds, potentially are capable of sensitizing susceptible allergic patients. Positive skin test reactivity to cat and dog is found in 1/4 to 1/3 of allergic individuals, and animal allergens are a significant occupational hazard for workers exposed to mice, rats, guinea pigs, etc. Farm workers may develop sensitivities to farm animals. In inner city areas, rodent urine may be an important source of animal allergen. Though furs processed for use in clothing are no longer allergenic, feather products retain significant allergenicity. Because allergen-bearing particles of animal origin are generally quite small and low density, they remain suspended in air for extended periods and disseminate widely in homes and other facilities. Symptoms of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis may occur within minutes of entering a contaminated area.

The major antigen in cat allergen, *Fel d* I is found on cat skin/dander and in saliva and urine. Cat albumin is also allergenic but a less frequent cause of sensitivity than *Fel d* I. *Fel d* I and albumin are common to all breeds of cats. Cat allergen has been identified in homes and other locations where cats were never present and occasionally may reach concentrations found in homes where cats are kept.[2] This is presumed to be passive contamination from cat allergen borne on clothing. Such contamination may be an unsuspected cause of symptoms in sensitive individuals.[13]

Allergy to dogs, though common, appears less frequent than cat allergy. The major dog allergen, *Can f* I, is found in dog skin/dander and saliva and is present in varying amounts in all breeds tested. Still, many dog-sensitive patients claim to respond differently to various breeds of dogs or even specific dogs of a single breed. Like cat allergen, *Can f* has been found in rooms in which dogs were never present.[2,13] Analysis of the location of this allergen suggests passive transport on clothing. Levels may be sufficient to elicit symptoms in sensitized patients.[13]

Avoidance clearly remains the most effective way of dealing with animal sensitivity. If the pet producing symptoms is in the home, the patient and family should be counseled to consider removing the animal to avoid possible progression of symptoms. A "trial" removal of a pet for a few days or even weeks may be of little value or, worse, misleading since, in the case of cat allergen, an average of 20 weeks (and in some cases much longer) is required for allergen levels to reach levels found in homes without cats. This decrease can be accelerated by removing carpeting and discarding upholstered furniture, but this is generally impractical. Steam cleaning of carpets and upholstered furniture following removal of the animal seems to have little advantage over routine vacuuming with a double filter vacuum system. If despite vigorous counseling the patient and/or family refuses to remove the pet, confining the animal to an uncarpeted room (other than the bedroom) with a HEPA or electrostatic air purifier may reduce airborne allergen in the remainder of the home by 90%.[13] Some[14,15] but not all[16] studies have demonstrated reduced airborne cat allergen by washing the animal on a weekly basis. Whether frequent bathing of dogs reduces airborne dog allergen is uncertain. Litter boxes should be eliminated whenever feasible or placed in an area unconnected to the air supply for the rest of the home. If not removed, caged pets (birds, rodents, guinea pigs, etc.) also should be kept in an uncarpeted area of the home and remote from the patient's bedroom.

Insect allergens. Allergic rhinoconjunctivitis and asthma have been reported with exposure to debris of numerous insects including cockroaches, crickets, caddis flies, house flies, midges and moths. Because of their prevalence and indoor living habits, cockroaches are a significant cause of respiratory allergy, especially in inner city populations. Up to 60% of dust-sensitive patients from urban areas react to cockroach allergens. The major cockroach allergens, *Bla g* I and *Bla g* II, are found on the insect's body and its feces. Cockroach allergen is most abundant in kitchen floor dust and may

reach high levels in poorly maintained homes and apartments. Eliminating cockroaches requires careful sanitation such as not allowing food to stand open or remain on unwashed dishes, promptly wiping up food spills and storing garbage in tightly closed containers. Use of "roach traps" has been advocated since these permit removal of the allergen-containing bodies of the insects. If the infestation is heavy, however, repeated applications of insecticide by a professional exterminator or changing homes may be required.

Miscellaneous and non-allergic factors. A host of other environmental factors may incite or worsen rhinitis. Agents producing occupational asthma by IgE-dependent mechanisms commonly trigger nasal and ocular symptoms. Because asthma may be more debilitating, occupational rhinoconjunctivitis is often ignored. Measures to control occupational asthma usually reduce occupational rhinitis and will not be discussed further. Rhinitis has also been attributed to irritants eg, tobacco smoke, formaldehyde, perfume and other strong odors, and newspaper ink. Some persons display increased "sensitivity" to environmental tobacco smoke.[17] The headache, nasal and chest symptoms do not appear to involve IgE. Avoidance of passive tobacco smoke is mandatory for such patients. The capacity of formaldehyde to cause stinging and burning of the eyes and nose, lacrimation, and decreased nasal mucous flow is well-established.[18] This appears to be irritant effect since even prolonged, high-level formaldehyde exposure only rarely results in IgE to formaldehyde-protein conjugates and this does not correlate with clinical symptoms.[18,19] Since respiratory symptoms generally occur at concentrations well above those at which the odor of formaldehyde is detectable, it is unlikely that formaldehyde would be an unsuspected cause of rhinitis. Perfume and newsprint are claimed to elicit symptoms in some rhinitis sufferers. The mechanism is uncertain but felt to be irritant.[20] If troublesome, avoidance is indicated.

References

1. Platts-Mills TAE, Thomas WR, Aalberse RC, et al. Dust mite allergens and asthma: report of a second international workshop. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;89:1046–1060.
2. Wood RA, Eggleston PA, Lind P, et al. Antigenic analysis of household dust samples. Am Rev Resp Dis 1988;137: 358–363.
3. Solomon WR, Burge HA, Boise JR. Exclusion of particulate allergens by window air conditioners. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1980;65:305–308.
4. Solomon WR, Platts-Mills TAE. Aerobiology and inhalant allergens. In: Middleton EJ, Reed CE, Ellis EF, et al, eds. Allergy: principles and practice. 5th ed. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, 1998:367–403.
5. Pollart S, Chapman MD, Platts-Mills TAE. House dust mite and dust control. Clin Rev Allergy 1988;6:23–33.
6. Burr UL, Dean BV, Merrett TG, et al. Effects of anti-mite measures on children with mite-sensitive asthma: a controlled trial. Thorax 1980;35: 506–512.
7. Nelson HS, Hirsch SR, Ohman JLJ, et al. Recommendations for the use of residential air-cleaning devices in the treatment of allergic respiratory disease. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;82: 661–669.
8. American Thoracic Society. Achieving healthy indoor air; report of the ATS workshop: Santa Fe, New Mexico, November 16–19, 1995. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1997;156:S33–S64.
9. Reisman RE, Mauriello PM, Davis GB, et al. A double-blind study of the effectiveness of a high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter in the treatment of patients with perennial allergic rhinitis and asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;85:1050–1057.
10. Hayden ML, Rose G, Diduch KB, et al. Benzyl benzoate moist powder: investigation of acarical activity in cultures and reduction of dust mite allergens in carpets. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;89:536–545.
11. Woodfolk JA, Hayden ML, Couture N, Platts-Mills TA. Chemical treatment of carpet to reduce allergen: comparison of the effects of tannic acid and other treatments on proteins derived from dust mites and cats. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;96:325–333.
12. Rose G, Woodfolk JA, Hayden ML, et al. Testing of methods to control mite allergen in carpets fitted to concrete slabs [Abstract]. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;89:315.
13. Munir AKM, Einarsson R, Schou C, et al. Allergens in school dust. I. The amount of the major cat (*Fel d* I) and dog (*Can f* I) allergens in dust from Swedish schools is high enough to probably cause perennial symptoms in most children with asthma who are sensitized to cat and dog. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;91:1067–1074.
14. deBlay F, Chapman MD, Platts-Mills TAE. Airborne cat allergen (*Fel d* I): Environmental control with the cat in situ. Am Rev Respir Dis 1991;143: 1334–1339.
15. Glinert R, Wilson P, Wedner HJ. *Fel d* I is markedly reduced following sequential washing of cats [Abstract]. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;85:327.
16. Klucka CV, Ownby DR, Green J, et al. Cat shedding of *Fel d* I is not reduced by washings, Allerpet-C spray or acepromazine. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:1164–1171.
17. Bascom R, Kulle T, Kagey-Sobotka A, et al. Upper respiratory tract environmental tobacco smoke sensitivity. Am Rev Respir Dis 1991;143:1304–1311.
18. Bardana EJ, Montanaro A. Formaldehyde: an analysis of its respiratory, cutaneous, and immunologic effects. Ann Allergy 1991;66: 441–452.
19. Dykewicz MS, Patterson R, Cugell DW, et al. Serum IgE and IgG to formaldehyde–human serum albumin: lack of relation to gaseous formaldehyde exposure and symptoms. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1991;87:48–57.
20. Theander C, Bende M. Nasal hyperreactivity to newspapers. Clin Exp Allergy 1989;19:57–58.

Pharmacologic Therapy

32. Pharmacologic management should be considered in relation to the etiology and pathophysiology of the condition. If it is possible to anticipate the onset of symptoms, eg, seasonal rhinitis or rhinitis triggered by sporadic exposure, initiating prophylactic use of medications may lessen the impact of such exposure on the patient.

Antihistamines

33. Oral antihistamines are effective in reducing symptoms of itching, sneezing, and rhinorrhea, and are first line therapy for treatment of allergic rhinitis. However, oral antihistamines have little objective effect on nasal congestion. Antihistamines reduce symptoms of allergic conjunctivitis, which are often associated with allergic rhinitis.

Issues with sedation/performance impairment

34. Sedation and performance impairment are undesirable and potentially dangerous side effects of first generation antihistamines. Consequently, second generation antihistamines that are associated with less risk or no risk for these side effects should usually be considered before sedating antihistamines for the treatment of allergic rhinitis, and are even mandated in some segments of the transportation industry. Studies have demonstrated that many patients may not perceive performance impairment that is associated with first generation (classical) antihistamines. In the majority of states, patients taking sedating antihistamines are legally considered "under the influence of drugs."

Adverse cardiac effects of some second generation antihistamines

35. Some older non-sedating antihistamines such as astemizole and terfenadine (the latter withdrawn from the US market in 1998) may cause prolongation of the QTc interval that may lead to the ventricular arrhythmia torsade de pointes especially with overdose, administration with certain concomitant medications (eg, some macrolide antibiotics, azole anti-fungal agents), and in the presence of severe liver disease.

Although many chemical mediators of inflammation play a role in producing the various symptoms and signs of allergic rhinitis, there is strong evidence that histamine is a mediator of major importance in this disorder. Once released from mast cells and basophils, histamine dilates blood vessels, increases vessel permeability, and stimulates sensory nerve endings and reflexes through the parasympathetic system that cause glandular secretion. Histamine given intranasally can reproduce all the symptoms of allergic rhinitis (sneezing, pruritus, rhinorrhea, blockage),[1] and therefore, H_1 histamine receptor antagonists (ie, H_1 antihistamines) are generally effective in controlling many of the symptoms of allergic rhinitis. Antihistamines are less efficacious (if at all) in other forms of rhinitis (eg, vasomotor, infectious), thereby making it important to establish a correct diagnosis before initiating therapy.

A major limitation of the use of the first generation (classical) antihistamines has been sedation. However, second generation antihistamines have been developed that in recommended doses significantly reduce or eliminate this problem. The availability of these second generation antihistamines has greatly improved the usefulness of antihistamines as pharmacotherapeutic agents since patients who otherwise would avoid antihistamine therapy due to sedation, can now utilize them and obtain significant benefit.

Mechanism/pharmacokinetics. Both first and second generation H_1 antihistamines are pharmacologic antagonists of histamine at the H_1-receptor site and act by competitively binding to the H_1 receptor, thus blocking the H_1 response. Certain H_1-receptor antagonists have metabolites that are active and as relevant, or even more relevant, than their parent compound (eg, loratadine, terfenadine, astemizole, hydroxyzine).[2] In addition to being antagonists of histamine, some of the second generation antihistamines may inhibit release of mast cell and basophil inflammatory mediators resulting in antiallergic and anti-inflammatory effects. Some of this action may be due to the ability of some, but not all, antihistamines to prevent release of histamine after antigen challenge.[3]

Oral antihistamines are readily absorbed, with peak serum concentrations usually occurring within 2 to 3 hours after a dose. The metabolism of all first generation and several second generation antihistamines is via the hepatic cytochrome P450 system. Clearance rates of H_1 antagonists are quite variable (2 hours to 10 days) but generally, serum elimination half-lives are shorter in children than in adults, longer in the elderly, but in all ages serum half-lives are less than their duration of bioactivity. In studies of the ability of antihistamines to suppress histamine- or antigen-induced wheal and flare reactions, peak suppression by antihistamines usually occurs 5 to 7 hours after an oral dose. Histamine suppressive effects can persist for up to 24 to 36 hours and longer (eg, hydroxyzine, cetrizine), even when serum concentrations of the parent compound have declined to their lowest limit of detection, probably secondary to the presence of active metabolites and/or high tissue drug concentrations.[2] Astemizole is unique in that it binds to peripheral H_1-receptor sites with far greater affinity than do other H_1-receptor antagonists. As a result, a single dose of astemizole produces serum and tissue levels that persist for days to weeks, with skin test suppression noted to last up to at least 6 weeks.[4]

Clinical efficacy. Oral antihistamines are capable of decreasing all the symptoms of allergic rhinitis (especially sneezing, itching, and nasal discharge) but are least effective in relieving nasal blockage. Numerous first generation antihistamines are available over-the-counter or by prescription. All first generation antihistamines belong to one of 6 different chemical classes based on their specific side chain substitution. There generally is little difference in clinical efficacy amongst these classes, although chlorpheniramine (alkylamine class) and hydroxyzine (piperazine class) have

been found to be more effective in certain studies when compared to other first generation antihistamines.[5]

Adverse Effects. Many patients with significant allergy symptoms would rather tolerate their symptoms than use an antihistamine for relief because of the associated sedation, performance impairment and other adverse effects. This phenomenon has great inter-patient variability. Some patients will be completely free of drowsiness, whereas others are heavily sedated even after a small dose. After continued use of antihistamines, it has been reported that some individuals may develop tolerance to sedation or performance impairment effects from these agents, but other studies report little or no reduction in these side effects.[6]

Many patients deny sedation with the use of first generation antihistamines but an increasing body of information suggests that CNS impairment can exist even when sedation is not reported.[7] The major objective parameters used to detect CNS effects with antihistamines are reduced sleep latency (greater sleepiness) and performance impairment. Measurements used to assess performance impairment include reaction time, visual-motor coordination, arithmetical exercises, memory, learning, and driving tests (eg, ability to avoid obstacles and drive in a straight line). Using these measurements, first generation antihistamines have been clearly associated with CNS depression and impairment, and these effects can be independent of any subjective complaints by the patient. First generation antihistamines have been demonstrated to impair children's learning and academic performance.[8,9] First generation antihistamines also may cause driving impairment and fatal automobile accidents.[10–14] One large epidemiologic study has demonstrated that drivers responsible for fatal automobile accidents were 1.5 more likely to be taken first-generation antihistamines than drivers killed but not responsible for accidents.[15] In the majority of states, patients taking sedating antihistamines are legally considered "under the influence of drugs."[16] Workers taking first generation antihistamines have decreased work performance and productivity and are also more likely to be involved in occupational accidents, a risk greater than that attributable to narcotics and sedative hypnotics.[17–20] Other CNS active substances such as alcohol, sedatives, hypnotics and anti-depressants may potentiate the performance impairment from antihistamines. Similar effects on performance and sleep latency have not been observed with the standard doses of available "non-sedating" second-generation antihistamines described below. Consequently, second generation antihistamines that are associated with less risk or no risk for these side effects should usually be considered before sedating antihistamines for the treatment of allergic rhinitis, and are even mandated in some segments of the transportation industry.

Adverse effects other than drowsiness can occur with first generation antihistamines, and are related mainly to the peripheral and central cholinergic nervous system; antiserotonin and anti-bradykinin effects may also be important. Peripheral anticholinergic effects including dry mouth, dry eyes, and urinary retention are not uncommon; tachycardia, impotence, worsening of glaucoma, and headache also rarely occur. Central effects in addition to somnolence may include coma, seizures, dyskinesia and behavioral changes. An atropine-like "psychosis" can result from overdose.

Second-Generation Antihistamines. Second generation H_1-receptor antagonists are relatively lipophobic, have a large molecular size, and possess an electrostatic charge, all of which contribute to poor penetration of the CNS, thereby decreasing or eliminating sedation. Other advantages of these second generation antihistamines include preferential binding to peripheral H_1-receptors over central ones and the feature of possessing minimal antiserotonin, anticholinergic and alpha-adrenergic blocking activity.[21]

The present list of available second generation antihistamines includes astemizole, loratadine, cetirizine, and fexofenadine; terfenadine marketing in the US ceased in 1998 (Table 3). These agents have proven effective in decreasing symptoms of sneezing, itching, and nasal discharge, and the ocular symptoms of allergic conjunctivitis often associated with allergic rhinitis. Although they possess an improved safety profile, most evaluations show, however, that this new class of antihistamines is no more effective than the first generation H_1-receptor antagonists.[22]

Pharmaceutical manufacturers recommend the following adult doses to provide optimal efficacy with minimal likelihood of causing sedation or other adverse effects: astemizole, 10 mg QD; cetirizine, 5 to 10 mg QD; fexofenadine, 60 mg BID; and loratadine 10 mg QD. Cetirizine, fexofenadine and loratadine have serum half-lives and duration of histamine-induced wheal and flare suppression in the range of 8 to 24 hours. Astemizole has an initial half-life of 7 to 9 days, and a

Table 3. Second Generation Oral Antihistamines

Agent	Usual adult dosing*	Available with decongestant	Reduce dose with liver disease?	Reduce dose with renal impairment?	Pregnancy category
Astemizole* (Hismanal®)	10 mg QD	No	Avoid	No change	C
Cetirizine (Zyrtec®)	5–10 mg QD	No	5 mg QD	5 mg QD	B
Fexofenadine (Allegra®)	60 mg PO BID	Yes	60 mg QD	No change	C
Loratadine (Claritin®)	10 mg PO QD	Yes	Start at 10 mg QOD	Start at 10 mg QOD	B

* For pediatric dosing, see Table 6.

terminal half-life of 19 days, accounting for its ability to suppress skin test responses for a month or longer in many subjects.

Although comparison trials of second generation agents are limited in number, overall clinical efficacy and patient acceptance appear similar among the different non-sedating or less sedating preparations. Astemizole does have a longer time for peak onset of symptom relief making it less useful as a prn medication.[23] When comparing antihistamine therapy with intranasal corticosteroids, both first and second generation oral antihistamines are less potent in improving allergic rhinitis symptoms, although, they provide more relief of ocular symptoms. Intranasal cromolyn and intranasal antihistamines provide comparable control of allergic rhinitis. Therefore, while antihistamine therapy is useful in the treatment of mild to moderate allergic rhinoconjunctivitis, patients with more severe disease will usually require an intranasal corticosteroid or combination regimen.[24]

Administration of standard doses of some second generation antihistamines (astemizole, fexofenadine, loratadine) result in no greater incidence of sedation than that seen with placebo. Therefore, these preparations have been termed "nonsedating." However, some nonsedating agents have been reported to cause sedation or CNS dysfunction at higher than usual doses (eg, with loratadine), or at recommended doses in certain individuals.[25] The incidence of sedation with the second generation antihistamine cetrizine at a standard adult dose of 10 mg is higher than with placebo, although it is significantly less sedating than most first generation antihistamines.

Non-sedating antihistamines have not been shown to potentiate the CNS effects of alcohol or diazepam. Astemizole has the additional property of appetite stimulation in certain patients resulting in unwanted weight gain. Previous concerns about the potential adverse effects of antihistamines in patients with asthma have not been substantiated with the second generation antihistamines. In fact, some other non-sedating antihistamines appear to have some mild anti-asthma effects[26] (see "Summary Statement #47").

Astemizole (and the no longer marketed terfenadine) can rarely produce serious cardiovascular effects if used in doses that exceed the manufacturer's recommendations. Patients with hepatic dysfunction, hypokalemia, hypocalcemia, congenital QT syndrome, or who are using certain concomitant medications that interfere with the metabolism of astemizole (or terfenadine), are also at risk.[27] The cardiovascular events seen include ventricular tachyarrhythmias (particularly torsades de pointes but also ventricular tachycardia, and ventricular fibrillation or flutter), cardiac arrest, sudden near death and death. The serious rhythm changes that occur are likely due to prolongation of the QT interval as a direct effect of elevated tissue levels of the parent compound of these second generation antihistamines, and, because of this prolongation, place the patient at risk for a ventricular arrhythmia. Cetirizine, fexofenadine, and loratadine have not been shown to be associated with QT interval changes or rhythm disturbances.[28] Astemizole should not be prescribed at greater than the recommended dose, or with concomitant medications that could inhibit astemizole metabolism by the cytochrome P450 3A4 isoenzyme system of the liver. Drugs that should be avoided or approached with caution include azole anti-fungals (fluconazole, itraconazole, miconazole), some macrolides (eg, erythromycin, clarithromycin) and ciprofloxacin. Patients using astemizole (or existing supplies of terfenadine) should inform all physicians that they are taking these agents when other medications are prescribed. Physicians should avoid giving these antihistamines to alcoholic patients or anyone suspected of significant liver disease. The dose of the antihistamines should always be decreased to the lowest dose that controls the symptoms.

Combined therapy with first and second generation antihistamines. In a strategy intended to reduce costs of antihistamine therapy while avoiding daytime sedation and performance impairment, it has been advocated that one may dose a non-sedating second generation antihistamine (that would otherwise be dosed twice daily) only once daily in the morning, followed by a first generation (and cheaper) antihistamine in the evening. The rationale for this strategy assumes that daytime sedation and performance impairment will be avoided if a first generation antihistamine is administered only at bedtime. However, studies have demonstrated that first generation antihistamines dosed only at bedtime may cause significant daytime sedation, decreased alertness and performance impairment,[29–34] in part because antihistamines and their metabolites have prolonged plasma half-lives and their end-organ effects persist even longer than plasma levels of the parent antihistamine agent. Consequently, an "AM/PM" dosing regimen combining a second generation agent in the AM with first generation agent in the PM is an ineffective strategy for avoiding daytime sedation and performance impairment from antihistamine treatment.

General principles of antihistamine therapy. There are certain general principles of antihistamine use that should be followed when treating patients with allergic rhinitis. Since neither first nor second generation oral antihistamines are very effective in relieving nasal blockage, a decongestant agent (eg, pseudoephedrine, phenylpropanolamine) or a topical nasal corticosteroid may need to be added to oral antihistamine therapy. Many combination antihistamine-decongestant formulations are available in a fixed dose preparation which allow the patient the ease and convenience of taking just one tablet. The drawbacks of these combination agents are: (1) certain patients are unable to tolerate the fixed dose of the decongestant (eg, cause stimulation), and (2) the dose of one ingredient cannot be adjusted, if necessary, without changing the dose of the second ingredient which may not need to be changed. For these reasons, using a separate antihistamine and sep-

arate decongestant can have the advantage of permitting one medication to be titrated independently of the other.

Patients need to be educated that for optimal results, antihistamines should be administered either prophylactically (2 to 5 hours before allergen exposure) or on a regular basis if needed chronically. Although antihistamines are effective on a PRN basis, they work best when taking them in a maintenance fashion.

References

1. White MV, Kaliner MA. Mediators of allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90:699–704.
2. Simons FER. H_1-receptor antagonists: clinical pharmacology and therapeutics. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1989;84: 845–861.
3. Bousquet JB, Lebel B, Chanal I, et al. Antiallergic activity of H_1-receptor antagonists assessed by nasal challenge. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;82: 881–887.
4. Richards DM, Brogden RN, Heel RC, et al. Astemizole: a review of its pharmacodynamic properties and therapeutic efficacy. Drugs 1984;28:38–61.
5. Sue MA, Tamasky PR, Abernathy SB, Klaustermeyer WB. A comparison of six antihistamine drugs in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Immunol Allergy Pract 1986;8:193–198.
6. Goetz DW, Jacobson JM, Murnane JE, et al. Prolongation of simple and choice reaction times in a double-blind comparison of twice daily hydroxyzine versus terfenadine. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;186:1034–1039.
7. Gengo FM, Manning C. A review of the effects of antihistamines on mental processes related to automobile driving. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;186: 1034–1039.
8. Simons FER, Reggin JD, Roberts JR, et al. Benefit/risk ratio of the antihistamines (H_1 receptor antagonists) terfendaine and chlorpheniramine in children. J Pediatr 1994;124:979–983.
9. Vuurman EFPM, van Veggel LMA, Uiterwijk MM, et al. Seasonal allergic rhinitis and antihistamine effects on children's learning. Ann Allergy 1993; 71:121–126.
10. O'Hanlon JF, Ramaekers JG. Antihistamine effects on actual driving performance in a standard test. A summary of the Dutch experience, 1989–1994. Allergy 1995;50:234–242.
11. O'Hanlon JF. Antihistamines and driving safely. In: Alcohol, drugs and traffic safety, vol 42. Institute for Drugs, Safety and Behavior: Ryksunirersitiet Limberg, Maastricht, The Netherlands, 1998:10–12.
12. Ramaekers JG, Uiterwijk MMC, O'Hanlon JF. Effects of loratadine and cetirizine on actual driving and psychometric test performance and EEG during driving. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 1992;42:363–369.
13. Ray WA, Thapa PB, Shorr RI. Medications and the older driver. Clin Geriatr Med 1993;9:413–438.
14. Cimbura G, Lucas DM, Bennett RC, et al. Incidence and toxicological aspects of drugs detected in 484 fatally injured drivers and pedestrians in Ontario. J Forensic Sci 1982;27:855–867.
15. Warren R, Simpson H, Hilchie J, et al. Drugs detected in fatally injured drivers in the province of Ontario. In: Goldberg L, ed. Alcohol, drugs and safety, I. Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell, 1981:203–217.
16. US Dept of Transportation digest of state Alcohol-Highway Related Legislation. 147th ed. 1996.
17. Gilmore TM, Alexander BH, Mueller BA, Rivera FP. Occupational injuries and medical use. Am J Ind Med 1996; 30:234–349.
18. Walsh JK, Muehlbach MJ, Schweitzer PK. Simulated assembly line performance following ingestion of cetirizine or hydroxyzine. Ann Allergy 1992; 69:195–200.
19. Adelsberg BR, D'Amico-Beadone A. The effects of loratadine, diphenhydramine and placebo on worker productivity. Results of a double blind trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;85:296.
20. Gaillard AWK, Grisen A, de Jong R. The influence of antihistamines on human performance. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 1988;35:249–253.
21. Meltzer EO. Comparative safety of H_1 antihistamines. Ann Allergy 1991;67: 625–633.
22. Kemp JP, Bahna SL, Chervinsky P, et al. A comparison of loratadine, a new nonsedating antihistamine, with clemastine and placebo in patients with fall seasonal allergic rhinitis. Am J Rhinol 1987;1:151–154.
23. Simons FER, Simons KJ. New nonsedating antihistamines. Chapter 26 In: Settipane G, ed. Rhinitis. Providence: Oceanside Publications, 1991.
24. Siegel SC. Topical intranasal corticosteroid therapy in rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;81:984–991.
25. Meltzer EO, Welch MJ. Adverse effects of H_1 receptor antagonists in the central nervous system. In: Simons FER, ed. Histamine and H_1 receptor antagonists in allergic disease. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1996: 357–381.
26. Rafferty P, Jackson L, Smith R, Holgate ST. Terfenadine, a potent histamine H_1-receptor antagonist in the treatment of grass pollen sensitive asthma. Br J Clin Pharmacol 1990;30: 229–235.
27. Kemp JP. Antihistamines–is there anything safe to prescribe? Ann Allergy 1992;69:276–280.
28. Woosley R, Darrow WR. Analysis of potential adverse drug reactions–a case of mistaken identity. Am J Cardiology 1994;74:208.
29. Hindmarch I, Parrot AC. A repeated dose comparison of the side effects of five antihistamines on objective assessments of psychomotor performance, central nervous system arousal and subjective appraisals of sleep and early morning behavior. Arneim-Forsch/Drug Res 1978;28:484–486.
30. Goetz DW, Jacobson JM, Apaliski SJ, et al. Objective antihistamine side effects are mitigated by evening dosing of hydroxyzine. Ann Allergy 1991;67: 448–454.
31. Alford C, Rombaut N, Jones J, et al. Acute effects of hydroxyzine on nocturnal sleep and sleep tendency the following day: a C-EEG study. Hum Psychopharmacol 1992;7:25–35.
32. Klein GL, Littlejohn III T, Lockhart EA, et al. Brompheniramine, terfenadine and placebo in allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma and Immunol 1996;77:365–370.
33. Kay GG, Plotkin KE, Quig MB, et al. Sedating effects of AM/PM antihistamine dosing with evening chlorpheniramine and morning terfenadine. Am J Managed Care 1997;3: 1843–1848.
34. Starbuck VN, Kay GG, Platenberg RC. Functional magnetic resonance imaging shows evidence of daytime sleepiness following evening dosing with chlorpheniramine (CP). J Allergy Clin Immunol 1998;101 (no. 1, part 2): (abstract 408).

Intranasal Antihistamines

36. Intranasal antihistamines are effective for treatment of allergic rhinitis. These agents are appropriate for use as first-line treatment for allergic rhinitis, and in contrast to most oral antihistamines, may help reduce nasal congestion. However, patients may perceive them as having a bitter taste and because significant systemic absorption may occur, they may be associated with resultant sedation in some patients.

Intranasal antihistamines have been approved for the treatment of the symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis such as rhinorrhea, sneezing and nasal pruritus. These agents are appropriate for use as first line treatment for the symptoms of allergic rhinitis, or as part of combination therapy with nasal corticosteroids or oral antihistamines.

Astelin (azelastine hydrochloride) is the first intranasal antihistamine preparation approved for use in the US.[1–3] It is formulated as a 0.1% aqueous solution in a metered spray delivery device. Recommended dosing is 2 sprays in each nostril BID for patients ≥12 years. An onset of action has been demonstrated within 3 hours versus placebo. Several studies have demonstrated efficacy that is at least equal to oral antihistamines. In clinical trials, 19.7% of patients complain of bitter taste, and 11.5% report somnolence.[4] In addition, azelastine nasal has been reported to reduce nasal congestion.[1–3]

References

1. Newson-Smith G, Powell M, et al. A placebo controlled study comparing the efficacy of intranasal azelastine and beclomethasone in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 1997;254:236–241.
2. Ratner PH, et al. A double-blind, controlled trial to assess the safety and efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1994;94:818–825.
3. LaForce C, et al. Safety and efficacy of azelastine nasal spray (Astelin NS) for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Clin Immunol 1996;76: 181–188.
4. Anonymous. Astelin (azelastine hydrochloride) nasal spray product insert (Rev. 10/96).

Oral and Nasal Decongestants

37. Oral decongestants, such as pseudoephedrine or phenylpropanolamine, can effectively reduce nasal congestion produced by rhinitis, but can cause insomnia, loss of appetite or excessive nervousness. In addition, these agents should be used with caution in patients with certain conditions, eg, arrhythmias, angina pectoris, some patients with hypertension and hyperthyroidism. Topical sympathomimetics can be useful for short-term (eg, 2 to 3 days) therapy for nasal congestion associated with rhinitis.

Oral alpha-adrenergic agents, such as pseudoephedrine, phenylephrine and phenyl-propanolamine, cause nasal vasoconstriction. These oral preparations are useful in the management of vasomotor rhinitis and relief of nasal congestion due to upper respiratory infections. In addition, studies have demonstrated that the efficacy of these drugs in combination with antihistamines in the management of allergic rhinitis is superior to the efficacy of either drug alone.[1] These combinations have also been shown to be useful for eosinophilic nonallergic rhinitis and in some individuals with nasal hyperreactivity with diffuse rhinorrhea or post nasal discharge.[2]

Some patients may experience systemic side effects from oral alpha-adrenergic agents which include elevated blood pressure, palpitations, loss of appetite, tremor and sleep disturbance.[2] Pseudoephedrine is less likely to cause elevated blood pressure than phenylpropanolamine.[3,4] Oral alpha-adrenergic agonists should be used with caution in patients with certain conditions, eg, arrhythmia, coronary heart disease, hypertension, hyperthyroidism, glaucoma, diabetes, and urinary dysfunction.

Topically applied sympathomimetic decongestant alpha-adrenergic agonists can be catecholamines such as phenylephrine or imidazoline agents such as oxymetazoline or xylometazoline. These medications cause nasal vasoconstriction and decreased nasal edema, decreased edema but have no effect on the antigen provoked nasal response.[2] Also, alpha-adrenergic vasoconstrictors reduce nasal obstruction but do not alter itching, sneezing or nasal secretion. Topical decongestants can decrease nasal airway resistance and nasal blood flow[5,6] but usually do not cause systemic sympathomimetic reactions.

Topical sympathomimetics can lead to rebound nasal congestion (rhinitis medicamentosa) with rhinitis medicamentosa which usually occurs after 5 to 10 days of treatment.[7] This can occur due to downregulation of alpha adrenoreceptors which makes them less sensitive to endogenously released noradrenalin and exogenously applied vasoconstrictors. Topical sympathomimetics can be useful for short-term (eg, 2 to 3 days) therapy for nasal congestion associated with acute bacterial or viral infections, allergic rhinitis, and eustachion tube dysfunction.[2]

References

1. Falliers CJ, Redding MA. Controlled comparison of a new antihistamine-decongestant combination to its individual components. Ann Allergy 1980; 45:75.
2. Druce HM. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. In: Middleton E, Reed CE, Ellis E, et al, eds. Allergy, principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, 1998:1005–1016.
3. Harowitz JD, Howes LG, Christophidis N, et al. Hypertensive responses induced by phenylpropanolamine in anorectic and decongestant preparation. Lancet 1980;1:60.
4. Coates ML, Rembold CM, Farr BM. Does pseudoephedrine increase blood pressure in patients with controlled hypertension. J Fam Prac 1995;40:22–26.
5. Anderson KE, Bende M. Adrenoceptors in the control of human nasal mu-

cosal blood flow. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 1984;93(2):179.
6. Malm L. Responses of resistance and capacitance vessels in feline nasal mucosa to vasoactive agents. Acta Otolaryngol (Stockh.) 1974;78:90.
7. Black MJ, Remsen KA. Rhinitis medicamentosa. Can Med Assoc J 1980; 122:881.

Nasal Corticosteroids

38. Nasally inhaled corticosteroids are the most effective medication class in controlling symptoms of allergic rhinitis. They are particularly useful for treatment of more severe allergic rhinitis and may be useful in some other forms of rhinitis. Except for intranasal dexamethasone, these agents are generally not associated with significant systemic side effects in adults. Although local side effects are minimal if the patient is carefully instructed in the use of this class of drugs, nasal irritation and bleeding may occur, and nasal septal perforations are rarely reported. Intranasal corticosteroids should be considered before initiating treatment with systemic corticosteroids for the treatment of severe rhinitis.

Oral and Parenteral Corticosteroids

39. A short (3 to 7 day) course of oral corticosteroids may be appropriate for the treatment of very severe or intractable nasal symptoms or to treat significant nasal polyposis. However, the use of parenteral corticosteroids, particularly if administered recurrently, is discouraged because of greater potential for long-term corticosteroid side effects.

The main mechanism by which corticosteroids relieve the symptoms of allergic rhinitis is through their anti-inflammatory activity.[1] The concept of delivering steroids topically to the nasal airway was developed in order to minimize potential steroid side effects of using systemic corticosteroids. Nasal steroids are variously available in propellant metered dose inhalers and/or aqueous suspensions or glycol solutions (Table 4).

Nasal steroids are effective in controlling the four major symptoms of allergic rhinitis, including sneezing, itching, rhinorrhea and nasal blockage. In clinical trials nasal steroids are more efficacious than nasal cromolyn sodium,[2] or oral antihistamines.[3–5] However, one study has reported that at least 50% of patients need to take both nasal corticosteroids and oral antihistamines to adequately control symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis.[6] Nasal steroids have also been shown to be effective in the treatment of certain types of non allergic rhinitis, especially NARES.[7] Because a patent nasal airway is necessary for optimal intranasal delivery of nasal steroids, a topical decongestant spray may be necessary for several days when nasal steroids are introduced.

The most common side effects encountered using nasal steroids are due to local irritation. This may present with burning or stinging and is more commonly associated with glycol-containing solutions.

Nasal bleeding is also seen with use of intranasal steroids. This is usually apparent as blood-tinged blown secretions but nasal septal perforation has also been rarely reported with long-term use of intranasal steroids.[8] This may occur secondary to local septal trauma from the spray in combination with the vasoconstrictor activity of the steroid. The use of aqueous preparations, longer extension applicators, and lower velocity sprays should help reduce local trauma to the nasal septum. Patients should always direct the spray away from the nasal septum to prevent the repetitive direct application to the septum. The nasal septum should be periodically examined to assure that there are no mucosal erosions that may precede development of nasal septal perforations that are rarely associated with intranasal corticosteroids. Nasal biopsies in subjects with perennial allergic rhinitis suggest no signs of tissue atrophy or change after five years of therapy.[9] The judicious use of nasal steroids in children is indicated with frequent re-evaluation of the patient to assess further need for nasal steroid use.

Current studies in adults suggest minimal systemic side effects with administration of nasal steroids in recommended doses (except dexamethasone which is capable of producing minor systemic steroid effects). Studies of new steroid preparations even in relatively high doses demonstrate no sys-

Table 4. Nasal Corticosteroid Sprays

Agent	Trade Name(s)	Dose Per Inhalation	Base Initial Adult Dosage*
Beclomethasone dipropionate	Beconase® Beconase AQ® Vancenase Pockethaler®	42 μg	1–2 sprays per nostril 2×/day
	Vancenase AQ Double Strength®	84 μg	1–2 sprays per nostril 1×/day
Budesonide	Rhinocort®	32 μg	2 sprays per nostril 2×/day or 4 sprays per nostril 1×/day
Flunisolide	Nasarel® Nasalide®	25 μg	2 sprays per nostril 2×/day
Fluticasone propionate	Flonase®	50 μg	2 sprays per nostril 1×/day or 1 spray per nostril 2×/day
Mometasone	Nasonex(AQ)®	50 μg	2 sprays per nostril 1×/day
Triamcinolone acetonide	Nasacort® Nasacort AQ®	55 μg	2 sprays per nostril 1×/day
Dexamethasone sodium phosphate	Dexacort®	84 μg	2 sprays per nostril 2–3×/day

temic steroid effect on hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis as assessed by morning cortisol concentrations, cosyntropin stimulation and 24-hour urinary-free cortisol excretion.[10] Despite the not uncommon occurrence of candida in the oropharynx in association with the use of inhaled steroids for asthma, candida overgrowth seems uncommon with intranasal steroid administration.

There have been reports of a possible association between the development of posterior subcapsular cataracts and the use of intranasal or inhaled steroids,[11] but this association has not been confirmed by other studies.[12] Concomitant use of systemic steroids in some subjects receiving intranasal steroids confounds interpretation of studies that attempt to address the question of this possible association. Studies of newer intranasal steroids in prospective trials over 24 weeks of treatment have not demonstrated the development of lenticular changes consistent with posterior subcapsular cataracts.[13] Based upon available studies, patients receiving standard doses of nasal steroids are not at increased risk for glaucoma.[14] Although steroids as a class of drugs are not thought to be teratogenic in humans, safety during pregnancy has not been established and benefit/risk ratio should be carefully considered. (See section on Rhinitis and Pregnancy under Summary Statement #48) In children, concerns about possible adverse effects on growth raise special considerations (see section on treatment of children under Summary Statement #48).

Although systemic steroids are not appropriate for chronic rhinitis therapy, short courses of systemic steroids may be very effective in severe cases that are unresponsive to other modalities of treatment, and especially those cases associated with polyposis. When systemic steroids are necessary, it is preferable to administer short (5 to 7 day) bursts of short-acting oral steroids such as prednisone or methylprednisolone. At doses equivalent to 40 mg/day of prednisone in adults, adrenal suppression is avoided. Depot injections of steroids may be effective for rhinitis symptoms but may be associated with prolonged adrenal suppression and lack the flexibility of oral dosing. Consequently, parenteral corticosteroid administration (particularly if recurrent) is discouraged because of greater potential for long-term corticosteroid side effects.

Intraturbinate injection of corticosteroids is not recommended for treatment of rhinitis because the potential benefits do not outweigh the potentially serious side effects of cavernous vein thrombosis and blindness,[15] and alternatives such as nasal and oral steroids are available.

References

1. Pauwels R. Mode of action of corticosteroids in asthma and rhinitis. Clin Allergy 1986;16:251–258.
2. Welsh PW, Stricker WE, Chu-Pin C, et al. Efficacy of beclomethasone nasal solution, flunisolide and cromolyn in relieving symptoms of ragweed allergy. Mayo Clin Proc 1987;62: 125–134.
3. Storms WW. Treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis with fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray: review of comparator studies. Allergy 1995;50: 25–29.
4. Bronsky E, Dockhorn R, Meltzer E, et al. Intranasal fluticasone propionate is more effective than terfenadine for treatment of seasonal rhinitis [Abstract]. Ann Allergy 1994;72(1):86.
5. Jeal W, Faulds D. Triamcinolone acetonide. A review of its pharmacological properties and therapeutic efficacy in the management of allergic rhinitis. Drugs 1997;53:257–280.
6. Juniper EF, Guyatt GH, Ferrie PJ, Griffith LE. First-line treatment of seasonal (ragweed) rhinoconjunctivitis. A randomized management trial comparing a nasal steroid spray and a nonsedating antihistamine. CMAJ 1997;156: 1123–1131.
7. Selner J, Banov C, Boltansky H, et al. Fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray effectively treats perennial nonallergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1994;93:165.
8. La Force C, Davis V. Nasal septal perforation with intranasal beclomethasone. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1985;75: 186.
9. Morrow Brown H, Storey G, Jackson FA. Beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol in treatment of perennial and seasonal rhinitis: a review of five years' experience. Br J Clin Pharmacol 1977;4:2835.
10. van As A, Bronsky E, Grossman J, et al. Dose tolerance study of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1991;67:156–162.
11. Fraunfelder FT, Meyer SM. Posterior subcapsular cataracts associated with nasal or inhalation corticosteroids. Am J Ophthalmol 1990;109:489–490.
12. Barenholtz H. Effect of inhaled steroids on the risk of cataract formation in patients with steroid-dependent asthma. Ann Pharmacother 1996;30: 1324–1327.
13. van As A, Bronsky EA, Dockhorn RJ, et al. Once daily fluticasone propionate is as effective for perennial allergic rhinitis as twice daily beclomethasone dipropionate. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;91:1146–1154.
14. Garbe E, LeLorier J, et al. Inhaled and nasal glucocorticoids and then risks of ocular hypertension or open-angle glaucoma. JAMA 1997;227:722–727.
15. Saunders WH. Surgery of the inferior nasal turbinates. Ann Oto Rhinol Laryngol 1982;91:445–457.

Intranasal Cromolyn

40. Intranasal cromolyn sodium is effective in some patients in controlling symptoms of allergic rhinitis and is associated with minimal side effects.

A 4% solution of cromolyn sodium, USP, was introduced into the US in 1983 as Nasalcrom for topical intranasal treatment of allergic rhinitis. Cromolyn sodium has been shown to inhibit the degranulation of sensitized mast cells thereby preventing the release of mediators of the allergic response and of inflammation. Thus, it prevents the allergic event rather than alleviate the symptoms once the reaction has begun.[1–6] The protective effect of cromolyn against nasal antigen challenge persists for 4 to 8 hours after insufflation.[7]

Cromolyn sodium nasal spray is administered as a metered aerosol via a pump spray. Each spray contains approximately 5.2 mg of cromolyn so-

dium, and the starting dose is 1 spray in each nostril every 4 hours when the patient is awake until relief is evident; effect is normally noted within 4 to 7 days. Severe or perennial cases may require 2 weeks or more for maximum effect. Thereafter, the treatment is continued at whatever maintenance dose is effective for the remainder of the expected season or period of exposure. Since a patent nasal airway is a prerequisite, a decongestant may be necessary for a few days. The presence of obstructing nasal polyps calls for the use of measures other than cromolyn sodium.

Cromolyn sodium has no intrinsic antihistamine effect. Although reported to be most effective in patients with a high preseasonal serum IgE level, it can be of benefit in both seasonal and perennial allergic rhinitis. The protective effect of cromolyn sodium in preventing both the acute and late-phase allergic reaction is noteworthy, especially in treating individuals with predictable periods of exposure (eg, veterinarians). Pretreatment with cromolyn sodium before an allergen exposure will result in considerable diminution or ablation of the nasal allergic response. Patients who are given nasal cromolyn sodium must be instructed to use it before an anticipated allergen exposure and to use it on a regular basis during the season or period of exposure normally associated with allergic symptoms. In controlled studies, cromolyn is generally less effective than intranasal corticosteroids.

Cromolyn appears to be useful for the treatment of allergic rhinitis and because of its safety profile it should be considered in very young children and pregnancy.

Patient selection is critical. Its use should be begun as early in an allergy season as possible. The rationale for early therapy is prevention of mediator release from mast cells rather than treatment of the pathologic sequelae of such release. Because it is immediately effective (provided that the nasal passages are patent), it can be administered just before exposure in patients with allergic rhinitis caused by occupational allergens or animal danders, or in those who anticipate a limited allergen exposure. When patients with high serum IgE levels and strongly positive skin test reactions are begun on cromolyn prior to or early in their season, they are most likely to benefit. Patients who are already highly symptomatic may require the addition of an antihistamine-decongestant combination during the first few days of cromolyn treatment.

Side effects are usually minor, including sneezing (10%), nasal stinging or burning (4% to 5%), nasal irritation (less than 3%), and epistaxis (less than 1%). No septal perforations or nasal crusting have been reported with the use of nasal cromolyn sodium. Teratogenicity of cromolyn sodium has not been demonstrated in animal studies, and nasal cromolyn sodium appears to be one of the safest preparations for use by the pregnant or pediatric patient with nasal allergy. Therefore, an advantage is its favorable safety profile.

There is no evidence that intranasal cromolyn will benefit patients with (1) vasomotor rhinitis; (2) NARES syndrome (nonallergic rhinitis with eosinophilia); or (3) with nasal polyposis.[8,9]

References

1. Altounyan REC. Review of clinical activity and mode of action of sodium cromoglycate. Clin Allergy 1980;10: 481–489.
2. Kay AB, Walsh GM, Moqbel R, et al. Disodium cromoglycate inhibits activation of human inflammatory cells in vitro. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1987; 80:1–8.
3. Cox JSG, Beach JE, Blair AMJN, et al. Disodium cromoglycate (Intal). Adv Drug Res 1970;5:115–196.
4. Fisons Corporation. Cromolyn sodium: clinical considerations. Princeton, NJ: Excerpta Medica, 1987: 5–6.
5. Orie NGM, Booij-Noord H, Pelikan Z, et al. Protective effect of disodium cromoglycate on nasal and bronchial reactions after allergen challenge. In: Proc Symp Disodium Cromoglycate in Allergic Airways Disease, London: Butterworths, 1970:33–44.
6. Pelikan Z, Snoek WJ, Booij-Noord H, et al. Protective effect of disodium cromoglycate on the allergen provocation of the nasal mucosa. Ann Allergy 1970;28:548–553.
7. Taylor G, Shivalkar PR. Disodium cromoglycate: laboratory studies and clinical trial in allergic rhinitis. Clin Allergy 1971;1:189–198.
8. Nelson BL, Jacobs RL. Response of the nonallergic rhinitis with eosinophilia (NARES) syndrome to 4% cromolyn sodium nasal solution. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1982;70:125–128.
9. Donovan R, Kapadia R. The effect of disodium cromoglycate on nasal polyp symptoms. J Laryng Otol 1972;86: 731–739.

Intranasal Anti-Cholinergics

41. Intranasal anticholinergics may effectively reduce rhinorrhea but have no effect on other nasal symptoms. Although side effects are minimal, dryness of the nasal membranes may occur.

Increased cholinergic hyperreactivity has been documented in nonallergic and allergic patients as well as in patients with recent upper respiratory tract infections.[1–4] A significant proportion of histamine- and antigen-induced secretion also appears to be cholinergically-mediated as well.[5,6] In addition to increased glandular secretion, parasympathetic stimulation also causes some vasodilation, particularly sinusoidal engorgement, which may contribute to nasal congestion.

Ipratropium bromide, oxitropium bromide, tiotropium bromide and glycopyrrolate are quaternary structured ammonium muscarinic receptor antagonists which are poorly absorbed across biological membranes. Ipratropium bromide, which has been most extensively studied in rhinitic patients, is poorly absorbed into the systemic circulation from the nasal mucosa; less than 20% of an 84 mcg per nostril dose is absorbed from the nasal mucosa of normal volunteers, induced-cold patients or perennial rhinitis patients.[7]

Controlled clinical trials have demonstrated that a quaternary agent such as intranasal fluorocarbon-propelled ipratropium bromide, does not alter physiologic nasal functions (eg, sense of smell, ciliary beat frequency, muco-

cilliary clearance, or the air conditioning capacity of the nose).[8,9]

Ipratropium bromide has been the most extensively studied intranasal anticholinergic agent. As a quaternary amine that minimally crosses the nasal and gastrointestinal membrane and the blood-brain barrier, ipratropium bromide exerts its effect locally on the nasal mucosa resulting in a reduction of the systemic anticholinergic effects (eg, neurologic, ophthalmic, cardiovascular, and gastrointestinal effects) that are seen with tertiary anticholinergic amines. Both a chlorofluorocarbon based nasal formulation (Atrovent MDI) developed in Europe and a new aqueous formulation (Atrovent Nasal Spray) developed in the United States are available for use.

The MDI formulation resulted in a relatively high incidence of nasal adverse events (dryness, bleeding, irritation and congestion) which may have been related to the concomitant administration of a fluorocarbon (a physical drying agent) with ipratropium bromide (a pharmacological drying agent). This has limited the clinical use of this formulation to those vasomotor patients with refractory rhinorrhea.[10]

Atrovent Nasal Spray sold in the U.S.A. is an isotonic aqueous solution with a pH of 4.7 that is compatible with nasal mucosa. It is available in two strengths, Atrovent (ipratropium bromide) Nasal Spray 0.03% for the symptomatic relief of rhinorrhea associated with allergic and nonallergic perennial rhinitis and Atrovent Nasal Spray 0.06%, for the symptomatic relief of rhinorrhea associated with the common cold.

The most frequently reported adverse events from ipratropium bromide nasal spray 0.03% compared to saline vehicle were mild, transient episodes of epistaxis (9% versus 5%) and nasal dryness (5% versus 1%). The dose of ipratropium bromide nasal spray 0.03% is 2 sprays (42 mcg) per nostril 2 or 3 times daily (total daily dose 168 to 252 mcg).

Ipratropium bromide has been demonstrated to be effective in reducing rhinorrhea in adults and children with perennial allergic and non-allergic rhinitis. Consequently, Atrovent (ipratropium bromide) Nasal Spray 0.03% alone or in combination with an antihistamine or a nasal steroid is indicated for treatment of rhinorrhea associated with allergic and nonallergic perennial rhinitis.[10–15] Ipratropium bromide is also useful in reducing rhinorrhea associated with eating, "gustatory rhinitis."[16]

Rhinorrhea associated with the common cold is due in part, to parasympathetic stimulation. Treatment with an anticholinergic agent such as ipratropium bromide (Atrovent nasal 0.06%) provides relief of rhinorrhea associated with the common cold.[17–21]

References

1. Raphael GD, Baraniuk JN, Kaliner MA. How and why the nose runs. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1991;87: 457–467.
2. Drugs Acting at Synaptic and Neuroeffector Junctional Sites. In: Goodman and Gilman's The pharmacological basis of therapeutics, 9th Edition, McGraw-Hill, 1996;148–160.
3. White MV. Muscarinic receptors in the human airways. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:1065–1068.
4. Druce HM, Wright RH, Kossoff D, et al. Cholinergic nasal hyperreactivity in atopic subjects. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1985;76:445.
5. Baroody FM, Wagenmann M, Naclerio RM. A comparison of the secretory response of the nasal mucosa to methacholine and histamine. J Appl Physiol 1993;74:2661–2671.
6. Baroody FM, Ford S, Lichtenstein LM, et al. Physiologic responses and histamine release after nasal antigen challenge. Effect of atropine. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1994;149: 1457–1465.
7. Wood CC, Fireman P, Grossman J, et al. Product characteristics and pharmacokinetics of intranasal ipratropium bromide. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:1111–1116.
8. Ohi M, Sakakura Y, Murai S, Miyoshi Y. Effect of ipratropium bromide on nasal mucociliary transport. Rhinology. 1984;22:241–246.
9. Krumlien, Drettner. The effect of ipratropium bromide on the air conditioning capacity of the nose. Clin Otolaryngol 1985;10:165–168.
10. Meltzer EO. Intranasal anticholinergic therapy of rhinorrhea. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90(6):1055–1070.
11. Meltzer E, Orgel A, Bronsky E, et al. Ipratropium bromide aqueousnasal spray for patients with perennial allergic rhinitis: a study of its effect on their symptoms, quality of life, and nasal cytology. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90:242–249.
12. Druce HM, Spector SL, Fireman P, et al. Double-blind study of intranasal ipratropium bromide in nonallergic perennial rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1992;69: 53–60.
13. Bronsky EA, Druce H, Findlay SR, et al. A clinical trial of ipratropium bromide nasal spray in patients with perennial rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:1117–1122.
14. Georgitis JW, Banov C, Boggs PB, et al. Ipratropium bromide nasal spray in nonallergic rhinitis: efficacy, nasal cytological response and patient evaluation on quality of life. Clin Exp Allergy 1993;24:1049–1055.
15. Grossman J, Banov C, Boggs P, et al. Use of ipratropium bromide nasal spray in chronic treatment of nonallergic perennial rhinitis, alone and in combination with other perennial rhinitis medications. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:1123–1127.
16. Raphael G, Hauptschein-Raphael M, Kaliner M. Gustatory rhinitis: a syndrome of food-induced rhinorrhea. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1989;83: 110–115.
17. Borum P, Olsen L, Winther B, Mygind N. Ipratropium nasal spray: a new treatment for rhinorrhea in the common cold. Am Rev Respir Dis 1981; 123:418–420.
18. Gaffey MJ, Hayden FG, Boyd JC, Gwaltney J. Ipratropium bromide treatment of experimental rhinovirus infection. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1988;32:1644–1647.
19. Dockhorn R, Grossman J, Posner M, et al. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study of the safety and efficacy of ipratropium bromide nasal spray versus placebo in patients with the common cold. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90: 1076–1082.
20. Diamond L, Dockhorn R, Grossman J, et al. A dose-response study of the efficacy and safety of ipratropium bromide nasal spray in the treatment of the common cold. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:1139–1146.

21. Hayden FG, Diamond L, Wood PB, et al. Effectiveness and safety of intranasal ipratropium bromide in common colds. Ann Intern Med 1996;125: 89–97.

Oral Anti-Leukotriene Agents

42. Although there is evidence that oral anti-leukotriene agents may be of value in treatment of allergic rhinitis, their role in therapy for this condition needs to be defined by further study.

Data suggest that some oral anti-leukotriene agents are beneficial in allergic rhinitis. In one study, montelukast 10 mg QD (a cysteinyl leukotriene antagonist) provided significant improvement in symptoms of seasonal rhinoconjunctivitis. The potential role of anti-leukotriene agents in treatment of allergic rhinitis needs to be defined by further study.

Reference

1. Malmstrom K, Meltzer E, Prenner B, et al. Effects of montelukast (a leukotriene receptor antagonist), loratadine, montelukast + loratadine and placebo in seasonal allergic rhinitis and conjunctivitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1998;101(1 pt 2):S97.

Allergen Immunotherapy

43. Allergen immunotherapy may be highly effective in controlling symptoms of allergic rhinitis. Patients with allergic rhinitis should be considered candidates for immunotherapy based on the severity of their symptoms, failure of other treatment modalities, presence of comorbid conditions, and of preventing worsening or possibly the development of comorbid conditions. Selection of the patient's immunotherapy extract should be based on a correlation between the presence of specific IgE antibodies (demonstrated by allergy skin testing or in vitro testing) and the patient's history. (See parameters on immunotherapy and on diagnostic testing).

Individuals are appropriate candidates for immunotherapy if their rhinitis is allergic in origin, due to allergens for which potent extracts are available, and the exposure to those allergens is significant and unavoidable. Also, the symptom complex should be severe enough to warrant the time, expense and relative risk of immunotherapy. Other factors such as age, duration of illness, progression of illness, concurrent illnesses, concurrent medications, response to pharmacotherapy and patient acceptance should be considered by the physician in the decision to recommend allergen immunotherapy. With rare exceptions, immunotherapy is inappropriate in preschool children and senior citizens. Immunotherapy may be appropriate for those individuals with yearly recurrent seasonal symptoms, perennial symptoms due to allergic factors and/or significant progression of symptoms. Immunotherapy is generally unnecessary for the treatment of an individual with sensitivity to only a single seasonal allergen when the seasonal exposure to that allergen is relatively short. Severe pulmonary and cardiovascular disease may be a relative contraindication, as is the concurrent use of beta blockers. Initiation of immunotherapy during pregnancy is to be avoided but continuation of effective maintenance immunotherapy during pregnancy is advisable.

A most important shortcoming is the lack of available standardized allergenic extracts for all clinically important allergens. Ideally, patients should be treated with only potent standardized extracts, but this is not yet possible. Since standardized potent extracts are not available for all clinically important allergens, nonstandardized but potent extracts are used commonly in clinical practice. In the future, once a standardized potent extract becomes available for any given allergen, it should be utilized and the nonstandardized extract abandoned. It is unacceptable to routinely treat patients with allergenic extracts that are not potent.

It is common clinical practice to treat patients with more than one allergen. Often these allergens are combined into a single mixture for administration. When this is done, it is important to insure that the components are compatible and that the potency of each individual allergen is not diminished by the presence of the other components because of a chemical interaction or excessive dilution. Once immunotherapy is begun, every attempt should be made to administer the highest possible tolerated dose. Immunotherapy is most effective when a "high dose" is used. It should be recognized that while safe, immunotherapy is not totally without risk. Immunotherapy should only be administered by professionals familiar with the procedure, in a setting where they are prepared to deal with anaphylaxis. Patients should wait at least 20 minutes in such a setting since most cases of anaphylaxis from immunotherapy occur in this time frame. Periodic assessments of efficacy should be made. In general, if after one year the patient has not improved, then immunotherapy should be discontinued. In those patients benefiting from immunotherapy, treatment should not be indefinite. Generally three to five years of treatment will be appropriate for most patients. There will be individual variability.

The above discussion pertains to the use of immunotherapy for the treatment of allergic rhinitis only. Many patients have both allergic rhinitis and asthma. The presence of concomitant asthma may be the determining factor in whether or not a specific patient is a good candidate for immunotherapy. Presence of a comorbid condition such as asthma that may benefit from immunotherapy may be an additional indication for considering immunotherapy. However, severe, unstable asthma may be associated with increased risk for reactions and possibly mortality from immunotherapy. Consequently, asthma should be well controlled when immunotherapy doses are given.

In summary, immunotherapy is a unique and effective treatment modality for allergic rhinitis. The increasing costs associated with excellent drug therapy for allergic rhinitis place this form of therapy in a position of relative

cost-effectiveness as well. The proper selection of patients and treatment allergens is key to the appropriate and successful use of this therapy. The ongoing supervision of a trained allergist is necessary. Both physician and patient should have a clear understanding of the therapeutic goals.

References

1. Creticos PS, Lockey RF, ed. Immunotherapy: a practical guide to current procedures. American Academy of Allergy and Immunology. 1994.
2. Executive Committee, American Academy of Allergy and Immunology. Personnel and equipment to treat systemic reactions caused by immunotherapy with allergic extracts (Position statement). J Allergy Clin Immunol 1986;77:271.
3. Executive Committee, American Academy of Allergy and Immunology. The waiting period after allergen skin testing and immunotherapy [Position Statement]. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;85:526–527.
4. Greenberger PA, ed. Immunotherapy of IgE–mediated disorders. Immunol Allergy Clin North Am 1992;12(1): 1–203.
5. Lockey RF, Benedict LM, Turkeltaub PC, Bukantz SC. Fatalities from immunotherapy (IT) and skin testing (ST). J Allergy Clin Immunol 1987;79: 660–677.
6. Norman PS, Van Metre TE Jr. The safety of allergenic immunotherapy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;85: 522–525.
7. Nelson HS. Immunotherapy for inhalant allergens. In: Middleton E Jr, Reed CE, Ellis EE, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: CV Mosby, 1998:1050–1062.
8. Dykewicz MS. Allergen immunotherapy for the patient with asthma. Immunol Allergy Clin North Am 1992;12: 125–144.

Surgical Approaches for Co-Morbid Conditions

44. Although there is no surgical treatment for allergic rhinitis per se, surgery may be indicated in the management of co-morbid conditions, eg, nasal obstruction from severe nasal septal deviation or recurrent refractory sinusitis.

There is no surgical treatment for allergic rhinitis. Surgery, however, plays a role in the management of nasal obstruction and in the management of problems that are sequelae of rhinitis. In these situations, surgical consultation should be considered.

Sixty percent of patients with perennial allergic rhinitis have x-ray evidence of sinus disease, which may significantly contribute to the patients symptoms. (See "Practice Parameter on Sinusitis"). Patients with coexisting sinusitis will often require antibiotics and some will require surgical intervention. Even though they seldom occur, complications of sinusitis may lead to permanent loss of vision or be life threatening. Complications can be classified as local, orbital and intracranial or combinations of these three types.

Allergic rhinitis causes swelling of the nasal mucosa. The effect of swelling on nasal function depends on the structure of the nasal cavity. For example a person with allergic rhinitis and an anterior septal deviation will become more obstructed compared to one without the septal deviation. Structural improvements in the airway may also permit greater access for topical medications. Whether cauterization, cryosurgery or laser reduction of turbinates helps the patient with allergic rhinitis by inducing submucosal fibrosis is unproven. Turbinate surgery in patients without allergic rhinitis provides mixed clinical results and has poor correlation with rhinomanometric changes.

In summary, although there is no specific surgical treatment for allergic rhinitis, surgery may be indicated for co-morbid conditions eg, severe nasal septal deviation or recurrent refractory sinusitis. Some patients with rhinitis benefit optimally from a dual approach which includes both medical management as well as surgery to improve nasal obstruction or aid in the management of concomitant sinusitis.

Reference

1. Druce HM. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis. In: Middleton E Jr, Reed CE, Ellis EE, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition, St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, 1998:1005–1016.

Important Considerations in Management

45. Management of rhinitis should be individualized, based on the spectrum and severity of symptoms, with consideration of cost effectiveness and utilization of both step-up and step-down approaches. More severe rhinitis may require multiple therapeutic interventions, including: (1) use of multiple medications, (2) evaluation for possible complications, and (3) instruction in and/or modifications of the medication or immunotherapy program. Similar to other chronic diseases, appropriate follow-up of patients with allergic rhinitis on a periodic basis is recommended.

Education of Patients and Caregivers

46. Education of the patient and/or the patient's caregiver in the regard to the management of rhinitis is essential. Such education maximizes compliance and the possibility of optimizing treatment outcomes.

After initiation of therapy, appropriate follow-up for patients with rhinitis is essential. This optimizes the chances that a patient will benefit from the broad array of therapeutic approaches available, and that possible complications from rhinitis or its treatment are identified and addressed. At these visits, education and compliance are critical elements.

Maximum therapeutic responses require patients who are compliant with recommendations. Patient compliance with physicians' recommendations for therapy is more likely in patients who understand their disease, the various available treatment options, and the likelihood of success of each possible treatment. This demands that the patient establishes a relationship of trust with, and confidence in their physi-

cian. It is important to educate both the patient and relevant family members regarding the nature of the disease and available treatments. This should include general information regarding the symptoms, causes and mechanisms of rhinitis. In addition, education about means of avoidance, immunotherapy, and drug therapy must be provided. It is vital that patients understand the potential side effects of therapy, especially drug side effects, in order to insure that patients do not abruptly discontinue beneficial therapy but rather communicate adverse events to their physician so they can deal with them in a manner best for the patient. It is also important to provide education to patients about complications of rhinitis including sinusitis, and otitis media, and about comorbid conditions such as nasal polyps. They should be aware of how such complications are recognized and how they are treated. Patients need to be aware of the potential negative impact of rhinitis on quality of life and potential benefits of complying with therapeutic recommendations. Patients must also have realistic expectations for the results of therapy and should understand that complete cures do not usually occur in treatment of any chronic disease, including rhinitis.

Compliance is enhanced when: (1) a fewer number of daily doses is required; (2) the patient schedules when doses are to be taken and selects an appropriate reminder mechanism, such as mealtimes, daily rituals, etc; (3) there is a good doctor-patient relationship with a high level of physician trust; (4) the patient has written instructions to follow; (5) rhinitis medication is taken with the same dosing frequency as other medications; (6) there is a well designed reminder chart for times of dosing interval.[1–5]

References

1. Horwitz RI, Horwitz SM. Adherence to treatment and health outcomes. Arch Intern Med 1993;153: 1863–1868.
2. Botelho RI, Dudrach II R. Home assessment of adherence to long-term medication in the elderly. J Fam Prac 1992;35:61–65.
3. Weinstein AG. Clinical management strategies to maintain drug compliance in asthmatic children. Ann Allergy 1995;74:305–310.
4. Cramer JA. Optimizing long-term patient compliance. Neurology 1995;45: 825–828.
5. Raynor DK, Booth TG, Blenkinsopp A. Effects of computer generated reminder charts on patients compliance with drug regimens. Br Med J 1993; 306:1158–1161.

Importance of Rhinitis Management for Concomitant Asthma, Sinusitis, and Otitis Media

47. Appropriate management of rhinitis may be an important component in effective management of co-existing or complicating respiratory conditions, such as asthma, sinusitis, or chronic otitis media. Data suggest that failure to reduce inflammation in the upper airway may lead to suboptimal results in asthma treatment.

Rhinitis and asthma frequently coexist in patients, and there is evidence that rhinitis is a risk factor for asthma. Mechanisms that connect upper and lower airway dysfunction are under investigation but include a nasal bronchial reflex, mouth breathing caused by nasal obstruction, and pulmonary aspiration of nasal contents.[1] In a study of patients with a history of allergic rhinitis symptoms that preceded or coincided with exacerbations of asthma, controlled allergen challenge to the nasal airways without delivery to the lungs significantly increased bronchial reactivity, suggesting that the nasal allergic response alters bronchial responsiveness.[2] Nasal obstruction has been shown to lead to increased pulmonary function decrements caused by exercise induced bronchospasm, presumably caused by mouth breathing that fails to warm and humidify air as efficiently as does nasal breathing.[3]

There is clinical evidence that treatment of rhinitis can improve the status of co-existing asthma. Nasal beclomethasone has been shown to prevent a seasonal increase in bronchial hyperresponsiveness in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma.[4] Although systemic absorption of nasal corticosteroids is minimal, the unlikely possibility has been raised that systemic absorption of corticosteroids administered intranasally may have a direct effect on the lungs. However, in a large placebo-controlled study of patients with asthma and allergic rhinitis, nasal cromolyn (an agent that has negligible systemic absorption) as well as intranasal steroids cause a significant reduction in asthma symptoms.[5] Although very high doses of some antihistamines have been required to achieve a modest bronchodilator effect in some studies, conventional doses of cetirizine, loratadine and oral decongestants have been reported to improve asthma symptoms and pulmonary function in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis in placebo controlled trials.[6,7] Consequently, optimal control of asthma may require effective control of concomitant rhinitis.

References

1. Corren J. Allergic rhinitis and asthma: how important is the link? J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;99:S781–S786.
2. Corren J, Adinoff, Irvin C. Changes in bronchial responsiveness following nasal provocation with allergen. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;89:611–618.
3. Shturman-Ellstein R, Zeballos RJ, Buckley JM, Souhrada JF. The beneficial effect on nasal breathing on exercise-induced bronchoconstriction. Am Rev Respir Dis 1978;118:65–73.
4. Watson WTA, Becker AB, Simons FER. Treatment of allergic rhinitis with intranasal corticosteroids in patients with mild asthma: effect on lower airway hyperresponsiveness. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;91: 97–101.
5. Welsh PW, Stricker WE, Chu-Pin C, et al. Efficacy of beclomethasone nasal solution, flunisolide and cromolyn in relieving symptoms of ragweed allergy. Mayo Clin Proc 1987;62: 125–134.
6. Grant JA, Nicodemus CF, Findlay SR, et al. Cetirizine in patients with seasonal rhinitis and concomitant asthma: prospective, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95:923–932.

7. Corren J, Harris A, Aaronson D, et al. Efficacy and safety of loratadine plus pseudoephedrine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and mild asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;100: 781–788.

Special Considerations in Children, the Elderly, Pregnancy, Athletes, and Patients with Rhinitis Medicamentosa

48. Special diagnostic and therapeutic considerations are warranted in selected patient subsets, including in children, the elderly, pregnancy women, athletes, and in those with rhinitis medicamentosa.

Rhinitis in Children

Disorders and prevalence. Rhinitis in children shares most of the pathophysiologic, clinical, diagnostic, and therapeutic characteristics observed in adults; however, the existence of some differences justify discussion.[1,2]

Viral-induced rhinitis, which may occur in the neonatal period, becomes more common later in infancy with increasing exposure of the infant to other children, averaging about 6 episodes per year in children between 2 to 6 years of age. The progression of viral to secondary bacterial rhinitis will prolong infection and symptoms from several days to weeks unless shortened by appropriate antibiotics. Staphylococcal aureus infection secondary to other primary rhinitis disorders, including allergic rhinitis, may manifest as impetigo of the anterior nares with characteristic crusting and irritation. Secondary bacterial rhinitis occurs with or without sinusitis in children with antibody, complement, and leukocyte deficiency disorders, hyper-IgE syndrome, structural defects (cleft palate, osteopetrosis) and cystic fibrosis, and may also occur in normal children. Sinusitis is common in perennial allergic rhinitis in childhood, occurring in half of children referred to specialists. Purulent rhinorrhea, especially if unilateral, persistent, bloody, or fetorous may indicate an intranasal foreign body.[3]

Chronic bacterial infectious rhinitis (distinct from coexisting sinusitis and pharyngitis) has been poorly documented, but probably does occur in children in unusual cases. Characteristics include nasal obstruction and purulent anterior and post-nasal discharge with erythematous turbinates and neutrophilic and bacterial infiltration of the nares. Primary bacterial rhinitis, though uncommon, may occur in the newborn due to congenital syphilis with characteristic rhinorrhea followed by ulceration. Localized bacterial rhinitis may also occur in during β-hemolytic Streptococcal infections, particularly scarlet fever (50% prevalence), diphtheria, yaws, gonorrhea, tuberculosis, typhus, and scleroma.[3]

Nasal symptoms, particularly congestion and rhinorrhea, are common in infants and children with pharyngonasal reflux resulting from prematurity, neuromuscular disease, dysautonomia, velopharyngeal incoordination, or cleft palate. Those affected experience frequent choking, apneic spells, recurrent pneumonia (due to concomitant gastroesophageal reflux and/or tracheal aspiration), and aspiration of formula leading to secondary chemical/infectious rhinitis. Increasing age and thickened feedings improve the pharyngonasal reflux.[3]

A critical period appears to exist early in infancy in which the genetically programmed atopic-prone or high-risk infant is at greater risk to become sensitized when exposed to both food and aeroallergens. Food sensitization in infancy manifests as food allergy, atopic dermatitis, urticaria/angioedema, and anaphylaxis which typically develops in infancy and early childhood. Sneezing, nasal congestion, rhinorrhea, and ocular symptoms occur in about 30% of children during a food allergic reaction. These upper respiratory symptoms rarely occur in the absence of gastrointestinal, dermatologic, or systemic manifestations. Although upper respiratory symptoms in infancy and early childhood are frequently attributed to foods, many studies have consistently failed to demonstrate foods as a trigger for chronic rhinitis.[4] On the other hand, aeroallergen sensitization which may begin in infancy manifests typically in allergic rhinitis and atopic asthma beginning after the toddler years.[5] The natural history of atopic disease characteristically begins with atopic dermatitis, food allergy, and food sensitization in infancy and early childhood followed by allergic rhinitis, atopic asthma, and aeroallergen sensitization after early childhood. In the general population, up to 10% of children and about 20% of adolescents manifest allergic rhinitis. Studies suggest that allergic rhinitis tends not to remit during childhood.[6] Atopic-prone infants and young children compared to their non-risk cohorts appear to experience more otitis media and upper respiratory infections which probably derives from subtle immunologic differences rather than specific-IgE causes, since sensitization is often not present yet. The child and adolescent with allergic rhinitis manifests symptoms indistinguishable from that seen in the adult, except for a greater frequency of the allergic salute and eye rubbing.

Non-allergic, non-infectious rhinitis with eosinophils (NARES) occurs extremely infrequently in childhood and probably accounts for less than 2% of children with nasal eosinophilia. Antihistamines/decongestants may provide adequate relief in some, but others may require topical or oral corticosteroids to control symptoms.[7]

Nasal obstruction from structural defects or adenoidal hypertrophy are often seen in children with rhinitis. Nasal polyps are rare in childhood, usually occurring only in adults. Conditions associated with nasal polyps in childhood include cystic fibrosis, ciliary dyskinesia, chronic infections as seen in immunologic deficiency states, and occasionally allergic rhinitis, while aspirin intolerance may be responsible in adolescents.

Diagnosis in children. The evaluation of children with chronic rhinitis demands a systematic approach. Accurate diagnosis rests with careful historical data collection and physical examination supplemented by appropriate laboratory studies. The history should include information pertaining to (1)

the onset of symptoms (infancy vs childhood, post viral upper respiratory infection, trauma, or acquisition of a new pet or home), (2) frequency (daily, seasonal, episodic, or unremitting), duration (weeks, months, or years), severity (annoying, disabling, interfering with sleep, or leading to emotional disturbance), symptoms (sneezing, anterior or posterior rhinorrhea, obstruction, or anosmia), character (watery, mucoid, or purulent) and color (clear, yellow, green) of the secretions, precipitating factors (allergens, irritants, climatic conditions), associated factors (atopic disorders, drugs, infections), and previous response to medication/treatment (efficacy and side effects).[8,9] The child with allergic rhinitis often manifests characteristic facial features and mannerisms including the "allergic salute," the allergic crease, Dennie-Morgan's lines (accentuated lines or folds below the margin of the inferior eyelid), and infraorbital dark circles or "allergic shiners."

The physical exam of children with rhinitis complaints should include, in addition to the nasal exam described below, the ears (evaluating for infection, fluid, and eustachian tube dysfunction, with additional use of a pneumatic otoscope or impedance tympanometer), the eyes (visualizing the palpebral infraorbital area for Dennie-Morgan's lines, the conjunctiva for infection, and the lids for blepharitis), the nasal pharynx for tonsillar and adenoid hypertrophy, and the chest for asthma or bronchitis. Class II malocclusions due to chronic mouth breathing may also be present. The nasal exam should describe the position of the septum, appearance of the turbinates, quality and quantity of secretions, and the presence of any abnormal growths. Should obstructing inferior turbinates be present in older children, topical vasoconstriction can be instilled to permit better visualization. Rhinopharyngoscopy may be necessary to evaluate structural defects in the child with recalcitrant rhinitis or suspected abnormality.

The laboratory work-up for children with rhinitis is similar to adults and includes the determination of specific-IgE by skin test or sensitive in vitro testing when directed by history and symptoms of allergic rhinitis. Other tests may also be indicated on an individual basis, including: (1) nasal cytology; and (2) specific diagnostic tests such as quantitative immunoglobulins, complement studies, leukocyte assays, ciliary function and morphology, and sweat test when disorders such as immunodeficiency, ciliary dyskinesia, and cystic fibrosis are suspected. As in adults, CT scans of the sinuses are more sensitive than standard radiographs for detecting sinus disease in children. Nonetheless, a single Water's view may be helpful in diagnosing sinusitis in children, with mucosal thickening >6 mm, opacification, or air fluid levels strongly suggestive of infection. A lateral nasal pharynx x-ray may help to exclude adenoid hypertrophy in those children with clinical history and physical exam consistent with mouth breathing, snoring, sleep apneic episodes, and nasal obstruction.

Techniques for skin testing are similar in children as for adults, except that reactions may be smaller in infancy and early childhood due to lower levels of specific-IgE and reduced skin reactivity particularly in infants. A multi-head puncture device may be useful in uncooperative infants and young children. Topically-applied EMLA® cream (lidocaine, prilocaine) has been advanced as a possible means of reducing the discomfort associated with skin testing in children. Total serum IgE levels are not sensitive enough (only about 50%) for routine clinical diagnosis of allergic rhinitis.

The cellular pattern derived from the nasal smear or tissue may help to differentiate eosinophilic from non-eosinophilic conditions. Eosinophil predominance suggests allergic rhinitis, aspirin sensitivity, or NARES. The degree of nasal eosinophilia is related to the severity of the condition. Basophilic cells, either basophilic leukocytes or mast cells, are common in pediatric allergic rhinitis and NARES. Levels of nasal eosinophils and basophilic cells correlate highly with each other from ages 4 months to 7 years. Nasal eosinophils in nasal scrapings possess a sensitivity, specificity, and positive predictive value of about 90% for aeroallergen sensitization in high-risk children.[9] (Also see Summary Statement #28)

Nasal allergen challenge in children is reserved for research purposes.

Therapeutic approach in children. The therapeutic approach to rhinitis in children is based on principles used in adults, generally differing only in specifics and dosages. Understanding the child's suffering and discomfort represents the cornerstone of therapy. The clinician must function as an advocate for the infant and child who may be unable to express the extent of their rhinitis problem.

Allergen avoidance as described in an earlier section represents the primary treatment of allergic rhinitis and is especially relevant in early infancy and childhood in which allergen sensitization first occurs. Early effective allergen avoidance measures may function during secondary prevention to down-regulate IgE production and turn off allergic sensitization, if instituted early enough in life. Controlled studies are proceeding to determine whether the early treatment of the atopic child with allergen avoidance, anti-inflammatory allergic medication, or immunotherapy will modify the natural history of allergic rhinitis and asthma.

Regurgitant rhinitis in infants should be treated with thickened and upright feedings, avoiding lying with a bottle, discontinuing formula feeding by 1 year, and prone resting at 30° following feeding.

Nasal saline washes may be tolerated by the older child and adolescent. For the younger child and infant, commercial saline sprays followed by bulb syringe suctioning of the nares may be helpful in reducing the tenacity of secretions often seen in bacterial rhinitis.

Specific intervention for infectious rhinitis of childhood include appropriate antibiotics in childhood dosages for proven bacterial rhinitis/sinusitis (Table 5).

Surgery may be indicated for adenoid hypertrophy, nasal webs, pharmacologically resistant nasal polyps,

medically unresponsive sinusitis, and other structural defects. Correction of septal deviation should be delayed until late adolescent after cessation of nasal growth. Multidimensional therapy is necessary for immune deficiency disorders, cystic fibrosis, and ciliary dyskinesia.

Pharmacotherapy is usually required in the management of allergic rhinitis when supportive and avoidance measures are inadequate in controlling symptoms.

Oral antihistamines (Table 6) or nasal cromolyn remain the first-line pharmacologic treatments of childhood allergic rhinitis.

The second generation antihistamines astemizole, fexofenadine, and loratadine are labelled as non-sedating. The second-generation antihistamine cetririzine is significantly less sedating than its parent drug hydroxyzine. Not all of these second generation antihistamines have received approval by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for use in young children. These agents should provide a greater benefit risk ratio than the first generation antihistamines, but generally do not provide any greater clinical effectiveness at ameliorating rhinitis symptoms.

Cromolyn nasal spray at dosages of 1 to 2 sprays TID to QID is effective in preventing allergic rhinitis and may be used in very young children. It is well tolerated but the frequency of needed administration may reduce its overall compliance and effectiveness.

Topical nasal corticosteroids in children as in adults represent the most effective pharmacologic therapy of allergic rhinitis with the capacity to control sneezing, pruritus, rhinorrhea, and congestion but not ocular symptoms. Extensive clinical and toxicologic studies have generally demonstrated that nasal corticosteroids have an excellent benefit/risk profile in long-term usage in children. In 1998, the FDA presented data that some nasal corticosteroids may have a temporary adverse effect on growth in children, but it is uncertain whether there may be a long term effect on ultimate attained height.

Table 5. Antibiotics and Pediatric Dosages in the Treatment of Bacterial Rhinosinusitis

Antibiotic (generic name)	Usual Pediatric Dosage
First line therapy	
Amoxicillin	20–50 mg/kg/24 hr divided TID
Trimethoprim(TMP)-sulfamethoxazole	Dosage based on TMP component: 10 mg/kg/24 hr divided BID
Penicillin and sulfisoxazole in combination but each prescribed separately	Penicillin (25–50 mg/kg/24 hr divided QID and sulfisoxazole (children >2 months of age = 150 mg/kg/24 hr divided QID)
Second line therapy	
Erythromycin ethylsuccinate 50 mg/kg/24 hr) and acetyl sulfisoxazole (150 mg/kg/24 hr)	Erythromycin (50 mg/kg/24 hr) and sulfisoxazole (150 mg/kg/24 hr) divided QID
Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	Children <40 kg: 20–40 mg/kg/24 hr divided TID
Cefaclor	40 mg/kg/24 hr divided TID
Cefixime	8 mg/kg/24 hr divided QD or BID
Clarithromycin	15 mg/kg/24 hr divided BID

Table 6. Representative Oral Antihistamines and Their Pediatric Dosages

H_1-antihistamine	Usual Pediatric Dosage
First generation	
Brompheniramine	0.5 mg/kg/day in 4 divided doses (max. 6 mg/24 hr for ages 2–6 yr; 12 mg/24 hr for ages 6–12 yr)
Carbinoxamine	0.8 mg/kg/24 hr in 4 divided doses
Chlorcyclizine	1.5 mg/kg/24 hr in 2–3 divided doses
Chlorpheniramine	0.35 mg/kg/24 hr in 4 divided doses; over 7 years may use up to 8 mg q 12 hr time release form
Clemastine	Children 6–12 yr: 0.5–1 mg BID
Cyproheptadine	2–6 yr: 2 mg q 8–12 hr (max. 12 mg/24 hr); 7–14 yr: 4 mg q 8–12 hr (max. 16 mg/24 hr)
Diphenhydramine	5 mg/kg/24 hr in 4 divided doses
Hydroxyzine	2 mg/kg/24 hr in 3 divided doses or at bedtime if tolerated
Promethazine	0.5 mg/kg/dose q 6–8 hr
Tripelennamine	5 mg/kg/24 hr in 4 divided doses
Triprolidine hydrochloride	<6 yrs: 0.3–0.6 mg q 6–8 hr >6 yrs: 1.25 mg q 6–8 hr
Second generation	
Astemizole (Hismanal®)	6–12 yr: 5 mg/24 hr in single dose*
Cetirizine (Zyrtec®) (tablet and syrup)	≥6 yr: 5–10 mg PO QD 2–5 yr: 2.5–5 mg in 24 hr (QD or BID)
Fexofenadine (Allegra®)	≥12 yr: 60 mg PO BID
Loratadine (Claritin®) (tablet, syrup, RediTab™)	≥6 yr: 10 mg PO QD 2–6 yr: 5 mg PO QD for <30 kg body weight*
Terfenadine† (Seldane®)	3–6 yr: 15 mg BID† 7–12 yr: 30–60 mg BID†

* As of August, 1998, not approved in the US for this age group. Information on pediatric dosages obtained from published medical literature or information supplied by pharmaceutical manufacturers about pediatric doses used in other countries.
† Withdrawn from US market in 1998.

It is also unclear whether all nasal corticosteroids may have such an effect. Because of this concern, nasal corticosteroids should be used in children at the lowest possible effective dose, the FDA recommends that height be monitored routinely, and other therapeutic approaches (environmental control, non-steroid pharmacologic agents, and if appropriate, allergen immunotherapy) should be used in conjunction with nasal corticosteroids so that nasal corticosteroid doses may be minimized.

Systemic corticosteroids are rarely needed for uncomplicated rhinitis in childhood. Rarely they may be necessary to control nasal polyps when topical corticosteroids prove ineffective. Topical vasoconstrictors are dangerous in infancy, due to the narrow margin between therapeutic and toxic dose which increases the risk for cardiovascular and CNS effects. Oral decongestants also should be used cautiously during childhood owing to their stimulatory effects. Indications for instituting immunotherapy (noted in an earlier section) should be considered.

Ipratropium nasal spray (Atrovent 0.03%) is approved for ages ≥6 years and may reduce rhinorrhea from allergic and non-allergic rhinitis, but has no effect on other nasal symptoms (summary statement #41).

The treatment of the child with allergic rhinitis should emphasize preventive, non-pharmacologic measures whenever possible before instituting medication to control the disorder.

Rhinitis in the elderly. Allergic rhinitis is an uncommon cause of perennial rhinitis in individuals over 65 years of age.[10] More commonly, rhinitis in the elderly is due to cholinergic hyperreactivity (associated with profuse watery rhinorrhea which may be aggravated after eating, "gustatory rhinitis"), alpha adrenergic hyperactivity (congestion associated with antihypertensive drug therapy) or sinusitis. The watery rhinorrhea syndrome frequently responds to intranasal ipratropium.[11] Discontinuation of an antihypertensive medication responsible for nasal congestion should be considered but may not always be feasible. Although alpha adrenergic agonists must be used with caution in hypertensive patients, recent data suggests that pseudoephedrine does not elevate the blood pressure in patients with well controlled hypertension.[12] Other side effects from decongestants that are of concern in the elderly include urinary retention in patients with prostatic hypertrophy and cardiac and CNS stimulation.[13]

In the elderly, certain adverse effects of medication for the treatment of allergic rhinitis may be more common or be of greater concern. The anticholinergic effects of the first generation antihistamines may cause bladder disturbances or problems with visual accommodation, and sedation may also be bothersome. Second generation antihistamines (eg, fexofenadine and loratadine), which do not cause significant anticholinergic effects, sedation, performance impairment or adverse cardiac effects[14] are better choices than sedating antihistamines for treatment of the elderly. Elderly patients may also be more likely to be treated with beta blockers, a relative contraindication for immunotherapy.[15]

Pregnancy. The most common causes of nasal symptoms during pregnancy are allergic rhinitis, sinusitis, rhinitis medicamentosa, and vasomotor rhinitis.[16] Sinusitis has been reported to be six times more common in pregnant than non-pregnant women.[17] Preexisting allergic rhinitis may worsen, improve or stay the same during pregnancy.[16] Progesterone and estrogen-induced glandular secretion[18] as well as nasal vascular pooling due to vasodilation and increased blood volume may account for worsening allergic rhinitis, increased sinusitis and vasomotor rhinitis during pregnancy. In contrast, increased serum free cortisol during pregnancy could improve allergic rhinitis.

Chlorpheniramine and tripelennamine have been the preferred antihistamines for use during pregnancy, and pseudoephedrine is the preferred decongestant.[19] Case control studies have linked first trimester use of oral decongestants with infant gastroschisis (a defect in the abdominal wall).[21,22] Therefore, oral decongestants should probably be avoided during the first trimester, if possible. For allergic rhinitis, nasal cromolyn is useful and may be considered first in view of its topical application and reassuring gestational human and animal data.[19] Intranasal beclomethasone may be used if nasal cromolyn does not provide adequate control of daily symptoms, or as an alternative to oral therapy, although there is no published experience on the use of intranasal beclomethasone during pregnancy. Intranasal beclomethasone may also be used to allow discontinuation of topical decongestants in patients with rhinitis medicamentosa. If nasal beclomethasone is used, it should be tapered to the lowest effective dose. Vasomotor rhinitis often is adequately controlled by intranasal saline instillation, exercise appropriate for pregnancy, and pseudoephedrine.[16] Appropriate antibiotics for use during pregnancy for the treatment of sinusitis include amoxicillin with or without clavulanate, erythromycin, and cephalosporins.[19]

Immunotherapy for allergic rhinitis may be continued during pregnancy, if it is providing benefit without causing systemic reactions.[19,20] Doses should not be increased and should be adjusted in order to minimize the chance of inducing a systemic reaction, which could be harmful to both mother and fetus. Benefit/risk considerations do not generally favor starting immunotherapy during pregnancy.[19]

Athletes. Physical exercise acts as a potent vasoconstrictor, gradually decreasing nasal resistance in proportion to increasing effort and pulse, owing to release of noradrenaline. In most athletes, physical exercise will increase nasal due to vasodilatation, with the effect frequently unobserved by the individual. In normal exercise situations, no rebound occurs and the vasoconstriction persists for about one hour. Athletes, especially long-distance runners, cyclists, or triathletes, may experience a rebound nasal congestion after the initial improvement in nasal patency which may affect peak performance.

Prescription of medication for the competitive athlete should be based on

two important principles: (1) no medication given to the athlete should be on any list of doping products and should be approved for use by the US Olympic Committee (USOC) and International Olympic committee (IOC) and (2) no medication should adversely affect the athlete's performance.

The USOC generally observes the International Olympic Committee list of banned and allowed drugs. Before a competitive athlete takes any medication prior to competition, it should be determined if it is allowed (Table 7). The USOC has a toll-free hotline (1-800-233-0393) to answer any questions a physician or athlete may have. Athletes and their physicians should be aware that all decongestants are banned with the exception of topical (nasal or ophthalmological) phenylephrine and imidazole preparations (ie, oxymetazoline and tetrahydrozoline).

Antihistamines are allowed by the USOC but may be banned by the international federation of certain sports. Substances allowed by the USOC for competitive athletes with asthma include: (1) inhaled beta-2-agonists, but only albuterol and terbutaline; (2) inhaled corticosteroids; and (3) theophyllines. Other allowed medications include (1) local anesthetics, (2) NSAIDs, (3) antacids, (4) antibiotics, antifungicides and antiviricides, (5) contraceptives, (6) ulcer medications, (7) anti-diarrheals, (8) guaifenesin expectorants, (9) codeine/dihydrocodeine/ and dextromethorphan antitussives, (10) laxatives, (11) anti-diabetics, and (12) certain pain and fever medications. Medications which are allowed by the USOC but may be banned by International Federations of certain sports include: (1) anti-anxiolytics, (2) antinauseants, (3) beta-blockers, and (4) sedatives/sleep aids. All physicians treating potential competitive athletes should have the USOC booklet of allowed and banned substances available for quick reference.

An adverse influence on physical performance may occur in the athlete with rhinitis treated with (1) first generation antihistamines which may have undesirable sedative and anticholinergic effects, or (2) immunotherapy, in which local discomfort of an extremity may rarely persist for several days after a subcutaneous injection.

Table 7. Rhinitis Medications/Substances Banned by the USOC and Considered Doping

Class of substance	Agents
Vasoconstrictors These agents may be found in many single or combination agent OTC and prescriptions used for allergy URIs, and cough,	Desoxyephredrine (oral or nasal) Ephedrine (oral or nasal) Ma Huang (herbal ephedrine) Phenylephrine (oral) Phenylpropanolamine (oral or nasal) Propylhexedrine (oral or nasal) Pseudoephedrine (oral or nasal)
Stimulants Caffeine in any form leading to urinary levels of >12 mcg/mL	Equivalent to 6–8 cups of coffee, 4 vivarin tablets, or 8 No Doz tablets 2–3 hr before testing
Corticosteroids	The use of corticosteroids is banned except for topical use (ear, eye, and skin), inhalation therapy (allergic rhinitis and asthma), and local or intra-articular injections. Physicians prescribing topical, inhalational, and intraarticular corticosteroids must send written notification of the indication to the USOC (USOC Drug Control Program, Medical Notifications, One Olympic Plaza, Colorado Springs, CO 80909). Taking corticosteroids (prednisoine, methylprednisolone, cortisone) orally or intravenously is banned.
Narcotic analgesics	All narcotics except codeine and dihydrocodone

After consideration of these issues, the optimal therapy for the athlete with symptomatic allergic rhinitis consists of aggressive allergen avoidance, a second generation H_1-antihistamine and a topical nasal corticosteroid. Intranasal cromolyn may be useful 30 minutes prior to commencing a competition likely to be associated with high allergen exposure. Immunotherapy may provide help for those athletes with seasonal allergic rhinitis not responding adequately to avoidance and medication.

Rhinitis medicamentosa. Rhinitis medicamentosa is a syndrome of rebound nasal congestion which follows the overuse of intranasal alpha-adrenergic decongestants or cocaine and occasionally even systemic decongestants.[23,24] Rhinitis medicamentosa may complicate a viral upper respiratory infection or be superimposed on any cause of chronic rhinitis. A presumptive diagnosis may be made in a patient with prominent nasal congestion who has used intranasal decongestants or cocaine on a daily basis for more than one week. Examination of the nose usually reveals a congested and reddened mucous membrane, but a pale, edematous mucosa may occasionally be observed. The mucosa in patients with rhinitis medicamentosa is characteristically unresponsive to further application of decongestants.[24]

Patients with rhinitis medicamentosa should receive intranasal corticosteroids and be advised to discontinue the topical decongestants as soon as clinical symptoms abate. Occasionally, a short course of oral corticosteroids (eg, prednisone 30 mg daily for 5 to 7 days) may be necessary in adults to allow for discontinuation of the topical decongestants. Underlying chronic rhinitis in patients with superimposed rhinitis medicamentosa must be appropriately evaluated and treated.[25]

References

1. Siegel SC. Rhinitis in children. In: Mygind N, Naclerio RM, eds. Allergic

and non-allergic rhinitis. Clinical aspects. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1993:174–183.
2. Van Cauwenberge P, ed. Immunologic and allergological items in pediatric otorhinolaryngology. Amsterdam: Kugler Publications; 1991.
3. Zeiger RS. Allergic and nonallergic rhinitis: classification and pathogenesis. Part II. Non-allergic rhinitis. Am J Rhinology 1989;3:113–139.
4. Bock SA, Sampson HA. Food hypersensitivity in infancy. In: Schatz M, Zeiger RS, ed. Asthma and allergy in pregnancy and early infancy, New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc, 1993; 463–502.
5. Bjorksten BB, Kjellman NIM, Zeiger RS. Development and prevention of allergic disease in childhood. In: Middleton E Jr, Reed CE, Ellis EE, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 5th edition. St. Louis: Mosby-Year Book, 1998;816–837.
6. Croner S, Kjellman NIM. Development of atopic disease in relation to family history and cord blood IgE levels. Eleven-year follow-up in 1654 children. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 1990;1:14–20.
7. Rupp GH, Friedman RA. Eosinophilic non allergic rhinitis in children. Pediatrics 1982;70:437–439.
8. Meltzer EO, Zeiger RS, Schatz M, Jalowayski AA. Chronic rhinitis in infants and children: etiologic, diagnostic, and therapeutic considerations. Pediatr Clin North Am 1983;30: 847–871.
9. Siegel CJ, Dockson RJ. An evaluation of childhood rhinorrhea. Ann Allergy 1982;48:9.
10. Lund VJ, Aaronson D, Bousquet J, and The International Rhinitis Management Working Group. International consensus report on the diagnosis and management of rhinitis. Allergy 1994; 49(Suppl 19):1–34.
11. Mygind N, Borum P. Anticholinergic treatment of watery rhinorrhea. Am J Rhinology 1990;4:1–5.
12. Coates ML, Rembold CM, Farr BM. Does pseudoephedrine increase blood pressure in patients with controlled hypertension. J Family Prac 1995;45: 22–26.
13. Marin L, Anggard A. Vasoconstrictors. In: Mygind N, Naclerio RM, eds. Allergic and non-allergic rhinitis. Clinical Aspects. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1993:95–100.
14. Simons FER. The therapeutic index of newer H, receptor antagonists. Clin Exp Allergy 1994;24:707–723.
15. Van Metre TE, Adkinson NF. Immunotherapy for aeroallergen disease. In: Middleton E Jr, Reed CE, Ellis EE, et al, eds. Allergy principles and practice, 4th edition, St. Louis: CV Mosby, 1993;1327–1344.
16. Schatz M, Zeiger RS. Diagnosis and management of rhinitis during pregnancy. Allergy Proc 1988;9:545–554.
17. Sorri M, Bortikanen-Sorri AI, Karja J. Rhinitis during pregnancy. Rhinology 1980;18:83–86.
18. Toppozada H, Michaels L, Toppozada M, et al. The human respiratory nasal mucosa in pregnancy. J Laryngol Otol 1982;96:613–626.
19. National Asthma Education Program Report of the Working Group on Asthma and Pregnancy. Management of Asthma During Pregnancy. NIH Publication No. 93-3279, September, 1993.
20. Metzger WJ, Turner E, Patterson R. The safety of immunotherapy during pregnancy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1978;61:268–271.
21. Werler MM, Mitchell AA, Shapiro S. First trimester maternal medication use in relation to gastroschisis. Teratology 1992;45:361–367.
22. Torfs CP, Katz EA, Bateson TF, et al. Maternal medications and environmental exposures as risk factors for gastroschisis. Teratology 1996;54: 84–92.
23. Scadding GK. Rhinitis medicamentosa. Clin Exp Allergy 1995;25: 391–394.
24. Baldwin RL. Rhinitis medicamentosa (an approach to treatment). J Med Assoc State Alabama 1971;47:33.
25. Fischer TJ, Entis GN, Winant Jr JG, Bernstein IL. Basic principles of therapy for allergic disease. In: Lawlor Jr GJ, Fischer TJ, eds. Manual of allergy and immunology: diagnosis and therapy, 2nd edition. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Company, 1988:46–95.

Consultation with an Allergist-Immunologist

49. There are a variety of circumstances in which the special expertise and training of an allergist-immunologist may offer benefits to a patient with rhinitis. Reasons for consultation for rhinitis with an allergist/immunologist include, but are not limited to:

1. Clarification and identification of allergic or other triggers for the patient's rhinitis condition.
2. When management of rhinitis is unsatisfactory due to inadequate efficacy or adverse reactions from treatment.
3. When allergen immunotherapy may be a consideration.
4. When there is impairment of patient's performance because of rhinitis symptom manifestations or medication side effects, eg, patients involved in the transportation industry, athletes, students, etc.
5. When the patient's quality of life is significantly affected (eg, patient comfort and well-being, sleep disturbance, small, taste).
6. When complications of rhinitis develop, eg, sinusitis, otitis media, orofacial deformities.
7. In the presence of co-morbid conditions such as recurrent or chronic sinusitis, asthma or lower airway disease, otitis media, nasal polyps.
8. When patients require systemic corticosteroids to control their symptoms.
9. When the duration of rhinitis symptoms is greater than 3 months.
10. When there is a significant cost from use of multiple medications.
11. When education in allergen avoidance techniques is needed.

Request for reprints should be addressed to:
Joint Council on Allergy, Asthma, & Immunology
50 N Brockway St, Ste 3-3
Palatine, IL 60067

STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION

European Patent No.	**EP 1 519 731 B1**
Patent Application No.	**03738280.1**
Title	**"COMBINATION OF AZELASTINE AND FLUTICASONE"**
Date of Patent Grant	**15 April 2009**
Patentee	**CIPLA Ltd.**
Opponent	**Glaxo Group Limited** Glaxo Wellcome House Berkeley Avenue Greenford Middlesex UB6 0NN UK

Section 1 INTRODUCTION

(01) The patent application (03 738 280.1), from which the opposed patent (EP 1 519 731 B1) was granted, corresponds to International Patent Application PCT/GB2003/002557 (published as WO2003/105856), having a filing date of 13 June 2003. The granted patent (EP 1 519 731 B1) will hereafter be referred to as "the Patent" and the patent application (03 738 280.1) will hereafter be referred to as "the Application as Filed".

(02) The Patent claims priority from one British patent application. This is GB0213739 filed on 14 June 2002 (hereafter "P1").

Section 2 REQUESTS

(03) The Patent is opposed under the provisions of Article 100(a), (b) and (c) EPC. Glaxo Group Limited (hereafter "the Opponent") hereby requests revocation of the Patent.

(04) In the event that the Opposition Division does not accede to this request then oral proceedings pursuant to Article 116 EPC are hereby requested.

Section 3 DOCUMENTS RELIED ON IN THIS OPPOSITION ("DOCUMENT LIST")

(05) Throughout this Statement of Opposition, the Opponent will use the following documents and numbering:

(06) **D1**: EP 0 780 127 A1, published 25 June 1997;

(07) **D2:** "Diagnosis and Management of Rhinitis: Complete Guidelines of the Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters in Allergy, Asthma and Immunology", Mark S Dykewicz *et al.,* Annals of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology, 1998, volume 81, pages 478 to 518. Published November 1998;

(08) **D3:** ABPI datasheet for fluticasone propionate, tradename Flixonase®. Published 1999-2000.

(09) Documents D1 to D3 all have publication dates prior to the earliest priority date and therefore constitute prior art citable under both Article 54 and Article 56 EPC.

Section 4 THE OPPOSED PATENT

(10) The Patent as granted has two categories of claims, the broadest of which are:

> *Claim 1*
> *A pharmaceutical formulation which comprises azelastine, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivatives thereof, and fluticasone or a pharmaceutically acceptable ester thereof.*
>
> *Claim 20*
> *A pharmaceutical product comprising (i) azelastine or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivative thereof, and (ii) fluticasone or a pharmaceutically acceptable ester thereof, as a combined preparation for use in medicine [sic], said (i) azelastine and (ii) fluticasone being in the form of an aerosol formulation for MDI delivery, in the form of an insufflation powder, or in the form of a nasal spray.*

(11) The Patent also has dependent formulation claims numbered 2 to 19 and dependent product claims numbered 21 to 24.

Section 5 ENTITLEMENT TO PRIORITY

(12) The Opponent submits that at least Claims 1 and 20 are not entitled to the claimed priority because the subject matter of Claims 1 and 20 is not disclosed in P1. The effective date therefore for evaluating novelty and inventive step is the filing date namely, 13 June 2003.

5.1 The legal framework

(13) Article 87 EPC provides

> *'A person who has duly filed … an application for a patent … shall enjoy for the purpose of filing a European patent application in respect of the same invention a right of priority during a period of twelve months from the date of filing of the first application'*

(14) The term "same invention" means that the subject matter of a claim in a European patent application may enjoy the priority of a previous application only if the skilled person can derive the subject matter of the claim directly and unambiguously, using common general knowledge from the previous application as a whole. This means that the specific combination of features present in the claim must at least be disclosed in the previous application (**G2/98** and Guidelines C-V, 1.3)

5.2 Claim 1

(15) Claim 1 of the Patent relates to *"azelastine, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivatives thereof".* P1 does not disclose pharmaceutically acceptable solvates or physiologically functional derivatives of azelastine, as recited in Claim 1 of the Patent. Rather, P1 only discloses azelastine and salts thereof (see, for example, claim 1 of P1 and page 2, paragraph 1 of P1). Solvates and physiologically functional derivatives are different to salts.

(16) The formulations of Claim 1 of the Patent are not required to be suitable for any particular route of administration, whereas P1 requires that the formulations be suitable for nasal or ocular administration (see, for example, claim 1 of P1, page 1, final paragraph, and page 2, first paragraph). Thus, Claim 1 of the Patent encompasses formulations which may not be suitable for nasal or ocular administration, for example, orally or parentally administered formulations.

(17) P1 does not therefore disclose "the same invention" as that claimed in Claim 1 and accordingly the Patent is not entitled to the priority date under the provisions of Article 87 EPC. Thus, the earliest date to which the claimed subject-matter is entitled is 13 June 2003.

5.3 Claim 20

(18) The argumentation above in section 5.2 applies equally to Claim 20.

(19) Therefore, Claim 20 is not entitled to the priority date of P1 for at least the reasons given above. Thus, the earliest date to which the claimed subject-matter is entitled is 13 June 2003.

Section 6 ADDED SUBJECT-MATTER

(20) The Opponent submits that the content of the description and at least Claims 1 and 20 contain subject matter which extends beyond the content of the Application as Filed. Consequently, the Patent contravenes Article 100(c) and Article 123(2) EPC.

6.1 Legal situation

(21) Article 123(2) provides:

> *"The European patent application or European patent may not be amended in such a way that it contains subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed".*

(22) The Guidelines at C-VI, 5.3.1 state that:

> *"An amendment should be regarded as introducing subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed, and therefore unallowable, if the overall change in the content of the application (whether by way of addition, alteration or excision) results in the skilled person being presented with information which is not directly and unambiguously derivable from that previously presented by the application, even when account is taken of matter which is implicit to a person skilled in the art."*

(23) Further, it is established case law that the Patentee must meet a strict "beyond reasonable doubt" standard of proof for Article 123(2) EPC issues. When considering the allowability of any amendment, an amendment should not be permitted if there is the slightest doubt that the patent application or patent as amended could be construed differently to the patent application as filed or patent as granted. This is confirmed in for example **T383/88** in which the Board stated (paragraph 2.2.2 of the Reasons for the Decision):

> *"2.2.2 In decision T 113/86 this Board considered that amendments requested by the Patentee should not be allowed if there was the slightest doubt that the unamended patent could be construed differently to the patent as amended (cf. paragraph 2.2 of the Reasons).*
>
> *This clearly means that the normal standard of proof in civil proceedings such as appeals before the Boards of Appeal, namely "the balance of probability", is inappropriate. Instead,* ***a rigorous standard, i.e. one equivalent to "beyond reasonable doubt" is considered by the Board as being the right one to apply in such a case****, for applying*

a lower standard could easily lead to undetected abuse by allowing amendments on the basis of ostensibly proven common general knowledge." [emphasis added]

(24) Therefore, if there exists the slightest doubt as to the derivability of an amendment, then the amendment should not be allowed.

6.2 Claim 1

(25) The Application as Filed discloses, in Claim 1:

"A pharmaceutical formulation which comprises azelastine, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivative thereof, and a ***steroid, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivative thereof****, preferably the formulation being in a form suitable for nasal or ocular administration." [emphasis added]*

(26) Claim 1 as filed thus relates to combinations of azelastine with any steroid, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivative thereof. The equivalent disclosure can be found in the description on page 2, lines 3 to 7.

(27) Claim 3 of the Application as Filed discloses:

"A formulation according to claim 1 or 2, wherein the steroid is beclomethasone or a pharmaceutically acceptable ester thereof, mometasone or a pharmaceutically acceptable ester thereof, fluticasone or a pharmaceutically acceptable ester thereof, budesonide or cyclosenide, in any chiral form or mixture."

(28) Claim 3 as filed thus provides a list of steroids which could be used in combination with azelastine.

(29) However, Claim 1 as granted reads:

A pharmaceutical formulation which comprises azelastine, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivatives thereof, and fluticasone or a pharmaceutically acceptable ester thereof.

(30) Claim 1 as granted relates only to combinations of azelastine with fluticasone or a pharmaceutically acceptable ester thereof, fluticasone (and esters thereof) having been selected from the list of five different steroids recited in claim 3 of the Application as Filed

(31) Claim 1 is an intermediate generalisation for which there is no verbatim basis in the Application as Filed. The selection of specifically fluticasone and pharmaceutically acceptable esters thereof from the list of steroids in claim 3 of the Application as Filed presents the skilled person with new information.

(32) In the Application as Filed, there is no particular preference, advantage or superior property given for fluticasone and esters thereof compared with the other classes of steroids disclosed as being suitable for use in combination with azelastine. In selecting fluticasone and its

esters and amending the specification accordingly, the skilled person is now taught that specifically combinations of azelastine and fluticasone (or esters thereof) have some advantage or are more effective than the other steroid/azelastine combinations (for example, combinations of azelastine and budesonide) that were disclosed in the Application as Filed (See the Patent, page 2, at paragraph [0006], and paragraph [0010], as compared to the Application as Filed, bridging paragraph of pages 1 and 2, and on page 2, fourth full paragraph).

(33) During prosecution, the Patentee submitted data comparing the stability of an azelastine/budesonide combination formulation with an azelastine/fluticasone propionate combination formulation and concluded that:

> *"The results show that the combination of **azelastine and budesonide are relatively unstable**, with varying, and high amounts of impurities developing during the tests. Surprisingly, the results for **azelastine and fluticasone show good stability** throughout the tests, as the amount of impurity remains constant and at a low level." [Response of Patentee filed on 18 January 2008, emphasis added]*

(34) In contrast, the Application as Filed at page 2, fourth full paragraph, discloses that aqueous formulations of azelastine with beclomethasone, mometasone, fluticasone, budesonide or cyclosenide are **all** stable. The Patentee has shifted position and selected a new invention which is unsupported in the Application as Filed.

(35) The Patentee is required to prove "beyond reasonable doubt" that there is a clear and unambiguous disclosure of formulations comprising azelastine with fluticasone or esters thereof in the Application as Filed. Here, for the reasons given above, there is very real doubt as to the derivability of Claim 1. The Patentee has not discharged the required burden of proof. Consequently, Claim 1 and the corresponding parts of the description contain added subject-matter and contravenes Article 123(2) EPC.

6.3 Claim 20

(36) The same arguments as presented above for Claim 1, in section 6.2 apply equally to Claim 20.

6.3.1 Use in Medicine

(37) In the Application as Filed, the claims and description were directed to *"use in the treatment of conditions for which administration of one or more anti-histamine and/or one or more steroid is indicated"*.

(38) In the Patent as Granted, this now reads *"for use in medecine"* [sic]. It is submitted that the term *"for use in medicine"* is a broader term than the original *"use in the treatment of conditions for which administration of one or more anti-histamine and/or one or more steroid is*

indicated", because it embraces treatments in which one or more anti-histamine and/or one or more steroid may not be implicated.

(39) Therefore, the Patent contains added subject-matter and contravenes Article 123(2) EPC.

Section 7 SUFFICIENCY

(40) The Opponent submits that at least Claims 1 and 20 are insufficient and therefore contravene Article 100(b) and Article 83 EPC, because it is undue burden for the skilled person to carry out the invention across the scope of the claims.

7.1 Legal Framework

(41) Article 83 EPC provides:

> *"The European patent application shall disclose the invention in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for it to be carried out by a person skilled in the art."*

(42) Note that it is the invention which must be sufficiently clearly and completely disclosed and that the invention is defined by the claims.

(43) The Guidelines, at C-II, 4.9 state that:

> *"…the application must contain, in addition to the examples, sufficient information to allow the person skilled in the art, using his common general knowledge, to perform the invention over the whole area claimed without undue burden and without needing inventive skill."*

(44) Moreover, a broad claim contravenes Article 83 EPC when the disclosure is insufficient to enable the skilled person to carry out the invention over the whole of the broad field claimed and there are serious doubts about whether the technical effect which the invention provides could be obtained for the entire scope claimed. The terms of a claim should be commensurate with, or be justified by, the invention (Guidelines C-III, 6.4).

7.2 Limited exemplification and lack of demonstration of technical effect leads to undue burden

(45) Claim 1 of the Patent is broad, covering any formulation, irrespective of route of administration, which contains any salt, solvate or physiologically functional derivative of azelastine and fluticasone or any ester thereof. In the context of azelastine, the Patent does not provide any guidance as to what physiologically functional derivatives are contemplated, or how a skilled person would prepare them. Moreover, the Patent does not teach any means by which

a skilled person could determine whether any derivative of azelastine would be physiologically functional or not.

(46) Furthermore, Claim 1 is not limited to any particular concentration of azelastine or fluticasone (or an ester thereof), nor is it limited to any particular excipients in any particular concentration. Thus, Claim 1 is a claim which covers a substantial number of formulations.

(47) In the Patent, the only Examples which are now relevant to the granted claim contain azelastine as the hydrochloride and either fluticasone propionate or fluticasone valerate.

(48) The Patent was granted on the basis of comparative stability data (submitted during prosecution), obtained using a specific formulation containing azelastine hydrochloride and fluticasone propionate.

(49) If the technical effect provided by the invention is an improvement in stability, then the Patent does not teach the skilled person how to achieve that technical effect across the scope of the claims. The claims are not limited to the formulation on which the comparative data were generated. The claims are not limited to azelastine in the form of a hydrochloride salt, nor to fluticasone as the propionate ester.

(50) Since the nature of the actives used in a formulation and the formulation excipients will have a significant impact on the properties of the formulation, such as stability, serious doubts must exist that all formulations covered by the claims would necessarily exhibit an improvement in stability.

(51) The Patentee made much during prosecution of the fact the producing formulations (other than commercially available formulations) is difficult and that carrying out comparative stability tests are *"time consuming and expensive"* (see Patentee's letter dated 24 September 2007, page 1, first and second paragraphs).

(52) Therefore, it is an undue burden on the skilled person to devise formulations which solve the problem of providing improved stability, with the consequence that the Patent is insufficient and contravenes Article 83 EPC.

Section 8 NOVELTY

8.1 Legal Framework

(53) Article 54 EPC provides:

> *"(1) An invention shall be considered to be new if it does not form part of the state of the art.*

(2) The state of the art shall be held to comprise everything made available to the public by means of a written or oral description, by use, or in any other way, before the date of filing of the European patent application."

(54) The Guidelines at C-IV, 9.2 state that:

"A document takes away the novelty of any claimed subject-matter derivable directly and unambiguously from that document including any features implicit to a person skilled in the art in what is expressly mentioned in the document."

(55) With respect to suitability of a substance, the Guidelines at Part C-III, 4.13, state:

".. a claim to a substance or composition for a particular use should be construed as meaning a substance or composition which is in fact suitable for the stated use … if the known product is in a form in which it is in fact suitable for the stated use, though it has never been described for that use, it would deprive the claim of novelty."

8.2 Novelty over D1

8.2.1 Claim 1

(56) D1 discloses three detailed Examples of aqueous intranasal formulations which contain a steroid and an antihistamine, for the treatment of allergic conditions. D1 also describes other Examples in less detail, by way of reference to Example III. Example III, on page 6, describes a specific intranasal formulation comprising triamcinolone acetonide and azelastine hydrochloride.

(57) The description of this Example continues on page 6, lines 44 to 46, which reads:

*"**Additionally, substantially similar results are also obtained** using, in whole or in part, equivalent amounts of other glucocorticoid agents **such as fluticasone**, mometasone, budesonide, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof." [emphasis added]*

(58) This is a clear and unambiguous disclosure of a formulation which contains fluticasone in combination with azelastine hydrochloride, and that this formulation gives substantially similar results to detailed Example III in terms of its ability to provide relief from allergy or allergy-like symptoms when delivered topically to the nose.

(59) The Patentee stated in his letter dated 18th January 2008, on page 2:

Although D2 [D1 in this opposition statement] does disclose azelastine.HCl in example III, this is in combination with triamcinolone, and there is nothing in the document to indicate that this particular salt might be placed in combination with fluticasone or esters thereof.

(60) Clearly, in the light of the foregoing, this statement is incorrect.

(61) Therefore, all the features of Claim 1 can be found in the disclosure of D1. Consequently, Claim 1 lacks novelty over D1 and contravenes Article 54 EPC.

8.2.2 Claim 20

(62) The arguments presented above at section 8.2.1 apply equally to Claim 20.

(63) A combined preparation in the sense of Claim 20 includes a preparation which is administered simultaneously, either in the same or different pharmaceutical formulations, or separately or sequentially (see paragraph [0032], on page 4, lines 6 to 8 of the Patent). Therefore, the combined preparation of Claim 20 includes a single formulation comprising both azelastine and fluticasone as disclosed in Example III of D1.

(64) The formulation of Example III of D1 is for use in medicine as required by Claim 20, because it is *"used for topical nasal application to provide relief from allergy or allergy-like symptoms"* (see page 6, lines 43 and 44).

(65) The formulation of Example III of D1 is in the form of an intranasally administered formulation (see page 6, lines 43 and 44), which may be in the form of either nasal drops or a nasal spray (see page 3, lines 44 to 45), as required by Claim 20.

(66) Therefore, all the features of Claim 20 can be found in the disclosure of D1. Consequently, Claim 20 lacks novelty over D1 and contravenes Article 54 EPC.

Section 9 INVENTIVE STEP

(67) The Opponent submits that the Claims lack an inventive step over each of documents D1 and D2 and therefore contravene Article 100(a) and Article 56 EPC.

9.1 The legal framework

(68) Article 56 EPC provides:

> *'An invention shall be considered as involving an inventive step if, having regard to the state of the art, it is not obvious to a person skilled in the art. If the state of the art also includes documents within the meaning of Article 54, paragraph 3, these documents shall not be considered in deciding whether there has been an inventive step'.*

(69) For the purposes of assessing inventive step, the "problem and solution approach" is to be applied. According to the Guidelines (C-IV, 11.7) the problem and solution approach has three main stages:

(i) determining the "closest prior art";

(ii) establishing the "objective technical problem" to be solved; and

(iii) considering whether or not the claimed invention, starting from the closest prior art and the objective technical problem, would have been obvious to the skilled person.

(70) In establishing the objective technical problem the Guidelines, at C-IV, 11.7.2 states that:

> *"Features which cannot be seen to make any contribution, either independently, or in combination with other features, to the technical character of an invention are not relevant for assessing inventive step."*

(71) It goes on to say:

> *"In the context of the problem-and-solution approach, the technical problem means the aim and task of modifying or adapting the closest prior art to provide the technical effects that the invention provides over the closest prior art… The objective technical problem derived in this way may not be what the applicant has presented as 'the problem' in his application."*

9.2 Comparative data not the legally correct comparison

(72) In order to show an unexpected technical effect to support inventive step, the Patentee submitted comparative data during prosecution. The data submitted related to the stability of the following formulations: azelastine, budesonide, fluticasone propionate, azelastine and budesonide in combination and azelastine and fluticasone propionate in combination.

(73) The Examiner asked during prosecution that comparative data be supplied with respect to the prior art, in particular with respect to the Examples of D1. It is submitted that the closest detailed Example in D1 is Example III, because this example contains triamcinolone and azelastine hydrochloride; one of the active ingredients covered by the present claims. Indeed, the Patentee in its letter dated 27 September 2007 acknowledged that this was the closest example *("It will be clear that the invention as claimed is closest to example 3 of D2"*).

(74) The Patentee did not provide any comparative data with respect to Example III of D1, which would have been the correct legal comparison to make. The Patentee has failed to demonstrate any improvement over the closest prior art, thus the technical effect associated with this data must be ignored.

(75) Furthermore, with respect to the stability data that has been provided, it should be noted that the azelastine and fluticasone propionate combination formulation and the azelastine and budesonide combination formulation differ not only in the selection of steroid, but also in the formulation excipients.

(76) According to **T181/82**, cited by the Patentee in its letter dated 18 January 2008:

> *To be relevant, such comparative tests must meet certain criteria. These include the* ***choice of a compound disclosed in the application and of a comparative substance taken from the state of the art****; at the same time, the pair being compared should* ***possess maximum similarity with regard to structure*** *and application. [Point 5 of Reasons for the Decision, emphasis added]*

(77) The “comparative substance”, i.e. the specific formulation of budesonide in combination with azelastine was not taken from the state of the art. Neither was the specific formulation of azelastine in combination with fluticasone propionate disclosed the Application as Filed.

(78) And in **T197/86**, at point 6.1.3 of the Reasons for the Decision it reads:

> *"In the present case the Board has concluded that in the case where comparative tests are chosen to demonstrate an inventive step with an improved effect over a claimed area, the nature of the comparison with the closest state of the art* ***must be such that the effect is convincingly shown to have its origin in the distinguishing feature of the invention****. For this purpose it may be necessary to modify the elements of comparison so that they differ only by such a distinguishing feature (supplementing T 181/82, "Spiro Compounds", OJ EPO, 1984, 401).[emphasis added]*

(79) In the present case, it can be seen that the comparative formulations differ not only in the selection of steroid, but also in the choice of excipients and their amounts. By way of example, preservatives are usually added to a formulation to improve stability, as explained in D1 on page 5, lines 16 and 17:

> *“A pharmaceutically-acceptable preservative is generally employed to increase the shelf life of the compositions...”*

(80) Benzalkonium chloride (BKC) is a preservative (see D1, page 5, line 18). The formulation comprising budesonide and azelastine has **twenty times less** BKC (0.005% w/w) than the formulation which comprises azelastine and fluticasone propionate (0.1% w/w). Furthermore, the latter formulation also comprises phenyl ethyl alcohol (0.25% w/w), whereas the former does not. Phenyl ethyl alcohol is also a preservative, as explained in D1 (see page 5, line 18).

(81) It can be concluded therefore that the formulations being compared do not possess maximum similarity with regard to composition (because the formulations being compared were different), as required by **T181/82**, and therefore the Patentee has not convincingly shown that any purported improvement in stability has its origins in the distinguishing feature of the claim, i.e. the use of a fluticasone ester, as required by **T197/86**. In accordance with the Guidelines at C-IV, 11.7.2, the technical problem cannot be based upon this purported improvement in stability.

(82) Consequently, the technical problem must be considered to be the provision of further combination treatments for allergic rhinitis.

9.3 Inventive step in the light of D1

9.3.1 Claim 1

(83) D1 discloses formulations comprising azelastine and fluticasone (see Example III, as discussed in novelty section 8.2), therefore, Claim 1, in so far as it relates to such formulations, lacks novelty.

(84) Claim 1, however, relates also to formulations comprising azelastine and fluticasone esters. The distinguishing feature as between D1 and Claim 1 in this respect is the use of an ester of fluticasone.

(85) As discussed above in section 9.2, the Patentee has not demonstrated a technical effect associated with the selection of an ester of fluticasone, and hence the technical problem must be seen to be the provision of an alternative combination for the treatment of allergic rhinitis.

(86) At the date of filing of the Application, the only commercially available form of fluticasone for the treatment of allergic rhinits was the ester, fluticasone propionate (see D3, which is representative of the common general knowledge in 1999-2000), sold under the tradename Flixonase® in Europe and Flonase® in the US.

(87) Therefore, the skilled person, in the light of D1 and wishing to provide an alternative combination for the treatment of allergic rhinitis would have used the approved form of fluticasone, fluticasone propionate and thereby produce an intransally administered formulation comprising azelastine (hydrochloride) and a fluticasone ester (propionate), which falls within the scope of Claim 1.

(88) Hence, Claim 1 lacks inventive step in the light of D1 and common general knowledge, and contravenes Article 56 EPC.

9.3.2 Claim 20

(89) For the same reasons as given above at section 9.3.1, Claim 20 also lacks an inventive step in the light of D1 and common general knowledge, and contravenes Article 56 EPC.

9.4 Inventive step in the light of D2

9.4.1 Claim 20

(90) Claim 20 is not limited to a pharmaceutical product in which both active ingredients are combined in the same formulation. Claim 20 refers to "*a combined preparation*" and from the description, it is clear that it is intended that the respective therapeutic agents can be

administered separately. Hence, there is no requirement for the therapeutic agents to be present in the same formulation, see for example paragraph [0032], page 4, lines 6 to 11:

> *"It will also be appreciated from the above, that the* ***respective therapeutic agents of the combined preparation can be administered simultaneously, either in the same or different pharmaceutical formulations, or separately or sequentially****. If there is separate or sequential administration, it will also be appreciated that the subsequently administered therapeutic agents should be administered to a patient within a time scale so as to achieve, or more particularly optimise, the above referred to advantageous synergistic therapeutic effect of a combined preparation as present in a pharmaceutical product according to the present invention."[emphasis added]*

(91) D2 discloses that nasal corticosteroids are the most effective medication class in controlling symptoms of allergic rhinitis (see page 506, section 38, left hand column). It also discusses intranasal antihistamines as being effective for the same use, and as being appropriate as a first-line treatment (see page 505, section 36, left hand column, in bold).

(92) It also discloses fluticasone propionate as a commercially available intranasal corticosteroid (see page Table 4 on page 506).

(93) The only commercially available intranasal antihistamine mentioned in D2 is azelastine hydrochloride (see page 505, section 36, left hand column, final paragraph).

(94) D2 goes on to recommend treatment of allergic rhinitis with both an intranasal antihistamine and an nasal corticosteroid:

> *"Intranasal antihistamines have been approved for the treatment of the symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis such as rhinorrhea, sneezing and nasal pruritus. These agents are appropriate for use as first line treatment for the symptoms of allergic rhinitis, or as part of combination therapy with nasal corticosteroids or oral antihistamines." [page 505, section 36, second paragraph]*

(95) In summary, D2 discloses fluticasone propionate as a commercially available nasal corticosteroid, azelastine hydrochloride as the only intranasal antihistamine, and combination therapy with an intranasal antihistamine and a nasal corticosteroid as a first-line treatment.

(96) The difference between Claim 1 and the disclosure of D2 is the specific selection of fluticasone propionate for use in a combined preparation with azelastine hydrochloride.

(97) The Patent does not provide any technical effect associated with the use of fluticasone propionate as compared to other nasal corticosteroids, and for the reasons given above, the purported benefit of improved stability should not be taken into account for the purposes of assessing inventive step.

(98) Hence, the problem to be solved is simply the provision of an alternative treatment for allergic rhinitis.

(99) The selection of fluticasone propionate is merely one of a number of possible combination therapies. For this reason, Claim 20 lacks an inventive step in the light of D2 and contravenes Article 56 EPC.

9.4.2 Failure to demonstrate a technical effect results in a lack of inventive step (T1329/04)

(100) **T1329/04** requires that the solution to a technical problem must at least be made plausible by the disclosure in the Application as Filed, and that the teaching of the Application as Filed solves the problem that the Patentee alleges it solves.

(101) As discussed above (see sections 6.2 and 9.2), the Application as Filed does not disclose azelastine/fluticasone (and pharmaceutically acceptable esters) combinations as having an improved stability over the other azelastine/steroid combinations that is discloses, such as azelastine/budesonide. There is no stability data provided in the Patent (or Application as Filed) to support this change in position. In contrast, the Application as Filed, on page 2, fourth full paragraph, teaches that formulations of azelastine in combination with beclomethasone, mometasone, fluticasone, budesonide or cyclosenide are all stable.

(102) The post-generated data and its analysis conclude that budesonide and azelastine hydrochloride combinations, are in fact, relatively unstable with varying, and high amounts of impurities developing during the tests. Thus, the “invention” of a formulation comprising fluticasone propionate and azelastine hydrochloride with improved stability had not been made at the date of filing.

(103) Post-generated data may not serve as the sole basis to establish that an application solves the problem it purports to solve and accordingly, in the present case, the post-generated data provided by the Patentee (which is the sole data supporting an inventive step) cannot be considered at all.

(104) Hence the claims lack an inventive step because the “invention” was not made at the filing date and does not plausibly provide a solution to the technical problem.

Section 10 CONCLUSIONS

(105) For the reasons outlined above, the opposed Patent does not meet the requirements of the EPC, and hence the Patent should be revoked in its entirety.

(19) Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

(11) EP 0 780 127 A1

(12) EUROPEAN PATENT APPLICATION

(43) Date of publication:
25.06.1997 Bulletin 1997/26

(21) Application number: **96308852.1**

(22) Date of filing: **05.12.1996**

(51) Int Cl.[6]: **A61K 31/57**, A61K 31/58, A61K 31/56, A61K 31/495, A61K 31/445, A61K 31/55 // (A61K31/56, 31:495), (A61K31/56, 31:445), (A61K31/56, 31:55), (A61K31/57, 31:495), (A61K31/57, 31:445), (A61K31/57, 31:55), (A61K31/58, 31:495), (A61K31/58, 31:445)

(84) Designated Contracting States:
AT BE CH DE DK ES FI FR GB GR IE IT LI LU NL PT SE

(30) Priority: **19.12.1995 US 574791**

(71) Applicant: **THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY**
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 (US)

(72) Inventor: **Cramer, Ronald Dean**
Cincinnati, Ohio 45215 (US)

(74) Representative: **Woof, Victoria**
Procter & Gamble Pharmaceuticals Ltd.,
Patent Department,
Lovett House,
Lovett Road
Staines, Middlesex TW18 3AZ (GB)

(54) A nasal spray containing a steroid and a antihistamine

(57) The present invention relates to novel nasal spray compositions comprising a safe and effective amount of a glucocorticosteroid and an antihistamine possessing leukotriene inhibiting properties.

EP 0 780 127 A1

Printed by Jouve, 75001 PARIS (FR)

Description

TECHNICAL FIELD

The present invention relates to novel nasal spray compositions comprising a safe and effective amount of a glucocorticosteroid and an antihistamine.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Allergic disorders remain a leading cause of both acute and chronic illnesses the world over. These illnesses are often times present in the form of acute or chronic rhinoconjunctivitis. The symptoms of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis are reddening of the eyes, ocular secretions, nasal congestion, ocular and palatial irritation, sneezing and hypersecretion. These symptoms occur following exposure to allergens. The most common allergens are grass and/or tree pollens, hence, allergic rhinoconjunctivitis is most common during the spring and summer months.

The symptoms of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis are believed to be due primarily to the stimulation of H-1 receptors by histamine, followed by reflexive activation of parasympathetic nerves causing increases in nasal secretion and obstruction. Histamine is initially released from the tissue mast cells upon sensitization of the mast cells. This sensitization results when airborne allergens combine with specific IgE antibodies attached to mast cell membranes.

Antihistamines and/or decongestants have traditionally been the drugs of choice in treating allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. Other forms of therapy include the use of cromolyn sodium, hypertonic salt solutions or immunotherapy.

In addition, Hagen et al., U.S. Patent 4,767,612, discloses nasal corticosteroid therapy as an effective means of treating allergic rhinoconjunctivitis; and is herein incorporated by reference in its entirety. Notwithstanding the many disclosures in the area of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis, there is still a need for additional formulations which provide improved symptomatic relief with increased user acceptance and compliance.

The present inventor has found that by combining a nasal corticosteroid with a leukotriene inhibiting antihistamine, improved intranasal compositions result, providing improved relief of symptoms generally associated with either seasonal or perennial allergic rhinoconjunctivitis.

It is, therefore, an object of the present invention to provide pharmaceutical compositions having improved effectiveness in the treatment of symptoms generally associated with either seasonal or perennial allergic rhinoconjunctivitis.

A further object of the present invention is to provide a safe and effective method for treating the symptoms of seasonal or perennial allergic rhinoconjunctivitis.

These objects and other objects will become more apparent from the detailed description that follows.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates to pharmaceutical compositions for nasal administration comprising:

a) a safe and effective amount of a glucocorticoid selected from the group consisting of beclomethasone, flunisolide, triamcinolone, fluticasone, mometasone, budesonide, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof;

b) a safe and effective amount of a leukotriene inhibiting antihistamine selected from the group consisting of cetirizine, loratadine, azelastine, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof, optically active racemates thereof and mixtures thereof; and

c.) an intranasal carrier.

The intranasal carrier of the present invention is preferably aqueous.

The present invention also relates to a method for the treatment of symptoms associated with seasonal or perennial allergic rhinoconjunctivitis comprising the administration of a safe and effective amount of the intranasal pharmaceutical compositions of the present invention. By "symptoms of seasonal or perennial allergic rhinoconjunctivitis" or "symptoms associated with seasonal or perennial allergic rhinoconjunctivitis," is meant ocular and palatial irritation, ocular secretions, reddening of the eyes, sneezing, mucoid hypersecretion, nasal congestion and itching.

By "safe and effective amount," as used herein, is an amount that is effective to mitigate and/or treat the symptoms for which the active ingredient is indicated in a human without undue adverse side effects commensurate with a reasonable risk/benefit ratio.

By "leukotriene inhibiting antihistamine,"as used herein, is meant an antihistamine effective in inhibiting or reducing *in vivo* the biosynthesis of and/or cellular release of leukotrienes or otherwise modulating mammalian leukotriene levels.

The pH of the compositions is preferably from about 4.5 to about 9, more preferably from about 6 to about 7.

All percentages and ratios herein are by weight unless otherwise specified. Additionally, all measurements are

made at 25°C unless otherwise specified.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

The compositions of the present invention contain the essential components as well as various optional components as indicated below.

More specifically, the compositions of the instant invention are for nasal administration and contain a therapeutically effective amount of the herein described pharmaceutical agents. They are preferably provided as isotonic aqueous solutions, suspensions or viscous compositions which may be buffered to a selected pH.

Essential Ingredients

Glucocorticoid Agents

Agents within this class have potent glucocorticoid activity and weak mineralocorticoid activity. Glucocorticoid agents most useful to the present invention include those selected from the group consisting of beclomethasone, flunisolide, triamcinolone, fluticasone, mometasone, budesonide, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof.

When used in the compositions of the present invention, the glucocorticoid component is preferably present at a concentration of from about 0.001% to about 0.2%, more preferably from about 0.01% to about 0.1%.

Leukotriene Inhibiting, Antihistaminic Agents

Antihistamines useful to the present invention are histamine H-1 receptor antagonists which also reduce mammalian leukotriene levels. Such H-1 receptor antihistamines may be selected from among the following groups of antihistamines: piperazines, phenothiazines, piperidines.

Examples of useful leukotriene inhibiting antihistamines include cetirizine, loratadine, azelastine and the like, optically active racemates thereof, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof. When used in the compositions of the present invention, the antihistamine component is preferably present at a concentration of from about 0.01% to about 4.0%, more preferably from about 0.01% to about 1%.

Pharmaceutically-Acceptable Aqueous Nasal Carrier.

One other essential component of the present invention is a pharmaceutically-acceptable intranasal carrier. Preferred for use herein are aqueous saline solution carriers. These solutions which generally contain sodium chloride as the salt are fully described in Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences, 17th edition (1985) p. 835, which is herein incorporated by reference. The salt is present in the solution at a level of about 0.01% to about 2%, preferably from about 0.5% to about 1.0%.

The combination of any of the above described antihistamines and glucocorticoids can be conveniently administered nasally to warm-blooded animals to elicit the desired therapeutic response by formulating it into a nasal dosage form, together with a nontoxic pharmaceutically-acceptable nasal carrier. Suitable nontoxic pharmaceutically-acceptable nasal carriers are known to those skilled in the art and are also fully disclosed in Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences, 17th edition, 1985. Obviously, the choice of suitable carrier forms will depend on the exact nature of the particular nasal dosage form required, e.g., whether the drug(s) is to be formulated into a nasal solution (for use as drops or as a spray), a nasal suspension, a nasal ointment, a nasal gel or another nasal form. Preferred nasal dosage forms are solutions, suspensions and gels, which normally contain sodium chloride in a major amount of water (preferably purified water) in addition to the antihistamine and glucocorticoid. Minor amounts of other ingredients such as pH adjusters (e.g., an acid such as HCl), emulsifiers or dispersing agents, buffering agents, preservatives, wetting agents and jelling agents (e.g., methylcellulose) may also be present. Most preferably, the nasal composition is isotonic, i.e., it has the same osmotic pressure as blood and lacrimal fluid.

Preferably the composition is applied to the nasal mucosa via topical application of a safe and effective amount of the composition to treat nasal symptoms. The amount of the antihistamine and glucocorticoid combination and frequency of topical application to the nasal mucosa may vary, depending upon personal or medical needs, but it is suggested, as an example, that topical application range from about once per day to about four times daily, preferably twice daily, most preferably once daily. As a practical matter the selected therapeutic compositions will normally be prepared in unit dosage forms or actuations to contain therapeutically effective amounts of the selected antihistamine and glucocorticoid combination. In specific instances fractions of these dosage units or multiple dosage units will be employed. Typically, dosage units may be prepared to deliver from about 0.5 mcg to about 100 mcg of the glucocorticoid

agent and from about 5 mcg to about 1000 mcg of the antihistaminic agent per spray actuation (e.g., 50 mg to about 200 mg of the spray composition). A typical dose contains one to four sprays per nostril.

Optional Ingredients

Optional ingredients useful in the present invention include decongestants. Decongestants useful to the present invention may be selected from among the class of sympathomimetic agents; examples of which include pseudoephedrine, desoxyephedrine, propylhexedrine, phenylpropanolamine, xylometazoline, phenylephrine, tetrahydrozoline, naphazoline, oxymetazoline, tramazoline and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof. Also useful as decongestants are the 5-(2-imidazolinylamino)benzimedazole compounds. Mixtures of these decongestants can also be used.

When used in the compositions of the present invention, the sympathomimetic agents may be incorporated at concentrations, preferably, of from about 0.01% to about 0.5%, more preferably from about 0.05% to about 0.1%.

The compositions of the present invention may also contain antiallergics. Suitable antiallergics include, but are not limited to, cromolyn, ketotifen, N-allyl-(dichloro-3, 4-benzyl)-2-methylamino-2-propanol-1, AP-582 (Pharmaprojects No. 3055-under investigation by Ariad Pharmaceuticals), Andolast, oxatamide and pharmaceutically-acceptable salts thereof. Mixtures of these antiallergics may also be used.

Similarly, mucolytics such as acetylcysteine and anticholinergics such as ipratropium bromide may also be used in the compositions of the present invention.

Also of optional use in the compositions of the present invention are nonopiate analgesics such as oxaprozin. The intranasal use of oxaprozin is described in Namiki et al., Studies on improvement of pharmaceutical preparations prescribed in hospitals. VI. oxaprozin nasal spray, Drug Design and Delivery 1988;2:pp. 311-321, herein incorporated by reference. Further examples of preferred nonopiate analgesics include, but are not limited to, acetaminophen, acetylsalicylic acid, ibuprofen, etodolac, fenbuprofen, fenoprofen, flurbiprofen, indomethacin, ketoprofen, naproxen, pharmaceutically-acceptable salts thereof, optically active racemates thereof and mixtures thereof. Still further examples of such drugs are disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 4,522,828, to Sunshine et al., issued June 11, 1985; this patent being incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

Synthetic opiate analgesics such as butorphanol may also be incorporated into the compositions of the present invention. The intranasal use of butorphanol is described in Baumel, Migraine: A pharmacologic review with newer options and delivery modalities, Neurology 1994;44(supp):pp. s13-s17, herein incorporated by reference. Further examples of preferred synthetic opioid analgesics include alfentanil, buprenorphine, fentanyl, meperidine, methadone, nalbuphine, natrexone, propoxyphene, pentazocine, sufenanil, pharmaceutically-acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof.

Compounds commonly known as lipoxygenase inhibitors and receptor antagonists are also optionally useful in the compositions of the present invention. Suitable lipoxygenase inhibitors are described in U.S. Patent 4,873,259, to Summers et al., issued October 10 1989 and European Patent Application 318093, both of which are herein incorporated by reference. Lipoxygenase antagonists suitable for use in the present invention include Zafirlukast (Accolate, Zeneca).

Leukotriene receptor antagonists may also be incorporated into the compositions of the present invention. Suitable examples include, but are not limited to, experimental agents such as LY171883, Wy-45,911, LY163443, ONO-RS-411 and ONO-RS-347 and ICI 198,615. A more detailed discussion of leukotriene receptor antagonists is found in Fleisch, J. H., Development of Cysteinyl Leukotriene Receptor Antagonists, Vol. 12 Advances in Inflammation Research 173-189 (A. Lewis et al. ed. 1988), herein incorporated by reference in its entirety.

Various aromatic components (e.g., aldehydes and esters) may also be used. These aromatics include, for example, menthol, camphor, eucalyptol, benzaldehyde (cherry, almond); citral (lemon, lime); neral; decanal (orange, lemon); aldehyde C-8, aldehyde C-9 and aldehyde C-12 (citrus fruits); tolyl aldehyde (cherry, almond); 2,6-dimethyl-octanal (green fruit); and 2-dodecenal (citrus, mandarin). Additional aromatic components suitable for use in the present invention include those described in U.S. Patent 4,136,163 to Watson et al., U.S. Patent 4,459,425 to Amano et al., and U.S. Patent 4,230,688 to Rowsell et al.; all of which are herein incorporated by reference. Mixtures of these aromatics can also be used.

The desired isotonicity of the compositions of this invention may be accomplished using, for example, the sodium chloride already present, or other pharmaceutically-acceptable agents such as dextrose, boric acid, citric acid, sodium tartrate, sodium phosphate, potassium phosphate, propylene glycol or other inorganic or organic solutes or mixtures thereof. Sodium chloride is preferred particularly for buffers containing sodium ions. Further examples of sodium chloride equivalents are disclosed in Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences pp. 1491-1497 (Alfonso Gennaro 18th ed. 1990).

Viscosity of the compositions may be maintained at the selected level using a pharmaceutically-acceptable thickening agent. Methyl cellulose is preferred because it is readily and economically available and is easy to work with. Other suitable thickening agents include, for example, xanthan gum, microcrystalline cellulose, carboxymethyl cellu-

lose, hydroxypropyl cellulose, hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose, hydroxymethyl cellulose, hydroxyethyl cellulose, carboxyvinyl polymer, carbomer, and the like or pharmaceutical salts thereof. Mixtures of such thickening agents may also be used. The preferred concentration of the thickener will depend upon the agent selected. The important point is to use an amount which will achieve the selected viscosity. Viscous compositions are normally prepared from solutions by the addition of such thickening agents.

Preferred compositions within the scope of this invention will contain from about 0.01% to about 5% of a humectant to inhibit drying of the mucous membrane and to prevent irritation. Any of a variety of pharmaceutically-acceptable humectants can be employed including, for example sorbitol, propylene glycol, polyethylene glycol, glycerol or mixtures thereof. As with the thickeners, the concentration will vary with the selected agent, although the presence or absence of these agents, or their concentration is not an essential feature of the invention.

Enhanced absorption across the nasal membrane can be accomplished employing a therapeutically acceptable surfactant. Typical useful surfactants for these therapeutic compositions include polyoxyethylene derivatives of fatty acid partial esters of sorbitol anhydrides such as Polysorbate 80, Polyoxyl 40 Stearate, Polyoxylethylene 50 Stearate and Octoxynol, as well as Oxyethylated tertiary octyl phenol formaldehyde polymer (available from Sterling Organics as tyloxapol) or mixtures thereof. The usual concentration is from 0.5% to 10% based on the total weight.

A pharmaceutically-acceptable preservative is generally employed to increase the shelf life of the compositions of the present invention. Benzyl alcohol is suitable, although a variety of preservatives including, for example, parabens, phenylethyl alcohol, thimerosal, chlorobutanol, phenylmecuric acetate or benzalkonium chloride may also be employed. The most preferred preservative system for use herein comprises a combination of benzalkonium chloride, chlorhexidine gluconate and disodium EDTA. A suitable concentration of the preservative will be from 0.001% to 2% based on the total weight, although there may be appreciable variation depending upon the agent selected Mixtures of these preservatives may also be used.

Other Optional Components. A variety of additional ingredients may be added to the emulsion compositions of the present invention. These additional ingredients include various polymers for aiding the film-forming properties and substantivity of the formulation, antioxidants, and agents suitable for aesthetic purposes such as fragrances, pigments, and colorings.

The compositions can also contain low levels of insoluble ingredients added, for example for visual effect purposes, e.g. thermochromic liquid crystalline materials such as the microencapsulated cholesteryl esters and chiral nematic (nonsterol) based chemicals such as the (2-methylbutyl) phenyl 4-alkyl(oxy)benzoates available from Hallcrest, Glenview, Illinois 60025, U.S.A. Mixtures of these ingredients may also be used.

EXAMPLES

The following examples further describe and demonstrate embodiments within the scope of the present invention. The examples are given solely for the purpose of illustration and are not to be construed as limitations of the present invention, as many variations thereof are possible without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention.

Example I

The intranasally administered pharmaceutical composition of the present invention is prepared by combining the following components utilizing conventional mixing techniques similar to that described below.

Component	Wgt %
beclomethasone diproprionate, monohydrate	0.042
loratadine	0.200
avicel RC - 591[1]	1.200
dextrose	5.100
polysorbate 80	0.025
benzalkonium chloride	0.040
phenylethyl alcohol	0.250
distilled water	q.s. to vol.

[1] microcrystalline cellulose and sodium carboxymethyl cellulose, supplied by FMC corporation.

In an appropriately sized vessel, the dextrose, polysorbate 80 and benzalkonium chloride are added one at a time to water with mixing, allowing each to dissolve or completely disperse before adding the next. To this is added, with mixing, a premixed slurry of the avicel and water. Upon forming a uniform solution, the beclomethasone, loratadine

and phenylethyl alcohol are added. After all the ingredients are added, purified water is used to bring the batch to the appropriate weight.

Administration of approximately 0.4 grams of the composition is used for topical nasal application to provide relief from allergy or allergy-like symptoms.

Example II

The intranasally administered pharmaceutical composition of the present invention is prepared by combining the following components utilizing conventional mixing techniques similar to that described in Example I.

Component	Wgt %
flunisolide	0.025
cetirizine	0.200
propylene glycol	2.000
polyethylene glycol	1.000
sodium chloride	0.900
ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid	0.050
benzalkonium chloride	0.010
distilled water	q.s. to vol.

Administration of approximately 0.4 grams of the composition is used for topical nasal application to provide relief from allergy or allergy-like symptoms.

Example III

The intranasally administered pharmaceutical composition of the present invention is prepared by combining the following components utilizing conventional mixing techniques similar to that described in Example I.

Component	Wgt %
triamcinolone acetonide	0.050
azelastine HCl	0.070
polysorbate 80	0.050
glycerin	2.000
hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose	1.000
sodium chloride	0.900
ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid	0.050
benzalkonium chloride	0.020
distilled water	q.s. to vol.

Administration of approximately 0.4 grams of the composition is used for topical nasal application to provide relief from allergy or allergy-like symptoms. Additionally, substantially similar results are also obtained using, in whole or in part, equivalent amounts of other glucocorticoid agents such as fluticasone, mometasone, budesonide, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof. Furthermore, the above described compositions may also contain a decongestant such as pseudoephedrine, phenylpropanolamine, phenylephrine, tetrahydrozoline, naphazoline, oxymetazoline, tramazoline, 5-(2-imidazolinylamino)benzimedazoles, optically active racemates thereof, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof. Those skilled in the art will quickly realize other suitable ingredients, diluents and dosage forms (or readily ascertain such using routine experimentation) which may further be incorporated into the above compositions without departing from the scope and spirit of the present invention.

Claims

1. A pharmaceutical composition comprising:

a) a safe and effective amount of a glucocorticoid selected from the group consisting of beclomethasone,

flunisolide, triamcinolone, fluticasone, mometasone, budesonide, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof;
b) a safe and effective amount of a leukotriene inhibiting antihistamine selected from the group consisting of cetirizine, loratadine, azelastine, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof, optically active racemates thereof and mixtures thereof; and
c.) an intranasal carrier.

2. A composition according to Claim 1 in the form of an isotonic aqueous solution

3. A composition according to Claim 1 or 2 wherein the glucocorticoid is selected from the group consisting of beclomethasone, budesonide, fluticasone and mixtures thereof.
4. A pharmaceutical composition according to any of Claims 1-3, which further comprises a sympathomimetic amine selected from the group consisting of pseudoephedrine, desoxyephedrine, propylhexedrine, phenylpropanolamine, xylometazoline, phenylephrine, tetrahydrozoline, naphazoline, oxymetazoline, tramazoline, 5-(2-imidazolinylamino)benzimedazoles, pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof, optically active racemates thereof and mixtures thereof.
5. A pharmaceutical composition according to any of Claims 1-4, which further comprises a non-steroidal anti inflammatory agent, or optically active racemates thereof and mixtures thereof.
6. A pharmaceutical composition according to any of Claims 1-5, which further comprises a lipoxygenase inhibitor or antagonist, a leukotriene receptor antagonist, a nonopiate analgesic, a mucolytic, an antiallergic, and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and mixtures thereof.

European Patent Office

EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

Application Number
EP 96 30 8852

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (Int.Cl.6)
X,Y	ADVANCES IN THERAPY, vol. 12, no. 6, November 1995 - December 1995, USA, pages 340-349, XP000651473 DROUIN ET AL: "ADDING LORATADINE TO TOPICAL NASAL STEROID THERAPY IMPROVES MODERATELY SEVERE SEASONAL ALLERGIC RHINOCONJUNCTIVITIS" * the whole document * ---	1-6	A61K31/57 A61K31/58 A61K31/56 A61K31/495 A61K31/445 A61K31/55 //(A61K31/56, A61K31:495), (A61K31/56, A61K31:445), (A61K31/56, A61K31:55), (A61K31/57, A61K31:495), (A61K31/57, A61K31:445), (A61K31/57, A61K31:55),
X,Y	CLINICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL ALLERGY, vol. 22, no. 10, October 1992, UK, pages 916-922, XP000651660 ARMITAGE ET AL : "INVESTICATION OF THE TENDENCY TO WHEEZE IN POLLEN SENSITIVE PATIENTS" * the whole document * ---	1-6	
X,Y	DRUG INVESTIGATION, vol. 8, no. 4, 1994, UK, pages 225-233, XP000651434 BENINCASA ET AL: "EVALUATION OF FLUTICASONE PROPIONATE AQUEOUS NASAL SPRAY TAKEN ALONE AND IN COMBINATION WITH CETIRIZINE IN THE PROPHYLACTIC TREATMENT OF SEASONAL ALLERGIC RHINITIS" * the whole document * ---	1-6	TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (Int.Cl.6) A61K
D,Y	US 4 767 612 A (HAGEN NICHOLAS S ET AL) 30 August 1988 * abstract * ---	1,2,4-6	
Y	JAMES E.F. REYNOLDS: "MARTINDALE THE EXTRA PHARMACOPOEIA, 13TH EDITION" 1993 , THE PHARMACEUTICAL PRESS , LONDON XP002028542 PAGE 931: AZELASTINE --- -/--	1-6	

The present search report has been drawn up for all claims

Place of search	Date of completion of the search	Examiner
MUNICH	1 April 1997	Herrera, S

CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS

X : particularly relevant if taken alone
Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category
A : technological background
O : non-written disclosure
P : intermediate document

T : theory or principle underlying the invention
E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date
D : document cited in the application
L : document cited for other reasons

& : member of the same patent family, corresponding document

EPO FORM 1503 03.82 (P04C01)

European Patent Office

EUROPEAN SEARCH REPORT

Application Number
EP 96 30 8852

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category	Citation of document with indication, where appropriate, of relevant passages	Relevant to claim	CLASSIFICATION OF THE APPLICATION (Int.Cl.6)
Y	EP 0 605 203 A (SENJU PHARMA CO) 6 July 1994 * the whole document * -----	1-6	(A61K31/58, A61K31:495), (A61K31/58, A61K31:445)

TECHNICAL FIELDS SEARCHED (Int.Cl.6)

The present search report has been drawn up for all claims

Place of search	Date of completion of the search	Examiner
MUNICH	1 April 1997	Herrera, S

CATEGORY OF CITED DOCUMENTS

X : particularly relevant if taken alone
Y : particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category
A : technological background
O : non-written disclosure
P : intermediate document

T : theory or principle underlying the invention
E : earlier patent document, but published on, or after the filing date
D : document cited in the application
L : document cited for other reasons

& : member of the same patent family, corresponding document

EPO FORM 1503 03.82 (P04C01)