

# Expedited Cataract Surgery Doesn't Reduce Falls

BY DENISE NAPOLI

“Expedited” cataract surgery occurring within 4 weeks of diagnosis did not significantly reduce falls among elderly women, according to a meta-analysis of two randomized, controlled trials.

That’s despite a sevenfold improvement in sight following surgery, compared with elderly cataract patients who were scheduled for surgery but had to wait as long as 12 months.

Nevertheless, “extensive wait times for cataract surgery are a global health care issue” and a major cause of preventable blindness, wrote the authors of the current analysis.

“Focusing resources on expedited cataract surgery would reduce the extensive waiting lists, influencing the health of the elderly population,” they said (*J. Cataract Refract. Surg.* 2010;36:13-9).

The authors, led by Ediriweera Desapriya, Ph.D., of the department of developmental neurosciences and child health at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, sorted through 234 studies found in 12 databases, including Medline, that mentioned “expedited cataract surgery.” Only three looked at outcome measures for both improve-

## VITALS

**Major Finding:** Fewer falls occurred after expedited cataract surgery (76 out of 274 patients), compared with standard surgery (87 out of 271 patients), but the difference was not significant.

**Data Source:** A meta-analysis of two studies with a total of 535 women who had cataract surgery.

**Disclosures:** None of the authors had relevant financial conflicts of interest.

ment of vision and reduction of injury. Just two studies, comprising 535 women over age 70, looked at falls specifically.

“Expedited” surgery was defined as occurring within 4 weeks of diagnosis in the two studies that were included in the falls analysis (*Br. J. Ophthalmol.* 2005; 89:53-9; *Age and Ageing* 2006;35: 66-71); the third study, which appeared only in the vision analysis, extended the definition to 6 weeks (*Lancet* 1998; 352:925-9).

“Routine” surgery in the first two trials occurred at 12 months after diagnosis and had not occurred yet at the time of analysis; in the vision-only study, it took place at 7-12 months.

Looking at all three studies, which included 372 patients in the routine surgery group and 365 who received expedited surgeries, “expedited cataract surgery was associated with significant-

ly enhanced visual acuity” at 6 months in the surgery group, compared with patients who had not yet had the procedure (odds ratio 7.22, 95% confidence interval 3.15-16.55).

In the two studies that looked at falls, although there was a trend toward fewer falls after expedited surgery (76/274 patients, 28%), compared with standard surgery (87/271 patients, 32%), with an OR of 0.81, the result did not reach significance (CI 0.55-1.17).

The authors acknowledged that a meta-analysis of only two studies may seem inadequate, but “when definitive and large trials have not been performed to evaluate the impact of expedited cataract surgery on the incidence of falls, a meta-analysis of all available trials could help re-

solve some important issues, reducing the need for large, costly new trials.”

The investigators found that two studies reported differences in predicted falls between men and women who have undergone cataract surgery. The age of the subjects could be a factor, as the literature shows the rate of falls increases after age 70, they wrote. Also, fragile, more easily broken bones that can result from “clinical conditions that primarily affect women in their postmenopausal years, such as osteoporosis, may increase the damage caused by falls and other injuries,” the authors said. Such conditions may “influence the overall results of this intervention,” they said.

In noting the limitations of their analysis, the authors said that both selected trials “had insufficient power, and the dropout rate was 7.8%. Significant cases were lost to follow-up in both trials (10.7%).” ■

## Dopamine Agonists Vie With L-Dopa for Parkinson's

BY DAMIAN McNAMARA

MIAMI BEACH — Levodopa produces greater symptomatic relief for Parkinson’s disease patients, compared with a dopamine agonist, consistent results of long-term studies indicate, but more dyskinesia and motor fluctuations are the trade-offs.

Dopamine agonists are still effective treatments for Parkinson’s disease, said Dr. Cheryl Waters at the World Federation of Neurology World Congress on Parkinson’s Disease and Related Disorders. So how do you choose one or the other for initial therapy?

Use patient age as a general guide. Prescribe levodopa for older and dopamine agonists for younger patients. However, “we shouldn’t be firmly stating use of a dopamine agonist or levodopa. We are individualizing therapy,” she said.

In the Comparison of the Agonist Pramipexole With Levodopa on Motor Complications of Parkinson’s Disease study, Dr. Waters, professor of clinical neurology at Columbia University Medical Center, New York, and her colleagues randomized 151 patients to pramipexole and 150 others to levodopa in 1996 and 1997. The patients were permitted to switch to levodopa during an open-label phase. Six-year results for 222 participants showed that 50% of the initial pramipexole group and 69% of the initial levodopa group had motor complications (*Arch. Neurol.* 2009;66:563-70).

By the final visit, dyskinesias were more common in the initial levodopa group than in the initial pramipexole group (37% vs. 20%, respectively), Dr. Waters said.

Dr. Waters also referred to the Pergolide Versus L-dopa Monotherapy and Positron Emission Tomography (PEL-

MOPET) trial in which 148 early Parkinson’s disease patients were randomized to pergolide (Permax) and another 146 to levodopa in this 3-year, multicenter, double-blind study (*Mov. Disord.* 2006;21:343-53). Pergolide was withdrawn from the U.S. market in 2007 because of its potential for heart valve damage.

There was a significant delay in the onset of dyskinesia and lower severity of motor symptoms in the pergolide group, Dr. Waters said. The levodopa group, however, reported significantly greater symptomatic relief. The authors concluded that both agents are suitable for initial therapy, so physician judgment drives the decision based on efficacy and adverse events.

Dr. Waters also addressed the 10-year results of a ropinirole (Requip) versus levodopa study (*Mov. Disord.* 2007;22: 2409-17). This was an extension of a study that compared treatment with ropinirole in 85 patients with levodopa therapy in 45 patients at 5 years (*N. Engl. J. Med.* 2000;342:1484-91). At that time point, the cumulative incidence of dyskinesia was 20% with ropinirole, compared with 45% with levodopa.

At 10 years, 51 patients remained in the ropinirole cohort and 29 in the levodopa group. “Even after the 10 years, there was a substantial difference in those being free of dyskinesia for those initially randomized to ropinirole [52%] versus levodopa [77%],” Dr. Waters said.

“These clinical trials are all quite consistent,” she said. “Dyskinesia is better with dopamine agonists and the [symptomatic] effect of levodopa is greater.” ■

**Disclosures:** Dr. Waters is on the advisory board or speakers bureau of Boehringer Ingelheim, GlaxoSmithKline, Novartis, and Teva.

## Pataday™ (olopatadine hydrochloride ophthalmic solution) 0.2%

### INDICATIONS AND USAGE

PATADAY™ solution is indicated for the treatment of ocular itching associated with allergic conjunctivitis.

### CONTRAINDICATIONS

Hypersensitivity to any components of this product.

### WARNINGS

For topical ocular use only. Not for injection or oral use.

### PRECAUTIONS

#### Information for Patients

As with any eye drop, to prevent contaminating the dropper tip and solution, care should be taken not to touch the eyelids or surrounding areas with the dropper tip of the bottle. Keep bottle tightly closed when not in use. Patients should be advised not to wear a contact lens if their eye is red.

PATADAY™ (olopatadine hydrochloride ophthalmic solution) 0.2% should not be used to treat contact lens related irritation. The preservative in PATADAY™ solution, benzalkonium chloride, may be absorbed by soft contact lenses. Patients who wear soft contact lenses and whose eyes are not red, should be instructed to wait at least ten minutes after instilling PATADAY™ (olopatadine hydrochloride ophthalmic solution) 0.2% before they insert their contact lenses.

#### Carcinogenesis, Mutagenesis, Impairment of Fertility

Olopatadine administered orally was not carcinogenic in mice and rats in doses up to 500 mg/kg/day and 200 mg/kg/day, respectively. Based on a 40 µL drop size and a 50 kg person, these doses were approximately 150,000 and 50,000 times higher than the maximum recommended ocular human dose (MROHD). No mutagenic potential was observed when olopatadine was tested in an *in vitro* bacterial reverse mutation (Ames) test, an *in vitro* mammalian chromosome aberration assay or an *in vivo* mouse micronucleus test. Olopatadine administered to male and female rats at oral doses of approximately 100,000 times MROHD level resulted in a slight decrease in the fertility index and reduced implantation rate; no effects on reproductive function were observed at doses of approximately 15,000 times the MROHD level.

#### Pregnancy:

#### Teratogenic effects: Pregnancy Category C

Olopatadine was found not to be teratogenic in rats and rabbits. However, rats treated at 600 mg/kg/day, or 150,000 times the MROHD and rabbits treated at 400 mg/kg/day, or approximately 100,000 times the MROHD, during organogenesis showed a decrease in live fetuses. In addition, rats treated with 600 mg/kg/day of olopatadine during organogenesis showed a decrease in fetal weight. Further, rats treated with 600 mg/kg/day of olopatadine during late gestation through the lactation period showed a decrease in neonatal survival and body weight.

There are, however, no adequate and well-controlled studies in pregnant women. Because animal studies are not always predictive of human responses, this drug should be used in pregnant women only if the potential benefit to the mother justifies the potential risk to the embryo or fetus.

#### Nursing Mothers:

Olopatadine has been identified in the milk of nursing rats following oral administration. It is not known whether topical ocular administration could result in sufficient systemic absorption to produce detectable quantities in the human breast milk. Nevertheless, caution should be exercised when PATADAY™ (olopatadine hydrochloride ophthalmic solution) 0.2% is administered to a nursing mother.

#### Pediatric Use:

Safety and effectiveness in pediatric patients below the age of 3 years have not been established.

#### Geriatric Use:

No overall differences in safety and effectiveness have been observed between elderly and younger patients.

#### ADVERSE REACTIONS

Symptoms similar to cold syndrome and pharyngitis were reported at an incidence of approximately 10%.

The following adverse experiences have been reported in 5% or less of patients:

**Ocular:** blurred vision, burning or stinging, conjunctivitis, dry eye, foreign body sensation, hyperemia, hypersensitivity, keratitis, lid edema, pain and ocular pruritus.

**Non-ocular:** asthma, back pain, flu syndrome, headache, increased cough, infection, nausea, rhinitis, sinusitis and taste perversion. Some of these events were similar to the underlying disease being studied.

#### DOSAGE AND ADMINISTRATION

The recommended dose is one drop in each affected eye once a day.

#### HOW SUPPLIED

PATADAY™ (olopatadine hydrochloride ophthalmic solution) 0.2% is supplied in a white, oval, low density polyethylene DROP-TAINER® dispenser with a natural low density polyethylene dispensing plug and a white polypropylene cap. Tamper evidence is provided with a shrink band around the closure and neck area of the package.

NDC 0065-0272-25

2.5 mL fill in 4 mL oval bottle

#### Storage:

Store at 2°C to 25°C (36°F to 77°F)  
U.S. Patents Nos. 4,871,865; 4,923,892; 5,116,863; 5,641,805; 6,995,186

#### Rx Only

#### References:

1. Abelson MB, Gomes PJ, Pasquine T, et al. Efficacy of olopatadine ophthalmic solution 0.2% in reducing signs and symptoms of allergic conjunctivitis. *Allergy Asthma Proc.* 2007;28:427-433.
2. PATADAY™ Solution Package Insert.
3. Vogelson CT, Abelson MB, Pasquine T, et al. Preclinical and clinical anti-allergic effect of olopatadine 0.2% solution 24 hours after topical ocular administration. *Allergy Asthma Proc.* 2004;25:69-75.
4. *Wolters Kluwer Health, Source® Pharmaceutical Audit Suite.* August 2009-September 2010.
5. *Wolters Kluwer Health, Source® Pharmaceutical Audit Suite.* September 2008-August 2009.

**Alcon®**

©2010 Alcon, Inc. 1/10 PAT10501JAD