Aspirin and Esomeprazole Appear Safe for Barrett's

BY FRAN LOWRY

Orlando Bureau

ORLANDO — Early findings from the Aspirin Esomeprazole Chemoprevention Trial indicate that therapy with aspirin and esomeprazole is safe and well tolerated for preventing the progression of Barrett's esophagus to adenocarcinoma.

Since the start of the randomized Aspirin Esomeprazole Chemoprevention Trial (AspECT) in September 2005, 1,192 (83%) of the 1,436 patients have remained on their medication, and just 33 adverse events have been reported, said the study's lead investigator Dr. Janusz Jankowski, professor of medicine, Oxford University (England), at a meeting on gastrointestinal cancers sponsored by the American Society of Clinical Oncology.

AspECT is an ambitious, 10-year clinical trial being conducted in the United Kingdom. The investigators are still recruiting to meet their goal of 3,000 pa-

R only

tients. The trial's primary aim is to determine whether treatment with the proton pump inhibitor esomeprazole (Nexium, AstraZeneca) and aspirin can stop Barrett's metaplasia from progressing to ade-

The investigators are also trying to determine whether this therapy will prevent or reduce myocardial infarction.

The United Kingdom is fertile ground for such a study, Dr. Jankowski said at the symposium, also sponsored by the AGA

Institute, the American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology, and the Society of Surgical Oncology.

The U.K. has the highest incidence of esophageal adenocarcinoma in the world—up to four times greater than that of other countries in Europe. Barrett's metaplasia is twice as common in the U.K. as it is in the United States," he said in an interview

Being able to show that aspirin "is in-Continued on following page

Tetanus Toxoid, Reduced **Diphtheria Toxoid and Acellular Pertussis Vaccine Adsorbed**

Adacel®
Brief Summary: Please see pa

Brief Summary: Please see package insert for full prescribing information

INDICATIONS AND USAGE ADACEL® vaccine is indicated for active booster immunization for the prevention of tetanus, diphtheria and pertussis as a single dose in persons 11 through 64 years of age. The use of ADACEL vaccine as a primary series, or to complete the primary series, has not been studied. As with any vaccine, ADACEL vaccine may not protect 100% of vaccinated individuals.

CONTRAINDICATIONS Known systemic hypersensitivity to any component of ADACEL vaccine or a life threatening reaction after previous administration of the vaccine or a vaccine containing the same substances are contraindications to vaccination with ADACEL vaccine. Because of uncertainly as to which component of the vaccine or any termited vaccine in which the diphtheria, tetanus or pertussis components should not be administered. Alternatively, such individuals may be referred to an allergist for evaluation infurther immunizations are to be considered. The following events are contraindications to administration of any pertussis containing vaccine: (1)

Encephalopathy within 7 days of a previous dose of pertussis containing vaccine not attributable to another identifiable cause.

Progressive neurological disorder, uncontrolled epilepsy or progressive encephalopathy. Pertussis vaccine should not be administered to individuals with these conditions until a treatment regimen has been established, the condition has stabilized, and the benefit deathy outweights the risk.

ADACEL vaccine is not contraindicated for use in individuals with HIV infection. (1)

WARNINGS Beause intramusuals in injection can cause injection site hematoma, ADACEL vaccine should not be given to persons with

clearly outweights the risk.

ADA/EL vaccine is not contraindicated for use in individuals with HIV infection. (1)

WARNINGS Because intranuscular injection can cause injection site hematoma, ADA/EL vaccine should not be given to persons with any bleeding disorder, such as hemophilia or thrombocylopenia, or to persons on anticoagulant therapy unless the potential benefits dearly outweigh the risk of administration. If the decision is made to administrat ADA/EL vaccine in such persons, it should be given with caution, with steps taken to avoid the risk of hematoms formation following injection. (1) If any of the following events occurred in temporal relation to previous receipt of a vaccine containing a vehole-cell persisss (eg. DPI) or an acelular persiss component, the decision to give ADA/EL vaccine should be based on careful consideration of the potential benefits and possible risks: (2)(3)

*Temperature of **-40-SC** (105**) within 48 hours not due to another identifiable cause;

*Collapse or shock-like state (hypotonic-hyporesponsive episode) within 48 hours;

*Sezizures with or without fiver occurring within 3 days.

*Mena a decision is made to withhold persussis vaccine, I'd vaccine should be given. Persons who experienced Arthus-type hypersensitivity reactions (eg. severe local reactions associated with systemic symptoms) (4) following a prior dose of telanus toxicol usually have high serum telanus antitional levels and should not be given emergency doses of telanus toxicol-containing vaccines more frequently than every 10 years, even if the vound is neither dean nor minor (4)(6) If Culliain-Barré yndrome occurred within 6 weeks of receipt or prior vaccine or toxing telatura toxiod, the decision to give ADA/EL vaccine or any vaccine containing telatura toxiod, the decision to give ADA/EL vaccine or any vaccine containing telatura toxiod should be based on careful consideration of the potential benefits and possible risks. (1) The decision to administer a persussis-containing vaccine to individuals with

Joseph Son Notae Authorities of Petros Security (2) and the lines (3) (1) PRECAUTIONS General Do not administer by intravascular injection: ensure that the needle does not penetrate a blood vessel. AAO/EL vaccine should not be administered into the buttods nor by the intradermal route, since these methods of administration have not been studied; a weaker immune response has been observed when these routes of administration have been used with other vaccines (1) The possibility of allergic reactions in persons ensible to components of the vaccine should be evaluated. Epinephine Hydrochloride Solution (11,1000) and other appropriate agents and equipment should be available for immediate use in case an anaphylactic or acute hyperestribility reaction occurs. Prior to administration of ADA/EL vaccine, the vaccine recipient and/or the parent or guardian must be asked about personal health history, including immunication history, current health status and any adverse event after previous immunizations. In persons who have a history of serious or severe veraction within 48 hours of a previous injection with a vaccine containing similar components, administration of ADA/EL vaccine must be carefully considered. The ACIP has published guidelines for the immunization of immunicoompromised individuals. (6) Immune responses to inactivated vaccines and toxoids when given to immunication of immunicoompromised individuals. (6) Immune responses to inactivated vaccines and toxoids when given to immunication or promote proving and meetic on a sterile disposable unit, must be ender for each person to prevent transmission of blood borne infectious agents. Needles should not be recapped but should be disposed of according to biohazard waste guidelines.

Reviews of the course, or a sense usuposuse unit, initials use used for each person to prevent transmission of blood borne infectious agents. Needless should not be recapped but should be disposed of according to biolazard waste guidelines. Information for Vaccine Recipients and/or Parent or Guardian Before administration of ADACEL vaccine, health-care provides should inform the vaccine recipient and/or parent or guardian to the benefits and disc. The health-care provides should inform the vaccine recipient and/or parent or guardian about the potential for adverse reactions that have been temporally associated with ADACEL vaccine or other vaccines containing similar components. The vaccine recipient and/or parent or guardian should be instructed to report any sensor adverse reactions to their health-care provider. Fernales of childbearing potential should be informed that Sanoff Pasteur Inc. maintains a pregnant registery to monitor fetal outcomes of pregnant women exposed to ADACEL vaccine. If they are program for the prime avare they were pregnant at the time of ADACEL vaccine immunization, they should contact their health-care providers and the provider should provide the Vaccine Information Statements (VISs) that are required by the National Childhood Vaccine Injuty Act of 1986 to be given with each immunization. The US Department of Health and Human Services has established a Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) to accept all reports of suspected advance events after the administration of any vaccine, including but not limited to the reporting of events required by the National Childhood vaccine Injuty Act of 1986 to be reporting of events required by the National Childhood vaccine Injuty Act of 1986 to be reporting of the very suspected advance events after the administration of any vaccine, including but not limited to the reporting of events required by the National Childhood vaccine Injuty Act of 1986, (7) The toll-free number for VAERS forms and information is 1940-80-22-27-96 or wist the VA

Centeral.) For information regarding simultaneous administration with other vaccines refer to the ADVENCE REAL (I/ONS and DOSACE AND ADMINISTRATION sections.

Carcinogenesis, Mutlagenesis, Impairment of Fertility. In studies have been performed with ADACEL vaccine to evaluate carcinogenicity, mutlagenic potential, or impairment of fertility.

Pregnancy Category C Animal reproduction studies have not been conducted with ADACEL vaccine. It is also not known whether ADACEL vaccine should be given to a pregnant woman only if clearly needed. Animal fertility studies have not been conducted with ADACEL vaccine. The effect of ADACEL vaccine on embryo-fetal and pre-weaning development was evaluated in two developmental toxicity studies using pregnant anbibs. Animals were administered ADACEL vaccine brigory to the studies of the properties of the properti

International pregnatory regord by calling 1-800-822-2460 (1-80U-VACCINE).

Nursing Mothers its not known whether ADACEL vaccine is excreted in human milk. Because many drugs are excreted in human milk, caution should be exercised when ADACEL vaccine is given to a nursing woman.

Pediatric Use ADACEL vaccine is not indicated for individuals less than 11 years of age. (See INDICATIONS AND USAGE) For immunization of persons 6 weeks through 6 years of age against diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis refer to manufacturers' package inserts for TDB vaccines.

inserts for Diatr' vaccines. Genfairt Use ADECL vaccine is not indicated for individuals 65 years of age and older. No data are available regarding the safety and effectiveness of ADACEL vaccine in individuals 65 years of age and older as clinical studies of ADACEL vaccine did not include

and effectiveness of ADACEL vaccine in individuals 65 years of age and older as clinical studies of ADACEL vaccine did not include subjects in the geriatric population.

ADMERSE RRACTIONS The safety of ADACEL vaccine was evaluated in 4 clinical studies. A total of 5,841 individuals 11-64 years of age inclusive (3,393 adolescents 11-17 years of age and 2,448 adults 18-64 years) received a single booster dose of ADACEL vaccine. The principal safety study was a randomized, observer blind, active controlled trial that enrolled participants 11-17 years of age (ADACEL vaccine N = 1,184, Td vaccine N = 792) and 18-64 years of age (ADACEL vaccine N = 1,792; Td vaccine N = 573). Study participants had not received tetanus or diphtheria containing vaccines within the previous 5 years. Observer blind design, ie, study

Product information as of January 2006

personnel collecting the safety data differed from personnel administering the vaccines, was used due to different vaccine packaging (ADACEL vaccine supplied in single dose vals. To vaccine supplied in multi-dose vals). Solicited local and systemic reactions and unsolicited events were monitored daily for 14 days post-vaccination using a diary card. From days 14-28 post-vaccination, information on adverse events necessitating a medical contract, such as a telephone call, vist to an emergency room, physican's office or hospitalization, was obtained via telephone interview or at an interim clinic vist. From days 28 to 6 months post-vaccination, participants were monitored for unexpected visits to a physician's office or to an emergency room, onset of serious lines and inspitalizations. Information regarding adverse events that occurred in the 6 month post-vaccination the period was obtained via a scripted telephone interview. Approximately 96% of participants completed the 6 month flooliew-up evaluation in the concomitant vaccination study with ADACEL and Hepatitis 8 vaccines, local and systemic adverse events were monitored divident participants or the concentral vaccination using a diary card. Local adverse events were only monitored at site/arm of ADACEL vaccine administration. Unsolicited reactions (including immediate reactions; serious adverse events were empty monitored at site/arm of ADACEL vaccine administration. Unsolicited reactions in the serious of the properties of the

(8) Headache was the most frequent systemic neardion and was usually of mild nonderate inferensity. Local and systemic solicited reactions occurred within the first 3 days after vaccination (with a mean duration of less than 3 days). Adverse Events in the Concomitant Vaccine Studies

Local and Systemic Reactions when Given with Hepatitis B Vaccine The rates reported for fever and injection site pain (at the ADACEL vaccine administration site) were smilar when ADACEL and Hep B vaccines were given concurrently or separately. However, the rates of injection site erythera C23-4% for concomitant vaccination and 17-9% for separate administration and 21-4% for separate administrations were line readed when co-administrated. Swollen and/or sore joints were reported by 22-5% for concomitant vaccination and 17-9% for separate administration. The rates of generalized body aches in the individuals who reported swollen and/or sore joints were reported by 22-5% for concomitant vaccination and 72-2% for separate administration. Most joint complaints were mild in intensity with a mean duration of 18 days. The incidence of other solicited and unsolicited adverse events were not different between the 2 study groups. (8)

Local and Systemic Reactions when Given with Trivialent Inactivated influenza Vaccine the rates of fever and injection site eyrthema and swelling were similar for recipients of concurrent and separate administration of ADACEL vaccine and Trivial recommendations and the ADACEL vaccine incidents are supported by 22-5% for concurrent administration and 9% for separate administration. Most join on the courted at statistically higher rests following concurrent administration and 9% for separate administration. Most join complaints were mild in intensity with a mean duration and 9% for separate administration. Most join complaints were mild in intensity with a mean duration and 9% for separate administration. Most join complaints were mild in intensity with a mean duration of 20 days. (8) Anditional Suddess An additio

expiration date.

REFERENCES 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), General recommendations on immunization: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) and the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP). MMWR 2002;51(RR-2):1-35. 2. CDC. Perfussis vaccination: use of acellular perfussis vaccines among infants and young children. Recommendations of the ACIP. MMWR 1997;46(RR-7):1-25. 3. CDC Update. Vaccine seld effects, adverse reactions, contraind-cations and precautions - recommendations of the ACIP. MMWR 1994;6(RR-12):1-35. CDC. Dipthtenta, tetanus and perfussis recommendations or of waccine to the preventive measures. Recommendations of the ACIP. MMWR 1991;40(RR-12):1-35. CDC. Dipthtenta, tetanus and perfussis recommendations of vaccine use and other preventive measures. Recommendations of the ACIP. MMWR 1993;42(RR-4):1-18. 7. CDC. Current trends - Vaccine Adverse event Reporting System (VAEKS). United States. MMWR 1993;34(21):730-3. 8. Data on file at Sanofi Pasteur Limited. 9. CDC. Current trends - national vaccine injury act requirements for permanent vaccinelion records and for propring of seeded events after vaccination. MMWR 1988;37(13):197-200. 10. FDA. New reporting requirements for vaccine adverse events. FDA Drug Bull 1988;18(2):16-8.

Printed in Canada

Tenofovir Beats Adefovir at Hep B **Viral Suppression**

BOSTON — Tenofovir suppresses viral load more rapidly and effectively than adefovir does in patients with HBe antigen-negative chronic hepatitis B, Dr. Patrick Marcellin reported at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases.

Although both patient groups experienced a rapid decline in viral load by week 4 of the 48-week trial, those taking tenofovir experienced a steeper decline and a higher response rate, and the response was maintained, said Dr. Marcellin of the Hospital Beaujon, Clichy, France.

In the phase III trial, 375 patients with chronic hepatitis B infection were randomized to either 300 mg/day tenofovir or 10 mg/day adefovir. The primary end points were suppression of viral DNA to below 400 copies/mL and reduction of at least 2 points in the Knodell necroinflammatory score without worsening of fibrosis.

The patients' mean age was 44 years, and their mean necroinflammation score was 8. Twenty percent had cirrhosis. At baseline, mean hepatitis B virus RNA levels were about 7 $\log_{10} c/mL$.

Both groups achieved rapid suppression of hepatitis B virus DNA, with the majority of responsive patients doing so by week 4. By week 48, however, response differences emerged. Significantly more tenofovir-treated patients than adefovir-treated patients achieved viral loads below 400 copies/mL (93% versus 63%, respectively).

There was no significant difference in histologic response between the two groups: 72% treated with tenofovir improved, versus 69% treated with adefovir. But there was a significant difference in the percentage of patients who achieved both virologic and histologic response: 71% of the tenofovir group, versus 49% of the adefovir group.

At week 48, the ALT level was normal in 77% of both groups. The incidence of ALT flare was about 1% in each group. There were no significant differences in amylase, lipase, or creatinine levels. Regarding drug resistance, none of the tenofovir-treated patients developed resistant mutations.

The phase III study was sponsored by Gilead Sciences Inc., Durham, N.C., the company that manufactures tenofovir. Dr. Marcellin disclosed he has a financial relationship with Gilead Sciences.

-Michele G. Sullivan

Continued from previous page

credibly well tolerated" is very gratifying, Dr. Jankowski said, because many people were skeptical that it could be done.

"One of the major criticisms of the study when we tried to get it funded in the first place was that people thought we were mad and dangerous, and that we would kill patients with low-dose aspirin. But about 90% of our patients are still on low-dose aspirin and esomeprazole 2 years into the study with hardly any adverse events, showing the drug combination is very well tolerated."

So far, 12% of patients randomized to 20 mg esomeprazole have required an increase to 40 mg for symptom control, Dr.

Besides conversion to high-grade dysplasia or cancer, the other primary end point of the study is allcause mortality.

Jankowski said.

Additionally, it will look at the pharmacokinetics

of aspirin resistance, genetic markers as potential risk factors for esophageal cancer, and quality of life.

The first planned efficacy analysis is scheduled for 2010, a second interim

Being able to show that aspirin is incredibly well tolerated' is very gratifying because many people were skeptical.

DR. JANKOWSKI

analysis is due in 2012, and the final analysis is due in 2016.

The trial is funded by Cancer Research UK, Oxford University, and AstraZeneca.

Dr. Jankowski disclosed that he is

a consultant to and receives research funding from AstraZeneca.

Clinical Trials Experience. The overall incidence of side effects reported in patients receiving sitagliptin and metformin was similar to that reported with patients receiving placebo and

In a 24-week placebo-controlled trial of sitagliptin 100 mg administered once daily added in a 24-week prace-oction that of stagging in 1900 mg administration to a twice-daily metformin regimen, there were no adverse reactions reported regardless of investigator assessment of causality in ≥5% of patients and more commonly than in patients given placebo. Discontinuation of therapy due to clinical adverse reactions was similar to the placebo treatment group (sitagliptin and metformin, 1.9%; placebo and metformin, 2.5%).

The overall incidence of adverse reactions of hypoglycemia in patients treated with sitaglipting and metformin was similar to patients treated with placebo and metformin (100 mg sitagliptin and metformin, 1.3%; placebo and metformin, 2.1%). Adverse reactions of hypoglycemia were based on all reports of hypoglycemia; a concurrent glucose measurement was not required. The incidence of selected gastrointestinal adverse reactions in patients treated with sitagliptin and metformin was also similar to placebo and metformin: nausea (sitagliptin and metformin vasing to placebo and metformin consideration). 1.3%; placebo and metformin, 0.8%), vomiting (1.1%, 0.8%), abdominal pain (2.2%, 3.8%), and diarrhea (2.4%, 2.5%).

No clinically meaningful changes in vital signs or in ECG (including in QTc interval) were observed with the combination of sitagliptin and metformin

The most common adverse experience in sitagliptin monotherapy reported regardless of investigator assessment of causality in \geq 5% of patients and more commonly than in patients given placebo was nasopharyngitis.

The most common (>5%) established adverse reactions due to initiation of metformin therapy are diarrhea, nausea/vomiting, flatulence, abdominal discomfort, indigestion, asthenia, and headache

Sitagliptin. The incidence of laboratory adverse reactions was similar in patients treated with sitagliptin and metformin (7.6%) compared to patients treated with placebo and metformin (8.7%). In most but not all studies, a small increase in white blood cell count (approximately 200 cells/microL difference in WBC vs placebo; mean baseline WBC approximately 6600 cells/microL) was observed due to a small increase in neutrophils. This change in laboratory parameters is not considered to be clinically relevant.

Metformin hydrochloride. In controlled clinical trials of metformin of 29 weeks duration a decrease to subnormal levels of previously normal serum Vitamin B₁₂ levels, without clinical manifestations, was observed in approximately 7% of patients. Such decrease, possibly due to interference with B₁₂ absorption from the B₁₂-intrinsic factor complex, is, however, very rarely associated with anemia and appears to be rapidly reversible with discontinuation of metformin or Vitamin B_{12} supplementation [see Warnings and Precautions].

Postmarketing Experience. The following additional adverse reactions have been identified during postapproval use of JANUMET or sitagliptin, one of the components of JANUMET. Because these reactions are reported voluntarily from a population of uncertain size, it is generally not possible to reliably estimate their frequency or establish a causal relationship to drug exposure.

Hypersensitivity reactions include anaphylaxis, angioedema, rash, urticaria and exfoliative skin conditions including Stevens-Johnson syndrome [see Warnings and Precautions]; upper respiratory tract infection

DRUG INTERACTIONS

Cationic Drugs. Cationic drugs (e.g., amiloride, digoxin, morphine, procainamide, quinidine, quinine, ranitidine, triamterene, trimethoprim, or vancomycin) that are eliminated by renal tubular secretion theoretically have the potential for interaction with metformin by competing for common renal tubular transport systems. Such interaction between metformin and oral cimetidine has been observed in normal healthy volunteers in both single- and multiple-dose metformin-cimetidine drug interaction studies, with a 60% increase in peak metformin plasma and whole blood concentrations and a 40% increase in plasma and whole blood metformin AUC. There was no change in elimination half-life in the single-dose study. Metformin had no effect on cimetidine pharmacokinetics. Although such interactions remain theoretical (except for cimetidine), careful patient monitoring and dose adjustment of JANUMET and/or the interfering drug is recommended in patients who are taking cationic medications that are excreted via the proximal renal tubular secretory system.

Digoxin. There was a slight increase in the area under the curve (AUC, 11%) and mean peak drug concentration (C_{max}, 18%) of digoxin with the coadministration of 100 mg sitagliptin for 10 days. These increases are not considered likely to be clinically meaningful. Digoxin, as a cationic drug, has the potential to compete with metformin for common renal tubular transport systems, thus affecting the serum concentrations of either digoxin, metformin or both. Patients receiving digoxin should be monitored appropriately. No dosage adjustment of digoxin or JANUMET is recommended.

Glyburide. In a single-dose interaction study in type 2 diabetes patients, coadministration of metformin and glyburide did not result in any changes in either metformin pharmacokinetics or pharmacodynamics. Decreases in glyburide AUC and C_{max} were observed, but were highly variable. The single-dose nature of this study and the lack of correlation between glyburide blood levels and pharmacodynamic effects make the clinical significance of this interaction uncertain.

Furosemide. A single-dose, metformin-furosemide drug interaction study in healthy subjects demonstrated that pharmacokinetic parameters of both compounds were affected by coadministration. Furosemide increased the metformin plasma and blood C_{max} by 22% and blood AUC by 15%, without any significant change in metformin renal clearance. When administered with metformin, the C_{max} and AUC of furosemide were 31% and 12% smaller, respectively, than when administered alone, and the terminal half-life was decreased by 32%, without any significant change in furosemide renal clearance. No information is available about the interaction of metformin and furosemide when coadministered chronically.

Nifedipine. A single-dose, metformin-nifedipine drug interaction study in normal healthy volunteers demonstrated that coadministration of nifedipine increased plasma metformin C_{max} and AUC by 20% and 9%, respectively, and increased the amount excreted in the urine. T_{max} and half-life were unaffected. Nifedipine appears to enhance the absorption of metformin. Metformin had minimal effects on nifedipine.

The Use of Metformin with Other Drugs. Certain drugs tend to produce hyperglycemia and may lead to loss of glycemic control. These drugs include the thiazides and other diuretics, corticosteroids, phenothiazines, thyroid products, estrogens, oral contraceptives, phenytoin, nicotinic acid, sympathomimetics, calcium channel blocking drugs, and isoniazid. When such drugs are administered to a patient receiving JANUMET the patient should be closely observed to maintain adequate glycemic control.

In healthy volunteers, the pharmacokinetics of metformin and propranolol, and metformin and ibuprofen were not affected when coadministered in single-dose interaction studies.

Metformin is negligibly bound to plasma proteins and is, therefore, less likely to interact with highly protein-bound drugs such as salicylates, sulfonamides, chloramphenicol, and probenecid, as compared to the sulfonylureas, which are extensively bound to serum proteins.

USE IN SPECIFIC POPULATIONS

Pregnancy

Pregnancy Category B.

JANUMET. There are no adequate and well-controlled studies in pregnant women with JANUMET or its individual components; therefore, the safety of JANUMET in pregnant women is not known. JANUMET should be used during pregnancy only if clearly needed.

Merck & Co.. Inc. maintains a registry to monitor the pregnancy outcomes of women exposed to JANUMET while pregnant. Health care providers are encouraged to report any prenatal exposure to JANUMET by calling the Pregnancy Registry at (800) 986-8999.

No animal studies have been conducted with the combined products in JANUMET to evaluate effects on reproduction. The following data are based on findings in studies performed with sitagliptin or metformin individually.

Sitagliptin. Reproduction studies have been performed in rats and rabbits. Doses of sitagliptin up to 125 mg/kg (approximately 12 times the human exposure at the maximum recommende human dose) did not impair fertility or harm the fetus. There are, however, no adequate and well-controlled studies with sitagliptin in pregnant women.

Sitagliptin administered to pregnant female rats and rabbits from gestation day 6 to 20 organogenesis) was not teratogenic at oral doses up to 250 mg/kg (rats) and 125 mg/kg (rabbits), or approximately 30 and 20 times human exposure at the maximum recommended human dose (MRHD) of 100 mg/day based on AUC comparisons. Higher doses increased the incidence of rib malformations in offspring at 1000 mg/kg, or approximately 100 times human exposure at the MRHD.

Sitagliptin administered to female rats from gestation day 6 to lactation day 21 decreased body weight in male and female offspring at 1000 mg/kg. No functional or behavioral toxicity was observed in offspring of rats.

Placental transfer of sitagliptin administered to pregnant rats was approximately 45% at 2 hours and 80% at 24 hours postdose. Placental transfer of sitagliptin administered to pregnant rabbits was approximately 66% at 2 hours and 30% at 24 hours.

Metformin hydrochloride. Metformin was not teratogenic in rats and rabbits at doses up to 600 mg/kg/day. This represents an exposure of about 2 and 6 times the maximum recom human daily dose of 2000 mg based on body surface area comparisons for rats and rabbits, respectively. Determination of fetal concentrations demonstrated a partial placental barrier

Nursing Mothers. No studies in lactating animals have been conducted with the combined components of JANUMET. In studies performed with the individual components, both sitagliptin and metformin are secreted in the milk of lactating rats. It is not known whether sitagliptin is excreted in human milk. Because many drugs are excreted in human milk, caution should be exercised when JANUMET is administered to a nursing woman.

Pediatric Use. Safety and effectiveness of JANUMET in pediatric patients under 18 years have not been established.

Geriatric Use, JANUMET, Because situation and metformin are substantially excreted by the kidney and because aging can be associated with reduced renal function, JANUMET should be used with caution as age increases. Care should be taken in dose selection and should be based on careful and regular monitoring of renal function [see Warnings and Precautions].

Sitagliptin. Of the total number of subjects (N=3884) in Phase II and III clinical studies of sitagliptin, 725 patients were 65 years and over, while 61 patients were 75 years and over. No overall differences in safety or effectiveness were observed between subjects 65 years and over and younger subjects. While this and other reported clinical experience have not identified differences in responses between the elderly and younger patients, greater sensitivity of some older individuals cannot be ruled out.

Metformin hydrochloride. Controlled clinical studies of metformin did not include sufficient numbers of elderly patients to determine whether they respond differently from younger patients, although other reported clinical experience has not identified differences in responses between the elderly and young patients. Metformin should only be used in patients with normal renal function. The initial and maintenance dosing of metformin should be conservative in patients with advanced age, due to the potential for decreased renal function in this population. Any dose adjustment should be based on a careful assessment of renal function [see Contraindications; Warnings and Precautions].





JANUMET is a trademark of Merck & Co., Inc. Copyright ©2008 Merck & Co., Inc All rights reserved. 20803037(1)(105)-JMT Whitehouse Station, NJ 08889, USA

Perception of Pain Altered in **IBS Patients**

BY KATE JOHNSON Montreal Bureau

Patients with irritable bowel syndrome have altered brain responses to the anticipation of pain and to pain itself, which may make them more sensitive to painful

"During expectation of pain, IBS [irritable bowel syndrome] patients generate higher levels of tonic noradrenergic activity, producing a bias toward interpretation of network activity as pain (speed over accuracy), and are inefficient at reducing such activity when discrimination of nonpainful stimulation should be maximized, or pain should be inhibited," wrote Dr. Steven M. Berman and his colleagues from the Center for the Neurobiology of Stress at the University of California, Los Angeles (J. Neurosci. 2008;28:349-59).

They used functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to measure the blood oxygen level-dependent response to anticipated and delivered rectal distention in 14 female IBS patients and 12 healthy controls (mean age 36 years). The imaging showed that, when the control subjects were anticipating a painful stimulus, brain activity decreased in the insula, supragenual anterior cingulate cortex, amygdala, and dorsal brainstem, but there was less of this anticipatory deactivation in the IBS patients.

Visceral distention of the rectum was then performed using a computer-driven pump and rectal balloon, which was inflated, in random order, to pressures of 25 mm Hg, 45 mm Hg, or 5 mm Hg (sham distension). The distention was performed after an 8-hour fast and two enemas.

Four to six sessions of 16 inflations were performed. Each inflation was preceded by an anticipatory cue, then 15 seconds of inflation at the designated pressure.

During rectal distention, increases in activity in the insula, dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, and dorsal brainstem were more extensive in IBS patients than in controls. "The DBS [dorsal brainstem] region contains multiple small structures implicated in the modulation of pain," the authors wrote.

Patients rated their mood, before and after the visceral distention, using the Stress Symptom Rating scale and they rated the intensity of their discomfort on a 3-point scale. In addition, they were all evaluated for depression and anxiety symptoms.

Overall, depression and anxiety scores fell within the normal range for all controls and 12 of the 14 IBS patients, but both scores were higher in IBS patients than controls, even when the two clinically elevated patients were excluded. Self-reported stress, anxiety, and anger were also higher in IBS patients. "The current results demonstrate that during certain expectation of experimental abdominal/pelvic discomfort, female IBS-C [IBS with constipation] patients are more anxious and less able than healthy controls to downregulate activity within the CNS network activated by potentially aversive interoceptive stimuli," the authors noted.