Q/ Intranasal steroids vs antihistamines: Which is better for seasonal allergies and conjunctivitis?

Evidence summary
The most commonly measured outcomes in allergic rhinitis and conjunctivitis trials are symptom scales, which are neither standardized nor clinically validated. Almost all the studies discussed here calculated outcomes as a percentage change from baseline symptom scores but didn’t provide absolute values, so it isn’t clear whether statistical differences are clinically relevant.

Steroids provide more relief of nasal symptoms
A meta-analysis of 21 randomized placebo-controlled trials (total 2821 patients, average age mid-30s) that compared changes in TNSS with intranasal steroids and oral antihistamines among adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis found that steroids reduced TNSS more than antihistamines.1 Most of the patients had had moderate to severe symptoms for several years.

Investigators calculated percent changes from baseline in mean TNSS, which typically included sneezing, itching, congestion, and rhinorrhea, each usually scored on a scale of 0 to 3.1 Individual RCTs compared one of 3 intranasal steroids (fluticasone, triamcinolone, or budesonide) and one of 3 oral antihistamines (cetirizine, loratadine, or fexofenadine) with placebo; no studies compared medications within classes against each other.1

On individual symptom scores, intranasal steroids reduced sneezing, itching, congestion, and rhinorrhea more than placebo by more than 20%. Both intranasal steroids and oral antihistamines decreased itching and rhinorrhea a similar amount, but antihistamines reduced congestion by only 5% to 10% more than placebo.1

This meta-analysis included only studies reporting TNSS as an outcome, and individual studies used varying TNSS scales. Investigators attributed heterogeneity in the studies to intraclass differences between medications.1

Two drug company-sponsored RCTs (1616 patients combined, average age 30s, moderate to severe allergic rhinitis) pub-
Established before the meta-analysis also demonstrated that the intranasal steroid fluticasone propionate modestly reduced TNSS compared with the oral antihistamine fexofenadine (1 point vs 1.3 on a scale of 0 to 12).2

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Harms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review of RCTs1</td>
<td>INS: 7 RCTs (total N=597) OAH: 14 RCTs (total N=2224)</td>
<td>Mean percentage change in TNSS from baseline: INS: −40.7% OAH: −23.5% Placebo: −15.0%</td>
<td>Changes in INS scores significantly greater than changes in OAH scores (P&lt;.001)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two RCTs, double blind, double dummy2</td>
<td>Study 1* INS (N=312) OAH (N=311) Placebo (N=313) Study 2* INS (N=224) OAH (N=227) Placebo (N=229)</td>
<td>Least squares mean difference from baseline TNSS score of INS vs OAH: Study 1: TNSS: −1.0 (95% CI, −0.7 to −1.4) Study 2: TNSS: −1.3 (95% CI, −0.9 to −1.7)</td>
<td>Changes in INS scores significantly greater than changes in OAH scores (P&lt;.001)</td>
<td>INS: sore throat (2%), urticaria (&lt;1%) OAH: epistaxis (2%), sore throat (&lt;1%), cholecystitis (&lt;1%), upper respiratory infection (&lt;1%), sinusitis (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI, confidence interval; INS, inhaled nasal steroids; OAH, oral antihistamine; RCTs, randomized controlled trials; TNSS, total nasal symptom score.

*The INS used was fluticasone furoate; the OAH used was fexofenadine.

**Results for eye symptoms are mixed**

A meta-analysis of 11 RCTs (1317 patients, average age 32) showed no significant difference in relief of eye symptoms between oral antihistamines (dexchlorpheniramine, terfenadine, and loratadine) and intranasal steroids (budesonide, beclomethasone, fluticasone, and triamcinolone) in patients with seasonal allergies, as measured by various symptom scores.3

Three other studies indicated that intranasal steroids (triamcinolone, fluticasone) relieved eye symptoms more effectively than oral antihistamines (loratadine, fexofenadine) based on mean reductions in TNSS, Rhinocconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire (RQLQ), and Total Ocular Symptom Score (TOSS).4-6 Of these scoring systems, only the RQLQ has been clinically validated.7

One additional study (including 2 RCTs) showed conflicting results.2 **TABLE 2** summarizes the results of studies comparing intranasal steroids and oral antihistamines to relieve eye symptoms.

**Antihistamines cost less than steroids and are available OTC**

Oral antihistamines are less expensive than intranasal steroids and are available over the counter. The cost of antihistamines ranges from $5.70 to $21.99 for a month of treatment, whereas the cost of intranasal steroids for the same period varies from $60.99 to $149.99.8

In the studies reviewed here, the 2 interventions showed similar harms, including sore throat, epistaxis, and headache.2,4-6

**Recommendations**

The American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology’s 2010 guidelines conclude that intranasal steroids are first-line treatment for allergic rhinitis. If the patient prefers, use oral antihistamines.9
The Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters for Allergy and Immunology also recommends intranasal steroids as the most effective medication class for treating allergic rhinitis; no drug within the class is preferable to another. Daily administration is more effective than administration as needed, although the latter is an option. For treating ocular symptoms, intranasal corticosteroids and oral antihistamines work equally well.10

### TABLE 2
How intranasal steroids compare with oral antihistamines for reducing eye symptoms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Harms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review3</td>
<td>INS vs OAH</td>
<td>OR for deterioration or no change of varied scoring systems: −0.043 (CI, −0.157 to 0.072)</td>
<td>No significant difference between INS and OAH scores</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RCT, double blind, double dummy5 | INS (triamcinolone acetonide), N=153 OAH (loratadine), N=152                | Percent reduction from mean baseline TNS ocular score: INS: 59% OAH: 48% Total TNS ocular score: 3 | Changes in INS scores significantly greater than changes in OAH scores (P<.05) | INS: headache (22%), anxiety (<1%), epistaxis (<1%)
|                               |                                                                               |                                                                       |                                                   | OAH: headache (18%), increase in rhinitis symptoms (2%), conjunctivitis (<1%) |
| RCT, double blind, double dummy4 | INS (fluticasone propionate), N=150 OAH (loratadine), N=150 INS+OAH, N=150 Placebo, N=150 Duration 2 wk | Mean change in RQLQ ocular score from baseline: INS: −1.9 OAH: −1.3 Total RQLQ ocular score: 6 | Changes in INS scores significantly greater than changes in OAH scores (P<.05; 0.5 change in score is clinically significant) | INS and OAH: blood in mucus (1%-2%), xerostomia (1%-2%), epistaxis (<1%) |
| RCT, double blind, double dummy6 | INS (fluticasone propionate), N=158 OAH (loratadine), N=158 Placebo, N=155 Duration 4 wk | Mean change in TOSS score from baseline: INS: −88.7±5.3 OAH: 72.5±5.4 Total TOSS score: 100 | Changes in INS scores significantly greater than changes in OAH scores (P<.045) | INS: headache (17%)
|                               |                                                                               |                                                                       |                                                   | OAH: headache (18%)                                                                 |
| Two RCTs, double blind, double dummy2 | Study 1: INS (fluticasone furoate), N=312 OAH (fexofenadine), N=311 Study 2: INS (fluticasone furoate), N=224 OAH (fexofenadine), N=227 Duration 2 wk | Least squares mean difference from baseline TOSS2 score: Study 1: TOSS2: −0.3 (95% CI, −0.6 to 0.0; P<.106) Study 2: TOSS2: −0.6 (95% CI, −0.9 to −0.2; P=.002) Total TOSS2 score: 9 | Changes in INS scores significantly greater than changes in OAH scores for Study 2 (P=.002) but not for Study 1 (P<.106) | INS: sore throat (2%), urticaria (<1%)
|                               |                                                                               |                                                                       |                                                   | OAH: epistaxis (2%), sore throat (<1%), cholecystitis (<1%), upper respiratory infection (<1%), sinusitis (<1%) |

CI, confidence interval; INS, intranasal steroids; OAH, oral antihistamines; OR, odds ratio; RCT, randomized controlled trial; RQLQ, rhinoconjunctivitis quality of life questionnaire; TNS, total nasal score; TNSS, total nasal symptom score; TOSS, total ocular symptom score; TOSS2, (variation of) total ocular symptom score.
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**PRIMARY CARE OPPORTUNITIES**

Geisinger Health System (GHS) is seeking BC/BE Family Medicine, Med-Peds, and Pediatric trained physicians for primary care opportunities throughout our service area.

Geisinger’s primary care opportunities offer:

- Enhanced competitive compensation package beginning day one of employment
- Additional financial incentives to ease the burden of transitioning from training to practice
- A collaborative working environment that promotes growth, innovation and teamwork
- Close proximity to major metropolitan locations – New York City, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and Baltimore

The fourth annual Thomson Reuters 15 Top Health Systems study ranks Geisinger as one of the top 15 health systems in the United States. Geisinger was also recently named to the Becker’s Hospital Review “100 Best Places to Work in Healthcare” list for 2011. It’s a great time to join our team.

**Geisinger Health System** serves nearly 3 million people in Northeastern and Central Pennsylvania and has been nationally recognized for innovative practices and quality care. A mature electronic health record connects a comprehensive network of 3 hospitals, 38 community practice sites and more than 900 Geisinger primary and specialty care physicians.

www.Join-Geisinger.org
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For more information or to apply for this position, please contact:

Matthew McKinney,
Department of Professional Staffing at 570-271-7003,
e-mail: mwmckinney@geisinger.edu