



Comparative clinical evaluation of effect of topical verses systemic anti -allergic drug in allergic rhinitis: a prospective study

Mohit Srivastava, Sunil Kumar Singh Bhadouriya, Rohit Saxena, Vandana singh, Abhinav

Srivastava, Mamta Bisht

Saraswati institute of Medical Sciences; Ghaziabad, U.P. India

ABSTRACT

Nasal passages form one of the chief sources of contact of the human with his environment. Hence, it is natural that the mucosa of the area is the victim of assault with multitudes of potential allergens. Allergic rhinitis is an inflammatory disease with worldwide prevalence of 10-40%. Clinically allergic rhinitis manifests as itching, sneezing, rhinorrhea, congestion and itchy eyes. Allergic rhinitis is a disease with low mortality but significantly lowers the quality of life and functioning. Both oral and intranasal antihistamines are approved for the first-line treatment of allergic rhinitis and both formulations result in a reduction in symptoms and an improvement in quality of life. The following study was designed to assess the efficacy and safety of the azelastine nasal spray in comparison to levocetirizine in patients with allergic rhinitis.

Out of the 68 patients, 34 cases were treated with topical azelastine (group A), while remaining 34 with systemic levocetirizine (group B). The effects of anti-allergic drugs have been studied on the basis of relief of symptoms and change in histopathology. Comparing the post therapy clinical and histopathological results in this study, azelastine nasal spray was found to be more effective and safe in the treatment of allergic rhinitis than levocetirizine.

INTRODUCTION

The term 'allergy', coined by von Pirquet, He proposed the term allergy, to describe a change of the living tissues, with increased or reduced sensitivity due to the formation of specific antibodies¹. On exposure to the foreign protein the allergen combines with cell – bound reagenic antibodies to release histamine & similar amines & other factors². Allergy is used to define the series of events which occurs when an antigen, which is not harmful in itself, causes an immune response, leading to symptoms and disease in genetically predisposed individuals. The various manifestations of atopy and allergy are allergic rhinitis, allergic asthma, allergic conjunctivitis, allergic dermatitis, drug allergies, bee stings and urticaria/angioedema. Naso-bronchial allergies i.e. asthma or rhinitis alone or asthma with rhinitis are the commonest allergic manifestations with 75.4% of patients belonging to this group³.

Vangham and Bray stated that roughly 10% of general population is frankly allergic & 50% given history of transient episodes⁴. Allergic rhinitis is the most common allergy encountered in clinical practice and constitutes about 55 % of allergies seen in India⁵. Shambough stated that at least 90% of chronic nasal infections & 70% of chronic sinus infections can be shown to have underlying allergic factors responsible for chronicity⁶. Clinically allergic rhinitis manifests as itching, sneezing, rhinorrhea, congestion and itchy eyes. Symptoms begin at any Age but usually in Adolescence and Young Adulthood. Onset of nasal allergy occurs frequently in first decade of life. In the second & third decades, smaller number develop allergic symptoms, & in the fourth, fifth & sixth decades the incidence sharply declines⁷.

No Racial or Ethnic variations. A positive family history is present in 50% cases. Those without a family history develop allergy in 7-12 % cases. Cookson et al noted the linkage of a specific chromosome region to allergic phenotype - the 11q13 genelocus^{8,9}. Development of allergy in addition to genetic predisposition also depends upon exposure to environmental allergens, infection, endocrine, psychological, physical factors. Precipitating factors are inhalants¹⁰, ingested foods, infectants, chemical substances, physical agent, and nonspecific irritants. On anterior rhinoscopy the pale, boggy, bluish tinged mucosa is characteristic of the well-developed allergic rhinitis. Not all allergic individuals exhibit the classical pale, boggy, blue gray mucosa; it may vary from a normal watermelon red to pathologic pale, pinkish white. During an attack there is swelling of the erectile tissue of the turbinate's and increased secretions. The mucous membrane, especially over the inferior turbinate's, is often swollen as completely to occlude the passage. Allergic secretions tend to be ropier in their consistency than secretion of inflammatory origin. On posterior rhinoscopy the classical pale, boggy mulberry like posterior tips of the inferior turbinate's are significant and should suggest the possibility of an allergy. These however may be physiological for certain individuals¹¹. Treatment of allergic rhinitis is far from satisfactory.

Ideal treatment should be directed towards correction of etiological factor, avoidance of allergens and desensitization. However accurate determination of the cause is often difficult. . Various methods of treatment are avoidance of precipitating factor, desensitization or hyposensitization, specific hypoventilation, antihistamines¹², corticosteroids¹³, sodium cromoglycate, gamma globulin, thyroid hormone, injections of sphenopalatine ganglion with alcohol, zinc ionization, sub mucosal injections of corticosteroids¹⁴, steroid aerosol¹⁵, anti-leukotrienes , oral decongestant , intranasal decongestant , intranasal anticholinergics , immunotherapy and cauterization, submucosal diathermy and cryosurgery¹⁶. Various methods of treatment have been advocated, each with its own limitations and degree of success.

Topical antihistamines, oral antihistamines are also recommended as first-line therapy in the treatment of allergic rhinitis¹⁷. Second-generation agents are generally preferred because they are less likely to cause sedation, performance impairment, and anticholinergic side effects, in both adults and children¹⁸. Unlike topical antihistamines, which mainly target nasal symptoms, oral antihistamines primarily target symptoms associated with histamine, such as sneezing, rhinorrhea, itchiness, watery eyes, and eye redness. Oral antihistamines have some effect on nasal congestion, although less than intranasal agents. Oral antihistaminic are approved for young children (desloratadine and cetirizine, age 6 months and up; loratadine and fexofenadine, age 2 years and up; Levocetirizine, age 6 years and up). Although not as rapid as topical histaminic oral antihistamines have a relatively rapid onset of action, (ranges from one to three hours)¹⁹. Levocetirizine works by blocking histamine receptors. It is a non-sedating histamine; Worked by preventing the action of histamine.

It does not prevent the actual release of histamine from mast cells, but prevents it binding to its receptors. This is in turn to prevent the release of other allergies chemicals and the blood supply to the area and provides relief from the typical symptoms of allergic rhinitis. There are a number of advantages of topical intranasal administration. Medication is more effectively delivered to the nasal mucosa, directly onto the target tissue harboring histamine-filled mast cells and inflammatory mediators. Topical administration is also associated with a faster onset of action and lower incidence of systemic side effects²⁰. Azelastine is a second generation antihistaminic. This H1 blocker has good topical activity in addition inhibits histamine release & inflammatory reaction triggered by leukotriene and platelet activating factor; and has a bronchodilator property. After intranasal application it has been shown to down regulate intracellular adhesion molecule-1 (ICAM-1) expression on nasal mucosa.

Azelastine have been shown to have a fast onset of action (15 minutes) and are also more effective than oral antihistamines for rhinitis symptoms^{21,22}. In addition, they are more rapidly effective than topical steroids, but in the long term, their effects are less potent²³ and less cost effective compared to those of topical steroids²⁴. Stinging in the nose & altered taste perception are the local side effects. Some somnolence has been reported on nasal application.

Materials and Methods:

This prospective study was carried out in outpatient department of otorhinolaryngology Santosh medical college and hospital Ghaziabad from September 2008 to October 2009. This study was approved by institutional ethics committee. 75 patients between the ages of 13 to 48 years with allergic rhinitis who gave written informed consent were recruited from the Out Patient Department. The cases were followed up for 4 weeks in the short duration of this study. In spite of best persuasion only 68 cases (90.6%) returned for follow up. The follow up study was made on 68 cases only. Patients treated with systemic and topical steroids during previous thirty days, antihistamines and decongestant during the past 7 days, were excluded from study. Patients with gross anatomical problem like deviated nasal septum, polyp, chronic sinusitis, throat problems and children less than 2 years were not included in the study. Patients with renal, hepatic and cardiovascular diseases were excluded from study. After obtaining a detailed medical history, clinical examination was done.

Complete blood count, absolute eosinophil count and paranasal sinus radiograph of the patients were taken and treatment planning commenced. Nose, throat and ears were thoroughly examined to rule out any infective or obstructive cause. Out of the 68 patients, 34 cases were treated with topical azelastine (group A), while remaining 34 with systemic levocetirizine (group B). One puff of topical azelastine spray (.1%) was prescribed twice daily for 4 weeks. In another group B levocetirizine was prescribed. The patients were asked to take 5mg dose of the drug once in the evening. In children less than 11 years up to 6 years 2.5 mg dose was prescribed. Follow up visits were scheduled every week for 4 weeks. Data was entered in Microsoft excel sheet and data analysis was done by using statistical software SPSS version 17. A $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Results:

A total of 75 patients were recruited in the study. Out of 75 patients recruited in study, 68 patients completed entire 4 weeks of study. The group comprised of 40 males and 28 females, with the mean age of 31.5 years. In majority of the cases (50.6%) physical agents were the main cause of the disease. Most of these were sensitive to change in atmospheric temperature, 33.3% were found allergic to inhalants, another 8% cases had multiple sensitivity and no specific causative factor was found in remaining 8% cases. Nature of discharge was watery profuse in 53.3% cases, watery scanty in 42.6% cases and mucoid in 4% cases. Out of the 68 patients, 34 cases were treated with topical azelastine (group A), while remaining 34 with systemic levocetirizine (group B). The Post therapy symptomatology was kept in three categories, in which there was complete absence of symptom considered as good, relief in the symptoms as fair and no improvement as poor. Sneezing was completely absent or markedly reduced in majority of cases, the next common symptom was nasal obstruction, in fairly good number of cases it became absent or reduced to a great extent and only two cases with azelastine and one with levocetirizine noticed no relief in the symptoms. Table 1 is showing degree of relief following levocetirizine therapy amongst 34 cases of Allergic Rhinitis. Table 2 is showing degree of relief following azelastine therapy amongst 34 cases of allergic rhinitis.

S. No.	Symptoms	No. of Cases	Complete Response	Fair Response	Poor Response
1.	Sneezing	34	20 (58.8%)	10 (29.4%)	04 (11.7%)
2.	Nasal Obstructi	28	13 (46.4%)	14 (50%)	02 (7.1%)
3.	Rhinorrhoea	20	08 (40%)	09 (45%)	03 (15%)

Table 1: Showing degree of relief following levocetizine therapy amongst 34 cases of allergic rhinitis

Results of histopathology were based upon the reduction in cellular infiltration, few mucous and serous glands no evidence of prominent dilated duct, decrease or absence of eosinophil infiltration, reduction in stromal oedema. Figure 1 is showing intense inflammatory reaction in stroma. Figure 2 is showing eosinophils in nasal biopsy section.




Figure 1: Photomicrograph showing intense inflammatory reaction in stroma (H&E, x100)

S. No.	Symptoms	No. of Cases	Complete Response	Fair Response	Poor Response
1.	Sneezing	34	25 (83.3%)	07 (20.5%)	02 (5.8%)
2.	Nasal Obstructi	30	22 (73.3%)	06 (20%)	02 (6.6%)
3.	Rhinorrhoea	20	14 (70%)	05 (25%)	01 (5%)

Table 2: Showing degree of relief following azelastine therapy amongst 34 cases of allergic rhinitis




Figure 2: Eosinophils in nasal biopsy section

S. No.	No. of Cases	Results		
		Good	Fair Nil	Poor
	34	20	08 05	01
	(%)	58.8% 2.9%	23.5% 14.7%	

Table 3: Showing results in post therapy histopathologically with levocetirizine

S.No .	No. of Cases	Results	
		Good Poor	Fair Nil
	34	24 01	08 01
	(%)	70.5% 2.9%	23.5% 2..9%

Table 4: Showing results in post therapy histopathologically with azelastine

	Sneezing			P-value
	Complete response	Fair response	Poor Response	
Levocetirizine therapy (n=34)	20 (58.8%)	10 (29.4%)	04 (11.7%)	0.199811
Azelastine therapy (n=34)	25 (83.3%)	07 (20.5%)	02 (5.8%)	Not significant

Table 5: Showing degree of relief (From sneezing) following levocetirizine therapy and azelastine therapy amongst 34 cases of allergic rhinitis

	Nasal Obstruction			P- value
	Complete response	Fair response	Poor Response	
Levocetirizine therapy (n=28)	13 (46.4%)	14 (50.0%)	2 (7.1%)	0.0258589
Azelastine therapy (n=30)	22 (73.3%)	6 (20.0%)	2 (6.6%)	Significant

Table 6: Showing degree of relief (From nasal obstruction) following levocetirizine therapy and azelastine therapy amongst 34 cases of allergic rhinitis

	Rhinorrhoea			P-value
	Complete response	Fair response	Poor Response	
Levocetirizine therapy (n=20)	08 (40.0%)	09 (45.0%)	03 (15.0%)	0.0565303 Borderline significant
Azelastine therapy (n=20)	14 (70.0%)	05 (25.0%)	01 (5.0%)	

Table 7: Showing degree of relief (From rhinorrhoea) following levocetirizine therapy and azelastine therapy amongst 34 cases of allergic rhinitis

	Results in Post therapy Histopathology				P-value
	Good	Fair	Poor	Nil	
Levocetirizine therapy (n=34)	20 (58.8%)	08 (23.5%)	01 (2.9%)	5 (14.7%)	0.3100875 Not significant
Azelastine therapy (n=34)	24 (70.5%)	08 (23.5%)	01 (2.9%)	01 (2.9%)	

Table 8: Showing results in post therapy histopathology with levocetirizine therapy and azelastine therapy

None of the cases in the present study had any major complications except in four cases that had mild bleeding after the nasal biopsy that was controlled by anterior nasal packing and systemic hemostatic and antibiotic drugs. No serious adverse event was reported in both groups. Few adverse events were noticed in cases with azelastine therapy and almost nil after effect was seen with levocetirizine therapy. None of the adverse events which were reported were severe enough to warrant termination of the treatment. With systemic levocetirizine therapy, 4 cases reported to have resistant rhinitis which was probably related to overuse of the drug. Stinging discomfort or dryness locally in the nose was encountered infrequently. With topical Azelastine therapy only two cases reported crusting and dryness of nose; on the other hand almost all the cases treated with azelastine felt such benefit that they continued the given treatment.

Discussion:

In our prospective study the clinical changes in response to topical azelastine (Group A) with systemic levocetirizine (Group B) were evaluated. Most of the cases suffering from allergic rhinitis were in the age group of 21-30 years (51 cases) with the mean age of 31.5 years. This observation is in accordance with that of Negus and Hagy²⁵.

In the present study, allergic rhinitis was found to occur more in males (60%) as compared to females (40%), which is in agreement with other studies²⁶. Negus (1955) observed, both sexes were equally affected.

The low incidence in female may be due to that in our country, females are less exposed, to outside atmospheric inhalants, allergens and temperature variations as they usually stay at home, but now this trend is changed.

In the present study, incidence of Allergic Rhinitis in relation to occupation revealed that housewives, office workers and students were the commonest sufferers. It is probable that these people are subjected to emotional stress, family troubles, examination worries, and work load.

In the present study a positive family was obtained in 29.3% cases. Genetic analysis of DNA from family members implicated genetic linkage with a gene (or genes) on chromosome 11q²⁷. An exciting recent development is the co-localization on chromosome 11q of the gene for the high affinity IgE receptor disorders of which, at least in part, may contribute to the atopic trait²⁸.

The classical symptoms of allergic rhinitis were sneezing (90.6%), nasal discharge (69.33%) and nasal obstruction (77.3%) found amongst 68 cases in varying degree of severity. Lindquist et al²⁹ in 1986 stated that in allergic rhinitis sneezing was the predominant feature followed by nasal obstruction and rhinorrhea. Present study is in accordance with his observation. The nasal discharge was watery in the majority of the cases (53.3%). This observation is in accordance with that of Binder et al³⁰. In the present study allergic rhinitis cases we got more successful results with topical azelastine nasal spray (91%) when compared to (81%) in cases of systemic anti-allergic levocetirizine. Moreover, there were almost no side effects like rebound swelling or recurrence reported with azelastine nasal spray therapy, however the possibility of over use related rebound swelling, should be kept in mind before prescribing azelastine topically nasal spray in allergic rhinitis cases.

Bunnang et al. reported significantly greater improvement in blocked nose, runny nose and runny eyes during the first 2 weeks of budesonide treatment than during the same period on astemizole³¹.

Wight et al.³² managed 59 cases of allergic rhinitis with azelastine 400 mg and 800 mg topically per day. He observed more or less same benefit in the cases with either dose of budesonide and no increase in adverse effects occurred with higher dose therapy.

Mc. Arthur³³ carried out a comparative study azelastine and beclamethasone sprays in 88 adults with allergic rhinitis. In this study the results with azelastine were good improvement in 69% of cases, fair in 22% of cases and there was poor improvement in 9% of cases.

When we compared the overall outcome in the two groups, we found topical azelastine spray relieves symptoms of allergic rhinitis rapidly and effectively. Thus we can expect better results in allergic rhinitis with topical azelastine nasal spray which has proven to be more effective than Systemic levocetirizine in the present study. The results of our study are in agreement with previous study where efficacy of azelastine nasal spray was significantly superior in improvement of nasal symptom severity³⁵. Intranasal agents may be preferred in patients in whom nasal congestion is particularly bothersome or in cases where a more rapid onset of action is desired^{34,35,36,37}.

Oral agents would be a better choice in young children, in cases of poor medication compliance, and in patients who are bothered most by histamine-associated symptoms, such as itching, sneezing or red and watery eyes. The topical effect of nasal drugs in allergic rhinitis, however, needs to be studied further. There are certain limitations of our study; first, the sample size is small due to less time of study. Each patient recruited in our study had to come for follow-up every week for 4 weeks. Secondly a clear-cut clinical efficacy evaluation cannot be made in the present study as no control group was available.

Conclusion:

Comparison will help us to formulate a set line of treatment in allergic rhinitis taking into consideration the season, type of presentation & histopathological response with clinical response. In this study the incidence of allergic rhinitis were found to be more below 30 years (68%). As the age advances, incidence sharply declines. Incidence of allergic rhinitis was found to be more in males (60%) than in females. Office workers, students and house wives were more affected than others (82.6%). In the present study, it has been noticed that physical allergy (50.6%) constitutes most important causative factor for the development of allergic rhinitis. Family history of allergic disease was positive in only (29.3%) cases and negative in (70.6%). The chief symptoms with which the patients presented were sneezing (96%), Nasal obstruction (78.6%) and less common symptom was rhinorrhoea (69.33%). The effect of systemic levocetirizine anti-allergic drug has been studied on the basis of relief of symptoms and change in histopathology and found to have complete response in 58% and fair response in 23.5% patients of allergic rhinitis.

The effect of Topical Azelastine nasal spray anti-allergic drugs has been studied on the basis of relief of symptoms and change in histopathology and found to have complete response in 70.5% and fair response in 23.5% patients of allergic rhinitis. Comparing the post therapy clinical and histopathological results in this study, topical azelastine nasal spray found to be more effective and safe in the treatment of allergic rhinitis than systemic levocetirizine as an anti-allergic drug.

References:

1. Von Pirquet C. Allergie. Munchener Medizinische Wochenschrift. 1906; 53:1457-1458.
2. White M.V, Kalinar M.A. Mediators of allergic rhinitis. Journal of allergy and clinical immunology.1992; 90:699-704.
3. Shaikh W A. Allergies in India: An analysis of 1619 patients attending an allergy clinic in Bombay, India. International Review of Allergology and Clinical Immunology.1997; 3:101-104.
4. Bray G.W. Recent advances in allergy. Journal of Laryngology & Otology.1952; 58:219.
5. Shaikh W A. Allergic Rhinitis. In: Suraj Gupte, editor. Recent advances in pediatrics Pulmonology. Special Volume 10. New Delhi: Jaypee Brothers medical publisher; 2002;p1-17.
6. Shambaugh .Nasal allergy for practicing rhinologist. Annals of Otology Rhinology and Laryngology.1945; 54(1):43.
7. Thomson St. C, Negus VE. Inflammatory diseases. Chronic Rhinitis. Diseases of the nose and throat, 6th edition. London: Cassel & Co. Lmt. 1955; 124-145.
8. Cook R A, van der Veer A. Human sensitization. Journal of Immunology, 1916; 1:201-305.
9. Sibbald B. Familial inheritance of asthma and allergy. In: Kay AB, Allergy and allergic disease. Oxford: Blackwell Science. 1997;p 1177-1186.
10. Stafford. Allergic rhinitis – A useful guide to diagnosis and treatment. Postgraduate Medical journal.1987; 81:147-157.
11. Mygind, N. Perennial rhinitis.In:Mygind N,editor. Nasal allergy. Second Edition. Blackwell Scientific Publications Oxford, London.1979; pp.224-232.
12. Dannenberg T.B.& Feinberg S.M. The development of tolerance to antihistamines: A study of the quantitative inhibiting capacity of antihistamines on the skin and mucous membrane reaction to histamine and antigens. The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology.1951; 22(4): 330-339.
13. Whil J.A. Recent progress in treatment of nasal allergy; intranasal steroid treatment.Rhinology.1984;22:27-31.
14. Gill B.S. Intraturbinate use of steroids in nasal allergy. The journal of Laryngology and Otology.1966; 80:506-510
15. Brown H. M, Storey G, Jackson F.A. Beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol in treatment of perennial and seasonal rhinitis : British Journal of clinical pharmacology,1977; 4 (suppl.3): 283S-286S.
16. Ozenberger, J.M. Cryosurgery in chronic rhinitis. The laryngoscope.1970; 80:723-727.
17. Wallace DV,DykewiczMS,Bernstein DI, et al .The diagnosis and management of rhinitis: An updated practice parameter. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology.2008; 122:S1–S77.
18. Schad CA, and Skoner DP. Antihistamines in the pediatric population: Achieving optimal outcomes when treating seasonal allergic rhinitis and chronic urticaria. Allergy and Asthma Proceedings.2008;29:7–13.

19. Dolen WK. Antihistamine onset of action: the importance to the patient. *Allergy Asthma Proceedings*.2004; 25:85-87.
20. Marple BF, Fornadley JA, Patel AA, et al. Keys to successful management of patients with allergic rhinitis: Focus on patient confidence, compliance, and satisfaction. *Journal of Otolaryngology and Head Neck Surgery*.2007;136:S107–S124.
21. McNeely W, Wiseman LR. Intranasal azelastine. A review of its efficacy in the management of allergic rhinitis. *Drugs*.1998;56:91-114.
22. Portnoy JM, Van Osdol T, Williams PB. Evidence-based strategies for treatment of allergic rhinitis. *Current Allergy and Asthma Reports*.2004;4:439-46.
23. Newson-Smith G, Powell M, Baehre M, Garnham SP, MacMahon MT. A placebo controlled study comparing the efficacy of intranasal azelastine and beclomethasone in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. *European Archives of Otorhinolaryngology*. 1997;254:236-41.
24. Lange B, Lukat KF, Rettig K, Holtappels G, Bachert C. Efficacy, cost-effectiveness, and tolerability of mometasone furoate, levocabastine, and disodium cromoglycate nasal sprays in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. *Annals of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology*.2005; 95:272-82
25. Hagy GW, Saltipane GA. Risk factors for developing asthma and allergic rhinitis. *Journal of allergy and clinical immunology*.1976;58:330-336.
26. Alsowaidi S, Abdulle A, Bernsen R, Zuberbier T. Allergic rhinitis and asthma: a large cross sectional study in the UAE. 2011; 153(3):274-279.
27. Cookson, Sharp PA, FauxJA et al. Linkage between immunoglobulin E responses underlying asthma and rhinitis and chromosome 11q. *Lancet*.1989; 333:1292-1295
28. Sandford et al. Localization of atopy and subunit of high affinity IgE receptor on chromosome 11q. *Lancet*.1993;341:332-334.
29. Lindquist N, Balle VH, Karma P et al. Long term safety and efficacy of budesonide nasal aerosol in perennial rhinitis. *Allergy*.1986;41:179-186.
30. Binder E, Holopainen E, Malmberg H, Salo OP. Clinical findings in patients with allergic rhinitis. *Rhinology*.1984;22(4):255-60
31. Bunnang C, Jareoncharsri P, Wong EC. A double blind comparison of nasal budesonide and oral astemizole for the treatment of perennial rhinitis. *Allergy*. 1992;47:313-317.
32. Wight RG, Jones AS, Beckingham E, Anderson B. A double blind comparison of intranasal budesonide 400 micrograms and 800 micrograms in perennial rhinitis. *Clinical Otolaryngology*.1992;17(4):354-358.
33. Mc. Arthur JG. A comparison of budesonide and beclomethasone dipropionate sprays in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. *Clinical Otolaryngology*.1994;19:537:542.
34. Cooren J, Storms W, Bernstein J, Berger W, Nayak A, Sacks H; Azelastine Cetirizine Trial No. 1 (ACT 1) Study Group. Effectiveness of azelastine nasal spray compared with oral ceterizine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2005; 27:543-53.

35. Horak F. Effectiveness of twice daily azelastine nasal spray in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. *Journal of Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management*. 2008; 4:1009-22.
36. Berger WE, White MV, Rhinitis Study Group. Efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in patients with an unsatisfactory response to loratadine. *Annals of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology*. 2003; 91:205-11.
37. Horak F, Zieglmayer UP, Zieglmayer R, Kavina A, Marschall K, Munzel U, Petzold U. Azelastine nasal spray and desloratadine tablets in pollen-induced seasonal allergic rhinitis: A pharmacodynamic study of onset of action and efficacy. *Current Medical Research & Opinion*. 2006; 22:151-7.