Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) guidelines: 2010 Revision

Jan L. Brożek, MD, PhD,[a] Jean Bousquet, MD, PhD,[b,c,d] Carlos E. Baena-Cagnani, MD,[e] Sergio Bonini, MD,[f,g] G. Walter Canonica, MD,[h] Thomas B. Casale, MD,[i] Roy Gerth van Wijk, MD, PhD,[j] Ken Ohta, MD, PhD,[k] Torsten Zuberbier, MD,[l] and Holger J. Schünemann, MD, PhD, MSc[a] *Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, Montpellier, France, Córdoba, Argentina, Rome, Naples, and Genoa, Italy, Omaha, Neb, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, Tokyo, Japan, and Berlin, Germany*

Background: Allergic rhinitis represents a global health problem affecting 10% to 20% of the population. The Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) guidelines have been widely used to treat the approximately 500 million affected patients globally.
Objective: To develop explicit, unambiguous, and transparent clinical recommendations systematically for treatment of allergic rhinitis on the basis of current best evidence.
Methods: The authors updated ARIA clinical recommendations in collaboration with Global Allergy and Asthma European Network following the approach suggested by the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation working group.
Results: This article presents recommendations about the prevention of allergic diseases, the use of oral and topical medications, allergen specific immunotherapy, and complementary treatments in patients with allergic rhinitis as well as patients with both allergic rhinitis and asthma. The guideline panel developed evidence profiles for each recommendation and considered health benefits and harms, burden, patient preferences, and resource use, when appropriate, to formulate recommendations for patients, clinicians, and other health care professionals.
Conclusion: These are the most recent and currently the most systematically and transparently developed recommendations about the treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults and children. Patients, clinicians, and policy makers are encouraged to use these recommendations in their daily practice and to support their decisions. (J Allergy Clin Immunol 2010;126:466-76.)

Key words: *AR, practice guideline*

REVIEW/CONSULTATION GROUP

Agache I (Faculty of Medicine, Transylvania University, Brasov, Romania)
Ameille J (AP-HP, Unité de pathologie professionnelle, Hôpital Raymond Poincaré, Garches, France)
Bachert C (Upper Airway Research Laboratory, University Hospital Ghent, Belgium)
Baker A (Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada)

From [a]the Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics and Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton; [b]Service des Maladies Respiratoires, Hôpital Arnaud de Villeneuve, Montpellier; [c]INSERM, CESP U1018, Respiratory and Environmental Epidemiology Team, Montpellier; [d]the WHO Collaborating Center for Rhinitis and Asthma, Montpellier; [e]the Faculty of Medicine, Catholic University of Córdoba; [f]the Institute of Neurobiology and Molecular Medicine—CNR, Rome; [g]the Department of Medicine, Second University of Naples; [h]Allergy and Respiratory Diseases, DIMI, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Genoa; [i]the Division of Allergy and Immunology, Department of Medicine, Creighton University, Omaha; [j]the Section of Allergology, Department of Internal Medicine, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam; [k]the Division of Respiratory Medicine and Allergology, Department of Medicine, Teikyo University School of Medicine, Tokyo; and [l]the Department of Dermatology and Allergy, Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin.

J.B., S.B., G.W.C., R.GvW., H.J.S., and T.Z. are members of the Global Allergy and Asthma European Network supported by European Commission Framework Programme grant FOOD-CT-2004-506378.

Disclosure of potential conflict of interest: J. L. B. is a member of the GRADE working group; he is an editor of a clinical journal where various drugs are advertised, including those that are the subject of these guidelines; he received honoraria for speaking at conferences and travel reimbursement from GlaxoSmithKline and i3 Research and for expert panel participation from Boehringer Ingelheim. J. B. received fees and honoraria for lectures, expert panel participation and consultations from Allmiral, ALK, AstraZeneca, Chiesi Farmaceutici, Faes Pharma, GlaxoSmithKline, Meda, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Mundifarma, Novartis, Nycomed-Altana, Roche, Sanofi-Aventis, Stallergènes, Schering- Plough, Teva, UCB and Uriach. C. E. B-C. received fees for consultancy, speaker bureau participation, lectures and research grants from Abello, ALK, FAES (Spain), GlaxoSmithKline, Grünenthal (Venezuela), Lofarma (Italy), Merk Serono, MSD, Novartis, Phoenix (Argentina), Sanofi-Aventis, Schering-Plough, and Uriach (Spain). S. B. received consultancy fees and honoraria for editorial activity or participation in sponsored symposia from: ALK, Almirall, AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, Menarini, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Nycomed, Phadia, Schering-Plough, Sigma Tau and Stallergens. G. W. C. received fees and honoraria for lectures, expert panel participation and consultations and research support from A. Menarini, Alcon, Alk-Abellò, Almirall, Anallergo, AstraZeneca, Biofutura Pharma, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi Farmaceutici, GlaxoSmithKline, Lofarma, Merck Sharp & Dome, Novartis, Nycomed, Pfizer, Phadia, Schering Plough, Sigma-Tau, Stallergenes, UCB Pharma, Uriach and Valeas. T. C. declares no potential conflict of interest. R.GvW. received fees for lectures, expert panel participation and consultancy from Allergopharma, Allmiral, Alcon, Crucell, Hal, Merck Sharp & Dome, Novartis, Stallargènes and UCB. K. O. received fees and honoraria for lectures, expert panel participation and consultations from AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck Banyu, Novartis, Schering Plough, Kyorin, Otsuka, and Taisho. H. J. S. is co-chair of the GRADE working group and he supports the implementation of the GRADE approach worldwide. From non-profit organizations he has accepted honoraria and consulting fees for activities in which his work with GRADE is relevant. In the past five years, H. J. S. received no personal payments for service from pharmaceutical for profit organizations. No financial support was received for the preparation of the evidence profiles or provided to the evidence synthesis team that HJS led as part of this work. T. Z. has received fees for consulting from Ansell, Bayer Schering, DST, Fujisawa, HAL, Henkel, Kryolan, Leti, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Novartis, Procter & Gamble, Sanofi-Aventis, Schering Plough, Stallergenes and UCB Pharma. None of the ARIA panel members have received any financial support for the work on these guidelines.

Received for publication April 12, 2010; revised June 7, 2010; accepted for publication June 10, 2010.

Reprint requests: Holger J. Schünemann, MD, PhD, MSc, Chair, Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University Health Sciences Centre, Room 2C10B, 1200 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON L8N 3Z5, Canada. E-mail: schuneh@mcmaster.ca.

0091-6749/$36.00
© 2010 American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology
doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2010.06.047

Abbreviations used
AR: Allergic rhinitis
ARIA: Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma
GRADE: Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation

Bateman E (Department of Medicine, University of Cape Town, South Africa)
Ben Kheder A (Hopital A. Mami, Ariana, Tunisia)
Bouchard J (Faculty of medecine, Université Laval, Québec, Canada, and Hôpital de la Malbaie, La Malbaie, Quebec, Canada)
Boulet LP (Pneumologue, Institut de cardiologie et de pneumologie de l'Hôpital Laval, Université Laval, Québec, Canada)
Bousquet PJ (BESPIM, GHU Caremeau, Nimes, France)
Bush A (Department of Paediatric Respiratory Medicine, Royal Brompton Hospital, London, United Kingdom)
Calderon M (Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Imperial College—NHLI, Royal Brompton Hospital, London, United Kingdom)
Camargos P (Department of Pediatrics, Medical School, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil)
Carlsen KH (University of Oslo, Medical Faculty, Voksentoppen, Department of Paediatrics, Rikshospitalet University Hospital, Oslo, Norway)
Cazzola M (University of Rome "Tor Vergata," Department of Internal Medicine, Rome, Italy)
Chan Yeung M (Occuational and Environmental Lung Diseases Research Unit, Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada)
Chavannes NH (Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands)
Chen YC (Center for Asthma Research and Education, Beijing, China)
Chuchalin A (Pulmonology Research Institute, Parkovaya, Moscow, Russia)
Costa D.J. (Primary Care Department, Montpellier I University, Montpellier, France)
Cox L (Nova Southeastern University School of Osteopathic Medicine, Davie, Fla)
Cruz A (ProAR. Federal University of Bahia School of Medicine, Salvador, Brazil)
Custovic A (University of Manchester, United Kingdom)
Dahl R (Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark)
De Blay F (Chest Diseases Department, Hôpitaux Universitaires de Strasbourg, France)
Demoly P (University Hospital of Montpellier—INSERM U657, Montpellier, France)
Denburg J (McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada)
Dokic D (Skopje, Macedonia)
Douagui H (Service de pneumo-allergologie, CHU de Béni-Messous, Alger, Algeria)
Dykewicz MS (Wake Forest University, NC)
El Gamal Y (Pediatric Allergy and Immunology Unit, Children's Hospital, Ain Shams University and Egyptian Society of Pediatric Allergy and Immunology, Cairo, Egypt)
Fokkens WJ (Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
Fukuda T (Dokkyo Medical University School of Medicine, Mibu, Tochigi, Japan)
Holgate S (IIR Division, Southampton General Hospital, Southampton, United Kingdom)
Humbert M (Université Paris-Sud 11, Hôpital Antoine-Béclère, Clamart, France)
Ivancevic JC (del Salvador University School of Medicine, Buenos Aires, Argentina)
Kalayci O (Hacettepe University School of Medicine, Pediatric Allergy and Asthma Unit, Ankara, Turkey)
Kaliner M (George Washington University School of Medicine, Washington DC)
Kim YY (Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, Korea)
Kowalski M (Medical University of Lodz, Poland)
Kuna P (Department of Pneumonology and Allergy, Medical University of Lodz, Poland)
Larenas D (Hospital Médica Sur, Mexico City, Mexico)
Le L (University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hochiminh City, Vietnam)
Lee BW (Department of Paediatrics, National University of Singapore, Singapore)
Li J (Guangzhou Medical College, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China)
Lipworth B (Asthma and Allergy Research Group, Univeristy of Dundee, United Kingdom)
Lockey R (University of South Florida College of Medicine and James A. Haley Veterans Administration Hospital, Tampa, Fla)
Malling HY (National University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark)
Marshall G (Division of Clinical Immunology and Allergy, University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, Miss)
Martinez FD (Arizona Respiratory Center, College of Medicine, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz)
Mohammad Y (Tishreen University School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Lattakia, Syria)
Mullol J (Rhinology Unit and Smell Clinic, ENT Department, Hospital Clinic, IDIBAPS, Barcelona, Spain)
Nelson HS (National Jewish Health, Denver, Colo)
Niggemann B (German Red Cross Hospital Westend, Berlin, Germany)
O'Hehir R (Alfred Hospital and Monash University, Melbourne, Australia)
Okamoto Y (Department of Otolaryngology, Graduate School of Medicne, Chiba University, Japan)
Papadopoulos N (Allergy Department, Second Pediatric Clinic, NKU Athens, Greece)
Park HS (Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, Korea)
Passalacqua G (Allergy and Respiratory Diseases, University of Genoa, Italy)
Pawankar R (Nippon Medical School, Tokyo, Japan)
Potter P (Department of Medicine, University of Cape Town, South Africa)
Price D (GPIAG, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom)
Rabe K (Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands)
Rodríguez-Pérez N (Autonomous State University of Tamaulipas, Matamoros, Tamaulipas, Mexico)
Rosenwasser L (Children's Mercy Hospital, Kansas City, Mo)
Ryan D (Woodbrook Medical Centre, Loughborough, and Clinical Research Fellow, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom)
Sanchez Borges M (Centro Medico-Docente La Trinidad, Caracas, Venezuela)

TABLE I. Interpretation of strong and conditional (weak)* recommendations

Implications	Strong recommendation	Conditional (weak) recommendation
For patients	Most individuals in this situation would want the recommended course of action, and only a small proportion would not. Formal decision aids are not likely to be needed to help individuals make decisions consistent with their values and preferences.	The majority of individuals in this situation would want the suggested course of action, but many would not.
For clinicians	Most individuals should receive the intervention. Adherence to this recommendation according to the guideline could be used as a quality criterion or performance indicator.	Recognize that different choices will be appropriate for individual patients and that you must help each patient arrive at a management decision consistent with his or her values and preferences. Decision aids may be useful helping individuals making decisions consistent with their values and preferences.
For policy makers	The recommendation can be adapted as policy in most situations.	Policy-making will require substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders.

*Guideline panels applying GRADE use the term "conditional" and "weak" synonymously.

Scadding G (RNTNE Hospital, London, United Kingdom)
Shaik A (University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom)
Simons FER (Faculty of Medicine, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada)
Toskala E (Department ORL, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki, Finland)
Valiulis A (Vilnius University Faculty of Medicine, Lithuania)
Valovirta E (Terveystalo Allergy Clinic, Turku, Finland)
Van Weel C (Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre, Nijmegen, The Netherlands)
Vandenplas O (Mont-Godinne Hospital, Université Catholique de Louvain, Yvoir, Belgium)
Wang DY (Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore)
Wickman M (Sachs' Children's Hospital, Sodersjukhuset and Centre for Allergy Research and Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden)
Yawn B (University of Minnesota, Rochester, Minn)
Yorgancioglu A (Department of Chest Disease, Medical Faculty, Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey)
Yusuf O (Allergy and Asthma Institute, Islamabad, Pakistan)
Zitt M (State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY)

Allergic rhinitis (AR) is an important health problem because of its prevalence and its impact on patients' social life, school performance, and work productivity.[1] Epidemiologic studies have consistently shown that asthma and rhinitis often coexist in the same patients.[1,2] It is therefore important to advise clinicians and patients about the best evidence-based management of AR in patients with and without concomitant asthma.

Clinical practice guidelines for the management of AR had been developed over the past 15 years and were found to improve care.[3] The first of those guidelines that were evidence-based were the Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) recommendations.[4] More recently, other guidelines have been published: the International Primary Care Respiratory Group guidelines,[5] the British Society of Allergy and Clinical Immunology guidelines,[6] the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology and American College of Allergy Asthma and Immunology Practice Parameters for the diagnosis and management of rhinitis,[7] and the ARIA 2008 Update.[1] These guidelines used evidence-based approaches to various degrees, but none used the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach.[8,9]

In this 2010 revision of ARIA, we present recommendations for the prevention and treatment of AR and asthma coexisting with AR. The ARIA guideline panel revised its clinical recommendations to improve their usefulness following the transparent and systematic approach developed by the GRADE working group.[8,9] For strong recommendations, we used the words "we recommend" and for conditional recommendations, "we suggest," and we offer the suggested interpretations of "strong" and "conditional (also known as "weak")" recommendations in Table I. Understanding the interpretation of these 2 grades—either strong or conditional—of the strength of recommendations is essential for sagacious clinical decision-making.

OBJECTIVE

Our objective was to develop explicit, unambiguous, and transparent clinical and practical recommendations systematically for the treatment of AR on the basis of current best evidence following the GRADE approach. This article summarizes the ARIA recommendations, and the complete rationale and explanation of all recommendations are provided in the unabridged text of the ARIA guidelines in this article's Online Repository 1 at www.jacionline.org.

METHODS

We previously described the methods of the ARIA 2010 Revision,[9] and the detailed methods are also provided in the unabridged text of the guidelines in Online Repository 1. We followed the principles for developing transparent, evidence-based guidelines suggested by the World Health Organization.[9-11]

We used the previous version of the ARIA guidelines as a starting point for the identification of clinical questions.[1] We followed the systematic approach suggested by the GRADE working group and other groups.[12-16] For each recommendation, we provide its strength and the quality of the supporting evidence. As described, for strong recommendations, we used the words "we recommend" and for conditional (also known as "weak") recommendations, "we suggest" (see Table I for interpretation aids). According to GRADE, we classified the quality of evidence into 4 categories: high, moderate, low, and very low.[8,15] The quality of evidence reflects the extent to which a guideline panel's confidence in an estimate of the effect was adequate to support a particular recommendation.[15] Assessments of the quality of evidence for each

TABLE II. A summary of the GRADE approach to grading the quality of evidence for each outcome (see Online Repository 1 for details)

Source of body of evidence	Initial rating of quality of a body of evidence	Factors that may decrease the quality	Factors that may increase the quality	Final quality of a body of evidence
Randomized trials	High	1. Risk of bias 2. Inconsistency 3. Indirectness 4. Imprecision 5. Publication bias	1. Large effect 2. Dose-response 3. All plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect or would suggest a spurious effect if no effect was observed	High (⊕⊕⊕⊕) Moderate (⊕⊕⊕○) Low (⊕⊕○○) Very low (⊕○○○)
Observational studies	Low			

important outcome took into account the study design, the risk of bias, the consistency of the evidence across studies, the directness of the evidence, and the precision of the estimate of the effect (Table II; Online Repository 1).

RESULTS

In this article, we present 10 recommendations about the primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention of allergy, AR, and asthma; 31 recommendations about the management of AR; and 7 recommendations about the management of AR and asthma in the same patient. In-depth explanations, search strategies, evidence syntheses, and rationales are presented in Online Repository 1 and this article's Online Repository 2 at www.jacionline.org.

Statements about the underlying values and preferences as well as the remarks are integral parts of the recommendations and serve to facilitate accurate interpretation. They should not be omitted when citing or translating recommendations in the ARIA guidelines.

I. Prevention of allergy

1. Should exclusive breast-feeding be used in infants to prevent allergy?. *Recommendation.* We suggest exclusive breast-feeding for at least the first 3 months for all infants irrespective of their family history of atopy (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on the prevention of allergy and asthma and a relatively low value on challenges or burden of breast-feeding in certain situations.

Remarks. The evidence that exclusive breast-feeding for at least the first 3 months reduces the risk of allergy or asthma is not convincing, and the recommendation to breast-feed exclusively is conditional. This recommendation applies to situations in which other reasons do not suggest harm from breast-feeding (eg, classic galactosemia, active untreated tuberculosis or HIV infection in the mother, antimetabolites, chemotherapeutic agents or radioactive isotopes used in the mother until they clear from the milk, and bacterial or viral infection of a breast).

2. Should antigen avoidance diet be used in pregnant or breast-feeding women to prevent development of allergy in children?. *Recommendation.* For pregnant or breast-feeding women, we suggest **no** antigen avoidance diet to prevent development of allergy in children (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on adequate nourishment of mothers and children and a relatively low value on very uncertain effects on the prevention of allergy and asthma in this setting.

3. Should children and pregnant women avoid environmental tobacco smoke (ie, passive smoking) to reduce the risk of developing allergy, wheezing, or asthma in children?. *Recommendation.* In children and pregnant women, we recommend total avoidance of environmental tobacco smoke (ie, passive smoking) (strong recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Remarks. Smoking and exposure to secondhand smoke are common health problems around the world, causing a substantial burden of disease for children and adults. Although it is very rare to make a strong recommendation based on low-quality or very low-quality evidence, the ARIA guideline panel felt that in the absence of important adverse effects associated with smoking cessation or reducing the exposure to secondhand smoke, the balance between the desirable and undesirable effects is clear.

4. Should infants and preschool children avoid exposure to house dust mite to reduce the risk of developing dust mite allergy and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In infants and preschool children, we suggest multifaceted interventions to reduce early life exposure to house dust mite (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively low value on the burden and cost of using multiple preventive measures (eg, encasings to parental and child's bed, washing bedding and soft toys at temperature exceeding 55°C [131°F], use of acaricide, smooth flooring without carpets, and so forth) and relatively high value on an uncertain small reduction of the risk of developing wheeze or asthma. For some children at lower risk of developing asthma and in certain circumstances, an alternative choice will be equally reasonable.

Remarks. Children at high risk of developing asthma are those with at least 1 parent or sibling with asthma or other allergic disease.

5. Should infants and preschool children avoid exposure to pets at home to reduce the risk of developing allergy or asthma?. *Recommendation.* In infants and preschool children, we suggest **no** special avoidance of exposure to pets at home (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible psychosocial downsides of not having a pet and relatively low value on potential reduction in the uncertain risk of developing allergy and/or asthma.

Remarks. Clinicians and patients may reasonably choose an alternative action considering circumstances that include other sensitized family members.

6. Should specific measures reducing occupational agent exposure be used to decrease the risk of sensitization and subsequent development of occupational rhinitis and asthma?. *Recommendation.* For individuals exposed to occupational agents, we recommend specific prevention measures eliminating or reducing occupational allergen exposure (strong recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on reducing the risk of sensitization to occupational allergens and developing occupational rhinitis and/or asthma with the subsequent adverse consequences, and a relatively low value on the feasibility and cost of specific strategies aimed at reducing occupational allergen exposure.

Remarks. Total allergen avoidance, if possible, seems to be the most effective primary prevention measure.

II. Treatment of AR—reducing allergen exposure

7. Should methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mite be used in patients with allergy to dust mite allergens?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and/or asthma sensitive to house dust mite allergens, we recommend that clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use currently available single chemical or physical preventive methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mites (strong recommendation | low-quality evidence) or their combination (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence), unless this is done in the context of formal clinical research.

We suggest multifaceted environmental control programs be used in inner-city homes to improve symptoms of asthma in children (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation to use multifaceted environmental control programs in inner-city homes places a relatively high value on possible reduction in the symptoms of asthma in children and a relatively low value on the cost of such programs.

8. Should patients with allergy to indoor molds avoid exposure to these allergens at home?. *Recommendation.* In patients with allergy to indoor molds, we suggest avoiding exposure to these allergens at home (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible reduction in the symptoms of rhinitis and asthma and a relatively low value on the burden and cost of interventions aimed at reducing exposure to household molds.

9. Should patients with allergy to animal dander avoid exposure to these allergens at home?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR caused by animal dander, we recommend avoiding exposure to these allergens at home (strong recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on potential reduction of symptoms of AR and a relatively low value on psychosocial downsides of not having a pet or the inconvenience and cost of environmental control measures.

Remarks. On the basis of a biological rationale, there is little doubt that total avoidance of animal allergens at home, and probably also marked reduction in their concentration, can improve symptoms, despite the paucity of published data to substantiate this statement.

10. Should immediate and total cessation of exposure to an occupational agent or exposure control be used in patients with occupational rhinitis and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients with occupational asthma, we recommend immediate and total cessation of exposure to occupational allergen (strong recommendation | very low-quality evidence). When total cessation of exposure is not possible, we suggest specific strategies aimed at minimizing occupational allergen exposure (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation to cease the exposure to occupational allergen immediately and totally places a relatively high value on reducing the symptoms of asthma and deterioration of lung function and a relatively low value on the potential socioeconomic downsides (eg, unemployment).

III. Pharmacologic treatment of AR

11. Should oral H_1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we recommend new-generation oral H_1-antihistamines that do not cause sedation and do not interact with cytochrome P450 (strong recommendation | low-quality evidence). In patients with AR, we suggest new-generation oral H_1-antihistamines that cause some sedation and/or interact with cytochrome P450 (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation to use new generation oral H_1-antihistamines that cause some sedation and/or interact with cytochrome P450 places a relatively high value on a reduction of symptoms of AR and a relatively low value on side effects of these medications.

Remarks. Astemizole and terfenadine were removed from the market because of cardiotoxic side effects.

12. Should new-generation oral H_1-antihistamines versus old-generation oral H_1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we recommend new-generation over old-generation oral H_1-antihistamines (strong recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on the reduction of adverse effects and a relatively low value on an uncertain comparative efficacy of new-generation versus old-generation oral H_1-antihistamines.

13. Should oral H_1-antihistamines be used in preschool children with other allergic diseases for the prevention of wheezing or asthma?. *Recommendation.* In infants with atopic dermatitis and/or family history of allergy or asthma (at high risk of developing asthma), we suggest clinicians do **not** administer and parents do **not** use oral H_1-antihistamines for the prevention of wheezing or asthma (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding side effects of oral H_1-antihistamines in infants and a lower value on the very uncertain reduction in the risk of developing asthma or wheezing.

Remarks. The recommendation not to use oral H_1-antihistamines in these infants refers only to prevention of asthma or wheezing. The guideline panel did not consider other conditions in which these medications may be commonly used (eg, urticaria).

14. Should intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* We suggest intranasal H_1-antihistamines in adults with seasonal AR (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence) and in children with seasonal AR (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence). In adults and children with persistent AR, we suggest that clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use intranasal H_1-antihistamines until more data on their relative efficacy and safety are available (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation to use intranasal H_1-antihistamines in patients with seasonal AR places a relatively high value on reduction of symptoms and a relatively low value on the risk of rare or mild side effects. The recommendation not to use intranasal H_1-antihistamines in patients with persistent AR places a relatively high value on their uncertain efficacy and possible side effects and a relatively low value on a possible small reduction in symptoms.

15. Should newer oral H_1-antihistamines versus intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* We suggest new-generation oral H_1-antihistamines rather than intranasal H_1-antihistamines in adults with seasonal AR (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence) and in adults with persistent AR (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence). In children with intermittent or persistent AR, we also suggest new-generation oral H_1-antihistamines rather than intranasal H_1-antihistamines (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. These recommendations place a relatively high value on probable higher patient preference for an oral versus intranasal route of administration as well as avoiding the bitter taste of some intranasal H_1-antihistamines, and a relatively low value on increased somnolence with some new-generation oral H_1-antihistamines. In many patients with different values and preferences or those who experience adverse effects of new-generation oral H_1-antihistamines, an alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

16. Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* We suggest oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults and children with seasonal AR (conditional recommendation | high-quality evidence) and in preschool children with persistent AR (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence). In adults with persistent AR, we suggest that clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (conditional recommendation | high-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation to use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults and children with seasonal AR and in preschool children with persistent AR places a relatively high value on their safety and tolerability and a relatively low value on their limited efficacy and high cost.

The recommendation not to use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults with persistent AR places a relatively high value on their very limited efficacy and high cost and a relatively low value on a potential small benefit in few patients.

Remarks. Evidence is available only for montelukast. This recommendation refers to the treatment of rhinitis, not to the treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant AR (see recommendation 45).

17. Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists versus oral H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* We suggest oral H_1-antihistamines over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in patients with seasonal AR (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence) and in preschool children with persistent AR (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding resource expenditure.

18. Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* We recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids for treatment of AR in adults (strong recommendation | high-quality evidence) and suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids in children with AR (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on the efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids and a relatively low value on avoiding their possible adverse effects.

19. Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus oral H_1-antihistamines be used in patients with AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with seasonal AR, we suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral H_1-antihistamines in adults (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence) and in children (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence). In patients with persistent AR, we suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral H_1-antihistamines in adults (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence) and in children (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on the likely higher efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids. In many patients with strong preference for the oral versus intranasal route of administration, an alternative choice may be reasonable.

20. Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used in patients with AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids rather than intranasal H_1-antihistamines (strong recommendation | high-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids and a relatively low value on their rare adverse effects.

21. Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus oral leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with seasonal AR, we recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (strong recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a high value on the efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids.

Remarks. Evidence is available for montelukast only.

22. Should oral glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of AR in patients not responding to other therapy?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and moderate to severe nasal and/or ocular symptoms that are not controlled with other treatments, we suggest a short course of oral glucocorticosteroids (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible relief of severe symptoms and a relatively low value on avoiding possible side effects of a short course of oral glucocorticosteroids.

Remarks. Systemic glucocorticosteroids should not be considered as a first line of treatment for AR. They can be used for few days as a last resort of treatment when combinations of other medications are ineffective. Oral glucocorticosteroids should be avoided in children, pregnant women, and patients with known contraindications.

23. Should intramuscular glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we recommend that clinicians do **not** administer intramuscular glucocorticosteroids (strong recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible side effects of a single or multiple injections of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids and relatively low value on their efficacy and convenience of use.

Remarks. Possible side effects of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids may be far more serious than the condition they are supposed to treat (ie, AR).

24. Should intranasal chromones be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest intranasal chromones (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on excellent safety and tolerability of intranasal chromones and a relatively low value on their limited efficacy and on limiting resource expenditure.

Remarks. The need for administration 4 times daily is likely to reduce patient adherence and reduce efficacy.

25. Should intranasal H_1-antihistamines versus intranasal chromones be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest intranasal H_1-antihistamines over intranasal chromones (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on possibly higher efficacy of intranasal H_1-antihistamines and a relatively low value on safety and tolerability of intranasal chromones.

Remarks. Chromones require administration 4 times daily that may limit patient adherence to treatment and reduce efficacy.

26. Should intranasal ipratropium bromide be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with persistent AR, we suggest intranasal ipratropium bromide for treatment of rhinorrhea (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

Remarks. Intranasal ipratropium bromide is effective for rhinorrhea. It is unlikely to be beneficial for other symptoms of AR.

27. Should intranasal decongestant be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In adults with AR and severe nasal obstruction, we suggest a very short course (not longer than 5 days and preferably shorter) of intranasal decongestant while coadministering other drugs (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence). We suggest that clinicians do **not** administer and parents do **not** use intranasal decongestants in preschool children (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation for use of a very short course of an intranasal decongestant in adults with AR places a relatively high value on the prompt relief of nasal obstruction and a relatively low value on avoiding the risk of adverse effects with a prolonged use of intranasal decongestant.

The recommendation against the use of an intranasal decongestant in children and against long-term use in adults places a relatively high value on avoiding the risk of serious adverse effects and a relatively low value on a possible benefit from a reduced nasal blockage.

28. Should oral decongestant be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest that clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use oral decongestants regularly (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of oral decongestants and a relatively low value on a possible small reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks. Oral decongestants may be of benefit for some patients as a rescue or as-needed medication.

29. Should a combination of oral decongestant and H_1-antihistamine versus oral H_1-antihistamine alone be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use regularly a combination of oral H_1-antihistamine and an oral decongestant compared with oral H_1-antihistamine alone (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of oral decongestant and a relatively low value on a small additional reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks. In adults with symptoms not controlled with oral H_1-antihistamine alone who are less averse to side effects of oral decongestants, an alternative choice may be equally reasonable. Administration of a combined treatment as a rescue medication may also be beneficial to some patients.

30. Should intraocular H_1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of ocular symptoms in patients with AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and symptoms of conjunctivitis, we suggest intraocular H_1-antihistamines (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on consistent effectiveness of intraocular H_1-antihistamines and a relatively low value on their side effects and uncertain effectiveness in patients already using other medications for AR.

Remarks. Only 1 study was done in children.

31. Should intraocular chromones be used for treatment of ocular symptoms in patients with AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and symptoms of conjunctivitis, we suggest intraocular chromones (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on excellent safety and tolerability of intraocular chromones and a relatively low value on their limited effectiveness.

Remarks. In adults and children with limited ocular symptoms, chromones may be tried first because of their excellent safety and tolerability. Chromones require administration 4 times

daily, which may limit patient compliance with treatment and reduce efficacy.

IV. Allergen-specific immunotherapy of AR

32. Should subcutaneous specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of AR in adults without concomitant asthma?. *Recommendation.* We suggest subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy in adults with seasonal (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence) and persistent AR caused by house dust mites (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on relieving the symptoms of AR and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and on resource expenditure.

33. Should subcutaneous specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of AR in children without concomitant asthma?. *Recommendation.* In children with AR, we suggest subcutaneous specific immunotherapy (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on probable reduction in symptoms of AR and the potential prevention of the development of asthma and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects in children and resource expenditure.

34. Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of AR in adults without concomitant asthma?. *Recommendation.* We suggest sublingual allergen specific immunotherapy in adults with rhinitis caused by pollen (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence) or house dust mites (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on alleviating the symptoms of rhinitis and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and resource expenditure.

Remarks. Local adverse effects are relatively frequent (~35%). An alternative choice may be equally reasonable if patients' values or preferences differ from those described.

35. Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of AR in children without concomitant asthma?. *Recommendation.* In children with AR caused by pollens, we suggest sublingual allergen-specific immunotherapy (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence). In children with AR caused by house dust mites, we suggest that clinicians do **not** administer sublingual immunotherapy outside rigorously designed clinical trials (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation to use sublingual immunotherapy in children with seasonal AR places a relatively high value on small reduction in nasal symptoms and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects in children and resource expenditure. The recommendation to use sublingual immunotherapy in children with persistent AR only in the context of clinical research places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects and resource expenditure and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in nasal symptoms.

Remark. Local adverse effects are relatively frequent (~35%). An alternative choice may be equally reasonable if patients' values or preferences differ from those described.

36. Should local nasal specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* We suggest intranasal allergen specific immunotherapy in adults (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence) and in children with AR caused by pollens (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on the reduction of symptoms of AR during pollen season and a relatively low value on avoiding local side effects and cost. An alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

V. Complementary and alternative treatments of AR

37. Should homeopathy be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest that clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use homeopathy (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible adverse effects and resource expenditure and a relatively low value on any possible, but unproven, benefit of these treatments in AR.

38. Should acupuncture be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use acupuncture (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding the potential complications of acupuncture and a relatively low value on uncertain reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks. In patients who choose to be treated with acupuncture, only disposable needles should be used.

39. Should butterbur be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use butterbur (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding the uncertain adverse effects of butterbur and a relatively low value on an equally uncertain reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks. In patients who are less risk-averse, an alternative may be equally reasonable. However, if one chooses to use butterbur, one should consider only commercial preparations in which butterbur extract does not contain toxic pyrrolizidine alkaloids.

40. Should herbal medicines other than butterbur be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use herbal medicines (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible serious adverse events and drug interactions and a relatively low value on possible reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

41. Should physical techniques and other alternative therapies be used for treatment of AR?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR, we suggest that clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use phototherapy or other physical techniques (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding potential adverse

effects of these therapies and a relatively low value on their very uncertain effect on symptoms of rhinitis.

VI. Treatment of AR and asthma in the same patient

42. Should oral H1-antihistamines be used for treatment of asthma in patients with AR and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients (both children and adults) with AR and asthma, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use oral H_1-antihistamines for the treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | very low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. The recommendation not to use oral H_1-antihistamines in adults with AR and asthma for the treatment of asthma places a relatively high value on avoiding their adverse effects and a relatively low value on their very uncertain effect on symptoms of asthma.

The recommendation not to use oral H_1-antihistamines in children with AR for the treatment of asthma or wheeze, despite the evidence of efficacy of ketotifen when used alone in children with mild to moderate asthma, places a relatively high value on avoiding its side effects and a relatively low value on its unknown efficacy in children already using inhaled corticosteroids, because inhaled corticosteroids are currently considered medications of first choice in treatment of chronic asthma.

Remarks. This recommendation suggests that oral H_1-antihistamines should not be used to treat symptoms of asthma, but they may still be used in patients with asthma and rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (recommendations 11 and 12).

43. Should combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant be used for treatment of asthma in patients with AR and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and asthma, we suggest clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use a combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in asthma symptoms of uncertain clinical significance.

44. Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of asthma in patients with AR and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and asthma, we suggest that clinicians do **not** administer and patients do **not** use intranasal glucocorticosteroids for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects, albeit a minor burden, and the cost of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, and a relatively low value on a small clinical benefit.

Remarks. This recommendation suggests that intranasal glucocorticosteroids are not used to treat symptoms of asthma, but they may still be used in patients with asthma and rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (recommendations 18-21).

45. Should leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of asthma in patients with AR and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and asthma, we recommend inhaled glucocorticosteroids over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists as a single controlling medication for asthma (strong recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

In patients with AR and asthma who prefer not to use or cannot use inhaled glucocorticosteroids or in children whose parents do not agree to use inhaled glucocorticosteroids, we suggest oral leukotriene receptor antagonists for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. These recommendations place a relatively high value on a limited efficacy of leukotriene receptor antagonists and additional cost of treatment. The suggestion to use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in patients who do not use inhaled glucocorticosteroids places relatively high value on small reduction in symptoms of asthma and improvement in quality of life and a relatively low value on limiting the cost of treatment.

Remarks. These recommendations do not apply to the treatment of rhinitis (recommendations 16, 17, and 21).

46. Should subcutaneous allergen-specific immunotherapy be used in patients with AR and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and asthma, we suggest subcutaneous specific immunotherapy for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on reducing the symptoms of asthma and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and limiting the cost of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy. In patients who are more averse to the side effects of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy, an alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

Remarks. Subcutaneous specific immunotherapy may also be used in patients with asthma and concomitant AR for treatment of rhinitis. Resource limitations will have stronger implications for the implementation of this recommendation.

47. Should sublingual allergen-specific immunotherapy be used in patients with AR and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and asthma, we suggest sublingual specific immunotherapy for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible reduction of asthma symptoms and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and limiting the cost of sublingual specific immunotherapy.

Remarks. Sublingual specific immunotherapy may also be used in patients with asthma and concomitant AR for treatment of rhinitis. Resource limitations will have stronger implications for the implementation of this recommendation.

48. Should a mAb against IgE be used for treatment of asthma in patients with AR and asthma?. *Recommendation.* In patients with AR and asthma with a clear IgE-dependent allergic component, uncontrolled despite optimal pharmacologic treatment and appropriate allergen avoidance, we suggest mAb against IgE for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate-quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences. This recommendation places a relatively high value on reduction of symptoms of asthma and exacerbations in patients with severe asthma and a relatively low value on avoiding the burden of subcutaneous injections, cost of treatment, small risk of anaphylaxis, and some uncertainty about the risk of malignancy.

DISCUSSION

The updated recommendations of the ARIA guidelines were developed by an international panel following the systematic and

transparent GRADE approach.[16,17] The target audience of these guidelines is all physicians treating patients with AR, other health care professionals, health care policy makers,[1,13,18] and patients.[19] Our review of the literature identified many areas where there are few studies or only studies with a high risk of bias are available. We also identified many areas that require more rigorous systematic reviews or where existing systematic reviews require updating. Nonetheless, the ARIA guideline panel believes that these recommendations reflect the current best treatment of patients with AR.

The strengths of these guidelines are the transparent, evidence-based approach to the development of recommendations and the consideration and explicit description of the values and preferences that influenced the recommendations. Other strengths include wide consultation with over 80 world experts in treatment and research of AR and asthma, review by patient representatives, and the availability of full evidence profiles that summarize research evidence supporting the recommendations (Online Repository 2). The main limitations include the paucity of high-quality evidence and lack of systematic reviews for many of the questions.

The ARIA guideline panel developed these recommendations with the aim of facilitating their implementation. The most important barrier to implementation results from the scarcity of high-quality evidence supporting decisions about the treatment of AR. As a result, many clinicians and patients base their decisions on unsystematic observations, advertisement, and poorly supported claims made by manufacturers of various medical products or proponents of certain techniques (both conventional and alternative). Systematic summaries of evidence will help these clinicians, despite the lack of high-quality evidence in many areas. Other important barriers include the unavailability of certain medications (eg, new-generation H_1-antihistamines[20]) in many countries or jurisdictions and the relatively high cost of some management options, particularly multifaceted environmental interventions.

It is crucial that these recommendations should never be seen as dictates. No recommendation can take into account all of the often compelling unique features of individual clinical circumstances. Thus, nobody charged with evaluating clinicians' actions should attempt to apply these recommendations by rote or in a blanket fashion.

The ARIA guideline panel raised additional issues regarding current clinical research in AR. The process highlighted relatively limited knowledge of the mechanisms of the development of allergy. There is also very little direct research evidence about the effectiveness of many management options, particularly in the primary and secondary prevention of AR and in treatment of asthma in patients with coexisting AR.

Despite the rationale for distinguishing intermittent and persistent AR, most research is still classifying AR according to the causative allergen as either seasonal or perennial. These studies rarely, if ever, specify whether the symptoms were intermittent or persistent, although it has been found that the 2 classifications are independent.[4]

There is also uncertainty about relative effects of treatments customarily belonging to certain classes because of their mechanism of action (eg, H_1-antihistamines, intranasal glucocorticosteroids, allergen extracts for immunotherapy, and so forth). For instance, H_1-antihistamines exert other actions in addition to antagonizing the effect of histamine that may contribute to the difference in their effectiveness or safety.[21] There are many classifications of H_1-antihistamines according to their chemical structure, the time when they reached the market, or their adverse effects.[20] All potential adverse effects and interactions are not dichotomous but rather a continuum, with any threshold arbitrary. As a result, there is no consensus which H_1-antihistamine belongs to which group, and this causes confusion for clinicians and patients. In the absence of a rigorous comparative systematic review of the effects of various medications within the class, their magnitude cannot be reliably estimated, and any relative benefits or downsides should be interpreted with care. Interestingly, we were not able to identify any systematic review of H_1-antihistamines and intranasal glucocorticosteroids in the treatment of AR in adults despite many agents being available in each group, their ubiquitous use, and large numbers of randomized trials available. Last, there seems to be room for improvement in the methodologic quality of primary and secondary clinical research in AR.

The ARIA guideline panel raised additional issues regarding the current clinical research in AR and asthma. The process highlighted a limited availability of high-quality, direct research evidence about patient-important outcomes of the treatment of asthma in patients with AR. There also seems to be room for improvement in the methodologic quality of primary and secondary clinical research in AR.

A revision of the ARIA guidelines will be required on the basis of new systematic reviews of the best evidence. The ARIA guideline panel will continue efforts to fill these gaps by supporting conducting additional reviews. ARIA will register and prioritize additional questions that have been identified as potentially important in treatment of AR and its impact on asthma to be included in subsequent revisions.

Nancy Santesso, Francesca Sperati, and Irene Terrenato contributed to preparation of evidence profiles. Anna Bedbrook provided administrative assistance during the development of the document. We thank the consultants who helped us improve the document during the consultation phase.

Clinical implications: Patients, clinicians, and policy makers can use these systematically developed and transparent recommendations to inform their judgments about the choice of the most appropriate treatment for patients with AR.

REFERENCES

1. Bousquet J, Khaltaev N, Cruz AA, Denburg J, Fokkens WJ, Togias A, et al. Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) 2008 update (in collaboration with the World Health Organization, GA(2)LEN and AllerGen). Allergy 2008; 63(suppl 86):8-160.
2. Ait-Khaled N, Pearce N, Anderson HR, Ellwood P, Montefort S, Shah J. Global map of the prevalence of symptoms of rhinoconjunctivitis in children: the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC) Phase Three. Allergy 2009;64:123-48.
3. Bousquet J, Lund VJ, Van Cauwenberge P, Bremard-Oury C, Mounedji N, Stevens MT, et al. Implementation of guidelines for seasonal allergic rhinitis: a randomized controlled trial. Allergy 2003;58:733-41.
4. Bousquet J, Van Cauwenberge P, Khaltaev N. Allergic rhinitis and its impact on asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2001;108:S147-334.
5. Price D, Bond C, Bouchard J, Costa R, Keenan J, Levy ML, et al. International Primary Care Respiratory Group (IPCRG) guidelines: management of allergic rhinitis. Prim Care Respir J 2006;15:58-70.
6. Scadding GK, Durham SR, Mirakian R, Jones NS, Leech SC, Farooque S, et al. BSACI guidelines for the management of allergic and non-allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy 2008;38:19-42.
7. Wallace DV, Dykewicz MS, Bernstein DI, Blessing-Moore J, Cox L, Khan DA, et al. The diagnosis and management of rhinitis: an updated practice parameter. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2008;122:S1-84.

8. Schünemann HJ, Jaeschke R, Cook DJ, Bria WF, El-Solh AA, Ernst A, et al. An official ATS statement: grading the quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in ATS guidelines and recommendations. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2006; 174:605-14.
9. Brozek JL, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bonini S, Canonica GW, Rasi G, van Wijk RG, et al. Methodology for development of the Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma guideline 2008 update. Allergy 2008;63:38-46.
10. Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Fretheim A. Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 16. Evaluation. Health Res Policy Syst 2006;4:28.
11. Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Fretheim A. Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 7. Deciding what evidence to include. Health Res Policy Syst 2006;4:19.
12. Hirsh J, Guyatt G. Clinical experts or methodologists to write clinical guidelines? Lancet 2009;374:273-5.
13. Costa DJ, Bousquet PJ, Ryan D, Price D, Demoly P, Brozek J, et al. Guidelines for allergic rhinitis need to be used in primary care. Prim Care Respir J 2009; 18:250-7.
14. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Vist GE, Liberati A, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations. BMJ 2008;336:1049-51.
15. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Schunemann HJ. What is "quality of evidence" and why is it important to clinicians? BMJ 2008;336:995-8.
16. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2008;336:924-6.
17. Brozek JL, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, Lang D, Jaeschke R, Williams JW, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in clinical practice guidelines. Part 1 of 3. An overview of the GRADE approach and grading quality of evidence about interventions. Allergy 2009;64:669-77.
18. ARIA in the pharmacy: management of allergic rhinitis symptoms in the pharmacy. Allergic rhinitis and its impact on asthma. Allergy 2004;59:373-87.
19. Bousquet J, Reid J, van Weel C, Baena Cagnani C, Canonica GW, Demoly P, et al. Allergic rhinitis management pocket reference 2008. Allergy 2008;63:990-6.
20. Church MK, Maurer M, Simons FE, Bindslev-Jensen C, van Cauwenberge P, Bousquet J, et al. Risk of first-generation H(1)-antihistamines: a GA(2)LEN position paper. Allergy 2010;65:459-66.
21. Bousquet J, van Cauwenberge P, Ait Khaled N, Bachert C, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bouchard J, et al. Pharmacologic and anti-IgE treatment of allergic rhinitis ARIA update (in collaboration with GALEN). Allergy 2006;61:1086-96.

Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) 2010 Revision

Full Online version – published in the Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology

Authors
Jan L. Brożek, MD, PhD – Department of Clinical Epidemiology & Biostatistics and Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada
Jean Bousquet, MD, PhD – Service des Maladies Respiratoires, Hôpital Arnaud de Villeneuve, Montpellier, France, INSERM, CESP U1018, Respiratory and Environmental Epidemiology Team, France, and WHO Collaborating Center for Rhinitis and Asthma
Carlos E. Baena-Cagnani, MD – Faculty of Medicine, Catholic University of Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina
Sergio Bonini, MD – Institute of Neurobiology and Molecular Medicine – CNR, Rome, Italy and Department of Medicine, Second University of Naples, Naples, Italy
G. Walter Canonica, MD – Allergy & Respiratory Diseases, DIMI, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy
Thomas B. Casale, MD – Division of Allergy and Immunology, Department of Medicine, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, USA
Roy Gerth van Wijk, MD, PhD – Section of Allergology, Department of Internal Medicine, Erasmus Medical Centre, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
Ken Ohta, MD, PhD – Division of Respiratory Medicine and Allergology, Department of Medicine, Teikyo University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan
Torsten Zuberbier, MD – Department of Dermatology and Allergy, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany
Holger J. Schünemann, MD, PhD, MSc – Department of Clinical Epidemiology & Biostatistics and Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada

J.B., S.B., G.W.C., R.GvW., H.J.S. and T.Z. are members of GA^{2}LEN (Global Allergy and Asthma European Network) supported by European Commission Framework Programme grant FOOD-CT-2004-506378.

Address for correspondence:
Holger J Schünemann, MD, PhD, MSc
Chair, Department of Clinical Epidemiology & Biostatistics
McMaster University Health Sciences Centre, Room 2C10B
1200 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON L8N 3Z5, Canada
schuneh@mcmaster.ca

Disclosure of potential conflict of interest:
J.L.B. is an editor of a clinical journal where various drugs are advertised, including those that are the subject of this guideline; he received honoraria for speaking at conferences from GlaxoSmithKline and is a member of the GRADE working group.
J.B. received fees and honoraria for lectures, expert panel participation and consultations from Allmiral, AstraZeneca, Centocor, Chiesi Farmaceutici, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Novartis, Nycomed-Altana, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi-Aventis, Stallergènes, Schering Plough, UCB and Uriach.

C.B.C. received fees for consultancy, speaker bureau participation, lectures and research grants from Sanofi-Aventis, Novartis, GSK, Schering Plough, ALK and Abello.
S.B. has no conflict of interest, but declares membership in the Agenzia Italiana del Farmaco (AIFA) Research & Development panel.
G.W.C. received fees and honoraria for lectures, expert panel participation and consultations and research support from A. Menarini, Alcon, Alk-Abellò, Almirall, Altana, Anallergo, AstraZeneca, Aventis Pharma, Bayer, Biofutura Pharma, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi Farmaceutici, Chiron, Essex, Fujisawa, Genentech, Gentili, GlaxoSmithKline, Lofarma, Merck Sharp & Dome, Novartis, Pfizer, Pharmacia & Upjohn, Schering Plough, SigmaTau, Stallergenes, Yamanuchi, UCB Pharma and Valeas.
R.GvW. received fees for lectures and expert panel participation from Allmiral, Alcon, Hal, Merck Sharp & Dome, Novartis, Stallargènes and UCB.
H.J.S. is co-chair of the GRADE working group and he supports the implementation of the GRADE approach worldwide. From non-profit organizations he has accepted honoraria and consulting fees for activities in which his work with GRADE is relevant. In the past five years, HJS received no personal payments for service from pharmaceutical for profit organizations. No financial support was received for the preparation of the evidence profiles or provided to the evidence synthesis team that HJS led as part of this work.
T.Z. has received fees for consulting with Schering Plough, Novartis, Leti, Stallergenes, Bayer Schering, Ansell, Kryolan, UCB Pharma, Merck Sharpe Dome, DST and Procter and Gamble.

Review group

Agache I (Faculty of Medicine, Transylvania University, Brasov, Romania)
Ameille J (AP-HP, Unité de pathologie professionnelle, Hôpital Raymond Poincaré, Garches, France)
Bachert C (URL, UZG (Upper Airway Research Laboratory, University Hospital Ghent), Belgium)
Baker A (Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB Canada)
Bateman E (Department of Medicine, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa)
Ben Kheder A (Hopital A.Mami, Ariana, Tunisia)
Bouchard J (Faculty of medecine, Université Laval, Québec, Canada and Hôpital de la Malbaie, La Malbaie, Canada)
Boulet LP (Pneumologue, Institut de cardiologie et de pneumologie de l'Hôpital Laval, Université Laval, Québec, Canada)
Bousquet PJ (BESPIM, GHU Caremeau, Nimes)
Bush A (Department of Paediatric Respiratory Medicine, Royal Brompton Hospital, London, UK)
Calderon M (Section of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, Imperial College – NHLI, Royal Brompton Hospital, London, UK)
Camargos P (Dept of Pediatrics, Medical School, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil)
Carlsen KH (University of Oslo, Medical Faculty, Voksentoppen, Dept. of Paediatrics, Rikshospitalet University Hospital, Oslo, Norway)
Cazzola M (University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Department of Internal Medicine, Rome, Italy)
Chan Yeung M (Occuational and Environmental Lung Diseases Research Unit, Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Canada)
Chavannes NH (Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands)
Chen YC (Center for Asthma Research and Education, Beijing, China)
Chuchalin A (Pulmonology Research Institute, Parkovaya, Moscow, Russia)
Costa D.J. (Primary Care Dept., Montpellier I University, France)
Cox L (Lauderdale, Florida, USA)

Cruz A (ProAR. Federal University of Bahia School of Medicine, Salvador, Brazil)
Custovic A (University of Manchester, Manchester, UK)
Dahl R (Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark)
De Blay F (Chest Diseases Department, Hôpitaux Universitaires de Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France)
Demoly P (University Hospital of Montpellier - Inserm U657, Montpellier, FRANCE)
Denburg J (McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada)
Dokic D (Skopje, Macedonia)
Douagui H (Service de pneumo-allergologie, CHU de Béni-Messous, Alger, Algeria)
Dykewicz MS (Wake Forest University, North Carolina, USA)
El Gamal Y (Pediatric Allergy and Immunology Unit, Children's Hospital, Ain Shams University and Egyptian Society of Pediatric Allergy and Immunology, Cairo, Egypt)
Fokkens WJ (Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Acadamic Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
Fukuda T (Dokkyo Medical University School of Medicine, Mibu, Tochigi, Japan)
Holgate S (IIR Division, Southampton General Hospital, Southampton, UK)
Humbert M (Université Paris-Sud 11, Hôpital Antoine-Béclère, Clamart, France)
Ivancevic JC (del Salvador University School of Medicine, Buenos Aires, Argentina)
Kalayci O (Hacettepe University School of Medicine, Pediatric Allergy and Asthma Unit, Ankara, Turkey)
Kaliner M (George Washington University School of Medicine, Washington DC, USA)
Kim YY (Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, Korea)
Kowalski M (Medical University of Lodz, Poland)
Kuna P (Department of Pneumonology and Allergy, Medical University of Lodz, Poland)
Larenas D (Hospital Médica Sur, Mexicocity, Mexico)
Le L (University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Hochiminh City, Vietnam)
Lee BW (Dept of Paedistrics, National University of Singapore, Singapore)
Li J (Guangzhou, China)
Lipworth B (Asthma and Allergy Research Group, Univeristy of Dundee, UK)
Lockey R (The University of South Florida College of Medicine and James A. Haley Veterans Administration Hospital, Tampa, Florida, USA)
Malling HY (National University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark)
Marshall G (Division of Clinical Immunology and Allergy)
University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS USA)
Martinez FD (Arizona Respiratory Center, College of Medicine, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA)
Mohammad Y (Tishreen University School of Medecine, Departement of Internal Medecine, Lattakia, Syria)
Mullol J (Rhinology Unit & Smell Clinic, ENT Department, Hospital Clínic, IDIBAPS. Barcelona, Catalunya, Spain)
Nelson HS (National Jewish Health, Denver, Colorado USA)
Niggemann B (German Red Cross Hospital Westend, Berlin, Germany)
O'Hehir R (Alfred Hospital and Monash University, Melbourne, Australia)
Okamoto Y (Department of Otolaryngology, Graduate School of Medicne, Chiba University, Chiba, Japan)
Papadopoulos N (Allergy Dpt, 2nd Pediatric Clinic, NKU Athens, Greece)
Park HS (Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, Korea)
Passalacqua G (Allergy and Respiratory Diseases, University of Genoa, Italy)
Pawankar R (Nippon Medical School, Tokyo, Japan)
Potter P (Department of Medicine, University of Cape Town, South Africa)
Price D (GPIAG, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK)
Rabe K (Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands)

Rodriguez Perez N (H. Matamoros, TAM. Mexico)
Rosenwasser L (Children's Mercy Hospital, Kansas City, MO, USA)
Ryan D (Woodbrook Medical Centre, Loughborough, UK)
and Clinical Research Fellow, University of Aberdeen, UK)
Sanchez Borges M (Centro Medico-Docente La Trinidad, Caracas, Venezuela)
Scadding G (RNTNE Hospital,London, UK)
Shaik A (University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK)
Simons FER (Faculty of Medicine, University of Manitoba, Canada)
Toskala E (Dept. ORL, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki, Finland)
Valiulis A (Vilnius University Faculty of Medicine, Vilnius, Lithuania)
Valovirta E (Terveystalo AllergyClinic, Turku, Finland)
Van Weel C (Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre, HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands)
Vandenplas O (Mont-Godinne Hospital, Université Catholique de Louvain, Yvoir, Belgium)
Wang DY (Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore)
Wickman M (Sachs' Children's Hospital, Sodersjukhuset and Centre for Allergy research and Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden)
Yawn B (University of Minnesota, USA)
Yorgancioglu A (Celal Bayar Uni. Med. Fac. Manisa, Turkey)
Yusuf O (The Allergy and Asthma Institute, Islamabad, Pakistan)
Zitt M (State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York, USA)

Table of content

Executive summary 8
Introduction 8
Methodology 9
How to use these guidelines 10
Key questions 10
Recommendations 10
Introduction and background 21
Scope 23
Methods 24
Recommendations 28
I. Prevention of allergy 29
Question 1 29
Should exclusive breastfeeding be used in infants to prevent allergy? 29
Question 2 30
Should antigen avoidance diet be used in pregnant or breastfeeding women to prevent development of allergy in children? 30
Question 3 31
Should children and pregnant women avoid environmental tobacco smoke (i.e. passive smoking) to reduce the risk of developing allergy, wheezing, or asthma in children? 31
Question 4 33
Should infants and preschool children avoid exposure to house dust mites to reduce the risk of developing dust mite allergy and asthma? 33
Question 5 34
Should infants and preschool children avoid exposure to pets at home to reduce the risk of developing allergy and asthma? 34
Question 6 36
Should specific measures reducing occupational agent exposure be used to decrease the risk of sensitization and subsequent development of occupational rhinitis and asthma? 36
II. Treatment of allergic rhinitis 38
Reducing allergen exposure 38
Question 7 38
Question 8 39
Should patients allergic to indoor moulds avoid exposure to these allergens at home? 39
Question 9 40
Should patients allergic to animal dander avoid exposure to these allergens at home? 40
Question 10 42
Should immediate and total cessation of exposure to an occupational agent or exposure control be used in patients with occupational rhinitis and asthma? 42

Pharmacological treatment of allergic rhinitis 43
Question 11 43
Should oral H1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of allergic rhinitis? 43
Question 12 45
Should new generation oral H_1-antihistamines versus old generation oral H1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of allergic rhinitis? 45
Question 13 47
Should oral H_1-antihistamines be used in preschool children with other allergic diseases for the prevention of wheezing or asthma? 47
Question 14 48
Should intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 48
Question 15 50
Should new generation oral H_1-antihistamines versus intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 50
Question 16 52
Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 52
Question 17 53
Question 18 55
Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 55
Question 19 56
Question 20 58
Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used in patients with allergic rhinitis? 58
Question 21 59
Question 22 60
Should oral glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in patients not responding to other therapy? 60
Question 23 61
Should intramuscular glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 61
Question 24 63
Should intranasal chromones be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 63
Question 25 64
Should intranasal H_1-antihistamines versus intranasal chromones be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 64
Question 26 65
Should intranasal ipratropium bromide be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 65
Question 27 66
Should intranasal decongestant be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 66
Question 28 67

Should oral decongestant be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 67
Question 29 69
Should combination of oral decongestant and H_1-antihistamine versus oral H1-antihistamine alone be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 69
Question 30 70
Should intraocular H_1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of ocular symptoms in patients with allergic rhinitis? 70
Question 31 71
Should intraocular chromones be used for treatment of ocular symptoms in patients with allergic rhinitis? 71
Specific allergen immunotherapy for allergic rhinitis 72
Question 32 72
Should subcutaneous specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults without concomitant asthma? 72
Question 33 74
Should subcutaneous specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in children without concomitant asthma? 74
Question 34 75
Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults without concomitant asthma? 75
Question 35 77
Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in children without concomitant asthma? 77
Question 36 80
Should local nasal specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 80
Alternative and complementary treatment for allergic rhinitis 81
Question 37 81
Should homeopathy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 81
Question 38 82
Should acupuncture be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 82
Question 39 84
Should butterbur be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 84
Question 40 85
Should herbal medicines other than butterbur be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 85
Question 41 86
Should physical techniques and other alternative therapies be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? 86
III. Treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma 87
Question 42 88

Should oral H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma? *88*
Question 43 ..... *90*
Question 44 ..... *91*
Question 45 ..... *93*
Should leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma? *93*
Question 46 ..... *95*
Should subcutaneous allergen-specific immunotherapy be used in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma? *95*
Question 47 ..... *97*
Question 48 ..... *99*
Should a monoclonal antibody against IgE be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma? *99*
Priorities for revision of the guidelines 102
Priorities for research 103
Adaptation and/or localisation of guidelines 105
Panel members and contributors (in alphabetical order) 105
Potential conflicts of interest 105
Acknowledgments 106
Appendix – search strategies 107
References 111

Executive summary

Introduction

Allergic rhinitis represents a global health problem affecting 10 to 20% of the population. In theory, evidence-based guidelines are the ideal way to inform and guide clinical decision makers. This document presents a revision of the clinical recommendations of the Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) guidelines developed in collaboration with the World Health Organization in 2001 (1) and recently updated in 2008 (2). This revision, however, differs from these previous guidelines. It results from a complete re-review of the underlying evidence based on systematic and transparent assessments of the quality of this evidence in evidence profiles. Furthermore, we have used a new process for developing recommendations following the GRADE approach. An evidence-based way of making health care decisions acknowledges that evidence alone is insufficient, and that values and preferences, clinical circumstances as well as clinical expertise inevitably influence decisions (3). The GRADE system builds on the previous grading systems and combines their advantages (4). The GRADE approach is recommended by the "Guidelines for WHO guidelines" (5) and is being used increasingly by many organizations, including the World Health Organization (WHO), American Thoracic Society, American College of Chest Physicians

and the UK National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence, and other organizations around the world (6).

Allergic rhinitis is defined clinically by the symptoms caused by immunologically mediated (most often IgE-dependent) inflammation after the exposure of the nasal mucous membranes to offending allergens. Symptoms of allergic rhinitis include rhinorrhea, nasal obstruction or blockage, nasal itching, sneezing, and postnasal drip that reverse spontaneously or after treatment. Allergic conjunctivitis often accompanies allergic rhinitis.

Following ARIA guidance we classified allergic rhinitis as "intermittent" or "persistent" according to the duration of symptoms, and as "mild" or "moderate-severe" depending on its severity.

Methodology

We briefly describe the methodology used to develop and grade recommendations and the quality of the supporting evidence to facilitate the interpretation of the guidelines. For the more detailed description see the section on methods.

We assessed the evidence according to the system described by the GRADE working group.

Quality of evidence is classified as either "high", "moderate", "low" or "very low" based on methodological characteristics of the available evidence for a specific health care problem. The GRADE definitions of each category are:

- High: Further research is very unlikely to change confidence in the estimate of effect.
- Moderate: Further research is likely to have an important impact on confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
- Low: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
- Very low: Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

According to the GRADE system, the strength of a recommendation is either strong or conditional (weak) and has explicit implications (Table 1). Understanding the interpretation of these two grades – either strong or conditional – of the strength of recommendations is essential for sagacious clinical decision making.

How to use these guidelines

The ARIA guidelines provide clinicians and their patients with a basis for rational decisions in the management of allergic rhinitis. Clinicians, patients, third-party payers, institutional review committees, other stakeholders, or the courts should never view these recommendations as dictates. No recommendation can take into account all of the often-compelling unique features of individual clinical circumstances. Therefore, nobody charged with evaluating clinicians' actions should attempt to apply the recommendations from these guidelines as rote or in a blanket fashion.

Key questions

The clinical questions covered by this document were developed in consultation with the ARIA guideline panel. The key questions are:

- Should allergen avoidance methods be used by parents to prevent development of allergy in children?
- Should occupational allergen avoidance methods be used?
- Should patients with allergic rhinitis and/or conjunctivitis use H1-antihistamines, glucocorticosteroids, antileukotrienes, chromones, decongestants, or ipratropium bromide? What is the relative effect of these medications?
- Should allergen specific immunotherapy be used in patients with allergic rhinitis? What is the effect of subcutaneous, intranasal, and sublingual specific immunotherapy?
- Should complementary and alternative treatments be used for allergic rhinitis?
- Should medications for allergic rhinitis be used in patients with concomitant asthma for the treatment of symptoms of asthma?

Recommendations

I. Prevention of allergy

Recommendation 1: We suggest exclusive breastfeeding for at least first three months for all infants irrespective of their family history of atopy (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Values and preferences

This recommendation places a relatively high value on the prevention of allergy and asthma, and a relatively low value on challenges or burden of breastfeeding in certain situations.

Remarks

The evidence, that exclusive breastfeeding for at least the first three months reduces the risk of allergy or asthma, is not convincing and, therefore, the recommendation to exclusively breastfeed is conditional. This recommendation applies to situations in which other reasons do not suggest harm from breastfeeding (e.g. classic galactosemia, active untreated tuberculosis or human immunodeficiency virus infection in mother, antimetabolites or chemotherapeutic agents or radioactive isotopes being used in the mother for diagnostic or therapeutic purposes until they clear from the milk, and bacterial or viral infection of a breast).

Recommendation 2: For pregnant or breastfeeding women, we suggest no antigen avoidance diet to prevent development of allergy in children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences

This recommendation places a relatively high value on adequate nourishment of mothers and children, and a relatively low value on very uncertain effects on the prevention of allergy and asthma in this setting.

Recommendation 3: In children and pregnant women, we recommend total avoidance of environmental tobacco smoke (i.e. passive smoking) (strong recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Remarks

Smoking and exposure to second-hand smoke are common health problems around the world causing a substantial burden of disease for children and adults. While it is very rare to make a strong recommendation based on low or very low quality evidence, the ARIA guideline panel felt that in the absence of important adverse effects associated with smoking cessation or reducing the exposure to second-hand smoke, the balance between the desirable and undesirable effects is clear.

Recommendation 4: In infants and preschool children, we suggest multifaceted interventions to reduce early life exposure to house dust mite (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively low value on the burden and cost of using multiple preventive measures (*e.g.* encasings to parental and child's bed, washing bedding and soft toys at temperature exceeding 55°C [131°F], use of acaricide, smooth flooring without carpets, etc.), and relatively high value on an uncertain small reduction of the risk of developing wheeze or asthma. For some children at lower risk of developing asthma and in certain circumstances an alternative choice will be equally reasonable.
Remarks
Children at high risk of developing asthma are those with at least one parent or sibling with asthma or other allergic disease.

Recommendation 5: In infants and preschool children, we suggest no special avoidance of exposure to pets at home (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible psychosocial downsides of not having a pet, and relatively low value on potential reduction in the uncertain risk of developing allergy and/or asthma.
Remarks
Clinicians and patients may reasonably choose an alternative action, considering circumstances that include other sensitized family members.

Recommendation 6: For individuals exposed to occupational agents, we recommend specific prevention measures eliminating or reducing occupational allergen exposure (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on reducing the risk of sensitisation to occupational allergens and developing occupational rhinitis and/or asthma with the subsequent adverse consequences, and a relatively low value on the feasibility and cost of specific strategies aimed at reducing occupational allergen exposure.
Remarks
Total allergen avoidance, if possible, seems to be the most effective primary prevention measure.

II. Treatment of allergic rhinitis
Reducing allergen exposure

Recommendation 7: In patients with allergic rhinitis and/or asthma sensitive to house dust mite allergens, we recommend that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use currently available single chemical or physical preventive methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mites (strong recommendation | low quality evidence) or their combination (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence), unless this is done in the context of formal clinical research.
We suggest multifaceted environmental control programmes be used in inner-city homes to improve symptoms of asthma in children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
The recommendation to use multifaceted environmental control programmes in inner-city homes places a relatively high value on possible reduction in the symptoms of asthma in children, and relatively low value on the cost of such programmes.

Recommendation 8: In patients allergic to indoor moulds, we suggest avoiding exposure to these allergens at home (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible reduction in the symptoms of rhinitis and asthma, and a relatively low value on the burden and cost of interventions aimed at reducing exposure to household moulds.

Recommendation 9: In patients with allergic rhinitis due to animal dander, we recommend avoiding exposure to these allergens at home (strong recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on potential reduction of symptoms of allergic rhinitis, and a relatively low value on psychosocial downsides of not having a pet or the inconvenience and cost of environmental control measures.
Remarks
Based on biological rationale, there is little doubt that total avoidance of animal allergens at home, and probably also marked reduction in their concentration, can improve symptoms, despite paucity of published data to substantiate this statement.

Recommendation 10: In patients with occupational asthma, we recommend immediate and total cessation of exposure to occupational allergen (strong recommendation | very low quality evidence). When total cessation of exposure is not possible, we suggest specific strategies aimed at minimizing occupational allergen exposure (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
The recommendation to immediately and totally cease the exposure to occupational allergen places a relatively high value on reducing the symptoms of asthma and deterioration of lung function, and a relatively low value on the potential socioeconomic downsides (e.g. unemployment).

Pharmacological treatment of allergic rhinitis

Recommendation 11: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we recommend new generation oral H1-antihistamines that do not cause sedation and do not interact with cytochrome P450 (strong recommendation | low quality evidence). In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest new generation oral H1-antihistamines that cause some sedation and/or interact with cytochrome P450 (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
The recommendation to use new generation oral H1-antihistamines that cause some sedation and/or interact with cytochrome P450 places a relatively high value on a reduction of symptoms of allergic rhinitis, and a relatively low value on side effects of these medications.
Remarks
Astemizole and terfenadine were removed from the market due to cardiotoxic side effects.
See recommendation 12 referring to the comparison of new generation versus old generation agents for the choice of one over the other.

Recommendation 12: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we recommend new generation over old generation oral H1-antihistamines (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on the reduction of adverse effects, and a relatively low value on an uncertain comparative efficacy of new versus old generation oral H1-antihistamines.

Recommendation 13: In infants with atopic dermatitis and/or family history of allergy or asthma (at high risk of developing asthma), we suggest clinicians do not administer and parents do not use oral H1-antihistamines for the prevention of wheezing or asthma (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences

This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding side effects of oral H1-antihistamines in infants, and a lower value on the very uncertain reduction in the risk of developing asthma or wheezing.

Remarks

The recommendation not to use oral H1-antihistamines in these infants refers only to prevention of asthma or wheezing. The guideline panel did not consider other conditions in which these medications may be commonly used (e.g. urticaria).

Recommendation 14: We suggest intranasal H1-antihistamines in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation| low quality evidence) and in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). In adults and children with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use intranasal H1-antihistamines until more data on their relative efficacy and safety is available (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences

The recommendation to use intranasal H1-antihistamines in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on reduction of symptoms, and a relatively low value on the risk of rare or mild side effects. The recommendation not to use intranasal H1-antihistamines in patients with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on their uncertain efficacy and possible side effects, and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in symptoms.

Recommendation 15: We suggest new generation oral H1-antihistamines rather than intranasal H1-antihistamines in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and in adults with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). In children with intermittent or persistent allergic rhinitis we also suggest new generation oral H1-antihistamines rather than intranasal H1-antihistamines (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences

These recommendations place a relatively high value on probable higher patient preference for oral versus intranasal route of administration as well as avoiding bitter taste of some intranasal H1-antihistamines, and relatively low value on increased somnolence with some new generation oral H1-antihistamines. In many patients with different values and preferences or those who experience adverse effects of new generation oral H1-antihistamines an alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

Recommendation 16: We suggest oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults and children with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | high quality evidence) and in preschool children with perennial allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence). In adults with perennial allergic rhinitis we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (conditional recommendation | high quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences

The recommendation to use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults and children with seasonal allergic rhinitis and in preschool children with perennial allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on their safety and tolerability, and relatively low value on their limited efficacy and high cost.

The recommendation not to use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on their very limited efficacy and high cost, and relatively low value on potential small benefit in few patients.
Remarks
Evidence is available only for montelukast. This recommendation refers to the treatment of rhinitis, not to the treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis (see recommendation 45).

Recommendation 17: We suggest oral H1-antihistamines over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and in preschool children with perennial allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding resource expenditure.

Recommendation 18: We recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults (strong recommendation | high quality evidence) and suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids in children with allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on the efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, and a relatively low value on avoiding their possible adverse effects.

Recommendation 19: In patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis, we suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral H1-antihistamines in adults (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence) and in children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). In patients with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis, we suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral H1-antihistamines in adults (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and in children (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on the likely higher efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids. In many patients with strong preference for oral versus intranasal route of administration an alternative choice may be reasonable.

Recommendation 20: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids rather than intranasal H1-antihistamines (strong recommendation | high quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, and a relatively low value on their rare adverse effects.

Recommendation 21: In patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis we recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a high value on the efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids.
Remarks
Evidence is available for montelukast only.

Recommendation 22: In patients with allergic rhinitis and moderate to severe nasal and/or ocular symptoms that are not controlled with other treatments, we suggest short course of oral glucocorticosteroids (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible relief of severe symptoms, and a relatively low value on avoiding possible side effects of a short course of oral glucocorticosteroids.
Remarks
Systemic glucocorticosteroids should not be considered as a first line of treatment for allergic rhinitis. They can be used for few days as a last resort of treatment when combinations of other medications are ineffective. Oral glucocorticosteroids should be avoided in children, pregnant women, and patients with known contraindications.

Recommendation 23: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we recommend that clinicians do not administer intramuscular glucocorticosteroids (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible side effects of a single or multiple injections of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids, and relatively low value on their efficacy and convenience of use.
Remarks
Possible side effects of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids may be far more serious than the condition they are supposed to treat (*i.e.* allergic rhinitis).

Recommendation 24: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest intranasal chromones (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on excellent safety and tolerability of intranasal chromones, and relatively low value on their limited efficacy and on limiting resource expenditure.
Remarks
The need for administration 4 times daily is likely to reduce patient adherence and reduce efficacy.

Recommendation 25: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest intranasal H1-antihistamines over intranasal chromones (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on possibly higher efficacy of intranasal H1-antihistamines, and relatively low value on safety and tolerability of intranasal chromones.
Remarks
Chromones require administration 4 times daily that may limit patient adherence to treatment and reduce efficacy.

Recommendation 26: In patients with perennial allergic rhinitis, we suggest intranasal ipratropium bromide for treatment of rhinorrhea (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
Remarks
Intranasal ipratropium bromide is effective for rhinorrhea. It is unlikely to be beneficial for other symptoms of allergic rhinitis.

Recommendation 27: In adults with allergic rhinitis and severe nasal obstruction, we suggest very short course (not longer than five days and preferably shorter) of intranasal decongestant while co-administering other drugs (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). We suggest that clinicians do not administer and parents do not use intranasal decongestants in preschool children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences

The recommendation for use of a very short course of an intranasal decongestant in adults with allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on the prompt relief of nasal obstruction, and relatively low value on avoiding the risk of adverse effects with a prolonged use of intranasal decongestant.
The recommendation against the use of an intranasal decongestant in children and against long-term use in adults places a relatively high value on avoiding the risk of serious adverse effects, and relatively low value on a possible benefit from a reduced nasal blockage.

Recommendation 28: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use oral decongestants regularly (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of oral decongestants, and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.
Remarks
Oral decongestants may be of benefit for some patients as a rescue or "as needed" medication.

Recommendation 29: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use regularly a combination of oral H1-antihistamine and an oral decongestant, compared to oral H1-antihistamine alone (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of oral decongestant, and a relatively low value on small additional reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.
Remarks
In adults with symptoms not controlled with oral H1-antihistamine alone who are less averse to side effects of oral decongestants an alternative choice may be equally reasonable. Administration of a combined treatment as a rescue medication may also be beneficial to some patients.

Recommendation 30: In patients with allergic rhinitis and symptoms of conjunctivitis, we suggest intraocular H1-antihistamines (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on consistent effectiveness of intraocular H1-antihistamines, and relatively low value on their side effects and uncertain effectiveness in patients already using other medications for allergic rhinitis.
Remarks
Only one study was done in children.

Recommendation 31: In patients with allergic rhinitis and symptoms of conjunctivitis, we suggest intraocular chromones (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on excellent safety and tolerability of intraocular chromones and relatively low value on their limited effectiveness.
Remarks
In adults and children with limited ocular symptoms, chromones may be tried first because of their excellent safety and tolerability. Chromones require administration 4 times daily that may limit patient compliance with treatment and reduce efficacy.

Recommendation 32: We suggest subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy in adults with seasonal (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and perennial allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on relieving the symptoms of allergic rhinitis, and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and on resource expenditure.

Recommendation 33: In children with allergic rhinitis, we suggest subcutaneous specific immunotherapy (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on probable reduction in symptoms of allergic rhinitis and the potential prevention of the development of asthma, and relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects in children and resource expenditure.

Recommendation 34: We suggest sublingual allergen specific immunotherapy in adults with rhinitis due to pollen (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) or house dust mites (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on alleviating the symptoms of rhinitis, and relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and resource expenditure.
Remarks
Local adverse effects are relatively frequent (~35%). An alternative choice may be equally reasonable, if patients' values or preferences differ from those described here.

Recommendation 35: In children with allergic rhinitis due to pollens, we suggest sublingual allergen-specific immunotherapy (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence). In children with allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites, we suggest that clinicians do not administer sublingual immunotherapy outside rigorously designed clinical trials (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
The recommendation to use sublingual immunotherapy in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on small reduction in nasal symptoms, and relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects in children and resource expenditure. The recommendation to use sublingual immunotherapy in children with perennial allergic rhinitis only in the context of clinical research places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects and resource expenditure, and relatively low value on possible small reduction in nasal symptoms.
Remark
Local adverse effects are relatively frequent (~35%). An alternative choice may be equally reasonable, if patients' values or preferences differ from those described here.

Recommendation 36: We suggest intranasal allergen specific immunotherapy in adults (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence) and in children with allergic rhinitis due to pollens (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on the reduction of symptoms of allergic rhinitis during pollen season, and a relatively low value on avoiding local side effects and cost. An alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

Alternative and complementary treatment for allergic rhinitis

Recommendation 37: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use homeopathy (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences

This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible adverse effects and resource expenditure, and a relatively low value on any possible, but unproven, benefit of these treatments in allergic rhinitis.

Recommendation 38: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use acupuncture (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding the potential complications of acupuncture, and a relatively low value on uncertain reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.
Remarks
In patients who choose to be treated with acupuncture ONLY disposable needles should be used.

Recommendation 39: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use butterbur (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding the uncertain adverse effects of butterbur, and a relatively low value on equally uncertain reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.
Remarks
In patients who are less risk averse an alternative may be equally reasonable. However, if one chooses to use butterbur one should consider only commercial preparations in which butterbur extract does not contain toxic pyrrolizidine alkaloids.

Recommendation 40: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use herbal medicines (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
The recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible serious adverse events and drug interactions, and a relatively low value on possible reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Recommendation 41: In patients with allergic rhinitis, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use phototherapy or other physical techniques (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding potential adverse effects of these therapies, and a relatively low value on their very uncertain effect on symptoms of rhinitis.

III. Treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma

Recommendation 42: In patients (both children and adults) with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use oral H1-antihistamines for the treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
The recommendation not to use oral H1-antihistamines in adults with allergic rhinitis and asthma for the treatment of asthma places a relatively high value on avoiding their adverse effects, and a relatively low value on their very uncertain effect on symptoms of asthma.
The recommendation not to use oral H1-antihistamines in children with allergic rhinitis for the treatment of asthma or wheeze, despite the evidence of efficacy of ketotifen when used alone in children with mild to moderate asthma, places a relatively high value on avoiding its side effects, and a relatively low value on its unknown efficacy in children already using inhaled corticosteroids, since inhaled corticosteroids are currently considered medications of first choice in treatment of chronic asthma.
Remarks

This recommendation suggests that oral H1-antihistamines should not be used to treat symptoms of asthma, but they may still be used in patients with asthma and rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (recommendations 11, 12, 15, and 17).

Recommendation 43: In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use a combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant, and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in asthma symptoms of uncertain clinical significance.

Recommendation 44: In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use intranasal glucocorticosteroids for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects, burden, and cost of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, and a relatively low value on unlikely clinical benefit.
Remarks
This recommendation suggests that intranasal glucocorticosteroids are not used to treat symptoms of asthma, but they may still be used in patients with asthma and rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (see recommendations 18, 19, 20, and 21).

Recommendation 45: In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we recommend inhaled glucocorticosteroids over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists as a single controlling medication for asthma (strong recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma who prefer not to use or cannot use inhaled glucocorticosteroids or in children whose parents do not agree to use inhaled glucocorticosteroids, we suggest oral leukotriene receptor antagonists for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
These recommendations place a relatively high value on a limited efficacy of LTRA and additional cost of treatment. The suggestion to use oral LTRA in patients who do not use inhaled glucocorticosteroids places relatively high value on small reduction in symptoms of asthma and improvement in quality of life, and a relatively low value on limiting the cost of treatment.
Remarks
These recommendations do not apply to the treatment of rhinitis (see recommendation 16, 17, 21).

Recommendation 46: In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest subcutaneous specific immunotherapy for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on reducing the symptoms of asthma, and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and limiting the cost of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy. In patients who are more averse to the side effects of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy an alternative choice may be equally reasonable.
Remarks
Subcutaneous specific immunotherapy may also be used in patients with asthma and concomitant allergic rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (see recommendations 32 and 33). Resource limitations will have stronger implications for the implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation 47: In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest sublingual specific immunotherapy for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible reduction of asthma symptoms, and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and limiting the cost of sublingual specific immunotherapy.
Remarks
Sublingual specific immunotherapy may also be used in patients with asthma and concomitant allergic rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (see recommendations 34 and 35). Resource limitations will have stronger implications for the implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation 48: In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma with a clear IgE-dependent allergic component, uncontrolled despite optimal pharmacologic treatment and appropriate allergen avoidance, we suggest monoclonal antibody against IgE for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).
Underlying values and preferences
This recommendation places a relatively high value on reduction of symptoms of asthma and exacerbations in patients with severe asthma, and a relatively low value on avoiding the burden of subcutaneous injections, cost of treatment, small risk of anaphylaxis and some uncertainty about the risk of malignancy.

Introduction and background

This document presents a revision of the Recommendations of the Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) guidelines developed in collaboration with the World Health Organization in 2001 (1) and recently updated in 2008 (2). This revision, however, differs from these previous guidelines. It results from a complete re-review of the underlying evidence based on systematic and transparent assessments of the quality of this evidence in evidence profiles. Furthermore, we have used a new process for developing recommendations following the GRADE approach.
An evidence-based approach to make health care decisions acknowledges that evidence alone is insufficient, and that values and preferences, clinical circumstances as well as clinical expertise inevitably influence decisions (3). GRADE has advantages over previous rating systems (4). Other systems share some of these advantages, but none, other than GRADE, combines them all (7). The GRADE approach is recommended by the "Guidelines for WHO guidelines" (5) and is being used increasingly by many organizations, including the World Health Organization (WHO), American Thoracic Society, American College of Chest Physicians and the UK National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence and other organizations around the globe (6).

Allergic rhinitis

Allergic rhinitis is defined clinically by nasal hypersensitivity symptoms induced by an immunologically mediated (most often IgE-dependent) inflammation after the exposure of the nasal mucous membranes to an offending allergen. Symptoms of rhinitis include rhinorrhea, nasal obstruction or blockage, nasal itching, sneezing, and postnasal drip that are reversible spontaneously or under treatment. Allergic conjunctivitis often accompanies allergic rhinitis.

We classified allergic rhinitis as "intermittent" or "persistent" according to the duration of symptoms, and as "mild" or "moderate-severe" according to the severity.

Classification of allergic rhinitis

Duration

- **Intermittent** – symptoms are present less than 4 days a week or for less than 4 weeks.
- **Persistent** – symptoms are present at least 4 days a week and for at least 4 weeks.

Severity

- **Mild** – none of the following is present.
- **Moderate-severe** – at least one of the following is present.
    - Sleep disturbance
    - Impairment of daily activities, leisure and/or sport
    - Impairment of school or work
    - Troublesome symptoms

Allergic rhinitis has been traditionally subdivided into seasonal, perennial, and occupational rhinitis. Perennial allergic rhinitis is most frequently, although not necessarily, caused by indoor allergens such as house dust mites, moulds, cockroaches, and animal dander. Seasonal allergic rhinitis is most often caused by outdoor allergens such as pollens or moulds. As in a previous edition of ARIA guidelines as in this document we retained the terms "seasonal" and "perennial" to enable the interpretation of published studies.

Allergic rhinitis represents a global health problem affecting 10 to 20% of the population (section 5.1.–5.2. in ARIA 2008 Update (2)). This is probably an underestimate, since many patients do not recognise rhinitis as a disease and the prevalence is increasing (8-12). Although allergic rhinitis is not usually a severe disease, it affects patients' social life, school performance, and work productivity (section 5.3.–5.7. in ARIA 2008 Update (2)).

Allergic rhinitis and asthma are linked by epidemiological, pathological, and physiological characteristics and by a common therapeutic approach (13-17). They frequently coexist – epidemiological studies suggest that asthma is found in as many as 15% to 38% of patients with allergic rhinitis (13, 18, 19). Some studies estimate that nasal symptoms are present in at least 75% of patients with asthma, but these estimates vary widely from 6% to 85% depending on the study (13, 20-23).

For specific treatment of asthma, complications of allergic rhinitis or non-allergic rhinitis(e.g. infectious rhinitis, chronic sinusitis, otitis media, and nasal polyps)clinicians should consult clinical practice guidelines focusing on those diseases.

Several other conditions can cause symptoms similar to allergic rhinitis: viral and bacterial infections, hormonal imbalance, exposure to physical agents, and other causes. Rhinitis may also be a side effect of some drugs. Therefore, a detailed and correct diagnosis should be made before selecting optimal treatment. These guidelines do not address the issues related to diagnosis of allergic rhinitis and it is assumed that the correct diagnosis had been established before commencing treatment.

How to use these guidelines

The ARIA guidelines are not intended to impose a standard of care for individual countries. They should, as any guideline, provide a basis for rational decisions in the management of allergic rhinitis to clinicians and their patients. Clinicians, patients, third-party payers, institutional review committees, other stakeholders, or the courts should never view these recommendations as dictates. Strong recommendations based on high quality evidence will apply to most patients for whom these recommendations are made, but they may not apply to **all** patients in **all** circumstances. No guidelines or recommendations can take into account all of the often-compelling unique features of individual clinical circumstances. Therefore, nobody charged with evaluating clinicians' actions should attempt to apply the recommendations from these guidelines as rote or in a blanket fashion.

Scope

The target audience of these guidelines is principally primary care clinicians and specialists managing patients with allergic rhinitis, but it includes other health care professionals and health care policy makers. It has been shown that a guideline-based treatment of allergic rhinitis is more effective than an unsystematic and variable treatment administered by both primary care physician (24) or a specialist. National programmes and treatment guideline groups may also wish to use this document as the basis for implementation or development of locally adapted guidelines (see Adaptation of guidelines).

The clinical questions covered by this document were developed in consultation with the ARIA guideline panel. The key questions can be summarized briefly as:

- Should allergen avoidance methods be used by parents to avoid development of allergy in children?
- Should occupational allergen avoidance methods be used?
- Should patients with allergic rhinitis and/or conjunctivitis use H1-antihistamines, glucocorticosteroids, antileukotrienes, chromones, decongestants, or ipratropium bromide? What is the relative effect of these medications?
- Should allergen specific immunotherapy be used in patients with allergic rhinitis? What is the effect of subcutaneous, intranasal, and sublingual specific immunotherapy?
- Should complementary and alternative treatments be used for allergic rhinitis?
- Should medications for the treatment of allergic rhinitis be used in patients with concomitant asthma for the treatment of asthma?

The recommendations in this document do not apply to prevention or treatment of other types of rhinitis (i.e. non-allergic) or complications of allergic rhinitis (e.g. sinusitis). The recommendations in these guidelines about treatment of asthma apply only to patients with asthma and concomitant allergic rhinitis, and advise only on using interventions that can be used in treatment of both asthma and allergic rhinitis.

Therefore, these guidelines do not provide recommendations on treatment of asthma in patients without concomitant allergic rhinitis, and recommendations for treatment of asthma in general.

Methods

We described the methodology for development of this revision of ARIA guidelines in detail elsewhere (25). Here we provide a summary.

The clinical questions and scope of these guidelines were defined by ARIA guideline panel members. These questions originated from the previous edition of ARIA guidelines (1, 25) and the subsequent updates of the selected topics that the ARIA guideline panel published (26-30). This work was supplemented by efforts of an independent team of GRADE Working Group members (JLB and HJS supported by two biostatisticians and research personnel), who prepared summaries of evidence, based on systematic reviews and health technology assessments (see Summary of Findings Tables) according to the GRADE methodology described in the "Guidelines for WHO guidelines" and elsewhere (31-34).

Group composition

The ARIA guideline panel included eight clinicians experienced in treating AR and asthma in adults and in children and two methodologists who were primarily responsible for collecting the evidence, developing evidence summaries, and drafting the guideline.

Formulation of questions and rating the importance of outcomes

The ARIA guideline panel identified clinical problems requiring guidance that led to formulation of thirty one specific clinical questions (35) about the treatment of AR, six questions about the prevention of allergy, and seven questions about the treatment of asthma in patients with coexisting AR and asthma.

The following outcomes were deemed by the guideline panel as important to patients: 1) development of allergy, allergic rhinitis, and/or asthma; 2) presence and severity of nasal, ocular, and bronchial symptoms; 3) exacerbations of asthma; 4) hospitalizations for asthma; 5) quality of life; 6) work/school performance; 7) adverse effects; and 8) resource utilization (cost). For this revision of ARIA guidelines we did not formally assess the relative importance of each outcome, but rather used an informal agreement of the guideline panel (36).

ARIA classifies AR as "intermittent" or "persistent" according to the duration of symptoms, and as "mild" or "moderate-severe" according to the severity (2). In this document we retained the terms "seasonal" and "perennial" to facilitate interpretation of published evidence. The panel also decided to use the terms "old generation" as corresponding to the terms "older", "first generation" or "sedating" and "new generation" as corresponding to "newer", "second generation" or "non-sedating" H_1-antihistamines. We chose not to use any functional designations, *e.g.* "sedating" or "non-sedating" because the degree of sedation is a continuum without a definite cut-off value and this terminology does not take into account other characteristics of H_1-antihistamines.

Preparation of evidence summaries

We prepared evidence profiles for each question following the GRADE approach (4, 37) using the GRADEpro© software version 3.1 (38). These concise evidence profiles allowed panel members to base their judgments on the same and concisely summarized evidence (39). The summaries of evidence were then peer reviewed and corrections and comments incorporated by the expert panel. The evidence profiles are shown in online supplement 2.

We based the evidence summaries on existing up-to-date well done systematic reviews. Systematic reviews were supplemented, if necessary, with additional recent randomized trials (until August 2007 and for selected clinical questions until January 2009). When there was no recent valid systematic review available, we did not perform rigorous systematic reviews, but we systematically searched MEDLINE and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) for relevant

studies (see appendix in this supplement for search strategies). When possible and justified we combined the results of identified studies using meta-analysis. The identified original studies were evaluated to inform judgements about the underlying evidence, if they addressed the relevant PICO question.
The GRADE system classifies the quality of evidence into four categories: high, moderate, low, and very low (40, 41). The quality of evidence reflects the extent to which a guideline panel's confidence in an estimate of the effect is adequate to support a particular recommendation (42). When classifying evidence into one of the quality categories one considers the following factors: 1) study design and rigour of its execution or risk of bias (as described above for this revision we did not review all original studies, but rather relied on the judgement of the authors of a systematic review), 2) the extent to which available evidence can be directly applied to the target patients, interventions, and outcomes, 3) the consistency of results, 4) whether the results are precise, and 5) whether there is a likelihood of publication bias (in this publication we grouped the evaluation of selective outcome reporting and typical publication bias – please note that the GRADE working group has since categorized selective outcome reporting bias under limitations in study design and execution and separated it from publication bias based on methods of the Cochrane Collaboration). The following three factors lead to upgrading the quality of evidence: 1) a strong or very strong association, 2) a dose-effect relationship, and 3) all plausible confounding may be working to reduce the demonstrated effect or increase the effect if no effect was observed (25). The overall quality of evidence is determined by the lowest quality of evidence for each of the critical outcomes. When outcomes point in the same direction (all critical outcomes suggesting benefit) then the overall quality of evidence reflects the quality of the better evidence (e.g., two critical outcomes showing convincing benefit are of low quality and a third of very low quality, the overall quality is not reduced from low to very low).

The following are the definitions of these categories:

- **High:** Further research is very unlikely to change confidence in the estimate of effect.
- **Moderate:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
- **Low:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
- **Very low:** Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Some outcomes in patients with allergic rhinitis are measured on a continuous scale (e.g. symptom scores and quality of life). When they are summarised across studies and combined in meta-analysis, they are often presented as standardised mean difference (SMD) that is expressed in standard deviation (SD) units. Results expressed as a SMD are challenging to interpret by clinicians. To facilitate understanding we used interpretation of the effect size suggested by Cohen (43). According to this interpretation, a SMD of around 0.2 is considered a small effect, around 0.5 – a moderate effect, and around 0.8 or higher – a large effect. We used this interpretation throughout this document whenever we referred to effects of interventions as eother small, moderate or large.

Panel meetings

We held two meetings to discuss the clinical questions, the results of the evidence reviews, and to agree on recommendations. No recommendation required voting.

Balancing desirable and undesirable consequences of available treatment options and developing recommendations

Formulating the recommendations included consideration of the quality of evidence, desirable and undesirable consequences of following the recommended course of action, and values and

preferences of those for whom the recommendations are intended. For most recommendations resource utilization (cost) was also taken into account (44). Recommendations were classified as 'strong' or 'weak' as recommended by the GRADE working group (4). Statements about the underlying *values and preferences* as well as the *remarks* are *integral parts of the recommendations* and serve to facilitate accurate interpretation. *They should not be omitted when citing or translating recommendations in the ARIA guidelines.* In this document, the expression "values and preferences" refers to the relative worth or importance of a health state or the consequences of a decision to follow a particular course of action (i.e. a relative weight one attributes to particular benefits, harms, burdens, and costs to determine their balance). Individuals usually assign less value to and have less preference for more impaired health states (e.g. death or impaired social functioning and work productivity due to severe rhinitis symptoms) compared to other health states (e.g. full health or having very mild symptoms that do not interfere with daily life). We used the decision framework described previously to determine the strength of recommendations (33, 45).
Little information about costs of prevention or treatment of allergic rhinitis was available to the panel and it is very likely that it varies considerably across geographical areas and jurisdictions. Cost, therefore, plays a limited role in these recommendations. However, whenever we considered cost and resource expenditure we used health system perspective (46). For individual patients cost may not be an issue if the medication is provided at reduced price or free of charge. Clinicians and patients should consider their local resource implications when interpreting these recommendations.

Following the GRADE approach, in these guidelines we classified **recommendations as either strong** or **conditional (weak)**. The strength of recommendations depends on a balance between all desirable and all undesirable effects of an intervention (i.e. net clinical benefit), quality of available evidence, values and preferences, and cost (resource utilization) (45). In general, the higher the quality of the supporting evidence, the more likely it is for the recommendation to be strong. Conversely, if the quality is low or very low a conditional recommendation is more likely. Strong recommendations based on low or very low quality evidence are rare, but possible (25).
An alternative, acceptable term for conditional recommendation is weak. **For strong recommendations we used words "we recommend" and for conditional recommendations – "we suggest".** We offer the suggested interpretation of strong and conditional (weak) recommendations in the Table (33). Understanding the interpretation of these two grades – either strong or conditional – of the strength of recommendations is essential for sagacious clinical decision making.

Consultation

We asked 80 clinicians involved in the management of patients and/or research of AR from a variety of countries and 3 members of patient organizations to review the guidelines. As a result we performed additional searches for most recent studies and reassessed the evidence for several questions.

We think that the natural order of clinical reasoning starts from defining the patients (population) and the clinical problem and subsequently choosing one the available management options (interventions). Thus, when formulating the recommendations for ARIA guidelines, we followed PICO (population, intervention, comparison, outcomes) format (35).

Some outcomes in patients with allergic rhinitis are measured on a continuous scale (e.g. symptom scores and quality of life). When they are summarised across studies and combined in meta-analysis, they are often presented as standardised mean difference (SMD) that is expressed in standard deviation (SD) units. Results expressed as a SMD are challenging to interpret by clinicians. To facilitate understanding we used interpretation of the effect size suggested by Cohen (43). According to this interpretation, a SMD of around 0.2 is considered a small effect, around 0.5 – a moderate effect, and around 0.8 or higher – a large effect. We used this interpretation throughout this document whenever we referred to effects of interventions as eother small, moderate or large.

Recommendations

In the following six sections we present specific recommendations for:

- prevention of allergy, allergic rhinitis, and/or asthma
- reducing allergen exposure for treatment of allergic rhinitis and/or asthma
- pharmacological treatment of allergic rhinitis
- immunotherapy in allergic rhinitis
- alternative and complementary treatment of allergic rhinitis
- treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis

Changing information about treatment of allergic rhinitis and paucity of up-to-date systematic reviews of available evidence will require a timely update of these guidelines. Future revisions of ARIA will include quality assessment of the individual studies cited in the systematic reviews we applied in making these recommendations.

Recommendations that address similar management options should be interpreted together. For instance, the recommendation to use oral H1-antihistamines (Question 11) should be interpreted in the context of other recommendations to use new-generation versus old-generation H1-antihistamines (Question 12), to use oral H1-anthistamines in children to prevent development of asthma (Question 13), and to use new-generation oral H1-antihistamines versus intranasal H1-antihistamines (Question 15), versus leukotriene receptor antagonists (Question 17) or versus intranasal glucocorticosteroids (Question 19).

I. Prevention of allergy

Question 1

Should exclusive breastfeeding be used in infants to prevent allergy?

Summary of findings

Seven systematic reviews addressed the question if exclusive breastfeeding prevents development of allergy. Three reviews focused on prevention of the development of atopic dermatitis (47), allergic rhinitis (48), and asthma (49) (see accompanying evidence profile). Their findings were summarised in overview of these reviews (50). The fifth systematic review explored if extending the period of exclusive breastfeeding beyond 3 months to up to 7 months influences child's health (including allergy), growth, and development (51) (see accompanying evidence profile). The sixth review summarised the available studies in a narrative form but did not provide any summary estimates (52). All reviews included prospective observational studies.
A recent systematic review (53) did not find any new studies investigating the risk of atopic dermatitis that would not be included in the analysis of Gdalevich and colleagues (47) and it found four more recent studies on the prevention of asthma (54-57).
We did not assess the quality of evidence supporting other benefits from breastfeeding except for development of allergy and asthma. For this revision of the ARIA guidelines we also have not assessed the relative benefit of exclusive breastfeeding compared to other alternative methods of infant nutrition, e.g. formulas containing hydrolysed protein for prevention of allergy and/or asthma in infants.

Benefits

There is evidence from observational studies that exclusive breastfeeding for at least 3 months may prevent atopic dermatitis, allergic rhinitis, and asthma. Some of the effect estimates are imprecise. Extending exclusive breastfeeding to at least 6 months may provide additional benefit, although the estimates are also imprecise and do not exclude no effect. All critical outcomes indicate beneficial effects in the same direction.

Harms

There were no important risks associated with exclusive breastfeeding reported in the systematic reviews. However, breastfeeding may not always be in the best interest of an infant when contraindications are present (e.g., classic galactosemia, active untreated tuberculosis or human immunodeficiency virus infection in mother, chemotherapeutic agents or radioactive isotopes being used in the mother for diagnostic or therapeutic purposes, some other medications until they clear from the milk, and bacterial or viral infection of a breast) (58).

Conclusions and research needs

Given the few specific possible undesirable effects of exclusive breastfeeding in situations that are relatively well described, exclusive breastfeeding for at least three months appears to be of net clinical benefit. However, the available evidence supporting its beneficial effect on development of allergy and asthma is limited and overall of low quality for the critical outcomes.

The relation between exclusive breastfeeding and the development of allergy or asthma needs further elucidation. However, it is unlikely to influence this recommendation.

What others are saying
Paediatric and obstetrical professional societies recommend breastfeeding for all infants unless there are contraindications (58-61), because of reduced risk of infections observed both in developing and in developed counties, lower risk of other diseases suggested in many studies, and because of maternal health benefits.

Recommendation

We suggest exclusive breastfeeding for at least the first three months for all infants irrespective of their family history of atopy (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on the prevention of allergy and asthma, and a relatively low value on challenges or burden of breastfeeding in certain situations.

Remarks: The evidence, that exclusive breastfeeding for at least the first three months reduces the risk of allergy or asthma, is not convincing and the recommendation to exclusively breastfeed is conditional. This recommendation applies to situations in which other reasons do not suggest harm from breastfeeding (e.g. classic galactosemia, active untreated tuberculosis or human immunodeficiency virus infection in the mother, antimetabolites, chemotherapeutic agents or radioactive isotopes used in the mother until they clear from the milk, and bacterial or viral infection of a breast).

Question 2

Should antigen avoidance diet be used in pregnant or breastfeeding women to prevent development of allergy in children?

Summary of findings

One systematic review reporting on 4 studies assessed maternal dietary antigen avoidance during pregnancy and/or lactation for preventing or treating atopic disease in the child (62) (see accompanying evidence profile).

Benefits

Results of available trials suggest that it is unlikely that antigen avoidance diet prevents development of allergy or asthma, although the results are inconsistent, very imprecise and the follow-up was limited to the first 18 months of life.

Harms

There is evidence of very low quality that antigen avoidance diet may increase the risk of preterm birth.

Conclusions and research needs

Any clinical benefit of antigen avoidance diet in pregnant or breastfeeding women to prevent development of allergy in children is very uncertain. Future research, if done, may have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

For pregnant or breastfeeding women, we suggest no antigen avoidance diet to prevent development of allergy in children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on adequate nourishment of mothers and children, and a relatively low value on very uncertain effects on the prevention of allergy and asthma in this setting.

Question 3

Should children and pregnant women avoid environmental tobacco smoke (i.e. passive smoking) to reduce the risk of developing allergy, wheezing, or asthma in children?

Summary of findings

A series of systematic reviews of observational studies evaluated the relation between environmental tobacco smoke (ETS, secondhand smoke or passive smoking) exposure and respiratory health in children. These systematic reviews generally reported an increased risk of asthma, wheeze, and chronic cough in children in families where either parent smoked (63-68). A link between environmental tobacco smoke exposure and development of allergy was not found (69).
We identified two additional more recent reports of studies that showed increased risk of wheezing in children exposed to parental smoking (70, 71).

A World Health Organization Report on Tobacco Smoke and Child Health (72) found that ETS has adverse effects during gestation and has definite effects after birth including increased risks of lower respiratory tract infection during infancy and chronic respiratory symptoms in school-aged children. ETS increases the severity and frequency of symptoms in children with asthma, is causally associated with increased risk of acute and chronic middle ear disease and is a cause of small reductions in average birth weight (exposure of non-smoking women during pregnancy). Parental smoking is also associated with learning difficulties, behavioural problems, and language impairment. There is evidence that tobacco smoke exposure causes non-allergic wheezing in early life, but whether it does cause asthma is less clear. In addition, evidence does not support a role of parental smoking during the perinatal period for allergic sensitization. Nevertheless, ETS exposure causes exacerbations of symptoms in children with asthma. Although these increased risks are modest, these are common health problems around the world. Thus small increases in risk translate into a substantial absolute burden of disease for children arising from exposure to ETS.

The most recent report from Surgeon General on respiratory Effects in Children from Exposure to Secondhand Smoke (68) found sufficient evidence to infer a causal relationship between parental smoking and cough, phlegm production, wheeze, and breathlessness as well as ever having asthma among children of school age. The evidence was judged sufficient to infer a causal relationship between ETS exposure from parental smoking and the onset of wheeze in early childhood. It was

judged suggestive and not sufficient to infer a causal relationship between ETS exposure and the onset of childhood asthma. Authors of this report also found inadequate evidence to infer the presence or absence of a causal relationship between parental smoking and the risk of allergy in children. Irrespective of its effect on asthma and allergy, ETS has other detrimental respiratory and developmental effects in children.

The authors of that report (68) found only one small study of a population intervention on parental smoking and the symptoms of asthma in children. That study concluded by stating that exposure to smoking be eliminated for the 37 asthmatic children in whom this was a problem. At 6-month to 2-year follow-up, 20 of the 35 families had complied, and improvement was obtained in 18 of these children and in only 4 of the 15 who had failed to comply (73).

We did not find any other studies of interventions aimed on reduction of ETS exposure and development of asthma or wheeze or on the symptoms in children that already had asthma.

Benefits

Exposure to ETS increases the risk of many chronic diseases in infants and children. Although there is very limited evidence that stopping the exposure to ETS benefits infants and children, there is little doubt that avoiding exposure would be beneficial in these populations and in pregnant women.

Harms

There are no important harms from smoking cessation and no known harms from reducing the exposure to environmental tobacco smoke.

Conclusions and research needs

It appears that there is a net clinical benefit from not exposing pregnant women, infants and children to environmental tobacco smoke. Given no important harms of smoking cessation or reducing the exposure to second-hand smoke, clinical benefit from stopping the exposure is also very likely, if pregnant women or children are already exposed.
Further well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of smoking cessation interventions that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes are needed. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on the quality of evidence supporting this recommendation.

Recommendation
In children and pregnant women, we recommend total avoidance of environmental tobacco smoke (i.e. passive smoking) (strong recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Remarks: Smoking and exposure to second-hand smoke are common health problems around the world causing a substantial burden of disease for children and adults. While it is very rare to make a strong recommendation based on low or very low quality evidence, the ARIA guideline panel felt that in the absence of important adverse effects associated with smoking cessation or reducing the exposure to second-hand smoke, the balance between the desirable and undesirable effects is clear.

Question 4

Should infants and preschool children avoid exposure to house dust mites to reduce the risk of developing dust mite allergy and asthma?

Summary of findings

No systematic review evaluated the association between early life exposure to house dust mite allergens and the risk of developing allergy and/or asthma in children.

A report from the Institute of Medicine (76) found that observational studies have shown an association between house dust mite sensitization and asthma (77-82). Some recent studies confirmed this effect (83, 84), but some did not (85). The results were consistent across different populations and showed odds ratios for asthma between 6 and 12 in individuals sensitized to house dust mite allergens. This report found that there was a dose-response relationship between exposure to house dust mite allergens and sensitization. However, the relationship between exposure and development of asthma was less clear.

No systematic review addressed the question if reducing the exposure to house dust mite allergens prevents the development of allergy or asthma.

Seven randomised trials of birth cohorts evaluated the effect of multifaceted interventions on the development of allergy and/or asthma – the Canadian Childhood Asthma Primary Prevention Study (86-88), the Prevention of Asthma in Children study (89), the Study on the Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe (90, 91), the Isle of Wight study (92, 93), the Childhood Asthma Prevention Study (94, 95), the Prevention and Incidence of Asthma and Mite Allergy Study (96-99), and the Manchester Asthma and Allergy Study (100, 101).
In these seven trials, families of children considered to be at high risk of developing allergy and/or asthma (based on at least one first degree relative with asthma or other allergic disorder) were randomly assigned to multifaceted interventions (frequent ventilation of the child's room, encasings to parental and child's bed, washing bedding and soft toys at >55°C, use of acaricide, smooth flooring without carpets) or usual care provided by primary care physicians. In three of these studies, families were also advised to part with a pet or keep it outside (see Question 5), and in four studies they were advised to follow various allergen avoidance diets and not to smoke.

Benefits

After 2 years of observation there was no significant difference between the multifaceted intervention and control groups in the percentage of children who developed recurrent wheezing or atopic dermatitis (eczema). Multifaceted interventions seemed to reduce the risk of rhinitis (relative risk: 0.72, 95% CI: 0.49 to 1.06) and asthma (relative risk: 0.81, 95% CI: 0.61 to 1.06) after 2 years of follow-up, but the results were imprecise and did not exclude no effect.
Five studies reported results after 3 to 8 years of follow-up. There was no decreased risk of developing allergic rhinitis or atopic dermatitis (eczema). However, multifaceted interventions were associated with lower risk of wheezing (relative risk: 0.77, 95% CI: 0.62 to 0.98) and suggested protection against developing asthma (relative risk: 0.82, 95% CI: 0.66 to 1.01) in children 3 to 8 years of age.

Harms

There were no direct adverse effects of these prophylactic interventions but there is inconvenience, cost of using multiple preventive measures, and psychological burden on parents who cannot afford them.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit from reducing exposure to house dust mite allergens in early childhood is uncertain. In children at high risk multifaceted interventions may reduce the risk of developing asthma, but it is unclear which aspects of the interventions would be most effective. The effect on development of allergic rhinitis is less certain and the effect on atopic dermatitis is unlikely. There is no evidence concerning children at average risk of developing allergy, but if present the effect would probably be even smaller in this population.

Recommendation

In infants and preschool children, we suggest multifaceted interventions to reduce early life exposure to house dust mite (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively low value on the burden and cost of using multiple preventive measures (*e.g.* encasings to parental and child's bed, washing bedding and soft toys at temperature exceeding 55°C [131°F], use of acaricide, smooth flooring without carpets, etc.), and relatively high value on an uncertain small reduction of the risk of developing wheeze or asthma. For some children at lower risk of developing asthma and in certain circumstances an alternative choice will be equally reasonable.

Remarks: Children at high risk of developing asthma are those with at least one parent or sibling with asthma or other allergic disease.

Question 5

Should infants and preschool children avoid exposure to pets at home to reduce the risk of developing allergy and asthma?

Summary of findings

Two systematic reviews of observational studies reported that early life exposure to pet allergens may increase the risk of asthma in children (102, 103), although the estimated effect was small and inconsistent including some studies that showed a reduced risk. Authors of the review suggested that this heterogeneity might have been caused by inappropriate time sequence of the exposure and outcome and a potential selection bias in individual studies. In studies ensuring the appropriate temporal sequence, previous exposure to pet allergens was not associated with increased risk of asthma (odds ratio: 0.99, 95% CI: 0.77 to 1.27) or wheezing (odds ratio: 0.80, 95% CI: 0.59 to 1.08) in children ≤6 years of age. In older children (>6 years) the risk might be higher both for asthma (odds ratio: 1.15, 95% CI: 0.86 to 1.56) or wheezing (odds ratio: 1.30, 95% CI: 1.11 to 1.52).

We did not identify any systematic review addressing the question if avoidance of pet allergens prevents the development of allergy or asthma. We also did not identify any randomised trial evaluating avoidance of pet allergens as a single intervention to prevent the development of allergy or asthma.

However, three randomised trials of birth cohorts evaluated the effect of multifaceted interventions on the development of allergy and/or asthma – the Canadian Childhood Asthma Primary Prevention Study (86-88), the Prevention of Asthma in Children study (89), and the Study on the Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe (90, 91). We used data from these trials to estimate the overall effect in a meta-analysis and used them to prepare the evidence profile.
In these three trials families of children considered to be at high risk of developing allergy and/or asthma (at least one first degree relative with asthma or other allergic disorder) were randomly assigned to multifaceted interventions (frequent ventilation of the child's room, encasings to parental and child's bed, washing bedding and soft toys at >55ºC, use of acaricide, smooth flooring without carpets, various dietary interventions, and were advised to part with a pet or keep it outside). Compliance with the recommendation to part with a pet or keep it outside was variable; in one study 51% families complied with the recommendation (104), and in the other 17 families (34% of 50 families that had a cat at baseline) parted with the cat, but 6 families acquired a new cat over a period of 2 years (105).

Benefits

After 2 years of observation there was no significant difference between the multifaceted intervention and control groups in the percentage of children who developed rhinitis, recurrent wheezing, or atopic dermatitis (eczema), but results were not precise enough to exclude important benefit or important harm from the intervention. Multifaceted intervention seemed to reduce the risk of asthma after 2 years of follow-up, but the results were imprecise, including no effect.
Only one study (86) reported results after more than 2 years of follow-up. There was a similar risk of development of allergic rhinitis and atopic dermatitis (eczema) after 7 years, although the results were imprecise. However, multifaceted intervention was associated with lower risk of developing asthma after 7 years (relative risk: 0.44, 95% CI: 0.25 to 0.79).

Harms

There were no direct adverse effects of these prophylactic interventions except for inconvenience and cost of using multiple preventive measures.

Conclusions and research needs

All available evidence for the benefit from avoiding pet allergens in childhood comes from interventions in high-risk families, and is very indirect and imprecise. Any clinical benefit from avoiding exposure to pet allergens in childhood is therefore very uncertain, and there is even some uncertainty if there is a risk associated with the exposure. Further well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of pet allergen avoidance that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes are needed.

Recommendation

In infants and preschool children, we suggest no special avoidance of exposure to pets at home (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible psychosocial downsides of not having a pet, and relatively low value on potential reduction in the uncertain risk of developing allergy and/or asthma.

Remarks: Clinicians and patients may reasonably choose an alternative action, considering circumstances that include other sensitized family members.

Question 6

Should specific measures reducing occupational agent exposure be used to decrease the risk of sensitization and subsequent development of occupational rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

We found no systematic review of primary prevention of occupational rhinitis. There is paucity of evidence about epidemiology, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of occupational allergic rhinitis.

One systematic review from the British Occupational Health Research Foundation assessed methods that reduce occupational agent exposure for the prevention and treatment of occupational asthma (106, 107).

Two systematic reviews assessed primary prevention of latex related sensitisation and occupational asthma (108, 109).

Benefits

Occupational rhinitis and occupational asthma frequently occur together and rhinitis usually precedes asthma (107). Nicolson and colleagues (106) found observational studies showing that reducing occupational exposure to airborne agents (acid anhydrides, enzymes, di-isotiocyanates, laboratory animal dander, and natural rubber latex) lowered the risk of sensitization and development of occupational asthma in workers. They also found that use of respiratory protection equipment reduced the risk of occupational asthma, but only when properly worn on every occasion, and it did not completely prevent asthma. The overall quality of evidence supporting the reduction of airborne allergens was low and for the use of respiratory protection equipment it was very low.

Bousquet and colleagues (108) and LaMontagne and colleagues (109) found nine observational studies of interventions aimed at reducing natural rubber latex in primary prevention of latex sensitivity, allergy, and asthma. These studies showed that substitution of powdered latex gloves with low-protein powder-free natural rubber latex gloves or latex-free gloves reduced latex aeroallergens, sensitisation, and asthma in healthcare workers.

Harms

There are no apparent downsides of interventions aimed at the reduction of exposure to occupational agents other than burden and cost of these interventions.

Conclusions and research needs

Specific measures reducing occupational agent exposure may be of net clinical benefit. The overall quality of evidence supporting the reduction of airborne allergens and substitution of natural rubber latex gloves with latex-free gloves was low, and for the use of respiratory protection equipment it was very low.

There is a need for rigorously designed and executed studies of primary prevention of occupational allergic rhinitis.

Recommendation

For individuals exposed to occupational agents, we recommend specific prevention measures eliminating or reducing occupational allergen exposure (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on reducing the risk of sensitization to occupational allergens and developing occupational rhinitis and/or asthma with the subsequent adverse consequences, and a relatively low value on the feasibility and cost of specific strategies aimed at reducing occupational allergen exposure.

Remarks: Total allergen avoidance, if possible, seems to be the most effective primary prevention measure.

II. Treatment of allergic rhinitis

Reducing allergen exposure

Question 7

Should methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mites be used in patients allergic to dust mite allergens?

Summary of findings

Two systematic reviews assessed the efficacy of house dust mite avoidance measures in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis (110) (see evidence profiles 1 to 3 for question 7) or asthma (111, 112) (see evidence profiles 4 to 6 for question 7).

We found three randomised trials that examined multifaceted interventions to reduce environmental allergen exposure in children with atopic asthma leaving in inner city, i.e. in densely populated neighbourhoods in large metropolitan areas inhabited by low income families (113-116).

Benefits

No certain benefits were found from using single or combined physical or chemical methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mite allergens in patients with persistent allergic rhinitis. However, the available evidence is of very low quality. In contrast, there is moderate quality evidence showing that impermeable bedding has no effect on symptoms of rhinitis. Similarly, no benefits were observed in studies using physical and/or chemical methods to reduce exposure to house dust mite allergens in patients with asthma.

Of the three randomised trials that examined multifaceted interventions to reduce environmental allergen exposure in children with atopic asthma, the Inner-City Asthma Study (113, 114) found fewer days with symptoms, unscheduled clinic visits, and less use of beta-agonist inhalers in the intervention group, compared to the controls. However, the intervention aimed at reducing the exposure to many indoor allergens and environmental tobacco smoke, most of the children were sensitive to many indoor allergens, had moderate or severe asthma, and less than 50% of them were receiving appropriate maintenance treatment according to the guidelines. Another randomized controlled trial (115) of multiple methods to reduce environmental allergen exposure in the homes of asthmatic children living in the inner city found improved daytime symptom scores in the treatment group. On the contrary, a multifaceted environmental and educational intervention in children with asthma living in urban environments (116) did not find the difference in asthma severity scores, medication use, emergency department visits or hospitalization between the intervention and control groups. We considered overall quality of evidence supporting multifaceted environmental interventions as very low due to inconsistency and imprecision of the results, and the indirectness of the population, because of inappropriate baseline treatment in the majority of patients.

Harms

There are no apparent downsides of using methods of reducing exposure to hose dust mite allergens except for the burden and cost of these interventions. Multifaceted environmental interventions may consume substantial healthcare resources. Moreover, compliance with allergen avoidance was low in the inner city asthma studies (117).

Conclusions and research needs

There seems to be no net clinical benefit from house dust mite avoidance measures in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis and/or asthma. However, many studies do not report or do not achieve reduction in house dust mite levels. Thus, there is uncertainty whether the lack of effect on symptoms of allergic rhinitis in these trials is due to inadequate reduction in allergen exposure or to ineffectiveness of this approach in spite of reduction in house dust mite levels. There may be net benefit from multifaceted environmental interventions for children with asthma living in inner city homes. Further adequately designed and executed trials of new methods of avoiding house dust mite allergens exposure or multifaceted interventions that measure patient-important outcomes are needed. This research, if done, may have important impact on this recommendation. These conclusions reflect a recent ARIA guidelines update (26) that reviewed the effectiveness of measures to change the indoor environment in the treatment of allergic rhinitis and asthma.

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and/or asthma sensitive to house dust mite allergens, we recommend that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use currently available single chemical or physical preventive methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mites (strong recommendation | low quality evidence) or their combination (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence), unless this is done in the context of formal clinical research.

We suggest multifaceted environmental control programmes be used in inner-city homes to improve symptoms of asthma in children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation to use multifaceted environmental control programmes in inner-city homes places a relatively high value on possible reduction in the symptoms of asthma in children, and relatively low value on the cost of such programmes.

Question 8

Should patients allergic to indoor moulds avoid exposure to these allergens at home?

Summary of findings

We found no systematic review addressing this question. We found two randomised trials that evaluated remediation aimed at moisture sources (118) or ultraviolet irradiation of homes (119).

Benefits

In one randomized trial (118), 62 asthmatic children living in a home with indoor mould, received an intervention including an asthma action plan and education. The remediation group also received household repairs (reduction of water infiltration, removal of water-damaged building materials,

and heating/ventilation/air-conditioning alterations). The control group received only home cleaning information. After 1 year the remediation group had a significant decrease in symptom days after remodelling, whereas these parameters in the control group did not change. The remediation group had a lower rate of acute care visits compared with control group, but the difference was not significant (10.0% vs 28.1%).In a second randomised, cross-over trial (119) centrally installed ultraviolet (UV) irradiation units were investigated among 19 asthmatic children sensitized to moulds. The authors reported improvement in asthma symptom scores, the number of days with asthma symptoms, total asthma medication use in children provided with UV irradiation units versus placebo, but this trial had methodological limitations and it was not clear if the difference between the groups was clinically important.

Harms

There were no definite adverse effects of these interventions but there is burden and cost.

Conclusions and research needs

Any net clinical benefit from methods aimed at reducing exposure to household moulds is very uncertain. Trials had methodological limitations, results were inconsistent, and there is some uncertainty about the directness of multiple interventions used in the study by Kercsmar and colleagues (118).
Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of methods aimed at reducing exposure to household moulds that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes are needed. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients allergic to indoor moulds, we suggest avoiding exposure to these allergens at home (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible reduction in the symptoms of rhinitis and asthma, and a relatively low value on the burden and cost of interventions aimed at reducing exposure to household moulds.

Question 9

Should patients allergic to animal dander avoid exposure to these allergens at home?

Summary of findings

We did not identify any systematic review directly addressing the question of pet allergen control measures in patients with allergic rhinitis. However, one recent systematic review reported 2 studies that investigated the clinical efficacy of air filtration units and concomitant environmental interventions in the homes of people with pet-allergic asthma who had pets (120). Authors' last literature search in September 2006 did not reveal any new trials since the original review was published in 2001.

One randomised trial has evaluated the effect of reducing levels of cat allergen on clinical symptoms in patients with cat allergy (121).

Benefits

Eight months of environmental control intervention (removing carpeting and upholstered furniture from bedrooms, and washing all walls and floors at study entry, weekly vacuuming floors, carpets, and furniture as well as washing bedding at 60°C (130°F), bimonthly applying tannic acid (3%) to carpeting and upholstered furniture, using polyester-filled duvets and pillows and impermeable covers, washing a cat every 2 weeks and keeping it out of bedroom), compared to no change in environment, reduced symptoms of nasal congestion, itching, and rhinorrhea (121). However, the results were very imprecise and there is some uncertainty about the directness of the environmental control intervention that influenced the exposure to other allergens as well.
One of the two small trials in patients with asthma included seven patients with rhinitis and found no significant changes in symptom scores in either the placebo or active groups, after 3 months of environmental control intervention (keeping cats from entering the bedroom, washing bedding once a week, and using high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) cleaner (122).
Two small trials included in the systematic review did not find any difference in asthma symptoms between intervention and control groups. In one study fewer patients reported difficulties in sleeping (4/9 vs. 12/14 in the intervention and control groups respectively) (122).

Harms

There are no direct harms associated with this intervention but there is burden and cost of using multiple environmental control measures.

Conclusions and research needs

Any benefit from avoiding exposure to animal dander at home of patients allergic to these allergens is very uncertain. Well designed and rigorously executed clinical studies of methods aimed at reducing exposure to animal dander at home that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes are needed to inform this recommendation. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis due to animal dander, we recommend avoiding exposure to these allergens at home (strong recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on potential reduction of symptoms of AR, and a relatively low value on psychosocial downsides of not having a pet or the inconvenience and cost of environmental control measures.

Remarks: Based on biological rationale, there is little doubt that total avoidance of animal allergens at home, and probably also marked reduction in their concentration, can improve symptoms, despite paucity of published data to substantiate this statement.

Question 10

Should immediate and total cessation of exposure to an occupational agent or exposure control be used in patients with occupational rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

One systematic review from the British Occupational Health Research Foundation (106) and one health technology assessment (123) assessed methods aimed at reducing occupational agent exposure for treatment of occupational asthma. The report by Beach and colleagues (123) was more extensive and provided more detailed information and we used it to inform this recommendation. Moreover, the findings of both reviews were consistent. Beach and colleagues found two small randomised trials (one employed respiratory devices in 26 farmers and the other compared reactions to various types of gloves in eight healthcare workers) and 52 cohort studies that investigated the effect of reducing exposure on asthma outcomes in workers with occupational asthma. Outcomes in workers with continued exposure was assessed in 14 studies, and reduced exposure in 18. Eight studies investigated the effectiveness of personal protection equipment. Most studies had methodological limitations and there was some uncertainty about the directness of the interventions due to confounding.

Benefits

Studies that assessed forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV_1) found that it improved over time in a minority of workers who were either removed from exposure or had reduced the exposure. In most studies symptoms either remained stable or deteriorated with continued exposure at work. On the other hand, the majority of studies that examined workers removed from exposure or whose exposure had been reduced reported improvement in asthma symptoms. Respiratory protective equipment reduced the severity, but did not eliminate symptoms. Only two studies measured quality of life and found that it did not differ among workers removed from exposure compared to those whose exposure had been reduced.

Harms

Seven studies examined socioeconomic outcomes among workers with occupational asthma and found that both workers removed from the workplace and those who continued the exposure suffered a loss in income. Two studies reported that a significant proportion of workers who were removed from exposure remained unemployed or took an early retirement (25% and 70% in each of the studies). The United Kingdom's Surveillance of Work-related and Occupational Respiratory Disease program found that 30% of people reported to have occupational asthma were unemployed when contacted later (124).

Conclusions and research needs

Specific measures reducing occupational agent exposure may be of net clinical benefit, but this likely depends on the type of causative agent. The overall quality of evidence supporting the reduction of exposure was very low.
Further research on cessation or reduction of occupational agent exposure is needed to inform this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with occupational asthma, we recommend immediate and total cessation of exposure to occupational allergen (strong recommendation | very low quality evidence). When total cessation of exposure is not possible, we suggest specific strategies aimed at minimizing occupational allergen exposure (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation to immediately and totally cease the exposure to occupational allergen places a relatively high value on reducing the symptoms of asthma and deterioration of lung function, and a relatively low value on the potential socioeconomic downsides (e.g. unemployment).

Pharmacological treatment of allergic rhinitis

Question 11

Should oral H1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Questions 11 and 12 should be considered as complimentary and indivisible.
We begin this section with a note on classification of H1-antihistamines. Then we evaluate whether oral H1-antihistamines should be used at all (Question 11). We consider old and new generation oral H1-antihistamines separately. Following these recommendations we compare old to new generation oral H1-antihistamines (Question 12).

Note on classification and terminology

H_1-antihistamines are a class of agents that share some mechanisms of action – they are antagonists of histamine at H_1 receptor sites or they act as inverse agonists. However, in addition to antagonising the effect of histamine, they have other actions that may contribute to the difference in their effectiveness or safety. There are many classifications of H_1-antihistamines according to their chemical structure (e.g. alkylamines, piperazines, piperidines, etc.), time when they reached the market (e.g. first generation versus second generation), or their adverse effects (e.g. sedating versus non-sedating, interacting with cytochrome P450 versus non-interacting, cardiotoxic versus non-cardiotoxic, interacting with food versus non-interacting etc.). All the above properties, except for chemical structure, are not dichotomous but rather a continuum with any threshold being arbitrary. Furthermore, the magnitude of these effects should be estimated with a systematic review of literature which is not yet available. As a result there is no consensus which H_1-antihistamine belongs to which group and this causes confusion for clinicians and patients.
In this document we use terms “old generation” or “new generation” as corresponding to the terms “older”, “first generation” or “sedating” and “newer”, “second generation” or “non-sedating” H_1-antihistamines. We chose not to use any functional designation, e.g. “sedating” or “non-sedating”, acknowledging that the degree of sedation is a continuum without a definite and reliable cut-off value and that this terminology does not take into account other potential adverse effects (e.g. cardiotoxicity or anticholinergic effect). We also did not rely on the commonly used definition of first and second generation based on the date threshold of 1980 when a particular medication reached the market (125).

Summary of findings

One systematic review addressed the question of the efficacy of oral H_1-antihistamines in reducing the symptom of nasal obstruction in adults with persistent allergic rhinitis (126).
Another systematic review of the effect of desloratadine in allergic rhinitis requires updating and could not be used to inform this recommendation (127).
One systematic review investigated the use of astemizole in allergic rhinitis and urticaria (128), but since astemizole and terfenadine have been withdrawn from the market and the review had considerable methodological limitations we did not consider it for this recommendation.
We did not identify any other systematic review of efficacy or safety of oral H_1-antihistamines compared to placebo in allergic rhinitis.

The ARIA guideline group has identified 78 trials of different oral H_1-antihistamines compared to placebo in patients with allergic rhinitis, that were published until the first quarter of 2007 (129-205).

Because no systematic review comparing oral H_1-antihistamines to placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis is available, we based the judgement about the quality of supporting evidence on an assumption that at least for two critical outcomes – quality of life and adverse effects – available evidence would be inconsistent and there would be a probability of publication and reporting bias. This assumption is based on the results of systematic reviews of trials that compared oral H1-antihistamines to active treatments (not to placebo) in allergic rhinitis.

Benefits

A systematic review found that oral H_1-antihistamines compared to placebo were more effective for nasal obstruction in patients with <u>persistent</u> allergic rhinitis (126). Since we could not identify any systematic review of the effectiveness of oral H_1-antihistamines compared to placebo in patients with <u>seasonal</u> allergic rhinitis overall effect and its magnitude are currently uncertain.

Harms

In the systematic review by Hore and colleagues (126) headache was the most common adverse event, but there was no statistically significant difference between the groups. The effect on fatigue was inconsistent across studies. In the absence of any other systematic review investigating the safety of oral H_1-antihistamines compared to placebo it is currently not feasible to estimate the magnitude of the risk of adverse effects. Based on unsystematic observations there is, however, concern about somnolence, headache, appetite stimulation, weight gain, QT interval prolongation, and altering of drug metabolism with some oral H_1-antihistamines, particularly those interacting with cytochrome P450 and P-glycoprotein (206-222).

Terfenadine and astemizole were withdrawn from the market in many countries because of serious cardiac adverse effects. Therefore, they were not considered for this recommendation.

Conclusions and research needs

Oral H_1-antihistamines may be of net clinical benefit in treatment of allergic rhinitis, but in absence of a systematic review the overall magnitude of the effect for both desirable and undesirable effects is not known. The only available systematic review of oral H1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis focused exclusively on nasal obstruction ignoring other outcomes important to patients.

A complete rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of all individual oral H1-antihistamines versus placebo in adults and children that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines. We based our current judgements on a less systematic evaluation of the evidence by the ARIA guideline panel members.
The ARIA guideline panel strongly supports that new generation oral H1-antihistamines be available worldwide, in particular in low to middle income countries.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we recommend new generation oral H_1-antihistamines that do not cause sedation and do not interact with cytochrome P450 (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).
In patients with AR, we suggest new generation oral H1-antihistamines that cause some sedation and/or interact with cytochrome P450 (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation to use new generation oral H_1-antihistamines that cause some sedation and/or interact with cytochrome P450 places a relatively high value on a reduction of symptoms of AR, and a relatively low value on side effects of these medications.

Remarks: Astemizole and terfenadine were removed from the market due to cardiotoxic side effects.

Question 12

Should new generation oral H_1-antihistamines versus old generation oral H1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of allergic rhinitis?

See the note on classification and terminology for question 11 above.

Summary of findings

One health technology report addressed the relative efficacy and safety of new generation ("non-sedating") compared to old generation ("sedating") oral H_1-antihistamines (225). Ten out of twelve randomised trials included in this review investigated terfenadine or astemizole as "non-sedating" oral H_1-antihistamines. Because both medications were withdrawn from the market in many countries for safety reasons, it was not possible to rely on the report by Long and colleagues to inform this recommendation.

One systematic review examined sedation and performance impairment with new generation H_1-antihistamines compared to old generation oral H_1-antihistamine – diphenhydramine (226).

We identified 13 randomised trials that directly compared new generation (referred to as "non-sedating") to old generation (referred to as "sedating") oral H_1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis. Three trials compared desloratadine with diphenhydramine (193, 227, 228), two compared fexofenadine with diphenhydramine (229) or hydroxizine (230), two compared cetirizine with chlorphenamine (231) or ketotifen (232), and six compared loratadine with chlorphenamine (233), diphenhydramine (234), brompheniramine (235), azatadine (236), and clemastine (149, 173, 237). Five trials were done in a laboratory environment and reported only data on sedation (227, 229-231, 234).

Benefits

Results of the studies that reported comparative efficacy of new generation versus old generation oral H_1-antihistamines were inconsistent. Two studies reported similar relief in nasal symptoms (173, 228), two favoured old generation antihistamine (193, 235), and four favoured new generation antihistamine (232, 233, 236, 237), although one used a non-standard high dose of the new generation medication (237). These variable results were similar to the results of other studies with terfenedine and astemizole included in the health technology assessment by Long and colleagues (225).

Harms

In a systematic review of sedation and performance impairment of diphenhydramine and new generation oral H_1-antihistamines (226), diphenhydramine decreased performance scores in comparison with new generation H1-antihistamines to a small or moderate extent (SMD: 0.31; 95% CI: 0.17–0.45), but the results of individual studies were inconsistent. Statistically significant difference was observed for self-reported sedation, attention, and memory. A small negative effect on performance was also observed in studies comparing new generation H_1-antihistamines to placebo (SMD: 0.14; 95% CI: 0.01–0.26), but the result is imprecise and includes a negligible difference close to no effect. Significant difference was observed for self-reported sedation and approached significance for reaction time.
In addition, in the 13 studies in allergic rhinitis that we identified, all but three reported less sedation with new generation oral H_1-antihistamines. The three remaining trials were all done in children and concluded there was no difference between the two kinds of medications (231, 232, 234).

Conclusions and research needs

There appears to be a net clinical benefit from using new generation oral H_1-antihistamines compared to older ones. Although their comparative efficacy seems similar, there is likely benefit from avoiding sedation and impaired performance. Because we did not conduct our own systematic review, we based our judgements about the quality of available evidence on unsystematic examination of the available evidence.
An updated rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of all individual new generation oral H1-antihistamines versus old generation oral H1-antihistamines that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines.
The ARIA guideline panel strongly supports that new generation oral H1-antihistamines be available worldwide.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we recommend new generation over old generation oral H_1-antihistamines (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on the reduction of adverse effects, and a relatively low value on an uncertain comparative efficacy of new versus old generation oral H_1-antihistamines.

Question 13

Should oral H_1-antihistamines be used in preschool children with other allergic diseases for the prevention of wheezing or asthma?

Summary of findings

Four randomised trials addressed the question whether oral H_1-antihistamines used in children with other allergic diseases prevent development of wheezing or asthma.
Two trials evaluated the use of ketotifen in children aged <3 years that were considered at high risk of developing asthma because they had atopic dermatitis and/or at least one parent or grandparent with a history of asthma or allergy, and/or elevated serum total IgE (238, 239). Both trials were small and had limitations in the design or execution.
One trial evaluated the use of cetirizine in children <2 years of age with atopic dermatitis and at least one parent or sibling with a history of asthma or allergy (240, 241). Another trial evaluated the effect of levocetirizine on the development of asthma in a similar population of children (218, 242), but its full results have not yet been published.

Benefits

Two trials that used ketotifen found a large reduction in the risk of developing asthma after one to 3 years of treatment. The trial that used cetirizine found no effect among all children studied after 18 months treatment, and an uncertain moderate effect in a post-hoc analysis of a subgroup of children with an elevated IgE level, mainly to grass pollen or house dust mites, at baseline.

Harms

Of the trials that used ketotifen one reported three cases of sedation, one case of vomiting, and one case of alopecia in the ketotifen group, and no side effects in the placebo group; the second trial did not report adverse events. In the trial that used cetirizine there were no significant differences in adverse events between the groups except for urticaria which was less frequent in the cetirizine group(240, 241, 243).

Conclusions and research needs

Any net clinical benefit from using oral H_1-antihistamine in high risk infants in terms of preventing or delaying the development of asthma is very uncertain. Full efficacy results of the Early Prevention of Asthma in Atopic Children (EPAAC) Trial (218, 242), when published, are very likely to have important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In infants with atopic dermatitis and/or family history of allergy or asthma (at high risk of developing asthma), we suggest clinicians do not administer and parents do not use oral H_1-antihistamines for the prevention of wheezing or asthma (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding side effects of oral H_1-antihistamines in infants, and a lower value on the very uncertain reduction in the risk of developing asthma or wheezing.

Remarks: The recommendation not to use oral H_1-antihistamines in these infants refers only to prevention of asthma or wheezing. The guideline panel did not consider other conditions in which these medications may be commonly used (e.g. urticaria).

Question 14

Should intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One recent systematic review assessed the effect of intranasal azelastine for the treatment of allergic rhinitis (244). However, we could not use its results to inform this recommendation, since it did not include several smaller studies (245-250) and pooled results from studies in patients with non-allergic rhinitis (251) or with very different and on occasion inadequate (252-254) duration of follow-up.

We found 19 randomised trials of azelastine compared to placebo (245-250, 252-264). Four studies had inadequate duration of follow-up (2 days in seasonal allergic rhinitis and 1 week in persistent rhinitis) and we did not consider them for this recommendation (252-254, 256). Of the remaining studies all but one were done in adults with seasonal (245, 246, 250, 255, 257-262, 264) or perennial (247, 248, 263) allergic rhinitis. One study was done in children with perennial allergic rhinitis (249). No study measured quality of life.
In adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis point estimates nasal symptom scores showed from 3–30% difference favouring azelastine 0.56 mg daily and 8–30% difference favouring azelastine 1.12 mg daily. However, most studies did not report variability in results so no combined estimate could be calculated and it is impossible to assess the precision of these findings.
Three studies assessed use of azelastine in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (247, 248, 263). One study that evaluated 19 patients used azelastine 1.12 mg daily and found a moderate effect favouring azelastine, but it did not exclude a large benefit or a small harm (effect size: -0.58, 95% CI: -1.51 to 0.35). Another study enrolled 130 patients and found no difference between the azelastine and placebo groups in nasal symptoms (data reported as graph with no variability) and the proportion of patients who rated their symptoms as improved (RB: 1.05, 95% CI: 0.80 to 1.36) (263). A third study reported that azelastine treatment was associated with the reduction in mean scores for sneezing, congestion, and rhinorrhea in selected time-points during the observation period, but it also reported the results as a graph only and did not provide any variability in results (247).
The only study performed in children with perennial allergic rhinitis enrolled 125 patients and found on average a 10–15% difference in symptoms favouring azelastine, but reported the results as a graph with no measure of variability (249). In this study children receiving azelastine were twice more likely to be rated by the investigator as improved (RB: 2.06, 95% CI: 1.38 to 3.17). (See evidence profiles 1–5 for question 14).

We did not identify any systematic review comparing other intranasal H1-antihistamines (olopatadine, levocabastine and antazoline) to placebo.

Our search for RCTs revealed two studies (published in four separate articles) done by the same group of investigators comparing olopatadine to placebo (265-268) and seven trials of levocabastine

versus placebo (269-275). We found no RCT of intranasal antazoline in patients with allergic rhinitis.

Two trials comparing olopatadine to placebo were done in adult patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (265-268). Both studies measured quality of life with the Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire and found that 0.6% solution of olopatadine improved quality of life by 0.45 points and 0.4% solution – by 0.35 points more than placebo compared to baseline values. However, the variability around these change estimates was not given in one trial hence it was not possible to combine their results (see evidence profile 7 and 8 for question 14). Both trials reported that symptoms of rhinitis improved more in the olopatadine treated patients compared to placebo. A mean difference in percentage change in symptom score from baseline was -11.7% (95% CI: -8.2 to -15.3) for 0.6% olopatadine compared to placebo and -8.9% (95% CI: -5.6 to -12.2) for 0.4% olopatadine compared to placebo. One additional study by the same group of investigators that was published only as an conference abstract confirmed these findings (276). Patients in the olopatadine groups were 16 to 27 times more likely to complain of bitter taste compared to placebo. Somnolence was 3 to 4 times more likely to occur in patients using olopatadine, but the estimates were very imprecise not excluding important harm or no effect.
We found only one study published as a conference abstract that investigated use of intranasal olopatadine in 924 adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (277). Authors concluded that olopatadine was superior to placebo in mean response to patient rated relief but did not provide a scale on which these were measured. Olopatadine also provided an increase in symptoms-free days compared to placebo (14.9% vs 9.5%). Epistaxis and bad/bitter taste were more common in patients receiving olopatadine.
We found one additional study published as a conference abstract that investigated use of intranasal olopatadine in 525 children aged 6–11 years with seasonal allergic rhinitis (278). Authors concluded that intranasal olopatadine 0.6% provided borderline statistically significant improvement in the overall Pediatric RQLQ and nose, practical problems and activity domains compared to placebo. However, authors reported neither estimated effects nor their precision.

All trials of intranasal levocabastine included adult patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis except for one that included also patients with non-allergic rhinitis (275). We did not consider this last trial for this recommendation, although it showed a mean difference in change from baseline of 0.9 point (0–12 point scale) indicating a small change of small clinical significance.
Of the six trials comparing intranasal levocabastine to placebo in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis none reported quality of life. Nasal symptoms were reported inconsistently and most studies did not report measure of variation. Overall intranasal levocabastine seems to have a moderate effect on nasal symptoms (see evidence profile 6 for question 14) and probably some effect on ocular symptoms, but the reporting of results in individual studies does not allow to draw certain conclusions. Adverse events were reported inconsistently and there seemed to be no difference between the groups. Somnolence or fatigue was reported in 2.6% vs 0.6% patients receiving levocabastine compared to placebo.

Benefits

Compared to placebo, intranasal H1-antihistamines showed a small to moderate effect on nasal symptoms in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis. However, many studies did not report variability in results and it was not possible to confidently estimate the magnitude of their effect and its precision. Quality of life was not measured in any study of intranasal azelastine and levocabastine, and it is not certain if the magnitude of effect observed in two studies of olopatadine would be important to patients.

Harms

The most frequently reported adverse effect of intranasal H1-antihistamines was unpleasant taste with azelastine and olopatadine (see evidence profiles for question 14). There is an increased risk of somnolence (see evidence profiles for question 14) with an pooled estimate of relative risk of 2.44 (95% CI: 1.22 to 4.87) over 7 studies of azelastine, 2 studies of levocabastine, and 2 studies of olopatadine. Assuming a baseline risk of somnolence of 0.5% (observed in these studies) this relative effect would translate into an absolute risk increase of 7 more patients experiencing somnolence per 1000 patients receiving intranasal H1-antihistamine (95% CI: 1–19 more per 1000).

Conclusions and research needs

A net clinical benefit of intranasal H_1-antihistamines is uncertain, because of imprecise estimates of the effects and poor reporting of many trials. Given the rare or mild adverse effects this class of agents may be beneficial in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis.
Answering this question requires an updated rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of all intranasal H1-antihistamines versus placebo that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects. Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of intranasal H1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes, if done, are very likely to have important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

We suggest intranasal H_1-antihistamines in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence) and in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). In adults and children with perennial/persistent AR, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use intranasal H1-antihistamines until more data on their relative efficacy and safety is available (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation to use intranasal H_1-antihistamines in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on reduction of symptoms, and a relatively low value on the risk of rare or mild side effects. The recommendation not to use intranasal H_1-antihistamines in patients with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on their uncertain efficacy and possible side effects, and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in symptoms.

Question 15

Should new generation oral H_1-antihistamines versus intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One recent systematic review assessed the relative effect of intranasal azelastine compared to new generation oral H_1-antihistamine for the treatment of allergic rhinitis (244). However, we could not use it to inform this recommendation, since it did not provide a meaningful estimate of the effect for the outcomes of interest for this guideline.

We found 9 randomised trials that compared intranasal H1-antihistamines to a new generation oral H1-antihistamines (255, 279-286). We did not consider studies that used old generation oral H1-antihistamines as well as studies that used astemizole or terfenadine as comparator, since they have been removed from the market because of adverse effects and no longer represent a therapeutic option in allergic rhinitis. An additional article (287) reported the results of the same study that we already included (282).
Seven studies compared intranasal versus oral H1-antihistamine in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (255, 280-284, 286), one study was done in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (285), and one in children with perennial allergic rhinitis (279).

All studies done in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis used azelastine as intranasal medication, except for one that used levocabastine (286). Of trials that used azelastine, four used a dose of 0.56 mg/d (255, 281, 282, 284) and two used 1.12 mg/d (280, 283). Many of these studies did not report a measure of variability in the results, thus obtaining a combined estimate of the effects was not possible. However, based on the studies that properly reported their results and on the point estimates from the other studies, it is likely that intranasal and oral H1-antihistamines have a similar effect on nasal and ocular symptoms in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (see evidence profile 1 for question 15). Incidence of somnolence was lower in patients receiving intranasal than in those receiving oral H1-antihistamines (RR: 0.39, 95% CI: 0.16 to 0.98). However, these results are very uncertain, because of the small number of events.

One study investigated the use of intranasal azelastine 0.56 mg/d compared to oral cetyrizine 10 mg in 40 adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (285). After 8 weeks of treatment mean total symprom score was lower in azelastine compared with cetirizine group, but authors reported neither the scale on which symptom score was measured nor the variability in these results. Rating of the efficacy of treatment by the investigators was also similar in azelastine and cetirizine treated patients (see evidence profile 2 for question 15).

One study with serious limitations compared intranasal levocabastine to oral cetirizine in children with perennial allergic rhinitis (279). This study found no difference between the two treatments but its results were very imprecise and indirect (see evidence profile 3 for question 15).

Benefits

Intranasal H1-antihistamines seem to equally effectively improve nasal and ocular symptoms as new generation oral H1-antihistamines. However, these estimates are imprecise.

Harms

Intranasal and oral H_1-antihistamines were well tolerated in these studies, but their adverse effects were reported inconsistently. The most common side effect with azelastine was bitter taste (up to 11% of patients). Somnolence was more frequent in the oral than in intranasal H1-antihistamine treated patients by the results were imprecise and it is likely that the oral H1-antihistamines differ in their potential of causing somnolence.

Conclusions and research needs

Intranasal H_1-antihistamines appear to be equally beneficial as new generation oral H_1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis. The net benefit with intranasal versus newer oral H_1-antihistamines may depend on patients' preference regarding the route of administration. There is some evidence that patients prefer oral to intranasal medications, however this was shown in

patients with migraine not in those with rhinitis (288). Intranasal H1-antihistamines may be beneficial in patients who experience somnolence while using oral medication.
Answering this question requires a rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of all intranasal versus oral H1-antihistamines that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects. Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of intranasal versus oral H1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes, if done, are likely to have important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

We suggest new generation oral H_1-antihistamines rather than intranasal H_1-antihistamines in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and in adults with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). In children with intermittent or persistent allergic rhinitis we also suggest new generation oral H_1-antihistamines rather than intranasal H_1-antihistamines (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: These recommendations place a relatively high value on probable higher patient preference for oral versus intranasal route of administration as well as avoiding bitter taste of some intranasal H_1-antihistamines, and relatively low value on increased somnolence with some new generation oral H_1-antihistamines. In many patients with different values and preferences or those who experience adverse effects of new generation oral H_1-antihistamines an alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

Question 16

Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

Three systematic reviews compared oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (LTRA) with placebo (289-291) in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Two were published in 2006 (289, 291) and one in 2004 (290). Of two more recent reviews one was methodologically more sound, included trials of all LTRAs (289) and, therefore, we used this review to inform this recommendation and to create the evidence profiles. Findings of all three reviews were in agreement. Most studies were of high methodological quality. Montelukast was the LTRA used in all studies that reported outcomes considered for this recommendation.

No systematic review compared oral LTRA with placebo in patients with perennial or persistent allergic rhinitis.

Two randomised trials compared the use of oral LTRA with placebo in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (292, 293) and one trial compared LTRA with placebo in children aged 2–6 years with perennial allergic rhinitis (294).

Benefits

In patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis oral montelukast compared to placebo reduced daytime (SMD: 0.24, 95% CI: 0.16 to 0.33) and night-time nasal symptoms (SMD: 0.23, 95% CI: 0.16 to 0.30), eye symptoms (SMD: 0.17, 95% CI: 0.08 to 0.27), and improved quality of life (SMD: 0.27, 95% CI: 0.19 to 0.34). However, the effect was small. One small trial with methodological limitations included 33 adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis and found no difference in total symptoms between zafirlukast and placebo (295).
In adults with perennial allergic rhinitis montelukast compared to placebo reduced daytime symptoms but the difference was very small and clinically negligible (292, 293). In preschool children with perennial allergic rhinitis montelukast compared to placebo moderately improved daytime symptoms, sleep at night, and quality of life, but the results were very imprecise (294).

Harms

Studies enrolling patients with seasonal or perennial allergic rhinitis showed a low incidence of adverse effects and there was no difference between treatment groups.

Conclusions and research needs

There is small net clinical benefit of oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. In patients with perennial allergic rhinitis there is a possible small benefit in preschool children but no clinically relevant benefit in adults.

Recommendation

We suggest oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults and children with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | high quality evidence) and in preschool children with perennial allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence). In adults with perennial allergic rhinitis we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (conditional recommendation | high quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation to use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults and children with seasonal allergic rhinitis and in preschool children with perennial allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on their safety and tolerability, and relatively low value on their limited efficacy and high cost.

The recommendation not to use oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on their very limited efficacy and high cost, and relatively low value on potential small benefit in few patients.

Remarks: Evidence is available only for montelukast. This recommendation refers to the treatment of rhinitis, not to the treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis (see recommendation 45).

Question 17

Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists versus oral H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

Three systematic reviews compared oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (LTRA) with oral H1-antihistamines in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (289-291). Of two more recent reviews one was methodologically more sound (289) and, therefore, used to create the evidence profile. Findings of all three reviews were in agreement. Most studies were of high methodological quality. Montelukast was the LTRA used in all studies.

No systematic review compared oral LTRA with oral H1-antihistamines in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis.

Three randomised trials compared the use of oral LTRA with oral H1-antihistamines in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis – two compared montelukast vs cetirizine in adults (292) and in children (294), and one compared zafirlukast vs loratadine or combined loratadine and pseudoephedrine (296).

Benefits

In patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis there was no difference between oral LTRA and oral H1-antihistamines in daytime and night-time nasal symptoms, eye symptoms, or quality of life.
In adults with perennial allergic rhinitis there was no difference between montelukast and cetirizine in standard doses in daytime and night-time symptom scores, eye symptom score, and quality of life.
In children with perennial allergic rhinitis differences in daytime and night-time symptom scores, eye symptom score, and quality of life between montelukast and cetirizine were small and inconsistent across outcomes.
Zafirlukast did not show a consistent benefit over loratadine or combined loratadine and pseudoephedrine in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis.

Harms

In studies in seasonal or perennial allergic rhinitis a low incidence of adverse effects was observed that was not different between groups. Zafirlukast has the potential for drug interactions (e.g. it increases the half-life of warfarin).

Conclusions and research needs

There is no apparent net clinical benefit of oral leukotriene receptor antagonists over oral H1-antihistamines, or vice versa, in patients with seasonal or perennial allergic rhinitis.

Recommendation

We suggest oral H_1-antihistamines over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and in preschool children with perennial allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding resource expenditure.

Question 18

Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One systematic review published in 2008 investigated the effects of mometasone fuorate nasal spray compared to placebo in patients with allergic rhinitis (297). We did not identify any systematic review of studies comparing intranasal glucocorticosteroids other than mometasone to placebo in adults.
One systematic review addressed the question of the efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in reducing the symptoms of nasal obstruction in children with intermittent and persistent allergic rhinitis, but found only three small trials in two of which the data analysis was flawed and in the third trial it was incomprehensible (298). However, this systematic review (298) excluded 17 other studies performed in children in which the use of a rescue medication was permitted. Should these studies be included in the analysis (provided that the medications were used similarly in experimental and control groups) the information on the effect of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in children could be estimated more accurately. Therefore, we did not use this review to inform this recommendation.

We found additional 117 randomised placebo-controlled trials of intranasal glucocorticosteroids other than mometasone fuorate in adults and children with allergic rhinitis (270, 299-328)(329-358)(250, 261, 272, 359-385)(263, 386-411). Despite the abundance of randomised trials, there is no systematic review comparing intranasal glucocorticosteroids other than mometasone fuorate to placebo in adults with allergic rhinitis. Therefore, we based our judgements on the systematic review of mometasone fuorate (297). We were not able to perform a complete systematic review of all individual intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus placebo for this revision of ARIA guidelines. Thus, we generalized the conclusions of the systematic review of mometasone to other intranasal glucocorticosteroids acknowledging that the evidence is indirect.

Intranasal glucocorticosteroids were also compared to other active treatments for allergic rhinitis. Two systematic reviews (412, 413) and one health technology assessment (225) compared intranasal glucocorticosteroids to oral H1-antihistamines (see Question 19), one systematic review compared them to intranasal H1-antihistamines (414) (see Question 20), and three systematic reviews compared them to oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (289-291) (see Question 21).

Benefits

Based on the systematic review of mometasone versus placebo (297), intranasal glucocorticosteroids moderately reduce nasal symptoms of congestion (SMD: 0.41 [95% CI: 0.27 to 0.56]), rhinorrhea (SMD: 0.44 [95% CI: 0.21 to 0.66]), sneezing (SMD: 0.40 [95% CI: 0.23 to 0.57]), and itching (SMD: 0.39 [95% CI: 0.25 to 0.53]) in adults with allergic rhinitis (see evidence profile 1 for question 18). The effect on nasal symptoms was similar in adults with seasonal (SMD: 0.52 [95% CI: 0.30 to 0.74) and perennial/persistent (SMD: 0.62 [95% CI: 0.41 to 0.83]) allergic rhinitis. None of the studies measured quality of life.
One study was performed in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis and found an effect of mometasone on nasal symptoms similar to that in adults (SMD: 0.41 [95% CI: 0.17 to 0.65]) (415).

Harms

In the systematic review of mometasone fuorate vs placebo the proportion of patients who experienced adverse events was similar in mometasone and placebo groups (RR: 0.99 [95% CI: 0.81 to 1.20]). Systematic reviews of other intranasal glucocorticosteroids compared to other active treatments reported low incidence of adverse effects. Epistaxis, headache, taste perversion, and pharyngitis were the most frequently reported side-effects of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in the reviews (225, 414). None of the short-term treatment studies analyzed in the reviews reported systemic side effects from intranasal glucocorticosteroids, although there has been concern that the prolonged use of intranasal glucocorticosteroids may be associated with systemic adverse effects including suppression of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis and suppression of growth in children. Although these effects were observed in few studies we were not able to identify any systematic review to inform the assessment of the risk and its magnitude.

Conclusions and research needs

Intranasal glucocorticosteroids may be of net clinical benefit in patients with allergic rhinitis, but the overall magnitude of the effect for both desirable and undesirable effects compared to placebo is not known. However, intranasal glucocorticosteroids compared to other active treatments in allergic rhinitis show a consistent moderately better effect on nasal symptoms. Further research is needed to answer the question about the efficacy and safety of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in children. A complete rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of all individual intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus placebo that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines.

Recommendation

We recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults (strong recommendation | high quality evidence) and suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids in children with allergic rhinitis (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on the efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, and a relatively low value on avoiding their possible adverse effects.

Question 19

Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus oral H1-antihistamines be used in patients with allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

Two systematic reviews (412, 413) and one health technology assessment (225) addressed the relative effect of intranasal glucocorticosteroids compared to oral H1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis. We considered the two systematic reviews as outdated since they were published in 1998. The health technology assessment was published in 2002 and found 3 more randomised trials that were not included in the systematic review by Weiner et al. (412). Long et al. did not perform a formal meta-analysis, because many of the original studies did not report data on variability of the outcome estimates (225). The majority of the studies included in these reviews investigated astemizole or tefenadine – two oral H1-antihistamines that were withdrawn from the market due to their cardiotoxicity – leaving seven studies that used currently available medications.

Our search revealed four more randomised trials since the search performed by Long et al. (225) – two in children (416, 417) and two in adults with seasonal (418) and perennial allergic rhinitis (419).

Altogether 8 randomised trials were performed in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (one trial included also children) (418, 420-426), one in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis (417), one in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (419), and one in children with perennial allergic rhinitis (416).

Two systematic reviews compared the use of intranasal glucocorticosteroids to oral H1-antihistamines plus oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (289, 291).

Benefits

In all studies conducted in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis, except for one (424), intranasal glucocorticosteroids were superior to oral H1-antihistamines in relieving symptoms of rhinitis. On average the effect was moderate. Quality of life was assessed in 3 of these studies (418, 425, 426) and was found to be improved more with intranasal glucocorticosteroids, although the magnitude of effect is not possible to estimate without formal meta-analysis.
One relatively small randomised trial found that intranasal glucocorticosteroid compared to oral H1-antihistamine at least moderately reduced nasal symptoms in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (419).
One small trial with serious methodological limitations and imprecise results showed that intranasal glucocorticosteroid may improve nasal symptoms and short-term memory compared to oral H1-antihistamine in children aged 8–17 years with seasonal allergic rhinitis (417). A very small trial showed improvement in nasal symptoms with intranasal glucocorticosteroid compared to oral H1-antihistamine in children 2–4 years of age with perennial rhinitis (416).
In randomised trials that compared intranasal glucocorticosteroid to combined oral H1-antihistamine plus oral leukotriene receptor antagonist there was no difference in nasal symptoms except for a possible effect of intranasal glucocorticosteroids on nasal congestion, but the results were very imprecise.

Harms

There were no major adverse effects reported in the included studies. Minor adverse effects were headache and pharyngitis that were inconsistent across the studies. In one study that used chlorphenamine sedation and dry mouth were most frequently reported adverse effects of an oral H1-antihistamine (420).

Conclusions and research needs

Intranasal glucocorticosteroids may be of net clinical benefit compared to oral H1-antihistamines in adults with seasonal and perennial allergic rhinitis. There is very little and low quality evidence, that there also may be a net benefit from intranasal glucocorticosteroids compared to oral H1-antihistamines in children.
A complete rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus oral H1-antihistamines that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines.

There is a need for well designed and rigorously executed (74, 75) trials measuring patient-important outcomes in adults with persistent allergic rhinitis and in children.

Recommendation

In patients with seasonal AR, we suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral H_1-antihistamines in adults (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence) and in children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). In patients with perennial/persistent AR, we suggest intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral H_1-antihistamines in adults (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and in children (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on the likely higher efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids. In many patients with strong preference for oral versus intranasal route of administration an alternative choice may be reasonable.

Question 20

Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus intranasal H_1-antihistamines be used in patients with allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

Two systematic reviews assessed the relative efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids compared to intranasal H1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis (414, 427, 428). After evaluating the methodological quality of the reviews, we used the review by Yáñez and Rodrigo (414) to prepare the summary of evidence, but the results of both reviews were consistent providing similar results with the same clinical interpretation.
We identified one additional small randomised trial evaluating the relative effect of intranasal mometasone compared to intranasal levocabastine published since the search for these systematic reviews was done (429).

Benefits

In nine studies included in this review (414) that enrolled 648 subjects intranasal corticosteroids moderately more reduced total nasal symptoms (SMD: -0.36, 95% CI: -0.57 to -0.14), (SMD: 0.41, 95% CI: -0.57 to -0.24), rhinorrhea (SMD: 0.47, 95% CI: -0.64 to -0.29), itching (SMD: 0.38, 95% CI: -0.56 to -0.19), and nasal blockage (SMD: -0.86, 95% CI: -1.07 to -0.64) compared with intranasal H1-antihistamines. There was no difference between the treatments for ocular symptoms and nasal congestion. However, for ocular symptoms two studies that compared intranasal corticosteroid to azelastine showed greater benefit from intranasal corticosteroid (261, 307) and two studies using levocabastine as comparator showed small benefit from H1-antihistamine (272, 274). One additional study that we identified confirmed these findings (429).

Harms

A low incidence of adverse effects was observed and there was no difference between groups. Most adverse events were rated as mild or moderate. The most frequently reported adverse events were respiratory symptoms, headache, epistaxis, and taste perversion with intranasal H1-antihistamines.

Conclusions and research needs

Treatment with intranasal glucocorticosteroids compared to intranasal H1-antihistamines is of net clinical benefit.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids rather than intranasal H_1-antihistamines (strong recommendation | high quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, and a relatively low value on their rare adverse effects.

Question 21

Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus oral leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

Three systematic reviews compared intranasal glucocorticosteroids with oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (LTRA) in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (289-291). Two were published in 2006 (289, 291) and one in 2004 (290). Of two more recent reviews one was methodologically more sound (289) and therefore was used to create evidence profile. Findings of all three reviews were in agreement. Most studies were of high methodological quality. Montelukast was the LTRA used in all studies.

No systematic review or randomised trial compared intranasal glucocorticosteroids with oral LTRA in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis.

Two systematic reviews reported information on adverse effects of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, but none reported quantitative data allowing estimating the magnitude of the risk (225, 414).

Benefits

Intranasal glucocorticosteroids compared to oral LTRA moderately reduced daytime and night-time nasal symptoms in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. No trial reported data on quality of life.

Harms

Low incidence of adverse effects was observed in patients taking oral LTRA, and there was no difference compared to placebo (289, 292, 293).
Systematic reviews of intranasal glucocorticosteroids reported low incidence of adverse effects – epistaxis, headache, taste perversion, and pharyngitis were the reported side-effects of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in the systematic reviews (225, 414). None of the short-term treatment studies included in the reviews reported systemic side effects from intranasal glucocorticosteroids.

Conclusions and research needs

There appears to be net clinical benefit of intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral LTRA in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Intranasal glucocorticosteroids are more efficacious, but they may have more adverse effects.

There is a need for rigorously designed and executed randomised trials of intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus oral LTRA in adults and children with seasonal allergic rhinitis that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes, including adverse effects.
A rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of adverse effects of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, especially in children, is required.

Recommendation

In patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis we recommend intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a high value on the efficacy of intranasal glucocorticosteroids.

Remarks: Evidence is available for montelukast only.

Question 22

Should oral glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in patients not responding to other therapy?

Summary of findings

We could not identify any systematic review, randomised trial, or controlled observational study that evaluated the use oral glucocorticosteroids in patient with allergic rhinitis not responding to other therapy.

Two randomised trials compared oral glucocorticosteroids in patients with allergic rhinitis, but one investigated the efficacy of different doses of methylprednisolone versus placebo in patients not treated with other medications (430), and the other compared prednisone 7.5 mg for 3 weeks with single intramuscular injection of betamethasone diproprionate also in patients not treated with other medications (431).

Benefits

In one of these studies oral methylprednisolone was significantly more effective than oral placebo (430) and in the other prednisone was equally effective in relieving symptoms as single intramuscular injection of betamethasone for three weeks (431). Systemic glucocorticosteroids, in contrast to intranasal treatment, reach all parts of the nose and the paranasal sinuses. Based on unsystematic observations, short courses of oral glucocorticosteroids in patients with severe perennial rhinitis or nasal polyps can be helpful.

Harms

Long-term treatment with oral glucocorticosteroids is associated with severe side effects. There is however little evidence that short-term is harmful. Two systematic reviews of treatment of acute asthma with systemic corticosteroids (432, 433) found that side effects were reported as being “rare” in most studies and were similar in frequency in both groups receiving or not receiving systemic glucocorticosteroids (see recommendation 23).

Conclusions and research needs

Short courses of oral glucocorticosteroids may be of net clinical benefit in patients with allergic rhinitis not responding to other therapy, but the benefit is very uncertain and is based on unsystematic clinical observations. Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trial of short course of oral glucocorticosteroids in patients with allergic rhinitis not responding to other therapy that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes is needed. If done, it is very likely to have important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and moderate to severe nasal and/or ocular symptoms that are not controlled with other treatments, we suggest short course of oral glucocorticosteroids (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible relief of severe symptoms, and a relatively low value on avoiding possible side effects of a short course of oral glucocorticosteroids.

Remarks: Systemic glucocorticosteroids should not be considered as a first line of treatment for AR. They can be used for few days as a last resort of treatment when combinations of other medications are ineffective. Oral glucocorticosteroids should be avoided in children, pregnant women, and patients with known contraindications.

Question 23

Should intramuscular glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One recent systematic review reported 11 randomised trials and 7 case series of using intramuscular (i.m.) glucocorticosteroids in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (434). Included trials compared i.m. glucocorticosteroids to placebo in 5 trials, or other glucocorticosteroid – intranasal (2 trials), oral (1 trial), or other intramuscular (6 trials). Studies included altogether 1362 patients that were included in safety analysis. No study included children. All studies were conducted between the year 1960 and 1988. Majority of studies used single doses of i.m. glucocorticosteroid corresponding to 80 mg of methylprednisolone (equivalent to 100 mg oral prednisone).

Three other systematic reviews included trials of i.m. glucocorticosteroids in adults for early emergency department treatment of acute asthma (432), for preventing relapse following acute exacerbations of asthma (433), and investigating the risk of avascular joint necrosis associated with glucocorticosteroid use (435). These were also used to assess safety of single injection of i.m. glucocorticosteroid.

No systematic review or randomised trial assessed the use of i.m. glucocorticosteroids in children with allergic rhinitis. Three systematic reviews assessed studies of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids used in children hospitalised with acute asthma (3 trials, 103 children) (436), prevention and treatment of post-extubation stridor (2 trials, 89 children; adverse events were did

not measured) (437), and for improving recovery following tonsillectomy (9 studies, 695 children) (438). Data from these reviews were used to assess safety in children.

Benefits

Single injection of an intramuscular glucocorticosteroid at a dose corresponding to 80 mg of methylprednisolone (equivalent of 100 mg oral prednisone) significantly reduces nasal symptoms throughout the pollen season compared to placebo. In two trials that compared single injection of i.m. glucocorticosteroid (2 or 5 mg betamethasone disodium phosphate or 80 mg methylprednisolone) were superior to intranasal beclomethasone 100 µg twice daily in one study, and equally effective when compared to intranasal budesonide 400 µg once daily (with increased use of supplementary medicines in the nasal steroid group). Quality of life was not measured in any of the included studies. There is a benefit of convenience of one drug injection compared to regular daily use of other medications.

Harms

In five trials that compared i.m. glucocorticosteroid to placebo all reported clinical side effects were considered minor. There was no statistically significant difference in side effects between the groups, not even in one study in which three consecutive i.m. injections of 80 mg methylprednisolone were given at weekly intervals. Altogether in randomised trials and in case series of patients receiving i.m. glucocorticosteroid no side effects or miscellaneous minor side effects were reported in a few participants. Reported adverse effects were pain at the site of injections, menstrual irregularities, flushing, tiredness, nervousness, and blue skin marks. Subcutaneous irritations with slight atrophy in 1.5% out of 949 injections were reported in one study. One series of eight cases showed peptic ulcer symptoms, peripheral cramps, or uveitis in three of the participants (434).
In addition, a systematic review of avascular joint necrosis found that while risk is associated with increased daily glucocorticosteroid dosage, no increased risk was observed with single bolus dosing (435). Two systematic reviews of early emergency department treatment of acute asthma with systemic corticosteroids (432) and use of systemic glucocorticosteroids for preventing relapse following acute exacerbations of asthma (433) found that side effects were reported as being “rare” in most studies and were similar in frequency in both groups.

None of three trials in children hospitalised with acute asthma formally addressed the issue of safety although all authors suggested that short courses of steroids were safe when used to treat acute exacerbations of asthma. Nine trials in children following tonsillectomy used dexamethasone in doses ranging from 0.15 to 1.0 mg/kg (maximum dose range = 8 to 25 mg). No adverse events attributable to dexamethasone were reported in these trials. Authors of the systematic review have additionally stated that “in their 10-year experience of routine use of intravenous dexamethasone during paediatric tonsillectomy (approximately 800 per year), there have been no attributable, adverse events”. Authors have also not found any reports in the literature of complications from use of intravenous dexamethasone during paediatric tonsillectomy.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids compared to other treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis is unlikely. Clinical importance of adverse effects and complications of intramuscular glucocorticosteroid injections, no matter how infrequent they are, seem to outweigh the importance of any burden of the symptoms of allergic rhinitis. Evidence for both benefit and harms in adults is of low quality. There is no evidence of use of intramuscular

glucocorticosteroids for allergic rhinitis in children. Further research is unlikely, because of ethical considerations.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we recommend that clinicians do not administer intramuscular glucocorticosteroids (strong recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible side effects of a single or multiple injections of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids, and relatively low value on their efficacy and convenience of use.

Remarks: Possible side effects of intramuscular glucocorticosteroids may be far more serious than the condition they are supposed to treat (*i.e.* AR).

Question 24

Should intranasal chromones be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One systematic review reporting 25 studies (427, 428) and one health technology assessment reporting 32 studies (225) assessed the relative efficacy of intranasal chromones compared placebo in patients with seasonal or perennial allergic rhinitis. Authors of the health technology report did not perform a formal meta-analysis, because many studies did not report data on variability of the outcome estimates.

Benefits

In all trials reviewed by Long and colleagues (225), except for two, significant improvement in symptoms of rhinitis were observed in patients treated with chromones compared to placebo. In 16 of the studies, at least three of the five common symptoms associated with allergic rhinitis (nasal itch, sneezing, rhinorrhea, nasal congestion, or postnasal drip) were significantly improved by treatment with a chromone compared to placebo. Frequently one of the nonresponsive symptoms was congestion. In 17 of 18 studies (14 of seasonal and 4 of perennial allergic rhinitis) that reported patient preference for or patient willingness to use the medication in the future there was a clear-cut preference for the chromone. Overall, in the report by Long and colleagues (225) chromones were effective for reducing symptoms associated with allergic rhinitis, although the magnitude of the effect and its precision cannot be assessed without meta-analysis. Authors concluded, that chromones seemed to have higher efficacy in seasonal than in perennial allergic rhinitis. Higher doses (including higher frequency of dosing) seemed to be more effective.

In the systematic review by Lange and Bachert (427, 428) the risk of therapy failure as judged by the patients was lower when intranasal chromones were used instead of placebo (17 trials, 2299 patients; relative risk: 0.52, 95% CI: 0.38 to 0.70). Nasal symptoms were also improved with chromones compared to placebo (9 trials, 1036 patients; SMD: -0.26, 95% CI: -0.41 to -0.12).

Harms

In the trials included in the report by Long and colleagues (225) no major adverse events were reported. Minor side effects included a high frequency of nasal irritation (18/29 studies), headache, and nasal congestion.

Conclusions and research needs

Despite its limited efficacy, treatment with intranasal chromones may be of net clinical benefit for some patients because of mild side effects. We concluded that overall quality of evidence supporting the use of intranasal chromones in allergic rhinitis is moderate, since most included studies had important methodological limitations.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest intranasal chromones (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on excellent safety and tolerability of intranasal chromones, and relatively low value on their limited efficacy and on limiting resource expenditure.

Remarks: The need for administration 4 times daily is likely to reduce patient adherence and reduce efficacy.

Question 25

Should intranasal H_1-antihistamines versus intranasal chromones be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One systematic review reporting 4 studies and 332 patients assessed the relative efficacy of intranasal H_1-antihistamines compared to intranasal chromones (427, 428).

One additional randomised trial including 82 patients evaluated relative efficacy of levocabastine and disodium cromoglycate in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (429).

Benefits

The risk of therapy failure as judged by the patients was lower when using intranasal H_1-antihistamines compared to intranasal chromones (relative risk: 0.46, 95% CI: 0.31 to 0.68). Nasal symptoms and other efficacy data could not be summarised due to the lack of usable data, but studies showed that intranasal H_1-antihistamines were either more effective or similarly effective in relieving rhinitis symptoms compared to chromones; no study favoured chromones (428). One additional small trial showed no difference in symptom scores between levocabastine and cromoglycate, but it was designed to compare intranasal mometasone with levocabastine and placebo, and could be underpowered to show a small difference.

Harms

Adverse effects were inconsistently reported. There seemed to be no difference in adverse effects between the groups and they were usually confined to mild local reactions.

Conclusions and research needs

There may be a small net clinical benefit of intranasal H_1-antihistamines over intranasal chromones in patients with allergic rhinitis. We concluded that overall quality of evidence supporting the use of intranasal H_1-antihistamines over intranasal chromones in allergic rhinitis is low, since studies had important methodological limitations and the results were imprecise.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest intranasal H_1-antihistamines over intranasal chromones (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on possibly higher efficacy of intranasal H_1-antihistamines, and relatively low value on safety and tolerability of intranasal chromones.

Remarks: Chromones require administration 4 times daily that may limit patient adherence to treatment and reduce efficacy.

Question 26

Should intranasal ipratropium bromide be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

We were not able to identify any systematic review assessing the use of intranasal ipratropium bromide in treatment of allergic rhinitis.

We found six randomised trials comparing intranasal ipratropium bromide to placebo that included adults with perennial allergic rhinitis (439-441) and mixed populations with allergic and non-allergic rhinitis – both adults (442, 443) and children (444).

One study compared intranasal ipratropium bromide to intranasal glucocorticosteroid in children (445).

Benefits

All trials found that ipratropium effectively controlled rhinorrhea. In one study combined use of ipratropium bromide nasal spray with beclomethasone dipropionate nasal spray was more effective in controlling rhinorrhea than either treatment alone (443). In another study in school children with allergic and non-allergic perennial rhinitis ipratropium bromide nasal spray was as effective as beclomethasone dipropionate nasal spray in controlling rhinorrhea and provided some relief from congestion (445).

Harms

There were no serious adverse events in these studies. Some patients complained of dry nose but there was no difference in from placebo.

Conclusions and research needs

Intranasal ipratropium bromide may be of net clinical benefit in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis in controlling rhinorrhea. In the absence of a systematic review, we judged the overall quality of the evidence supporting this recommendation as moderate, since most trials were old and had some limitations, and there is uncertainty about the magnitude of the effect and its precision.

Recommendation

In patients with perennial AR, we suggest intranasal ipratropium bromide for treatment of rhinorrhea (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

Remarks: Intranasal ipratropium bromide is effective for rhinorrhea. It is unlikely to be beneficial for other symptoms of AR.

Question 27

Should intranasal decongestant be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

We were unable to identify any systematic reviews or randomised trials of intranasal decongestants in patients with allergic rhinitis.

We were also unable to identify any randomised trials comparing intranasal decongestants to placebo or to oral decongestants in allergic rhinitis. One clinical trial evaluated the effect xylometazoline nasal spray compared to cetirizine plus pseudoephedrine on nasal congestion in patients with persistent allergic rhinitis, but it used allergen challenge test and nasal cavity photographs to evaluate the results (446).

We did not search for observational studies evaluating intranasal decongestants for allergic rhinitis for this revision of the ARIA guidelines.

We found one systematic review of intranasal decongestants for the common cold (447), but we judged the evidence to be too indirect to inform this recommendation. We used it only to estimate the risk of harm.

Benefits

There are unsystematic observations that intranasal decongestants are modestly effective in the treatment of nasal obstruction in acute allergic and non-allergic rhinitis when used as rescue medications for up to three to five days. However, they seem not to improve other symptoms.

Harms

Systematic review of 7 trials in 740 adults (six studies assessed a single dose and three – multiple doses) found no serious side effects of intranasal decongestants (447). Insomnia occurred in 5% of

participants receiving intranasal decongestant and was more likely to occur with pseudoephedrine (odds ratio: 6.18, 95% CI: 1.38 to 27.66). Headache and hypertension occurred in less than 4% of patients and did not differ from placebo.
However, there is a concern that a prolonged use of intranasal decongestants for more than three to five days may lead to rebound swelling of the nasal mucosa and to drug-induced rhinitis (*rhinitis medicamentosa*)(448-450).

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit of intranasal decongestants in treatment of allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. There may be a net clinical benefit from prompt relief of nasal obstruction with a short course of intranasal decongestant administered along with other medications. However, there is concern about safety of intranasal decongestant when inappropriately used for more than three to five days.
Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trial of an intranasal decongestant versus placebo in patients receiving other medications for allergic rhinitis that measure and properly report (74, 75) all patient-important outcomes is needed. If done, it is likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In adults with allergic rhinitis and severe nasal obstruction, we suggest very short course (not longer than five days and preferably shorter) of intranasal decongestant while co-administering other drugs (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence). We suggest that clinicians do not administer and parents do not use intranasal decongestants in preschool children (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation for use of a very short course of an intranasal decongestant in adults with allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on the prompt relief of nasal obstruction, and relatively low value on avoiding the risk of adverse effects with a prolonged use of intranasal decongestant.

The recommendation against the use of an intranasal decongestant in children and against long-term use in adults places a relatively high value on avoiding the risk of serious adverse effects, and relatively low value on a possible benefit from a reduced nasal blockage.

Question 28

Should oral decongestant be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One recent systematic review assessed the efficacy and safety of oral phenylephrine (451), but only two of the 15 studies were done in populations that may have included patients with allergic rhinitis, so no information on efficacy could inform this recommendation.

One systematic review assessed the effect of pseudoephedrine on blood pressure and heart rate (452).

No systematic review investigated use of oral decongestant in patients with allergic rhinitis.

We found four randomised trials that directly compared pseudoephedrine to placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (453-456). None of these studies reported measures of variation in the symptom scores so it was not possible to combine their results. In all trials patients used pseudoephedrine regularly; no study investigated its use as a rescue medication.
No randomised trial assessed quality of life, the effect of oral decongestant in persistent or perennial allergic rhinitis, or use of oral decongestant in children.

Benefits

Results of all four studies point towards the small benefit from pseudoephedrine compared to placebo in relieving symptoms in patients with allergic rhinitis, although the exact magnitude of the effect and the precision of estimate are unknown. Response to treatment evaluated by physicians was fair on average both in patients receiving pseudoephedrine or placebo, with more patients taking pseudoephedrine judged to have excellent or good response, although the results were imprecise and included no difference.

Harms

In two of the four studies adverse events were reported by more patients taking pseudoephedrine with insomnia and dry mouth being the most pronounced side effects. In the other two studies it was not possible to estimate the difference in adverse events between pseudoephedrine and placebo.

Two systematic reviews found small increase in systolic blood pressure with phenylephrine 15 mg (2.7 mm Hg; 95% CI: 1.6 to 3.7), and with pseudoephedrine immediate-release formulations (1.53 mm Hg; 95% CI: 0.49–2.56), but not with sustained-release formulations (–0.98 mm Hg; 95% CI: –2.44 to 0.47).

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit from regular use of oral decongestants alone in seasonal allergic rhinitis is unlikely. Although there are no published reports supporting the use of oral decongestants alone as a rescue or “as needed” medication it may be of benefit for some patients.
Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trial of oral decongestant used as a rescue meditation versus placebo that measure and properly report (74, 75) all patient-important outcomes is needed. If done, it is likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use oral decongestants regularly (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of oral decongestants, and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks: Oral decongestants may be of benefit for some patients as a rescue or “as needed” medication.

Question 29

Should combination of oral decongestant and H_1-antihistamine versus oral H1-antihistamine alone be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One health technology assessment reporting 13 studies compared the combination of an oral H1-antihistamine with pseudoephedrine to oral H1-antihistamine alone in patients with seasonal and/or perennial allergic rhinitis (457).

We identified three additional randomised trials that have been published since the literature search for the review by McCrory and colleagues was done. All compared a combination of desloratadine plus pseudoephedrine with desloratadine alone in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (458-460).

Benefits

Trials included in the systematic review and subsequently published studies found a consistent small added benefit of combination of an oral H_1-antihistamine with pseudoephedrine compared to oral H1-antihistamine alone in relieving nasal symptoms other than congestion as well as nasal congestion. Quality of life was not assessed in any of the studies.

Harms

Reporting of adverse events in the older studies was inconsistent. Overall headache seemed the most common adverse event reported in both groups. Commonly reported in H_1-antihistamine group was somnolence, and in combination group: also somnolence, dry mouth, and insomnia.
In three trials of desloratadine not included in the systematic review adverse events, in particular somnolence, insomnia, and dry mouth, were more frequent in the combination group compared to oral H1-antihistamine alone, but the results were imprecise.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit from regular use of a combination of oral H_1-antihistamine and decongestant compared to oral H_1-antihistamine alone in allergic rhinitis is uncertain. Small improvement in nasal symptoms seems counterbalanced with increased risk of adverse effects.
We could not identify any published reports of using a combination of oral H_1-antihistamine and a decongestant as a rescue or “as needed” medication, which theoretically might have reduced the burden of adverse effects compared to regular use. Hence, the ARIA guideline panel felt “uncertain” about the effect of using a combination of these medications in patient with allergic rhinitis.
Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of a combination of oral H1-antihistamine and an oral decongestant used as a rescue meditation versus oral H1-antihistamine alone that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes are needed. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use regularly a combination of oral H_1-antihistamine and an oral decongestant, compared to oral H_1-antihistamine alone (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of oral decongestant, and a relatively low value on small additional reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks: In adults with symptoms not controlled with oral H_1-antihistamine alone who are less averse to side effects of oral decongestants an alternative choice may be equally reasonable. Administration of a combined treatment as a rescue medication may also be beneficial to some patients.

Question 30

Should intraocular H_1-antihistamines be used for the treatment of ocular symptoms in patients with allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One systematic review reporting 9 studies assessed the efficacy of intraocular H_1-antihistamines for treatment of allergic conjunctivitis (461). However, all except for two of included studies investigated topical H_1-antihistamines with allergen provocation tests. Moreover, many other trials were published since this review was done, so we could not use it to inform this recommendation.

We found seventeen placebo-controlled randomised trials that investigated intraocular H1-antihistamines in patients with allergic conjunctivitis. Six trials investigated two H1-antihistamines giving 23 comparisons. Seven trials investigated azelastine (462-468), one – epinastine (469), two – ketotifen (470, 471), nine – levocabastine (462, 463, 468, 469, 471-475), and four –olopatadine (470, 476-478). All studies enrolled adults and/or adolescents, and only one was done in children (468). Trials investigated patients with seasonal allergic conjunctivitis or rhinoconjuncivitis except for two that included patients with perennial allergic conjunctivitis (462, 467). No study was done explicitly in patients with allergic rhinitis.
Studies were of variable methodological quality. Most trials showed a consistent benefit from intraocular H1-antihistamines, but many did not report the measures of variation in the results, therefore a formal meta-analysis was not possible. No study reported quality of life.

Benefits

Based on patients' assessment, intraocular H1-antihistamines compared to placebo consistently improved ocular itching and redness, and had variable effect on other symptoms. None of the studies assessed quality of life. There is uncertainty about the effect of intraocular H1-antihistamines in patients with allergic rhinitis who already use other treatment for rhinitis, because in most studies concomitant treatment of rhinitis was not allowed.

Harms

Adverse events were reported variably. Application site reaction was the most frequent adverse effect reported. Based on the reported results it was three times more frequent with azelastine than with placebo, borderline statistically significantly more frequent with levocabastine than with placebo, and equally frequent with ketotifen, epinastine, olopatadine, and placebo. Azelastine caused taste perversion in 10–20% of patients.

Conclusions and research needs

Intraocular H1-antihistamines may be of net clinical benefit in patients with allergic rhinitis who have ocular symptoms, although in the absence of an up-to-date systematic review, poor reporting of results, and no information on quality of life the balance between desirable and undesirable effects is uncertain. We concluded overall quality of evidence supporting this recommendation to be low, because of important limitations in study execution and reporting, and uncertainty about how the results apply to patients with allergic rhinitis and concomitant ocular symptoms as opposed to patients with allergic conjunctivitis that were included in clinical trials. There is almost no information on the effect of intraocular H1-antihistamines in children.
A complete rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of all intraocular H1-antihistamines versus placebo in patients with allergic rhinitis and ocular symptoms that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines.

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and symptoms of conjunctivitis, we suggest intraocular H_1-antihistamines (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on consistent effectiveness of intraocular H_1-antihistamines, and relatively low value on their side effects and uncertain effectiveness in patients already using other medications for AR.

Remarks: Only one study was done in children.

Question 31

Should intraocular chromones be used for treatment of ocular symptoms in patients with allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One systematic review(461) reporting 13 randomised trials examined the difference between the use of intraocular sodium cromoglycate or nedocromil sodium compared to placebo.
Since the literature search for this systematic review had been done one additional trial was published that compared sodium cromoglycate to placebo in allergic conjunctivitis(465).
No trials were identified directly comparing one chromone with another.

Benefits

Sodium cromoglycate and nedocromil sodium when compared to placebo improved a variety of subjective symptoms (ocular itching, burning, soreness, and lacrimation), but the results of trials were inconsistent and poorly reported not allowing for a formal meta-analysis. Patients using intraocular sodium cromoglycate were 1.6 to 7 times more likely to perceive benefit than those using placebo, but the authors of a systematic review suggested a likelihood of publication bias in these studies. Adults using intraocular nedocromil sodium were 1.2 to 1.8 times more likely to perceive a benefit than those using placebo and there was no evidence of clinical benefit in one small trial that included only children.

Harms

No important side effects were reported with the sodium cromoglycate treatment. There was an unpleasant taste reported immediately after instillation of the nedocromil sodium.

Conclusions and research needs

Despite its limited effectiveness treatment with intraocular chromones may be of net clinical benefit because of no adverse effects and very mild side effects.

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and symptoms of conjunctivitis, we suggest intraocular chromones (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on excellent safety and tolerability of intraocular chromones and relatively low value on their limited effectiveness.

Remarks: In adults and children with limited ocular symptoms, chromones may be tried first because of their excellent safety and tolerability. Chromones require administration 4 times daily that may limit patient compliance with treatment and reduce efficacy.

Specific allergen immunotherapy for allergic rhinitis

Question 32

Should subcutaneous specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults without concomitant asthma?

Summary of findings

One systematic review (479) assessed the efficacy of allergen specific subcutaneous immunotherapy (SCIT) for seasonal allergic rhinitis and one health technology assessment (457) assessed its efficacy in both seasonal and perennial allergic rhinitis.

Additional review of the literature done by the ARIA group members (28) identified 2 more randomised trials of SCIT in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis and/or asthma that were published since the literature search for the systematic review by McCrory and colleagues (457) was done.

We used information from the systematic review by Calderon and colleagues (479) to prepare summaries of evidence for SCIT in seasonal allergic rhinitis and we described the findings of the remaining studies in perennial allergic rhinitis.

McCrory and colleagues found 12 randomised trials of SCIT in perennial allergic rhinitis of which 5 had very serious limitations in design and execution, and there was very serious uncertainty about directness of the intervention, so they were excluded by the authors of the review. Of the remaining trials SCIT with house dust mite allergen was assessed in four (251 patients enrolled, 205 evaluated,

11 children under 12 years of age), and cat (n = 28), latex (n =17), and *Alternaria* (n = 24) were assessed in one trial each. Range of treatment duration was 10 to 18 months.

Benefits

Systematic review of the studies in seasonal allergic rhinitis showed a consistent small to large effect of SCIT compared to placebo on the symptoms of allergic rhinitis, ocular symptoms, and quality of life. It also showed a reduction of medication use for control of allergic rhinitis.

All trials that used house dust mite allergens reported significant improvement in nasal symptoms, although the actual magnitude of the effect is not known without a meta-analysis. Trial that used cat, and mould allergens also reported improvement in nasal symptoms, but one small trial of SCIT with natural rubber latex had inconsistent results.

Harms

In a systematic review of the studies in seasonal allergic rhinitis no fatal events were reported in any of the studies.
There were 834 local reactions not requiring treatment in 907 patients in the SCIT group and 227 events in 697 patients in the placebo group. There were 21 local reactions requiring treatment in 208 patients in the SCIT group and eight events in 186 patients in the placebo group.
Early (occurring in less than 30 minutes) mild systemic reaction – mild rhinitis and/or asthma (PEFR over 60% of predicted or of the personal best values) – responding adequately to antihistamine or inhaled β_2-agonist): there were 154 events among 706 patients in the SCIT group and 44 events among 566 patients in the placebo group.
Early non-life-threatening systemic reaction – urticaria, angioedema, or severe asthma (PEFR under 60% of predicted or of personal best values) responding well to treatment: there were 43 events among 615 patients in the SCIT group and three events among 463 patients in the placebo group.
There were 458 late (>30 minutes) systemic reactions among 514 patients in the SCIT group and 148 events among 412 patients in the placebo group.
There were three anaphylactic shocks among 417 patients in the SCIT group and one among 303 patients in the placebo group.
Adrenaline had been used in 19 times per 14,085 injections in the SCIT group and once per 8278 injections in the placebo group.

In studies of SCIT in allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites local injection site reactions occurred in 30% to 90% of patients receiving active immunotherapy and 0% to 33% of those receiving placebo, although only two studies reported them. Systemic reactions were reported in 3 studies: one stated there were three systemic reactions of which one required use of adrenaline not specifying in which group (33 patients in the study), another reported no anaphylaxis and 3% vs 1% systemic reactions in treated and placebo groups respectively, and in the third one (n = 72) there were 3 vs 0 cases of anaphylaxis and 18 vs 6 asthma exacerbations in the SCIT and placebo groups. Need for hospitalization or death were not reported.
In the trial of SCIT with cat allergen there were 7 local and 3 systemic reactions, but authors did not specify in which group (28 patients in the study). In the trial with *Alternaria* there were 2 asthma exacerbations in active treatment group (15%) and no systemic reactions in placebo group.

Conclusions and research needs

Subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy may be of net clinical benefit in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis due to pollens. Net clinical benefit of allergen specific immunotherapy in

adults with allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites is uncertain. We judged overall quality of evidence supporting the SCIT for the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites as low, since the trials had important limitations and the results were imprecise. Any net clinical benefit of SCIT for other perennial allergens is very uncertain.
Additional well designed (480) and executed clinical trials that measure and carefully report (74, 75) all patient-important outcomes are needed to assess the effectiveness of SCIT for the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis.

Recommendation

We suggest subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy in adults with seasonal (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) and perennial allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on relieving the symptoms of AR, and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and on resource expenditure.

Question 33

Should subcutaneous specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in children without concomitant asthma?

Summary of findings

One recently published systematic review included 6 trials that examined the use of subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy (SCIT) in children with allergic rhinitis and/or asthma (481). Four studies were conducted in children with seasonal (482-485) and 2 in children with perennial allergic rhinitis (486, 487).
Authors of a systematic review of SCIT in children with allergic rhinitis did not provide any combined estimates of effects, because in many trials point estimates and measures of variability were reported in a way that precluded meta-analysis (481) (see evidence profile for question 33).

Benefits

Four studies found no difference between the SCIT and untreated groups in symptom scores or medication use (482, 485-487). One small study reported beneficial effect on symptoms (484) and the other stated that the nasal symptoms were significantly lower in SCIT group, but failed to report the magnitude of this effect (483). In this latter study – the Preventive Allergy Treatment (PAT) study, SCIT reduced the risk of development of asthma (relative risk: 0.46, 95% CI: 0.27 to 0.77) in a subgroup of children that had no asthma at baseline.

Harms

Data on adverse events were reported in five of six studies. Adverse effects were poorly reported and the definitions of an adverse event were often unclear. Local side-effects were more frequently reported in the intervention groups. Systemic side-effects (e.g. asthma) were rare and mild. Systemic anaphylactic reactions did not occur. Thus, an estimate of the risk of adverse events in children with allergic rhinitis may only be extrapolated from the systematic review of randomised trials of SCIT in seasonal allergic rhinitis including adult and mixed – paediatric and adult – populations (479). In this review only 9 of 51 included trials extended the age range to participants

younger than 18 years of age. The risk of non-life threatening systemic adverse events was estimated to be 7% in SCIT and 0.65% in placebo groups, and the risk of anaphylactic shock was estimated to be 0.72% and 0.33% respectively. There were no fatal events reported in any of the studies. Adrenalin was used in 19 per 14,085 injections given in the SCIT groups and in 1 per 8278 injections in the placebo groups.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit of subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy in children with allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. However, based on the results of studies in adults it may be of some benefit in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis. There is a need for rigorously designed and executed randomised trials of SCIT in children with allergic rhinitis that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes and adverse events. Further research, if done, will have important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In children with AR, we suggest subcutaneous specific immunotherapy (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on probable reduction in symptoms of allergic rhinitis and the potential prevention of the development of asthma, and relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects in children and resource expenditure.

Question 34

Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults without concomitant asthma?

Summary of findings

One systematic review including 22 trials (16 in adults) addressed the question of the efficacy and safety of sublingual specific immunotherapy (SLIT) in adults with allergic rhinitis (488, 489).
We identified 27 additional studies of SLIT in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis that were not included in this review or published after this review as done (490-515). We also identified additional four additional studies in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis (516-519). Therefore, we could not use the review by Wilson and colleagues to inform this recommendation.
We excluded four studies reporting safety outcomes only with no parallel information on efficacy (520-523) and six publications that were reporting the results of other studies already included in our analysis (524-529).
We extracted data from all original publications of 36 studies in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis (490-515, 530-540) and 8 studies in adults with perennial rhinitis (516-519, 541-544). We combined the results in meta-analysis when possible. Many studies did not report variability in the outcome measures, so it was not possible to combine their results. Some studies did not report variability, but were included in the meta-analysis by Wilson and colleagues (488). We assumed that authors used unpublished data and we used these in our analysis. For this recommendation we examined results of both analyses: including and excluding studies that did not report variability in results in the original publication (see evidence profile 1 and 2 for question 34).
Eight studies measured quality of life. Seven included patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis – three reported statistically significant improvement in quality of life, however, they reported their results

in a way that precluded combining their results (496, 497, 510). Two studies found an improvement that was statistically not significant, but did not report variability (495, 507). Two studies found no difference: one did not report what were the results (501) and the other found almost no change in score from baseline in both SLIT and placebo groups (509). One study in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis used a generic instrument (SF-36) and found no difference between the treated and placebo groups (517).
Two studies used sublingual spit technique, three did not report the details of administration, and all remaining studies used sublingual swallow immunotherapy.

Benefits

In adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis SLIT compared to placebo had a small to moderate beneficial effect on nasal and ocular symptoms, and may have improved quality of life, but the magnitude and precision of this effect was impossible to assess due to shortcomings in reporting. In adults with perennial allergic rhinitis the effect of SLIT on nasal symptoms may be large, but the estimates were imprecise.

Harms

There were no serious adverse effects reported in any of 44 studies of SLIT in adults with allergic rhinitis (altogether 2424 patients receiving SLIT). However, local adverse effects – most commonly oral pruritus, oral and labial oedema – and gastrointestinal intolerance were frequent in the SLIT groups and significantly more often led to discontinuation of treatment (see evidence profile 1 and 2 for question 34).

Cox and colleagues (545) have recently reviewed 66 studies, including observational studies with and without a control group that provided any information on safety of SLIT. Most of the studies did not report the actual number of doses given and the authors of the review estimated number of doses from the immunotherapy schedule, treatment duration, the number of included patients and completeness of follow-up. In the 66 studies (excluding studies of SLIT in latex allergy, ultrarush, or using allergoid) nearly 1,200,000 doses of SLIT were administered to 4378 patients. There were no life-threatening reactions reported. In studies that reported only total number adverse events there were 1047 adverse events per 386,149 doses given (27 reactions per 10,000 doses; 41 studies). In studies that reported number of patients with an adverse event 529 patients of 4378 (12%) reported an adverse event (49 studies). In studies that specified severity of reaction, systemic reactions occurred in 169 of 314,959 (54 per 100,000 doses administered). There were 16 serious adverse events reported – 14 were probably SLIT-related of which 7 were asthma exacerbations (one required hospitalization) – in 3984 patients treated for 5377 treatment years with 1,019,826 doses of SLIT (1 serious adverse event per 64,000 doses; 58 studies). There were 244 moderate adverse events requiring dose adjustment or causing withdrawal from the study in 2939 patients treated for 4586 treatment years with 810,693 doses of SLIT (50 studies). Majority of these reactions were gastrointestinal symptoms, exacerbation of rhinitis or conjunctivitis, and/or urticaria. There were 823 local reactions (oral mucosal itch and burning, lip swelling) in 66 included studies (68 per 100,000 doses). This however is likely an underestimated number since many studies reported information on adverse events as a general statement with no numeric data.

Other considerations

Swallow SLIT is considered more appropriate than sublingual spit immunotherapy (546). Dosing regimens in clinical trials varied from daily to weekly. Daily dosing seems to be preferred, but the optimal dosing frequency of SLIT has not been established yet. There is a general tendency toward

initiating of once-daily SLIT in constant dose without updosing that was proven to be safe in clinical trials (547). Optimal duration of SLIT also has not been established. Preliminary results suggest that the optimal duration of a SLIT might be 4 years (548, 549). Other aspects of SLIT requiring investigation include the optimal maintenance dose, criteria for the selection of patients who are likely to obtain most benefit, and cost-effectiveness.
There is also some concern about the directness of patient population included in the available trials of SLIT, that on average have milder symptoms and better quality of life than patients enrolled in other trials assessing medications.

Conclusions and research needs

Sublingual allergen specific immunotherapy may be of net clinical benefit in adults with allergic rhinitis. In patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis the effect on nasal symptoms is probably small to moderate and in patients with perennial symptoms the current estimate of the effect is very imprecise. There is inconsistent information on quality of life. Small reduction in symptoms seems counterbalanced by frequent local adverse effects. Sublingual specific immunotherapy seems to be safe and induce rare systemic reactions. However, once they develop they may pose a serious problem, since they occur at home.
A complete, rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of sublingual specific immunotherapy versus placebo in adults with allergic rhinitis that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines.

Recommendation

We suggest sublingual allergen specific immunotherapy in adults with rhinitis due to pollen (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence) or house dust mites (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on alleviating the symptoms of rhinitis, and relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and resource expenditure.

Remarks: Local adverse effects are relatively frequent (~35%). An alternative choice may be equally reasonable, if patients' values or preferences differ from those described here.

Question 35

Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in children without concomitant asthma?

Summary of findings

Four systematic reviews (481, 488, 489, 550, 551) evaluated sublingual allergen specific immunotherapy (SLIT) in children with allergic rhinitis. However, these reviews had different inclusion criteria and thus described different trials. The most recent review did not combine the data from individual studies (481). Our additional search performed for this revision of ARIA guidelines found eight more randomised trials, not included in these systematic reviews, that evaluated SLIT in children with allergic rhinitis and/or asthma and reported nasal symptoms (552-559).

We excluded one study since it reported only safety outcomes with no parallel information on efficacy (560) and another study, because it was published in Chinese language (561). This last study, however, found a significant improvement in symptoms compared to placebo and a trend towards less rescue medication use.
We extracted data from all original publications of 22 studies in children with seasonal or perennial allergic rhinitis (552-559, 562-575). We combined the results in meta-analysis when possible. Many studies did not report variability in the outcome measures, so it was not possible to combine their results. Some studies did not report variability, but were included in meta-analyses in previous systematic reviews by Penagos or Wilson (488, 551). We assumed that authors used unpublished data and we used these in our analysis. For this recommendation we examined results of both analyses: including and excluding studies that did not report variability in results in the original publication (see evidence profile 1 and 2 for question 35).
One study (n = 66) reported its results on a graph as several measurements over time (573). Authors of each of the three systematic reviews that combined results in meta-analysis extracted different values from the same graph showing different effects on nasal symptoms ranging from large benefit from SLIT (effect size: -1.18, 95% CI: -0.65 to -1.70) (551), through small and statistically insignificant benefit from SLIT (effect size: -0.23, 95% CI: - 0.71 to +0.26)(550), to small detrimental effect of SLIT (effect size: +0.17, 95% CI: -0.32 to +0.65)(488). Using end-of-study values for meta-analysis was not possible, because they did not reflect the actual symptoms during the study, and we did not attempt calculating an average effect over duration of the study, therefore we did not use this study results.
Another study (572) including 58 children reported results on a graph with likely mislabelled measures of variability. For this recommendation we examined results of both analyses: assuming the measure of variability as labelled by the authors (i.e. standard deviation) and as it likely should be labelled (i.e. standard error; see evidence profile 2 for question 35).

Benefits

In children with seasonal allergic rhinitis SLIT compared to placebo has small effect on nasal symptoms and probably also on ocular symptoms and rescue medication use, although the results of clinical studies did not exclude no effect. Only one study (559) measured quality of life, but the results were inconsistent and imprecise precluding any reliable conclusions (see evidence profile 1 for question 35). One trial performed in children with grass pollen allergy found that fewer children receiving SLIT plus standard symptomatic treatment, compared to standard symptomatic treatment alone, developed asthma after 3 years (relative risk: 0.43; 95% CI: 0.21 to 0.87) (568). However, this trial had serious methodological limitations and the results are imprecise.

Studies that used SLIT in children allergic to house dust mite did not find evidence of its efficacy – there was no effect on nasal symptoms and medication use, however, these studies had serious methodological limitations and results do not exclude a small benefit or small harm (see evidence profile 1 for question 35). No study measured quality of life.

Harms

There were no serious adverse effects in any of included studies of SLIT in children with allergic rhinitis that reported measuring this outcome (altogether 580 children receiving SLIT). Other adverse effects were poorly reported in the included studies. Similar to SLIT in adults, local adverse effects (oral and labial pruritus and oedema) were frequent in the SLIT groups and more often led to discontinuation of treatment, but these estimates are very imprecise (see evidence profile 1 and 2 for question 34).

Cox et al. also reviewed observational studies that provided any information on safety or tolerance of SLIT in children (545). Two observational studies (98 children) and one post-marketing survey (126 children) assessed safety of SLIT in 2–7 years old children with allergic rhinitis or asthma. In one study children received SLIT with a monomeric allergoid (22,200 doses altogether) and were followed for 22 months. Two children had abdominal pain (1 episode each; 5% of patients; 7.1 per 100,000 doses). In a second study children received SLIT to various pollens or house dust mites for 8 months. There were 13 adverse events in 11 children (6 episodes of urticaria, 4 gastrointestinal symptoms, and 3 oral itch; all were reported to be mild or moderate, and none required discontinuation of treatment). A post-marketing survey of children treated with SLIT to various allergens for 2 years (39,000 doses) found 9 adverse events recorded by parents on diary cards in 7 children (5.6% of children; 2.3 per 10,000 doses). Of these 7 were systemic reactions (1 mild abdominal pain, 6 moderate abdominal pain with diarrhoea), and 2 were oral itching. All events occurred during the induction phase.

Other considerations

See question 34 above.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit of sublingual immunotherapy in children with allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. Small reduction in symptoms seems counterbalanced by frequent local adverse effects. Sublingual specific immunotherapy seems to be safe and induce rare systemic reactions. However, once the develop they may pose a serious problem, since they occur at home.
A complete, rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of sublingual specific immunotherapy versus placebo in adults with allergic rhinitis that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines. There is also a need for rigorously designed and executed randomised trials of SLIT in children, especially with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis, that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes and adverse events. Further research, if done, will have important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In children with allergic rhinitis due to pollens, we suggest sublingual allergen-specific immunotherapy (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence). In children with allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites, we suggest that clinicians do not administer sublingual immunotherapy outside rigorously designed clinical trials (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation to use sublingual immunotherapy in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis places a relatively high value on small reduction in nasal symptoms, and relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects in children and resource expenditure. The recommendation to use sublingual immunotherapy in children with perennial allergic rhinitis only in the context of clinical research places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects and resource expenditure, and relatively low value on possible small reduction in nasal symptoms.

Remark: Local adverse effects are relatively frequent (~35%). An alternative choice may be equally reasonable, if patients' values or preferences differ from those described here.

Question 36

Should local nasal specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

We found one systematic review of local nasal immunotherapy (LNIT) in children (481) that included four studies (576-579). We found no systematic review addressing this question in adults, however, there is a protocol of a systematic review recently registered in the Cochrane Library (580).

We found 19 randomised trials that compared intranasal specific immunotherapy to placebo in adults with allergic rhinitis (581-599). We did not consider studies in which histamine was given intranasally in the control group (600-605). We could not use two studies of LNIT with grass allergens (67 patients total) (595, 597) to inform this recommendation, because we were not able to obtain their full reports in time given to revise this ARIA guidelines. However, based on the available information, both studies found statistically significant improvement in symptoms in the LNIT groups and reported only mild local adverse effects.
Two studies in adults (583, 590) and one in children (578) were performed in patients allergic to house dust mite; two additional studies in adults included a subgroup of patients allergic to these allergens (586, 593). All other studies included patients allergic to seasonal allergens.
Seven studies reported the effect of LNIT on nasal symptoms, but did not provide variability in results (581, 582, 584, 585, 589, 593, 594), so we could not combine their results with other studies. However, these studies also reported number of patients who rated their symptoms as improved or absent and we used these estimates of effect to infer about symptoms (see evidence profile 1 for question 36).

Benefits

Almost all studies showed moderate to large improvement in nasal symptoms and need for rescue medications during the pollen season. Patients receiving LNIT were twice as likely to rate their symptoms as improved (see evidence profile 1 for question 36). No study measured quality of life.

Harms

Serious adverse events did not occur in any of included studies. Local adverse effects were reported inconsistently (only 35% of studies provided actual numbers), but they were more frequent in the LNIT groups during treatment, despite in most studies intranasal chromones were used prior to application of LNIT (see evidence profile 1 and 2 for question 36).
Bronchoconstriction has been described after dry powder extract application that was attributed to incorrect technique of administration.

Other considerations

Optimal form of administration has not been established – intranasal allergen immunotherapy may be administered as aqueous extracts of unmodified or chemically modified allergens (allergoids) or as dry powder. Optimal duration of LNIT has not yet been determined, but no sustained effect following discontinuation of treatment has been demonstrated yet. There is also no data on possible preventive effect against development of asthma.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit from intranasal specific immunotherapy is uncertain. Benefits seem to be closely balanced by local adverse effects during treatment.
A complete rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of intranasal specific immunotherapy versus placebo that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines.

Recommendation

We suggest intranasal allergen specific immunotherapy in adults (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence) and in children with allergic rhinitis due to pollens (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on the reduction of symptoms of allergic rhinitis during pollen season, and a relatively low value on avoiding local side effects and cost. An alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

Alternative and complementary treatment for allergic rhinitis

Question 37

Should homeopathy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

We found no systematic review of homeopathy in allergic rhinitis.

A review of literature published by the ARIA group members (27) found six randomised trials that compared homeopathy to placebo and one that compared it to intranasal chromones in patients with allergic rhinitis. We identified one additional study published after the search for this review was done (606).

We found only one overview with meta-analysis of trials of *Galphimia glauca* in treatment of allergic rhinitis, but it was researchers' review of their own trials on the topic (607).

Benefits

Reviewed studies reported conflicting results of homeopathy on nasal symptoms and quality of life, and many studies had important limitations. The evidence is promising for *Galphimia glauca* for allergic rhinitis, but requires confirmation.
There are a variety of homeopathic dilutions available and in the absence of a systematic review it is probably not feasible to assess their individual effects. Many systematic reviews of homeopathy in various conditions suggested that homeopathy may be more effective than placebo, but the findings were inconsistent, and the evidence for a specific effect of homeopathy is weak compared to the evidence for conventional (allopathic) treatments (608-614).

Harms

Homeopathic remedies are much diluted and contain very small doses of active compounds. Because of this they are assumed to be safe and not interacting with conventional medicines. However, we could not identify any systematic review of adverse or side effects of homeopathy, and most trials were very small possibly underpowered to reveal infrequent but important adverse effects.

Conclusions and research needs

Any clinical benefit from homeopathy in patients with allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. We concluded that the overall quality of the evidence supporting the use of homeopathy in allergic rhinitis would be very low, because of the limitations in the design of the studies, and inconsistent and imprecise results.
Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of homeopathy that measure and properly report (74, 75) all patient-important outcomes are needed. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use homeopathy (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible adverse effects and resource expenditure, and a relatively low value on any possible, but unproven, benefit of these treatments in AR.

Question 38

Should acupuncture be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

A review of literature published by the ARIA group members found three randomised trials that compared acupuncture to sham acupuncture in patients with allergic rhinitis (27).

Additional search for randomised trials published after the review by Passalacqua and colleagues was done, found two more trials (615, 616).

Three systematic reviews (617-619) and three large observational studies (620-622) assessed the safety of acupuncture. We used information from these reviews to determine the safety of acupuncture.

A systematic review of the efficacy and safety of acupuncture in allergic rhinitis has been published in April 2008 (623). This review included only trials described above and its results were consistent with those of our previous assessment.

Benefits

Two randomised trials showed an improvement in symptoms with acupuncture compared to sham procedure. One involved 30 patients with seasonal rhinitis and showed that acupuncture significantly reduced symptoms without changing the need for rescue medications (624). The other included 52 adults who had typical symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis and were assigned to

acupuncture and Chinese herbs, or a control group which received sham acupuncture and a nonspecific Chinese herbal formula. After 3 weeks of treatment patients in the active treatment group showed improvement in rhinitis symptoms and quality of life (616).
One trial in children with perennial allergic rhinitis (3-month treatment plus 3-month follow-up) reported a significant improvement in daily symptoms (limited to the follow-up period) and an increase of symptom-free days in the active group with no change in the use of symptomatic medications (625).
Two additional trials did not find a difference between the acupuncture and sham acupuncture groups. One compared the effect of active versus sham acupuncture in 40 patients with a history of allergic rhinitis and a positive skin test after 12 months. No differences in clinical symptoms were seen between active versus sham acupuncture (615). The other also failed to demonstrate a difference in symptoms and use of rescue medication between real and sham acupuncture (626).

Harms

A systematic review of life-threatening adverse events associated with acupuncture reported two cases of fatal staphylococcal septicaemia, 65 cases of pneumothorax, four cases of cardiac tamponade (one fatal), and one case of fatal asthma exacerbation being described in the medical literature (617). In another systematic review of safety of acupuncture that included 9 prospective observational studies with almost 250,000 treatments the most serious adverse effects were pneumothorax (2 patients) and broken needle (2 patients) (618).
Two large prospective observational studies of acupuncture practices in the United Kingdom found no serious adverse events in over 66 000 acupuncture treatments provided by experienced practitioners (620, 621). The most serious adverse events reported were exacerbation of symptoms (12 patients), fainting (10 patients), pain at needle insertion site (6 patients), needle being left in place (5 patients), seizure (1 patient with epilepsy), and slurred speech (1 patient). However, acupuncturists interfered with the prescribed medications of 3% of patients that might be considered an indirect risk of acupuncture (620). Another large observational study from Sweden found no serious adverse events in almost 9300 acupuncture treatments, except for minor bleeding being reported in 15% of treatments (622).
Despite the evidence of the relative safety of acupuncture procedure, there is a substantial concern about the risk of infection with hepatitis virus, human immunodeficiency virus, or bacteria when non-disposable needles are used (617, 619).

Conclusions and research needs

Net benefit from acupuncture in treatment of allergic rhinitis is uncertain. The risks seem to outweigh the very imprecise data on the efficacy of acupuncture in allergic rhinitis.
Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials of acupuncture that describe the procedure in sufficient detail so it can be reproduced and that measure and properly report (74, 75) all patient-important outcomes are needed. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use acupuncture (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding the potential complications of acupuncture, and a relatively low value on uncertain reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks: In patients who choose to be treated with acupuncture ONLY disposable needles should be used.

Question 39

Should butterbur be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

One systematic review assessed the efficacy and safety of butterbur (*Petasites hybridus*) in patients with allergic rhinitis (627), although it did not include several recently published trials, therefore we did not use it to inform this recommendation.

We found five randomised trials that evaluated butterbur compared to placebo or oral H1-antihistamine in patients with allergic rhinitis (628-634), but one reported only changes in physiological parameters (628). Two papers were reports of the same study (632, 633).
All studies had important methodological limitations. Studies supported by the manufacturer of butterbur extract concluded that it was effective, while studies not supported by industry found small or no effect.

A systematic review of the efficacy and safety of herbal medicines, including butterbur, in allergic rhinitis has been published in December 2007(635), therefore we did not use it when reviewing the evidence for this recommendation. However, this review included the same studies of butterbur we described above and its results were consistent with those of our previous assessment.

Benefits

Overall all studies, except for one (631), suggested that butterbur was superior to placebo or equal to oral H1-antihistamine in reducing symptoms of rhinitis and improving quality of life. However, reporting of the results was either flawed or did not allow drawing any clinical conclusions. Follow-up in one very small trial in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis (630) was most likely too short to assess the efficacy of butterbur – current requirement for the optimal duration of clinical trials to assess drug efficacy in perennial allergic rhinitis is 4 weeks (636-638).

Harms

Long-term effects and interaction of butterbur with other drugs have not been studied. There is however concern about safety, since native unpurified butterbur contains pyrrolizidine alkaloidsthat have been shown to be both hepatotoxic and carcinogenic (639).

Treatment considerations

If used, only commercial preparations of butterbur should be considered in which extracts are required to contain lower-than-detectable amounts of pyrrolizidine alkaloids.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit of butterbur in treatment of allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. We judged overall quality of evidence supporting the use of butterbur in allergic rhinitis as very low since all studies

had important methodological limitations, their results were inconsistent, there is a high probability of reporting bias, and there is little evidence about long-term safety. Further well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials that measure and properly report (74, 75) all patient-important outcomes are needed. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use butterbur (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding the uncertain adverse effects of butterbur, and a relatively low value on equally uncertain reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Remarks: In patients who are less risk averse an alternative may be equally reasonable. However, if one chooses to use butterbur one should consider only commercial preparations in which butterbur extract does not contain toxic pyrrolizidine alkaloids.

Question 40

Should herbal medicines other than butterbur be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

A review of literature published by the ARIA group members (27) found four randomised trials that compared herbal medicines other than butterbur to placebo in patients with allergic rhinitis. Search for trials published after this review was done did not find additional studies.

Three recent systematic reviews assessed the safety of herbal medicines (640-642).

A systematic review of the efficacy and safety of herbal medicines in allergic rhinitis has been published in December 2007 (635), therefore we did not use it when reviewing the evidence for this recommendation. This review included several older studies that the ARIA guideline panel did not identify previously. However, the assessment of the quality of available evidence and the results were consistent with our assessment of a smaller sample of studies. Using this review would not change the recommendation.

Benefits

One study in patients with seasonal rhinitis found that a mixture of 18 Chinese herbs was significantly better than placebo relieved symptoms and increased quality of life (643). Another study in perennial rhinitis found significant effects of the Chinese herb formulation biminne (644). The third trial included 52 adults who had typical symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis and were assigned to acupuncture and Chinese herbs, or a control group which received sham acupuncture and a nonspecific Chinese herbal formula. After 3 weeks of treatment patients in the active treatment group showed improvement in rhinitis symptoms and quality of life (616).An additional randomised trial found that grape seed extract (100 mg twice daily) was no more effective than placebo for ragweed-induced rhinitis (645).

Harms

Herbal remedies contain several active pharmacologic ingredients that may be responsible for their clinical effect. However, laws and regulations of the manufacturing of traditional herbal products are much less strict than for pharmaceuticals (646). Despite the common belief that phytotherapy is safe, systematic reviews of safety of herbal medicines reported several serious adverse events associated with herbal products (640-642). The reported causes of adverse reactions associated with herbal medicines include toxic ingredients either inherent to the plant or due to growing conditions, misidentification of toxic herbs, contamination or adulteration during manufacturing process, interactions with other medicines, overdose, and allergic reactions (646-649). Many herbal remedies have been reported to cause allergic sensitization or photosentization and various skin reactions (650). One review of Chinese literature found that only during 1993 and 1994 there were 1133 reports of adverse events associated with herbal medicines, including 59 fatal events related to raw herbs and 6 deaths attributed to final herbal products (646).

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit from herbal remedies in allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. Although mixture of Chinese herbs seems to be efficacious there is a concern about reproducibility of the intervention and serious concern about safety. We concluded that the overall quality of evidence supporting use of herbal medicines for allergic rhinitis is very low, because at least for one critical outcome – adverse effects – available data come from unsystematic observations of cases of serious adverse effects including fatal events. Future adequately designed and conducted research, standardisation of herbal mixtures, and adequate laws and regulations of manufacturing herbal medicines to ensure their safety may have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation

In patients with AR, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use herbal medicines (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding possible serious adverse events and drug interactions, and a relatively low value on possible reduction in symptoms of rhinitis.

Question 41

Should physical techniques and other alternative therapies be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis?

Summary of findings

No systematic review addressed this question.

A recent literature review by the ARIA group members found two trials of phototherapy in patients with allergic rhinitis (27). Authors did not find trials performed in rhinitis with other forms of alternative or complementary procedures: aromatherapy, chromotherapy, Bach's flowers, anthroposophy, Hopi candles, hydro-colon, urine therapy, clinical ecology, and iridology.
For this revision of the ARIA guidelines we did not search for observational studies evaluating these treatments.

Benefits

One study used a low-energy narrow-band red light intranasal therapy in perennial rhinitis. Active treatment produced a significant improvement of symptoms, but the methodological quality of this study was poor (651). The other trial in seasonal allergic rhinitis reported that a combination of ultraviolet light (UV-B and UV-A) compared with visible light improved sneezing, rhinorrhea, nasal itching, and total nasal symptoms in the UV group but none of the scores improved significantly in the control group (652).

Harms

Side effects are not known.

Conclusions and research needs

Any clinical benefit from phototherapy, other physical techniques, or alternative therapies is very uncertain. We judged the overall quality of evidence supporting this recommendation as very low, since the available studies had methodological limitations, the results were imprecise, and there is a high probability of reporting bias.
Further research, if done, may have an important impact on this recommendation.

Recommendation
In patients with AR, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use phototherapy or other physical techniques (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding potential adverse effects of these therapies, and a relatively low value on their very uncertain effect on symptoms of rhinitis.

III. Treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma

Allergic rhinitis and asthma often co-exist and appear to produce a continuum of airway disease (see section 9 of ARIA 2008 Update (2)). Despite increasing interest in the epidemiological, molecular, and environmental links between allergic rhinitis and asthma, there is a relative paucity of data in the literature describing the characteristics of asthma in patients with coexisting rhinitis. In allergic patients, seasonal exposure to pollens and/or moulds induces intermittent or persistent rhinitis. Some patients present concomitant symptoms suggestive of asthma (e.g. shortness of breath, wheeze, or cough) (653) and a nonspecific bronchial hyper-reactivity, that may be present during the allergen and for few weeks thereafter (654, 655). Bronchial inflammation may also increase during the pollen season in patients with rhinitis (656). These symptoms have been termed “seasonal asthma”. However, what is exactly meant by this is still unclear – many patients with allergic rhinitis and chest symptoms (cough, wheeze, and/or shortness of breath) neither exhibit relevant airflow obstruction nor demonstrate reversibility of forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV_1) following bronchodilator administration and increased peak flow variability (657-660). Therefore, there is some uncertainty if the magnitude of effect of treatments shown to be effective in patients with persistent asthma is similar in patients with allergic rhinitis and concomitant symptoms of “seasonal asthma”.

Question 42

Should oral H_1-antihistamines be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

One systematic review published in 1997 assessed the use of oral H_1-antihistamines for treatment of asthma, but it reported only the results of pulmonary function tests, rescue medication use, and adverse events (661). H_1-antihistamines used in these studies were: ketotifen (6 studies), azelastine (4 studies), terfenadine (3 studies), cetirizine (2 studies), and oxatomide, picumast, pemirolast, and loratadine (1 study each).

One systematic review investigated the use of ketotifen alone or as additional medication for long-term control of asthma and wheeze in children (662). Authors' last search for additional literature in May 2006 did not reveal any new articles.

We identified eight trials that compared oral H_1-antihistamines to placebo in patients with allergic rhinitis and concomitant asthma (168, 179, 196, 203, 657, 663-665). Two of these trials (663, 664) had a cross-over design without a washout period and one was published in Chinese language (665), therefore we did not use them to inform this recommendation. Of the remaining trials four included adults (168, 179, 196, 657) and one included children (203). Most of these studies had various limitations in execution and reporting. Of the five included trials three investigated cetirizine (168, 203, 657), one desloratadine (179), and one levocetirizine (196).

Benefits

Randomised trials in adults showed a larger reduction in asthma symptoms among patients receiving oral H_1-antihistamine compared to placebo, although the results did not exclude the possibility of no effect and there were serious problems with reporting of this outcome. One small study measured quality of life and showed a small improvement, the precision of which was not possible to assess due to reporting issues.
The systematic review of ketotifen for the control of asthma and wheeze in children found that ketotifen alone or in combination with other co-interventions improved asthma and wheezing symptoms, reduced the risk of exacerbations, and reduced the need for oral glucocorticosteroids and bronchodilators in children with mild and moderate asthma (662). However, in most studies inhaled glucocorticosteroids (currently considered an initial maintenance treatment)were not used so the additional benefit from ketotifen in children already using inhaled corticosteroids is not known. The only trial in children that we identified evaluated cetirizine and presented the results the way that did not allow for drawing valid conclusions.

Harms

Adverse events were inconsistently reported in randomised trials performed in adults and it was not possible to calculate any overall effect without making several assumptions. Overall number of all adverse events in patient receiving oral H1-antihistamine or placebo seemed to have been similar. One study reported 17 versus 4 events of fatigue or somnolence among patients receiving cetirizine 10 mg and placebo respectively.

The systematic review of different oral H1-antihistamines in adults with asthma (661) found an incidence of sedation was mentioned in 11 of 19 studies and ranged from 0 to 39% in the placebo and 0 to 70% in the H1-antihistamine groups. An overall effect for all studies showed that the difference in incidence of sedation between oral H1-antihistamines and placebo was statistically significant, but the authors did not report the magnitude of the effect and the results were inconsistent. Besides sedation, several other side-effects (weight gain, altered taste, headache, and dry mouth) were mentioned in the studies, but again the actual values were not reported. Since many included studies used sedating H1-antihistamines there is some uncertainty about the directness of these findings.
Systematic review of ketotifen in children found more side effects – sedation and weight gain – among children receiving ketotifen, but the estimates were very imprecise.

Conclusions and research needs

Any clinical benefit from oral H1-antihistamines in adults and children with asthma and allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. Further research on long-term use of oral H1-antihistamines in patients with asthma and allergic rhinitis reporting control of asthma symptoms, quality of life, and adverse effects – if done – is very likely to have an important impact on this recommendation. There may be a net clinical benefit from ketotifen when used alone for treatment of symptoms of asthma and wheeze in children with concomitant allergic rhinitis, however, an additional benefit from ketotifen in children already using inhaled corticosteroid is not known. More research seems justified to determine the effect of ketotifen as an add-on therapy to inhaled glucocorticosteroids in children with asthma or wheeze and concomitant allergic rhinitis.

What others are saying

Guidelines for the treatment of asthma prepared by other organizations do not recommend oral H1-antihistamines, stating that they are ineffective or have limited role in patients with established asthma when administered in the usual doses (666, 667). One guideline stated that current evidence does not suggest a primary role for oral H1-antihistamines in the treatment of asthma, but they may have a small beneficial effect on asthma in subjects with concurrent rhinitis (668).

Recommendation

In patients (both children and adults) with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use oral H_1-antihistamines for the treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | very low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: The recommendation not to use oral H_1-antihistamines in adults with allergic rhinitis and asthma for the treatment of asthma places a relatively high value on avoiding their adverse effects, and a relatively low value on their very uncertain effect on symptoms of asthma. The recommendation not to use oral H_1-antihistamines in children with allergic rhinitis for the treatment of asthma or wheeze, despite the evidence of efficacy of ketotifen when used alone in children with mild to moderate asthma, places a relatively high value on avoiding its side effects, and a relatively low value on its unknown efficacy in children already using inhaled corticosteroids, since inhaled corticosteroids are currently considered medications of first choice in treatment of chronic asthma.

Remarks: This recommendation suggests that oral H_1-antihistamines should not be used to treat symptoms of asthma, but they may still be used in patients with asthma and rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (recommendations 11 and 12).

Question 43

Should combination of oral H_1-antihistamine and oral decongestant be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

We did not identify any systematic reviews that addressed this question.

We found two randomised trials that investigated efficacy and safety of a combination of oral H_1-antihistamine and pseudoephedrine compared to placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and concomitant mild to moderate asthma (669, 670).
We did not find any clinical trial comparing these management options in patients with persistent allergic rhinitis and concomitant asthma.

Benefits

There was imprecise and poorly reported improvement in asthma symptoms and quality of life with combined treatment compared to placebo, but there is uncertainty if the magnitude of the observed effect is clinically important.

Harms

In one study more patients in the combined treatment group experienced asthma exacerbation, but results were very imprecise, not excluding benefit or serious harm. Risk of insomnia was higher with combined treatment compared to placebo, but again the results were very imprecise.

Conclusions and research needs

Any net clinical benefit of a combination of oral H_1-antihistamine and oral decongestant for the treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis is very uncertain. Possible small benefits are closely balanced with adverse effects. Further research, if done, is likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

What others are saying

Guidelines for the treatment of asthma prepared by other organizations do not mention a combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant for the treatment of asthma (666-668, 671).

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest clinicians do not administer and patients do not use a combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects of combination of oral H1-antihistamine and oral decongestant, and a relatively low value on possible small reduction in asthma symptoms of uncertain clinical significance.

Question 44

Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

One systematic review investigated the use of intranasal glucocorticosteroids for control of asthma in patients with coexisting asthma and rhinitis (672). However, this review had many limitations, e.g. it included also trials that explicitly excluded patients with asthma but measured asthma symptoms, or that were cross-over trials without washout period. Therefore we could not use its results to inform this recommendation.

Our search found three more randomised trials (319, 362, 673) published after the search for literature by Taramarcaz and colleagues (672) was done. We re-examined the trials included in this systematic review and the additional three trails that we identified. Of the ten trials included in the systematic review, that reported various asthma symptom scores, we excluded six: two because they enrolled patients without asthma or with unclear diagnosis of asthma (250, 674), one because patients with asthma were a subgroup (50%) of all patients in this study (675), one because it investigated airway responses to cat exposure challenges (676), and two because they had cross-over design without a washout period (677) or a washout period was too short (372).
Of the remaining randomised trials four included patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis (319, 362, 678, 679) and two with perennial allergic rhinitis (673, 680). Two of these trials did not allow inhaled glucocorticosteroids during the study period (678, 679) and the use of inhaled corticosteroids was unclear in one study that was also the only one performed in children (680). None of the studies reported quality of life.

Benefits

Of the three randomised trials that compared combined treatment with inhaled and intranasal glucocorticosteroid to inhaled glucocorticosteroid alone (376 patients in treatment and 369 in control groups), one found no difference in asthma-free days, drug-free days, and night-time awakenings, the other stated only that symptoms improved in both groups, and the third one measured but did not report asthma symptoms. We judged overall quality of evidence from these trials as low due to very serious limitations in design and reporting.
Of the three trials that did not allow inhaled glucocorticosteroids or did not state if they were used (87 patients in treatment and 61 in control groups), one found “significantly” less asthma symptoms with intranasal glucocorticosteroid, second found no statistically significant difference, but the symptoms improved in treated patients and worsened in those receiving placebo, and the third reported a similar mean symptom score of about 0.3 point (on a 4-point scale, where 0 – no symptoms to 3 – severe symptoms) in all groups suggesting almost no symptoms in all groups during the study. We judged overall quality of evidence from these studies as very low, because all studies had limitations in design or execution, number of patients was very small, and there is uncertainty about the directness of the results (in the largest study providing 63% of patients symptom scores suggested no symptoms during the trial in all groups and all trials did not allow inhaled glucocorticosteroids).

Harms

Studies either reported that the incidence of adverse events was similar in all groups or did not report adverse events. For more information on adverse effects of intranasal glucocorticosteroids see recommendation 18.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in the treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis is uncertain, but seems unlikely.
An updated rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of all individual intranasal glucocorticosteroids versus placebo that provides information on asthma symptoms, quality of life, and adverse effects is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines. Well designed and executed randomised trials among patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma that measure and properly report (74, 75) asthma symptoms, quality of life, and adverse effects, if done, may have an important impact on this recommendation.

What others are saying

Guidelines for the treatment of asthma prepared by other organizations do not make explicit recommendations for use of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in patients with asthma and concomitant rhinitis. They state that there is limited benefit of intranasal glucocorticosteroids or that they have not been shown to improve asthma symptoms or reduce asthma morbidity (667, 668).A recent guideline from National Asthma Education and Prevention Program (671)only reported three retrospective observational studies (681-683) with methodological limitations that found the use intranasal steroids decreased emergency department visits for asthma.

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest that clinicians do not administer and patients do not use intranasal glucocorticosteroids for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on avoiding adverse effects, albeit minor burden, and cost of intranasal glucocorticosteroids, and a relatively low value on a small clinical benefit.

Remarks: This recommendation suggests that intranasal glucocorticosteroids are not used to treat symptoms of asthma, but they may still be used in patients with asthma and rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis (recommendations 18–21).

Question 45

Should leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

Two systematic reviews assessed leukotriene receptor inhibitors (LTRA) for the treatment of chronic asthma – compared to inhaled glucocorticosteroids (684) or as an add-on therapy in patients already receiving inhaled glucocorticosteroids (685). Authors of both systematic reviews pointed out that it was not possible to examine the effect of allergic rhinitis on the effectiveness of compared treatments due to inadequate reporting. However, five included trials comparing LRTA in

licensed dose + inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) versus same dose of ICS reported including more than 50% patients with allergic triggers of asthma (yet it was still not clear how many had concomitant allergic rhinitis) (686-690). Two trials (~75% patients with allergic rhinitis) found no statistically significant difference between the groups (686, 688), two trials (patients with atopy – 100% (687) and 66% (689)) did not report any patient-important outcomes, and one trials reported the results in a way that precluded meaningful clinical interpretation of the effect (690).
We were not able to identify any systematic review that assessed the use of LTRA compared to placebo in patients with asthma.

We found seven trials that compared LTRA to inhaled glucocorticosteroid published after the search for the systematic reviews by Ducharme and colleagues was done. Five trials included children (691-695) and two included adults (696, 697). Four of these trials reported 62–80% of patients being either atopic or having allergic rhinitis and three did not mention atopic/allergic status of the patients (692, 694, 695). Results of these additional trials consistently confirmed the findings of an earlier systematic review (684).

We used the available systematic review of LTRA as an add-on therapy in patients receiving inhaled glucocorticosteroids (685) to prepare an evidence profile, since we did not find any more recent trials.
We also used the available systematic review of LTRA versus inhaled glucocorticosteroids (684) acknowledging that there were more trials subsequently published, but their results consistently confirmed the findings of the review.

Our search for trials comparing LTRA to placebo in patients with asthma that assessed patient-important outcomes revealed 28 trials of which 21 included adults (179, 698-716), two explicitly included school children and adolescents (717, 718), and five included preschool and school children (309, 719-722).

An additional systematic review of montelukast as an add-on therapy in patients receiving inhaled glucocorticosteroids was published in 2008 after our final search date in September 2007 (723). Joos and colleagues (723) included only studies that followed patients for more than 12 weeks and included the same studies that were included in the analysis done by Ducharme et al. (685). Joos and colleagues do not provide a pooled estimate of the effect, whereas the review by Ducharme and colleagues does. Moreover, inclusion of the results of the review by Joos and colleagues would not change this recommendation as they are similar.

Benefits

In patients with mild to moderate persistent asthma oral LTRA used as an add-on therapy to inhaled glucocorticosteroids improved lung function and there was a trend towards improvement in clinical outcomes, but the results were very imprecise (685). There was no evidence of the effect of oral LTRA on patient-important outcomes in the trials that reported including patients with allergy or atopy.
Oral LTRA in monotherapy were less effective than inhaled glucocorticosteroids in relieving symptoms and reducing exacerbations of asthma both in adults and in children.
Oral LTRA compared to placebo were little more effective in reducing symptoms and inhaled β-agonist use or improving quality of life, both in adults and children. However, the results of the trials were inconsistent. In the absence of a systematic review and meta-analysis is not possible to estimate the effect, but based on examination of identified studies it is small at most. The results of six trials that reported including 64–100% patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis and/or asthma aggravated by exposure to seasonal allergens seemed not to differ for the results of all other studies.

Harms

In both systematic reviews, there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups in overall adverse events or in withdrawals due to adverse events, but results were again imprecise. Zafirlukast can increase the half-life of warfarin.

Conclusions and research needs

There is no net clinical benefit from oral leukotriene receptor antagonists compared to inhaled glucocorticosteroids used in monotherapy in patients with asthma – inhaled glucocorticosteroids are more beneficial. Net clinical benefit of oral leukotriene receptor antagonists in patients with asthma who already use inhaled glucocorticosteroids is uncertain. Considerable proportion of patients included in these trials had concomitant allergic rhinitis, although the exact number is impossible to estimate due to inadequate reporting. In trials that reported including more than 50% of patients with allergy or atopy there was no apparent clinical benefit from adding an oral leukotriene receptor antagonist to inhaled glucocorticosteroid. There is uncertainty if the results obtained in studied populations apply equally to patients who have both asthma and allergic rhinitis. The ARIA guideline panel did not make a recommendation about the relative benefit of using a combination of leukotriene receptor antagonists and inhaled glucocorticosteroids compared to inhaled glucocorticosteroids alone, because the available evidence was inconsistent and imprecise. Panel members felt it was not feasible to tell which option would be better for patients. that there may be subgroups of patients that would benefit from combined treatment, and therefore more research in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma is needed to inform clinical recommendation. In the absence of a systematic review of trials that compared oral LTRA with placebo, net clinical benefit from using oral LTRA alone in patients who cannot use inhaled glucocorticosteroids or in children whose parents are concerned about use of inhaled glucocorticosteroids is uncertain. However, it is likely to be small at most. In the absence of a systematic review we concluded that the quality of available evidence supporting the use of oral LTRA compared to placebo would be moderate at best, because of the inconsistency in the results.
Well designed and rigorously executed randomised trials among patients with allergic rhinitis and allergic asthma that compare LTRA to placebo both in monotherapy or as add-on medication to inhaled glucocorticosteroids are needed. These trials should measure and properly report (74, 75) all asthma-related outcomes that are important to patients. If done, they are likely to have an important impact on this recommendation.

What others are saying

Guidelines for the treatment of asthma prepared by other organizations recommend LTRA as an add-on treatment to an initial therapy with inhaled glucocorticosteroid, but they acknowledge that this is less efficacious than adding long-acting β_2-agonist (666-668, 671). Guidelines also recommend LTRA as an optional single controlling medication for mild persistent asthma, but state that inhaled glucocorticosteroids are a preferred choice (666, 668, 671).

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we recommend inhaled glucocorticosteroids over oral leukotriene receptor antagonists as a single controlling medication for asthma (strong recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma who prefer not to use or cannot use inhaled glucocorticosteroids or in children whose parents do not agree to use inhaled glucocorticosteroids,

we suggest oral leukotriene receptor antagonists for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: These recommendations place a relatively high value on a limited efficacy of LTRA and additional cost of treatment. The suggestion to use oral LTRA in patients who do not use inhaled glucocorticosteroids places relatively high value on small reduction in symptoms of asthma and improvement in quality of life, and a relatively low value on limiting the cost of treatment.

Remarks: These recommendations do not apply to the treatment of rhinitis (recommendations 16, 17, 21).

Question 46

Should subcutaneous allergen-specific immunotherapy be used in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

One systematic review of 75 randomised trials assessed the efficacy of subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy for asthma (724). We estimated that the limitations in the design and execution of the majority of included trials were not serious enough to downgrade the quality of evidence for this criterion.

Eight additional randomised trials published after the search for literature for this review was done were identified by the ARIA group members and summarised in ARIA update on allergen immunotherapy (28). Results of these trials confirmed the findings of the systematic review by Abramson and colleagues (724).

Benefits

Asthma symptoms were reported in 28 studies included in the systematic review by Abramson and colleagues (724). There was a significant moderate to large reduction in asthma symptoms, compared to placebo, following the subcutaneous immunotherapy with pollens (14 trials, 547 patients; SMD: -0.66; 95% CI: -0.99 to -0.33), house dust mite (9 trials, 304 patients; SMD: -0.78; 95% CI: -1.27 to -0.29), and cat allergens (2 trials, 54 patients; SMD: -1.74; 95% CI: -2.70 to -0.78). There was no improvement following immunotherapy noted after immunotherapy with dog or multiple allergen extracts (one very small study each). Twenty two studies reported symptoms as worse, the same or improved. Symptoms were less likely to be rated as worsened following subcutaneous immunotherapy with pollen (RR: 0.25, 95% CI: 0.07 to 0.90), animal dander (RR: 0.46, 95% CI: 0.22 to 0.94), house dust mite (RR: 0.62, 95% CI: 0.44 to 0.87), and other allergens (RR: 0.46, 95% CI: 0.33 to 0.64).
Three trials compared subcutaneous immunotherapy to no treatment and noted similar effect on asthma symptoms (SMD: -1.84; 95% CI: -3.21 to -0.47). Only one trial of those included in the review measured quality of life in 44 patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and asthma (655). Impairment of overall quality of life during the pollen season was less in the immunotherapy group than in the placebo group (median difference 0.8 point, 95% CI: 0.18 to 1.5 on a 7-point scale).

Harms

Abramson and colleagues did not report adverse effects of subcutaneous immunotherapy in these trials. An estimate of the risk of adverse events may be extrapolated from the systematic review of 51 randomised trials of SCIT in seasonal allergic rhinitis (479). In this review the risk of non-life threatening systemic adverse events was estimated to be 7% in SCIT and 0.65% in placebo groups, and the risk of anaphylactic shock was estimated to be 0.72% and 0.33% respectively. Adrenalin was used in 19 per 14,085 injections given in the SCIT groups and in 1 per 8278 injections in the placebo groups. There were no fatal events reported in any of the studies included in the review by Calderon and colleagues (479). However, there are observational data suggesting that there is a risk of death with subcutaneous immunotherapy, particularly in patients with asthma (725-727). In the report of the Committee of the Safety of Medicine sixteen of 26 patients that died from anaphylaxis induced by desensitising agent had asthma, one had allergic rhinitis, and nine had undocumented reason for immunotherapy (727). Estimated incidence of death was one per 97,285 courses of treatment sold (the number of injections in a course of treatment varied from three to 18, depending on the product). The Immunotherapy Committee of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology reports there were 17 (11 with asthma) fatal cases in 1985–1989 (725) and 41 fatal cases in 1990–2001 (726). Detailed data was available for 17 of 41 cases described by Bernstein and colleagues. Fifteen of these patients had asthma, and the majority had either labile asthma or had experienced prior hospital admission, emergency room visit, and/or respiratory arrest for asthma. It was estimated that fatal reactions occurred in 1 per 2,500,000 injections, with an average of 3.4 deaths per year (726).

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit from subcutaneous specific immunotherapy in patients with allergic rhinitis and concomitant asthma is uncertain. There is a moderate to large reduction in asthma symptoms, compared to placebo, following the subcutaneous immunotherapy, but the risk of serious adverse events is substantial. There is also small, but serious risk of death. In the absence of an updated systematic review, we concluded that an overall quality of evidence for subcutaneous immunotherapy with pollen, house dust mite, and cat allergens to be moderate, since the evidence is imprecise due to small number of patients in the trials.
An updated rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy in patients with allergic rhinitis and concomitant asthma that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines.

What others are saying

Guidelines for the treatment of asthma prepared by other organizations either recommend that subcutaneous specific immunotherapy is considered for patients who have persistent asthma and for whom there is clear evidence of a relationship between symptoms and exposure to an allergen to which the patient is sensitive (666, 671) or do not make explicit recommendations for use of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy (668, 728). Those that do not make explicit recommendations state that immunotherapy may reduce asthma symptoms and use of asthma medications, but further comparative studies are needed (667) or that the role of specific immunotherapy in adult asthma is limited and it should be considered only after strict environmental avoidance and pharmacologic intervention have failed to control a patient's asthma(668).

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest subcutaneous specific immunotherapy for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on reducing the symptoms of asthma, and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and limiting the cost of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy. In patients who are more averse to the side effects of subcutaneous specific immunotherapy an alternative choice may be equally reasonable.

Remarks: Subcutaneous specific immunotherapy may also be used in patients with asthma and concomitant allergic rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis. Resource limitations will have stronger implications for the implementation of this recommendation.

Question 47

Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

Four systematic reviews assessed the efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy in asthma. One included randomised trials performed in adults and children (729), and the other three focused on children (550, 730, 731). We could not use any of these reviews to inform this recommendation, because they were done before newer important studies were published and there was high likelihood of errors during data extraction from primary studies.

Most studies in adults and children with allergic rhinitis (see questions 34 and 35) included also some patients with asthma. We identified five trials of SLIT in adults that explicitly enrolled patients with asthma (493, 494, 503, 516, 542) and another four trials in which at least 50% of patients had asthma (502, 505, 537, 540). Of these studies we used only two (493, 516) to inform this recommendation (see evidence profile 1 for question 47). We excluded other studies, because they either measured overall symptoms, did not report variability in results or did not specify what measure of variability was used. Thus, the results were highly inconsistent and there was very serious concern about directness of composite symptom scores that at least in some studies were explicitly designed to emphasize nasal symptoms.
We identified ten studies of SLIT that explicitly enrolled children with asthma (555, 562, 564, 566, 569, 571, 732-735) and another three trials in which at least 50% of children had asthma (553, 565, 573). We could not use data from two studies. One reported variability in a way that could not be reliably used in meta-analysis (of note, the authors of three systematic reviews of SLIT used different values of effect on asthma symptoms from this study, none of which was actually reported in the original publication) (562) and the other reported its results on a graph as several measurements over time (573) in a way that it was not possible to use any values for meta-analysis that would reflect the actual symptoms during the study (see description of studies for question 35).
All other studies of SLIT in adults and children with allergic rhinitis either included less than 50% patients with concomitant asthma or did not report the proportion of patients with asthma, despite some of them measured asthma symptoms (557, 570, 575). We considered results of these studies too indirect to inform this recommendation (pooled estimate from these three studies showed no effect and was very imprecise SMD: -0.13, 95% CI: -0.67 to 0.41).
We included only studies that explicitly enrolled children with asthma in our primary analysis (see evidence profile 2 for question 47). Including all studies that enrolled at least 50% children with asthma would not substantially change the estimate of effect (SMD: -0.80, 95% CI: -0.20 to -1.41). Including all above studies plus those that enrolled less than 50% of children with asthma but reported asthma symptoms and were included in previous systematic reviews (557, 570, 572, 575)

would also not change the estimate of effect on asthma symptoms (SMD: -0.62, 95% CI: -0.18 to -1.06).
One additional study (568) reported its results as number of children whose asthma improved and fond a benefit from SLIT (relative risk: 1.23, 95% CI: 1.00 to 1.53; risk difference: 157 more per 1000, 95% CI: from 1 more to 307 more), however, the results did not exclude no effect.

Benefits

Sublingual specific immunotherapy may have a small to moderately beneficial effect on asthma symptoms in adults and children (see evidence profile 1 and 2 for question 47), but the results do not exclude no effect. Asthma exacerbations and quality of life were not measured or reported in any of the studies.

Harms

There were no serious adverse effects in the included studies, however, there was a consistent increased risk of local adverse reactions (oral pruritus and oedema) with sublingual specific immunotherapy (see discussion of harms for questions 34 and 35).

Other considerations
See discussion of other considerations for questions 34 and 35.

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit of sublingual specific immunotherapy in treatment of asthma is uncertain. There is uncertainty if beneficial effects are large enough to counterbalance frequent local adverse effects. An updated rigorously performed and reported (223, 224) systematic review of sublingual specific immunotherapy versus placebo among adults and children with allergic rhinitis and asthma that provides information on all outcomes important to patients, including adverse effects, is required for the next update of the ARIA guidelines. There is also a need for rigorously designed and executed randomised trials of SLIT in adults and children that measure and properly report (74, 75) patient-important outcomes and adverse effects. Further research, if done, is very likely to have important impact on this recommendation.

What others are saying

Guidelines for the treatment of asthma prepared by other organizations do not make recommendations about sublingual specific immunotherapy and either do not mention it at all (667, 668) or state that it has been reported to be effective in asthma (671) and more clinical trials are needed (666).

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma, we suggest sublingual specific immunotherapy for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | low quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on possible reduction of asthma symptoms, and a relatively low value on avoiding adverse effects and limiting the cost of sublingual specific immunotherapy.

Remarks: Sublingual specific immunotherapy may also be used in patients with asthma and concomitant allergic rhinitis for treatment of rhinitis. Resource limitations will have stronger implications for the implementation of this recommendation.

Question 48

Should a monoclonal antibody against IgE be used for treatment of asthma in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma?

Summary of findings

One systematic review reporting 14 studies assessed the efficacy and safety of monoclonal antibody against IgE (anti-IgE) compared with placebo in patients with allergic asthma (736). Another systematic review reporting 5 trials focused exclusively on the quality of life (737).
We used systematic review by Walker and colleagues to prepare summary of evidence and to inform this recommendation, because it was methodologically more sound, reported all outcomes, and included more studies. Trials assessing the efficacy of monoclonal anti-IgE compared to placebo in patients with asthma not receiving inhaled glucocorticosteroids did not report any patient-important outcomes (736).
All studies included adult or adolescent patients, except for one that enrolled children aged 6–12 years (738). Positive result of skin test to common aero-allergens was an entry criterion in all studies.In the trials that examined subcutaneous monoclonal anti-IgE patients had moderate to severe asthma.
One non-systematic review examined omalizumab manufacturer's clinical trials and postmarketing surveillance data on anaphylaxis (739).

Benefits

In patients with moderate/severe allergic asthma monoclonal anti-IgE used as an add-on to inhaled glucocorticosteroids moderately reduced asthma symptoms and exacerbations, and improved quality of life compared to placebo. Considerable placebo effect on quality of life and global evaluation of treatment was observed. Subcutaneous administration of monoclonal anti-IgE allowed reducing the usage of inhaled glucocorticosteroids by a mean of 118 µg (95% CI: 83 to 154) budesonide equivalents with almost twice as many patients being able to reduce their inhaled corticosteroid dose by more than 50% compared to placebo (relative benefit: 1.79, 95% CI: 1.59 to 1.99). However, clinical significance of this effect is uncertain, since there was a large mean improvement in the placebo group of 320 µg daily in patients with moderate/severe asthma. This reduction in inhaled corticosteroid dose was accompanied with reduced risk of exacerbation.
Among patients with severe asthma who used oral glucocorticosteroids, monoclonal anti-IgE did not influence the probability of oral corticosteroid withdrawal (relative risk: 0.99, 95% CI: 0.50 to 1.74) or daily dose reduction (median 69% vs. 75%, p=0.68) compared to placebo, but these results were very imprecise.
One trial focused specifically on patients with asthma and concomitant allergic rhinitis (740). Its results were consistent with the results of other trials in patients with allergic asthma regardless of allergic rhinitis status.

Harms

Subcutaneous monoclonal anti-IgE was generally well tolerated, although it requires subcutaneous injections. Injection site reactions were present in 10% of patients and were twice as frequent with monoclonal anti-IgE as with placebo (relative risk 1.91, 95% CI: 1.35 to 2.67). In a review of randomised trials and observational studies that examined the risk of anaphylaxis there were 41 anaphylactic reactions (35 patients) in 39 510 patients that received omalizumab, that represents a

risk of 9 per 10 000 patients (739). None of the patients died or required intubation and mechanical ventilation. There is also uncertainty about the risk of malignancy, that although statistically not significant does not exclude a serious harm (relative risk: 2.17, 95% CI: 0.84 to 5.57; risk difference: 3 more per 1000, 95% CI: from 1 less per 1000 to 6 more per 1000)(741).

Conclusions and research needs

Net clinical benefit from a monoclonal antibody against IgE in patients with asthma is uncertain, because clinical benefits seem to be very closely balanced with risks, burden, and cost of treatment. Monoclonal anti-IgE reduces symptom severity and the risk of exacerbation, and improves quality of life when added to inhaled corticosteroids in patients with moderate/severe allergic asthma. It also allows reducing the dose of inhaled corticosteroids, although clinical significance of this effect is uncertain. In patients with severe asthma receiving oral glucocorticosteroids monoclonal anti-IgE did not allow reducing their dose, although the estimated effect is very imprecise.
Because of these downsides, any net clinical benefit from monoclonal antibody against IgE seems to be confined to patients with severe asthma not responding to other treatment.

What others are saying

Guidelines for the treatment of asthma prepared by other organizations recommend that monoclonal anti-IgE may be considered as adjunctive therapy for patients who have allergies and severe persistent asthma that is inadequately controlled with the combination of high-dose inhaled corticosteroids and long-acting β_2-agonists (671). Others do not make explicit recommendations, but either state its registered indications(667) or that a monoclonal anti-IgE is a treatment option limited to patients with elevated serum levels of IgE and has been shown to improve control of allergic asthma when it has not been achieved with a combination of other controller medications including high-doses of inhaled or oral glucocorticosteroids(668). Guidelines for the treatment of asthma in children state that no data are yet available for a paediatric population and further research is needed (666).

Recommendation

In patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma with a clear IgE-dependent allergic component, uncontrolled despite optimal pharmacologic treatment and appropriate allergen avoidance, we suggest monoclonal antibody against IgE for treatment of asthma (conditional recommendation | moderate quality evidence).

Underlying values and preferences: This recommendation places a relatively high value on reduction of symptoms of asthma and exacerbations in patients with severe asthma, and a relatively low value on avoiding the burden of subcutaneous injections, cost of treatment, small risk of anaphylaxis and some uncertainty about the risk of malignancy.

Priorities for revision of the guidelines

Plans for updating the guidelines

Guidelines are living documents. To remain useful, they need to be updated regularly as new information becomes available. A revision of this document will be needed because for many clinical questions it asked there were no systematic reviews of current evidence. This document will be updated when these reviews are performed, major new research is published or new treatments become available. This update is planned in 2012.

Updating or adapting recommendations locally

The methods used to develop the guidelines are transparent. The recommendations have been developed to be as specific and detailed as possible without losing sight of the user-friendliness of this document and the individual recommendations. Since recommendations in ARIA guidelines are developed as international guidelines, the ARIA guideline panel encourages feedback on all aspects of these guidelines including their applicability in individual countries. This feedback will be considered when revising the document.

Inclusion of additional information

These guidelines cover a limited number of clinical questions. Many other questions relevant to the management of allergic rhinitis and its impact on asthma have been identified as potentially important. ARIA will develop a process to register and prioritize additional questions to be included in subsequent revisions. Topics that were identified during the consultation as potential priorities for update and additional evidence reviews include:

- recommendations on using special formulas containing hydrolysed protein for prevention of allergy in infants
- relative effectiveness and safety of different homeopathic methods and herbal medicines
- recommendations on using intranasal saline in perennial allergic rhinitis
- recommendations on prevention and treatment of complications of allergic rhinitis
- refinement of recommendations on the use of particular medications considering the intermittent/seasonal or persistent/perennial allergic rhinitis

Priorities for research

General comments

During the guideline development process we often identified a need for more data on specific topics. This results in the following recommendations for research. We summarize these gaps in the evidence as research recommendations, to assist those in a position to provide such information by the design and execution of specific research projects and programmes to answer these questions. Any Recommendation in these guidelines that was supported by low or very low evidence clearly indicates an area in which there is need for more evidence through systematic research. Examining the available evidence for this revision of ARIA guidelines we found serious limitations in investigating and reporting some critical outcomes, particularly quality of life and adverse effects. We encourage investigators to measure and properly report all outcomes that are important to patients.

Most prominent specific research questions to be addressed

Prevention of allergy

1. Should formulas containing hydrolysed protein instead of cow's milk be used in infants not being able to be breastfed for the prevention of allergy and/or asthma?

Allergen avoidance measures for allergic rhinitis and/or asthma

2. Should patients allergic to indoor moulds avoid exposure to these allergens at home? (a well designed and executed randomised trials of different methods of removing moulds are needed)

Pharmacotherapy for allergic rhinitis

3. What is the relative efficacy and safety of individual oral H1-antihistamines in treatment of allergic rhinitis? (a systematic review addressing patient-important outcomes is needed)
4. Should oral H1-antihistamine be used as a rescue medication (as-needed) versus regularly for treatment of allergic rhinitis? (a systematic review addressing patient-important outcomes is needed)
5. What is the efficacy and safety of intranasal glucocorticosteroids in treatment of allergic rhinitis? (a systematic review addressing patient-important outcomes is needed)
6. Should oral glucocorticosteroids be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in patients not responding to other therapy? (a well designed and executed randomised trial investigating the effect of a short course of oral glucocorticosteroids as an add-on therapy on patient-important outcomes is needed)
7. Should short courses of intranasal decongestant be used for treatment of nasal obstruction in allergic rhinitis? (a well designed and executed randomised trial investigating the effect of a short course of intranasal decongestant as an add-on therapy on patient-important outcomes is needed)
8. Should oral decongestant be used as a rescue medication (as-needed) for treatment of allergic rhinitis? (a well designed and executed randomised trial measuring patient-important outcomes is needed)
9. Should combination of oral decongestant and H1-antihistamine versus oral H1-antihistamine alone be used as a rescue medication (as-needed) for treatment of allergic rhinitis? (a well designed and executed randomised trial measuring patient-important outcomes is needed)

Allergen specific immunotherapy for allergic rhinitis

10. Should subcutaneous specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults and children without concomitant asthma? (a well designed and executed randomised trial that measure and carefully report patient-important outcomes is needed)
11. Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults and children without concomitant asthma? (a complete rigorously performed systematic review that reports all patient-important outcomes is needed; a well designed and executed randomised trial that measure and carefully report patient-important outcomes is needed; optimal dose, dosing schedule, and duration of sublingual specific immunotherapy have to be established)
12. Should local nasal specific immunotherapy be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis in adults and children? (a complete rigorously performed systematic review that reports all patient-important outcomes is needed)

Complementary and alternative treatments for allergic rhinitis
13. Should butterbur extract be used for treatment of allergic rhinitis? (an independent well designed and executed randomised trial that measures and carefully reports patient-important outcomes is needed)

Treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis
14. Should leukotriene receptor antagonists be used for treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis? (a well designed and executed randomised trial that measure and carefully report patient-important outcomes in this particular population of patients with seasonal or perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis is needed)
15. Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used in patients with allergic rhinitis and concomitant asthma? (a well designed and executed randomised trial that measure and carefully report patient-important outcomes is needed)

Adaptation and/or localisation of guidelines

As described above, adaptation of these guidelines will be necessary in many circumstances Depending on when such a process takes place, advice to the WHO describes that the following steps should be taken(742):

- Appointing a guideline committee comprising clinicians and methodologists
- Determining the scope of the guidelines
- Defining the clinical questions to be addressed
- Updating the evidence tables if necessary
- Reviewing the recommendations in the guidelines (the recommendations may need to be modified at a national level, depending on the local values, availability of medications, and costs)
- Disseminating the guidelines, with a "use by" date
- Developing a method to obtain feedback and plans for review and update.

Panel members and contributors (in alphabetical order)

Sergio Bonini
Jean Bousquet
Jan L. Brożek
Carlos Baena-Cagnani
Alvaro Cruz
G. Walter Canonica
Roy Gerth van Wijk
Ken Ohta
Guido Rasi
Holger J. Schünemann
Torsten Zuberbier

Potential conflicts of interest

The following statements follow the template of declaring potential conflict of interests for the World Health Organization.

J.L.B. is an editor of a clinical journal where various drugs are advertised, including those that are the subject of this guideline; he received honoraria for speaking at conferences from GlaxoSmithKline and is a member of the GRADE working group.
J.B. received fees and honoraria for lectures, expert panel participation and consultations from Allmiral, AstraZeneca, Centocor, Chiesi Farmaceutici, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Novartis, Nycomed-Altana, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi-Aventis, Stallergènes, Schering Plough, UCB and Uriach.
C.B.C. received fees for consultancy, speaker bureau participation, lectures and research grants from Sanofi-Aventis, Novartis, GSK, Schering Plough, ALK and Abello.

S.B. has no conflict of interest, but declares membership in the Agenzia Italiana del Farmaco (AIFA) Research & Development panel.
G.W.C. received fees and honoraria for lectures, expert panel participation and consultations and research support from A. Menarini, Alcon, Alk-Abellò, Almirall, Altana, Anallergo, AstraZeneca, Aventis Pharma, Bayer, Biofutura Pharma, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi Farmaceutici, Chiron, Essex, Fujisawa, Genentech, Gentili, GlaxoSmithKline, Lofarma, Merck Sharp & Dome, Novartis, Pfizer, Pharmacia & Upjohn, Schering Plough, SigmaTau, Stallergenes, Yamanuchi, UCB Pharma and Valeas.
R.GvW. received fees for lectures and expert panel participation from Allmiral, Alcon, Merck Sharp & Dome, Novartis, Stallargènes and UCB.
H.J.S. is co-chair of the GRADE working group and he supports the implementation of the GRADE approach worldwide. From non-profit organizations he has accepted honoraria and consulting fees for activities in which his work with GRADE is relevant. In the past five years, HJS received no personal payments for service from pharmaceutical for profit organizations. No financial support was received for the preparation of the evidence profiles or provided to the evidence synthesis team that HJS led as part of this work.
T.Z. has received fees for consulting with Schering Plough, Novartis, Leti, Stallergenes, Bayer Schering, Ansell, Kryolan, UCB Pharma, Merck Sharpe Dome, DST and Procter and Gamble.

Acknowledgments

Nancy Santesso, Francesca Sperati, Irene Terrenato contributed to preparation of evidence profiles. Anna Bedbrook provided administrative assistance during the development of the document. We wish to thank the consultants who helped us improve the document during the consultant phase.

Appendix – search strategies

I. General search terms for identifying systematic reviews and randomized trials

For systematic reviews we searched:

1. the Cochrane Library of Systematic Reviews
2. PubMed MEDLINE using the following search terms: systematic[sb] OR medline[Title/Abstract] OR meta-analysis[Title] OR meta-analysis[Publication Type] OR "systematic review"[Title]

If no systematic review was found we searched Google Scholar using the terms: meta-analysis OR "systematic review"

For randomized trials we searched:

1. the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)
2. PubMed MEDLINE using the following search terms: (randomized controlled trial[Publication Type] OR (randomized[Title/Abstract] AND controlled[Title/Abstract] AND trial[Title/Abstract]))

If no RCT was found we searched PubMed MEDLINE using the following search terms: ((clinical[Title/Abstract] AND trial[Title/Abstract]) OR clinical trials[MeSH Terms] OR clinical trial[Publication Type] OR random*[Title/Abstract] OR random allocation[MeSH Terms] OR therapeutic use[MeSH Subheading])

If no RCT was found we searched Google Scholar using the terms: randomized OR randomised

I. Specific search terms for identifying evidence about each clinical question

Question 1

(breastfeeding OR breast feeding) AND (atopy OR sensitization OR allergy OR allergic OR asthma)

Question 2

(diet OR dietary) AND (atopy OR sensitization OR allergy OR allergic OR asthma)

Question 3

(tobacco OR smoke OR smoking) AND (atopy OR sensitization OR allergy OR allergic OR asthma)

Questions 4 & 7

(mite OR mites OR dermatophagoides OR euroglyphus) AND (atopy OR atopic OR allergy OR allergic OR asthma* OR wheez*)

Question 5 & 9

(atopy OR atopic OR allergy OR allergic OR asthma* OR wheez*) AND (prevent* OR develop* OR avoid*) AND (pet[tiab] OR pets[tiab] OR dog[tiab] OR dogs[tiab] OR canine[tiab] OR cat[tiab] OR cats[tiab] OR feline[tiab] OR bird[tiab] OR birds[tiab] OR animal[tiab] OR animals[tiab]) NOT (animal[mh] NOT human[mh]))

Question 6 & 10

(occupational OR workplace OR “work related” OR worker OR workers) AND (atopy OR atopic OR allergy OR allergic OR asthma* OR wheez*)

Question 8

(mold[tiab] OR molds[tiab] OR dampness[tiab]) AND (atopy OR atopic OR allergy OR allergic OR asthma* OR wheez*)

Question 11–13

(antihistamine* OR “Histamine H1 Antagonists”[mh] OR mepyramine OR pyrilamine OR antazoline OR diphenhydramine OR carbinoxamine OR doxylamine OR clemastine OR dimenhydrinate OR pheniramine OR chlorphenamine OR chlorpheniramine OR brompheniramine OR triprolidine OR hydroxyzine OR promethazine OR cyproheptadine OR azatadine OR ketotifen OR acrivastine OR cetirizine OR loratadine OR mizolastine OR fexofenadine OR levocetirizine OR desloratadine) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR "hay fever" OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 14

(((antihistamine* OR “Histamine H1 Antagonists”[mh]) AND (nasal OR intranasal OR topical)) OR azelastine OR levocabastine OR olopatadine) AND (allergic rhinitis OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR nasal allergy OR nasal allergies OR nasal congestion OR nasal itching OR rhinorrhea)

Question 15 & 25

(azelastine OR levocabastine OR olopatadine) AND (cetirizine OR loratadine OR mizolastine OR fexofenadine OR levocetirizine OR desloratadine) AND (allergic rhinitis OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR nasal allergy OR nasal allergies OR nasal congestion OR nasal itching OR rhinorrhea)

Question 16–17 & 21

(leukotriene antagonists[mh] OR antileukotriene* OR leukotriene* OR montelukast OR zafirlukast OR pranlukast OR zileuton) AND (allergic rhinitis OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR nasal allergy OR nasal allergies OR nasal congestion OR nasal itching OR rhinorrhea)

Question 18

(steroid* OR steroids OR corticosteroid* OR glucocorticoid* OR beclomethasone OR fluticasone OR triamcinolone OR budesonide OR mometasone OR flunisolide OR ciclesonide OR (“Anti-Inflammatory Agents”[pa] NOT “Anti-Inflammatory Agents, Non-Steroidal”[pa])) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR "hay fever" OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 19

(antihistamine* OR (“Histamine H1 Antagonists”[mh]) OR mepyramine OR pyrilamine OR antazoline OR diphenhydramine OR carbinoxamine OR doxylamine OR clemastine OR dimenhydrinate OR pheniramine OR chlorphenamine OR chlorpheniramine OR brompheniramine OR triprolidine OR hydroxyzine OR promethazine OR cyproheptadine OR azatadine OR ketotifen OR acrivastine OR cetirizine OR loratadine OR mizolastine OR fexofenadine OR levocetirizine OR desloratadine) AND (steroid* OR steroids OR corticosteroid* OR glucocorticoid* OR beclomethasone OR fluticasone OR triamcinolone OR budesonide OR mometasone OR flunisolide OR ciclesonide) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR "hay fever" OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 20

(steroid* OR steroids OR corticosteroid* OR glucocorticoid* OR beclomethasone OR fluticasone OR triamcinolone OR budesonide OR mometasone OR dexamethasone OR flunisolide OR ciclesonide OR (“Anti-Inflammatory Agents”[pa] NOT “Anti-Inflammatory Agents, Non-Steroidal”[pa])) AND (((antihistamine* OR “Histamine H1 Antagonists”[mh]) AND (nasal OR intranasal OR topical)) OR azelastine OR levocabastine OR olopatadine)

Question 22

(steroid* OR steroids OR corticosteroid* OR glucocorticoid* OR dexamethasone OR prednisone OR prednisolone OR methylprednisolone OR (“Anti-Inflammatory Agents”[pa] NOT “Anti-Inflammatory Agents, Non-Steroidal”[pa])) AND (oral[tiab] OR orally[tiab] OR “per os”[tiab] OR systemic[tiab]) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 23

(steroid* OR steroids OR corticosteroid* OR glucocorticoid* OR dexamethasone OR methylprednisolone OR diprophos OR betamethasone OR hydrocortisone OR (“Anti-Inflammatory Agents”[pa] NOT “Anti-Inflammatory Agents, Non-Steroidal”[pa])) AND (depot OR intramuscular OR prolong*) AND (allergic rhinitis OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR nasal allergy OR nasal allergies OR nasal congestion OR nasal itching OR rhinorrhea)

Question 24

(chromones OR nedocromil OR cromolyn OR cromoglycate OR lodoxamide) AND (allergic rhinitis OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR nasal allergy OR nasal allergies OR nasal congestion OR nasal itching OR rhinorrhea)

Question 26

ipratropium AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 27

(((nasal OR intranasal) AND decongestant) OR phenylephrine OR naphazoline OR xylometazoline OR oxymetazoline) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 28 & 29

((oral* AND decongestant*) OR ephedrine OR pseudoephedrine) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 30

(antihistamine* OR “Histamine H1 Antagonists”[mh] OR azelastine OR emedastine OR levocabastine OR olopatadine OR ketotifen)

Question 31

("chromones"[MeSH Terms] OR chromones[Text Word]) OR ("nedocromil"[MeSH Terms] OR nedocromil[Text Word]) OR (("cromolyn sodium"[TIAB] NOT Medline[SB]) OR "cromolyn sodium"[MeSH Terms] OR cromoglycate[Text Word]) OR ("lodoxamide ethyl"[Substance Name] OR lodoxamide[Text Word]) AND (intraocular OR ocular OR eye OR eyes OR conjunctiv* OR drops)

Question 32–36 & 46 & 47

(immunotherapy OR desensiti* OR hyposensiti*) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR "nasal congestion" OR "nasal itching" OR rhinorrhea)

Question 37

homeopat* AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR “nasal congestion” OR “nasal itching” OR rhinorrhea)

Question 38

accupuncture AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR “nasal congestion” OR “nasal itching” OR rhinorrhea)

Question 39

(butterbur OR petasites) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR “nasal congestion” OR “nasal itching” OR rhinorrhea)

Question 40

(herbal OR herb) AND ("allergic rhinitis" OR “hay fever” OR hayfever OR "nasal allergy" OR "nasal allergies" OR “nasal congestion” OR “nasal itching” OR rhinorrhea)

Question 41

We relied on the search done by Passalacqua and colleagues (J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;117:1054–1062)

Question 42

(asthma OR wheez*) AND (antihistamine* OR “Histamine H1 Antagonists”[mh] OR mepyramine OR pyrilamine OR antazoline OR diphenhydramine OR carbinoxamine OR doxylamine OR clemastine OR dimenhydrinate OR pheniramine OR chlorphenamine OR chlorpheniramine OR brompheniramine OR triprolidine OR hydroxyzine OR promethazine OR cyproheptadine OR azatadine OR ketotifen OR acrivastine OR cetirizine OR loratadine OR mizolastine OR fexofenadine OR levocetirizine OR desloratadine)

Question 43

(asthma OR wheez*) AND (decongestant OR ephedrine OR pseudoephedrine)

Question 44

(steroid* OR steroids OR corticosteroid* OR glucocorticoid* OR beclomethasone OR fluticasone OR triamcinolone OR budesonide OR mometasone OR dexamethasone OR flunisolide OR

ciclesonide OR ("Anti-Inflammatory Agents"[pa] NOT "Anti-Inflammatory Agents, Non-Steroidal"[pa])) AND (asthma OR wheez*) AND (nasal OR intranasal OR nose OR topical)

Question 45

(leukotriene antagonists[mh] OR antileukotriene* OR leukotriene* OR montelukast OR zafirlukast OR pranlukast OR zileuton) AND (asthma OR wheez*)

Question 48

omalizumab OR xolair

References

1. Bousquet J, Van Cauwenberge P, Khaltaev N. Allergic rhinitis and its impact on asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2001;108(5 Suppl):S147-334.
2. Bousquet J, Khaltaev N, Cruz AA, Denburg J, Fokkens WJ, Togias A, et al. Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma (ARIA) 2008 update (in collaboration with the World Health Organization, GA(2)LEN and AllerGen). Allergy 2008;63 Suppl 86:8-160.
3. Guyatt GH, Haynes B, Jaeschke R, Meade MO, Wilson M, Montori V, et al. The philosophy of evidence-based medicine. In: Guyatt GH, Rennie D, Meade MO, Cook DJ, editors. Users' guides to the medical literature: a manual for evidence-based clinical practice. Chicago, IL: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.; 2008. p. 9-16.
4. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2008;336(7650):924-6.
5. Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy (2003) Guidelines for WHO guidelines. EIP/GPE/EQC/2003.1. In. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003.
6. The GRADE Working Group. Organizations that have endorsed or that are using GRADE. Available at: http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/society/index.htm. 2008 [cited; Available from: http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/society/index.htm
7. Atkins D, Eccles M, Flottorp S, Guyatt GH, Henry D, Hill S, et al. Systems for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations I: critical appraisal of existing approaches The GRADE Working Group. BMC Health Serv Res 2004;4(1):38.
8. Aberg N, Sundell J, Eriksson B, Hesselmar B, Aberg B. Prevalence of allergic diseases in schoolchildren in relation to family history, upper respiratory infections, and residential characteristics. Allergy 1996;51(4):232-7.
9. Lundback B. Epidemiology of rhinitis and asthma. Clin Exp Allergy 1998;2:3-10.
10. Sakurai Y, Nakamura K, Teruya K, Shimada N, Umeda T, Tanaka H, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of allergic rhinitis and cedar pollinosis among Japanese men. Prev Med 1998;27(4):617-22.
11. Sly RM. Changing prevalence of allergic rhinitis and asthma. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(3):233-48.
12. Holgate ST. The epidemic of allergy and asthma. Nature 1999;402(6760 Suppl):B2-4.
13. Corren J. Allergic rhinitis and asthma: how important is the link? J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;99(2):S781-6.
14. Corren J. The impact of allergic rhinitis on bronchial asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1998;101(2 Pt 2):S352-6.
15. Rowe-Jones JM. The link between the nose and lung, perennial rhinitis and asthma--is it the same disease? Allergy 1997;52(36 Suppl):20-8.
16. Townley RG, Kiboneka A. Allergic rhinitis: relationship to asthma: similarities, differences, and interactions [editorial]. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1998;80(2):137-9.
17. Vignola AM, Chanez P, Godard P, Bousquet J. Relationships between rhinitis and asthma. Allergy 1998;53(9):833-9.
18. Gergen PJ, Turkeltaub PC. The association of individual allergen reactivity with respiratory disease in a national sample: data from the second National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1976-80 (NHANES II). J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90(4 Pt 1):579-88.
19. Leynaert B, Bousquet J, Neukirch C, Liard R, Neukirch F. Perennial rhinitis: An independent risk factor for asthma in nonatopic subjects: Results from the European Community Respiratory Health Survey. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104:301-304.

20. Celedon JC, Palmer LJ, Weiss ST, Wang B, Fang Z, Xu X. Asthma, rhinitis, and skin test reactivity to aeroallergens in families of asthmatic subjects in Anqing, China. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2001;163(5):1108-12.
21. Pedersen PA, Weeke ER. Asthma and allergic rhinitis in the same patients. Allergy 1983;38(1):25-9.
22. Greisner Wr, Settipane RJ, Settipane GA. Co-existence of asthma and allergic rhinitis: a 23-year follow-up study of college students. Allergy Asthma Proc 1998;19(4):185-8.
23. Guerra S, Sherrill DL, Martinez FD, Barbee RA. Rhinitis as an independent risk factor for adult-onset asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2002;109(3):419-25.
24. Bousquet J, Lund VJ, Van Cauwenberge P, Bremard-Oury C, Mounedji N, Stevens MT, et al. Implementation of guidelines for seasonal allergic rhinitis: a randomized controlled trial. Allergy 2003;58(8):733-741.
25. Brozek JL, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bonini S, Canonica GW, Rasi G, van Wijk RG, et al. Methodology for development of the Allergic Rhinitis and its Impact on Asthma guideline 2008 update. Allergy 2008;63(1):38-46.
26. Custovic A, Wijk RG. The effectiveness of measures to change the indoor environment in the treatment of allergic rhinitis and asthma: ARIA update (in collaboration with GA(2)LEN). Allergy 2005;60(9):1112-5.
27. Passalacqua G, Bousquet PJ, Carlsen KH, Kemp J, Lockey RF, Niggemann B, et al. ARIA update: I--Systematic review of complementary and alternative medicine for rhinitis and asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;117(5):1054-62.
28. Passalacqua G, Durham SR. Allergic rhinitis and its impact on asthma update: allergen immunotherapy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;119(4):881-91.
29. Bonini S, Bonini M, Bousquet J, Brusasco V, Canonica GW, Carlsen KH, et al. Rhinitis and asthma in athletes: an ARIA document in collaboration with GA2LEN. Allergy 2006;61(6):681-92.
30. Bousquet J, van Cauwenberge P, Ait Khaled N, Bachert C, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bouchard J, et al. Pharmacologic and anti-IgE treatment of allergic rhinitis ARIA update (in collaboration with GALEN). Allergy 2006;61(9):1086-96.
31. World Health Organization. Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy. Guidelines for WHO Guidelines. EIP/GPE/EQC/2003.1. Geneva; 2003.
32. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2004;328(7454):1490.
33. Schünemann HJ, Jaeschke R, Cook DJ, Bria WF, El-Solh AA, Ernst A, et al. An official ATS statement: grading the quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in ATS guidelines and recommendations. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2006;174(5):605-14.
34. Schünemann HJ, Fretheim A, Oxman AD. Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 9. Grading evidence and recommendations. Health Res Policy Syst 2006;4:21.
35. Oxman AD, Guyatt GH. Guidelines for reading literature reviews. CMAJ 1988;138(8):697-703.
36. Schunemann HJ, Oxman AD, Fretheim A. Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 6. Determining which outcomes are important. Health Res Policy Syst 2006;4:18.
37. Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Fretheim A. Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 8. Synthesis and presentation of evidence. Health Res Policy Syst 2006;4:20.
38. Schünemann H, Brozek J, Oxman A. GRADEprofiler. (http://www.cc-ims.net/revman/gradepro). 2008 [cited; Available from: http://www.cc-ims.net/revman/gradepro 2009.
39. Schünemann HJ, Hill SR, Kakad M, Vist GE, Bellamy R, Stockman L, et al. Transparent development of the WHO rapid advice guidelines. PLoS Med 2007;4(5):e119.

40. Schunemann HJ, Oxman AD, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Jaeschke R, Vist GE, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations for diagnostic tests and strategies. BMJ 2008;336(7653):1106-10.
41. Schunemann HJ, Jaeschke R, Cook DJ, Bria WF, El-Solh AA, Ernst A, et al. An official ATS statement: grading the quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in ATS guidelines and recommendations. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2006;174(5):605-14.
42. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Schunemann HJ. What is "quality of evidence" and why is it important to clinicians? BMJ 2008;336(7651):995-8.
43. Cohen J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
44. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Jaeschke R, Helfand M, Liberati A, et al. Incorporating considerations of resources use into grading recommendations. BMJ 2008;336(7654):1170-3.
45. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Vist GE, Liberati A, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations. BMJ 2008;336(7652):1049-51.
46. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Jaeschke R, Helfand M, Liberati A, et al. Incorporating considerations of resources use into grading recommendations. BMJ 2008;336(7654):1170-1173.
47. Gdalevich M, Mimouni D, David M, Mimouni M. Breast-feeding and the onset of atopic dermatitis in childhood: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. J Am Acad Dermatol 2001;45(4):520-7.
48. Mimouni Bloch A, Mimouni D, Mimouni M, Gdalevich M. Does breastfeeding protect against allergic rhinitis during childhood? A meta-analysis of prospective studies. Acta Paediatr 2002;91(3):275-9.
49. Gdalevich M, Mimouni D, Mimouni M. Breast-feeding and the risk of bronchial asthma in childhood: a systematic review with meta-analysis of prospective studies. J Pediatr 2001;139(2):261-6.
50. Muraro A, Dreborg S, Halken S, Host A, Niggemann B, Aalberse R, et al. Dietary prevention of allergic diseases in infants and small children. Part III: Critical review of published peer-reviewed observational and interventional studies and final recommendations. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2004;15(4):291-307.
51. Kramer MS, Kakuma R. Optimal duration of exclusive breastfeeding. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2002(1):CD003517.
52. van Odijk J, Kull I, Borres MP, Brandtzaeg P, Edberg U, Hanson LA, et al. Breastfeeding and allergic disease: a multidisciplinary review of the literature (1966-2001) on the mode of early feeding in infancy and its impact on later atopic manifestations. Allergy 2003;58(9):833-43.
53. Ip S, Chung M, Raman G, Chew P, Magula N, DeVine D, et al. Breastfeeding and maternal and infant health outcomes in developed countries. Evid Rep Technol Assess (Full Rep) 2007(153):1-186.
54. Burgess SW, Dakin CJ, O'Callaghan MJ. Breastfeeding does not increase the risk of asthma at 14 years. Pediatrics 2006;117(4):e787-92.
55. Kull I, Almqvist C, Lilja G, Pershagen G, Wickman M. Breast-feeding reduces the risk of asthma during the first 4 years of life. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;114(4):755-60.
56. Sears MR, Greene JM, Willan AR, Taylor DR, Flannery EM, Cowan JO, et al. Long-term relation between breastfeeding and development of atopy and asthma in children and young adults: a longitudinal study. Lancet 2002;360(9337):901-7.
57. Wright AL, Holberg CJ, Taussig LM, Martinez FD. Factors influencing the relation of infant feeding to asthma and recurrent wheeze in childhood. Thorax 2001;56(3):192-7.
58. Gartner LM, Morton J, Lawrence RA, Naylor AJ, O'Hare D, Schanler RJ, et al. Breastfeeding and the use of human milk. Pediatrics 2005;115(2):496-506.
59. Agence Nationale d'Accreditation et d'Evaluation en Sante. Allaitement maternel: mise en oeuvre et poursuite dans les six premiers mois de vie de l'enfant. Recommandations (mai 2002). Gynecol Obstet Fertil 2003;31(5):481-90.

60. Nationale Stillkommission am BfR. Empfehlungen zur Stilldauer. Empfehlungen der Nationalen Stillkommission vom 1. Marz 2004. Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz 2004;47(9):908.
61. Committee on Health Care for Underserved Women, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 361: Breastfeeding: maternal and infant aspects. Obstet Gynecol 2007;109(2 Pt 1):479-80.
62. Kramer M, Kakuma R. Maternal dietary antigen avoidance during pregnancy or lactation, or both, for preventing or treating atopic disease in the child. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2006;3:CD000133.
63. Strachan DP, Cook DG. Health effects of passive smoking. 1. Parental smoking and lower respiratory illness in infancy and early childhood. Thorax 1997;52(10):905-14.
64. Strachan DP, Cook DG. Health effects of passive smoking. 6. Parental smoking and childhood asthma: longitudinal and case-control studies. Thorax 1998;53(3):204-12.
65. Cook DG, Strachan DP. Health effects of passive smoking. 3. Parental smoking and prevalence of respiratory symptoms and asthma in school age children. Thorax 1997;52(12):1081-94.
66. Zmirou D, Blatier JF, Andre E, Ferley JP, Balducci F, Rossum F, et al. [Passive smoking respiratory risk. A quantitative synthesis of the literature]. Rev Mal Respir 1990;7(4):361-71.
67. Jaakkola JJ, Jaakkola MS. Effects of environmental tobacco smoke on the respiratory health of children. Scand J Work Environ Health 2002;28 Suppl 2:71-83.
68. US Department of Health and Human Services. The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke: A Report of the Surgeon General. Chapter 6. Respiratory Effects in Children from Exposure to Secondhand Smoke. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Coordinating Center for Health Promotion, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; 2006.
69. Strachan DP, Cook DG. Health effects of passive smoking .5. Parental smoking and allergic sensitisation in children. Thorax 1998;53(2):117-23.
70. Lannero E, Wickman M, Pershagen G, Nordvall L. Maternal smoking during pregnancy increases the risk of recurrent wheezing during the first years of life (BAMSE). Respir Res 2006;7:3.
71. Pattenden S, Antova T, Neuberger M, Nikiforov B, De Sario M, Grize L, et al. Parental smoking and children's respiratory health: independent effects of prenatal and postnatal exposure. Tob Control 2006;15(4):294-301.
72. World Health Organization. Tobacco Free Initiative. International Consultation on Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) and Child Health. Geneva, Switzerland; 1999.
73. O'Connell EJ, Logan GB. Parental smoking in childhood asthma. Ann Allergy 1974;32(3):142-5.
74. Gagnier JJ, Boon H, Rochon P, Moher D, Barnes J, Bombardier C. Reporting randomized, controlled trials of herbal interventions: an elaborated CONSORT statement. Ann Intern Med 2006;144(5):364-7.
75. Ioannidis JP, Evans SJ, Gotzsche PC, O'Neill RT, Altman DG, Schulz K, et al. Better reporting of harms in randomized trials: an extension of the CONSORT statement. Ann Intern Med 2004;141(10):781-8.
76. Institute-of-Medicine. Indoor Biologic Exposures. In: Clearing the Air. Asthma and Indoor Air Exposures. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2000.
77. Platts-Mills TA, Vervloet D, Thomas WR, Aalberse RC, Chapman MD. Indoor allergens and asthma: report of the Third International Workshop. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;100(6 Pt 1):S2-24.
78. Gelber LE, Seltzer LH, Bouzoukis JK, Pollart SM, Chapman MD, Platts-Mills TA. Sensitization and exposure to indoor allergens as risk factors for asthma among patients presenting to hospital. Am Rev Respir Dis 1993;147(3):573-8.

79. Peat JK, Tovey E, Toelle BG, Haby MM, Gray EJ, Mahmic A, et al. House dust mite allergens. A major risk factor for childhood asthma in Australia. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1996;153(1):141-6.
80. Squillace SP, Sporik RB, Rakes G, Couture N, Lawrence A, Merriam S, et al. Sensitization to dust mites as a dominant risk factor for asthma among adolescents living in central Virginia. Multiple regression analysis of a population-based study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1997;156(6):1760-4.
81. Sears MR, Herbison GP, Holdaway MD, Hewitt CJ, Flannery EM, Silva PA. The relative risks of sensitivity to grass pollen, house dust mite and cat dander in the development of childhood asthma. Clin Exp Allergy 1989;19(4):419-24.
82. Sporik R, Holgate ST, Platts-Mills TA, Cogswell JJ. Exposure to house-dust mite allergen (Der p I) and the development of asthma in childhood. A prospective study. N Engl J Med 1990;323(8):502-7.
83. Huss K, Adkinson NF, Jr., Eggleston PA, Dawson C, Van Natta ML, Hamilton RG. House dust mite and cockroach exposure are strong risk factors for positive allergy skin test responses in the Childhood Asthma Management Program. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2001;107(1):48-54.
84. Illi S, von Mutius E, Lau S, Niggemann B, Gruber C, Wahn U. Perennial allergen sensitisation early in life and chronic asthma in children: a birth cohort study. Lancet 2006;368(9537):763-70.
85. Cullinan P, MacNeill SJ, Harris JM, Moffat S, White C, Mills P, et al. Early allergen exposure, skin prick responses, and atopic wheeze at age 5 in English children: a cohort study. Thorax 2004;59(10):855-61.
86. Chan-Yeung M, Ferguson A, Watson W, Dimich-Ward H, Rousseau R, Lilley M, et al. The Canadian Childhood Asthma Primary Prevention Study: outcomes at 7 years of age. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005;116(1):49-55.
87. Chan-Yeung M, Manfreda J, Dimich-Ward H, Ferguson A, Watson W, Becker A. A randomized controlled study on the effectiveness of a multifaceted intervention program in the primary prevention of asthma in high-risk infants. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2000;154(7):657-63.
88. Becker A, Watson W, Ferguson A, Dimich-Ward H, Chan-Yeung M. The Canadian asthma primary prevention study: outcomes at 2 years of age. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;113(4):650-6.
89. Schonberger HJ, Dompeling E, Knottnerus JA, Maas T, Muris JW, van Weel C, et al. The PREVASC study: the clinical effect of a multifaceted educational intervention to prevent childhood asthma. Eur Respir J 2005;25(4):660-70.
90. Halmerbauer G, Gartner C, Schierl M, Arshad H, Dean T, Koller DY, et al. Study on the Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe (SPACE): allergic sensitization at 1 year of age in a controlled trial of allergen avoidance from birth. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2003;14(1):10-7.
91. Horak F, Jr., Matthews S, Ihorst G, Arshad SH, Frischer T, Kuehr J, et al. Effect of mite-impermeable mattress encasings and an educational package on the development of allergies in a multinational randomized, controlled birth-cohort study -- 24 months results of the Study of Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(8):1220-5.
92. Arshad SH, Bateman B, Matthews SM. Primary prevention of asthma and atopy during childhood by allergen avoidance in infancy: a randomised controlled study. Thorax 2003;58(6):489-93.
93. Arshad SH, Bateman B, Sadeghnejad A, Gant C, Matthews SM. Prevention of allergic disease during childhood by allergen avoidance: the Isle of Wight prevention study. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;119(2):307-13.
94. Marks GB, Mihrshahi S, Kemp AS, Tovey ER, Webb K, Almqvist C, et al. Prevention of asthma during the first 5 years of life: a randomized controlled trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;118(1):53-61.

95. Mihrshahi S, Peat JK, Marks GB, Mellis CM, Tovey ER, Webb K, et al. Eighteen-month outcomes of house dust mite avoidance and dietary fatty acid modification in the Childhood Asthma Prevention Study (CAPS). J Allergy Clin Immunol 2003;111(1):162-8.
96. Corver K, Kerkhof M, Brussee JE, Brunekreef B, van Strien RT, Vos AP, et al. House dust mite allergen reduction and allergy at 4 yr: follow up of the PIAMA-study. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2006;17(5):329-36.
97. Koopman LP, van Strien RT, Kerkhof M, Wijga A, Smit HA, de Jongste JC, et al. Placebo-controlled trial of house dust mite-impermeable mattress covers: effect on symptoms in early childhood. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002;166(3):307-13.
98. van Strien RT, Koopman LP, Kerkhof M, Oldenwening M, de Jongste JC, Gerritsen J, et al. Mattress encasings and mite allergen levels in the Prevention and Incidence of Asthma and Mite Allergy study. Clin Exp Allergy 2003;33(4):490-5.
99. van Strien RT, Koopman LP, Kerkhof M, Spithoven J, de Jongste JC, Gerritsen J, et al. Mite and pet allergen levels in homes of children born to allergic and nonallergic parents: the PIAMA study. Environ Health Perspect 2002;110(11):A693-8.
100. Simpson A, Simpson B, Custovic A, Craven M, Woodcock A. Stringent environmental control in pregnancy and early life: the long-term effects on mite, cat and dog allergen. Clin Exp Allergy 2003;33(9):1183-9.
101. Woodcock A, Lowe LA, Murray CS, Simpson BM, Pipis SD, Kissen P, et al. Early life environmental control: effect on symptoms, sensitization, and lung function at age 3 years. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2004;170(4):433-9.
102. Apelberg BJ, Aoki Y, Jaakkola JJ. Systematic review: Exposure to pets and risk of asthma and asthma-like symptoms. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2001;107(3):455-60.
103. Richardson G, Eick S, Jones R. How is the indoor environment related to asthma?: literature review. J Adv Nurs 2005;52(3):328-39.
104. Schonberger HJ, Maas T, Dompeling E, Knottnerus JA, van Weel C, van Schayck CP. Compliance of asthmatic families with a primary prevention programme of asthma and effectiveness of measures to reduce inhalant allergens--a randomized trial. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(7):1024-31.
105. Chan-Yeung M, Ferguson A, Dimich-Ward H, Watson W, Manfreda J, Becker A. Effectiveness of and compliance to intervention measures in reducing house dust and cat allergen levels. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;88(1):52-8.
106. Nicholson PJ, Cullinan P, Taylor AJ, Burge PS, Boyle C. Evidence based guidelines for the prevention, identification, and management of occupational asthma. Occup Environ Med 2005;62(5):290-9.
107. Newman Taylor AJ, Nicholson PJ, Cullinan P, Boyle C, Burge PS. Guidelines for the prevention, identification & management of occupational asthma: Evidence review & recommendations. London: British Occupational Health Research Foundation; 2004.
108. Bousquet J, Flahault A, Vandenplas O, Ameille J, Duron JJ, Pecquet C, et al. Natural rubber latex allergy among health care workers: a systematic review of the evidence. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;118(2):447-54.
109. LaMontagne AD, Radi S, Elder DS, Abramson MJ, Sim M. Primary prevention of latex related sensitisation and occupational asthma: a systematic review. Occup Environ Med 2006;63(5):359-64.
110. Sheikh A, Hurwitz B, Shehata Y. House dust mite avoidance measures for perennial allergic rhinitis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007(1):CD001563.
111. Gotzsche PC, Johansen HK. House dust mite control measures for asthma: systematic review. Allergy 2008;63(6):646-59.
112. Gotzsche PC, Johansen HK. House dust mite control measures for asthma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2008(2):CD001187.

113. Morgan WJ, Crain EF, Gruchalla RS, O'Connor GT, Kattan M, Evans R, 3rd, et al. Results of a home-based environmental intervention among urban children with asthma. N Engl J Med 2004;351(11):1068-80.
114. Kattan M, Stearns SC, Crain EF, Stout JW, Gergen PJ, Evans R, 3rd, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a home-based environmental intervention for inner-city children with asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005;116(5):1058-63.
115. Eggleston PA, Butz A, Rand C, Curtin-Brosnan J, Kanchanaraksa S, Swartz L, et al. Home environmental intervention in inner-city asthma: a randomized controlled clinical trial. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(6):518-24.
116. Williams SG, Brown CM, Falter KH, Alverson CJ, Gotway-Crawford C, Homa D, et al. Does a multifaceted environmental intervention alter the impact of asthma on inner-city children? J Natl Med Assoc 2006;98(2):249-60.
117. Busse PJ, Wang JJ, Halm EA. Allergen sensitization evaluation and allergen avoidance education in an inner-city adult cohort with persistent asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005;116(1):146-52.
118. Kercsmar CM, Dearborn DG, Schluchter M, Xue L, Kirchner HL, Sobolewski J, et al. Reduction in asthma morbidity in children as a result of home remediation aimed at moisture sources. Environ Health Perspect 2006;114(10):1574-80.
119. Bernstein JA, Bobbitt RC, Levin L, Floyd R, Crandall MS, Shalwitz RA, et al. Health effects of ultraviolet irradiation in asthmatic children's homes. J Asthma 2006;43(4):255-62.
120. Kilburn S, Lasserson TJ, McKean M. Pet allergen control measures for allergic asthma in children and adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2003(1):CD002989.
121. Bjornsdottir US, Jakobinudottir S, Runarsdottir V, Juliusson S. The effect of reducing levels of cat allergen (Fel d 1) on clinical symptoms in patients with cat allergy. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;91(2):189-94.
122. Wood RA, Johnson EF, Van-Natta ML, Chen PH, Eggleston PA. A placebo-controlled trial of a HEPA air cleaner in the treatment of cat allergy. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1998;158(1):115-20.
123. Beach J, Rowe BH, Blitz S, Crumley E, Hooton N, Russell K, et al. Diagnosis and Management of Work-Related Asthma. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 129 (Prepared by University of Alberta Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0023). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2005.
124. Ross DJ, McDonald JC. Health and employment after a diagnosis of occupational asthma: a descriptive study. Occup Med (Lond) 1998;48(4):219-25.
125. Slater JW, Zechnich AD, Haxby DG. Second-generation antihistamines: a comparative review. Drugs 1999;57(1):31-47.
126. Hore I, Georgalas C, Scadding G. Oral antihistamines for the symptom of nasal obstruction in persistent allergic rhinitis--a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Clin Exp Allergy 2005;35(2):207-12.
127. Canonica GW, Tarantini F, Compalati E, Penagos M. Efficacy of desloratadine in the treatment of allergic rhinitis: a meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind, controlled trials. Allergy 2007;62(4):359-66.
128. Gutierrez Castrellon P, Ramirez Mayans J, Lopez Perez G. [Efficacy and safety of astemizole in the treatment of allergic rhinitis and urticaria: a systematic review with meta-analysis]. Rev Alerg Mex 2005;52(3):113-26.
129. Gibbs TG, McDonnell KA, Stokes T, Graham AA. Acrivastine in two doses compared with placebo in a multicentre, parallel group study for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Br J Clin Pract 1989;43(1):11-4.
130. Gibbs TG, Irander K, Salo OP. Acrivastine in seasonal allergic rhinitis: two randomized crossover studies to evaluate efficacy and safety. J Int Med Res 1988;16(6):413-9.

131. Franke W, Messinger D. Double-blind multicenter controlled clinical study comparing the efficacy of picumast dihydrochloride versus astemizole and placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Arzneimittelforschung 1989;39(10A):1360-3.
132. Aaronson DW. Comparative efficacy of H1 antihistamines. Ann Allergy 1991;67(5):541-7.
133. Bousquet J, Czarlewski W, Cougnard J, Danzig M, Michel FB. Changes in skin-test reactivity do not correlate with clinical efficacy of H1-blockers in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1998;53(6):579-85.
134. Weiler JM, Donnelly A, Campbell BH, Connell JT, Diamond L, Hamilton LH, et al. Multicenter, double-blind, multiple-dose, parallel-groups efficacy and safety trial of azelastine, chlorpheniramine, and placebo in the treatment of spring allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;82(5 Pt 1):801-11.
135. Falliers CJ, Brandon ML, Buchman E, Connell JT, Dockhorn R, Leese PT, et al. Double-blind comparison of cetirizine and placebo in the treatment of seasonal rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1991;66(3):257-62.
136. Wasserman SI, Broide DH, Marquardt DL. Cetirizine therapy for seasonal allergic rhinitis: alternative dosage schedules. Clin Ther 1991;13(6):707-13.
137. Mansmann H, Jr., Altman RA, Berman BA, Buchman E, Dockhorn RJ, Leese PT, et al. Efficacy and safety of cetirizine therapy in perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1992;68(4):348-53.
138. Lockey RF, Widlitz MD, Mitchell DQ, Lumry W, Dockhorn R, Woehler T, et al. Comparative study of cetirizine and terfenadine versus placebo in the symptomatic management of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(5):448-54.
139. Pearlman DS, Lumry WR, Winder JA, Noonan MJ. Once-daily cetirizine effective in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis in children aged 6 to 11 years: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Clin Pediatr Phila 1997;36(4):209-15.
140. Howarth PH, Stern MA, Roi L, Reynolds R, Bousquet J. Double-blind, placebo-controlled study comparing the efficacy and safety of fexofenadine hydrochloride (120 and 180 mg once daily) and cetirizine in seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104(5):927-33.
141. de-Molina M, Cadahia A, Cano L, Sanz A. Efficacy and tolerability of ebastine at two dose levels in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Drug Invest 1989;1:40-6.
142. Ankier SI, Warrington SJ. A double-blind placebo-controlled study of the efficacy and tolerability of ebastine against hayfever in general practice patients. J Intern Med 1989;226(6):453-8.
143. Storms WW. Clinical studies of the efficacy and tolerability of ebastine 10 or 20 mg once daily in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis in the US. Drugs 1996;52(Suppl 1):20-25.
144. Bernstein DI, Schoenwetter WF, Nathan RA, Storms W, Ahlbrandt R, Mason J. Efficacy and safety of fexofenadine hydrochloride for treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;79(5):443-8.
145. Bronsky EA, Falliers CJ, Kaiser HB, Ahlbrandt R, Mason JM. Effectiveness and safety of fexofenadine, a new nonsedating H1-receptor antagonist, in the treatment of fall allergies. Allergy Asthma Proc 1998;19(3):135-41.
146. Casale TB, Andrade C, Qu R. Safety and efficacy of once-daily fexofenadine HCl in the treatment of autumn seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 1999;20(3):193-8.
147. Dockhorn RJ, Bergner A, Connell JT, Falliers CJ, Grabiec SV, Weiler JM, et al. Safety and efficacy of loratadine (Sch-29851): a new non-sedating antihistamine in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1987;58(6):407-11.
148. Bruttmann G, Pedrali P. Loratadine (SCH29851) 40 mg once daily versus terfenadine 60 mg twice daily in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Int Med Res 1987;15(2):63-70.
149. Kemp J, Bahna S, Chervinsky P, Rachelefsky G, Seltzer J, Vande-Stouwe R, et al. A compariosn of loratadine, a new nonsedating antihistamine, with clemastine and placebo in patients with fall seasonal allergic rhinitis. Am J Rhinol 1987;3:151-4.

150. Gutkowski A, Bedard P, Del-Carpio J, Hebert J, Prevost M, Schulz J, et al. Comparison of the efficacy and safety of loratadine, terfenadine, and placebo in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;81(5 Pt 1):902-7.
151. Horak F, Bruttmann G, Pedrali P, Weeke B, Frolund L, Wolff HH, et al. A multicentric study of loratadine, terfenadine and placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Arzneimittelforschung 1988;38(1):124-8.
152. Oei HD. Double-blind comparison of loratadine (SCH 29851), astemizole, and placebo in hay fever with special regard to onset of action. Ann Allergy 1988;61(6):436-9.
153. Del-Carpio J, Kabbash L, Turenne Y, Prevost M, Hebert J, Bedard PM, et al. Efficacy and safety of loratadine (10 mg once daily), terfenadine (60 mg twice daily), and placebo in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1989;84(5 Pt 1):741-6.
154. Gervais P, Gervais A, De Beule R, Van der Bijl W. [Comparative study of a new antihistamine, mequitazine, and placebos]. Acta Allergol 1975;30(5):286-97.
155. Leynadier F, Bousquet J, Murrieta M, Attali P. Efficacy and safety of mizolastine in seasonal allergic rhinitis. The Rhinase Study Group. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(2):163-8.
156. Stern M, Blondin-Ertzbischoff P, Murrieta-Aguttes M, Hardwicke C, Emmerson EB, Judd MS. Rapid and sustained efficacy of mizolastine 10 mg once daily in seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Int Med Res 1998;26(6):292-303.
157. Sabbah A, Daele J, Wade AG, Ben-Soussen P, Attali P. Comparison of the efficacy, safety, and onset of action of mizolastine, cetirizine, and placebo in the management of seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. MIZOCET Study Group [In Process Citation]. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;83(4):319-25.
158. Melillo G, D'Amato G, Zanussi C, Ortolani C, Pastorello E, Loy M, et al. A multicentre controlled trial of terfenadine, dexchlorpheniramine, and placebo in allergic rhinitis. Arzneimittelforschung 1982;32(9a):1202-3.
159. Boerner D, Metz K, Eberhardt R, Schurmann W. A placebo-controlled comparison of the efficacy and tolerability of picumast dihydrochloride and terfenadine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Arzneimittelforschung 1989;39(10A):1356-9.
160. Ramirez Chanona N, Campillo R, Baez Loyola C. [Treatment of allergic rhinitis with ketotifen. A double-blind vs. placebo study]. Alergia 1986;33(1):9-17.
161. Molina Medina C. [Double-blind comparative study of ketotifen and a placebo in allergic rhinitis]. Alergia 1985;32(4):109-15.
162. Wood SF, Barber JH. Oxatomide in the management of hay fever--a placebo-controlled double-blind study in general practice. Clin Allergy 1981;11(5):491-7.
163. Vannieuwenhuyse E, De-Proost W, Degreef F, Callier J. Oxatomide in the treatment of chronic allergic rhinitis. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 1982;91(2 Pt 1):175-8.
164. Meltzer EO, Storms WW, Pierson WE, Cummins LH, Orgel HA, Perhach JL, et al. Efficacy of azelastine in perennial allergic rhinitis: clinical and rhinomanometric evaluation. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;82(3 Pt 1):447-55.
165. Bruttmann G, Arendt C, Berheim J. Double-blind, placebo-controlled comparison of cetirizine 2HCl and terfenadine in atopic perennial rhinitis. Acta Ther 1989;15:99-109.
166. Baelde Y, Dupont P. Cetirizine in children with chronic allergic rhinitis. A multicentre double-blind study of two doses of cetirizine and placebo. Drug Invest 1992;4:466-72.
167. Jobst S, van-den-Wijngaart W, Schubert A, van-de-Venne H. Assessment of the efficacy and safety of three dose levels of cetirizine given once daily in children with perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1994;49(8):598-604.
168. Aaronson DW. Evaluation of cetirizine in patients with allergic rhinitis and perennial asthma. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(5):440-6.

169. Bousquet J, Duchateau J, Pignat JC, Fayol C, Marquis P, Mariz S, et al. Improvement of quality of life by treatment with cetirizine in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis as determined by a French version of the SF-36 questionnaire. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1996;98(2):309-16.
170. Picado-Valles C, Cadahia-Garcia A, Cistero-Bahima A, Cano-Cantudo L, Sanz-Amaro A, Zayas-Sanza JM. Ebastine in perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1991;67(6):615-8.
171. Bousquet J, Gaudano EM, Palma Carlos AG, Staudinger H. A 12-week, placebo-controlled study of the efficacy and safety of ebastine, 10 and 20 mg once daily, in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Multicentre Study Group [In Process Citation]. Allergy 1999;54(6):562-8.
172. Bruttmann G, Charpin D, Germouty J, Horak F, Kunkel G, Wittmann G. Evaluation of the efficacy and safety of loratadine in perennial allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1989;83(2 Pt 1):411-6.
173. Frolund L, Etholm B, Irander K, Johannessen TA, Odkvist L, Ohlander B, et al. A multicentre study of loratadine, clemastine and placebo in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1990;45(4):254-61.
174. Pukander JS, Karma PH, Penttila MA, Perala ME, Ylitalo P, Kataja MJ. Mequitazine and dexchlorpheniramine in perennial rhinitis. A double-blind cross-over placebo-controlled study. Rhinology 1990;28(4):249-56.
175. Bellioni P, Catalano B, Cervellera G, Filiaci F, Mira E, Carraro A. Comparison of mizolastine with loratadine in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Rhinology 1996;34(2):101-4.
176. Bachet C, Brostoff J, Scadding G. Mizolastine therapy also has an effect on nasal blockade in perennial allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. Allergy 1998;53:969-75.
177. Nayak AS, Schenkel E. Desloratadine reduces nasal congestion in patients with intermittent allergic rhinitis. Allergy 2001;56(11):1077-80.
178. Berger WE, Schenkel EJ, Mansfield LE. Safety and efficacy of desloratadine 5 mg in asthma patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and nasal congestion. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;89(5):485-91.
179. Baena-Cagnani CE, Berger WE, DuBuske LM, Gurne SE, Stryszak P, Lorber R, et al. Comparative effects of desloratadine versus montelukast on asthma symptoms and use of beta 2-agonists in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and asthma. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2003;130(4):307-13.
180. Simons FE, Prenner BM, Finn A, Jr. Efficacy and safety of desloratadine in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2003;111(3):617-22.
181. Wilson AM, Haggart K, Sims EJ, Lipworth BJ. Effects of fexofenadine and desloratadine on subjective and objective measures of nasal congestion in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy 2002;32(10):1504-9.
182. Ratner PH, Lim JC, Georges GC. Comparison of once-daily ebastine 20 mg, ebastine 10 mg, loratadine 10 mg, and placebo in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. The Ebastine Study Group. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2000;105(6 Pt 1):1101-7.
183. Hampel F, Jr., Howland W, 3rd, Van Bavel J, Ratner P. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study comparing the efficacy and safety of ebastine (20 mg and 10 mg) to loratadine 10 mg once daily in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2004;14(1):56-63.
184. Ratner P, Hampel F, Jr., Van Bavel J, Howland W, 3rd. Efficacy and safety of ebastine 20 mg compared to loratadine 10 mg once daily in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2004;133(4):371-9.
185. Ratner P, Hampel F, Jr., Gispert J. Efficacy of ebastine in the control of nasal congestion associated with allergic rhinitis. Methods Find Exp Clin Pharmacol 2003;25(2):111-5.
186. Van Cauwenberge P, Juniper EF. Comparison of the efficacy, safety and quality of life provided by fexofenadine hydrochloride 120 mg, loratadine 10 mg and placebo administered once

daily for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis [In Process Citation]. Clin Exp Allergy 2000;30(6):891-9.
187. Freche C, Leynadier F, Horak F, Hide D, Gracia FD, Goos M, et al. Mizolastine provides effective symptom relief in patients suffering from perennial allergic rhinitis: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study versus loratadine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;89(3):304-10.
188. Leynadier F, Mees K, Arendt C, Pinelli ME. Efficacy and safety of levocetirizine in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Acta Otorhinolaryngol Belg 2001;55(4):305-12.
189. Bachert C, Bousquet J, Canonica GW, Durham SR, Klimek L, Mullol J, et al. Levocetirizine improves quality of life and reduces costs in long-term management of persistent allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;114(4):838-44.
190. Guadano EM, Serra-Batlles J, Meseguer J, Castillo JA, De Molina M, Valero A, et al. Rupatadine 10 mg and ebastine 10 mg in seasonal allergic rhinitis: a comparison study. Allergy 2004;59(7):766-71.
191. Kim K, Sussman G, Hebert J, Lumry W, Lutsky B, Gates D. Desloratadine therapy for symptoms associated with perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(3):460-5.
192. Meltzer EO, Jalowayski AA, Vogt K, Iezzoni D, Harris AG. Effect of desloratadine therapy on symptom scores and measures of nasal patency in seasonal allergic rhinitis: results of a single-center, placebo-controlled trial. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(2):363-8.
193. Raphael GD, Angello JT, Wu MM, Druce HM. Efficacy of diphenhydramine vs desloratadine and placebo in patients with moderate-to-severe seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(4):606-14.
194. Berger WE, Lumry WR, Meltzer EO, Pearlman DS. Efficacy of desloratadine, 5 mg, compared with fexofenadine, 180 mg, in patients with symptomatic seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2006;27(3):214-23.
195. Potter PC. Levocetirizine is effective for symptom relief including nasal congestion in adolescent and adult (PAR) sensitized to house dust mites. Allergy 2003;58(9):893-9.
196. Pasquali M, Baiardini I, Rogkakou A, Riccio AM, Gamalero C, Descalzi D, et al. Levocetirizine in persistent allergic rhinitis and asthma: effects on symptoms, quality of life and inflammatory parameters. Clin Exp Allergy 2006;36(9):1161-7.
197. Ciprandi G, Cirillo I, Vizzaccaro A, Tosca MA. Levocetirizine improves nasal obstruction and modulates cytokine pattern in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis: a pilot study. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(6):958-64.
198. Wilson AM, Orr LC, Coutie WJ, Sims EJ, Lipworth BJ. A comparison of once daily fexofenadine versus the combination of montelukast plus loratadine on domiciliary nasal peak flow and symptoms in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy 2002;32(1):126-32.
199. Okubo K, Gotoh M, Shimada K, Ritsu M, Okuda M, Crawford B. Fexofenadine improves the quality of life and work productivity in Japanese patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis during the peak cedar pollinosis season. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2005;136(2):148-54.
200. Hyo S, Fujieda S, Kawada R, Kitazawa S, Takenaka H. The efficacy of short-term administration of 3 antihistamines vs placebo under natural exposure to Japanese cedar pollen. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;94(4):457-64.
201. Nunes C, Ladeira S. Double-blind study of cetirizine and loratadine versus placebo in patients with allergic rhinitis. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2000;10(1):20-3.
202. Ciprandi G, Cosentino C, Milanese M, Mondino C, Canonica GW. Fexofenadine reduces nasal congestion in perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy 2001;56(11):1068-70.
203. Ciprandi G, Tosca M, Passalacqua G, Canonica GW. Long-term cetirizine treatment reduces allergic symptoms and drug prescriptions in children with mite allergy. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2001;87(3):222-6.

204. Frank H, Jr., Gillen M, Rohatagi SS, Lim J, George G. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study of the efficacy and safety of ebastine 20 mg once daily given with and without food in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Clin Pharmacol 2002;42(10):1097-104.
205. Pradalier A, Neukirch C, Dreyfus I, Devillier P. Desloratadine improves quality of life and symptom severity in patients with allergic rhinitis. Allergy 2007;62(11):1331-4.
206. Bartra J, Valero AL, del Cuvillo A, Davila I, Jauregui I, Montoro J, et al. Interactions of the H1 antihistamines. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2006;16 Suppl 1:29-36.
207. Davila I, Sastre J, Bartra J, del Cuvillo A, Jauregui I, Montoro J, et al. Effect of H1 antihistamines upon the cardiovascular system. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2006;16 Suppl 1:13-23.
208. Dresser GK, Bailey DG, Leake BF, Schwarz UI, Dawson PA, Freeman DJ, et al. Fruit juices inhibit organic anion transporting polypeptide-mediated drug uptake to decrease the oral availability of fexofenadine. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2002;71(1):11-20.
209. Jauregui I, Mullol J, Bartra J, del Cuvillo A, Davila I, Montoro J, et al. H1 antihistamines: psychomotor performance and driving. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2006;16 Suppl 1:37-44.
210. Montoro J, Sastre J, Bartra J, del Cuvillo A, Davila I, Jauregui I, et al. Effect of H1 antihistamines upon the central nervous system. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2006;16 Suppl 1:24-8.
211. Casale TB, Blaiss MS, Gelfand E, Gilmore T, Harvey PD, Hindmarch I, et al. First do no harm: managing antihistamine impairment in patients with allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2003;111(5):S835-42.
212. Hansen J, Klimek L, Hormann K. Pharmacological management of allergic rhinitis in the elderly: safety issues with oral antihistamines. Drugs Aging 2005;22(4):289-96.
213. Mann RD, Pearce GL, Dunn N, Shakir S. Sedation with "non-sedating" antihistamines: four prescription-event monitoring studies in general practice. Bmj 2000;320(7243):1184-6.
214. Shamsi Z, Hindmarch I. Sedation and antihistamines: a review of inter-drug differences using proportional impairment ratios. Hum Psychopharmacol 2000;15(S1):S3-S30.
215. Simons FE. H1-receptor antagonists. Comparative tolerability and safety. Drug Saf 1994;10(5):350-80.
216. Simons FE, Fraser TG, Maher J, Pillay N, Simons KJ. Central nervous system effects of H1-receptor antagonists in the elderly. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(2):157-60.
217. Simons FE, Fraser TG, Reggin JD, Simons KJ. Comparison of the central nervous system effects produced by six H1-receptor antagonists. Clin Exp Allergy 1996;26(9):1092-7.
218. Simons FE. Safety of levocetirizine treatment in young atopic children: An 18-month study. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2007;18(6):535-42.
219. Simons FE. Prospective, long-term safety evaluation of the H1-receptor antagonist cetirizine in very young children with atopic dermatitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104(2 Pt 1):433-440.
220. Simons FE, Silas P, Portnoy JM, Catuogno J, Chapman D, Olufade AO, et al. Safety of cetirizine in infants 6 to 11 months of age: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2003;111(6):1244-8.
221. Stevenson J, Cornah D, Evrard P, Vanderheyden V, Billard C, Bax M, et al. Long-term evaluation of the impact of the H1-receptor antagonist cetirizine on the behavioral, cognitive, and psychomotor development of very young children with atopic dermatitis. Pediatr Res 2002;52(2):251-7.
222. Verster JC, de Weert AM, Bijtjes SI, Aarab M, van Oosterwijck AW, Eijken EJ, et al. Driving ability after acute and sub-chronic administration of levocetirizine and diphenhydramine: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 2003;169(1):84-90.
223. Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.0.1 [updated September 2008]. Available from www.cochrane-handbook.org: The Cochrane Collaboration; 2008.

224. Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF. Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses. Lancet 1999;354(9193):1896-900.
225. Long A, McFadden C, DeVine D, Chew P, Kupelnick B, Lau J. Management of Allergic and Nonallergic Rhinitis. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 54 (Prepared by New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-97-0019). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2002.
226. Bender BG, Berning S, Dudden R, Milgrom H, Tran ZV. Sedation and performance impairment of diphenhydramine and second-generation antihistamines: a meta-analysis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2003;111(4):770-6.
227. Vuurman EF, Rikken GH, Muntjewerff ND, de Halleux F, Ramaekers JG. Effects of desloratadine, diphenhydramine, and placebo on driving performance and psychomotor performance measurements. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2004;60(5):307-13.
228. Wilken JA, Kane RL, Ellis AK, Rafeiro E, Briscoe MP, Sullivan CL, et al. A comparison of the effect of diphenhydramine and desloratadine on vigilance and cognitive function during treatment of ragweed-induced allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;91(4):375-85.
229. Weiler JM, Bloomfield JR, Woodworth GG, Grant AR, Layton TA, Brown TL, et al. Effects of fexofenadine, diphenhydramine, and alcohol on driving performance. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial in the Iowa driving simulator. Ann Intern Med 2000;132(5):354-63.
230. Tashiro M, Horikawa E, Mochizuki H, Sakurada Y, Kato M, Inokuchi T, et al. Effects of fexofenadine and hydroxyzine on brake reaction time during car-driving with cellular phone use. Hum Psychopharmacol 2005;20(7):501-9.
231. Ng KH, Chong D, Wong CK, Ong HT, Lee CY, Lee BW, et al. Central nervous system side effects of first- and second-generation antihistamines in school children with perennial allergic rhinitis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled comparative study. Pediatrics 2004;113(2):e116-21.
232. Lai DS, Lue KH, Hsieh JC, Lin KL, Lee HS. The comparison of the efficacy and safety of cetirizine, oxatomide, ketotifen, and a placebo for the treatment of childhood perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;89(6):589-98.
233. Nwawolo CC, Olusesi AD. Controlled clinical study of the efficacy of loratadine in Nigerian patients with allergic rhinitis. Niger Postgrad Med J 2001;8(3):127-32.
234. Bender BG, McCormick DR, Milgrom H. Children's school performance is not impaired by short-term administration of diphenhydramine or loratadine. J Pediatr 2001;138(5):656-60.
235. Druce HM, Thoden WR, Mure P, Furey SA, Lockhart EA, Xie T, et al. Brompheniramine, loratadine, and placebo in allergic rhinitis: a placebo-controlled comparative clinical trial. J Clin Pharmacol 1998;38(4):382-9.
236. Katelaris C. Comparative effects of loratadine and azatadine in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol 1990;8(2):103-7.
237. Irander K, Odkvist LM, Ohlander B. Treatment of hay fever with loratadine--a new non-sedating antihistamine. Allergy 1990;45(2):86-91.
238. Iikura Y, Naspitz CK, Mikawa H, Talaricoficho S, Baba M, Sole D, et al. Prevention of asthma by ketotifen in infants with atopic dermatitis. Ann Allergy 1992;68(3):233-6.
239. Bustos GJ, Bustos D, Bustos GJ, Romero O. Prevention of asthma with ketotifen in preasthmatic children: a three- year follow-up study. Clin Exp Allergy 1995;25(6):568-73.
240. ETAC Study Group. Allergic factors associated with the development of asthma and the influence of cetirizine in a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial: first results of ETAC. Early Treatment of the Atopic Child. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 1998;9(3):116-24.
241. Warner JO. A double-blinded, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of cetirizine in preventing the onset of asthma in children with atopic dermatitis: 18 months' treatment and 18 months' posttreatment follow-up. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2001;108(6):929-37.

242. Simons FE. H1-antihistamine treatment in young atopic children: effect on urticaria. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;99(3):261-6.
243. Simons FE. Prospective, long-term safety evaluation of the H1-receptor antagonist cetirizine in very young children with atopic dermatitis. ETAC Study Group. Early Treatment of the Atopic Child. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104(2 Pt 1):433-40.
244. Lee TA, Pickard AS. Meta-Analysis of Azelastine Nasal Spray for the Treatment of Allergic Rhinitis. Pharmacotherapy 2007;27(6):852-859.
245. Arcimowicz M, Samolinski B, Zawisza E. [Clinical assessment of azelastine nasal spray in seasonal allergic rhinitis]. Pol Merkur Lekarski 1998;5(30):363-7.
246. Ciprandi G, Ricca V, Passalacqua G, Truffelli T, Bertolini C, Fiorino N, et al. Seasonal rhinitis and azelastine: long- or short-term treatment? J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;99(3):301-7.
247. Davies RJ, Lund VJ, Harten-Ash VJ. The effect of intranasal azelastine and beclomethasone on the symptoms and signs of nasal allergy in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis. Rhinology 1993;31(4):159-64.
248. Golden S, Teets SJ, Lehman EB, Mauger EA, Chinchilli V, Berlin JM, et al. Effect of topical nasal azelastine on the symptoms of rhinitis, sleep, and daytime somnolence in perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2000;85(1):53-7.
249. Herman D, Garay R, Le-Gal M. A randomized double-blind placebo controlled study of azelastine nasal spray in children with perennial rhinitis. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol 1997;39(1):1-8.
250. Pelucchi A, Chiapparino A, Mastropasqua B, Marazzini L, Hernandez A, Foresi A. Effect of intranasal azelastine and beclomethasone dipropionate on nasal symptoms, nasal cytology, and bronchial responsiveness to methacholine in allergic rhinitis in response to grass pollens. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95(2):515-23.
251. Banov CH, Lieberman P. Efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in the treatment of vasomotor (perennial nonallergic) rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2001;86(1):28-35.
252. Meltzer EO, Weiler JM, Dockhorn RJ, Widlitz MD, Freitag JJ. Azelastine nasal spray in the management of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1994;72(4):354-9.
253. Weiler JM, Meltzer EO. Azelastine nasal spray as adjunctive therapy to azelastine tablets in the management of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;79(4):327-32.
254. Weiler JM, Meltzer EO, Benson PM, Weiler K, Widlitz MD, Freitag J. A dose-ranging study of the efficacy and safety of azelastine nasal spray in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis with an acute model. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1994;94(6 Pt 1):972-80.
255. Berger WE, White MV. Efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in patients with an unsatisfactory response to loratadine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;91(2):205-11.
256. Dorow P, Aurich R, Petzold U. Efficacy and tolerability of azelastine nasal spray in patients with allergic rhinitis compared to placebo and budesonide. Arzneimittelforschung 1993;43(8):909-12.
257. Ghimire A, Das BP, Mishra SC. Comparative efficacy of steroid nasal spray versus antihistamine nasal spray in allergic rhinitis. Nepal Med Coll J 2007;9(1):17-21.
258. LaForce C, Dockhorn RJ, Prenner BM, Chu TJ, Kraemer MJ, Widlitz MD, et al. Safety and efficacy of azelastine nasal spray (Astelin NS) for seasonal allergic rhinitis: a 4-week comparative multicenter trial [see comments]. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(2):181-8.
259. LaForce CF, Corren J, Wheeler WJ, Berger WE. Efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in seasonal allergic rhinitis patients who remain symptomatic after treatment with fexofenadine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2004;93(2):154-9.
260. Lumry W, Prenner B, Corren J, Wheeler W. Efficacy and safety of azelastine nasal spray at a dose of 1 spray per nostril twice daily. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;99(3):267-72.
261. 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. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 1997;254(5):236-41.

262. Ratner PH, Findlay SR, Hampel F, Jr., van-Bavel J, Widlitz MD, Freitag JJ. 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(5):818-25.
263. Stern MA, Wade AG, Ridout SM, Cambell LM. Nasal budesonide offers superior symptom relief in perennial allergic rhinitis in comparison to nasal azelastine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1998;81(4):354-8.
264. Storms WW, Pearlman DS, Chervinsky P, Grossman J, Halverson PC, Freitag JJ, et al. Effectiveness of azelastine nasal solution in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ear Nose Throat J 1994;73(6):382-386, 390-394.
265. Meltzer EO, Hampel FC, Ratner PH, Bernstein DI, Larsen LV, Berger WE, et al. Safety and efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(6):600-6.
266. Ratner PH, Hampel FC, Amar NJ, van Bavel JH, Mohar D, Marple BF, et al. Safety and efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis to mountain cedar. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(5):474-9.
267. Hampel FC, Jr., Ratner PH, Amar NJ, van Bavel JH, Mohar D, Fairchild CJ, et al. Improved quality of life among seasonal allergic rhinitis patients treated with olopatadine HCl nasal spray 0.4% and olopatadine HCl nasal spray 0.6% compared with vehicle placebo. Allergy Asthma Proc 2006;27(3):202-7.
268. Fairchild CJ, Meltzer EO, Roland PS, Wells D, Drake M, Wall GM. Comprehensive report of the efficacy, safety, quality of life, and work impact of Olopatadine 0.6% and Olopatadine 0.4% treatment in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2007;28(6):716-23.
269. Dahl R, Pedersen B, Larsen B. Intranasal levocabastine for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis: a multicentre, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Rhinology 1995;33(3):121-5.
270. Di Lorenzo G, Gervasi F, Drago A, Esposito Pellitteri M, Di Salvo A, Cosentino D, et al. Comparison of the effects of fluticasone propionate, aqueous nasal spray and levocabastine on inflammatory cells in nasal lavage and clinical activity during the pollen season in seasonal rhinitics. Clin Exp Allergy 1999;29(10):1367-77.
271. Hampel F, Jr., Martin BG, Dolen J, Travers S, Karcher K, Holton D. Efficacy and safety of levocabastine nasal spray for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Am J Rhinol 1999;13(1):55-62.
272. Ortolani C, Foresi A, Di Lorenzo G, Bagnato G, Bonifazi F, Crimi N, et al. A double-blind, placebo-controlled comparison of treatment with fluticasone propionate and levocabastine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. FLNCO2 Italian Study Group. Allergy 1999;54(11):1173-80.
273. Schata M, Jorde W, Richarz-Barthauer U. Levocabastine nasal spray better than sodium cromoglycate and placebo in the topical treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1991;87(4):873-8.
274. Svensson C, Andersson M, Greiff L, Blychert LO, Persson CG. Effects of topical budesonide and levocabastine on nasal symptoms and plasma exudation responses in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1998;53(4):367-74.
275. van de Heyning PH, van Haesendonck J, Creten W, Rombaut N. Effect of topical levocabastine on allergic and non-allergic perennial rhinitis. A double-blind study, levocabastine vs. placebo, followed by an open, prospective, single-blind study on beclomethasone. Allergy 1988;43(5):386-91.
276. Mohar D, Ratner P, Shah S, Drake M, Crenshaw K, Wall G. Olopatadine nasal spray 0.6% is superior to vehicle and non-inferior to azelastine nasal spray 0.1% when dosed twice-daily for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology (AAAAI) 64th Annual Meeting. Philadelphia, PA, USA, March 14-18, 2008. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 2008;121(2 (Suppl 1)):S49, Abstract No. 192.
277. Lanier BQ. Safety and efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride nasal spray 665 mcg (Patanase Nasal Spray) in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis. American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and

Immunology (AAAAI) 62nd Annual Meeting. Miami Beach, FL, USA, March 3-7, 2006. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 2006;117(2 (Suppl 1)):S165, Abstract No. 645.
278. Amar NJ, Shah S, Ratner P, Mohar D, Dimas C, Crenshaw K, et al. Quality of life and safety of olopatadine HCl nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis in children. American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology (AAAAI) 64th Annual Meeting. Philadelphia, PA, USA, March 14-18, 2008. . Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology 2008;121(2 (Suppl 1)):S50, Abstract No. 195.
279. Arreguín Osuna L, Garcia Caballero R, Montero Cortes MT, Ortiz Aldana I. Levocabastina contra cetirizina en niños con rinitis alérgica perenne. Rev Alerg Mex 1998;45(3):7-11.
280. Berger W, Hampel F, Jr., Bernstein J, Shah S, Sacks H, Meltzer EO. Impact of azelastine nasal spray on symptoms and quality of life compared with cetirizine oral tablets in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;97(3):375-81.
281. Charpin D, Godard P, Garay RP, Baehre M, Herman D, Michel FB. A multicenter clinical study of the efficacy and tolerability of azelastine nasal spray in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis: a comparison with oral cetirizine. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 1995;252(8):455-8.
282. Conde Hernandez DJ, Palma Aqilar JL, Delgado Romero J. Comparison of azelastine nasal spray and oral ebastine in treating seasonal allergic rhinitis. Curr Med Res Opin 1995;13(6):299-304.
283. Corren J, Storms W, Bernstein J, Berger W, Nayak A, Sacks H, et al. Effectiveness of azelastine nasal spray compared with oral cetirizine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Ther 2005;27(5):543-53.
284. Gambardella R. A comparison of the efficacy of azelastine nasal spray and loratidine tablets in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Int Med Res 1993;21(5):268-75.
285. Passali D, Piragine F. A comparison of azelastine nasal spray and cetirizine tablets in the treatment of allergic rhinitis. J Int Med Res 1994;22(1):17-23.
286. Swedish GP Allergy Team. Topical levocabastine compared with oral loratadine for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. Allergy 1994;49(8):611-5.
287. Conde Hernandez J, Palma Aguilar JL, Delgado Romero J. Investigation on the efficacy and tolerance of azelastine (HCL) nasal spray versus ebastine tablets in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergol Immunopathol Madr 1995;23(2):51-7.
288. Rapoport AM, Bigal ME, Tepper SJ, Sheftell FD. Intranasal medications for the treatment of migraine and cluster headache. CNS Drugs 2004;18(10):671-85.
289. Rodrigo GJ, Yanez A. The role of antileukotriene therapy in seasonal allergic rhinitis: a systematic review of randomized trials. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(6):779-86.
290. Wilson AM, O'Byrne PM, Parameswaran K. Leukotriene receptor antagonists for allergic rhinitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Med 2004;116(5):338-44.
291. Grainger J, Drake-Lee A. Montelukast in allergic rhinitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Otolaryngol 2006;31(5):360-7.
292. Philip G, Williams-Herman D, Patel P, Weinstein SF, Alon A, Gilles L, et al. Efficacy of montelukast for treating perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2007;28(3):296-304.
293. Patel P, Philip G, Yang W, Call R, Horak F, LaForce C, et al. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of montelukast for treating perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(6):551-7.
294. Chen ST, Lu KH, Sun HL, Chang WT, Lue KH, Chou MC. Randomized placebo-controlled trial comparing montelukast and cetirizine for treating perennial allergic rhinitis in children aged 2-6 yr. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2006;17(1):49-54.
295. Pullerits T, Praks L, Skoogh BE, Ani R, Lotvall J. Randomized placebo-controlled study comparing a leukotriene receptor antagonist and a nasal glucocorticoid in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1999;159(6):1814-8.
296. Jiang RS. Efficacy of a leukotriene receptor antagonist in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. J Otolaryngol 2006;35(2):117-21.

297. Penagos M, Compalati E, Tarantini F, Baena-Cagnani CE, Passalacqua G, Canonica GW. Efficacy of mometasone furoate nasal spray in the treatment of allergic rhinitis. Meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, clinical trials. Allergy 2008;63(10):1280-91.
298. Al Sayyad J, Fedorowicz Z, Alhashimi D, Jamal A. Topical nasal steroids for intermittent and persistent allergic rhinitis in children. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007(1):CD003163.
299. Mygind N. Local effect of intranasal beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol in hay fever. Br Med J 1973;4(890):464-6.
300. Agertoft L, Pedersen S. Short-term lower leg growth rate in children with rhinitis treated with intranasal mometasone furoate and budesonide. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104(5):948-52.
301. Agertoft L, Wolthers OD, Fuglsang G, Pedersen S. Nasal powder administration of budesonide for seasonal rhinitis in children and adolescents. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 1993;4(3):152-6.
302. Allen DB, Meltzer EO, Lemanske RF, Jr., Philpot EE, Faris MA, Kral KM, et al. No growth suppression in children treated with the maximum recommended dose of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray for one year. Allergy Asthma Proc 2002;23(6):407-13.
303. Andersen JB, Halberg P, Mygind N. Beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol treatment of hay fever. A dose-response investigation. Acta Allergol 1975;30(5):316-25.
304. Andersson M, Lindqvist N, Svensson C, Ek L, Pipkorn U. Dry powder inhalation of budesonide in allergic rhinitis. Clin Otolaryngol 1993;18(1):30-3.
305. Banov CH, Woehler TR, LaForce CF, Pearlman DS, Blumenthal MN, Morgan WF, et al. Once daily intranasal fluticasone propionate is effective for perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1994;73(3):240-6.
306. Bende M, Carrillo T, Vona I, da Castel-Branco MG, Arheden L. A randomized comparison of the effects of budesonide and mometasone furoate aqueous nasal sprays on nasal peak flow rate and symptoms in perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;88(6):617-23.
307. Berlin JM, Golden SJ, Teets S, Lehman EB, Lucas T, Craig TJ. Efficacy of a steroid nasal spray compared with an antihistamine nasal spray in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. J Am Osteopath Assoc 2000;100(7 Suppl):S8-13.
308. Bernstein DI, Levy AL, Hampel FC, Baidoo CA, Cook CK, Philpot EE, et al. Treatment with intranasal fluticasone propionate significantly improves ocular symptoms in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(6):952-7.
309. Bisgaard H, Zielen S, Garcia-Garcia ML, Johnston SL, Gilles L, Menten J, et al. Montelukast reduces asthma exacerbations in 2- to 5-year-old children with intermittent asthma. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2005;171(4):315-22.
310. Boner A, Sette L, Martinati L, Sharma RK, Richards DH. The efficacy and tolerability of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1995;50(6):498-505.
311. Brannan MD, Herron JM, Reidenberg P, Affrime MB. Lack of hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis suppression with once-daily or twice-daily beclomethasone dipropionate aqueous nasal spray administered to patients with allergic rhinitis. Clin Ther 1995;17(4):637-47.
312. Cameron AW, Stanley IM, Wright HJ. Randomised double blind controlled clinical trial of intranasal budesonide in treatment of hay fever. Br Med J 1984;288(6434):1881-3.
313. Casale TB, Azzam SM, Miller RE, Oren J. Demonstration of therapeutic equivalence of generic and innovator beclomethasone in seasonal allergic rhinitis. SAR Study Group. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(5):435-41.
314. Chervinsky P, Kunjibettu S, Miller DL, Prenner BM, Raphael G, Hall N, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of intranasal ciclesonide in adult and adolescent patients with perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;99(1):69-76.
315. Ciprandi G, Canonica WG, Grosclaude M, Ostinelli J, Brazzola GG, Bousquet J. Effects of budesonide and fluticasone propionate in a placebo-controlled study on symptoms and quality of life in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 2002;57(7):586-91.

316. Clayton DE, Kooistra JB, Geller M, Ouellette J, Cohen M, Reed CE, et al. Short-term efficacy trial and twenty-four-month follow-up of flunisolide nasal spray in the treatment of perennial rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1981;67(1):2-7.
317. Craig TJ, Mende C, Hughes K, Kakumanu S, Lehman EB, Chinchilli V. The effect of topical nasal fluticasone on objective sleep testing and the symptoms of rhinitis, sleep, and daytime somnolence in perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2003;24(1):53-8.
318. Creticos P, Fireman P, Settipane G, Bernstein D, Casale T, Schwartz H. Intranasal budesonide aqueous pump spray (Rhinocort Aqua) for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Rhinocort Aqua Study Group. Allergy Asthma Proc 1998;19(5):285-94.
319. Dahl R, Nielsen LP, Kips J, Foresi A, Cauwenberge P, Tudoric N, et al. Intranasal and inhaled fluticasone propionate for pollen-induced rhinitis and asthma. Allergy 2005;60(7):875-81.
320. Darnell R, Pecoud A, Richards DH. A double-blind comparison of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray, terfenadine tablets and placebo in the treatment of patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis to grass pollen. Clin Exp Allergy 1994;24(12):1144-50.
321. Day J, Alexander M, Drouin M, Frankish C, Mazza J, Moote W, et al. Budesonide aqueous nasal spray and pressurized metered dose inhaler in the treatment of adult patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Am J Rhinol 1997;11(1):77-83.
322. Day J, Carrillo T. Comparison of the efficacy of budesonide and fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray for once daily treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1998;102(6 Pt 1):902-8.
323. Di Lorenzo G, Pacor ML, Pellitteri ME, Morici G, Di Gregoli A, Lo Bianco C, et al. Randomized placebo-controlled trial comparing fluticasone aqueous nasal spray in mono-therapy, fluticasone plus cetirizine, fluticasone plus montelukast and cetirizine plus montelukast for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(2):259-67.
324. Dolovich J, Wong AG, Chodirker WB, Drouin MA, Hargreave FE, Hebert J, et al. Multicenter trial of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray in ragweed allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1994;73(2):147-53.
325. Drouin M, Yang WH, Bertrand B, Van Cauwenberge P, Clement P, Dalby K, et al. Once daily mometasone furoate aqueous nasal spray is as effective as twice daily beclomethasone dipropionate for treating perennial allergic rhinitis patients. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;77(2):153-60.
326. Dykewicz MS, Kaiser HB, Nathan RA, Goode-Sellers S, Cook CK, Witham LA, et al. Fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray improves nasal symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis when used as needed (prn). Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;91(1):44-8.
327. Feiss G, Morris R, Rom D, Mansfield L, Dockhorn R, Ellis E, et al. A comparative study of the effects of intranasal triamcinolone acetonide aerosol (ITAA) and prednisone on adrenocortical function. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;89(6):1151-6.
328. Findlay S, Huber F, Garcia J, Huang L. Efficacy of once-a-day intranasal administration of triamcinolone acetonide in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1992;68(3):228-32.
329. Fluticasone Propionate Collaborative Pediatric Working Group. Treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis with once-daily intranasal fluticasone propionate therapy in children. J Pediatr 1994;125(4):628-34.
330. Fokkens WJ, Cserhati E, dos Santos JM, Praca F, van Zanten M, Schade A, et al. Budesonide aqueous nasal spray is an effective treatment in children with perennial allergic rhinitis, with an onset of action within 12 hours. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;89(3):279-84.
331. Fokkens WJ, Jogi R, Reinartz S, Sidorenko I, Sitkauskiene B, van Oene C, et al. Once daily fluticasone furoate nasal spray is effective in seasonal allergic rhinitis caused by grass pollen. Allergy 2007;62(9):1078-84.
332. Foresi A, Pelucchi A, Gherson G, Mastropasqua B, Chiapparino A, Testi R. Once daily intranasal fluticasone propionate (200 micrograms) reduces nasal symptoms and inflammation but

also attenuates the increase in bronchial responsiveness during the pollen season in allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1996;98(2):274-82.
333. Galant SP, Melamed IR, Nayak AS, Blake KV, Prillaman BA, Reed KD, et al. Lack of effect of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray on the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis in 2- and 3-year-old patients. Pediatrics 2003;112(1 Pt 1):96-100.
334. Grossman J, Banov C, Bronsky EA, Nathan RA, Pearlman D, Winder JA, et al. Fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray is safe and effective for children with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Pediatrics 1993;92(4):594-9.
335. Gurevich F, Glass C, Davies M, Wei W, McCann J, Fisher L, et al. The effect of intranasal steroid budesonide on the congestion-related sleep disturbance and daytime somnolence in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2005;26(4):268-74.
336. Howland WC, 3rd, Dockhorn R, Gillman S, Gross GN, Hille D, Simpson B, et al. A comparison of effects of triamcinolone acetonide aqueous nasal spray, oral prednisone, and placebo on adrenocortical function in male patients with allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1996;98(1):32-8.
337. Howland WC, 3rd, Hampel FC, Jr., Martin BG, Ratner PH, van Bavel JH, Field EA. The efficacy of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray for allergic rhinitis and its relationship to topical effects. Clin Ther 1996;18(6):1106-17.
338. Hughes K, Glass C, Ripchinski M, Gurevich F, Weaver TE, Lehman E, et al. Efficacy of the topical nasal steroid budesonide on improving sleep and daytime somnolence in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy 2003;58(5):380-5.
339. Incaudo G, Schatz M, Yamamoto F, Mellon M, Crepea S, Johnson JD. Intranasal flunisolide in the treatment of perennial rhinitis: Correlation with immunologic parameters. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1980;65(1):41-9.
340. Jen A, Baroody F, de Tineo M, Haney L, Blair C, Naclerio R. As-needed use of fluticasone propionate nasal spray reduces symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2000;105(4):732-8.
341. Jones LM, Spector SL, English GM, Taylor-Dawson K. Treatment of perennial rhinitis with flunisolide corticosteroid spray. Ann Allergy 1979;42(3):139-44.
342. Kaiser HB, Naclerio RM, Given J, Toler TN, Ellsworth A, Philpot EE. Fluticasone furoate nasal spray: a single treatment option for the symptoms of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;119(6):1430-7.
343. Kammermeyer JK, Rajtora DW, Anuras J, Richerson HB. Clinical evaluation of intranasal topical flunisolide therapy in allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1977;59(4):287-93.
344. Kim KT, Rabinovitch N, Uryniak T, Simpson B, O'Dowd L, Casty F. Effect of budesonide aqueous nasal spray on hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis function in children with allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2004;93(1):61-7.
345. Knight A, Underdown BJ, Connell JT, Nedzelski J, Elie R. Immunological parameters in perennial rhinitis. Clin Allergy 1979;9(2):159-66.
346. Kobayashi RH, Beaucher WN, Koepke JW, Luskin A, Ransom JH, Rosen JP, et al. Triamcinolone acetonide aqueous nasal spray for the treatment of patients with perennial allergic rhinitis: a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Clin Ther 1995;17(3):503-13.
347. Koepke JW, Beaucher WN, Kobayashi RH, Ransom JH, Rosen JP, Feiss G, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of triamcinolone acetonide aqueous nasal spray for the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 1997;18(1):33-7.
348. Kozma CM, Schulz RM, Sclar DA, Kral KM, Mackowiak JI. A comparison of costs and efficacy of intranasal fluticasone propionate and terfenadine tablets for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Ther 1996;18(2):334-46.

349. LaForce CF, Dockhorn RJ, Findlay SR, Meltzer EO, Nathan RA, Stricker W, et al. Fluticasone propionate: an effective alternative treatment for seasonal allergic rhinitis in adults and adolescents. J Fam Pract 1994;38(2):145-52.
350. Lavigne F, Cameron L, Renzi PM, Planet JF, Christodoulopoulos P, Lamkioued B, et al. Intrasinus administration of topical budesonide to allergic patients with chronic rhinosinusitis following surgery. Laryngoscope 2002;112(5):858-64.
351. Lindqvist N, Andersson M, Bende M, Loth S, Pipkorn U. The clinical efficacy of budesonide in hay fever treatment is dependent on topical nasal application. Clin Exp Allergy 1989;19(1):71-6.
352. Mandl M, Nolop K, Lutsky BN. Comparison of once daily mometasone furoate (Nasonex) and fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal sprays for the treatment of perennial rhinitis. 194-079 Study Group. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;79(4):370-8.
353. Mandl M, Nolop K, Lutsky BN. Comparison of once daily mometasone furoate (Nasonex) and fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal sprays for the treatment of perennial rhinitis. The 194-079 Study Group. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;79(3):237-45.
354. Mansfield LE, Posey CR. Daytime sleepiness and cognitive performance improve in seasonal allergic rhinitis treated with intranasal fluticasone propionate. Allergy Asthma Proc 2007;28(2):226-9.
355. Martin BG, Ratner PH, Hampel FC, Andrews CP, Toler T, Wu W, et al. Optimal dose selection of fluticasone furoate nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis in adults and adolescents. Allergy Asthma Proc 2007;28(2):216-25.
356. Meltzer EO. Clinical and antiinflammatory effects of intranasal budesonide aqueous pump spray in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1998;81(2):128-34.
357. Meltzer EO, Kunjibettu S, Hall N, Wingertzahn MA, Murcia C, Berger W, et al. Efficacy and safety of ciclesonide, 200 microg once daily, for the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;98(2):175-81.
358. Meltzer EO, Orgel HA, Bronsky EA, Furukawa CT, Grossman J, LaForce CF, et al. A dose-ranging study of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray for seasonal allergic rhinitis assessed by symptoms, rhinomanometry, and nasal cytology. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1990;86(2):221-30.
359. Munk ZM, Gross GN, Hampel FC, Jr., Ratner PH. Preseasonal, once daily triamcinolone acetonide nasal aerosol for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;78(3):325-31.
360. Munk ZM, LaForce C, Furst JA, Simpson B, Feiss G, Smith JA. Efficacy and safety of triamcinolone acetonide aqueous nasal spray in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;77(4):277-81.
361. Nathan RA, Bronsky EA, Fireman P, Grossman J, LaForce CF, Lemanske RF, Jr., et al. Once daily fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray is an effective treatment for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1991;67(3):332-8.
362. Nathan RA, Yancey SW, Waitkus-Edwards K, Prillaman BA, Stauffer JL, Philpot E, et al. Fluticasone propionate nasal spray is superior to montelukast for allergic rhinitis while neither affects overall asthma control. Chest 2005;128(4):1910-20.
363. Nayak AS, Ellis MH, Gross GN, Mendelson LM, Schenkel EJ, Lanier BQ, et al. The effects of triamcinolone acetonide aqueous nasal spray on adrenocortical function in children with allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1998;101(2 Pt 1):157-62.
364. Ngamphaiboon J, Thepchatri A, Chatchatee P, Chumdermpadetsuk S. Fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray treatment for perennial allergic rhinitis in children. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;78(5):479-84.
365. Norman PS, Creticos PS, Tobey R, Proud DG, Kagey-Sobotka A, Meyers DA, et al. Budesonide in grass pollen rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1992;69(4):309-16.

366. Nuutinen J, Ruoppi P, Sorri M, Suonpaa J, Vainio-Mattila J. Two-dose beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Rhinology 1983;21(2):165-72.
367. Nuutinen J, Ruoppi P, Suonpaa J. One-dose beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. A preliminary report. Rhinology 1987;25(2):121-7.
368. Orgel HA, Meltzer EO, Kemp JP, Welch MJ. Clinical, rhinomanometric, and cytologic evaluation of seasonal allergic rhinitis treated with beclomethasone dipropionate as aqueous nasal spray or pressurized aerosol. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1986;77(6):858-64.
369. Pedersen B, Bundgaard Larsen B, Dahl R, Lindqvist N, Mygind N. Powder administration of pure budesonide for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1991;46(8):582-7.
370. Pedersen B, Dahl R, Lindqvist N, Mygind N. Nasal inhalation of the glucocorticoid budesonide from a spacer for the treatment of patients with pollen rhinitis and asthma. Allergy 1990;45(6):451-6.
371. Pedersen B, Larsen BB, Dahl R, Hedbys L, Mygind N. Budesonide powder administration for the treatment of grass-pollen- induced allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1994;49(10):855-60.
372. Pedersen W, Hjuler I, Bisgaard H, Mygind N. Nasal inhalation of budesonide from a spacer in children with perennial rhinitis and asthma. Allergy 1998;53(4):383-387.
373. Pipkorn U, Rundcrantz H, Lindqvist N. Budesonide - a new nasal steroid. Rhinology 1980;18(4):171-5.
374. Potter PC, Van Niekerk CH, Schoeman HS. Effects of triamcinolone on quality of life in patients with persistent allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;91(4):368-74.
375. Prahl P, Wilken-Jensen K, Mygind N. Beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol in treatment of hay fever in children. Arch Dis Child 1975;50(11):875-8.
376. Prenner BM, Chervinsky P, Hampel FC, Jr., Howland WC, Lawrence M, Meltzer EO, et al. Double-strength beclomethasone dipropionate (84 micrograms/spray) aqueous nasal spray in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1996;98(2):302-8.
377. Pullerits T, Praks L, Ristioja V, Lotvall J. Comparison of a nasal glucocorticoid, antileukotriene, and a combination of antileukotriene and antihistamine in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2002;109(6):949-55.
378. Ratner P, van Bavel J, Gross G, Bynum L, Munshi A. New formulation of aqueous flunisolide nasal spray in the treatment of allergic rhinitis: comparative assessment of safety, tolerability, and efficacy. Allergy Asthma Proc 1996;17(3):149-56.
379. Ratner PH, Howland WC, 3rd, Jacobs RL, Reed KD, Goode-Sellers ST, Prillaman BA, et al. Relief of sinus pain and pressure with fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray: a placebo-controlled trial in patients with allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2002;23(4):259-63.
380. Ratner PH, Paull BR, Findlay SR, Hampel F, Jr., Martin B, Kral KM, et al. Fluticasone propionate given once daily is as effective for seasonal allergic rhinitis as beclomethasone dipropionate given twice daily. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90(3 Pt 1):285-91.
381. Ratner PH, van Bavel JH, Martin BG, Hampel FC, Jr., Howland WC, 3rd, Rogenes PR, et al. A comparison of the efficacy of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray and loratadine, alone and in combination, for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Fam Pract 1998;47(2):118-25.
382. Ratner PH, Wingertzahn MA, van Bavel JH, Hampel F, Darken PF, Hellbardt S, et al. Effectiveness of ciclesonide nasal spray in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;97(5):657-63.
383. Ratner PH, Wingertzahn MA, van Bavel JH, Hampel F, Darken PF, Shah T. Efficacy and safety of ciclesonide nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;118(5):1142-8.
384. Rosenblut A, Bardin PG, Muller B, Faris MA, Wu WW, Caldwell MF, et al. Long-term safety of fluticasone furoate nasal spray in adults and adolescents with perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy 2007;62(9):1071-7.
385. Rosenthal R, Berger W, Bronsky E, Dockhorn R, Korenblat P, Lampl K, et al. Tri-Nasal triamcinolone acetonide nasal spray 200 and 400 micrograms qd versus placebo and Nasacort

triamcinolone acetonide nasal aerosol 440 micrograms qd in patients suffering from seasonal allergic rhinitis during the grass season. Am J Rhinol 1998;12(6):427-33.
386. Sahay JN, Chatterjee SS, Engler C. Flunisolide--a new intranasal steroid for the treatment of allergic rhinitis. Clin Allergy 1979;9(1):17-24.
387. Sarsfield JK, Thomson GE. Flunisolide nasal spray for perennial rhinitis in children. Br Med J 1979;2(6182):95-7.
388. Schenkel EJ, Skoner DP, Bronsky EA, Miller SD, Pearlman DS, Rooklin A, et al. Absence of growth retardation in children with perennial allergic rhinitis after one year of treatment with mometasone furoate aqueous nasal spray. Pediatrics 2000;105(2):E22.
389. Schulz JI, Johnson JD, Freedman SO. Double-blind trial comparing flunisolide and placebo for the treatment of perennial rhinitis. Clin Allergy 1978;8(4):313-20.
390. Settipane G, Korenblat PE, Winder J, Lumry W, Murphree J, Alderfer VB, et al. Triamcinolone acetonide Aqueous nasal spray in patients with seasonal ragweed allergic rhinitis: a placebo-controlled, double-blind study. Clin Ther 1995;17(2):252-63.
391. Siegel SC, Katz RM, Rachelefsky GS, Geller BD, Montag LL, Brandon ML, et al. Multicentric study of beclomethasone dipropionate nasal aerosol in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1982;69(4):345-53.
392. Skoner DP, Gentile D, Angelini B, Kane R, Birdsall D, Banerji D. The effects of intranasal triamcinolone acetonide and intranasal fluticasone propionate on short-term bone growth and HPA axis in children with allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;90(1):56-62.
393. Skoner DP, Rachelefsky GS, Meltzer EO, Chervinsky P, Morris RM, Seltzer JM, et al. Detection of growth suppression in children during treatment with intranasal beclomethasone dipropionate. Pediatrics 2000;105(2):E23.
394. Smith JM, Clegg RT, Cook N, Butler AG. Intranasal beclomethasone diproprionate in allergic rhinitis. Br Med J 1975;2(5965):255.
395. Spector S, Bronsky E, Chervinsky P, Lotner G, Koepke J, Selner J, et al. Multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of triamcinolone acetonide nasal aerosol in the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1990;64(3):300-5.
396. Spector SL, English G, Jones L. Clinical and nasal biopsy response to treatment of perennial rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1980;66(2):129-37.
397. Steensen H, Lindqvist N. Treatment of grass pollen-induced hay fever with intranasal budesonide. A double-blind clinical comparison between budesonide and placebo. Allergy 1981;36(4):245-9.
398. Stern MA, Dahl R, Nielsen LP, Pedersen B, Schrewelius C. A comparison of aqueous suspensions of budesonide nasal spray (128 micrograms and 256 micrograms once daily) and fluticasone propionate nasal spray (200 micrograms once daily) in the treatment of adult patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Am J Rhinol 1997;11(4):323-30.
399. Storms W, Bronsky E, Findlay S, Pearlman D, Rosenberg S, Shapiro G, et al. Once daily triamcinolone acetonide nasal spray is effective for the treatment of perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1991;66(4):329-34.
400. Tarlo SM, Cockcroft DW, Dolovich J, Hargreave FE. Beclomethasone dipropionate aerosol in perennial rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1977;59(3):232-6.
401. Turkeltaub PC, Norman PS, Johnson JD, Crepea S. Treatment of seasonal and perennial rhinitis with intranasal flunisolide. Allergy 1982;37(5):303-11.
402. van As A, Bronsky E, Grossman J, Meltzer E, Ratner P, Reed C. Dose tolerance study of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1991;67(2 Pt 1):156-62.
403. van As A, Bronsky EA, Dockhorn RJ, Grossman J, Lumry W, Meltzer EO, et al. Once daily fluticasone propionate is as effective for perennial allergic rhinitis as twice daily beclomethasone diproprionate. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;91(6):1146-54.

404. van Bavel J, Findlay SR, Hampel FC, Jr., Martin BG, Ratner P, Field E. Intranasal fluticasone propionate is more effective than terfenadine tablets for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Arch Intern Med 1994;154(23):2699-704.
405. Warland A. Evaluation of flunisolide nasal solution in the symptomatic treatment of perennial rhinitis. Allergy 1982;37(6):417-20.
406. Warland A, Moller P, Lindqvist N. Budesonide - a new steroid for intranasal use. A double-blind clinical comparison between budesonide and placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1981;36(6):425-8.
407. Welch MJ, Bronsky EA, Grossman J, Shapiro GG, Tinkelman DG, Garcia JD, et al. Clinical evaluation of triamcinolone acetonide nasal aerosol in children with perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy 1991;67(5):493-8.
408. Welsh PW, Stricker WE, Chu CP, Naessens JM, Reese ME, Reed CE, et al. Efficacy of beclomethasone nasal solution, flunisolide, and cromolyn in relieving symptoms of ragweed allergy. Mayo Clin Proc 1987;62(2):125-34.
409. Wight RG, Jones AS, Beckingham E, Andersson B, Ek L. A double blind comparison of intranasal budesonide 400 micrograms and 800 micrograms in perennial rhinitis. Clin Otolaryngol 1992;17(4):354-8.
410. Wilson AM, Sims EJ, Orr LC, Coutie WJ, White PS, Gardiner Q, et al. Effects of topical corticosteroid and combined mediator blockade on domiciliary and laboratory measurements of nasal function in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2001;87(4):344-9.
411. Wolthers OD, Jorgensen BA, Pedersen S. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study of the effect of intranasal budesonide in the treatment of children with seasonal rhinitis. Acta Paediatr 1992;81(11):902-6.
412. Weiner JM, Abramson MJ, Puy RM. Intranasal corticosteroids versus oral H1 receptor antagonists in allergic rhinitis: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. BMJ 1998;317(7173):1624-9.
413. Stempel DA, Thomas M. Treatment of allergic rhinitis: an evidence-based evaluation of nasal corticosteroids versus nonsedating antihistamines. Am J Manag Care 1998;4(1):89-96.
414. Yanez A, Rodrigo GJ. Intranasal corticosteroids versus topical H1 receptor antagonists for the treatment of allergic rhinitis: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;89(5):479-84.
415. Meltzer EO, Berger WE, Berkowitz RB, Bronsky EA, Dvorin DJ, Finn AF, et al. A dose-ranging study of mometasone furoate aqueous nasal spray in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104(1):107-14.
416. Fokkens WJ, Scadding GK. Perennial rhinitis in the under 4s: a difficult problem to treat safely and effectively? A comparison of intranasal fluticasone propionate and ketotifen in the treatment of 2-4-year-old children with perennial rhinitis. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2004;15(3):261-6.
417. Bender BG, Milgrom H. Comparison of the effects of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray and loratadine on daytime alertness and performance in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2004;92(3):344-9.
418. Kaszuba SM, Baroody FM, deTineo M, Haney L, Blair C, Naclerio RM. Superiority of an intranasal corticosteroid compared with an oral antihistamine in the as-needed treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Arch Intern Med 2001;161(21):2581-7.
419. Rinne J, Simola M, Malmberg H, Haahtela T. Early treatment of perennial rhinitis with budesonide or cetirizine and its effect on long-term outcome. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2002;109(3):426-32.
420. Munch EP, Soborg M, Norreslet TT, Mygind N. A comparative study of dexchlorpheniramine maleate sustained release tablets and budesonide nasal spray in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1983;38(7):517-24.

421. Schoenwetter W, Lim J. Comparison of intranasal triamcinolone acetonide with oral loratadine for the treatment of patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Ther 1995;17(3):479-92.
422. Jordana G, Dolovich J, Briscoe MP, Day JH, Drouin MA, Gold M, et al. Intranasal fluticasone propionate versus loratadine in the treatment of adolescent patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1996;97(2):588-95.
423. Gehanno P, Desfougeres JL. Fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray compared with oral loratadine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy 1997;52(4):445-50.
424. D'Ambrosio FP, Gangemi S, Merendino RA, Arena A, Ricciardi L, Bagnato GF. Comparative study between fluticasone propionate and cetirizine in the treatment of allergic rhinitis. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 1998;26(6):277-82.
425. Ratner PH, van-Bavel JH, Martin BG, Hampel F, Jr., Howland Wr, Rogenes PR, et al. A comparison of the efficacy of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray and loratadine, alone and in combination, for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Fam Pract 1998;47(2):118-25.
426. Condemi J, Schulz R, Lim J. Triamcinolone acetonide aqueous nasal spray versus loratadine in seasonal allergic rhinitis: efficacy and quality of life. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2000;84(5):533-8.
427. Lange B. Wirksamkeit, Kosten-Wirksamkeit und Verträglichkeit topischer intranasaler Arzneimittel zur Behandlung der allergischen Rhinitis. Systematische Review mit Metaanalysen (Teil A) und klinische Studie (Teil B). Düsseldorf: Heinrich-Heine-Universität; 2004.
428. Lange B, Bachert C. Die topische intranasale Therapie der allergischen Rhinitis. Eine Wirksamkeits- und Kostenanalyse. Allergologie 2003;26(5):177-195.
429. 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. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(3):272-82.
430. Brooks CD, Karl KJ, Francom SF. Oral methylprednisolone acetate (Medrol Tablets) for seasonal rhinitis: examination of dose and symptom response. J Clin Pharmacol 1993;33(9):816-22.
431. Laursen LC, Faurschou P, Pals H, Svendsen UG, Weeke B. Intramuscular betamethasone dipropionate vs. oral prednisolone in hay fever patients. Allergy 1987;42(3):168-72.
432. Rowe BH, Spooner C, Ducharme FM, Bretzlaff JA, Bota GW. Early emergency department treatment of acute asthma with systemic corticosteroids. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2001(1):CD002178.
433. Rowe B, Spooner C, Ducharme F, Bretzlaff J, Bota G. Corticosteroids for preventing relapse following acute exacerbations of asthma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007(3):CD000195.
434. Ostergaard MS, Ostrem A, Söderström M. Hay fever and a single intramuscular injection of corticosteroids: a systematic review. Primary Care Resp J 2005;14(3):123-130.
435. Felson DT, Anderson JJ. Across-study evaluation of association between steroid dose and bolus steroids and avascular necrosis of bone. Lancet 1987;1(8538):902-6.
436. Smith M, Iqbal S, Elliott TM, Everard M, Rowe BH. Corticosteroids for hospitalised children with acute asthma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2003(2):CD002886.
437. Markovitz BP, Randolph AG. Corticosteroids for the prevention and treatment of postextubation stridor in neonates, children and adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 1999;Issue 3. Art. No.: CD001000.
438. Steward DL, Welge JA, Myer CM. Steroids for improving recovery following tonsillectomy in children. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2003(1):CD003997.
439. Meltzer EO, Orgel HA, Bronsky EA, Findlay SR, Georgitis JW, Grossman J, et al. Ipratropium bromide aqueous nasal 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(2):242-9.
440. Georgitis JW. The anticholinergic treatment of allergic perennial rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90(6 Pt 2):1071-6.

441. Kaiser HB, Findlay SR, Georgitis JW, Grossman J, Ratner PH, Tinkelman DG, et al. The anticholinergic agent, ipratropium bromide, is useful in the treatment of rhinorrhea associated with perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 1998;19(1):23-9.
442. von Haacke NP, Moore-Gillon V, Capel LH. Double blind cross over trial of ipratropium and placebo in chronic rhinorrhoea. Br Med J (Clin Res Ed) 1983;287(6401):1258-9.
443. Dockhorn R, Aaronson D, Bronsky E, Chervinsky P, Cohen R, Ehtessabian R, et al. Ipratropium bromide nasal spray 0.03% and beclomethasone nasal spray alone and in combination for the treatment of rhinorrhea in perennial rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(4):349-59.
444. Meltzer EO, Orgel HA, Biondi R, Georgitis J, Milgrom H, Munk Z, et al. Ipratropium nasal spray in children with perennial rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;78(5):485-91.
445. Milgrom H, Biondi R, Georgitis JW, Meltzer EO, Munk ZM, Drda K, et al. Comparison of ipratropium bromide 0.03% with beclomethasone dipropionate in the treatment of perennial rhinitis in children. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;83(2):105-11.
446. Stubner UP, Toth J, Marks B, Berger UE, Burtin B, Horak F. Efficacy and safety of an oral formulation of cetirizine and prolonged-release pseudoephedrine versus xylometazoline nasal spray in nasal congestion. Arzneimittelforschung 2001;51(11):904-10.
447. Taverner D, Latte J. Nasal decongestants for the common cold. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007(1):CD001953.
448. Graf P. Rhinitis medicamentosa: a review of causes and treatment. Treat Respir Med 2005;4(1):21-9.
449. Graf PM. Rhinitis medicamentosa. Clin Allergy Immunol 2007;19:295-304.
450. Ramey JT, Bailen E, Lockey RF. Rhinitis medicamentosa. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2006;16(3):148-55.
451. Hatton RC, Winterstein AG, McKelvey RP, Shuster J, Hendeles L. Efficacy and safety of oral phenylephrine: systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Pharmacother 2007;41(3):381-90.
452. Salerno SM, Jackson JL, Berbano EP. Effect of oral pseudoephedrine on blood pressure and heart rate: a meta-analysis. Arch Intern Med 2005;165(15):1686-94.
453. Bronsky E, Boggs P, Findlay S, Gawchik S, Georgitis J, Mansmann H, et al. Comparative efficacy and safety of a once-daily loratadine-pseudoephedrine combination versus its components alone and placebo in the management of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;96(2):139-47.
454. Storms WW, Bodman SF, Nathan RA, Chervinsky P, Banov CH, Dockhorn RJ, et al. SCH 434: a new antihistamine/decongestant for seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1989;83(6):1083-90.
455. Dockhorn RJ, Williams BO, Sanders RL. Efficacy of acrivastine with pseudoephedrine in treatment of allergic rhinitis due to ragweed. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(2):204-8.
456. Williams BO, Hull H, McSorley P, Frosolono MF, Sanders RL. Efficacy of acrivastine plus pseudoephedrine for symptomatic relief of seasonal allergic rhinitis due to mountain cedar. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(5):432-8.
457. McCrory DC, Williams JW, Dolor RJ, Gray RN, Kolimaga JT, Reed S, et al. Management of allergic rhinitis in the working-age population. Evid Rep Technol Assess (Summ) 2003(67):1-4.
458. Chervinsky P, Nayak A, Rooklin A, Danzig M. Efficacy and safety of desloratadine/pseudoephedrine tablet, 2.5/120 mg two times a day, versus individual components in the treatment of patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2005;26(5):391-6.
459. Pleskow W, Grubbe R, Weiss S, Lutsky B. Efficacy and safety of an extended-release formulation of desloratadine and pseudoephedrine vs the individual components in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;94(3):348-54.
460. Schenkel E, Corren J, Murray JJ. Efficacy of once-daily desloratadine/pseudoephedrine for relief of nasal congestion. Allergy Asthma Proc 2002;23(5):325-30.

461. Owen CG, Shah A, Henshaw K, Smeeth L, Sheikh A. Topical treatments for seasonal allergic conjunctivitis: systematic review and meta-analysis of efficacy and effectiveness. Br J Gen Pract 2004;54(503):451-6.
462. Canonica GW, Ciprandi G, Petzold U, Kolb C, Ellers-Lenz B, Hermann R. Topical azelastine in perennial allergic conjunctivitis. Curr Med Res Opin 2003;19(4):321-9.
463. Giede C, Metzenauer P, Petzold U, Ellers-Lenz B. Comparison of azelastine eye drops with levocabastine eye drops in the treatment of seasonal allergic conjunctivitis. Curr Med Res Opin 2000;16(3):153-63.
464. Giede-Tuch C, Westhoff M, Zarth A. Azelastine eye-drops in seasonal allergic conjunctivitis or rhinoconjunctivitis. A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study. Allergy 1998;53(9):857-62.
465. James IG, Campbell LM, Harrison JM, Fell PJ, Ellers-Lenz B, Petzold U. Comparison of the efficacy and tolerability of topically administered azelastine, sodium cromoglycate and placebo in the treatment of seasonal allergic conjunctivitis and rhino-conjunctivitis. Curr Med Res Opin 2003;19(4):313-20.
466. Lenhard G, Mivsek-Music E, Perrin-Fayolle M, Obtulowicz K, Secchi A. Double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled study of two concentrations of azelastine eye drops in seasonal allergic conjunctivitis or rhinoconjunctivitis. Curr Med Res Opin 1997;14(1):21-8.
467. Nazarov O, Petzold U, Haase H, Nguyen DT, Ellers-Lenz B, Hermann R. Azelastine eye drops in the treatment of perennial allergic conjunctivitis. Arzneimittelforschung 2003;53(3):167-73.
468. Sabbah A, Marzetto M. Azelastine eye drops in the treatment of seasonal allergic conjunctivitis or rhinoconjunctivitis in young children. Curr Med Res Opin 1998;14(3):161-70.
469. Whitcup SM, Bradford R, Lue J, Schiffman RM, Abelson MB. Efficacy and tolerability of ophthalmic epinastine: a randomized, double-masked, parallel-group, active- and vehicle-controlled environmental trial in patients with seasonal allergic conjunctivitis. Clin Ther 2004;26(1):29-34.
470. Avunduk AM, Tekelioglu Y, Turk A, Akyol N. Comparison of the effects of ketotifen fumarate 0.025% and olopatadine HCl 0.1% ophthalmic solutions in seasonal allergic conjunctivities: a 30-day, randomized, double-masked, artificial tear substitute-controlled trial. Clin Ther 2005;27(9):1392-402.
471. Kidd M, McKenzie SH, Steven I, Cooper C, Lanz R. Efficacy and safety of ketotifen eye drops in the treatment of seasonal allergic conjunctivitis. Br J Ophthalmol 2003;87(10):1206-11.
472. Azevedo M, Castel-Branco MG, Oliveira JF, Ramos E, Delgado L, Almeida J. Double-blind comparison of levocabastine eye drops with sodium cromoglycate and placebo in the treatment of seasonal allergic conjunctivitis. Clin Exp Allergy 1991;21(6):689-94.
473. Davies BH, Mullins J. Topical levocabastine is more effective than sodium cromoglycate for the prophylaxis and treatment of seasonal allergic conjunctivitis. Allergy 1993;48(7):519-24.
474. Donshik PC, Pearlman D, Pinnas J, Raizman MB, Tauber J, Tinkelman D, et al. Efficacy and safety of ketorolac tromethamine 0.5% and levocabastine 0.05%: a multicenter comparison in patients with seasonal allergic conjunctivitis. Adv Ther 2000;17(2):94-102.
475. Pipkorn U, Bende M, Hedner J, Hedner T. A double-blind evaluation of topical levocabastine, a new specific H1 antagonist in patients with allergic conjunctivitis. Allergy 1985;40(7):491-6.
476. Abelson MB, Turner D. A randomized, double-blind, parallel-group comparison of olopatadine 0.1% ophthalmic solution versus placebo for controlling the signs and symptoms of seasonal allergic conjunctivitis and rhinoconjunctivitis. Clin Ther 2003;25(3):931-47.
477. Abelson MB, Gomes PJ, Vogelson CT, Pasquine TA, Gross RD, Turner FD, et al. Clinical efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride ophthalmic solution 0.2% compared with placebo in patients with allergic conjunctivitis or rhinoconjunctivitis: a randomized, double-masked environmental study. Clin Ther 2004;26(8):1237-48.

478. Kamis U, Ozturk BT, Ozkagnici A, Gunduz K. Comparison of the efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride 0.1% ophthalmic solution and artificial tears in seasonal allergic conjunctivitis. Acta Ophthalmol Scand 2006;84(1):148-9.
479. Calderon M, Alves B, Jacobson M, Hurwitz B, Sheikh A, Durham S. Allergen injection immunotherapy for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007(1):CD001936.
480. Canonica GW, Baena-Cagnani CE, Bousquet J, Bousquet PJ, Lockey RF, Malling HJ, et al. Recommendations for standardization of clinical trials with Allergen Specific Immunotherapy for respiratory allergy. A statement of a World Allergy Organization (WAO) taskforce. Allergy 2007;62(3):317-24.
481. Röder E, Berger MY, de Groot H, Gert van Wijk R. Immunotherapy in children and adolescents with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: a systematic review. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2008;19(3):197-207.
482. Fontana VJ, Holt LE, Jr., Mainland D. Effectiveness of hyposensitization therapy in ragweed hay-fever in children. JAMA 1966;195(12):985-92.
483. Möller C, Dreborg S, Ferdousi HA, Halken S, Host A, Jacobsen L, et al. Pollen immunotherapy reduces the development of asthma in children with seasonal rhinoconjunctivitis (the PAT-study). J Allergy Clin Immunol 2002;109(2):251-6.
484. Sanders S. The treatment of seasonal hay fever and asthma in children. A controlled trial of pre-seasonal depot pollen therapy. Practitioner 1966;196(176):811-5.
485. Weisnagel J. Nouvel agent hyposensibilisant dans le traitement de la rhinite allergique saisonnière (fièvre des foins) à l'herbe à poux chez l'enfant: le MRTA (modified ragweed tyrosine adsorbate). Union Med Can 1979;108(6):685-90.
486. Dreborg S, Agrell B, Foucard T, Kjellman NI, Koivikko A, Nilsson S. A double-blind, multicenter immunotherapy trial in children, using a purified and standardized Cladosporium herbarum preparation. I. Clinical results. Allergy 1986;41(2):131-40.
487. Urbanek R, Behrle M, Kuhn W. Die problematik der hausstaubmilbenallergie. Pädiatr Pädol 1991;26(1):25-30.
488. Wilson DR, Torres LI, Durham SR. Sublingual immunotherapy for allergic rhinitis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2003(2):CD002893.
489. Wilson DR, Lima MT, Durham SR. Sublingual immunotherapy for allergic rhinitis: systematic review and meta-analysis. Allergy 2005;60(1):4-12.
490. Bowen T, Greenbaum J, Charbonneau Y, Hebert J, Filderman R, Sussman G, et al. Canadian trial of sublingual swallow immunotherapy for ragweed rhinoconjunctivitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2004;93(5):425-30.
491. Clavel R, Bousquet J, Andre C. Clinical efficacy of sublingual-swallow immunotherapy: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of a standardized five-grass-pollen extract in rhinitis. Allergy 1998;53(5):493-8.
492. Dahl R, Kapp A, Colombo G, de Monchy JG, Rak S, Emminger W, et al. Efficacy and safety of sublingual immunotherapy with grass allergen tablets for seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;118(2):434-40.
493. Dahl R, Stender A, Rak S. Specific immunotherapy with SQ standardized grass allergen tablets in asthmatics with rhinoconjunctivitis. Allergy 2006;61(2):185-90.
494. D'Anneo RW, Arena A, Gammeri E, Bruno ME, Falagiani P, Riva G, et al. Parietaria sublingual allergoid immunotherapy with a co-seasonal treatment schedule. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 2008;36(2):79-84.
495. de Blay F, Barnig C, Kanny G, Purohit A, Leynadier F, Tunon de Lara JM, et al. Sublingual-swallow immunotherapy with standardized 3-grass pollen extract: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;99(5):453-61.
496. Di Rienzo V, Pucci S, D'Alo S, Di Cara G, Incorvaia C, Frati F, et al. Effects of high-dose sublingual immunotherapy on quality of life in patients with cypress-induced rhinitis: A placebo-controlled study. Clinical and Experimental Allergy Reviews 2006;6(3):67-70.

497. Didier A, Malling HJ, Worm M, Horak F, Jager S, Montagut A, et al. Optimal dose, efficacy, and safety of once-daily sublingual immunotherapy with a 5-grass pollen tablet for seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;120(6):1338-45.
498. Durham SR, Yang WH, Pedersen MR, Johansen N, Rak S. Sublingual immunotherapy with once-daily grass allergen tablets: a randomized controlled trial in seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;117(4):802-9.
499. Feliziani V, Lattuada G, Parmiani S, Dall'Aglio PP. Safety and efficacy of sublingual rush immunotherapy with grass allergen extracts. A double blind study. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 1995;23(5):224-30.
500. Horiguchi S, Okamoto Y, Yonekura S, Okawa T, Yamamoto H, Kunii N, et al. A randomized controlled trial of sublingual immunotherapy for Japanese cedar pollinosis. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2008;146(1):76-84.
501. Khinchi MS, Poulsen LK, Carat F, Andre C, Hansen AB, Malling HJ. Clinical efficacy of sublingual and subcutaneous birch pollen allergen-specific immunotherapy: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, double-dummy study. Allergy 2004;59(1):45-53.
502. Marogna M, Spadolini I, Massolo A, Canonica GW, Passalacqua G. Randomized controlled open study of sublingual immunotherapy for respiratory allergy in real-life: clinical efficacy and more. Allergy 2004;59(11):1205-10.
503. Marogna M, Spadolini I, Massolo A, Canonica GW, Passalacqua G. Clinical, functional, and immunologic effects of sublingual immunotherapy in birch pollinosis: a 3-year randomized controlled study. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005;115(6):1184-8.
504. Marogna M, Spadolini I, Massolo A, Zanon P, Berra D, Chiodini E, et al. Effects of sublingual immunotherapy for multiple or single allergens in polysensitized patients. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;98(3):274-80.
505. Moreno-Ancillo A, Moreno C, Ojeda P, Dominguez C, Barasona MJ, Garcia-Cubillana A, et al. Efficacy and quality of life with once-daily sublingual immunotherapy with grasses plus olive pollen extract without updosing. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2007;17(6):399-405.
506. Mosges R, Bruning H, Hessler HJ, Gotz G, Knaussmann HG. Sublingual immunotherapy in pollen-induced seasonal rhinitis and conjunctivitis: a randomized controlled trial. Acta Dermatovenerol Alp Panonica Adriat 2007;16(4):143-8.
507. Okubo K, Gotoh M, Fujieda S, Okano M, Yoshida H, Morikawa H, et al. A randomized double-blind comparative study of sublingual immunotherapy for cedar pollinosis. Allergol Int 2008;57(3):265-75.
508. Palma-Carlos AG, Santos AS, Branco-Ferreira M, Pregal AL, Palma-Carlos ML, Bruno ME, et al. Clinical efficacy and safety of preseasonal sublingual immunotherapy with grass pollen carbamylated allergoid in rhinitic patients. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 2006;34(5):194-8.
509. Pokladnikova J, Krcmova I, Vlcek J. Economic evaluation of sublingual vs subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2008;100(5):482-9.
510. Rak S, Yang WH, Pedersen MR, Durham SR. Once-daily sublingual allergen-specific immunotherapy improves quality of life in patients with grass pollen-induced allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: a double-blind, randomised study. Qual Life Res 2007;16(2):191-201.
511. Sabbah A, Hassoun S, Le Sellin J, Andre C, Sicard H. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial by the sublingual route of immunotherapy with a standardized grass pollen extract. Allergy 1994;49(5):309-13.
512. Sambugaro R, Puccinelli P, Burastero SE, Di Rienzo V. The efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy for respiratory allergy is not affected by different dosage regimens in the induction phase. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 2003;31(6):329-37.
513. Smith H, White P, Annila I, Poole J, Andre C, Frew A. Randomized controlled trial of high-dose sublingual immunotherapy to treat seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;114(4):831-7.

514. Torres Lima M, Wilson D, Pitkin L, Roberts A, Nouri-Aria K, Jacobson M, et al. Grass pollen sublingual immunotherapy for seasonal rhinoconjunctivitis: a randomized controlled trial. Clin Exp Allergy 2002;32(4):507-14.
515. Worm M. Efficacy and tolerability of high dose sublingual immunotherapy in patients with rhinoconjunctivitis. Eur Ann Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;38(10):355-60.
516. Alvarez-Cuesta E, Berges-Gimeno P, Gonzalez-Mancebo E, Fernandez-Caldas E, Cuesta-Herranz J, Casanovas M. Sublingual immunotherapy with a standardized cat dander extract: evaluation of efficacy in a double blind placebo controlled study. Allergy 2007;62(7):810-7.
517. Passalacqua G, Pasquali M, Ariano R, Lombardi C, Giardini A, Baiardini I, et al. Randomized double-blind controlled study with sublingual carbamylated allergoid immunotherapy in mild rhinitis due to mites. Allergy 2006;61(7):849-54.
518. Sanchez Palacios A, Schamann F, Garcia JA. [Sublingual immunotherapy with cat epithelial extract. Personal experience]. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 2001;29(2):60-5.
519. Tonnel AB, Scherpereel A, Douay B, Mellin B, Leprince D, Goldstein N, et al. Allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites: evaluation of the efficacy of specific sublingual immunotherapy. Allergy 2004;59(5):491-7.
520. Calderon M, Essendrop M. Specific immunotherapy with high dose SO standardized grass allergen tablets was safe and well tolerated. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2006;16(6):338-44.
521. Grosclaude M, Bouillot P, Alt R, Leynadier F, Scheinmann P, Rufin P, et al. Safety of various dosage regimens during induction of sublingual immunotherapy. A preliminary study. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2002;129(3):248-53.
522. Kleine-Tebbe J, Ribel M, Herold DA. Safety of a SQ-standardised grass allergen tablet for sublingual immunotherapy: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Allergy 2006;61(2):181-4.
523. Malling HJ, Lund L, Ipsen H, Poulsen L. Safety and immunological changes during sublingual immunotherapy with standardized quality grass allergen tablets. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2006;16(3):162-8.
524. Dahl R, Kapp A, Colombo G, de Monchy JG, Rak S, Emminger W, et al. Sublingual grass allergen tablet immunotherapy provides sustained clinical benefit with progressive immunologic changes over 2 years. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2008;121(2):512-518 e2.
525. Didier A, Melac M, Montagut A, Lheritier-Barrand M, Tabar A, Worm M. Agreement of efficacy assessments for five-grass pollen sublingual tablet immunotherapy. Allergy 2009;64(1):166-71.
526. Durham SR, Riis B. Grass allergen tablet immunotherapy relieves individual seasonal eye and nasal symptoms, including nasal blockage. Allergy 2007;62(8):954-7.
527. Horak F, Jaeger S, Worm M, Melac M, Didier A. Implementation of pre-seasonal sublingual immunotherapy with a five-grass pollen tablet during optimal dosage assessment. Clin Exp Allergy 2008.
528. Pfaar O, Klimek L. Efficacy and safety of specific immunotherapy with a high-dose sublingual grass pollen preparation: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2008;100(3):256-63.
529. Sabbah A, Lesellin J, Hassoun S, Sicard H, Andre C. [Sublingual specific immunotherapy for rhinoconjunctivitis caused by grass pollens]. Allerg Immunol (Paris) 1993;25(6):241-7.
530. Andre C, Perrin-Fayolle M, Grosclaude M, Couturier P, Basset D, Cornillon J, et al. A double-blind placebo-controlled evaluation of sublingual immunotherapy with a standardized ragweed extract in patients with seasonal rhinitis. Evidence for a dose-response relationship. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2003;131(2):111-8.
531. Ariano R, Spadolini I, Panzani RC. Efficacy of sublingual specific immunotherapy in Cupressaceae allergy using an extract of Cupressus arizonica. A double blind study. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 2001;29(6):238-44.

532. Casanovas M, Guerra F, Moreno C, Miguel R, Maranon F, Daza JC. Double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial of preseasonal treatment with allergenic extracts of Olea europaea pollen administered sublingually. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 1994;4(6):305-14.
533. Drachenberg KJ, Pfeiffer P, Urban E. Sublingual Immunotherapy - Results from a multi-centre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study with a standardised birch and grass/rye pollen extract. Allergologie 2001;24:525-534.
534. Hordijk GJ, Antvelink JB, Luwema RA. Sublingual immunotherapy with a standardised grass pollen extract; a double-blind placebo-controlled study. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 1998;26(5):234-40.
535. Passalacqua G, Albano M, Riccio A, Fregonese L, Puccinelli P, Parmiani S, et al. Clinical and immunologic effects of a rush sublingual immunotherapy to Parietaria species: A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104(5):964-8.
536. Pradalier A, Basset D, Claudel A, Couturier P, Wessel F, Galvain S, et al. Sublingual-swallow immunotherapy (SLIT) with a standardized five-grass-pollen extract (drops and sublingual tablets) versus placebo in seasonal rhinitis. Allergy 1999;54(8):819-28.
537. Purello-D'Ambrosio F, Gangemi S, Isola S, La Motta N, Puccinelli P, Parmiani S, et al. Sublingual immunotherapy: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial with Parietaria judaica extract standardized in mass units in patients with rhinoconjunctivitis, asthma, or both. Allergy 1999;54(9):968-73.
538. Purello-D'Ambrosio F, Ricciardi L, Isola S, Savi E, Parmiani S, Puccinelli P, et al. Rush sublingual immunotherapy in Parietaria allergic patients. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 1996;24(4):146-51.
539. Troise C, Voltolini S, Canessa A, Pecora S, Negrini AC. Sublingual immunotherapy in Parietaria pollen-induced rhinitis: a double-blind study. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 1995;5(1):25-30.
540. Voltolini S, Modena P, Minale P, Bignardi D, Troise C, Puccinelli P, et al. Sublingual immunotherapy in tree pollen allergy. Double-blind, placebo-controlled study with a biologically standardised extract of three pollens (alder, birch and hazel) administered by a rush schedule. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 2001;29(4):103-10.
541. Guez S, Vatrinet C, Fadel R, Andre C. House-dust-mite sublingual-swallow immunotherapy (SLIT) in perennial rhinitis: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Allergy 2000;55(4):369-75.
542. Mungan D, Misirligil Z, Gurbuz L. Comparison of the efficacy of subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy in mite-sensitive patients with rhinitis and asthma--a placebo controlled study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(5):485-90.
543. Nelson HS, Oppenheimer J, Vatsia GA, Buchmeier A. A double-blind, placebo-controlled evaluation of sublingual immunotherapy with standardized cat extract. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;92(2):229-36.
544. Passalacqua G, Albano M, Fregonese L, Riccio A, Pronzato C, Mela GS, et al. Randomised controlled trial of local allergoid immunotherapy on allergic inflammation in mite-induced rhinoconjunctivitis. Lancet 1998;351(9103):629-32.
545. Cox LS, Linnemann DL, Nolte H, Weldon D, Finegold I, Nelson HS. Sublingual immunotherapy: a comprehensive review. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;117(5):1021-35.
546. Passalacqua G, Villa G, Altrinetti V, Falagiani P, Canonica GW, Mariani G, et al. Sublingual swallow or spit? Allergy 2001;56(6):578.
547. Rodriguez F, Boquete M, Ibanez MD, de la Torre-Martinez F, Tabar AI. Once daily sublingual immunotherapy without updosing—A new treatment schedule. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2006;140(4):321-6.
548. Marogna M, Bruno M, Massolo A, Falagiani P. Long-lasting effects of sublingual immunotherapy for house dust mites in allergic rhinitis with bronchial hyperreactivity: a long-term (13-year) retrospective study in real life. Int Arch Allergy Immunol 2007;142(1):70-8.

549. Marogna M, Spadolini I, Massolo A. Long lasting effect according to the duration of SLIT: a 15-year prospective study [abstract]. In: XXVI EAACI Congress; 2007; Goteborg; 2007. p. 276.
550. Olaguibel JM, Alvarez Puebla MJ. Efficacy of sublingual allergen vaccination for respiratory allergy in children. Conclusions from one meta-analysis. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2005;15(1):9-16.
551. Penagos M, Compalati E, Tarantini F, Baena-Cagnani R, Huerta J, Passalacqua G, et al. Efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy in the treatment of allergic rhinitis in pediatric patients 3 to 18 years of age: a meta-analysis of randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trials. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;97(2):141-8.
552. Bufe A, Eberle P, Franke-Beckmann E, Funck J, Kimmig M, Klimek L, et al. Safety and efficacy in children of an SQ-standardized grass allergen tablet for sublingual immunotherapy. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2009;123(1):167-173 e7.
553. Marcucci F, Sensi L, Di Cara G, Salvatori S, Bernini M, Pecora S, et al. Three-year follow-up of clinical and inflammation parameters in children monosensitized to mites undergoing sub-lingual immunotherapy. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2005;16(6):519-26.
554. Marogna M, Tomassetti D, Bernasconi A, Colombo F, Massolo A, Businco AD, et al. Preventive effects of sublingual immunotherapy in childhood: an open randomized controlled study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2008;101(2):206-11.
555. Pham-Thi N, Scheinmann P, Fadel R, Combebias A, Andre C. Assessment of sublingual immunotherapy efficacy in children with house dust mite-induced allergic asthma optimally controlled by pharmacologic treatment and mite-avoidance measures. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2007;18(1):47-57.
556. Tseng SH, Fu LS, Nong BR, Weng JD, Shyur SD. Changes in serum specific IgG4 and IgG4/ IgE ratio in mite-sensitized Taiwanese children with allergic rhinitis receiving short-term sublingual-swallow immunotherapy: a multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol 2008;26(2-3):105-12.
557. Valovirta E, Jacobsen L, Ljorring C, Koivikko A, Savolainen J. Clinical efficacy and safety of sublingual immunotherapy with tree pollen extract in children. Allergy 2006;61(10):1177-83.
558. Wahn U, Tabar A, Kuna P, Halken S, Montagut A, de Beaumont O, et al. Efficacy and safety of 5-grass-pollen sublingual immunotherapy tablets in pediatric allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2009;123(1):160-166 e3.
559. Röder E, Berger M, Hop W, Bernsen R, d-Groot H, Gerth-van-Wijk R. Sublingual immunotherapy with grass pollen is not effective in symptomatic youngsters in primary care. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;119(4):892-898.
560. Ibanez MD, Kaiser F, Knecht R, Armentia A, Schopfer H, Tholstrup B, et al. Safety of specific sublingual immunotherapy with SQ standardized grass allergen tablets in children. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2007;18(6):516-22.
561. Cao LF, Lu Q, Gu HL, Chen YP, Zhang Y, Lu M, et al. [Clinical evaluation for sublingual immunotherapy of allergic asthma and atopic rhinitis with Dermatophagoides Farinae Drops]. Zhonghua Er Ke Za Zhi 2007;45(10):736-41.
562. Bahçeciler NN, Isik U, Barlan IB, Basaran MM. Efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy in children with asthma and rhinitis: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Pediatr Pulmonol 2001;32(1):49-55.
563. Bufe A, Ziegler-Kirbach E, Stoeckmann E, Heidemann P, Gehlhar K, Holland-Letz T, et al. Efficacy of sublingual swallow immunotherapy in children with severe grass pollen allergic symptoms: a double-blind placebo-controlled study. Allergy 2004;59(5):498-504.
564. Caffarelli C, Sensi LG, Marcucci F, Cavagni G. Preseasonal local allergoid immunotherapy to grass pollen in children: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial. Allergy 2000;55(12):1142-7.

565. Hirsch T, Sahn M, Leupold W. Double-blind placebo-controlled study of sublingual immunotherapy with house dust mite extract (D.pt.) in children. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 1997;8(1):21-7.
566. Ippoliti F, De Santis W, Volterrani A, Lenti L, Canitano N, Lucarelli S, et al. Immunomodulation during sublingual therapy in allergic children. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2003;14(3):216-21.
567. La Rosa M, Ranno C, Andri C, Carat F, Tosca MA, Canonica GW. Double-blind placebo-controlled evaluation of sublingual-swallow immunotherapy with standardized Parietaria judaica extract in children with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1999;104(2 Pt 1):425-432.
568. Novembre E, Galli E, Landi F, Caffarelli C, Pifferi M, De Marco E, et al. Coseasonal sublingual immunotherapy reduces the development of asthma in children with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;114(4):851-7.
569. Pajno GB, Vita D, Parmiani S, Caminiti L, La Grutta S, Barberio G. Impact of sublingual immunotherapy on seasonal asthma and skin reactivity in children allergic to Parietaria pollen treated with inhaled fluticasone propionate. Clin Exp Allergy 2003;33(12):1641-7.
570. Rolinck-Werninghaus C, Wolf H, Liebke C, Baars JC, Lange J, Kopp MV, et al. A prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled multi-centre study on the efficacy and safety of sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT) in children with seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis to grass pollen. Allergy 2004;59(12):1285-93.
571. Stelmach I, Kaczmarek-Wozniak J, Majak P, Olszowiec-Chlebna M, Jerzynska J. Efficacy and safety of high-doses sublingual immunotherapy in ultra-rush scheme in children allergic to grass pollen. Clin Exp Allergy 2008.
572. Tari MG, Mancino M, Monti G. Efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy in patients with rhinitis and asthma due to house dust mite. A double-blind study. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 1990;18(5):277-84.
573. Vourdas D, Syrigou E, Potamianou P, Carat F, Batard T, Andre C, et al. Double-blind, placebo-controlled evaluation of sublingual immunotherapy with standardized olive pollen extract in pediatric patients with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis and mild asthma due to olive pollen sensitization. Allergy 1998;53(7):662-72.
574. Wüthrich B, Bucher C, Jorg W, Bircher A, Eng P, Schneider Y, et al. Double-blind, placebo-controlled study with sublingual immunotherapy in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis to grass pollen. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2003;13(3):145-8.
575. Yuksel H, Tanac R, Gousseinov A, Demir E. Sublingual immunotherapy and influence on urinary leukotrienes in seasonal pediatric allergy. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 1999;9(5):305-13.
576. Bardare M, Zani G, Novembre E, Vierucci A. Local nasal immunotherapy with a powdered extract for grass pollen induced rhinitis in pediatric age. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 1996;6(6):359-63.
577. Cserhati E, Mezei G. Nasal immunotherapy in pollen-sensitive children. Allergy 1997;52(33 Suppl):40-4.
578. Marcucci F, Sensi LG, Caffarelli C, Cavagni G, Bernardini R, Tiri A, et al. Low-dose local nasal immunotherapy in children with perennial allergic rhinitis due to Dermatophagoides. Allergy 2002;57(1):23-8.
579. Mehta SB, Smith JM. Nasal hyposensitization and hay fever. Clin Allergy 1975;5(3):279-84.
580. McDonald S, Hilton M, Khalil H, Dowley A. Local nasal immunotherapy for allergic rhinitis (Protocol). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2009:Issue 1. Art. No.: CD007599. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007599.

581. Andri L, Senna G, Andri G, Dama A, Givanni S, Betteli C, et al. Local nasal immunotherapy for birch allergic rhinitis with extract in powder form. Clin Exp Allergy 1995;25(11):1092-9.
582. Andri L, Senna G, Betteli C, Givanni S, Andri G, Dimitri G, et al. Local nasal immunotherapy with extract in powder form is effective and safe in grass pollen rhinitis: a double-blind study. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1996;97(1 Pt 1):34-41.
583. Andri L, Senna G, Betteli C, Givanni S, Andri G, Falagiani P. Local nasal immunotherapy for Dermatophagoides-induced rhinitis: efficacy of a powder extract. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;91(5):987-96.
584. Andri L, Senna GE, Betteli C, Givanni S, Andri G, Falagiani P, et al. Local nasal immunotherapy in allergic rhinitis to Parietaria. A double-blind controlled study. Allergy 1992;47(4 Pt 1):318-23.
585. Ariano R, Panzani RC, Chiapella M, Augeri G, Falagiani P. Local intranasal immunotherapy with allergen in powder in atopic patients sensitive to Parietaria officinalis pollen. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 1995;5(3):126-32.
586. Ascione E, De Lucia A, Imperiali M, Varricchio A, Motta G. Nasal application of immunotherapy. Chem Immunol Allergy 2003;82:89-98.
587. Bertoni M, Cosmi F, Bianchi I, Di Berardino L. Clinical efficacy and tolerability of a steady dosage schedule of local nasal immunotherapy. Results of preseasonal treatment in grass pollen rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(1):47-51.
588. Cirla AM, Sforza N, Roffi GP, Alessandrini A, Stanizzi R, Dorigo N, et al. Preseasonal intranasal immunotherapy in birch-alder allergic rhinitis. A double-blind study. Allergy 1996;51(5):299-305.
589. D'Amato G, Lobefalo G, Liccardi G, Cazzola M. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of local nasal immunotherapy in allergic rhinitis to Parietaria pollen. Clin Exp Allergy 1995;25(2):141-8.
590. Fanales-Belasio E, Ciofalo A, Zambetti G, Ansotegui IJ, Scala E, Paganelli R, et al. Intranasal immunotherapy with Dermatophagoides extract: in vivo and in vitro results of a double-blind placebo-controlled trial. Rhinology 1995;33(3):126-31.
591. Gaglani B, Borish L, Bartelson BL, Buchmeier A, Keller L, Nelson HS. Nasal immunotherapy in weed-induced allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;79(3):259-65.
592. Johansson SG, Deuschl H, Zetterstrom O. Use of glutaraldehyde-modified timothy grass pollen extract in nasal hyposensitisation treatment of hay fever. Int Arch Allergy Appl Immunol 1979;60(4):447-60.
593. Motta G, Passali D, De Vincentiis I, Ottaviani A, Maurizi M, Sartoris A, et al. A multicenter trial of specific local nasal immunotherapy. Laryngoscope 2000;110(1):132-9.
594. Nickelsen JA, Goldstein S, Mueller U, Wypych J, Reisman RE, Arbesman CE. Local intranasal immunotherapy for ragweed allergic rhinitis. I. Clinical response. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1981;68(1):33-40.
595. Pacor M, Biasi D, Girelli D, Lunardi C. Efficacia dell'immunoterapia locale nella oculorinite allergica da graminacee. G Ital Allergol Imrnunol Clin 1994;4:199-204.
596. Passalacqua G, Albano M, Ruffoni S, Pronzato C, Riccio AM, Di Berardino L, et al. Nasal immunotherapy to Parietaria: evidence of reduction of local allergic inflammation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1995;152(2):461-6.
597. Pocobelli D, Del Bono A, Venuti L, Falagiani P, Venuti A. Nasal immunotherapy at constant dosage: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study in grass-allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol 2001;11(2):79-88.
598. Schumacher MJ, Pain MC. Intranasal immunotherapy and polymerized grass pollen allergens. Allergy 1982;37(4):241-8.

599. Taylor G, Shivalkar PR. Local nasal desensitization in allergic rhinitis. Clin Allergy 1972;2(2):125-36.
600. Dvorin DJ, Randolph CC, Tronolone MJ, Wypych JI, Reistnan RE. Local nasal immunotherapy (LNIT) with high-dose gluteraldehyde-modified ragweed extract (PRW) (abs 243). J Allergy Clin Immunol 1985;75(1 part 2):165.
601. Georgitis JW, Clayton WF, Wypych JI, Barde SH, Reisman RE. Further evaluation of local intranasal immunotherapy with aqueous and allergoid grass extracts. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1984;74(5):694-700.
602. Georgitis JW, Reisman RE, Clayton WF, Mueller UR, Wypych JI, Arbesman CE. Local intranasal immunotherapy for grass-allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1983;71(1 Pt 1):71-6.
603. Mathews KP, Bayne NK, Banas JM, McLean JA, Bacon J. Controlled studies of intranasal immunotherapy for ragweed pollenosis. Int Arch Allergy Appl Immunol 1981;66(2):218-24.
604. McLean J, Wypych J, Bayne N, Brayton P, Solomon W. A controlled study of intranasal immunotherapy with short ragweed extract (abs 106). J Allergy Clin Immunol 1979;63(3):166.
605. Welsh PW, Zimmermann EM, Yunginger JW, Kern EB, Gleich GJ. Preseasonal intranasal immunotherapy with nebulized short ragweed extract. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1981;67(3):237-42.
606. Kim LS, Riedlinger JE, Baldwin CM, Hilli L, Khalsa SV, Messer SA, et al. Treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis using homeopathic preparation of common allergens in the southwest region of the US: a randomized, controlled clinical trial. Ann Pharmacother 2005;39(4):617-24.
607. Ludtke R, Wiesenauer M. Eine Metaanalyse der homoopathischen Behandlung der Pollinosis mit Galphimia glauca. Wien Med Wochenschr 1997;147(14):323-7.
608. Kleijnen J, Knipschild P, ter Riet G. Clinical trials of homoeopathy. BMJ 1991;302(6772):316-23.
609. Cucherat M, Haugh MC, Gooch M, Boissel JP. Evidence of clinical efficacy of homeopathy. A meta-analysis of clinical trials. HMRAG. Homeopathic Medicines Research Advisory Group. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2000;56(1):27-33.
610. Linde K, Clausius N, Ramirez G, Melchart D, Eitel F, Hedges LV, et al. Are the clinical effects of homeopathy placebo effects? A meta-analysis of placebo-controlled trials. Lancet 1997;350(9081):834-43.
611. Linde K, Hondras M, Vickers A, ter Riet G, Melchart D. Systematic reviews of complementary therapies - an annotated bibliography. Part 3: homeopathy. BMC Complement Altern Med 2001;1:4.
612. Linde K, Melchart D. Randomized controlled trials of individualized homeopathy: a state-of-the-art review. J Altern Complement Med 1998;4(4):371-88.
613. Walach H. Unspezifische Therapie-Effekte. Das Beispiel Homöopathie. PhD thesis. Freiburg: Albert-Ludwigs-Universität; 1997.
614. Shang A, Huwiler-Muntener K, Nartey L, Juni P, Dorig S, Sterne JA, et al. Are the clinical effects of homoeopathy placebo effects? Comparative study of placebo-controlled trials of homoeopathy and allopathy. Lancet 2005;366(9487):726-32.
615. Magnusson AL, Svensson RE, Leirvik C, Gunnarsson RK. The effect of acupuncture on allergic rhinitis: a randomized controlled clinical trial. Am J Chin Med 2004;32(1):105-15.
616. Brinkhaus B, Hummelsberger J, Kohnen R, Seufert J, Hempen CH, Leonhardy H, et al. Acupuncture and Chinese herbal medicine in the treatment of patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis: a randomized-controlled clinical trial. Allergy 2004;59(9):953-60.
617. Ernst E, White A. Life-threatening adverse reactions after acupuncture? A systematic review. Pain 1997;71(2):123-6.
618. Ernst E, White AR. Prospective studies of the safety of acupuncture: a systematic review. Am J Med 2001;110(6):481-5.
619. Ernst E, Sherman KJ. Is acupuncture a risk factor for hepatitis? Systematic review of epidemiological studies. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2003;18(11):1231-6.

620. MacPherson H, Thomas K, Walters S, Fitter M. The York acupuncture safety study: prospective survey of 34 000 treatments by traditional acupuncturists. BMJ 2001;323(7311):486-7.
621. White A, Hayhoe S, Hart A, Ernst E. Adverse events following acupuncture: prospective survey of 32 000 consultations with doctors and physiotherapists. BMJ 2001;323(7311):485-6.
622. Odsberg A, Schill U, Haker E. Acupuncture treatment: side effects and complications reported by Swedish physiotherapists. Complement Ther Med 2001;9(1):17-20.
623. Roberts J, Huissoon A, Dretzke J, Wang D, Hyde C. A systematic review of the clinical effectiveness of acupuncture for allergic rhinitis. BMC Complement Altern Med 2008;8:13.
624. Xue CC, English R, Zhang JJ, Da Costa C, Li CG. Effect of acupuncture in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis: a randomized controlled clinical trial. Am J Chin Med 2002;30(1):1-11.
625. Ng DK, Chow PY, Ming SP, Hong SH, Lau S, Tse D, et al. A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of acupuncture for the treatment of childhood persistent allergic rhinitis. Pediatrics 2004;114(5):1242-7.
626. Williamson L, Yudkin P, Livingstone R. Hay fever treatment in general practice: a randomised controlled trial comparing standardized Western acupuncture with sham acupuncture. Acupunct Med 1996;14:6-10.
627. Ulbricht C, Giles M, Khalsa KP, Kirkwood CD, Park C, Basch E. Butterbur: an evidence-based systematic review by the natural standard research collaboration. J Herb Pharmacother 2005;5(3):119-43.
628. Lee DK, Carstairs IJ, Haggart K, Jackson CM, Currie GP, Lipworth BJ. Butterbur, a herbal remedy, attenuates adenosine monophosphate induced nasal responsiveness in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy 2003;33(7):882-6.
629. Schapowal A. Randomised controlled trial of butterbur and cetirizine for treating seasonal allergic rhinitis. BMJ 2002;324(7330):144-6.
630. Lee DK, Gray RD, Robb FM, Fujihara S, Lipworth BJ. A placebo-controlled evaluation of butterbur and fexofenadine on objective and subjective outcomes in perennial allergic rhinitis. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(4):646-9.
631. Gray RD, Haggart K, Lee DK, Cull S, Lipworth BJ. Effects of butterbur treatment in intermittent allergic rhinitis: a placebo-controlled evaluation. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2004;93(1):56-60.
632. Brattstrom A. A newly developed extract (Ze 339) from butterbur (Petasites hybridus L.) is clinically efficient in allergic rhinitis (hay fever). Phytomedicine 2003;10 Suppl 4:50-2.
633. Schapowal A. Butterbur Ze339 for the treatment of intermittent allergic rhinitis: dose-dependent efficacy in a prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2004;130(12):1381-6.
634. Schapowal A. Treating intermittent allergic rhinitis: a prospective, randomized, placebo and antihistamine-controlled study of Butterbur extract Ze 339. Phytother Res 2005;19(6):530-7.
635. Guo R, Pittler MH, Ernst E. Herbal medicines for the treatment of allergic rhinitis: a systematic review. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;99(6):483-95.
636. Krouse JH, Roland PS, Marple BF, Wall GM, Hannley M, Golla S, et al. Optimal duration of allergic rhinitis clinical trials. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2005;133(4):467-87; discussion 488.
637. Food-and-Drug-Administration. Guidance for Industry. Allergic Rhinitis: Clinical Development Programs for Drug Products (draft guidance). 2000 [cited 2007 August, 16]; Available from: http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/2718dft.htm
638. European-Medicines-Agency. Guideline on the Clinical Development of Medicinal Products for the Treatment of Allergic Rhino-conjunctivitis. CHMP/EWP/2455/02. 2004 [cited 2007 August, 16]; Available from: http://www.emea.europa.eu/pdfs/human/ewp/245502en.pdf
639. Sadler C, Vanderjagt L, Vohra S. Complementary, holistic, and integrative medicine: butterbur. Pediatr Rev 2007;28(6):235-8.
640. Ernst E. Serious psychiatric and neurological adverse effects of herbal medicines -- a systematic review. Acta Psychiatr Scand 2003;108(2):83-91.

641. Ernst E. Cardiovascular adverse effects of herbal medicines: a systematic review of the recent literature. Can J Cardiol 2003;19(7):818-27.
642. Ernst E. Serious adverse effects of unconventional therapies for children and adolescents: a systematic review of recent evidence. Eur J Pediatr 2003;162(2):72-80.
643. Xue CC, Thien FC, Zhang JJ, Da Costa C, Li CG. Treatment for seasonal allergic rhinitis by Chinese herbal medicine: a randomized placebo controlled trial. Altern Ther Health Med 2003;9(5):80-7.
644. Hu G, Walls RS, Bass D, Ramon B, Grayson D, Jones M, et al. The Chinese herbal formulation biminne in management of perennial allergic rhinitis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 12-week clinical trial. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;88(5):478-87.
645. Bernstein DI, Bernstein CK, Deng C, Murphy KJ, Bernstein IL, Bernstein JA, et al. Evaluation of the clinical efficacy and safety of grapeseed extract in the treatment of fall seasonal allergic rhinitis: a pilot study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2002;88(3):272-8.
646. Ko RJ. A U.S. perspective on the adverse reactions from traditional Chinese medicines. J Chin Med Assoc 2004;67(3):109-16.
647. Ernst E. Adulteration of Chinese herbal medicines with synthetic drugs: a systematic review. J Intern Med 2002;252(2):107-13.
648. Cupp MJ. Herbal remedies: adverse effects and drug interactions. Am Fam Physician 1999;59(5):1239-45.
649. Barrett B, Kiefer D, Rabago D. Assessing the risks and benefits of herbal medicine: an overview of scientific evidence. Altern Ther Health Med 1999;5(4):40-9.
650. Niggemann B, Gruber C. Side-effects of complementary and alternative medicine. Allergy 2003;58(8):707-16.
651. Neuman I, Finkelstein Y. Narrow-band red light phototherapy in perennial allergic rhinitis and nasal polyposis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1997;78(4):399-406.
652. Koreck AI, Csoma Z, Bodai L, Ignacz F, Kenderessy AS, Kadocsa E, et al. Rhinophototherapy: a new therapeutic tool for the management of allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005;115(3):541-7.
653. Nelson HS. The importance of allergens in the development of asthma and the persistence of symptoms. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2000;105(6 Pt 2):S628-32.
654. Boulet LP, Cartier A, Thomson NC, Roberts RS, Dolovich J, Hargreave FE. Asthma and increases in nonallergic bronchial responsiveness from seasonal pollen exposure. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1983;71(4):399-406.
655. Walker SM, Pajno GB, Lima MT, Wilson DR, Durham SR. Grass pollen immunotherapy for seasonal rhinitis and asthma: a randomized, controlled trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2001;107(1):87-93.
656. Chakir J, Laviolette M, Turcotte H, Boutet M, Boulet LP. Cytokine expression in the lower airways of nonasthmatic subjects with allergic rhinitis: influence of natural allergen exposure. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2000;106(5):904-10.
657. Grant JA, Nicodemus CF, Findlay SR, Glovsky MM, Grossman J, Kaiser H, et al. Cetirizine in patients with seasonal rhinitis and concomitant asthma: prospective, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95(5 Pt 1):923-32.
658. Higgins BG, Francis HC, Yates C, Warburton CJ, Fletcher AM, Pickering CA, et al. Environmental exposure to air pollution and allergens and peak flow changes. Eur Respir J 2000;16(1):61-6.
659. Rak S, Heinrich C, Jacobsen L, Scheynius A, Venge P. A double-blinded, comparative study of the effects of short preseason specific immunotherapy and topical steroids in patients with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis and asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2001;108(6):921-8.
660. Bousquet J, Boushey HA, Busse WW, Canonica GW, Durham SR, Irvin CG, et al. Characteristics of patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and concomitant asthma. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(6):897-903.

661. Van Ganse E, Kaufman L, Derde MP, Yernault JC, Delaunois L, Vincken W. Effects of antihistamines in adult asthma: a meta-analysis of clinical trials. Eur Respir J 1997;10(10):2216-24.
662. Bassler D, Mitra A, Ducharme FM, Forster J, Schwarzer G. Ketotifen alone or as additional medication for long-term control of asthma and wheeze in children. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2004(1):CD001384.
663. Aubier M, Neukirch C, Peiffer C, Melac M. Effect of cetirizine on bronchial hyperresponsiveness in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and asthma. Allergy 2001;56(1):35-42.
664. Balzano G, Gallo C, Masi C, Cocco G, Ferranti P, Melillo E, et al. Effect of azelastine on the seasonal increase in non-specific bronchial responsiveness to methacholine in pollen allergic patients. A randomized, double-blind placebo-controlled, crossover study. Clin Exp Allergy 1992;22(3):371-7.
665. He WQ, Zheng JP, Ran PX, Liu HZ, Lin H, Cai DM, et al. Effects of H1 blocker and inhaled corticosteroids on asthmatic patients with allergic rhinitis. Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi 2003;26(3):157-60.
666. Becker A, Berube D, Chad Z, Dolovich M, Ducharme F, D'Urzo T, et al. Canadian Pediatric Asthma Consensus guidelines, 2003 (updated to December 2004): introduction. CMAJ 2005;173(6 Suppl):S12-4.
667. British Thoracic Society, Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network. British Guideline on the Management of Asthma. A national clinical guideline. Revised edition July 2007. 2007 [cited 2007 03 Dec]; Available from: http://www.sign.ac.uk/pdf/sign63.pdf
668. Global Initiative for Asthma. Global strategy for asthma management and prevention. GINA. Update from NHLBI/WHO Workshop Report 1995, Revised 2006. www.ginasthma.com 2006.
669. Nathan RA, Finn AF, Jr., LaForce C, Ratner P, Chapman D, de Guia EC, et al. Comparison of cetirizine-pseudoephedrine and placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and concomitant mild-to-moderate asthma: randomized, double-blind study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;97(3):389-96.
670. Corren J, Harris AG, Aaronson D, Beaucher W, Berkowitz R, Bronsky E, et al. Efficacy and safety of loratadine plus pseudoephedrine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and mild asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;100(6 Pt 1):781-8.
671. National Heart Lung and Blood Institute, National Asthma Education and Prevention Program. Expert Panel Report 3 (EPR-3): Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Asthma – Full Report 2007. 2007 [cited August 31, 2007; Available from: http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/guidelines/asthma/index.htm
672. Taramarcaz P, Gibson PG. Intranasal corticosteroids for asthma control in people with coexisting asthma and rhinitis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2003;3:CD003570. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003570.
673. Stelmach R, do Patrocinio TNM, Ribeiro M, Cukier A. Effect of treating allergic rhinitis with corticosteroids in patients with mild-to-moderate persistent asthma. Chest 2005;128(5):3140-7.
674. Armitage JM, Lam KS, Wilkinson I, Faux JA, Hopkin JM. Investigation of the tendency to wheeze in pollen sensitive patients. Clin Exp Allergy 1992;22(10):916-22.
675. Reed CE, Marcoux JP, Welsh PW. Effects of topical nasal treatment on asthma symptoms. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1988;81(5 Pt 2):1042-7.
676. Wood RA, Eggleston PA. The effects of intranasal steroids on nasal and pulmonary responses to cat exposure. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1995;151(2 Pt 1):315-20.
677. Watson WT, Becker AB, Simons FE. Treatment of allergic rhinitis with intranasal corticosteroids in patients with mild asthma: effect on lower airway responsiveness. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;91(1 Pt 1):97-101.

678. Corren J, Adinoff AD, Buchmeier AD, Irvin CG. Nasal beclomethasone prevents the seasonal increase in bronchial responsiveness in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1992;90(2):250-6.
679. Thio BJ, Slingerland GL, Fredriks AM, Nagelkerke AF, Scheeren RA, Neijens HJ, et al. Influence of intranasal steroids during the grass pollen season on bronchial responsiveness in children and young adults with asthma and hay fever. Thorax 2000;55(10):826-32.
680. Henriksen JM, Wenzel A. Effect of an intranasally administered corticosteroid (budesonide) on nasal obstruction, mouth breathing, and asthma. Am Rev Respir Dis 1984;130(6):1014-8.
681. Adams RJ, Fuhlbrigge AL, Finkelstein JA, Weiss ST. Intranasal steroids and the risk of emergency department visits for asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2002;109(4):636-42.
682. Corren J, Manning BE, Thompson SF, Hennessy S, Strom BL. Rhinitis therapy and the prevention of hospital care for asthma: a case-control study. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;113(3):415-9.
683. Crystal-Peters J, Neslusan C, Crown WH, Torres A. Treating allergic rhinitis in patients with comorbid asthma: the risk of asthma-related hospitalizations and emergency department visits. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2002;109(1):57-62.
684. Ducharme FM, Di Salvio F. Anti-leukotriene agents compared to inhaled corticosteroids in the management of recurrent and/or chronic asthma in adults and children. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2004(1):CD002314.
685. Ducharme F, Schwartz Z, Kakuma R. Addition of anti-leukotriene agents to inhaled corticosteroids for chronic asthma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2004(1):CD003133.
686. Laviolette M, Malmstrom K, Lu S, Chervinsky P, Pujet JC, Peszek I, et al. Montelukast added to inhaled beclomethasone in treatment of asthma. Montelukast/Beclomethasone Additivity Group. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1999;160(6):1862-8.
687. O'Sullivan S, Akveld M, Burke CM, Poulter LW. Effect of the addition of montelukast to inhaled fluticasone propionate on airway inflammation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2003;167(5):745-50.
688. Simons FE, Villa JR, Lee BW, Teper AM, Lyttle B, Aristizabal G, et al. Montelukast added to budesonide in children with persistent asthma: a randomized, double-blind, crossover study. J Pediatr 2001;138(5):694-8.
689. Tomita K, Hashimoto K, Matsumoto S, Nakamoto N, Tokuyasu H, Yamasaki A, et al. Pranlukast allows reduction of inhaled steroid dose without deterioration in lung function in adult asthmatics. Arerugi 1999;48(4):459-65.
690. Wada K, Minoguchi K, Kohno Y, Oda N, Matsuura T, Kawazu K, et al. Effect of a leukotriene receptor antagonist, pranlukast hydrate, on airway inflammation and airway hyperresponsiveness in patients with moderate to severe asthma. Allergology International 2000;49:63-68.
691. Garcia Garcia ML, Wahn U, Gilles L, Swern A, Tozzi CA, Polos P. Montelukast, compared with fluticasone, for control of asthma among 6- to 14-year-old patients with mild asthma: the MOSAIC study. Pediatrics 2005;116(2):360-9.
692. Ostrom NK, Decotiis BA, Lincourt WR, Edwards LD, Hanson KM, Carranza Rosenzweig JR, et al. Comparative efficacy and safety of low-dose fluticasone propionate and montelukast in children with persistent asthma. J Pediatr 2005;147(2):213-20.
693. Sorkness CA, Lemanske RF, Jr., Mauger DT, Boehmer SJ, Chinchilli VM, Martinez FD, et al. Long-term comparison of 3 controller regimens for mild-moderate persistent childhood asthma: the Pediatric Asthma Controller Trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;119(1):64-72.
694. Szefler SJ, Phillips BR, Martinez FD, Chinchilli VM, Lemanske RF, Strunk RC, et al. Characterization of within-subject responses to fluticasone and montelukast in childhood asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005;115(2):233-42.

695. Zeiger RS, Szefler SJ, Phillips BR, Schatz M, Martinez FD, Chinchilli VM, et al. Response profiles to fluticasone and montelukast in mild-to-moderate persistent childhood asthma. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;117(1):45-52.
696. Peters SP, Anthonisen N, Castro M, Holbrook JT, Irvin CG, Smith LJ, et al. Randomized comparison of strategies for reducing treatment in mild persistent asthma. N Engl J Med 2007;356(20):2027-39.
697. Zeiger RS, Bird SR, Kaplan MS, Schatz M, Pearlman DS, Orav EJ, et al. Short-term and long-term asthma control in patients with mild persistent asthma receiving montelukast or fluticasone: a randomized controlled trial. Am J Med 2005;118(6):649-57.
698. Altman LC, Munk Z, Seltzer J, Noonan N, Shingo S, Zhang J, et al. A placebo-controlled, dose-ranging study of montelukast, a cysteinyl leukotriene-receptor antagonist. Montelukast Asthma Study Group. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1998;102(1):50-6.
699. Baumgartner RA, Martinez G, Edelman JM, Rodriguez Gomez GG, Bernstein M, Bird S, et al. Distribution of therapeutic response in asthma control between oral montelukast and inhaled beclomethasone. Eur Respir J 2003;21(1):123-8.
700. Busse WW, Casale TB, Dykewicz MS, Meltzer EO, Bird SR, Hustad CM, et al. Efficacy of montelukast during the allergy season in patients with chronic asthma and seasonal aeroallergen sensitivity. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(1):60-8.
701. Busse W, Wolfe J, Storms W, Srebro S, Edwards L, Johnson M, et al. Fluticasone propionate compared with zafirlukast in controlling persistent asthma: a randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. J Fam Pract 2001;50(7):595-602.
702. Fish JE, Kemp JP, Lockey RF, Glass M, Hanby LA, Bonuccelli CM. Zafirlukast for symptomatic mild-to-moderate asthma: a 13-week multicenter study. The Zafirlukast Trialists Group. Clin Ther 1997;19(4):675-90.
703. Israel E, Chervinsky PS, Friedman B, Van Bavel J, Skalky CS, Ghannam AF, et al. Effects of montelukast and beclomethasone on airway function and asthma control. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2002;110(6):847-54.
704. Jayaram L, Pizzichini E, Lemiere C, Man SF, Cartier A, Hargreave FE, et al. Steroid naive eosinophilic asthma: anti-inflammatory effects of fluticasone and montelukast. Thorax 2005;60(2):100-5.
705. Malmstrom K, Rodriguez-Gomez G, Guerra J, Villaran C, Pineiro A, Wei LX, et al. Oral montelukast, inhaled beclomethasone, and placebo for chronic asthma. A randomized, controlled trial. Montelukast/Beclomethasone Study Group. Ann Intern Med 1999;130(6):487-95.
706. Minoguchi K, Kohno Y, Minoguchi H, Kihara N, Sano Y, Yasuhara H, et al. Reduction of eosinophilic inflammation in the airways of patients with asthma using montelukast. Chest 2002;121(3):732-8.
707. Nathan RA, Bernstein JA, Bielory L, Bonuccelli CM, Calhoun WJ, Galant SP, et al. Zafirlukast improves asthma symptoms and quality of life in patients with moderate reversible airflow obstruction. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1998;102(6 Pt 1):935-42.
708. Nathan RA, Minkwitz MC, Bonuccelli CM. Two first-line therapies in the treatment of mild asthma: use of peak flow variability as a predictor of effectiveness. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(5):497-503.
709. Noonan MJ, Chervinsky P, Brandon M, Zhang J, Kundu S, McBurney J, et al. Montelukast, a potent leukotriene receptor antagonist, causes dose- related improvements in chronic asthma. Montelukast Asthma Study Group. Eur Respir J 1998;11(6):1232-9.
710. Pizzichini E, Leff JA, Reiss TF, Hendeles L, Boulet LP, Wei LX, et al. Montelukast reduces airway eosinophilic inflammation in asthma: a randomized, controlled trial. Eur Respir J 1999;14(1):12-8.
711. Reiss TF, Chervinsky P, Dockhorn RJ, Shingo S, Seidenberg B, Edwards TB. Montelukast, a once-daily leukotriene receptor antagonist, in the treatment of chronic asthma: a multicenter,

randomized, double-blind trial. Montelukast Clinical Research Study Group. Arch Intern Med 1998;158(11):1213-20.
712. Sandrini A, Ferreira IM, Gutierrez C, Jardim JR, Zamel N, Chapman KR. Effect of montelukast on exhaled nitric oxide and nonvolatile markers of inflammation in mild asthma. Chest 2003;124(4):1334-40.
713. Spector SL, Smith LJ, Glass M. Effects of 6 weeks of therapy with oral doses of ICI 204,219, a leukotriene D4 receptor antagonist, in subjects with bronchial asthma. ACCOLATE Asthma Trialists Group. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1994;150(3):618-23.
714. Suissa S, Dennis R, Ernst P, Sheehy O, Wood-Dauphinee S. Effectiveness of the leukotriene receptor antagonist zafirlukast for mild-to-moderate asthma. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Ann Intern Med 1997;126(3):177-83.
715. Yoshida S, Ishizaki Y, Shoji T, Onuma K, Nakagawa H, Nakabayashi M, et al. Effect of pranlukast on bronchial inflammation in patients with asthma. Clin Exp Allergy 2000;30(7):1008-14.
716. Zeidler MR, Kleerup EC, Goldin JG, Kim HJ, Truong DA, Simmons MD, et al. Montelukast improves regional air-trapping due to small airways obstruction in asthma. Eur Respir J 2006;27(2):307-15.
717. Spahn JD, Covar RA, Jain N, Gleason M, Shimamoto R, Szefler SJ, et al. Effect of montelukast on peripheral airflow obstruction in children with asthma. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(4):541-9.
718. Stelmach I, Jerzynska J, Majak P, Grzelewski T, Gorski P, Stelmach W, et al. [The effect of triamcinolone acetonide, montelukast, nedocromil sodium, formoterol on levels levels of sICAM-1, sIL-2R in serum and clinical course of asthma in children]. Pol Merkur Lekarski 2002;12(68):99-103.
719. Becker AB, Kuznetsova O, Vermeulen J, Soto-Quiros ME, Young B, Reiss TF, et al. Linear growth in prepubertal asthmatic children treated with montelukast, beclomethasone, or placebo: a 56-week randomized double-blind study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(6):800-7.
720. Knorr B, Franchi LM, Bisgaard H, Vermeulen JH, LeSouef P, Santanello N, et al. Montelukast, a leukotriene receptor antagonist, for the treatment of persistent asthma in children aged 2 to 5 years. Pediatrics 2001;108(3):E48.
721. Pearlman DS, Lampl KL, Dowling PJ, Jr., Miller CJ, Bonuccelli CM. Effectiveness and tolerability of zafirlukast for the treatment of asthma in children. Clin Ther 2000;22(6):732-47.
722. Straub DA, Moeller A, Minocchieri S, Hamacher J, Sennhauser FH, Hall GL, et al. The effect of montelukast on lung function and exhaled nitric oxide in infants with early childhood asthma. Eur Respir J 2005;25(2):289-94.
723. Joos S, Miksch A, Szecsenyi J, Wieseler B, Grouven U, Kaiser T, et al. Montelukast as add-on therapy to inhaled corticosteroids in the treatment of mild to moderate asthma: a systematic review. Thorax 2008;63(5):453-62.
724. Abramson MJ, Puy RM, Weiner JM. Allergen immunotherapy for asthma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2003(4):CD001186.
725. Reid MJ, Lockey RF, Turkeltaub PC, Platts-Mills TA. Survey of fatalities from skin testing and immunotherapy 1985-1989. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;92(1 Pt 1):6-15.
726. Bernstein DI, Wanner M, Borish L, Liss GM. Twelve-year survey of fatal reactions to allergen injections and skin testing: 1990-2001. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;113(6):1129-36.
727. Committee of the Safety of Medicine. CSM Update: Desensitising vaccines. Br Med J 1986;293(6552):948.
728. British Thoracic Society, Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network. British guideline on the management of asthma. Thorax 2003;58 Suppl 1:i1-94.
729. Calamita Z, Saconato H, Pela AB, Atallah AN. Efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy in asthma: systematic review of randomized-clinical trials using the Cochrane Collaboration method. Allergy 2006;61(10):1162-72.

730. Penagos M, Passalacqua G, Compalati E, Baena-Cagnani CE, Orozco S, Pedroza A, et al. Metaanalysis of the efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy in the treatment of allergic asthma in pediatric patients, 3 to 18 years of age. Chest 2008;133(3):599-609.
731. Miceli Sopo S, Macchiaiolo M, Zorzi G, Tripodi S. Sublingual immunotherapy in asthma and rhinoconjunctivitis; systematic review of paediatric literature. Arch Dis Child 2004;89(7):620-4.
732. Lue KH, Lin YH, Sun HL, Lu KH, Hsieh JC, Chou MC. Clinical and immunologic effects of sublingual immunotherapy in asthmatic children sensitized to mites: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2006;17(6):408-15.
733. Niu CK, Chen WY, Huang JL, Lue KH, Wang JY. Efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy with high-dose mite extracts in asthma: a multi-center, double-blind, randomized, and placebo-controlled study in Taiwan. Respir Med 2006;100(8):1374-83.
734. Novembre E, Marano E, Bernardini R, Caria M, Dini L, Vierucci A. Studio controllato sull'ITS per via sublinguale nel trattamento dell'asma allergico del bambino. Rivista Italiana di Pediatria 1991;17(1):75-78.
735. Pajno GB, Morabito L, Barberio G, Parmiani S. Clinical and immunologic effects of long-term sublingual immunotherapy in asthmatic children sensitized to mites: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Allergy 2000;55(9):842-9.
736. Walker S, Monteil M, Phelan K, Lasserson TJ, Walters EH. Anti-IgE for chronic asthma in adults and children. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2006(2):CD003559.
737. Niebauer K, Dewilde S, Fox-Rushby J, Revicki DA. Impact of omalizumab on quality-of-life outcomes in patients with moderate-to-severe allergic asthma. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;96(2):316-26.
738. Milgrom H, Berger W, Nayak A, Gupta N, Pollard S, McAlary M, et al. Treatment of childhood asthma with anti-immunoglobulin E antibody (omalizumab). Pediatrics 2001;108(2):E36.
739. Cox L, Platts-Mills TA, Finegold I, Schwartz LB, Simons FE, Wallace DV. American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology/American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology Joint Task Force Report on omalizumab-associated anaphylaxis. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;120(6):1373-7.
740. Vignola AM, Humbert M, Bousquet J, Boulet LP, Hedgecock S, Blogg M, et al. Efficacy and tolerability of anti-immunoglobulin E therapy with omalizumab in patients with concomitant allergic asthma and persistent allergic rhinitis: SOLAR. Allergy 2004;59(7):709-17.
741. Food and Drug Administration, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. Omalizumab (recombinant humanized monoclonal antibody to IgE) for treatment of allergic asthma (Briefing document on safety BLA STN 103976/0). In. Rockville, MD: Department of Health & Human Services. Public Health Service; 2003.
742. Schünemann HJ, Fretheim A, Oxman AD. Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 13. Applicability, transferability and adaptation. Health Res Policy Syst 2006;4:25.

Table 1. Interpretation of strong and conditional (weak) recommendations		
	Strong recommendation	**Conditional (weak) recommendation**
Implications		
For patients	Most individuals in this situation would want the recommended course of action and only a small proportion would not. Formal decision aids are not likely to be needed to help individuals make decisions consistent with their values and preferences.	The majority of individuals in this situation would want the suggested course of action, but many would not.
For clinicians	Most individuals should receive the intervention. Adherence to this recommendation according to the guideline could be used as a quality criterion or performance indicator.	Recognize that different choices will be appropriate for individual patients and that you must help each patient arrive at a management decision consistent with his or her values and preferences. Decision aids may be useful helping individuals making decisions consistent with their values and preferences.
For policy makers	The recommendation can be adapted as policy in most situations	Policy making will require substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders

Table. Interpretation of "strong" and "weak" recommendations		
	Strong recommendation	**Conditional (weak) recommendation**
Implications		
For patients	Most individuals in this situation would want the recommended course of action and only a small proportion would not. Formal decision aids are not likely to be needed to help individuals make decisions consistent with their values and preferences.	The majority of individuals in this situation would want the suggested course of action, but many would not.
For clinicians	Most individuals should receive the intervention. Adherence to this recommendation according to the guideline could be used as a quality criterion or performance indicator.	Recognize that different choices will be appropriate for individual patients, and that you must help each patient arrive at a management decision consistent with his or her values and preferences. Decision aids may be useful helping individuals making decisions consistent with their values and preferences.
For policy makers	The recommendation can be adapted as policy in most situations	Policy making will require substantial debates and involvement of various stakeholders

Summary of findings tables

Question 1 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-06-04
Question: Should exclusive breastfeeding for at least 3 months be used in infants for the prevention of allergy?
Bibliography: 1. Gdalevich M, Mimouni D, David M, Mimouni M. Breast-feeding and the onset of atopic dermatitis in childhood: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2001;45(4):520-7. 2. Gdalevich M, Mimouni D, Mimouni M. Breast-feeding and the risk of bronchial asthma in childhood: a systematic review with meta-analysis of prospective studies. J Pediatr. 2001;139(2):261-6. 3. Mimouni Bloch A, Mimouni D, Mimouni M, Gdalevich M. Does breastfeeding protect against allergic rhinitis during childhood? A meta-analysis of prospective studies. Acta Paediatr. 2002;91(3):275-9.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	breastfeeding	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Atopic dermatitis (follow-up mean 2.9 years[1])												
18	observational study[2]	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision [4]	none	–/2079[5]	–/2079[5]	OR 0.77 (0.6 to 0.98)		⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Atopic dermatitis (high risk children) (follow-up mean 2.36 years[1])												
14[2]	observational study	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency[6]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision [4]	none	–/668[7]	–/668[7]	OR 0.58 (0.41 to 0.92)		⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Atopic dermatitis (low risk + general population) (follow-up mean 3.14 years[1])												
7	observational study[2]	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency[6]	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	–/1410[9]	–/1410[9]	OR 0.84 (0.59 to 1.19)		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Allergic rhinitis (follow-up mean 2.25 years[1])												
6	observational study[2]	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[10]	none	–/1651[11]	–/1651[11]	OR 0.74 (0.54 to 1.01)		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Allergic rhinitis (high risk only) (follow-up mean 2.4 years[1])												
4	observational study[2]	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	–/397[12]	–/397	RR 0.87 (0.48 to 1.58)		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Allergic rhinitis (low risk + general population) (follow-up mean 2.7 years[1])												
3	observational study[2]	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[10]	none	–/1254[13]	–/1254[13]	RR 0.68 (0.47 to 0.99)		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma (follow-up 1.5 to 8.4 years)												
12	observational study[2]	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	–/4091[14]	–/4091[14]	RR 0.70 (0.6 to 0.81)		⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma (high risk) (follow-up 1.5 to 8.4 years)												
7	observational study	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	–/620[15]	–/620[15]	RR 0.52 (0.35 to 0.79)		⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma (low risk + general population) (follow-up 2 to 8.4 years)												
9	observational study	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	–/3471[16]	–/3471[16]	RR 0.73 (0.62 to 0.86)		⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma (low risk) (follow-up 3 to 8.4 years)												

4	observational study	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	–/957[17]	–/957[17]	RR 0.99 (0.48 to 2.03)		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Mean age at the end of follow-up.
[2] "prospective studies"
[3] We assumed no serious limitations, but detailed information was not provided in the systematic review.
[4] Results do not exclude almost no effect or a moderate effect.
[5] There were 4158 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[6] We did not downgrade for inconsistency, since we already downgraded for imprecision.
[7] There were 1337 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[8] Results include both important benefit and harm.
[9] There were 2821 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[10] Results include an important benefit or no effect.
[11] There were 3303 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[12] There were 794 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[13] There were 2509 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[14] There were 8183 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[15] There were 1241 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[16] There were 6942 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.
[17] There were 1915 children overall. Authors of the review did not report the number of children in each of the groups or the number of events per group.

Question 1 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-29
Question: Should exclusive breastfeeding for 3 to 7 months vs breastfeeding for up to 3 months be used in infants for the prevention of allergy?
Settings: developed countries
Bibliography: Kramer MS, Kakuma R. Optimal duration of exclusive breastfeeding. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2002, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD003517. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003517.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	exclusive breastfeeding for 3 to 7 months	breastfeeding for up to 3 months	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Atopic eczema (follow-up 1 and 5 years)												
2	observational study	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	27/691	101/2927	RR 0.73 (0.49 to 1.08)	9 fewer per 1000 (from 18 fewer to 3 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Pollen allergy (follow-up 5 years)												
1	observational study	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness[4]	serious[3,5]	none	10/51	23/62	RR 0.53 (0.28 to 1.01)	174 fewer per 1000 (from 267 fewer to 4 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Asthma (follow-up 5 to 6 years)												
2	observational study	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[6]	none	37/258	46/294	RR 0.91 (0.61 to 1.36)	14 fewer per 1000 (from 61 fewer to 56 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Death (follow-up 12 months)												
1	observational study[7]	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[6,8]	none	1/621	2/2862	RR 2.30 (0.21 to 25.37)	1 more per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 24 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Other adverse outcomes												
20[9]	observational study	not assessed	not assessed	not assessed	not assessed	none	–	–	–	–	–	

[1] One small study had inadequate blinding and follow-up.
[2] We did not downgrade for inconsistency, since we already downgraded for limitations in execution and imprecision.
[3] Results do not exclude important benefit or no effect.
[4] We did not downgrade for indirectness although there is some uncertainty what "pollen allergy" means.
[5] One very small study with few outcomes.
[6] Results do not exclude important benefit or harm.
[7] prospective cohort nested in a randomised trial
[8] Only 3 event in both groups.
[9] Nine studies were from developing countries (two of which were experimental trials) and 11 from developed countries. Studies do not suggest that infants who continue to be exclusively breastfed for six months, instead of three months, show deficits in weight or length gain, although results were imprecise and did not exclude modest risk of undernutrition. Based primarily on the analysis of a large cohort study nested in a randomized trial in Belarus, infants who continued exclusive breastfeeding for at least six months appear to have reduced risk of gastrointestinal infection. Data from the two Honduran trials suggest that exclusive breastfeeding through six months is associated with delayed resumption of menses and more rapid postpartum weight loss in the mother.

Question 2
Date: 2007-06-28
Question: Should antigen avoidance diet be used in pregnant or breastfeeding women to prevent development of allergy in children?
Bibliography: Kramer MS, Kakuma R. Maternal dietary antigen avoidance during pregnancy or lactation, or both, for preventing or treating atopic disease in the child. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD000133. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000133.pub2.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	antigen avoidance diet	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Atopic eczema in first 12-18 months (follow-up 12-18 months)												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious	none	35/157	39/177	RR 1.01 (0.57 to 1.79)	2 more per 1000 (from 95 fewer to 174 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma in first 18 months (follow-up 18 months)												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious	none	4/157	2/177	RR 2.22 (0.39 to 12.67)	13 more per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 128 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Allergic rhinitis/conjunctivitis in first 18 months (follow-up 18 months)												
1	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3]	none	0/81	0/82	not estimable[3]	not estimable[3]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Allergic urticaria in first 18 months (follow-up 18 months)												
1	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[4]	none	3/81	3/82	RR 1.01 (0.21 to 4.87)	0 more per 100 (from 3 fewer to 14 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Any atopic condition in first 18 months (follow-up 18 months)												
1	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[5]	none	15/81	20/82	RR 0.76 (0.42 to 1.38)	59 fewer per 1000 (from 93 fewer to 142 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Preterm birth												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[6]	none	3/98	0/138	RR 10.06 (0.53 to 192.26)	0 more per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 0 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Birth weight (measured with: grams; Better indicated by more)												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[7]	no serious imprecision	none	98	138	-	WMD -83 (-221 to 55)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] "intention-to-treat" principle not followed, and in one trial randomisation was not described, there were inconsistencies in reporting of the number of randomised women, concealment not adequate, analysis based on individual subjects despite cluster randomization, large differences at baseline in type of allergy raises question about randomization
[2] only 18 months of observation
[3] 1 trial with no events
[4] one trial with 163 patients and 3 events
[5] only one trial with 163 patients 45 events
[6] two small trials, one with no events and another with 3 events in experimental group
[7] uncertainty if birth weight is a reliable indicator of malnutrition

Question 4
Date: 2007-08-15
Question: Should methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mites vs no such methods be used in infants and preschool children?
Settings: home
Bibliography: [1] Chan-Yeung M, Ferguson A, Watson W, Dimich-Ward H, Rousseau R, Lilley M, et al. The Canadian Childhood Asthma Primary Prevention Study: outcomes at 7 years of age. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005;116(1):49-55. [2] Chan-Yeung M, Manfreda J, Dimich-Ward H, Ferguson A, Watson W, Becker A. A randomized controlled study on the effectiveness of a multifaceted intervention program in the primary prevention of asthma in high-risk infants. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2000;154(7):657-63. [3] Becker A, Watson W, Ferguson A, Dimich-Ward H, Chan-Yeung M. The Canadian asthma primary prevention study: outcomes at 2 years of age. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004;113(4):650-6. [4] Schonberger HJ, Dompeling E, Knottnerus JA, Maas T, Muris JW, van Weel C, et al. The PREVASC study: the clinical effect of a multifaceted educational intervention to prevent childhood asthma. Eur Respir J 2005;25(4):660-70. [5] Halmerbauer G, Gartner C, Schierl M, Arshad H, Dean T, Koller DY, et al. Study on the Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe (SPACE): allergic sensitization at 1 year of age in a controlled trial of allergen avoidance from birth. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2003;14(1):10-7. [6] Horak F, Jr., Matthews S, Ihorst G, Arshad SH, Frischer T, Kuehr J, et al. Effect of mite-impermeable mattress encasings and an educational package on the development of allergies in a multinational randomized, controlled birth-cohort study -- 24 months results of the Study of Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe. Clin Exp Allergy 2004;34(8):1220-5. [7] Arshad SH, Bateman B, Matthews SM. Primary prevention of asthma and atopy during childhood by allergen avoidance in infancy: a randomised controlled study. Thorax 2003;58(6):489-93. [8] Arshad SH, Bateman B, Sadeghnejad A, Gant C, Matthews SM. Prevention of allergic disease during childhood by allergen avoidance: the Isle of Wight prevention study. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007;119(2):307-13. [9] Marks GB, Mihrshahi S, Kemp AS, Tovey ER, Webb K, Almqvist C, et al. Prevention of asthma during the first 5 years of life: a randomized controlled trial. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2006;118(1):53-61. [10] Mihrshahi S, Peat JK, Marks GB, Mellis CM, Tovey ER, Webb K, et al. Eighteen-month outcomes of house dust mite avoidance and dietary fatty acid modification in the Childhood Asthma Prevention Study (CAPS). J Allergy Clin Immunol 2003;111(1):162-8. [11] Corver K, Kerkhof M, Brussee JE, Brunekreef B, van Strien RT, Vos AP, et al. House dust mite allergen reduction and allergy at 4 yr: follow up of the PIAMA-study. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2006;17(5):329-36. [12] Koopman LP, van Strien RT, Kerkhof M, Wijga A, Smit HA, de Jongste JC, et al. Placebo-controlled trial of house dust mite-impermeable mattress covers: effect on symptoms in early childhood. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002;166(3):307-13. [13] van Strien RT, Koopman LP, Kerkhof M, Oldenwening M, de Jongste JC, Gerritsen J, et al. Mattress encasings and mite allergen levels in the Prevention and Incidence of Asthma and Mite Allergy study. Clin Exp Allergy 2003;33(4):490-5. [14] van Strien RT, Koopman LP, Kerkhof M, Spithoven J, de Jongste JC, Gerritsen J, et al. Mite and pet allergen levels in homes of children born to allergic and nonallergic parents: the PIAMA study. Environ Health Perspect 2002;110(11):A693-8. [15] Simpson A, Simpson B, Custovic A, Craven M, Woodcock A. Stringent environmental control in pregnancy and early life: the long-term effects on mite, cat and dog allergen. Clin Exp Allergy 2003;33(9):1183-9. [16] Woodcock A, Lowe LA, Murray CS, Simpson BM, Pipis SD, Kissen P, et al. Early life environmental control: effect on symptoms, sensitization, and lung function at age 3 years. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2004;170(4):433-9.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	methods aimed at reducing exposure to house dust mites	no such methods	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Rhinitis at 2 years of follow-up (follow-up 24 months)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[1]	none	128/637	162/619	RR 0.72 (0.49 to 1.06)	73 fewer per 1000 (from 134 fewer to 16 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Allergic rhinitis (diagnosed) or rhinitis after 3-8 years (follow-up 3 to 8 years)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[2]	none	226/968	213/890	RR 1.03 (0.88 to 1.2)	7 more per 1000 (from 29 fewer to 48 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Eczema (atopic dermatitis) at 2 years of follow-up (follow-up 24 months)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[2]	none	278/1308	262/1276	RR 1.02 (0.82 to 1.24)	4 more per 1000 (from 37 fewer to 49 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Eczema (atopic dermatitis) after 3-8 yeras (follow-up 3 to 8 years)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[2]	none	163/968	161/890	RR 0.91 (0.7 to 1.2)	16 fewer per 1000 (from 54 fewer to 36 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Wheezing at 2 years (follow-up 24 months)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious [3]	none	199/1223	181/1193	RR 1.08 (0.87 to 1.34)	12 more per 1000 (from 20 fewer to 52 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Wheezing at 3-7 years (follow-up 3 to 7 years)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[2]	none	118/910	144/828	RR 0.77 (0.62 to 0.98)	40 fewer per 1000 (from 66 fewer to 3 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma at 2 years (follow-up 24 months)												

4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[1]	none	121/856	143/826	RR 0.81 (0.61 to 1.06)	33 fewer per 1000 (from 67 fewer to 10 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma at 3-8 years (follow-up 3 to 8 years)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[2]	none	121/644	144/611	RR 0.82 (0.66 to 1.01)	42 fewer per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 2 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Plausible results include no benefit as well as large benefit from the intervention.
[2] Plausible results include no benefit as well as benefit from the intervention in the context of the results for other outcomes.
[3] Plausible results do not exclude important harm, although this seems unlikely given the other results.
[4] The included trials used different interventions and it is not clear which parts of the multifaceted interventions would exert an effect.

Question 5
Date: 2007-08-15
Question: Should avoidance of pet allergens vs no such avoidance be used in non-allergic infants or preschool children?
Settings: population-based birth cohorts
Bibliography: 1. Chan-Yeung M., Ferguson A., Watson W., Dimich-Ward H., Rousseau R., Lilley M., Dybuncio A., Becker A. The Canadian Childhood Asthma Primary Prevention Study: outcomes at 7 years of age. J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2005;116:49-55. 2. Chan-Yeung M., Manfreda J., Dimich-Ward H., Ferguson A., Watson W., Becker A. A randomized controlled study on the effectiveness of a multifaceted intervention program in the primary prevention of asthma in high-risk infants. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med, 2000;154:657-663. 3. Becker A., Watson W., Ferguson A., Dimich-Ward H., Chan-Yeung M. The Canadian asthma primary prevention study: outcomes at 2 years of age. J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2004;113:650-656. 4. Schonberger H.J., Dompeling E., Knottnerus J.A., Maas T., Muris J.W., van Weel C., van Schayck C.P. The PREVASC study: the clinical effect of a multifaceted educational intervention to prevent childhood asthma. Eur Respir J, 2005;25:660-670. 5. Halmerbauer G., Gartner C., Schierl M., Arshad H., Dean T., Koller D.Y., Karmaus W., Kuehr J., Forster J., Urbanek R., Frischer T. Study on the Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe (SPACE): allergic sensitization at 1 year of age in a controlled trial of allergen avoidance from birth. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2003;14:10-17. 6. Horak F., Jr., Matthews S., Ihorst G., Arshad S.H., Frischer T., Kuehr J., Schwieger A., Forster J. Effect of mite-impermeable mattress encasings and an educational package on the development of allergies in a multinational randomized, controlled birth-cohort study -- 24 months results of the Study of Prevention of Allergy in Children in Europe. Clin Exp Allergy, 2004;34:1220-1225.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	avoidance of pet allergens	no such avoidance	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Rhinitis at 2 years of follow-up (follow-up 24 months)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[2]	none	126/579	155/557	RR 0.74 (0.52 to 1.11)	72 fewer per 1000 (from 133 fewer to 31 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Allergic rhinitis (diagnosis) at 7 years of follow-up (follow-up 7 years)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[3,4]	none	64/202	49/178	RR 1.13 (0.71 to 1.81)	36 more per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 223 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Eczema (atopic dermatitis) at 2 years of follow-up (follow-up 24 months)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[3]	none	123/558	118/542	RR 1.02 (0.77 to 1.35)	4 more per 1000 (from 50 fewer to 76 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Eczema (atopic dermatitis: diagnosis) at 7 years of follow-up (follow-up 7 years)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[3,4]	none	25/202	24/178	RR 0.92 (0.49 to 1.73)	11 fewer per 1000 (from 99 fewer to 69 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Wheezing (recurrent) at 2 years of follow-up (follow-up 24 months)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	no serious imprecision[3]	none	85/531	83/521	RR 1.00 (0.77 to 1.32)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 37 fewer to 51 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Asthma at 2 years of follow-up (follow-up 24 months)												
2[5]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[3,4]	none	72/552	73/534	RR 1.01 (0.59 to 1.72)	1 more per 1000 (from 56 fewer to 99 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma (diagnosis) at 7 years of follow-up (follow-up 7 years)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[4]	none	30/202	41/178	RR 0.44 (0.25 to 0.79)	129 fewer per 1000 (from 172 fewer to 48 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Studies used multiple interventions directed at multiple potential risk factors.
[2] Results do not exclude a important benefit or no benefit.
[3] Results do not exclude a important benefit or important harm, although the point estimate suggests no effect.
[4] Small number of events.
[5] We used definitions of "Asthma diagnosed by physician" or "asthma"

Question 7 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-07-31
Question: Should high efficiency pariculate air filters be used for perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Sheikh A, Hurwitz B, Shehata Y. House dust mite avoidance measures for perennial allergic rhinitis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007, Issue 1.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	high efficiency pariculate air filters	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Quality of Life - not measured[1]												
0	-	-[2]	-	-	-[3]	none[3]	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
Rhinitis symptoms (follow-up 2 to 8 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	very serious[2]	serious[4]	no serious indirectness	very serious[5]	none[3]	41	41	-	not pooled	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Days off/sick leave - not measured[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		IMPORTANT
medication usage (follow-up 2 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	very serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[5]	none[3]	32	32	-	–[6]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
adverse effects (follow-up 8 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	very serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[5]	none[3]	0/9	0/9	not pooled	not pooled	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Outcome was not measured in the included studies
[2] allocation concealment and randomisation unclear or inadequate, power calculations with small samples not provided, outcome measures not validated.
[3] Reporting bias not assessed.
[4] Significant results in 1 trial and non-significant results in other trial not explained.
[5] Very few patients.
[6] Effect sizes not reported but analyses found significant reduction in medication usage.

Question 7 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-07-31
Question: Should acaricides be used for perennial allergic rhinitis?
Settings: Home
Bibliography: Sheikh A, Hurwitz B, Shehata Y. House dust mite avoidance measures for perennial allergic rhinitis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007, Issue 1.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	acaricides	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Quality of Life - not measured[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		CRITICAL
rhinitis symptoms (follow-up 6 to 12 months; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3]	none[4]	27	25	-	not pooled[5]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Days off/sick leave - not measured[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		IMPORTANT
Adverse effects (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trial	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3]	none	0/10	0/10	not pooled[6]	not pooled[6]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Outcome was not measured in the included studies.
[2] allocation concealment and randomisation unclear or inadequate, power calculations with small samples not provided,.
[3] Very few patients.
[4] Reporting bias not assessed.
[5] 1 trial significant reduction of symptoms, 1 trial reduction of symptoms but significance unknown.
[6] there were no events in both groups

Question 7 [profile 3]
Date: 2007-07-31
Question: Should barrier bedding be used for perennial allergic rhinitis?
Settings: Home
Bibliography: Sheikh A, Hurwitz B, Shehata Y. House dust mite avoidance measures for perennial allergic rhinitis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007, Issue 1.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	barrier bedding	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Quality of Life - not measured[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		CRITICAL
Rhinitis symptoms (follow-up 12 months; measured with: Daily symptom scale; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none[4]	100[3]	98	-	WMD 0.15 (-0.26 to 0.56)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Days off/sick leave - not measured[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		IMPORTANT
Medication usage (follow-up 9 to 11 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[5,6]	none[4]	30	30	-	not pooled[5]	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects - not reported												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	–	–	-	-		NOT IMPORTANT

[1] Outcome was not measured
[2] Intent-to-treat analysis was not performed
[3] The confidence interval crosses no difference and does not rule out a small increase.
[4] Reporting bias not assessed.
[5] No difference was found but the values were not reported.
[6] Very few patients.

Question 7 [profile 4]

Date: 2009-03-28
Question: Should chemical methods to reduce house dust mite allergens be used in patients with asthma allergic to mites?
Settings: home
Bibliography: Gøtzsche PC, Johansen HK. House dust mite control measures for asthma. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2008, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD001187. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001187.pub3.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	chemical methods to reduce house dust mite allergens	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 3 to 12 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
4[1]	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none[4]	59	66	-	SMD 0.39 higher (0.04 to 0.75 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Improvement of asthma (follow-up 6 to 12 months)												
3[5]	randomised trials	very serious[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none[4]	38/65 (58.5%)	45/73 (61.6%)	RR 0.94 (0.72 to 1.24)	37 fewer per 1000 (from 173 fewer to 148 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Medication use (follow-up 12 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none[4]	11	12	-	SMD 0.89 higher (0.02 to 1.75 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	–	–	-	-		CRITICAL

[1] All studies included children; two also included adults.
[2] Randomisation method and allocation concealment not described, 88% follow-up.
[3] No explanation was provided
[4] Most trials were very small, and results may have been influenced by publication bias, which would exaggerate the effect of treatment.
[5] All studies included children; one study also included adults.
[6] Randomisation method and allocation concealment described in one study; 62% follow-up.
[7] Few events and patients. Results do not exclude appreciable benefit or harm.
[8] Very few patients.

Question 7 [profile 5]

Date: 2009-03-28
Question: Should physical methods to reduce house dust mite allergens be used in patients with asthma allergic to mites?
Settings: home
Bibliography: Gøtzsche PC, Johansen HK. House dust mite control measures for asthma. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2008, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD001187. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001187.pub3.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	physical methods to reduce house dust mite allergens	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 3 to 24 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
10	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	none[4]	513	485	-	SMD 0.07 lower (0.20 lower to 0.05 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Improvement of asthma (follow-up 8 weeks)												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness[5]	very serious[6]	none	16/26 (61.5%)	15/27 (55.6%)	RR 1.11 (0.7 to 1.74)	61 more per 1000 (from 167 fewer to 411 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Medication use (follow-up 3 to 24 months[7]; Better indicated by lower values)												
6	randomised trials	serious[1,8]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	464	456	-	SMD 0.07 lower (0.20 lower to 0.06 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Unscheduled hospital visit or course of oral steroids (follow-up 6 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1,9]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[10]	none	38/315 (12.1%)	27/310 (8.7%)	RR 1.39 (0.87 to 2.20)	34 more per 1000 (from 11 fewer to 105 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse effects - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0 (0%)	0/0 (0%)	-	-		CRITICAL

[1] Randomisation and allocation concealment were not described in 6 studies. Large loss to follow-up in most studies. Largest study showing no effect provided only a subgroup analysis.
[2] One open label small study (n=24) sponsored by air cleaner manufacturer showed very large effect; results of other studies were consistent.
[3] Results do not exclude small benefit, however this is unlikely.
[4] Most trials were small, and results may have been influenced by publication bias, which would exaggerate the effect of treatment.
[5] There is some concern about directness since 50% of patients improved with placebo treatment (visit by nurse).
[6] Very few events and patients. Results do not exclude an appreciable benefit or harm.
[7] median: 12 months.
[8] Randomisation and allocation concealment were not described in 2 studies. Only 3 studies were blinded. Large loss to follow-up in most studies. Largest study showing no effect provided only a subgroup analysis.
[9] Subgroup analysis of one study. Most studies did not measure or report these obvious outcomes.
[10] Few events.

Question 7 [profile 6]

Date: 2009-03-28
Question: Should a combination of physical and chemical methods to reduce house dust mite allergens be used in patients with asthma allergic to mite?
Settings: Home
Bibliography: Gøtzsche PC, Johansen HK. House dust mite control measures for asthma. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2008, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD001187. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001187.pub3.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	a combination of physical and chemical methods to reduce house dust mite allergerns	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 4 to 6 weeks; range of scores: 0-0; Better indicated by lower values)												
2[1]	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none[4]	93	99	-	SMD 0.01 lower (0.29 lower to 0.28 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Improvement of asthma (follow-up 24 weeks)												
1[5]	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	3/23 (13%)	4/26 (15.4%)	RR 0.85 (0.21 to 3.4)	23 fewer per 1000 (from 122 fewer to 369 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Medication use - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		IMPORTANT
Adverse effects - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0 (0%)	0/0 (0%)	-	-		CRITICAL

[1] Adults only.
[2] allocation concealment and randomisation unclear
[3] Few patients. Results do not exclude small benefit or small harm.
[4] Studies were small, and results may have been influenced by publication bias, which would exaggerate the effect of treatment.
[5] Children only.

Question 9 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-17
Question: Should avoidance of exposure to pet allergens be used in patient with allergic rhinitis sensitive to these allergens?
Bibliography: Bjornsdottir US, Jakobinudottir S, Runarsdottir V, Juliusson S. The effect of reducing levels of cat allergen (Fel d 1) on clinical symptoms in patients with cat allergy. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2003;91(2):189-94.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	avoidance of exposure to pet allergens	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal congestion (follow-up 8 months; measured with: 11-point scale (0: no symptoms; 10: worst symptoms experienced)range of scores: 0-10; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3]	none	15	16	-		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Rhinorrhea (follow-up 8 months; measured with: 11-point scale (0: no symptoms; 10: worst symptoms experienced)range of scores: 0-10; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3]	none	15	16	-		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
nasal itching (follow-up 8 months; measured with: 11-point scale (0: no symptoms; 10: worst symptoms experienced)range of scores: 0-10; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3]	none	15	16	-		⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured[4]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL

[1] 22% did not complete the study.
[2] Patients used multiple interventions that might also decrease house dust mite allergens.
[3] One very small trial.
[4] Quality of life was not measured in available studies.

Question 9 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-17
Question: Should avoidance of exposure to pet allergens be used in patient with asthma sensitive to these allergens?
Bibliography: Kilburn S, Lasserson TJ, McKean M. Pet allergen control measures for allergic asthma in children and adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2003(1):CD002989.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	avoidance of exposure to pet allergens	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 3 months; Better indicated by less)												
1[1]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3]	none	18	17	-	WMD 0 (0 to 0)[4]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 3 months; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[5]	none	40[6]	39[6]	-	not pooled[7]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Medication usage (follow-up 3 months; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[8]	very serious[5]	none	40[6]	39[6]	-	not pooled[9]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Sleeping difficulty (follow-up 3 months)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[10]	none	4/9	12/14	RR 0.21 (0.04 to 0.94)	677 fewer per 1000 (from 51 fewer to 823 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured[11]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL

[1] trials used air filtration units
[2] only 7 of 35 patients had rhinitis
[3] very small study; 7 patients had allergic rhinitis
[4] Authors reported no important change in morning, afternoon and night nasal symptom scores in both groups.
[5] Two very small trials.
[6] one study had a cross-over design
[7] Authors of one study did not report numerical values for changes in symptoms. Authors of both studies reported no important changes in symptoms in both groups.
[8] There is some uncertainty about the directness of outcome measure.
[9] One study did not detect any important difference in either maintenance or as-needed medication usage in the active or placebo groups. Other study withdrew the data contributed by participants who embarked new therapies or who came off existing therapies during the study; no medication usage scores were reported.
[10] one very small trial
[11] Quality of life was not measured in available studies.

Question 11 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-20
Question: Should oral H1-antihistamines be used in patients with perennial or persistent allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Hore I., Georgalas C., Scadding G. Oral antihistamines for the symptom of nasal obstruction in persistent allergic rhinitis--a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Clin Exp Allergy, 2005;35:207-212.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral H1-antihistamines	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal obstruction (patient-assessed) (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks; measured with: 4-point scale; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	142	126	-	WMD -0.52 (-0.31 to -0.73)[2]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Nasal obstruction (healthcare worker-assessed) (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks; measured with: 4-point scalerange of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[3]	no serious imprecision	none	190	181	-	WMD -0.33 (-0.16 to -0.49)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks)												
7	randomised trial					none	0/0	0/0	not pooled[4]	not pooled[4]		IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not measured[5]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		

[1] there was little information on the methodological quality of the included studies; follow-up was from 84% to 98%
[2] Three studies presented data in a way that could not be pooled; one found no statistically significant reduction in “stuffiness” in patients on antihistamine compared with placebo, second found that nasal stuffiness improved in 50% patients on loratadine and 13% on placebo, and the third found a statistically significant reduction in “stuffiness” in patients on cetirizine 20 mg (but not 10 mg) daily compared with placebo.
[3] there is uncertainty if the clinician assessment of the effect corresponds to the patients'
[4] Headache was the most common adverse event, but there was no statistically significant difference between the groups; one study found statistically significant increase in fatigue in the antihistamine group with cetirizine 20 mg once daily, and one study found a statistically significant increase in tiredness in the placebo group, compared with loratidine 10 mg once daily.
[5] Outcome was not measured in the included studies

Question 11 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-25
Question: Should oral H1-antihistamines be used in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: see guideline document

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral H1-antihistamines	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (Better indicated by less)												
80[1]	randomised trial	no serious limitations[2]	serious[3]	no serious indirectness[4]	no serious imprecision[5]	none	–	–	-	–	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Quality of life (Better indicated by less)												
80[1]	randomised trial	no serious limitations[2]	serious[3]	no serious indirectness[4]	no serious imprecision[5]	reporting bias[6]	–	–	-	–	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse effects												
80[1]	randomised trial	no serious limitations[2]	serious[3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[5]	reporting bias[7]	–	–	–	–	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] An estimate based on the studies identified by ARIA group members
[2] We assumed most of the studies would have no serious limitations.
[3] We assumed, there would be serious inconsistency in the results due to different effect of various H1-antihistamines or dosing schedules
[4] We did not downgrade for indirectness, because we already downgraded for inconsistency, however different effect of particular medications and dosing may also be considered as influencing directness
[5] We assumed, that with that many trials that will be no imprecision in the results
[6] We assumed, based on the systematic reviews of other interventions, that many trials would not measure or report quality of life.
[7] We assumed, based on the systematic reviews of other interventions in allergic rhinitis, that many trials would not measure or report adverse events.

Question 13
Date: 2007-06-13
Question: Should oral H1-antihistamines vs placebo be used for prevention of asthma in children at high risk?
Bibliography: 1. Allergic factors associated with the development of asthma and the influence of cetirizine in a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial: first results of ETAC. Early Treatment of the Atopic Child. Pediatr Allergy Immunol. 1998 Aug;9(3):116-24. 2. Bustos GJ, Bustos D, Bustos GJ, Romero O. Prevention of asthma with ketotifen in preasthmatic children: a three-year follow-up study. Clin Exp Allergy. 1995 Jun;25(6):568-73. 3. Iikura Y, Naspitz CK, Mikawa H, Talaricoficho S, Baba M, Sole D, Nishima S. Prevention of asthma by ketotifen in infants with atopic dermatitis. Ann Allergy. 1992 Mar;68(3):233-6.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral H1-antihistamines	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
development of asthma (all trials) (follow-up 1 to 3 years)												
3	randomised trial	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	162/509	190/507	RR 0.48 (0.18 to 1.27)	20 fewer per 100 (from 10 fewer to 31 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
development of asthma (ketotifen only) (follow-up 1 to 3 years)												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	12/111	39/110	RR 0.31 (0.17 to 0.55)	24 fewer per 100 (from 16 fewer to 29 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
development of asthma (cetirizine only; all children) (follow-up 18 months)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	150/398	151/397	RR 0.99 (0.83 to 1.18)	4 fewer per 1000 (from 65 fewer to 68 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
development of asthma (cetirizine only; subgroup allergic to pollen and house dust mites) (follow-up 18 months)												
2	randomised trial	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[6]	none	26/76	44/82	RR 0.64 (0.44 to 0.92)	193 fewer per 1000 (from 43 fewer to 301 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse effects (ketotifen) (follow-up 1 to 3 years)												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4]	none	0/0	0/0	not pooled[7]	not pooled	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse effects (cetirizine) (follow-up 18 months)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0/0	0/0	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	

[1] no information on method of randomisation, blinding, concealment, and ITT in 2 trials, 15% lost to follow-up in one trial and no info on lost to follow-up in another
[2] One big trial showing no effect and 2 small ones showing benefit
[3] Pooled relative risk = 0,46 (95% CI 0,17 to 1,26)
[4] two small trials with small number with events
[5] post hoc analysis of a subgroup
[6] results do not exclude a large effect or negligible effect; few events
[7] in one trial there were three cases of sedation, one case of vomiting, and one case of alopecia in ketotifen group, and no side effects in placebo group; second trial did not report adverse events

Question 14 [profile 1]
Date: 2009-03-04
Question: Should intranasal azelastine 0.56 mg/d vs placebo be used in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Arcimowicz M, Samolinski B, Zawisza E. Clinical assessment of azelastine nasal spray in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Pol Merkur Lekarski 1998;5(30):363-7. 2. Ciprandi G, Ricca V, Passalacqua G, Truffelli T, Bertolini C, Fiorino N, et al. Seasonal rhinitis and azelastine: long- or short-term treatment? J Allergy Clin Immunol 1997;99(3):301-7. 3. LaForce C, Dockhorn RJ, Prenner BM, Chu TJ, Kraemer MJ, Widlitz MD, et al. Safety and efficacy of azelastine nasal spray (Astelin NS) for seasonal allergic rhinitis: a 4-week comparative multicenter trial [see comments]. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(2):181-8. 4. Lumry W, Prenner B, Corren J, Wheeler W. Efficacy and safety of azelastine nasal spray at a dose of 1 spray per nostril twice daily. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2007;99(3):267-72. 5. 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. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 1997;254(5):236-41. 6. Pelucchi A, Chiapparino A, Mastropasqua B, Marazzini L, Hernandez A, Foresi A. Effect of intranasal azelastine and beclomethasone dipropionate on nasal symptoms, nasal cytology, and bronchial responsiveness to methacholine in allergic rhinitis in response to grass pollens. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1995;95(2):515-23. 7. Ratner PH, Findlay SR, Hampel F, Jr., van-Bavel J, Widlitz MD, Freitag JJ. 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(5):818-25. 8. Storms WW, Pearlman DS, Chervinsky P, Grossman J, Halverson PC, Freitag JJ, et al. Effectiveness of azelastine nasal solution in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ear Nose Throat J 1994;73(6):382-386, 390-394.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal azelastine 0.56 mg/d	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks[1]; Better indicated by lower values)												
8	randomised trials	serious[2,3]	serious[4]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[5]	none	444	448	-	not pooled[3,4]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
quality of life - not reported[6]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		CRITICAL
adverse effects (bitter taste) (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks[1])												
5	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[7]	strong association	78/414 (18.8%)	1/393 (0.3%)	RR 19.95 (6.38 to 62.36)	48 more per 1000 (from 14 more to 156 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
adverse effects (somnolence/fatigue) (follow-up 2 weeks)												
3	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	11/404 (2.7%)	5/409 (1.2%)	RR 1.83 (0.69 to 4.85)	10 more per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 47 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Most studies followed patients for 2-4 weeks
[2] Only 2 studies reported adherence to the intention to treat principle and none reported concealment of allocation.
[3] Most studies did not report variability in results so no combined estimate could be calculated.
[4] Five of 7 studies did not report variability in results. Point estimates showed 3% to 30% difference in symptom scores favouring azelastine. Results of 3 studies were not statistically significant.
[5] We did not downgrade for imprecision, because we already downgraded for inconsistency. It was not possible to estimate precision since most studies did not report variability in results.
[6] One study measured quality of life in 20-30% of patients and found no significant difference between azelastine and placebo-treated groups.
[7] We did not downgrade for imprecision despite only 79 events, since this outcome was observed only in azelastine group. Studies that used 0.56 mg/d and 1.12 mg per day gave very consistent results; combining them would give 128 events and a RR of 21.07 (95% CI: 8.68 to 51.13).
[8] Results do not exclude serious increase in somnolence/fatigue, or no effect.

Question 14 [profile 2]
Date: 2009-03-04
Question: Should intranasal azelastine 1.12 mg/d vs placebo be used in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Berger WE, White MV. Efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in patients with an unsatisfactory response to loratadine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;91(2):205-11. 2. Ghimire A, Das BP, Mishra SC. Comparative efficacy of steroid nasal spray versus antihistamine nasal spray in allergic rhinitis. Nepal Med Coll J 2007;9(1):17-21. 3. LaForce C, Dockhorn RJ, Prenner BM, Chu TJ, Kraemer MJ, Widlitz MD, et al. Safety and efficacy of azelastine nasal spray (Astelin NS) for seasonal allergic rhinitis: a 4-week comparative multicenter trial [see comments]. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1996;76(2):181-8. 4. LaForce CF, Corren J, Wheeler WJ, Berger WE. Efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in seasonal allergic rhinitis patients who remain symptomatic after treatment with fexofenadine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2004;93(2):154-9. 5. 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. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 1997;254(5):236-41. 6. Ratner PH, Findlay SR, Hampel F, Jr., van-Bavel J, Widlitz MD, Freitag JJ. 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(5):818-25. 7. Storms WW, Pearlman DS, Chervinsky P, Grossman J, Halverson PC, Freitag JJ, et al. Effectiveness of azelastine nasal solution in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ear Nose Throat J 1994;73(6):382-386, 390-394.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal azelastine 1.12 mg/d	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks[1]; Better indicated by lower values)												
7	randomised trials	serious[2,3]	no serious inconsistency[4]	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	457	455	-	not pooled[3,4]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
adverse effects (bitter taste) (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks)												
5	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	strong association	49/369 (13.3%)	0.01%[6]	RR 22.91 (5.59 to 93.95)	2 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 9 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
adverse effects (somnolence/fatigue) (follow-up 2 weeks)												
6	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	16/444 (3.6%)	6/442 (1.4%)	RR 2.17 (0.93 to 5.08)	16 more per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 55 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] One study followed patients for 4 weeks
[2] One study was not blinded, 3/7 did not report adherence to the intention to treat principle and none reported concealment of allocation.
[3] Most studies did not report variability in results so no combined estimate could be calculated.
[4] Five of 7 studies did not report variability in results. Point estimates showed 8% to 30% difference in symptom scores favouring azelastine. Results of 2 studies were not statistically significant.
[5] We downgraded for imprecision, because it was not possible to estimate precision since most studies did not report variability in results.
[6] No event occurred in control groups. We assumed a baseline risk of 1 per 10,000 to estimate the absolute effect.
[7] Results do not exclude important harm or no effect.

Question 14 [profile 3]
Date: 2009-03-04
Question: Should intranasal azelastine 0.56 mg/d vs placebo be used in adults with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Davies RJ, Lund VJ, Harten-Ash VJ. The effect of intranasal azelastine and beclomethasone on the symptoms and signs of nasal allergy in patients with perennial allergic rhinitis. Rhinology 1993;31(4):159-64.
2. Stern MA, Wade AG, Ridout SM, Cambell LM. Nasal budesonide offers superior symptom relief in perennial allergic rhinitis in comparison to nasal azelastine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1998;81(4):354-8.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal azelastine 0.56 mg/d	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 6 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	none	110	87	-	not pooled[4]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
adverse effects (follow-up 6 weeks; bitter taste[5])												
1[6]	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	22/45 (48.9%)	0/22	RR 22.5 (1.4 to 354.6)	490 more per 1000[8]	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] One study was not blinded, none reported concealment of allocation or adherence to intention to treat principle. In one trial only 78% of patients finished the study and the other did not report follow-up.
[2] Both studies reported their results on graphs only with no measure of variability. However, one reported a statistically significant befit with azelastine and the other reported no difference.
[3] We did not downgrade for imprecision, because we already downgraded for inconsistency. Precision of the results could not be evaluated, because no measure of variability was reported.
[4] One study reported a statistically significant befit with azelastine and the other reported no difference. Data were reported as graphs only with no measure of variability.
[5] nausea and vomiting, sore throat, and intolerance to nasal spray were also more common in azelastine treated patients
[6] One study did not report any adverse effects
[7] One small study with few events.
[8] No events occurred in control group. Therefore, it was not possible to estimate the precision of the absolute effect.

Question 14 [profile 4]
Date: 2009-03-04
Question: Should intranasal azelastine 1.12 mg/d vs placebo be used in adults with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Golden S, Teets SJ, Lehman EB, Mauger EA, Chinchilli V, Berlin JM, et al. Effect of topical nasal azelastine on the symptoms of rhinitis, sleep, and daytime somnolence in perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2000;85(1):53-7.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal azelastine 1.12 mg/d	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 8 weeks; measured with: 5-point scale; range of scores: 0-4; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	8	11	-	mean 0.48 lower (1.43 lower to 0.48 higher)[3]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0 (0%)	0/0 (0%)	-	-		CRITICAL
adverse effects (withdrawal from the study)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4]	none	3/12 (25%)	0/12	RR 7.0 (0.4 to 122)	250 more per 1000[5]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Sample size calculation was based on an erroneous assumption that the effect of azelastine would be the same as intranasal steroid. 79% of patients completed the study.
[2] One very small study with results not excluding important benefit or harm.
[3] point estimate favours azelastine
[4] One very small study with results not excluding important harm.
[5] No events occurred in control group. Therefore, it was not possible to estimate the precision of the absolute effect.

Question 14 [profile 5]
Date: 2009-03-04
Question: Should intranasal azelastine 0.56 mg/d vs placebo be used in children with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Herman D, Garay R, Le-Gal M. A randomized double-blind placebo controlled study of azelastine nasal spray in children with perennial rhinitis. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol 1997;39(1):1-8.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal azelastine 0.56 mg/d	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 6 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	58	59	-	not pooled[2]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
adverse effects												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	17/64 (26.6%)[5]	19/61 (31.1%)[5]	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] Single study with 125 participants; no measure of variability was provided.
[2] Authors reported results on a graph with no measure of variability, but on average a difference of 10 to 15% between azelastine and placebo was observed and the p-value for the difference was <0.0001.
[3] Authors did not report somnolence and bitter taste which one could expect to occur.
[4] Single study with 125 participants; there were only 29 events in total. Some adverse events that one would expect to occur (e.g. bitter taste) were not reported.
[5] Assuming that adverse events were independent , i.e. none occurred in the same patient twice. Only number of events not number of patients with an event were reported.

Question 14 [profile 6]
Date: 2009-03-07
Question: Should intranasal levocabastine vs placebo be used in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Dahl R., Pedersen B., Larsen B. Intranasal levocabastine for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis: a multicentre, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Rhinology, 1995;33:121-125. 2. Di Lorenzo G., Gervasi F., Drago A., Esposito Pellitteri M., Di Salvo A., Cosentino D., Potestio M., Colombo A., Candore G., Mansueto S., Caruso C. Comparison of the effects of fluticasone propionate, aqueous nasal spray and levocabastine on inflammatory cells in nasal lavage and clinical activity during the pollen season in seasonal rhinitics. Clin Exp Allergy, 1999;29:1367-1377. 3. Hampel F., Jr., Martin B.G., Dolen J., Travers S., Karcher K., Holton D. Efficacy and safety of levocabastine nasal spray for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Am J Rhinol, 1999;13:55-62. 4. Ortolani C., Foresi A., Di Lorenzo G., Bagnato G., Bonifazi F., Crimi N., Emmi L., Prandini M., Senna G.E., Tursi A., Mirone C., Leone C., Fina P., Testi R. A double-blind, placebo-controlled comparison of treatment with fluticasone propionate and levocabastine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. FLNCO2 Italian Study Group. Allergy, 1999;54:1173-1180. 5. Schata M., Jorde W., Richarz-Barthauer U. Levocabastine nasal spray better than sodium cromoglycate and placebo in the topical treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1991;87:873-878. 6. Svensson C., Andersson M., Greiff L., Blychert L.O., Persson C.G. Effects of topical budesonide and levocabastine on nasal symptoms and plasma exudation responses in seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy, 1998;53:367-374.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal levocabastine	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 4 to 6 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
6	randomised trials	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[2]	none	242	233	-	SMD 0.48 lower (0.15 to 0.81 lower)[3]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
nasal symptoms (global assessment of efficacy) (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; rating: excellent or good)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	89/150 (59.3%)	53/149 (35.6%)	RR 1.83 (1.16 to 2.89)	30 more per 100 (from 6 more to 67 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
ocular symptoms (follow-up 2 to 6 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	262	253	-	not pooled[8]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
adverse effects (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; somnolence/fatigue[9])												
2	randomised trials	serious[9,10]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[11]	none	4/151 (2.6%)	1/157 (0.6%)	RR 3.17 (0.51 to 19.71)	14 more per 1000 (from 3 fewer to 119 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] One study blinded patients only and 2 did not report type of analysis (overall 10% of patients did not complete these studies)
[2] Results do not exclude small or large effect.
[3] Other 3 trials did not report variability in results so it was not possible to combine their results. However, all reported statistically significant difference favouring levocabastine (one showed a difference of ~12% and the other of ~28%; the third trial did not report the scale or variability in results).
[4] In one study 25% patients did not complete treatment.
[5] Results do not exclude a large effect or a negligible one. Only 142 events.
[6] One study blinded patients only, 2 did not report type of analysis, and only one study reported variability in results.
[7] It was not possible to estimate the precision of the findings since only one study provided variability in results.
[8] One study reported -18% difference vs placebo, second reported 71.4% days free of eye symptoms compared to 56.1% with placebo, third reported a change in symptoms -1.92 vs -0.19 on a 4-point scale, and the last reported an effect size of -0.28 (95% CI: -1.10 to 0.54) favouring levocabastine.
[9] Other adverse effects were poorly reported. In one study 4 vs 3 patients withdrew due to unspecified adverse effects, one reported that there were no adverse effects, one provided a detailed table but there were no differences and 2 studies dd not repot adverse effects at all.
[10] 15% patients did not complete the studies
[11] Results do not exclude a large harm or a benefit. Very few events.

Question 14 [profile 7]

Date: 2009-03-07
Question: Should intranasal olopatadine 0.4% vs placebo be used in adults wth seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Fairchild CJ, Meltzer EO, Roland PS, Wells D, Drake M, Wall GM. Comprehensive report of the efficacy, safety, quality of life, and work impact of Olopatadine 0.6% and Olopatadine 0.4% treatment in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2007;28(6):716-23. 2. Hampel FC, Jr., Ratner PH, Amar NJ, van Bavel JH, Mohar D, Fairchild CJ, et al. Improved quality of life among seasonal allergic rhinitis patients treated with olopatadine HCl nasal spray 0.4% and olopatadine HCl nasal spray 0.6% compared with vehicle placebo. Allergy Asthma Proc 2006;27(3):202-7. 3. Meltzer EO, Hampel FC, Ratner PH, Bernstein DI, Larsen LV, Berger WE, et al. Safety and efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(6):600-6. 4. Ratner PH, Hampel FC, Amar NJ, van Bavel JH, Mohar D, Marple BF, et al. Safety and efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis to mountain cedar. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(5):474-9.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal olopatadine 0.4%	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: % change from baseline; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[1]	418	416	-	MD 8.87 lower (5.55 to 12.18 lower)[2]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
quality of life (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: change in Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality-of-Life Questionnaire (RQLQ); range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	reporting bias[1]	418	416	-	MD 0.35 lower[4,5]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
eye symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: percent change from baseline; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	reporting bias[1]	418	416	-	MD 9.1 lower (1.26 to 16.93 lower)[6]	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
adverse effects (somnolence) (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	4/418 (1%)	1/416 (0.2%)	RR 2.97 (0.47 to 18.76)	5 more per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 43 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
adverse effects (bitter taste) (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	strong association[8]	31/418 (7.4%)	2/417 (0.5%)	RR 15.46 (4.13 to 58.25)	69 more per 1000 (from 15 more to 275 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT

[1] There are only 2 studies available. Results of these two studies were published as 4 separate papers and all were supported by the manufacturer of olopatadine.
[2] Mean change from baseline in the placebo group was -22.5%.
[3] Results do not exclude a moderate effect or no effect.
[4] Mean change from baseline in the RQLQ score combined from both studies was -1.15 points in the olopatadine 0.4% and -0.8 points the placebo group. Authors did not provide a measure of variability for the total score combined from both studies. Based on the results of one of these studies that reported variability in results, a mean difference between olopatadine 0.4% and placebo in RQLQ score would be -0.30 points (95% CI: -0.06 to -0.54). Assuming a minimal important difference for RQLQ is 0.5 points, a mean change is most likely lower than the MID.
[5] Mean change from baseline in the placebo group was -0.8 points.
[6] Mean change from baseline in the placebo group was -23.6%.
[7] Results do not exclude no effect or important harm.
[8] lower limit of 95% CI is 4.0.

Question 14 [profile 8]

Date: 2009-03-07
Question: Should intranasal olopatadine 0.6% vs placebo be used in adults wth seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Fairchild CJ, Meltzer EO, Roland PS, Wells D, Drake M, Wall GM. Comprehensive report of the efficacy, safety, quality of life, and work impact of Olopatadine 0.6% and Olopatadine 0.4% treatment in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc 2007;28(6):716-23. 2. Hampel FC, Jr., Ratner PH, Amar NJ, van Bavel JH, Mohar D, Fairchild CJ, et al. Improved quality of life among seasonal allergic rhinitis patients treated with olopatadine HCl nasal spray 0.4% and olopatadine HCl nasal spray 0.6% compared with vehicle placebo. Allergy Asthma Proc 2006;27(3):202-7. 3. Meltzer EO, Hampel FC, Ratner PH, Bernstein DI, Larsen LV, Berger WE, et al. Safety and efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(6):600-6. 4. Ratner PH, Hampel FC, Amar NJ, van Bavel JH, Mohar D, Marple BF, et al. Safety and efficacy of olopatadine hydrochloride nasal spray for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis to mountain cedar. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2005;95(5):474-9.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal olopatadine 0.6%	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: percentage change from baseline; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[1]	406	416	-	MD 11.73 lower (8.17 to 15.30 lower)[2]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
quality of life (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: change in Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality-of-Life Questionnaire (RQLQ); range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	reporting bias[1]	406	416	-	MD 0.45 lower[4,5]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
eye symptoms (follow-up 2 days; measured with: percentage change from baseline; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[1]	406	416	-	MD 14.51 lower (7.47 to 21.54 lower)[6]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
adverse effects (somnolence) (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	4/406 (1%)	1/417 (0.2%)	RR 4.11 (0.62 to 27.27)	7 more per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 63 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
adverse effects (bitter taste) (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	very strong association[8]	53/406 (13.1%)	2/417 (0.5%)	RR 27.22 (7.39 to 101.0)	126 more per 1000 (from 31 more to 480 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT

[1] There are only 2 studies available. Results of these two studies were published as 4 separate papers and all were supported by the manufacturer of olopatadine. The only conference abstracts we identified that also reported this outcome was also supported by the manufacturer.
[2] Mean change from baseline in the placebo group was -22.5%.
[3] Results do not exclude a moderate or negligible effect.
[4] Mean change from baseline in the placebo group was -0.8 points.
[5] Mean change from baseline in the RQLQ score combined from both studies was -1.25 points in the olopatadine 0.6% and -0.8 points the placebo group. Authors did not provide a measure of variability for the total score combined from both studies. Based on the results of one of these studies that reported variability in results, a mean difference between olopatadine 0.6% and placebo in RQLQ score would be -0.40 points (95% CI: -0.15 to -0.65). Assuming a minimal important difference for RQLQ is 0.5 points, a fair proportion of patients might have benefited from the treatment at least minimally.
[6] Mean change from baseline in the placebo group was -23.6%.
[7] Results do not exclude important harm or no effect.
[8] Lower limit of 95% CI is 7.4.

Question 15 [profile 1]

Date: 2009-03-10
Question: Should intranasal H1-antihistamines vs oral H1-antihistamines be used in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Berger W, Hampel F, Jr., Bernstein J, Shah S, Sacks H, Meltzer EO. Impact of azelastine nasal spray on symptoms and quality of life compared with cetirizine oral tablets in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2006;97(3):375-81. 2. Berger WE, White MV. Efficacy of azelastine nasal spray in patients with an unsatisfactory response to loratadine. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2003;91(2):205-11. 3. Charpin D, Godard P, Garay RP, Baehre M, Herman D, Michel FB. A multicenter clinical study of the efficacy and tolerability of azelastine nasal spray in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis: a comparison with oral cetirizine. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 1995;252(8):455-8. 4. Conde Hernandez DJ, Palma Aqilar JL, Delgado Romero J. Comparison of azelastine nasal spray and oral ebastine in treating seasonal allergic rhinitis. Curr Med Res Opin 1995;13(6):299-304. 5. Corren J, Storms W, Bernstein J, Berger W, Nayak A, Sacks H, et al. Effectiveness of azelastine nasal spray compared with oral cetirizine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Clin Ther 2005;27(5):543-53. 6. Gambardella R. A comparison of the efficacy of azelastine nasal spray and loratidine tablets in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Int Med Res 1993;21(5):268-75. 7. Swedish GP Allergy Team. Topical levocabastine compared with oral loratadine for the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. Allergy 1994;49(8):611-5.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal H1-antihistamines	oral H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (change from baseline) (follow-up 2 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)												
2[1]	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	330	330	-	SMD 0.21 higher (0.06 to 0.36 higher)[3]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
nasal symptoms (symptom score) (follow-up 2 to 6 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5,6]	none	144	147	-	not pooled[5,7]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
treatment efficacy (follow-up 2 to 6 weeks; rated as excellent or good [as opposed to moderate or poor])												
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness[8]	serious[9]	none	102/144 (70.8%)	100/147 (68%)	RR 1.04 (0.89 to 1.20)	27 more per 1000 (from 75 fewer to 136 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
								50%		20 more per 1000 (from 55 fewer to 100 more)		
ocular symptoms (follow-up 2 to 6 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5,6]	none	144	147	-	not pooled[5,10]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
adverse effects (somnolence)												
5	randomised trials	no serious limitations[4]	no serious inconsistency[11]	no serious indirectness	serious[12]	none	6/369 (1.6%)	18/379 (4.7%)	RR 0.39 (0.16 to 0.98)[13]	29 fewer per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 40 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
								1%		6 fewer per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 8 fewer)		

[1] Both studies compared intranasal azelastine 1.12 mg/d with oral cetirizine 10 mg/d.
[2] Results do not exclude a small effect favouring cetirizine or no difference.
[3] Favouring cetirizine (control)
[4] One study was not blinded and 2 did not report if they followed intention to treat principle during the analysis.
[5] Only 1 of these 4 studies reported variability in results.
[6] Only 291 patients.
[7] The only study that reported variability in results compared intranasal levocabastine to oral loratadine and found a negligible difference between the groups of -0.02 points (95% CI: -0.27 to 0.23) on a 4-point scale, but the symptom scores in both groups were very low during whole study (average 0.7 points).

[8] In one study (blinded) the evaluation of the efficacy of treatment was done by investigators not by patients.
[9] Results do not exclude important benefit with either treatment.
[10] The only study that reported variability in results compared intranasal levocabastine to oral loratadine and found a negligible difference between the groups of -0.01 points (95% CI: -0.21 to 0.23) on a 4-point scale, but the symptom scores in both groups were very low during whole study (average 0.48 points). No other study found any difference between the two treatments.
[11] Increased somnolence with oral compared to intranasal H1-antihistamines was observed in studies that used ebastine and cetirizine. In one study that used desloratadine there was only one event of somnolence in 111 patients. However, any conclusions that desloratadine causes less somnolence that cetirizine or ebastine should not be drawn based on the results of these studies, since the comparison is indirect and there were very few events.
[12] Very few events. Results do not exclude serious harm form oral compared to intranasal H1-antihistamines or no difference.
[13] Favours intranasal H1-antihistamines

Question 15 [profile 2]

Date: 2009-03-11
Question: Should intranasal H1-antihistamines vs newer oral H1-antihistamines be used in adults with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Passali D, Piragine F. A comparison of azelastine nasal spray and cetirizine tablets in the treatment of allergic rhinitis. J Int Med Res 1994;22(1):17-23.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal H1-antihistamines	newer oral H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 8 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[2,3,4]	none	19	18	-	mean 24% lower[5]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
treatment efficacy (follow-up 8 weeks)												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[6]	very serious[4,7]	none	14/19 (73.7%)	10/18 (55.6%)	RR 1.33 (0.81 to 2.17)	183 more per 1000 (from 106 fewer to 650 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
adverse effects (somnolence) (follow-up 8 weeks)												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4,7]	none	0/19 (0%)	3/18 (16.7%)	RR 0.14 (0.01 to 2.46)[8]	143 fewer per 1000 (from 165 fewer to 243 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Authors did not report if the allocation was concealed or if they followed intention to treat principle during analysis.
[2] Authors did not report the scale of measurement so it is not possible to evaluate the magnitude of this finding.
[3] No measure of variability was reported.
[4] Only 40 patients.
[5] mean total symptom score was 24% lower in azelastine compared with cetirizine group, but authors reported neither the scale on which symptom score was measured nor the variability in these results.
[6] Efficacy was rated the investigators not patients themselves.
[7] Results do not exclude important benefit with either treatment.
[8] Favours intranasal azelastine.

Question 15 [profile 3]

Date: 2009-03-11
Question: Should intranasal H1-antihistamines vs newer oral H1-antihistamines be used in children with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Arreguin Osuna L, Garcia Caballero R, Montero Cortes MT, Ortiz Aldana I. Levocabastina contra cetirizina en niños con rinitis alergica perenne. Rev Alerg Mex 1998;45(3):7-11.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal H1-antihistamines	newer oral H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: Total Symptom Score; range of scores: 0-15; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3,4]	none	13	17	-	mean 0.54 higher (1.79 lower to 2.87 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
ocular symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: symptom score; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3,4]	none	13	17	-	mean 0.15 lower (0.64 lower to 0.34 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
adverse effects												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	–	–	–[5]	–	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Authors did not report allocation concealment or intention to treat analysis. Study was not blinded, the outcomes were assessed by the investigators.
[2] Treatment was administered for 2 weeks only. Most investigators agree that follow-up in studies in perennial allergic rhinitis should be at least 4 weeks (Krouse 2005).
[3] Results do not exclude an important benefit from either treatment.
[4] Only 30 patients.
[5] One patient in cetirizine group reported somnolence, one increase in appetite and one epistaxis. In the levocabastine group one child reported feeling of facial edema.

Question 16 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-11
Question: Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists vs placebo be used for treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Rodrigo G.J., Yanez A. The role of antileukotriene therapy in seasonal allergic rhinitis: a systematic review of randomized trials. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2006;96:779-786.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Daytime nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	2512[1]	2512[1]	-	SMD -0.24 (-0.16 to -0.33)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Night-time nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	2512[1]	2512[1]	-	SMD -0.23 (-0.16 to -0.3)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; measured with: Rhinoconjunctivitis quality of life questionnaire (RQLQ)Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	2481[2]	2481[2]	-	SMD -0.27 (-0.19 to -0.34)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Eye symptoms (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1376[3]	1376[3]	-	SMD -0.17 (-0.08 to -0.27)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[4]	publication bias[5]	0/0	0/0	not pooled[6]	not pooled[6]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

[1] Number of patients in each group was not stated. There were altogether 5024 patients in both intervention and control groups.
[2] Number of patients in each group was not stated. There were altogether 4962 patients in both intervention and control groups.
[3] Number of patients in each group was not stated. There were altogether 2753 patients in both intervention and control groups.
[4] we did not downgrade for imprecision since we already downgraded for reporting bias
[5] results were not pooled and were not reported in one study suggesting a reporting bias
[6] Adverse effects were not pooled because of insufficient information to combine the results of different studies. A low incidence of adverse effects was observed in 4 studies. Most adverse events were rated mild, and there was no difference between groups. One of the most frequently reported adverse events was headache (3%–5% of patients treated with oral leukotriene receptor antagonists).

Question 16 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-11
Question: Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists vs placebo be used in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Patel P., Philip G., Yang W., et al. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of montelukast for treating perennial allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2005;95:551-557. 2. Philip G., Williams-Herman D., Patel P., et al. Efficacy of montelukast for treating perennial llergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc, 2007;28:296-304.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Daytime nasal symptoms (change from baseline) (follow-up 6 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious	no serious imprecision	none	1632	1603	-	SMD -0.08 (-0.11 to -0.05)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Nighttime symptoms (change from baseline) (follow-up 6 weeks; measured with: 4-point scale (0 - none; 3 - severe)range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1002	990	-	mean -0.06 (-0.02 to -0.1)[1]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 6 weeks; measured with: rhinoconjunctivitis quality-of-life questionnaire range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by more)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1632	1603	-	not pooled[2]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Quality of life (% with meaningful improvement) (follow-up 6 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	570/977	514/969	RR 1.1 (1.02 to 1.19)	53 more per 1000 (from 11 more to 101 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Daytime eye symptoms (follow-up 6 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3,4]	none	630	613	-	not pooled[4]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects (Upper respiratory infection) (follow-up 6 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	63/1632	45/1603	RR 1.37 (0.94 to 2)	10 more per 1000 (from 2 fewer to 28 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects (Headache) (follow-up 6 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	61/1632	72/1603	RR 0.83 (0.6 to 1.16)	8 fewer per 1000 (from 18 fewer to 7 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects (other) (follow-up 6 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	–/1632	–/1603	not pooled[5]	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT

[1] A second trial reported only that there was no statistically significant difference between the groups
[2] change in RQLQ from baseline was -0,15 (95% CI: -0.06 to -0.24) in one study, and -0,13 (95% CI: 0.00 to -0,25) in another.
[3] one trial
[4] authors stated only that there was no difference between the groups
5 There were many different adverse effects of uncertain relation to treatment and importance to patients; it was also uncertain how many occurred per patient.

Question 16 [profile 3]
Date: 2007-08-11
Question: Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists vs placebo be used in children with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Chen S.T., Lu K.H., Sun H.L., et al. Randomized placebo-controlled trial comparing montelukast and cetirizine for treating perennial allergic rhinitis in children aged 2-6 yr. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2006;17:49-54.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Total nasal symptoms (follow-up 12 weeks; measured with: mean of eight symptoms; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none[2]	20	20	-	mean -0.32 (-0.21 to -0.43)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Night sleeping quality (follow-up 12 weeks; measured with: 0 - slept well to 3 - slept very poorly or woke up >3 times; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	20	20	-	mean -0.37 (-0.29 to -0.45)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 12 weeks; measured with: Pediatric Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire (23 items; 7-point scale each); range of scores: 0-138; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	20	20	-	mean 15.3 (5.9 to 24.7)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse events (follow-up 12 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3]	none[2]	0/20	0/20	not pooled[4]	not pooled	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Very limited data.
[2] we did not downgrade for publication bias, because we already downgraded for very serious imprecision
[3] one very small study
[4] Authors stated only that "no serious adverse events were observed".

Question 17 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-11
Question: Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists vs oral histamine H1 antagonists be used for seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Rodrigo G.J., Yanez A. The role of antileukotriene therapy in seasonal allergic rhinitis: a systematic review of randomized trials. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2006;96:779-786.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	oral histamine H1 antagonists	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Daytime and night-time nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	2481[1]	2481[1]	-	SMD 0.04 (-0.04 to 0.11) (favours H1 antagonist)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; measured with: Rhinoconjunctivitis quality of life questionnaire (RQLQ); Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	2481[1]	2481[1]	-	SMD 0.04 (-0.04 to 0.12) (favours H1 antagonist)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Eye symptoms (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1376[2]	1376[2]	-	SMD -0.02 (-0.09 to 0.13) (favours LTRA)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Adverse effects												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	reporting bias[4]	–[5]	–[5]	not pooled[5]	not pooled[5]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

[1] Number of patients in each group was not stated. There were altogether 4962 patients in both intervention and control groups.
[2] Number of patients in each group was not stated. There were altogether 2753 patients in both intervention and control groups.
[3] We did not downgrade for imprecision since we already downgraded for reporting bias.
[4] Only 3 of 5 trials reported adverse events.
[5] insufficient information to combine the results of adverse effects in different studies. A low incidence of adverse effects was observed in 4 studies. Most adverse events were rated mild, and there was no difference between groups. One of the most frequently reported adverse events was headache (3-5% of patients treated with oral leukotriene receptor antagonists).

Question 17 [profile 2]

Date: 2007-08-11
Question: Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists vs oral histamine H1 antagonists be used in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Philip G., Williams-Herman D., Patel P., et al. Efficacy of montelukast for treating perennial allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc, 2007;28:296-304.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	oral histamine H1 antagonists	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Daytime nasal symptoms (follow-up 6 weeks; measured with: four-point scale; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	630	122	-	mean 0.03 higher (0.07 lower to 0.12 higher)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Nighttime symptoms - not reported[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	630	122	-	-		CRITICAL
Daytime eye symptoms - not reported[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-[1]	none	630	122	-	-		IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not reported[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	630	122	-	-		CRITICAL
Adverse effects (follow-up 6 weeks; somnolence[2])												
1[3]	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[3,4]	serious[5]	none	5/630 (0.8%)	6/122 (4.9%)	RR 0.06 (0.02 to 0.19)	46 fewer per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 48 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Actual values not reported. Authors only stated that the difference was not statistically significant.
[2] Various other adverse events were reported, but they were rare and the difference between montelukast and cetirizine was not statistically significant for any of them. However, there was a trend towards more fatigue, dry mouth and dry nose in the cetirizine group, compared to montelukast. Quality of evidence fir these outcomes would also be low, because of indirect comparison and imprecision.
[3] Data on adverse effects were reported as pooled from two studies of montelukast in perennial allergic rhinitis (Patel 2005 and Philip 2007), but cetirizine was used in only one of them.
[4] Indirect comparison. Adverse effects in montelukast group are pooled from two studies whereas data on cetirizine are from one study only.
[5] Very few events.

Question 17 [profile 3]
Date: 2007-08-12
Question: Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists vs oral histamine H1 antagonists be used in children with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Chen S.T., Lu K.H., Sun H.L., et al. Randomized placebo-controlled trial comparing montelukast and cetirizine for treating perennial allergic rhinitis in children aged 2-6 yr. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2006;17:49-54.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	oral histamine H1 antagonists	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Total nasal symptoms (follow-up 12 weeks; measured with: mean of eight symptoms; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	20	20	-	mean 0.17 (0.02 to 0.32)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Night sleep quality (follow-up 12 weeks; measured with: 0 - slept well to 3 - slept very poorly or woke up >3 times; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	20	20	-	mean -0.13 (-0.03 to -0.23)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 12 weeks; measured with: Pediatric Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire (23 items; 7-point scale each); range of scores: 0-138; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	20	20	-	mean 0.17 (0.02 to 0.32)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse effects (follow-up 12 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none[2]	0/20	2/20[3]	Not pooled[3]	-[3]	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Small study that did not exclude no effect or a moderate effect.
[2] We did not downgrade for reporting bias, because we already downgraded for very serious imprecision
[3] Authors stated, that "only mild medication-induced sedation was noted in two of children treated with cetirizine".

Question 18
Date: 2008-12-09
Question: Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids vs no intranasal glucocorticosteroids be used in patients with allergic rhinitis?[1]
Bibliography: Penagos M., Compalati E., Tarantini F., Baena-Cagnani C.E., Passalacqua G., Canonica G.W. Efficacy of mometasone furoate nasal spray in the treatment of allergic rhinitis. Meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, clinical trials. Allergy, 2008;63:1280-1291.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal mometasone	no intranasal mometasone	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (adults) (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks; measured with: Total Nasal Symptom Score (TNSS); Better indicated by lower values)												
10[2]	randomised trials	no serious limitations[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	967	911	-	SMD 0.56 lower (0.41 to 0.71 lower)[4]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Nasal symptoms (children) (follow-up 4 weeks; measured with: Total Nasal Symptom Score (TNSS); Better indicated by lower values)												
1[5]	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[6]	none	135	136	-	SMD 0.41 lower (0.17 to 0.65 lower)[4]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Congestion (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	812	770	-	SMD 0.41 lower (0.27 to 0.56 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Rhinorrhea (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[7]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	812	770	-	SMD 0.44 lower (0.21 to 0.66 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Sneezing (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	812	770	-	SMD 0.40 lower (0.23 to 0.57 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Nasal itching (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[8]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	812	770	-	SMD 0.39 lower (0.25 to 0.53 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not reported[9]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	–	–	-	-		CRITICAL
Adverse events (follow-up 2 to 12 weeks)												
9	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	335/1041 (32.2%)	333/1031 (32.3%)	RR 0.99 (0.86 to 1.20)	3 fewer per 1000 (from 45 fewer to 65 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL[10]

[1] systematic review is available for mometasone fuorate trials only
[2] Four of these studies were done in patients with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis. Authors of the review performed a sensitivity analysis and their results showed the effect similar to the remaining studies in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis.
[3] Based on Jadad score these were high quality studies. Out of 14 studies only 3 lost to follow-up more than 10% of subjects and only one lost ~23%. Median loss to follow-up was 3.5%. Authors of the review did not report the type of analysis (intention-to-treat vs per protocol), although they stated that they used ITT data when possible.
[4] Favours mometasone
[5] This study was done in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis.
[6] Results do not exclude small or moderate effect. We did not downgrade for imprecision despite only 271 patients were studied. This evidence is consistent with the effect in adults.
[7] We did not downgrade for inconsistency, because it would not influence the decision to use or not to use mometasone. However some heterogeneity was observed (I^2 = 79%) and could not be explained by differences in population, intervention or study quality.
[8] As could be expected, the effect seemed more pronounced in patients with seasonal compared to perennial allergic rhinitis.

[9] Studies either not measured or not reported quality of life or the systematic review did not provide any information on this outcome. There are however recent studies suggesting improved quality of life in patients with rhinitis using mometasone (Bachert C, and Meltzer E.O. Effect of mometasone furoate nasal spray on quality of life of patients with acute rhinosinusitis. Rhinology. 2007 Sep;45:190-196).
[10] There is some uncertainty about the importance of adverse effects, since authors of the systematic review did not report what they were. However, they commented that "epistaxis, headache, and pharyngitis were the most common adverse effects".

Question 19 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-13
Question: Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids vs oral H1-antihistamines be used in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Long A., McFadden C., DeVine D., Chew P., Kupelnick B., Lau J. (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality). Management of Allergic and Nonallergic Rhinitis. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 54 (Prepared by New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-97-0019). 2002. 2. Kaszuba S.M., Baroody F.M., deTineo M., Haney L., Blair C., Naclerio R.M. Superiority of an intranasal corticosteroid compared with an oral antihistamine in the as-needed treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Arch Intern Med, 2001;161:2581-2587.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intranasal glucocorticosteroids	oral H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 14 to 60 days; Better indicated by less)												
8	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1,2]	none	0[3]	0[3]	-	not pooled[1,4]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 14 to 60 days; measured with: Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire; range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by more)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1,2]	none	0[3]	0[3]	-	not pooled[1,5]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Adverse events												
8	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[6]	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	0/0[3]	0/0[3]	not pooled[7]	not pooled[7]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] No systematic review available. Results were not pooled.
[2] No overall estimate of the effect.
[3] There were 1788 patients altogether in all 8 trials
[4] Seven studies favoured intranasal glucocorticosteroids over oral H1-antihistamines, and one favoured oral H1-antihistamine. On average the effect was moderate.
[5] Patients in the intranasal corticosteroid group reported statistically significantly better scores in the selected domains and overall score of RQLQ.
[6] Studies have reported form 0 to 40% incidence of headaches. Other side effects were also inconsistent.
[7] There were no major adverse effects reported in the included studies. Minor adverse effects were headache and pharyngitis that were inconsistent across the studies. In one study that used chlorpheniramine sedation and dry mouth were most frequently reported adverse effects of an oral H1-antihistamine.

Question 19 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-13
Question: Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids vs oral H1-antihistamines be used in adults with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Rinne J., Simola M., Malmberg H., Haahtela T. Early treatment of perennial rhinitis with budesonide or cetirizine and its effect on long-term outcome. J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2002;109:426-432.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal glucocorticosteroids	oral H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 12 months; measured with: 3 symptoms on 6-point scale (0 = no symptoms; 5 = very severe symptoms)range of scores: 0-15; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	71	72	-	WMD -1.08 (-1.72 to -0.44)[3]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Eye symptoms (measured with: 6-point scale (0 = no symptoms; 5 = very severe symptoms)range of scores: 0-5; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2,4]	none	71	72	-	WMD 0.31 (0 to 0)[4]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Quality of Life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		
viral upper respiratory tract infections (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	48/71	52/72	RR 0.94 (0.75 to 1.16)[5]	43 fewer per 1000 (from 116 fewer to 180 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Blood in nasal secretion (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	19/71	9/72	RR 2.14 (1.04 to 4.41)	143 more per 1000 (from 5 more to 426 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
conjunctivitis (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	8/71	5/72	RR 1.62 (0.56 to 4.72)[5]	43 more per 1000 (from 30 fewer to 257 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Headache												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	6/71	1/72	RR 6.08 (0.75 to 49.27)[5]	71 more per 1000 (from 3 fewer to 676 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Sinusitis												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	2/71	1/72	RR 2.03 (0.19 to 21.87)[5]	14 more per 1000 (from 11 fewer to 292 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Allocation concealment unknown; randomised; ITT conducted; adequate follow-up;
[2] One small study.
[3] The percentage of rhinitis-free days was also higher in the budesonide group (45.1%) compared to cetirizine group (25.9%).
[4] Authors stated only that there was no important difference between the groups in eye symptoms.
[5] The confidence interval crosses no difference and does not rule out a small increase with glucocorticosteroids

Question 19 [profile 3]
Date: 2007-08-13
Question: Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids vs oral H1-antihistamines be used in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Settings: home
Bibliography: Bender B.G., Milgrom H. Comparison of the effects of fluticasone propionate aqueous nasal spray and loratadine on daytime alertness and performance in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2004;92:344-349.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal glucocorticosteroids	oral H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: 5-point scale (0 - very little; 4 - very much) [1]range of scores: 0-4; Better indicated by more)												
1[2]	randomised trial	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	serious[1,4]	serious[5,6]	none	20[7]	20[7]	-	WMD 0.55 (0.17 to 0.93)[8,9]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: Adolescent Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire; range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by less)												
1[2]	randomised trial	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	serious[6]	none	20[7]	20[7]	-	WMD 0 (0 to 0)[10]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Memory (follow-up 22 days; measured with: California Verbal Learning Test® "Children's Version[11]; Better indicated by more)												
1[2]	randomised trial	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	serious[11,12]	serious[6,11]	none	20[7]	20[7]	-	WMD 4.25 (-0.71 to 9.21)[9]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse events - not reported[13]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		

[1] Parents were rating the symptoms answering the question: How do you feel that the study drug has controlled your child's allergic rhinitis symptoms in the last week?
[2] Children were 8-17 year old.
[3] Allocation concealment, ITT, and follow-up not reported; outcomes poorly reported
[4] Parents were rating the symptoms of their 8-17 year old children.
[5] results do not exclude important benefit from intranasal glucocorticosteroid or a negligible difference.
[6] one small trial
[7] Exact numbers of children in each group were not stated. There were 60 children altogether randomised into 3 groups.
[8] The confidence interval crosses no difference and does not rule out a small increase with glucocorticosteroids
[9] 95% CI was estimated with an assumption of 20 children in each group.
[10] Overall score not provided; individual scores all not statistically significantly different between groups.
[11] no information on the interpretation of the results measured with a used scale
[12] There is serious uncertainty about the real-life meaning of the results of the used scale
[13] Adverse events were measured in the trial but not reported in the results

Question 19 [profile 4]
Date: 2007-08-13
Question: Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids vs oral H1-antihistamines be used in children with perennial allergic rhinitis?
Settings: home
Bibliography: Fokkens W.J., Scadding G.K. Perennial rhinitis in the under 4s: a difficult problem to treat safely and effectively? A comparison of intranasal fluticasone propionate and ketotifen in the treatment of 2-4-year-old children with perennial rhinitis. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2004;15:261-266.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal glucocorticosteroids	oral H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms - daytime score (follow-up 6 weeks; measured with: parent assessment of symptoms[1]; Better indicated by less)												
1[2]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3]	none	11	12	-	WMD -1.90 (-3.56 to -0.24)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Nasal symptoms - night time scores (follow-up 6 weeks; measured with: parent assessment of symptoms[1]; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3]	none	11	12	-	WMD -2.30 (-4.24 to -0.36)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of Life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		
Adverse events (follow-up 6 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	serious[4,5]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3,4]	none	0/11	0/12	RR 0 (0 to 0)[4]		⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] no description of the scale was provided
[2] Children were 2 to 4 years old
[3] one very small trial
[4] Authors stated only that there were no reports of serious adverse events. The incidence of adverse events that were assessed as being related to the drug treatment was very low and with no statistical difference between the groups.
[5] poorly reported

Question 19 [profile 5] and **question 21** [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-13
Question: Should intranasal glucocorticosteroids vs combined oral H1-antihistamines plus oral leukotriene receptor antagonists be used in patients with allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Rodrigo G.J., Yanez A. The role of antileukotriene therapy in seasonal allergic rhinitis: a systematic review of randomized trials. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2006;96:779-786.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intranasal glucocorticosteroids	combined oral H1-antihistamines plus oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	134[3]	134[3]	-	SMD -0.23 (-0.6 to 0.13)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Nasal congestion (follow-up 2 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[4]	no serious indirectness	very serious[5]	none	134[3]	134[3]	-	SMD -0.97 (-1.92 to -0.01)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not reported[6]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
Adverse events - not reported[7]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		

[1] Two of the 5 trials had Jadad score of 2.
[2] There is possibility of no difference or a moderately better effect of intranasal glucocorticosteroids.
[3] Authors did not provide the number of patients per group. There were altogether 268 patients in all 5 studies.
[4] There was very serious heterogeneity in results (I^2 = 88%) due to two studies being of low methodological quality.
[5] There is possibility of no difference or a large benefit with intranasal glucocorticosteroids.
[6] Quality of life was not reported in the review. There was insufficient information in the individual trials.
[7] Authors of the review did not mention if adverse events were reported in individual studies.

Question 20 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-07-18
Question: Should intranasal corticosteroids vs intranasal H1-antihistamines be used in patients with allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Yanez A, Rodrigo GJ. Intranasal corticosteroids versus topical H1 receptor antagonists for the treatment of allergic rhinitis: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 2002;89(5):479-84.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intranasal corticosteroids	intranasal H1-antihistamines	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Total nasal symptom score (follow-up 2 to 6 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[1]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0[2]	0[2]	-	SMD -0.36 (-0.14 to -0.57)[1]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Sneezing (follow-up 2 to 8 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
7	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0[4]	0[4]	-	SMD -0.41 (-0.24 to -0.57)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Rhinorrhea (follow-up 2 to 8 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0[5]	0[5]	-	SMD -0.47 (-0.29 to -0.64)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Itching (follow-up 2 to 6 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0[6]	0[6]	-	SMD -0.38 (-0.19 to -0.56)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Nasal blockage (follow-up 6 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0	0	-	SMD -0.86 (-0.64 to -1.07)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Nasal congestion (follow-up 2 and 8 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	serious[7]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[8]	none	0[9]	0[9]	-	SMD -0.01 (-0.56 to 0.53)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Ocular symptoms (Better indicated by less)												
4		no serious limitations	serious[10]	no serious indirectness	serious[11]	none	0[12]	0[12]	-	SMD -0.07 (0.12 to -0.27)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not measured[13]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	-	-	-	-		CRITICAL
Adverse effects[14]												
4	randomised trial	-	-	-	-	none	-	-	not pooled	not pooled	-	IMPORTANT

[1] Five high quality studies showed substantial decrease in total nasal symptom score compared with the one study of low quality (SMD: -0.42, 95% CI: 0.63 to 0.20 vs 0.55, 95% CI: 0.53 to 1.62). Five studies among patients with seasonal rhinitis showed slightly more benefit than the one study of patients with perennial rhinitis (SMD: -0.38, 95% CI: -0.64 to -0.13 vs -0.33, 95% CI: -0.73 to 0.07).
[2] Total number of participants in the 6 studies was 346
[3] One small (n = 14) and methodologically weak study showed different effect that the other studies.
[4] Total number of participants in these studies was 594
[5] Total number of participants in these studies was 523
[6] Total number of participants in these studies was 460
[7] Two small studies with Jadad score of 2.
[8] 95% confidence interval includes appreciable benefit from both treatments.
[9] Total number of participants in these studies was 52

[10] There was significant heterogeneity, with two studies showing greater benefit from intranasal corticosteroids (both used azelastine as comparator) and two showing the opposite (both used levocabastine as comparator).
[11] If studies comparing different H1-antihistamines were considered separately there may have been an appreciable benefit from intranasal corticosteroids compared to azelastine.
[12] Total number of participants in these studies was 428
[13] None of the studies measured quality of life.
[14] Authors stated only that a low incidence of adverse effects was observed and there was no difference between groups; most adverse events were rated as mild or moderate, and the most frequently reported adverse events were respiratory symptoms, headache, epistaxis, and taste perversion with intranasal H1-antihistamine.

Question 21 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-11
Question: Should oral leukotriene receptor antagonists vs intranasal glucocorticosteroids be used for allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Rodrigo G.J., Yanez A. The role of antileukotriene therapy in seasonal allergic rhinitis: a systematic review of randomized trials. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2006;96:779-786.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral leukotriene receptor antagonists	intranasal glucocorticosteroids	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Daytime nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	414[3]	414[3]	-	SMD 0.41 (0.27 to 0.56) (favours steroids)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Night-time nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	414[3]	414[3]	-	SMD 0.33 (0.18 to 0.48) (favours steroids)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
Adverse effects - not reported[4]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		IMPORTANT

[1] Jadad score of both trials was 2.
[2] 95% CI around SMD did not exclude small and negligible effect or a moderate and possibly clinically important effect.
[3] Number of patients in each group was not stated. There were altogether 767 patients in both intervention and control groups.
[4] Adverse effects were not pooled because only one study reported them. Authors of the review did not report any adverse events of intranasal glucocorticosteroids.

Question 23
Date: 2007-08-14
Question: Should intramuscular glucocorticosteroids be used for seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Østergaard M.S., Østrem A., Söderström M. Hay fever and a single intramuscular injection of corticosteroids: a systematic review. Primary Care Resp J, 2005;14:123-130.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	intramuscular glucocorticosteroids	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Symptoms of allergic rhinitis (vs placebo in randomised trials) (measured with: global satisfaction scale[1]Better indicated by more)												
5	randomised trial	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	none	128[4]	128[4]	-	not pooled[3]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Clinical side effects (vs placebo in randomised trials)												
4	randomised trial	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	–/128[4]	–/128[4]	not pooled[6]	not pooled[6]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Physiological side effects (vs placebo in randomised trials)												
1[7]	randomised trial	serious[8]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	–/47[10]	–/47[10]	–[11]	–	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Symptoms of allergic rhinitis (vs intranasal corticosteroids in randomised trials) (follow-up 3 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by more)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[12]	no serious indirectness	serious[12,13]	none	24	25	-	not pooled[12]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] In all studies the clinical effect was rated on different scales, i.e. either as "no symptoms, slight or moderate symptoms, severe symptoms", or "restored/improved or unimproved" or using an "excellent, good, poor or none effect" scale. Specific symptoms such as nasal blockage, nasal itching and eye symptoms were measured by grading them and by counting the occurrence.
[2] Not explicitly assessed in the review, but studies were conducted between 1960 and 1988 rising high possibility of lower methodological quality.
[3] All studies showed statistically significant and large effect with i.m. glucocorticosteroids lasting from the second day after injection until 3-5 weeks.
[4] Exact numbers in each group were not provided. There was altogether 257 patients in both groups in all 5 trials.
[5] Only 5 trials with few events.
[6] All reported clinical side effects were considered minor. There were no statistically significant differences in side effects between the groups, not even in one study with patients being given three consecutive i.m. injections of metylprednisolone 80 mg at weekly intervals.
[7] Only one of 5 studies measured physiological side effects.
[8] Not explicitly assessed in the review, but study was conducted in 1960 rising high possibility of lower methodological quality.
[9] There is a high uncertainty about directness of physiological side effects.
[10] Exact numbers in each group were not provided. There was altogether 95 patients in both groups in this trial.
[11] Glycosuria was observed in 1 of 90 patients. Weight and blood pressure were unaffected.
[12] Single injection of intramuscular glucocorticosteroid (2 or 5 mg betamediasone disodium phosphate or 80 mg methylprednisolone) proved to be importantly superior to intranasal beclomethasone 100 µg twice daily in one study, and equally effective when compared to intranasal budesonide 400 µg once daily (with increased use of supplementary medicines in the nasal steroid group).
[13] Two small trials with few patients.

Question 28
Date: 2007-08-23
Question: Should oral decongestant vs placebo be used for seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Bronsky E, Boggs P, Findlay S, et al. Comparative efficacy and safety of a once-daily loratadine-pseudoephedrine combination versus its components alone and placebo in the management of seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 1995;96(2):139-47. 2. Storms WW, Bodman SF, Nathan RA, et al. SCH 434: a new antihistamine/decongestant for seasonal allergic rhinitis. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 1989;83(6):1083-90. 3. Dockhorn RJ, Williams BO, Sanders RL. Efficacy of acrivastine with pseudoephedrine in treatment of allergic rhinitis due to ragweed. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 1996;76(2):204-8. 4. Williams BO, Hull H, McSorley P, Frosolono MF, Sanders RL. Efficacy of acrivastine plus pseudoephedrine for symptomatic relief of seasonal allergic rhinitis due to mountain cedar. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol. 1996;76(5):432-8.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral decongestant	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal and eye symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: Total nasal and non-nasal symptom scores; Better indicated by less)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[1]	serious[2]	no serious imprecision[3]	none	708	564	-	not pooled[4,5]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Response to treatment (physician evaluation) (follow-up 2 weeks)												
1[6]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[7]	serious[8]	none	98/201	81/207	RR 1.24 (1 to 1.56)	94 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 219 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		
Adverse event leading to discontinuation of treatment (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[9]	none	17/331	3/324	RR 5.39 (1.59 to 18.34)	40 more per 1000 (from 5 more to 156 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Treatment failure leading to discontinuation (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8,9]	none	12/331	23/324	RR 0.52 (0.26 to 1.03)	34 fewer per 1000 (from 2 fewer to 53 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Any adverse event (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2[10]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	very serious[2,11]	no serious imprecision	none	188/139	331/324	RR 1.32 (1.13 to 1.54)	327 more per 1000 (from 133 more to 552 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Insomnia (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[9]	none	38/331	3/324	RR 10.41 (1.8 to 60.3)	85 more per 1000 (from 7 more to 534 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Headache (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[12]	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	68/331	81/324	RR 0.75 (0.42 to 1.32)	62 fewer per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 145 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Dry mouth (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[9]	none	29/331	10/324	RR 2.83 (1.4 to 5.72)	57 more per 1000 (from 12 more to 146 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

[1] All trials showed more reduction in symptoms with pseudoephedrine compared to placebo, but none provided information, if the difference was statistically significant
[2] In all trials patients used pseudoephedrine regularly twice (60 or 120 mg per dose) or 4 times (60 mg per dose) daily for 2 weeks
[3] we did not downgrade for imprecision because there seemed to be a consistent effect showing small benefit
[4] No trial provided a measure of variation in symptom scores
[5] Results were not pooled. Overall effect could not be estimated. Mean symptom scores in pseudoephedrine group were numerically smaller than in placebo group.
[6] second study reported a mean score in physician evaluation; it was 3.0 in placebo and 2.7 in pseudoephedrine groups (p
[7] There is uncertainty how physician's global evaluation of treatment response relates to patient importance
[8] results include no effect or a large effect
[9] very few events

[10] remaining two studies reported adverse events the way it was not possible to estimate the difference between pseudoephedrine and placebo
[11] there is uncertainty if all adverse event were related to treatment and how important they were to patients
[12] one trial showed unusual proportion of patient with headache in placebo group
[13] results do not exclude important benefit or important harm

Question 29 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-23
Question: Should combination of oral H1-antihistamine and decongestant vs oral H1-antihistamine alone be used for seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: McCrory D.C., Williams J.W., Dolor R.J., Gray R.N., Kolimaga J.T., Reed S., Sundy J., Witsell D.L. Management of allergic rhinitis in the working-age population. Evid Rep Technol Assess (Summ), 2003; 67 :1-4.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	combination of oral H1-antihistamine and decongestant	oral H1-antihistamine alone	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal and non-nasal symptoms (follow-up 2 weeks; Better indicated by more)												
7[1]	randomised trial	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	none	1100	1099	-	SMD 0.23 (0.15 to 0.32)[4]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 3 to 15 days; Better indicated by less)												
8	randomised trial	no serious limitations[5]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	none	1115	1114	-	SMD 0.33 (0.24 to 0.41)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		
Adverse effects (follow-up 3 to 14 days)												
12	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[6]	no serious indirectness[7]	no serious imprecision[8]	none[8]	0/0[9]	0/0[9]	not pooled[9]	not pooled[9]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] There were 11 studies altogether that reported total symptom score, but six studies were excluded from the analysis, because of study duration of less than 2 weeks (2 studies -- showed essentially similar symptom scores in the groups, but no formal statistical tests were reported) or effect size could not be calculated (4 studies -- all showed that an antihistamine-decongestant combination was superior to antihistamine alone for reducing symptoms).
[2] 6 studies did not describe allocation concealment, and 3 did not describe ITT
[3] Consistent small effect
[4] For 3 studies that used non-sedating H1-antihistamine SMD was 0.16 (95% CI: 0.03 to 0.29)
[5] 6 trials did not describe concealment, and 5 did not describe ITT
[6] Reporting was inconsistent, sometimes giving number of total events per group sometimes reporting each type of adverse event in detail with variability between studies.
[7] In all trials drugs were administered regularly, not "as needed"
[8] We did not downgrade, since we already downgraded for inconsistency.
[9] there were altogether over 2700 patients. Adverse events were reported in all studies but one. Reporting was inconsistent, sometimes giving number of all event per group sometimes reporting each type of adverse event in detail. Overall headache seemed the most common adverse event reported in both groups. Commonly reported in H1-antihistamine group was somnolence, and in combination group: dry mouth, insomnia, and also somnolence.

Question 29 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-23
Question: Should combination of oral desloratadine and pseudoephedrine vs oral desloratadine alone be used for seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Chervinsky P., Nayak A., Rooklin A., Danzig M. Efficacy and safety of desloratadine/pseudoephedrine tablet, 2.5/120 mg two times a day, versus individual components in the treatment of patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis. Allergy Asthma Proc, 2005;26:391-396. 2. Pleskow W., Grubbe R., Weiss S., Lutsky B. Efficacy and safety of an extended-release formulation of desloratadine and pseudoephedrine vs the individual components in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2005;94:348-354. 3. Schenkel E., Corren J., Murray J.J. Efficacy of once-daily desloratadine/pseudoephedrine for relief of nasal congestion. Allergy Asthma Proc, 2002;23:325-330.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	combination of oral desloratadine and pseudoephedrine	oral desloratadine alone	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal and non-nasal symptoms (excluding congestion) (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: 7 symptoms rated on a 4-point scale; range of scores: 0-21; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[1]	none	586	586	-	WMD -1.15 (-1.57 to -0.72)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Nasal congestion (follow-up 2 weeks; measured with: 4-point scale; range of scores: 0-3; Better indicated by less)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[2]	none	922	926	-	not pooled[3]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		
Adverse events (follow-up 2 weeks)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	306/922	222/926	RR 1.45 (0.99 to 2.14)	108 more per 1000 (from 2 fewer to 274 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Dry mouth (follow-up 2 weeks)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	67/922	22/926	RR 2.97 (1.84 to 4.78)	47 more per 1000 (from 20 more to 91 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Insomnia (follow-up 2 weeks)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	54/922	10/926	RR 5.27 (2.7 to 10.3)	47 more per 1000 (from 19 more to 102 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Somnolence (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none[6]	24/708	12/712	RR 1.97 (0.99 to 3.95)	16 more per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 50 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Headache (follow-up 2 weeks)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	47/922	44/926	RR 1.06 (0.71 to 1.58)	3 more per 1000 (from 14 fewer to 28 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Fatigue (follow-up 2 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none[6]	15/708	17/712	RR 0.93 (0.34 to 2.51)	2 fewer per 1000 (from 16 fewer to 36 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

[1] Results include only small effect.

[2] Small consistent change.
[3] No measure of variation was provided, but mean change from baseline was 0.2 points in all studies.
[4] results do not exclude no effect or a serious increase in adverse events
[5] Very few events.
[6] One study did not report this outcome.

Question 31 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-07-16
Question: Should sodium cromoglycate vs placebo be used for seasonal allergic rhinitis and symptoms of conjunctivitis?
Settings: Canada, Philippines, Northern Ireland, Italy, and the Netherlands
Bibliography: Owen C.G., Shah A., Henshaw K., Smeeth L., Sheikh A. Topical treatments for seasonal allergic conjunctivitis: systematic review and meta-analysis of efficacy and effectiveness. Br J Gen Pract, 2004;54:451-456.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	sodium cromoglycate	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Conjunctivitis symptoms (all trials) (follow-up 1 to 4 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
8	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[1]	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	reporting bias[2]	0[3]	0[3]	-	not pooled[4]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Patient perceived benefit (all trials)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[5]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[2]	108/152	42/164	OR 17.2 (3.8 to 78.4)	920 more per 1000 (from 404 more to 1000 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Patient perceived benefit (seasonal allergic rhinitis only)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[2]	85/95	32/106	RR 3.4 (1.57 to 7.34)[6]	725 more per 1000 (from 172 more to 1000 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Patient perceived benefit (chronic conjunctivitis) (follow-up 4 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	23/57	15/58	RR 1.56 (0.91 to 2.67)	145 more per 1000 (from 23 fewer to 433 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured[8]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		
Adverse effects												
0	no evidence available					none	0/0	0/0	not pooled	not pooled		

[1] It was not possible to assess, because mean scores or measures of accuracy were not reported in the trials.
[2] Trials reporting marked and statistically significant benefits of active treatment over placebo were mostly small. One of two formal tests for publication bias was statistically significant.
[3] Number of patients not reported in the review.
[4] Not pooled. Five studies reported an improvement in symptoms while using topical sodium cromoglycate preparations whereas the remaining three trials found no difference in symptoms between treatment groups. An additional trial published after the systematic review was done (James 2003) also found important improvement in symptoms compared to placebo. Symptoms were: itching, burning, soreness, and lacrimation.
[5] Pooled trials were heterogeneous. One trial that showed least effect was performed in patients with chronic conjunctivitis.
[6] Because event rates were high, presentation of the results as relative risk is more informative than as an odds ratio.
[7] results include no effect or large effect
[8] Outcome was not measured in the included studies

Question 31 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-07-23
Question: Should nedocromil sodium vs placebo be used in patients with allergic rhinitis and symptoms of conjunctivitis?
Bibliography: Owen C.G., Shah A., Henshaw K., Smeeth L., Sheikh A. Topical treatments for seasonal allergic conjunctivitis: systematic review and meta-analysis of efficacy and effectiveness. Br J Gen Pract, 2004;54:451-456.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	nedocromil sodium	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Conjunctivitis symptoms (itching, burning, soreness, lacrimation) (follow-up 4 to 9 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[1]	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	283	273	-	not pooled[2]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Patient perceived benefit (all trials) (follow-up 4 to 9 weeks)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	175/283	130/273	OR 1.8 (1.3 to 2.6)	241 more per 1000 (from 101 more to 414 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Patient perceived benefit (adults) (follow-up 4 to 9 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	123/207	81/203	RR 1.49 (1.22 to 1.82)	196 more per 1000 (from 88 more to 327 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Patient perceived benefit (children) (follow-up mean 4 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	24/32	19/32	RR 0.98 (0.79 to 1.21)	12 fewer per 1000 (from 125 fewer to 125 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured[4]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		
Adverse effects												
0	no evidence available					none	0/0	0/0	not pooled	not pooled		

[1] It was not possible to assess, because trials were not pooled.
[2] The differences were statistically significant in three of the studies and of borderline significance in the two studies.
[3] There was moderate heterogeneity in the results with one large study conducted in children showing no effect.
[4] Outcome was not measured in the included studies

Question 31 [profile 3]
Date: 2007-07-24
Question: Should Iodoxamide vs placebo be used in patients with allergic rhinitis and symptoms of conjunctivitis?
Bibliography: Owen C.G., Shah A., Henshaw K., Smeeth L., Sheikh A. Topical treatments for seasonal allergic conjunctivitis: systematic review and meta-analysis of efficacy and effectiveness. Br J Gen Pract, 2004;54:451-456.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Iodoxamide	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
symptoms requiring additional treatment (follow-up 4 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	2/14	11/13	RR 0.17 (0.05 to 0.5)	702 fewer per 1000 (from 423 fewer to 804 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		
Adverse effects (follow-up 4 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	0/14	0/13	RR 0 (0 to 0)[2]		⊕⊕OO LOW	

[1] One small trial (n = 27)
[2] No side effects associated with use of the active treatment were reported.

Question 32
Date: 2007-09-06
Question: Should subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy vs placebo be used in adults with allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Calderon M., Alves B., Jacobson M., Hurwitz B., Sheikh A., Durham S. Allergen injection immunotherapy for seasonal allergic rhinitis. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online), 2007:CD001936.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	subcutaneous allergen specific immunotherapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Symptoms (recorded in diary) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
15[2]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency [3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	597	466	-	SMD -0.73 (-0.97 to -0.5)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Medication score (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
13	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency [3]	serious[4]	no serious imprecision	none	549	414	-	SMD -0.57 (-0.33 to -0.82)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
symptom and medication score (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
8	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[4]	no serious imprecision	none	320	297	-	SMD -0.48 (-0.29 to -0.67)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
9[6]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	serious[3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	396	276	-	SMD -1.59 (-0.89 to -2.29)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Bronchial symptoms (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
5[7]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency [3]	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	266	163	-	SMD -0.59 (-0.11 to -1.06)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Ocular symptoms (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
3[8]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	226	119	-	SMD -1.80 (-0.31 to -3.28)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Global improvement (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
9[9]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	–[10]	no serious indirectness	–[10]	none	0	0	-	not pooled[9]		IMPORTANT
Quality of life (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	332	239	-	SMD -0.52 (-0.34 to -0.69)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Adverse events (local reaction not requiring treatment) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1])												
24	randomised trial	no serious limitations	–[10]	no serious indirectness	–[10]	none	–/907[11]	–/697[12]	not pooled	not pooled		IMPORTANT
Adverse events (local reaction requiring treatment) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1])												
7	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	–/208[14]	–/186[15]	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Adverse events (early mild systemic reaction [< 30 minutes]) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years; assessed with: mild systemic reactions[16])												
17	randomised trial	no serious limitations	–[10]	no serious indirectness	–[10]	none	–/706[17]	–/566[18]	not pooled	not pooled		CRITICAL
Adverse events (early severe systemic reaction [< 30 minutes]) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; assessed with: non life-threatening systemic reactions[19])												
13	randomised trial	no serious limitations	–[10]	no serious indirectness	–[10]	none	–/615[20]	–/463[21]	not pooled	not pooled		CRITICAL

Adverse events (early life-threatening systemic reaction [< 30 minutes]) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1]; assessed with: anaphylactic shock[22])												
9	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	–/417[23]	–/303[24]	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Adverse events late systemic reaction [>30 minutes]) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years[1])												
11	randomised trial	no serious limitations	–[10]	no serious indirectness	–[10]	none	–/514[25]	–/412[26]	not pooled	not pooled		CRITICAL
Adverse events (systemic reaction - severity and time of onset not specified)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	–/142[27]	–/63[28]	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Adverse events (adrenaline use) (follow-up 3 days to 3 years)												
13	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	–[29]	–[30]	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Death - not reported[31]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	–	–	–	-	-		IMPORTANT

[1] Duration of maintenance treatment and the period of follow-up varied considerably between studies, largely reflecting pre-seasonal, co-seasonal and post-seasonal administration.
[2] 16 further studies measured symptom scores, but did not provide enough information to allow pooling the results. All 16 favoured the intervention group.
[3] There was large heterogeneity in results, but exclusion of an outlying study would not change the conclusion.
[4] There is uncertainty to what extent use of medications expressed as "medication score" reflects a patient-important outcome.
[5] Results include large and small effect.
[6] Seven of the eight studies not included in the meta-analysis, favoured the intervention group.
[7] Eight of the ten studies not included in the meta-analysis favoured the intervention group.
[8] Six of the nine studies not included in the meta-analysis favoured the intervention group.
[9] All nine studies favoured the intervention group.
[10] Not assessed. Without pooled estimate it was not possible to assess the consistency or precision of the results.
[11] 834 events
[12] 227 events
[13] Very few events.
[14] 21 events
[15] 8 events
[16] Mild rhinitis and/or asthma (peak expiratory flow rates over 60% of predicted or of the personal best values) responding adequately to antihistamines or inhaled beta2-agonists.
[17] 154 events
[18] 44 events
[19] Urticaria, angioedema, or severe asthma (PEFR under 60% of predicted or of personal best values) responding well to treatment.
[20] 43 events
[21] 3 events
[22] Rapidly evoked reaction of itching, flushing, erythema, bronchial obstruction, etc. requiring intensive treatment.
[23] 3 events
[24] one event
[25] 458 events
[26] 148 events
[27] 12 events
[28] no events
[29] 19 events per 14,085 injections
[30] One event per 8278 injections.
[31] No fatal events were reported in any of the studies included in this systematic review.

Question 33
Date: 2008-12-11
Question: Should subcutaneous immunotherapy be used in children with allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Röder E., Berger M.Y., de Groot H., van Wijk R.G. Immunotherapy in children and adolescents with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: a systematic review. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2008;19:197-207.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	subcutaneous immunotherapy	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 1 to 36 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
6	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	none	229	230	-	not pooled[2,4]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Development of asthma (follow-up 5 years)												
1	randomised trials	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[6]	none	15/75 (20%)	29/67 (43.3%)	RR 0.46 (0.27 to 0.77)	234 fewer per 1000 (from 100 fewer to 316 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not measured[7]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	–	–	-	-	—	CRITICAL
Adverse effects (follow-up 1 to 36 months)												
5	randomised trials	very serious[1,8]	no serious inconsistency[9]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	–	–	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Non-life threatening systemic adverse events (based on studies in adults)												
13	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[10]	no serious imprecision	none	43/615 (7%)[11]	3/463 (0.6%)[11]	not pooled[12]	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Anaphylactic shock (based on studies in adults)												
9	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[10]	serious[13]	none	3/417 (0.7%)	1/303 (0.3%)	not pooled[14]	not pooled	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Adrenaline use for systemic reaction (based on studies in adults)												
13	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[10]	no serious imprecision	none	19/14085 (0.1%)[15]	1/8278 (0%)[15]	RR 11.17 (1.9 to 65.58)	1 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 8 more)[15]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] Only 2 trials reported concealment of allocation, groups were not similar at the start of any of the studies, 3 studies attempted to blind at least patients, caregivers or outcome assessors, one reported an intention-to-treat analysis, and 2 lost to follow-up more than 20% of patients. Reporting of the results was poor.
[2] Two trials "demonstrated efficacy" and four did not.
[3] We did not downgrade for imprecision, because it was not possible to assess it without meta-analysis, and we already downgraded for inconsistency.
[4] Results were not pooled because "description of the various scores was often insufficient as for instance information on the range and composition of the score was lacking. Different point estimates (e.g. mean or ranks) were presented and the measures of variability (e.g. SD or 95% CI) were not always stated"
[5] Post-hoc subgroup analysis.
[6] Small trial with small number of events.
[7] Quality of life was not investigated in any of the included studies.
[8] Data on adverse events were presented in 5/6 trials. Adverse effects were poorly reported and the definitions of an adverse event were often unclear. Local side-effects were more frequently reported in the intervention groups. Systemic side-effects (e.g. asthma) were rare and mild. Systemic anaphylactic reactions did not occur.
[9] We did not downgrade for inconsistency or imprecision since they were impossible to assess. We already downgraded the quality of evidence to low because of very serious limitations in design, execution or reporting of outcomes.
[10] Extrapolated from trials in adults (Calderon M. et al. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2007:CD001936).
[11] Most studies reported number of adverse events, rather than the number of participants in which one or more adverse events were observed.

[12] Authors of the systematic review did not combine the results of individual studies. However, under the assumption that all these events were independent (i.e. each event occurred in a different patient) and not taking into consideration the weight of individual studies, the estimated effect would be: RR 10.79 (95% CI: 3.59 to 32.7) and a corresponding absolute difference would be 63 more per 1000 (95% CI: from 17 more to 205 more).
[13] Very few events.
[14] Authors of the systematic review did not combine the results of individual studies. However, under the assumption that all these events were independent (i.e. each event occurred in a different patient) and not taking into consideration the weight of individual studies, the estimated effect would be: RR 2.18 (95% CI: 0.31 to 15.18) and a corresponding absolute difference would be 4 more per 1000 (95% CI: from 12 less to 18 more).
[15] number of events per number of injections

Question 34 [profile 1]

Date: 2009-01-08
Question: Should sublingual specific immunotherapy be used in adults with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Andre C., Perrin-Fayolle M., Grosclaude M., Couturier P., Basset D., Cornillon J., Piperno D., Girodet B., Sanchez R., Vallon C., Bellier P., Nasr M. A double-blind placebo-controlled evaluation of sublingual immunotherapy with a standardized ragweed extract in patients with seasonal rhinitis. Evidence for a dose-response relationship. Int Arch Allergy Immunol, 2003;131:111-118. 2. Ariano R., Spadolini I., Panzani R.C. Efficacy of sublingual specific immunotherapy in Cupressaceae allergy using an extract of Cupressus arizonica. A double blind study. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 2001;29:238-244. 3. Bowen T., Greenbaum J., Charbonneau Y., Hebert J., Filderman R., Sussman G., Del Carpio J., Gold M., Keith P., Moote W., Cecchetto S., Cecchetto O., Sharp D., Broutin O., Andre C. Canadian trial of sublingual swallow immunotherapy for ragweed rhinoconjunctivitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2004;93:425-430. 4. Casanovas M., Guerra F., Moreno C., Miguel R., Maranon F., Daza J.C. Double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial of preseasonal treatment with allergenic extracts of Olea europaea pollen administered sublingually. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol, 1994;4:305-314. 5. Clavel R., Bousquet J., Andre C. Clinical efficacy of sublingual-swallow immunotherapy: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of a standardized five-grass-pollen extract in rhinitis. Allergy, 1998;53:493-498. 6. Dahl R., Kapp A., Colombo G., de Monchy J.G., Rak S., Emminger W., Rivas M.F., Ribel M., Durham S.R. Efficacy and safety of sublingual immunotherapy with grass allergen tablets for seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2006;118:434-440. 7. Dahl R., Stender A., Rak S. Specific immunotherapy with SQ standardized grass allergen tablets in asthmatics with rhinoconjunctivitis. Allergy, 2006;61:185-190. 8. D'Anneo R.W., Arena A., Gammeri E., Bruno M.E., Falagiani P., Riva G., Leonardi S., La Rosa M. Parietaria sublingual allergoid immunotherapy with a co-seasonal treatment schedule. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 2008;36:79-84. 9. de Blay F., Barnig C., Kanny G., Purohit A., Leynadier F., Tunon de Lara J.M., Chabane H., Guerin L. Sublingual-swallow immunotherapy with standardized 3-grass pollen extract: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2007;99:453-461. 10. Di Rienzo V., Pucci S., D'Alo S., Di Cara G., Incorvaia C., Frati F., Romano A. Effects of high-dose sublingual immunotherapy on quality of life in patients with cypress-induced rhinitis: A placebo-controlled study. Clinical and Experimental Allergy Reviews, 2006;6:67-70. 11. Drachenberg K.J., Pfeiffer P., Urban E. Sublingual Immunotherapy - Results from a multi-centre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study with a standardised birch and grass/rye pollen extract. Allergologie, 2001;24:525-534. 12. Durham S.R., Yang W.H., Pedersen M.R., Johansen N., Rak S. Sublingual immunotherapy with once-daily grass allergen tablets: a randomized controlled trial in seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2006;117:802-809. 13. Feliziani V., Lattuada G., Parmiani S., Dall'Aglio P.P. Safety and efficacy of sublingual rush immunotherapy with grass allergen extracts. A double blind study. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 1995;23:224-230. 14. Hordijk G.J., Antvelink J.B., Luwema R.A. Sublingual immunotherapy with a standardised grass pollen extract; a double-blind placebo-controlled study. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 1998;26:234-240. 15. Horiguchi S., Okamoto Y., Yonekura S., Okawa T., Yamamoto H., Kunii N., Sakurai D., Fujimura T., Nakazawa K., Yasueda H. A randomized controlled trial of sublingual immunotherapy for Japanese cedar pollinosis. Int Arch Allergy Immunol, 2008;146:76-84. 16. Khinchi M.S., Poulsen L.K., Carat F., Andre C., Hansen A.B., Malling H.J. Clinical efficacy of sublingual and subcutaneous birch pollen allergen-specific immunotherapy: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, double-dummy study. Allergy, 2004;59:45-53. 17. Marogna M., Spadolini I., Massolo A., Canonica G.W., Passalacqua G. Randomized controlled open study of sublingual immunotherapy for respiratory allergy in real-life: clinical efficacy and more. Allergy, 2004;59:1205-1210. 18. Marogna M., Spadolini I., Massolo A., Canonica G.W., Passalacqua G. Clinical, functional, and immunologic effects of sublingual immunotherapy in birch pollinosis: a 3-year randomized controlled study. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2005;115:1184-1188. 19. Marogna M., Spadolini I., Massolo A., Zanon P., Berra D., Chiodini E., Canonica W.G., Passalacqua G. Effects of sublingual immunotherapy for multiple or single allergens in polysensitized patients. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2007;98:274-280. 20. Moreno-Ancillo A., Moreno C., Ojeda P., Dominguez C., Barasona M.J., Garcia-Cubillana A., Martin S. Efficacy and quality of life with once-daily sublingual immunotherapy with grasses plus olive pollen extract without updosing. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol, 2007;17:399-405. 21. Mosges R., Bruning H., Hessler H.J., Gotz G., Knaussmann H.G. Sublingual immunotherapy in pollen-induced seasonal rhinitis and conjunctivitis: a randomized controlled trial. Acta Dermatovenerol Alp Panonica Adriat, 2007;16:143-148. 22. Okubo K., Gotoh M., Fujieda S., Okano M., Yoshida H., Morikawa H., Masuyama K., Okamoto Y., Kobayashi M. A randomized double-blind comparative study of sublingual immunotherapy for cedar pollinosis. Allergol Int, 2008;57:265-275. 23. Palma-Carlos A.G., Santos A.S., Branco-Ferreira M., Pregal A.L., Palma-Carlos M.L., Bruno M.E., Falagiani P., Riva G. Clinical efficacy and safety of preseasonal sublingual immunotherapy with grass pollen carbamylated allergoid in rhinitic patients. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 2006;34:194-198. 24. Passalacqua G., Albano M., Riccio A., Fregonese L., Puccinelli P., Parmiani S., Canonica G.W. Clinical and immunologic effects of a rush sublingual immunotherapy to Parietaria species: A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1999;104:964-968. 25. Pokladnikova J., Krcmova I., Vlcek J. Economic evaluation of sublingual vs subcutaneous allergen immunotherapy. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2008;100:482-489. 26. Pradalier A., Basset D., Claudel A., Couturier P., Wessel F., Galvain S., Andre C. Sublingual-swallow immunotherapy (SLIT) with a standardized five-grass-pollen extract (drops and sublingual tablets) versus placebo in seasonal rhinitis. Allergy, 1999;54:819-828. 27. Purello-D'Ambrosio F., Gangemi S., Isola S., La Motta N., Puccinelli P., Parmiani S., Savi E., Ricciardi L. Sublingual immunotherapy: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial with Parietaria judaica extract standardized in mass units in patients with rhinoconjunctivitis, asthma, or both. Allergy, 1999;54:968-973. 28. Purello-D'Ambrosio F., Ricciardi L., Isola S., Savi E., Parmiani S., Puccinelli P., Musarra A. Rush sublingual immunotherapy in Parietaria allergic patients. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 1996;24:146-151. 29. Rak S., Yang W.H., Pedersen M.R., Durham S.R. Once-daily sublingual allergen-specific immunotherapy improves quality of life in patients with grass pollen-induced allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: a double-blind, randomised study. Qual Life Res, 2007;16:191-201. 30. Sabbah A., Hassoun S., Le Sellin J., Andre C., Sicard H. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial by the sublingual route of immunotherapy with a standardized grass pollen extract. Allergy, 1994;49:309-313. 31. Sambugaro R., Puccinelli P., Burastero S.E., Di Rienzo V. The efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy for respiratory allergy is not affected by different dosage regimens in the induction phase. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 2003;31:329-337. 32. Smith H., White P., Annila I., Poole J., Andre C., Frew A. Randomized controlled trial of high-dose sublingual immunotherapy to treat seasonal allergic rhinitis. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2004;114:831-837. 33. Torres Lima M., Wilson D., Pitkin L., Roberts A., Nouri-Aria K., Jacobson M., Walker S., Durham S. Grass pollen sublingual immunotherapy for seasonal rhinoconjunctivitis: a randomized controlled trial. Clin Exp Allergy, 2002;32:507-514. 34. Troise C., Voltolini S., Canessa A., Pecora S., Negrini A.C. Sublingual immunotherapy in Parietaria pollen-induced rhinitis: a double-blind study. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol, 1995;5:25-30. 35. Voltolini S., Modena P., Minale P., Bignardi D., Troise C., Puccinelli P., Parmiani S. Sublingual immunotherapy in tree pollen allergy. Double-blind, placebo-controlled study with a biologically standardised extract of three pollens (alder, birch and hazel) administered by a rush schedule. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 2001;29:103-110. 36. Worm M. Efficacy and tolerability of high dose sublingual immunotherapy in patients with rhinoconjunctivitis. Eur Ann Allergy Clin Immunol, 2006;38:355-360.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	sublingual specific immunotherapy	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up median 6 months[1]; range of scores: 0-0; Better indicated by lower values)												
22	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency[3]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1108	1100	-	SMD 0.43 lower (0.28 to 0.58 lower)[4]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Ocular symptoms (follow-up median 7 months[5]; Better indicated by lower values)												
8	randomised trials	serious[6]	no serious inconsistency[7]	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	597	616	-	SMD 0.26 lower (0.06 to 0.46 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Medication use (follow-up median 7 months[5]; Better indicated by lower values)												
13	randomised trials	serious[6,9]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	712	704	-	SMD 0.32 lower (0.19 to 0.46 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Symptom-medication score (follow-up 4 to 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[11]	none	99	51	-	SMD 0.49 lower (0.14 to 0.84 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of life (follow-up median 7 months[12])												
7	randomised trials	serious[13]	no serious inconsistency[14]	no serious indirectness	serious[15]	none	445	435	-	not pooled[15]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Serious adverse effects (follow-up median 7 months[1])												
36	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0/2253 (0%)	0/1906 (0%)	not pooled[16]	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Withdrawal due to adverse effect (follow-up median 7 months[1])												
25	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	70/1691 (4.1%)	16/1430 (1.1%)	RR 2.91 (1.72 to 4.92)	21 more per 1000 (from 8 more to 44 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Oral pruritus or burning (follow-up median 7 months[1])												
19	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	strong association[17]	481/1304 (36.9%)	73/1152 (6.3%)	RR 4.92 (3.16 to 7.67)	248 more per 1000 (from 137 more to 423 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Oral oedema (follow-up median 8 months[1,18])												
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[19]	very strong association[20]	113/763 (14.8%)	4/702 (0.6%)	RR 11.47 (4.66 to 28.24)	60 more per 1000 (from 21 more to 155 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Gastrointestinal adverse effects (follow-up median 7 months[1]; nausea, vomiting, stomach upset, diarrhoea)												
9	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[21]	none	40/482 (8.3%)	10/413 (2.4%)	RR 2.85 (1.44 to 5.65)	45 more per 1000 (from 11 more to 113 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] The duration of maintenance treatment and the period of follow up varied considerably between studies, largely reflecting pre-seasonal, co-seasonal and perennial administration. Range of follow-up was 1 to 48 months.
[2] Most studies did not report if they followed intention-to-treat principle; no study reported concealment of allocation. In 7 studies 10-20% patients withdrew prematurely and in 3 -- between 20% and 40%.
[3] There was some inconsistency in the results, but when one study that included 50% patients with perennial rhinitis was excluded, the results were consistent.
[4] In the analysis we included 6 studies that did not provide variability in results; we took variability from unpublished data included in a systematic review done by Wilson and colleagues in 2003. Excluding these studies from current analysis would not change the results (SMD: -0.42, 95% CI: -0.25 to -0.59).
[5] Range: 3.5 to 18 months.
[6] In all studies but one between 10% and 20% of patients withdrew from the study. Majority of studies did not report following intention-to-treat principle and was analysed per-protocol.
[7] There was some inconsistency in results, but removing the studies with extreme results did not substantially change the estimate of effect.
[8] Results do not exclude a moderate effect on no difference.
[9] In seven studies 10-20% of patients withdrew from the study, and in 2 withdrew more than 20%. Majority of studies did not report following intention-to-treat principle and two were analysed per-protocol.
[10] No study reported intent-to-treat analysis; one study was not blinded, and in one 28% did not complete treatment.

[11] Only 150 patients. Results do not exclude a small or a large effect.
[12] Range: 4 to 36.
[13] Five of seven studies did not report if they followed intention -to-treat principle during the analysis. One study was not blinded and one did not report blinding. In one study 38% of patients did not complete treatment. Outcomes were poorly reported.
[14] Only 2 studies reported variability in results. Other studies described their results as either improved QoL with SLIT or no difference. We did not downgrade for inconsistency, since we already downgraded for limitations in design and execution and for imprecision.
[15] Three of seven studies reported statistically significant improvement in quality of life, however, they reported their results in a way that precluded combining their results. Two studies found an improvement that was statistically not significant, but did not report variability. Two studies found no difference: one did not report what were the results and the other found almost no change in score from baseline in both SLIT and placebo groups.
[16] There were no serious adverse observed in any of the studies.
[17] Lower confidence limit was 3.16.
[18] Range: 4 to 24 months.
[19] Only 117 events.
[20] Lower confidence limit was 4.66
[21] Only 50 events.

Question 34 [profile 2]

Date: 2009-03-21
Question: Should sublingual immunotherapy vs placebo be used in adults with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Alvarez-Cuesta E, Berges-Gimeno P, Gonzalez-Mancebo E, Fernandez-Caldas E, Cuesta-Herranz J, Casanovas M. Sublingual immunotherapy with a standardized cat dander extract: evaluation of efficacy in a double blind placebo controlled study. Allergy 2007;62(7):810-7. 2. Guez S, Vatrinet C, Fadel R, Andre C. House-dust-mite sublingual-swallow immunotherapy (SLIT) in perennial rhinitis: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Allergy 2000;55(4):369-75. 3. Mungan D, Misirligil Z, Gurbuz L. Comparison of the efficacy of subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy in mite-sensitive patients with rhinitis and asthma--a placebo controlled study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 1999;82(5):485-90. 4. Nelson HS, Oppenheimer J, Vatsia GA, Buchmeier A. A double-blind, placebo-controlled evaluation of sublingual immunotherapy with standardized cat extract. J Allergy Clin Immunol 1993;92(2):229-36. 5. Passalacqua G, Albano M, Fregonese L, Riccio A, Pronzato C, Mela GS, et al. Randomised controlled trial of local allergoid immunotherapy on allergic inflammation in mite-induced rhinoconjunctivitis. Lancet 1998;351(9103):629-32. 6. Passalacqua G, Pasquali M, Ariano R, Lombardi C, Giardini A, Baiardini I, et al. Randomized double-blind controlled study with sublingual carbamylated allergoid immunotherapy in mild rhinitis due to mites. Allergy 2006;61(7):849-54. 7. Sanchez Palacios A, Schamann F, Garcia JA. [Sublingual immunotherapy with cat epithelial extract. Personal experience]. Allergol Immunopathol (Madr) 2001;29(2):60-5. 8. Tonnel AB, Scherpereel A, Douay B, Mellin B, Leprince D, Goldstein N, et al. Allergic rhinitis due to house dust mites: evaluation of the efficacy of specific sublingual immunotherapy. Allergy 2004;59(5):491-7.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	sublingual immunotherapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (house dust mite) (follow-up 12 to 24 months[1]; Better indicated by lower values)												
5	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	89	84	-	SMD 0.82 lower (0.24 to 1.4 lower)[4]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Nasal symptoms (cat) (follow-up 3 to 12 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency[6]	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	53	55	-	SMD 1.68 lower (0.12 to 3.23 lower)[8]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 24 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[9]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[10]	none	28	28	-	not pooled[11]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Serious adverse effects (follow-up 3 to 24 months[1])												
6[12]	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0/171 (0%)	0/169 (0%)	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Oral pruritus/burning/oedema												
4[12,13]	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[14]	none	5/76 (6.6%)	1/74 (1.4%)	RR 2.31 (0.53 to 10.09)	18 more per 1000 (from 6 fewer to 123 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] Four of five studies of SLIT for house dust mites lasted for 24 months, only one followed patients for 12 months. Two studies of SLIT for cat followed patients for 12 months and one for 3 months.
[2] Only one study reported following intent-to-treat analysis. No study reported concealment of allocation. In one study 44% did not complete treatment.
[3] Only 173 patients. Estimate of the effect does not exclude a very large or small effect.
[4] One study reported implausibly small variability in results; if it were excluded the effect size would be -0.54, 95% CI: -0.09 to -0.99. Another study reported the results as a graph only; using the end-of study results overestimates the effect seen during the study; if this study were also excluded the effect size would be -0.39, 95% CI: -0.79 to 0.01. One study reported its results as change score; mean difference between SLIT and placebo group was -2.17 points (95% CI: -1.14 to -3.20) on a 13-point scale.
[5] One study reported only the results of per-protocol analysis and other two did not report if they followed the intention-to-treat principle. No study reported concealment of allocation. In one study 34% did not complete treatment.
[6] One study showed much larger effect than the other two, but it was due to extremely small variability in results caused by all patients in control group been classified in one category.
[7] Only 108 patients. Results do not exclude a very large or a very small effect.
[8] If one study with extremely small variability because of too few categories in the scale used to measure the outcome were excluded, the effect size would be -0.74, 95% CI: -0.27 to -1.22.
[9] method of analysis was not reported and 18% did not complete treatment. Only one study with poor reporting of this outcome.

[10] Only one study with 56 patients. No measure of variability in results.
[11] Authors did not report a summary score or any variability in the results. They stated that ‘there was no statistical change in all the domains of the SF-36 questionnaire at the six time points, and all the scores were quite high’.
[12] Two studies did not mention adverse effects at all.
[13] Studies in patients allergic to cat dander did not mention adverse effects at all.
[14] Only 6 events. Results do not exclude a very large harm or no effect.

Question 35 [profile 1]

Date: 2009-03-23
Question: Should sublingual immunotherapy vs placebo be used in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Bufe A., Eberle P., Franke-Beckmann E., Funck J., Kimmig M., Klimek L., Knecht R., Stephan V., Tholstrup B., Weisshaar C., Kaiser F. Safety and efficacy in children of an SQ-standardized grass allergen tablet for sublingual immunotherapy. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2009;123:167-173 e167. 2. Bufe A., Ziegler-Kirbach E., Stoeckmann E., Heidemann P., Gehlhar K., Holland-Letz T., Braun W. Efficacy of sublingual swallow immunotherapy in children with severe grass pollen allergic symptoms: a double-blind placebo-controlled study. Allergy, 2004;59:498-504. 3. Caffarelli C., Sensi L.G., Marcucci F., Cavagni G. Preseasonal local allergoid immunotherapy to grass pollen in children: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial. Allergy, 2000;55:1142-1147. 4. La Rosa M., Ranno C., Andri C., Carat F., Tosca M.A., Canonica G.W. Double-blind placebo-controlled evaluation of sublingual-swallow immunotherapy with standardized Parietaria judaica extract in children with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1999;104:425-432. 5. Marogna M., Tomassetti D., Bernasconi A., Colombo F., Massolo A., Businco A.D., Canonica G.W., Passalacqua G., Tripodi S. Preventive effects of sublingual immunotherapy in childhood: an open randomized controlled study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2008;101:206-211. 6. Novembre E., Galli E., Landi F., Caffarelli C., Pifferi M., De Marco E., Burastero S.E., Calori G., Benetti L., Bonazza P., Puccinelli P., Parmiani S., Bernardini R., Vierucci A. Coseasonal sublingual immunotherapy reduces the development of asthma in children with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2004;114:851-857. 7. RÃ¶der E., Berger M., Hop W., Bernsen R., d-Groot H., Gerth-van-Wijk R. Sublingual immunotherapy with grass pollen is not effective in symptomatic youngsters in primary care. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2007;119:892-898. 8. Rolinck-Werninghaus C., Wolf H., Liebke C., Baars J.C., Lange J., Kopp M.V., Hammermann J., Leupold W., Bartels P., Gruebl A., Bauer C.P., Schnitker J., Wahn U., Niggemann B. A prospective, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled multi-centre study on the efficacy and safety of sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT) in children with seasonal allergic rhinoconjunctivitis to grass pollen. Allergy, 2004;59:1285-1293. 9. Valovirta E., Jacobsen L., Ljorring C., Koivikko A., Savolainen J. Clinical efficacy and safety of sublingual immunotherapy with tree pollen extract in children. Allergy, 2006;61:1177-1183. 10. Wahn U., Tabar A., Kuna P., Halken S., Montagut A., de Beaumont O., Le Gall M. Efficacy and safety of 5-grass-pollen sublingual immunotherapy tablets in pediatric allergic rhinoconjunctivitis. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 2009;123:160-166 e163. 11. WÃ¼thrich B., Bucher C., Jorg W., Bircher A., Eng P., Schneider Y., Schnyder F., Eigenmann P., Senti G. Double-blind, placebo-controlled study with sublingual immunotherapy in children with seasonal allergic rhinitis to grass pollen. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol, 2003;13:145-148. 12. Yuksel H., Tanac R., Gousseinov A., Demir E. Sublingual immunotherapy and influence on urinary leukotrienes in seasonal pediatric allergy. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol, 1999;9:305-313.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	sublingual immunotherapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up median 21 months[1]; Better indicated by lower values)												
12	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	558	554	-	SMD 0.27 lower (0.15 to 0.37 lower)[3]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Development of asthma (follow-up 3 years)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	8/45 (17.8%)	18/44 (40.9%)	RR 0.43 (0.21 to 0.87)	233 fewer per 1000 (from 53 fewer to 323 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (children) (follow-up 24 months; measured with: Pediatric Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire; range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[6]	serious[7]	no serious indirectness[8]	serious[9]	none	30	26	-	MD 0.30 higher (0.14 lower to 0.74 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (adolescents) (follow-up 24 months; measured with: Adolescent Rhinoconjunctivitis Quality of Life Questionnaire; range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[6]	serious[7]	no serious indirectness[8]	serious[9]	none	56	47	-	MD 0.40 lower (0.95 lower to 0.15 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Ocular symptoms (follow-up median 12 months[10]; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[11]	no serious indirectness	serious[12]	none	208	206	-	SMD 0.18 lower (0.44 lower to 0.08 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Medication use (follow-up median 12 months[1]; Better indicated by lower values)												
6	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	387	390	-	SMD 0.21 lower (0.07 to 0.35 lower)[14]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Serious adverse effects (follow-up median 24 months[1])												
7	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	0/516 (0%)	0/500 (0%)	not pooled[15]	not pooled[15]	⊕⊕⊕⊕	IMPORTANT

	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision						HIGH	
Withdrawal due to adverse effects (follow-up median 24 months[16])												
8	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[17]	none	19/620 (3.1%)	8/543 (1.5%)	RR 2.07 (0.89 to 4.84)	16 more per 1000 (from 2 fewer to 57 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Oral prutitus/oedema (follow-up median 18 months[16])												
5	randomised trials	serious[18]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	strong association[19]	157/446 (35.2%)	38/438 (8.7%) 2%[20]	RR 4.03 (1.64 to 9.93)	263 more per 1000 (from 56 more to 775 more) 61 more per 1000 (from 13 more to 179 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL

[1] Range: 3 to 36 months.
[2] Only 4 of 12 studies reported following intention-to-treat principle; none reported concealment of allocation, and on average 12% of children withdrew prematurely from these studies.
[3] The results did not change substantially if we included two studies that enrolled children with asthma (and/or allergic rhinitis) that also measured nasal symptoms (SMD: -0.26, 95% CI: -0.14 to -0.38). Three studies did not report variability in their results, but we obtained it from unpublished data included in the systematic review by M. Penagos and colleagues (2006); when we excluded these studies the results also did not change substantially (SMD: -0.23, 95% CI: -0.09 to -0.37).
[4] Randomisation, concealment of allocation, and type of analysis (intention-to-treat or per protocol) were not described, no blinding, 21% lost to follow-up.
[5] One small study. Very few events.
[6] Subgroup analysis.
[7] Results pointed opposite directions in children and in adolescents.
[8] Some experts consider the dosing of SLIT in this study inadequate, however, the authors do not share this view.
[9] Few patients. Results do not exclude important benefit or harm.
[10] Range: 3 to 32 months.
[11] There was inconsistency with results, but could be explained by one study (Caffarelli 2000) explicitly including patients with allergic conjunctivitis. This study showed a larger effect (ES: -0.68, 95% CI: -0.07 to -1.29) than the other three studies together (SMD: -0.11, 95% CI: -0.32 to 0.09). Inclusion of one additional study that enrolled children with asthma some of whom had also rhinitis did not substantially change the results (SMD: -0.18, 95% CI: -0.39 to 0.03).
[12] Results do not exclude a moderate benefit with SLIT or no difference.
[13] Results do not exclude small benefit with SLIT or no effect.
[14] Including two additional studies that enrolled children with asthma, of whom some also had rhinitis, did not change the results (SMD: -0.23, 95% CI: -0.06 to -0.39).
[15] There were no serious adverse events related to the treatment in these studies.
[16] Range: 5 to 36 months.
[17] Results do not exclude appreciable harm with SLIT or no difference.
[18] Most studies poorly reported this and other adverse effects (e.g. stating the total number of events in the study but not reporting in which group they occured).
[19] Lower confidence limit is 1.64 and all plausible biases as well as the results from studies in adults suggest that the effect is larger than estimated.
[20] A low (2%) assumed baseline risk was estimated based on 2 most recent studies included in the analysis.

Question 35 [profile 2]

Date: 2009-03-23
Question: Should sublingual immunotherapy vs placebo be used in children with perennial/persistent allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Hirsch T., Sahn M., Leupold W. Double-blind placebo-controlled study of sublingual immunotherapy with house dust mite extract (D.pt.) in children. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 1997;8:21-27. 2. Marcucci F., Sensi L., Di Cara G., Salvatori S., Bernini M., Pecora S., Burastero S.E. Three-year follow-up of clinical and inflammation parameters in children monosensitized to mites undergoing sub-lingual immunotherapy. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2005;16:519-526. 3. Tari M.G., Mancino M., Monti G. Efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy in patients with rhinitis and asthma due to house dust mite. A double-blind study. Allergologia et immunopathologia, 1990;18:277-284. 4. Tseng S.H., Fu L.S., Nong B.R., Weng J.D., Shyur S.D. Changes in serum specific IgG4 and IgG4/ IgE ratio in mite-sensitized Taiwanese children with allergic rhinitis receiving short-term sublingual-swallow immunotherapy: a multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol, 2008;26:105-112.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	sublingual immunoterapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 6 to 12 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
4[1]	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	54	54	-	SMD 0.02 higher (0.36 lower to 0.4 higher)[4]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Ocular symptoms (follow-up 18 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[6]	none	30	28	-	not pooled[7]	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Medication use - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		IMPORTANT
Serious adverse effects (follow-up 6 to 18 months)												
2	randomised trials	serious[8]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0/64 (0%)	0/65 (0%)	not pooled[9]	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Withdrawal due to adverse effects (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[11]	none	1/15 (6.7%)	0/15 (0%)	RR 3.0 (0.13 to 68.26)	0 more per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 0 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
								1%[12]		20 more per 1000 (from 9 fewer to 673 more)		
Oral pruritus/oedema (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[13]	none	5/15 (33.3%)	1/15 (6.7%)	RR 5.0 (0.66 to 37.87)	267 more per 1000 (from 23 fewer to 2458 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
								2%[14]		80 more per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 737 more)		

[1] All trials included children allergic to house dust mite.
[2] Only one study properly reported results. One study did not report variability; one reported large baseline imbalance in symptoms, despite randomisation, that overestimated the treatment effect; one had serious errors in labelling the results on the graphs that involve making critical assumptions in order to interpret the results.
[3] Results do not exclude a small benefit or no effect.
[4] One additional study (Tari 1990) including 58 patients (SLIT= 30, placebo = 28) reported results in a way that their interpretation involves many assumptions. It reported the results on a graph with variability labelled as standard deviation (SD). However, SD of this little magnitude is very implausible (compared to variability in other similar studies) and there were errors in labelling the graphs. Assuming the measure of variability was really a SD (very implausible, showing an effect size an order of magnitude larger than any other study) the pooled estimate across all 4 studies would be SMD: -0.43 (95% CI: -1.50 to 0.63). Assuming an error in labelling and the reported measure of variability was actually a standard error (SE) the pooled estimate would be SMD: -0.12 (95% CI: -0.42 to 0.19) and the results would be consistent across all 4 studies.

[5] One small study that did not report concealment of allocation or intent-to-treat analysis. reporting of outcomes was ambiguous.
[6] One small study. Results do not exclude a plausible benefit or no effect.
[7] The only study that reported ocular symptoms had important flaws in reporting that require critical assumptions in order to interpret its results. The difference between the groups was 0.74 point on a 22-point scale, which shows a small difference likely not important to patients (assuming a difference of 1.5 on a 22-point scale would be a minimal important difference). Point estimate favoured SLIT. The precision of this estimate is uncertain, but irrespective of the assumptions it was not statistically significant.
[8] Only two of four studies reported measuring serious adverse effects.
[9] There were no serious adverse effects in two studies that reported measuring them.
[10] Only one study reported measuring this outcome.
[11] One very small study, only one event, but results do not exclude an important harm.
[12] Assumed risk based on the event rate among children receiving placebo in studies of seasonal allergens.
[13] One small study. Very few events, but results do not exclude important harm.
[14] A low (2%) assumed baseline risk was estimated based on 2 most recent studies of SLIT in children allergic to seasonal allergens.

Question 36 [profile 1]

Date: 2009-02-24
Question: Should local nasal immunotherapy (LNIT) vs placebo or usual care be used in adults with allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Andri L., Senna G., Andri G., Dama A., Givanni S., Betteli C., Dimitri G., Falagiani P., Mezzelani P. Local nasal immunotherapy for birch allergic rhinitis with extract in powder form. Clin Exp Allergy, 1995;25:1092-1099. 2. Andri L., Senna G., Betteli C., Givanni S., Andri G., Dimitri G., Falagiani P., Mezzelani P. Local nasal immunotherapy with extract in powder form is effective and safe in grass pollen rhinitis: a double-blind study. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1996;97:34-41. 3. Andri L., Senna G., Betteli C., Givanni S., Andri G., Falagiani P. Local nasal immunotherapy for Dermatophagoides-induced rhinitis: efficacy of a powder extract. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1993;91:987-996. 4. Andri L., Senna G.E., Betteli C., Givanni S., Andri G., Falagiani P., Lugo G. Local nasal immunotherapy in allergic rhinitis to Parietaria. A double-blind controlled study. Allergy, 1992;47:318-323. 5. Ariano R., Panzani R.C., Chiapella M., Augeri G., Falagiani P. Local intranasal immunotherapy with allergen in powder in atopic patients sensitive to Parietaria officinalis pollen. J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol, 1995;5:126-132. 6. Ascione E., De Lucia A., Imperiali M., Varricchio A., Motta G. Nasal application of immunotherapy. Chem Immunol Allergy, 2003;82:89-98. 7. Bertoni M., Cosmi F., Bianchi I., Di Berardino L. Clinical efficacy and tolerability of a steady dosage schedule of local nasal immunotherapy. Results of preseasonal treatment in grass pollen rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 1999;82:47-51. 8. Cirla A.M., Sforza N., Roffi G.P., Alessandrini A., Stanizzi R., Dorigo N., Sala E., Della Torre F. Preseasonal intranasal immunotherapy in birch-alder allergic rhinitis. A double-blind study. Allergy, 1996;51:299-305. 9. D'Amato G., Lobefalo G., Liccardi G., Cazzola M. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of local nasal immunotherapy in allergic rhinitis to Parietaria pollen. Clin Exp Allergy, 1995;25:141-148. 10. Fanales-Belasio E., Ciofalo A., Zambetti G., Ansotegui I.J., Scala E., Paganelli R., Filiaci F. Intranasal immunotherapy with Dermatophagoides extract: in vivo and in vitro results of a double-blind placebo-controlled trial. Rhinology, 1995;33:126-131. 11. Gaglani B., Borish L., Bartelson B.L., Buchmeier A., Keller L., Nelson H.S. Nasal immunotherapy in weed-induced allergic rhinitis. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 1997;79:259-265. 12. Johansson S.G., Deuschl H., Zetterstrom O. Use of glutaraldehyde-modified timothy grass pollen extract in nasal hyposensitisation treatment of hay fever. Int Arch Allergy Appl Immunol, 1979;60:447-460. 13. Motta G., Passali D., De Vincentiis I., Ottaviani A., Maurizi M., Sartoris A., Pallestrini E., Motta S., Salzano F.A. A multicenter trial of specific local nasal immunotherapy. Laryngoscope, 2000;110:132-139. 14. Nickelsen J.A., Goldstein S., Mueller U., Wypych J., Reisman R.E., Arbesman C.E. Local intranasal immunotherapy for ragweed allergic rhinitis. I. Clinical response. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1981;68:33-40. 15. Passalacqua G., Albano M., Ruffoni S., Pronzato C., Riccio A.M., Di Berardino L., Scordamaglia A., Canonica G.W. Nasal immunotherapy to Parietaria: evidence of reduction of local allergic inflammation. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine, 1995;152:461-466. 16. Schumacher M.J., Pain M.C. Intranasal immunotherapy and polymerized grass pollen allergens. Allergy, 1982;37:241-248. 17. Taylor G., Shivalkar P.R. Local nasal desensitization in allergic rhinitis. Clin Allergy, 1972;2:125-136.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	local nasal immunotherapy (LNIT)	placebo or usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (seasonal rhinitis) (follow-up median 4 months[1]; Better indicated by lower values)												
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency[3]	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	72	72	-	SMD 1.33 lower (0.38 to 2.28 lower)[5]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Nasal symptoms (perennial rhinitis due to house dust mite) (follow-up 3 and 12 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency[6]	no serious indirectness	very serious[7]	none	21	20	-	SMD 0.95 lower (2.98 lower to 1.08 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Patient rating as improved (seasonal rhinitis) (follow-up 4 months[1])												
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	88/114 (77.2%)	43/104 (41.3%)	RR 1.79 (1.21 to 2.65)	327 more per 1000 (from 87 more to 682 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Patient rating as improved (perennial rhinitis due to house dust mite) (follow-up 8 to 12 months)												
3	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	serious[9]	no serious indirectness	serious[10]	none	61/68 (89.7%)	14/61 (23%)	RR 3.73 (0.78 to 17.8)	627 more per 1000 (from 50 fewer to 3856 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Ocular symptoms (seasonal rhinitis) (follow-up median 3.5 months[11]; Better indicated by lower values)												
5	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency[12]	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	57	54	-	SMD 0.64 lower (1.31 lower to 0.02 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL

Medication use (seasonal rhinitis) (follow-up median 3 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[14]	none	43	41	-	SMD 0.72 lower (0.27 to 1.16 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Serious adverse effects (follow-up median 4 months[1])												
9	randomised trials	no serious limitations[15]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0/143 (0%)	0/137 (0%)	not pooled[16]	not pooled[16]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Withdrawal due to adverse effect (follow-up median 5 months)												
12	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[17]	none	5/193 (2.6%)	3/179 (1.7%)	RR 1.23 (0.38 to 4.00)	4 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 50 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Local adverse effects (follow-up median 5 months)												
6	randomised trials	serious[18]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[19]	none	28/64 (43.8%)	6/67 (9%)	RR 3.29 (1.45 to 7.47)	205 more per 1000 (from 40 more to 579 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Range: 1.5 to 8 months.
[2] No study reported allocation concealment or following intention-to-treat principle, however, most studies were done before year 2000 when reporting of methods was less rigorous.
[3] There was serious inconsistency in the results, but it could be explained by very large effect of one study that reported its results on a graph and end-of-study values clearly overestimated the treatment effect. Another study reported its results as a composite of nasal and ocular symptoms. If these two studies were excluded from analysis the results did not change substantially (SMD: -1.21, 95% CI: -0.78 to -1.64).
[4] Only 144 patients.
[5] However, studies reported that symptoms were higher in LNIT group during the treatment phase.
[6] We did not downgrade for inconsistency since there were only two studies that differed by length of follow-up and we already downgraded for imprecision.
[7] Only 41 patients and results do not exclude a large benefit or no effect.
[8] Only 218 patients; results do not exclude a very small effect and improvement was observed in 40% of patients receiving placebo.
[9] One study showed no difference and two studies showed large improvement.
[10] Results do not exclude a very large benefit or no difference.
[11] Range: 1.5 to 5 months.
[12] There was serious inconsistency in the results, but it could be explained by very large effect of one study that reported its results on a graph and end-of-study values overestimated the treatment effect. If this study was excluded from analysis the results would be SMD: -0.37 (95% CI: -0.85 to 0.11).
[13] Only 111 patients and results do not exclude a large effect or no difference.
[14] Only 84 patients.
[15] Only 50% of studies reported measuring this outcome, but we assumed that if serious adverse effects occurred they would be reported.
[16] There were no serious adverse effects in these studies.
[17] Very few events, but results do not exclude a 5% absolute increase in risk.
[18] Only 35% of studies reported measuring this outcome.
[19] Only 34 events.

Question 36 [profile 2]

Date: 2009-02-24
Question: Should local nasal immunotherapy (LNIT) vs placebo (or usual treatment) be used in children with allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: Röder E, Berger MY, de Groot H, Gert van Wijk R. Immunotherapy in children and adolescents with allergic rhinoconjunctivitis: a systematic review. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2008;19(3):197-207.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	local nasal immunotherapy (LNIT)	placebo (or usual treatment)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Nasal symptoms (follow-up 3 to 18 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	82	71	-	not pooled[4]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Ocular symptoms (Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	very serious[5]	serious[6]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	0	0	-	not pooled	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0 (0%)	0/0 (0%)	-	-		CRITICAL
Adverse effects (Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	82[7]	71[7]	-	not pooled	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Allocation was not concealed and ITT analysis not mentioned in any study. Baseline imbalance in prognostic factors was noted in 3 of 4 studies. Primary outcome was not stated in 3/4 studies. Outcomes were poorly reported.
[2] We did not downgrade for inconsistency, because we already downgraded for limitations in design and for imprecision and no meta-analysis was possible (3/4 studies did not report variability in results). However, all studies found "positive effect on symptoms".
[3] We downgraded for imprecision, because of few participants (154) and no information on variability in results in 3/4 studies.
[4] No meta-analysis was possible (3/4 studies did not report variability in results). However, all studies found "positive effect on symptoms". One study that reported variability in results did not clearly specify the measurement scale so it was possible to calculate effect size only (ES: -3.10, 95% CI: -1.90 to -4.30; n=26). Another study reported that patients rated their symptoms as "benefit from treatment" and those receiving LNIT were 3 times more likely to benefit (RB: 3.00, 95% CI: 1.33 to 6.75).
[5] Allocation was not concealed and ITT analysis not mentioned in any study. Baseline imbalance in prognostic factors was noted in 2 of 3 studies. Primary outcome was not stated in any study. Outcomes were poorly reported.
[6] We downgraded for inconsistency, because one study showed a decrease in symptoms, one did not, and the results of the third were discordant between two groups that received different allergens.
[7] Adverse effects were reported inconsistently and qualitatively. The definition of an adverse event was often unclear (e.g. one trial stated that no side-effects occurred, but some patients suffered from nasal complaints after the LNIT application). Two studies reported that there were no serious adverse effects.

Question 42 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-27
Question: Should oral H1-antihistamines be used for symptoms of asthma in adults with concomitant allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Aaronson D.W. Evaluation of cetirizine in patients with allergic rhinitis and perennial asthma. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 1996;76:440-446. 2. Baena-Cagnani C.E., Berger W.E., DuBuske L.M., Gurne S.E., Stryszak P., Lorber R., Danzig M. Comparative effects of desloratadine versus montelukast on asthma symptoms and use of beta 2-agonists in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and asthma. Int Arch Allergy Immunol, 2003;130:307-313. 3. Grant J.A., Nicodemus C.F., Findlay S.R., Glovsky M.M., Grossman J., Kaiser H., Meltzer E.O., Mitchell D.Q., Pearlman D., Selner J., et a. Cetirizine in patients with seasonal rhinitis and concomitant asthma: prospective, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1995;95:923-932. 4. Pasquali M., Baiardini I., Rogkakou A., Riccio A.M., Gamalero C., Descalzi D., Folli C., Passalacqua G., Canonica G.W. Levocetirizine in persistent allergic rhinitis and asthma: effects on symptoms, quality of life and inflammatory parameters. Clin Exp Allergy, 2006;36:1161-1167.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	oral H1-antihistamines	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 4 weeks[1]; measured with: Sum of 3 individual symptoms rated on 4-point scale each[1]; range of scores: 0-9; Better indicated by less)												
4	randomised trial	serious[2]	serious[3]	no serious indirectness[4]	serious[5]	reporting bias[6]	311[1]	302[1]	-	WMD -0.32 (-0.04 to -0.6)[1,4]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 8 weeks; measured with: Rhinasthma lower airways scale[7]; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[8]	very serious[9,10]	none[11]	20[12]	20[12]	-	WMD -5.7 (0 to 0)[9]	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Adverse effects												
3	randomised trial	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[13]	reporting bias[14]	0/0	0/0	not pooled	not pooled	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] From one trial hat was high quality and provided numerical data.
[2] No study reported concealment of allocation; only one reported intention-to-treat analysis; and percentage of patients that dropped out from the studies was 12% to to 36%. Randomisation and blinding were adequate in 2 studies and unclear in the other two.
[3] One trial showed a small, borderline statistically significant effect, the other suggested important difference, and in the other it was not possible to interpret the magnitude of effect.
[4] One study did not report a separate score for asthma symptoms, just a combined asthma and rhinitis score. This was only presented on a graph, but a visual inspection of the graphs for combined score and rhinitis score suggests that all differences were due to the difference in rhinitis score.
[5] We did not downgrade for imprecision, since we already downgraded for inconsistency.
[6] Reporting of this outcome was very poor, in most cases not possible to interpret. One large and methodologically sound trial showed borderline statistically significant small effect.
[7] Authors also measured quality of life using SF-36 questionnaire, but did not report data, except the statement that the results were statistically significant for some of the domains at different time-points.
[8] Only 40% of patients had current asthma. 60% had no current symptoms and only past history of asthma.
[9] Measure of variation for a change score could not be extracted from data.
[10] One very small study.
[11] We did not downgrade for reporting bias since we already downgraded for very serious imprecision.
[12] 5 patients in each group dropped out.
[13] We did not downgrade for imprecision, since we already downgraded for reporting bias.
[14] Adverse events were reported, but inconsistently and it was not possible to calculate any overall effect without making several assumptions. Overall number of all adverse events in both groups seemed to the same; one study reported 17 vs 4 events of fatigue or somnolence among cetirizine 10 mg and placebo; other reported adverse events occurred equally frequently.

Question 42 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-27
Question: Should ketotifen be used for long-term control of asthma and wheeze in children?
Bibliography: 1. Bassler D., Mitra A., Ducharme F.M., Forster J., Schwarzer G. Ketotifen alone or as additional medication for long-term control of asthma and wheeze in children. Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online), 2004:CD001384.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	ketotifen	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 10 to 12 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[3,4]	none[5,6]	72	76	-	SMD -0.49 (-0.16 to -0.82)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Asthma exacerbations (follow-up 12 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2,7]	serious[4]	none[6]	10/105	32/104	RR 0.31 (0.19 to 0.59)	213 fewer per 1000 (from 126 fewer to 249 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Use of oral glucocorticosteroid (follow-up 10 to 20 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none[5,6]	21/156	73/150	RR 0.28 (0.13 to 0.58)	351 fewer per 1000 (from 205 fewer to 424 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Efficacy assessed either by participants or parents (follow-up 12 to 26 weeks)												
7	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[8]	none[6]	101/301	143/298	RR 0.71 (0.52 to 0.96)	139 fewer per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 230 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Efficacy evaluated by physicians (follow-up 10 to 26 weeks)												
10	randomised trial	serious[9]	serious[10]	very serious[2,11]	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[12]	113/310	188/315	RR 0.6 (0.46 to 0.79)	239 fewer per 1000 (from 125 fewer to 322 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Reduction in the use of bronchodilators (follow-up 12 to 16 weeks)												
12	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none[6]	56/76	21/73	RR 2.39 (1.64 to 3.48)	400 more per 1000 (from 184 more to 714 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Sedation (follow-up 10 to 26 weeks)												
7	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4,13]	none[6]	45/218	26/221	RR 1.69 (1.11 to 2.59)[14]	81 more per 1000 (from 13 more to 188 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Weight gain (follow-up 10 to 26 weeks)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[13,15]	none[6,16]	38/142	24/141	RR 1.42 (1.02 to 1.99)	71 more per 1000 (from 3 more to 168 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Withdrawal from study due to side effects (follow-up 10 to 16 weeks)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	very serious[4,17]	none[6,16]	5/129	3/109	RR 1.22 (0.3 to 4.92)	6 more per 1000 (from 20 fewer to 110 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Most trials have been published before 1990, when reporting of methods were not as stringent as they are now, which may lead to inadequate reporting of good methods rather than bad methods per se.
[2] Inhaled corticosteroids were allowed as additional intervention in eight trials. There was not enough information in the studies to assess the effect of ketotifen as an add-on therapy to inhaled corticosteroids that are the mainstay of therapy of asthma today.
[3] Results include small or large effect.
[4] Very small trials with few events.
[5] Only four trials reported that outcome, but we did not downgrade since we already downgraded for very serious imprecision.

[6] Minority of all 25 trials reported each outcome that might suggest reporting bias. However, we did not automatically downgrade for reporting bias because most trials were done before 1990 when less emphasis was placed on patient-important outcomes and more on measurement of physiological parameters.
[7] There is less uncertainty about directness since both trials included 70% children with nasal symptoms. Children had also eczema (31%) and a family history of asthma (55%) that might suggest a high risk population.
[8] Results do not exclude negligible or large effect.
[9] Seven of 10 studies had unclear blinding and these trials showed larger benefit. In three studies with adequate blinding the RR was 0.75 (95% CI: 0.52-1.09)
[10] There was heterogeneity between trials which could not be explained by differences between age groups and appropriateness of blinding.
[11] There is serious uncertainty to what extent efficacy assessed by a physician reflects a patient important benefit.
[12] Funnel plot suggested bias.
[13] Results do not exclude negligible or large increase in the risk of sedation.
[14] No information was available on the time lag between onset of treatment with ketotifen and sedation to confirm resolution of sedation with use.
[15] The magnitude of weight gain could not be determined because of reporting issues.
[16] We did not downgrade since we already downgraded for very serious imprecision.
[17] Results do not exclude large benefit or large harm.

Question 43
Date: 2007-08-28
Question: Should combination of oral H1-antihistmine and decongestant vs placebo be used for treatment of asthma in patients with concomitant allergic rhinitis?
Bibliography: 1. Corren J., Harris A.G., Aaronson D., Beaucher W., Berkowitz R., Bronsky E., Chen R., Chervinsky P., Cohen R., Fourre J., Grossman J., Meltzer E., Pedinoff A., Stricker W., Wanderer A. Efficacy and safety of loratadine plus pseudoephedrine in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and mild asthma. The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 1997;100:781-788. 2. Nathan R.A., Finn A.F., Jr., LaForce C., Ratner P., Chapman D., de Guia E.C., Hewlett D., Kramer B. Comparison of cetirizine-pseudoephedrine and placebo in patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis and concomitant mild-to-moderate asthma: randomized, double-blind study. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol, 2006;97:389-396.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	combination of oral H1-antihistamine and decongestant	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 4 weeks; measured with: 4-point scale (0 - none; 3 - severe); range of scores: 0-12; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none[2]	225	226	-	not pooled[3]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Asthma exacerbation (follow-up 4 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4]	none	20/139	14/135	RR 1.39 (0.74 to 2.61)	41 more per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 167 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life (follow-up 4 to 6 weeks; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	reporting bias[6]	225	226	-	not pooled[6]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Headache (follow-up 4 to 6 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[7]	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	33/236	34/231	RR 0.97 (0.65 to 1.44)	4 fewer per 1000 (from 51 fewer to 65 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Insomnia (follow-up 4 to 6 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[9]	none	14/236	1/231	RR 9.50 (1.79 to 50.41)	34 more per 1000 (from 3 more to 198 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] One study reported symptom scores without measure of variation and the other one presented results on a graph without any numerical results.
[2] We did not downgrade for reporting bias since we already downgraded for imprecision.
[3] In one study mean difference in change from baseline was 0.6 point for daytime symptoms and 0.4 point for nighttime symptoms; no measure of variation was provided, but authors stated the change was statistically significant for daytime symptoms. In the other study change from baseline was 0.86 point in the morning and 0.79 in the evening, and both were reported as statistically significant. All in favour of combination treatment compared to placebo.
[4] Results do not exclude important benefit or harm. One trial with few events.
[5] In both studies quality of life improved by 0.5-0.55 point in placebo group and by 0.77-0.9 point in the combined treatment group. No measure of variation was provided. These results suggest that both groups reached minimal important improvement in quality of life with small difference between the groups.
[6] In one study quality of life improved by 0.5 point in placebo group and by 0.9 point in the combined treatment group. No measure of variation was provided. These results suggest that both groups reached minimal important improvement in quality of life with small difference between the groups. In the second study three different quality of life questionnaires were used, and not all data were reported. Authors did not provide information on what scales were used in these questionnaires and it was not possible to determine the results for which of the questionnaires were actually reported.
[7] We did not downgrade for inconsistency, since we already downgraded for imprecision.
[8] Few events. Very large difference in risk (2% to 32%)
[9] Very few events.

Question 45 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-26
Question: Should licensed dose of anti-leukotrienes plus inhaled glucocorticosteroids vs same dose of inhaled glucocorticosteroids be used for chronic asthma?
Bibliography: F Ducharme, Z Schwartz, R Kakuma. Addition of anti-leukotriene agents to inhaled corticosteroids for chronic asthma. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2004, Issue 1.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	licensed dose of anti-leukotrienes plus inhaled glucocorticosteroids	same dose of inhaled glucocorticosteroids	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 4 to 16 weeks; measured with: Daytime asthma symptom score; range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by less)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[2]	reporting bias[3]	510	508	-	MD -0.10 (-0.24 to 0.03)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Night-time awakenings (measured with: episodes/week; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[5]	none	193	200	-	MD -0.59 (-1.68 to 0.5)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Exacerbations requiring systemic steroids (follow-up 4 to 16 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[6]	serious[2]	reporting bias[3]	22/493	35/495	RR 0.64 (0.38 to 1.07)	14 fewer per 1,000	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
								11%		39 fewer per 1,000		
Quality of life (follow-up 4 to 16 weeks; measured with: Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire; range of scores: 0-7; Better indicated by more)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[6]	serious[2]	reporting bias[3]	465	456	-	MD 0.08 (-0.03 to 0.2)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Overall adverse effects (follow-up 4 to 16 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[3]	255/594	246/578	RR 1.01 (0.88 to 1.15)	4 more per 1000 (from 51 fewer to 64 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

[1] There was no effect in trials that reported including patients with both allergic rhinitis and asthma. Therefore, there is serious uncertainty if the results obtained in studied populations apply equally to patients who have both asthma and allergic rhinitis.
[2] The confidence interval crosses no difference and does not rule out worse outcome.
[3] Few studies that measured this outcome were pooled.
[4] Only one of 16 trials reported that outcome.
[5] results include big benefit and small harm
[6] This outcome was not reported in trials that reported including patients with both allergic rhinitis and asthma. Therefore, there is serious uncertainty if the results obtained in studied populations apply equally to patients who have both asthma and allergic rhinitis.

Question 45 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-12-02
Question: Should leukotriene receptor antagonists vs inhaled glucocorticosteroids be used for asthma?
Bibliography: Ducharme FM, Di Salvio F. Anti-leukotriene agents compared to inhaled corticosteroids in the management of recurrent and/or chronic asthma in adults and children. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2004, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD002314. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002314.pub2.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	leukotriene receptor antagonists	inhaled glucocorticosteroids	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
At least one exacerbation requiring systemic steroids (follow-up 6 to 40 weeks)												
18	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	254/2529	128/2436	RR 1.56 (1.36 to 2.00)	30 more per 1000 (from 19 more to 53 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
At least one exacerbation requiring hospital admission (follow-up 6 to 40 weeks)												
13	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	10/1641	5/1548	RR 1.62 (0.64 to 4.15)	2 more per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 9 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Quality of life (change from baseline) (follow-up 8 to 16 weeks; measured with: Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire; Better indicated by more)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias[2]	575	452	-	MD -0.30 (-0.43 to -0.17)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Daytime symptoms (change from baseline) (follow-up 8 to 16 weeks[3]; Better indicated by less)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1376	1167	-	SMD 0.29 (0.21 to 0.37)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Night-time awakenings (change from baseline) (follow-up 8 to 16 weeks[3]; Better indicated by less)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1089	906	-	SMD 0.21 (0.13 to 0.30)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Symptom-free days (change from baseline) (follow-up 8 to 16 weeks[3]; measured with: percentage; Better indicated by more)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	652	676	-	MD -11.47 (-15.72 to -7.23)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Withdrawal due to adverse effects (follow-up 6 to 40 weeks)												
16	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	96/3257	77/3020	RR 1.15 (0.86 to 1.54)	4 more per 1000 (from 3 fewer to 13 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Adverse effects (overall) (follow-up 6 to 40 weeks)												
15	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	1284/2942	1120/2706	RR 0.99 (0.93 to 1.04)	4 fewer per 1000 (from 29 fewer to 17 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Rescue-free days (change from baseline) (follow-up 8 to 16 weeks; measured with: percentage; Better indicated by more)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	545	565	-	MD -13.92 (-18.32 to -9.51)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Daily use of beta2-agonists (change from baseline) (follow-up 8 to 16 weeks[3]; Better indicated by less)												
8	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious[6]	no serious imprecision	none	1467	1266	-	SMD 0.28 (0.20 to 0.36)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Days off work or school (follow-up 8 to 16 weeks; measured with: number of days; Better indicated by less)												

2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	298	312	-	MD 0.06 (-0.03 to 0.15)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT

[1] Results include no effect or 1% more patients requiring hospitalization in absolute terms.
[2] Only two trials reported this outcome
[3] We chose a follow-up of 12 ±4 weeks, because it was the longest follow-up with the most studies providing the results. However, results were consistently similar during shorter and longer observation.
[4] Possible harm or no effect.
[5] From 3% fewer to 2% more in absolute terms.
[6] There is serious uncertainty if the number of puffs of reliever medication per day is critical to patients.

Question 47 [profile 1]

Date: 2009-03-25
Question: Should sublingual immunotherapy vs placebo be used in adults with asthma?
Bibliography: 1. Dahl R., Stender A., Rak S. Specific immunotherapy with SQ standardized grass allergen tablets in asthmatics with rhinoconjunctivitis. Allergy, 2006;61:185-190. 2. Alvarez-Cuesta E., Berges-Gimeno P., Gonzalez-Mancebo E., Fernandez-Caldas E., Cuesta-Herranz J., Casanovas M. Sublingual immunotherapy with a standardized cat dander extract: evaluation of efficacy in a double blind placebo controlled study. Allergy, 2007;62:810-817.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	sublingual immunotherapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 5 and 12 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	85	55	-	SMD 0.38 lower (0.04 to 0.73 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Medication use (follow-up 5 months; measured with: daily asthma medication score; range of scores: 0-32; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	68	39	-	mean 0.05 higher (0.41 lower to 0.51 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of life - not measured												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0 (0%)	0/0 (0%)	-	-		CRITICAL
Serious adverse effects												
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	0/85 (0%)	0/55 (0%)	not pooled[6]	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Oral pruritus (follow-up 5 months)												
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	strong association[7]	32/61 (52.5%)	1/32 (3.1%)	RR 16.79 (2.40 to 117.26)	493 more per 1000 (from 44 more to 3633 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL

[1] Both studies reported the results of per-protocol analysis only. In one study 18% did not complete treatment and in the other -- 36%.
[2] Few patients. Results do not exclude large effect or no difference,
[3] Study reported the results of per-protocol analysis only and 18% did not complete treatment.
[4] Few patients.
[5] Few patients.
[6] There were no serious adverse effects.
[7] Lower confidence limit is 2.4.

Question 47 [profile 2]

Date: 2009-03-25
Question: Should sublingual immunotherapy vs placebo be used in children with asthma?
Bibliography: 1. Caffarelli C., Sensi L.G., Marcucci F., Cavagni G. Preseasonal local allergoid immunotherapy to grass pollen in children: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial. Allergy, 2000;55:1142-1147. 2. Ippoliti F., De Santis W., Volterrani A., Lenti L., Canitano N., Lucarelli S., Frediani T. Immunomodulation during sublingual therapy in allergic children. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2003;14:216-221. 3. Lue K.H., Lin Y.H., Sun H.L., Lu K.H., Hsieh J.C., Chou M.C. Clinical and immunologic effects of sublingual immunotherapy in asthmatic children sensitized to mites: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2006;17:408-415. 4. Niu C.K., Chen W.Y., Huang J.L., Lue K.H., Wang J.Y. Efficacy of sublingual immunotherapy with high-dose mite extracts in asthma: a multi-center, double-blind, randomized, and placebo-controlled study in Taiwan. Respir Med, 2006;100:1374-1383. 5. Pajno G.B., Morabito L., Barberio G., Parmiani S. Clinical and immunologic effects of long-term sublingual immunotherapy in asthmatic children sensitized to mites: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Allergy, 2000;55:842-849. 6. Pajno G.B., Vita D., Parmiani S., Caminiti L., La Grutta S., Barberio G. Impact of sublingual immunotherapy on seasonal asthma and skin reactivity in children allergic to Parietaria pollen treated with inhaled fluticasone propionate. Clin Exp Allergy, 2003;33:1641-1647. 7. Pham-Thi N., Scheinmann P., Fadel R., Combebias A., Andre C. Assessment of sublingual immunotherapy efficacy in children with house dust mite-induced allergic asthma optimally controlled by pharmacologic treatment and mite-avoidance measures. Pediatr Allergy Immunol, 2007;18:47-57. 8. Stelmach I., Kaczmarek-Wozniak J., Majak P., Olszowiec-Chlebna M., Jerzynska J. Efficacy and safety of high-doses sublingual immunotherapy in ultra-rush scheme in children allergic to grass pollen. Clin Exp Allergy, 2008.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	sublingual immunotherapy	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (seasonal allergen) (follow-up 3 to 24 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
3[1]	randomised trials	no serious limitations[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	59	50	-	SMD 0.53 lower (0.08 to 0.98 lower)[1]	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Asthma symptoms (children allergic to house dust mite) (follow-up median 6 months[4]; Better indicated by lower values)												
5[5]	randomised trials	no serious limitations[6]	serious[7]	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	172	161	-	SMD 1.17 lower (0.05 to 2.28 lower)[5]	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of life - not reported[9]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0	0	-	-		CRITICAL
Serious adverse efects (follow-up 3 to 24 months)												
8	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	0/237 (0%)	0/225 (0%)	not pooled[10]	not pooled	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Withdrawal due to adverse effects (follow-up 6 to 24 months)												
5	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[11]	none	2/152 (1.3%)	2/145 (1.4%)	RR 0.97 (0.15 to 6.44)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 12 fewer to 75 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Local adverse effects (follow-up 24 months; oral burning, pruritus or oedema)												
2	randomised trials	serious[12]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[13]	none	14/37 (37.8%)	3/37 (8.1%)	RR 4.12 (1.43 to 11.89)	253 more per 1000 (from 35 more to 883 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Four additional studies investigated SLIT in children with allergic rhinitis due to seasonal allergen and measured asthma symptoms. Some of them were also included in systematic reviews of Calamita 2007, Olaguibel 2005 or Penagos 2008. However, these trials included less than 50% children with asthma. One of them could not be used (see text of guideline for details). If we included the results of other three studies the effect would be smaller (for all 6 studies: n = 266; SMD: -0.32, 95% CI: -0.67 to 0.03).
[2] In one study 30% did not complete treatment.
[3] Few patients. Results do not exclude a large effect or no difference.
[4] Range: 6 to 24 months.
[5] Three additional studies investigated SLIT in children with allergic rhinitis due to house dust mite and measured asthma symptoms. Two of them was also included in systematic reviews of Calamita 2007, Olaguibel 2005 or Penagos 2008. Two of these trials (Hirsh 1997 and Marcucci 2001) included 74% and 83% children with asthma. If we included the results of these two studies the effect would be smaller (for

all 6 studies: n = 378; SMD: -0.93, 95% CI: -0.08 to -1.79). One additional study that included unreported proportion of children with asthma was included in two systematic reviews. This study poorly reported this outcome and its inclusion would not change the conclusions (see text of guideline for details).

[6] Four of six studies did not report following intention-to-treat principle.

[7] There was serious inconsistency in the results that could not be explained neither by study methodology, year of publication or manufacturer of allegen extract.

[8] Results do not exclude a large effect or no difference.

[9] One study measured quality of life, but found no difference between the SLIT and placebo groups and did not report any numerical values.

[10] There were no serious adverse effects in these studies.

[11] Very few events, but results do nit exclude an important increase in risk.

[12] Only 2 of 8 studies reported these obvious adverse effects.

[13] Few events.

Question 48 [profile 1]
Date: 2007-08-27
Question: Should subcutaneous anti-IgE vs placebo be used for chronic asthma in patients receiving stable dose of inhaled corticosteroids?
Settings: stable steroid phase
Bibliography: S Walker, M Monteil, K Phelan, TJ Lasserson, EH Walters. Anti-IgE for chronic asthma in adults and children. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006, Issue 2.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	subcutaneous anti-IgE	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms (follow-up 16 to 28 weeks; measured with: Asthma score at end of treatment; range of scores: 0-4; Better indicated by less)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none[1]	668	649	-	MD -0.46 (-0.63 to -0.29)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Asthma exacerbation (follow-up 12 to 28 weeks)												
6	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none[1]	181/1152	252/999	RR 0.64 (0.47 to 0.88)[3]	9 fewer per 100 (from 3 fewer to 13 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Asthma exacerbations per patient (follow-up 16 to 28 weeks; measured with: exacerbations per patient; Better indicated by less)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none[1]	893	758	-	MD -0.19 (-0.29 to -0.09)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Change in Quality of Life (follow-up 16 to 28 weeks; measured with: Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire; range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by more)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness[4]	no serious imprecision	none[1]	1081	1050	-	MD 0.32 (0.22 to 0.43)[5]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Global evaluation (rated good or excellent) (follow-up 16 to 28 weeks)												
2	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none[1]	240/418	141/406	RR 1.95 (1.63 to 2.29)	0 more per 1,000	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT

[1] Authors of the review did not assess publication bias,
[2] One small trial in patients with more severe asthma receiving oral corticosteroids showed OR: 1.65 (95% CI: 0.66 to 4.13)
[3] Based on the results assuming random effects.
[4] The end of trial data on quality if life suggested an important placebo effect. The improvements in global treatment efficacy and overall quality of life noted in control subjects suggest that the basic trial design which included close medical monitoring, might have contributed to a large placebo effect.
[5] Effect size did not reach clinical relevance of 0.5.

Question 48 [profile 2]
Date: 2007-08-27
Question: Should subcutaneous anti-IgE vs placebo be used for chronic asthma in patients receiving tapered doses of inhaled corticosteroids?
Settings: steroid reduction phase
Bibliography: S Walker, M Monteil, K Phelan, TJ Lasserson, EH Walters. Anti-IgE for chronic asthma in adults and children. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006, Issue 2.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	subcutaneous anti-IgE	placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Asthma symptoms - not measured[1]												
0	-	-	-	-	-	none	0/0	0/0	-	-		CRITICAL
Asthma exacerbation (follow-up 12 to 16 weeks)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none[2]	179/934	250/792	RR 0.54 (0.44 to 0.67)	15 fewer per 100 (from 10 fewer to 18 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Asthma exacerbations per patient (follow-up 16 to 28 weeks; measured with: exacerbations per patient; Better indicated by less)												
5	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	934	795	-	MD -0.27 (-0.37 to -0.16)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Change in Quality of life (follow-up 16 weeks; measured with: Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire; range of scores: 0-6; Better indicated by less)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none[2]	126	120	-	MD 0.42 (0.17 to 0.67)[3]	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	CRITICAL
Complete inhaled corticosteroid withdrawal (follow-up 12 to 16 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious	no serious imprecision	none[2]	370/884	159/750	RR 2.04 (1.74 to 2.38)	220 more per 1000 (from 157 more to 293 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
More than 50% reduction in inhaled corticosteroid usage (follow-up 12 to 16 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none[2]	678/884	420/750	RR 1.79 (1.59 to 1.99)	44 more per 100 (from 33 more to 55 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Change in steroid consumption (follow-up 12 to 16 weeks; measured with: micro gram of budesonide equivalent; Better indicated by more)												
3	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	618	570	-	MD -118.76 (-83.14 to -154.38)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Oral steroid withdrawal (follow-up 16 weeks)												
1	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4]	none	21/50	19/45	RR 0.99 (0.50 to 1.74)	4 fewer per 1000 (from 211 fewer to 312 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Outcome was not measured in the included studies
[2] Reporting bias not assessed.
[3] Effect size did not reach clinical relevance.
[4] One small trial

Question 48 [profile 3]
Date: 2007-08-31
Question: What are the adverse effects of subcutaneous anti-IgE used for chronic asthma in adults and children?
Settings: all phases
Bibliography: S Walker, M Monteil, K Phelan, TJ Lasserson, EH Walters. Anti-IgE for chronic asthma in adults and children. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006, Issue 2.

Quality assessment							Summary of findings					Importance
							No of patients		Effect		Quality	
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	subcutaneous anti-IgE	control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Withdrawal due to adverse event (follow-up 28 to 30 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	7/893	10/759	RR 0.53 (0.21 to 1.31)	6 fewer per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 4 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Injection site reaction (follow-up 24 to 32 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	87/854	45/825	RR 1.91 (1.35 to 2.67)	50 more per 1000 (from 19 more to 92 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Urticaria (follow-up 24 to 32 weeks)												
4	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	10/834	9/697	RR 0.93 (0.38 to 2.27)	1 fewer per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 17 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Malignancy												
14[2]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[3]	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	20/4127	5/2236	RR 1.9 (0.7 to 6.5)	2 more per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 11 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Malignancy (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer)												
14[2]	randomised trial	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency[3]	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	16/4127	2/2236	RR 3.8 (0.9 to 34.3)	3 more per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 33 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] Results do not exclude important benefit or important harm.
[2] All completed trials reported by the manufacturer to Food and Drug Administration. Department of Health & Human Services Public Health Service. Food and Drug Administration. Omalizumab (recombinant humanized monoclonal antibody to IgE) for treatment of allergic asthma (Briefing document on safety BLA STN 103976/0). Rockville, MD, 2003
[3] We did not downgrade for inconsistency, since we already downgraded for imprecision.
[4] Results do not exclude no effect or a serious harm.