Adverse Event M=% (N=1218) Flushing Palpitations Somnolence

Palpitations 1.4 3.3 0.9 0.9

Somnolence 1.3 1.6 0.8 0.8

The following events occurred in ≤1% but >0.1% of patients treated with amlodipine in controlled clinical trials or under conditions of open trials or marketing experience where a causal relationship is uncertain; they are listed to alert the physician to a possible relationship: Cardiovascular: arrhythmia (including ventricular tachycardia and atrial fibrillation), bradycardia, chest pain, hypotension, peripheral ischemia, syncope, tachycardia, postural dizziness, postural hypotension, vasculitis. Central and Peripheral Nervous System: hypoesthesia, neuropathy peripheral, paresthesia, tremor, vertigo. Gastrointestinal: anorexia, constipation, dyspepsia,** dysphagia, diarrhea, flatulence, pancreatitis, vomiting, gingival hyperplasia. General: allergic reaction, asthenia,** back pain, hydishagia, diarrhea, flatulence, pancreatitis, vomiting, gingival hyperplasia. General: allergic reaction, asthenia,** back pain, hydishagia, diarrhea, flatulence, pancreatitis, vomiting, gingival hyperplasia. General: allergic reaction, asthenia,** back pain, hydishagia, diarrhea, flatulence, pancreatitis, vomiting, gingival hyperplasia. General: allergic reaction, asthenia,** back pain, hydishagia, and female), insomnia, nervousness, depression, abnormal dreams, anxiety, depersonalization. Psychiatric: sexual dysfunction (male** and female), insomnia, nervousness, depression, abnormal dreams, anxiety, depersonalization. Respiratory System: dyspona, dyspena, eystemamicularity, expersion, abnormal dreams, anxiety, depersonalization. Mutritional: hyperplycemia, thirst. Hemopoletic: leukopenia, purpura, thrombocytopenia. The following events occurred in ≤0.1% of patients treated with amlodipine in controlled clinical trials or under conditions of open trials or marketing experience: cardiac failure, pulse in the partition of the dependence of the partition flation and angina and cannot be distinguished from medications or concurrent disease states such as myocardial infarcti

Table 3. Adverse Events in Placebo-Controlled Studies (%	∕o of	i Patients)
--	-------	-------------

Body System/ Adverse Event	atorvastatin						
	Placebo N=270	10 mg N=863	20 mg N=36	40 mg N=79	80 mg N=94		
	N=270	N=003	N=30	N=79	N=94		
BODY AS A WHOLE	40.0	40.0		40.4			
Infection	10.0	10.3	2.8	10.1	7.4		
Headache	7.0	5.4	16.7	2.5	6.4		
Accidental Injury	3.7	4.2	0.0	1.3	3.2		
Flu Syndrome	1.9	2.2	0.0	2.5	3.2		
Abdominal Pain	0.7	2.8	0.0	3.8	2.1		
Back Pain	3.0	2.8	0.0	3.8	1.1		
Allergic Reaction	2.6	0.9	2.8	1.3	0.0		
Asthenia	1.9	2.2	0.0	3.8	0.0		
DIGESTIVE SYSTEM							
Constipation	1.8	2.1	0.0	2.5	1.1		
Diarrhea	1.5	2.7	0.0	3.8	5.3		
Dyspepsia	4.1	2.3	2.8	1.3	2.1		
Flatulence	3.3	2.1	2.8	1.3	1.1		
RESPIRATORY SYSTEM							
Sinusitis	2.6	2.8	0.0	2.5	6.4		
Pharyngitis	1.5	2.5	0.0	1.3	2.1		
SKIN AND APPENDAGES							
Rash	0.7	3.9	2.8	3.8	1.1		
MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM							
Arthralgia	1.5	2.0	0.0	5.1	0.0		
Myalgia	1.1	3.2	5.6	1.3	0.0		
A	T./-1 (40)						

Arthralgia

1.5

2.0

3.2

3.2

5.6

Anglo-Seandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial (ASCOT): In ASCOT involving 10,305 participants treated with atorvastatin 10 mg daily (n=5,168) or placebo (n=5,137), the safety and tolerability profile of the group treated with atorvastatin was comparable to that of the group treated with patch as a median of 3.3 years of follow-up. The following adverse events were reported, regardless of causality assessment, in patients treated with atorvastatin in clinical trials. The events in italics occurred in ≥2% of patients. Body as a Whole: Chest pain, face edema, fever, neck rigidity, malaise, photosensitivity reaction, generalized edema. Digestive System: Nausea, gastroenteritis, liver function tests abnormal, colitis, vomiting, gastritis, dry mouth, rectal hemorrhage, esophagitis, eructation, glossitis, mouth ulceration, anorexia, increased appetite, stomatitis, biliary pain, chelilitis, cholestatic jaundice. Respiratory System: Nausea, gastroenteritis, liver function tests abnormal, colitis, vomiting, gastritis, dry mouth, rectal hemorrhage, esophagitis, eructation, glossitis, mouth ulceration, anorexia, increased appetite, stomatitis, biliary pain, chelilitis, cholestatic jaundice. Respiratory System: Bronchitis, rhinitis, pneumonia, dyspnea, asthma, epistaxis. Nervous System: Insomnia, dizziness, paresthesia, somnolence, amnesia, abnormal dreams, libido decreased, emotional lability, incoordination, peripheral neuropathy, torticollis, facial paralysis, hyperkinesia, depression, hypesthesia, hypertonia. Musculoskeletal System: Arrivitis, leg cramps, bursitis, tenosynovitis, myasthenia, tendinous contracture, myositis, Skin and Appendages: Pruritus, contact dermatitis, alopecia, dry skin, sweating, acne, uriticaria, eczema, seborrhea, skin ulcer. Urogenital System: Urinary ractact intercion, urinary frequency, cystitis, hematuria, impotence, dysuria, kidney calculus, nocturia, epididymitis, fibrocystic breast, vaginal hemorrhage, albuminuria, breast enlargement, metrorrhagia, ephri

safety and tolerability profile of atorvastatin 10 to 20 mg daily was generally similar to that of placebo (see PRECAUTIONS, Pediatric Use).

OVERDOSAGE: There is no information on overdosage with CADUET in humans. Information on Amlodipine: Single oral doses of amlodipine maleate equivalent to 40 mg amlodipine/kg and 100 mg amlodipine/kg in mice and rats, respectively, caused deaths. Single oral amlodipine maleate doses equivalent to 4 or more mg amlodipine/kg in dogs (11 or more times the maximum recommended clinical dose on a mg/m² basis) caused a marked peripheral vasodilation and hypotension. Overdosage might be expected to cause excessive peripheral vasodilation with marked hypotension and possibly a reflex tachycardia. In humans, experience with intentional overdosage of amlodipine is limited. Reports of intentional overdosage include a patient who ingested 250 mg and was asymptomatic and was not hospitalized; another (120 mg) was hospitalized, underwent gastric lavage and remained normotensive; the third (105 mg) was hospitalized and had hypotension (90/50 mmHg) which normalized following plasma expansion. A patient who took 70 mg amlodipine and an unknown quantity of benzodiazepine plasma concentration. A case of accidental drug overdose has been documented in a 19-month-old male who ingested 30 mg amlodipine (about 2 m/kg). During the emergency room presentation, vital signs were stable with no evidence of hypotension, but a heart rate of 180 bpm. Ipecac was administered 3.5 hours after ingestion and on subsequent observation (overnight) no sequelae were noted. If massive overdose should occur, active cardiac and respiratory monitoring should be instituted. Frequent blood pressure measurements are essential. Should hypotension occur, cardiovascular support including elevation of the extremities and the judicious administration of fluids should be initiated. If hypotension remains unresponsive to these conservative measures, administration of vasopressors (such as phenylephrine) should be considered wi

significantly enhance activastatin clearance.
**Based on patient weight of 50 kg.

**These events occurred in less than 1% in placebo-controlled trials, but the incidence of these side effects was between 1% and 2% in all multiple dose studies.

 ${f R}$ only Manufactured by: Pfizer Ireland Pharmaceuticals Dublin, Ireland

Distributed by: Pfizer Labs Division of Pfizer Inc., NY, NY 10017

Rev. 1 October 2004

© 2004 Pfizer Ireland Pharmaceuticals

Myth Persists on Seafood Allergy, Contrast Link

BY ROBERT FINN

San Francisco Bureau

SAN DIEGO — An old medical myth that patients who are allergic to seafood are at risk of adverse reactions to radiologic contrast media—persists even among cardiologists, despite having been thoroughly debunked, Dr. Andrew D. Beaty reported at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology.

In a survey of 231 specialists at six academic medical centers, 69% of the physicians admitted asking patients about

seafood allergy before radiologic procedures using contrast media. Of those surveyed, 37% of the physicians admitted withholding contrast media or premedicating seafood-allergic patients with corticosteroids or antihistamines before the procedure.

Many studies over the past 30 years have failed to find any special relabetween seafood allergy and adverse reactions to radiologic contrast media (RCM). According to

some, atopic patients in general may have a fourfold to fivefold increased risk of adverse events in response to RCM. However, the baseline rate of these events is so low that even if these studies were to be confirmed in larger populations, less than 1% of atopic patients would be affected.

About 10 million procedures using RCM are conducted every year in the United States. Life-threatening reactions occur in about 0.2% of patients receiving high-osmolarity contrast media and 0.04% of those getting low-osmolarity contrast media.

The origin of the seafood allergy myth is unknown. But Dr. Beaty, of St. Louis University, has traced it at least as far as a 1975 paper in the American Journal of Roentgenology that stated that 15% of patients who experienced adverse reactions to RCM reported having seafood allergy (Am. J. Roentgenol. Radium Ther. Nucl. Med. 1975;124:145-52). The authors of that study hypothesized that the iodine in seafood cross-reacted with the iodine in RCM. They never verified those patient reports, however, and similar percentages of patients with adverse reactions in their study reported allergies to other common foods such as milk and eggs.

Since then, it has been determined that seafood allergy is mediated by immunoglobulin E (IgE) antibodies to proteins in meat, with iodine playing no role. Furthermore, IgE does not mediate severe RCM reactions. The combination of these two findings effectively discounts the hypothesis of iodine cross-reactivity.

For his study, Dr. Beaty and his colleagues mailed anonymous questionnaires to 231 faculty members at six prominent academic medical centers in the Midwest. Of the individuals queried, 49% responded.

The survey consisted of eight brief questions, but only two of them related to seafood allergy and RCM. The other six were intended as distractors.

The first seafood-related question was, Do you or someone on your behalf inquire about a history of seafood or shellfish allergy prior to administration of contrast media?" Sixty-five percent of the radiologists and 89% of the cardiologists answered, "Yes,"

The second question was, "Would you withhold RCM administration or recom-



Half of the cardiologists in the survey said that they would withhold RCM or pretreat patients with seafood allergies.

mend pretreatment with corticosteroids and/or antihistamines based on a history of seafood or shellfish allergy?" Thirty-five percent of the radiologists and 50% of the cardiologists answered, "Yes."

While 69% of the total respondents said that they would ask patients about seafood allergy, only 37% said that they would change management based on that information. That suggests that about 32% would ask the question even if the answer would not affect patient management.

Merely asking that question may serve to perpetuate the myth among patients, Dr. Beaty said. He pointed to a separate study indicating that 65% of patients with seafood allergy had either read or been told by their physician to avoid RCM, and 92% believed that iodine in seafood was responsible for their allergy (Allergy Asthma Proc. 2005;26:468-9).

Several physicians in the audience rose to describe their experiences with this medical myth. One described a radiologic technician who received an official reprimand for failing to ask a patient about seafood allergy. Another physician said that at his institution no allergic patients were allowed to receive RCM unless they were premedicated.

A third physician said that at his institution, the computer system automatically categorized every patient with a seafood allergy as being sensitive to RCM, and every patient who was sensitive to RCM as having a seafood allergy. That has now been changed, but patients who were seen before the change will have that erroneous information persist in their records until someone changes it manually.

Pfizer U.S. Pharmaceuticals

LN273466

© 2006 Pfizer Inc.

April 2006