General practitioners’ advice to use topical rather than oral ibuprofen resulted in equivalent effects on chronic knee pain
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General practitioners’ advice to use topical rather than oral ibuprofen resulted in equivalent effects on chronic knee pain

STUDY DESIGN
Design: randomised controlled trial (Topical or Oral Ibuprofen [TOIB]).
Allocation: concealed.*
Blinding: blinded (data collectors).*

STUDY QUESTION
Setting: 26 general practices in the UK.
Patients: 282 patients ≥50 years of age (mean age 63 y, 54% women) with knee pain (97% with osteoarthritis). Exclusion criteria included history of, or awaiting, knee replacement, and recent knee injury.
Intervention: the patient’s general practitioner prescribed or recommended preferential use of over-the-counter topical ibuprofen, applied according to manufacturer’s instructions (eg, 0.5 g per knee up to 3 times/d, equivalent to 75 mg/d of ibuprofen using a 5% preparation) (n = 138), or oral ibuprofen, up to 1.2 g/day (n = 144). Increased dose, additional painkillers, or alternate non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) were allowed, but maintaining the allocated route was encouraged.
Outcomes: primary outcomes were the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) score and adverse effects. The study had >80% power to show equivalence in WOMAC scores to within 10 mm (α = 0.05).

Follow-up period: 12 months.
Patient follow-up: 88% (intention-to-treat analysis).

MAIN RESULTS
Groups did not differ for change in WOMAC scores (table). Proportions of patients with ≥1 unplanned hospital admission were similar (4.4% in the topical group v 1.4% in the oral group, p = 0.16); no death or episode of gastric bleeding occurred in either group. Patients in the topical group had a lower rate of minor respiratory adverse effects (7%/v 17%, p = 0.02), but groups did not differ for minor gastrointestinal (42%/v 40%) or renovascular (16%/v 15%) adverse effects.

CONCLUSION
In older patients with chronic knee pain, general practitioners’ advice to use topical rather than oral ibuprofen resulted in equivalent effects on knee pain.

*See glossary.
A modified version of this abstract appears in Evidence-Based Nursing.
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## Advice from general practitioners to use topical v oral ibuprofen for chronic knee pain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMAC domain*</th>
<th>Baseline scores</th>
<th>12-month scores</th>
<th>Difference (95% CI)†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>39 (Topical)</td>
<td>38 (Topical)</td>
<td>1 (−4 to 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 (Oral)</td>
<td>36 (Oral)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffness</td>
<td>50 (Topical)</td>
<td>46 (Topical)</td>
<td>0 (−6 to 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 (Oral)</td>
<td>43 (Oral)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>37 (Topical)</td>
<td>39 (Topical)</td>
<td>3 (−2 to 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 (Oral)</td>
<td>36 (Oral)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global assessment</td>
<td>38 (Topical)</td>
<td>40 (Topical)</td>
<td>2 (−2 to 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WOMAC, Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (visual analogue scale, range 0 to 100 [worst]).
†Difference in change from baseline, adjusted for baseline values. A positive difference favours oral ibuprofen. CI defined in glossary.

...continued

Compared with placebo, paracetamol, at doses of 2.6 to 4 g/day, provides a reduction in osteoarthritic pain of modest clinical significance.1 NSAIDs reduce pain more than paracetamol, especially in severe osteoarthritis, but with increased incidence of gastrointestinal adverse effects.1 A 2004 systematic review of topical NSAIDs found that they were superior to placebo for osteoarthritis in the first 2 weeks of treatment but not at weeks 3 or 4 (the maximum length of the trials).2 However, 2 subsequent manufacturer-sponsored trials in patients with knee osteoarthritis showed that topical diclofenac reduced WOMAC pain scores more than placebo at 4 and 12 weeks, respectively.3 4

The trial by Underwood et al is the first long-term study comparing an oral with a topical NSAID, ibuprofen. The trial was designed to show equivalence, rather than superiority; the authors concluded that there was no difference in effectiveness. However, the more important finding may be that there was little difference between mean baseline and 12-month WOMAC scores for both preparations (eg, change for global assessment was +2 with topical and -2 with oral ibuprofen). In the absence of a placebo group, it is impossible to conclude whether the 2 treatments were equally mildly effective or equally ineffective.
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