		r informational purposes only. le based on the approved package insert				
	Link to drug label					
Proprietary Drug Name Celebrex	INN Celecoxib	Therapeutic area and FDA approvedindicationsRelief of signs and symptoms of osteoarthritisRelief of signs and symptoms of rheumatoidarthritis in adultsManagement of acute pain in adultsTreatment of primary dysmenorrheaReduce the number of adenomatous colorectalpolyps in familial adenomatous polyposis as anadjunct to usual care				
Name of Sponsor/Company:	Pfizer Pharmace	euticals Inc.				
	cebo-controlled, r	andomized two-week study, comparing small bowel aproxen (500 mg bid) plus omeprazole (20 mg qd)				
		jects at 8 centers in the USA and 1 center in Israel.				
Publication (reference, if applica						
celecoxib, 200 mg (BID) alone an secondary objective was to assess	e of this study was d with naproxen (5 the mucosal break	ase of development: Phase 4 to assess the small bowel lesion pattern associated with i00 mg BID) plus omeprazole (20 mg QD). The s, small bowel lesions and visible blood without celecoxib alone and with naproxen plus omeprazole.				
Methodology: This was a 4-week comparator, randomized study, con naproxen (500 mg BID) plus ome	multicenter, doub mparing small bow prazole (20 mg QE n (500 mg BID) an	le-blind, triple-dummy, placebo-controlled, active- vel lesions associated with celecoxib (200 mg BID) vs.) in healthy adult subjects. Eligible subjects received d omeprazole (20 mg QD), or placebo to be taken				
Visit 4 (Day 30 ± 1 / final visit). T	he Screening visit oscopic procedure	Day 14 ± 1), Visit 3 (Day 16 ± 1 / randomization) and marked the beginning of a 2-week (+/- 1 day) washout . During this period the subject could not consume estinal mucosal lesions.				
Capsule endoscopic procedures we Imaging Inc were used to provide video was reviewed at the site. Vid gastric lesion were stripped of iden review by a Small Bowel Events C gastroenterologists trained in inter consensus of the committee memb or if the small bowel video was less	ere performed at V an M2A Plus video leos from Visit 4 in tifying informatio committee (SBEC) pretation of the M2 ers. Subjects with as than 2 hours in d	nused study medication was collected at Visit 4. Tisits 2 and 4. Endoscopy capsules made by Given [®] to of approximately 8 hours in duration. The endoscopy in which the site had noted at least 1 small bowel or in and comments from sites and then forwarded for for grading. The SBEC consisted of 4 2A Plus data. All grades were assigned by complete small bowel mucosal breaks or visible blood at Visit 2 luration were not eligible for randomization. ocheck fecal occult blood test kit, and those subjects				

participating in the calprotectin portion of the study were given a calprotectin test kit. These test kits were collected with the fecal samples for analysis at Visits 2 and 4.

Telephone calls were made to each subject the day before Visits 2 and 4 to remind subjects to collect fecal occult blood test samples and to prepare for the capsule endoscopic procedure. A follow-up phone call was made 5 days after the capsule endoscopy to confirm capsule excretion. If capsule excretion could not be positively verified, an abdominal X-ray examination was required.

Number of patients (planned and analyzed): A total of 300 subjects were planned to be enrolled; Actual enrollment was 356 randomized to treatment (120 subjects in the celecoxib group, 118 subjects in the naproxen plus omeprazole group and 118 subjects in the placebo group). A total of 356 subjects were included in the safety population, 339 subjects were included in the modified intent-to-treat (MITT) population, and 312 subjects were included in the Evaluable population.

Diagnosis and main criteria for inclusion: Eligible subjects were healthy males or females 18 – 70 years of age with a normal, healthy gastrointestinal tract: ie, no small bowel mucosal breaks or blood found at Visit 2 based on the capsule endoscopic data review, history of gastrointestinal ulcers, bleeding or surgery, or complete or partial stenosis of the small intestine.

Duration of treatment: 2 Weeks

Test product, dose and mode of administration:

Celecoxib treatment: Subjects randomized to the celecoxib treatment group were treated with 200 mg celecoxib BID for 2 weeks. They took 1 capsule of celecoxib 200 mg, 1 placebo capsule identical to naproxen and 1 placebo capsule identical to omeprazole daily with the morning meal and 1 capsule of celecoxib 200 mg plus 1 placebo capsule identical to naproxen daily with the evening meal.

Reference therapy, dose and mode of administration:

Naproxen plus omeprazole treatment: Subjects randomized to the naproxen plus omeprazole treatment group were treated with 500 mg naproxen BID plus 20 mg omeprazole QD for 2 weeks. They took 1 capsule of naproxen 500 mg, 1 capsule of omeprazole 20 mg and 1 placebo capsule identical to celecoxib daily with the morning meal and 1 capsule of naproxen 500 mg plus 1 placebo capsule identical to celecoxib daily with the evening meal.

Placebo treatment: Subjects randomized to the placebo treatment group took 1 placebo capsule identical to naproxen, 1 placebo capsule identical to omeprazole and 1 placebo capsule identical to celecoxib daily with the morning meal and 1 placebo capsule identical to naproxen plus 1 placebo capsule identical to celecoxib daily with the evening meal.

Criteria for evaluation:

Efficacy: Clinical efficacy was not assessed in this study.

Safety: Videos of subjects with at least one lesion noted by the site were assessed by the SBEC. The findings of the SBEC constituted the lesion endpoints for these subjects. For the subjects whose videos showed no lesions at site review, the lesion count was zero. The primary endpoint was the number of mucosal breaks in the small bowel at the final visit as assessed by the SBEC and the sites on reviewing the endoscopy. Secondary endpoints were the percentage of subjects with at least 1 small bowel mucosal break, the total number of small bowel lesions with or without hemorrhage, and the percentage of subjects with visible blood in the small bowel without evidence of lesions. Exploratory endpoints were the number and incidence of gastric lesions and the results of the calprotectin and Hemocheck tests.

Statistical methods: The primary analysis population was the modified intent-to-treat population consisting of all randomized subjects who presented evaluable endoscopies at the Final visit. Incidence rates were compared between treatment groups using Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel statistics, stratified by site. The number of mucosal lesions of the various types was compared between treatment groups using Kruskal-Wallis and Wilcoxon Rank Sum statistics. The protocol-specified generalized linear model analysis of lesion counts was performed, but due to the non-normal distribution of the data, non-parametric methods were used instead.

Summary

Endoscopy results: The mean number of small bowel mucosal breaks at the Final visit was significantly higher in the naproxen plus omeprazole treatment group than in the celecoxib treatment group (0.32 for celecoxib group 2.99 for the naproxen plus omeprazole, and 0.11 for placebo group; p < 0.001, MITT population). Similar observations were made in the analyses of gastric mucosal breaks and combined gastric or small bowel mucosal breaks. In the MITT population, celecoxib yielded significantly fewer mucosal breaks, gastric and small bowel, than the naproxen plus omeprazole combination. Fewer subjects in the celecoxib treatment group (16%) experienced small bowel mucosal breaks (grade 2.3,6,7) than subjects treated with naproxen plus omeprazole (55%) compared to 7% of the subjects treated with the placebo, and this difference was statistically significant. Gastric mucosal breaks were experienced by 3%, 38% and 6% of the celecoxib group, the naproxen plus omeprazole group, and the placebo group, respectively (p<0.001). The incidence rate for the subjects experiencing small bowel or gastric mucosal breaks was 17%, 65%, and 12% respectively, for the celecoxib group, the naproxen plus omeprazole group, and placebo group (p < 0.001). The results were similar in the Evaluable Population, and corresponding trends were noted in other endpoints as well. The most prevalent lesions were grade 2 (mucosal breaks without hemorrhage) bowel lesions and occurred less frequently in celecoxib or placebo group than in naproxen plus omeprazole group. The presence of blood without visualized lesions was found more rarely. The risk of this event was greater in the 2 active treatment groups than in the placebo group, but did not show statistically significant differences between the 2 active treatments.

Summary of Endoscopy Endpoints (MITT Population)

	Naproxen +				
	Celecoxib	Omeprazole	Placebo	p-value	
	N = 115	N = 111	N = 113		
Number of subjects with small bow	rel				
mucosal breaks	18 (16%)	61 (55%)	8 (7%)	< 0.001	
Celecoxib vs placebo				0.040	
Naproxen vs placebo				< 0.001	
Celecoxib vs naproxen				<0.001	
Number of small bowel mucosal breaks					
Mean (SD)	0.32 (1.09)	2.99 (5.33)	0.11 (0.45)	< 0.001	
Range	0 – 9	0 - 30	0 – 3		
Celecoxib vs placebo				0.042	
Naproxen vs placebo				< 0.001	
Celecoxib vs naproxen				< 0.001	
Number of subjects with blood					
without visualized lesions	8 (7%)	9 (8%)	1(1%)	0.034	
Celecoxib vs placebo		. ,		0.014	
Naproxen vs placebo				0.007	
Celecoxib vs naproxen				0.754	

Safety Results: The incidence of AEs and treatment-related AEs was similar among the treatment groups. The majority of AEs were mild or moderate in severity. The AEs in each treatment group were primarily in GI system disorders. The most commonly occurring AEs were abdominal pain, headache, diarrhea, nausea, dyspepsia, and flatulence. Of these, only headache, abdominal pain and flatulence occurred in more than 5% of the subjects in any 1 treatment group: Headache was reported by 3.3%, 1.7% and 8.5% subjects, respectively, in the celecoxib, naproxen plus omeprazole, and placebo groups. Abdominal pain was reported by 4.2%, 7.6% and 3.4%, respectively, in the celecoxib, naproxen plus omeprazole, and placebo groups. Flatulence was reported by 0.8%, 5.9%, and 0% subjects, respectively, in the celecoxib, naproxen plus omeprazole, and placebo groups. Overall, there were few problems with UGI tolerability in this study. A total of 30 subjects (9 in the celecoxib group, 12 in the naproxen plus omeprazole group and 9 in the placebo group) who did not take ASA during the trial reported mild UGI discomfort (abdominal pain,

dyspepsia or nausea) and 4 subjects in the naproxen plus omeprazole group reported moderate or severe UGI discomfort. A total of 27 subjects (9 in the celecoxib group, 12 in the naproxen plus omeprazole group and 6 in the placebo group) who did not take NSAIDs/analgesics reported mild UGI discomfort and 4 subjects in the naproxen plus omeprazole group reported moderate or severe UGI discomfort. No statistically significant treatment differences among treatment groups were observed for this last category (p=0.073) or for any of the other categories analyzed. One SAE, severe cholelithiasis, occurred during the study, and this was not related to the study medication. The results of this study indicate that celecoxib treatment is safe and well tolerated when used in the regimen prescribed by the study protocol.

Conclusion(s):

In conclusion, the results of this study indicate that there was lower incidence of small bowel/gastric lesions as determined by video capsule endoscopy in subjects treated with celecoxib (200 mg BID) than in subjects treated with naproxen (500 mg BID) plus omeprazole (20 mg QD). Celecoxib was safe and well tolerated in this study population.

Based on report completed on: 01 October 2003