Table I-1. Evaluation of applicability for individual studies for innovator versus generic antiepileptic drug evaluation

| Study, Year | Effectiveness Study Designation and Composite Score | Effectiveness StudyCriteria Met | Applicability Limitation Category | Specific Factors Limiting Applicability |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Zachry, 2009N=1664 | Study Designation: Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study duration with clinically relevant treatmentsAdequate sample size | Population, Outcomes | In this study, patients were switched from one version of the medication to another “A” rated version. This could be from innovator to generic, generic to generic, or generic to innovator. As such it is not a true comparison of innovator to generic switching.ADRs not reported |
| Rascati, 2009N=3964 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study duration with clinically relevant treatmentsAdequate sample size | Population, Outcomes | In this study, patients were switched from one version of the medication to another “A” rated version. This could be from innovator to generic, generic to generic, or generic to innovator. As such it is not a true comparison of innovator to generic switching.ADRs not reported |
| Devine, 2010N=11796 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study duration with clinically relevant treatmentsAdequate sample size | Population, Outcomes | In this study, patients were switched from one version of the medication to another “A” rated version. This could be from innovator to generic, generic to generic, or generic to innovator. As such it is not a true comparison of innovator to generic switching.ADRs not reported |
| Labiner, 2010aN=18125  | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study duration with clinically relevant treatmentsAdequate sample size | Outcomes | ADRs not reported |
| Labiner 2010bN=15500  | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study duration with clinically relevant treatmentsAdequate sample size | Outcomes | ADRs not reported |
| Kauko, 1974N=20 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:1 of 7 | Intention to treat analysis | Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Setting | Only in mentally retarded patientsNo final health outcomes reportedShort duration of followup (30 days)Small sample size (only 20 patients enrolled)ADRs not reportedInstitutionalized facility for mentally retardedConducted in EuropeStudy conducted before 1990 |

| Table I-1. Evaluation of applicability for individual studies for innovator versus generic antiepileptic drug evaluation (continued) |
| --- |
| Study, Year | Effectiveness Study Designation and Composite Score | Effectiveness StudyCriteria Met | Applicability Limitation Category | Specific Factors Limiting Applicability |
| Glende, 1983N=5 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Setting | Short duration of followup (4 weeks total, 2 weeks per group)Small sample size (only 5 patients enrolled)Conducted in EuropeStudy conducted before 1990 |
| Jumao-as, 1989N=10 | Study Designation:Effectiveness studyComposite Score:5 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Setting | Short duration of followup (10 weeks total, 5 weeks per group)Small sample size (only 10 patients enrolled)Study conducted before 1990 |
| Hartley, 1990N=23 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Assessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesEnrolled primary care population | Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Setting | Patients all young (6–15 years)No final health outcomes reportedShort study duration (12 weeks total, 6 weeks per group)Small sample size (only 23 patients enrolled)Patients withdrawn were taken out of the final analysisConducted in Europe |
| Hartley, 1991N=12 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:2 of 7 | Intention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Setting | Patients all young (6.5–15 years)No final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reportedSmall sample size (only 12 patients enrolled)Short duration of followup (12 weeks total, 6 weeks per group)Conducted in Europe |
| Oles, 1992aN=20 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Assessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Population, Intervention, Comparator | Patients had to be 13 years or older Patients had to be seizure free for extended time (5 months to 2 years) Had to have been receiving carbamazepine for at least 6 monthsSmall sample size (only 20 patients enrolled) Short duration of followup (3 months in each group) |
| Oles 1992bN=20 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Assessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Population, Intervention, Comparator | Patients had to be 13 years or older Patients had to have refractory seizures (at least 2 per month in previous 3 months) Had to have been receiving CBZ for at least 6 monthsSmall sample size (only 20 patients enrolled)Short duration of followup (3 months in each group) |
| Reunanen, 1992N=21 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Setting | Small sample size (only 21 patients enrolled)Short duration of followup (3 months in each group)Conducted in Europe |
| Silpakit, 1997N=18 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Setting | Small sample size (only 18 patients enrolled)Short duration of followup (12 weeks total, 3 weeks on each phase)Conducted in Asia |
| Aldenkamp, 1998 N=12 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:5 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Setting | Small sample size (only 12 patients enrolled)Short duration of followup (9 days total, 3 days per therapy)Conducted in Europe |
| LeLorier, 2008aN=671 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study durationAdequate sample size | Outcomes, Setting | No ADRs reportedConducted in Canada |
| LeLorier, 2008bN=1060 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAdequate study durationAdequate sample size | Outcomes, Setting | No final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reportedConducted in Canada |
| LeLorier, 2008cN=202 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:2 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAdequate study duration | Outcomes, Setting | No final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reportedConducted in Canada |
| LeLorier 2008dN=851 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAdequate study durationAdequate study sample | Outcomes, Setting | No final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reportedConducted in Canada |
| Andermann, 2007aN=1142 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAdequate study durationAdequate sample size | Population, Outcomes, Setting | Population not well specifiedNo final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reported Conducted in Canada |
| Andermann, 2007bN=1600 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAdequate study durationAdequate sample size | Population, Outcomes, Setting | Population not well specifiedNo final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reported Conducted in Canada |
| Andermann, 2007cN=2017 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAdequate study durationAdequate sample size | Population, Outcomes, Setting | Population not well specifiedNo final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reportedConducted in Canada |
| Nielsen, 2008aN=9 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Setting | No final health outcomes reportedNo ADRs reportedShort duration of followup (2 weeks on innovator and 7-15 days on generic)Small sample size (only 9 patients enrolled)Conducted in Europe |
| Lund, 1974 N=9  | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Assessed adverse outcomesIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Population, Setting | Patients treated with drug for at least one year admitted to hospital to exclude irregular drug intakeNo final health outcomes reportedShort duration of followup (8 days on innovator and 11 days on generic)Small sample size (only 9 patients enrolled)Conducted in EuropeConducted before 1990 |
| Chen, 1982N=18 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed adverse outcomesEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Setting | No final health outcomes reportedShort duration of followup (9 weeks total, 3 weeks per therapy)Small sample size (only 20 patients enrolled)Conducted in EuropeConducted before 1990 |
| Hodges, 1986N=30 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:3 of 7 | Assessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesEnrolled primary care population | Population, Intervention, Comparator, Setting | Only pediatric patients (3–15 years)Short duration of followup (12 weeks total, 4 weeks on each therapy)Small sample size (only 30 patients enrolled)Conducted in EuropeConducted before 1990 |
| Kishore, 1986N=60  | Study Designation:Effectiveness studyComposite Score:5 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Setting | Short duration of followup (3 months)Small sample size (only 60 patients enrolled)Conducted in AsiaConducted before 1990 |
| Mikati, 1992N=10  | Study Designation:Effectiveness studyComposite Score:6 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesAdequate study durationIntention to treat analysisEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator | Small sample size (only 10 pts enrolled) |
| Soryal, 1992 N=14  | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomesEnrolled primary care population | Intervention, Comparator, Setting | Short duration of followup (4 weeks per therapy)Small sample size (only 14 patients enrolled)Conducted in Europe |
| Duh, 2009N=948 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study durationAdequate sample size | Outcomes, Setting | No ADRs reportedConducted in Canada |
| Paradis, 2009aN=1164 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:4 of 7 | Less stringent eligibility criteriaAssessed final health outcomesAdequate study durationAdequate sample size | Outcomes, Setting | No ADRs reportedConducted in Canada |
| Vadney, 1997N=64 | Study Designation:Efficacy studyComposite Score:2 of 7 | Assessed final health outcomesAssessed adverse outcomes | Population, Intervention, Comparator | Limited to patients with mental retardationShort duration of followup (8 weeks total, 4 weeks on each therapy)Small sample size (only 64 patients enrolled) |