The catechol-O-methyltransferase (COMT) inhibitor entacapone enhances the pharmacokinetic and clinical response to Sinemet CR in Parkinson’s disease
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Abstract

Objectives—Entacapone is a specific, potent, peripherally acting catechol-O-methyltransferase (COMT) inhibitor. It has been shown to improve the bioavailability of plasma levodopa and extend its clinical effect when used as an adjunct to standard levodopa preparations, but there is little experience of the effect of entacapone on controlled release levodopa preparations.

Methods—A double blind, placebo controlled, single dose, randomised, cross over trial was performed in 14 patients with Parkinson’s disease with motor fluctuations to investigate the clinical effect of a single dose of entacapone (200 mg) when administered with either standard levodopa-carbidopa (Sinemet™) or controlled release levodopa-carbidopa preparations (Sinemet CR™).

Results—When entacapone was administered with standard Sinemet™ the duration of the clinical response to standard Sinemet™ was longer in comparison with the response after placebo (p=0.02). Moreover, in the same patients, entacapone significantly increased the duration of the clinical response to Sinemet CR™ (p=0.05) without prolonging the latency of response or enhancing dyskinesias.

Conclusions—These data confirm the clinical efficacy of entacapone-standard Sinemet™ combination. They also indicate that adding entacapone to controlled release levodopa preparations might provide a useful treatment option in patients with Parkinson’s disease with motor fluctuations. A double blind clinical trial with a chronically administered entacapone—Sinemet CR™ combination is, however, required to verify this viewpoint.
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The combination of levodopa and a peripheral dopa decarboxylase (DDC) inhibitor continues to be the mainstay for the symptomatic treatment of Parkinson’s disease. It provides stable and effective relief from symptoms and signs of the disease in most patients. Unfortunately, after several years of levodopa treatment fluctuations in the motor response appear and patients experience a wearing off of the antiparkinsonian effect at the end of each levodopa dose. About 30% of the patients treated with levodopa for 3 years can be expected to develop such “wearing off” effects. Consequently the motor fluctuations become more complex and unpredictable.

An important approach to the treatment of motor fluctuations and in particular the “wearing off” effect has been an attempt to prolong the elimination half life of levodopa in the plasma and so obtain more stable plasma levodopa concentrations. With this in mind, controlled release levodopa preparations—namely levodopa-carbidopa (Sinemet CR™) and levodopa-benserazide (Madopar HBS™)—were developed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Studies using these preparations have shown conflicting results, some reporting a significant clinical benefit when used as an adjunct with standard levodopa preparations and others finding no difference.

Controlled release levodopa preparations have several drawbacks: their bioavailability is poorer and even more variable than with standard levodopa preparations, the dose of levodopa has, therefore, to be increased by about 30% to 50% compared with standard preparations. In addition, the derived clinical benefit, as measured by levodopa challenges, is not as long as might be expected.

When DDC is inhibited, levodopa becomes peripherally inactivated via 3-O-methylation catalysed by catechol-O-methyltransferase (COMT). Entacapone is a highly potent, selective, reversible, peripherally acting COMT inhibitor. It is currently registered in EU countries in addition to being in further clinical trials. Entacapone does not have an intrinsic antiparkinsonian effect but, when it is used in combination with standard levodopa-DDC inhibitor formulations, it increases the bioavailability of levodopa by reducing its peripheral conversion to 3-O-methyl-dopa (3-OMD); this results in a prolongation of the therapeutic response to levodopa. In clinical studies entacapone as an adjunct to standard levodopa therapy has prolonged the “on” time of patients with fluctuating Parkinson’s disease by 30 to 60 minutes compared with levodopa treatment alone.

Most studies have been conducted using entacapone in association with standard levodopa-carbidopa formulations and there is
little experience of its effect with controlled release levodopa preparations. Theoretically, in patients with Parkinson’s disease with “wearing off” fluctuations the combination of entacapone and controlled release levodopa should be even more beneficial than the combination of entacapone with standard levodopa. This is because there is more extensive degradation of levodopa into 3-OMD in the bowel with controlled release preparations. However, in one non-randomised open study, entacapone prolonged the “on” time to a similar extent with standard levodopa-carbidopa and controlled release levodopa-carbidopa.

In this study we tested the clinical response to single doses of entacapone added to standard levodopa-carbidopa and controlled release levodopa-carbidopa formulations in patients with fluctuating Parkinson’s disease, using a double blind, placebo controlled, randomised, cross over design.

Methods

PATIENTS

Fifteen patients with idiopathic Parkinson’s disease and fluctuating motor responses to levodopa (wearing off) were studied. Seven of the 15 patients also experienced levodopa induced dyskinesias. Their demographic data are shown in table 1. In addition to standard levodopa-carbidopa preparations, two patients were also taking dopamine agonists (pergolide; patient 7, bromocriptine; patient 11) and four were taking selegiline (patients 5, 8, 10, and 15).

Only patients without psychiatric disorders or severe illnesses were included in the study. The study was conducted according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the ethics committee of Hammersmith Hospital, London. All patients gave their signed consent after receiving verbal and written information about the study.

STUDY DESIGN

The study followed a double blind, randomised, placebo controlled, comparative cross over design over a 4 day period. On each test day the patients were administered one of the following:

1. Standard Sinemet™ (200 mg/50 mg) with or without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone.
2. Sinemet CR™ (200 mg/50 mg) with or without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone.
3. Placebo.

Results

All patients completed the study. The clinical results are shown in table 2. Sinemet CR™ with entacapone prolonged the “on” time to a similar extent, with a significant improvement in UPDRS score over the entire study period.

Table 1 Demographic data of the patients and their history of Parkinson’s disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient No</th>
<th>Sex/age</th>
<th>Duration of symptoms (y)</th>
<th>Duration of levodopa treatment (y)</th>
<th>Duration of fluctuations (y)</th>
<th>Modified Hoehn and Yahr stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M/75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F/70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F/70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M/44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F/62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F/66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F/77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M/71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F/59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M/63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M/74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M/64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F/75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M/66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M/75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 “On” time (20% improvement from baseline UPDRS score) after administration of standard Sinemet™ (200 mg/50 mg) with or without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone, or Sinemet CR™ (200 mg/50 mg) with and without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone to 14 patients with Parkinson’s disease (means). *p < 0.05.

Figure 2 UPDRS maximal improvement after administration of standard Sinemet™ (200 mg/50 mg) with and without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone, or Sinemet CR™ (200 mg/50 mg) with or without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone to 14 patients with Parkinson’s disease (means). *p < 0.05.

Figure 3 “On” time (20% improvement on baseline tapping) after administration of standard Sinemet™ (200 mg/50 mg) with or without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone, or Sinemet CR™ (200 mg/50 mg with or without a single dose of 200 mg entacapone) to 14 patients with Parkinson’s disease (means). *p < 0.05.
the following: a single dose of 200/50 mg levodopa-carbidopa (Sinemet™) and 200 mg of entacapone; 200/50 mg Sinemet™ and placebo; 200/50 mg controlled release levodopa-carbidopa (Sinemet CR™), or 200 mg entacapone; 200/50 mg Sinemet CR™ and placebo. Each patient was randomised to treatment sequences using replicated latin squares.

There was an interval of a week between each test day. During the interval the patients returned to taking their usual medications. All medications were stopped at least 6 hours before the test day.

On the test day the patients were given one of the four aforementioned drug combinations between 7:30 and 8:30 am; they had a low protein breakfast at 10:30 am and lunch at 12:30 pm.

### Clinical Response Assessment and Efficacy Indices

The clinical response on each test day was evaluated 30 and 15 minutes before and every 30 minutes for 6 hours after the intake of the drugs using the motor section (part III) of the unified Parkinson’s disease rating scale (UPDRS) supplemented with a dyskinesia score and a tapping test.

The primary clinical efficacy variable was the duration of the motor response (“on” time). The patient was considered “on” when a 20% improvement from the baseline UPDRS and tapping scores (average of the scores obtained 15 and 30 minutes before the medications) was seen. The secondary efficacy variables were the UPDRS maximal improvement (maximal improvement from the baseline in UPDRS motor score), the latency to the motor response and the duration and severity of dyskinesias.

### Plasma Collection and Pharmacokinetic Analysis

Venous blood samples for measurement of plasma concentrations of levodopa, its metabolites, and carbidopa and entacapone concentrations were collected 30 minutes before the intake of the medications and subsequently during the 6 hours that followed: every 30 minutes for the first 2 hours and, after that, every 60 minutes. The samples were protected from light during the handling and storing procedures. An ion pair reverse phase high pressure liquid chromatography (RP-HPLC) method with amperometric detection was used for determination of levodopa, 3-OMD, 3,4-dihydroxyphenyl acetic acid (DOPAC), homovanillic acid (HVA), and carbidopa. Entacapone concentrations were measured by RP-HPLC with amperometric detection. The maximum plasma peak concentration (Cmax), the time of maximum concentration (Tmax) of levodopa, carbidopa, and entacapone were determined according to standard methods as described previously. The area under the plasma concentration time curve (AUC) was calculated by the linear trapezoidal method from zero to the last detectable concentration (AUC) for levodopa, carbidopa, DOPAC, 3-OMD, and HVA.

### Statistical Method

Statistical analysis of clinical and pharmacokinetic variables comparing the effects of entacapone on Sinemet™ and Sinemet CR™ were performed with a paired Wilcoxon test.

### Table 2: Clinical data (14 patients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Sinemet™</th>
<th>Sinemet CR™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Entacapone</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“On” duration UPDRS score (h)</td>
<td>3.4 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“On” duration tapping test (h)</td>
<td>2.5 (1.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor UPDRS improvement</td>
<td>19.7 (7.4)</td>
<td>18.3 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latency to “on” (h)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.4)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyskinesias (magnitude)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.8)</td>
<td>1.8 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyskinesias duration (h)</td>
<td>1.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>1.0 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are presented as mean (SD), except Δ=mean differences (SE) *p<0.05.
Results
All 15 patients completed the protocol as outlined. A few months after the end of the study, one of the patients (patient 15, table 1) developed prominent signs of autonomic failure and mild cerebellar ataxia. This patient was rediagnosed as having multiple system atrophy and his data were excluded from subsequent analyses.

Plasma samples from two other patients were lost in transit to the central laboratory and so only 12 patients had pharmacokinetic analyses.

CLINICAL RESULTS
The duration of “on” time was prolonged when entacapone was administered with both standard Sinemet™ (30 minute increase, p=0.03) and Sinemet CR™ (48 minute increase, p=0.05) in comparison with the responses when placebo was added (fig 1).

The UPDRS maximal improvement was greater when entacapone was given with Sinemet CR™ (p=0.02) but not with standard Sinemet™. After Sinemet CR™ with placebo the UPDRS maximal improvement was smaller compared with standard Sinemet™ with placebo but the difference was not significant (fig 2).

The latency of the motor response was not significantly affected by adding entacapone to levodopa; an increase of 0.2 hours with standard Sinemet™ and 0.3 hours with Sinemet CR™ was noted (p=0.21 and p=0.31, respectively).

The duration of “on” time assessed with a tapping test was also longer when entacapone was administered with either standard Sinemet™ (48 minutes increase, p=0.01) or Sinemet CR™ (54 minutes increase, p=0.03) in comparison with the responses obtained after addition of placebo (figure 3).

Eight of the 14 patients had dyskinesias after administration of standard Sinemet™ with placebo and four had dyskinesias after Sinemet CR™ with placebo. In these patients the addition of entacapone to Sinemet CR™ did not increase the severity (p=0.50) or duration (p=0.34) of dyskinesias. The addition of entacapone to standard Sinemet™ reduced the severity (p=0.02), but not the duration of dyskinesias (p=0.19). These clinical results are summarised in table 2.

Figures 4 and 5 show the time course of the UPDRS motor scores and levodopa plasma concentrations after standard Sinemet™ (fig 4) and Sinemet CR™ (fig 5), both with and without entacapone.

PHARMACOKINETICS
Pharmacokinetic indices of levodopa, its metabolites, carbidopa, and entacapone are summarised in table 3. Briefly, when 200 mg entacapone was added to standard Sinemet™ the mean area under the curve (AUC) values of levodopa increased by 10% compared with placebo. This change did not, however, reach significance (p=0.15). The Cmax of levodopa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Pharmacokinetic data (12 patients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Sinemet™</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levodopa AUC (h×ng/mg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levodopa Cmax (ng/ml)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levodopa Tmax (h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-OMD AUC (h×ng/mg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOPAC AUC (h×ng/mg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbidopa AUC (h×ng/mg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbidopa Cmax (ng/ml)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbidopa Tmax (h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entacapone AUC (h×ng/mg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entacapone Cmax (ng/ml)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are presented as mean (SD), except A=mean (SE).
*p<0.05; **p<0.01.
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Discussion
levodopa non-significantly by 18%.

When 200 mg entacapone was added to the Sinemet CR™ treatment, the mean increase in
AUC of levodopa was 22 % (p=0.01) com-
pared with placebo. Entacapone also increased the Cmax by 28% (p=0.02) and the Tmax of
levodopa non-significantly by 18%.

The functional effects of entacapone treat-
ment have also been elegantly demonstrated with
-6-fluorodopa positron emission tomo-
graphy (PET), a 400 mg oral dose increasing
striatal levodopa storage by 40% in patients
with early Parkinson’s disease.20–31

To date, there has been little reported experience of the effect of entacapone on con-
trolled release levodopa preparations. A phar-
macological interaction study of entacapone and controlled release levodopa-carbidopa in
healthy volunteers12 showed that entacapone increased the AUC of levodopa and the Cmax,
but did not influence the Tmax. Similar results
were observed when tolcapone, another COMT inhibitor, was combined with a
levodopa-benserazide formulation. Kaakkola
et al31 have investigated the clinical and
pharmacokinetic responses to levodopa when
entacapone was administered concomitantly
with either a standard or a controlled release
levodopa-carbidopa preparation in patients
with Parkinson’s disease. Results from this
short term open cross over study suggested
that entacapone improved the clinical response to
the controlled release levodopa preparation.

Our study is the first one conducted in a
double blind placebo controlled randomised
fashion. Entacapone, added to controlled release levodopa-carbidopa (Sinemet CR™)
was significantly more effective than placebo in
prolonging the duration of “on” time assessed
using both the motor section (III) of the
UPDRS and a tapping test. The maximal
improvement of the motor response was also
increased when entacapone was added to
Sinemet CR™. The duration of the “on” time
was less prolonged than in the previous open
study by Kaakkola et al.22 This could be due to
the fact that we considered patients to be “on”
when the UPDRS and tapping test score were
improved by ≥ 20% from the baseline score.
When using Kaakkola’s 10% improvement cri-
terion for “on”, the duration of “on” time after
entacapone was longer than the 6 hour test
period in some of our patients. The latencies
to the onset of motor response and the magnitude
duration and dyskinesias were not affected by
entacapone.

Pharmacokinetic results mirrored the clini-
cal results: the AUC of levodopa was signifi-
cantly increased after addition of entacapone
compared with placebo. Entacapone also
increased the Cmax and the Tmax of levodopa
when given with Sinemet CR™.

These results, obtained after single doses of
entacapone, indicate that the chronic addition
of this drug to controlled release levodopa
preparations could be a useful treatment strat-
egy in Parkinson’s disease patients with motor
fluctuations. A double blind long-term treat-
ment study is warranted to confirm this view
point.

Moreover, there are indications that combi-
nation entacapone plus controlled release lev-
dopa formulations could be useful in patients
with Parkinson’s disease in the early stages
of disease. Chronic intermittent stimulation of
dopaminergic receptors, such as occurs with
conventional multiple daily standard levodopa
treatments, may induce D1 and D2 receptor
down regulation36–37 and modify the release and
the striatal metabolism of dopamine.38 Such
changes could be important in the pathogen-
esis of motor fluctuations. Therefore, any
possible smoothing of the intermittent pulsatile
nature of short levodopa preparations lending
to a more sustained striatal response should in
theory be adopted from the earliest stages of
Parkinson’s disease. Controlled release prepara-
tions of levodopa cannot be expected to pro-
duce plasma levodopa profiles comparable to
continuous infusion, nevertheless, compared to
standard preparations, they provide somewhat
more stable plasma levodopa concentrations’
with significantly fewer doses each day.1 We
suggest that controlled release levodo-
pa preparations in combination with entac-
apone is a further option for better controlling
the administration and elimination of levodopa
to produce a truly uniform pharmacokinetic
and clinical response and could be used in
patients with early Parkinson’s disease without
motor fluctuations.
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