Comparative adherence to oxybutynin or tolterodine among older patients

Angus Thompson

Received: 9 January 2012 / Accepted: 13 January 2012 / Published online: 15 February 2012
© Springer-Verlag 2012

Dear Editor,

In their short communication, Gomes et al. [1] provide interesting data on the real-life use of two antimuscarinic agents used in urinary incontinence. Nonetheless, in many countries around the world, these two agents are available in a range of formulations, as oxybutynin immediate-release (IR) tablets, extended release (ER) tablets, and transdermal patches; and as tolterodine IR tablets and ER capsules. Numerous studies suggest that the incidence of dry mouth, cited by patients as a common reason for treatment discontinuation, varies significantly between these formulations [2–4]. Consequently, the clinical value of the report by Gomes et al. would be greatly increased if the profile of oxybutynin and tolterodine formulations that comprise their data was described.

Yours sincerely,
Angus Thompson

References

1. Gomes T, Juurlink TN, Mamdani MM (2012) Comparative adherence to oxybutynin or tolterodine among older patients. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 68:97–99
2. Davila GW, Daugherty CA, Sanders SW et al (2001) A short-term, multicenter, randomized doubleblind dose titration study of the efficacy and anticholinergic side effects of transdermal compared to immediate release oral oxybutynin treatment of patients with urge urinary incontinence. *J Urol* 166(1):140–145
3. Anderson RU, Mobley D, Blank B et al (1999) Once daily controlled versus immediate release oxybutynin chloride for urge urinary incontinence. OROS Oxybutynin Study Group. *J Urol* 161(6):1809–1812
4. Van Kerrebroeck P, Kreder K, Jonas U et al (2001) Tolterodine once-daily: superior efficacy and tolerability in the treatment of the overactive bladder. *Urology* 57(3):414–421

A. Thompson (✉)
School of Pharmacy, University of Tasmania,
Hobart, Australia
e-mail: angus.thompson@utas.edu.au