European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences 2014; 18: 3349-3349

Letter to the Editor

Comment to Comparative efficacy of selegiline versus rasagiline in the treatment of early Parkinson's disease

Dear Editor,

We read the publication "Comparative efficacy of selegiline versus rasagiline in the treatment of early Parkinson's disease"[1] with considerable interest. At the end of the text the authors conclude that "both selegiline and rasagiline might be considered equally effective in early stages of Parkinson's disease".

They also remark that their results contradict ours[2]. We will try to resolve this contradiction.

1. The authors performed a more selective literature search compared to ours[2]. They did their search solely in data banks and failed to give any details as to the time frame of the search or the key words they referenced. Our metaanalysis made use of data banks, registers of ongoing studies and review articles as well, with the goal of doing as extensive a search as possible and most of all in the hopes of finding the most complete evidence available to date for a metaanalysis. One should get the impression that we succeeded here merly by looking at the number of publications we included.
2. The metaanalysis in Marconi et al[1] is insufficiently described: There is no information as to any degree of heterogeneity, or the model applied (which smd was applied: Cohen's d or Hedge's g, or whether the effect model was fixed or random, etc.). The Forest plot (Figure 4) indicates that there are studies on rasagiline and selegiline which contribute to heterogeneity. An example is ADAGIO-RCT in rasagilin and Olanow-RCT in selegiline. On this point a Funnel plot should be calculated (as in our publication[2] which, as a sensitivity analysis, serves the purpose of obtaining greater reliability when interpreting the results).
3. Marconi and Zwingers did not consider the different therapy concepts for Parkinson's disease, they went into monotherapy and combination therapy in a meta-analysis, while we[2] treated the therapies separately.

Summarizing, we conclude that the text by Marconi fails to address essential parameters of meta-analysis with the result that the conclusion of such a meta-analysis (SEL = RAS) cannot be evaluated or validated. Our metaanalysis fully conforms to the recommendationds of the Cochrane Collaboration, as we mention several times in our text. According to our metaanalysis, then, there is a distinct superiority to be found in rasagline.

Conflict of Interest

The Authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

References

1) Marconi S, Zwingers T. Comparative efficacy of selegiline versus rasagiline in the treatment of early Parkinson's disease. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2014; 18: 1879-1882.
2) Jost WH, Friede M, Schnitker J. Indirect metaanalysis of randomized placebo-controlled clinical trials on rasagiline and selegiline in the symptomatic treatment of Parkinson's disease. Basal Ganglia 2012; 2: S17-S26.

W.H. Jost[1], M. Friede[2], J. Schnitker[3]

[1]Parkinson-Klinik Wolfach, University of Freiburg, Wolfach, Germany
[2]Lundbeck, Hamburg, Germany
[3]Institut für angewandte Statistik, Bielefeld, Germany

Corresponding Author: Wolfgang H. Jost, MD; e-mail: w.jost@parkinson-klinik.de