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ABSTRACT

Background: Knee Osteoarthritis is a progressive disease showing increasing trend of occurrence in a population. It has lead to great morbidity and disability. Combinations which showed anti-inflammatory property and suppression of cartilage degeneration are better options for management of knee osteoarthritis. According to medical practice, quick relief within short period of exposure to drug therapy is preferred. This study was an attempt to compare the safety and effectiveness of diacerein-glucosamine and univestin-chondroitin combinations in knee osteoarthritic patients in a tertiary care hospital. These drugs are now prescribed by Indian physicians in the current scenario.

Patients and Method: The study began only after getting the approval from Institutional Ethics Committee and obtaining Inform Consent from subjects. The study was conducted in the department of orthopedics in Pushpagiri Medical College hospital, Kerala. From 140 patients who arrived at the Orthopedics OPD Pushpagiri medical college hospital, we sorted and selected only 64 patients based on the study criteria. We divided into two groups (32 each) one receiving diacerein-glucosamine and another receiving univestin chondroitin combinations. From these groups grade 1 and 2 patients are subdivided. They were assessed by WOMAC, KOOS, VAS, 6 minute walk test, and Standard ADR questionnaires (Naranjo’s) for measuring safety and effectiveness of drug combinations. Change in the short term effectiveness for both drugs measure was assessed before the start of treatment, and after 30 days of treatment.

Conclusion: For Grade 1 patients both drugs were equally effective. But for Grade 2 Patients diacerein-glucosamine combination therapy shows more benefit than univestin-chondroitin. However, semi-synthetic drug combination showed more safety profile than synthetic drug combination in the short term treatment of knee osteoarthritis.
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INTRODUCTION

OA (Osteoarthritis) may be defined as a heterogeneous group of conditions that lead to joint symptoms and signs which are associated with defective integrity of articular cartilage in addition to related changes in the underlying bone and at the joint margins. OA is usually a progressive disease of synovial joints that represents failed repair of joint damage that results from stresses that may be initiated by an abnormality in any of the synovial joint tissues including articular cartilage, subchondral bone, ligament menisci, periarticular muscles, peripheral nerves or synovium. This ultimately results in the breakdown of cartilage and bone leading to the symptoms of pain, stiffness and functional disability. Abnormal intra-articular stress and failure of repair may rise as a result of biochemical, biomechanical and genetic factors. This process may be localized to as single joint, a few joint or generalized and the factors that initiate OA likely varying depending on the joint site. (1)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

STUDY DESIGN: Prospective Observational Study

*Corresponding author: Dr. Mathew George |
STUDY SETTING: Tertiary care setting; Department of Orthopedics; Pushpagiri Medical College Hospital, Thiruvalla.

STUDY POPULATION: All patients with Kellgren-Lawrance Osteoarthritic (knee) Grade1,2 reported to Department of Orthopedics, Pushpagiri Medical College Hospital, Thiruvalla

STUDY PERIOD: 6 months

SAMPLE SIZE: As per the following equation, 
\[ n = \frac{\left( Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_{1-\beta} \right)^2 \sigma^2}{d^2} \], \ n=64

- \( Z_{1-\alpha/2} \) : value of z at significance level 5%
- \( Z_{1-\beta} \) : value of z at power 95%
- \( \sigma \) : standard deviation of population
- \( d \) : difference of the means

INCLUSION CRITERIA
- OP patients in orthopedics department.
- Both female and male patients.
- Those who give consent voluntarily to participate in the study.
- Patients receiving diacerein-glucosamine and univestin-chondroitin combinations.
- Patients sorted for grade 1, 2 osteoarthritis (knee).
- Patients between the age of 35-70. Patients with primary knee OA.
- Patients having comorbidities of hypertension or diabetes can be included.
- Patients receiving NSAIDS for one week.

EXCLUSION CRITERIA:
- Patients who are not willing to give consent.
- Patients taking steroid medications.
- Patients who were advised or had undergone knee replacement surgery.
- Patients having Pre-existing deformities of knee.
- Patients having rheumatoid arthritis, sera-negative arthritis, gouty arthritis and secondary osteoarthritis.
- Patients having previous history of fracture and trauma. Patients with renal insufficiency.
- Patients receiving anticoagulants.

BRIEF PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY
- A prospective, observational study was conducted in Department of orthopedics at Pushpagiri Medical College Hospital on the topic comparative study on the safety and effectiveness of glucosamine-diacerein and univestin – chondroitin in knee osteoarthritis patients in a tertiary care hospital.
- The entire study was carried out only after getting approval from Institutional Ethics Committee.
- The selection of patients was based upon the inclusion and exclusion criteria. All patients were provided with a brief introduction regarding the study and the confidentiality of the data. A written Informed Consent was obtained from the patient or care-giver. Patients who met inclusion criteria were first divided into two groups.
- Demographic details of the patients were collected and recorded.
- One set of patients received Glucosamine (750mg)-diacerein (50mg) and others received Univestin (250mg) Chondroitin (200mg), for a period of 1 month.
- The patients were also prescribed with NSAID for 1 week along with the medication.
- The patients were further divided into 2 groups based on the Kellgren-Lawrence grade 1, 2.
- We used the standard questionnaire including WOMAC, KOOS, VAS, 6 minute walk test, and Standard ADR questionnaires.
- Between the two groups, change in the short term efficacy measure was assessed before the start of treatment, and after 30 days of treatment.
RESULT:

In the prospective observational study 64 patients with grade 1 and 2 knee OA were selected. Among them 32 were received Univestin – chondroitin (DRUG 1) and others received Diacerein - Glucosamine (DRUG 2) combinations respectively.

I. WOMAC QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 1: Distribution of patients according to gender by WOMAC index

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|-----------|------------|
| Male   | 12        | 18.8       |
| Female | 52        | 81.3       |
| Total  | 64        | 100        |

Figure 1: Graphical representation for Distribution of patients according to Gender

Table 2: Distribution of patients according to age by WOMAC index

| DRUG | No: of patients | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std.deviation |
|------|-----------------|---------|---------|--------|---------------|
| 1    | 32              | 36      | 80      | 59.969 | 11.9069       |
| 2    | 32              | 36      | 72      | 53.313 | 11.0262       |

Figure 2: Graphical representation for Distribution of patients according to age by WOMAC index
Table 3: Table representing the statistical analysis of difference in pain in study subjects by WOMAC index

| Patients                        | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1                         |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy        | 400         | 208.923 | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | 7.653 | 3.950 | 0.056 |
| Grade 2                         |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy        | 306.250     | 87.761  | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | 95.063 | 27.242 | 0.000 |

Figure: 3(a)
There is no considerable change of effect in pain by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients.

Figure 3(b)

In grade 2 patients there is decrease in pain by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

**Figure 3: Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of pain using WOMAC index score.**

**Table 4: Table representing the statistical analysis of difference in stiffness in study subjects by WOMAC index**

| Patients | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|----------|------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1  | 54.391     | 34.648  | 0.000        |
| Before and After therapy | 0.016 | 0.010 | 0.921 |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | | | |
| Grade 2  | 87.891     | 47.428  | 0.000        |
| Before and After therapy | 17.016 | 9.180 | 0.005 |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | | | |
There is no considerable change of effect in stiffness by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients.

In grade 2 patients there is decrease in stiffness by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

**Figure 4 (a,b):** Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of stiffness by WOMAC index score.
Table 5: Table representing the statistical analysis of variability in daily activities of study subjects by using WOMAC index.

| Patients | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|----------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1  | 2889.063    | 258.770 | 0.000        |
| Before and After therapy | 25.000 | 2.239 | 0.145 |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | | | |
| Grade 2  | 3306.25     | 128.357 | 0.000        |
| Before and After therapy | 576.000 | 22.362 | 0.000 |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | | | |

There is no considerable change of effect in daily activities by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients.
In grade 2 patients there is better changes in daily activities by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

Figure 5 (a,b): Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of daily activities by WOMAC index score.

1. **KOOS QUESTIONNAIRE**

Table 6: Table for Distribution of patients according to age by KOOS index

| DRUG | GRADE  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. deviation |
|------|--------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1    | Grade1 | 36      | 80      | 59.94 | 13.359         |
|      | Grade2 | 38      | 80      | 60.00 | 10.702         |
| 2    | Grade1 | 36      | 66      | 53.81 | 9.446          |
|      | Grade2 | 37      | 72      | 52.81 | 12.708         |
Figure 6: Graphical representation for Distribution of age according to KOOS score

Table 7: Table for Distribution of patients according to gender by KOOS index

| Drug   | Grade | Sex        | Count | Percent |
|--------|-------|------------|-------|---------|
| Drug 1 | Grade 1 | Male   | 3     | 18.8    |
|        |        | Female   | 13    | 81.3    |
|        |        | Male Female | 2 | 12.5    |
|        |        | Female Male | 14 | 87.5    |
| Drug 2 | Grade 1 | Male   | 4     | 25.0    |
|        |        | Female   | 12    | 75.0    |
|        |        | Male Female | 1  | 6.3     |
|        |        | Female Male | 15 | 93.8    |

Figure 7: Graphical Representation for Distribution of gender by KOOS index
Table 8: Table representing the statistical analysis of difference in symptoms in study subjects by KOOS index

| Patients          | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|-------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1           |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy | 2889.063   | 213.160 | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | 18.063     | 11.560  | 0.002        |
| Grade 2           |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy | 534.766    | 119.640 | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | 107.641    | 24.082  | 0.000        |

In grade 1 patients there is a change of effect in symptoms by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients. Here the drug 2 is more effective compared to drug 1.

Figure 8(a)

Figure 8(b)
In grade 2 patients there is effective change in symptoms by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients. Here the drug 2 is more effective compared to drug 1.

Figure 8: Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of symptoms by KOOS index

Table 9: Table representing the statistical analysis of difference in stiffness in study subjects by KOOS index

| Patients                  | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1                   |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy  | 54.391      | 34.648  | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy  |             |         |              |
| against both drugs        | 0.016       | 0.010   | 0.921        |
| Grade 2                   |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy  | 87.891      | 47.428  | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy  |             |         |              |
| against both drugs        | 17.016      | 9.180   | 0.005        |

Figure 9(a)
There is no considerable change or effect in stiffness by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients.

In grade 2 patients there is effective change in stiffness by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

**Figure 9: Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of stiffness by KOOS index**

**Table 10: Table representing the statistical analysis of difference in pain in study subjects by KOOS index**

| Patients       | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|----------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1        |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy | 826.563     | 255.968 | .000         |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | 7.562       | 2.342   | .136         |
| Grade 2        |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy | 798.063     | 63.182  | .000         |
| Before and after therapy against both drugs | 196.000     | 15.517  | .000         |
There is no considerable change or effect in pain by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients.
In grade 2 patients there is decrease in pain by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

**Table 11: Table representing the statistical analysis of variability in daily activities in study subjects by KOOS index**

| Patients                  | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1                   |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy  | 2889.063    | 258.770 | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy  | 25.000      | 2.239   | 0.145        |
| Grade 2                   |             |         |              |
| Before and After therapy  | 3306.250    | 128.357 | 0.000        |
| Before and after therapy  | 576.000     | 22.362  | 0.000        |

**Figure 11: Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of daily activities KOOS index**

![Figure 11(a)](image)

There is no considerable change or effect in daily activities by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients.
In grade 2 patients there is decrease in daily activities by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

### Table 12: Table representing the statistical analysis of variability in entertainment activities in study subjects by KOOS index

| Patients | Before and After therapy | Before and after therapy against both drugs | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1  | Before and After therapy |                                            | 112.891     | 89.789  | 0.000        |
|          | Before and after therapy against both drugs |                      | 1.891       | 1.504   | 0.230        |
| Grade 2  | Before and After therapy |                                            | 172.266     | 76.456  | 0.000        |
|          | Before and after therapy against both drugs |                      | 40.641      | 18.037  | 0.000        |

**Figure 12: Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of entertainment activity by KOOS index**
There is no considerable change of effect in entertainment by the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients.

In grade 2 patients there is effective change in entertainment by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.
Table 13: Table representing the statistical analysis of difference in Quality Of Life in study subjects by KOOS index.

| Patients                  | Before and After therapy | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1                   |                          | 199.516     | 204.850 | 0.000        |
|                           | Before and after therapy against both drugs | 0.766 | 0.786 | 0.382 |
| Grade 2                   |                          | 297.563     | 111.065 | 0.000        |
|                           | Before and after therapy against both drugs | 33.063 | 12.341 | 0.001 |

Figure 13: Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure for Quality Of Life using KOOS score.

Figure 13(a)

There is no considerable change or effect in the use of drug 1 and drug 2.
In grade 2 patients there is effective change in quality of life by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

### 3. VAS SCORE

Table 14: **Table representing the statistical analysis of difference in pain in study subjects by VAS score.**

| Patients | Before and After therapy | Before and after therapy against both drugs | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1  | Before and After therapy |                                             | 2613.766    | 152.490 | 0.000        |
|          | Before and after therapy against both drugs | 34.516 | 2.014 | 0.166 |
| Grade 2  | Before and After therapy |                                             | 3206.391    | 106.528 | 0.000        |
|          | Before and after therapy against both drugs | 1048.141 | 34.823 | 0.000 |

Figure 14: **Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of pain by VAS score**

Figure 14(a)
By the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients there is no considerable change or effect in pain which measured by visual analogue scale.

**Figure 14(b)**

In grade 2 patients there is decrease in pain by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.
4.6-MINUTE WALK SCORE

Table 15: Table representing the statistical analysis of walking capability in subjects by 6-min walk score

| Patients        | Before and After therapy | Before and after therapy against both drugs | Mean square | F-value | Significance |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|---------|--------------|
| Grade 1         |                           |                                             | 110.513     | 11.560  | 0.345        |
|                 | Before and After therapy |                                             | 4683.319    | 213.160 | 0.000        |
| Grade 2         |                           |                                             | 156.563     | 15.947  | 0            |
|                 | Before and After therapy |                                             | 427.973     | 43.592  | 0            |

Figure 15: Graphical Representation for estimated marginal measure of 6-minute walking score
Figure 15(a)

By the use of drug 1 and 2 in grade 1 patients there is no considerable change or effect in six minute walk score of patients before and after therapy.
In grade 2 patients there is effective change in six minute walk of patients by the use of drug 2 compared to drug 1. Thus drug 2 is more effective in case of grade 2 patients.

5. **NARANJO’s SCALE**

Table 16: Table representing statistical analysis of Adverse Drug Reactions.

| Side Effects (ADR) | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Doubtful ADR       | 61        | 95.3    |
| Possible ADR       | 3         | 4.7     |
| Probable ADR       | 0         | 0       |
| Definite ADR       | 0         | 0       |
| Total              | 64        | 100.0   |

| Side effects                        | No of patients |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| Gastritis                           | 1              |
| Yellow discoloration of urine       | 2              |
From the table we can conclude that 95.3% were doubtful ADR and remaining 4.7% is possible chance of ADR. Among 64 patients 3 of them reported the side effects especially gastritis, yellow discoloration of urine and abdominal discomfort.

**Side Effects**

![Graphical representation of Adverse Drug Reactions](image)

**SUMMARY**

A prospective, observational study was conducted in Department of orthopedics at Pushpagiri Medical College Hospital to compare the safety and effectiveness of glucosamine- diacerein and univestin – chondroitin in knee osteoarthritis patients. From 140 patients who arrived at the orthopedics OPD Pushpagiri medical college hospital, we sorted and selected only 64 patients based on the study criteria. Demographic details of the patients were collected, recorded and analyzed. We used the standard questionnaire including WOMAC, KOOS, VAS, 6 minute walk test, and Standard ADR questionnaires (Naranjo’s) for measuring safety and effectiveness of drug combinations. Change in the short term effectiveness for both drugs measure was assessed before the start of treatment, and after 30 days of treatment. Collected data was organized, tabulated and analyzed using statistical method and described with the help of tables and graphs.

- The majority of patients belong to 35-80 age groups. Among the patients there is no significant relationship between drug effectiveness with respect to their age proportion. The age of population only have a relationship with occurrence of disease. Possibility of disease occurrence increase with aging.
- Female are more prone to knee osteoarthritis than males. Gender has no direct relationship with effectiveness of drugs.
- Diarrhoea, gastritis and dark yellow coloured urine are adverse drug reactions that are reported by 3 of the patients within one month of therapy using diacerein-glucosamine combination. There are no observed adverse drug reactions reported for univestin-chondroitin for short period of time.
- Both drug combinations showed reduction in WOMAC AND KOOS pain scores. Both the drugs showed anti-nociceptive property by reducing pain within short period of therapy. In grade 1 patients there is no considerable change in antinociceptive effect for both drugs. In grade 2 patients there is significant reduction in pain by use of drug 2 as compared to drug1.
- Both drug combinations showed reduction in
WOMAC AND KOOS stiffness scores. Both the drugs showed anti-inflammatory property by reducing stiffness within short period of therapy. In grade 1 patients there is no considerable change in anti-inflammatory effect for both drugs. In grade 2 patients there is significant reduction in stiffness by use of drug 2 as compared to drug 1.

- The difficulty in performing daily activities and entertainment activities decreased with use of both drugs. In grade 1, both drugs showed similar effect. However Diacerein-glucosamine combination is more beneficial for grade 2.

- The 6-min walking score increased for those taking diacerein-glucosamine than those patients taking univestin-chondroitin combination.

- The Quality of Life was found to be more improved for patients taking diacerein-glucosamine than univestin; chondroitin combinations.

- Among 64 populations, diacerein-glucosamine combination was found to be more effective in knee osteoarthritis patients of grade 1 and 2. However univestin-chondroitin was found to have more safety profile in short term therapy.

CONCLUSION

Knee Osteoarthritis is a progressive disease showing increasing trend of occurrence in a population. Females are more prone to this disease than male. This study is an attempt to compare the safety and effectiveness of diacerein-glucosamine and univestin chondroitin combinations which are prescribed by physicians in the current scenario. The current study was conducted in the department of orthopaedics in Pushpagiri medical college hospital. 64 patients having knee OA were selected for the study and they were divided into two groups (32 each) ,one receiving diacerein-glucosamine and another receiving univestin chondroitin combinations.

We can conclude that both drugs are equally effective for grade 1 and grade 2 patients. The study reveals that among these two drugs diacerein-glucosamine combination therapy shows more benefit for grade 2 patients than univestin-chondroitin. As per AAOS (17), ARA(18), NHS(19) guidelines there are no combination of medication that shows ant-inflammatory property and that suppress cartilage degeneration. In this study we found that both the combination therapies showed anti-inflammatory property and that suppress cartilage degeneration. Apart from this, there is 4.7% of possible chance of ADR for diacerein – glucosamine combination. However, there are no ADRs reported for the other combination. Hence semi-synthetic drug combination showed more safety profile than synthetic drug combination in the treatment of knee osteoarthritis. Since Univestin is a newer drug for knee OA in the current scenario, supporting studies on its combination therapy was not yet conducted. According to medical practice, quick relievenent within short period of exposure to drug therapy is preferred. Therefore further studies to reveal the short term effectiveness of univestin is needed.
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