obtained were indicative of greater reduction of early-morning stiffness on phenylbutazone and of joint swelling on indomethacin. The personal preference, expressed at the end of the trial, was in favour of phenylbutazone.

In a mixed group of patients treated over two and a half years indomethacin was effective in improving the symptoms of osteoarthritis (65.3%) and of ankylosing spondylitis (68.7%). In rheumatoid arthritis failures were more frequent, a satisfactory response being recorded in 50.5% of cases.

Side-effects on indomethacin capsules, at an average maintenance dose of 75 mg. daily, occurred in 36.6% of patients in the mixed group. The common side-effects were headache, giddiness, muzziness, nausea, and vomiting. Dyspepsia was not a major problem, occurring in 7.92% of patients; it was only rarely dose-dependent and occurred at any time during long-term administration in contrast to the other side-effects, which were dependent on dose and developed almost always within the first 14 days of treatment.

ADDENDUM

Since the completion of this study, one patient on indomethacin, 200 mg. daily, and prednisolone, 8 mg. daily, with a history of duodenal ulceration, present 20 years earlier, developed dyspepsia after six months on indomethacin. This was followed by a haematemesis which required blood transfusion. In many of the cases of haematemesis reported this combination of drugs was used.

We would like to thank Dr. R. Hodgkinson, of Merck, Sharp, and Dohme Ltd., for generous supplies of indomethacin.

References

American Rheumatism Association Committee (1959). *Ann. rheum. Dis.*, 18, 49.
Ballabio, C. B., Cirla, E., Girardi, G., Caruso, I., and Colombia, B. (1963). *Rheumatismo*, 15, 487.
Bilka, P. J., Wollheim, F., and Williams, R. C., jun. (1964). *Minn. Med.*, 47, 777.
Boardman, P. L., and Hart, F. Dudley (1965). *Practitioner*, 194, 560.
Catoggio, P. M., Centurion, A., Alberti, H., Roldan, H., and Canepa, L., (1964). *Arthr. and Rheum.*, 7, 300.
Clark, G. M. (1964), Ibid., 7, 300.
Dixon, A. St. J., Jones, L., Wanka, J., and Wood, P. (1963). *Abstracts of Communications*, Fifth European Congress on Rheumatic Diseases, p. 174.
Hart, F. Dudley, and Boardman, P. L. (1963). *Brit. med. F.*, 2, 965.
——— (1964). *Practitioner*, 192, 828.
Lövgren, O., and Allander, E. (1964). *Brit. med. F.*, 1, 118.
Paul, W. D., and Strottman, M. P. (1963). *Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation (Iowa) Medical Information Bulletin*, 4 (3), 1.
Percy, J., Stephenson, P., and Thompson, M. (1963). *Abstracts of Communications*, Fifth European Congress on Rheumatic Diseases, p. 176.
Smyth, C. J., Valayos, E. E., and Amoroso, C. (1963). *Arth. and Rheum.*, 6, 299.
——— Amoroso, C., and Valayos, E. (1964). Ibid., 7, 345.
Steinbrocker, O., Traeger, C. H., and Batterman, R. C. (1949). *F. Amer. med. Ass.*, 140, 659.

Senator NELSON. This is probably a question for Mr. Goodrich.

As you know, all of these drugs are handled and promoted by detail men. What legal control, if any, do you have over the information presented by detail men to the physician?

Mr. GOODRICH. Basically our control would be over the detailing pieces—the written, printed and graphic materials that the company develops to be used as detailing pieces. As we move into some of the drugs, particularly Vibramycin which is coming up later, a detailing piece is one of the major pieces there we will be going over with you.

In addition to that, the regulations require that all promotions, whether it be advertising, direct mailings, promotional material left by the detail man, must all conform to the approved labeling, and must all present the full disclosure of both the good and the bad about the drug.