PHARMACOLOGIC MANAGEMENT OF URINARY INCONTINENCE IN WOMEN

Penn Urology Alan J. Wein, MD, PhD (hon), FACS Founders Professor and Emeritus Chief of Urology Director, Training Program in Urology University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine

Penn

POTENTIAL COI

- Advisor/Consultant to
- Avadel Serenity
- Axonics Valencia
- Allergan
- Medtronic
- Roivant

Renn Urology







Potential Management Strategies : SUI

1. Increase intraurethral closure pressure during filling/storage, not during emptying

Duloxetine was withdrawn from the approval process in the US for SUI in women and will not be discussed

Penn

Potential Management Strategies: OAB/DO

- 1. Decrease activation on motor (efferent) or/and sensory (afferent) side of micturition cycle
- 2. Decrease residual urine and thereby increase FBC (functional bladder capacity)
- 3. Decrease urine volume and thereby increase time to activation
- Treatment of associated/causative factors, e.g. bladder outlet obstruction, prolapse, SUI

OAB: Ideal Drug

- Block Urgency
- Block DO
- No effect on Voluntary Voiding
- Minimal AEs
- No safety issues

OAB Treatment Goals

- Symptom relief
- Ultimate goal is symptom resolution
 BUT
- <u>Realistic</u> goal is symptom improvement, not cure
- Patient expectations must be realistic

Penn Urology

Renn Urology





ICI-2013, 2016(Committee 8)



Metrics for OAB Efficacy

- Frequency
- Volume Voided
- Urgency(episodes or severity)
- Urgency Incontinence Episodes
- Nocturia
- Quality of life(various metrics)

Penn

Reported Efficacy of Antimuscarinic Therapy (M+F)(Medians)

- UUI reduction: 55-80%; Placebo 35-40%
 - Drug/placebo=1.4-2
- Urgency reduction: 30-50%; Placebo 15-25%
 - Drug/placebo=2
- Frequency reduction: 15-20%
 - Placebo: 10-12%
- QOL increases any metric

Wein and Chapple. Overactive Bladder in Clinical Practice , 2012

Renn Urology

Reported Adverse Events of Antimuscarinics

- Dry mouth: 9.6-35%
 - -Placebo: 6-10%
- Constipation: <2-21.3%
- Cardiac: not in clinical doses
- Cognitive: ?oxybutynin IR
 - -Inconsistent (LOE 2-EAU)

Penn Urology

Antimuscarinic Monotherapy Improves Storage Symptoms

Meta-analysis: subgroup analysis of 582 men from 4 RCTs (phase III) evaluating the efficacy and safety of solifenacin (12 weeks) in male OAB patients (n=2,848)



Antimuscarinics: Efficacy

- To level the playing field, take measures from FDA approved labelling/product information
- FDA allows frequency, UUI episodes, volume voided, not urgency episodes. They generally use means, not medians
- Use solifenacin(revised 2016), fesoterodine (revised 2011)

Penn Urology

| Solifenacin (5 mg) | 2.6 (1.4) (<mark>54</mark>) | 2.6 (1.6) (<mark>61</mark>) | - |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Placebo | 2.7 (0.8) (30) | 3.2 (1.3) (41) | - |
| Solifenacin (10 mg) | 2.6 (1.5) (<mark>55</mark>) | 2.8 (1.6) (<mark>57</mark>) | 2.9 (2.0) (69) |
| Placebo | 2.7 (0.8) (30) | 3.2 (1.3) (41) | 2.9 (1.2) (41) |
| Fesoterodine (4 mg) | 3.8 (2.06) (<mark>54</mark>) | 3.9 (1.77) (<mark>45</mark>) | |
| Placebo | 3.7 (1.2) (32) | 3.7 (1.0) (27) | |
| Fesoterodine (8 mg) | 3.7 (2.27) (<mark>61</mark>) | 3.9 (2.42) (<mark>62</mark>) | |
| Placebo | 3.7 (1.2) (32) | 3.7 (1.0) (27) | |
| | | | A Pen |

Efficacy : Urinary Frequency (Decrease)

| Solifenacin (5 mg) | 12.1(2.2 <mark>)(18%)</mark> | 12.1 (2.4) | - |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| Placebo | 12.2(1.2) <mark>(10%)</mark> | 12.3 (1.7) | - |
| Solifenacin (10 mg) | 12.3(2.3) <mark>(19%)</mark> | 12.1 (2.9) | 11.5 (2.4) |
| Placebo | 12.2 (1.2) | 12.3 (1.7) | 11.8 (1.3) |
| Fesoterodine (4 mg) | 11.6 (1.74) | 12.9 (1.86) | |
| Placebo | 12 (1.02) | 12.2 (1.02) | |
| Fesoterodine (8 mg) | 11.9 (1.94) | 12.0 (1.94) | |
| Placebo | 12.0 (1.02) | 12.2 (1.02) | |
| | | | Urolog |

Efficacy: Volume voided (Increase)

| Solifenacin (5mg) | 150 (33) | 148 (32) | - |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|---------------|
| Placebo | 144 (7.4) | 147 (11) | 176 (13) |
| Solifenacin (10 mg) | 147 (39) | 146 (37) | 174 (46) |
| Fesoterodine (4 mg) | 160 (27) | 152 (17) | |
| Placebo | 150 (10) | 159 (18) | |
| Fesoterodine (8 mg) | 154 (33) | 156 (33) | |
| | | | ₩ Peni |

Efficacy of Antimuscarinic Agents vs Placebo from Published Trials

| Frequency Orug % | Frequency Placebo % | Ratio | UUI Drug % | UUI Placebo % | Ratio |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | 1.47 | | | 2.15 |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | | | -50 | |
| -18.1 -20.5 | -8.4 -13.5 | 2.15 1.52 | -59 -63 | -44 -43 | 1.34 1.47 |
| -19.6 -17 | -12.8 -8 | 1.53 2.12 | -62.7 -65 | -42.5 -40 | 1.48 1.63 |
| -21.9 -20 | -12.8 -8 | 1.71 2.5 | -57.1 -63 | -42.5 -40 | 1.34 1.58 |
| -16.6 | -9.1 | 1.82 | -68.4 | -53.8 | 1.27 |
| -17.4 | -9.9 | 1.76 | -76.8 | -58.3 | 1,31 |
| | Frequency Prug 9 4 -22 NA -18 -18 -18 -18 -18 -18 -19 6 -17 -21 9 -20 -16 6 -17 -18 -18 -18 -17 -22 -22 -22 -22 -22 -22 -22 -2 | Frequency Orus Frequency Placebo 7.0 7.0 7.2 -15 NA NA -18.1 68.4 -0.5 -12.8 -17 -6 -20 -12.8 -17 -8 -20 -12.8 -17 -8 -20 -12.8 -17 -9 | Frequency Orug Frequency Placebo Ratio 22 -15 1.47 NA NA NA -18 -8.7 2.07 -18.1 -8.4 2.15 -19.6 -112.8 1.53 -17 -8 2.12 -21.9 -12.8 1.71 -20 -9.8 2.52 -16.6 -9.1 1.82 -16.4 -9.9 1.76 | Frequency Drug Frequency % Frequency Ratio UUI 0.702 Placebo Ratio 0.703 -22 -15 1.47 -7.1 NA NA NA NA -18 -8.7 2.07 -7.5 -18.1 -8.4 2.01 -6.3 -19.6 -12.8 1.53 -62.7 -17 -8 2.12 -66. -20 -42.8 1.71 -45.71 -20 -8 2.5 -63. -18 -9.8 2.6 -68. -19.6 -9.1 1.82 -68.4 -17 -8 2.12 -66. -9.1 1.82 2.63.4 -63.4 -20 -8 2.5 -63. -18 2.6 -84.3 -66.4 -17.4 -9.9 1.76 >76.8 | Frequency Drus Frequency Placebo Ratio UUI Drus UUI Placebo UUI Placebo -72 -15 1.47 -71 -33 NA NA NA NA NA -18 -8.7 2.07 -7.50 -50 -18.1 -13.5 1.52 -63 -44 -19.6 -12.8 1.53 -62.7 -40 -21 -8 2.12 -65. -40 -20 -12.8 1.71 -52. -43 -19.6 -9.8 2.12 -65. -40 -19.2 -12.8 1.74 -50.71 -42.5 -17 -8 2.5 -63 -40 -20 -8 2.5 -63 -40 -16.6 -9.1 1.82 -68.4 -55.8 -17.4 -9.9 1.76 -76.8 55.8 |





Antimuscarinics and Cognitive Dysfunction

 This concern seems to have ebbed among urologists since AUA 2016 but remains a matter of concern, especially in the elderly

Penn

ICI Assessments(International **Consultation on Incontinence**)

Table 1. ICI assessments 2008: Oxford guidelines (modified)

Levels of evidence

Level 1: Systematic reviews, meta-analyses, good quality randomized controlled clinical trials (RCTs) Level 2: RCTs, good quality prospective cohort studies Level 3: Case control studies, case series Level 4: Expert opinion Grades of recommendation

- Grade A: Based on level 1 evidence (highly recommended) Grade B: Consistent level 2 or 3 evidence (recommended)
- Grade C: Level 4 studies or "majority evidence" (optional)
- Grade D: Evidence inconsistent/inconclusive (no recommendation possible) or the evidence indicates that
- the drug should not be recommended

| | Level of Evidence | Grade of Recommendation | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------|
| Antimuscarinic drugs | | | _ |
| Atropine, hyoscyamine | 3 | С | |
| Darifenacin | 1 | A | |
| Fesoterodine | 1 | A | |
| Imidafenacin | 1 | A | |
| Propantheline | 2 | В | |
| Solifenacin | 1 | A | |
| Tolterodine | 1 | A | |
| Trospium | 1 | A | |
| Drugs with mixed actions | | | |
| Oxybutynin | 1 | A | |
| Propiverine | 1 | A | er |
| Flavorate | 2 | D | rolo |

All 1-A Antimuscarinics, and Combined Action(OAB/DO)(ICI 2016

Documented beneficial effect Acceptable side effect profile

Penn

Antimuscarinics (EAU 2017)

- "Mainstay of treatment for UUI"
- · Problem: Lack of standard definition of improvement
- · Problem: Lack of use of "cure" as primary outcome
- "In general, systematic reviews note that the overall treatment effect... is usually small but larger than placebo"

Penn

Antimuscarinics (EAU 2017)

"...ER and IR formulations...offer clinically significant short term cure and improvement rates for UUI compared with placebo"

"...IR formulations tend to be associated with more side effects...'

"...every drug where cure of UI was available showed superiority to placebo...but the absolute effect of the size is small"

Penn

Antimuscarinics: EAU(2017)

| Summary of evidence | LE |
|--|--------|
| There is limited evidence that one antimuscarinic drug is superior to an alternative antimuscarinic drug for cure or improvement of urgency urinary incontinence. | 1b |
| Higher doses of antimuscarinic drugs are more effective to cure or improve urgency urinary incontinence, but with a higher risk of side effects. | 1b |
| Once daily (extended release) formulations are associated with lower rates of adverse events compared to immediate release ones, although similar discontinuation rates are reported in clinical trials. | 1b |
| Dose escalation of antimuscarinic drugs may be appropriate in selected patients to improve treatment effect although higher rates of adverse events can be expected. | 1b |
| Transdermal oxybutynin (patch) is associated with lower rates of dry mouth than oral antimuscarinic drugs, but has a high rate of withdrawal due to skin reaction. | 1b |
| •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | rology |

Recommendations for Antimuscarinics (EAU 2017)

| Recommendations | GR |
|---|-----|
| Offer antimuscarinic drugs for adults with urgency urinary incontinence who failed conservative treatment. | A |
| Consider extended release formulations in patients who do not tolerate immediate release antimuscarinics. | A |
| If antimuscarinic treatment proves ineffective, consider dose escalation or offering an alternative treatment. | В |
| Consider using transdermal oxybutynin if oral antimuscarinic agents cannot be tolerated due to dry mouth. | В |
| Offer and encourage early review (of efficacy and side effects) of patients on antimuscarinic medication for urgency urinary incontinence. | С |
| ⊼ P | enn |

Antimuscarinic Agents EAU Guidelines(2017)

No consistent evidence that one is superior to another for cure or improvement of UUI or QOL (LOE 1a)

Renn Urology

Antimuscarinics

- Efficacy similar
- Differing characteristics exist and have given rise to various <u>marketing strategies</u> <u>and comparisons</u> (our best vs your worst), mostly having to do with <u>theoretical</u> rather than <u>real edges</u>
- Decisions revolve around perceived tolerability, safety, and efficacy (latter based on personal experience)

Penn

Combined Behavioral and Drug Therapy for Urge Incontinence

"Whether drug and behavioral therapy are combined from the onset or used sequentially in a stepped program, the evidence from the present study is that two interventions combined have a greater potential to enhance outcome than could be achieved by either intervention alone."

Burgio K et al. JAGS. 2000;48:370-374.

Renn Urology







<figure>

Poor Adherence (EAU 2017)

Low efficacy 41.3% Adverse events 22.4% Cost 18.7%

IR vs ER preparations Lower persistence among young adults Unrealistic expectations of treatment Higher in women Minorities more apt to d/c or switch

> Penn Urology

> Penn



Mirabegron: MOA in OAB

Direct relaxing effect on Detrusor SM

- 1. Activation of adenylyl cyclase \rightarrow cyclic AMP
- 2. Opening bladder K+ channels may be important; activation causes hyperpolarization

Suggestion of activation of pre-junctional receptors to down-regulate Ach release from cholinergic terminals

Afferent inhibition suggested as well

Rougel et al, Pharmacol Res, 2014: 80; 14-20 D'Agostino et al, Eur J Pharmacol, 2015; 758: 115-122 Sammarineed by Andersson et al. 2017. INCONTINENC

| | | NITTI et al, 1328 Pa | Mirabe EAU 2011, N tients, Place | GION lorth Americ: bo Run In (0 | a (885) 47) | |
|---------|---|-------------------------|--|--|----------------|-----|
| | | | Placebo | 50 mg M | 100 mg M | |
| S CE | | Baseline | 3.03 | 2.77 | 2.69 | |
| E E | | ↓4 weeks | 0.72 | 1.20* | 1.18* | |
| LNO SIL | | ↓12 weeks | 1.13 | 1.47 | 1.63* | |
| ž " | < | ↓% | 37.3 | 53.1 | 61.7 | |
| | | D/P Ratio | | 1.42 | 1.65 | |
| | | Baseline | 11.51 | 11.8 | 11.66 | |
| νČ | | ↓4 weeks | 0.77 | 1.19* | 1.37* | |
| л. | | ↓12 weeks | 1.05 | 1.66* | 1.75* | |
| Ε¥. | < | √% | 9.1 | 14.1 | 15.0 | |
| | | D/P Ratio | | 1.55 | 1.65 | |
| | | Baseline | 157.5 | 156.3 | 157.6 | |
| OIDED | | ↓4 weeks | | | | |
| 2 E | | \downarrow 12 weeks | 7.0 | 18.2 | 18.0 | |
| OLUN | < | 1% | 4.44 | 11.6 | 11.4 | |
| - | | D/P Ratio | | 2.6 | 2.6 | Pen |
| ō, | | D/P Ratio | | 2.6 | 2.6 | |

| | Mirabegron KHULLAR et al, EAU 2011 Europe/Australia (886) 1978 Patients, Placebo Run In (046) | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|-----------|---------|----------|--------|---------|--|
| | | | | Placebo | 50 mg M | 100 mg M | T 4 mg | | |
| | Ë, | | Baseline | 2.63 | 2.83 | 2.89 | 2.63 | | |
| | DE | | ↓4 weeks | 0.65 | 1.04* | 1.03 | | | |
| | ONI | | \downarrow 12 weeks | 1.17 | 1.57* | 1.46* | 1.27 | | |
| | N N | < | √% | 43.8 | 55.5 | 50.5 | 48.3 | | |
| | | | | D/P Ratio | | 1.27 | 1.13 | 1.10 | |
| | | | Baseline | 11.71 | 11.65 | 11.51 | 11.54 | | |
| | NCY | | \downarrow 4 weeks | 0.77 | 1.16* | 1.29* | | | |
| | 50E | | \downarrow 12 weeks | 1.34 | 1.93* | 1.77* | 1.59 | | |
| | FRE < | < | ↓% | 11.4 | 16.6 | 15.4 | 13.8 | | |
| | | | D/P Ratio | | 1.46 | 1.35 | 1.21 | | |
| | _ | | Baseline | 156.7 | 161.1 | 158.3 | 158.8 | | |
| | DIDED | | ↓4 weeks | | | | | | |
| | 1 K | | \downarrow 12 weeks | 12.30 | 24.20 | 25.60 | 25.0 | | |
| | OLUN | < | ↓% | 7.8 | 15.0 | 16.2 | 15.7 | | |
| | > | | D/P Ratio | | 1.92 | 2.08 | 1.97 | Penn | |
| | | | | | | | | Jrology | |





Adverse Events: Mirabegron

Table 1: Percentages of Patients with Adverse Reactions, Derived from All Adverse Events, Exceeding Placebe Rate and Reported by 1% or More Patients Treated With Myrbetriq 25 mg or 50 mg Once Daily in Studies 1, 2, and 3

| | Placebo (%) | Myrbetriq 25 mg (%) | Myrbetriq 50 mg (%) |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Number of Patients | 1380 | 432 | 1375 |
| Hypertension* | 7.6 | 11.3 | 7.5 |
| Nasopharyngitis | 2.5 | 3.5 | 3.9 |
| Urinary Tract Infection | 1.8 | 4.2 | 2.9 |
| Headache | 3.0 | 2.1 | 3.2 |
| Constipation | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Upper Respiratory Tract Infection | 1.7 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Arthralgia | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Diarrhea | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| Tachycardia | 0.6 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Abdominal Pain | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.6 |
| Fatigue | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| *Includes reports of blood pressure subjects with baseline hypertension | above the normal range, a | nd BP increased from baseline, occu | arring predominantly in |

Safety Assessments

Most frequent (≥ 2% in any treatment group) treatment emergent adverse events

| | Placebo | Mirabegron | Mirabegron |
|-----------------------------------|---------|------------|------------|
| | N=433 | N=432 | N=440 |
| Hypertension | 8.5% | 11.3% | 10.7% |
| Nasopharyngitis | 3.2% | 3.5% | 5.7% |
| Urinary Tract Infection (UTI) | 2.3% | 4.2% | 4.8% |
| Headache | 4.4% | 2.1% | 2.7% |
| Upper Respiratory Tract Infection | 1.8% | 2.1% | 1.6% |
| Dry Mouth | 2.1% | 1.9% | 1.6% |
| Dizziness | 0.5% | 2.3% | 0.9% |
| Nausea | 2.3% | 1.2% | 1.4% |
| Back Pain | 2.1% | 1.4% | 0.9% |

Beta-3 agonist (Mirabegron)

- 1A (ICI-2016) for efficacy-LUTS/OAB/DO
- LOE 1a from EAU for cure/improvement of UUI

Penn Urology

LUTS/OAB/DO (ICI-2016)

| Ecter of Effective | Grade of Recommendation |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| | |
| 3 | С |
| 3 | С |
| 1 | A |
| | |
| 1 | В |
| | 3 3 1 1 |

B3AR Agonists (EAU Guidelines 2017)

| Summary of evidence | LE |
|--|-----|
| Mirabegron is better than placebo and as efficacious as antimuscarinics for improvement of urgency urinary incontinence symptoms. | 1a |
| Adverse event rates with mirabegron are similar to placebo. | 1a |
| Patients inadequately treated with solifenacin 5 mg may benefit more from the addition of mirabegron than dose escalation of solifenacin. | 1b |
| | |
| Recommendation | GR |
| In patients with UUI and an inadequate response to conservative treatments offer mirabegron, unless they have uncontrolled hypertension. | A |
| ₩ P | enn |

Mirabegron: Summary (EAU 2016)

| Summary of evidence | LE |
|---|----|
| Mirabegron is better than placebo for improvement of UUI symptoms. | 1a |
| here is no evidence that mirabegron is better than placebo for curing incontinence. | 1b |
| Mirabegron is no more effective than tolterodine. | 1b |
| Adrenergic-mediated side effects of mirabegron appear mild and not clinically significant in a rial setting. | 1a |
| Discontinuation rates from mirabegron are similar to tolterodine in a trial setting. | 1b |
| ₩Pe | nn |

Mirabegron: Recommendation (EAU 2016)

| Recommendation | GR |
|--|----------------------|
|)ffer mirabegron to people with urgency urinary incontinence, but inform patients receiving nirabegron that the possible long-term side effects remain uncertain. | В |
| | |
| ₩ ₩ ₩ | nn _{ogy} |

Questions to be Answered

- How is the efficacy compared to current "Gold Standard" titratable antimuscarinics?
- Is there an additive effect (or Not) with antimuscarinics?
 - (Symphony Study) To improve treatment of overactive bladder, mirabegron/solifenacin in combination was compared with each drug alone and placebo. Combination therapy improved OAB symptoms and had similar safety and acceptability.

Penn Urology



Combination Treatment with Mirabegron and Solifenacin in Patients with Overactive Bladder: Efficacy and Safety Results from a Randomised, Double-blind, Dose-ranging, Phase 2 Study (Symphony)

Paul Abrams^{6,*}, Con Kelleher^b, David Staskin^c, Tomasz Rechberger^d, Richard Kay^e, Reynaldo Martina¹, Donald Newgreen¹, Asha Paireddy¹, Rob van Maanen¹, Arwin Ridder¹ I^{stress Ungelen Instme, Swithmes Honjiat, Insteu UK² Voyo and St Tomar Inspirat, London, UK² Tufy University School of Medice, Boson, M.}

> Penn Urology



Mixed Urinary Incontinence (EUA 2017)

| Summary of evidence | LE |
|---|--------------------|
| Limited evidence suggests that antimuscarinic drugs are effective for improvement of the urgency urinary incontinence component in patients with mixed urinary incontinence. | 2 |
| Duloxetine is effective for improvement of both stress urinary incontinence and urgency urinary incontinence in patients with mixed urinary incontinence. | 1b |
| | |
| | |
| Recommendations | GR |
| Recommendations Treat the most bothersome symptom first in patients with mixed urinary incontinence. | GR C |
| Recommendations Treat the most bothersome symptom first in patients with mixed urinary incontinence. Offer antimuscarinic drugs or beta3 agonists to patients with urgency-predominant mixed urinary incontinence. | GR C A* |
| Recommendations Treat the most bothersome symptom first in patients with mixed urinary incontinence. Offer antimuscarinic drugs or beta3 agonists to patients with urgency-predominant mixed urinary incontinence. Consider duloxetine for patients with mixed urinary incontinence unresponsive to other conservative treatments and who are not seeking cure. | GR C A* B |

Elderly (EUA 2017) ummary of evidence LE 1b muscarinic drugs are effective in elderly patients gron has been shown to be efficacious and safe in elderly patients. 1b people, the cognitive impact of drugs which have anticholinergic effects is cumulative and es with length of exposure. 2 ybutynin may worsen cognitive function in elderly patients lifenacin, darifenacin, fesoterodine and trospium have been shown not to cause cognitive 1b n in elderly people in short-ter Recommendations GR older people being treated for urinary incontinence, every effort should be made to employ cological treatments first B* ng-term antimuscarinic treatment should be used with caution in elderly patients especially vho are at risk of, or have, cognitive dysfunction en prescribing antimuscarinic for urgency urinary incontinence, consider the total muscarinic load in older people on multiple drugs. ider the use of mirabegron in elderly patients if additional antimuscarinic load is to be

ESTROGEN(ICI, 2016)

• For LUTS/OAB/DO:

2 C

• For SUI in Women:

2 D

Penn Urology

ESTROGEN

Cochrane Meta Analysis (2012):

The combined results of 6 trials of systemic administration(oral oestrogen) resulted in worse incontinence than placebo. However there was some evidence that oestrogen used locally as vaginal creams or pessaries improved incontinence. Overall there was less frequency and urgency in those women treated with local oestrogen"

Cody et al, 2012, Cochrane Database Syst Rev Oct 17; 10:CD001405

<text><text><image>

