

Sag nr. 409a, Sammenlignende reklame, brochure

Markedsføringsnævnet:	Strange Beck (formand), Charlotte Sonne og Anne Mette Strunz
Afgørelsesdato:	20. februar 2026
Klager:	Zoetis Animal Health ApS, Øster Allé 48, 2100 København Ø, ("Zoetis")
Indklagede:	Elanco Animal Health ApS, Lautrupvang 12,1.th, 2750 Ballerup, ("Elanco")
Klageemne:	Sammenlignende reklame, brochure

Den 16. januar 2026 modtager Markedsføringsnævnet en klage fra Zoetis vedrørende Elancos brochure for veterinærlægemidlet Zenrelia. (Brochuren er gengivet nedenfor.)

Klagen rummer følgende to klagepunkter:

1. Sammenlignende reklame uden tilstrækkelig dokumentation og vildledende påstande
2. Manglende information om bivirkninger og vaccinationseffekter

Ad klagepunkt 1 – Sammenlignende reklame uden tilstrækkelig dokumentation og vildledende påstande

Ifølge **Zoetis** anvender Elanco studiet "Comparative efficacy and safety of ilunocitinib and oclacitinib for the control of pruritus and associated skin lesions in dogs with atopic dermatitis" i virksomhedens brochure for Zenrelia samt i præsentationer for dyrlæger ude på klinikkerne. Studiet er designet som et non-inferiority studie med et end-point på dag 28. Studiets statistiske design gør det derfor umuligt at konkludere på andet end om Zenrelias effekt er non-inferior til Apoquels på dag 28.

I påstanden ”I det sammenlignende studie opnåede 77 % af Zenrelia-behandlede hunde remission fra kløe, i forhold til 53 % af oclacitinib-behandlede hunde” nævnes et sammenlignende studie. Det direkte sammenlignende studie, der sammenligner behandling med Zenrelia og behandling med Apoquel, viste, at Zenrelia havde en tilsvarende effekt med Apoquel på dag 28, hvilket var det primære effektive endepunkt. Påstanden i Elanco vet-brochure er baseret på PVAS-scoren på dag 112 i studiet, som var et sekundært endepunkt. Når flere endepunkter testes statistisk mod hinanden, kan type I-fejlrate (sandsynligheden for fejlagtigt at konkludere en effekt, når sandheden er, at der ikke er nogen effekt) blive forhøjet. Derfor bør p-værdierne for analyserne af de multiple sekundære endepunkter ikke tolkes som bevis på statistisk signifikante forskelle. Til støtte for synspunktet citerer Zoetis en FDAs afgørelse fra USA, hvor det samme spørgsmål blev rejst:

“Your product Detailer¹⁴ makes the claim “77% of Zenrelia-treated dogs returned to normal versus 53% of Apoquel treated dogs.” The head-to-head study comparing treatment with Zenrelia to treatment with Apoquel showed that Zenrelia had similar efficacy as Apoquel on day 28, which was the primary effectiveness endpoint. The claim in the Detailer is based on PVAS scores on Day 112 of the study, which was a secondary endpoint. When multiple endpoints are tested statistically, the Type I error rate (the probability of erroneously concluding an effect when the truth is that there is no effect) may be inflated. Therefore, the p-values associated with the analyses of the multiple secondary endpoints should not be interpreted as evidence of statistically significant differences. We acknowledge you note with an asterisk that “PVAS <2; P<0.05. Secondary end point P values are not adjusted for multiple testing; therefore, caution should be exercised in interpretation.” However, this information is located in much smaller font at the bottom of the page and its inclusion in the Detailer does not mitigate the misleading impression made by the claim, which is presented prominently in large font in the center of the page. See 21 CFR 202.1(e)(7)(viii).”

Zoetis henviser desuden til, at der i studiet selv flere steder tages forbehold for at fortolke på denne måde med sætningen: *“Additional endpoints are not adjusted for multiple testing; therefore, caution should be exercised in interpretation”* (Tekst under figur fra studiet. Figuren sidst i dookumenett.)

Zoetis anmoder om, at Elanco omgående stopper brugen af brochuren, da der er tale om bevidst misvisende markedsføring.

Zoetis påpeger endvidere, at der i samme brochure står angivet, at *“Zenrelia vurderes højt af både hundeejere og dyrlæger”* sammen med en påstand om, at *“Zenrelia fik signifikant højere bedømmelse end oclacitinib”*. Hertil kommer udtrykkene *“Virker hurtigt”* og *“Høj succesrate”* (slide 2). Dette anser Zoetis også som værende misvisende.

I brev af 30. januar 2026 kommenterer **Elanco** klagepunkt 1 med følgende bemærkninger:

“We wish to highlight to the committee that not once has Zoetis reached out to Elanco local management to discuss or state its objections regarding the marketing materials.

We equally understand that Zoetis' complaint addresses multiple sources and comments made by the United States of America's Food and Drug Agency (FDA). While Elanco as a multinational company appreciates operating under different regulatory frameworks, we fail to see the relevance of any comments of the FDA in a specific US to US context. The Lægemiddelstyrelsen and/or the European Medicines Agency are the sole sovereign sources of truth concerning a marketing authorization regarding a veterinary medicinal product authorized in the Kingdom of Denmark and the European Union. As such, we ask ViNordic to disregard the arguments made by Zoetis as they are non-relevant to Denmark and misleading in itself. Furthermore, it is a clear strategy by the dominant player in the dermatology for dogs market to disparage challengers to its dominant position, which is forbidden by European Law (see in that regard the multiple European Court of Justice cases).

Elanco has experienced similar complaints by Zoetis in multiple other European jurisdictions (e.g. Belgium, Spain, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Germany) where none of these cross-border arguments were held to be of merit. We wish to highlight that in the case of a NOAH complaint in the UK, the NOAH Committee "expressed dissatisfaction with Zoetis' behavior", as Zoetis actively tried to create alleged breaches to bring a complaint. The attempt to abuse ViNordic's procedure to possibly obtain a favorable ruling trying to damage Zenrelia™'s brand as well as Elanco's reputation is deplorable, but fits in the pattern Zoetis has displayed in the last months. However, in the assumption that the committee expects a comment on the scientific questions possibly raised by Zoetis' complaint, Elanco will proceed to address these flawed arguments:

We add a copy of the published study "Comparative efficacy and safety of ilunocitinib and oclacitinib for the control of pruritus and associated skin lesions in dogs with atopic dermatitis" by Forster et al. (2025) for the ViNordic committee. This peer-reviewed study was used by Elanco in the procedure for the EMA to obtain approval for Zenrelia™ by the European Commission. It was published online in Veterinary Dermatology in January 2025. Veterinary Dermatology is the leading journal in this field with an editorial board consisting of internationally renowned veterinary dermatologists. The study was subject to expert peer review prior to publication, performed by both veterinary dermatology experts and expert statisticians. The conclusions of the study have been accepted by both groups of expert reviewers.

Regarding the alleged misleading comparative statement: "77% of the dogs reached clinical remission of itch versus 53% of the dogs treated with oclacitinib." There is no statistical significance mentioned in this Detailer, only the factual percentages are directly cited from the study Forster et al. As stated above, this study is robust, has been subjected to peer review and additional statistical review which concluded that "Ilunocitinib treatment demonstrated better clinical outcomes compared to oclacitinib treatment in multiple efficacy parameters." There is also a clear reference "(1)" to the study where this statement is cited from, which is freely accessible to veterinary professionals and where all the details related to this point can easily be reviewed. Moreover, the P-values are consistently and clearly indicated in the top left corner of the graphics of the Detailer. We also stress the American claim "77% of Zenrelia-treated dogs returned to normal versus 53% of Apoquel treated dogs." was considered by the FDA to be a superiority claim and the FDA comments should be read in that perspective.

Elanco in Denmark does not state in the contested Detailer Zenrelia™ to be superior, but states correctly the results of Forster et al. We wish to highlight to the ViNordic committee that the figure shown by Zoetis is not part of the Danish Detailer in the form presented by Zoetis. Elanco Denmark ApS cannot be held accountable by ViNordic for American marketing in a different regulatory landscape by a different Elanco affiliate.

Regarding the statements: “Zenrelia vurderes højt af både hundeejere og dyrlæger” and “Zenrelia fik signifikant højere bedømmelse end oclacitinib” as well as “Virker hurtigt” og “Høj succesrate”. We understand Zoetis to allege the above statements to be misleading as they are partly based on the results of the continuation phase (secondary endpoints) of the study. As we have stated above, the statements are correct and taken from the efficacy statements of the study. The PVAS grading scale in itself is not questioned by Zoetis and moreover we quote the study literally: On D28, there was a mild increase in PVAS for oclacitinib-treated dogs, while ilunocitinib-treated dogs demonstrated continuous improvement in PVAS scoring.

We understand that Zoetis wishes to have included that the limitations of the study are more highlighted to the veterinarian. Elanco asserts that a professional can assess the limitations of the study. As such, Elanco does not see the need to stop using the detailer as is. However, if the committee were to align with the FDA that such additional clarity was to be needed, Elanco can commit to include in any new version of the Detailer to outline that “The p-values for secondary endpoints were not adjusted for multiplicity and should be interpreted with caution”.

Den 10. februar 2026 kommenterer **Zoetis** ovennævnte bemærkninger fra Elanco:

”Til Nævnets underretning kan nævnes, at der i ViNordics Marketing Compliance Committee arbejdes på et nyt kodeks for fælles markedsføringsregler vedr. regler for reklame for veterinære lægemidler. Heri blev der udtrykt enighed om en såkaldt “gentleman’s agreement”, hvor medlemmerne opfordres til at henvende sig til hinanden mhp. hurtig opklaring. Kodekset er dog ikke endeligt godkendt. Det bør tilføjes, at Zoetis i løbet af de seneste fem år har modtaget flere klager fra Elanco, hvor Elanco ikke har aget initiativ til at etablere kontakt eller indgå i dialog forud for henvendelse.

Klagen opretholdes. Zoetis ønsker blot at kommentere, at når der er blevet klaget over disse materialer på adskillige markeder, drejer det sig snarere om, at Elanco ikke overholder loven end en koordineret strategi, som Zoetis afviser pure. Som følge af og som konsekvens af den relaterede klage, som Zoetis indgav i Storbritannien (sag nr. 305-10-25 Zoetis UK Ltd. v Elanco AH UK), blev Elanco fundet i strid med gældende regler. Dette understreger en aggressiv markedsføringsstrategi fra Elancos side, som på flere EU-markeder har overtrådt reglerne. Udtalelsen om ”manglende merit” er således ikke korrekt og Zoetis har ikke anledning til at uddybe dette punkt yderligere.

Vedrørende studiet "Comparative efficacy and safety of ilunocitinib and oclacitinib for the control of pruritus and associated skin lesions in dogs with atopic dermatitis" by Forster et al. (2025) bemærker Zoetis følgende:

"Zoetis anerkender integriteten af det omtalte studie, men vi har væsentlige forbehold i relation til Elancos fortolkning og anvendelse af studiet - promotionelt. Det er afgørende at understrege, at der er tale om et non-inferiority-studie (et studie, der undersøger, om en ny behandling ikke er dårligere end den nuværende behandling), som i dette tilfælde bliver brugt promotionelt, som medfører, at Zenrelia fremstår overlegent i forhold til oclacitinib. Dette er vildledende og imod saglighedskravet, jf. VEJ nr. 9401 af 20/04/2022. Vi referer til det indsendte materiale pr. d. 16-Jan-2026, der er på dansk. Graferne, der ses på slide 3 i fremsendte materiale, tilsvarede graferne (Figure 2 og 3) fra studiet af Forster et al. (på dansk)"

Vedrørende udtrykkene, "Zenrelia vurderes højt af både hundeejere og dyrlæger", "Zenrelia fik signifikant højere bedømmelse end oclacitinib", "Virker hurtigt" og "Høj succesrate" bemærker Zoetis: "Ingen yderligere kommentarer, og klagen forbliver uændret,"

Vedrørende spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt begrænsningerne i studiet skal fremhæves over for dyrlægerne bemærker Zoetis følgende:

"Det kan ikke forventes, at en dyrlæge selv identificerer et studies metodiske begrænsninger ud fra en fodnote i en reklame. Det er påkrævet, at alle relevante fakta og forbehold tydeligt fremgår, så vurderinger baseres på et retvisende grundlag."

I brev af 13. februar 2026 kommenterer **Elanco** bemærkningerne af 10. februar 2026 fra Zoetis:

"We note Zoetis to not object to our point that only Danish material is part of the scope of the complaint. As such, referrals to US materials by Zoetis should be disregarded."

Elanco wishes to point out the inconsistency of Zoetis argumentation as Zoetis disregards the draft Code in case 409, while in case 410 Zoetis explicitly infers to already apply the draft Code. It is indeed in the spirit of the ongoing reviewal process of the Code that Elanco has reached out in other dossiers via e-mail to other members of the association, but we understand Zoetis not to dhere to the same officious standards.

Zoetis' argumentation is again not consistent: when the Danish material was to be incorrect according to EU and Danish standards, no referral was necessary to the FDA comments. Also, complaints raised by Zoetis in several EU markets to Zenrelia™ materials do not equal incompliance of said materials in these jurisdictions. We note Zoetis to not substantiate any of its claimed incompliance of the use of Forster et al.

Zoetis has not accurately reflected our statement: Elanco held quite clearly that none of the cross-border arguments were of merit. Every single association, authority or court assesses local complaints based upon the combination of local (association) rules

and EU Regulation 2019/6. In that regard, while the Board can find the summary statement of the NOAH case online, Elanco has attached the full decision to the Board. The single (1) breach by Elanco was explicitly considered to be minor, while the other elements of the complaint were not upheld. Zoetis cannot merely state to not elaborate further while equally stating that “Elanco to has violated the rules in multiple EU markets” when solely referring to the UK case, as it is not part of the EU and only one country. When not substantiated, these remain mere allegations.”

Vedrørende den påståede vildledende sammenlignende reklame bemærker Elanco:

”Elanco appreciates Zoetis’ acknowledgment of the integrity of Forster et al. and understands Zoetis to not further substantiate its “reservations” regarding the promotional use of Forster et al.

For avoidance of doubt: Elanco has not and will not proclaim in Denmark to be superior to oclacitinib, as indeed Forster et al. is a non-inferiority study as a head-to-head study. A factual representation of the results obtained in the study is not misleading nor not objective in the meaning of art. 119 of the EU Regulation 2019/6 and VEJ nr 9401 of 20/04/2022. Zoetis’ discontent with the possible conclusion a veterinarian may draw after presentation of these factual statements regarding the head-to-head comparison of the products at hand, should not be conflated to be a misleading statement by Elanco.

Elanco has correctly and accurately reported in the Danish Detailer the results of the head-to-head study by reflecting the 77% vs 53% figures directly from Forster et al. We wish to stress to the Board that Zoetis selectively copies from the FDA complaint, but disregards the superiority claim in the (initial) American marketing and does not show that the Danish Detailer is misleading by simply referencing.

Vedrørende en eventuel tydeliggørelse af begrænsningerne i det refererede studie bemærker Elanco:

”Elanco wishes to highlight to the Committee that Zoetis has accepted the suggested additional clarification in other EU jurisdictions (e.g. Belgium) and has shown in multiple other jurisdictions examples of not clarifying secondary endpoints in promotions of Zoetis’ products to veterinarians themselves. The proposed commitment of Elanco is to be seen as an additional effort without prejudice against any wrongdoing. Elanco reaffirms its disagreement with Zoetis’ position that the Detailer should be retracted because of this point as the communicated data is clear, factual and not misleading to the veterinarian.”

Ad klagepunkt 2 - Manglende information om bivirkninger og vaccinationseffekter

Vedrørende dette klagepunkt anfører **Zoetis** følgende i klagen af 16. januar 2026:

”FDA har for nylig modificeret teksten i Zenrelias ”Boxed Warning”, så der ikke længere advares om risikoen for dødelig, vaccineinduceret sygdom, hvilket initielt var inkluderet. Dog advares der stadig om, at hunde skal stoppe behandlingen med Zenrelia 28 dage – 3 måneder inden vaccination samt først starte igen tidligst 28 dage efter.

I det godkendte produktresumé (afsnit 3.8) står desuden følgende:

”Respons på primær CPiV-vaccination (ikke-kernevaccine) hos behandlede dyr var 4 ud af 6 over grænsen vs. 6 ud af 8 kontroller over grænsen efter primær vaccination. Der blev observeret en forsinket eller nedsat respons på RV. Den kliniske relevans af disse observerede effekter hos dyr, der blev vaccineret under administration af ilunocitinib i henhold til det anbefalede doseringsregime, er uklar.”

Problematikken omkring reduceret effekt ved vaccination ville have været særdeles relevant at nævne i deres Vetbrochure, jf. slide 2 og 3. Dertil bør denne problematik gøres opmærksom på, da der dels er tale om en sygdom som er dødelig, skulle hunden smittes, dels er tale om zoonotisk risiko for rabies, og derfor potentielt fatal vaccineinduceret sygdom hos mennesker som måtte være i kontakt med hunden.

Ovenstående kan understøttes med FDAs black box-warning tekst med netop denne info grundet risici ved anvendelsen af Zenrelia. Se nedenstående black box-warning tekst:

”WARNING: VACCINE-INDUCED DISEASE AND INADEQUATE IMMUNE RESPONSE TO VACCINES. Based on results of the vaccine response study, dogs receiving Zenrelia are at risk of fatal vaccine-induced disease from modified live virus vaccines and inadequate immune response to any vaccine. Discontinue Zenrelia for at least 28 days to 3 months prior to vaccination and withhold Zenrelia for at least 28 days after vaccination. (Jf. https://www.fda.gov/animal_veterinary/product-safety-information/dear-veterinarian-letter-regarding-important-safety-information-associated-use-zenrelia-ilunocitinib)”

Der nævnes altså intet i Elancos materialer (slide 2 og 3) om, at vacciners effekt kan være reduceret, også jf. afsnit 3.8 i Elancos produktresumé. Ligeledes nævnes det heller ikke af Elanco ude på dyreklinikkerne – selv på direkte forespørgsel om emnet. Zoetis finder dette problematisk ud fra et sikkerhedsmæssigt synspunkt og vi beder derfor om en redegørelse for ovenstående.

I brev af 30. januar 2026 kommenterer **Elanco** klagepunkt 2 med følgende bemærkninger:

”As stated above, we fail to see the relevance for Denmark of any comments of the FDA in a specific US to US context. The Detailer as communicated as such, equal to any in-practice communication by any Elanco account manager, is in line with the approved Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC) in the European Union. Any other third country regulator’s comments, in this specific case the FDA black box warning, are not to be seen separately from the regulatory framework in which said regulator as the FDA operates and thus not applicable to the European Union.

We assume Zoetis to not have read the recently published European Public Assessment Report (EPAR) of Zenrelia™, available since January 6th, 2026 prior to filing its complaint, as Zoetis would have read that the EPAR states:

“It is noted that in September 2024, the US-FDA issued a "Dear Veterinarian" letter to veterinarians in the United States relating to the risk of vaccine-induced disease. However, the cited PCR analysis [regarding two deaths in the ilunocitinib-administered group] was conducted subsequent to the publication of this letter (January 2025) – therefore these data were not available to US authorities. On this basis, the CVMP is satisfied that, as argued by the applicant, it is not necessary to include additional warning regarding risk of vaccine-induced disease in the EU product information for ilunocitinib.”

If Zoetis were to have read the EPAR, it is in bad faith to argue on the basis of the FDA letter that Elanco is misleading or not properly informing veterinarians.

Equally, section of 3.8 the SPC of Zenrelia™ was updated to hold clear language on primary vaccine and booster responses in treated dogs. That language was deemed sufficient by EMA. If Zoetis deems it necessary Elanco to inform veterinarians beyond the language of the SPC, we would like to point out that EMA has included a reference to Zoetis' Apoquel at this exact point: "As rabies vaccines are frequently given to dogs aged over 12 months (e.g. booster vaccines and/or to meet travel requirements), it is agreed that the prescribing veterinarian should be made aware of potential impacts on vaccine efficacy when given to dogs receiving concomitant treatment with ilunocitinib. The proposed text is considered to be acceptable to the CVMP, noting that similar warnings have been included for oclacitinib."

As such, the current explicit reference to communication by the FDA is nothing else but an attempt by Zoetis to cast doubt on the safety and efficacy of Zenrelia™. The panel should disregard such complaint as the CVMP and the EMA have considered the safety vs. benefit tradeoff to be positive in order for the European Commission to grant a marketing authorization for Zenrelia™. We demand Zoetis substantiate its claim that any question by a veterinarian in a clinic was not answered according to the SPC or in a truthful way, as our account managers are regularly trained on compliance to act and market in accordance with the Law, sector regulations and our own Elanco Code of Conduct.

Additionally, the argument by Zoetis is in non-compliance with EU Competition Law, as explained by the CJEU in its judgment of January 23, 2018, F. Hoffmann-La Roche, C-179/16, paragraph 91. Another company active in the marketing of a competing veterinary medicinal product covered by a separate market authorization has no bearing on which risk should be communicated to veterinarians – this is for the marketing authorization holder to do so, in line with the Summary of Product Characteristics and possibly guidance of the appropriate medical authority. Elanco reserves the right to file a complaint to the Konkurrence- og Forbrugerstyrelsen and/or the European Commission, whether or not the ViNordic panel sees merit in the current flawed argument put forward by Zoetis.”

Den 10. februar 2026 kommenterer **Zoetis** ovennævnte bemærkninger fra Elanco på følgende måde:

” Ingen yderligere kommentarer. Den opnåede ændring blev godkendt efter, at materialerne i klagen blev skabt og distribueret (maj 2025). Elanco har derfor distribueret materialer uden at have opnået den af Elanco nævnte godkendelse ”.

I brev af 13. februar 2026 svarer **Elanco** på kommentarerne i Zoetis’ brev af 10. februar:

”Again, Zoetis’ arguments fail and moreover, are concerning: Elanco received a marketing authorization for Zenrelia™ for the European Union on the 24th of July, 2025. The materials Zoetis in its initial complaint referred to are US materials and FDA communications regarding a black box warning, which have no legal bearing in the Kingdom of Denmark.

Zoetis statement that “the obtained change was approved after the materials in the complaint were created and distributed (May 2025). Elanco has therefore distributed materials without having obtained the approval mentioned by Elanco” are factually incorrect and baseless allegations. While the argument is concise, we state that:

- preparing materials and aligning these internally for a launch product in time, which is reflected in a materials number (“05-2025”) is not prohibited nor does it constitute any proof of distribution pre-approval. Effectively, Zoetis seems to blame Elanco for preparing Zenrelia™’s launch in time;*
- if Zoetis asserts Elanco to have marketed pre-approval materials, Elanco refutes this allegation in the strongest wording and notes to the Board that no proof has been provided by Zoetis – these are mere allegations without any factual basis. Elanco notes equally that no additional proof has been rendered by Zoetis regarding any alleged behavior by Elanco’s account managers;*
- if Zoetis asserts that Zenrelia™’s SPC was “changed” in the meantime (July 2025 – January 2026), we wish to inform Zoetis that “updated” regarding Section 3.8 of the SPC is to be read in the EPAR as “updated [during the application procedure from the initial application].” Zoetis’ argument would thus be non-sensical;*
- the initial complaint by Zoetis only concerned a perceived need to inform Danish veterinarians on the FDA warning letter – the additional accusation of pre-approval marketing is only made by Zoetis for the sake of argument without merit.”*

Markedsføringsnævnets afgørelse

Markedsføringsnævnet har på sit møde den 20. februar 2026 behandlet Zoetis' klage af 16. januar 2026 vedrørende Elancos brochure for Zenrelia.

Ad klagepunkt 1 – Sammenlignende reklame uden tilstrækkelig dokumentation og vildledende påstande

Markedsføringsnævnets afgørelser baseres grundlæggende på de reguleringer, der er gældende i Danmark og generelt i EU, herunder også meddelelser og afgørelser fra Lægemiddelstyrelsen og EMA. Markedsføringsnævnet har noteret sig Zoetis' oplysninger vedrørende afgørelsen fra den amerikanske FDA.

I Elancos brochure for Zenrelia er blandt andet følgende udsagn fremhævet: *"I det sammenlignende studie opnåede 77% af Zenrelia-behandlede hunde remission fra kløe i forhold til 53% af oclactinib-behandlede hunde"*. Udsagnet er baseret på studiet *"Comparative efficacy and safety of ilunocitinib and oclacitinib for the control of pruritus and associated skin lesions in dogs with atopic dermatitis"* by Forster et al. (2025). Brochuren henviser til studiet i en note. Der er tale om et non-inferiority studie med primært endepunkt på dag 28, mens ovennævnte udsagn baseres på PVAS-scoren på dag 112. Som anført af Zoetis kan type I-fejlraten blive forhøjet, når flere endepunkter testes statistisk mod hinanden. Uanset dyrlæger generelt må forventes at have de uddannelsesmæssige forudsætninger for at kunne vurdere udsagnet i den korrekte sammenhæng, burde Elanco have markeret disse begrænsninger i studiet. Ifølge Veterinærforordningens artikel 119, stk. 5 må reklamer for veterinærlægemidler ikke indeholde nogen form for oplysninger, der kan være vildledende. Brochuren skal derfor fremover indeholde en relevant påpegning af begrænsningerne i studiet i overensstemmelse med Elancos forslag i brev af 30. januar 2026. Elanco pålægges at ophøre med anvendelsen af brochuren i den foreliggende udgave.

Med tilføjelsen af den nævnte tydeliggørelse af reklameteksten giver udsagnene *"Zenrelia vurderes højt af både hundeejere og dyrlæger"*, *"Zenrelia fik signifikant højere bedømmelse end oclacitinib"*, *"Virker hurtigt"* og *"Høj succesrate"* ikke anledning til yderligere bemærkninger.

Ad klagepunkt 2 - Manglende information om bivirkninger og vaccinationseffekter

Zoetis anfører i klagen, at Elancos brochure burde have nævnt problematikken om reduceret effekt ved vaccination.

Brochuren for Zenrelia rummer relevant pligttekst blandt andet med omtale af risici og bivirkninger og henvisning til lægemidlets produktresumé. Den seneste EPAR for Zenrelia finder det ikke nødvendigt med yderligere advarsel vedrørende *"vaccine-induced disease"* i produktinformationen for lægemidlet. På denne baggrund og under henvisning til pkt. 3.8 i det af EMA godkendte produktresumé for Zenrelia finder Markedsføringsnævnet det heller ikke nødvendigt med yderligere oplysninger i Elancos brochure om reduceret effekt ved vaccination.

Elanco afviser Zoetis' påstand om, at Elancos repræsentanter på direkte forespørgsel i dyreklinikkerne ikke svarer korrekt vedrørende vaccineres mulige reducerede effekt. Da Zoetis påstand ikke er dokumenteret, afvises klagen.

Markedsføringsnævnet har ikke taget stilling til Zoetis påstand i brev af 10. februar 2026, hvorefter Elanco skulle have distribueret materialer uden at have opnået godkendelse. Påstanden var ikke en del af den oprindelige klage af 16. januar 2026.

For overtrædelsen af reklamereglerne pålægges Elanco en bøde på 20.000 kr., jf. Statutter for Markedsføringsnævnet, § 10, litra B.

Bøden på 20.000 kr. samt et klagegebyr på 16.000 kr., jf. Statutter for Markedsføringsnævnet § 6, stk. 1 og bilag til Statutterne, bedes indbetalt til Markedsføringsnævnet senest 30 dage fra dato.

Zenrelia vet brochure DK

1/2

Få ro på kløsen med Zenrelia[™] (lincosid)

Behandling af pruritus forårsaget af allergisk dermatitis og behandling af lokale manifestationer af allergisk dermatitis hos hunde

Zenrelia inkluderer det aktive stof lincocidlin, som er en NY JAK-hæmmer til hunde med allergisk og atopisk dermatitis

EN DAGLIG BEHANDLING BEVIRKER:

- PRÆKTISK** - Regulerer og lindrer kløe og uro
- EFFEKTIV** - Lægger sig godt på huden og virker hurtigt
- BEKVEM** - Behandling uden brug af sprøjter

Vilker med liden vægt alvorlig dermatitis, som leds. omkvalitet?

- ✓ Effektivt
- ✓ Let at bruge
- ✓ Kompatibel

EN DAGLIG BEHANDLING BEVIRKER:

- EFFEKTIV** - Lægger sig godt på huden og virker hurtigt
- BEKVEM** - Behandling uden brug af sprøjter

Zenrelia er enkelt at bruge

Zenrelia er enkelt at bruge hos 12 måneder gamle hunde og ældre hunde. Den er nem at bruge og har ingen smag, så den er nem at give.

Zenrelia tabletstørrelser

10 mg 15 mg 20 mg 30 mg 40 mg

Doserings

Zenrelia behandles i 4 uger og gives de første 4 uger på 10 mg eller 15 mg.

Tablet størrelse	10 mg	15 mg	20 mg	30 mg	40 mg
10 mg	10 mg	10 mg	10 mg	10 mg	10 mg
15 mg	15 mg	15 mg	15 mg	15 mg	15 mg
20 mg	20 mg	20 mg	20 mg	20 mg	20 mg
30 mg	30 mg	30 mg	30 mg	30 mg	30 mg
40 mg	40 mg	40 mg	40 mg	40 mg	40 mg

Orbitax Zenrelia

Zenrelia er enkelt at bruge til behandling af pruritus forårsaget af allergisk dermatitis og behandling af lokale manifestationer af allergisk dermatitis hos hunde.



