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**Trustworthy Guidelines on Severe Asthma thanks to ERS and ATS**
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Although severe asthma is estimated to be present in less than 10% of all asthmatics, these patients have the greatest morbidity and consume an overwhelming proportion of health care costs. There have also been challenges defining the disease in terms of severity and control, characteristics which both lead to increased morbidity and mortality. Thus, the greatest unmet need in asthma care is in the severe asthma arena, where its heterogeneity with regard to clinical presentation and course has posed therapeutic challenges. The identification of clinical and molecular phenotypes, as discussed in this version of the severe asthma guidelines, move the field forward and will ultimately lead us to more personalized therapy. These guidelines describe the definition of severe asthma and provide recommendations for an approach to diagnostics and therapeutics given the data available today.

Clinical practice guidelines aim to help clinicians and healthcare professionals to make evidence-based decisions about the optimal care for patients. In the past decade, the methodology and the science of developing guidelines have made major progress. In contrast to narrative reviews or expert consensus-based clinical position statements (also called “strategic documents”), the development of guidelines requires that the evidence is appraised in a comprehensive and systematic manner and that the recommendations for practice are provided in a transparent manner. The Institute of Medicine has published standards for trustworthy guidelines, providing recommendations on several crucial domains in the development process, including transparency, panel composition and conflict of interest. Importantly, funders should not play a role in the development, and guideline panels should be multidisciplinary and include patients and/or patient advocates. For the literature review and the grading of recommendations, a systematic approach is mandatory to rate the quality of the evidence, to summarize the benefits and harms of a given treatment, and to grade the strength of the recommendations. Since ERS and ATS have adopted the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system for these methodological requirements, the ERS/ATS Task Force has succeeded in developing trustworthy, high-quality Guidelines on the Definition, Mechanisms, Evaluation and Treatment of Severe Asthma (see pages … in this issue of the ERJ). In addition, the ERS/ATS Guideline on Severe Asthma has many assets.

A first asset of the Severe Asthma Guidelines is a clear definition of severe asthma and uncontrolled asthma. When a diagnosis of asthma is confirmed and co-morbidities addressed, severe asthma is defined as “asthma which requires treatment with high dose inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) plus a second controller (long acting β2 agonist [LABA],
leukotriene modifier, theophylline or systemic corticosteroids) to prevent it from becoming uncontrolled or which remains uncontrolled despite this therapy”. The updated ERS/ATS Task Force definition thus focuses on severe asthma refractory to currently available medications using a simple definition that can be translated to clinical practice, in contrast to untreated severe asthma (as used previously in the first and second version of the Global Initiative for Asthma [GINA] guidelines) \(^{9,10}\). Uncontrolled asthma is defined by the presence of any one of four criteria, encompassing (1) poor symptom control, (2) frequent severe exacerbations, (3) serious exacerbations and (4) airflow limitation. This definition underlines the heterogeneity of uncontrolled severe asthma, since both patients with persistent airflow limitation and/or repetitive exacerbations qualify as uncontrolled asthmatics \(^{11,12}\). A similar classification approach has been used by the Global Initiative for Obstructive Lung disease (GOLD), since the updated strategic document qualifies COPD patients into the most severe category (GOLD category D) based on the presence of low lung function and/or frequent exacerbations \(^{13}\).

A second asset of the ERS/ATS Guideline is the detailed chapter on the phenotyping of severe asthma, highlighting that severe asthma is a heterogeneous syndrome. Phenotyping integrates biological and clinical features and aims to improve therapy (by predicting the therapeutic response to available drugs in pre-specified phenotypes, or by identifying novel therapeutic targets in specific phenotypes) \(^{14}\). Important clinical features in phenotyping severe asthma are the age at onset of the disease, the presence or absence of allergy, the frequency of exacerbations and the level of airflow limitation \(^{12,14,15}\). An important biological feature is the nature of the underlying airway inflammation, discerning eosinophilic and non-eosinophilic (neutrophilic or paucigranulocytic) severe asthma \(^{14,16}\). While nitric oxide is currently not recommended to guide therapy in adults and children with severe asthma, it may be valuable to determine the inflammatory phenotype and decisions regarding the use of Th2 focused biologic therapy \(^{17-19}\). The crucial role of asthma phenotyping is well illustrated by the history of the clinical development of monoclonal antibodies against interleukin-5 (anti-IL5 mo abs; mepolizumab and reslizumab). In the original studies, anti-IL5 monoclonal antibodies were used as add-on therapy in patients with moderate-to-severe asthma, without phenotyping the underlying airway inflammation, and evaluating the effect on lung function as primary outcome \(^{20,21}\). These studies were negative. In contrast, when only patients with severe asthma and evidence of persistent eosinophilic airway inflammation were enrolled, add-on therapy with anti-IL5 monoclonal antibodies – on top of ICS and LABA - has been shown to reduce significantly the rate of moderate and severe exacerbations \(^{22-24}\). Similarly,
most RCTs of macrolide antibiotics did not show benefits in patients with moderate-to-severe asthma, explaining the sixth recommendation of the ERS/ATS Guideline. However, a recent trial of long-term treatment with azithromycin in severe asthma suggests that patients with exacerbation-prone, non-eosinophilic asthma might benefit. Although this hypothesis has to be confirmed in larger RCTs, the observations are in line with the proven efficacy of macrolides in other neutrophilic chronic airway diseases, including cystic fibrosis (CF), non-CF bronchiectasis and diffuse panbronchiolitis.

In addition to phenotype specific therapies, new therapies such as bronchial thermoplasty, have also been included for discussion and evaluation in this guideline. Bronchial thermoplasty is a unique, new therapy that employs radiofrequency heat applied directly to the airways as treatment for severe asthma. There are data to suggest the effects are sustained but the asthmatic patients who received sham bronchoscopy were not followed long term. The technique did reveal improvements in severe exacerbations, an outcome that is extremely important in severe asthma (AIR2 trial). However, until there are data that allow us to identify the best candidates for a procedure that is expensive and invasive, the recommendation for additional study and use in specialized centers put forth in this guideline is reasonable. There is considerable interest within the asthma community to study this therapy and hopefully add it to our armamentarium, as effective treatment of severe asthma is an unmet need. However, in an era of phenotype-driven therapy, bronchial thermoplasty should not be an exception.

Furthermore, the ERS/ATS Task Force has not only taken into account evidence on efficacy and safety of drugs in severe asthma from randomized controlled trials (RCTs), but also complementary evidence on real-life effectiveness, cost-effectiveness and long-term safety from observational studies. While classical RCTs provide the highest quality evidence, the outcomes reported from RCTs may not always be generalizable to real-world patients followed in clinical practice settings. Indeed, classical RCTs, including tightly-controlled registration trials, investigate the effects of a new drug – compared with placebo - in specialized centers on surrogate outcomes (such as lung function) in highly selected patients, without co-morbidities but with optimal adherence to the study treatment and protocol. The ERS/ATS Workshop Report on Guideline Development as well as the respiratory effectiveness group plead that guideline developers should also consider evidence from pragmatic trials and nonrandomized studies, investigating the real-life effectiveness and long-term safety of a treatment in large populations of heterogeneous patients followed in routine care. Since real-world patients often have co-
morbid illnesses and low(er) adherence with medications, it is important to complement the 
efficacy data from RCTs – obtained in ideal circumstances - with effectiveness data from 
observational studies. The paucity of real-life effectiveness and cost-effectiveness data in 
severe asthma has contributed to the fact that the ERS/ATS Task Force has graded the quality 
of the evidence of most of the specific clinical recommendations on the treatment of severe 
asthma as “low” or “very low” and the strength of the respective recommendations as 
“conditional”.

As the field of severe asthma is dynamic and not all areas are well supported by 
significant evidence in 2013, there are limitations to these guidelines. This is reflected in the 
relatively limited number of PICO (Patients/Intervention/Comparator/Outcome) questions 
which could be addressed by the ERS/ATS Task Force. This observation suggests that there 
must be updates to include the latest literature as the field moves forward to create a “living 
document”. Examples of areas to expand upon in the future include the role of long acting 
muscarinic antagonists in severe asthma, the role of monoclonal antibodies targeting specific 
cytokines, how exhaled nitric oxide is best used in clinical practice and issues surrounding 
asthma pathobiology such as innate immune mechanisms, airway remodeling and the 
microbiome.

What we can do today is ensure that these guidelines are disseminated widely through 
our societies through thoughtful, coordinated action at our annual scientific meetings, but also 
through our journals, websites and other modes of communication such as webinars, podcasts 
and toolkits for providers and patients. We have a unique opportunity not only to disseminate, 
but implement these guidelines to ultimately improve the health of our patients with severe 
asthma.
References


4 Kuehn BM. IOm sets out “gold standard” practices for creating guidelines, systematic reviews. Jama 2011; 305:1846-1848


11 Wenzel SE. Asthma: defining of the persistent adult phenotypes. Lancet 2006; 368:804-813


15 Wenzel SE. Asthma: defining of the persistent adult phenotypes. The Lancet 2006; 368:804-813

19 Corren J. Anti-interleukin-13 antibody therapy for asthma: one step closer. European Respiratory Journal 2013; 41:255-256
33 Wahidi MM, Kraft M. Bronchial Thermoplasty for Severe Asthma. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine 2012; 185:709-714
36 Wilt T, Guyatt G, Kunz R, et al. Deciding what type of evidence and outcomes to include in guidelines: article 5 in Integrating and coordinating efforts in COPD guideline