Impact of Inhaled corticosteroid use on outcome in COPD patients admitted with pneumonia
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Abstract

Background: The aim of this study was to investigate if inhaled corticosteroid (ICS) use impacts on outcome in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) admitted with community-acquired pneumonia (CAP).

Methods: A prospective observational study of patients with spirometry-confirmed COPD presenting with a primary diagnosis of CAP in Lothian, UK. Outcome measures were compared between ICS users and non-users.

Results: Of 490 patients included in the study, 76.7% were classified as ICS users. ICS users had higher GOLD stage compared with non-users (mean(SD) 3.2(0.8) vs 2.6(0.9); p<0.0001). There were no significant differences in pneumonia severity (mean(SD) pneumonia severity index (PSI) 4.2(0.8) vs 4.3(0.8), p = 0.3; mean(SD) CURB65 score 2.1(1.3) vs 2.3(1.3), p=0.07) or markers of systemic inflammation (median CRP 148(58-268) vs 183(85-302) mg/L; p=0.08) between ICS users and non-users.

On multivariable analysis, after adjustment for COPD severity and PSI, ICS use was not independently associated with 30-day mortality (OR 1.71 [95% CI 0.75-3.90], p=0.2), 6-month mortality (OR 1.62 [95% CI 0.82-3.16], p=0.2), requirement for mechanical ventilation and/or inotropic support (OR 0.73 [95% CI 0.33-1.62], p=0.4) or development of complicated pneumonia (OR 0.71 [95% CI 0.25-1.99], p=0.5).

Conclusion: Prior ICS use has no impact on outcome in patients with COPD admitted with CAP.
Introduction

Several large trials have reported increased community acquired pneumonia (CAP) risk associated with use of inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) [1-3]. There is some evidence that patients with COPD who develop pneumonia may experience worse clinical outcomes [4-6], although this association is debated [7-9]. Despite the increased pneumonia frequency observed with use of ICS in COPD, there has been no associated rise in mortality reported by any of the recent trials [1-3]. This has led to speculation that ICS use may increase CAP risk but protect against severe pneumonia or pneumonia-related complications [10-11].

The aim of our study was to assess the impact of ICS pre-treatment on admission markers of severity and outcome in COPD patients presenting with community-acquired pneumonia.

Methods

The Edinburgh Pneumonia Study was a prospective observational study of adult patients presenting with a diagnosis of CAP between January 2005 and December 2009 to NHS Lothian, UK [12]. This manuscript reports a sub-analysis of this study investigating the effect of ICS use on severity and outcome in patients with spirometry-confirmed COPD. The study was approved by the Lothian Research Ethics Committee.

All patients included in the study had a diagnosis of COPD confirmed by spirometry according to published criteria [13] and presented with a new infiltrate on chest radiograph along with 3 or more of the following symptoms or signs: cough, sputum production, breathlessness, pleuritic chest pain or signs consistent with pneumonia on auscultation.

Exclusion criteria were: hospital-acquired pneumonia (development of symptoms >48 hours following admission or discharge from an acute care facility <2 weeks prior to admission); active thoracic malignancy; a primary diagnosis of asthma;
immunosuppression (defined as long term (>28 day) use of oral prednisolone at any
dose or other immunosuppressive drugs (methotrexate, azathioprine, cyclosporin
and anti-tumour necrosis factor alpha agents) or patients with solid organ
transplantation; pulmonary embolism and patients in whom active treatment was not
considered appropriate (palliative care).

Study Protocol

For all patients admitted with community acquired pneumonia, a pro-forma was
completed on admission that includes baseline observations (pulse, blood pressure,
respiratory rate, temperature) and standard blood tests (full blood count, urea and
electrolytes, liver function tests, and C-reactive protein). All variables were taken
within 4 hours of hospital admission. On admission, patients were risk assessed
using the CURB65 score and the Pneumonia severity index (PSI) (see appendix 1)[14-15]. All patients received standard antibiotic therapy in accordance with British
Thoracic Society guidelines [16].

Assessment of COPD and Inhaled corticosteroid use

COPD was defined according to GOLD criteria [13]. All patients included in the study
had a confirmed diagnosis of COPD made by spirometry in primary or secondary
care within 6 months of admission to hospital with CAP, while clinically stable. The
use of inhaled corticosteroids (either in single inhaler or combination ICS/long acting
Beta2 agonist (LABA) preparation) was recorded on admission. Patients were
classified as ICS users if they self-reported prescription of any of these medications
on repeat prescription from their General Practitioner at the time of admission. The
prescriptions for all patients were confirmed by contacting the patient’s General
Practitioner within 1 working day of admission. All patients classified as ICS users
had been taking ICS for at least one month, prior to admission with CAP. Compliance with medication was not recorded.

Patients using ICS were then further sub-divided according to type of ICS used: budesonide (alone or in combination with formoterol), fluticasone (alone or in combination with salmeterol), beclomethasone or ciclesonide.

**Outcomes**

The outcomes of interest were 30-day mortality, 6-month mortality, need for mechanical ventilation and/or inotropic support and development of complicated pneumonia (complicated parapneumonic effusion, empyema or pulmonary abscess). The indications for mechanical ventilation and inotropic support were left to the discretion of the attending physician. We also assessed time to clinical stability (defined using the modified Halms criteria as the first 24 hour period in which the following criteria were met: temperature <37.2°C; heart rate <100/minute; respiratory rate <24/minute; systolic blood pressure >90mmHg; oxygen saturations >90% on room air; able to maintain oral intake; baseline mental status)[17] and the length of hospital stay.

**Statistical analysis**

All data were analysed using SPSS version 13 for windows (SPSS inc., Chicago, IL). Descriptive statistics of demographic and clinical variables are presented as median (IQR) unless otherwise stated. The Chi-squared test was used to compare categorical data between groups. The Mann-Whitney U test was used for comparison of 2 groups of continuous data. Kaplan–Meier analysis was used for comparison of survival between ICS users and non ICS users. The statistical significance was evaluated using the log-rank test.
We used multivariable logistic regression to compare the outcomes of interest in patients with ICS pre-treatment compared to non ICS users. To the baseline model we included COPD severity (GOLD criteria) and the pneumonia severity index. We also used multivariable logistic regression to compare 30 day mortality in ICS users with non-ICS users in the subgroups of ICU admitted patients and those in PSI class V. To both these models, we included COPD severity (GOLD criteria). A 2 tailed p value <0.05 was considered statistically significant for all tests.

**Power calculation**

With a sample size of 376 (inhaled corticosteroid group) and 114 (no inhaled corticosteroid group), this study is powered for an effect size of 9% using two sided, two sample test with 5% level of significance and 80% power.
**Results**

The study enrolled a total of 1883 cases of community acquired pneumonia. Spirometry results were available for 718 patients, of which 490 confirmed a suspected diagnosis of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. 376 patients were classified as inhaled corticosteroid users and 114 were not prescribed ICS. A flowchart of patient enrolment into the study is illustrated in figure 1. There were no patients treated with inhaled therapy in whom spirometry results were not available.

**Sub-classes of ICS**

Among ICS users, 67.9% were prescribed fluticasone/salmeterol combination, 21.1% were prescribed budesonide/formoterol combination and 11% were taking a single ICS inhaler without long acting beta-agonist. Of the 41 single agent ICS users, 18 were prescribed fluticasone, 17 were prescribed beclometasone, 5 were prescribed budesonide and 1 patient was prescribed ciclesonide. The doses of ICS prescribed were as follows:- fluticasone users: mean dose 948mcg/day (Standard deviation (SD) 424.8); budesonide users: mean dose 909.5mcg/day (SD 374.4); beclomethasone users: mean dose 741.2 mcg/day (SD 209.3).

**Baseline characteristics**

Baseline characteristics of the ICS and non ICS groups are shown in table 1. ICS users were more likely to have cardiac failure and also be classified with GOLD stage 4 disease, while non ICS users were more likely to be classified with GOLD stage 1 and 2 disease. Otherwise, there was no significant differences between the two groups in terms of age, comorbidities, clinical parameters, markers of systemic inflammation and radiographic findings. Rates of administration of systemic steroids on admission were similar between the two groups (table 1).
Table 1: Baseline characteristics of ICS users and non ICS users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Characteristics</th>
<th>Inhaled corticosteroid users (n = 376)</th>
<th>Non-ICS users (n = 114)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean (SD))</td>
<td>71.5 (9.92)</td>
<td>72.7 (11.02)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (% males)</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac failure</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver disease</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular disease</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic renal failure</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold stage 1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold stage 2</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold stage 3</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold stage 4</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New onset confusion</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory rate (breaths/min)</td>
<td>24 (20-30)</td>
<td>24 (16-32)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic blood pressure (mm Hg)</td>
<td>120 (104-140)</td>
<td>119 (95-138)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure (mm Hg)</td>
<td>69 (60-78)</td>
<td>68 (57-76)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
<td>37.4 (37.1-38.2)</td>
<td>37.3 (37.1-38.0)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse rate (beats/min)</td>
<td>100 (90-120)</td>
<td>100 (88-114)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematocrit</td>
<td>39.7% (36%-43.4%)</td>
<td>38.9% (34.5%-41.8%)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White cell count (x10⁹/L)</td>
<td>14.4 (10.9-18.7)</td>
<td>13.5 (10.1-18.0)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelet count (x10⁹/L)</td>
<td>246 (194-324)</td>
<td>252 (191-361)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urea (mmol/L)</td>
<td>7.2 (5.2-10.7)</td>
<td>8 (5.8-11.5)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium (mmol/L)</td>
<td>137 (134-139)</td>
<td>137 (134-139)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium (mmol/L)</td>
<td>4.1 (3.8-4.4)</td>
<td>4.1 (3.7-4.5)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin (g/L)</td>
<td>37 (33-40)</td>
<td>36 (32-39)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-reactive protein (mg/L)</td>
<td>148 (58-268)</td>
<td>183 (85-302)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilobar chest x-ray shadowing</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleural effusion</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic corticosteroid administration on admission</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as % of group or median (IQR) unless otherwise stated.
Stratification of ICS and non ICS users according to CURB65 and PSI

Table 2 shows ICS and non ICS users, stratified according to pneumonia severity index (PSI) class and CURB65 class. There was no significant difference between ICS users and non ICS users, when stratified according to either scoring system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity score</th>
<th>ICS users (n=376)</th>
<th>Non-ICS users (n=114)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURB65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICS use and outcome

Table 3 shows markers of severity and outcome in ICS users and non-users. ICS users had higher mean GOLD stage, indicating more severe COPD. There were no significant differences in 30 day mortality, 6 month mortality, need for mechanical ventilation and/or inotropic support, development of complicated pneumonia, length of hospital stay and time to clinical stability, when comparing ICS users with non-ICS users.
Table 3: Markers of severity and outcome in ICS users and Non-ICS Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICS Users</th>
<th>Non-ICS Users</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOLD stage (mean (SD))</td>
<td>3.2 (0.8)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.9)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURB65 (mean (SD))</td>
<td>2.1 (1.3)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.3)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI class (mean(SD))</td>
<td>4.2 (0.8)</td>
<td>4.3 (0.8)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 day mortality</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 month mortality</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for MV/IS</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated pneumonia</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to clinical stability (days)</td>
<td>3 (2-6)</td>
<td>3 (1-5)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of hospital stay (days)</td>
<td>6 (3-11)</td>
<td>6 (4-12)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as % of group or median (IQR), unless otherwise stated

Survival Analysis

Figure 2 shows Kaplan Meier analysis for 30 day mortality in ICS users and non-ICS users. There was no significant difference in survival, when comparing ICS users with non-ICS users (Log rank test chi square 0.83; df=1, p=0.4).

Multivariable analysis

On multivariable analysis, after adjustment for severity of COPD (GOLD criteria) and PSI score, ICS use was not independently associated with 30-day mortality (OR 1.71 [95% CI 0.75-3.90], p=0.2), 6-month mortality (OR 1.62 [95% CI 0.82-3.16], p=0.2), requirement for MV/IS (OR 0.73 [95% CI 0.33-1.62], p=0.4) or development of complicated pneumonia OR 0.71 [95% CI 0.25-1.99], p=0.5)

Outcome in ICU admitted patients and those with severe pneumonia (PSI class V)

There were 39 patients admitted to ICU. Mortality in this group was 38.5%. Of those admitted to the ICU, 26 (66.7%) were ICS users and 13 (33.3%) were non-ICS users. On multivariable analysis, ICS use was not associated with 30-day mortality in the sub-group admitted to ICU (OR 0.37 [95 % CI 0.07-1.95], p=0.3).
There were 212 patients in PSI class V. Mortality in this group was 20.8%. Of those in PSI class V, 157 (74.1%) were ICS users and 55 (25.9%) were non-ICS users. On multivariable analysis, ICS use was not associated with 30-day mortality for patients in PSI class V (OR 1.92 [95% CI 0.76-4.86], p=0.2).

Discussion

Our study has found that prior ICS use has no impact on severity and outcomes in patients with COPD who are hospitalised with CAP. We assessed a range of clinical outcomes including 30-day mortality, 6-month mortality, need for mechanical ventilation and/or inotropic support, development of complicated pneumonia, time to clinical stability and length of hospital stay. Regardless of which outcome measure was used, we found no significant differences between ICS users and non-ICS users, after adjustment for COPD severity (GOLD criteria) and pneumonia severity (PSI criteria).

The hypothesis that ICS use may be associated with improved outcomes of CAP in patients with COPD has been raised by a number of large randomised controlled trials which, despite showing significantly increased pneumonia rates associated with ICS use, have reported no overall increase in mortality [1-3]. A post hoc analysis of the TORCH trial has shown that although rates of pneumonia are higher in ICS receiving groups, there is no difference in serious adverse events (death or hospitalisation) [10]. This has led to the speculation that episodes of pneumonia associated with ICS use may be mild in severity and that ICS may increase risk of pneumonia but protect against pneumonia-related complications [10-11]. The results of our study do not support this hypothesis. ICS are proposed to improve outcome in CAP by causing a reduction in airway inflammation and neutrophil influx, leading to a blunted systemic inflammatory response [18-21]. However, we found no significant difference in levels of markers of systemic inflammation such as c-reactive protein and white cell count between ICS users and non ICS users in our study. In addition, there is no convincing evidence that systemic corticosteroid administration improves outcomes in CAP [22-23]. This adds further weight to our findings as locally-acting inhaled corticosteroids would, therefore, also be expected to have minimal impact on mortality.

Our findings contradict a recent study by Malo de Molina and colleagues.[21] They analysed a large database of patients >64 years with COPD who were hospitalised with CAP and found that ICS use was associated with reduced 30 day and 90 day
mortality. Although the current study utilises a smaller cohort, significant methodological differences may explain the discrepancy in findings between the two studies. Firstly, the study by Malo de Molina et al used ICD-9 discharge codes to classify CAP, while inclusion criteria into our study required radiographic confirmation of CAP. Previous studies suggest that ICD-9 codes will miss approximately 25% of CAP cases admitted to hospital [24]. As there is no specific ICD-9 code for community-acquired pneumonia, retrospective studies rely on less precise definitions such as pneumonia, respiratory failure or sepsis. This raises the possibility that some of the patients included in the study by Malo de Molina et al may have been misclassified as CAP and thus included, despite presenting with an acute ‘non-pneumonic’ exacerbation of COPD. Inhaled corticosteroids may have differential effects on these two disease entities and if a greater proportion of episodes of CAP were misclassified in one group compared to the other, this may have had a confounding effect on mortality. Furthermore, our study includes only patients with spirometry-confirmed COPD, in contrast to Malo de Molina et al, who used ICD9 code based definitions of COPD. Patients included in their study could have therefore been misclassified with COPD and actually have had an alternative chronic respiratory disease. In addition, we were able to use spirometric data to adjust for severity of COPD. Without adjustment for severity, it is unclear whether the lower rates of mortality seen in ICS users are due to differences in severity of disease between the 2 groups rather than use of ICS itself per se. Our data show that ICS use is more common in patients with more severe COPD.

Although the study by Malo de Molina et al utilised a much larger sample size, power calculations suggest that, based on a sample size of 490 patients, our study is adequate to detect an improvement in survival of >9%. Notably, the study by Malo de Molina et al demonstrated a 24% reduction in 30 day mortality associated with ICS use. Our study is, therefore, adequately sized to detect such a large effect but may not detect more subtle changes. Further validation of our findings in larger independent cohorts is needed.

The issue of whether ICS use contributes to increased risk of development of CAP in patients with COPD is controversial [11, 25-28] and requires further characterisation. Our study was not designed to address this question but rather to determine if ICS associated CAP differs from non-ICS associated CAP in terms of severity and outcome. It has been suggested recently that lower strength ICS such as budesonide may have less influence on development of CAP than higher potency preparations such as fluticasone [29]. However, due to lack of detailed information about doses of
ICS and duration and compliance with therapy, we were unable to assess whether lower and higher strength ICS had differential effects on outcome in CAP in our study. Variation in dose and formulation presents difficulties when analysing data on treatments from observational studies and this is a recognised limitation to our study.

In summary, this study found no evidence to support the hypothesis that ICS related CAP has a distinct clinical phenotype, or that prior ICS use improves clinical outcomes in CAP. Our results are in contrast to some of the existing studies and, thus, further independent validation is now required.
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Figure 1: Flow chart of patient enrolment into study

Prospective observational cohort of patients with community acquired pneumonia-January 2005-December 2009: 1883 patients

Spirometry results from general practice or outpatient clinic review prior to hospitalization

Patients with spirometry confirmed chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: 490 patients

Admission medication history confirmed with general practice records

Inhaled corticosteroid use: 376

Non-inhaled corticosteroid use: 114
Figure 2: Survival analysis in ICS users and non-ICS users
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