





## The effect of exacerbation history on outcomes in the IMPACT trial

David M.G. Halpin<sup>1</sup>, Mark T. Dransfield<sup>2</sup>, MeiLan K. Han<sup>3</sup>, C. Elaine Jones<sup>4</sup>, Sally Kilbride<sup>5</sup>, Peter Lange<sup>6,7</sup>, David A. Lipson <sup>8,9</sup>, David A. Lomas<sup>10</sup>, Fernando J. Martinez<sup>11</sup>, Steve Pascoe<sup>8,12</sup>, Dave Singh<sup>13</sup>, Robert Wise <sup>14</sup> and Gerard J. Criner<sup>15</sup>

Affiliations: <sup>1</sup>University of Exeter Medical School, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK. <sup>2</sup>Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, and Critical Care Medicine, Lung Health Center, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA. <sup>3</sup>University of Michigan, Pulmonary & Critical Care, Ann Arbor, MI, USA. <sup>4</sup>GlaxoSmithKline, Research Triangle Park, NC, USA. <sup>5</sup>GlaxoSmithKline, Stockley Park, UK. <sup>6</sup>Medical Dept, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital, Herlev, Denmark. <sup>7</sup>University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark. <sup>8</sup>GlaxoSmithKline, Collegeville, PA, USA. <sup>9</sup>Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA. <sup>10</sup>UCL Respiratory, University College London, London, UK. <sup>11</sup>New York-Presbyterian Hospital/Weill Cornell Medical Center, New York, NY, USA. <sup>12</sup>Sanofi, Philadelphia, PA, USA. <sup>13</sup>University of Manchester, NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre, Manchester University NHS Foundation Hospitals, Trust, Manchester, UK. <sup>14</sup>Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Johns Hopkins Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA. <sup>15</sup>Lewis Katz School of Medicine at Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

**Correspondence**: David M.G. Halpin, University of Exeter Medical School, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX1 2LU, UK. E-mail: d.halpin@nhs.net

## ♥ @ERSpublications

FF/UMEC/VI shows benefits vs FF/VI and UMEC/VI across multiple endpoints irrespective of exacerbation history. Exacerbation history and eosinophils influenced the comparison between UMEC/VI and FF/VI, and eosinophils that between FF/UMEC/VI and UMEC/VI. http://bit.ly/2SHu2ey

Cite this article as: Halpin DMG, Dransfield MT, Han MLK, et al. The effect of exacerbation history on outcomes in the IMPACT trial. Eur Respir J 2020; 55: 1901921 [https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01921-2019].

This single-page version can be shared freely online.

ABSTRACT IMPACT, a 52-week, randomised, double-blind trial, assessed the efficacy and safety of fluticasone furoate/umeclidinium/vilanterol (FF/UMEC/VI) triple therapy *versus* FF/VI or UMEC/VI in patients with symptomatic COPD and a history of exacerbations.

Subgroup analyses assessed whether the efficacy of FF/UMEC/VI versus FF/VI or UMEC/VI and UMEC/VI versus FF/VI varies according to prior exacerbation history, and the combined effects of exacerbation history and blood eosinophil counts. Three subgroups were defined: single moderate (1 moderate/no severe; n=3056 (30%)), frequent moderate ( $\geq$ 2 moderate/no severe; n=4628 (45%)) and severe ( $\geq$ 1 severe/any moderate; n=2671 (26%)). End-points included annual on-treatment moderate/ severe exacerbation rate (pre-specified), lung function and health status (both post-hoc).

Moderate/severe exacerbation rates (reduction % (95% CI)) were reduced in the FF/UMEC/VI group *versus* FF/VI (single moderate 20% (10–29), frequent moderate 11% (2–19), severe 17% (7–26)) and *versus* UMEC/VI (single moderate 18% (5–29), frequent moderate 29% (21–37), severe 26% (14–35)). Moderate/ severe exacerbation rates were reduced in the FF/VI group *versus* UMEC/VI in the frequent moderate subgroup; a numerical reduction was observed in the severe subgroup (single moderate 2% (–12–18), frequent moderate 21% (11–29), severe 11% (–3–22)). Moderate/severe exacerbation rates were lower in the FF/VI group compared with UMEC/VI in patients with higher eosinophil counts. FF/UMEC/VI improved lung function and health status *versus* both dual therapies irrespective of exacerbation subgroup. UMEC/VI improved lung function *versus* FF/VI in all subgroups.

Copyright ©ERS 2020. This article is open access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Licence 4.0.

Triple therapy was more effective than dual regardless of exacerbation history, consistent with results in the intent-to-treat population. Comparisons between dual therapies were influenced by prior exacerbation history and eosinophil counts.