

TITLE: Opioids for chronic refractory breathlessness: patient predictors of beneficial response

RUNNING HEAD: Predictors of improved dyspnoea with opioids

AUTHORS:

Miriam J Johnson MD. Professor of Palliative Medicine, Hull York Medical School, University of Hull, UK

J Martin Bland PhD Professor for Medical Statistics, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, Heslington, York, UK

Stephen G Oxberry PhD Consultant in Palliative Medicine, Kirkwood Hospice, Huddersfield, UK

Amy P Abernethy MD. Associate Professor. Division of Medical Oncology, Department of Medicine, Duke University Medical Centre, Durham, USA.

Discipline, Palliative and Supportive Services, Flinders University Australia.

David C Currow FRACP. Professor. Discipline, Palliative and Supportive Services, Flinders University.

AUTHOR FOR CORRESPONDENCE:

M. J. Johnson HYMS, Hertford Building, The University of Hull, Cottingham Road, Hull

HU6 7RX Tel: +44 (0)1482 463482 Fax: +44 (0) 1482 464705 Email:

miriam.johnson@hyms.ac.uk

FUNDING None

Key Words: dyspnoea; morphine;

WORD COUNT: Manuscript 2989; Abstract 199

INTRODUCTION

Chronic refractory breathlessness remains a distressing and limiting symptom, common in many advanced diseases.(1-3) It affects all aspects of life for the patient and those who care for them. Improvement in chronic *refractory* breathlessness, by definition, is difficult. The concept of “total breathlessness” captures its multi-factorial nature; breathlessness generated and exacerbated by varying interplays between physical, psychosocial and spiritual factors.(4;5)

This understanding is reflected in the complex interventions developed and evaluated for breathlessness management using a “toolkit” of non-pharmacological and pharmacological approaches.(6-8) The aims of management are broad, and include not only reduction in intensity of breathlessness, but also reduction in distress due to breathlessness, an increase in mastery over, and of coping with breathlessness and ideally an increase in exercise tolerance and meaningful activity. Even small improvements in breathlessness intensity (improvement by one point on a 0- 10 numerical rating scale [NRS] or 10mm on a 0 – 100mm visual analogue [VAS] scale anchored with 0 = “no breathlessness” and 10 or 100 = “worst imaginable breathlessness”) may be clinically relevant to people with chronic refractory breathlessness.(9-12) Thus careful assessment of individual response to therapeutic strategies may make an important difference to quality of life.

Some questions remain unanswered, but a growing evidence base supports the use of opioids for the alleviation of chronic refractory breathlessness.(13) Most studies confirm efficacy for reduction of intensity, although data from people with breathlessness due to chronic heart failure are less consistent.(14-17) There are some data to support opioid-related improvement in exercise tolerance, although whether this translates to meaningful increase in activity is

unknown,(13) and neuro-imaging and exercise laboratory studies are contributing to an understanding of mechanisms of action.(18-21)

What is known about predictors of response to opioids?

Hypothesis generating secondary analyses from three studies contribute to our current knowledge.(16;22;23) First, data from a placebo crossover randomised controlled trial (RCT) of morphine in 48 participants with chronic refractory breathlessness due to a range of aetiologies provided some evidence that baseline characteristics (age, gender, functional status, disease aetiology, use of oxygen or breathlessness intensity) may help to predict response. Participants who were younger (<75), had better functional status (European Oncology Co-operative Group [ECOG] status <2) were more likely to respond.(23) People with cardiovascular disease as the predominant cause were also more likely to respond (p=0.05), but this group was very small (n=4). Interestingly, there did not appear to be any relationship between more intense baseline breathlessness and response to morphine, which is unexpected given greater scope for improvement with worse baseline scores. Second, data from a placebo controlled randomised crossover trial of morphine or oxycodone in 39 participants with breathlessness due to chronic heart failure failed to demonstrate any effect of gender, aetiology of heart failure, concurrent cardiac medication or baseline severity of heart failure (assessed by NT-proBNP, ejection fraction or tolerated percentage of recommended angiotensin inhibition) on response to opioids.(16) Third, a randomised continuous sequential clinical trial assessing the response in breathlessness from breakthrough doses of morphine in 35 participants with terminal cancer found that those with lower baseline breathlessness intensity had a three times greater response to morphine than those with more severe breathlessness although this was not statistically significant (P=0.1).(22) No study was adequately powered to answer these sub-group questions, so formal conclusions cannot be drawn.

Question: Which patient characteristics predict those most likely to gain improvement in breathlessness?

In order to investigate potential predictors of breathlessness response to opioids in a larger sample of participants, we pooled the individual data from three placebo controlled, randomised trials of morphine or oxycodone, and one prospective cohort dose increment and pharmacovigilance study of morphine.(14;16;17;24) All participants had chronic refractory breathlessness due to advanced disease, and the primary outcome measure was breathlessness intensity in all studies.

PARTICIPANTS AND METHODS

Design

This was an international, multi-centre, retrospective analysis of individual pooled data from 178 clinical trial participants with chronic refractory breathlessness treated with morphine or oxycodone for the management of breathlessness. Of these, 35 provided data from separate periods of exposure to two different opioids to give a total of 213 sets of data. Anonymised individual participant data were obtained from the chief investigators and an analysis of the pooled individual data was performed. Confirmation that National Health Service ethical permission was not required for pooling of anonymised data for secondary analysis was obtained. Appropriate ethics approval had been obtained for each of the contributing studies and all participants gave informed written consent.

Methods

Key features of the contributing four studies are seen in table 1; the methods are described in detail elsewhere.(14;16;17;24) In summary, three were placebo controlled, randomised, crossover trials, two of which had sufficient complete datasets to allow an 80% power of detecting a change of 10/100 mm VAS or 1 point NRS. The third was a pilot study.(17)

These crossover studies compared 4 days of morphine with 4 days of placebo, with the addition by Oxberry and colleagues of a third arm with 4 days of oxycodone. There was one phase II cohort study examining breathlessness response to morphine dose increments.(24) The Abernethy and Oxberry studies provided data for two of the three preliminary studies of baseline predictors of response described above. (14,16)

Study participants

All participants had chronic refractory breathlessness. A variety of primary causes of the breathlessness were represented; two studies included only those with CHF;(16;17) the other two studies included participants predominantly with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).(14;24) Because there was only one participant with motor neurone disease, this case was dropped by the statistical algorithm and is not represented in the results.

Data elements

Baseline characteristics common to all four studies were; age, gender, disease aetiology, breathlessness intensity and a measure of functional status.

Measurement of breathlessness

As three studies used the VAS, and both NRS and VAS appear to be reported by patients in a linear fashion,(25) NRS intensity scores were represented as equivalent 0 – 100mm in the combined dataset. An empirical conversion table to approximate equivalent performance status scores between ECOG and the Karnofsky Performance Scale (KPS) has been published.(26) This conversion was used and performance scores for participants in the study using ECOG were entered as the equivalent KPS score. There are no published data regarding the equivalence of New York Heart Association (NYHA) class and KPS. However, both study arm baseline KPS and NYHA status were recorded in the Oxberry study, and unpublished data including KPS and NYHA status from 101 recruits to a currently recruiting

study in people with heart failure Oxygen-HF trial (trial registration number: ACTRN12609000103268; used with permission) gave a combined dataset of 176 KPS/NYHA pairs. An association between the two measures was confirmed, then linear regression was used to predict KPS from NYHA and the predicted score rounded to an integer and then to 10s, and then the KPS for patients in the Johnson study estimated from the NYHA class. A more detailed description is given elsewhere.

Definition of response

“Response to opioid” was defined in two ways. Firstly, as an absolute value of ≥ 10 mm improvement on the VAS and secondly, as a relative value of $\geq 10\%$ improvement from each participant’s own baseline VAS value; which was an arbitrary measure used in the Currow paper.(24)

Statistical analysis

The analysis looked firstly at absolute responders, and secondly at relative responders.

We used logistic regression to investigate baseline predictors. We used stepwise analysis with backwards elimination; at each stage we removed the variable with the largest non-significant p value and then repeated this until there were no non-significant predictors. In the regression analyses, we included “study” as a variable to account for differences between countries and study designs. Participants from the Oxberry study are included twice (morphine and oxycodone arm) and to allow for this we used robust standard errors, with each person in this study being defined as a cluster.

Study of origin was included as a variable in all analyses. As there were four studies, in order to model the effect of each study we generated three variables to allow “study” to be included. The reference study was that of Abernethy et al as this was the largest RCT. For

the other three studies, we added study variables equal to one indicating that this was the study of origin for this participant and zero otherwise. For example, the variable “Currow” is equal to 1.0 for patients from the Currow study and zero otherwise, the variable “Johnson” is equal to 1.0 for patients from the Johnson study and zero otherwise, etc. For participants from the Abernethy study, all three study variables would be zero. In the same way for the five disease categories, four variables were generated with the reference category being heart failure.

Two studies (Abernethy and Oxberry) had also documented participant breathlessness descriptors (n=107). Only the descriptors 3, 4, 5, 10, and 11 (Box 1), were used in the analysis because these were the five most frequently given. For both absolute and relative responses, we tried adding each of the descriptors singly to the final baseline variables regression model rather than including all possible descriptors in the original stepwise regression analysis.

Sensitivity analysis

As it might be predicted that those with higher breathlessness baseline intensity scores would have a greater chance of having a demonstrable improvement, a sensitivity analysis was performed removing all those with baseline breathlessness scores of < 30mm.

RESULTS

Baseline characteristics of the combined dataset are presented in Table 2; these were the available potential predictors of therapeutic response investigated: age, gender, underlying aetiology, baseline breathlessness intensity and functional ability.

Absolute response

Absolute therapeutic response was defined as an absolute difference in breathlessness intensity observed for individuals exposed to opioid or placebo. Logistic regression demonstrated that younger age ($p=0.039$), and higher baseline breathlessness intensity ($p<0.001$) were likely predictors of absolute response (Table 3).

The final model after stepwise regression is that higher baseline breathlessness intensity ($p<0.001$) continued to be a very significant predictor of response (Table 4).

Relative response

Relative therapeutic response was defined as a difference in breathlessness intensity referenced to the proportion of breathlessness at baseline, observed for individuals exposed to opioid or placebo. The final model after stepwise regression for relative therapeutic response mimicked absolute response (Table 4) in terms of predictors identified, although the findings were more significant with smaller p values; younger age remained a predictor (younger age: $p = 0.025$; higher baseline breathlessness intensity: $p < 0.001$).

Descriptors

Descriptors of breathlessness were explored in both the absolute and relative response models. We added each of the five most commonly cited descriptors (descriptors 3, 4, 5, 10, 11) singly to the final baseline variables model. For absolute response, there was weak evidence for the descriptor “cannot get enough air” (D11) as a predictor when adjusted for age and baseline intensity ($P=0.052$). For relative response, again there was only weak evidence for descriptor “cannot get enough air” ($P = 0.061$). There was no evidence for any other descriptor predicting response.

Sensitivity analyses

The repeat analysis removing participant data where the baseline breathlessness score <30mm included 128 datasets. The predictive significance of higher baseline breathlessness remained for an absolute response ($P = 0.009$) but was lost for a relative response ($p=0.055$).

DISCUSSION

This larger dataset confirms younger age to be a predictor of breathlessness response to an opioid whilst controlling for the other key available data including functional status. Unlike previous published secondary analysis from individual studies, we found that worse baseline breathlessness intensity *was* a strong predictor of response but disease group or functional status was *not*.

Younger age

As a relationship with performance status is not apparent from these data, the explanation for the observed improved response rate in younger participants cannot be linked to improved exercise tolerance. Chronic refractory breathlessness seems to be a final common pathway in advanced disease(28) independent of underlying aetiology, and the reduced response in the older person may reflect very long breathlessness trajectories with established central pathways involved in the perception of breathlessness. In addition, central neuronal pathways may become less plastic with age and/or longer duration of breathlessness, and therefore older people have less ability to respond to opioids by modifying their central perception. We do not have data in this study regarding duration of breathlessness, but this would be interesting.

Baseline intensity of breathlessness

In contrast to the previous findings(16;22;24) that response is unrelated(16;24) or more likely in those with less baseline breathlessness intensity,(22) this pooled dataset shows that

increased baseline intensity is a highly significant predictor of response. Regression towards the mean would be greater for those with the higher baseline breathlessness intensity, so there would be an expected improvement in those participants even without intervention.(29)

Another way to look at this is that people with a high degree of breathlessness have more scope for improvement than those who begin with only a small amount. The previous two studies were smaller, demonstrating the need to repeat analyses on larger datasets.

Furthermore, the participants in the Allard study(22) appear to be a different population; much more unwell with a median survival of only 15 days. In contrast, many participants in the Abernethy, Johnson and Oxberry studies were alive months and even years after the study closure.(14;16;17) It could be argued that the perception pathway for refractory breathlessness in patients in the Allard study had become so established, that response to any intervention was less likely. However, this result of Allard et al is most likely a chance finding in a small group.

Disease aetiology

Excess sympathetic outflow is a recognised pathophysiological response, proposed as a possible unifying mechanism for breathlessness and fatigue in CHF, two primary symptoms, acting through the complex relationship between skeletal muscle, the ergoreflex and autonomic nervous system.(30) As skeletal muscle abnormalities and inflammation are also recognised features of advanced cancer and non-malignant lung disease, it is possible that opioids may have a peripheral, as well as central, effect in the alleviation of breathlessness.

However, we found no association between response and disease aetiology, in keeping with the observation that breathlessness is an end stage symptom in many diseases.(28) As opioids may alleviate the sensation of breathlessness through central neural pathways,(31) this

supports the hypothesis that opioids act on a “final common pathway of perception” rather than in any disease specific manner.

Functional status

We could not demonstrate a relationship between functional status and opioid response in our pooled dataset, and although there was a reasonable spread of scores, participants studied were not in the last few weeks of life.

Descriptors

The subjective experience of breathlessness is complex. The language people use to describe their experience of breathlessness may relate to the mechanism whereby the breathlessness is generated. Initial work by in the late 1980s studied the language used by volunteers with induced breathlessness through eight different mechanisms.(32) Further work in people with medical conditions indicates that particular phrases appear to be more common in some diseases causing breathlessness than others. A discussion is beyond the scope of this paper, but a full review has been published by Garrard and Williams in 2008.(33) Given the preliminary findings that patients with cardiovascular disease may be more likely to have breathlessness that responds to opioids, we looked at the available descriptor data in this dataset. The only descriptor which showed any evidence of being a predictor was “cannot get enough air”. This phrase has been associated with COPD, asthma or CHF. From our data, these breathlessness descriptors do not seem to be a useful addition with regard to prediction of opioid response, however, our sample size for participants with descriptor data is still relatively small (n=107).

Implications for clinical practice

One of the “known unknowns” in the pharmacological management of chronic refractory breathlessness relates to the observation that, as with many interventions, not everyone benefits.(13;23;24) In people with chronic refractory breathlessness, the number needed to treat has been estimated as 1.6 to gain at least a 10% relative improvement at one week over the participant’s own baseline on a 0-10 NRS scale.(24) The number needed to harm was found to be 4.6, although all adverse reactions reversed when the morphine was discontinued and none resulted in hospital admission. Although there are no reported opioid-related serious adverse events from these studies of appropriately monitored opioids, any iatrogenic harm may be significant in vulnerable people with advanced disease.(14;16;17;24) This improved understanding of those whose chronic refractory breathlessness is most likely to improve with opioids would help reduce the numbers exposed to harm without benefit; it is important to identify *a priori* those who are most likely to respond. Careful titration may minimise adverse effects to nausea and sedation allowing tolerance to develop and increasing confidence in patients and prescribers who may be anxious about the use of morphine.

Limitations

Although this study included the largest pool of patients to date there are still insufficient numbers to draw firm conclusions over some aspects and should still be considered exploratory. It has been an important opportunity to develop the methodology for pooling data where the measures have been different. We also recognise that a larger dataset for some aspects such as the relationship between KPS and NYHA status is needed and we need to continue to add to the database. It also underlines the importance of researchers using common outcome measures to facilitate such individual pooled data analyses.

This analysis only allowed examination of gross measures such as gender, age, and disease. More nuanced exploration was not possible, and thought should be given to baseline data

collection in future studies that include intensity and other dimensions of breathlessness such as unpleasantness, the descriptor “cannot get enough air” and actual directly measured activity, not simply function.

CONCLUSIONS

These pooled data suggest that a therapeutic trial of morphine for chronic refractory breathlessness is appropriate for patients *irrespective* of the primary cause of the breathlessness or functional status. Those with worse breathlessness intensity are more likely to gain net benefit, however, this study suggest that this is less likely to be the case for people with milder breathlessness. Opioid therapies should be monitored closely as the therapeutic index may be narrower for patients such as the elderly with less to gain. Likewise, older people are at particular risk of drug-drug and drug-host related adverse events. Therefore, as they may be less likely to benefit, close monitoring is needed to judge whether a continued opioid is warranted. Opioids have a role in the management of chronic refractory breathlessness, but the net benefit for individuals must be optimised.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS None.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Contributors

MJ and DC conceived the question and design; MJ, DC, SO and AA provided anonymised data; MJ and MB designed and conducted the statistical analysis; MJ drafted the initial manuscript. All authors contributed to interpretation of the data, critical revision of the manuscript and agreed the final manuscript.

Other contribution

With thanks to Ms Tracey Hawkes for able assistance in combining the datasets.

REFERENCES

1. Bausewein C, Booth S, Gysels M, Kuhnbach R, Haberland B, Higginson IJ. Understanding breathlessness: cross-sectional comparison of symptom burden and palliative care needs in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and cancer 295. *J Palliat Med* 2010;**13**:1109-18.
2. Currow DC, Plummer JL, Crockett A, Abernethy AP. A community population survey of prevalence and severity of dyspnea in adults. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2009;**38**:533-45.
3. Currow DC, Smith J, Davidson PM, Newton PJ, Agar MR, Abernethy AP. Do the trajectories of dyspnea differ in prevalence and intensity by diagnosis at the end of life? A consecutive cohort study. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2010;**39**:680-90.
4. Abernethy AP, Wheeler JL. Total dyspnoea. *Curr Opin Support Palliat Care* 2008;**2**:110-3.
5. Booth S, Silvester S, Todd C. Breathlessness in cancer and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: using a qualitative approach to describe the experience of patients and carers. *Palliat Support Care* 2003;**1**(4):337-44.

6. Bausewein C, Booth S, Gysels M, Higginson I. Non-pharmacological interventions for breathlessness in advanced stages of malignant and non-malignant diseases. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008;(2):CD005623.
7. Booth S, Bausewein C, Higginson I, Moosavi SH. Pharmacological treatment of refractory breathlessness. *Expert Rev Respir Med* 2009;**3**:21-36.
8. Kamal AH, Maguire JM, Wheeler JL, Currow DC, Abernethy AP. Dyspnea review for the palliative care professional: treatment goals and therapeutic options. *J Palliat Med* 2012;**15**:106-14.
9. Dorman S, Jolley C, Abernethy A, Currow D, Johnson M, Farquhar M, et al. Researching breathlessness in palliative care: consensus statement of the National Cancer Research Institute Palliative Care Breathlessness Subgroup. *Palliat Med* 2009;**23**:213-27.
10. Oxberry SG, Bland JM, Clark AL, Cleland JG, Johnson MJ. Minimally Clinically Important Difference (MCID) in chronic breathlessness: Every little helps. *American Heart Journal* 2012 **164**:229-35
11. Ries AL. Minimally clinically important difference for the UCSD Shortness of Breath Questionnaire, Borg Scale, and Visual Analog Scale. *COPD* 2005;**2**:105-10.
12. Improving research methodology in breathlessness: a meeting convened by the MRC clinical trials unit and the Cicely Saunders Foundation. *Palliat Med* 2006;**20**:219-20.
13. Johnson MJ, Abernethy AP, Currow DC. Gaps in the evidence base of opioids for refractory breathlessness. A future work plan? *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2012;**43**:614-24.

14. Abernethy AP, Currow DC, Frith P, Fazekas BS, McHugh A, Bui C. Randomised, double blind, placebo controlled crossover trial of sustained release morphine for the management of refractory dyspnoea. *BMJ* 2003;**327**:523-8.
15. Jennings AL, Davies AN, Higgins JP, Gibbs JS, Broadley KE. A systematic review of the use of opioids in the management of dyspnoea. *Thorax* 2002;**57**:939-44.
16. Oxberry SG, Torgerson DJ, Bland JM, Clark AL, Cleland JG, Johnson MJ. Short-term opioids for breathlessness in stable chronic heart failure: a randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2011;**13**:1006-12.
17. Johnson MJ, McDonagh TA, Harkness A, McKay SE, Dargie HJ. Morphine for the relief of breathlessness in patients with chronic heart failure-a pilot study. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2002;**4**:753-6
18. Chua TP, Harrington D, Ponikowski P, Webb-Peploe K, Poole-Wilson PA, Coats AJ. Effects of dihydrocodeine on chemosensitivity and exercise tolerance in patients with chronic heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1997;**29**:147-52.
19. Jensen D, Alshail A, Viola R, Dudgeon DJ, Webb KA, O'Donnell DE. Inhaled fentanyl citrate improves exercise endurance during high-intensity, constant work-rate cycle exercise in COPD. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2012;**43**:706-719
20. Natalini G, Di MA, Rosano A, Ferretti P, Bertelli M, Bernardini A. Remifentanyl improves breathing pattern and reduces inspiratory workload in tachypneic patients. *Respir Care* 2011;**56**:827-33.

21. Mahler DA, Murray JA, Waterman LA, Ward J, Kraemer WJ, Zhang X, et al. Endogenous opioids modify dyspnoea during treadmill exercise in patients with COPD. *Eur Respir J* 2009;**33**:771-7.
22. Allard P, Lamontagne C, Bernard P, Tremblay C. How effective are supplementary doses of opioids for dyspnea in terminally ill cancer patients? A randomized continuous sequential clinical trial. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1999;**17**:256-65
23. Currow DC, Plummer J, Frith P, Abernethy AP. Can we predict which patients with refractory dyspnea will respond to opioids? *J Palliat Med* 2007;**10**:1031-6.
24. Currow DC, McDonald C, Oaten S, Kenny B, Allcroft P, Frith P, et al. Once-daily opioids for chronic dyspnea: a dose increment and pharmacovigilance study. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2011;**42**:388-99.
25. Powers J, Bennett SJ. Measurement of dyspnea in patients treated with mechanical ventilation. *Am J Crit Care* 1999;**8**:254-61.
26. Ma C, Bandukwala S, Burman D, Bryson J, Seccareccia D, Banerjee S, et al. Interconversion of three measures of performance status: an empirical analysis. *Eur J Cancer* 2010;**46**:3175-83.
27. Currow DC. Why don't we do more rigorous clinical research so that we can stop experimenting on patients? *J Palliat Med* 2010;**13**:636-7.
28. Solano JP, Gomes B, Higginson IJ. A comparison of symptom prevalence in far advanced cancer, AIDS, heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and renal disease. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2006;**31**:58-69.

29. Bland JM, Altman DG. Some examples of regression towards the mean. *BMJ* 1994;**309**:780.
30. Piepoli M, Clark AL, Volterrani M, Adamopoulos S, Sleight P, and Coats AJ. Contribution of muscle afferents to the hemodynamic, autonomic, and ventilatory responses to exercise in patients with chronic heart failure: effects of physical training. *Circulation*. 1996;**93**: 940-952.
31. von Leupoldt A., Sommer T, Kegat S, Baumann HJ, Klose H, Dahme B, et al. Dyspnea and pain share emotion-related brain network. *Neuroimage* 2009;**48**:200-6
32. Simon PM, Schwartzstein RM, Weiss JW, Lahive K, Fencel V, Teghtsoonian M, et al. Distinguishable sensations of breathlessness induced in normal volunteers. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1989;**140**:1021-7.
33. Garrard AK, Williams M. The language of dyspnoea: a systematic review. *The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice* 2008;**6**(1):<http://ijahsp.nova.edu>. Accessed 04.08.2012

Table 1. Contributing studies to a pooled analysis of predictors of response to opioids for chronic refractory dyspnoea due to a range of underlying aetiologies.

study	design	N =	Aetiology	Functional measure used	Primary outcome measure	Primary study findings
Abernethy et al 2003(14)	Placebo controlled randomised cross-over trial (80% power) Intervention: 4 days oral morphine (sustained release)	48	COPD (88%) Cancer (6%) Other (6%)	ECOG status	VAS intensity	Better scores in the morphine arm: morning; 6.6 mm (95% CI 1.6 mm - 11.6 mm) evening; 9.5 mm (3.0 mm -16.1 mm) P = 0.011 and P = 0.006, respectively
Currow et al 2012(24)	Dose increment and pharmacovigilance study Intervention: oral morphine, dose titrated after 7 days if no response	83	COPD (54%) Cancer (29%) RLD (12%) Other (5%)	Australian modified Karnofsky scale	VAS intensity	response rate (improvement of >10% over baseline) = 52/83 (63%), NNT = 1.6, NNH = 4.6.
Johnson et al 2002(17)	Pilot placebo controlled randomised cross-over trial Intervention: 4 days oral morphine	10	CHF	NYHA class	VAS intensity	morphine arm: 23mm reduction by day 2, (P =0.02) sustained for duration of dosing placebo: 13mm reduction by day 2 (NS) revert to baseline by day 4
Oxberry et al 2011(16)	Placebo controlled randomised cross-over Trial (80% power) Intervention: 4 days oral morphine or 4 days oxycodone	37	CHF	NYHA class and KPS	NRS intensity	NS difference between opioid and placebo or between the two types of opioid (-1.37 for placebo group vs. -0.41 in morphine group (P = 0.13) and -1.29 for oxycodone group (P = 0.90))

COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; ECOG = European Co-operative Oncology Group; VAS = visual analogue scale; CHF = chronic heart failure; RLD= restrictive lung disease; NYHA = New York Heart Association; KPS = Karnofsky Performance Status; NS = not significant; NNT = number needed to treat for one person to benefit; NNH = number needed to harm for one person to be harmed

Box 1 Baseline descriptors derived from the work of Simon et al(32) used in the analysis. (Descriptors were presented in random order for each participant)

Number	Description
3	“does not go in”
4	“shallow breathing”
5	“more effort”
10	“out of breath”
11	“cannot get enough air”

Table 2. Baseline demographic and clinical data for four studies that prospectively evaluated the use of opioids for chronic refractory dyspnoea.

Variable		Abernethy (14)		Currow (24)		Johnson (16)		Oxberry Morphine (16)		Oxberry Oxycodone (16)		Combined	
Number		47	%	85	%	10	%	35	%	35	%	213	%
Age	Mean	73.1		74.8		66.2		70.2		70.2		73.1	
	SD	9.5		8.9		11.6		11.1		11.1		9.5	
	Range	41-89		51-88		45-83		41-89		41-89		41- 89	
Gender	M	35	75	53	62	10	100	30	86	30	86	158	74
	F	13	25	32	38	0		5	14	5	14	55	26
Disease	HF	0	0	3	3.5	10	100	35	100	35	100	83	39
	COPD	42	89	42	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	39
	MND	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	<1
	Cancer	3	6	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	13
	RLD	2	4	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	8
Intensity of breathlessness	Mean	42		48		35		41		48		45	
	SD	23		22		25		20		22		22	
	Range	23- 86		1 to 85		1- 77		10- 90		10-100		1 - 100	
Karnofsky Performance Scale	mean	63.6		63.3		67.6		69.1		69.4		65.5	
	SD	16.4		9.5		3.9		6.1		6.1		10.7	
	range	20-85		40-80		62-70		60-80		60-80		20-85	

SD standard deviation; HF heart failure; COPD Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; MND motor neurone disease; RLD restrictive lung disease

Table 3. Logistic regression for absolute response

(Std. Err. adjusted for 166 clusters in study id)

Response (abs)	Odds Ratio	P	[95% Conf. Interval]	
age	0.96	0.039	0.93	1.00
bi-baseline	1.04	0.000	1.03	1.06
performance status	0.98	0.298	0.95	1.02
COPD	0.49	0.486	0.07	3.64
cancer	0.36	0.338	0.04	2.94
RLD	0.30	0.266	0.03	2.53
gender	0.75	0.485	0.33	1.69
Currow	1.79	0.251	0.66	4.87
Johnson	1.20	0.897	0.08	19.09
Oxberry	1.50	0.729	0.15	14.96

bi-baseline = baseline intensity breathlessness; rld = restrictive lung disease; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; absolute; Std. Err. = standard error

The odds ratio indicates whether the patients with that characteristic were more (>1) or less (<1) likely to respond to morphine e.g. those with “more” age (older) were less (<1) likely to respond to morphine.

Table 4. Final model from stepwise logistic regression: absolute and relative

Model for “absolute” response			
(Std. Err. adjusted for 166 clusters in studyid)			
Response (abs)	Odds Ratio	P	95% Conf. Interval
age	0.97	0.068	0.94 – 1.00
bi-baseline	1.04	0.000	1.03 – 1.06
Currow	1.52	0.382	0.59 – 3.85
Johnson	2.68	0.278	0.45 – 15.95
Oxberry	3.03	0.031	1.12 - 8.19

Model for “relative” response			
(Std. Err. adjusted for 166 clusters in studyid)			
Response (rel)	Odds Ratio	P	95% Conf. Interval
age	0.96	0.025	0.93 – 1.00
bi-baseline	1.03	0.000	1.02 – 1.05
Currow	2.04	0.109	0.85 – 4.90
Johnson	4.38	0.090	0.80 – 24.13
Oxberry	2.09	0.113	0.84 – 5.18

Abs = absolute; Rel = relative; bi-baseline = baseline intensity breathlessness;

The odds ratio indicates whether the patients with that characteristic were more (>1) or less (<1) likely to respond to morphine e.g. those with “more” age (older) were less (<1) likely to respond to morphine.