

## CORRESPONDENCE

# **N-acetylcysteine is unlikely to reduce hospitalisation for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease**

To the Editor:

We read with interest the recent paper by GERRITS *et al.* [1] reporting on the effectiveness of *N*-acetylcysteine in reducing re-hospitalisations for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). We are concerned, however, that the apparent benefit is actually the result of bias in study design and analysis.

The paper mentions that patients were considered users if they received *N*-acetylcysteine "immediately" after discharge. However, we are not given the definition of "immediately" nor are we provided with the average and range of the length of time from hospital discharge to dispensing of the first prescription for *N*-acetylcysteine. Since follow-up time starts at discharge from hospital for all subjects, irrespective of whether they will or will not be dispensed *N*-acetylcysteine, there is a strong possibility of immortal time bias [2]. Indeed, the time period from discharge to the first dispensing is "immortal" by definition since re-admissions could not occur during this period; if they did occur before the first prescription, the subject would have been classified as "unexposed". Moreover, this immortal time period is in fact unexposed, since the subject has not yet received the drug, but is misclassified as exposed by this approach to data analysis.

Consequently, such misclassified immortal time will cause the rate of re-admission in the "unexposed" to be artificially inflated resulting in an impression of a protective rate ratio for exposure. This bias will also accentuate the apparent dose/response effect, since the daily dose calculation uses the immortal unexposed time and also considers it as exposed. It would be useful to redo these analyses, after properly classifying exposures.

**P. Ernst, S. Suissa**

\*Pharmacoepidemiology Unit, McGill University Health Centre, McGill University, Montréal, Quebec, Canada.

### References

1. Gerrits CMJM, Herings RMC, Leufkens HJH, Lammers JWJ. *N*-acetylcysteine reduces the risk of re-hospitalisation among patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Eur Respir J* 2003; 21: 795–798.
2. Suissa S. Effectiveness of inhaled corticosteroids in COPD: immortal time bias in observational studies. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003; 168: 49–53.

From the authors:

We thank S. Suissa and P. Ernst for their interest in our paper [1]. We agree that immortal bias could have invalidated the results of our study if there had been a significant time lag between hospital discharge of patients with chronic

obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and the start of *N*-acetylcysteine therapy. However, this was not the case. Patients were classified as "exposed" when they showed up with a prescription in the retail pharmacy for *N*-acetylcysteine within a period of 2 days after discharge. When therapy is initiated during hospitalisation, it is common practice in Dutch hospitals that patients receive a few daily dosages of *N*-acetylcysteine to bridge the gap between the time of discharge and the first occasion they can visit their retail pharmacy. In the exposed group with a re-admission for COPD, usage of *N*-acetylcysteine was virtually continuous (87.6% were still using at the time of the second admission). In order to assess the possible impact of exposure variation over time (*e.g.* treatment interruption), we also applied Cox's proportional hazards models with time-dependent exposure classification and found no differences with our initial estimates of the relative risks. For reasons of clarity, we decided to present only the results of the overall use and the average daily dose of *N*-acetylcysteine analyses.

S. Suissa and P. Ernst also point to the possible role of immortal bias in the daily dose calculations, but this comment is inaccurate as only person/time experience was included in the analyses directly derived from the time-windows of measured exposure of *N*-acetylcysteine. The Dutch pharmacy system enforces patients to frequent a single retail pharmacy for their prescription drugs, facilitating the recording of precise start and stop date of therapy.

In assessing the effect of a hypothetical bias, appropriate study designs and analysis are of course pivotal. But the strength of available molecular and clinical evidence of the exposure/outcome association should also be considered. As S. Suissa pointed out, the precise role of inhaled steroids in the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease is still heavily debated [2]. Although the plea for more cautiousness to prevent immortal bias by S. Suissa and P. Ernst makes absolute sense, it would be a challenge and an imperative next step to show the role of immortal bias in a case of an "established" association, such as the role of inhaled steroids in the prevention of asthma rehospitalisations [3]. Variations in time-windows used for denominator data always have an impact on risk estimates, as shown by SUISSA [2] in analyses with exposures of inhaled  $\beta$ -agonists in relation to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease morbidity and mortality and also shown for other drug exposures [4].

**C.M.J.M. Gerrits\***, **R.M.C. Herings<sup>#</sup>**, **H.G.M. Leufkens\***, **J.W.J. Lammers<sup>†</sup>**

\*Dept of Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacotherapy, Utrecht Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, <sup>#</sup>The PHARMO Institute, <sup>†</sup>Dept of Pulmonary Diseases, Heart Lung Centre Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

### References

1. Gerrits CMJM, Herings RMC, Leufkens HGM, Lammers JWJ. *N*-acetylcysteine reduces the risk of re-hospitalisation among

- patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Eur Respir J* 2003; 21: 795–798.
2. Suissa S. Effectiveness of inhaled corticosteroids in COPD: immortal time bias in observational studies. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003; 168: 49–53.
  3. Blais L, Ernst P, Boivin JF, Suissa S. Inhaled corticosteroids

- and the prevention of readmission to hospital for asthma. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1998; 158: 126–132.
4. van Staa TP, Abenham L, Leufkens H. A study of the effects of exposure misclassification due to the time-window design in pharmacoepidemiologic studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1994; 47: 183–189.

## Major conceptual change required to improve lung cancer: see a respiratory physician

To the Editor:

We fully agree with the discussion of FIELD and BRAMBILLA [1] regarding effective strategies that could lead to important reductions in lung cancer mortality. We would like to add a fifth strategy, chemoprevention, which can be used in parallel with screening of high risk individuals. Chemoprevention is the medicinal use of natural or synthetic agents to arrest, delay, or reverse early carcinogenesis [2]. The potential of this approach to decrease the incidence of cancer and cancer precursor lesions has been demonstrated recently in breast and colon cancer [3, 4]. While prior phase III chemopreventive studies of the antioxidant, beta-carotene, did not show a reduction in lung cancer incidence [5, 6], several promising new drugs are in the early and middle phases of development and chemoprevention remains a major part of the National Cancer Institute's initiative to eliminate suffering and death from cancer by the year 2015. In contrast to helical computerised tomography screening, which detects peripheral malignancies at earlier and therefore, in theory, curable stages but has no impact on an individual's risk of cancer, chemoprevention, when successful, actually reduces an individual's absolute risk for cancer. This distinction gains added importance given the recent information that smoking cessation may not lead to a reduction in one's risk of lung cancer but rather stabilises one's risk; in contrast, continued smoking leads to increasing risk [7]. Therefore, in the future, we foresee a multimodality strategy of molecular screening of smokers and former smokers to identify individuals at particularly high risk, combined with early detection through computerised tomography screening and perhaps improved sputum cytology techniques, coupled with chemoprevention.

J.S. Vourlekis, E. Szabo

Lung and Upper Aerodigestive Cancer Research Group, Division of Cancer Prevention, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Health and Human Services, Bethesda, MD, USA.

### References

1. Field JK, Brambilla C. Major conceptual change required to improve lung cancer: see a respiratory physician. *Eur Respir J* 2003; 21: 565–566.
2. Kelloff GJ. Perspectives on cancer chemoprevention research and drug development. *Adv Cancer Res* 2000; 78: 199–334.
3. Fisher B, Constantino JP, Wickerham DL, *et al.* Tamoxifen for prevention of breast cancer: report of the national surgical adjuvant breast and bowel project P-1 study. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1998; 90: 1371–1388.
4. Steinbach G, Lynch PM, Phillips RK, *et al.* The effect of celecoxib, a cyclooxygenase-2 inhibitor, in familial adenomatous polyposis. *New Engl J Med* 2000; 342: 1946–1952.
5. The Alpha-Tocopherol Beta Carotene Cancer Prevention Study Group. The effect of vitamin E and beta carotene on the incidence of lung cancer and other cancers in male smokers. *New Engl J Med* 1994; 330: 1029–1035.
6. Omenn GS, Goodman GE, Thornquist MD, *et al.* Effects of a combination of beta carotene and vitamin A on lung cancer and cardiovascular disease. *New Engl J Med* 1996; 334: 1150–1155.
7. Bach PB, Kattan MW, Thornquist MD, *et al.* Variations in lung cancer risk among male smokers. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2003; 95: 470–478.