The association of lung function and St. George's respiratory questionnaire with exacerbations in COPD: a systematic literature review and regression analysis
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Abstract

Background: This study investigated the relationship between changes in lung function (as measured by forced expiratory volume in one second [FEV1]) and the St. George’s Respiratory Questionnaire (SGRQ) and economically significant outcomes of exacerbations and health resource utilization, with an aim to provide insight into whether the effects of COPD treatment on lung function and health status relate to a reduced risk for exacerbations.

Methods: A systematic literature review was conducted in MEDLINE, Embase, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials to identify randomized controlled trials of adult COPD patients published in English since 2002 in order to relate mean change in FEV1 and SGRQ total score to exacerbations and hospitalizations. These predictor/outcome pairs were analyzed using sample-size weighted regression analyses, which estimated a regression slope relating the two treatment effects, as well as a confidence interval and a test of statistical significance.

Results: Sixty-seven trials were included in the analysis. Significant relationships were seen between: FEV1 and any exacerbation (time to first exacerbation or patients with at least one exacerbation, \( p = 0.001 \)); between FEV1 and moderate-to-severe exacerbations (time to first exacerbation, patients with at least one exacerbation, or annualized rate, \( p = 0.045 \)); between SGRQ score and any exacerbation (time to first exacerbation or patients with at least one exacerbation, \( p = 0.0002 \)) and between SGRQ score and moderate-to-severe exacerbations (time to first exacerbation or patients with at least one exacerbation, \( p = 0.0279 \); annualized rate, \( p = 0.0024 \)). Relationships between FEV1 or SGRQ score and annualized exacerbation rate for any exacerbation or hospitalized exacerbations were not significant.

Conclusions: The regression analysis demonstrated a significant association between improvements in FEV1 and SGRQ score and lower risk for COPD exacerbations. Even in cases of non-significant relationships, results were in the expected direction with few exceptions. The results of this analysis offer health care providers and payers a broader picture of the relationship between exacerbations and mean change in FEV1 as well as SGRQ score, and will help inform clinical and formulary-making decisions while stimulating new research questions for future prospective studies.
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Background
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) is characterized by persistent airway obstruction related to chronic inflammatory responses in the lungs with symptoms including disabling dyspnea, fatigue, and persistent cough with excessive sputum. Exacerbations are characterized by a sustained acute worsening of respiratory symptoms beyond daily fluctuations, which leads to changes in medication use. Due to the disease symptoms, COPD patients often have a reduced capacity for physical activity and this may worsen potential systemic manifestations of the disease, such as cardiovascular and psychiatric comorbidities. The global prevalence of COPD is estimated to be 9.2 % [1] with variable estimates, ranging from 3.9 % [2] in the Netherlands to 20.9 % in the US, [3] when reported by country. Therefore, COPD presents a major clinical and humanistic burden, [4] despite the availability and use of standard treatments, which aim to relieve symptoms and slow disease progression [5].

This heavy disease toll inevitably focuses interest on how patients are treated and the extent to which medications produce meaningful benefits. Assessment of such value in clinical trials has traditionally relied on measures of lung function (such as forced expiratory volume in one second [FEV$_1$]), symptom control, health status, and rates of exacerbation over a period of up to one year. Exacerbations are a particularly important marker, not least because they are a key driver of health resource use (HRU), such as emergency department visits, antibiotic use and hospitalization. Evidence of this includes the fact that an exacerbation can cost upwards of $7,000 each, depending on its severity and whether the patient is hospitalized [6]. Unsurprisingly, payers tend to focus on this outcome in their formulary considerations, with the expectation that decreased exacerbation rates will likely result in lower costs for their plan.

The clinical and economic importance of exacerbations in COPD invites questions about their interrelationship with other well-established measures of treatment effect. These include, for example, persistent and/or uncontrolled disease symptoms and health status as measured by the St. George’s Respiratory Questionnaire [SGRQ] – which captures symptoms, impact on patient well-being, and activities of daily living. Additionally, clinically relevant improvements in lung function measures such as FEV$_1$, are often required by regulators for certain drug approval processes. Of note, previous studies have looked at the link between FEV$_1$ and SGRQ score [7, 8] but their relationship to longer-term outcomes, such as exacerbations and HRU, is not well-known and/or accepted, and this may account for why they have received comparatively less consideration from clinicians and payers.

Against this background, the current study aimed to investigate the relationship between changes in FEV$_1$ and SGRQ score and economically significant outcomes of exacerbations and HRU, by conducting a systematic literature review (SLR) and regression analysis of relevant studies of pharmacological interventions for COPD. The results of this analysis will help the interpretation of clinical trial results and provide insights into whether or how the effects of COPD treatment seen in such studies relate to long-term clinical benefits.

Methods

Literature review

Search strategy
We systematically reviewed MEDLINE- (via PubMed), Embase-, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) -indexed literature published from January 1, 2002 through October 1, 2014. The search algorithms used keywords for COPD paired with terms for the endpoints of interest—SGRQ, FEV$_1$, exacerbations, and HRU. Limits included clinical trials on humans published in English.

Study selection
Following the literature search, all titles and abstracts identified from MEDLINE, Embase, and CENTRAL were manually reviewed against the inclusion and exclusion criteria using PICOS (Patient, Interventions, Comparisons, Outcomes, Study Design)-related elements. Studies were required to report on at least 20 adult COPD patients, to evaluate pharmacologic treatments labeled for or intended for use as treatment of COPD with any comparator treatment, to report mean change in either FEV$_1$ or SGRQ score and either COPD exacerbations or any HRU endpoint, and to be a randomized controlled trial (RCT). A single investigator screened all abstracts identified through the searches, according to the specified inclusion and exclusion criteria. The full-text articles of accepted studies that passed abstract screening were retrieved for further review. Screening was conducted by a single investigator using the same inclusion and exclusion criteria that had been applied at the abstract level. All excluded studies were confirmed by a second, senior investigator and any discrepancies between the two investigators were resolved by involvement of a third investigator.

Data extraction process
The results of all accepted studies identified as part of the SLR were extracted by a single investigator trained in the critical assessment of evidence, with validation performed by a senior investigator. Trial quality and risk of bias were assessed during extraction for each included study using the Jadad quality score assessment.
Statistical analysis
The analyses relating measures of FEV$_1$ and SGRQ total score to exacerbations and HRU followed the meta-analyses methods outlined by Johnson et al. [9] Each trial supplied one or more pairs of data points on the treatment effects of interest. These predictor/outcome pairs from each of the studies were analyzed using sample-size weighted regression analyses, which estimated a regression slope relating the two treatment effects, as well as a confidence interval and a test of statistical significance. In general, the predictor was a relative treatment effect for change in SGRQ or trough FEV$_1$, and the outcome was a log-relative-risk or log-rate for exacerbations. Pre-bronchodilator FEV$_1$ was considered as equivalent to trough FEV$_1$ for analysis, while post-bronchodilator measures and FEV$_1$ that was unspecified were not included. Primary analyses were designed to avoid the use of an intercept in the regressions, but fit was superior with an intercept included.

For the analyses of patients experiencing at least one exacerbation, studies were included if they reported on exacerbations of all severities. For analyses of patients experiencing at least one moderate-to-severe exacerbation, studies were included if they reported on exacerbations that required antibiotics, oral corticosteroids (OCS), and/or hospitalization. Data on time to first exacerbation or the number of patients with at least one exacerbation were combined for analysis. COPD exacerbations reported as an adverse event were not included in analysis. All studies reporting data at timepoints ≥24 weeks were eligible for inclusion in the analyses. Separate analyses were conducted for all timepoints ≥24 weeks and ≥48 weeks.

Results

Literature review
The literature review identified 67 trials reporting endpoints of interest at timepoints ≥24 weeks that were eligible for inclusion in the regression analysis. Fig. 1 outlines the overall search hits and study attrition during screening and analysis.

Regression analysis
In the figures representing the analyses, each point in the plot represents a study comparison for two effects. For instance, the point in the middle of Fig. 2 is from Bateman et al. [10] and represents their findings in the comparison of tiotropium 5 mg (via the Respimat® inhaler) vs. placebo. In this example, the difference between the two treatments in trough FEV$_1$ change was -0.10, and the hazard ratio (HR) for any exacerbation risk was 0.693 (for a log-HR of -0.37). Each study with two arms (one treatment comparison, e.g. treatment A...
vs. treatment B) and with sufficient data contributed one data point to the analysis; studies with three arms (two treatment comparisons, e.g. A vs. B and A vs. C) contributed two data points.

Any given slope can be interpreted by determining what difference between treatments in log-exacerbation risk one would expect given the difference in trough FEV$_1$ change. The predicted log-relative-risk of exacerbation in studies like Bateman 2010 is:

$$\ln \text{RR}_{\text{AnyExacerbation}} = \text{Intercept} + \text{Slope} \times \text{Difference in trough FEV}_1 \text{change}.$$ 

Or

$$\ln \text{RR}_{\text{AnyExacerbation}} = 0.14 - 3.56(0.10),$$

$$= -0.22.$$

As $\exp (-0.22) = 0.80$, we can predict that the relative risk of exacerbation in studies like Bateman 2010 will be 20% lower for active treatment than for control. As noted above and in the plot, in Bateman 2010 the relative risk of any exacerbation was actually slightly lower than this value (0.693).

Relationships with exacerbations at $\geq 48$ weeks

**Forced Expiratory Volume in One Second (trough FEV$_1$)**

**Mean Change in Trough FEV$_1$ and COPD Patients’ Risk for Any Exacerbation** The relationship between relative treatment effects on change in FEV$_1$ and any exacerbation was of moderate strength and was statistically significant (slope: $-3.56, p = 0.0001$; Fig. 2) when defining the exacerbation outcome as time to first exacerbation or the number of patients with at least one exacerbation. No relationship was found (slope: $0.078, p = 0.9199$) between treatment effects on FEV$_1$ and annualized exacerbation rate. Figure 2 plots the relationship between the mean difference in trough FEV$_1$ and relative risk for any exacerbation and Table 1 shows the raw trial data contributing to this analysis.

**Mean Change in Trough FEV$_1$ and COPD Patients’ Risk for Moderate-to-Severe Exacerbations** The relationship between relative treatment effects on change in FEV$_1$ and moderate-to-severe exacerbations was of moderate strength and was statistically significant (slope: $-1.46, p = 0.045$; Fig. 3) when defining the exacerbation outcome as time to first exacerbation, the number of patients with at least one exacerbation, or as annualized exacerbation rates. Figure 3 shows the relationship between the mean difference in trough FEV$_1$ and the relative risk for a moderate-to-severe exacerbation. Table 2 shows the raw trial data contributing to this analysis.

**St. George’s respiratory questionnaire**

**Mean Change in SGRQ Total Score and COPD Patients’ Risk for Any Exacerbations** The relationship between relative treatment effects for change in SGRQ score and any exacerbation was of moderate strength (slope: $0.112, p = 0.0002$; Fig. 4) and was statistically significant when defining the exacerbation outcome as time to first-exacerbation or the number of patients with at least one exacerbation. The relationship was weaker and not statistically significant (slope: $0.014, p = 0.2825$) when examining annualized exacerbation rates. Figure 4 shows the relationship between the mean difference in SGRQ score and relative risk for any exacerbation and Table 3 shows the raw trial data contributing to this analysis.
Table 1: Study Data for Trials Reporting Mean Change in Trough FEV\textsubscript{1} and Patients Experiencing Any Exacerbation

| Author, Year | Treatment | Time point (weeks) | N Randomized | Definition of exacerbation | Annual exacerbation rate | N with any exacerbation | Comparison data for Time to first exacerbation (Hazard ratio) | Mean change in Trough FEV\textsubscript{1} (L) | Comparison data for Trough FEV\textsubscript{1} (treatment difference) |
|--------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Bateman, 2010 [10] | Tiotropium 5 ug | 48 | 1989 | B+ | 0.12 | 685 | Tio5 vs. Placebo: 0.69 | 0.119 | – |
| | Placebo | 48 | 2002 | | 0.15 | 842 | | 0.018 | – |
| Calverley, 2010 [12] | Beclomethasone/formoterol pMDI 400/24 ug | 48 | 237 | NR | 0.074 | 64 | | 0.077 | B/F pMDI vs. F-DPI: 0.051 |
| | Budesonide/formoterol DPI/800/24 ug | 48 | 242 | | 0.033 | 64 | | 0.08 | B/F dry vs. F-DPI: 0.053 |
| | Formoterol DPI 12 ug | 48 | 239 | | 0.04 | 66 | | 0.026 | – |
| Chapman, 2011 [13] | Indacaterol, 150 ug | 52 | 420 | A | – | – | Inda150 vs. Placebo: 0.82 | 0.12 | – |
| | Indacaterol, 300 ug | 52 | 418 | | – | – | Inda300 vs. Placebo: 0.86 | 0.13 | – |
| | Placebo | 52 | 425 | | – | – | | –0.04 | – |
| Dahl, 2010 [14] | Indacaterol 300 ug | 52 | 437 | A | – | – | Inda300 vs. Placebo: 0.77 | – | Inda300 vs. Placebo: 0.16 |
| | Indacaterol 600 ug | 52 | 428 | | – | – | Inda600 vs. Placebo: 0.69 | – | Inda600 vs. Placebo: 0.15 |
| | Formoterol | 52 | 435 | | – | – | F vs. Placebo: 0.77 | – | F vs. Placebo: 0.05 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 432 | | – | – | | – | – |
| Decramer, 2013 [15] | Tiotropium bromide 18 ug | 26 | 1721 | C | – | – | Tio18 vs. Inda150: 0.81 | – | Tio18 vs. Inda150: 0.02 |
| | Indacaterol maleate 150 ug once-daily | 26 | 1723 | | – | – | | – | – |
| | Tiotropium bromide 18 ug | 52 | 1721 | | 0.07 | 547 | – | 0.092 | – |
| | Indacaterol maleate 150 ug once-daily | 52 | 1723 | | 0.1 | 619 | – | 0.073 | – |
| Dusser, 2006 [16] | Tiotropium 18 ug once daily | 48 | 500 | C | – | 248 | – | – | – |
| | Placebo | 48 | 510 | | – | 305 | – | – | Tio18 vs. Placebo: 0.12 |
| Ferguson, 2008 [17] | Fluticasone propionate/ salmeterol (FSC) 250/50 | 52 | 394 | C | – | 343 | – | –0.012 | – |
| | Salmeterol 50 ug | 52 | 388 | | – | 335 | – | –0.082 | – |
| van Grunsven, 2003 [18] | Fluticasone propionate (Flixotide) 250 ug bid | 103 | 24 | D | – | 5 | – | –0.12 | F250 vs. Placebo: 0.06 |
| | Placebo bid | 103 | 24 | | – | 3 | – | –0.17 | – |
| Vincken, 2002 [19] | Tiotropium 18 ug qd in the morning | 52 | 356 | B | – | 125 | – | 0.12 | – |
| | Ipratropium 40 ug qid | 52 | 179 | | – | 82 | – | –0.03 | – |
| Wouters, 2005 [20] | Salmeterol/fluticasone (3 month run in period of salmeterol 50 ug and fluticasone 500 ug bid) | 52 | 189 | E | – | 115 | – | –0.04 | S/F vs. S: 0.05 |
| | Salmeterol (3 month run in period of salmeterol 50 ug and fluticasone 500 ug bid) | 52 | 184 | | – | 109 | – | –0.1 | – |
| Zhou, 2006 [21] | Theophylline | 52 | 57 | C | – | 26 | – | 0.0063 | – |
| | Placebo | 52 | 53 | | – | 30 | – | –0.0533 | – |
The relationship between relative treatment effects for change in SGRQ score and a moderate-to-severe exacerbation was of moderate strength and was statistically significant when defining the exacerbation outcome as either the number of patients with at least one exacerbation (slope: 0.046, \( p = 0.0279 \), Fig. 5) or as an annualized exacerbation rate (slope: 0.056, \( p = 0.0024 \), figure not shown). Figure 5 shows the relationship between the mean difference in SGRQ score and the relative risk for a moderate-to-severe exacerbation and Table 4 shows the raw trial data contributing to this analysis.

### Table 1: Study Data for Trials Reporting Mean Change in Trough FEV\(_1\) and Patients Experiencing Any Exacerbation (Continued)

| Drug Combination | n  | Mean FEV\(_1\) Change (L) | Mean Difference in SGRQ Score | Relative Risk for Moderate-to-Severe Exacerbation |
|------------------|----|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Dransfield, 2013 [22] |    |                           |                              |                                               |
| Vilanterol 25 μg | 52 | 0.02 | -0.02 | -0.04 |
| Fluticasone furoate 50 μg + Vilanterol 25 μg | 52 | 0.01 | -0.01 | -0.02 |
| Fluticasone furoate 100 μg + Vilanterol 25 μg | 52 | 0.02 | -0.02 | -0.02 |
| Fluticasone furoate 200 μg + Vilanterol 25 μg | 52 | 0.03 | -0.03 | -0.03 |
| Fluticasone furoate 50 μg + Vilanterol 25 μg | 52 | 0.01 | -0.01 | -0.02 |
| Fluticasone furoate 100 μg + Vilanterol 25 μg | 52 | 0.02 | -0.02 | -0.02 |
| Fluticasone furoate 200 μg + Vilanterol 25 μg | 52 | 0.03 | -0.03 | -0.03 |

Exacerbation Definitions:

A: Symptom deterioration requiring antibiotics, systemic corticosteroids, and/or hospitalization
B: A complex of respiratory events lasting ≥3 days
B+: A complex of respiratory events lasting ≥3 days requiring treatment
C: Worsening of at least two symptoms for at least two days
D: Having two of the following three symptoms: increased cough, wheezing and/or dyspnea; change in sputum color; use of bronchodilator rescue medication
E: If a patient has in ≥2 consecutive days used ≥3 extra inhalations of salbutamol per 24 hours above their reference rescue value
- = Not Reported

Mean Change in SGRQ Total Score and COPD Patients’ Risk for Moderate-to-severe Exacerbations
The relationship between relative treatment effects for change in SGRQ score and a moderate-to-severe exacerbation was of moderate strength and was statistically significant when defining the exacerbation outcome as either the number of patients with at least one exacerbation (slope: 0.046, \( p = 0.0279 \), Fig. 5) or as an annualized exacerbation rate (slope: 0.056, \( p = 0.0024 \), figure not shown). Figure 5 shows the relationship between the mean difference in SGRQ score and the relative risk for a moderate-to-severe exacerbation and Table 4 shows the raw trial data contributing to this analysis.

![Figure 3: Relationship between Mean Change in Trough FEV\(_1\) and Risk for a Moderate-to-Severe Exacerbation](image-url)
| Author, Year | Treatment | Time point (weeks) | N Randomized | Annual exacerbation rate (M-S) | N with M-S exacerbation | Comparison data for Time to first exacerbation (Hazard ratio) | Mean change in Trough FEV1 (L) | Comparison data for Trough FEV1 (treatment difference) |
|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Anzueto, 2009 [23] | Fluticasone propionate/salmeterol 250 mcg/50 mcg bid | 52 | 394 | 1.1 | 208 | FP250 + S50 vs. S50: 0.73 | -0.017 | – |
| Bateman, 2010 [10] | Salmeterol 50 mcg bid | 52 | 403 | 1.59 | 234 | – | -0.097 | – |
| | Tiotropium 5 µg orally inhaled once daily | 48 | 670 | 0.93 | 249 | – | 0.08 | Tio5 vs. Placebo: 0.127 |
| | Tiotropium 10 µg orally inhaled once daily | 48 | 667 | 1.02 | 246 | – | 0.11 | Tio10 vs. Placebo: 0.150 |
| | Placebo | 48 | 653 | 1.91 | 288 | – | -0.04 | – |
| Dahl, 2010 [14] | Indacaterol 300 µg | 52 | 437 | 0.6 | 133 | – | – | Inda300 vs. Placebo: 0.16 |
| | Indacaterol 600 µg | 52 | 428 | 0.57 | 116 | – | – | Inda600 vs. Placebo: 0.15 |
| | Formoterol | 52 | 435 | 0.56 | 126 | – | – | F vs. Placebo: 0.05 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 432 | 0.74 | 145 | – | – | – |
| Donohue, 2014 [24] | UMEC/VI 125/25 mcg | 52 | 226 | – | 30 | UMEC/VI vs. Placebo: 0.6 | 0.18 | UMEC/VI vs. Placebo: 0.231 |
| | UMEC 125 mcg | 52 | 227 | – | 34 | UMEC vs. Placebo: 0.4 | 0.13 | UMEC vs. Placebo: 0.178 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 210 | 0.74 | 26 | – | 0.05 | – |
| Ferguson, 2008 [17] | Fluticasone propionate/salmeterol (FSC) 250/50 | 52 | 394 | 1.06 | 211 | FP/S vs. S: 0.75 | -0.012 | – |
| | Salmeterol 50 µg | 52 | 388 | 1.53 | 230 | – | -0.082 | – |
| Kerwin, 2012 [25] | NVA237 50 µg qd | 52 | 529 | 0.54 | – | NVA vs. Placebo: 0.66 | 0.112 | NVA vs. Placebo: 0.108 |
| | Tiotropium 18 µg qd | 52 | 268 | – | – | NVA vs. Tio: 1.1 | 0.092 | NVA vs. Tio: 0.019 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 269 | 0.8 | – | – | -0.097 | – |
| Sharafkhaneh, 2012 [26] | Budesonide/formoterol pMDI 160/4.5 µg x 2 inhalations bid (320/9 µg) | 52 | 407 | 0.867 | 169 | – | 0.07 | – |
| | Budesonide/formoterol pMDI 80/4.5 µg x 2 inhalations bid (160/9 µg) | 52 | 408 | 0.952 | 173 | – | 0.07 | – |
| | Formoterol DPI 4.5 µg x 2 inhalations bid (9 µg) | 52 | 404 | 1.171 | 182 | – | 0.04 | – |
| Tang, 2013 [27] | Tiotropium 5 µg (2 x 2.5 µg/puff) | 48 | 167 | – | 58 | Tio5 vs. Placebo: 0.54 | – | Tio5 vs. Placebo: 0.134 |
| | Placebo (2 puffs) | 48 | 171 | – | 83 | – | – | – |
| Tashkin, 2008 [11] | Tiotropium 18 µg once daily; followed by 40 µg of ipratropium four times daily for 30 days after 4 years of treatment. | 206 | 2987 | – | 2001 | – | 0.03 | – |
| | Placebo once daily; followed by 40 µg of ipratropium four times daily for 30 days after 4 years of treatment. | 206 | 3006 | – | 2049 | – | -0.05 | – |
| Calverley, 2009 [28] | Roflumilast 500 mcg once per day | 52 | 765 | 1.08 | 344 | ROLF500 vs. Placebo (Trial 1): 0.88 | 0.046 | ROLF500 vs. Placebo (Trial 1): 0.039 |
### Table 2: Study Data for Trials Reporting Mean change in FEV₁ and Patients Experiencing Moderate-to-Severe COPD Exacerbation (Continued)

| Treatment                  | N   | Mean Change in FEV₁ | M-S | Placebo     | Roflumilast 500 mcg once per day | Placebo     | Roflumilast 500 mcg once per day |
|----------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Placebo                    | S2  | 758                 | 1.27| 389         | ROLF500 vs. Placebo (Trial 2): 0.89| 0.008       | ROLF500 vs. Placebo (Trial 2): 0.058 |
| Vilanterol 25 µg           | S2  | 796                 | 1.49| 432         |                                   |             |                                  |
| Dransfield, 2013 [22]      |     |                     |     |             |                                  |             |                                  |
| Fluticasone furoate 50 µg + Vilanterol 25 µg | S2  | 408                 | 0.92|             | FF200 + V vs. V: 0.9             | -0.04       |                                  |
| Fluticasone furoate 100 µg + Vilanterol 25 µg | S2  | 403                 | 0.7 |             | FF50 + V vs. V: 0.9              | 0.02        |                                  |
| Fluticasone furoate 200 µg + Vilanterol 25 µg | S2  | 402                 | 0.9 |             |                                   | 0.02        |                                  |
| Vilanterol 25 µg           | S2  | 409                 | 1.14|             | FF200 + V vs. V: 0.7             | -0.02       |                                  |
| Fluticasone furoate 50 µg + Vilanterol 25 µg | S2  | 412                 | 0.92|             | FF100 + V vs. V: 0.8             | 0.02        |                                  |
| Fluticasone furoate 100 µg + Vilanterol 25 µg | S2  | 403                 | 0.9 |             | FF50 + V vs. V: 0.9              | 0.01        |                                  |
| Fluticasone furoate 200 µg + Vilanterol 25 µg | S2  | 409                 | 0.79|             |                                   | 0.01        |                                  |
| Aclidinium 200 µg          | S2  | 627                 | 167 |             |                                 | -0.013      |                                  |
| Jones, 2011 [29]           |     |                     |     |             |                                  |             |                                  |
| Placebo                    | S2  | 216                 | 0.46| 55          |                                 | -0.065      |                                  |
| Aclidinium 200 µg          | S2  | 600                 | 199 |             |                                 | -0.009      |                                  |
| Placebo                    | S2  | 204                 | 0.8 | 81          |                                 | -0.024      |                                  |

M-S = moderate-to-severe
– = Not reported

**Fig. 4** Relationship between Mean Change in SGRQ Total Score and Risk for Any Exacerbation
| Author, year | Treatment | Time point (weeks) | N Randomized | N with any exacerbation | Annual exacerbation rate (any) | Definition of exacerbation | Mean change in SGRQ Total Score | Comparison data for Time to first exacerbation (Hazard ratio) | Mean change in SGRQ Total Score (treatment difference) | Comparison data for SGRQ Total Score (treatment difference) |
|--------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Bateman, 2010 [10] | Tiotropium 5 μg | 48 | 1989 | B+ | 0.69 | 685 | | Tio vs. placebo: 0.93 | -4.7 | Tio5 vs. placebo: -2.9 |
| | Placebo | 48 | 2002 | | 0.87 | 842 | | | | |
| Calverley, 2003 [30] | Budesonide/formoterol 320/9 mg (bid) | 52 | 254 | A | 1.38 | | | B + F vs. B: 0.77 | - | B + F vs. B: -4.5 |
| | Budesonide 400 mg (bid) | 52 | 257 | | 1.6 | | | B + F vs. F: 0.71 | | B + F vs. F: -3.4 |
| | Formoterol 9 mg (bid) | 52 | 255 | | 1.85 | | | B + F vs. Placebo: 0.72 | | B + F vs. Placebo: -7.5 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 256 | | 1.8 | | | | | |
| Calverley, 2010 [12] | Beclomethasone/formoterol pMDI 400/24 μg | 48 | 237 | NR | 0.414 | 64 | | | -3.75 | |
| | Budesonide/formoterol DPI 800/24 μg | 48 | 242 | | 0.423 | 64 | | | -4.28 | |
| | Formoterol DPI 12 μg | 48 | 239 | | 0.431 | 66 | | | -2.9 | |
| Casaburi, 2002 [31] | Tiotropium 18 μg | 52 | 550 | B | 0.76 | 198 | | | -3.2 | |
| | Placebo | 52 | 371 | | 0.95 | 156 | | | 0.5 | |
| Chapman, 2011 [13] | Indacaterol, 150 μg | 52 | 420 | A | | | | | -7.5 | |
| | Indacaterol, 300 μg | 52 | 418 | | | | | | -5.5 | |
| | Placebo | 52 | 425 | | | | | | -5.5 | |
| Dahl, 2010 [14] | Indacaterol 300 μg | 52 | 437 | A | | | | | -6.5 | |
| | Indacaterol 600 μg | 52 | 428 | | | | | | -7.2 | |
| | Formoterol | 52 | 435 | | | | | | -7 | |
| | Placebo | 52 | 432 | | | | | | -1.7 | |
| Decramer, 2013 [15] | Tiotropium bromide 18 μg | 26 | 1721 | C | | | | | -5.2 | |
| | Indacaterol maleate 150 μg once-daily | 26 | 1723 | | | | | | -4.5 | |
| | Tiotropium bromide 18 μg | 52 | 1721 | | 0.61 | 547 | | | -4.9 | |
| | Indacaterol maleate 150 μg once-daily | 52 | 1723 | | 0.79 | 619 | | | -4.5 | |
| Ferguson, 2008 [17] | Fluticasone propionate/salmeterol (FSC) 250/50 | 52 | 394 | C | 4.82 | 343 | | FP/S vs. S: -1.86 | -3.49 | |
| | Salmeterol 50 μg | 52 | 388 | | 5.78 | 335 | | | -1.86 | |
| Vincken, 2002 [19] | Tiotropium 18 μg qd in the morning | 52 | 356 | B | 0.73 | 125 | | Tio18 vs. Iprap40: -3.3 | -3.74 | |
| | Ipratropium 40 μg qid | 52 | 179 | | 0.96 | 82 | | | -0.44 | |
Relationship between FEV$_1$ and SGRQ and Hospitalized COPD Exacerbations

There were insufficient data to analyze association with all-cause hospitalizations, and the annualized and patient-level data were combined for the analysis of hospitalizations due to exacerbations. Additionally, relative effects for the number of patients with an exacerbation were combined with annualized exacerbation rates to facilitate analyses.

**Table 3** Study Data for Trials Reporting Mean change in SGRQ Total Score and Patients Experiencing Any COPD Exacerbation (Continued)

| Study | Intervention | n | SGRQ | FEV$_1$ | Change in SGRQ | FEV$_1$ Effect | p-value |
|-------|--------------|---|------|---------|----------------|---------------|---------|
| Wedzicha, 2014 [32] | beclomethasone dipropionate/formoterol fumarate (BDP/FOR) 100/6 μg, 2 inhalations BID | 48 | 602 | F | 0.8 | 264 | BDP + F vs. F: 0.8 | -3.55 |
| Formoterol fumarate (FOR) 12 μg, 1 inhalation BID | 48 | 597 | 1.12 | 294 | – | -0.77 | – |
| Wouters, 2005 [20] | Salmeterol/fluticasone (3 month run in period of salmeterol 50 μg and fluticasone 500 μg bid) | 52 | 189 | E | – | 115 | – | 2.4 | S/F vs. S: -0.89 |
| Salmeterol (3 month run in period of salmeterol 50 μg and fluticasone 500 μg bid) | 52 | 184 | – | 109 | – | 3.2 | – |

**Exacerbation Definitions:**
A: Symptom deterioration requiring antibiotics, systemic corticosteroids, and/or hospitalization
B: A complex of respiratory events lasting ≥3 days
B+: A complex of respiratory events lasting ≥3 days requiring treatment
C: Worsening of at least two symptoms for at least two days
E: If a patient has in ≥2 consecutive days used ≥3 extra inhalations of salbutamol per 24 hours above their reference rescue value
F: An acute event characterized by a worsening of the patient’s respiratory symptoms that is beyond normal day-to-day variations and leads to a change in medication
– = Not reported

**Relationship between FEV$_1$ and SGRQ**

For both SGRQ score and FEV$_1$, the plots indicate a somewhat weaker relationship with exacerbations resulting in hospitalization (compared to the findings for exacerbations overall). Results were not statistically significant (FEV$_1$ slope: -1.49, p-value = 0.174 [Fig. 6]; SGRQ slope: 0.0518, p = 0.126 [Fig. 7]) for either relationship.

**Fig. 5** Relationship between Mean Change in SGRQ Total Score and Risk for a Moderate-to-severe Exacerbation
Table 4  Study Data for Trials Reporting Mean change in SGRQ Total Score and Patients Experiencing Moderate-to-severe COPD Exacerbation

| Author, Year | Treatment | Time point (weeks) | N Randomized | Annual exacerbation rate (M-S) | N with M-S exacerbation | Comparison data for Time to first exacerbation (Hazard ratio) | Mean change in SGRQ Total Score | Comparison data for SGRQ (treatment difference) |
|--------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Anzueto, 2009 [23] | Fluticasone propionate/salmeterol 250 mcg/50 μg bid | 52 | 394 | 1.1 | 208 | FP250 + S50 vs. S50: 0.73 | 2.49 | FP250 + S50 vs. S50: -0.81 |
| Bateman, 2010 [20] | Tiotropium 5 μg orally inhaled once daily | 48 | 670 | 0.93 | 249 | – | -5.1 | Tio5 vs. Placebo: -3.5 |
| | Tiotropium 10 μg orally inhaled once daily | 48 | 667 | 1.02 | 246 | – | -5.5 | Tio10 vs. Placebo: -3.8 |
| | Placebo | 48 | 653 | 1.91 | 288 | – | -1.6 | – |
| Dahl, 2010 [14] | Indacaterol 300 μg | 52 | 437 | 0.6 | 133 | – | -6.5 | Inda300 vs. Placebo: -4.7 |
| | Indacaterol 600 μg | 52 | 428 | 0.57 | 116 | – | -7 | Inda600 vs. Placebo: -4.6 |
| | Formoterol | 52 | 435 | 0.56 | 126 | – | -7 | F vs. Placebo: -4 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 432 | 0.74 | 145 | – | -1.7 | – |
| Ferguson, 2008 [17] | Fluticasone propionate/salmeterol (FSC) 250/50 μg | 52 | 394 | 1.06 | 211 | FP + S vs. S: 0.75 | -3.49 | FP/S vs. S: -1.86 |
| | Salmeterol 50 μg | 52 | 388 | 1.53 | 230 | – | -1.86 | – |
| Hagedorn, 2013 [33] | Salmeterol xinafoate/fluticasone propionate via a single inhaler (SFC) | 52 | 108 | 0.81 | 42 | – | -1.8 | – |
| | Salmeterol xinafoate/ fluticasone propionate via separate inhalers (Sal/FP) | 52 | 106 | 0.98 | 44 | – | -2.6 | – |
| Kerwin, 2012 [25] | NVA237 50 μg qd | 52 | 529 | 0.54 | – | NVA vs. Placebo: 0.66 | – | NVA vs. Placebo: -3.32 |
| | Tiotropium 18 μg qd | 52 | 266 | – | – | NVA vs. Tio: 1.1 | – | NVA vs. Tio: -0.48 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 269 | 0.8 | – | – | – | – |
| Sharafkhaneh, 2012 [26] | Budesonide/formoterol pMDI 160/4.5 μg x 2 inhalations bid (320/9 μg) | 52 | 407 | 0.867 | 169 | – | – | – |
| Tang, 2013 [27] | Tiotropium 5 μg (2 x 2.5 μg/puff) | 48 | 167 | – | 58 | Tio5 vs. Placebo: 0.54 | -7.1 | Tio5 vs. Placebo: -3.9 |
| | Placebo (2 puffs) | 48 | 171 | – | 83 | – | -3.3 | – |
Impact of including All timepoints >24 weeks
Expanding the data set from outcomes reported at >48 weeks to include outcomes reported at >24 weeks showed similar directionality but weaker results compared with the long-term analysis data of both SGRQ score and FEV₁ (data not shown).

Table 4 Study Data for Trials Reporting Mean change in SGRQ Total Score and Patients Experiencing Moderate-to-severe COPD Exacerbation (Continued)

| Study | Drug | Mean change in SGRQ Total Score | Patients Experiencing Moderate-to-severe COPD Exacerbation | Reference |
|-------|------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Tashkin, 2008 [11] | Tiotropium 18 μg once daily; followed by 40 μg of ipratropium four times daily for 30 days after 4 years of treatment. | 206 | 2987 | – | 2001 | – | -1.25 | – |
| | Placebo once daily; followed by 40 μg of ipratropium four times daily for 30 days after 4 years of treatment. | 206 | 3006 | – | 2049 | – | -1.21 | – |
| Wedzicha, 2008 [34] | Salmeterol 50 μg + fluticasone propionate 500 μg bid | 104 | 658 | – | 408 | – | -1.7 | – |
| | Tiotropium bromide 18 μg once daily | 104 | 665 | – | 392 | – | 0.37 | S + F vs. Tio18: -2.07 |
| Jones, 2011 [29] | Aclidinium 200 μg | 52 | 627 | – | 167 | – | Aclid200 vs. Placebo (trial 1): 1.00 | – |
| | Placebo | 52 | 216 | – | 55 | – | – | – |
| | Aclidinium 200 μg | 52 | 600 | – | 199 | – | – | Aclid200 vs. Placebo (trial 2): -2.21 |
| | Placebo | 52 | 204 | – | 81 | – | – | – |

M-S = moderate-to-severe
= Not reported

Discussion
Our systematic literature review and regression analysis demonstrated that beneficial mean change in either FEV₁ or SGRQ total score was associated with a lower risk for exacerbations. Specifically, it showed that in randomized trials of COPD drug treatments lasting ≥48 weeks, there

![Fig. 6 Relationship between Mean Change in FEV₁ and Risk for Hospitalization](image-url)
was generally a relationship between relative efficacy in improving FEV$_1$ and SGRQ total score and relative efficacy for lowering exacerbation risk. The majority of analyses showed the same trend towards a relationship between positive changes in FEV$_1$ and SGRQ score and exacerbation risk, even though results did not always reach statistical significance. Of note, there was no relationship shown between mean change in FEV$_1$ and annualized exacerbation rate, despite this relationship being moderate and statistically significant when the risk of experiencing at least one exacerbation in patients was analyzed. The mean change in SGRQ total score was not significantly related to the rate of exacerbations across all severities but had a moderate, statistically significant relationship with the rate of moderate-to-severe exacerbations. The relationship between FEV$_1$ and SGRQ score and hospitalizations was less clear, and further research is needed in this area.

To our knowledge, the literature review and regression analysis we conducted is the first such study to evaluate the inter-relationship that health status and lung function have with exacerbation risk. It provides a more rigorous examination of a relationship between laboratory values and exacerbations than has been done in the past, as, unlike former studies, it correlates relative treatment effects instead of absolute ones, thus lowering the possibility of ecological bias. However, as this analysis used only aggregated patient data from published trials, we cannot assume that any statistical association observed between arm-level variables may be translated to patient-level associations. Therefore, our findings cannot be used to predict any outcome at the patient-level. Additionally, our analysis may be limited by the available data for the surrogate measures given the trials reported FEV$_1$ in several different ways. Since our analysis was limited to trough or prebronchodilator FEV$_1$ data, analysis using other measures of FEV$_1$ could yield different results. Similarly, regarding exacerbation severity, we categorized exacerbations based on the definitions reported by study authors using a standardized approach as defined in our methods section. However, in some cases definitions were not reported so we relied on author-defined groupings of any or moderate-to-severe exacerbations.

Our research may have important implications for regulatory assessment of drugs intended to help reduce the risk of exacerbations in COPD and, in particular, the evidence considered in such deliberations. Currently, to gain marketing approval for this indication, such treatments have to be tested in long-term, parallel trials, which represent a logistic and economic burden on the sponsoring organization. Because of this, few trials of COPD drugs are powered to identify a significant difference in the reduced risk of exacerbations. It is for this reason that to date very few drugs have been approved for reducing exacerbations on the basis of prospective 1–2 year parallel trials, usually in patients with history of acute exacerbations in the prior year. Our study suggests changes in FEV$_1$ and SGRQ might serve as reliable surrogate markers of patients’ likelihood of experiencing an
exacerbation. If so, these measures could allow future trials to be shorter and more manageable while still offering key insights into treatments’ longer-term efficacy. Since exacerbations can be costly to health plans, payers should consider the effect of medications on these surrogate markers, even when long-term RCTs cannot be carried out. Also, confirmation of our results would broaden the application of data already available from published shorter-term studies. This is especially important since the trials used to inform regulatory approval were powered on each specific drug’s expected effect on the acute exacerbation rate and all but one [11] were small and had very selective entry criteria. This contrasts with the trials contributing data for our review and analysis, since these were broader and more inclusive (e.g. with regards to disease duration and reversibility, comorbidities, interventions, and concomitant therapies) and collectively more representative of the general COPD population seen in everyday clinical practice. Therefore, these collated data sources potentially allow more generalizable conclusions to be drawn regarding whether or how standard short-term endpoints assessed in trials relate to effects on exacerbations.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this study demonstrates a significant association between improvements in FEV1 and SGRQ total score and lower risk for COPD exacerbations. We believe that the results of our study offer providers and payers a more informed picture of the inter-relationship between exacerbations and both FEV1 and SGRQ score, which will aid clinical and formulary decisions while stimulating research questions for future prospective studies.
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