

CHEST: Visual and Interactive Guidelines Articles & Issues Meeting Abstracts Sections Topics All Content Search Advanced Search Share this page < Previous Article June 2019 Volume 155, Issue 6, Pages 1158-1165 Next Article > Access this article on ScienceDirect To read this article in full, please review your options for gaining access at the bottom of the page. Article Tools

Comparative Effectiveness and Safety of LABA-LAMA vs LABA-ICS Treatment of COPD in Real-World Clinical

vs LABA-ICS Treatment of COPD in Real-World Clinica Practice

Samy Suissa, PhD*, ■ Non Sophie Dell'Aniello, MSc, Pierre Ernst, MD

Centre for Clinical Epidemiology, Lady Davis Institute-Jewish General Hospital, and the Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Occupational Health, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

PlumX Metrics

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2019.03.005



Article Info

Abstract Full Text Images References Supplemental Materials

Background

Long-acting β_2 -agonists (LABAs) and long-acting muscarinic antagonists (LAMAs) are recommended as initial maintenance treatments for COPD, with their combination (LABA-LAMA) advocated as the disease progresses. Randomized trials comparing the effectiveness of this combination with the alternative combination of LABA with inhaled corticosteroid (LABA-ICS) have reported conflicting data, while there are no real-world comparative effectiveness and safety studies of these regimens in clinical practice settings.

Methods

We identified a cohort of patients with COPD during 2002-2015, age 55 years or older, from the United Kingdom's Clinical Practice Research Datalink. Patients initiating LABA-LAMA on the same day (no ICS) were matched on time-conditional high-dimensional propensity scores with patients initiating LABA-ICS on the same day (no LAMA), and monitored for 1 year for the occurrence of a moderate or severe COPD exacerbation and severe pneumonia.

Results

The cohort included 1,977 initiators of LABA-LAMA matched with 1,977 initiators of LABA-ICS. The hazard ratio (HR) of moderate or severe COPD exacerbation associated with LABA-LAMA initiation, relative to LABA-ICS initiation, was 1.04 (95% CI, 0.90-1.20), while for a severe exacerbation it was 0.94 (95% CI, 0.65-1.36). The incidence of severe pneumonia requiring hospitalization was lower with LABA-LAMA initiation (HR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.41-1.05), particularly in the on-treatment analysis (HR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.50-0.87).

Conclusions

In a real-world clinical practice setting of COPD treatment, combined LABA-LAMA inhalers appear to be as effective as combined LABA-ICS inhalers in preventing COPD exacerbations. However, a LABA-LAMA combination may be preferred because it is associated with fewer severe pneumonias.

Key Words:

COPD treatment, database research, observational study, real world evidence

PDF (314 KB)

Download Images(.ppt)
About Images & Usage

Email Article

Add to My Reading List

Export Citation

Create Citation Alert

Cited by in Scopus (0)

Request Permissions

Order Reprints

(100 minimum order)

Related Articles

POINT: Should LAMA/LABA Combination Therapy Be Used as Initial Maintenance Treatment for COPD? Yes CHEST, Vol. 154, Issue 4

EVALUATING PATIENT
PREFERENCES OF
MAINTENANCE THERAPY
FOR THE TREATMENT OF
COPD: A DISCRETE CHOICE
EXPERIMENT

CHEST, Vol. 154, Issue 4

COUNTERPOINT: Should LAMA/LABA Combination Therapy Be Used as Initial Maintenance Treatment for COPD? No

CHEST, Vol. 154, Issue 4

View All

Abbreviations:

CPRD (Clinical Practice Research Datalink), HR (hazard ratio), ICS (inhaled corticosteroid), IMPACT (Informing the Pathway of COPD Treatment), LABA (long-acting β2-agonist), LAMA (long-acting muscarinic antagonist)

To access this article, please choose from the options below

Log In

Login to existing account

Forgot password?

Register

Create a new account

Purchase access to this article

• \$35.95 USD | PDF Download and 24 Hours Online Access

Claim Access

If you are a current subscriber with Society Membership or an Account Number, <u>claim your access now.</u>

Subscribe to this title

<u>Purchase a subscription</u> to gain access to this and all other articles in this journal.

Institutional Access

<u>Visit ScienceDirect</u> to see if you have access via your institution.



FUNDING/SUPPORT: This research was funded in part by grants from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) [Grant No. CIHR MOP-49462], the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) [Grant No. CFI 94480], and Boehringer-Ingelheim. S. S. is the recipient of the James McGill Professorship award.

© 2019 American College of Chest Physicians. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

< Previous Article

<u>June 2019</u> Volume 155, Issue 6, Pages 1158–1165

Next Article >

ELSEVIER Copyright © 2019 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. | Privacy Policy | Terms & Conditions | Use of Cookies | About Us | Help & Contact | Accessibility

The content on this site is intended for health professionals.

We use cookies to help provide and enhance our service and tailor content and ads. By continuing you agree to the <u>use of cookies</u>. Advertisements on this site do not constitute a guarantee or endorsement by the journal, Association, or publisher of the quality or value of such product or of the claims made for it by its manufacturer.

RELX™