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ABSTRACT

Background Bronchodilator responsiveness is a potential phenotypic characteristic of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). We studied whether change in lung function after a bronchodilator is abnormal in COPD, whether stable responder subgroups can be identified, and whether these subgroups experience different clinical outcomes.

Methods 1831 patients with COPD, 286 smoking (SC) and 228 non-smoking (NSC) controls from the Evaluation of COPD Longitudinally to Identify Predictive Surrogate Endpoints (ECLIPSE) cohort. Spirometric reversibility to 400 μg inhaled salbutamol was assessed on four occasions over 1 year.

Results Forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV1) increase after salbutamol was similar in SC (mean 0.14 litres (SD 0.15)) and COPD (0.12 litres (0.15)) and was significantly greater than NSC (0.08 litres (0.14)). Reversibility status varied with repeated testing in parallel with the day-to-day variation in pre-bronchodilator FEV1, which was similar in control subjects and patients with COPD. Absolute FEV1 change decreased by Global initiative for chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) stage in patients with COPD (GOLD II, mean 0.16 litres (SD 0.17); III, 0.10 litres (0.13); IV, 0.05 litres (0.08) as did chances of being classified as reversible. CT-defined emphysema was weakly related to the absolute change in FEV1 post salbutamol. Consistently reversible patients (n=227) did not differ in mortality, hospitalisation or exacerbation experience from irreversible patients when allowing for differences in baseline FEV1.

Limitations Reversibility only assessed with salbutamol and defined by FEV1 criteria. The COPD population was older than the control populations.

Conclusions Post-salbutamol FEV1 change is similar in patients with COPD and smoking controls but is influenced by baseline lung function and the presence of emphysema. Bronchodilator reversibility status varies temporally and does not distinguish clinically relevant outcomes, making it an unreliable phenotype.

Clinical trial registration number NCT00292552 (http://ClinicalTrials.gov).

Key messages

What is the key question?

▸ Is responsiveness to salbutamol a stable phenotype in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and if so, is it a phenotype that predicts outcome?

What is the bottom line?

▸ Bronchodilator responsiveness in COPD does not represent a reliable or useful clinical phenotype.

Why read on?

▸ Evidence from the well characterised Evaluation of COPD Longitudinally to Identify Predictive Surrogate Endpoints (ECLIPSE) cohort of patients with COPD and comparator patients shows that over 3 years reversibility is an unstable characteristic, even when the threshold definition is increased.

INTRODUCTION

A chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) phenotype is defined as ‘a single or combination of disease attributes that describe differences among individuals with COPD as they relate to clinically meaningful outcomes’.1 COPD is characterised by airflow limitation not fully normalised after an inhaled bronchodilator.2 However, some patients increase their forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV1) by >12% and >200 ml of the pre-test value, which guidelines define as ‘reversible’.3 Thus reversibility is a candidate COPD phenotype, and has been used by clinicians as a marker for patients more likely to respond to bronchodilators. This approach has been adopted by some medical regulators and is used to define patient subgroups in treatment trials. Recently, reversibility has been linked to a specific COPD genotype.4

However, concerns remain about using reversibility in this way. Although the normalisation of lung function after a bronchodilator in treatment-naive patients excludes a diagnosis of COPD, we do not know whether smaller changes in lung function that meet the accepted criteria for...
METHODS

Design overview
ECLIPSE (NCT00292552; SCO104960) is a 3-year, non-interventional prospective study conducted at 46 centres in 12 countries.

Setting and participants
ECLIPSE recruited 2164 patients with COPD (40–75 years) with clinically diagnosed COPD, a post-bronchodilator FEV₁/forced vital capacity (FVC) ratio ≤0.7 and FEV₁ <80% of predicted. All were current/former smokers of ≥10 pack-years and exacerbation free for at least 4 weeks. Three hundred and thirty-seven SC (current/former) and 245 NSC (<1 pack-year) subjects also participated. All subjects gave written informed consent and the study protocol was approved by all relevant research ethics committees. Only subjects with complete data at baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months are included in this analysis.

Outcomes and follow-up
At each visit participants performed spirometry (VIASYS MasterScope) to American Thoracic Society (ATS)/European Respiratory Society (ERS) standards, before and 15 min after inhaling 400 μg salbutamol. At visit 1, a low-dose CT scan was performed to determine emphysema severity. Objective emphysema severity was defined by the percentage of CT voxels with x-ray attenuation values <−950 Hounsfield units (HU) (per cent low attenuation area, %LAA) as described previously. Subjective emphysema was assessed by two independent radiologists who scored radiographical emphysema severity.

Further details of spirometric and CT methodology are given in online appendix supplement 1.

Data analysis and statistical methods
Data are presented as mean and SD for continuous variables, and counts/frequencies for categorical variables unless otherwise stated. Only subjects with reversibility data at all four visits are included. Data are presented as mean and SD for continuous variables, and counts/frequencies for categorical variables unless otherwise stated. Only subjects with reversibility data at all four visits are included. Response is expressed as absolute volume change or as change in %FEV₁ predicted for sex-related differences and relationship to pre-salbutamol FEV₁. Reversibility was defined by ATS/ERS criteria of ≥12% and ≥200 ml increase from pre-bronchodilator FEV₁, and absolute response of >400 ml. Skewness and kurtosis were calculated for each distribution of absolute FEV₁ change. Comparisons between subject groups were carried out by analysis of variance and pairwise contrasts or Cochran–Mantel–Haenszel tests, as appropriate. Linear and logistic regression was used to examine factors potentially associated with response measured by absolute change in FEV₁ or reversibility (ATS/ERS criteria), respectively. Mean pre-bronchodilator FEV₁ of the four attendances for each subject was calculated and we tested whether a positive reversibility response was associated with the subject being above or below this mean lung function value. Finally, selected clinical outcomes (mortality, withdrawal after the year of follow-up, annual hospitalisation rate, and exacerbation frequency calculated as described elsewhere) were compared via logistic regression and negative binomial regression in patients who met the ATS/ERS reversibility criteria on at least three of four occasions with those who did not. Spearman’s ρ was calculated to describe the magnitude of linear correlation between variables. p Values lower than 0.05 were considered significant. No adjustments for multiple comparisons were done. All analyses were conducted with SAS V.9.1.

RESULTS

Demographics and characteristics of the analysis population (COPD=1831, SC=228, NSC=229) did not differ from the full ECLIPSE population. The use of tiotropium did not affect the likelihood of being classed as reversible in any GOLD stage. Four hundred and two patients reported previous asthma or an asthma diagnosis on the respiratory questionnaire. Their lung function changes in FEV₁ after salbutamol were no different compared with patients without this diagnosis (online appendix table 1).

Comparison of the bronchodilator response between groups at baseline
At baseline, change in FEV₁ post salbutamol was not normally distributed in the three groups studied (online appendix figures 1A–C) or within GOLD stage (online appendix figures 1D–F); measures of skewness and kurtosis suggest positive skewness with higher peaks than might be expected in a normal distribution. FEV₁ (mean (SD)) increased more in patients with COPD (0.12 litres (0.15)) and SC (0.14 litres (0.15)) than in NSC (0.08 litres (0.14); p<0.001). FEV₁ response differences between COPD and SC were not significant at baseline (p=0.11) or subsequently (tables 2 and 3).

At baseline, 24% of patients with COPD met ATS/ERS reversibility criteria, contrasting with 5% SC and 2% NSC. Using a 400 ml volume change to identify reversibility classified 5% of patients with COPD, 4% SC and 1% NSC as reversible. Absolute change in FEV₁ post salbutamol was largest in patients with GOLD II and smallest in patients with GOLD IV disease (p<0.001 for all comparisons; tables 2 and 3). It was not related to pre-test FEV₁ (figure 1A, r=−0.04, p=0.075) but when expressed as a percentage change increased as pre-salbutamol FEV₁ declined (figure 1B, r=−0.52, p<0.001). As fewer patients met the volume criterion, FEV₁ reversibility was less likely in those with GOLD IV than in those with GOLD II disease (OR 0.129 (95% CI 0.074 to 0.764), p<0.001).

In the whole COPD group post-salbutamol change in FVC paralleled FEV₁ (tables 2 and 3), leaving the mean FEV₁/FVC ratio unchanged. In contrast, a small but significant increase...
In GOLD II the FEV1/FVC ratio (tables 2 and 3). In GOLD II the FEV1/FVC ratio became negative in GOLD IV due to the small change in FEV1 increasing post salbutamol, was unchanged in GOLD III and increasing severity, producing significant changes in the ratio (tables 2 and 3). Between GOLD stages FEV1 and FEV1/FVC were significant changes in the ratio (tables 2 and 3). In GOLD II the FEV1/FVC ratio increased post salbutamol, was unchanged in GOLD III and became negative in GOLD IV due to the small change in FEV1 relative to the increase in FVC, i.e. FVC increased by 0.25 litres from 3.14 litres in GOLD II, and by 0.25 litres from 2.13 litres in GOLD IV (tables 1–3). Between-group differences for change in FEV1 and FEV1/FVC were significant (p<0.053).

Temporal stability of reversibility status in patients with COPD

In the COPD group, mean post-salbutamol response in FEV1 and FVC were similar at each visit so the total number of reversible subjects was stable between visits. However, there was significant individual between-visit variability in reversibility status. Only 16% of subjects considered reversible at the first visit met the ATS/ERS reversibility criteria at all subsequent visits while 66% considered initially irreversible were irreversible at all visits (figure 2A).

The use of a larger absolute volume change (400 ml) to define reversibility did not abolish this variability, 11% were reclassified on at least one visit and only 4% of subjects showed reversibility so defined on two or more occasions (figure 2B).

Predictors of reversibility status in COPD

Age, smoking status (see online appendix table 2), and cumulative smoking exposure (pack-years) were not related to post-salbutamol change in FEV1, or to ATS/ERS reversibility status at visit 1.

### Table 1: Demographics and background characteristics of participants in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Patients with COPD</th>
<th>GOLD II</th>
<th>GOLD III</th>
<th>GOLD IV</th>
<th>Smoker controls</th>
<th>Non-smoker controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, years</td>
<td>63.4 (7.0)</td>
<td>63.5 (7.1)</td>
<td>63.5 (6.9)</td>
<td>62.6 (6.9)</td>
<td>55.8 (8.9)</td>
<td>54.0 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, men/women</td>
<td>1207/624</td>
<td>517/331</td>
<td>515/235</td>
<td>175/58</td>
<td>165/120</td>
<td>89/139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women, %</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoker, %</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former smoker, %</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack-years</td>
<td>48.4 (27.2)</td>
<td>48.2 (29.0)</td>
<td>48.8 (25.6)</td>
<td>48.1 (25.9)</td>
<td>31.9 (22.3)</td>
<td>0.2 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FEV1, litres</td>
<td>1.25 (0.49)</td>
<td>1.60 (0.44)</td>
<td>1.04 (0.28)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.15)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.72)</td>
<td>3.24 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FEV1, % predicted</td>
<td>44.7 (15.0)</td>
<td>57.5 (9.6)</td>
<td>36.9 (7.0)</td>
<td>23.3 (4.0)</td>
<td>104.2 (12.0)</td>
<td>112.3 (14.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FVC, litres</td>
<td>2.81 (0.87)</td>
<td>3.14 (0.87)</td>
<td>2.66 (0.75)</td>
<td>2.13 (0.66)</td>
<td>4.23 (0.97)</td>
<td>4.12 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FVC, % predicted</td>
<td>80.3 (16.5)</td>
<td>90.7 (16.5)</td>
<td>75.4 (16.9)</td>
<td>58.1 (14.0)</td>
<td>112.1 (14.2)</td>
<td>118.2 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV1/FVC</td>
<td>0.447 (0.113)</td>
<td>0.518 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.403 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.332 (0.76)</td>
<td>0.762 (0.61)</td>
<td>0.789 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FVC, % predicted</td>
<td>0.447 (0.113)</td>
<td>0.518 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.403 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.332 (0.76)</td>
<td>0.762 (0.61)</td>
<td>0.789 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FVC, % predicted</td>
<td>0.447 (0.113)</td>
<td>0.518 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.403 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.332 (0.76)</td>
<td>0.762 (0.61)</td>
<td>0.789 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FVC, % predicted</td>
<td>0.447 (0.113)</td>
<td>0.518 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.403 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.332 (0.76)</td>
<td>0.762 (0.61)</td>
<td>0.789 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are given as mean (SD) unless otherwise indicated.

FEV1, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; FVC, forced vital capacity; GOLD, Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease; ICS, inhaled corticosteroid; %LAA, per cent low attenuation area; LABA, long-acting β2 agonist.

### Table 2: Change in lung function, as measured every 3 months, patients with COPD and the comparator groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirometric variable</th>
<th>Visit (months)</th>
<th>NSC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Patients with COPD</th>
<th>NSC vs SC</th>
<th>NCS vs patients with COPD</th>
<th>SC vs patients with COPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FEV1 change (litres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.15)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.22)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.08 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.13 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.07 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FVC change (litres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.22)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.34)</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.22)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.31)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.23 (0.31)</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FEV1/FVC change (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.13 (3.46)</td>
<td>2.98 (4.25)</td>
<td>0.29 (4.35)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.29 (3.93)</td>
<td>2.51 (3.41)</td>
<td>0.35 (4.15)</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.42 (3.20)</td>
<td>2.45 (3.29)</td>
<td>0.61 (4.43)</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.90 (4.20)</td>
<td>2.31 (3.59)</td>
<td>0.71 (4.13)</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are given as mean (SD). COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; FEV1, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; FVC, forced vital capacity; NCS, non-smoker control; SC, smoker control.

Men showed a greater FEV₁ improvement than women (0.3 litres) and had 11% more chance of being classed as reversible. However, because men and women differed in their pre-salbutamol lung function, they showed a similar increase in FEV₁ when expressed as per cent predicted (4.5% in each group) (table 4).

The degree of emphysema (quantitative or subjective) generally increased as FEV₁ fell (p<0.001; table 1). Objective emphysema (%LAA) showed a significant but very weak relationship to the absolute change in FEV₁ post salbutamol (r=0.09, p<0.001). When separated into four groups of equivalent size according to the radiologist-defined severity (<5%, 5–25%, 25–50%, >50%) patients with more emphysema (>50%) had the least FEV₁ improvement (0.15, 0.14, 0.13 and 0.09, respectively; p<0.001).

Pre-salbutamol FEV₁ varied between visits to the same extent in COPD and controls (table 5). Between-visit variation in pre-salbutamol FEV₁ decreased with increasing GOLD stage. Patients with COPD were significantly more likely to have a positive bronchodilator response on test days when their pre-salbutamol FEV₁ was lower than its mean value derived from all four visits (p<0.001).

Relationship of reversibility status with clinically relevant outcomes

Although patients judged ‘irreversible’ on three of the four occasions tended to a higher mortality and were more likely to be hospitalised and withdraw from follow up these differences were not statistically significant (table 6). When we used logistic regression to compare frequent (≥2/year) with never exacerbators, reversibility status identified frequent exacerbators (unadjusted OR (95% CI) 0.557 (0.377 to 0.764), p<0.001). This association was unaffected by age, sex, smoking status and body mass index in a multivariate model but disappeared when pre-salbutamol FEV₁% predicted was included as a covariate (OR 0.901 (95% CI 0.617 to 1.517), p=0.59).

DISCUSSION

This is the first report of bronchodilator response in patients with COPD and appropriate comparators using the same methodology. The absolute change in post-salbutamol FEV₁ was no different in patients with COPD and smoking controls, but was greater in non-smokers. When classified in a binary manner (reversible or not), there was considerable individual between-visit variation which was reduced but not abolished if a higher threshold for response was chosen. This between-visit variation reflected the spontaneous and physiologically normal day-to-day fluctuation in pre-salbutamol FEV₁, which was seen in all study
subjects. Age, sex and smoking history did not influence the response in patients with COPD. Irreversible (at least three of four occasions) patients had worse lung function and more CT-defined emphysema, but these features did not preclude a bronchodilator response. Finally, in patients with consistent reversibility or irreversibility, no significant difference was observed with respect to clinically important outcomes, such as mortality, severe exacerbations and withdrawal. While exacerbation rates were higher in those exhibiting consistent irreversibility, no association was observed between reversibility status and frequent (at least two) exacerbations. These findings confirm that bronchodilator responsiveness, whether defined by a single assessment as has recently been suggested or by repeated testing as shown here, is not a reliable or clinically relevant COPD phenotype, as has been recently suggested.

Interpretation of findings
In our non-smoker controls the mean change in FEV₁ post salbutamol was 80 ml, a constant finding over the study. This is similar to a change of 67 ml reported in a population of asymptomatic non-smokers with a mean age approximately 10 years younger than that reported here. The FEV₁ change in the smoker controls was greater and more variable, as expected. Absolute change in FEV₁ was generally similar in COPD and smokers but defining patients with COPD by GOLD stage using post-bronchodilator FEV₁ data showed that those with the worse baseline function had the smallest FEV₁ increase. This difference, although small, fits with the increased small airways fibrosis seen in COPD and the greater degree of emphysema we observed across GOLD stages.

The absolute FVC change was similar across GOLD stages, thus the greater FEV₁ increase in GOLD II relative to GOLD IV caused an increase in FEV₁/FVC ratio for GOLD II while for

---

Table 4  Lung function characteristics in patients with COPD and comparator subjects according to sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Patients with COPD</th>
<th>Smoker controls</th>
<th>Non-smoker controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FEV₁ change (litres)</td>
<td>0.13 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.16 (0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator % predicted FEV₁</td>
<td>43.3 (15.0)</td>
<td>47.4 (14.6)</td>
<td>102.8 (11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible (standard criteria) (%) subjects</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FEV₁ day-to-day variation (litres)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR (95% CI)*</td>
<td>1.79 (1.39 to 2.31)</td>
<td>6.14 (1.56 to 24.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FEV₁ change (%) predicted</td>
<td>4.3 (5.0)</td>
<td>4.3 (5.4)</td>
<td>4.6 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible (400 ml) (%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are given as mean (SD) unless otherwise indicated.

*The odds of a man classified as reversible versus the odds of a woman classified as reversible after adjusting for FEV₁. Note that there is no OR for non-smoker controls because no men were classified as reversible.

COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; FEV₁, forced expiratory volume in 1 s.
GOLD IV the proportionately greater increase in FVC compared with FEV₁ resulted in airflow obstruction apparently worsening post salbutamol. Similar ‘volume responders’ have been seen after multiple bronchodilator drugs and our data confirm earlier predictions that volume response would be associated with more emphysema.

Change in FEV₁ post salbutamol was not normally distributed in patients with COPD, with a rightward shift in response in some groups. Women appeared less reversible than men, but this reflected their smaller size and lower pre-test FEV₁ as the difference disappeared when post-salbutamol change was corrected for predicted lung function. When post-bronchodilator FEV₁ change is considered as a dichotomous, rather than continuous variable, problems arise as the threshold for a significant change is close to the between-test reproducibility for FEV₁ measurement. The components of the ATS/ERS definition of reversibility affected the probability of a positive response differently. A response based on a percentage change from baseline was more likely at lower FEV₁ values, but this was more compensated for by the effect of the volume threshold which was seldom achieved in patients with severe disease tested with just salbutamol. Increasing the response threshold (>400 ml change) as previously proposed substantially decreased the numbers of subjects considered reversible, but did not prevent day-to-day variability in reversibility classification nor did these subjects differ in their baseline characteristics from the remaining patients with COPD. Consequently, problems of reversibility classification are unlikely to be resolved by changes to test criteria.

Although the extent of reversibility in any large subgroup was constant, between tests individual classification varied, independent of age and smoking status. The emphysema data on reversibility were conflicting with no important relationship with objective scoring, but stronger evidence of responsiveness with qualitative scoring. This may reflect the lower baseline FEV₁ of patients with severe emphysema and how subjective scores account for hyperinflation and distribution of emphysematous spaces, which are not captured in quantitative scores. Pre-salbutamol FEV₁ had a more obvious influence on reversibility; spontaneous variation was similar in all groups, suggesting cholinergic receptor mediated variation in airway smooth muscle tone, a major factor explaining this variability was relatively normal in COPD. When analysed by GOLD stage, pre-salbutamol FEV₁ varied less in GOLD IV and this may explain why changes in reversibility were less common in these patients, although they still occurred.

Classifying reversibility status at one visit does not predict clinical outcomes. Our data extend these observations to groups defined by relatively consistent responses to testing. Again there was no association with important outcomes like mortality and study withdrawal. The relationship with reversibility and exacerbation rate reflected the influence of a lower baseline FEV₁ which was associated with less reversibility and more exacerbations and explained the apparent association between reversibility and exacerbations. This indirect relationship likely explains other studies in which a relationship between reversibility and outcomes has been suggested. In a previous report we found that ECLIPSE subjects meeting ATS/ERS reversibility criteria had a faster decline in lung function (17.4 ml/year) which was most evident in patients with GOLD II disease. This may be due to residual confounding by baseline lung function as happened in our exacerbation analysis since baseline lung function was not included in the multivariate analysis of predictive variables. Whether a patient population exists in which larger responses protect against disease progression would require a longer follow up to resolve than the current data provide.

### Strengths and limitations

The lung function changes here were smaller than those previously reported in a 4-year interventional study. The most likely reason for this was testing with anticholinergic and β agonists at

---

**Table 5** Consistency of reversibility status and clinical outcomes summary of pre-bronchodilator FEV₁ at each visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Patients with COPD</th>
<th>GOLD II</th>
<th>GOLD III</th>
<th>GOLD IV</th>
<th>Smoker controls</th>
<th>Non-smoker controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FEV₁ (visit 1)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.49)</td>
<td>1.60 (0.44)</td>
<td>1.04 (0.28)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.15)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.72)</td>
<td>3.24 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FEV₁ (visit 2)</td>
<td>1.27 (0.51)</td>
<td>1.60 (0.48)</td>
<td>1.07 (0.34)</td>
<td>0.71 (0.21)</td>
<td>3.15 (0.73)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FEV₁ (visit 3)</td>
<td>1.26 (0.51)</td>
<td>1.58 (0.47)</td>
<td>1.06 (0.34)</td>
<td>0.71 (0.22)</td>
<td>3.15 (0.71)</td>
<td>3.21 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator FEV₁ (visit 4)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.50)</td>
<td>1.57 (0.47)</td>
<td>1.04 (0.33)</td>
<td>0.71 (0.23)</td>
<td>3.13 (0.71)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation between visits</td>
<td>257 (210)</td>
<td>322 (210)</td>
<td>257 (173)</td>
<td>179 (150)</td>
<td>265 (170)</td>
<td>276 (189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR for reversibility when below</td>
<td>2.920 (2.274)</td>
<td>2.593 (1.883)</td>
<td>3.593 (2.925 to 5.623)</td>
<td>5.945 (1.300 to 27.189)</td>
<td>2.818 (0.784 to 999.999)</td>
<td>3.749 (2.593 to 5.945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variation on test day</td>
<td>to 3.749</td>
<td>to 3.570</td>
<td>to 2.719</td>
<td>to 10.123</td>
<td>to 999.999</td>
<td>to 999.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are given as mean (SD) or OR (95% CI).

**Table 6** Consistency of reversibility status and clinical outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Consistently* reversible</th>
<th>Consistently* irreversible</th>
<th>p Value adjusted for FEV₁ % predicted</th>
<th>p Value adjusted for GOLD stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject death</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>83 (6%)</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exacerbation rate</td>
<td>0.8 (1.1)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.6)</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalised due to COPD</td>
<td>15 (7%)</td>
<td>206 (15%)</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exacerbation</td>
<td>29 (13%)</td>
<td>186 (14%)</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consistent = reversible or irreversible according to American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society criteria on three of four occasions.

COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; FEV₁, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; GOLD, Global initiative for chronic Obstructive Lung Disease.
optimised times,7 as both that study and ours employed rigorous data quality assurance methods.23 Some of the variation in pre-
testing FEV1 may have been due to variable adherence to
treatment, confounding the pretest measurement. However,
most patients in COPD studies use their medication regularly24
and similar changes were seen in the placebo limb of the Inhaled
Steroids in Obstructive Lung Disease (ISOLDE) study.6 By
chance, our non-smoking control group contained relatively
more women, but this did not affect findings when the popula-
tions were separated by sex. Finally, we focused on the
conventional FEV1 definition of reversibility and not on FVC
change, which has some theoretical attractions. However, the
normal distribution of the FVC response suggests this test
would not identify especially responsive individuals.

Clinical implications
In this large convenience sample of patients with COPD mean
change in post-salbutamol FEV1 resembled that in smoker
controls and was unimodally distributed, suggesting patients
with undiagnosed asthma are infrequent among those with
COPD meeting our entry criteria (clinical diagnosis, reduced
FEV1/FVC). Consequently clinical trials recruiting such patients
are unlikely to be confounded by a mixed disease group. As
reversibility varies with baseline lung function and sex, reported
differences in reversibility in clinical studies are more likely to
have arisen by chance and the use of different bronchodilator
regimes, rather than by selecting a different type of disease. The
FEV1 change we saw was similar to both spontaneous overnight
changes reported with and without bronchodilators25 26 and
normal values for diurnal FEV1 variation.27 This suggests that
airway smooth muscle behaves normally in COPD and any
apparently greater responsiveness is a function of normalising
for baseline airway calibre. The preservation of FVC response as
the disease worsens aligns with the importance of volume,
rather than ‘flow’-related change, in explaining treatment
response.27 Together, these data explain why attempts at defining
responder subgroups in clinical trials using spirometry have been
largely unsuccessful. Reversibility status on one occasion is an
unreliable basis on which to make clinical decisions, no addi-
tional clinically useful data (beyond that provided by pre-test
FEV1) are obtained when testing on multiple occasions. Whether
the degree of day-to-day variability of pre-bronchodilator lung
function will prove to be a more useful marker for differences in
the natural history of COPD, as suggested by Anthonisen and
colleagues,6 remains to be tested in more severe disease and this is
a goal in the follow-up phase of the ECLIPSE study.

CONCLUSIONS
Our results show that the presence of a positive bronchodilator
response, however defined, is not a reliable way to define a
specific COPD phenotype or direct clinical management.
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