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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, 285 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
‘reversibility’ identify discrete patient subgroups, or relate to clinically meaningful outcomes. The prevalence of ‘reversible’ COPD varies,5–7 reflecting differences in patient selection, bronchodilator(s) used and the presence of emphysema.5 Reversibility status also varies between days in some patients with severe COPD,5 which has led to a proposal for higher thresholds to define reversibility in a more meaningful way. Finally, and most importantly, it is unknown whether post-bronchodilator change in lung function in COPD differs from that in older healthy subjects.

Here we address these questions by comparing the frequency distribution and absolute change in FEV1 post bronchodilator in patients with COPD and in smoker (SC) and non-smoker (NSC) controls; determining the temporal stability of COPD reversibility and factors that contribute to differences between patients; and determining whether consistently reversible patients have different clinical outcomes from those who are not. To do this, we used data from the Evaluation of COPD Longitudinally to Identify Predictive Surrogate Endpoints (ECLIPSE) study, in which bronchodilator reversibility data were collected using the same methodology on multiple occasions in patients with COPD and comparator subjects.

METHODS
Design overview
ECLIPSE (NCT00292552; SCO104960) is a 3-year, non-interventional prospective study conducted at 46 centres in 12 countries.9

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,10 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.11 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 reported here. 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–Manzel–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 elsewhere12) 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 r 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 V9.1.

RESULTS
Demographics and characteristics of the analysis population (COPD=1831, SC=228, NSC=228) did not differ from the full ECLIPSE population.13 (table 1). 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
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Post-bronchodilator FEV₁/FVC change (litres) in the control groups was driven by increased FEV₁ (tables 2 and 3). Between GOLD stages change in FVC was similar, but change in FEV₁ declined with increasing severity, producing significantly different changes in the ratio (tables 2 and 3). In GOLD II the FEV₁/FVC ratio increased post salbutamol, was unchanged in GOLD III and increasing severity, producing significantly different changes in the ratio (tables 2 and 3). Between GOLD stages change in FEV₁, or to ATS/ERS reversibility status at visit 1.

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 irreversable 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>1563</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%LAA</td>
<td>17.5 (12.1)</td>
<td>12.2 (9.6)</td>
<td>20.2 (11.6)</td>
<td>27.9 (12.5)</td>
<td>2.5 (3.2)</td>
<td>4.2 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologist score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>430 (26%)</td>
<td>290 (37%)</td>
<td>120 (18%)</td>
<td>20 (9%)</td>
<td>249 (90%)</td>
<td>195 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–25%</td>
<td>370 (22%)</td>
<td>212 (27%)</td>
<td>133 (20%)</td>
<td>25 (12%)</td>
<td>24 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–50%</td>
<td>316 (19%)</td>
<td>145 (19%)</td>
<td>131 (19%)</td>
<td>40 (19%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50%</td>
<td>553 (33%)</td>
<td>130 (17%)</td>
<td>296 (44%)</td>
<td>127 (60%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>SC 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></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</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></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</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></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.23 (3.63)</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.42 (3.20)</td>
<td>2.45 (3.28)</td>
<td>0.61 (4.43)</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</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 (4.3% 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 ($\geq 2$/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 groups.

---

**Table 3** Change in lung function, as measured every 3 months, among patients with COPD according to disease severity (GOLD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirometric variable</th>
<th>Visit (months)</th>
<th>GOLD II</th>
<th>GOLD III</th>
<th>GOLD IV</th>
<th>p Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOLD II vs GOLD III</td>
<td>GOLD II vs GOLD IV</td>
<td>GOLD III vs GOLD IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FEV₁ change (litres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.08)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.09)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.16 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.11 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.10)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.16 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.09)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FVC change (litres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25 (0.33)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.24 (0.33)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.24 (0.31)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.27)</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FEV₁/FVC change (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.94 (4.39)</td>
<td>0.04 (4.11)</td>
<td>-1.30 (4.47)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.74 (3.97)</td>
<td>0.29 (3.94)</td>
<td>-0.88 (5.06)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.10 (4.66)</td>
<td>0.40 (3.89)</td>
<td>-0.51 (4.99)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.05 (4.17)</td>
<td>0.52 (3.91)</td>
<td>0.11 (4.54)</td>
<td>0.011</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; GOLD, Global initiative for chronic Obstructive Lung Disease.

---

**Figure 1** The relationship between the change in forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV₁) post bronchodilator and the pre-bronchodilator FEV₁ expressed as an absolute value (A) or as a percentage change from baseline (B) at visit 1.
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 14 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.15 FEV1 change in the smoker controls was greater and more variable, as expected.16 The greater absolute improvement in FEV1 was largely explained by the lower pre-salbutamol FEV1 %predicted in the smokers, as post-salbutamol changes in smoker and non-smoker controls were similar. This effect may be due to increased inflammation in the airways of smokers.17 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 COPD18 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

![Figure 2](http://thorax.bmj.com/) The reproducibility of the classification of reversibility in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease followed on four occasions over 1 year. (A) Using the American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society reversibility criteria; (B) change in absolute FEV1 of more than 400 ml.

<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>n</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-bronchodilator FEV1 change (litres)</td>
<td>0.13 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.16 (0.18)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bronchodilator % predicted FEV1</td>
<td>43.3 (15.0)</td>
<td>102.8 (11.9)</td>
<td>110.6 (13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible (standard criteria) (% subjects)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FEV1 day-to-day variation (litres)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.15)</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>4.6 (5.6)</td>
<td>2.1 (3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversible (400 ml) (%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</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 classification are unlikely to be resolved.

The lung function changes here were smaller than those previously reported, 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>
<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>277 (195)</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 variation on test day</td>
<td>2.922 (2.724)</td>
<td>2.593 (1.883)</td>
<td>3.593 (2.295 to 5.623)</td>
<td>5.945 (3.100 to 10.797)</td>
<td>2.818 (0.784 to 10.113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; FEV1, forced expiratory volume; GOLD, Global initiative for chronic Obstructive Lung Disease.

### 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>p Value adjusted for FEV1 % predicted</td>
<td>p Value adjusted for GOLD stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject death</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>83 (6%)</td>
<td>0.688</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 exacerbation</td>
<td>15 (7%)</td>
<td>206 (15%)</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject withdrawal</td>
<td>29 (13%)</td>
<td>186 (14%)</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
optimised times, as both that study and ours employed rigorous data quality assurance methods. 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 regularly and similar changes were seen in the placebo limb of the Inhaled Steroids in Obstructive Lung Disease (ISOLDE) study. By chance, our non-smoking control group contained relatively more women, but this did not affect findings when the populations 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 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 bronchodilators and normal values for diurnal FEV₁ variation. 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 effects. 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 additional 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, 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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