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ABSTRACT

Background Current guidelines recommend treatment with one or more long-acting bronchodilators for patients with moderate or more severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). The authors investigated the approach of dual bronchodilation using indacaterol, a once-daily long-acting β2 agonist, and the long-acting muscarinic antagonist tiotropium, compared with tiotropium alone.

Methods In two identically designed, double-blind, 12-week studies, patients with moderate to severe COPD were randomised to indacaterol 150 μg once daily or matching placebo. All patients concurrently received open-label tiotropium 18 μg once daily. The primary outcome was standardised area under the curve of forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV1) from 5 min to 8 h post dose at week 12. The key secondary outcome was 24 h post-dose (‘trough’) FEV1 at week 12. Resting inspiratory capacity (IC) was measured in a subgroup.

Results 1134 and 1142 patients were randomised in studies 1 and 2; 94% and 94% completed. Compared with monotherapy, concurrent therapy increased FEV1 (area under the curve by 130 and 120 ml, trough by 80 and 70 ml; all p < 0.001) and trough IC (by 130 and 100 ml; p < 0.01). Cough was more common with indacaterol plus tiotropium (10% and 9%) than with tiotropium alone (4% and 4%). Most cases (~90%) of cough were mild. Other adverse events were similar for concurrent therapy compared with tiotropium alone.

Conclusions Compared with tiotropium monotherapy, indacaterol plus tiotropium provided greater bronchodilation and lung deflation (reflected by increased resting IC). Adverse events were similar between treatments apart from mild cough being more common with indacaterol plus tiotropium. These results support COPD guideline recommendations to combine bronchodilators with different mechanisms of action.

Trial registration numbers NCT00846586 and NCT00877383.

INTRODUCTION

Current guidelines recommend treatment with one or more long-acting bronchodilators for patients with moderate or more severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).1–3 The candidate agents include the long-acting muscarinic antagonist (LAMA) tiotropium, given once daily,4–5 and the long-acting β2 agonists (LABAs) formoterol and salmeterol, given twice daily, or the once-daily indacaterol. Given as bronchodilator monotherapy, indacaterol has been shown to be effective and to have a good safety profile in patients with moderate to severe COPD in placebo-controlled studies of up to 1 year in duration.4–9 Indacaterol has demonstrated superiority in bronchodilator efficacy and clinical outcomes compared with twice daily LABAs5–8 and was shown to perform at least as well as tiotropium.9–11

In general, the addition of a second bronchodilator from a different pharmacological class has

Key messages

What is the key question?

► Can additional efficacy be obtained by treating patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) with concurrent once-daily inhaled bronchodilators compared with a single bronchodilator alone, without incurring increased adverse events?

What is the bottom line?

► The results of two studies show significant additional bronchodilation (forced expiratory volume in 1 s) and lung deflation (increased inspiratory capacity) after 12 weeks of treatment with concurrent indacaterol and tiotropium beyond that achieved with tiotropium alone. Safety profiles were similar apart from an increase in mild cough with concurrent treatment compared with tiotropium alone.

Why read on?

► These are the first 12-week studies to report on the combined efficacy and safety of two once-daily bronchodilators, indacaterol and tiotropium. The results demonstrate that bronchodilators with different mechanisms of action can provide increased benefit with little or no increase in risk of clinically relevant adverse events.
been shown to improve lung function, symptoms and health status compared with a single bronchodilator.\textsuperscript{12–18} However, much of the data supporting combination bronchodilator treatment involves short-term studies\textsuperscript{14–16} or the use of short-acting bronchodilators.\textsuperscript{12, 13} There are limited data for the combination of once-daily bronchodilators.\textsuperscript{19} Van Noord and colleagues\textsuperscript{19} reported that a once-daily dual bronchodilator consisting of indacaterol and glycopyrronium provided greater bronchodilation compared with indacaterol monotherapy and placebo for 7 days in 135 patients with moderate to severe COPD.

In the present study, we report the results of two identically designed studies examining the efficacy of two once-daily inhaled bronchodilator medications, indacaterol and tiotropium. The hypothesis of the two studies was that the concurrent use of a once-daily LABA and a once-daily LAMA would provide greater bronchodilation and reduce hyperinflation compared with a LAMA alone. Duplicate studies were conducted to meet US regulatory requirements.

\textbf{METHODS}

\textbf{Patients}

Participating physicians enrolled patients aged \( \geq 40 \) years with moderate to severe COPD (defined according to Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) criteria\textsuperscript{20}), with a smoking history \( \geq 10 \) pack-years and post-bronchodilator (salbutamol 100 \( \mu \)g \( \times \) four puffs) forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV\(_1\)) \( \leq 65\% \) and \( \leq 50\% \) of predicted normal, and post-bronchodilator FEV\(_1\)/forced vital capacity \( <70\% \) at screening. The midpoint of GOLD stage II, namely FEV\(_1\) 65\% of predicted, was chosen as the upper limit for the protocol of this study evaluating two long-acting bronchodilators to target a more ‘severe’ GOLD II patient population that would benefit from combined bronchodilator treatment. GOLD guidelines at that time stated that one or more long-acting bronchodilators should be used for patients in GOLD stage II, and we believe that in practice this would comprise initial treatment with a single bronchodilator with another long-acting bronchodilator being added as patients become more symptomatic. Patients were not eligible if they had a history of asthma or had experienced a respiratory tract infection or COPD exacerbation within the previous 6 weeks.

\textbf{Study design}

Two identically designed, randomised, double-blind, 12-week studies were conducted. Study 1 involved 186 centres in 14 countries: Argentina (10), Australia (6), Colombia (5), Denmark (5), Germany (25), Greece (4), Guatemala (5), Mexico (5), Peru (6), Philippines (2), South Africa (6), Spain (13), Turkey (13) and USA (81). Study 2 had 182 centres in 11 countries: Argentina (9), Canada (16), Colombia (3), Czech Republic (9), Hungary (4), India (9), Netherlands (6), Philippines (5), Slovakia (10), Spain (11) and USA (102). Data were collected from outpatient clinics and physicians’ offices.

\textbf{Study treatments}

Patients were randomised to treatment with indacaterol 150 \( \mu \)g once daily or placebo to indacaterol. All patients concurrently received tiotropium 18 \( \mu \)g once daily, and all treatments were taken once daily via their proprietary single-dose dry-powder inhalers. Study treatments were taken at the same time each morning and in the fixed order of tiotropium followed by indacaterol/placebo, to be taken as soon after each other as possible. Salbutamol (albuterol in the USA) was available for as-needed use.

Patients receiving inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) at baseline continued treatment (or were switched to ICS monotherapy if taken as a fixed combination with a bronchodilator) at equivalent dose and regimen during the study. Other COPD treatments were withdrawn with appropriate washouts prior to screening (short-acting \( \beta \) agonists other than allowed in the study, 6 h; short-acting anticholinergics, 8 h; LABAs, 48 h; theophylline, 7 days).

\textbf{Randomisation and blinding}

Randomisation (1:1) was performed using an automated interactive voice response system and was stratified by COPD severity (moderate or severe), with balance maintained at country level. Patients and staff at participating centres were unaware of treatment assignment. The tiotropium in both arms was given open label, and blinding was achieved by the use of placebo to indacaterol (ie, placebo given via the inhaler used for indacaterol). Patients, investigators, those performing the assessments and data analysts were blinded unless an emergency arose for a patient.

\textbf{Objectives, assessments and outcome measures}

The primary objective was to demonstrate superiority of indacaterol plus tiotropium versus tiotropium plus placebo in its effect on standardised area under the curve (AUC) of FEV\(_1\) from 5 min to 8 h post dose (FEV\(_1\) AUC\(_{\text{5min}–8\text{h}}\)) after 12 weeks (primary variable). The key secondary variable was 24 h post-dose FEV\(_1\) (‘trough’; mean of measurements made at 25 h 10 min and 25 h 45 min post dose) at week 12. Further efficacy variables included other spirometric values (FEV\(_1\) at other times and forced vital capacity). Exploratory variables were inspiratory capacity (IC, measured in a subgroup of approximately 120 patients per treatment arm) and use of as-needed salbutamol and symptoms. The patients in whom IC was measured were from study centres that elected to perform this measurement. Patients used diaries to record the number of salbutamol puffs used and severity of cough, wheeze, breathlessness and sputum production and colour during the last 12 h on four-point scales of increasing severity, each morning (premedication) and evening; there is no established threshold of clinical significance for these measures.

Safety data included adverse events, notable vital signs (pulse, blood pressure), blood chemistry (blood glucose, serum potassium) and ECG (QTc interval, corrected using Fridericia’s formula) at any time post baseline (measured pre dose and 30 min post dose at weeks 4, 8 and 12).

\textbf{Statistical methods}

Two populations were defined for analysis. The full analysis (intention-to-treat) population comprised randomised patients who received at least one dose of the study drug, analysed according to allocated treatment group. The safety population comprised patients who received at least one dose of the study drug, analysed according to treatment received.

The primary variable (FEV\(_1\) AUC\(_{\text{5min}–8\text{h}}\) after 12 weeks) was analysed using a mixed-model analysis of covariance containing treatment as a fixed effect and, as covariates, baseline FEV\(_1\) and FEV\(_1\) before and after salbutamol and before and after ipratropium inhalation. The model also included disease severity (moderate/severe), country, smoking history and ICS use as fixed effects and centre nested within country as a random effect. Similar methods were used to analyse secondary efficacy variables, with appropriate baseline measurements as covariates.
To allow for multiplicity, a hierarchical testing procedure was used to maintain an α level of 0.05 for the primary and key secondary variables (FEV₁ AUC₅₅₈h and trough FEV₁ after 12 weeks). Any missing values were carried forward from the latest available of the values at weeks 4 or 8 ('last observation carried forward'). Exploratory analyses of FEV₁ AUC₅₅₈h at week 12 were performed in patient subgroups according to disease severity (moderate or less, severe or worse), smoking history (current smoker, ex-smoker) and the use of ICS at baseline (yes, no), using appropriate interaction terms and covariates.

Results are shown as least squares means with SEs for group mean values and 95% CIs for differences between treatments. Adverse events and other safety data are summarised descriptively.

For the primary analysis, to show superiority in standardised FEV₁ AUC₅₅₈h by 60 ml¹⁷ with a SD of 220 ml, 478 evaluable patients per arm were needed for 98% power which, with an assumed dropout of 15%, required 568 patients per arm or a total of 1126. For the key secondary analysis of trough FEV₁, assuming a difference of 45 ml²⁻¹⁴ and a SD of 225 ml, 478 evaluable patients per arm would provide 87% power. Since the key secondary variable would only be tested if the primary objective was significant, the power for the key secondary would be 85% (i.e., 87% × 98%).

RESULTS

The studies were conducted between March 2009 and March 2010.

Patients

Patient disposition is shown in figure 1. The main reason for screening failure was not meeting diagnostic/severity criteria, followed by unacceptable test procedure results and withdrawal of consent. Completion rates were similar between treatment groups and studies: 93% and 94% of patients in study 1, and 95% and 94% in study 2. Patient demographics and other baseline characteristics were similar between the two treatment groups, apart from a slightly higher proportion of baseline ICS users in the indacaterol plus tiotropium treatment group of study 2. The two studies were well balanced, apart from a higher proportion of Asian patients in study 2 (table 1).

Lung function

In both studies the primary objective was met, and superiority of indacaterol plus tiotropium versus tiotropium plus placebo was demonstrated for FEV₁ AUC₅₅₈h at week 12, with differences of 150 ml (95% CI 100 to 150) and 120 ml (95% CI 90 to 140) in studies 1 and 2, respectively (both p < 0.001). Results for FEV₁ AUC₅₅₈h in the subgroups analysed according to COPD severity, smoking status and ICS use are shown in table 2.
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

Table 1  Demographics and baseline characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indacaterol + tiotropium (n = 570)</td>
<td>Tiotropium + placebo (n = 561)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indacaterol + tiotropium (n = 572)</td>
<td>Tiotropium + placebo (n = 570)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years), mean (SD)</td>
<td>64.0 (9.07)</td>
<td>63.4 (9.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.1 (8.83)</td>
<td>62.8 (8.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, men/women, %</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>67/33</td>
<td></td>
<td>63/37</td>
<td>68/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of COPD (years), mean (SD)</td>
<td>7.1 (6.12)</td>
<td>6.6 (6.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 (6.48)</td>
<td>7.1 (6.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of COPD, n (%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate†</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe or very severe</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS use, yes/no %</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td>52/48</td>
<td></td>
<td>57/43</td>
<td>51/49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-smoker/smoker, %</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>64/36</td>
<td></td>
<td>62/28</td>
<td>57/43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack-years, mean (SD)</td>
<td>47.2 (25.36)</td>
<td>47.2 (26.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.2 (25.52)</td>
<td>46.3 (24.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁, litres (post salbutamol)</td>
<td>48.3 (9.70)</td>
<td>48.9 (11.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.6 (9.74)</td>
<td>48.6 (9.76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁/FVC (post salbutamol)</td>
<td>46.4 (9.74)</td>
<td>45.8 (10.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0 (10.21)</td>
<td>47.2 (9.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁ reversibility† (pre/post salbutamol), %</td>
<td>1.15 (0.357)</td>
<td>1.15 (0.384)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14 (0.364)</td>
<td>1.15 (0.356)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁, litres (post salbutamol), mean (SD)</td>
<td>1.32 (0.367)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.418)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29 (0.368)</td>
<td>1.32 (0.374)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁ reversibility† (pre/post salbutamol), %</td>
<td>16.5 (14.48)</td>
<td>17.3 (17.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.3 (15.85)</td>
<td>16.5 (16.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁, litres (pre ipratropium), %</td>
<td>1.16 (0.367)</td>
<td>1.17 (0.396)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16 (0.373)</td>
<td>1.18 (0.378)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁, litres (post ipratropium), mean (SD)</td>
<td>1.36 (0.419)</td>
<td>1.35 (0.429)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33 (0.402)</td>
<td>1.35 (0.407)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁ reversibility† (pre/post ipratropium), %</td>
<td>18.5 (15.68)</td>
<td>19.8 (16.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4 (15.32)</td>
<td>16.5 (15.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) 2007. Data missing for one patient in study 2.
†Includes one patient (study 1, tiotropium group) with mild severity.
‡At screening, spirometry measurements were taken to assess bronchodilator reversibility, first to a short-acting β₂ agonist (FEV₁ measured 10–15 min after inhalation of 4 × 100 μg puffs of salbutamol (equivalent to 4 × 90 μg albuterol ex-mouthpiece) compared with pre-bronchodilator value) and, on the next morning, to an anticholinergic (FEV₁ increase 1 h after inhalation of 2 × 21 μg ipratropium bromide (equivalent to 2 × 17 μg ipratropium ex-mouthpiece) compared with pre-bronchodilator value).

Differences between indacaterol plus tiotropium and tiotropium plus placebo remained statistically significant in all subgroups, although the differences within each pair of subgroups were wider in study 2 than in study 1, particularly for smokers versus ex-smokers.

Indacaterol plus tiotropium also performed better than tiotropium plus placebo for the key secondary variable, trough FEV₁ (last observation carried forward) at week 12, with differences of 80 ml (95% CI 50 to 100) and 70 ml (95% CI 50 to 90) (both p<0.001). Again, statistically significant differences between the two treatments were maintained in subgroups analysed according to COPD severity, smoking status and ICS use (table 2).

After the first dose on day 1 of treatment, indacaterol plus tiotropium had a significantly greater effect than tiotropium plus placebo on FEV₁ at 5 min post dose, with differences of 90 ml (95% CI 80 to 100 ml) and 80 ml (95% CI 70 to 90 ml) (both p<0.001). At this time point, least square mean increases between the two treatments were maintained in subgroups

Table 2  Differences between treatments (indacaterol plus tiotropium—tiotropium plus placebo) in FEV₁, AUC<sub>0-8h</sub>, and trough FEV₁ in patient subgroups analysed according to COPD severity, smoking status and ICS use*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between indacaterol + tiotropium versus tiotropium + placebo</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>Trough FEV₁</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COPD severity†</td>
<td></td>
<td>120 ml (90 to 160) (n = 233/237)§</td>
<td>130 ml (90 to 160) (n = 247/237)</td>
<td>90 ml (50 to 130) (n = 258/260)</td>
<td>90 ml (60 to 120) (n = 261/258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate‡</td>
<td>130 ml (100 to 160) (n = 272/267)</td>
<td>110 ml (80 to 140) (n = 283/267)</td>
<td>70 ml (30 to 110) (n = 302/289)</td>
<td>60 ml (30 to 90) (n = 304/306)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe or very severe</td>
<td></td>
<td>120 ml (90 to 150) (n = 300/324)</td>
<td>140 ml (110 to 170) (n = 331/285)</td>
<td>70 ml (40 to 110) (n = 335/350)</td>
<td>80 ml (60 to 110) (n = 352/322)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking status</td>
<td>Ex-smoker</td>
<td>130 ml (90 to 170) (n = 205/180)</td>
<td>90 ml (50 to 120) (n = 199/219)</td>
<td>80 ml (40 to 130) (n = 226/199)</td>
<td>60 ml (20 to 90) (n = 213/242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoker</td>
<td></td>
<td>130 ml (90 to 160) (n = 263/268)</td>
<td>140 ml (100 to 170) (n = 229/251)</td>
<td>70 ml (30 to 110) (n = 271/260)</td>
<td>90 ml (60 to 120) (n = 244/274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS use</td>
<td>ICS non-users</td>
<td>130 ml (90 to 160) (n = 242/236)</td>
<td>140 ml (100 to 170) (n = 229/251)</td>
<td>70 ml (30 to 110) (n = 271/260)</td>
<td>90 ml (60 to 120) (n = 244/274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS users</td>
<td></td>
<td>130 ml (100 to 160) (n = 263/268)</td>
<td>100 ml (70 to 140) (n = 301/253)</td>
<td>80 ml (50 to 120) (n = 290/289)</td>
<td>60 ml (30 to 90) (n = 321/290)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are least squares means with 95% CI in parentheses. All treatment contrasts significant at p<0.001.
*The interaction term for treatment by subgroup was non-significant in all cases (p>0.1).
†Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) 2007.
‡Includes one patient (study 1, tiotropium group) with mild severity.
§Patient numbers are for indacaterol + tiotropium and tiotropium groups, respectively.
AUC<sub>0-8h</sub> area under the curve from 5 min to 8 h post dose; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; FEV₁, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; FVC, forced vital capacity; ICS, inhaled corticosteroid.
were statistically significantly greater in the combined treat-
ment group in both studies (table 3).

Safety

Adverse events were reported for similar proportions of patients
in the two treatment groups in both studies (table 4). Many
of the most common events reflected the disease characteristics
of COPD and had a similar incidence in all four treatment
groups. The most common adverse event overall was COPD worsen-
ing. Cough was more common with the indacaterol plus tiotropium
treatment. Most cases of cough with concurrent treatment were
mild (54/59, 92%; and 46/52, 89%), and only one (moderate) case led to study
drug discontinuation. Other differences between treatment groups (eg, in muscle spasms and dyspnoea)
were small and not observed consistently in the two studies.

Two patients died during the treatment period in study 1,
both in the indacaterol plus tiotropium treatment group (causes
were anaphylaxis and myocardial infarction). Three patients
died during the treatment period in study 2, one in the indaca-
terol plus tiotropium group (cause was myocardial infarction)
and two in the tiotropium group (causes were unknown and
cardiac arrest). Another two patients died in the 30 days
following discontinuation of tiotropium (acute renal failure) or
indacaterol plus tiotropium treatment (unknown cause). In the
opinion of the investigators, apart from the death due to cardiac
arrest (in the tiotropium group of study 2), all were considered
unrelated to study treatment.

Serious adverse events were reported for similar proportions of
patients in the indacaterol plus tiotropium and monotherapy
groups: 3.7% and 3.0% (study 1) and 3.5% and 3.2% (study 2).
The primary system organ classes in which 1% or more of
patients had a serious adverse event were ‘respiratory, thorac-
ic and mediastinal disorders’ (1.1% and 1.6% with indacaterol plus
tiotropium treatment; 2.1% and 1.6% with tiotropium), mostly
comprising COPD worsening (1.1% and 1.6% with indacaterol
plus tiotropium; 2.0% and 1.6% with tiotropium); and ‘infect-
ions and infestations’ (1.1% and 1.2% with indacaterol plus
tiotropium treatment; 0.5% and 0.7% with tiotropium), which
included pneumonia and lower respiratory tract infections.

Results for vital signs, plasma potassium, blood glucose and
QTc intervals are shown in table 5. Findings were generally
similar between the two treatments; a numerically higher inci-
dence of elevated systolic blood pressure with indacaterol plus
tiotropium treatment (unknown cause). In the
opinion of the investigators, apart from the death due to cardiac
arrest (in the tiotropium group of study 2), all were considered
unrelated to study treatment.

DISCUSSION

Several placebo-controlled studies have demonstrated the effi-
cacy and safety of indacaterol given as long-acting bronchodi-
lator monotherapy in patients with moderate to severe
COPD.6 7 9 21 Its bronchodilator effect was shown to be superior
to the twice-daily LABAs6 8 and at least as effective as
tiotropium, although indacaterol had the faster onset of effect
on first dose.9 11 Indacaterol was also shown to improve clinical
outcomes (dyspnoea and health status) to a statistically signif-
icantly greater extent than tiotropium.10

Coadministration of indacaterol and tiotropium provided
significantly greater bronchodilation (AUC and trough FEV₁)
compared with tiotropium alone. These differences were seen
from the first dose onwards. The statistically significant different-
ental bronchodilator effect was maintained in patient
subgroups irrespective of baseline COPD severity, smoking
status or ICS use. The differential between the two treatments
was fairly constant between the subgroups in study 1 but

Figure 2 Differences between treatments (indacaterol plus tiotro-
pium—tiotropium plus placebo) in effect on forced expiratory volume in 1
s (FEV₁) at intervals post dose at week 12. Data are least squares means
and 95% CIs. All differences significant at p<0.001. (Treatment
contrasts for the trough measurements shown in the figure are without
imputation for missing values.)
differed somewhat in study 2, particularly in the smoking subgroups, where ex-smokers had a mean difference of 50 ml (advantage) over current smokers. Reasons for the difference are unknown but it could be due to the small sample size. Disease severity, smoking status and history were similar in the two studies, and the higher proportion of patients of Asian origin in study 2 (16.5% vs 5% in study 1, including 13.5% from India) did not influence treatment responsiveness (results not shown). The primary outcome was chosen to reflect the period of the day when patients are more active and when multiple spirometric assessments are more conveniently made. The results show an average increase in FEV1 of 120 ml over this period with indacaterol plus tiotropium treatment versus tiotropium alone. The treatment differences from the analysis models in the two studies are compatible, with only small differences (of 10 ml) between studies. The average differences between the two studies are compatible, with only small differences (of 10 ml) between studies. The average differences between the two treatments in their effect on trough FEV1 may be regarded as substantial compared with the 90 ml margin previously reported in a meta-analysis with tiotropium over placebo.4

While FEV1 is important for diagnosing airflow obstruction and monitoring COPD progression, changes in FEV1 are poorly correlated with changes in dyspnoea.22 23 Although the mechanisms of dyspnoea in patients with COPD are complex and multifactorial, lung hyperinflation, both static and dynamic, is an important physiological consideration.24–26 The significant increases in resting IC with indacaterol plus tiotropium treatment compared with tiotropium alone are consistent with a greater reduction in lung hyperinflation. However, functional residual capacity was not measured in these studies to confirm this process. In previous studies, increases in IC with bronchodilator therapies were associated with improvements in clinical outcomes, including dyspnoea, exercise tolerance, health status and exacerbations.25 27–29 Similarly, in the present studies, the statistically significant reductions in symptom scores and as-needed salbutamol use demonstrate clinical improvement with indacaterol plus tiotropium treatment compared with tiotropium alone.

Adverse events and serious adverse events were reported by similar percentages of patients for the two study groups. Combining the two classes of bronchodilators did not reveal any safety concerns compared with tiotropium alone during the 12-week study. An increased incidence of cough with indacaterol

### Table 3 Patient-reported symptoms and use of as-needed salbutamol over 12 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indacaterol + tiotropium</td>
<td>Tiotropium + placebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline symptom score</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full 24 h</td>
<td>11.9 (5.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>6.2 (2.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-time</td>
<td>5.6 (3.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change from baseline symptom score</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(full 24 h) during treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between treatments</td>
<td>−2.1 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between treatments</td>
<td>−0.5 (−0.9 to −0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between treatments</td>
<td>−1.2 (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between treatments</td>
<td>−0.3 (−0.5 to −0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong> salbutamol use (puffs/day)</td>
<td>5.5 (4.24) (n=538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from baseline salbutamol use</td>
<td>−2.5 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between treatments</td>
<td>−1.1 (−0.8 to −1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days during baseline</strong> with no salbutamol use (%)</td>
<td>16.1 (30.95) (n=532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days during treatment with no salbutamol use (%)</strong></td>
<td>43.2 (1.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference between treatments</strong></td>
<td>9.0 (5.1 to 12.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline values are raw means (SD). Changes from baseline are least square means (SE) and treatment comparisons are least square means (95% CI).

*Measured during 14-day run-in.
†Composite of scores for cough, wheeze, sputum production/colour and breathlessness, each measured twice daily on a four-point scale of increasing severity.

### Table 4 Adverse events overall and most commonly occurring (≥2% in any treatment group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indacaterol + tiotropium (n=570)</td>
<td>Tiotropium + placebo (n=561)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any adverse event (% of patients)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPD worsening</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cough</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasopharyngitis</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle spasms</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyspnoea</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper respiratory tract infection</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry mouth</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.
Table 5  Number (%) of patients with notable values for plasma potassium, blood glucose, pulse rate, blood pressure and QTc interval (Friden’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indacaterol + tiotropium</td>
<td>Tiotropium + placebo</td>
<td>Indacaterol + tiotropium</td>
<td>Tiotropium + placebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma potassium $&lt;$3.5 mmol/litre</td>
<td>13 (2.3)</td>
<td>12 (2.1)</td>
<td>9 (1.6)</td>
<td>8 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood glucose $&gt;$9.99 mmol/litre</td>
<td>11 (1.9)</td>
<td>10 (1.8)</td>
<td>14 (2.4)</td>
<td>13 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse rate—high*</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
<td>4 (0.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic blood pressure—high†</td>
<td>13 (2.3)</td>
<td>3 (0.5)</td>
<td>6 (1.0)</td>
<td>7 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure—high‡</td>
<td>6 (1.1)</td>
<td>4 (0.7)</td>
<td>4 (0.7)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTc interval</td>
<td>Absolute value $&gt;$450/470 ms (men/women)</td>
<td>18 (3.2)</td>
<td>16 (2.9)</td>
<td>10 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute value $&gt;$500 ms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from baseline 30—60 ms</td>
<td>23 (4.1)</td>
<td>22 (3.9)</td>
<td>24 (4.2)</td>
<td>20 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from baseline $&gt;$60 ms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $>$130 bpm, or $\geq120$ bpm and $\geq15$ bpm increase from baseline.  
† $>$205 mm Hg, or $\geq180$ mm Hg and $\geq25$ mm Hg increase from baseline.  
‡ $>$115 mm Hg, or $\geq105$ mm Hg and $\geq15$ mm Hg increase from baseline.
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