Effect of oral prednisolone on response to salbutamol and ipratropium bromide aerosols in patients with chronic airflow obstruction
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ABSTRACT We examined the bronchodilator responses to inhalation of salbutamol (200 μg) and of ipratropium bromide (40 μg) in the morning and in the afternoon before and during a course of oral prednisolone (40 mg daily) in 15 patients with chronic, partly reversible airflow obstruction. Bronchodilatation was assessed by measuring serial peak expiratory flow rates (PEFR) for six hours after aerosol drug administration and calculating the area under the time-response curves. Eleven patients were found to be corticosteroid resistant in not attaining a baseline bronchodilatation of at least 25% during corticosteroid treatment. These patients also failed to show any enhancement of their bronchodilator responses to either salbutamol or ipratropium bromide during prednisolone administration. We therefore conclude that there is no rationale for giving or continuing corticosteroid treatment in known steroid-resistant patients in the hope of nevertheless potentiating their bronchodilator responses to salbutamol or ipratropium bromide.

Corticosteroids have been used to treat airflow obstruction in acute and chronic asthma for over 30 years.1 Their use in chronic bronchitis is more controversial but a trial of corticosteroid treatment is often indicated.4 Evidence has been accumulating for various cellular effects of corticosteroids that may result in bronchial relaxation and it has been suggested that one possible mode of action may be by the potentiation of endogenous and exogenous catecholamines.9-11

There is a subgroup of patients with partly reversible airflow obstruction in response to bronchodilator drugs who do not show bronchodilatation with corticosteroid treatment. Our study was designed to determine whether corticosteroid treatment might nevertheless be of benefit in these patients by enhancing the bronchodilatation normally achieved with either salbutamol, a β-adrenergic agonist related to the catecholamines, or ipratropium bromide, a parasympatholytic agent, given by pressurised aerosols in conventional doses. These two bronchodilators with different actions were compared to determine any possible specificity of potentiation of either by prednisolone.

Patients and methods

Fifteen patients (mean age 64 years) with chronic airflow obstruction were studied. All had been having long-term bronchodilator treatment but persistent symptoms were severe enough to warrant a trial of oral corticosteroid treatment. None had received oral corticosteroids during the previous month, although one patient was taking inhaled beclomethasone dipropionate, which was continued throughout. Selection criteria were: (a) evidence of airflow obstruction obtained by measuring the forced expiration in the first second (FEV₁) and the forced vital capacity (FVC) with a Collins spirometer, the FEV₁/FVC being under 75% and the FEV₁ under 80% of the predicted value; and (b) sufficient reversibility to produce at least a 15% incremental response in the FEV₁ with each of separate inhaled doses of salbutamol 200 μg and of ipratropium bromide 40 μg given by standard metered-dose aerosols (two puffs of each). Patients with acute bronchospasm or overt cardiovascular disease were excluded. All who entered the study...
Table 1  Design of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Age (y)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Initial FEV₁ (%)</th>
<th>Initial FEV₁/FVC (%)</th>
<th>Final FEV₁ (%)</th>
<th>Final FEV₁/FVC (%)</th>
<th>Final baseline % change in PEFR am</th>
<th>Final baseline % change in PEFR pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean ± SEM 64 ± 2 47.4 ± 6.5 47.8 ± 4.7 52.3 ± 6.4 46.1 ± 3.8 4 ± 2.5 8.9 ± 3.5

% pred—percentage of predicted normal value; FEV₁—forced expiratory volume in one second; FVC—forced vital capacity; PEFR—peak expiratory flow rate.
baseline values and by the unpaired t test for group comparison of responses to aerosol inhalers. Differences were regarded as significant at the 5% level.

Results

All 15 patients completed the study. Four patients were found to respond to prednisolone and their results were therefore excluded from the main analysis. Data for the 11 steroid-resistant patients are shown in table 2.

The two methods of calculating the PEFR responses gave similar results (fig). Afternoon responses were consistently smaller than morning ones and were associated with higher afternoon baseline values. This difference between morning and afternoon baseline values was not significant on day 1 (p = 0.25) but did reach significance on day 2 (p < 0.02) and day 3 (p = 0.05). There was no significant difference between the bronchodilatation achieved by salbutamol before and during prednisolone administration. Similarly, there was no significant difference between the bronchodilatations achieved by ipratropium bromide before and during prednisolone administration. Moreover, there was no significant difference between the bronchodilatation achieved by salbutamol and by ipratropium bromide either before prednisolone administration or during it. For no individual was there any significant difference between morning and evening PEFR values measured one hour after inhalation of a bronchodilator.

Some data were available on the four steroid-responsive patients. Analysis indicated that these patients did not show significantly enhanced bronchodilator responses during prednisolone administration. Because of the small number of these patients, however, a valid conclusion could not be drawn.

Discussion

The difficulty in predicting corticosteroid responsiveness or unresponsiveness in patients with chronic airflow obstruction is well known.8 13 14 For the purpose of this study therefore patients were selected on the grounds of having some reversibility of their airflow obstruction and responding to both the bronchodilator agents used.15

The PEFR, although to some extent effort dependent, has been found to be as sensitive as other tests of airways obstruction in assessing bronchodilator drugs16 and is an accepted measurement for this purpose.17

It is known that during a trial of corticosteroid treatment in chronic airflow obstruction some improvement may be noted after three hours16 but the maximum response may not be reached for six days10 or eight days.18 In the present study a seven-day course of prednisolone was chosen.

Shenfield et al noted an enhanced response to inhaled isoprenaline during prednisone administration in six of nine asthmatic patients, and interpreted this effect as potentiation of isoprenaline by corticosteroids.10 Lightbody et al noted a marginal incremental response when adding oral prednisolone for three days to combined treatment with salbutamol and ipratropium bromide by aerosol, again in asthmatics.19 Interpreting these effects is complicated because in some patients the degree of bronchodilatation achieved by bronchodilators may depend on the variable baseline bronchial relaxa-
tion, as shown by Hume and Rhys Jones, while in others it may be much less regular. No such additional bronchodilatation attributable to corticosteroids was found in chronic bronchitic patients. In our study we did not categorise patients according to a specific diagnosis, but all had a degree of reversibility in airflow obstruction to bronchodilators and may therefore be considered to have had an asthmatic component. Our results enlarge on the findings of the above-mentioned studies and show that in the absence of a baseline response to prednisolone in conventional dosage no enhancement of bronchodilator response to either salbutamol or ipratropium bromide given in the usual dose by pressurised aerosol inhaler may be expected. We have found a consistent diurnal variation with lower afternoon response attributable to higher baseline values. This variation was not affected by prednisolone. Diurnal variation is known to occur in normal people, chronic bronchitics, and, with greater amplitude, asthmatics. In our patients part of the effect seems to have been due to a carry-over from the morning bronchodilator as it was significantly different on active-inhaler as opposed to placebo-inhaler days. As the postbronchodilator PEFR values in any one patient were similar for mornings and afternoons, probably the difference in the bronchodilator responses obtained was due to the difference in the baseline values.
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