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Abstract

Background — Diffuse panbronchiolitis (DPB) is characterised clinically by chronic airflow limitation and respiratory tract infection, and pathologically by chronic bronchiolar inflammation. To elucidate the functional differences between chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and DPB the bronchial responsiveness to methacholine was compared in 64 patients with COPD and 32 patients with DPB, and the bronchodilator response was compared in 72 patients with COPD and 49 with DPB.

Methods — Bronchial responsiveness to methacholine was determined by the dosimeter method and expressed as PD_{20}FEV_{1}, and bronchodilator response was measured as the change in percentage predicted response with 5 mg nebulised salbutamol.

Results — Baseline FEV_{1} was similar in the two groups of patients. Patients with COPD were more responsive to methacholine than were those with DPB (geometric mean PD_{20}FEV_{1} 8.87 v 48.0 cumulative units). Reversibility of airflow obstruction, expressed as the difference between the percentage predicted postbronchodilator FEV_{1}, and prebronchodilator FEV_{1}, was significantly larger in patients with COPD than in those with DPB (7.87 (6.52)% v 4.16 (4.43)%).

Conclusions — The observation that patients with DPB differ substantially in bronchial responsiveness from those with COPD is thought to reflect the difference in the mechanisms of these two diseases — that is, airway disease in DPB and more parenchymal disease in the group of patients with COPD. The nature of bronchiolar inflammation in COPD and DPB is also different, possibly explaining the difference in bronchial responsiveness. More fixed airflow limitation as a result of structural bronchiolar lesions in DPB will explain the smaller reversibility of airflow obstruction.

(Thorax 1994;49:540–544)
Table 1  Mean (SD) baseline pulmonary function in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and diffuse panbronchiolitis (DPB)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COPD</th>
<th>DBP</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (male:female)</td>
<td>75:0</td>
<td>30:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking history*</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC (l)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.49 (1.00) &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%predicted</td>
<td>91.6 (19.6)</td>
<td>69.0 (21.2) &lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVC (l)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.47 (1.04) &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV (l)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.37 (1.04) NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLCO (mmol/min/kPa)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.38 (1.05) NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV/TLC (%)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.38 (1.05) NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV/FVC (%)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.38 (1.05) NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC (%)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.38 (1.05) NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IgE-RIST (IU/ml)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73.1 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VC = vital capacity; FVC = forced vital capacity; FEV = forced expiratory volume in one second; TLC = total lung capacity; RV = residual volume; TLCO = gas transfer factor for the lung; TLCO/VA = transfer coefficient; Cst = static compliance; Raw = airways resistance; IgE-RIST: immunoglobulin E measured by radioimmunoassort test.

*Current smokers + ex-smokers.

**Geometric mean.

Methods

PATIENTS

The study population consisted of 75 patients with COPD and 51 with DBP who visited the Chest Disease Research Institute Hospital, Kyoto University from 1985 to 1992 (table 1).

CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE

The diagnosis of COPD was based on the definition of the American Thoracic Society. 7 The patients with COPD in the present study fulfilled the following criteria: (1) a maximum ratio of forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV) to forced vital capacity (FVC) of less than 70% over several measurements of postbronchodilator spirometry; (2) a smoking history of more than 20 pack years; (3) no history consistent with asthma such as paroxysmal dyspnoea and wheezing; and (4) chest radiographic findings compatible with pulmonary emphysema. In addition, most patients had low attenuation areas on high resolution computed tomography, indicating the presence of centriflobular emphysema. 12

DIFFUSE PANBRONCHIOLITIS

The diagnosis of DBP was made according to the clinical diagnostic guidelines established for DBP in the nationwide survey by the Welfare and Health Ministry of Japan. 1 The criteria can be summarised as follows: (1) symptoms of chronic cough, sputum, and dyspnoea on exertion; (2) physical signs of crackles or rhonchi; (3) chest radiographic findings of diffusely disseminated small nodular shadows with hyperinflation of the lung; and (4) lung function studies giving more than three of the following: FEV/FVC < 70%, slow vital capacity < 80% of the predicted value, residual volume (RV) > 150% of the predicted value, RV/tidal lung capacity > 45% or PaO2 < 10.5 kPa. In addition, chronic paranasal sinusitis and high resolution computed tomographic findings compatible with DBP — that is, centriflobular nodules 13 — were confirmed in all patients with DBP. In nine patients, including those who did not fulfil the above stated clinical guidelines, the diagnosis was confirmed by open lung biopsy. The specimen exhibited focal lesions of panbronchiolitis consisting of an aggregate of foamy macrophages and lymphoid cells within the wall of respiratory bronchioles and adjacent alveolar ducts and alveoli. 14,15 Because long term low dose erythromycin is an effective treatment for DBP, 16,17 all measurements were performed before initiating erythromycin treatment in these patients.

Based on the baseline prebronchodilator spirometric measurements, the severity of the obstructive abnormality in patients with COPD and DBP was graded as follows: 18 mild, %pred FEV1 < 80; moderate, %pred FEV1 < 70 and > 60; moderately severe, %pred FEV1 < 60 and > 50; severe, %pred FEV1 < 50 and > 34; very severe, %pred FEV1 < 34.

All patients were stable for at least two months before performing the baseline pulmonary function tests, the acute bronchodilator test, and the methacholine inhalation challenge test. With a few exceptions the methacholine inhalation challenge test and the acute bronchodilator test were performed within a month of each other. Inhalation of β receptor agonists or anticholinergic drugs were withheld for at least 12 hours and oral theophylline for 48 hours before performing the three tests. No subjects had taken oral or inhaled steroids. All subjects were informed of the purpose of this study.

METHODS

METHACHOLINE INHALATION CHALLENGE TEST

Methacholine challenge tests were performed in patients who had an FEV1 of > 40% of the predicted value using the method described by Chai and coworkers. 19 Methacholine chloride was dissolved in phosphate buffered saline (pH 7.0). Phosphate buffered saline and methacholine solutions were delivered by a dosimeter (Rosenthal French, Baltimore, USA) using a No 646 DeVilbiss nebuliser (DeVilbiss Co, Somerset, USA) at a pressure of 139 kPa (20 psi). Subjects performed spirometric tests correctly on a hard copy spirometer (AS-600, Minato Medical Equipment Co, Tokyo, Japan) three times before inhalation and twice after inhalation of each concentration of methacholine. The largest value for each measurement was used. The results were expressed as the dose of methacholine required to produce a 20% fall in FEV1 (PD20FEV1). The doses of methacholine were expressed as cumulative units where one inhalation of 1 mg/ml methacholine solution = one cumulative unit, and the PD20FEV1 values were determined by linear interpolation of the log cumulative dose-response curve.

BRONCHODILATOR RESPONSE

Five milligrams of salbutamol with 2 ml of saline was inhaled using a DeVilbiss No 646
nebuliser. Spirometric testing was performed before and 15 minutes after each inhalation. To minimise the effect of the baseline airway calibre results were expressed as the difference between percentage predicted postbronchodilator FEV₁ and prebronchodilator FEV₁.²⁰⁻²² The largest FVC and the largest FEV₁ of at least three acceptable measurements were used.²³

PULMONARY FUNCTION TESTING
Diffusion capacity was measured by the single breath method using carbon monoxide (Chestex 65VH, Chest Co, Tokyo, Japan).²⁴ Total lung capacity was calculated as the sum of the volume of thoracic gas determined by pressure corrected flow type body plethysmography²⁵ (model MBR 2000M, Nihon Kohden Co, Tokyo, Japan), the inspiratory residual volume and the tidal volume. The residual volume (RV) was calculated as the thoracic gas volume minus the expiratory residual volume. Static compliance was measured by the single breath interrupted technique. The predicted values for FEV₁ and vital capacity were those established by the Japan Society of Chest Diseases.²⁶

SERUM IMMUNOGLOBULIN E
Serum immunoglobulin E was measured by radioimmunosorbent test.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
The data were analysed by the Kruskal-Wallis test and Mann-Whitney U test; p<0.05 was considered significant. Spearman correlation coefficients were used for the analysis of the relation between baseline FEV₁ and bronchial responsiveness to methacholine. Data are expressed as mean (SD).

---

Table 2 Mean (SD) bronchial responsiveness to methacholine (expressed as log PD₂₀, FEV₁) in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and diffuse panbronchiolitis (DPB) in relation to obstructive abnormality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade*</th>
<th>n COPD</th>
<th>n DPB</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.886 (0.382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.115 (0.410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately severe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.685 (0.731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.453 (0.736)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.681 (0.652)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mild = %pred FEV₁ <100 and ≥70; moderate = %pred FEV₁ <70 and ≥60; moderately severe = %pred FEV₁ <60 and ≥50; severe = %pred FEV₁ <50 and ≥34; very severe = %pred FEV₁ <34.

---

Table 3 Mean (SD) acute bronchodilator response (expressed as difference between % predicted FEV₁ before and after bronchodilator) in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and diffuse panbronchiolitis (DPB) in relation to obstructive abnormality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade*</th>
<th>n COPD</th>
<th>n DPB</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.94 (3.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.12 (4.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately severe</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.15 (6.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.56 (6.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very severe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.48 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.16 (4.43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mild = %pred FEV₁ <100 and ≥70; moderate = %pred FEV₁ <70 and ≥60; moderately severe = %pred FEV₁ <60 and ≥50; severe = %pred FEV₁ <50 and ≥34; very severe = %pred FEV₁ <34.

---

Results
Seventy five patients with COPD and 51 patients with DPB were included in the study. Baseline pulmonary function and other characteristics are summarised in table 1. Airway resistance and RV/TLC were in the same range for both diseases. Both groups of patients had similar serum IgE levels. All of the patients with COPD were smokers as a smoking history was an entry criterion. On the other hand, 78% of patients with DPB had never smoked.

Bronchial responsiveness was determined in 64 patients with COPD and 32 with DPB, and bronchodilator response was obtained in 72 of the patients with COPD and 49 of those with DPB. No significant differences in baseline FEV₁ values between the two groups were observed before the bronchial responsiveness and bronchodilator response tests (1.38 (0.45) l vs 1.57 (0.86) l and 1.33 (0.48) l vs 1.27 (0.70) l, respectively). The patients with COPD showed significantly greater bronchial responsiveness and bronchodilator response than those with DPB (tables 2 and 3, respectively). Five of the 49 patients with DPB and 21 of the 72 patients with COPD had a bronchodilator response of more than 15%.

To exclude the possible effect of baseline airway calibre on bronchial responsiveness²⁷ and bronchodilator response²⁸ we analysed separately patients subdivided according to the severity of their airflow limitation (tables 2 and 3). Patients with COPD with moderate to severe airflow limitation were significantly more responsive to methacholine than were patients with DPB. There were no statistically significant differences in bronchodilator response between patients with COPD and DPB, except for those who had moderately severe airflow limitation. However, the bronchodilator response tended to be greater in general in the patients with COPD than those with DPB.

Whereas a strong correlation between baseline FEV₁ and bronchial responsiveness was noted in patients with COPD (fig 1; r₄ = 0.473, p<0.001), the correlation was weaker, but still significant, in patients with DPB (fig 2,
some factors other than bronchiolar inflammation, such as a decreased interaction between the airways and parenchyma, have been proposed to contribute to the pathogenesis of bronchial hyperresponsiveness in COPD. This suggestion is further supported by our observation that patients with COPD had an increased static lung compliance relative to those with DPB, which may reflect destruction of alveolar septal attachment to airways and allow airway collapse.

A strong relation was found between baseline FEV\(_1\) and bronchial hyperresponsiveness in our patients with COPD, and this observation is compatible with previous reports.\(^{27,28}\) In addition, since we found a weak but significant correlation between baseline FEV\(_1\) and bronchial responsiveness in patients with DPB, baseline airway calibre appears to influence bronchial responsiveness in patients with chronic airflow limitation. Since patients with DPB exhibited a smaller bronchodilator response than the patients with COPD, structural bronchiolar lesions in DPB seem to cause more fixed airflow limitation. In contrast, airways in patients with COPD are better preserved, and factors other than airway lesions such as the decreased interaction between airway and parenchyma probably cause airflow limitation.\(^{27}\) In fact, bronchiolar and peribronchial changes in COPD are much milder than in DPB.\(^{2}\) Whilst only a few patients with DPB (five out of 49) showed a bronchodilator response of more than 15%, many patients with COPD responded to inhaled salbutamol.

DPB has similarities to cystic fibrosis and bronchiectasis, conditions also characterised by chronic lower respiratory tract infection and obstructive changes. Pathological findings in advanced DPB have shown airway dilatation progressing to the more proximal bronchi, and some investigators have pointed out this resemblance between DPB and diffuse bronchiectasis. Increased bronchial responsiveness also occurs in patients with cystic fibrosis.\(^{38-39}\) and bronchiectasis.\(^{40-41}\) The response to methacholine in the patients with DPB in the present study was similar to that seen in patients with cystic fibrosis reported by Eggleston et al.\(^{38}\)

Most of the patients with COPD in our study had CT findings compatible with emphysema, probably because few patients with COPD in Japan have predominantly intrinsic airways disease without significant emphysema. Thus, there might be racial differences in the effects of smoking related airway inflammation causing a variable pattern in chronic bronchitis in our country.

In conclusion, our observation that patients with DPB differ substantially in bronchial responsiveness and bronchodilator response from those with COPD is thought to reflect the distinct mechanisms of these two diseases - that is, airway disease in DPB and parenchymal disease in COPD with emphysema. The nature of bronchiolar inflammation in COPD and DPB is also quite different, possibly explaining the difference in bronchial hyperresponsiveness.
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