Comment on: Morbidity and mortality associated with the restrictive spirometric pattern: a longitudinal study

We read with interest the paper by Guerra et al. profiling the demographic clinical characteristics and prospectively assessing the prognosis of subjects with a restrictive spirometric pattern enrolled in the TESAOD population-based study. The manuscript has the merit of following up a large number of patients for 14 years and investigating how selected co-morbidities are relevant to survival.

The results of this study deserve comparison with those published in 2008 by our research group on 1265 subjects aged 65 years. First, in an older population (mean age 73.4 years) we found a comparable prevalence of restriction at spirometry (12% vs 10.9%), although restriction is an age-related phenomenon and, thus, is expected to be much lower in the younger population (ie, 6.6% in a population aged 42.2 years). Secondly, the study by Guerra and colleagues strongly reproduces the increased mortality risk rates (MRRs) observed in our work: for all (HR 1.89; 95% CI 1.27 to 3.32) status are strong independent correlates of restriction.

Our study focused on the identification of the mechanisms underlying the link between restriction and frailty. Clarifying these issues will allow the implementation of both guided screening and preventive interventions. These comorbidities may be in the causal pathway from spirometric restriction to mortality, and the possible implications of these findings for early identification of subjects at risk.

We appreciate the interest shown in our study by Scarlata and colleagues. We agree with them that, in line with several previous reports, the prevalence of the restrictive spirometric pattern was strikingly similar in the TESAOD and SARA studies, despite the substantial difference in age distribution between the two populations (the TESAOD report included subjects ≥ 21 years and the SARA study subjects ≥ 65 years of age).

However, a direct comparison of cause-specific mortality between the two studies should be interpreted with caution because of the different assessment of the restrictive spirometric pattern, which was evaluated at a single point in time in the SARA study and prospectively in the TESAOD study. Not all subjects with the restrictive spirometric pattern at baseline will have a consistent restrictive spirometric pattern (the one that was used for comparison in the letter by Scarlata et al) over time. Actually, in TESAOD only one out of three such subjects did. The remaining two-thirds either had an inconsistent restrictive longitudinal pattern or developed airflow limitation at some point during the follow-up. Profiles of cause-specific mortality risk differed notably across these three longitudinal groups. For example, hazard ratios for mortality by cardiac disease were 2.0, 2.7 and 1.6, respectively.

We believe that the most novel contribution of our study does not lie in confirming the mortality risk associated with the cross-sectional restrictive spirometric pattern, but rather in assessing spirometric patterns prospectively, for two main reasons. First, our data indicate that up to 38% of subjects with a restrictive spirometric pattern at enrolment developed airflow limitation during the study follow-up. These subjects were more likely to be smokers, to have a physician-confirmed diagnosis of asthma at enrolment, and—unlike those with recurrent or inconsistent restrictive patterns—to die of COPD during follow-up. These results suggest that an underlying airway obstruction may be present in a significant proportion of cases with spirometric restriction assessed at a single time point, and this may explain the finding (apparently conflicting with ours) of an increased pulmonary mortality risk associated with spirometric restriction in the SARA study. Second, the prospective analyses of our study demonstrate that, among subjects who do not develop an obstructive pattern over time, both the recurrent and the inconsistent spirometric restriction increase all-cause mortality risk by a substantial magnitude.

Although what causes increased mortality in these groups remains to be determined, our findings do suggest that this pulmonary condition predisposes to (or at least is linked to) other extrapulmonary conditions such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes. Thus, these comorbidities may be in the causal pathway from spirometric restriction to mortality and we therefore elected not to include them among covariates in our Cox proportional hazards models. We definitely agree with Scarlata and colleagues that further research is required to understand the factors that are related aetologically to spirometric restriction, the molecular mechanisms that drive its effects on all-cause and cause-specific mortality, and the possible implications of these findings for early identification of subjects at risk.
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