

and QRISK2 and the degree of airflow obstruction (FEV1: $r = -0.470^{**}$, $\rho = -0.325^{*}$), emphysema (KCO: $r = -0.493^{**}$, $r = -0.411^{**}$) and hyperinflation (RV%TLC: $r = 0.550^{**}$, $r = 0.433^{**}$). Including only patients with ≥ 3 PFT results, we found a significant relationship between emphysema progression and calculated but not measured cardiovascular risk: KCO change vs. QRISK2 ($r = -0.549$, $p = 0.015$, $n = 19$).

Conclusions Reduced lung function was associated with a greater magnitude of measured and calculated cardiac risk in the AATD cohort. However AATD-mediated lung disease progression was not significantly related to measured CV risk – an exception being a significant relationship between the rate of decline of KCO and QRISK2.

P137 WHY IS ERDOSTEINE RECOMMENDED AS A TREATMENT FOR ACUTE EXACERBATIONS OF CHRONIC BRONCHITIS? A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF CLINICAL TRIALS

¹CL Johnson, ²DF Rogers. ¹Imperial College London, London, UK; ²National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, London, UK

10.1136/thoraxjnl-2016-209333.280

Background Exacerbations of chronic bronchitis or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) are a significant health burden. A substantial component of these exacerbations in many patients is mucus-hypersecretion. Mucolytics, drugs that ‘thin’ mucus, have potential efficacy in these patients.

Currently, erdoesteine is the only mucolytic in the British National Formulary (BNF) indicated for “symptomatic treatment of acute exacerbations of chronic bronchitis”, while other BNF mucolytics (carbocisteine, mecysteine and N-acetylcysteine) have had more general or non-respiratory indications, e.g. “reduction in sputum viscosity”. It is theorised that there is clinical evidence that erdoesteine is useful in treatment of acute exacerbations of chronic bronchitis, unlike any of the other aforementioned mucolytics.

Methods In this narrative systematic review, databases utilised included: Medline, Embase and PubMed. Studies for inclusion had to be Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs) primarily investigating the effect of erdoesteine in exacerbations of chronic bronchitis or COPD. For comparison, RCTs were also included if they investigated carbocisteine, mecysteine and N-acetylcysteine’s effects in exacerbations. A secondary outcome was to investigate the use of these mucolytics in improving COPD signs and symptoms.

Once selected, a two-stage publication elimination process was devised by the author to assess the quality of the trials.

Results Very few trials of adequate quality assessed the efficacy of mucolytics in chronic bronchitis or COPD. Of the 5,560 search results, only 62 trials investigated the aforementioned mucolytics use in chronic bronchitis or COPD, 41 were RCTs. Of the 41 RCTs only 13 were found to be of adequate quality; erdoesteine (1 RCT), carbocisteine (3 RCTs), mecysteine (0 RCTs) and N-acetylcysteine (9 RCTs).

There was no evidence that erdoesteine is useful in treating exacerbations, and very limited, weak evidence for some efficacy in exacerbation prevention. In contrast, carbocisteine showed some strong evidence of efficacy in preventing exacerbations, especially in Asian populations. N-acetylcysteine trial results were variable, and evenly distributed between positive and no effects,

with one study showing adverse effects. There were no trials of adequate quality investigating mecysteine.

Conclusion There is little evidence that erdoesteine is useful in treating chronic bronchitis exacerbations, whereas, overall carbocisteine seems to be more efficacious in exacerbation prevention.

P138 AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH TO STUDY DESIGN: USING ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORDS TO INFORM THE FEASIBILITY AND DESIGN OF THE NOVELTY STUDY (A NOVEL OBSERVATIONAL LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON PATIENTS WITH ASTHMA AND/OR COPD)

¹HK Reddel, ²M Gerhardsson de Verdier, ³A Agustí, ⁴R Beasley, ⁵EH Bel, ⁶C Janson, ⁷B Make, ⁷RJ Martin, ⁸I Pavord, ⁹D Postma, ¹⁰D Price, ²C Keen, ²A Gardev, ²S Rennard, ²A Sveréus, ¹¹AT Bansal, ²L Brannman, ²N Karlsson, ²J Nuevo, ²F Nyberg, ²S Young, ¹²J Vestbo. ¹Woolcock Institute of Medical Research, Sydney, Australia; ²AstraZeneca, Madrid, Spain; ³Hospital Clinic University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; ⁴Medical Research Institute of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand; ⁵Academic Medical Centre, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ⁶Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden; ⁷National Jewish Health and University of Colorado, Denver, USA; ⁸University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; ⁹University of Groningen, University Medical Centre Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands; ¹⁰Research in Real-Life, Singapore, Singapore; ¹¹Acclarogen Ltd, Cambridge, UK; ¹²The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

10.1136/thoraxjnl-2016-209333.281

Introduction Asthma and COPD have traditionally been viewed as distinct diseases. While they have overlapping biological mechanisms, past studies often focused on specific aspects of each disease based on a single diagnostic label, and many clinical trial populations were defined by strict enrolment criteria with limited generalisability. NOVELTY is a prospective, multinational, observational, longitudinal cohort study aiming to enrol 14,800 patients aged ≥ 12 years with a diagnosis or suspected diagnosis of asthma and/or COPD. In this population, the objectives of NOVELTY are to: (i) describe patient characteristics, treatment patterns and burden of illness over time in clinical practice; and (ii) use biomarkers and clinical parameters to identify phenotypes and endotypes associated with differential outcomes for symptom burden, clinical evolution and healthcare utilisation.

Aim This feasibility analysis of electronic medical records (EMRs) aimed to understand the potential study population, assess patient numbers across disease severities and evaluate EMRs as a data source for NOVELTY.

Methods EMRs from patients with asthma and/or COPD were identified from national databases covering primary and specialist care in 11 countries (Table). Disease severity was classified using treatment- and/or lung function-based algorithms for asthma and COPD. EMR variable coverage and completeness were assessed for standardised clinical, laboratory and physiological data and patient-reported outcomes (PROs).

Results EMRs for 921,888 patients with asthma, 958,945 with COPD and 117,893 with both diagnoses were identified. EMRs routinely documented patient demographics and characteristics, but many disease- and treatment-related data, and PROs/symptoms required for evaluation of disease severity and clinical outcomes were frequently missing (not collected or not documented; Table). Disease severity could not be classified in 561,837 patients (asthma) and 355,743 patients (COPD), representing 22–100% and 7–85% of patients across countries.

Conclusions EMR analysis revealed numbers of patients per country potentially eligible for NOVELTY. Many variables required to meet NOVELTY objectives were missing in EMRs (e.g. lung function and PRO/symptoms); therefore, variables in