treatment of this patient population and may guide future interventions.

P221 COMPARING THE PERCEPTION OF FEED-BACK MECHANISM OF THE BREEZHALER® DEVICE WITH THE ELLIPTA® DEVICE IN PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE (COPD): THE ADVANTAGE STUDY

¹P Altman, ²MA Bergna, ³GR García, ⁴K Kostikas, ⁵T Guerin, ⁶AV Pino, ⁵J Whiteford. ¹Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, East Hanover, USA; ²Respiratory Research, CEMER Centro Médico de Enfermedades Respiratorias, Vicente López, Argentina; ³Pneumology, Cenasma Institute, La Plata, Argentina; ⁴Novartis Pharma AG, Basel, Switzerland; ⁵Novartis Ireland Limited, Dublin, Ireland; ⁶Novartis Argentina S.A., Buenos Aires, Argentina

10.1136/thoraxjnl-2016-209333.364

Background and aims Patient preference and satisfaction with inhalers are important factors that may impact adherence to treatment and hence its outcome.¹ The ADVANTAGE study compared the Breezhaler® and the Ellipta® inhalers for patient perception of feedback mechanism and the comfort of the mouth piece, in COPD patients, naïve to dry powder inhaler use.

Methods This open-label cross-over study randomised (1:1) patients (≥40 years) with COPD [all severities as per GOLD 2014] and smoking history of ≥10 pack-years to use both the Breezhaler® and Ellipta® devices in differing sequences with a separation of ≥5 minutes between devices. After inhalation, patients completed a questionnaire² containing 4 questions that captured patients' perception of the feedback mechanism (mean of first three questions) and comfort of the mouth piece (fourth question). Questions were answered on a scale of 1 (lower preference) to 5 (higher preference), a Wilcoxon signed rank test was performed to test the difference between devices at a 2-sided 2.5% level of significance for both endpoints. Safety assessments

included adverse events, physical examination, vital signs, height and weight.

Results One hundred patients (64 men and 36 women) with a mean (SD) age of 65.2 (9.07) years were randomised to inhale sequentially through both devices. Thirty two patients were current smokers and had a mean (SD) duration of COPD for 6.1 (4.82) years. Overall, patients perceived that the Breezhaler® inhaler offered greater confidence of dose delivery and better comfort of the mouth piece (mean (SD) score 4.3 (0.70) and 4.3 (0.82); respectively) vs. the Ellipta® inhaler [mean (SD) score 3.6 (1.05) and 3.9 (0.84); respectively] (Figure). No safety signals were identified during the study.

Conclusions In this study, COPD patients had greater confidence of receiving full dose with the Breezhaler® device and better comfort with the mouth piece compared with the Ellipta® device.

REFERENCES

- 1 PJ Anderson. *Eur Respir Rev* 2005;**14**(96):109–116.
- 2 Altman P, et al. *Prim Care Respir Med* 2016;**26**:CR052.

P222 INPUT OF A PATIENT ADVISORY GROUP INTO EVALUATING THE BENEFIT: RISK PROFILE OF EXISTING AND POTENTIAL COPD THERAPIES

DR Burrage, M Tumilty, S Ruickbie, EH Baker. *St George's, University of London, London, UK*

10.1136/thoraxjnl-2016-209333.365

Introduction People with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) have considerable disability and reduced life expectancy, despite current treatments. New medicines are required, but few successfully complete clinical trials and become established in practice. During drug development, understanding the nature and magnitude of benefits relevant to patients and risks they will accept to achieve these is important, particularly where the drug has a narrow therapeutic index. Our aim was to explore patient

Data are presented as mean (standard deviation); Δ, treatment difference; CI, confidence interval

* p<.0001

Abstract P221 Figure 1 Mean Scores of the analysis of patients preference of the Breezhaler and the Ellipta devices