

Spirometric Indices after Bronchodilator Test in Obstructive Lung Disease

Amir Houshang Mehrparvar*, Seyed Jalil Mirmohammadi, and Mohammad Mehdi Sohrabi

Department of Occupational Medicine, Shahid Rahnamoun Hospital, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran

Received: 11 Jan. 2009; Received in revised form: 28 Jul. 2009; Accepted: 19 Oct. 2009

Abstract- Bronchial responsiveness to bronchodilator medications is usually tested to establish reversibility of airflow obstruction. Among the various tests to establish bronchodilator response, FEV₁, FEF_{25-75%} or FEF_{50%}, and FVC are the most widely used. In a cross-sectional study, we assessed spirometric responses after administration of bronchodilator in 187 workers with obstructive pattern in spirometry. Considering responsiveness to bronchodilator (200cc and 12% increase in FEV₁ or FVC), the study cases were divided into responsive or non-responsive groups, and the average increase in spirometric indices were measured and compared between two groups. 35.8% of cases were responsive to bronchodilator. Among responsive cases, FEV₁ was the most frequent index increased significantly; And PEF and FVC were the least frequent ones. The highest mean increase from baseline after administration of bronchodilator was observed in FEF_{75%}. Increases in all indices were significantly higher in responsive group. The increase in FEV₁% predicted was inversely correlated with baseline FEV₁. In conclusion, we consider that FEV₁ is the most reliable spirometric index for assessing bronchodilator response. And Bronchial reversibility has an inverse relationship with baseline measures.

© 2010 Tehran University of Medical Sciences. All rights reserved.

Acta Medica Iranica 2010; 48(4): 226-230.

Key words: Spirometry; bronchodilator agents; lung disease; obstructive

Introduction

Spirometry is a medical test that measures the volume of air an individual inhales or exhales and the rate at which the volume is changing as a function of time. Results of the test are usually compared with reference values to make an assessment (interpretation) of them (1).

The most important spirometric indices used are: forced vital capacity (FVC), forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁), FEV₁/FVC ratio, peak expiratory flow (PEF), forced expiratory volume between 25% and 75% of FVC (FEF_{25-75%}), forced expiratory volume at 25%, 50% and 75% of FVC (FEF_{25%}, FEF_{50%}, FEF_{75%}).

An obstructive ventilatory defect is a disproportionate reduction of maximal airflow from the lung in relation to the maximal volume that can be displaced from the lung and is defined by a reduced FEV₁/FVC ratio below the 5th percentile of the predicted value (2). This definition contrasts with other definitions which utilize a fixed FEV₁/FVC ratio at 0.7 rather than at the 5th percentile (3). However, in practice FEV₁ and FVC measurements that are > 80% of predicted values and FEV₁/FVC ratio > 70-75% are typically considered normal (4).

A method of categorizing the severity of lung function impairment based on the FEV₁% predicted is: Mild: >70, Moderate: 60–69, Moderately severe: 50–59, Severe: 35–49, and Very severe: <35 (2, 3).

Bronchial responsiveness to bronchodilator medications is an integrated physiological response. Short-acting β₂-agonists, such as salbutamol, are recommended for testing bronchial responsiveness (2, 3). Bronchodilator response is usually tested to establish reversibility of airflow obstruction, to aid in diagnosis, and to help plan long-term bronchodilator therapy. Among the various tests to establish bronchodilator response, FEV₁, FEF_{25-75%} or FEF_{50%}, and FVC are the most widely used (5).

Studies show a tendency for the calculated bronchodilator response to increase with decreasing baseline FVC or FEV₁, regardless of whether the response was considered as an absolute change or as a percent of the initial value (2).

Values 12% and 200 mL compared with baseline during a single testing session suggest a “significant” bronchodilatation. (2, 3). But for other spirometric indices there isn't a consensus about significant increase. Some authors recommend a 30 percent increase in

*Corresponding Author: Amir Houshang Mehrparvar

Department of Occupational Medicine, Shahid Rahnamoun Hospital, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran
Tel: +98 351 6229192, Fax: +98 351 6229194, E-mail: ahmehrparvar@ssu.ac.ir

isovolume FEF_{25-75%} or FEF_{50%} above baseline are acceptable criteria for bronchodilator response (5).

We designed this study to assess the amount of increase in all spirometric indices in patients with obstructive spirometric pattern and compare it between responsive and non-responsive cases to bronchodilator.

Patients and Methods

In a cross-sectional study, we assessed spirometric responses after administration of bronchodilator in workers referred to Yazd occupational medicine clinic with obstructive pattern in spirometry (regardless of diagnosis) in a period of one year (from May 2007 till May 2008).

We considered FEV₁/FVC ratio < 75% as obstructive spirometry. Then post-bronchodilator responses were assessed among them. Female workers (because of little sample size, only 5 persons) and cases with mixed pattern of lung function in spirometry were excluded from the study. At last 187 male individuals entered the study. Spirometry was performed for all of them (spirometer: spirolab II, MIR, Italy) in our respiratory lab in a standard situation (in a sitting position, in the morning, at BTPS) by an occupational medicine resident with direct supervision of an occupational medicine specialist. The highest of three technically acceptable recordings was taken (1). After baseline test, they were administered bronchodilator (salbutamol, 400µg, inhalational) and were tested again after 15 minutes (1). Before performing the test, all factors intervening or contraindicating spirometry were questioned. Considering responsiveness to bronchodilator (200cc and 12% increase in FEV₁ or FVC), the study cases were divided into two groups: responsive or non-responsive (2). The average increase in main spirometric indices (*i.e.* FVC, FEV₁, FEV₁/FVC, and PEF) and volumes of isoflow (FEF_{25%}, FEF_{50%}, FEF_{75%}, and FEF_{25-75%}) were measured and compared between two groups. We used SPSS (ver.11.5) for data analysis. Descriptive indices such as mean, median, standard deviation, standard error and range were used for quantitative data, and independent samples t test and also one-way ANOVA were used for comparing means. *P* values of 0.05 were deemed to be statistically significant, and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated. We obtained an informed consent from all participants. We didn't have any conflict of interest.

Results

The mean age, height, and weight of the subjects was 37.43±10.61 (range: 16-69), 170.26±6.23 (range: 155-189), and 74.50±13.75 (range: 46-117), respectively.

Descriptive statistics of spirometric indices before and after administration of bronchodilator are shown in table 1.

The cases were divided into two groups considering their responsiveness to bronchodilator: 67 persons (35.8%) were responsive and 120 persons (64.2%) were non-responsive to bronchodilator.

The mean age in responsive and non-responsive group was 36.37±11.37 and 38.03±10.15, respectively and the difference was not statistically significant (*P* = 0.3). And also the average height and weight were not significantly different between two groups (*P* = 0.7 and *P* = 0.2 for weight and height, respectively).

Among responsive cases, FEV₁ was the most frequent index increased significantly. In our study, among 67 responsive cases, 44 persons (65.7%) showed significant increase in FEV₁ only, 5 persons (7.5%) in FVC only and 18 persons (26.9%) in both FEV₁ and FVC. If we consider 30% increase as positive response for other indices, frequency of responsiveness in each index is as following: 19 persons (28.35%), 60 persons (89.55%), 51 persons (76.12%), 61 persons (91.04%), and 55 persons (82.08%) showed significant increase in PEF, FEF_{25-75%}, FEF_{25%}, FEF_{50%}, FEF_{75%}, respectively.

Mean baseline spirometric indices (*i.e.* before bronchodilator administration) in responsive group were significantly lower compared with non-responsive group (Table 2).

The highest mean increase from baseline after administration of bronchodilator in responsive group was observed in FEF_{75%}. Generally increases seen in volumes of isoflow were more than FEV₁ and FVC (*i.e.* 80.55% in FEF_{75%}, 61.21% in FEF_{25-75%}, 60.92% in FEF_{50%}, 47.30% in FEF_{25%} versus 23.20% for PEF, 21.03% for FEV₁, 11.11% for FEV₁/FVC and 9.35% for FVC). Besides main indices (*i.e.* FEV₁ and FVC), increases in all other indices were significantly higher in responsive group. Mean increases of spirometric indices in both groups are shown in table 3.

According to baseline FEV₁, all cases were divided into 5 groups of severity. The most frequent severity observed was mild obstruction (144 persons, 74.9%); and 22 persons (11.8%), 7 persons (3.7%), 15 persons (8%), and 3 persons (1.6%) showed moderate, moderately severe, severe, and very severe obstruction, respectively.

Spirometric indices after bronchodilator test in obstructive lung disease

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of spirometric indices before and after bronchodilator administration.

Spirometric indices	Mean	SD	Median	Range
FEV ₁ before bronc. (lit)	2.92	0.78	3.01	0.86-4.59
FEV ₁ after bronc. (lit)	3.19	0.81	3.24	0.93-5.35
FEV ₁ % pred. before bronc.	77.63	16.78	80	29-130
FEV ₁ % pred. after bronc.	85.06	16.12	88	35-135
FVC before bronc. (lit)	4.31	0.96	4.32	1.57-6.67
FVC after bronc. (lit)	4.41	0.86	4.39	2.18-6.64
FVC% pred. before bronc.	95.72	16.18	97	45-169
FVC% pred. after bronc.	98.32	13.46	99	61-152
FEV ₁ /FVC before bronc.	67.21	8.48	70	30.80-84.60
FEV ₁ /FVC after bronc.	71.83	9.00	74.15	35.10-93
PEF before bronc (lit/s)	6.41	1.88	6.71	1.31-10.48
PEF after bronc (lit/s)	7.11	1.86	7.35	1.53-11.84
PEF% pred. before bronc	71.12	19.72	72.50	17-117
PEF% pred after bronc	79.09	18.66	81	22-119
FEF _{25-75%} before bronc (lit/s)	2.077	0.72	2.12	0.39-3.59
FEF _{25-75%} after bronc (lit/s)	2.66	0.89	2.69	0.47-5.10
FEF _{25-75%} % pred. before bronc	47.10	14.57	49	10-82
FEF _{25-75%} % pred. after bronc	60.47	17.89	61	13-112
FEF _{25%} before bronc (lit/s)	4.29	1.53	4.34	0.64-7.94
FEF _{25%} after bronc (lit/s)	5.22	1.74	5.42	0.82-8.66
FEF _{25%} % pred. before bronc	55.26	18.72	58	9-109
FEF _{25%} % pred. after bronc	67.31	20.56	70	13-103
FEF _{50%} before bronc (lit/s)	2.21	0.79	2.26	0.34-4.21
FEF _{50%} after bronc (lit/s)	2.82	0.97	2.78	0.44-4.82
FEF _{50%} % pred before bronc	44.28	14.61	47	8-84
FEF _{50%} % pred after bronc	56.77	17.77	58	10-100
FEF _{75%} before bronc (lit/s)	0.84	0.34	0.84	0.16-1.93
FEF _{75%} after bronc (lit/s)	1.12	0.44	1.08	0.16-2.43
FEF _{75%} % pred. before bronc	39.22	13.35	40	11-101
FEF _{75%} % pred. after bronc	51.84	17.09	51	10-103

Pred.: predicted, bronc: bronchodilator administration

Table 2. Comparison of predicted spirometric indices before bronchodilator administration between two groups.

Pred. indices before bronch.	Mean (SD)		SE		Significance* (95% CI)
	R	N-R	R	N-R	
FEV ₁	66.24 (17.63)	84.00 (12.40)	2.15	1.13	<0.001 (13.40-22.12)
FVC	87.52 (17.49)	100.30 (13.44)	2.14	1.23	<0.001 (8.26-17.30)
FEV ₁ /FVC	62.83 (10.22)	69.62 (6.18)	1.25	0.56	<0.001 (4.41-9.15)
PEF	59.60 (16.92)	77.31 (18.34)	2.09	1.66	<0.001 (12.29-23.13)
FEF _{25-75%}	37.84 (14.75)	52.28 (11.66)	1.81	1.07	<0.001 (10.54-18.33)
FEF _{25%}	42.43 (17.52)	62.34 (15.34)	2.17	1.41	<0.001 (14.98-24.82)
FEF _{50%}	34.95 (14.65)	49.43 (11.81)	1.81	1.08	<0.001 (10.54-18.40)
FEF _{75%}	33.32 (15.55)	42.47 (10.71)	1.92	0.98	<0.001 (5.29-13)

Pred.: predicted, SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error of mean, R: responsive to bronchodilator, N-R: non-responsive to bronchodilator, CI: confidence interval * P value for difference between means

Table 3. Comparison of average increase in spirometric indices after bronchodilator administration between two groups.

Increase in spirometric indices after bronch	Mean (SD)			SE			Significance* (95% CI)
	R	N-R	Total	R	N-R	total	
FEV ₁ (mL)	476.26 (179.99)	169.50 (131.57)	279.41 (210.53)	21.99	12.01	15.39	<0.001 (257.09-356.44)
FEV ₁ % pred (%)	21.03 (11.39)	5.22 (3.91)	10.88 (10.66)	1.39	0.35	0.77	<0.001 (12.95-18.67)
FVC (mL)	280.00 (251.79)	6.58 (151.58)	104.54 (233.40)	30.76	13.83	17.06	<0.001 (206.43-340.39)
FVC% pred (%)	9.35 (10.02)	0.35 (3.49)	3.58 (7.88)	1.22	0.31	0.57	<0.001 (6.47-11.52)
FEV ₁ /FVC (%)	11.11 (8.87)	5.01 (4.67)	7.17 (7.08)	1.09	0.42	0.52	<0.001 (3.75-8.41)
PEF (mL/s)	1032.72 (852.39)	518.17 (871.37)	700.57 (879.01)	104.92	79.54	65.77	<0.001 (253.11-776.01)
PEF% pred (%)	23.22 (24.55)	8.52 (15.24)	13.74 (20.27)	3.02	1.39	1.48	<0.001 (8.09-21.30)
FEF _{25-75%} (mL/s)	937.57 (346.52)	390.00 (452.30)	586.41 (458.66)	52.35	31.90	33.81	<0.001 (433.37-661.77)
FEF _{25-75%} % pred (%)	61.21 (32.57)	16.57 (13.90)	32.58 (31.01)	4.01	1.28	2.28	<0.001 (36.25-53.01)
FEF _{25%} (mL/s)	1406.46 (728.17)	671.44 (698.00)	932.51 (789.98)	90.31	64.50	53.39	<0.001 (518.98-951.05)
FEF _{25%} % pred (%)	47.30 (23.26)	13.91 (14.05)	25.77 (23.96)	2.88	1.29	1.77	<0.001 (27.10-39.67)
FEF _{50%} (mL/s)	946.92 (450.44)	429.55 (403.06)	613.32 (487.26)	55.87	37.10	36.02	<0.001 (389.22-645.50)
FEF _{50%} % pred (%)	60.92 (33.86)	16.72 (14.54)	32.42 (31.45)	4.20	1.33	2.32	<0.001 (35.41-52.97)
FEF _{75%} (mL/s)	483.84 (273.20)	167.79 (214.65)	280.05 (280.83)	33.88	19.76	20.76	<0.001 (238.9-393.80)
FEF _{75%} % pred (%)	80.55 (60.29)	18.14 (21.10)	40.43 (49.69)	7.47	1.95	3.68	<0.001 (47.00-77.81)

Pred.: predicted, SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error of mean, R: responsive to bronchodilator, N-R: non-responsive to bronchodilator, CI: confidence interval, mL: Mili liter, mL/s: mili liter/second.

* *P* value for difference between means

The increase in FEV₁% predicted was inversely correlated with baseline FEV₁ and the difference in FEV₁ increase among 4 groups (*i.e.* 7.79%, 13.23%, 19.85%, 27.66% for groups 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively) was significant ($P < 0.001$); Because of low sample size in group 5 (*i.e.* very severe obstruction), we didn't consider this group in this analysis.

After bronchodilator administration, 85 persons (45%) had normal FEV₁/FVC ratio (without obstruction) and 101 persons (54%) remained obstructive.

Discussion

Spirometry measures the volume and flow of air into and out of the lungs as a function of time. Obstructive lung disease is shown by a reduced FEV₁/FVC ratio

below the 5th percentile of the predicted value or (in practice) below 70-75%. (1, 2, 4, 6).

Bronchodilator response is usually tested to establish reversibility of airflow obstruction, to aid in diagnosis.

In our study, after administration of bronchodilator (salbutamol) we assessed responsiveness to the drug. Less than 40% of cases showed reversibility to bronchodilator. Age, height and weight didn't affect responsiveness, but baseline spirometric indices significantly affected responsiveness (*i.e.* those with lower spirometric volumes showed more responsiveness), other studies also show a tendency for the calculated bronchodilator response to increase with decreasing baseline FVC or FEV₁, regardless of whether the response was considered as an absolute change or as a percent of the initial value (2, 4, 8).

Spirometric indices after bronchodilator test in obstructive lung disease

Between spirometric indices (except for volumes of isoflow) FEV₁ was the one with most frequent increase after bronchodilator administration. From our data it seems that FEV₁ is the most reliable spirometric index for bronchodilator response (8, 9, 10, 11, 12), and PEF and FVC are the least reliable indices; although some studies has shown a positive correlation between increase in FEV₁ and FVC (13). Among other indices, FEF_{25-75%} and FEF_{50%} are the most reliable ones, which is consistent with the results of Ninković M, et al. study (9). In conclusion, we consider that FEV₁ is the most reliable spirometric index for assessing bronchodilator response. Among other indices, FEF_{25-75%} and FEF_{50%} are also useful (though with 30% increase from baseline), but PEF and FVC, because of high variability, are not useful for this test. Bronchial reversibility has an inverse relationship with baseline measures. Although, Further studies are required to determine the clinical significance of these findings.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. Abbas Ghoreishi, Dr. Zargham Sadeghi, and Dr. Fatemeh Fathi, occupational medicine residents, for their collaboration in this project.

References

1. American Thoracic Society. Standardization of Spirometry 1994 Update. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1995;152(3):1107-36.
2. Pellegrino R, Viegi G, Brusasco V, Crapo RO, Burgos F, Casaburi R, et al. Interpretative strategies for lung function tests. *Eur Respir J* 2005;26(5):948-68.
3. Garay SM. Pulmonary function testing. In: Rom WN, Markowitz SB, editors. *Environmental and Occupational Medicine*. 4th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2007. p. 200-35.
4. Weir NA, Gulati M, Redlich CA. Diseases of the lung and pleura. In: Rosenstock L, Cullen MR, Brodtkin CA, Redlich CA, editor. *Textbook of Clinical Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier Saunders; 2005. p. 289-91.
5. Shim C. Response to bronchodilators. *Clin Chest Med* 1989;10(2):155-64.
6. Neukirch F, Cartier A. Measure of bronchial hyperreactivity in epidemiology. *Rev Mal Respir* 1994;11(2):101-9.
7. Teculescu D, Racineux JL. The analysis of bronchial obstruction and its reversibility after bronchodilators using a study of "density-effect" on maximum flow. *Rev Mal Respir* 1991;8(1):29-37.
8. Kabondo P, Orehek J. Reversibility of airway obstruction in asthma and chronic bronchitis. *Bull Eur Physiopathol Respir* 1977;13(6):829-36.
9. Ninković M, Ranković B, Plavec G. Evaluation of the bronchodilator test. *Vojnosanit Pregl* 1991;48(1):19-22.
10. Tweeddale PM, Alexander F, McHardy GJ. Short term variability in FEV₁ and bronchodilator responsiveness in patients with obstructive ventilatory defects. *Thorax* 1987;42(7):487-90.
11. Brand PL, Quanjer PH, Postma DS, Kerstjens HA, Koëter GH, Dekhuijzen PN, et al. Interpretation of bronchodilator response in patients with obstructive airways disease. The Dutch Chronic Non-Specific Lung Disease (CNSLD) Study Group. *Thorax* 1992;47(6):429-36.
12. Chhabra SK, Vijayan VK, Gupta R, De S. Expression of bronchodilator response: comparison of four indices. *Respir Med* 2002;96(8):611-4.
13. Schermer T, Heijdra Y, Zadel S, van den Bemt L, Boonman-de Winter L, Dekhuijzen R, et al. Flow and volume responses after routine salbutamol reversibility testing in mild to very severe COPD. *Respir Med* 2007;101(6):1355-62.