

Tiotropium improved lung function more than ipratropium in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

van Noord JA, Bantje Th A, Eland ME, et al, on behalf of the Dutch Tiotropium Study Group. A randomised controlled comparison of tiotropium and ipratropium in the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Thorax* 2000 Apr;55:289-94.

Source of funding:
Boehringer Ingelheim
BV

For correspondence:
Dr J A van Noord,
Department of
Respiratory Diseases,
Atrium Medisch
Centrum, Hemri
Dunantstraat 5, 6419
PC Heerlen, the
Netherlands. Fax +31
455767534.

QUESTION: In patients with stable chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), what is the long term effectiveness and safety of tiotropium compared with those of ipratropium?

Design

Randomised [allocation concealed*]†, blinded (patient and outcome assessor)*, controlled trial with 13 weeks of follow up.

*See glossary.

†Information provided by the author.

Setting

14 centres in the Netherlands.

Tiotropium v ipratropium at 13 weeks in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (lung function improvement, in litres, compared with baseline at start of study)‡

Outcomes	Tiotropium	Ipratropium	Mean difference (95% CI)
FEV ₁ trough	0.16	0.03	0.13 (0.08 to 0.18)
FEV ₁ peak (at 50 d)	0.38	0.30	0.08 (0.02 to 0.15)
FEV ₁ mean (over 6 h)	0.26	0.18	0.08 (0.03 to 0.13)
FVC trough	0.39	0.18	0.21 (0.10 to 0.32)
FVC mean (at 50 d)	0.62	0.45	0.17 (0.50 to 0.29)

‡FVC=forced vital capacity.

Patients

288 patients ≥40 years of age (mean age 64 y, 83% men) who were current or past smokers with a diagnosis of COPD and stable airways obstruction, an FEV₁ < 65% of the predicted normal rate, and a ratio of FEV₁ to forced vital capacity (FVC) of < 70%. Exclusion criteria included a history of asthma, allergic rhinitis, or atopy; a recent history of myocardial infarction, heart failure, or cardiac arrhythmia requiring drug treatment; upper respiratory tract infection in the past 6 weeks; and hypersensitivity to anticholinergic drugs. 90% completed all tests.

Intervention

191 patients were assigned to tiotropium, 18 µg once daily, delivered by a dry powder inhaler system; and 97 were assigned to ipratropium, 40 µg 4 times daily, delivered by a metred dose inhaler. Each group also received placebo doses of the other treatment.

COMMENTARY

The anticholinergic agent ipratropium bromide is frontline treatment for patients with non-asthmatic COPD.¹ In most of these patients, ipratropium used alone is more effective as a bronchodilator than is an inhaled β-agonist used alone. (Combination therapy, however, is often more effective than either agent used alone.) Ipratropium bromide has a relatively short duration of action, requiring inhalation every 6 to 8 hours. In addition, ipratropium non-selectively inhibits all 3 of the known muscarinic receptors in the human airway (M₁, M₂, and M₃). This is of theoretical concern because the M₂ receptor normally acts as a feedback inhibitory receptor; blockade of the M₂ receptor results in increased acetylcholine release in the airway and could attenuate or reverse the bronchodilation achieved by blockade of the M₁ and M₃ receptors.² The clinical relevance of this issue is uncertain.

Tiotropium is a potent and long lasting muscarinic antagonist that has "kinetic selectivity" for M₁ and M₃ receptors over M₂ receptors.² A single dose of inhaled tiotropium produces bronchodilation for 24 hours in patients with COPD,³ and attenuates methacholine induced bronchoconstriction for 48 hours in patients with asthma.⁴ Once daily dosing for 4 weeks in stable patients with COPD provides sustained bronchodilation with an excellent safety profile.⁵

The study by van Noord *et al* provides important data, showing the superiority of tiotropium (18 µg once/d) over the usual dose of ipratropium (40 µg 4 times/d). Patients were permitted to use many of their own usual medications (including methylxanthines, inhaled steroids, and oral steroids up to 10 mg of prednisone/d) during the course of the trial, showing the effectiveness of tiotropium in a meaningful clinical context. Tiotropium, not yet approved for use in the United States, appears to have great potential in the long term maintenance treatment of COPD.

Herbert P Wiedemann, MD
Cleveland Clinic Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio, USA

Main outcome measures

Lung function, peak expiratory flow (PEF), use of concomitant salbutamol, and adverse effects.

Main results

Trough, peak, and mean FEV₁ response and trough and mean FVC response showed greater improvement with tiotropium than with ipratropium (table). Morning and evening PEF was consistently better with tiotropium (p < 0.05). Use of concomitant salbutamol was lower in the tiotropium group (p < 0.05). The groups did not differ for adverse effects.

Conclusions

In patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, tiotropium improved lung function more than ipratropium. The safety profiles of the 2 drugs were similar.

- 1 American Thoracic Society. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1995;152:S77-121.
- 2 Barnes PJ. *Chest* 2000;117:S63-6.
- 3 Maesen FP, Smeets JJ, Sledsens TJ, et al. Dutch Study Group. *Eur Respir J* 1995;8:1506-13.
- 4 O'Connor BJ, Towse LJ, Barnes PJ. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1996;154:876-80.
- 5 Littner MR, Ilowite JS, Tashkin DP, et al. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2000;161:1136-42.