INHALED IPRATROPIUM BROMIDE AND FENOTEROL BEFORE BRONCHOFIBROSCOPY II. EFFECT ON DETERIORATION IN LUNG FUNCTION

H. PUOLIJOKI AND A. PALOJOKI

Departments of Diseases of the Chest and Clinical Allergology, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

ABSTRACT

In a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, fenoterol as a premedication was shown to have better bronchodilative properties, especially on the small airways, than ipratropium bromide or placebo in 181 nonasthmatic patients undergoing fiberoptic bronchoscopy for diagnostic reasons. When the patients were assessed 20 minutes after the procedure, the deterioration in lung function induced by either the bronchoscopy itself or the lidocaine used as a topical anesthetic was minor in all groups, compared with baseline values.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies¹⁻³ have verified that bronchofibroscopy induces deterioration in lung function. The topical anesthetic lidocaine, which has been shown to cause bronchoconstriction in hyperreactive airways,^{4,5} may be the principal cause of decreased lung function.⁶ These findings raise the question of whether lung function impairment during bronchoscopy can be prevented by premedication with inhaled ipratropium bromide (IB), a muscarinic antagonist, or fenoterol (FEN), a beta₂-adrenergic drug.

This double-blind, placebo-controlled trial was designed to compare the effects of IB inhalation powder with those of FEN and placebo powders as a premedication before bronchofibroscopy.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

A total of 181 nonasthmatic patients (107 men and 74 women) participated in the study. The mean age was 53 years (range, 21 to 75 years). Ninety of the patients were smokers, of whom 68 were men. All patients underwent bronchofibroscopy for diagnostic reasons, primarily because of pulmonary

Address correspondence to: Hannu Puolijoki, M.D., Department of Internal Medicine, Etelä-Pohjanmaa Central Hospital, SF-60220 Seinäjoki, Finland.

Received for publication on April 27, 1993. Printed in the U.S.A.

Reproduction in whole or part is not permitted.

infiltrate, cough, or hemoptysis. Patients were excluded if they had chronic cardiac arrhythmia or used antiarrhythmic agents, had thyrotoxicosis, or used antihistamine drugs, or were receiving chronic sympathomimetic or anticholinergic medication.

Patients were randomly assigned to receive either 0.08 mg of ipratropium bromide,* 0.4 mg of fenoterol hydrobromide,† or identical placebo (two capsules each) inhalation powder 1 hour before bronchofibroscopy. Separate prerandomized series in blocks of six patients each were used for smokers and nonsmokers. All study drugs were administered using an Ingelheim inhalator. All patients also received 10 mg of diazepam‡ IM 1 hour before the procedure. Before the premedication was given and 20 minutes after the bronchoscopy was performed, each patient underwent ventilation-volume spirometry (Jaeger Masterlab ML/t-FP, Würtzburg, Germany).

Topical anesthesia included puffs of 10% lidocaine§ spray onto the oropharynx and 4% lidocaine drops into the trachea. When needed, additional 2% lidocaine, the quantity of which was recorded, was administered via the bronchoscope. The doses were adjusted individually to achieve appropriate local anesthesia. All bronchoscopies were performed by the same investigator, with the patient in a supine position and the bronchoscope passed transorally. Olympus BF types P20D, B3R, 10, and 20 and Pentax type FB19H bronchoscopes were used, all with a tip size of 6 mm.

The protocol was accepted by the joint ethical committee of Turku University and Turku University Central Hospital, and the patients gave their informed consent. Student's t test and general linear models were used in the statistical analysis. A P value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Bronchofibroscopy induced deterioration in peak expiratory flow (PEF) values in all three groups studied (Table I). The change was statistically significant in the IB and placebo groups but not in the FEN group. The differences in the trends toward either an increase or decrease in forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁), forced vital capacity (FVC), and forced inspiratory volume in 1 second (FIV₁) did not differ among the study groups, although FEN tended to increase these parameters, particularly FEV₁ in nonsmokers (from 3.09 to 3.18 L; P = 0.033).

In the parameters usually used to measure small airways function, a clear benefit was seen with FEN (Table II). Both IB and FEN significantly

^{*} Trademark: Atrovent[®] (Boehringer Ingelheim International GMBH, Ingelheim am Rhein, Germany).

[†] Trademark: Berotec® (Boehringer Ingelheim International GMBH, Ingelheim am Rhein, Germany).

[‡] Trademark: Diapam® (Orion, Espoo, Finland).

[§] Trademark: Xylocaine® (Suomen Astra, Kirkkonummi, Finland).

	īđ	Ipratropium Bromide	de		Fenoterol			Placebo	
	Smokers (n = 31)	Nonsmokers $(n = 30)$	All (n = 61)	$\begin{array}{l} \text{Smokers} \\ \text{(n = 26)} \end{array}$	Nonsmokers (n = 33)	All (n = 59)	Smokers (n = 31)	Nonsmokers $(n = 30)$	All (n = 61)
FEV ₁ (L) Change in means	$2.53 \pm 0.22 + 0.02$	2.74 ± 0.33 + 0.04		2.68 ± 0.27 + 0.09	3.09 ± 0.22 +0.09	$2.91 \pm 0.24 + 0.09$		2.65 ± 0.19 + 0.10	$2.72 \pm 0.22 - 0.04$
FVC (L) Change in means	3.85 ± 0.27 -0.19	4.01 ± 0.20 -0.09		$\begin{array}{c} 0.1319\\ 3.91 \pm 0.30\\ + 0.01\\ \end{array}$	4.17 ± 0.22 -0.07	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0098 \\ 4.06 \pm 0.26 \\ -0.04 \end{array}$	0.3611 3.69 ± 0.31 +0.02	0.2504 4.12 ± 0.23 -0.04	0.1620 3.91 ± 0.27 -0.02
P PEF (L/sec) Change in means	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0632 \\ 7.73 \pm 1.20 \\ -0.67 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.004 \\ 8.23 \pm 1.28 \\ -0.40 \end{array}$	$0.0012 \\ 7.96 \pm 1.24 \\ -0.53$	0.9110 8.09 ± 1.16 -0.32	0.0752 8.98 ± 1.07 -0.17	0.2765 8.59 ± 1.10 -0.24	$\begin{array}{c} 0.4936 \\ 8.41 \pm 1.47 \\ -0.84 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.6346 \\ 7.60 \pm 0.85 \\ -0.59 \end{array}$	
P FIV ₁ (L) Change in means P	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0042\\ 2.61 \pm 0.70\\ -0.10\\ 0.4481\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.1624 \\ 2.89 \pm 0.71 \\ -0.02 \\ 0.2020 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0023\\ 2.75 \pm 0.70\\ -0.09\\ 0.1470\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.1676\\ 3.00\pm0.69\\ -0.26\\ 0.0255\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.3679\\ 3.19\pm0.82\\ -0.21\\ 0.1112\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.1035\\ 3.10\pm0.76\\ -0.029\\ 0.0076\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0034\ 2.71\pm0.59\ -0.01\ 0.6288\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0008\\ 2.87\pm0.59\\ 0\\ 0.5558\end{array}$	
Data are mean \pm SD. FEV ₁ = forced expiratory volu	SD. Diratory volume in	1 second; FVC	= forced vital ca	apacity; PEF = p	eak expiratory fl	1 second; FVC = forced vital capacity; PEF = peak expiratory flow; FIV, = forced inspiratory volume in 1 second	d inspiratory vol	ume in 1 second	

INHALED IPRATROPIUM BROMIDE AND FENOTEROL II

	lp Ip	Ipratropium Bromide	de		Fenoterol			Placebo	
i	Smokers (n = 31)	Nonsmokers (n = 30)	All (n = 61)	Smokers (n = 26)	Nonsmokers (n = 33)	All (n = 59)	Smokers (n = 31)	Nonsmokers (n = 30)	All (n = 61)
FEV ₂₅₋₇₅ (L/sec) Change in means P FEF ₅₀ (L/sec) Change in means P FEF ₂₅ (L/sec) Change in means P	$\begin{array}{c} 1.70 \pm 0.47 \\ +0.09 \\ 0.2322 \\ 0.2322 \\ -0.13 \\ +0.13 \\ +0.13 \\ +0.13 \\ +0.13 \\ +1.17 \pm 1.09 \\ 1.17 \pm 1.09 \\ 0.3365 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.24 \pm 0.40 \\ + 0.48 \\ 0.0002 \\ 2.87 \pm 0.64 \\ + 0.21 \\ 0.0663 \\ 1.46 \pm 0.40 \\ + 0.20 \\ 0.0009 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.96 \pm 0.44 \\ + 0.18 \\ 0.0007 \\ 2.57 \pm 0.60 \\ + 0.16 \\ + 0.16 \\ 1.32 \pm 0.83 \\ + 0.141 \\ 0.1519 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.93 \pm 0.52 \\ + 0.15 \\ 0.1460 \\ 0.1460 \\ 2.61 \pm 0.61 \\ + 0.36 \\ 1.08 \pm 1.55 \\ + 0.33 \\ + 0.316 \\ 1.08 \pm 1.55 \\ - 0.2816 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.76 \pm 0.47 \\ + 0.51 \\ - 0.6001 \\ 3.55 \pm 0.84 \\ + 0.59 \\ - 0.0047 \\ 1.28 \pm 0.35 \\ < 0.0047 \\ < 0.0001 \\ < 0.0001 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.41 \pm 0.52 \\ + 0.35 \\ - 0.0001 \\ 3.13 \pm 0.75 \\ + 0.49 \\ - 0.0001 \\ 1.23 \pm 1.05 \\ + 0.36 \\ - 0.0159 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.04 \pm 0.31 \\ -0.05 \\ 0.4339 \\ 0.4339 \\ 2.69 \pm 0.57 \\ -0.10 \\ 0.2626 \\ +0.24 \\ +0.02 \\ +0.764 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.06 \pm 0.46 \\ + 0.04 \\ 0.6764 \\ 2.75 \pm 0.55 \\ - 0.12 \\ 0.3086 \\ 0.97 \pm 0.24 \\ + 0.01 \\ 0.0770 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.05 \pm 0.39 \\ -0.01 \\ 0.9222 \\ 0.9222 \pm 0.55 \\ -0.11 \\ -0.11 \\ -0.11 \\ +0.01 \\ +0.01 \end{array}$
Data are mean ± SD. FEF = forced expiratory flow	SD. ratory flow.								

H. PUOLIJOKI AND A. PALOJOKI

increased FEF₂₅₋₇₅ (Table II). The same trend was seen for FEF₅₀ and FEF₂₅ among patients pretreated with FEN compared with those receiving placebo and among nonsmokers treated with IB compared with nonsmokers in the placebo group.

DISCUSSION

In this study, fiberoptic bronchoscopy caused only slight deterioration in lung function when the flow-volume curves were measured more than 1 hour before and 20 minutes after the procedure. The only clear evidence of deterioration, perhaps due to lidocaine,⁶ was seen in PEF values. However, unlike Peacock et al,⁶ we did not measure immediate changes in the spirometric values during bronchoscopy.

Our results showed that FEN had better bronchodilative properties, especially on the small airways, than ipratropium bromide in nonasthmatic patients undergoing fiberoptic bronchoscopy for diagnostic reasons. However, the deterioration in lung function induced by either the bronchoscopy itself or the lidocaine used as topical anesthetic was minor in all groups. Thus routine premedication with IB or FEN cannot be recommended for all patients but may be useful in patients with lung function impairment, particularly of the small airways.

Acknowledgment

This study was supported by Boehringer Ingelheim, Finland.

References:

- 1. Matshushima Y, Jones RL, King EG, et al. Alterations in pulmonary mechanics and gas exchange during routine bronchoscopy. *Chest* 1984; 86:184–187.
- Salisbury BG, Metzger LLF, Altose MD, et al. Effect of fiberoptic bronchoscopy on respiratory performance in patients with chronic airways obstruction. *Thorax* 1975; 30:441–446.
- Lindholm CE, Ollman B, Snyder JV, et al. Cardiorespiratory effects of flexible fiberoptic bronchoscopy in critically ill patients. *Chest* 1978; 74:362-368.
- 4. Weiss EB, Patwardhan AV. The response to lidocaine in bronchial asthma. *Chest* 1977; 72:429-438.
- 5. Fish JE, Peterman VI. Effects of inhaled lidocaine on airway function in asthmatic subjects. *Respiration* 1979; 37:201-207.
- 6. Peacock AJ, Benson-Mitchell R, Godfrey R. Effect of fiberoptic bronchoscopy on pulmonary function. *Thorax* 1990; 45:38-41.