

University of Groningen

The minimal clinically important difference of the Severe Respiratory Insufficiency questionnaire in severe COPD

Raveling, Tim; Kort, Janine; Bladder, Gerrie; Windisch, Wolfram; Wijkstra, Peter J; Duiverman, Marieke L

Published in:
European Respiratory Journal

DOI:
[10.1183/13993003.01334-2020](https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01334-2020)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Raveling, T., Kort, J., Bladder, G., Windisch, W., Wijkstra, P. J., & Duiverman, M. L. (2020). The minimal clinically important difference of the Severe Respiratory Insufficiency questionnaire in severe COPD. *European Respiratory Journal*, 56(6), Article 2001334. <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01334-2020>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



The minimal clinically important difference of the Severe Respiratory Insufficiency questionnaire in severe COPD

To the Editor:

The Severe Respiratory Insufficiency Questionnaire (SRI) was developed to measure health-related quality of life (HRQoL) specifically in patients with chronic hypercapnic respiratory failure (CHRF) [1]. It has been validated for patients with a broad spectrum of underlying diseases, including patients with COPD [2], and has been used extensively in trials investigating noninvasive ventilation (NIV) for CHRF due to different aetiologies. Furthermore, its use in clinical practice for care quality monitoring is increasing, and might increase further since convenient applications for mobile devices recently became available. Unfortunately, the minimal clinically important difference (MCID) has not been determined. Therefore, it remains difficult to interpret the improvements in HRQoL or to use the SRI as a primary outcome in clinical trials as the MCID determines the sample size needed. Therefore, we aimed to estimate the MCID of the SRI in a group of severe COPD patients treated with NIV.

Data were collected prospectively in three trials on chronic NIV in COPD. All trials were approved by our Ethical Review Board and patients gave written informed consent to participate. The study designs of these trials are described elsewhere [3–5]. The following parameters were collected at baseline and after 6 months of NIV: room air blood gasses, lung function, the 6-min walking distance (6MWD), the SRI and the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) [6]. Additionally, patients were retrospectively asked for their perceived change in health after 6 months of NIV, using an 11-point global rating scale of change (GRC), ranging from –5 (health deteriorated) to +5 (health improved) [7].

Data are presented as mean±SD. To determine the MCID of the SRI, we used a combination of anchor- and distribution-based approaches. To be included as an anchor, the Pearson correlation coefficient (or nonparametric equivalent) between the change (Δ) in the SRI scores and the Δ anchor was required to be >0.3. If this condition was satisfied, we conducted univariate linear regression analyses with the Δ SRI scores as dependent variables, and the Δ anchor as independent variables. For the GRC, we calculated the average Δ SRI of the participants scoring +2 and +3 as estimate for the MCID, as only these scores were considered minimally clinically relevant [7]. For the distribution approach, the MCID was calculated as 0.5 times the SD of the Δ SRI scores.

This analysis included 108 patients with severe COPD (forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV₁) 0.69±0.27 L) and CHRF (arterial partial pressure of carbon dioxide (P_{aCO_2}) 7.2±0.8 kPa/54±6 mmHg). Patients experienced poor exercise capacity (6MWD 238±121 m). The mean±SD SRI summary score (SRI-SS) was 52±15, and ranged between 37 and 62 for the subdomains. The mean±SD HADS scores were 6.6±4.8 and 7.6±4.5 points, respectively. The ΔP_{aCO_2} and Δ bicarbonate were not correlated sufficiently with the Δ SRI ($r=-0.21$ and $r=-0.13$ for the SRI-SS) and therefore could not be used as an anchor. According to the GRC, 76% experienced improved health, of which 38% (n=30) experienced a minimal relevant improvement (GRC +2/+3). Table 1 presents the correlations between the Δ anchors and Δ SRI scores, and the MCID estimates of the SRI subdomain and SRI-SS.

 @ERSpublications

The SRI is frequently used to measure quality of life in severe COPD patients treated with NIV, but its MCID is unknown. This paper shows MCID estimates between 4.5–6.2, so that we suggest an increase of approximately 5 points is clinically relevant. <https://bit.ly/3e0M7MT>

Cite this article as: Raveling T, Kort J, Bladder G, *et al.* The minimal clinically important difference of the Severe Respiratory Insufficiency questionnaire in severe COPD. *Eur Respir J* 2020; 56: 2001334 [<https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01334-2020>].

TABLE 1 MCID estimates for the SRI domain and summary scores, separately for the different anchors and distribution approaches

	Anchor approach				Distribution approach	
	6MWD	FEV ₁ [#]	HADS-a	HADS-d	GRC [¶]	
SRI respiratory complaints (SRI-RC)						
R	0.33**	0.44**	-0.26**	-0.27**	0.35**	
MCID estimate	8.6 (7.6–9.7)	11.2 (9.3–13.1)			10.3 (5.3–15.3)	7.5
SRI physical functioning (SRI-PF)						
R	0.44**	0.19	-0.24*	-0.33**	0.18	
MCID estimate	2.3 (1.3–3.4)			3.1 (2.0–4.1)		8.0
SRI attendant symptoms and sleep (SRI-AS)						
R	0.19	0.27**	-0.25**	-0.22*	0.31**	
MCID estimate					7.4 (0.6–14.2)	8.6
SRI social relationships (SRI-SR)						
R	0.21*	0.15	-0.25**	-0.23*	0.25*	
MCID estimate						6.3
SRI anxiety (SRI-AX)						
R	0.21*	0.33**	-0.48**	-0.39**	0.24*	
MCID estimate		9.6 (7.0–12.2)	7.8 (6.5–9.0)	8.0 (6.7–9.3)		10.2
SRI psychological well-being (SRI-WB)						
R	0.18	0.20*	-0.53**	-0.52**	0.24*	
MCID estimate			3.9 (2.9–5.0)	4.6 (3.5–5.6)		8.8
SRI social functioning (SRI-SF)						
R	0.39**	0.21*	-0.32**	-0.38**	0.26*	
MCID estimate	1.7 (0.5–2.8)		2.1 (1.0–3.3)	2.8 (1.8–3.9)		8.5
SRI summary score (SRI-SS)						
R	0.39**	0.35**	-0.48**	-0.48**	0.35**	
MCID estimate	4.5 (3.7–5.3)	6.2 (4.7–7.7)	5.1 (4.4–5.9)	5.5 (4.8–6.2)	5.0 (0.6–9.3)	6.0

R: correlations between the change in the SRI and the change in the anchors after 6 months, correlation data are Pearson correlation coefficient, except for the FEV₁ anchor where data are Spearman correlation coefficient. MCID estimates are presented with 95% confidence intervals. For the anchor approach, only anchors that correlated >0.3 were used. MCID: minimal clinically important difference; SRI: Severe Respiratory Insufficiency questionnaire; 6MWD: 6-min walking distance; FEV₁: forced expiratory volume in 1 s; HADS-a/HADS-d: Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale anxiety (-a)/depression (-d) domains (a higher score indicates more symptoms of anxiety or depression); GRC: global rating scale of change. [#]: Spearman correlation coefficient; [¶]: n=30; *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01.

We present the first MCID estimate of the SRI in a population of severe COPD patients treated with NIV. Using different clinical and patient-reported anchors with established MCIDs in patients with severe COPD and a distribution estimate, our results indicate MCID estimates between 4.5 and 6.2 points. We therefore suggest that an increase of approximately 5 points on the SRI-SS can be considered clinically relevant in this population.



In this study, we have estimated the MCID of both the summary and subdomains scores. It is important to get insight into the MCID of the subdomains as the SRI measures different HRQoL aspects. These aspects are impaired to a varying degree and NIV may affect these aspects differently. Our MCID estimates of certain subdomains are considerably aberrant to the 5 points of the SRI-SS. Although this might reflect that for these subdomains a relevant change is truly different, it should be noted that the MCID estimates were probably less precise as the number of available anchors, *i.e.* measures that correlated with the subdomains, was more limited.

To reach a precise estimate of a MCID, it is recommended to use multiple patient and disease centred anchors [8]. Anchors should be correlated with the outcome, be relevant and reflect the content of the measure and should have an established MCID derived from comparable populations. First, we used measures as anchors if they were sufficiently correlated (>0.3) to the change in the SRI [8]. Second, our anchors are relevant and reflected the change in HRQoL: physical anchors correlated with physical domains (respiratory complaints and physical functioning) and psychological domains correlated well with the HADS scores. This is in line with an earlier paper which showed that the HADS explained over 50% of the variance of the SRI-SS [9]. Also, domains that require more mixed competencies, such as social functioning, correlated well with both a physical and psychological anchor. The GRC was used as an additional anchor, as this specifically represents a patient rated change in their HRQoL. The convergent results confirm the reflection of these anchors to changes in the specific SRI scores.

Finally, our anchors have an established MCID derived from comparable populations. For the 6MWD, we have used the MCID of 26 m estimated from a cohort of severe emphysema patients (FEV₁ 26.9% predicted) [10]. The MCID of the HADS of -1.5 points per domain was estimated in a population of moderate-to-severe COPD (FEV₁ 34.3% predicted) with comparable baseline HADS scores [11]. The MCID of the FEV₁ of 100 mL was based on multiple studies with varying severity of COPD [12]. A concern with this MCID is that the initial FEV₁ might influence the potential for improvement, so a single MCID might be inappropriate [13]. A relative change has also been proposed for patients with severe airflow obstruction, but what percentage would be of minimal importance is not yet determined. Experts have proposed a 12% improvement to be clinically relevant, which in our cohort would imply that an improvement of only 78 mL would be relevant, resulting in a smaller MCID [13]. We therefore hypothesise that the MCID of 100 mL overestimates the MCID of the SRI. For the GRC, we used a +2/+3 score as minimally relevant, in line with previous studies using this method.

Interestingly, we could not demonstrate a correlation between the change in P_{aCO_2} /bicarbonate and the change in the SRI score. Trials that have shown HRQoL benefits of chronic NIV in COPD patients all targeted and achieved a significant reduction in P_{aCO_2} [3, 14]. This reduction has therefore been advocated to be responsible for the benefits of NIV [15]. Although P_{aCO_2} certainly reflects ventilatory efficacy, our results suggest that a change in other parameters might have more influence on the change in HRQoL. Whether these parameters are actual targets of NIV is still to be determined.

We have established the first MCID estimate of the SRI in COPD patients with CHRF. Using a combination of clinical and patient-reported anchors, we precisely estimated the MCID of the SRI-SS between 4.5 and 6.2 points. The estimates of the subdomains might, however, be more imprecise and future studies need to determine the accuracy of these estimates. We emphasise that our estimates are only applicable to a selected group of stable hypercapnic COPD patients. The validity of our estimates should be further investigated for other populations with CHRF, including COPD patients initiated on chronic NIV following an exacerbation. Our MCID should be used to value significant results of clinical trials and to determine the sample size of future trials in this population with severely impaired HRQoL.

Tim Raveling ^{1,2}, **Janine Kort**¹, **Gerrie Bladder**¹, **Wolfram Windisch**³, **Peter J. Wijkstra**^{1,2} and **Marieke L. Duiverman** ^{1,2}

¹Dept of Pulmonary Diseases and Home Mechanical Ventilation, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands. ²Groningen Research Institute of Asthma and COPD (GRIAC), University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands. ³Dept of Pneumology, Cologne Merheim Hospital, Kliniken der Stadt Köln gGmbH Witten/Herdecke University, Faculty of Health/School of Medicine, Cologne, Germany.

Correspondence: Tim Raveling, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Dept of Pulmonary Diseases and Home Mechanical Ventilation, Home postal code: AA62; Post box 30001; 9700 RB Groningen, The Netherlands. E-mail: t.raveling@umcg.nl

Received: 3 April 2020 | Accepted after revision: 10 June 2020

Conflict of interest: T. Raveling has nothing to disclose. J. Kort has nothing to disclose. G. Bladder has nothing to disclose. W. Windisch reports grants from Weinmann Germany, Vivisol Germany, Heinen und Löwenstein Germany, VitalAire Germany and Philips/Respironics USA, during the conduct of the study; personal fees for lectures from companies dealing with mechanical ventilation, outside the submitted work. P.J. Wijkstra reports grants and personal fees from Philips and Resmed, grants from Vital Air, Vivisol and Goedegebuure, personal fees from Synapse and Bresotec, outside the submitted work. M.L. Duiverman reports grants and personal fees for lectures from Philips BV, personal for lectures and advisory board work fees from Resmed Ltd, grants from Vivisol BV and Fisher and Paykel Ltd, outside the submitted work.

Support statement: Both the RECOVER and the RECONSIDER trail were funded by the Dutch Lung Foundation. The RECAPTURE trail was funded by ResMed Ltd. Funding sources had no involvement in the study design; and in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data. Funding information for this article has been deposited with the Crossref Funder Registry.

References

- 1 Windisch W, Freidel K, Schucher B, *et al*. The Severe Respiratory Insufficiency (SRI) Questionnaire: a specific measure of health-related quality of life in patients receiving home mechanical ventilation. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003; 56: 752–759.
- 2 Windisch W, Budweiser S, Heinemann F, *et al*. The Severe Respiratory Insufficiency Questionnaire was valid for COPD patients with severe chronic respiratory failure. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61: 848–853.
- 3 Duiverman ML, Wempe JB, Bladder G, *et al*. Nocturnal non-invasive ventilation in addition to rehabilitation in hypercapnic patients with COPD. *Thorax* 2008; 63: 1052–1057.
- 4 Duiverman ML, Vonk JM, Bladder G, *et al*. Home initiation of chronic non-invasive ventilation in COPD patients with chronic hypercapnic respiratory failure: a randomised controlled trial. *Thorax* 2020; 75: 244–252.
- 5 ClinicalTrials.gov. The Effects of Nocturnal Non-invasive Ventilation in Stable COPD (RECAPTURE). www.ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03053973 Date last accessed: 09 June 2020. Date last updated: 13 December 2019.

- 6 Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, *et al.* The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. *J Psychosom Res* 2002; 52: 69–77.
- 7 Kamper SJ, Maher CG, Mackay G. Global rating of change scales: a review of strengths and weaknesses and considerations for design. *J Man Manip Ther* 2009; 17: 163–170.
- 8 Revicki D, Hays RD, Cella D, *et al.* Recommended methods for determining responsiveness and minimally important differences for patient-reported outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61: 102–109.
- 9 Duiverman ML, Wempe JB, Bladder G, *et al.* Health-related quality of life in COPD patients with chronic respiratory failure. *Eur Respir J* 2008; 32: 379–386.
- 10 Puhan MA, Chandra D, Mosenifar Z, *et al.* The minimal important difference of exercise tests in severe COPD. *Eur Respir J* 2011; 37: 784–790.
- 11 Puhan MA, Frey M, Buchi S, *et al.* The minimal important difference of the hospital anxiety and depression scale in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2008; 6: 46.
- 12 Donohue JF. Minimal clinically important differences in COPD lung function. *COPD* 2005; 2: 111–124.
- 13 Cazzola M, MacNee W, Martinez FJ, *et al.* Outcomes for COPD pharmacological trials: from lung function to biomarkers. *Eur Respir J* 2008; 31: 416–469.
- 14 Kohnlein T, Windisch W, Kohler D, *et al.* Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation for the treatment of severe stable chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a prospective, multicentre, randomised, controlled clinical trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2014; 2: 698–705.
- 15 Windisch W, Storre JH, Kohnlein T. Nocturnal non-invasive positive pressure ventilation for COPD. *Expert Rev Respir Med* 2015; 9: 295–308.

Copyright ©ERS 2020