



LEEDS  
BECKETT  
UNIVERSITY

---

Citation:

Jackson, A and Allen, H and Hull, JH and Hopker, J and Backhouse, SH and Price, OJ and Dickinson, J (2019) Diagnosing exercise-induced bronchoconstriction: over or under-detection? Allergy. ISSN 1398-9995 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.14005>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/6118/>

Document Version:

Article (Accepted Version)

---

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on [openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

# **DIAGNOSING EXERCISE-INDUCED BRONCHOCONSTRICTION: OVER OR UNDER- DETECTION?**

Anna Jackson<sup>1,2\*</sup> PhD, Hayden Allen<sup>3\*</sup> MRes, James H. Hull<sup>4</sup>, PhD FACSM,

James Hopker<sup>1</sup> PhD, Susan H. Backhouse<sup>3</sup> PhD, Oliver J. Price<sup>3†</sup> PhD, John Dickinson PhD<sup>1†</sup>

**\*Co-first authors; †Senior author contribution.**

<sup>1</sup>School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Kent, United Kingdom (UK); <sup>2</sup>English Institute of Sport, London, UK; <sup>3</sup>Carnegie School of Sport, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK; <sup>4</sup>Department of Respiratory Medicine, Royal Brompton Hospital, London, UK

## **Corresponding author:**

Dr Oliver J. Price BSc (Hons.) MRes PhD FHEA

Carnegie School of Sport, Leeds Beckett University

Leeds, LS6 3QT, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)113 8123 532

Email: [o.price@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:o.price@leedsbeckett.ac.uk)

**Key words:** Asthma, athletes, diagnosis, exercise-induced bronchoconstriction (EIB), indirect bronchoprovocation.

*To the Editor:*

Exercise-induced bronchoconstriction (EIB) refers to acute airway narrowing that occurs in association with physical activity and is prevalent in both elite and recreational athletes <sup>1,2</sup>. It is important to accurately detect EIB to reduce its potential impact on respiratory health and sporting performance <sup>3,4</sup>, however diagnosis is clinically challenging due to the limited value of self-reported respiratory symptoms <sup>5</sup> and broad differential diagnosis associated with exertional breathing difficulty <sup>6</sup>. It is therefore recommended that EIB should be objectively confirmed via indirect bronchoprovocation prior to initiating treatment <sup>7</sup>. In this context, exercise challenge testing (EX) and eucapnic voluntary hyperpnoea (EVH) are the most commonly employed diagnostic tests, with a positive result most typically defined as a pre-post challenge reduction in lung function; i.e.  $\geq 10\%$  fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> <sup>7</sup>. However, the most appropriate diagnostic threshold currently remains unclear on the basis that the 'normative' airway response to EX appears to be mild bronchodilation (primarily due to withdrawal of vagal cholinergic tone) - whereas the highly provocative stimulus of EVH typically elicits bronchoconstriction <sup>8</sup>. Accordingly, to date, there remains a lack of consensus regarding the optimal or 'gold-standard' approach to assessment <sup>9</sup>, which in turn, presents a potential for misdiagnosis; i.e. over and under-detection.

The primary aim of this study was therefore to compare the airway response to EX (conducted in a controlled dry environment) against an EVH challenge. An evaluation of current <sup>7</sup> and revised diagnostic thresholds <sup>8</sup> was undertaken to determine the impact of any proposed modification to EIB screening outcome. We hypothesised that the achieved ventilation and severity of bronchoconstriction would be greater following EVH in comparison to EX.

The study was conducted as a multi-site randomised trial. Following approval from local research ethics committees, sixty-three recreationally active individuals ( $\geq 5$  hours endurance training per week) (male:  $n = 47$ ) provided written informed consent. At the beginning of each visit, exertional respiratory symptoms and eosinophilic airway inflammation were assessed via interview and fractional exhaled nitric oxide (FeNO), respectively, followed by either an EX or EVH challenge. Spirometry was performed in triplicate at baseline and in duplicate at 3, 5, 7, 10, and 15-min post challenge. A positive

diagnosis for EIB was defined by  $\geq 10\%$  fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> at two consecutive time-points for both EX and EVH<sup>7</sup> and  $\geq 15\%$  fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> at one time-point for EVH<sup>8</sup> (for detailed overview of study methodology refer to online supplement).

Fourteen participants (22%) had a prior diagnosis of asthma +/- EIB. Despite this, all participants had normal resting lung function with no evidence of airflow limitation (FEV<sub>1</sub> predicted  $>80\%$  and FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC  $>70\%$  predicted). Over half of the cohort (63%) reported exertional respiratory symptoms, and twenty-six (41%) had elevated FeNO ( $>25$ ppb). Clinical characteristics and baseline lung function are presented in Table 1.

Fifty-eight (92%) and forty-four (70%) participants achieved a  $\dot{V}_E \geq 60\%$  predicted MVV (i.e. the accepted minimal ventilatory load for a valid test) for EVH and EX, respectively. Although power output during EX ( $260 \pm 57$  W) was lower than the calculated target ( $323 \pm 92$  W;  $P < 0.01$ ), all participants achieved a mean heart rate  $>80\%$  predicted maximum ( $162 \pm 11$  beats.min<sup>-1</sup>). Despite this,  $\dot{V}_E$  for EX ( $93 \pm 19$  L.min<sup>-1</sup>) was lower than EVH  $106 \pm 22$  L.min<sup>-1</sup>,  $P < 0.01$ ; Table 1).

The mean fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> was greater following EVH ( $-7.9 \pm 6.9\%$ ) in comparison to EX ( $-1.9 \pm 7.1$ ;  $P < 0.01$ ), with a reduction in FEV<sub>1</sub> observed following EVH in almost all participants (94%). In contrast, EX elicited bronchodilation in over half of the cohort (53%). Thirteen (21%) had a fall in FEV<sub>1</sub>  $\geq 10\%$  following EVH, of which five (8%) were positive to EX. Importantly, none were positive to EX and negative to EVH (Figure 1a). Furthermore, in those with  $\geq 10\%$  fall in FEV<sub>1</sub>, the mean reduction in lung function (i.e. severity of EIB) was greater following EVH ( $-19 \pm 7\%$ ) in comparison to EX ( $-11 \pm 9\%$ ;  $P < 0.01$ ). Nine (14%) had a  $\geq 15\%$  fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> post EVH, of which four (6%) were positive to EX. Of note, in those who failed to achieve 60% MVV, two were still positive to EVH whereas none were positive to EX. Although a positive correlation was observed between EX and EVH ( $r_s = 0.46$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) the mean bias was 6.1% with wide limits of agreement (LOA) ( $-5.3$  to  $+17.5$  %) (Figure 1b). Similarly, a positive correlation was observed in those with asthma +/- EIB ( $r = 0.73$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) (mean bias: 7.5%; LOA:  $-6.7$  to  $+22.7\%$ ). Importantly, a similar pattern of response was observed for the forty-four participants (70%) who achieved  $\geq 60\%$  MVV for both tests. The mean fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> was greater

following EVH ( $-8.3 \pm 7.4\%$ ) in comparison to EX ( $-2.3 \pm 7.8$ ;  $P < 0.01$ ). Eleven (25%) had a fall in  $FEV_1 \geq 10\%$  following EVH, of which five (18%) were positive to EX. Seven (16%) had a  $\geq 15\%$  fall in  $FEV_1$  post EVH, of which four (6%) were positive to EX. Sensitivity and specificity for EVH and FeNO (to predict a positive EX test) are presented (for the entire cohort) in Tables S2 and S3, respectively.

The present study indicates that the proportion of individuals who meet the diagnostic criteria for EIB is consistently greater following EVH in comparison to a controlled laboratory EX test in a standardised dry environment. Applying a 10% fall in  $FEV_1$  cut-off for EVH increases diagnostic sensitivity, whereas a 15% fall in  $FEV_1$  improves diagnostic specificity. The observed disparity in screening outcome has implications for the clinical application of EVH when utilised as a surrogate airway challenge for EX and highlights a potential risk of over and under-detection depending on test selection when applying current guidelines <sup>7</sup>.

The airway response to any indirect bronchoprovocation challenge is directly related to the potency of the airway stimulus delivered. In the context of EX and EVH, provocation is primarily driven by  $\dot{V}_E$  and the water content of inspired air. However, aligning  $\dot{V}_E$  for EX and EVH is problematic from a methodological standpoint on the basis that  $\dot{V}_E$  increases over time with EX, whereas EVH involves an immediate square-wave rise with sustained hyperpnoea throughout the challenge. In addition, the relative humidity of medical-grade gas utilised for EVH was substantially lower (EX: 25% RH vs. EVH: 2% RH) despite conducting EX in a controlled environment in accordance with current ATS recommendations ( $< 10 \text{ mg H}_2\text{O/L}$ ) <sup>7</sup>. It is important to highlight that a warm-up prior to EX was included in the present study (albeit low intensity without a rest period), and whilst speculative, it is possible for a refractory period to have occurred in some participants. Taken together these factors likely explain the observed disparity in EIB prevalence between tests (EX: 8% vs. EVH: 21%). Finally, although employing a revised threshold for EVH <sup>8</sup> contributed to improved diagnostic agreement (EX: 8% vs. EVH: 14%) - one participant with a mild positive  $FEV_1$  fall post EX ( $\sim 10\%$ ) remained undetected. Of note, this individual did not report exertional respiratory symptoms (i.e. entirely asymptomatic) and would therefore only be detected via widespread screening.

Our findings indicate that the proportion of individuals who meet the diagnostic criteria for EIB is consistently greater following EVH in comparison to EX. A pragmatic solution for practitioners utilising EVH to screen athletes may be to apply a 10% fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> cut-off to ensure no EIB cases are missed, whereas a 15% fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> cut-off may increase the ‘clinical’ relevance in athletes presenting with exertional breathing difficulty. Further population-based research evaluating the normative response to indirect bronchoprovocation in this setting remains a priority.

*Anna Jackson\* PhD*

*Hayden Allen\* MRes*

*James H. Hull PhD*

*Susan H. Backhouse PhD*

*James Hopker PhD*

*Oliver J. Price† PhD*

*John Dickinson† PhD*

## **FUNDING STATEMENT**

Nil relevant.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors have no real or perceived conflict of interest in respect of this manuscript.

## **CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT**

All authors were involved in the conception and design of the study. AJ and HA collected and interpreted the data. All authors were involved with drafting and critical revision of the manuscript and final approval of the version to be published.

## **GUARANTOR STATEMENT**

OJP and JD confirm full responsibility for the content of the manuscript, including data and analysis.

## REFERENCES

1. Dickinson JW, Whyte GP, McConnell AK, Harries MG. Screening elite winter athletes for exercise induced asthma: a comparison of three challenge methods. *British journal of sports medicine*. 2006;40(2):179-182.
2. Molphy J, Dickinson J, Hu J, Chester N, Whyte G. Prevalence of bronchoconstriction induced by eucapnic voluntary hyperpnoea in recreationally active individuals. *Journal of Asthma*. 2014;51(1):44-50.
3. Price OJ, Ansley L, Menzies-Gow A, Cullinan P, Hull JH. Airway dysfunction in elite athletes—an occupational lung disease? *Allergy*. 2013;68(11):1343-1352.
4. Price OJ, Hull JH, Backer V, Hostrup M, Ansley L. The impact of exercise-induced bronchoconstriction on athletic performance: a systematic review. *Sports Med*. 2014;44(12):1749-1761.
5. Price OJ, Hull JH, Ansley L, Thomas M, Eyles C. Exercise-induced bronchoconstriction in athletes - A qualitative assessment of symptom perception. *Respir Med*. 2016;120:36-43.
6. Nielsen EW, Hull JH, Backer V. High prevalence of exercise-induced laryngeal obstruction in athletes. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*. 2013;45(11):2030-2035.
7. Parsons JP, Hallstrand TS, Mastrorarde JG, et al. An official American Thoracic Society clinical practice guideline: exercise-induced bronchoconstriction. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2013;187(9):1016-1027.
8. Price OJ, Ansley L, Levai IK, et al. Eucapnic voluntary hyperpnea testing in asymptomatic athletes. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2016;193(10):1178-1180.
9. Hull JH, Ansley L, Price OJ, Dickinson JW, Bonini M. Eucapnic Voluntary Hyperpnea: Gold Standard for Diagnosing Exercise-Induced Bronchoconstriction in Athletes? *Sports Med*. 2016;46(8):1083-1093.



**Table 1.** Participant clinical characteristics and airway response to EX and EVH.

| Variables  |       |   |         |       |   |         |         |
|--|-------|---|---------|-------|---|---------|---------|
| Sex (M:F)  | 47    | : | 16      |       |   |         |         |
| Age (years)                                      | 32    | ± | 11      |       |   |         |         |
| Height (cm)                                      | 177   | ± | 11      |       |   |         |         |
| Weight (kg)                                      | 74    | ± | 12      |       |   |         |         |
| BMI (kg•m <sup>-2</sup> )                        | 24    | ± | 3       |       |   |         |         |
| Training (hrs•wk <sup>-1</sup> )                 | 9     | ± | 4       |       |   |         |         |
| Physician diagnosed asthma +/- EIB               | 14/63 |   | (22%)   |       |   |         |         |
| Inhaler therapy:                                 | 14/14 |   | (100%)  |       |   |         |         |
| Short-acting beta-2-agonist (SABA)               | 12/14 |   | (86%)   |       |   |         |         |
| Inhaled corticosteroid (ICS)                     | 1/14  |   | (7%)    |       |   |         |         |
| SABA + ICS                                       | 1/14  |   | (7%)    |       |   |         |         |
| Exertional respiratory symptoms:                 | 43/63 |   | (67%)   |       |   |         |         |
| Cough  | 27/63 |   | (43%)   |       |   |         |         |
| Excessive mucus production                       | 22/63 |   | (35%)   |       |   |         |         |
| Wheeze   | 18/63 |   | (29%)   |       |   |         |         |
| Chest tightness                                  | 11/63 |   | (17%)   |       |   |         |         |
| Dyspnoea   | 9/63  |   | (14%)   |       |   |         |         |
|  | EVH   |   |         | EX    |   |         | P-value |
| FEV <sub>1</sub> (L)                             | 4.07  | ± | 0.73    | 4.05  | ± | 0.73    | 0.25    |
| FEV <sub>1</sub> predicted (%)                   | 103.9 | ± | 11.3    | 103.6 | ± | 11.1    | 0.42    |
| FVC (L)  | 5.11  | ± | 1.08    | 5.10  | ± | 1.07    | 0.46    |
| FVC predicted (%)                                | 108.9 | ± | 13.0    | 108.6 | ± | 13.3    | 0.53    |
| FEV <sub>1</sub> /FVC (%)                        | 80.2  | ± | 7.2     | 80.1  | ± | 6.7     | 0.70    |
| PEF (L.min <sup>-1</sup> )                       | 576.1 | ± | 93.6    | 575.7 | ± | 92.9    | 0.89    |
| PEF predicted (%)                                | 107.6 | ± | 15.3    | 107.5 | ± | 15.3    | 0.86    |
| Predicted min ventilation (L.min <sup>-1</sup> ) | 142   | ± | 26      | 142   | ± | 25      | 0.28    |
| Achieved min ventilation (L.min <sup>-1</sup> )  | 106   | ± | 22      | 93    | ± | 19      | <0.01*  |
| Achieved min ventilation (%)                     | 75    | ± | 12      | 67    | ± | 16      | <0.01*  |
| Average fall in FEV <sub>1</sub> (%)             | -7.9  | ± | 6.9     | -1.9  | ± | 7.0     | <0.01*  |
| EIB positive (≥10% fall in FEV <sub>1</sub> )    | 13/63 |   | (21%)   | 5/63  |   | (8%)    | <0.01*  |
| EIB positive (≥15% fall in FEV <sub>1</sub> )    | 9/63  |   | (14%)   | 2/63  |   | (2%)    | <0.01*  |
| FeNO (ppb)                                       | 20    |   | (5-162) | 18    |   | (5-155) | 0.29    |
| FeNO (≥25ppb)                                    | 22/63 |   | (35%)   | 24/63 |   | (37%)   | 0.82    |

Data presented as mean ± SD and ratio (percentage). \*Indicates difference between EVH and EX (P<0.05). Non-normally distributed data presented as median score (range). Definitions of abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; EVH, eucapnic voluntary hyperpnea; EX, exercise challenge test; FEV<sub>1</sub>, Forced expiratory volume in 1<sup>s</sup>; FVC, Forced vital capacity; PEF, Peak expiratory flow; MVV, Maximum voluntary ventilation; FeNO, Fractional exhaled nitric oxide.




Figure 1.

## FIGURE HEADERS

**Figure 1a.** Airway response following bronchoprovocation.

EX + EVH negative (*closed circles*); EX + EVH positive (*open circles*); EX negative + EVH positive (*split circles*); EX positive + EVH negative (*closed triangle*). Diagnostic thresholds: Black vertical line and black horizontal line ( $\geq 10\%$  fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> at two consecutive time-points); Red vertical line (15% fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> at one time-point).

**Figure 1b.** Bland-Altman plot of the change in FEV<sub>1</sub> post EX and EVH challenges.