



Oral corticosteroids in asthma and beyond: moving forward

Jeffrey Shi Kai Chan ¹, Ruth B. Murray¹ and David Price ^{1,2}

¹Observational and Pragmatic Research Institute, Midview City, Singapore. ²Centre of Academic Primary Care, Division of Applied Health Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK.

Corresponding author: David Price (dprice@opri.sg)



Shareable abstract (@ERSpublications)

While life-saving in severe exacerbations, oral corticosteroid (OCS) use in asthma is increasingly recognised as a cause of short- and long-term adverse effects; this requires implementation of OCS stewardship strategies to minimise the need for their use <https://bit.ly/3LDDoBd>

Cite this article as: Chan JSK, Murray RB, Price D. Oral corticosteroids in asthma and beyond: moving forward. *Eur Respir J* 2022; 60: 2200776 [DOI: 10.1183/13993003.00776-2022].

Copyright ©The authors 2022.
For reproduction rights and
permissions contact
permissions@ersnet.org

Received: 13 April 2021
Accepted: 21 April 2022

As some of the earliest-known and most effective anti-inflammatory agents, corticosteroids have long been a part of the physicians' armamentarium against asthma and other chronic inflammatory conditions. While inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) are the cornerstone of asthma therapy, both the Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA) and British Thoracic Society/Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (BTS/SIGN) guidelines recommended the use of oral corticosteroids (OCS) as intermittent therapy in severe acute asthmatic attacks and as maintenance therapy in selected patients with severe asthma refractory to inhaled therapies [1, 2]. More recently, OCS have also been recommended as an adjunct to biologic therapies [1, 2]. However, it has become abundantly clear that OCS use is associated with a wide range of short- and long-term adverse effects. For example, their use is associated with a 2-fold increase in the risk of pneumonia and opportunistic infections and up to a 2.5-fold increase in the risk of other chronic physical and psychiatric conditions such as diabetes, osteoporosis, adrenal insufficiency, heart failure, depression and anxiety [3–8]. Despite such, supposedly, limited indications of OCS use in asthma, a recent systematic review by BLEECKER *et al.* [3] found that approximately a quarter of patients with asthma required short-term OCS use during a 1-year period, with up to 12% of patients having long-term OCS use. A recent analysis from the International Severe Asthma Registry also found that almost half of patients with severe asthma treated at GINA step 5 were receiving regular OCS therapy [9].

In this issue of the *European Respiratory Journal*, SKOV *et al.* [10] further consolidated our understanding of OCS-related adverse outcomes. Incorporating a new-user design, they performed propensity score-matched analyses of a prospective population-based Danish cohort of patients with asthma. Analysing the comprehensive OCS prescription records of 151 760 patients in the matched cohort, they found that OCS use was associated with increased risk of morbidity, mortality and hospital attendances, with a strong dose–response relationship noted. Importantly, even patients who received ≤ 500 mg of OCS were at increased risk of adverse events [10]. Although some studies have reported dose–response relationships in the past, with higher cumulative exposures shown to be associated with elevated risk of numerous adverse effects that translated into higher healthcare costs, the adverse effects associated with such low-dose OCS use, as reported by SKOV *et al.* [10], have been relatively under-explored [6, 8, 11, 12]. The findings by SKOV *et al.* [10] thus confirmed prior observations, and bettered our understanding of the adverse effects associated with the full spectrum of OCS doses, particularly at the lower end of the dose spectrum. Notably, in this study, whilst OCS users had significantly higher risk of all-cause and respiratory mortality, no difference was observed for cardiovascular mortality.

Whilst we appreciate this study's high data quality and good representation of real-world practice, it is important to note its limitations. For example, only patients aged 18–45 years old were studied, which limits the applicability of findings to older patients with asthma. Also, the follow-up duration of OCS non-users was significantly shorter than that of OCS users, an issue which the authors themselves addressed by a sensitivity analysis which restricted follow-up durations to 5 years [10]. Although the

results demonstrated robustness and validity of the findings, the study's overall implications about the long-term detriments of OCS use were nonetheless impacted by the short follow-up duration for OCS non-users.

Furthermore, Skov *et al.* [10] did not report, nor analyse, prescription patterns; no distinction was made between intermittent or maintenance OCS use. Indeed, this issue is a common one among other studies, most of which have not distinguished between intermittent or long term OCS use, or focused solely on OCS use as maintenance therapy [11, 13–15]. As over half of the patients in the study by Skov *et al.* [10] received low dose OCS, it seems likely that these patients mostly received intermittent OCS prescriptions, especially given the relatively low intensity of maintenance asthma therapy reported at baseline (14.6% of OCS users did not receive any ICS, and 55.9% received only low dose ICS). This propensity for intermittent OCS prescription has been reported by others [3], which begs the question “why do many clinicians continue to prescribe OCS for their patients with asthma?” One obvious answer is that OCS are lifesaving in severe cases. Physicians may also view OCS as an inexpensive, effective and low risk therapy [16]. More studies focusing on the effects of intermittent OCS therapy are urgently needed. One such study, presented as an abstract at the 2021 European Respiratory Society (ERS) International Congress, systematically classified intermittent OCS therapy. It found that even infrequent intermittent OCS use was associated with increased risk of adverse outcomes, with more frequent use patterns associated with further increase in risk [17]. The final results of that study will likely be important for bridging this gap in evidence. Similarly, little is known about the longitudinal trajectory of OCS prescription patterns, such as prescription frequencies or dosages, or risk factors that predict progression and intensification of OCS regimens. Understanding the trajectories of OCS use is critical, not only for our overall understanding of OCS use in asthma, but also for identifying patients at risk of intensive OCS use and potential OCS-related morbidities. A recent abstract at the BTS 2021 Winter Meeting presented initial work on the longitudinal patterns of OCS prescriptions in patients with asthma and other diseases. It showed that since 2013, despite a gradual decrease in the use of high dose systemic corticosteroids among patients with asthma, low dose prescriptions have driven an overall increase in the prevalence of systemic corticosteroid prescriptions [18]. The final results of that study will be an important addition to the asthma and OCS therapy literature.

Given the findings reported by Skov *et al.* [10], it is ever more important to research and establish pragmatic strategies for avoiding OCS use, or for limiting OCS use to only when absolutely necessary. In this regard, both the GINA strategy and BTS/SIGN guidelines emphasise the importance of risk factor modifications and inhaler technique improvement [1, 2], both of which have proven efficacious when properly executed [19, 20]. The prevalence of OCS prescriptions, despite these clear recommendations, points to a problem not in the recommendations themselves, but in the adoption of these recommendations. The most important and obvious solution to this problem is to increase the general medical community's awareness of the detrimental effects of OCS on morbidities, mortality and costs. Early intervention should be emphasised, specifically early introduction of ICS, which have been consistently shown to reduce symptoms, improve lung function and slow down its decline, reduce exacerbations, and improve quality of life [21]. Risk stratification tools that can reliably predict risk of OCS-related adverse events would also aid the translation of research findings into clinical practice and curtail excessive OCS prescriptions, thus allowing clinicians to easily identify patients at particularly high risk of these adverse events. Recently, an abstract presented at the 2021 ERS International Congress reported a model predicting osteoporosis among patients with asthma who received OCS. Developed from a large British general practice cohort, this model may further facilitate efforts for reducing OCS use and OCS-related morbidities amongst patients with asthma [22].

Clinicians also need to be aware about newer classes of therapeutic agents which can mitigate OCS overuse, particularly biologics, and ensure that patients are referred in a timely manner to specialists when appropriate who can prescribe biologics. Currently six biologic agents are approved by the Food and Drug Administration for treating severe asthma [23]. Evidence for biologic associated reduction of OCS use comes not only from randomised controlled trials but also real-life observational studies [23, 24]. But what is the best way of reducing OCS use in biologic treated patients? Most landmark trials have adopted a uniform OCS tapering approach for all participants, without considering individual patients' response to therapy and clinical status; an approach which may not be entirely relevant and reproducible in real-life clinical practice [25–27]. This issue of OCS tapering was addressed by Menzies-Gow *et al.* [28] in a recent multicentre study. They demonstrated that in selected patients with severe asthma, the co-initiation of benralizumab and a personalised OCS reduction algorithm (which considered initial OCS dosage, asthma control and adrenal function) was efficacious in eliminating or minimising OCS use. Such personalised approaches may be more relevant in clinical practice. Further exploration of similar approaches for substituting OCS use with biologics are needed. Lastly, the significant cost of biologics has also impeded

their widespread use leading to debate about their cost-effectiveness [29, 30]. Existing cost-effectiveness evaluations have focused on costs directly related to asthma only and neglected costs related to OCS use and its consequences [29, 30]. Given the significant cost burden incurred by OCS use [12, 31], OCS-related costs should be considered in future cost-effectiveness evaluations of biologics. Currently, biologics remain under-utilised, and switching or stopping of biologics is not uncommon [32, 33]. Much remains to be done in order for biologics to be accepted as a cost-effective steroid-sparing agent for widespread clinical use.

Finally, OCS-related morbidities are clearly not specific to asthma, and the burden of OCS beyond asthma should not be overlooked. COPD is another prevalent disease that often requires systemic corticosteroid therapy. High dose systemic corticosteroid use in COPD has been associated with an estimated 63% increase in the risk of mortality and more than double the risk of vertebral fracture [34]. Like in asthma, existing literature on systemic corticosteroid-related morbidities in COPD generally lack granularity, such as prescription patterns and dosage. Further investigations in this area are much needed. Beyond asthma and COPD, systemic corticosteroid therapy is indicated for many other diseases, including autoimmune diseases and organ transplants. While investigations of corticosteroid-related adverse effects for the latter have been relatively thorough [35], only a few common autoimmune diseases, such as systematic lupus erythematosus [36] and rheumatoid arthritis [37, 38], have been investigated. Remarkably, biologics also reduce corticosteroid usage in these conditions with varying levels of success [39–41]. As such, it is not unlikely that OCS use and thus OCS-related morbidities in other steroid-treated respiratory diseases (such as eosinophilic granulomatosis with polyangiitis), can also be minimised by using alternative agents such as biologics. Investigations of OCS-related morbidities in such conditions are thus warranted.

In the end, it will not be easy to thoroughly convince the general medical community of the treacherous nature of OCS. Given the many harms of OCS though, it is a worthwhile effort that deserves wider and deeper investigations irrespective of the underlying condition. The present work by Skov *et al.* [10] should not be the end of the road, but the start of a journey: one which translates research findings into clinical practice and effects changes to improve patient care. It is high time to move forward.

Conflict of interest: J.S.K. Chan and R.B. Murray report no conflicts of interest. D. Price reports advisory board membership with AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi, Mylan, Novartis, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Sanofi Genzyme and Thermofisher; consultancy agreements with Airway Vista Secretariat, AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi, EPG Communication Holdings Ltd, FIECON Ltd, Fieldwork International, GlaxoSmithKline, Mylan, Mundipharma, Novartis, OM Pharma SA, PeerVoice, Phadia AB, Spirosure Inc, Strategic North Limited, Synapse Research Management Partners S.L., Talos Health Solutions, Theravance and WebMD Global LLC; grants and unrestricted funding for investigator-initiated studies (conducted through Observational and Pragmatic Research Institute Pte Ltd) from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi, Mylan, Novartis, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Respiratory Effectiveness Group, Sanofi Genzyme, Theravance and UK National Health Service; payment for lectures/speaking engagements from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Chiesi, Cipla, GlaxoSmithKline, Kyorin, Mylan, Mundipharma, Novartis, Regeneron Pharmaceuticals and Sanofi Genzyme; payment for travel/accommodation/meeting expenses from AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, Mundipharma, Mylan, Novartis and Thermofisher; stock/stock options from AKL Research and Development Ltd which produces phytopharmaceuticals; owns 74% of the social enterprise Optimum Patient Care Ltd (Australia and UK) and 92.61% of Observational and Pragmatic Research Institute Pte Ltd (Singapore); 5% shareholding in Timestamp which develops adherence monitoring technology; is peer reviewer for grant committees of the UK Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation programme, and Health Technology Assessment; and was an expert witness for GlaxoSmithKline.

References

- 1 Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network, British Thoracic Society. BTS/SIGN British Guideline on the Management of Asthma. London/Edinburgh, BTS/SIGN, 2019.
- 2 Global Initiative for Asthma. Global Strategy for Asthma Management and Prevention. 2021. <https://ginasthma.org/gina-reports/>.
- 3 Bleeker ER, Menzies-Gow AN, Price DB, *et al.* Systematic literature review of systemic corticosteroid use for asthma management. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020; 201: 276–293.
- 4 Sweeney J, Patterson CC, Menzies-Gow A, *et al.* Comorbidity in severe asthma requiring systemic corticosteroid therapy: cross-sectional data from the Optimum Patient Care Research Database and the British Thoracic Difficult Asthma Registry. *Thorax* 2016; 71: 339–346.
- 5 Gurnell M, Heaney LG, Price D, *et al.* Long-term corticosteroid use, adrenal insufficiency and the need for steroid-sparing treatment in adult severe asthma. *J Intern Med* 2021; 290: 240–256.

- 6 Price DB, Trudo F, Voorham J, *et al.* Adverse outcomes from initiation of systemic corticosteroids for asthma: long-term observational study. *J Asthma Allergy* 2018; 11: 193–204.
- 7 Waljee AK, Rogers MAM, Lin P, *et al.* Short term use of oral corticosteroids and related harms among adults in the United States: population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2017; 357: j1415.
- 8 Dalal AA, Duh MS, Gozalo L, *et al.* Dose-response relationship between long-term systemic corticosteroid use and related complications in patients with severe asthma. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm* 2016; 22: 833–847.
- 9 Wang E, Wechsler ME, Tran TN, *et al.* Characterization of severe asthma worldwide: data from the International Severe Asthma Registry. *Chest* 2020; 157: 790–804.
- 10 Skov IR, Madsen H, Henriksen DP, *et al.* Low-dose oral corticosteroids in asthma associates with increased morbidity and mortality. *Eur Respir J* 2022; 60: 2103054.
- 11 Price D, Trudo F, Voorham J, *et al.* Adverse outcomes from initiation of systemic corticosteroids for asthma: long-term observational study. *J Asthma Allergy* 2018; 11: 193–204.
- 12 Voorham J, Xu X, Price DB, *et al.* Healthcare resource utilization and costs associated with incremental systemic corticosteroid exposure in asthma. *Allergy* 2019; 74: 273–283.
- 13 Sullivan PW, Ghushchyan VH, Globe G, *et al.* Oral corticosteroid exposure and adverse effects in asthmatic patients. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2018; 141: 110–116.e7.
- 14 Rice JB, White AG, Scarpati LM, *et al.* Long-term systemic corticosteroid exposure: a systematic literature review. *Clin Ther* 2017; 39: 2216–2229.
- 15 Al Efraij K, Johnson K, Wiebe D, *et al.* A systematic review of the adverse events and economic impact associated with oral corticosteroids in asthma. *J Asthma* 2019; 56: 1334–1346.
- 16 Behluli E, Nikoloski M, Spahiu L, *et al.* Evaluation of attitudes of health care professionals towards the use of corticosteroids in the Republic of Kosovo. *Maced Pharm Bull* 2017; 63: 73–77.
- 17 Heatley H, Tran T, Bourdin A, *et al.* The burden of intermittent oral corticosteroid use in asthma. *Eur Respir J* 2021; 58: Suppl. 65, OA1491.
- 18 Voorham J, Menzies-Gow A, Tran T, *et al.* Longitudinal systemic corticosteroid utilisation for asthma and other diseases in the United Kingdom from 1990 to 2018: a population-based cohort analysis. *Thorax* 2021; 76: Suppl. 1, A21.
- 19 Price DB, Román-Rodríguez M, McQueen RB, *et al.* Inhaler errors in the CRITIKAL study: type, frequency, and association with asthma outcomes. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2017; 5: 1071–1081.e9.
- 20 Abreo A, Gebretsadik T, Stone CA, *et al.* The impact of modifiable risk factor reduction on childhood asthma development. *Clin Transl Med* 2018; 7: 15.
- 21 Haahtela T, Selroos O, O’Byrne PM. Revisiting early intervention in adult asthma. *ERJ Open Res* 2015; 1: 00022–2015.
- 22 Stanley B, Chapaneri J, Tran T, *et al.* Oral corticosteroid (OCS) risk predictor for osteoporosis. *Eur Respir J* 2021; 58: Suppl. 65, PA2159.
- 23 Brusselle GG, Koppelman GH. Biologic therapies for severe asthma. *N Engl J Med* 2022; 386: 157–171.
- 24 Cataldo D, Louis R, Michils A, *et al.* Severe asthma: oral corticosteroid alternatives and the need for optimal referral pathways. *J Asthma* 2021; 58: 448–458.
- 25 Bel EH, Wenzel SE, Thompson PJ, *et al.* Oral glucocorticoid-sparing effect of mepolizumab in eosinophilic asthma. *N Engl J Med* 2014; 371: 1189–1197.
- 26 Nair P, Wenzel S, Rabe KF, *et al.* Oral glucocorticoid-sparing effect of benralizumab in severe asthma. *N Engl J Med* 2017; 376: 2448–2458.
- 27 Rabe KF, Nair P, Brusselle G, *et al.* Efficacy and safety of dupilumab in glucocorticoid-dependent severe asthma. *N Engl J Med* 2018; 378: 2475–2485.
- 28 Menzies-Gow A, Gurnell M, Heaney LG, *et al.* Oral corticosteroid elimination via a personalised reduction algorithm in adults with severe, eosinophilic asthma treated with benralizumab (PONENTE): a multicentre, open-label, single-arm study. *Lancet Respir Med* 2022; 10: 47–58.
- 29 Tice JA, Campbell JD, Synnott PG, *et al.* The effectiveness and value of biologic therapies for the treatment of uncontrolled asthma: a summary from the institute for clinical and economic review’s midwest comparative effectiveness public advisory council. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm* 2019; 25: 510–514.
- 30 McQueen RB, Sheehan DN, Whittington MD, *et al.* Cost-effectiveness of biological asthma treatments: a systematic review and recommendations for future economic evaluations. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2018; 36: 957–971.
- 31 Barry LE, Sweeney J, O’Neill C, *et al.* The cost of systemic corticosteroid-induced morbidity in severe asthma: a health economic analysis. *Respir Res* 2017; 18: 129.
- 32 Menzies-Gow AN, McBrien C, Unni B, *et al.* Real world biologic use and switch patterns in severe asthma: data from the International Severe Asthma Registry and the US CHRONICLE Study. *J Asthma Allergy* 2022; 15: 63–78.
- 33 Inselman JW, Jeffery MM, Maddux JT, *et al.* Trends and disparities in asthma biologic use in the United States. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2020; 8: 549–554.e1.

- 34 Chang YP, Lai CH, Lin CY, *et al.* Mortality and vertebral fracture risk associated with long-term oral steroid use in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a systemic review and meta-analysis. *Chron Respir Dis* 2019; 16: 1479973119838280.
- 35 Veenstra DL, Best JH, Hornberger J, *et al.* Incidence and long-term cost of steroid-related side effects after renal transplantation. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1999; 33: 829–839.
- 36 Davidson JE, Fu Q, Rao S, *et al.* Quantifying the burden of steroid-related damage in SLE in the Hopkins Lupus Cohort. *Lupus Sci Med* 2018; 5: e000237.
- 37 Costello RE, Marsden A, Movahedi M, *et al.* The effect of glucocorticoid therapy on mortality in patients with rheumatoid arthritis and concomitant type II diabetes: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC Rheumatol* 2020; 4: 4.
- 38 Spivey CA, Griffith J, Kaplan C, *et al.* A retrospective analysis of corticosteroid utilization before initiation of biologic DMARDs among patients with rheumatoid arthritis in the United States. *Rheumatol Ther* 2018; 5: 255–270.
- 39 Black RJ, Lester S, Buchbinder R, *et al.* Factors associated with oral glucocorticoid use in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a drug use study from a prospective national biologics registry. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2017; 19: 253.
- 40 Fortunet C, Pers YM, Lambert J, *et al.* Tocilizumab induces corticosteroid sparing in rheumatoid arthritis patients in clinical practice. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2015; 54: 672–677.
- 41 Oon S, Huq M, Godfrey T, *et al.* Systematic review, and meta-analysis of steroid-sparing effect, of biologic agents in randomized, placebo-controlled phase 3 trials for systemic lupus erythematosus. *Semin Arthritis Rheum* 2018; 48: 221–239.