Respiratory support in a population-based ALS cohort: demographic, timing and survival determinants

INTRODUCTION
Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is a neurodegenerative disease leading to a progressive loss of motor function and cognitive impairment of the frontotemporal type (FTD). Respiratory failure is a common symptom and can be treated with non-invasive mechanical ventilation (NIMV) and/or invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) via tracheostomy.1 Studies on NIMV report a quite wide range of survival time, due to the heterogeneity of the clinical setting and patients’ characteristics, and very few data are available about NIMV and IMV in population-based cohorts.2 3

The aim of this study was to assess the outcome and prognostic determinants of ventilatory supports in a large population-based cohort of patients with ALS.

METHODS
The study population includes all patients with ALS diagnosed from 2008 to 2015 in the prospective population-based Piemonte and Valle d’Aosta Register for ALS. Demographic and clinical information, including those related to NIMV/IMV, were collected. The determinants of NIMV, IMV and NIMV to IMV transition were assessed with binary logistic regression analysis (backward). Additional details on methods and statistical analysis are reported in the online supplemental material.

RESULTS
During the study period, 1159 patients were diagnosed with ALS (median age at onset of 68.4 years (IQR 60.3–74.7); 540 females (46.6%); 395 (34.1%) bulbar onset). The characteristics of patients according to the different respiratory supports are reported in the online supplemental table 1. NIMV was performed by 391 (33.7%) patients, NIMV followed by IMV by 81 (7.0%); 620 patients (53.5%) did not undergo ventilation.

The median survival time after NIMV initiation was 1.00 year (IQR 0.51–2.34). Factors related to the use of NIMV are reported in the online supplemental material. Pre-NIMV spirometry values were available for 308 (64.3%) patients. A dose–response effect of FVC% on the outcome of NIMV was found, with an increased survival at higher FVC% values (p=0.0001) (figure 1A). Therefore, we ran two Cox multivariable models for evaluating factors related to survival after NIMV (online supplemental table 2). In Model A, which excluded Forces Vital Capacity percent of expected (FVC%) and did not under NIMV, the median survival time after NIMV was 1.08 (IQR 0.74–2.75), FVC% 70–79 (red) 65 cases, median survival time 1.34 (IQR 0.75–2.82), FVC% ≥80 (violet) 25 cases, median survival time 2.51 (1.49–5.00) (p<0.0001). (B) Survival after invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) in patients who did (blue) and did not (green) undergo NIMV before performing IMV (p=0.014). (C) Survival from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) onset. NIMV+IMV (violet), median survival time 6.09 (IQR 3.89–10); IMV alone (red) median survival time 3.40 (IQR 1.95–5.41) (p=0.0001); NIMV (blue) median survival time 2.84 (IQR 1.75–5.25); non-respiratory support (green) median survival time 2.41 (IQR 1.33–5.18).

The median survival time after IMV was 1.97 years (IQR 0.66–5.05); however, it was 3.00 years (IQR 0.70–8.54) for patients undergoing IMV after NIMV, and 1.58 years (IQR 0.59–3.66) (p=0.014) for those who performed directly IMV (figure 1B).

Comparing survival from disease onset in all groups, patients who underwent IMV and/or NIMV had a significantly longer survival compared with non-ventilated patients (figure 1C). NIMV and IMV remained independently significant...
in Cox multivariable analysis (online supplemental table 4).

**DISCUSSION**

This is the first study to have systematically assessed in a large ALS population-based series the factors related to the choice to undergo mechanical ventilation and the determinants of survival. About 50% of our cohort underwent NIMV/IMV, confirming an improved adherence to current guidelines. Patients who used mechanical ventilation had an increased overall survival compared with non-ventilated patients. Main factors related to a better survival after NIMV/IMV were a higher FVC% and a lower ∆ALSFRS-R at time of ventilation.

In the last two decades, respiratory support via NIMV has become the standard treatment of respiratory failure in ALS. The use of IMV is less explored and neurologists’ attitudes are considerably less uniform. In general, when discussing the option of IMV, much emphasis is put on patients’ personal motivations and to inform that IMV may prolong survival but does not modify disease progression or quality of life and may increase caregivers’ burden.2,4

Younger age and attending an ALS multidisciplinary clinic resulted to be independently related to patients’ decision to perform NIMV. Younger age was also an independent determinant of the use of IMV, together with male sex, ∆ALSFRS-R at diagnosis and bulbar onset. These two latter factors are a novel finding of our study and may be due to the rapid progression of respiratory impairment in fast progressors, and the scarce tolerance of NIMV interface or aspiration pneumonia in patients with bulbar impairment. Another important novel observation of our study is that patients with comorbid FTD had a 50% chance to undergo mechanical ventilation compared with patients with normal cognition. Finally, our data revealed that the sex inequality in the use of mechanical ventilation is declining, although not completely.

In our cohort, −20% of patients performing NIMV chose to undergo IMV. The transition from NIMV to IMV was significantly more frequent in patients followed by multidisciplinary clinics and it was almost invariably planned in advance by the patients. The main reasons for the transition were the use of NIMV for more than 20 hours/day, acute respiratory infections and increased difficulty in clearing secretions.

Although several studies have reported that NIMV increases survival, the effect on patients’ outcome of NIMV and IMV is still controversial.3–5 In our series, we found that patients who underwent NIVM alone or followed by IMV had a better outcome than non-ventilated ones independently from other prognostic factors. This is true also for patients with bulbar onset, differently from previous reports. Besides, we identified a positive correlation between higher FVC% values and better survival, thus supporting an earlier starting of NIMV, when patients’ ventilatory function is still partially preserved. Finally, the prognostic role of lower ∆ALSFRS-R before NIMV suggests that respiratory support does not modify the rate of functional decline.

A better survival after IMV was associated with younger age, ∆ALSFRS-R before IMV, and to be married. Notably, we also observed a better outcome of IMV in patients who previously underwent NIMV, likely because the intervention is planned in advance and not performed in an emergency setting.

This study is not without limitations. First, we could not include cognitive impairment in the multivariable models since patients with a diagnosis of comorbid FTD were less likely to undergo NIMV, hindering the possibility to unbiasefully assess the effect of cognitive impairment on survival. Second, most patients performing NIMV/IMV attended a multidisciplinary clinic, limiting the possibility to evaluate the effect of multidisciplinary care on mechanical ventilation outcome.

The real-world data of this large population-based study indicate that mechanical ventilation prolongs survival independently from other prognostic factors, including bulbar onset. In addition, our data will be useful for the management of patients and for designing clinical trials, which should keep into account the substantial effect of mechanical ventilation on the course of the disease and its demographic and clinical determinants.
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