Metered-Dose Inhaler versus nebulizer for the treatment of acute asthma exacerbation in preschool children
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Pro/con MDI vs Nebulizer for acute asthma exacerbation in preschool children
Objectives

1. Learn about aerosols drug delivery.
2. Understand the benefits of MDI devices and the disadvantages of nebulizers.
3. Discuss the arguments for MDI use compared to nebulizer use.
4. Review studies that support MDI use- regarding efficacy, cost effectiveness and patient and parents’ satisfaction.
5. Review GINA, CTS and AHS recommendations for the treatment of acute asthma exacerbation in preschool children.
Background-Inhaled Aerosol drug delivery

Aerosol is a suspension of solid/liquid particles in gas.

Inhaled Aerosol drug delivery improves **efficacy and decreases side effects** compared to other routes of administration.

**Variables determine aerosol deposition:** particle size, breathing pattern, anatomic and functional status of the lungs and mode of inhalation.
Mechanisms of deposition of aerosol

- **Mechanism:** Impaction
- **Particle size:** Large (>5 μm)
- **Representative site:** Nasopharynx

- **Mechanism:** Sedimentation
- **Particle size:** Medium (1–5 μm)
- **Representative site:** Small airways

- **Mechanism:** Diffusion
- **Particle size:** Small (<0.1 μm)
- **Representative site:** Alveoli
Background-Inhaled Aerosol drug delivery

**Aerosols Use for the treatment of** many respiratory disorders in children (including asthma).

*Inhaled selective B2 agonist* is the *drug of choice for acute asthma* in children, and can be delivered by *nebulizer or MDI.*
Background-MDI
Metered Dose Inhaler

MDI – a pressurized inhaler that delivers medication by using a propellant spray.

First introduced in 1956 by Riker Laboratories.

MDI consists of 3 major components:

Pressurized Canister - Contains the drug suspended in a mixture of propellants.

Metering valve, metered quantity of the formulation.

Actuator and mouthpiece
Pressure MDI
Benefits of MDI compared to nebulizer

1. MDI is more **convenient** (easy and rapid administration) and is **portable**.
2. MDI is more **efficient**.
3. MDI has **less side effects**
4. MDI is more **cost effective**.
5. MDI increases child and parents’ **satisfaction** from the treatment.
6. MDI **reduces** the risk of **bacterial contamination**.
7. MDI produces **accurate and reproducible dosing**.
MDI Disadvantages

1. MDI required **correct coordination** of actuation and inspiration due to the **high velocity of discharge of particles**.
2. This activity is **difficult for children**, for patients with severe muscle weakness or patients with hand deformities.
3. Improper technique increases **oropharyngeal drug deposition** and side effects.
4. It is hard to determine when the **MDI is empty**.
MDI/AD (accessory devices) – spacer

The development of MDI/AD accessory devices (spacer) in the early 1980, improved the administration of aerosol bronchodilators through MDI and resolved the need for coordination.
Spacer devices

A spacer is an open-ended tube or bag.

Spacer allows the aerosol to settle in the chamber and the propellant to evaporate.

Spacers are **100-700ml in volume** and have a distance of **10-30 cm** between the MDI edge and the mouth.

**Spacer should be with one way valved-VHC-valve holding chamber**
A number of spacer devices are commercially available
Benefits of spacer

1. **Provides a reservoir of trapped aerosol** that can be inhaled for 3-5 sec, decreases the velocity of the particles and **eliminates the need for coordination**.

2. **Decreases the oropharyngeal drug deposition and improves distal delivery of the drug.**
Nebulizer - background

Widely used to deliver aerosol therapy in children. Nebulizers are commonly used in patients who are very ill and in situations where large drug doses are needed.
Nebulizer benefits

1. Allows provision of **oxygen** in case of hypoxia.
2. Large doses of the drug can be delivered (antibiotics—such as Tobramycin).
3. Some medications are available only in liquid form (DNAase, hypertonic saline).
Nebulizer Disadvantages

1. Requires a **power source** /compressed air or oxygen.
2. Needs **more delivery time that decreases compliance**.
3. Requires **regular maintenance** (clean after every use).
4. Large particles impact in the upper airway, **systemically absorbed**, more **side effects**.
5. **More expensive** (equipment, staff time and drug cost).
6. Risk of **infections** (Gram negative).
7. Risk of **drug exposure** to staff and caregiver.
8. Highly **variable rate of aerosol delivery. Inefficient/waste medication**.
Radiolabeled Ventolin deposition MDI vs NEB

MDI USE WITH NON TIGHTLY FITTED MASK

NEB USE WITH NON TIGHTLY FITTED MASK
Radiolabeled Ventolin deposition MDI vs NEB

MDI USE NON COOPERATIVE CHILD

NEB USE NON COOPERATIVE CHILD
Radiolabeled Ventolin deposition MDI vs NEB

MDI USE IN COOPERATIVE CHILD WITH FITTED MASK

NEB USE IN COOPERATIVE CHILD WITH FITTED MASK
Pro- MDI use

- Efficacy
- Cost effectiveness
- Patient and parents satisfactions
Efficacy

Metered-Dose Inhaler Accessory Devices in Acute Asthma

Efficacy and Comparison With Nebulizers: A Literature Review

Israel Amirav, MD; Michael T. Newhouse, MD, FRCPC

ARCH PEDIATR ADOLESC MED/VOL 151, SEP 1997
10 RCT-randomized controlled trials,

301 children (0-18y) treated with B agonists via MDI+AD and 274 children via nebulizers.

Major outcomes: PFT, SaO2 and clinical assessment.

Results: 2 studies showed that MDI+AD was more effective than nebulizer, 8 studies MDI+AD is as effective as nebulizer.

There was a tendency to prefer the use of MDI+AD (convenience, fast, patient preferences and cost effective).

Conclusion: MDI+AD should be the first line treatment in acute asthma in children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source, y</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Mean Age (Range), y</th>
<th>No. (Total) Subjects, MDI/SVN</th>
<th>Dose Ratio, MDI:SVN</th>
<th>Variables Measured</th>
<th>Results of MDI vs SVN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freelander and Van Asperen, 1984</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>7.6 (3-13)</td>
<td>14/14 (28)</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>Yes, No, Yes</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuglsang and Pedersen, 1986</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>10.0 (7-14)</td>
<td>21/21 (21)†</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Yes, No, Yes</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendergast et al, 1989</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>4.5 (3-7)</td>
<td>18/9 (27)</td>
<td>1:2, 1:4</td>
<td>Yes, No, No</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba et al, 1989</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>11.9 (7-18)</td>
<td>14/13 (27)</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>Yes, No, Yes</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee et al, 1991</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3.2 (0.5-6)</td>
<td>16/17 (33)</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>Yes, Yes, No</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keram et al, 1993</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>10.3 (6-14)</td>
<td>17/16 (33)</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>Yes, Yes, Yes</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin et al, 1995</td>
<td>ED/clinic</td>
<td>8.3 (5-16)</td>
<td>56/55 (111)</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>Yes, Yes, Yes</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkin et al, 1995</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>3.0 (1-5)</td>
<td>30/30 (60)</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>Yes, No, No</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou et al, 1995</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>7.7 (NA)</td>
<td>71/81 (152)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes, Yes, Yes</td>
<td>= or Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams et al, 1996</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>10.4 (6-18)</td>
<td>42/18 (60)</td>
<td>1:6.9</td>
<td>Yes, Yes, Yes</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efficacy

β-AGONISTS THROUGH METERED-DOSE INHALER WITH VALVED HOLDING CHAMBER VERSUS NEBULIZER FOR ACUTE EXACERBATION OF WHEEZING OR ASTHMA IN CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW WITH META-ANALYSIS

José A. Castro-Rodríguez, MD, and Gustavo J. Rodrigo, MD

The Journal of Pediatrics • August 2004
Results

6 RCT that were published between 1998-2003. 491 children (<5y) were randomly received B agonist via MDI+VHC or nebulizer.

Primary outcome- hospital admission.

Secondary outcomes - clinical score (severity assessment), duration of treatment in the ED, RR, SO2 and HR.
Results primary outcome- hospital admission

Primary outcome- hospital admission

Children with MDI+VHC showed a significant lower admission rate (>50%) compared to nebulizer (OR 0.42, 95% CI 0.24-0.72, P=0.02).

More significant among children with moderate to severe wheezing exacerbations (OR 0.27, 95% CI 0.13-0.54, P=0.0003).
Primary outcome- hospital admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>MDI + VHC n/N</th>
<th>Nebulization n/N</th>
<th>OR (95%CI Random)</th>
<th>Weight %</th>
<th>OR (95% CI Random)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closa [39]</td>
<td>4 / 17</td>
<td>4 / 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00[0.20,4.88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado [44]</td>
<td>5 / 83</td>
<td>20 / 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21[0.07,0.59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leversha [40]</td>
<td>10 / 30</td>
<td>18 / 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33[0.12,0.96]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandelberg [41]</td>
<td>6 / 23</td>
<td>7 / 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61[0.16,2.26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploin [42]</td>
<td>3 / 32</td>
<td>3 / 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00[0.19,5.37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubilar [43]</td>
<td>0 / 62</td>
<td>1 / 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32[0.01,8.08]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28 / 247</td>
<td>53 / 244</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.42[0.24,0.72]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for heterogeneity chi-square=4.46 df=5 p=0.49
Test for overall effect z=-3.10 p=0.002

Fig 1. Pooled odds ratios of hospital admissions comparing treatment with β-agonists by MDI+VHC or nebulizer. Logarithmic scale was used for plotting odds ratios. Width of horizontal line represents 95% CI around point estimate (black square). Size of point estimate represents relative weight (percentage of weight) of each trial in the pooled summary estimate (diamond). Vertical line is line of no effect (OR, 1.0).
Results-secondary outcomes

1. Five studies with clinical scores were analyzed. The analysis showed a significant decrease of severity in the clinical score with MDI+VHC use (95%CI -0.68 to -0.20, p=.0003).

2. Two out of three studies that reported HR showed significant increase of HR with nebulizer use.

3. One study showed a significant increase in RR with nebulizer use.

4. No differences in oxygen saturation.
Secondary outcome - clinical score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>MDI + VHC</th>
<th>Nebulizer</th>
<th>SMD (95%CI Random)</th>
<th>Weight %</th>
<th>SMD (95%CI Random)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close [39]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-0.65[-1.34,0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado [44]</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>-0.27[-0.58,0.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leversha [40]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>-0.27[-0.78,0.23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandelberg [41]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-0.25[-0.86,0.36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubilar [43]</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>-0.77[-1.14,-0.40]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (95%CI): 215 212

Test for heterogeneity chi-square=5.43 df=4 p=0.25
Test for overall effect z=3.66 p=0.0003

**Fig 2.** Pooled SMD in clinical score after treatment with β-agonists by MDI+VHC or nebulizer. SMD represents difference in means between groups displayed on SD units. Width of horizontal line represents 95% CI around point estimate (black square). Size of point estimate represents relative weight (percentage of weight) of each trial in the pooled summary estimate (diamond).
Study conclusion

B agonists by MDI+VHC was more effective.

Side effects were lower suggesting less systemic absorption.

**Conclusion:** MDI+VHC should be used as a first choice to administer beta-agonists in children<5y of age for the treatment of acute exacerbation of wheezing/asthma in the PED.
Efficacy

PHARMACOTHERAPY

Spacers versus nebulizers in treatment of acute asthma – a prospective randomized study in preschool children

Niki Mitselou, MD¹, Gunilla Hedlin, MD, PhD², and Carl-Axel Hederos, MD, PhD³
Spacer versus nebulizer for the treatment of acute Asthma in preschool children

**Aim:** to compare the use of spacer device to nebulizer device to administer bronchodilators in acute asthma attack in the PED in **preschool children (0-6y).**

**RCT** that included **98 children (0-6y).**

45 pt were treated with MDI, 53 pt with nebulizer.

**Primary outcome:** admission rates and LOS (length of stay) PED.

**Secondary outcomes:** SO2, RR, HR.
Spacer versus nebulizer for the treatment of acute Asthma in preschool children

Results:
Primary outcome - LOS-PED and admission rates were similar.
Secondary outcomes - HR, RR, SO2 - showed no significant differences.

Conclusion: MDI with spacers are at least as effective as nebulizers in the delivery of B-agonists to treat preschool children with acute asthma/wheezing.
Aim: To assess the effects of spacers compared to nebulizers for the delivery of beta agonists for acute asthma.

Selection criteria: RCT in adults and children (>2y) with asthma.

39 trials that included 1897 children and 729 adults.

33 trials were conducted in the ER and equivalent community settings, 6 trials in inpatients with acute asthma.
Results and conclusions: *(Regarding children).*

1. No significant difference in hospital admission rates.
2. LOS-PED was **significantly shorter with spacer use.** The mean time difference was **33 minutes less.**
3. HR was lower with spacer use, mean difference -5% difference.
4. Tremor was lower with spacer use *(RR 0.64; 95% CI 0.44 to 0.95).*
Inhaled short-acting bronchodilators for managing emergency childhood asthma: an overview of reviews

M. Pollock¹, I. P. Sinha², L. Hartling¹, B. H. Rowe³, S. Schreiber¹ & R. M. Fernandes⁴,⁵

¹Alberta Research Centre for Health Evidence, Department of Pediatrics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada; ²Institute of Child Health, Alder Hey Children’s Hospital, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK; ³Department of Emergency Medicine and School of Public Health, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada; ⁴Clinical Pharmacology Unit, Instituto de Medicina Molecular, University of Lisbon Lisboa, Portugal; ⁵Department of Pediatrics, Lisbon Academic Medical Centre, Santa Maria Hospital, Lisboa, Portugal

Allergy 72 (2017) 183-200 © 2016 John Wiley & Sons A/S. Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd
13 systematic reviews including 56 trials (RCT+/CCT).

5526 children (0-18y) who were treated in the PED or equivalent care setting for acute exacerbation of asthma or recurrent wheeze.

Exclusion criteria: single first episodes of wheezing or bronchiolitis.
Interventions: inhaled SABA, SAAC (short acting anticholinergics) and inhaled magnesium sulfate that were administered via MDI +/- spacer or nebulizers.

Primary outcomes: hospital admission, LOS in the PED, ICU +/- ventilation.

Secondary outcomes: clinical assessment, adverse effects (N/V, tremor), PFT-PEF, FEV1.
1. Results regarding B-agonist via MDI vs Nebulizer:

Primary outcome:

1. **For children < 3y**: 6 trials, (490 children)- treatment with MDI+spacer led to 44% decrease in admission. Limited to younger children with moderate to severe asthma only.

2. **For children age 3-18y**: 10 trials (784 children) showed no difference in admission. 3 trials (396 children) showed that MDI with spacers led to decrease in PED LOS of about 30min regardless of asthma severity.
1. **Results: for secondary outcomes:**

1. **For children <3y:** inconsistent.

2. **For children 3-10y:** SABA via MDI showed *decreased incidence of tremor* by 37% compared to nebulizer.

**Conclusion:** SABA should be given as the first line bronchodilator with the use of MDI + spacer in children with mild to moderate attacks, particularly in young children.
Cost effectiveness of MDI versus nebulizers

Economic impact of Salbutamol inhalation procedure in ED.

Most studies showed that MDI is associated with significant economic gains and decreased costs.
Cost effectiveness of MDI versus nebulizers

A Cost Analysis of Salbutamol Administration by Metered-Dose Inhalers with Spacers versus Nebulization for Patients with Wheeze in the Pediatric Emergency Department: Evidence from Observational Data in Nova Scotia

Paul Spin, MA, PhD ABD; Ingrid Sketris, PharmD, MPA(HSA); Barbara Hill-Taylor, BSP, MLIS; Courtney Ward, MA, PhD; Katrina F. Hurley, MD, MHi
Cost effectiveness of MDI versus nebulizers

**Aim:** to evaluate the relative costs of MDI versus nebulizer for Salbutamol inhalation.

**Methods:** Retrospective cohort study that collected data from patients’ charts to estimate the associations between MDI/nebulizer and costs, LOS-PED and LOS-hospital and the probability of hospital admission.

**Population:** a random sample of 822 children presenting with wheeze to the PED in IWK Health Centre in Maritime Canada.

664 were treated via MDI and 158 with NEB.
Cost of MDI versus nebulizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Use</th>
<th>CDN$/Unit</th>
<th>CDN$/Patient, 1 treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDI-s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDI†</td>
<td>2.95/Unit</td>
<td>2.95‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacer§</td>
<td>33.07/Unit</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Time¶</td>
<td>31.88/hour</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mask</td>
<td>0.97/Unit</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubing</td>
<td>0.27/Unit</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebule</td>
<td>0.43/Unit</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Time¶</td>
<td>31.88/hour</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salbutamoll</td>
<td>0.06/mg</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDI-s and NEB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,077/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost effectiveness of MDI versus nebulizers

Results:

1. **PED- LOS** was similar in both groups.

2. Treatment with MDI showed lower costs and improved clinical outcomes.
   1. Reduction in admission rate of 4.4% (p<0.05) and reduction of 25h on average in inpatient stay (for those who were admitted).
   2. Saving of 24CND$/pt in PED costs.
   3. Saving of 180CND$/pt in total cost per visit (p<0.001) mostly due to lower inpatient costs.

Conclusion: MDI for salbutamol inhalation was associated with significant economic gains.
Cost-effectiveness of Metered-Dose Inhalers for Asthma Exacerbations in the Pediatric Emergency Department

AUTHORS: Quynh Doan, MDCM, Allan Shefrin, MD, and David Johnson, MD

WHAT'S KNOWN ON THIS SUBJECT: Treatment of mild and moderate asthma exacerbations in emergency departments can be efficaciously delivered by using either metered-dose inhalers or wet nebulization. Cost is a frequently cited reason for not using metered-dose inhalers over nebulization in emergency departments.

WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS: Metered-dose inhalers are a cost-efficient mode of delivery for bronchodilators, and transitioning from nebulization to metered-dose inhaler in pediatric emergency departments may result in significant cost savings associated with each admission averted.
Cost effectiveness of MDI versus nebulizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Protocol</th>
<th>Cost, Can$</th>
<th>Effect (Admission Averted)</th>
<th>Incremental Cost-effectiveness (Can$ per Admission Averted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall MDI and space chamber with hospital admission costs</td>
<td>262.73</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averaged drug and delivery-device costs</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averaged nursing time for the LOS in ED costs</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of admission multiplied by hospital admission costs</td>
<td>220.37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet nebulization with hospital admission costs</td>
<td>417.68</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averaged drug and delivery-device costs</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averaged nursing time for the LOS in ED costs</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of admission multiplied by hospital admission costs</td>
<td>366.35</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental</td>
<td>-154.95</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-2499.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child and parents satisfaction with the use of spacer devices in acute asthma


EM COTTERELL,¹,² M GAZARIAN,² RL HENRY,² MW O’MEARA¹,² and SR WALES¹

¹Children’s Emergency Department, Sydney Children’s Hospital, Randwick and ²School of Women’s and Children’s Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia
Child and parents satisfaction with MDI

**Aim:** to evaluate both child and parents’ satisfaction with the use of MDI + spacer.

**Methods:** Parents and children >8y, presented to the PED with mild to moderately severe acute asthma attack and were treated with bronchodilators by MDI. They were asked to complete separate questionnaires independently.
Child and parents satisfaction with MDI

**Results:** 111 parents, 17 children responded.

84% of the parents found it easy/very easy to use the spacer.

84% of the parents preferred the spacer over the nebulizer.

82% of the children preferred spacer because it was quicker and easier to use.

**Conclusion:** the use of spacer devices in mild-moderately severe acute asthma is highly acceptable for children and parents.
Nebule to Metered Dose Inhaler (MDI) with spacer Therapeutic Interchange

**BOTTOM LINE:** Whenever possible, any order for nebulized ipratropium, salbutamol, combination ipratropium/salbutamol, or budesonide should be interchanged to a MDI with spacer.

**Background:** Conversion of nebulized ipratropium, salbutamol, combination ipratropium/salbutamol, or budesonide to a MDI with spacer reduces the risk of medical air/oxygen misconnects, spread of infection, drug exposure to staff, and adverse effects to patients.

**Efficacy:** MDI with spacer produces outcomes that are at least equivalent to administration by nebulizer in both adults and pediatrics in the emergency department and inpatient settings.\(^1,2\) Dose equivalence between drugs given by nebulization or MDI with spacer is not well-defined in the literature.\(^1,2\) The proposed dose conversions have been used successfully within AHS and Covenant Health.
Treatment by wet nebulization is restricted to:
- Severe, life-threatening respiratory disease (e.g. those with severe or impending respiratory arrest, those with hypoventilation or ventilation compromise, continuous nebulization, end-stage COPD, CF);
  OR
- Patients who are uncooperative or are unable to follow the directions required for MDI with spacer use;
  OR
- Patients with a history of poor response to MDI with spacer

As with any medication change, it is important for a provider (e.g. clinical pharmacist, physician, nurse, or respiratory therapist) to do a patient assessment of dose response and side effects.
CHOICE OF INHALER DEVICE

Inhaled therapy constitutes the cornerstone of asthma treatment in children 5 years and younger. A pressurized metered dose inhaler (pMDI) with a valved spacer (with or without a face mask, depending on the child’s age) is the preferred delivery system. This recommendation is based on studies with beta-agonists. The spacer device should have documented efficacy in young children. The dose delivered may vary considerably between spacers, so consider this if changing from one spacer to another.

The only possible inhalation technique in young children is tidal breathing. The optimal number of breaths required to empty the spacer depends on the child’s tidal volume, and the dead space and volume of the spacer. Generally 5-10 breaths will be sufficient per actuation. The way a spacer is used can markedly affect the amount of drug delivered:

- Spacer size may affect the amount of drug available for inhalation in a complex way depending on the drug prescribed and the pMDI used. Young children can use spacers of all sizes, but theoretically a lower volume spacer (<360 mL) is advantageous in very young children.
- A single pMDI actuation should be delivered at a time, with the inhaler shaken in between. Multiple actuations into the spacer before inhalation may markedly reduce the amount of drug inhaled.
- Delay between actuating the pMDI into the spacer and inhalation may reduce the amount of drug available. This varies between spacers, but to maximize drug delivery, inhalation should start as soon as possible after actuation.
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Take home message

1. **MDI with spacer** should be used as a **first choice** to administer beta-agonists **in children<5y** for the treatment of **acute asthma exacerbation**.

2. MDI is more **convenient** (rapid and easy administration).

3. MDI is more **efficient with less side effects and less risk of drug and bacterial exposure**.

4. MDI is **cost effective** and increases child and parents satisfaction.
Questions?
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Thank you for listening