

Original article

Comparison of Oscillometry with Lung Function Parameters between Bronchial Asthma with Airflow Obstruction and COPD Patients

Sajal De, MD, FCCP

Aakansha Ashok Sarma, MD

Department of Pulmonary Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Raipur-492099, Chhattisgarh, India

Correspondence and reprint requests:

Dr Sajal De, Department of Pulmonary Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India; Phone: 91-9406573824; E-Mail: sajalde@yahoo.com

Funding

None

Author Contributions

Conceived, interpretation of results, drafting the manuscript by SD. Data collection by AS. Both authors approved the manuscript and decided to submit it for publication.

Financial Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

Keywords list: Asthma, COPD, lung oscillometry, respiratory resistance, respiratory reactance, bronchodilator responsiveness, spirometry

Abbreviations list

ATS: American Thoracic Society

BDR: Bronchodilator responsiveness

COPD: Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

EFL_T: Expiratory flow limitation at tidal breaths

ERS: European Respiratory Society

FEV₁: Forced expiratory volume 1 s

FVC: Forced vital capacity

MMEF: Maximal mid-expiratory flow

PR: Paradoxical responsiveness

R5: Respiratory system resistance at 5 Hz

R5-19: Difference in respiratory resistance between 5 Hz and 19 Hz

Rrs: Respiratory system resistance

sRaw: Specific airway resistance

X5: respiratory system reactance at 5 Hz

Xrs: Respiratory system reactance

$\Delta X5$: Difference between inspiratory and expiratory reactance at 5 Hz

Background: Lung oscillometry is an emerging lung function test for assessing obstructive airway disease. Comparisons of oscillometry parameters and their bronchodilator responsiveness (BDR) between bronchial asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) patients are limited.

Research Question: Do oscillometry parameters and their BDR differ between stable asthma and COPD patients with similar severity of airflow obstruction?

Study Design and Methods: We included 467 consecutive adult patients with a clinical history of asthma (n=187) or COPD (n=280). Oscillometry, spirometry, and body plethysmography were performed before and after inhaling 400 µg of salbutamol. Patients were stratified based on the severity of airflow obstruction in spirometry. The z scores of the oscillometry parameters were used for the comparison. The BDR of oscillometry parameters with other lung function parameters was also compared.

Results: The average age of the study population was 54.9 years, and 76.4% were male. COPD patients were older, had a greater number of smokers, and had poorer lung function. The magnitude of oscillometry parameters worsened with increasing severity of airflow obstruction, regardless of the underlying disease. Asthma patients, particularly those with moderate and severe airway obstruction, had significantly higher R5 and R19 than COPD patients. The within- and whole-breath X5 of asthma were not different from those of COPD patients with similar severities of airflow obstruction. Expiratory flow limitation at tidal breaths ($\Delta X5 > 0.28$ kPa/L/s) was observed in both asthma and COPD patients across all severities of airflow obstruction. The proportion of BDR in oscillometry was significantly lower than that in spirometry for both asthma (35.3% vs. 57.1%; $p < 0.01$) and COPD patients (19.3% vs. 47.1%; $p = 0.02$).

Interpretation: Oscillometry parameters except for R5 and R19 did not differ between asthma and COPD patients with similar severities of airflow obstruction. Similar to spirometry, COPD patients had lower BDR in oscillometry than asthma patients.

Short title: Comparison of oscillometry parameters between asthma and COPD patients

Take-home Points

Study Question: Are oscillometry parameters and their bronchodilator responsiveness different between bronchial asthma and COPD patients with similar severities of airflow obstruction?

Results: We compared the FOT between 187 bronchial asthma and 280 COPD patients. Except for R5 and R19, the severity and distribution of high oscillometry parameters did not differ between asthma and COPD patients.

Interpretation: The severity of oscillometry abnormalities is primarily determined by the severity of airflow obstruction, not the underlying disease.

BACKGROUND

Asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) are major obstructive airway diseases that affect millions.^{1,2} Both diseases are characterized by chronic inflammation leading to airflow obstruction. However, the types of airway inflammation, pathophysiological changes, and bronchodilator responsiveness (BDR) of spirometry differ.³

Oscillometry is an emerging noninvasive technique for assessing small airway dysfunction. It superimposes multiple oscillations on tidal breaths to measure respiratory system resistance (Rrs) and reactance (Xrs). Collapsing the small airways during tidal breathing increases the difference between inspiratory and expiratory Xrs.

Spirometry is the gold standard for diagnosing airflow obstruction and assessing BDR. Forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV₁) and forced vital capacity (FVC) measured by spirometry primarily reflect the functionality of medium to large airways. The correlation between oscillometry parameters and spirometry parameters is generally weak.⁴ The BDR criteria for spirometry defined by the European Respiratory Society (ERS)/American Thoracic Society (ATS) in 2022 differ from their previous criteria published in 1991.^{5,6}

Patients with obstructive airway diseases may have high specific airway resistance (sRaw) and residual volume (RV). A reduction in sRaw by $\geq 50\%$ after inhalation of salbutamol

confirms BDR of sRaw with certainty.⁷ A more than 20% decrease in the RV after inhalation of salbutamol had 70% sensitivity and 60% specificity for the BDR of the RV based on FEV₁.⁸

The primary objective of our study was to compare oscillometry parameters (within- and whole-breath) and their bronchodilator responsiveness with other lung function parameters between stable asthma with airflow obstruction and COPD patients with similar severity of airflow obstruction. The secondary objective was to compare the BDR of the spirometry indices of asthma and COPD patients according to the ERS/ATS criteria published in 1991 and 2022 and their agreement with the BDR of oscillometry parameters.

Study Design and Methods

Population

This retrospective study included clinically diagnosed adult asthma and COPD patients who underwent lung function testing at our department between July 2021 and December 2023. The Institutional Ethics Committee approved the study protocol (No: 4705/IEC-AIIMSRPR/2024). The clinical diagnosis of asthma was based on a history of respiratory symptoms, e.g., wheezing, shortness of breath, chest tightness, and cough, which varied over time and in intensity as per the GINA guidelines.¹ The clinical diagnosis of COPD was based on the patient's clinical history and symptoms, including dyspnea on exertion, as per the GOLD guidelines, and postbronchodilator FEV₁/FVC <70%.² All lung functions were performed before and 15–20 min after inhaling 400 µg of salbutamol by a metered-dose inhaler through a spacer to assess the BDR.

Oscillometry

The Resmon Pro Full (V3; RestechSrl, Milan, Italy) was used for oscillometry using 5, 11, and 19 Hz sinusoidal signals. Oscillometry was performed according to the ERS technical

standard.⁹ The tests were carried out while the participants were sitting, wearing a nose clip, and with their cheeks supported. At least three tests were performed, each continued until ten accepted breaths were recorded. The means of three trials with coefficients of variation for R5 <10% were used for the analysis. The parameters included were whole-breath Rrs at 5 Hz (R5), within- and whole-breath Xrs at 5 Hz (X5); the difference between inspiratory and expiratory reactance at 5 Hz ($\Delta X5$); and the difference in Rrs between 5 and 19 Hz (R5-19), the resonant frequency (Fres), and the area above the Xrs curve from 5 Hz to the resonant frequency (AX). The severity of oscillometry parameters was compared using the z scores recommended by the ERS technical standards.⁹ The z scores were computed according to the predictive equation of oscillometry parameters for the local population.¹⁰ R5 and R5-19 were classified as "high" if their z scores were > 1.64. X5 were classified as "high" if their z scores were > -1.64. Severity was classified based on z score, i.e., mild (> 1.64 and ≤ 2.5), moderate (> 2.5 and ≤ 4), and severe (> 4) impairment of R5 and mild (> -1.64 and ≤ -2.5) moderate (> -2.5 and ≤ -4) and severe (> -4) impairment of X5. Owing to the nonavailability of the z scores of Fres and AX of the local population, we considered Fres > 18 Hz and AX > 30 cmH₂O/L/s as high. BDR was defined according to the ERS technical standard, i.e., a 40% decrease in R5, a 50% decrease in X5, and an 80% decrease in AX.⁹ The presence of BDR in R5, X5, or AX was defined as the BDR of oscillometry. Tidal expiratory flow limitation (EFL_T) was defined as $\Delta X5 > 0.28$ kPa/L/s. We defined paradoxical responsiveness (PR) in oscillometry as a 40% increase in R5 or a 50% increase in X5 after bronchodilator use.

A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis was conducted to determine the cutoff for the BDR of oscillometry parameters in terms of changes in the z score and absolute values using the cutoff for BDR as recommended by the ERS technical standards.⁹

Spirometry and body plethysmography

Spirometry and body plethysmography were performed according to the ERS/ATS recommendations using a PowerCube Body⁺ (GANSORN Medizin Electronic, Germany) while the patients were sitting and wearing a nose clip.⁵ To assess the BDR of spirometry, we used the ERS/ATS guidelines published in 1991 (i.e., $\geq 12\%$ and ≥ 200 mL increase in FEV₁ and/or FVC from baseline) and in 2022 (i.e., $>10\%$ relative to the predicted value for FEV₁ and/or FVC).^{5,6} The Global Lung Function Initiative equations were used to assess the BDR as per the ERS/ATS-2022 guidelines.¹¹ A PR on spirometry was defined as a $\geq 12\%$ and 200 mL reduction in FEV₁, FVC, or both. The predictive equations of spirometry parameters for the Indian population were used to calculate the FEV₁% predicted.¹² Without the z-score of spirometry parameters of the local population, we stratified the severity of airflow obstruction based on prebronchodilator FEV₁% predicted as per the ERS/ATS-1991 guidelines, i.e., FEV₁% predicted $\geq 70\%$ mild; $<70\%$ to $\geq 60\%$ moderate; $<60\%$ to $\geq 50\%$ to moderately severe; $<50\%$ to $\geq 35\%$ severe; and $<35\%$ very severe.⁵

A postbronchodilator increase in maximal mid-expiratory flow (MMEF) $\geq 30\%$ of baseline was used to define BDR in MMEF.¹³ A $>20\%$ decrease in RV and a $\geq 50\%$ reduction in sRaw were defined as BDR in body plethysmography.^{7,8}

Statistical methods

The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS statistics for Windows (Version 23.0, Armonk, NY: IBM corp). Categorical variables are presented as numbers and percentages. Continuous data are presented as the mean \pm standard deviation. Differences in proportions were tested using the Pearson χ^2 test. The student's t-test was used to compare the variables between the two groups. A p-value of <0.05 was statistically significant. The consistency between the different

parameters was evaluated using Cohen's kappa (κ). The values of κ 0–0.20, 0.21–0.40, 0.41–0.60, and 0.61–0.80 indicate slight, fair, moderate, and substantial agreement, respectively. Univariate (unadjusted odds ratio) analysis was performed to identify the predictors (age, sex, disease category, severity of airflow obstruction, BDR of FVC, FEV₁, MMEF, RV, sRaw) for the BDR of oscillometry parameters. Based on a p-value <0.20 in the univariate analysis, a multivariate logistic regression (adjusted odds ratio and confidence intervals) analysis was performed.

RESULTS:

Study population

Lung function data of 532 clinically diagnosed adult asthma (n=248) and COPD (n=284) patients were extracted from our records. Each spirometry recording was visually inspected for technical errors. Only technically acceptable data were included in the analysis. We excluded 61 patients with clinically diagnosed asthma who did not have airflow obstruction, i.e., prebronchodilator FEV₁/FVC >75%, from the analysis. Four COPD patients were excluded from the analysis because their postbronchodilator FEV₁/FVC was >70%. The final study population comprised 467 patients with 187 asthma and 280 COPD patients. The mean (\pm SD) age of the cohort was 54.9 (15.1) years. Among the 467 patients, 76.4% were male. The anthropometric measurements and spirometry parameters of asthma and COPD patients are compared in Table 1. COPD patients were mostly smokers (79.3%), had a greater male predominance (91.4%), were older, and had poorer lung function (FEV₁% predicted 49.2% vs. 67.9%, p<0.01).

Oscillometry parameters

The oscillometry parameters of asthma and COPD patients were compared according to the severity of airflow obstruction determined by spirometry (Table 2). The majority of asthma

patients had mild airflow obstruction (49.7%). With increasing severity of airflow obstruction, the magnitude of oscillometry parameters progressively worsened in both asthma and COPD patients. Asthma patients, particularly those with moderate to severe airflow obstruction, had significantly higher R5 and R19 than COPD patients with similar severity of airflow obstruction. The magnitude of R5-19 did not differ between asthma and COPD patients, regardless of the severity of airflow obstruction. The within- and whole-breath X5 values of asthma were not significantly different from those of COPD patients across all severities of airflow obstruction. The AX of asthma was not different from that of COPD patients across all severities of airflow obstruction. Except for mild airflow obstruction, the Fres of asthma was also not different from that of COPD patients. The prevalence of EFL_T between asthma and COPD patients was not different, except for very severe airflow obstruction.

We compared the distribution of R5 and X5 impairment severity between asthma and COPD patients according to the severity of airflow obstruction (Table 3). The distribution of severity of abnormalities in oscillometry parameters was not different between asthma and COPD patients, except for moderately severe airflow obstruction. The prevalence of impairment severity in R5 and X5 increased with increasing severity of airflow obstruction ($p < 0.001$), irrespective of the underlying disease. The $\Delta X5$, i.e., expiratory X5, increased progressively with the severity of airflow obstruction, and it was not different between asthma and COPD patients. We also found that the magnitude and proportion of oscillometry-defined small airway dysfunction (i.e., abnormalities in X5 and R5-19) in asthma were not different from those in COPD patients with similar airflow obstruction.

Bronchodilator responsiveness

The BDR of the spirometry, body plethysmography, and oscillometry of asthma and COPD patients are compared in Table 4. Compared with the 1991 criteria, the ERS/ATS-2022 criteria significantly underestimate the BDR of FEV₁ (43.5% vs. 52.2%, p<0.01), FVC (23.4% vs. 29.9%, p<0.01), and spirometry (47.3% vs. 57.1%, p<0.01) in asthma patients. Adopting the ERS/ATS-2022 criteria also significantly underestimated the BDR of FEV₁ (16.1% vs. 27.1%, p<0.01), FVC (27.9% vs. 41.4%, p<0.01), and spirometry (31.4% vs. 47.1%, p<0.01) in COPD patients. Regardless of the criteria, the FEV₁ of asthma patients was significantly greater than that of COPD patients. According to the ERS/ATS-1991 criteria, the FVC of COPD patients was significantly greater than that of asthma patients (41.4% vs. 27.9%, p<0.01), but not according to the 2022 criteria (29.9% vs. 23.4%, p=0.14). The prevalence of BDR, according to the ERS/ATS-1991 criteria, increased with the progression of airflow obstruction in COPD (p<0.01) but not in asthma patients (p=0.51). Agreement on BDR in spirometry between the ERS/ATS-2022 and 1991 criteria for asthma ($\kappa=0.79$) and COPD ($\kappa=0.68$) was moderate. The sRaw of asthma patients had a significantly greater BDR than that of COPD patients (53.8% vs. 29.7%; p<0.001). The proportion of BDR of sRaw and spirometry according to the ERS/ATS-1991 criteria was not significantly different in asthma patients (53.8% vs. 57.1%), but the agreement was weak ($\kappa=0.44$). The BDR of the RV for both asthma (11.1%) and COPD patients (9.4%) was less and was not different (p=0.36).

The BDR of oscillometry parameters of asthma and COPD patients were significantly lower than those of spirometry, regardless of the criteria used to define BDR by spirometry. Among all oscillometry parameters, AX had the lowest BDR in both asthma (18.2%) and COPD patients (3.9%). The prevalence of BDR of R5 and X5 in asthma was similar, but their concordance was moderate ($\kappa=0.55$). The X5 of COPD patients had a significantly higher BDR

than the R5 (16.4% vs. 11.4%, $p < 0.01$). The distribution of the BDR of oscillometry parameters across severities of airflow obstruction was not different for either asthma ($p = 0.62$) or COPD ($p = 0.9$) patients. The ERS/ATS-1991 criteria of BDR in spirometry and BDR of FOT had a fair agreement for asthma ($\kappa = 0.36$) but slight ($\kappa = 0.11$) for COPD patients.

The PR of spirometry was 2.4%, and it was equally distributed between asthma and COPD patients. PR of R5 was observed in only two patients (0.4%); both were COPD patients. PR of X5 was observed in eight patients (1.7%), and the majority had COPD ($n = 7$).

Multivariate analysis revealed that female sex (adjusted OR, 2.14; 95% CI, 1.02--4.47; $p = 0.04$), the presence of BDR in FEV₁ (adjusted OR, 2.25; 95% CI, 1.04--4.88; $p = 0.04$), the BDR of MMEF (adjusted OR, 2.85; 95% CI, 1.49--5.48; $p = 0.002$), and the BDR of sRaw (adjusted OR, 6.26; 95% CI, 3.49--11.24; $p < 0.001$) were independently associated with the BDR of oscillometry (Table 5). The severity of airflow obstruction, underlying diseases, and the BDR of FVC were not independently related to the BDR of oscillometry.

The decrease of 1.75 z score of R5 had a sensitivity of 75.5% and a specificity of 98.8%, with an AUC of 0.96 for diagnosing BDR using the criterion of a $> 40\%$ decrease in R5 (Figure 1). The absolute reduction of 1.68 cmH₂O/L/s of R5 had an AUC of 0.96, a sensitivity of 75.2%, and a specificity of 99.7% for diagnosing BDR. The reduction in R5-19 of 50% had an AUC of 0.87, with a sensitivity of 64.8% and specificity of 98.4% for diagnosing BDR, using the criteria of $> 40\%$ reduction in R5. The change in the z score of X5 had an AUC of 0.9, a sensitivity of 96.9%, and a specificity of 65.0% for diagnosing BDR when the criterion of a $> 50\%$ decrease in X5. The absolute reduction in X5 of 0.76 cmH₂O/L/s for X5 had an AUC of 0.91, a sensitivity of 62.6%, and a specificity of 99.6% for diagnosing BDR using the same criterion.

Discussion

We compared the oscillometry parameters and their BDR with other lung function parameters between stable asthma with airflow obstruction and COPD patients with similar severity of airflow obstruction. The magnitude of R5 and R19 was significantly higher in asthma patients with moderate to severe airflow obstruction. The other oscillometry did not differ between asthma and COPD patients, regardless of the severity of airflow obstruction. Adopting the ERS/ATS-2022 criteria significantly reduced the BDR in spirometry of both asthma and COPD patients.

Over the last decade, lung oscillometry has become increasingly popular for evaluating obstructive airway diseases. Similar to our observations, previous studies reported significantly higher R5 and R20 in asthma than in COPD patients.^{3,14,16} Qi et al. proposed that R5 and R20 are valuable in distinguishing asthma from COPD patients with similar severity of airflow obstructions.¹⁵ Kanda et al. reported the progressive worsening of oscillometry with increasing severity of airflow obstruction, and only the R20 was significantly higher in asthma than in COPD patients.¹⁶ Studies have shown that the R5-20 of asthma patients is substantially greater than that of COPD patients, whereas others studies have reported the contradictory.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ The higher Rrs in asthma is probably because the disease predominantly involves the airways. Kanda et al. reported that the Fres of asthma was lower than that of COPD patients.¹⁵ Paredi et al. reported that the $\Delta X5$ of COPD was greater than that of asthma patients with similar airflow obstructions, although the difference was insignificant.¹⁷ They included fewer patients and patients with very severe airflow obstruction were not included. Kamada et al. also reported that $\Delta X5$ of COPD patients was significantly higher than asthma patients.¹⁸ The unequal distribution of determinants of oscillometry parameters (i.e., age, sex, and standing height) across the groups

may impact the comparison. Therefore, we used the z scores of oscillometry parameters for the comparison.

Dellacà et al. suggested that the presence of EFL_T is a characteristic feature of severe COPD.¹⁹ Both asthma and COPD patients in our study had EFL_T , regardless of the severity of airflow obstruction. We also observed that the presence of EFL_T was not exclusive to COPD patients, as suggested by Dellacà et al.¹⁹

A large population-based European study reported that the BDR in spirometry of asthma and COPD patients according to the ERS/ATS-1991 criteria was lower than ours. This is probably because the lung functions in our study were primarily performed for diagnostic purposes. Our observations were consistent with observations by Li et al. that adopting the ERS/ATS-2022 criteria led to a significant reduction in the BDR of spirometry for both asthma and COPD patients.²¹

A significant number of patients with obstructive lung disease classified as nonresponsive based on spirometry may have a significant BDR in the RV.²² The BDR of the RV in our study was similar to that reported by McCartney et al.²² Unlike them, we observed that the severity of airflow obstruction and underlying diseases did not influence the presence of BDR in the RV.

The ERS technical standards are silent on whether the presence of the BDR of any of the oscillometry parameters will be considered as BDR. The thresholds for BDR in oscillometry parameters were inconsistent across previous studies and differed from the ERS standard.²³⁻²⁵ Park et al. reported that a cutoff lower than the ERS standard had very high sensitivity and specificity for diagnosing BDR of oscillometry.¹⁴ Cottee et al. reported that the BDR of oscillometry parameters in asthma patients was twice that of spirometry.²⁴ Park et al. reported that the BDR of oscillometry parameters in asthma patients was not different from that in COPD

patients.¹⁴ Unlike ours, Lu et al. observed that the AX of COPD patients had the highest BDR among all oscillometry parameters.²⁵ The BDR of X5 and R5 in their COPD patients was much lower than ours. The difference between our and earlier studies could be due to different cutoffs in defining the BDR. The concordance between the BDR of oscillometry parameters and spirometry parameters was poor across all studies, as the two tests measure different respiratory system mechanics. The criteria and prevalence of BDR of Rrs at a higher frequency, i.e., R19, have never been reported. We observed a >40% decrease in R19 in only 1.3% of the cohort.

The PR in spirometry due to bronchodilator-associated bronchoconstriction is well recognized. The PR in spirometry of our study was a little lower than that reported by the COPDGene cohort.²⁶ The mechanism of PR in oscillometry is different. Bronchodilators can increase Rrs and decrease Xrs because bronchodilators affect airway caliber and closure.⁹ The criteria for PR in oscillometry is yet to be defined. The prevalence of PR in oscillometry parameters has not been reported earlier. We observed that COPD patients are likely to have more PR in oscillometry parameters. This might be because the FVC of COPD patients usually has a relatively high BDR. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to document PR in spirometry and oscillometry in patients with obstructive airway disease. The agreement of BDR of oscillometry and other lung function parameters is weak.

Our study had limitations. The study design limited the functional assessment of the patients. The data were collected from a single center. Because our study was hospital-based, many COPD patients had severe airflow obstruction. We did not distinguish patients with asthma COPD overlapped from COPD patients.

In conclusion, oscillometry parameters worsened with the progression of airflow obstruction, regardless of the underlying disease. The FOT did not differ between asthma and

COPD patients with similar airflow obstructions, except for R5 and R19. The distribution of high oscillometry parameters between asthma and COPD patients with identical airflow obstructions was not different. The severity of abnormalities in oscillometry parameters is not affected by the underlying disease but rather by the severity of airflow obstruction. Asthma patients also experience expiratory flow limitations at tidal breaths regardless of the severity of airflow obstruction. Oscillometry parameters of both asthma and COPD patients had a significantly lower BDR than all spirometry parameters, including MMEF.

References

1. Global Initiative for Asthma. Global Strategy for Asthma Management and Prevention 2023. Updated July 2023. Available from: https://ginasthma.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/GINA-2023-Full-report-23_07_06-WMS.pdf. Last accessed on January 05, 2024.
2. Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) data are available from <https://goldcopd.org/2024-gold-report/>. Last accessed on April 05, 2024.
3. Kitaguchi Y, Yasuo M, Hanaoka M. Comparison of pulmonary function in patients with COPD, asthma-COPD overlap syndrome, and asthma with airflow limitation. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis*. 2016;11:991-7.
4. De S. Diagnostic accuracy of oscillometry parameters parameters to detect airflow obstruction in adults. *Indian Journal of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology*. 2021;35:22-26.
5. American Thoracic Society. Lung function testing: selection of reference values and interpretive strategies. *Am Rev Respir Dis*. 1991;144:1202–18.

6. Stanojevic S, Kaminsky DA, Miller MR, et al. ERS/ATS technical standard on interpretive strategies for routine lung function tests. *Eur Respir J.* 2022;60:2101499.
7. Criée CP, Sorichter S, Smith HJ, et al; Working Group for Body Plethysmography of the German Society for Pneumology and Respiratory Care. Body plethysmography-its principles and clinical use. *Respir Med.* 2011;105:959-71.
8. Agmy G, Mahmoud MA, Ali EDA, Adam M. Diagnostic performance of lung volumes in assessment of reversibility in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Egyptian Journal of Bronchology.* 2021;15:26.
9. King GG, Bates J, Berger KI, et al. Technical standards for respiratory oscillometry. *Eur Respir J.* 2020;55:1900753.
10. De S, Banerjee N, Kushwah GDS, Dharwey D. Regression equations of oscillometry parameters of Indian adults measured by forced oscillation technique. *Lung India.* 2020;37:30-6.
11. Quanjer PH, Stanojevic S, Cole TJ, et al; ERS Global Lung Function Initiative. Multiethnic reference values for spirometry for the 3-95-yr age range: the global lung function 2012 equations. *Eur Respir J.* 2012;40:1324-43.
12. Chhabra SK, Kumar R, Gupta U, Rahman M, Dash DJ. Prediction equations for spirometry in adults from northern India. *Indian J Chest Dis Allied Sci.* 2014;56:221-9.
13. Alobaidi NY, Almeshari MA, Stockley JA, Stockley RA, Sapey E. The prevalence of bronchodilator responsiveness of the small airway (using mid-maximal expiratory flow) in COPD - a retrospective study. *BMC Pulm Med.* 2022;22:493.

14. Park JH, Lee JH, Kim HJ, et al. Usefulness of impulse oscillometry for the assessment of bronchodilator response in elderly patients with chronic obstructive airway disease. *J Thorac Dis.* 2019;11:1485-94.
15. Qi G-S, Wu H, Yang H, Yuan YP, Feng Xi F, Gu WC. oscillometry parameters differences between chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asthma patients with the same airflow limitation severities. *Int J Clin Exp Med.* 2016;9:14471-9.
16. Kanda S, Fujimoto K, Komatsu Y, Yasuo M, Hanaoka M, Kubo K. Evaluation of oscillometry parameters in asthma and COPD by an impulse oscillation system. *Intern Med.* 2010;49:23-30.
17. Paredi P, Goldman M, Alamen A, et al. Comparison of inspiratory and expiratory resistance and reactance in patients with asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Thorax.* 2010;65:263-67.
18. Kamada T, Kaneko M, Tomioka H. Comparison of respiratory system oscillometry parameters in asthma and COPD: A prospective observational study. *Respirology.* 2018;23:478-84.
19. Dellacà RL, Duffy N, Pompilio PP, et al. Expiratory flow limitation detected by forced oscillation and negative expiratory pressure. *Eur Respir J.* 2007; 29:363–74.
20. Janson C, Malinovschi A, Amaral AFS, et al. Bronchodilator reversibility in asthma and COPD: findings from three large population studies. *Eur Respir J.* 2019;54:1900561.
21. Li Y, Lin J, Wang Z, et al. Bronchodilator responsiveness defined by the 2005 and 2021 ERS/ATS criteria in patients with asthma as well as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis.* 2022;17:2623-33.

22. McCartney CT, Weis MN, Ruppel GL, Nayak RP. Residual volume and total lung capacity to assess reversibility in obstructive lung disease. *Respir Care*. 2016;61:1505-12.
23. Jetmalani K, Brown NJ, Boustany C, et al. Normal limits for oscillometric bronchodilator responses and relationships with clinical factors. *ERJ Open Res*. 2021;7:00439-2021.
24. Cottee AM, Seccombe LM, Thamrin C, King GG, Peters MJ, Farah CS. Bronchodilator response assessed by the forced oscillation technique identifies poor asthma control with greater sensitivity than spirometry. *Chest*. 2020;157:1435-1441.
25. Lu L, Wu F, Peng J, et al. Clinical characterization and outcomes of impulse oscillometry-defined bronchodilator response: an ECOPD cohort-based study. *Respir Res*. 2024;25:149. doi: 10.1186/s12931-024-02765-7.
26. Bhatt SP, Wells JM, Kim V, et al.; COPDGene Investigators. Radiological correlates and clinical implications of the paradoxical lung function response to β_2 agonists: an observational study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2014;2:911-18.

Legends for figures

Figure 1: Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves of changes in resistance at 5 Hz (R5) and resistance between 5 and 19 Hz (R5-19) are used to identify bronchodilator responsiveness. Red solid line: absolute change in R5; green solid line: change in the z score of R5; black solid line: percentage change in R5--20; yellow solid line: change in R5--19.

Table 1. The anthropometric and pre-bronchodilator lung function parameters of the cohort

Variables	Asthma (n=187)	COPD (n=280)	Total (N=467)
Male, n (%)	101 (54)	256 (91.4)*	357 (76.4)
Age, years	42.6±13.5	63.2±9.4*	54.9±15.1
Smoking, n (%)	14 (7.5)	222 (79.3)*	236 (50.5)
FEV ₁ % predicted [#]	67.9±18.9	49.2±18.5*	56.7±20.8
FVC % predicted [#]	81.2±18.3	65.3±16.6*	71.7±18.9
FEV ₁ /FVC%	64.7±8.5	52.0±9.4*	57.1±10.9
sRaw, kPa/s	2.82±2.54	4.59±2.9*	4.04±2.92
RV/TLC, % predicted	47.8±14.4	62±9.7*	57.6±13.1
High R5 only, n (%)	27 (14.4)	12 (4.3)*	39 (8.4)
High X5 only, n (%)	2 (1.1)	34 (12.1)*	36 (7.7)
Both R5 and X5 high, n (%)	91 (48.7)	194 (69.3)*	285 (61)

Notes: [#]: calculated as per the predicted equation for the Indian population; *: p-value <0.01
Abbreviations: FEV₁: forced expiratory volume 1 s; FVC: forced vital capacity; sRaw: specific airway resistance; RV/TLC: ratio of residual volume and total lung capacity, High R5: resistance at 5Hz >1.64; High X5: reactance at 5 Hz >-1.64.

Table 2. Comparison of pre-bronchodilator oscillometry parameters between bronchial asthma and COPD patients stratified by severity of airflow obstruction

Variables	Mild airflow obstruction (n=128)			Moderate airflow obstruction (n=73)			Moderately severe airflow obstruction (n=70)			Severe airflow obstruction (n=117)			Very severe airflow obstruction (n=79)		
	Asthma (n=93)	COPD (n=35)	p-value	Asthma (n=33)	COPD (n=40)	p-value	Asthma (n=28)	COPD (n=42)	p-value	Asthma (n=22)	COPD (n=95)	p-value	Asthma (n=11)	COPD (n=68)	p-value
Male, n (%)	52 (55.9)	29* (82.9)	<0.01	20 (60.6)	39* (97.5)	<0.01	14 (50)	39* (92.9)	<0.01	8 (36.4)	83* (87.4)	<0.001	7 (63.6)	66* (97.1)	<0.01
R5 total, z-score	2.02±2.26	1.86±2.14	0.71	2.83±2.12	2.16±2.29	0.19	4.49±2.31	2.86±1.97*	<0.01	5.52±3.5	3.71±2.17	<0.01	5.41±2.13	4.11±2.09	0.06
High R5, n (%)	44 (47.3)	19 (54.3)	0.30	21 (63.6)	20 (50)	0.18	24 (85.7)	28 (66.7)	0.06	18 (81.8)	78 (82.1)	0.59	11 (100)	61 (89.7)	0.33
R19 total, z-score	2.07±1.93	1.77±2.06	0.44	2.40±1.72	1.58±1.90	0.06	3.22±1.7	1.98±1.71*	<0.01	3.79±2.53	2.37±1.87*	<0.01	3.59±2.01	2.53±1.71	0.07
High R19, n (%)	44 (47.3)	19 (54.3)	0.31	21 (63.6)	20 (50)	0.18	24 (85.7)	28 (66.7)	0.06	18 (81.8)	78 (82.1)	0.59	11 (100)	61 (89.7)	0.33
R5-19, z-score	0.81±1.85	1.07±2.24	0.49	1.92±1.95	2.18±2.33	0.62	3.51±2.56	2.99±2.2	0.37	3.41±2.43	3.97±2.21	0.29	5.37±2.91	5.35±2.75	0.99
High R5-19, n (%)	22 (23.7)	9 (25.7)	0.49	15 (45.5)	24 (60)	0.16	21 (75)	29 (69)	0.39	17 (77.3)	81 (85.3)	0.27	10 (90.9)	64 (94.1)	0.54
X5insp, z-score	-0.76±1.19	-0.94±1.01	0.43	-1.37±1.25	-1.63±1.35	0.39	-2.53±1.57	-2.28±1.57	0.50	-2.35±1.59	-3.02±1.73	0.09	-	-4.11±2.22	0.89
X5exp, z-score	-1.90±3.84	-2.22±2.63	0.66	-3.38±4.08	-3.94±4.59	0.59	-6.32±4.67	-6.68±6	0.79	-9.03±7.48	-8.80±5.08	0.86	-	-	0.75
X5total, z-score	-1.32±2.73	-1.69±2.11	0.47	-2.53±2.96	-3.26±3.84	0.37	-4.81±3.45	-5.29±4.68	0.64	-6.38±5.11	-7.05±3.98	0.5	-	-8.88±4.55	0.45
High X5, n (%)	25 (26.9%)	16* (45.7)	0.04	18 (54.5)	26 (65)	0.25	21 (75)	33 (78.6)	0.47	18 (81.8)	88 (92.6)	0.13	11 (100)	65 (95.6)	0.64
ΔX5 (cm H ₂ O/L/s)	0.61±1.74	0.85±1.36	0.47	1.22±1.95	1.58±2.38	0.48	2.15±2.12	2.89±3.23	0.29	3.82±3.81	3.68±2.46	0.83	3.26±2.49	3.99±2.76	0.41
EFL _T , n (%)	9 (9.7)	2 (5.7)	0.38	5 (15.2)	7 (17.5)	0.52	10 (35.7)	15 (35.7)	0.59	11 (50.0)	56 (58.9)	0.29	3 (27.3)	41* (60.3)	0.04
AX (cm H ₂ O/L/s)	16.67±20.33	20.59±16	0.31	25.98±21.36	30.1±22.27	0.43	42.51±25.46	42.53±25.37	0.99	56.24±37.02	52.4±24.46	0.55	62.19±27.67	60.64±24.79	0.85
High Ax, n (%)	14 (15.1)	8 (22.9)	0.22	10 (30.3)	18 (45)	0.15	18 (64.3)	27 (64.3)	0.60	17 (77.3)	75 (78.9)	0.53	10 (90.9)	61 (89.7)	0.69
Fres, Hz	18.97±6.45	22.24±6.4	0.01	22.7±6.96	25.14±6.28	0.12	25.81±5.5	27.03±5.57	0.37	26.27±6.44	27.44±4.3	0.30	28.88±3.	28.13±3.9	0.55

		g*					3				2		29	2	
High Fres, n (%)	53 (57)	25 (71.4)	0.09	25 (75.8)	33 (82.5)	0.34	26 (92.9)	38 (90.5)	0.54	19 (86.4)	93 (97.9)	0.05	11 (100)	68 (100)	-

Notes: *: p-value<0.05

Abbreviations: R5: whole-breath respiratory system resistance at 5 Hz; R19: whole-breath respiratory system resistance at 19 Hz; R5-19: difference in whole-breath resistance at 5 and 19 Hz; X5insp: inspiratory respiratory system reactance at 5 Hz; X5exp: expiratory respiratory system reactance at 5 Hz; X5: whole-breath respiratory system reactance at 5 Hz; ΔX5: difference between inspiratory and expiratory reactance at 5 Hz; AX: reactance area; Fres: resonant frequency; EFL_T: expiratory flow limitation at tidal breath.

Table 3. Comparison of severity of abnormalities in oscillometry parameters between bronchial asthma and COPD patients across different severity of airflow obstruction

Variables	Mild airflow obstruction (n=128)			Moderate airflow obstruction (n=73)			Moderately severe airflow obstruction (n=70)			Severe airflow obstruction (n=117)			Very severe airflow obstruction (n=79)		
	Asthma (n=93)	COPD (n=35)	p-value	Asthma (n=33)	COPD (n=40)	p-value	Asthma (n=28)	COPD (n=42)	p-value	Asthma (n=22)	COPD (n=95)	p-value	Asthma (n=11)	COPD (n=68)	p-value
Severity of R5															
Mild, n (%)	16 (17.2)	5 (14.3)	0.06	5 (15.2)	5 (12.5)	0.39	1 (3.6)	8 (19)	0.03	1 (4.5)	12 (12.6)	0.24	0	6 (8.8)	0.25
Moderate, n (%)	11 (11.8)	11 (31.4)		7 (21.2)	10 (25)		7 (25)	8 (19)		3 (13.6)	26 (27.4)		2 (18.2)	20 (29.4)	
Severe, n (%)	17 (18.3)	3 (8.6)		9 (27.3)	5 (12.5)		16 (57.1)	12 (28.6)		14 (63.6)	40 (42.1)		9 (81.8)	35 (51.5)	
Severity of X5															
Mild, n (%)	9 (9.7)	9 (25.7)	0.06	5 (15.2)	5 (12.5)	0.62	1 (3.6)	5 (11.9)	0.66	1 (4.5)	3 (3.2)	0.44	1 (9.1)	2 (2.9)	0.69
Moderate, n (%)	6 (6.5)	1 (2.9)		6 (18.2)	7 (17.5)		5 (17.9)	6 (14.3)		2 (9.1)	12 (12.6)		1 (9.1)	7 (10.3)	
Severe, n (%)	10 (10.8)	6 (17.1)		7 (21.2)	14 (35)		15 (53.6)	22 (52.4)		15 (68.2)	73 (76.8)		9 (81.8)	56 (82.4)	

Abbreviations: R5: whole-breath respiratory system resistance at 5 Hz; X5: whole-breath respiratory system reactance at 5 Hz.

Table 4. Comparison of bronchodilator responsiveness of lung function and oscillometry parameters between bronchial asthma and COPD

Variables	Asthma (n=184) [§]	COPD (n=280)
BDR of FEV ₁ (ATS/ERS-1991 criteria) [^] , n (%)	96 (52.2)	76 (27.1)*
BDR of FEV ₁ (ATS/ERS-2022 criteria) [@] , n (%)	80 (43.5)	45 (16.1)*
BDR of FVC (ATS/ERS-1991 criteria) [^] , n (%)	55 (29.9)	116 (41.4)*
BDR of FVC (ATS/ERS-2022 criteria) [@] , n (%)	43 (23.4)	78 (27.9)
BDR of spirometry (ATS/ERS-1991 criteria) [^] , n (%)	105 (57.1)	132 (47.1)*
BDR of spirometry (ATS/ERS-2022 criteria) [@] , n (%)	87 (47.3)	88 (31.4)*
BDR of MMEF, n (%)	106 (57.6)	62 (22.2)
BDR of sRaw, n (%) [#]	63 (53.8)	79 (29.7)*
BDR of RV, n (%) [#]	13 (11.1)	25 (9.4)
BDR of R5, n (%)	52 (27.8)	32 (11.4)*
BDR of X5, n (%)	52 (27.8)	46 (16.4)*
BDR of AX, n (%)	34 (18.2)	11 (3.9)*
BDR of Zrs, n (%)	65 (35.3)	54 (19.3)*

Notes: [§]: Bronchodilator responsiveness of three bronchial asthma patients was not performed; [^]: $\geq 12\%$ and ≥ 200 mL increase; [@]: $>10\%$ relative to the predicted value; [#]: Body plethysmography was carried out in 117 bronchial asthma and 266 COPD patients; *: p-value <0.05 .

Abbreviations: BDR: bronchodilator responsiveness; MMEF: maximal mid-expiratory flow rate; sRaw: specific airway resistance; RV: residual volume; R5: whole-breath respiratory system resistance at 5 Hz; X5: whole-breath respiratory system reactance at 5 Hz; AX: reactance area; Zrs: oscillometry parameters.

Table 5. Multivariate analysis for the predictors of bronchodilator responsiveness of oscillometry parameters

Variables	R5 Adjusted OR (CI)	X5 Adjusted OR (CI)	AX Adjusted OR (CI)	Zrs Adjusted OR (CI)
Age	0.99 (0.97-1.03)	1.03* (1.0-1.06)	0.99 (0.96-1.03)	1.02 (0.99-1.05)
Gender				
Male	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Female	2.09 (0.96-4.57)	1.72 (0.79-3.73)	1.58 (0.58-4.27)	2.14* (1.02-4.47)
Disease				
COPD	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Bronchial asthma	0.99 (0.38-2.6)	0.85 (0.33-2.10)	0.53 (0.15-1.93)	0.86 (0.36-2.06)
Severity of airflow obstruction				
Mild	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Moderate	1.59 (0.61-4.11)	0.85 (0.33-2.17)	0.83 (0.24-2.87)	1.37 (0.56-3.32)
Moderately severe	1.32 (0.48-3.64)	1.31 (0.5-3.42)	1.04 (0.28-3.88)	1.27 (0.5-3.2)
Severe	0.98 (0.37-2.6)	0.72 (0.29-1.79)	0.61 (0.16-2.31)	0.71 (0.29-1.72)
Very severe	0.63 (0.17-2.27)	0.73 (0.24-2.23)	0.42 (0.06-2.76)	0.74 (0.26-2.14)
BDR of FVC (ATS/ERS-2022 criteria)				
BDR absent	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
BDR present	0.88 (0.39 -1.97)	0.98 (0.47-2.05)	1.53 (0.51-4.54)	1.12 (0.55-2.27)
BDR of FEV ₁ (ATS/ERS-2022 criteria)				
BDR absent	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
BDR present	3.15* (1.32-7.51)	2.37* (1.05-5.35)	1.89 (0.57-6.28)	2.25* (1.04-4.88)
BDR of MMEF				
BDR absent	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
BDR present	1.88 (0.88-3.99)	2.28* (1.14-4.59)	1.63 (0.55-4.89)	2.85* (1.49-5.48)
BDR of sRaw				
BDR absent	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
BDR present	4.92* (2.49-9.74)	8* (4.19-15.29)	17.17* (3.85-76.5)	6.26* (3.49-11.24)

Notes: *: p-value <0.05.

Abbreviations: OR: Odds ratio; CI: confidence intervals; R5: whole-breath respiratory system resistance at 5 Hz; X5: whole-breath respiratory system reactance at 5 Hz; AX: reactance area; Zrs: oscillometry parameters; BDR: bronchodilator responsiveness; FEV₁: forced expiratory volume 1 s; FVC: forced vital capacity; MMEF: maximal mid-expiratory flow rate; RV: residual volume.; sRaw: specific airway resistance.

