Results: This approach resulted in a significant enhancement of the quality of care criteria analyzed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documented in the medical record</th>
<th>Before (n = 115)</th>
<th>After (n = 93)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent focus of the disease</td>
<td>79 (60%)</td>
<td>88 (75%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of follow-up</td>
<td>32 (28%)</td>
<td>49 (53%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathlessness</td>
<td>66 (57%)</td>
<td>77 (83%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEF before treatment</td>
<td>22 (19%)</td>
<td>32 (37%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEF after treatment</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>17 (19%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterility therapy</td>
<td>56 (43%)</td>
<td>71 (76%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up after ED-discharge</td>
<td>1990 (21%)</td>
<td>3504 (74%)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion and Conclusion: Implementation of locally developed guidelines with the participation of all healthcare personal was time consuming but had a significant impact on the ED management of asthma patients. This program should be continued to even further increase the quality of patient care. The impact on clinical outcome is currently being assessed.

P1286
Undertreatment in asthmatic outpatients with mild bronchial obstruction
B. Farabollini, M.S. Garritani, S. Pucci, M.B. Bil6, L. Antonicelli, E Bonifazi. Allergy Respiratory Units, Hospital Umberto I, Ancona, Italy

Undertreatment is one of the reasons for symptoms, sleep disturbance and limitation of activities in asthmatics. Inhaled anti-inflammatory drugs, in particular steroids, are very effective in controlling asthma symptoms in patients of all ages and severity.

The aim of our study was to evaluate, in asthmatics with mild bronchial obstruction, the difference between the domiciliary treatments carried out by outpatients (Opts) and that prescribed by the specialists (Sp's) based on the severity of symptoms referred.

A retrospective study of 112 consecutive Opts (51 males, 61 females; mean age: 29 yrs, range: 13-63) with % FEV1 = 70 (mean: 99%, range: 70-125%) was performed.

The patients' history and disease severity score in the previous four weeks (DSS) were investigated and the therapy (level 0-4) used by the Opts and prescribed by the Sp's was compared. Spearman's rank correlation was used for parametric data.

Only 6 out of 112 (5%) Opts did not report symptoms of asthma (DSS equal to 0) after domiciliary treatment.

We found a significant difference between the therapy used by Opts at home and that prescribed by the Sp's (median: home therapy: 0.5; Sp's: 2; p < 0.0001, Wilcoxon test), even if a correlation did exist between them (r = 0.39, p < 0.0001).

The total DSS was not associated with the therapy used by the Opts, unlike that of the Sp's (r = 0.24, p < 0.001).

We found a significant correlation between the domiciliary therapy and day symptoms only (r = 0.20, p < 0.03) and shortness of breath due to exertion (r = 0.19, p < 0.04); on the contrary there was significant correlation between Sp's therapy and day symptoms (r = 0.22, p < 0.01), shortness of breath due to exertion (r = 0.23, p < 0.01) and also night symptoms (r = 0.21, p < 0.02).

In conclusion, in asthmatics with mild bronchial obstruction: 1) the treatment used by the Opts at home is different from that prescribed by the Sp's and their treatment level is indicated by the severity of day symptoms and shortness of breath (r = 0.20); 2) the domiciliary therapy is not used regularly; therefore the night symptoms are probably still present.

P1287
Non-participation in early intervention with inhaled steroids in asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD): The role of ‘fear of steroids’. Results of the ‘DIMCA’ study
P.M. van Groningen, C.P.H.J. Schuyt, H.I.M. van Kollenburg, K. van Boheleide, H.J.M. van den Hoogen, J. Molenaar1, C. van Weel, Dept. of General Practice and Social Medicine, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, 1Dept. of Pulmonology, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Treatment of chronic airflow obstruction with inhaled steroids at an early stage has shown to preserve the lung function. However, long-term treatment with inhaled steroids may cause local and systemic adverse effects. We tested the hypothesis that ‘fear of steroids’ is an important reason of non-participation in the ‘DIMCA’ project, a Detection, Early intervention and Monitoring program on COPD and Asthma. 1749 Randomly selected adult subjects derived from 10 general practices were invited to a screening program to detect asthma or COPD. 604 Subjects were selected on the basis of the presence of bronchial obstruction, reversibility of obstruction and bronchial symptoms. After a two-year monitoring period 241 patients were smaller in strategy B vs A (Cox regression; p = 0.05).

Further more, individual standard deviations over the last 1.5 yr period for PEV1%pred, morning PEF, PEF-variability and PC20 were smaller in strategy B vs A (MANOVA: p < 0.05).

In conclusion, in asthmatics with mild bronchial obstruction: 1) the treatment used by the Opts at home is different from that prescribed by the Sp's and their treatment level is indicated by the severity of day symptoms and shortness of breath (r = 0.20); 2) the domiciliary therapy is not used regularly; therefore the night symptoms are probably still present.

P1288
The clinical control of asthma after adding airway hyperresponsiveness (AHR) to the politics of low intensity of treatment: A two-year randomized trial
J.P. Som1, L., N.A. Williams2, E.H. Bre3, C.E. Evertse1, J.P. Vandenbroecke2, P.I. Sterk1, the AMPUL Study Group. Departments of 1Pulmonology; 2Clinical Epidemiology, Lederon University Medical Centre, The Netherlands

According to present guidelines (GINA), the level of anti-inflammatory treatment for asthma is solely based on symptoms and lung function. In a randomised parallel design we investigated whether a treatment strategy aimed at reducing AHR (strategy B) on top of improving symptoms, FEV1 and peak flow (PEF) variability (strategy A) lead to more effective control of 150 non-smoking adults with mild to moderate asthmatic asthma (18-50 yr; 23 newly detected; FEV1, mean ± SD: 92 ± 15 %pred) visited the chest physician, every 3 months during 2 yrs. Prior to each visit, methacholine PC20 (baseline: 1X4, mean ± SD: 0.63 mg/ml ± 2.11 DD) was assessed and the subjects received asthmatic symptoms, FEV1, s2-agonist usage and morning + evening PEF on a diary card, during 14 days. At each visit, in both strategies, controller medication with inhaled corticosteroids and/or prednisone (4 levels: no steroids, 400, 800, 1600 μg/day + 2×6k prednisone) was assessed according to a stepwise approach similar to GINA, and to which 4 corresponding classes of AHR were added. In 62% of all instances, AHR-class indicated the need for an increased medication level, which was only applied in strategy B. Improvements in FEV1 and morning PEF (% personal best) were more pronounced in strategy B vs A (B: 5.0%pred, 90% and A: 1.0%pred and 3.5 λs, respectively; p < 0.05).

In conclusion, we found that a treatment strategy aimed at reducing BHR on top of improving symptoms, FEV1, and PEF-variability leads to more effective control of asthma, resulting in fewer exacerbations and less variable airflow limitation. This implicates a roll for monitoring AHR in the long-term management of asthma.

This abstract is funded by: The Netherlands Asthma Foundation
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Use of a simple patient focussed asthma morbidity score
L.D. Rimington, L. Azocoffsky, A. Mowatt, E. Wharburton, L. Ryland, M.G. Pearson. Aintree Chest Centre, Liverpool and Dept Rehabilitation, Univ of Salford, UK

Established and validated questionnaires have been shown to be useful research tools with which to assess asthma morbidity (Juniper 1993), but they too time consuming for routine clinical practice. We have used four questions that the doctor would usually ask in each consultation (covering night waking, reliever inhaled use, daytime breathing and disruption of activities) to produce an 8-point score that requires no extra time from the clinician. We have assessed this short questionnaire score (Q score) with the Juniper morbidity score (total score and symptom score), with levels of FEV1, and with the UK asthma guidelines treatment step in 81 patients randomly selected from 3 general practices (mean (SD), age: 44 (12), 26 male, PEF 345 (138), FEV1 2.2 (0.9)) and repeated the observations two weeks later in a subset of 21 patients.

The paired observations showed that both Juniper (r = 0.87) and Qscore (r = 0.79) were repeatable with similar variability. The Qscore was negatively correlated with the Juniper symptom score (r = 0.79, p < 0.01) and total score (r = 0.73, p < 0.01) and both Juniper and Qscore correlated with level of resting FEV1 (Q: r = 0.44, J: r = -0.42) and with the severity of asthma as indicated by the treatment step (Q: r = 0.47, J: r = -0.36, all p < 0.01) although there was considerable scatter for the latter. The Qscore correlates well with both the established longer questionnaire and also shows similar relationships to lung function and to severity.

If it also shows sensitivity to changes in asthma status over the next year it may provide a practical tool with which to estimate asthma morbidity in routine practice.

P1290
Effects of patient education to the life quality In asthma patients: 3 years experience
E. Akkaya, A. Yilmaz, F. Ece, B. Baymatogilir, A. Baran, A. Akaloka. SSK Sivriyesapa Center for Chest Diseases and Thoracic Surgery, Istanbul, Turkey

Acceptance and application of the International Asthma Report by most countries made asthma therapy more than a simple prescription. It may be expected that patient education in addition to drug treatment will improve the life quality and prognosis of patients. For this reason, we studied randomly selected 25 cases (group I) that given specialized education for 1 year and randomly selected 27 cases

Group I Group II

% KS 77.6 ± 12.0* 53.8 ± 10.5*

% DS 97.4 ± 6.10* 92.2 ± 15.6*

Ate score 0.52 ± 0.87* 0.85 ± 1.20*

NIQ 1.20 ± 0.60 1.60 ± 0.90

QOL 0.53 ± 0.62* 0.81 ± 1.21

5 ≤ 0.0005 6 ≤ 0.05 7 ≤ 0.05 8 ≤ 0.05 9 ≤ 0.0001