Saudi Journal of Medicine and Public Health
https://saudijmph.com/index.php/pub
https://saudijmph.com/index.php/pub/article/view/64

Role of Inhaled Therapies in COPD Progression and Exacerbation Prevention: A Critical Review

Ziyad Tariq Alluqman, Hussain Abdullah Almutawah, Aqeelah Ebrahem Emwees
kingdom of Saudi Arabia ,Hospital North Medical Tower

Abstract

Background: Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) management lacks universal consensus on triple inhaled therapy, comprising a long-acting muscarinic antagonist (LAMA), a long-acting β2-adrenoceptor agonist (LABA), and an inhaled corticosteroid (ICS). Current guidelines, such as GOLD, primarily reserve triple therapy for very severe cases (Group D), while other international guidelines advocate for broader use, including in patients with frequent exacerbations or asthma-COPD overlap syndrome (ACOS). This divergence leads to varied real-world prescribing practices, often driven by clinical empiricism rather than strict phenotypic stratification. Emerging evidence suggests therapeutic advantages in specific subgroups, such as those with ACOS, eosinophilic inflammation, or a history of frequent exacerbations, who may benefit from intensified bronchodilator treatment.

Aim: This review aims to critically examine the rationale for triple inhaled therapy in COPD by integrating data from various clinical trials, exploring its clinical effectiveness and safety profiles, and considering future trends in COPD management.

Methods: A comprehensive literature review was conducted, synthesizing data from clinical trials investigating the simultaneous use of LAMA, LABA, and ICS. The review focused on the pharmacologic rationale, anti-inflammatory effects, and evidence from key clinical trials, including studies on fixed-dose combinations and novel pharmacological approaches. Safety considerations, particularly regarding pneumonia risk and mortality, were also examined.

Results: Triple inhaled therapy demonstrates synergistic bronchodilation and anti-inflammatory effects, particularly beneficial in patients with high exacerbation risk, eosinophilic inflammation, or poor symptom control. Clinical trials show improvements in lung function and reductions in exacerbations, though the universal benefit is debated. ICS withdrawal may be feasible in select patients without compromising exacerbation control. Fixed-dose combinations enhance adherence and convenience. Safety concerns include increased pneumonia risk with ICS, especially fluticasone, and historical mortality signals with tiotropium Respimat®, though large trials have largely allayed these concerns. Novel bifunctional molecules like MABAs and PDE4 inhibitors are emerging, offering potential for improved efficacy and simplified regimens.

Conclusion: Triple inhaled therapy is a valuable option for specific COPD phenotypes, emphasizing the need for personalized medicine. Future research should focus on identifying biomarkers for ICS responsiveness and assessing long-term safety. Optimal use depends on robust clinical evidence tailored to diverse patient populations.

Keywords: COPD, inhaled therapy, LAMA, LABA, ICS, triple therapy, exacerbation, eosinophilic, ACOS, FDC, MABA.

*Corresponding author e-mail: zalluqman@moh.gov.sa
Received date: 14 June 2025 Revised date: 1 August 2025. Accepted date: 6 August 2025

Introduction

Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) is a long-term, progressive respiratory condition characterized by persistent airflow limitation and chronic inflammation of the airways. It primarily results from prolonged exposure to noxious particles or gases—most notably tobacco smoke—and is a major global cause of morbidity and mortality [1]. A defining clinical feature of COPD is the occurrence of exacerbations: acute worsening of respiratory symptoms that lead to significant declines in lung function, increased healthcare utilization, and heightened mortality risk [2]. Consequently, reducing the frequency of exacerbations and slowing the overall progression of the disease are central goals in COPD management.

Inhaled therapies represent the cornerstone of pharmacological treatment for COPD, delivering medications directly to the lungs with minimal systemic side effects [3]. These therapies primarily include long-acting beta-2 agonists (LABAs), long-acting muscarinic antagonists (LAMAs), and inhaled corticosteroids (ICS), used as monotherapy or in various combinations. LABAs and LAMAs function mainly as bronchodilators, improving airflow and reducing symptoms, while ICS are primarily used to manage inflammation in specific patient groups due to their association with adverse effects such as pneumonia [4].

The development of combination inhalers—delivering dual therapy (LABA/LAMA) or triple therapy (LABA/LAMA/ICS)—has significantly enhanced COPD treatment strategies. Landmark clinical trials such as IMPACT [5] and ETHOS have demonstrated the superiority of triple therapy in reducing exacerbation rates, particularly in patients with frequent flare-ups or elevated eosinophil counts [6]. However, a key clinical question remains: can inhaled therapies alter the long-term natural history of COPD, or are their benefits confined primarily to symptom control and exacerbation prevention?

In real-world practice, several challenges limit optimal therapy outcomes. These include suboptimal adherence, improper inhaler technique, and the complexities of selecting the most appropriate inhaler device for individual patients [7]. In response, recent guideline updates increasingly emphasize the need for personalized treatment strategies, guided by biomarkers and clinical phenotypes [1].

This review critically examines current evidence on the role of inhaled treatments in COPD, with a focus on their potential to modify disease progression and reduce exacerbations. It also compares the efficacy of monotherapy, dual therapy, and triple therapy, while addressing recent therapeutic innovations and practical barriers to implementation in everyday clinical practice.

Pharmacology and Rationale for Triple Inhaled Therapy in COPD

The development of triple inhaled therapy for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) is grounded in the pharmacodynamic properties and mechanisms of action of long-acting muscarinic antagonists (LAMAs), long-acting β2-agonists (LABAs), and inhaled corticosteroids (ICS), particularly when used in combination. The therapeutic rationale is based on the synergistic effects achieved through these different drug classes, which act on distinct pathways to produce a more pronounced and sustained bronchodilatory response, reduce inflammation, and improve respiratory outcomes. When LAMAs and LABAs are administered together as an FDC, they exert a complementary pharmacologic effect that enhances bronchodilation beyond what is achievable with either agent used alone. This combination not only improves airflow and symptom control but also does so without significantly increasing adverse effects compared to monotherapy at higher doses [8]. The bronchodilatory action of LAMAs is primarily mediated through antagonism of the M3 subtype of muscarinic acetylcholine receptors located on airway smooth muscle cells. These receptors are normally activated by acetylcholine, a neurotransmitter released by parasympathetic nerve endings in central airways and by non-neuronal sources in peripheral lung regions [9-11].

Binding of acetylcholine to M3 receptors activates a cascade beginning with the stimulation of Gq-type GTP-binding proteins, which in turn activate phospholipase C. This enzyme catalyzes the hydrolysis of

phosphatidylinositol 4,5-bisphosphate into two secondary messengers: inositol 1,4,5-triphosphate (IP3) and diacylglycerol (DAG) [11]. IP3 binds to receptors on the endoplasmic reticulum, triggering the release of calcium ions (Ca2+) from intracellular storage sites, while DAG activates protein kinase C (PKC). The rise in intracellular Ca2+ concentration promotes activation of myosin light chain kinase (MLCK) through the formation of calcium-calmodulin complexes. MLCK then phosphorylates myosin light chains, facilitating their interaction with actin filaments and leading to contraction of airway smooth muscle [11]. Additional pathways sustain this contraction. Ryanodine-sensitive receptors on the endoplasmic reticulum and L-type voltage-dependent calcium (VDC) channels on the plasma membrane allow for continued Ca2+ influx and maintenance of contractile tone. Moreover, PKC and Rho kinase act on CPI-17, an endogenous inhibitor of myosin light chain phosphatase (MLCP), thereby preventing dephosphorylation of myosin and further promoting contraction [11]. By blocking M3 receptors, LAMAs interfere with all of these steps, relaxing airway smooth muscle and improving airflow. Furthermore, inhibition of M3 receptors on airway submucosal glands reduces mucus secretion, alleviating airflow obstruction [11].

The contribution of M2 receptors in vivo remains uncertain. Laboratory findings suggest that presynaptic M2 receptor blockade may lead to increased acetylcholine release from parasympathetic nerves, while inhibition of postsynaptic M2 receptors on smooth muscle cells may enhance relaxation induced by β2-adrenergic agonists [9-12]. The β2-agonists, including LABAs, induce bronchodilation via a separate mechanism involving stimulation of β2-adrenergic receptors on airway smooth muscle cells. These receptors are coupled to Gs proteins, which activate adenylyl cyclase and lead to increased intracellular levels of cyclic adenosine monophosphate (cAMP) [11, 12]. The accumulation of cAMP activates protein kinase A (PKA), which then phosphorylates target proteins, including MLCK, reducing its activity. This action results in lower levels of phosphorylated myosin light chain and reduced contractility of airway smooth muscle. In addition, β2-agonist activity decreases intracellular Ca2+ concentrations, further reducing muscle tone. LABAs also promote bronchodilation through hyperpolarization of the plasma membrane, which is achieved by activation of large-conductance Ca2+-activated potassium channels (KCa) via the Gs protein pathway [11]. This hyperpolarization reduces the open probability of VDC channels, thereby limiting Ca2+ influx and contributing to muscle relaxation.

Experimental evidence supports that inhibition of M2 receptors can amplify β2-agonist-induced airway smooth muscle relaxation [13]. This finding has led to speculation that the observed synergistic bronchodilation from LAMA and LABA combinations may be partially due to M2 receptor antagonism facilitating β2-receptor signaling through KCa channel activation [9]. When KCa channels are opened, they permit the efflux of K+ ions, generating large outward currents that hyperpolarize the membrane. This reduces the influx of Ca2+ through voltage-gated channels and promotes relaxation of airway smooth muscle. This sequence of effects underscores the pharmacological synergy between LAMAs and LABAs, justifying the development of combination products. The dual actions of LAMA and LABA agents, when combined with ICS, provide the basis for triple inhaled therapy. While the principal function of LAMA and LABA agents is to achieve maximal bronchodilation, ICS compounds add anti-inflammatory effects by modulating gene expression. ICS bind to glucocorticoid receptors in the cytoplasm and translocate to the nucleus, where they suppress the transcription of pro-inflammatory genes while enhancing anti-inflammatory gene expression. This mechanism is particularly relevant in COPD patients who exhibit elevated levels of eosinophils or features of asthma-COPD overlap syndrome (ACOS), where inflammation plays a greater role in disease progression and exacerbations.

Evidence from clinical and preclinical studies suggests that triple therapy offers significant clinical benefit in certain COPD phenotypes. These include patients with high exacerbation risk, those with eosinophilic inflammation, and individuals with poor symptom control despite dual therapy. The goal of combining LAMA, LABA, and ICS in a single inhaler is to simplify treatment regimens, improve adherence, and maximize therapeutic efficacy while minimizing systemic side effects. Nonselective

LAMAs like tiotropium have been widely studied, but newer LAMAs with increased M3 selectivity are preferred in modern drug development to avoid unwanted M2-mediated effects [16]. In conclusion, the pharmacologic rationale for triple inhaled therapy in COPD lies in the complementary mechanisms of bronchodilation and anti-inflammatory action provided by LAMAs, LABAs, and ICS, respectively. LAMAs target cholinergic pathways by antagonizing muscarinic receptors, LABAs stimulate β2-adrenergic pathways to increase cAMP and reduce intracellular Ca2+, and ICS modulate inflammatory gene transcription. The evidence supports a synergistic interaction between these agents, particularly in specific patient subgroups. These insights support the ongoing clinical development of fixed-dose triple therapies and emphasize the importance of personalized medicine in the management of COPD.

Anti-Inflammatory Effects and Glucocorticoid Resistance in COPD

Although inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) have demonstrated anti-inflammatory effects on bronchial mast cells and, in ex-smokers, CD8+ cells, as evidenced by a bioptic study [14], the predominant neutrophilic and alveolar macrophage-driven airway inflammation in most COPD patients remains largely resistant to glucocorticoid treatment [15]. However, a subset of COPD patients with elevated peripheral blood eosinophilia—but not those with a non-eosinophilic phenotype—may benefit from ICS in combination with long-acting beta-agonists (LABA), as this regimen has been shown to reduce moderate and severe exacerbations [16]. The anti-inflammatory mechanisms of glucocorticoids in chronic inflammatory diseases involve the reversal of histone acetylation in activated inflammatory genes. This process is mediated by liganded glucocorticoid receptors binding to coactivator molecules, such as CREB-binding protein (CBP) and p300/CBP-activating factor, along with the recruitment of histone deacetylase-2 (HDAC2) to the activated transcription complex [17]. At higher concentrations, glucocorticoid receptor homodimers interact with DNA recognition sites, promoting histone acetylation of anti-inflammatory genes and transcription of genes associated with glucocorticoid-related adverse effects [17]. Glucocorticoid resistance in COPD patients has been linked to reduced HDAC2 activity and expression in alveolar macrophages, airways, and peripheral lung tissue [18], a consequence of elevated oxidative and nitrative stress that diminishes the anti-inflammatory efficacy of glucocorticoids [17]. To address this resistance, alternative anti-inflammatory therapies and agents capable of restoring HDAC2 expression—such as phosphoinositide 3-kinase δ inhibitors and theophylline—are under investigation [17].

Triple Therapy for COPD: Evidence from Clinical Trials

The efficacy of triple inhaled therapy—comprising a long-acting muscarinic antagonist (LAMA), LABA, and ICS—has been compared with LAMA monotherapy, LAMA/LABA, or ICS/LABA in patients with moderate to very severe COPD [19-21]. In a 52-week, parallel-group, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial involving 449 COPD patients with post-bronchodilator FEV1 <65% predicted and at least one exacerbation in the preceding year, participants were randomized to receive tiotropium (18 μg once daily) plus fluticasone propionate/salmeterol (500/50 μg twice daily), tiotropium plus salmeterol (50 μg twice daily), or tiotropium plus placebo [19]. The primary outcome—proportion of patients experiencing a respiratory exacerbation within 52 weeks—did not differ significantly among the three groups (60% vs. 64.8% vs. 62.8%, respectively), with no absolute risk reduction observed for either combination therapy compared to tiotropium monotherapy ($P = 0.62$ and $P = 0.71$, respectively) [19]. However, triple therapy demonstrated secondary benefits, including improved pre-bronchodilator FEV1 ($P = 0.049$) and a reduced incidence of exacerbations requiring hospitalization [incidence rate ratio 0.53 (95% CI, 0.33–0.86)] compared to tiotropium plus placebo [19]. Both triple and dual therapies also enhanced disease-specific quality of life ($P = 0.01$ and $P = 0.02$, respectively), though direct comparisons between triple and dual therapy were not reported [19]. A separate 12-week, randomized, double-blind, multicenter study involving 660 COPD patients with pre-bronchodilator FEV1 ≤50% predicted and at least one prior exacerbation evaluated the addition of budesonide/formoterol (320/9 μg twice daily) to tiotropium (18 μg once daily) [20]. Triple therapy significantly increased predose FEV1 by 6% (65 mL) compared to tiotropium plus placebo ($P < 0.001$) and was associated with improved pulmonary function, symptom relief, and a

reduction in severe exacerbations [rate ratio 0.38 (95% CI, 0.25–0.57; P < 0.001)] [20].

The WISDOM study, a 52-week, randomized, double-blind, noninferiority trial involving 2485 patients with severe or very severe COPD, examined the impact of ICS withdrawal on exacerbations, lung function, and health status [21]. Following a 6-week run-in period with tiotropium, salmeterol, and fluticasone propionate, patients were randomized to either continue triple therapy or undergo stepwise ICS withdrawal over 12 weeks [21]. The hazard ratio for the first moderate or severe exacerbation was 1.06 (95% CI, 0.94–1.19), confirming noninferiority of ICS withdrawal, as the upper confidence limit did not exceed the prespecified margin of 1.20 [21]. However, ICS discontinuation led to a modest but significant decline in trough FEV1 at 18 weeks (−38 mL, P < 0.001) and 52 weeks (−43 mL, P = 0.001) compared to continued ICS use, though health status and dyspnea were minimally affected [21]. These findings suggest that dual bronchodilator therapy is noninferior to triple therapy in preventing exacerbations in severe COPD, though the potential benefit of ICS in eosinophilic-predominant subgroups—who may derive greater therapeutic effects could not be assessed due to the lack of phenotypic stratification [21]. Two additional randomized, double-blind trials (NCT01957163; NCT02119286) involving 1146 participants evaluated the addition of umeclidinium (62.5 or 125 µg once daily) to fixed-dose fluticasone furoate/vilanterol (100/25 µg once daily) in COPD patients [22]. Both studies demonstrated significant improvements in trough FEV1 after 12 weeks compared to placebo, with least mean square differences ranging from 0.111 to 0.128 L (P ≤ 0.001) and no dose-dependent effect observed [22]. Further research is needed to assess the long-term impact of triple ICS/LABA/LAMA therapy on lung function and exacerbation frequency. Current evidence underscores the variable efficacy of glucocorticoids in COPD, with benefits largely confined to patients with eosinophilic inflammation. Triple therapy demonstrates advantages in lung function and exacerbation reduction, though ICS withdrawal may be feasible in select patients without compromising exacerbation control. Ongoing investigations into alternative anti-inflammatory strategies and personalized treatment approaches based on inflammatory phenotypes remain critical to optimizing COPD management.

New LAMA/LABA/ICS Fixed-Dose Combinations (FDCs)

The development of fixed-dose combinations (FDCs) integrating long-acting muscarinic antagonists (LAMA), long-acting beta-agonists (LABA), and inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) into a single inhaler represents a significant advancement in the management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). These triple-therapy FDCs enhance patient adherence by simplifying treatment regimens while ensuring optimal drug delivery. Several novel FDCs are currently in phase III clinical development for COPD, including fluticasone furoate/vilanterol/umeclidinium (GSK 2834425), budesonide/formoterol/glycopyrronium (PT010), and beclometasone/formoterol/glycopyrronium (CHF 5993). Additionally, mometasone furoate/indacaterol/glycopyrronium is being investigated for asthma (see: adisinsight.springer.com; clinicaltrials.gov). Among these, umeclidinium, a once-daily LAMA, has been approved for the maintenance treatment of moderate to very severe COPD, either as monotherapy or in combination with vilanterol, a once-daily LABA [22,23]. Similarly, the fluticasone furoate/vilanterol FDC is indicated for asthma patients aged 12 years and older who remain inadequately controlled on ICS and short-acting β_2-agonists [24], as well as for COPD patients with a history of two or more exacerbations per year despite bronchodilator therapy [25] (see: EMA Fluticasone/Vilanterol EPAR). The once-daily dosing regimen of fluticasone furoate is facilitated by its enhanced receptor affinity and prolonged lung tissue retention [26-28].

Pharmacokinetic and Pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) Studies of Triple FDCs

Two single-center, four-way, single-dose, crossover studies (CTT116415/NCT01691547 and 200587/NCT01894386) evaluated the pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and safety of the fluticasone furoate/umeclidinium/vilanterol FDC compared to dual-

therapy FDCs [38]. In these studies, 88 healthy subjects were randomized to receive four consecutive inhalations via a single dry powder inhaler (DPI). The doses administered were significantly higher than those approved for COPD (fourfold for fluticasone furoate and vilanterol, four-to-eightfold for umeclidinium) to assess safety margins.

Key findings from these studies demonstrated that:

- **PK/PD parameters** (e.g., systemic exposure, peak plasma concentrations) were comparable when the three drugs were administered as a triple FDC versus dual FDCs (fluticasone/vilanterol or umeclidinium/vilanterol).
- **Safety profiles** were similar across all treatment groups, with a low incidence of adverse effects, suggesting no additional safety concerns with the triple FDC.
- **Lung deposition** of the active components was consistent whether delivered via a single triple inhaler or dual FDCs, supporting the feasibility of a once-daily triple-therapy inhaler [29].

These results indicate that the fluticasone furoate/umeclidinium/vilanterol FDC maintains comparable pharmacokinetics, safety, and lung bioavailability to existing dual therapies, reinforcing its potential as a convenient and effective treatment option for COPD.

Ongoing Phase III Clinical Trials

Several phase III randomized clinical trials are currently assessing the efficacy, safety, and tolerability of ICS/LABA/LAMA FDCs in patients with severe to very severe COPD. Notably, some trials (NCT02465567, NCT02497001, NCT02536508) are also enrolling patients with moderate COPD (see: clinicaltrials.gov). However, as of now, no interim or final results from these studies have been published. A critical gap in current research is the lack of trials specifically evaluating triple FDCs in high-risk subgroups, such as:

- **Frequent exacerbators** (patients with ≥2 exacerbations/year)
- **Asthma-COPD overlap syndrome (ACOS)** patients
- **Eosinophilic-phenotype COPD** patients, who may derive greater benefit from ICS

Given the known heterogeneity of COPD, future studies should stratify patients based on inflammatory phenotypes (e.g., eosinophilic vs. neutrophilic) to determine whether ICS-containing triple therapy offers superior outcomes in specific subgroups.

Unmet Needs and Future Directions

While triple FDCs offer a promising therapeutic approach, several unresolved questions remain:

1. **Comparative Efficacy vs. Dual Therapy:**
   - Do ICS/LABA/LAMA FDCs provide additional benefits over LAMA/LABA in non-eosinophilic COPD?
   - Is the reduction in exacerbations driven primarily by ICS or enhanced bronchodilation?
2. **Personalized Medicine Approaches:**
   - Can biomarkers (e.g., blood eosinophil counts) predict ICS responsiveness in triple therapy?
   - Should ICS be withdrawn in patients without eosinophilic inflammation?
3. **Long-Term Safety:**
   - What are the risks of prolonged ICS use (e.g., pneumonia, osteoporosis) in elderly COPD patients?
   - Does once-daily dosing mitigate systemic side effects compared to twice-daily regimens?

The development of once-daily LAMA/LABA/ICS FDCs represents a significant step forward in COPD management, offering improved convenience and adherence. Early PK/PD studies suggest that these combinations maintain safety and efficacy profiles comparable to dual therapies. However, ongoing phase III trials must address critical gaps, including the role of ICS in specific COPD phenotypes and the long-term impact of triple therapy on exacerbations and lung function. Future research should prioritize precision medicine approaches to identify patients most likely to benefit from ICS-containing

regimens, ensuring optimal therapeutic outcomes while minimizing unnecessary corticosteroid exposure. Until further data emerge, clinicians should consider individual patient characteristics—such as exacerbation history, eosinophil levels, and comorbidities—when selecting between dual and triple inhaled therapies. The introduction of these novel FDCs holds promise for improving COPD care, but their optimal use will depend on robust clinical evidence tailored to diverse patient populations.

Table-1: Clinical Trials.

Study/Reference	Design & Population	Interventions	Key Findings	Clinical Implications
52-week trial [27]	449 COPD patients (FEV1 <65%), ≥1 exacerbation	Tiotropium + FP/SAL vs Tiotropium + SAL vs Tiotropium + placebo	• No difference in exacerbation rates (60% vs 64.8% vs 62.8%) • Improved FEV1 with triple therapy (P=0.049) • 47% reduction in hospitalization risk	Supports triple therapy for lung function improvement but not universal exacerbation prevention
12-week trial [28]	660 COPD patients (FEV1 ≤50%), ≥1 exacerbation	Tiotropium + BUD/FOR vs placebo	• 6% FEV1 improvement (65mL, P<0.001) • 62% reduction in severe exacerbations	Demonstrates rapid benefits in severe COPD
WISDOM [29]	2485 severe/very severe COPD patients	ICS withdrawal vs continuation	• Non-inferior exacerbation control (HR 1.06) • 38-43mL FEV1 decline post-withdrawal	ICS may be safely withdrawn in some patients without eosinophilia
NCT studies [30]	1146 COPD patients	UMEC added to FF/VI	• 111-128mL FEV1 improvement (P≤0.001) • No dose-dependent effect	Supports once-daily triple therapy efficacy

Safety Considerations in COPD Pharmacotherapy

The safety profile of pharmacological treatments for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) remains a critical area of investigation, particularly regarding the risk-benefit ratio of inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) and long-acting bronchodilators. Current evidence highlights several important safety concerns that clinicians must consider when prescribing maintenance therapy for COPD patients. One of the most well-documented adverse effects associated with ICS-containing regimens is the increased risk of pneumonia, which appears to vary significantly between different corticosteroid molecules. Multiple large-scale studies and meta-analyses have demonstrated that fixed-dose combinations (FDCs) containing fluticasone exhibit a dose-dependent increase in pneumonia risk [30,31,32]. A comprehensive meta-analysis of observational studies revealed that the relative risk for severe pneumonia was substantially higher with fluticasone-containing regimens (RR 2.01; 95% CI 1.93-2.10) compared to those containing

budesonide (RR 1.17; 95% CI 1.09-1.26) [32]. This differential risk profile between ICS molecules may be attributed to several factors, including differences in pharmacokinetic properties, receptor binding affinities, and tissue retention characteristics. Fluticasone's higher lipophilicity and prolonged tissue retention in the respiratory tract may contribute to its greater immunosuppressive effects on pulmonary host defenses, thereby increasing susceptibility to bacterial pneumonia. The risk of pneumonia with ICS appears to be particularly elevated in certain patient subgroups, including older individuals, those with severe airflow limitation (FEV1 < 50% predicted), and patients with a history of previous pneumonia episodes. Furthermore, the pneumonia risk seems to persist throughout the duration of ICS therapy, emphasizing the need for regular reassessment of the ongoing necessity for ICS in COPD management. Clinicians should maintain a high index of suspicion for pneumonia in COPD patients receiving ICS who present with worsening respiratory symptoms, as the clinical presentation may sometimes be atypical in this population.

Another significant safety concern in COPD pharmacotherapy involves the potential increased mortality risk associated with tiotropium bromide delivered via the soft mist inhaler (Respimat®) device. Several meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials have suggested an elevated mortality risk with tiotropium Respimat® compared to placebo (OR 1.51; 95% CI 1.06-2.19) and other active comparators including tiotropium dry powder inhaler (DPI) (OR 1.65; 95% CI 1.13-2.43), LABA monotherapy (OR 1.63; 95% CI 1.10-2.44), and LABA/ICS combinations (OR 1.90; 95% CI 1.28-2.86) [33]. The excess mortality risk appeared particularly pronounced for cardiovascular causes and in patients with severe COPD [33]. These findings raised important questions about the safety of the Respimat® delivery system and prompted further investigation. The large-scale TIOSPIR trial (N=17,135) was specifically designed to address these safety concerns and found no significant difference in all-cause mortality between tiotropium Respimat® (5 or 2.5 μg) and tiotropium DPI (18 μg) over a mean follow-up of 2.3 years [34]. However, a subsequent post hoc analysis of the TIOSPIR data suggested possible differences in cardiovascular mortality patterns [35], highlighting the need for continued surveillance. The mechanisms underlying the potential safety signals with tiotropium Respimat® remain incompletely understood but may relate to differences in systemic absorption patterns compared to the DPI formulation.

Table-2: Safety Considerations.

Therapy	Safety Concern	Evidence	Risk Factors	Clinical Recommendations
ICS-containing FDCs	Pneumonia risk	• Fluticasone RR 2.01 (1.93-2.10) • Budesonide RR 1.17 (1.09-1.26) [41]	• Higher ICS doses • Severe airflow limitation • Previous pneumonia history	Prefer budesonide in high-risk patients; regular pneumonia monitoring
Tiotropium Respimat®	Mortality signal	• OR 1.51 vs placebo (1.06-2.19) • OR 1.65 vs DPI (1.13-2.43) [43]	• Severe COPD • Cardiovascular disease • Higher doses	TIOSPIR showed comparable safety to DPI [44]; monitor CV risk
Novel MABAs	Systemic exposure	• Increased FP AUC in batefenterol/FP blend [52]	• High doses • Comorbid conditions	Requires careful PK monitoring in phase III trials
Triple FDCs	Formulation challenges	• Variable fine particle fractions [48]	• Multiple drug components • Differe	Co-suspension technology may improve

Therapy	Safety Concern	Evidence	Risk Factors	Clinical Recommendations
			nt solubilities	consistency [48]

Emerging Pharmacological Strategies in COPD

The limitations and safety concerns associated with current COPD therapies have spurred the development of innovative pharmacological approaches aimed at improving efficacy while minimizing adverse effects. One of the most promising strategies involves the creation of bifunctional molecules that combine multiple pharmacological activities in a single compound. These novel agents have the potential to simplify treatment regimens, improve adherence, and potentially enhance therapeutic outcomes through synergistic mechanisms of action. Muscarinic antagonist-β2 agonist (MABA) compounds represent a major advancement in this field, offering the potential for superior bronchodilation compared to individual monocomponents [36,37]. By combining muscarinic antagonism and β2-agonism in a single molecule, MABAs may provide more balanced and coordinated effects on airway smooth muscle tone while reducing the complexity of combination therapies. The development of these dual-pharmacology compounds also facilitates the creation of simpler triple therapy regimens, as combining a MABA with an ICS in a single inhaler would require only two active components rather than three [38]. This approach could help overcome some of the significant technical challenges associated with formulating multiple drugs with differing physicochemical properties in a single delivery device.

The formulation of combination inhalers presents substantial technical hurdles due to differences in drug solubilities, physical-chemical characteristics, and required doses. The presence of multiple drugs in a single inhaler can compromise suspension stability, leading to potential variability in drug delivery and inconsistent fine particle fractions [38]. Recent advances in pharmaceutical technology have addressed these challenges through innovative approaches such as co-suspension pMDI systems. These systems utilize porous phospholipid microparticles to maintain stable suspensions of multiple drug microcrystals in propellant, enabling consistent and reliable delivery of combination therapies [38]. This technology offers several advantages, including the ability to formulate very low drug doses (below 1 μg) while maintaining consistent fine particle fractions across different drug combinations. Among the MABA compounds in development, batefenterol (GSK 961081) has progressed furthest in clinical evaluation. This first-in-class MABA has demonstrated clinical proof-of-concept and is currently being investigated in fixed-dose combination with fluticasone furoate for COPD treatment (NCT02666287; NCT02573870) [39,40]. Phase I pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies have revealed important formulation-dependent effects, with the batefenterol/fluticasone propionate dry powder blend showing increased systemic fluticasone exposure compared to concurrent administration of the separate components [41]. This finding suggests that physical interactions in the blended formulation may affect oropharyngeal deposition patterns when delivered via DPI, potentially influencing both efficacy and safety profiles. Ongoing clinical trials are further characterizing the pharmacokinetic profile of batefenterol/fluticasone furoate combinations (NCT02666287) and evaluating their efficacy and safety in COPD patients (NCT02573870). These studies employ rigorous methodologies to assess key outcomes including systemic exposure, bronchodilator effects, and cardiovascular safety parameters. The phase IIa trial specifically examines the effect on heart rate as a primary safety endpoint, reflecting the importance of cardiovascular monitoring with novel bronchodilator therapies [42].

Several other MABA compounds are progressing through earlier stages of clinical development, including AZD8871 (NCT02573155) and AZD8999. These agents may offer differentiated profiles in terms of receptor binding kinetics, duration of action, or safety characteristics. Beyond MABAs, researchers are exploring other innovative bifunctional molecules such as GS5759, which combines potent β2-agonist activity (EC50 = 8 ± 4 nM) with phosphodiesterase-4 (PDE4) inhibitory effects (IC50 = 5 ± 3

nM) [43,44]. This dual mechanism of action could provide both bronchodilation and anti-inflammatory effects in a single molecule, potentially addressing multiple aspects of COPD pathophysiology simultaneously. The development of these novel pharmacological strategies creates opportunities for more personalized approaches to COPD management. Future research should focus on evaluating these therapies in clinically important patient subgroups, including those with asthma-COPD overlap (ACOS), eosinophilic inflammation, or frequent exacerbations. Such targeted investigations could help identify patients most likely to benefit from these advanced therapies while minimizing unnecessary exposure to potential side effects. Additionally, comparative effectiveness studies against existing triple therapy regimens will be essential to determine the optimal positioning of these innovative treatments in the COPD management paradigm. As these new therapeutic options progress through clinical development, ongoing attention to safety monitoring will remain paramount. The lessons learned from previous experiences with ICS-related pneumonia risks and bronchodilator safety concerns should inform the design of robust pharmacovigilance programs for these novel agents. By combining innovative pharmacological approaches with rigorous safety evaluation, the next generation of COPD therapies may offer improved outcomes with more favorable risk-benefit profiles for patients across the spectrum of disease severity [45-53].

Conclusion:

The critical review of inhaled therapies in COPD underscores the evolving understanding and application of triple inhaled therapy. Initially reserved for severe cases, the evidence now strongly supports its targeted use in specific patient phenotypes, particularly those with a history of frequent exacerbations, eosinophilic inflammation, or asthma-COPD overlap syndrome (ACOS). The pharmacological synergy between long-acting muscarinic antagonists (LAMAs), long-acting β2-adrenoceptor agonists (LABAs), and inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) provides comprehensive bronchodilation and anti-inflammatory effects. Clinical trials have consistently demonstrated that triple therapy leads to significant improvements in lung function and a reduction in exacerbation rates in these responsive subgroups. The development of fixed-dose combinations (FDCs) has further enhanced patient adherence and convenience, streamlining complex treatment regimens into single inhaler devices. However, the universal applicability of triple therapy remains a subject of ongoing debate, with some studies suggesting that dual bronchodilator therapy may be noninferior in preventing exacerbations in certain severe COPD patients, especially those without eosinophilic inflammation. This highlights the importance of patient stratification and personalized medicine approaches. From a clinical perspective, the findings emphasize the necessity of moving beyond a one-size-fits-all approach to COPD management. Clinicians should meticulously assess individual patient characteristics, including exacerbation history, inflammatory biomarkers like blood eosinophil counts, and the presence of ACOS, to guide therapeutic decisions. The observed differential risk of pneumonia with various ICS molecules, particularly the higher risk associated with fluticasone compared to budesonide, necessitates careful consideration of the ICS component in triple therapy. While the large-scale TIOSPIR trial has largely allayed concerns regarding the mortality risk associated with tiotropium Respimat®, continuous pharmacovigilance remains crucial for all long-term COPD treatments. The emergence of novel pharmacological strategies, such as bifunctional molecules like muscarinic antagonist-β2 agonist (MABA) compounds and those combining β2-agonist with phosphodiesterase-4 (PDE4) inhibitory effects, represents a promising frontier. These innovations aim to simplify regimens further and offer more targeted therapeutic benefits, potentially addressing multiple pathophysiological aspects of COPD with fewer components. Despite significant advancements, several unmet needs persist. Future research must focus on robustly identifying biomarkers that predict responsiveness to ICS-containing regimens, thereby optimizing patient selection and minimizing unnecessary corticosteroid exposure. Long-term safety data, particularly concerning the risks of prolonged ICS use (e.g., pneumonia, osteoporosis) in elderly COPD patients, require continued investigation. Comparative effectiveness studies are essential to definitively position novel therapies against existing dual and triple regimens. The optimal use of triple inhaled therapy and emerging pharmacological agents will ultimately

depend on the generation of comprehensive clinical evidence tailored to the diverse and heterogeneous COPD patient population. This will pave the way for truly personalized care strategies that maximize therapeutic outcomes while mitigating potential risks.

References:

1. Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD). (2024). Global strategy for the prevention, diagnosis and management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: 2024 report. https://goldcopd.org/2024-gold-report-2/
2. Rabe, K. F., Watz, H., Baraldo, S., Pedersen, F., Schmidt, H., & Bals, R. (2023). Triple therapy in COPD: When, for whom, and why? The Lancet Respiratory Medicine, 11(3), 236–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(22)00399-9
3. Vestbo, J., & Vogelmeier, C. F. (2022). Pharmacological treatment of COPD: From evidence to implementation. European Respiratory Review, 31(166), 210144. https://doi.org/10.1183/16000617.0144-2021
4. Rogers, D. F., & Donnelly, L. E. (2020). Inhaled corticosteroids: Risks and benefits in COPD. European Respiratory Journal, 55(2), 1901041. https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01041-2019
5. Lipson, D. A., Barnhart, F., Brealey, N., Brooks, J., Criner, G. J., Day, N. C., … & Pascoe, S. J. (2018). Once-daily single-inhaler triple versus dual therapy in patients with COPD. New England Journal of Medicine, 378(18), 1671–1680. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1713901
6. Cazzola, M., Rogliani, P., Matera, M. G., & Hanania, N. A. (2020). The future of inhaled therapy in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Looking beyond the inhaled corticosteroid/long-acting beta2-agonist/long-acting muscarinic antagonist combination. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 202(11), 1490–1498. https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.202004-0997PP
7. Agustí, A., & Hogg, J. C. (2019). Update on the pathogenesis of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 381(13), 1248–1256. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1900475
8. Montuschi, P., & Ciabattoni, G. (2015). Bronchodilating drugs for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Current status and future trends. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 58(10), 4131-4164.
9. Montuschi, P., et al. (2013). Inhaled muscarinic acetylcholine receptor antagonists for treatment of COPD. Current Medicinal Chemistry, 20(11), 1464-1476.
10. Kume, H., et al. (2015). Research and development of bronchodilators for asthma and COPD with a focus on G protein/KCa channel linkage and β2-adrenergic intrinsic efficacy. Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 156, 75-89.
11. Pera, T., & Penn, R. B. (2014). Crosstalk between β2-adrenoceptor and muscarinic acetylcholine receptors in the airway. Current Opinion in Pharmacology, 16, 72-81.
12. Belmonte, K. E. (2005). Cholinergic pathways in the lungs and anticholinergic therapy for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Proceedings of the American Thoracic Society, 2(4), 297-304.
13. Brown, S. M., et al. (2013). A role for M2 and M3 muscarinic receptors in the contraction of rat and human small airways. European Journal of Pharmacology, 702(1-3), 109-115.
14. Hoonhorst, S. J., et al. (2014). Steroid resistance in COPD? Overlap and differential anti-inflammatory effects in smokers and ex-smokers. PLoS One, 9(1), e87443.
15. Jiang, Z., & Zhu, L. (2016). Update on molecular mechanisms of corticosteroid resistance in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Pulmonary Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 37, 1-8.
16. Pavord, I. D., et al. (2016). Blood eosinophils and inhaled corticosteroid/long-acting β2 agonist efficacy in COPD. Thorax, 71(2), 118-125.
17. Barnes, P. J. (2013). Corticosteroid resistance in patients with asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 131(3), 636-645.
18. .Ito, K., et al. (2005). Decreased histone deacetylase activity in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 352(19), 1967-1976.
19. Aaron, S. D., et al. (2007). Tiotropium in combination with placebo, salmeterol, or fluticasone-salmeterol for treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: A randomized trial. Annals of Internal Medicine, 146(8), 545-555.
20. Welte, T., et al. (2009). Efficacy and tolerability of budesonide/formoterol added to tiotropium in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 180(8), 741-750.
21. Magnussen, H., et al. (2014). Withdrawal of inhaled glucocorticoids and exacerbations of COPD. New England Journal of Medicine, 371(14), 1285-1294.
22. Siler, T. M., et al. (2015). Efficacy and safety of umeclidinium added to fluticasone propionate/salmeterol in patients with COPD: Results of two randomized, double-blind studies. COPD: Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, 13(1), 1-10.
23. Pleasants, R. A., et al. (2016). Inhaled umeclidinium in COPD patients: A review and meta-analysis. Drugs, 76(3), 343-361.

24. Scott, L. J., & Hair, P. (2014). Umeclidinium/vilanterol: First global approval. Drugs, 74(3), 389-395.
25. Syed, Y. Y. (2015). Fluticasone furoate/vilanterol: A review of its use in patients with asthma. Drugs, 75(4), 407-418.
26. McKeage, K. (2014). Fluticasone furoate/vilanterol: A review of its use in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Drugs, 74(13), 1509-1522.
27. Biggadike, K., et al. (2008). X-ray crystal structure of the novel enhanced-affinity glucocorticoid agonist fluticasone furoate in the glucocorticoid receptor-ligand binding domain. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 51(11), 3349-3352.
28. Valotis, A., & Högger, P. (2007). Human receptor kinetics and lung tissue retention of the enhanced-affinity glucocorticoid fluticasone furoate. Respiratory Research, 8(1), 54.
29. Bollmeier, S. G., & Prosser, T. R. (2014). Combination of fluticasone furoate and vilanterol for the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Annals of Pharmacotherapy, 48(2), 250-257.
30. Brealey, N., et al. (2016). Pharmacokinetics of fluticasone furoate, umeclidinium, and vilanterol as a triple therapy in healthy volunteers. International Journal of Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 53(9), 753-764.
31. Calverley, P. M., et al. (2007). Salmeterol and fluticasone propionate and survival in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 356(8), 775-789.
32. Crim, C., et al. (2015). Pneumonia risk with inhaled fluticasone furoate and vilanterol compared with vilanterol alone in patients with COPD. Annals of the American Thoracic Society, 12(1), 27-34.
33. Suissa, S., et al. (2013). Inhaled corticosteroids in COPD and the risk of serious pneumonia. Thorax, 68(11), 1029-1036.
34. Singh, S., et al. (2011). Mortality associated with tiotropium mist inhaler in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. BMJ, 342, d3215.
35. Dong, Y. H., et al. (2013). Comparative safety of inhaled medications in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Systematic review and mixed treatment comparison meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Thorax, 68(1), 48-56.
36. Wise, R. A., et al. (2023). Tiotropium Respimat inhaler and the risk of death in COPD. New England Journal of Medicine, 369(16), 1491-1501.
37. Loke, Y. K., et al. (2014). Tiotropium and the risk of death in COPD. New England Journal of Medicine, 370(5), 480-481.
38. Hughes, A. D., et al. (2015). Discovery of (R)-1-(3-((2-chloro-4-(((2-hydroxy-2-(8-hydroxy-2-oxo-1,2-dihydroquinolin-5-yl)ethyl)amino)methyl)-5-methoxyphenyl)amino)-3-oxopropyl)piperidin-4-yl [1,1′-biphenyl]-2-ylcarbamate (TD-5959, GSK961081, batefenterol): First-in-class dual pharmacology multivalent muscarinic antagonist and β-agonist (MABA) for the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 58(6), 2609-2622.
39. .Jones, L. H., et al. (2015). Molecular hybridization yields triazole bronchodilators for the treatment of COPD. Bioorganic & Medicinal Chemistry Letters, 25(22), 5121-5126.
40. Vehring, R., et al. (2012). Cosuspensions of microcrystals and engineered microparticles for uniform and efficient delivery of respiratory therapeutics from pressurized metered dose inhalers. Langmuir, 28(43), 15015-15023.
41. Bateman, E. D., et al. (2013). Pharmacodynamics of GSK961081, a bi-functional molecule, in patients with COPD. Pulmonary Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 26(5), 581-587.
42. Norris, V., & Ambery, C. (2013). Bronchodilation and safety of supratherapeutic doses of salbutamol or ipratropium bromide added to single dose GSK961081 in patients with moderate to severe COPD. Pulmonary Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 26(5), 574-580.
43. Hedge, S. S., et al. (2014). Pharmacologic characterization of GSK-961081 (TD-5959), a first-in-class inhaled bifunctional bronchodilator possessing muscarinic receptor antagonist and β2-adrenoceptor agonist properties. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 351(1), 190-199.
44. Norris, V., et al. (2014). Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of GSK961081, a novel inhaled muscarinic antagonist β2-agonist, and fluticasone propionate administered alone, concurrently and as a combination blend formulation in healthy volunteers. Clinical Pharmacology in Drug Development, 3(4), 305-313.
45. Tannheimer, S. L., et al. (2014). The in vitro pharmacology of GS-5759, a novel bifunctional phosphodiesterase 4 inhibitor and long acting β2-adrenoceptor agonist. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 349(1), 85-93.
46. Salmon, M., et al. (2014). The in vivo efficacy and side effect pharmacology of GS-5759, a novel bifunctional phosphodiesterase 4 inhibitor and long-acting β2-adrenoceptor agonist in preclinical animal species. Pharmacology Research & Perspectives, 2(1), e00046.
47. Barnes, P. J. (2010). Inhaled corticosteroids in COPD: A controversy. Respiration, 80(2), 89-95.
48. Van Tho, N., et al. (2015). A mixed phenotype of airway wall thickening and emphysema is associated with dyspnea and hospitalization for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Annals of the American Thoracic Society, 12(7), 988-996.
49. Hurst, J. R., et al. (2010). Susceptibility to exacerbation in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 363(12), 1128-1138.

50. Russell, D. W., et al. (2016). Disease phenotyping in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: The neutrophilic endotype. Current Opinion in Pulmonary Medicine, 22(2), 91-99.
51. Kim, S., et al. (2015). Integrative phenotyping framework (iPF): Integrative clustering of multiple omics data identifies novel lung disease subphenotypes. BMC Genomics, 16(1), 924.
52. Shaw, D. E., et al. (2015). Clinical and inflammatory characteristics of the European U-BIOPRED adult severe asthma cohort. European Respiratory Journal, 46(5), 1308-1321.
53. Beier, J., et al. (2013). Efficacy and safety of aclidinium bromide compared with placebo and tiotropium in patients with moderate-to-severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: Results from a 6-week, randomized, controlled Phase IIIb study. COPD: Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, 10(4), 511-522.