PostScript.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

If you have a burning desire to respond to a paper published in *Thorax*, why not make use of our "rapid response" option? Log on to our website (www.thoraxjnl.com), find the paper that interests you, and send your response via email by clicking on the "eLetters" option in the box at the top right hand corner.

Providing it isn't libellous or obscene, it will be posted within seven days. You can retrieve it by clicking on "read eLetters" on our homepage.

The editors will decide as before whether to also publish it in a future paper issue.

Usefulness of GOLD classification of COPD severity

In 2001 the US National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) and the World Health Organization announced guidelines for the diagnosis, management, and treatment of COPD (Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease, GOLD).¹ One key aspect of these guidelines is that COPD is classified by severity into five stages which constitute the basis of treatment recommendations. However, to date there has been little evidence for the usefulness of these severity stages.

We retrospectively reviewed 1000 patients with COPD diagnosed clinically in 2001; 500 patients originated from a pulmonary rehabilitation hospital. Patients' symptoms (based on a standardised interview), findings of a standardised lung examination, lung function data, and chest radiographic findings are routinely documented in a database. The inclusion criteria were symptoms of COPD (chronic cough with chronic sputum production for more than 2 years) and radiographic findings of COPD (hyperinflation, diaphragmatic flattening). Patients with a history of asthma (variability of spirometric parameters, improvement in forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁) of >20% after inhalation of β_2 agonists, symptoms predominantly at night, seasonal allergies, allergic rhinitis, or eczema) were excluded from the study, as were those in whom FEV₁ and forced vital capacity (FVC) differed by more than 5% according to the American Thoracic Society (ATS) guidelines² and patients with an abnormal chest radiograph or chronic cough caused by a disease other than COPD.

FEV, and FEV,/FVC were determined three times. The predicted values for FEV, were taken from the European Respiratory Society (ERS) guidelines.³ The individual values of FEV, and FEV,/FVC for all patients are shown in fig 1. Almost 14% of patients clinically diagnosed as having COPD could not be classified because they had an FEV,/FVC ratio of >70%, despite having a reduced FEV, (<80% predicted). This combination is not represented in the GOLD classification. Less than 5% of all patients were classified as GOLD stage I.

The finding that the GOLD classification missed an important subgroup of patients with mild COPD challenges any proposed advantage of this classification scheme over existing guidelines from the ATS⁴ and ERS.⁵ Only six patients not classified as having COPD by GOLD were missed using the ATS criteria (stage I: FEV₁ ≥50%) and ERS criteria (mild: FEV₁ ≤70% and FEV₁/VC >88% for men and >89% for women). Obviously, any arbitrary classification of a continuous variable such as FEV₁ and FEV₁/FVC results in a borderline group of patients. The GOLD classification, however, provides no guidance





as to the further diagnosis of the unclassified subgroup (fig 1). Our results also show that stage I disease (FEV₁/FVC <70% and FEV₁ >80% predicted) was very rare, constituting only 4–5% of the patients. This indicates that the distribution of the stages, especially stage I, is inhomogeneous.

Despite its retrospective design, this study was strengthened by the fact that lung function data, chest radiographic findings, and the results of a standard clinical examination were available for all patients. It therefore offers the chance to investigate the clinical impact of the GOLD classification, especially in patients with mild COPD.

Our study therefore suggests that GOLD criteria miss an important subgroup of patients with clinically diagnosed COPD, which reduces its usefulness as a clinical tool.

D Köhler

Krankenhaus Kloster Grafschaft, D-57392 Schmallenberg, Germany

J Fischer, F Raschke

Klinik Norderney, D-26548 Norderney, Germany

B Schönhofer

Abteilung für Pneumologie und Intensivmedizin, Klinikum Hannover, Podbielskistrasse 380, 30659 Hannover, Germany

Correspondence to: Dr D Köhler, Krankenhaus Kloster Grafschaft, D-57392 Schmallenberg, Germany; D.Koehler@fkkg.de

References

- Pauwels RA, Buist AS, Calverley PM, et al. Global strategy for the diagnosis, management, and prevention of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. NHLBI/WHO Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) Workshop summary. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2001;163:1256–76.
- 2 American Thoracic Society. Standardization of spirometry, 1994 update. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1995;152:1107–36.
- 3 Quanjer PH, Dalhuijsen A, Van Zomeren BC. Summary equations of reference values. Bull Eur Physiopathol Respir 1983;19:45–51.
- 4 American Thoracic Society. Standards for the diagnosis and care of patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1995;152:S77–121.
- Siafakas NM, Vermeire P, Pride NB, et al. Optimal assessment and management of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). The European Respiratory Society Task Force. Eur Respir J 1995;8:1398–420.

Sahaja yoga in asthma

Since the publication of our paper on Sahaja yoga in the management of moderate to severe asthma¹ we have received a large number of enquiries. One issue that has been raised about the technique used in the study warrants clarification and further acknowledgement.

The Sahaja yoga meditation technique used in the study was *not* developed by the authors. The technique was taught to subjects in the intervention group by experienced Sahaja yoga practitioners free of charge. The technique itself was developed by yoga expert H H Shri Mataji Nirmala Devi and she permitted the investigators to conduct the study on the following reasonable conditions: (1) that no part of the technique be misrepresented, misappropriated or commercialised by the investigators; (2) that the founder and practitioners of the process be appropriately