Obstructive Sleep Apnea
Non-CPAP Treatments

Nancy A. Collop, M.D.
Conflicts of Interest

• Royalties from UPTODATE as an author and editor
• Received grant monies and was on advisory council for Jazz Pharmaceuticals (2017-2018)
Learning Objectives

1. Discuss the role of oral appliances for the treatment of OSA including indications, patient selection and outcomes.
2. Review surgical methods including hypoglossal nerve stimulation used for the treatment of OSA and relevant outcome data.
3. Evaluate the effect of weight loss on the treatment of OSA including gastric bypass surgery
4. Outline other treatments used for OSA including position modification, medications and exercise
Oral Appliance

• Mechanisms:
  – Increase palatopharyngeal and palatoglossus muscle activity
  – Reduce pharyngeal tissue folds
  – Posture the tongue forward
  – Stabilize the mandible and hyoid bone

• Typically fit by a dentist or oral surgeon

- We recommend that sleep physicians prescribe OAs, rather than no therapy, for adult patients who request **treatment of primary snoring** (STANDARD)
- When OA is prescribed by a sleep physician for an adult patient with OSA, we suggest that a **qualified dentist use a custom, titratable appliance** over non-custom oral devices. (GUIDELINE)
- We recommend that sleep physicians consider prescription of OAs, rather than no treatment, for adult patients with obstructive sleep apnea **who are intolerant of CPAP therapy or prefer alternate therapy**. (STANDARD)
- We suggest that **qualified dentists provide oversight**— rather than no follow-up—of OAT in adult patients with OSA, to survey for **dental-related side effects** or occlusal changes and reduce their incidence. (GUIDELINE)

• We suggest that sleep physicians conduct follow-up sleep testing to improve or confirm treatment efficacy, rather than conduct follow-up without sleep testing, for patients fitted with OAs. (GUIDELINE)

• We suggest that sleep physicians and qualified dentists instruct adult patients treated with oral appliances for obstructive sleep apnea to return for periodic office visits— as opposed to no follow-up—with a qualified dentist and a sleep physician. (GUIDELINE)
Appliance Differences

- Position/presence of adjustment mechanism
- Minimum upper and lower jaw separation required
- Degree of condylar movement permitted
- Construction materials – durability, hypoallergenic
- Adaptability for future dental changes
Selection Criteria

• State of dental and TM health
• Mandibular plane angulation
• Anatomy – exostoses, palatal width, tongue size
• Sleep and other habits
• Tooth form, arrangement, and contour
• Patient preference and dexterity
Compliance and Side Effects

- Regular use reported in 76-90% of pts
- Side effects:
  - Excessive salivation
  - Jaw stiffness, TMJ or tooth pain
  - Altered occlusion
  - Loosening of dental work
- Bite change occurs in 75% (50% judged favorable)
  - Must alert patient to this possibility
Custom vs Prefabricated

Vanderveken et al. AJRCCM 2008.
Findings

- Only the custom devices significantly reduced the AHI
- Failure rate with prefabricated (non-custom) devices was 69%
- 63% of patients who failed with the prefabricated device were successfully treated with the custom device.
- 82% of patients preferred the custom device

Vanderveken et al. AJRCCM 2008.
When comparing OAT to CPAP, which of the following is consistently lower with OAT?

A. AHI
B. Nightly adherence
C. Patient preference
D. Changes in bite
E. Nightly SPO2
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B. Nightly adherence
C. Patient preference
D. Changes in bite
E. Nightly SPO2
Predictors for favorable response to MAD

**Clinical**
- Younger age
- Lower BMI
- Lower neck circumference
- Positional OSA
- Lower AHI (not consistently)
- Increased protrusion

**Craniofacial**
- Small/narrow oropharynx
- Smaller overjet
- Short soft palate length
- Shorter mandibular plane to hyoid distance
- Larger angle cranial base to mandibular plane
Effectiveness of MAD

- Prospective studies: 54-81% have 50% reduction in AHI; 51-64% had post-tx AHI < 10
- Cross-over trials with CPAP show CPAP reduces AHI (-8 events/hr), snoring, improves SpO2 (+3%) but pts generally prefer MAD over CPAP
- Adherence better than PAP (Avg 0.7 – 1.1 hrs/nt)
- Trials show improvement in:
  - Sleepiness
  - Blood pressure
  - QOL
  - Mortality? (1 study)
Predicting Efficacy

- Titrate during PSG – patient or tech removes device on command for events to advance
- Use device to automatically advance device during PSG
- DISE
- Imaging – no consistent findings predictable
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MATRx 2.0

- Developed a feedback controlled mandibular positioning program
- Part 1 of study to develop a predictive model (n = 149, 131 completed); Part 2 of study was to prospectively test the model (n = 53, 48 completed)
- MATRx device used and the FCMP processed signals from nasal pressure and oximetry
- 2 night study: 1st night with dynamic interaction with plates and respiratory events; 2nd night “fine tuning” to evaluate accuracy (only move if ODI > 10 for > 2 hrs)
- If protrusive position > 80%, a third night was done starting at 70% to see if it was effective
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Predicted as Therapeutic Success
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## MATRx 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predicted Success</th>
<th>Predicted Failure</th>
<th>Sensitivity 85%</th>
<th>Specificity 93%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Success</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Failure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PPV 97%**  
**NPV 72%**

[Register now at congress.chestnet.org](https://congress.chestnet.org)
Methods

- AHI > 10
- Enough teeth (10/Arch); no significant periodontal disease
- Underwent overnight PSG with RCMP after dental trays fitted by a dentist
- Advanced as per algorithm up to 3 x by 0.2 mm increments
- Success = < 1 event detected per 5 min supine REM sleep (lateral was acceptable if that was the primary position for most of the night)
- Patient then had an OA fabricated and started wearing at 70% maximum protrusion, then increased to maximum comfortable limit → repeat PSG
- “treatment response” = AHI < 10 with 50% reduction in AHI from BL
Results

- 40 completed RCMP study; 33 completed OA PSG
- Mean age 57.1 (38-78)
- Mean BMI 29.6 (22.8-43.3)
- Mean AHI 31.5 (10-93)
- 15 were TR’s (45%)
- Mandibular advancement mean was 92% of max
- 88% were predicted correctly (25/33); in 8/33 RCMP study was inconclusive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Nonresponder</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>15 (45)</td>
<td>18 (55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (y)</td>
<td>54.6 ± 12.2</td>
<td>61.6 ± 11.0</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (% male)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>27.8 ± 2.3</td>
<td>30.1 ± 4.6</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHI (events/h)</td>
<td>23.5 ± 11.4</td>
<td>38.1 ± 24.6</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral appliance treatment level (%)</td>
<td>34.6 ± 8.4</td>
<td>85.4 ± 12.3</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Treatment Outcome</th>
<th>Predicted Treatment Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresponder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using DISE to Predict

![Bar chart showing percentages for DISE Group and No DISE Group across different AHI categories.]
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Tongue Retaining Device

• Indications:
  – Edentulous patients
  – TMJ problems

• Problems:
  – Sore tongue
  – Tongue elongation
  – Appliance dislodgement
Management of Side Effects of Oral Appliance Therapy for Sleep-Disordered Breathing

Table 1—Side effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporomandibular joint-related side effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Transient morning jaw pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Persistent temporomandibular joint pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenderness in muscles of mastication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint sounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introral tissue-related side effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Soft tissue and tongue irritation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gingival irritation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excessive salivation/drooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dry mouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occlusal changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Altered occlusal contacts/bite changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incisor changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decreased overjet and overbite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alterations in position of mandibular canines and molars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interproximal gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage to teeth or restorations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Tooth mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tooth fractures or damage to dental restorations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appliance issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Appliance breakage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allergies to appliance material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gagging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dental Changes Over Time

Fig. 3. Tracing of one of the study patient's initial (T₀) and final (T₁) lateral cephalograms showing the lower incisor proclination and upper incisor retroclination.
Dental Changes Over Time

• Wearing minimum of 8 yrs
• maxillary incisor retroclination
  – mean 6°
  – constant rate of retroclination = 0.5°/year
• mandibular incisor proclination
  – mean 8°
  – variable rate
Marklund et al:
• cohort using OAT > 5 yrs
  – Of those initially successful with therapy, the improvement in symptoms and PSG outcomes remained robust at 5 - 10 years
• cohort > 15 yrs
  – (controlled for weight gain) pts remained pleased with treatment and control of snoring
  – almost doubled their baseline AHI in 16 years (17 to 32 per hour)
  – with OA: treated AHI increased from 7.2 to 35.1 per hour!
• May require continued titration

Oral Appliances

• Efficacy not as good as CPAP but patients use more and prefer in most head-to-head trials

• Predicting response:
  • Severity, POSA, age, sex, weight, other features somewhat helpful in predicting response but imperfect
  • Use of remotely controlled mandibular positioner or DISE may improve selection but many “non-responders” may respond
  • Cost and inconvenience of using during PSG have limited its usefulness

• Long term:
  • Efficacy good, lower BP shown
  • Bite changes likely
Surgical techniques for OSA

- Tracheostomy
- Maxillomandibular advancement
- Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty
- Nasal surgery
- Tonsillectomy
- Hypoglossal nerve stimulator
Aside from tracheostomy, which single surgical procedure for adult OSA has the best efficacy?

A. Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty  
B. Tonsillectomy  
C. Anterior hyoid advancement  
D. Palatal implants  
E. Maxillomandibular advancement

Q3: Collop
Aside from tracheostomy, which single surgical procedure for adult OSA has the best efficacy?

A. Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty  
B. Tonsillectomy  
C. Anterior hyoid advancement  
D. Palatal implants  
E. Maxillomandibular advancement
Tracheostomy

• Effective single surgical intervention
• Reserved for severe OSA
  – Other options exhausted
  – Life threatening complications
Maxillomandibular Advancement

- For Level III
- High success: 90%
- Overnight stay + diet modification
- Pt likes “strong jaw”
• Does NOT normalize AHI in moderate to severe OSA
• Efficacy may fade with time - ? Weight gain
• Makes CPAP more difficult due to mouth leak
• Fallen out of favor with most sleep surgeons
Hypoglossal nerve stimulation

- Implanted device
- Receives input from sensing lead to time delivery of stimulation to nerve with onset of inspiration
- Outcome (STAR Trial):
  - Reduced AHI by 68%; 29.3 to 9.0
  - Therapy maintenance group showed sustained reduction

Register now at congress.chestnet.org

Followup study from original STAR Trial

- 91 participants (original cohort 126; 73%)
- Exclusion: BMI > 32; AHI < 20, > 50; DISE w/o circumferential collapse
- Epworth, FOSQ, snoring vs baseline data
95 subjects showed up; 4 had incomplete data

- Of the original cohort:
  - 3 had died: 2 from CVD, 1 homicide
  - 3 had elective explantation of HGNS
  - 25 lost to followup:
    - 15 missed 48 month visit
    - 5 exited study
    - 5 were from study sites that closed
  - 2 required surgery to replace malfunctioning components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Comparison of Baseline Characteristics of Initial STAR Cohort and Those Completing 12- and 48-Month Follow-up.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preimplant</strong> (N = 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 mo</strong> (n = 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48 mo</strong> (n = 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age, y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 ± 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3 ± 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.7 ± 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMI, kg/m²</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.4 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.6 ± 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AH1, events/h</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.0 ± 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.7 ± 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2 ± 11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upper Airway Stimulation for Obstructive Sleep Apnea: Patient-Reported Outcomes after 48 Months of Follow-up

Epworth and FOSQ Scores

![Epworth and FOSQ Scores Graphs]
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Upper Airway Stimulation for Obstructive Sleep Apnea: Patient-Reported Outcomes after 48 Months of Follow-up

Snoring

Otoaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery 2017; Vol. 156(4): 765-771
Patient Self Reported “Nightly Usage”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Usage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Month</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Month</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Month</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Month</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adverse Events

• Procedure Related:
  – Postop pain from incision or surgery
  – Temporary tongue weakness
  – Intubation effects
  – Headache
  – Infection

• Device Related:
  – Discomfort due to stimulation
  – Tongue abrasion
  – Mechanical pain associated with device presence
  – Problem with device functionality or usability
  – Infection
Upper airway stimulation for treatment of obstructive sleep apnea; an evaluation and comparison of outcomes at two academic centers
C Huntley, T Kaffenberger, K Doghramji, R Soose, M Boon

• HGNS implantation from May-August 2016 comparing Univ Pittsburgh (UP) to Thomas Jefferson (TJ)
• Data collection:
  • Gender
  • BMI
  • ESS
  • PSG (pre and postop)
  • Adherence (objective)
• 63 implantations TJ, 57 implantations UP with 48 and 49 postop PSG available respectively
Upper airway stimulation for treatment of obstructive sleep apnea; an evaluation and comparison of outcomes at two academic centers
C Huntley, T Kaffenberger, K Doghramji, R Soose, M Boon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TJUH</th>
<th>UPMC</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>30 Male 18 Female</td>
<td>30 Male 19 Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>60.88 ± 11.12</td>
<td>52.84 ± 10.81</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative BMI</td>
<td>29.29 ± 3.72</td>
<td>27.74 ± 3.66</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postoperative BMI</td>
<td>29.09 ± 3.71</td>
<td>27.76 ± 3.75</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Demographic data. Age and BMI values represent mean ± standard deviation.
• OSA is present in ~ 60% of Down Syndrome children and frequently persists after T&A
• DS patients often have trouble with PAP therapy
• Case series of 6 DS adolescents with OSA (AHI > 10), s/p T & A
• Underwent HGNS – evaluated efficacy (AHI) and OSA-18 (QOL measure) at 6 and 12 months
Hypoglossal Nerve Stimulation in Adolescents With Down Syndrome and Obstructive Sleep Apnea

Table 1. Patient Characteristics and Baseline Polysomnogram Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient No.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age, y</th>
<th>BMI</th>
<th>Baseline, Events/h</th>
<th>AHI</th>
<th>CAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>48.5(^a)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>17.1(^b)</td>
<td>0.8(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.6(^b)</td>
<td>6.3(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Polysomnogram Results Before and After Implantation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient No.</th>
<th>Preimplantation AHI, Events/h</th>
<th>Follow-up, mo</th>
<th>Stimulator Parameters, V</th>
<th>Postimplantation AHI, Events/h</th>
<th>Device Use, Mean, h/Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.5(^a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7-1.9</td>
<td>7.4(^b)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5-1.7</td>
<td>6.1(^c)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9-2.3</td>
<td>4.7(^d)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypoglossal Nerve Stimulation in Adolescents With Down Syndrome and Obstructive Sleep Apnea

Table 4. Baseline and Follow-up Domain Scores for the Obstructive Sleep Apnea-18 (OSA-18) Survey (n = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSA-18 Domain</th>
<th>Domain Content Items</th>
<th>Change Score, Mean (SD), Range</th>
<th>Change Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sleep disturbance</td>
<td>Loud snoring; breath holding or pauses in breathing; choking or gasping; fragmented sleep</td>
<td>1.9 (1.4), -0.5 to 3.0</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical suffering</td>
<td>Mouth breathing; frequent colds or upper respiratory infections; rhinorrhea; dysphagia</td>
<td>0.4 (0.7), -0.8 to 1.0</td>
<td>Trivial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional distress</td>
<td>Mood swings or temper tantrums; aggressive or hyperactive behavior; discipline problems</td>
<td>0.9 (1.3), -0.7 to 2.7</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime problems</td>
<td>Excessive drowsiness or sleepiness; poor attention span; difficulty awakening</td>
<td>1.4 (1.0), 0.3 to 1.5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver concerns</td>
<td>Caregiver worried over child health; concerned not getting enough air; missed activities; frustration</td>
<td>2.2 (0.9), 1 to 3.3</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall survey score</td>
<td>Mean score for all 18 items</td>
<td>1.5 (0.6), 0.9 to 2.3b</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MRI of HGNS Pts

- 13 pts (6 nonresponders)
- CT awake with and w/o HGNS on
- Responders had:
  - smaller baseline soft palate volume
  - with stimulation - greater increase in retroglossal airway size; increased shortening of the mandible-hyoid distance; greater anterior displacement of the tongue
• “Treatment AHI is fraught with issues related to the lack of standardization for minimum duration, position, or sleep stage.”
  – Emory HGNS cohort (n = 43)
  – Treatment AHI vs full-night efficacy AHI
    • mean treatment AHI was 7.7 events/h vs 19.2 events/h from full-night efficacy studies
1. Full-night efficacy (i.e., single device setting) studies from either a HSAT or PSG

2. 4% oxygen desaturation index (ODI) as the primary outcome of therapy effectiveness
Conclusions: HGNS

- Hypoglossal nerve stimulation is growing in popularity
- Although it does not reduce AHI as well as CPAP, adherence is better
- Relatively low side effect profile
- Need consistent reporting standards
- No good treatment comparison studies (to other treatments) at this time
Weight Loss

- 1% change in weight results in ~ 3% change in AHI
- Most studies confirm decrease in AHI even with modest amount of weight loss
- Gastric bypass is becoming very popular weight loss method – dramatic results
  - bariatric surgery is indicated for BMI of 35 kg/m² or more with OSA or other obesity-related complications
  - Asians have higher risks of developing obesity-related complications at lower BMIs when compared with whites; BMI cutoff for Asians is lower: 32.5 kg/m²
- Many patients regain weight, therefore long term risk exists
Obesity Effect on the UA

- Increases in neck size leads to reduction in pharyngeal size
- Reduction in lung volumes and loss of caudal traction on UA
- Obesity result in modulation of UA neuromuscular control
Gastric Bypass and OSA

- Roux-en-Y is most common GB performed
- Mortality rates < 2%
- Sleep apnea has been independently shown to be an independent risk factor for mortality
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Gastric Bypass and OSA

- 1000 surgeries done by same surgeon
- 146 men, 854 women
- Avg age 38.3, mean BMI 51.8
- CAD and OSA were correlated most strongly with mortality
Gastric Bypass and OSA

- 24 patients before and after GBP (18 female)
- Avg weight reduction 54 kg
- AHI reduced from 47.9 to 24.5; CPAP fell from 11.5 to 8.4 cm H2O
  - 2 pts had increase in AHI!
  - Only 1 patient was “cured”
Bariatric Surgery and OSA – Meta-analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Pre-surgery Mean [events/h]</th>
<th>Pre-surgery SD [events/h]</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Post-surgery Mean [events/h]</th>
<th>Post-surgery SD [events/h]</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI [events/h]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bae et al. 2014 [73]</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>41.70 [19.05, 64.35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. 2013 [40]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>12.00 [9.11, 14.88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Genio et al. 2016 [43]</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>27.00 [26.32, 27.68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon et al. 2005 [26]</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>48.20 [34.70, 61.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredheim et al. 2013 [30]</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>21.50 [13.82, 29.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardiano et al. 2003 [75]</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>41.00 [16.50, 65.50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haines et al. 2006 [46]</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>36.00 [35.13, 36.87]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krieger et al. 2012 [44]</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>15.20 [-1.27, 31.67]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettieri et al. 2008 [36]</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>23.40 [8.06, 38.74]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peromaa-Haavisto et al. 2017 [34]</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>17.70 [13.05, 22.35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priyadarshini et al. 2017 [45]</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>11.60 [-0.02, 23.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasrawy et al. 2016 [41]</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>43.00 [37.14, 48.86]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia-Pons et al. 2004 [42]</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>38.50 [19.23, 57.77]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zou et al. 2015 [37]</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>15.30 [9.35, 21.25]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (95% CI) | 558 | 545 | 100.0% | 25.07 [20.20, 29.94] |

Heterogeneity: Tau² = 64.47; Chi² = 521.69; df = 14 (P < 0.00001); I² = 97%
Test for overall effect: Z = 10.09 (P < 0.00001)
Gastric Bypass and OSA

• Bariatric surgery (regardless of type) can lead to substantial weight loss, significant reductions in OSA severity, improvement in daytime sleepiness
• Surgical weight loss is more effective in reducing both AHI and BMI when compared to non-surgical weight loss strategies
• Higher baseline AHI and BMI, as well as a longer duration of follow-up, are associated with greater reductions in weight and AHI
• There is no relationship between the amount of weight lost and the improvement in AHI
• A significant proportion of patients have residual OSA post-surgery despite improvements in clinical symptoms – long term followup needed!!
Other Medications

- **Donepezil**
  - Shown to reduce AHI in Alzheimer disease

- **Mirtazipine**
  - Statistically significant reduction in AHI, not clinically significant

- **Modafinil/Armodafinil**
  - Adjunctive for EDS; should not be used in isolation
Pharmacotherapy of Apnea by Cannabimimetic Enhancement, the PACE Clinical Trial: Effects of Dronabinol in Obstructive Sleep Apnea

David W. Carley, PhD, Bharati Prasad, MD, Kathryn J. Reid, PhD, Ronell Malliani, MD, Hyer Altarian, MD, Sabra M. Abbott, MD, PhD, Boris Vem, MD, PhD, Hui Xie, PhD, Chengbo Yuan, MPH, Phyllis C. Zee, MD, PhD

- OSA pharmacotherapy is nonexistent
- A small dose escalation trial showed promise for dronabinol
  - Dampen afferent vagal feedback to the medulla
- Multicenter trial (n = 73) for moderate – severe OSA (AHI ≥ 15)
  - Exclusion criteria included ESS < 7, BMI > 45, severe hypoxemia
- Placebo vs 2.5 mg dose vs 10 mg dose
- Protocol: overnight PSG, MWT, ESS, satisfaction questionnaire at BL; take drug for 6 weeks (60 minutes before bedtime) and return q2 weeks for PSG, MWT, PE and questionnaire completion
Increase in AHI in placebo group - NS

Δ in AHI with drug significant with both doses but not between doses

Effect driven by reduction in apneas

6/39 had AHI < 15 + AHI reduced > 50% of BL AHI
Pharmacotherapy of Apnea by Cannabimimetic Enhancement, the PACE Clinical Trial: Effects of Dronabinol in Obstructive Sleep Apnea

David W. Carley, PhD
Bharati Prasad, MD
Kathryn J. Reid, PhD
Ronell Mallani, MD
Hyer Altarian, MD
Sabra M. Abbott, MD
Boris Vem, MD
Hui Xie, PhD
Chengbo Yuan, MPH
Phyllis C. Zee, MD, PhD
Pharmacotherapy of Apnea by Cannabimimetic Enhancement, the PACE Clinical Trial: Effects of Dronabinol in Obstructive Sleep Apnea

David W. Carley, PhD, Bharati Prasad, MD, Kahryn J. Reid, Ph D, Ronell Malkani, MD, Hryan Altarian, MD, Sabra M. Abbott, MD, PhD, Boris Vem, MD, PhD, Hui Xie, PhD, Chengbo Yuan, MPH, Phyllis C. Zee, MD, PhD

\[ \begin{align*}
\Delta \text{ESS} &
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Placebo} \\
2.5 \text{ mg/day} \\
10 \text{ mg/day}
\end{array} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[ \begin{align*}
\Delta \text{MWT Mean Latency (min)} &
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Placebo} \\
2.5 \text{ mg/day} \\
10 \text{ mg/day}
\end{array} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Not significant
“Responders” were younger, longer BL TST, higher BL REM AHI and % REM

- 90% of participants had an AE but NS different between drug and placebo
- 1 serious AE involved transient vomiting and diarrhea – subject completed study
- Greatest satisfaction was in the highest drug dose
Positional Therapy

- Depending on definition, positional OSA prevalence is > 50%
- Techniques include
  - TBT (tennis ball)
  - Alarm training
  - Position vests
- Compliance with technique not well reported – one study of TBT found only 38% still using after 6 months
- Efficacy is suboptimal in most studies (AHI reduction of < 50%)
Positional therapy

- Up to 75% of patients have a positional component (worsening of OSA)
  - Differing definitions
  - More prevalent in Asians
  - Prevalence decreases as severity increases
- Studies suggest POSA have:
  - Backward positioning of the lower jaw
  - Lower facial height
  - Longer posterior airway space (PAS) measurements
  - Smaller volume of lateral pharyngeal wall tissue (greater lateral diameter and elliptoid shape)
  - Smaller neck circumference
- Can be effective but most patients abandon over time
Meta-analysis of POSA treatments
Positional therapy in sleep apnoea - one fits all? What determines success in positional therapy in sleep apnoea syndrome

Natascha Troester¹*, Michael Palfner¹, Markus Dominco¹, Christoph Wohlkœnig¹, Erich Schmidberger², Martin Trinker¹, Alexander Avian²,³

• This study examined the followup of patients with pOSA (AHI < 5 in nonsupine positions)
• Instructed to try positional therapy (Backpack with a football or swimming aid, long plastic pipe or commercial model)
• 105 pts with 93 having a repeat PSG on therapy (70% therapy was effective)
• At one year, only 37% of patients were still using therapy
• BMI, female weight, male height were predictors of failure

• Sleep position trainer – device worn around chest and vibrates when lying supine
• PSG at baseline and 1 year
• 9/58 stopped using by 1 year (16%)
• 34 completed PSG’s
  • male/female ratio, 28/6; overall AHI 16
  • significant reduction in overall AHI to 6 (p < 0.001)
  • median % of supine sleep decreased to 1% (p < 0.001)
  • mean objective SPT use in 28 pts = 7.3 ± 0.9 h/night and 69 ± 26% of the nights
• 75% of the patients reported a better sleep quality since the start of SPT treatment.
Treatment of sleep-disordered breathing with positional therapy: long-term results

Jolien Beyers¹,²,³ • O. M. Vanderveken¹,²,³ • C. Kastor¹,² • A. Boudewyns¹,² • I. De Volder³,⁴ • A. Van Gastel³,⁴
J. A. Verbraecken²,³,⁵ • W. A. De Backer² • M. J. Braem²,⁶ • P. H. Van de Heyning¹,² • M. Dieltjens¹,²

a) Reduction in AHI

\[ p < 0.001 \]

b) Reduction in percentage of supine sleep

\[ p < 0.001 \]

Register now at congress.chestnet.org
SPT vs APAP: Randomized, Crossover

N = 110

Berry et al, JCSM Accepted Paper (in press)
Positional Therapy

• Can be relatively effective in the right population
  • No real outcome data to date (CV risk, QOL, adherence)
• Patients need long term followup if this is recommended as many abandon over time
### Exercise and OSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study name</th>
<th>Difference in means</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Lower limit</th>
<th>Upper limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kline 2011</td>
<td>-7.578</td>
<td>2.499</td>
<td>-12.475</td>
<td>-2.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sengul 2011</td>
<td>-4.180</td>
<td>1.694</td>
<td>-7.500</td>
<td>-0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servantes 2011 (Aerobic)</td>
<td>-8.500</td>
<td>5.405</td>
<td>-19.094</td>
<td>2.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servantes 2011 (Aerobic+Strength training)</td>
<td>-10.000</td>
<td>3.739</td>
<td>-17.328</td>
<td>-2.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes 2009</td>
<td>-6.300</td>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>-13.061</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman 2000</td>
<td>-10.100</td>
<td>4.687</td>
<td>-19.287</td>
<td>-0.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.272</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>-8.544</td>
<td>-3.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference in means and 95% CI**

![Graph showing decrease and increase in AHI](image-url)
Conclusions

• Best OA are adjustable mandibular advancing devices – work in coordination with a dentist given high likelihood of dental changes; OA have good efficacy and adherence if functional
• MMA has best surgical outcomes
• HGNS becoming more available and popular; needs better reporting standards
• Surgical weight loss has better outcomes that medical; pts may continue to have OSA however
• POSA works well for some patients, newer “training” devices have promise; need long term followup
• Exercise is good for everything!