Dust mite control measures don’t help asthma patients

Forget about mattress covers and air filtration systems. They don’t work, despite what the guidelines say.

**Practice changer**

Stop recommending dust mite control measures to your asthma patients. Neither chemical nor physical reduction measures are effective in improving peak flow, symptoms of asthma, or medication usage.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Based on a meta-analysis of 54 fair quality randomized trials in patients with mite-sensitive asthma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**ILLUSTRATIVE CASE**

The parents of a 10-year-old patient whom you recently diagnosed with asthma want to do everything they can to reduce his asthma symptoms. They are considering buying hypoallergenic mattress covers and an expensive air filtration system to decrease the levels of dust mite allergens in their home and want to know if you think that will help their son. What do you tell them?

We want to do everything we can to help our patients control their asthma symp-

**Guidelines still encourage mattress cover use**

The National Asthma Education and Prevention Program (NAEPP) 2007 guidelines recommend using allergen-impermeable mattress and pillow covers and washing sheets and blankets in hot water. They also recommend “considering” reducing indoor humidity, removing bedroom carpets, and washing stuffed toys weekly. The NAEPP Expert Panel cites many studies to support these recommendations.³
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To what extent do you encourage or discourage patients from using dust mite control measures?

- Encourage most patients to use them
- Encourage selected patients to use them
- Neither encourage nor discourage patients
- Discourage patients from using them

Go to www.jfponline.com and take our Instant Poll!
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2005 guidelines recommend additional measures to reduce dust mite exposure including vacuuming using a high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter, removing draperies, and considering using a portable air cleaner with a HEPA filter.

STUDY SUMMARY

54 trials, but no support for dust mite measures

This Cochrane systematic review included 54 randomized trials that assessed the effects of physical and/or chemical interventions to reduce exposure to house dust mite antigens in the homes of patients with mite-sensitive asthma. These studies included a total of 3002 pediatric and adult asthma patients (9 - 628 patients analyzed per trial) with mite sensitization confirmed by skin testing or IgE serum assays.

Thirty-six studies tested physical interventions, including mattress covers, vacuum cleaning, heating, ventilation, freezing, washing, air filtration, and ionizers. Ten used chemical interventions to kill dust mites; 8 used a combination of physical and chemical methods. Control groups received either placebo or no treatment.

Outcomes studied. The authors extracted data for the following outcomes: subjective well-being, asthma symptom scores, use of medication, days of sick leave from school or work, number of unscheduled visits to a physician or hospital, forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁), peak expiratory flow rate (PEFR), and provocative concentration that causes a 20% fall in FEV₁ (PC20). Length of the intervention and follow-up ranged from 2 weeks to 2 years.

Quality of studies. According to modern standards for randomized trials, the quality of many of the 54 studies was not optimal, especially in the descriptions of randomization and the reporting of outcomes. The method of randomization and concealment of allocation was rarely described. Eleven trial reports did not contain any usable data for the meta-analysis because of the way data were reported, and there was significant potential for reporting bias in favor of a treatment effect in the studies included. Mite reduction was successful in 17 trials, unsuccessful in 24 trials, and not reported in 13 trials.

Interventions didn’t help. There were no differences between the intervention and control groups for any of the outcomes. The percentage of patients who improved after the experimental interventions was not significantly different from the percentage of patients in the control groups (relative risk [RR]=1.01; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.80-1.27; data based on 7 trials). There was no difference in medication usage (data from 10 trials), FEV₁ (data from 14 trials), morning PEFR (data from 23 trials), or PC 20 (data from 14 trials) between the intervention and control groups (TABLE).¹

WHAT’S NEW?

Nothing is new, yet this will be “news” to many

This Cochrane review includes 5 additional trials that have been conducted since the last Cochrane review of this topic in 2004. However, the 2004 review reported the same conclusion—that interventions to reduce house dust mite exposure in asthma patients are ineffective—as did 3 other Cochrane reviews on the same topic beginning in 1998.⁵⁻⁸

So why are the guidelines out of step? Schmidt and Gotzsche (one of the authors of the Cochrane review) conducted a systematic review of narrative review articles in 2005 to answer this question. They found 70 review articles, 90% of which recommended physical methods to reduce exposure to house dust mites. They discovered that although these review articles included references to support their recommendations of dust mite control measures, the reviews showed significant bias in favor of positive studies.
and highlighted the results of low-quality studies, including non-randomized studies that had been excluded from the Cochrane reviews.9

CAVEATS

Duration of studies not long enough?

We know that extreme measures to reduce exposure to dust mite allergens, such as relocating to a high altitude or prolonged hospitalization, can reduce asthma symptoms,10,11 but these are clearly not practical solutions for most patients with dust mite-sensitive asthma. When it comes to this Cochrane review, some might argue that many of the interventions included were not of sufficient duration and did not sufficiently reduce the level of house mite allergen to improve asthma symptoms.

However, the subgroups of trials with long treatment duration (1-2 years) and successful mite reduction (determined by different methods, including mite counts and measured antigen levels in dust samples) also failed to show a significant difference between intervention and control groups.1

Tweak the approach? Most dust mite-sensitive asthma patients are sensitive to other allergens, so perhaps multifaceted interventions that target multiple allergens would be more effective.12 But until these potential interventions are supported by stronger evidence, we should not recommend them to our patients.

CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTATION

Swimming against the tide is never easy

Although the evidence to date indicates that interventions to reduce home dust mite exposure are ineffective, there are hundreds of products—including mattress and pillow covers ($10-$100), ionizers ($100-$200), and air filtration systems ($500-$800)—that are being marketed to patients with asthma. In addition, patient education handouts from sources such as the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and UpToDate recommend implementing dust mite control measures to reduce dust mite allergen exposure.13,15

We need to start educating our asthma patients properly so they can spend their time, energy, and money on interventions, such as medications, that work—and not on interventions that make no difference. ■

TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>STANDARDIZED MEAN DIFFERENCE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication usage</td>
<td>-0.06 (-0.18 to 0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV1</td>
<td>0.11 (-0.05 to 0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning PEFR</td>
<td>0.00 (-1.0 to 1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 20</td>
<td>0.05 (-0.13 to 0.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standardized mean difference is a common way to combine results of different studies for comparison purposes. If the 95% CI crosses 0, there is no effect of the intervention compared with the control.
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FAST TRACK

Despite a lack of evidence, patient handouts from the American Academy of Family Physicians and the American Academy of Pediatrics still recommend dust mite control measures
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See for yourself

We’re ecstatic about the new, improved Current Clinical Practice Web site. But don’t take our word for it. See for yourself.

To encourage you to visit the new site, in December we’re printing abstracts of the exciting articles written by key opinion leaders. You’ll be able to read the full text online.

Along with the journal articles, you’ll find:

✓ Free CME for journal articles and industry-sponsored supplements
✓ A list of our most-read articles
✓ Links to important conferences
✓ A library of related pay-for-performance and quality improvement articles, and much more...

Visit www.currentclinicalpractice.com TODAY for the latest articles on pay-for-performance and quality initiatives, written by experts and approved by our prestigious editorial board.
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