

COPD LANDMARK TRIALS: Triple Therapy Overview

A Holaday BSP © www.RxFiles.ca Oct 2025 (Last revised Jan 28, 2026)

POPULATION / CHARACTERISTICS		IMPACT 2018 ^{1,2}	ETHOS 2020 ^{3,4}	TRIBUTE 2018 ⁵
Inclusion criteria & baseline characteristics		<i>N=10355, Duration: 52 weeks</i> Age ≥40 (average 65yr); COPD duration ≥5yr: 63% FEV ₁ <80% (mean 46%), CAT ≥10 (mean 20.1 points) ≥1 moderate-severe exacerbation in past yr [^] : >99% ≥1 maintenance inhaler (pre-study: ICS 71%; TT 38%) High exacerbation risk at baseline: 70% of patients Baseline eosinophils (EOS) ≥0.15x10 ⁹ /L: 57% Excluded (ineligible) at screening: ~25%	<i>N=8588, Duration: 52 weeks</i> Age 40-80 (average 65yr); average COPD duration 8yr FEV ₁ 25-65% (mean 43%), CAT ≥10 (mean 20 points) ≥1 moderate-severe exacerbation in past yr [^] : 99.9% ≥2 maintenance inhalers (pre-study: ICS 80%; TT 39%) Baseline eosinophils ≥0.15x10 ⁹ /L ~60%; ≥0.3x10 ⁹ /L ~15% Excluded (ineligible) at screening: 46%	<i>N=1532, Duration: 52 weeks</i> Age ≥40 (average 64yr); average COPD duration 8yr FEV ₁ <50% (mean 36%), CAT ≥10 (mean not reported) ≥1 moderate-severe exacerbation in past yr: 100% Maint. inhaler(s) <u>≥2 mo prior to study</u> : LAMA <u>or</u> any 2 of LAMA, LABA, ICS; <u>no triple therapy</u> (pre-study ICS 65%) Average eosinophils: 0.23-0.247x10 ⁹ /L Excluded (ineligible) at screening: 27%
Intervention (LAMA/LABA/ICS) Comparator (LAMA/LABA) (some RCTs had multiple study arms)		UMEC/VIL/FF 62.5/25/100mcg DPI (TRELEGY Ellipta) UMEC/VIL 62.5/25mcg DPI (ANORO Ellipta) <i>Dose - all study arms: 1 inhalation daily</i>	GLY/FFD/BUD 9/4.8/160mcg pMDI (BREZTRI Aerosphere) GLY/FFD 9/4.8mcg pMDI (BEVESPI Aerosphere) <i>Dose - all study arms: 2 inhalations BID</i>	GLY/FFD/BDP 9/5/87mcg pMDI (TRIMBOW MDI*) <i>Dose: 2 inhalations BID</i> GLY/IND 43/85mcg DPI (ULTIBRO Breezhaler) <i>Dose: Contents of 1 cap inhaled via Breezhaler daily</i>
OUTCOMES – TRIPLE THERAPY (LAMA/LABA/ICS) VS DUAL THERAPY (LAMA/LABA)				
1° outcome	Rate of mod-severe exacerbations per patient/year [†]	0.91 vs 1.21; RR 0.75 (0.7-0.81) ¹	1.08 vs 1.42; RR 0.76 (0.69-0.83) ³	0.5 vs 0.59; RR 0.85 (0.72-0.995) ⁵
	Subgroup analysis: Eosinophils (EOS)	EOS <0.15x10 ⁹ /L: 0.85 vs 0.97; RR 0.88 (0.78-0.99) ⁶ EOS ≥0.15x10 ⁹ /L: 0.95 vs 1.39; RR 0.68 (0.62-0.75) ⁶	EOS <0.15x10 ⁹ /L: rate not reported; HR 0.87 (0.75-1.02) NS ⁴ EOS ≥0.15x10 ⁹ /L: rate not reported; HR 0.68 (0.61-0.77) ⁴	EOS <0.2x10 ⁹ /L: rate not reported; RR 0.87 (0.69-1.1) NS ⁵ EOS ≥0.2x10 ⁹ /L: rate not reported; RR 0.81 (0.65-1.01) NS ⁵
	Subgroup analysis: Pre-study ICS status	ICS at screening: 0.98 vs 1.38; RR 0.71 (0.65-0.77) ¹⁰ No ICS at screening: 0.73 vs 0.83; RR 0.88 (0.76-1.03) NS ¹⁰	ICS at screening: 1.14 vs 1.51; RR 0.76 (0.68-0.84) ⁸ No ICS at screening: 0.84 vs 1.11; RR 0.75 (0.61-0.94) ⁸	
2° outcomes	Rate of severe exacerbations per patient/year [†]	0.13 vs 0.19; RR 0.66 (0.56-0.78) ¹	0.13 vs 0.15; RR 0.84 (0.69-1.03) NS ³	0.07 vs 0.09; RR 0.79 (0.06-1.13) NS ⁵
	All-cause mortality	1.3% vs 2.2% (NNT≈112 /yr); HR 0.58 (0.38-0.88) ⁶	1.3% vs 2.3% (NNT≈ 100 /yr); HR 0.54 (0.34-0.87) ³	0.4% vs 1%; ⁵ HR not reported (NS) [‡]
	Subgroup analysis: Pre-study ICS status	ICS at screening: 1.03% vs 2.13%; HR 0.44 (0.27-0.71) ¹¹ No ICS at screening: 1.79% vs 1.06%; HR 1.49 (0.55-4.06) NS ¹¹	ICS at screening: 1.3% vs 3% HR 0.41 (0.25-0.69) ⁹ No ICS at screening: 1.8% vs 1.2% HR 1.49 (0.49-4.55) NS ⁹	
	SGRQ response (MCID ↓4-points)	MCID achieved: 42% vs 34% (NNT≈13 /yr); OR 1.4 (1.3-1.6) ¹ Mean difference: ↓1.8-points (↓2.6 to ↓1); ¹ ?clinical significance	MCID achieved: 44% vs 37% (NNT≈15 /yr); OR 1.4 (1.2-1.6) ⁴ Mean difference: ↓1.88-points (↓2.84 to ↓0.91); ⁴ ?clinical significance	MCID achieved: 41% vs 36%; OR 1.22 (0.99-1.51) NS ⁵
	FEV ₁ outcomes (MCID ↑100mL)	Mean difference: ↑54mL (↑36 to ↑69); ¹ ?clinical significance		MCID achieved: 23% vs 16%; OR 1.19 (0.91-1.55) NS ⁵
Safety	Pneumonia	Radiologically confirmed: 3.7% vs 1.9% ⁷ (NNH≈56 /yr) [‡] Investigator-reported: 7.5% vs 4.6% ¹ (NNH≈35 /yr) [‡]	4.2% vs 2.3% ³ (NNH≈ 53 /yr) [‡] (Confirmed by an independent clinical end-point committee)	4% vs 4%; ⁵ RR not reported (NS) [‡]
Additional considerations		-↑oral candidiasis: 3.9% vs 2% ¹ (NNH ≈ 53 /yr) [‡] - Excluded patients on long-term oxygen (>3L/min at rest). -Mild COPD (FEV ≥80%), low symptom burden (CAT <10), and no exacerbations in past year excluded; lack insight re: role of triple therapy for initial treatment of COPD. -Abrupt ICS discontinuation in majority of those in LAMA/LABA group may have confounded results (?increased exacerbation risk after stopping ICS). -Patients in these RCTs who had bronchodilator reversibility (18% ^{IMPACT} , 31% ^{ETHOS} , 8.6%, ^{TRIBUTE}) were more likely to have a favourable response to ICS-containing treatment arms. -Significant results were noted in some secondary outcomes, however the studies lacked sufficient power, limiting confidence in the magnitude of the effect. -Eosinophils ≥0.15x10 ⁹ /L were associated with a more substantial reduction in exacerbations; the role of baseline eosinophil counts may help inform COPD treatment changes.		
Bottom Line		Reduced rates of moderate-severe exacerbations with use of triple therapy are seen consistently across these RCTs; results also trended in favour of ↓severe exacerbation rates, ↓mortality, and improved health status at the risk of increased ICS-related side effects, most notably pneumonia. Triple therapy is likely to benefit those with moderate-very severe airflow limitation (FEV1 <80%), high symptom burden (CAT≥10), and a history of moderate-severe exacerbation(s) within the past year.		
RxFiles Trial Summaries		IMPACT – Link to trial summary	ETHOS – Link to trial summary	TRIBUTE – Link to trial summary
[†] Model-estimated rates based on modeling rates adjusted for continuous and categorical covariates listed in the supplementary appendix. [‡] Not provided in manuscript/supplement – calculated by RxFiles.				

†Model-estimated rates based on modeling rates adjusted for continuous and categorical covariates listed in the supplementary appendix. ‡ Not provided in manuscript/supplement – calculated by RxFiles.

Abbreviations: Δ=change **AECOPD**=acute exacerbation of COPD **BDP**=beclomethasone dipropionate **BUD**=budesonide **CAT**=COPD assessment test **COPD**=chronic obstructive pulmonary disease **EOS**=eosinophils (blood eosinophil count) 0.15x10⁹/L=150 cells/mcL **FEV₁**=forced expiratory volume in 1 second **FF**=fluticasone furoate **FFD**=formoterol fumarate dihydrate **GLY**=Glycopyrronium **HR**=hazard ratio **ICS**=inhaled corticosteroid **IND**=indacaterol **LABA**=long-acting beta agonist **LAMA**=long-acting muscarinic antagonist **MCID**=minimal clinically important difference **mo**=month(s) **MOD**=moderate **NNH**=number needed to harm **NNT**=number needed to treat **NS**=non-significant **OR**=odds ratio **RCT**=randomized controlled trial **RR**=risk ratio **SEV**=severe **SIG**=significant **TT**=triple therapy **UMEC**=umeclidinium **VIL**=vilanterol

COPD exacerbation definitions: moderate exacerbation= resulted in treatment with antibiotics &/or systemic corticosteroids; severe exacerbation= resulted in hospital admission or death.

***TRIMBOW** approved but not yet marketed in Canada (as of January 2026).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Prepared By: Andrea Holaday. September 2025. Last revised January 21, 2026. Reviewers: Loren Regier, Amy Wiebe.

DISCLAIMER: RxFiles Academic Detailing is part of the College of Pharmacy and Nutrition at the University of Saskatchewan. The content of this work represents the research, experience and opinions of the authors and not those of the University of Saskatchewan. Neither the authors nor the University of Saskatchewan nor any other party who has been involved in the preparation or publication of this work warrants or represents that the information contained herein is accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the result obtained from the use of such information. Any use of the materials will imply acknowledgment of this disclaimer and release any responsibility of the University of Saskatchewan, its employees, servants or agents. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. Additional information and references online at www.RxFiles.ca Copyright September 2025 – RxFiles, University of Saskatchewan (U of S)

References:

1. **IMPACT** Lipson DA, Barnhart F, Brealey N, et al. Once-Daily Single-Inhaler Triple versus Dual Therapy in Patients with COPD. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2018;378(18):1671-1680.
2. Lipson DA, Barnhart F, Brealey N, et al. *Supplementary Appendix to: Once-daily single-inhaler triple versus dual therapy in patients with COPD*. N Engl J Med. 2018;378:1671-1680. Available at: https://www.nejm.org/doi/suppl/10.1056/NEJMoa1713901/suppl_file/nejmoa1713901_appendix.pdf. Accessed August 6, 2025. *IMPACT supplementary appendix*
3. **ETHOS** Rabe KF, Martinez FJ, Ferguson GT, et al. Triple Inhaled Therapy at Two Glucocorticoid Doses in Moderate-to-Very-Severe COPD. N Engl J Med. 2020 Jul 2;383(1):35-48. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1916046.
4. Rabe KF, Martinez FJ, Ferguson GT, et al. Supplementary Appendix: Triple inhaled therapy at two glucocorticoid doses in moderate-to-very-severe COPD. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2020 Jul 2 [cited 2025 Jul 28];383(1):35–48. Available from: https://www.nejm.org/doi/suppl/10.1056/NEJMoa1916046/suppl_file/nejmoa1916046_appendix.pdf *ETHOS supplementary appendix*
5. **TRIBUTE** Papi A, Vestbo J, Fabbri L, et al. Extrafine inhaled triple therapy versus dual bronchodilator therapy in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (TRIBUTE): a doubleblind, parallel group, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2018 Mar 17;391(10125):1076-1084.
6. GlaxoSmithKline. A Phase III, 52 Week, Randomised, Double-Blind, 3-Arm Parallel Group Study, Comparing the Efficacy, Safety and Tolerability of the Fixed Dose Triple Combination FF/UMEC/VI with the Fixed Dose Dual Combinations of FF/VI and UMEC/VI, All Administered Once-Daily in the Morning via a Dry Powder Inhaler in Subjects with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Clinical Study Report No. GSK-116855. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02164513. January 10, 2018. Available at: <https://www.gsk-studyregister.com/en/trial-details/?id=4871&oldId=true>. Accessed August 5, 2025.
7. Dransfield MT, Crim C, Criner GJ, et al. Risk of Exacerbation and Pneumonia with Single-Inhaler Triple versus Dual Therapy in IMPACT. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. 2021 May;18(5):788-798. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202002-096OC.
8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Multidiscipline Review for New Drug Application 212122 Orig 1 s000. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2021 [cited 2025 Jul 16]. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2021/212122Orig1s000MultidisciplineR.pdf
9. Martinez FJ, Rabe KF, Ferguson GT, et al. Reduced All-Cause Mortality in the ETHOS Trial of Budesonide/Glycopyrrolate/Formoterol for Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. A Randomized, Double-Blind, Multicenter, Parallel-Group Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2021 Mar 1;203(5):553-564. doi: 10.1164/rccm.202006-2618OC.
10. Han MK, Criner GJ, Dransfield MT, et al. The Effect of Inhaled Corticosteroid Withdrawal and Baseline Inhaled Treatment on Exacerbations in the IMPACT Study. A Randomized, Double-Blind, Multicenter Clinical Trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2020;202(9):1237-1243. doi:10.1164/rccm.201912-2478OC.
11. Lipson DA, Crim C, Criner GJ, et al. Reduction in All-Cause Mortality with Fluticasone Furoate/Umeclidinium/Vilanterol in Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2020;201(12):1508-1516. doi:10.1164/rccm.201911-2207OC.