CHEST®

Official publication of the American College of Chest Physicians

CHEST PAPERS IN PRESS

Efficacy of An Adjustable Oral Appliance and Comparison to Continuous Positive Airway Pressure For the Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea Syndrome

Aaron B. Holley, Christopher J. Lettieri and Anita A. Shah

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services can be found online on the World Wide Web at:
http://chestjournal.chestpubs.org/content/early/2011/06/01/chest.10-2851

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF

chest

PHYSICIANS®

How does this advance the field?

Previous studies using oral appliances have been small and contain a selection bias. Our study is larger with less selection bias, and our success rates were significantly higher than those published previously.

What are the clinical implications?

Oral appliances can be considered for a broader range of patients.

Efficacy of An Adjustable Oral Appliance and Comparison to Continuous Positive Airway

Pressure For the Treatment of Obstructive Sleep Apnea Syndrome

Aaron Holley has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Christopher Lettieri has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Anita Shah has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Because the study was retrospective in nature and all patient identifiers were removed from the database, patient consent was not required.

Background:

We sought to establish the efficacy of an adjustable oral appliance (aOA) in the largest patient population studied to date, and provide a comparison to CPAP.

Methods:

Retrospective analysis of patients prescribed an aOA. Results of overnight, PSG with aOA titration were evaluated and compared to CPAP. Predictors of a successful aOA titration were determined using a multivariate logistic regression model.

Results:

A total of 497 patients were prescribed an aOA during the specified time period. The aOA reduced the mean AHI to 8.4±11.4, and 70.3%, 47.6%, and 41.4% of patients with mild, moderate, and severe disease achieved an AHI<5, respectively. Patients using an aOA decreased their mean Epworth Sleepiness Score (ESS) by 2.71 (95% CI: 2.3-3.2; p<0.001) at follow-up. CPAP improved the AHI by - 3.43 (95% CI: 1.88-4.99; p<0.001) when compared to an aOA, but when adjusted for severity of disease, this difference only reached significance for patients with severe disease (-5.88 (95% CI: -8.95 - -2.82; p<0.001)). However, 70.1% of all patients achieved an AHI < 5 using CPAP, compared to 51.6% for the aOA (p<0.001). On multivariate analysis, baseline AHI was a significant predictor of achieving an AHI < 5 on aOA titration, and age showed a trend toward significance.

Conclusions:

In comparison to past reports, more patients in our study achieved an AHI < 5 using an aOA. The aOA is comparable to CPAP for patients with mild disease, while CPAP is superior for patients with moderate to severe disease. A lower AHI was the only predictor of a successful aOA titration.

Introduction:

An oral appliance (OA) is a device that fits within the oral cavity and prevents upper airway collapse in patients with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome (OSAS). A recent American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) guideline concluded that OAs are less effective than continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), but are a reasonable alternative for patients with mild-to-moderate obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in specific situations.[1,2] For patients with severe OSA, a trial of CPAP is required prior to their use, and surgery may be preferred over an OA for CPAP failures. Predicting which patients will have a successful OA titration and treatment response is difficult.[1,2]

The studies used to establish these guidelines are limited by small sample sizes, select patient populations, and the absence of device titration during polysomnography (PSG). The two largest trials enrolled only 256[19] and 263[18] patients. Trials included patients who failed or had a contraindication to CPAP,[18,22,23] which may bias the results toward a less responsive population. Most study protocols for performing a PSG with an OA in place did not include active titration during the study.[8,18,24] Given these limitations, the published data likely underestimates the efficacy of an OA and leaves clinicians uncertain as to which patients might benefit from their use.

At the Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC) sleep clinic, an adjustable OA (aOA) is often ordered for patients who are set to deploy, even if they are already using CPAP. This provides an opportunity to study a large patient population not biased by a high proportion of CPAP failures. In addition, all patients have their aOA setting optimized by titration during

PSG. We sought to analyze data from patients prescribed an aOA by our clinic to clarify their role in the treatment of OSAS, with the expectation that our success rate would be higher than previously published estimates.

Methods:

Patients

Using a protocol approved by the Department of Clinical Investigation (DCI) IRB Committee at our institution, we performed a retrospective review of all patients who were prescribed an adjustable oral appliance (aOA) by a provider from our clinic. All patients had an AHI > 5, and patients with Cheyne-Stokes respirations (CSR), central-sleep apnea (CSA), and the obesity-hypoventilation syndrome (OHS) were not given an aOA in our clinic. Patients with an edentulous jaw, known tempomandibular joint (TMJ) disease, and acute periodontal disease also were not offered an OA. Data on craniofacial characteristics, body-mass index, age, Epworth Sleepiness Score (ESS), and co-morbid hypertensive disease were abstracted from the initial sleep clinic visit.

Many patients in our clinic deploy to austere environments where electricity is not available. Reliance on CPAP may result in duty restrictions or separation from service, so from 2004 to 2006 it was standard practice to prescribe both CPAP and an OA for patients diagnosed with OSAS and expected to deploy. Patients did not have to try or fail CPAP prior to being given an OA. Patients are advised to use CPAP whenever possible, while the OA is reserved for travel to locations that cannot support a CPAP unit.

All patients diagnosed with the OSAS at our institution undergo education regarding the health effects of untreated OSA and the need for adequate therapy. Whether they are prescribed

CPAP, an OA, or both, they are trained in the proper care for and maintenance of their device(s). We provide serial clinical evaluations after therapy is initiated, where methods to maximize adherence are discussed. When applicable, active sinus disease is adequately treated prior to initiating OA therapy.

Oral Appliance

All patients received a Thorton Adjustable Positioner (Airway Management, Inc., Dallas, TX), an aOA designed for PSG titration and used for the treatment of snoring and OSAS. The Thorton Adjustable Positioner (TAP) is a custom made, two-piece appliance which fits over the upper and lower teeth. It aims to prevent the tongue and soft tissues of the throat from collapsing into the airway by forward protrusion of the lower jaw. The TAP has an anterior dial which allows adjustment to achieve maximum comfort and efficacy. Each turn is equal to 0.25 mm of additional jaw protrusion.

After being diagnosed with OSAS, patients were followed by a board-certified sleep medicine physician. They were referred to one of two dentists, each specifically trained in sleep medicine, to be fitted for an individually customized device. After the maximum mandibular protrusion (MMP) was estimated, the dentist then fit the appliance, instructed the patient on how to adjust and care for the device, and counseled the patient on side effects. The initial setting was usually at 70-80% of the MMP.

After being fitted, patients began an at-home adjustment protocol with the aOA set in a neutral position. Patients were instructed to advance the device 0.25mm (1 turn) each night as tolerated, with the goal of optimizing subjective sleep quality. In the event of discomfort, the device was regressed 0.5 mm (2 turns) and subsequent advancement was resumed at a slower

pace. Using the setting that the patient settled on during the at-home titration protocol and the patient's sleep diary, the degree of mandibular advancement that optimized sleep quality was estimated.

Follow-up PSG with aOA titration was scheduled after subjective improvement in sleep quality. At follow-up PSG, the aOA was set to 1 mm of mandibular advancement less than the number of turns used at home, and incrementally advanced to eliminate respiratory events (apneas, hypopneas, and snoring). If the patient was uncomfortable at a given number of turns, the technician was instructed to dial back two turns and to cease advancing the device for the remainder of the study. Technicians were instructed not to advance the device past the MMP. After their titration PSG, patients used the number of turns that provided the lowest AHI, provided side effects were tolerable.

Polysomnography

The diagnosis of OSA was made by an attended, overnight level I polysomnogram in all subjects. The apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) was used to define the severity of OSA in accordance with the American Academy of Sleep Medicine (AASM) criteria, as follows:[25,26]

Mild	AHI 5-15/hr
Moderate	AHI >15-30/hr
Severe	AHI > 30/hr

Hypopneas were defined by the AASM alternative criteria.[26] For the overnight CPAP titration on PSG, patients were titrated according to AASM guidelines.[27]

All PSGs were scored by a certified sleep technician in accordance with the published AASM guidelines,[26] and interpreted by a board-certified sleep physician. Relevant PSG data

were abstracted, including oxygen saturation nadir, total time with oxygen saturation less than ninety percent, and AHI in both the supine and lateral positions. Patients were labeled as having "positional" sleep apnea if the AHI in the lateral position was < 5 and was 50% lower than that seen in the supine position. For aOA titration studies, the time, AHI, and amount of REM sleep at the maximum number of turns were recorded. For CPAP titration studies, the final pressure and the AHI at that pressure were recorded.

Treatment Success

Because a CPAP titration is considered unsuccessful unless an AHI < 5 is achieved,[27] we used an AHI < 5 as our criteria for success when we compared the aOA to CPAP. Many OA studies cited in the AASM practice guideline used an AHI < 10[1,3,8,18,19,28-31] to define success, so success rates according to this standard are also provided.

Statistical Analysis

.   All means are followed by standard deviation. Comparisons between categorical variables were performed using Chi-square and McNemar Chi-square analyses. Differences between means were compared using the paired samples and independent samples t-tests. To identify baseline demographic, polysomnographic, and physical exam predictors of an AHI < 5 on an aOA titration, logistic regression was performed. Variables were entered into models if they reached a p-value of < 0.10 in univariate analysis, or if association was assumed clinically. (Formerly Statistical Package for Social Sciences 17.0, SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL).

Results

A total of 720 consecutive patients had an OA prescribed at our clinic between August 1996 and March 2009. Of these, 96 were excluded because they were given a fixed device that could not be adjusted. This left 624 patients who received an adjustable appliance during the specified time period, and 497 had data from their aOA titration available for analysis. The 127 patients who received an adjustable appliance but did not have data available for the aOA titration were younger (39.3± vs 41.3±; p=0.03) and had more subjective sleepiness according to the ESS (14.2±5.0 vs 12.9±5.1; p=0.02), when compared to the 497 with data. There was no significant difference in AHI, O2 nadir, or percent time below an oxygen saturation of ninety percent on the initial PSG, and no difference in BMI, percent of patients with positional OSA, gender, or OSA severity between the two groups. Baseline demographics and PSG data for the 497 patients who had an aOA titration are listed in table 1. The average time between diagnostic PSG and aOA titration was 296.5±315.7 days.

Tables 2 and 3 list the results of the aOA titration. An ESS was documented at the time of the aOA titration and the diagnostic PSG for 330 patients. Presumably, they had been prescribed and were using their aOA in the interim. The average time between studies for these 330 patients was 297.3±317.2 days, and the ESS was 13.0±5.0 prior to the diagnostic PSG and 10.4±5.3 at the time of the aOA titration (- 2.7; 95% CI: -2.2 to -3.1; p<0.001).

There were 378 patients who had both CPAP and aOA titrations available for comparison, and titrations with the aOA were completed an average of 232±355 days after those with CPAP. Most patients (98.7%) had their CPAP titrations performed first. Results for the CPAP titration studies are shown in table 4. When compared to the aOA, CPAP improved the AHI by - 3.43 (95% CI: 1.88-4.99; p<0.001). When adjusted for severity of disease, the

difference in AHI improvement between CPAP and an aOA was -1.9 (95% CI: -3.8–0.02; p=0.053), -1.7 (95% CI: -4.0-0.7; p=0.17), and -5.88 (95% CI: -8.95 - -2.82; p<0.001) for mild, moderate and severe disease respectively. On CPAP titration, 70.1% (268/378) of patients achieved an AHI < 5 at final pressure, compared to 51.6% (195/378) at final turn on their aOA titration (p<0.001 for difference). When the same comparison was done, adjusting for disease severity, success rates (AHI < 5) for CPAP versus aOA were 76.2% versus 62.3% (p=0.15), 71.0% versus 50.8% (p=0.001), and 63.4% versus 39.9% (p<0.001) for mild, moderate, and severe disease respectively.

Results for the univariate analysis are shown in table 5, and multivariate modeling in table 6. Patients who achieved an AHI < 5 on their aOA titration were younger, had a lower BMI, and less severe OSA as measured by the AHI and degree of nocturnal hypoxia. They were also more likely to be female. On multivariate analysis, only baseline AHI retained significance, while age showed a trend toward significance. Using an AHI< 10 as the dependent variable, AHI at baseline remained the only significant predictor in multivariate modeling (OR 0.98, 95% CI: 0.97-0.99; p=0.002).

Discussion

We found that the majority of patients using an aOA achieved an AHI < 5 on the PSG titration, and the ESS decreased significantly after an aOA was prescribed. In multivariate analysis, only AHI remained a significant predictor of aOA success. Although CPAP was superior for patients with severe OSA, the difference in AHI reduction between the aOA and CPAP was not significant for patients with mild and moderate disease.

In comparison to previous studies, the OA success rate at our clinic was higher. The AASM Guidelines[1,2] and a recent review[32] both quote a summary success rate from the literature, using AHI < 10, of just over 50%. Our population's success rate using the same criteria was 73.6%. The largest studies performed to date quote success rates of 54%[18,19] 51%,[8] and 49.1%[28] using an AHI < 10, and 36%[24] using an AHI < 5 as the definition for success, all considerably lower than our rates. Our success rate for patients with severe disease was also higher than previously seen.[1,2,18,32]

The absence of a statistically superior AHI reduction with CPAP in comparison to the aOA in a large group of patients with mild and moderate disease is an important addition to the existing literature. Other investigators have reported mixed results for the comparison of CPAP to an OA for this outcome. Most have found significant differences favoring CPAP for mild to moderate disease[3,28,30,33,34] but a few have not.[29,31]

All of the variables identified as predictors in our univariate analysis have been cited in the literature before.[1,32] Evaluations of predictors performed by different investigators have varied based on the outcomes predicted, the definitions used for positional apnea, the type of analysis performed (linear versus logistic regression), and whether or not cephalometric and other variables were included in the models.[8,11,18,35-38] This makes comparisons difficult, and the lack of prospective validation limits the inferences that can be made from the existing data on predictors of success.

We cannot determine with certainty why our aOA success rates were higher than those seen previously, but we believe there are two possible reasons. First, our patients had their aOAs titrated during the follow-up PSG, which is a relatively new technique that is only briefly

mentioned in the 2006 AASM guidelines.[1,39,40] Although previous studies routinely allowed a variable period of time for self-adjustment,[8,18,24,28,37,41] very few specifically stated that they followed-up with an in lab titration. Most follow-up PSGs with the OA in place appear to have occurred at a single device setting without changes during the study. Titration in the lab likely provided a superior improvement in the AHI for our patients.

Second, because the 1995[42,43] and 2006 AASM OA guidelines state that OAs should be considered second line, and that patients with moderate[42,43] or severe[1,2,42,43] disease should have a trial of CPAP prior to using an OA, previous studies only included moderate or severe disease patients if they had already failed CPAP.[18,38] Even for those studies that did not explicitly state whether patients failed CPAP prior to using an OA, given the guidelines, it is reasonable to assume that a portion of the patients enrolled had tried and failed CPAP. Because many of the patients seen at our clinic had not failed CPAP when their OA was prescribed, our population was not subject to the same degree of selection bias.

Our study has several limitations. Because it was retrospective, we were not able to collect variables that others found predictive of OA success, to include the maximum jaw protrusion and the cephalometric analysis that was done at the initial dental visit. Our population includes a large portion of active duty Military members, so our findings may not generalize to a civilian population with different demographics and anthropomorphic features. While the long time interval between diagnostic PSG and aOA titration likely reflects issues with timely access to dental care and PSG wait times, if the patient lost weight during this period or made additional adjustments to their treatment, this could bias our results towards a better aOA titration. We also have no data on side effects, treatment preferences, adherence, or clinical failures, so it is not possible to perform a risk-benefit analysis for aOA therapy.

In summary, in the largest patient population studied to date, we found a higher aOA success rate than previously seen. Based on our results, an aOA would be a reasonable, first-line alternative to CPAP for patients with mild disease. For patients with moderate to severe disease, our higher success rates call into question the recommendation that a CPAP failure is required prior to using an adjustable OA. Future studies should focus on measuring aOA adherence and side effects along with patient treatment preferences so that a comprehensive comparison to CPAP can be conducted.

Acknowledgements:

Bibliography

1. Ferguson KA CR, Rogers R, Schmidt-Nowara W. Oral Appliances for Snoring and Obstructive Sleep Apnea: A Review. SLEEP 2006;29(2):244-262.
2. Kushida CA MT, Littner MR, Alessi CA, Bailey D, Coleman J, Friedman L, Hirshkowitz M, Kapen S, Kramer M, Lee-Chiong T, Owens J, Pancer JP. Practice Parameters for the Treatment of Snoring and Obstructive Sleep Apnea with Oral Appliances: An Update for 2005. SLEEP 2006;29(2):240-143.
3. Randerath WJ HM, Hinz R, Ruehle, KH. . An individually adjustable oral appliance vs continuous positive airway pressure in mild-to-moderate obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. CHEST 2002;122:569-575.
4. Lowe AA ST, Ryan CF, Fleetham JA, Ferguson KA, Remmers, JE. Treatment, airway and compliance effects of a titratable oral appliance. Sleep 2000;23:S172-178.
5. Menn SJ LD, Morgan TD, Mitler MM, Berger JS, Erman MK. The mandibular repositioning device: Role in the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. Sleep 1996;19:794-800.
6. Neill A. WR, Bannan S, Jeffrey O, Campbell A. Mandibular advancement splint improves indices of obstructive sleep apnoea and snoring but side effects are common. N Z Med J 2002;115:289-292.

7.   O'Sullivan RA HD, Mateljan R, Pantin C, Finucane KE. Mandibular advancement splint: an appliance to treat snoring and obstructive sleep apnea. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1995;151:194-198.

8.   Pancer J A-FS, Al-Faifi M, Hoffstein V. Evaluation of variable mandibular advancement appliance for treatment of snoring and sleep apnea. CHEST 1999;116:1511-1518.

9.   Rose E SR, Schulte-Monting J, Jonas IE. Treatment of obstructive sleep apnea with the Karwetzky oral appliance. Eur J Oral Sci 2002;110:99-105.

10.   Liu Y LA. Factors related to the efficacy of an adjustable oral appliance for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea. Chin J Dent Res 2000;3:15-23.

11.   Marklund M PM, Franklin KA. Treatment success with a mandibular advancement device is related to supinedependent sleep apnea. CHEST 1998;114(1630-1635).

12.   Walker-Engström ML RI, Vestling O, Wilhelmsson B, Tegelberg Å. A prospective randomized study comparing two different degrees of mandibular advancement with a dental appliance in treatment of severe obstructive sleep apnea. Sleep Breath 2003;7:119-130.

13.   Rose E SR, Virchow C, Jonas IE. A comparative study of two mandibular advancement appliances for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnoea. Eur J Orthod 2002;24:191-198.

14.   Esaki K KH, Uchida T, Mizuma H, Sakamoto T, Kameyama T. Treatment of sleep apnea with a new separated type of dental appliance (mandibular advancing positioner). Kurume Med J 1997;44:315-319.

15.   Marklund M FK, Sahlin C, Lundgren R. The effect of a mandibular advancement device on apneas and sleep in patients with obstructive sleep apnea. CHEST 1998;113:707-713.

16.   de Almeida FR BL, de Almeida CI, Tsuiki S, Lowe AA, Tufik S Effects of mandibular posture on obstructive sleep apnea severity and the temporomandibular joint in patients fitted with an oral appliance. Sleep 2002;25:507-513.

17.   Kato J IS, Tanaka A, Watanabe T, Araki D, Tanzawa H, Nishino T. Dose-dependent effects of mandibular advancement on pharyngeal mechanics and nocturnal oxygenation in patients with sleep-disordered breathing. CHEST 2000;117:1065-1072.

18.   Marklund M SH, Franklin KA. Mandibular Advancement Devices in 630 Men and Women With Obstructive Sleep Apnea and Snoring* Tolerability and Predictors of Treatment Success. CHEST 2004;125:1270-1278.

19.   Yoshida K. Effects of a mandibular advancement device for the treatment of sleep apnea syndrome and snoring on respiratory function and sleep quality. Cranio 2000;18:98-105.

20.   Wilhelmsson B TÅ, Walker-Engström ML, Ringqvist M, Andersson L, Krekmanov L, Ringqvist I. A prospective randomized study of a dental appliance compared with uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in the treatment of obstructive sleep apnoea. Acta Otolaryngol 1999;119:503-509.

21.   Fransson AM TÅ, Leissner L, Wenneberg B, Isacsson G. Effects of a mandibular protruding device on the sleep of patients with obstructive sleep apnea and snoring problems: a 2-year follow-up. Sleep Breath 2003;7:131-142.

22.   Eveloff SE RC, Carlisle CC, Millman RP. Efficacy of a Herbst mandibular advancement device in obstructive sleep apnea. Amer J Respir Crit Care Med 1994;149:905-909.

23.   Bloch KE IA, Zhang JN, Xie X, Kaplan V, Stoeckli PW, and Russi EW A randomized, controlled crossover trial of two oral appliances for sleep apnea treatment. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2000;162:246-251.

24.   Gotsopoulos H CC, Qian J, Cistulli PA. Oral appliance therapy improves symptoms in obstructive sleep apnea: a randomized, controlled trial. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002;166:743-748.

25.   Kushida CA, Littner MR, Morgenthaler T, Alessi CA, Bailey D, Coleman J, Jr., Friedman L, Hirshkowitz M, Kapen S, Kramer M and others. Practice parameters for the indications for polysomnography and related procedures: an update for 2005. Sleep 2005;28(4):499-521.

26.   Iber C A-IS, Chesson AL Jr, Quan SF. The AASM Manual for Scoring of Sleep and Associated Events: Rules, Terminology, and Technical Specifications. AASM Manual for Scoring Sleep 2007:3-59.

27.   Kushida CA CA, Berry RB, Brown LK, Gozal D, Iber C, Parthasarathy S, Quan SF, Rowley JA. Clinical Guidelines for the Manual Titration of Positive Airway Pressure in Patients with Obstructive Sleep Apnea. Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine 2008;4(2):157-171.

28.   Barnes M MR, Banks S, Tarquinio N, Murray CG, Vowles N, Pierce RJ Efficacy of positive airway pressure and oral appliance in mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnea. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2004;170:656-664.

29.   Clark GT BI, Yoffe N, Peled E, Lavie P. A crossover study comparing the efficacy of continuous positive airway pressure with anterior mandibular positioning devices on patients with obstructive sleep apnea. CHEST 1996;109:1477-1483.

30.   Ferguson KA OT, Lowe AA, Al-Majed S, Love LL, Fleetham JA. A short term controlled trial of an adjustable oral appliance for the treatment of mild to moderate obstructive sleep apnoea. Thorax 1997;52:362-368.

31.   Tan YK LEP, Luo YM, Smith C, Grant HR, Simonds AK, Spiro SG, Battagel JM. Mandibular advancement splints and continuous positive airway pressure in patients with obstructive sleep apnoea: a randomized cross-over trial. Eur J Orthod 2002;24:239-249.

32.   V H. Review of oral appliances for treatment of sleep-disordered breathing. Sleep Breath 2007;11:1-22.

33.   Engleman HM MJ, Graham D, Lello GE, Kingshott RN, Coleman EL, Mackay TW, Douglas NJ. Randomized Crossover Trial of Two Treatments for Sleep Apnea/Hypopnea Syndrome Continuous Positive Airway Pressure and Mandibular Repositioning Splint. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002;166:855-859.

34.   Ferguson KA OT, Lowe AA, Keenan SP, Fleetham JA. A Randomized Crossover Study of an Oral Appliance vs Nasal-Continuous Positive Airway Pressure in the Treatment of Mild-Moderate Obstructive Sleep Apnea. CHEST 1996;109:1269-1275.

35.   Otsuka R dAF, Lowe AA, Ryand F. A comparison of responders and nonresponders to oral appliance therapy for the treatment of obstructive sleep apnea Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2006;129:222-229.

36.   Liu Y LA, Fleetham JA, MD, Park YC. Cephalometric and physiologic predictors of the efficacy of an adjustable oral appliance for treating obstructive sleep apnea. Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2001;120:639-647.

37.   Mehta A QJ, Petocz P, Darendeliler MA, Cistulli PA. A Randomized, Controlled Study of a Mandibular Advancement Splint for Obstructive Sleep Apnea. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2001;163:1457-1461.

38.   Levendowski DJ MT, Patrickus JE, Westbrook PR, Berka C, Zavora T, Popovic D. In-home evaluation of efficacy and titration of a mandibular advancement device for obstructive sleep apnea. Sleep Breath 2007;11:139-147.

39.   Pételle B VG, Gagnadoux F, Rakotonanahary D, Meyer B, Fleury B. One-night mandibular advancement titration for obstructive sleep apnea syndrome: a pilot study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002;165:1150-1153.

40.   Gagnadoux F FB, Vielle B, Petelle B, Meslier N, N'Guyen XL, Trzepizur W, Racineux JL. Titrated mandibular advancement versus positive airway pressure for sleep apnea. Eur Respir J 2009;34:914-920.

41.   Naismith SL WV, Hickie IB, Cistulli PA. Effect of oral appliance therapy on neurobehavioral functioning in obstructive sleep apnea: a randomized controlled trial. J Clin Sleep Medicine 2005;1:374-380.

42.   Thorpy M CA, Derderian S, Kader G, Millman R, Potolicchio S, Rosen G, Strollo PJ, Wooten V Practice parameters for the treatment of snoring and obstructive sleep apnea with oral appliances. Sleep 1995. Sleep 1995;18:511-513.

43.   Schmidt-Nowara W LA, Wiegand L, Cartwright R, Perez-Guerra F, Menn S. Oral Appliances For The Treatment Of Snoring And Obstructive Sleep Apnea: A Review Sleep 1995;18(6):501-510.

44.   Tsai WH VJ, Oshima T, Dort L, Roycroft B, Lowe AA, Hajduk E, Remmers JE. Remotely controlled mandibular positioner predicts efficacy of oral appliances in sleep apnea. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2004;170:366-370.

45.   Campbell AJ RG, Trengrove H, Neil AM. Mandibular advancement splint titration in obstructive sleep apnea. Sleep Breath 2009;13:157-162.

46.   Kuna ST GP, Stanton DC, Levin LM, Frantz D. Evaluation of an oral mandibular advancement titration appliance. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod 2006;101:593-603.

Table 1 Baseline Characteristics

Age		41.3±9.0
BMI		28.7±4.4
Men		86.4%
HTN		28.7%
ESS		12.9±5.1
Mallampatti	1	7.3%
	2	17.4%
	3	50.0%
	4	25.3%
Retro/Micrognathia		63.5%
Diagnostic PSG results:		
AHI		30.0±24.8
Supine		23.7±17.9
Side		13.6±17.5
Positional		37.4%*
SpO2 nadir		83.8±7.5%
SpO2 % TST < 90%		5.1±10.0%
Mild OSA		33.4%
Moderate OSA		30.8%
Severe OSA		35.8%

*AHI 50% less on side when compared to supine, and AHI < 5 on side

Table 2   aOA Titration Results

AHI*	8.3±11.4
AHI supine	12.4±13.5
AHI side	6.7±13.3
SpO2 nadir	85.1±7.3%
SpO2 %TST < 90%	3.3±8.8
REM at final turns	84.4%
Time @ final turns (mins)	221.4±124.1
AHI < 5*	53.8%
AHI < 10*	73.9%
Mild OSA (n=186)	
AHI*	5.2±7.3
AHI < 5*	69.9%
AHI < 10*	86.0%
Moderate OSA (n=144)	
AHI*	7.4±8.1
AHI < 5*	47.9%
AHI < 10*	75.0%
Severe OSA (n=167)	
AHI*	12.3±15.4
AHI < 5*	41.9%
AHI < 10*	60.5%

*Data reflect AHI at final turn

Table 3   **Improvements with aOA**

	Mean AHI reduction @ final turn	95% CI	p-value
Overall	-21.6	19.4-23.8	<0.001
Mild	-4.46	3.3-5.6	<0.001
Moderate	-13.5	12.0-15.0	<0.001
Severe	-44.5	40.7-48.4	<0.001
	Change in O2 saturation nadir	95% CI	p-value
Overall	+1.27	0.5-2.1	0.001
	% time SpO2 < 90%	95% CI	p-value
Overall	-1.88	0.8-3.0	0.001

Table 4 CPAP Titration Results

AHI @ final pressure	5.6±10.9
Final CPAP pressure	8.7±2.9
AHI < 5 @ final pressure	69.1%
AHI < 10 @ final pressure	84.3%
Mild OSA (n=113)	
AHI @ final pressure	3.8±7.4
AHI < 5 @ final pressure	76.2%
AHI < 10 @ final pressure	85.7%
Moderate OSA (n=114)	
AHI @ final pressure	5.7±11.0
AHI < 5 @ final pressure	70.7%
AHI < 10 @ final pressure	87.7%
Severe OSA (n=151)	
AHI @ final pressure	6.8±12.8
AHI < 5 @ final pressure	62.9%
AHI < 10 @ final pressure	80.1%

Table 5   **Univariate Analysis for successful aOA Titration**

	AHI<5	AHI>5	p-value
Age	40.0±8.8	42.9±8.8	<0.001
BMI	28.1±4.7	29.3±4.0	0.007
ESS	12.9±5.0	12.9±5.2	0.99
SpO2 %TST < 90%	3.6±7.7	7.1±12.3	0.003
AHI	24.3±20.2	36.5±27.8	<0.001
Retro/micrognathia	64.0%	62.6%	0.78
Female	16.8%	9.3%	0.014
Positional*	43.1%	31.8%	0.18

* AHI 50% less on side when compared to supine, and AHI < 5 on side

Table 6   Multivariate Logistic Regression

	OR	95% CI	p-value
Age	0.97	0.95-1.00	0.06
BMI	0.97	0.91-1.01	0.20
SpO2 %TST < 90%	1.00	0.97-1.03	0.94
AHI	0.98	0.97-0.99	<0.001
Female	1.88	0.88-4.02	0.11

This information is current as of July 21, 2011

A M E R I C A N   C O L L E G E   O F

CHEST

P H Y S I C I A N S ®