Results of a programme to improve house staff use of metered dose inhalers and spacers

M Lee-Wong, P H Mayo

**Purpose:** Metered dose inhalers (MDIs) and spacers are used widely in the treatment of asthma. Medical personnel who are responsible for training patients must themselves be proficient with the devices. The proficiency of a group of new medical interns with use of MDI and spacer devices was determined, and improvement in their use of these devices was sought.

**Subjects:** Fifty six medical interns tested at the start of their first house staff training year.

**Methods:** The ability of medical interns to use MDIs and spacers was assessed using a visual scoring system before and after a large group lecture emphasising proper device use and once again after an intensive one-on-one training session with an attending physician.

**Results:** Initially, only 5% used an MDI perfectly. This improved to 13% after a lecture and demonstration, and 73% after an intensive one-on-one session. Almost no new interns could use a collapsible or tube spacer properly initially. This improved to 15% and 29% respectively after a lecture. After one-on-one training, correct technique was increased to 69% for collapsible spacer and 95% for the tube spacer. Analysis of individual steps of MDI use showed that interns had particular difficulty in coordinating actuation with inhalation. The tube spacer appeared easiest to learn.

**Conclusions:** Incoming medical house staff have limited ability to use MDI with and without spacers. A large group lecture is relatively ineffective when compared with a one-on-one training session in training with these devices.

**Abbreviations:** BIMC, Beth Israel Medical Center; MDI, metered dose inhaler

---

**Table 1** Steps used to assess device score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>MDI</th>
<th>Tube spacer</th>
<th>Collapsible spacer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Remove cap</td>
<td>Remove caps and connect MDI to spacer</td>
<td>Attach mouthpiece to bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Shake inhaler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insert MDI into mouthpiece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hold inhaler upright</td>
<td>Hold inhaler and spacer together and shake</td>
<td>Shake MDI spacer combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tilt head back or keep at level</td>
<td>Exhale to FRC or RV</td>
<td>Open spacer bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Exhale to FRC or RV</td>
<td>Insert mouthpiece between lips</td>
<td>Exhale to FRC or RV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Insert or keep mouthpiece 2–4 cm away from mouth</td>
<td>Actuate MDI once</td>
<td>Actuate MDI once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Begin breathing then actuate canister once</td>
<td>Inhale slowly and deeply</td>
<td>Place spacer upright between lips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Continue slow, deep inspiration</td>
<td>Should hear a hissing sound and not a whistle</td>
<td>Inhale slowly to TLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hold breath for 5–10 sec</td>
<td>Hold breath for 5–10 sec</td>
<td>Hold breath for 5–10 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Exhale, wait 20–30 sec before second dose</td>
<td>Wait for 20–30 sec before second dose</td>
<td>Wait 20–30 sec before next dose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Shake again before a second actuation</td>
<td>Shake again before a second actuation</td>
<td>Shake again before second actuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRC, functional residual capacity; MDI, metered dose inhaler; RV, residual volume; TLC, total lung capacity.
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Each intern used in random sequence a MDI device, a MDI with collapsible spacer (Inspirease, Key Pharmaceuticals, Kenilworth, NJ) and a MDI with tube spacer (Aerochamber, Forest Pharmaceuticals, St Louis, MO). An MDI filled with placebo medication was used throughout. House staff were evaluated MDI and tube spacer use. Placebo medication was used throughout. House staff were instructed to use the MDI, with and without spacers. Each session lasted at least 20 minutes, and did not end until the intern could repeatedly demonstrate perfect technique with all devices.

In October 1995, the same examiner scheduled a final grading session to evaluate the device scores for all available house staff who had undergone initial one-on-one training. After the standard visual scoring of MDI and spacer technique, remedial training was given, if necessary.

### Statistical analysis

Data were analysed with the $\chi^2$ method applied to $2 \times 2$ contingency tables. A significance level of $5\% = 0.05$ was used throughout. The null hypothesis in all cases was that the observed frequencies were from the same distribution (that is, there was no improvement in the performance of correct steps). The alternative hypothesis was that the observed frequencies were from different distributions (that is, there was a significant improvement in the performance of correct steps). In this case, the $\chi^2$ method was two sided. The data, however, were unidirectional. This would indicate that the alpha of 5% is actually smaller making the conclusions more compelling.

### RESULTS

Fifty-six medical interns were available for initial testing of MDI and spacer technique. One and one half weeks later, 52 were able to attend the large group lecture and demonstration of device use. At the first follow up individual training session, 48 interns were available, and on the second follow up training session these same 48 interns were retested for MDI and spacer technique. All of them had attended the large group lecture. Interns who were not available had conflicts caused by work schedules and vacations.
The percentage of house staff able to use the devices with perfect technique is shown in table 2. Results of the scores for each step of use are presented in figs 1, 2, and 3 for MDI, collapsible spacer, and tube spacer respectively. To identify and compare specific steps for each MDI method, data are expressed as percentage of house staff who completed each step correctly as the number of house staff in the test groups before and after training differed. At the time of the one-on-one session, 21 of 48 interns recalled that they received a handout on MDI and spacer use attached to their pay stubs and 10 reported reading it. Since the handout was stapled to their pay stubs and all pay stubs were picked up and signed for, all 48 interns did receive the handout. None stated that they found it useful. Informal discussion with house staff after the final training session elicited a very favourable response to one-on-one sessions, as well as the repeated comment that “hands on” training with the actual devices was very useful in acquiring good technique. Many stated that hearing about how to use these devices in lectures, or reading about how to use them, was either not useful or inadequate compared with actual training with the devices. Some interns commented that having their own devices in hand was useful for patient training purposes.

**DISCUSSION**

No matter how efficacious the medication in an MDI may be, poor inhaler technique may render it ineffective. Care providers have a responsibility to train their patients in correct MDI use. Unless the care provider can use an MDI correctly, they cannot be expected to train their patients properly. We chose to focus training efforts on house staff, as they provide much of the primary care to our patient population. We felt that every medical house officer should be able to use an MDI and spacer perfectly as a necessary first step in being able to train their patients. Our intent was to train all house staff with perfect technique—that is, a perfect visual score.

The one-on-one session improved all steps to a major extent. Few starting interns could perform any of the individual steps. The lecture resulted in improvement in all steps of use, and the one-on-one session had further positive effect on all steps measured. Few starting interns could perform any steps to use the tube spacer; and the lecture effected some improvement in all steps. The one-on-one session improved all steps to a major extent. House staff appeared to retain technique with the tube spacer more readily than the other two devices. This may reflect the fact that the device does not require close coordination of actuation and inhalation. Also, the device is simpler in design than the collapsible spacer.

Several studies have measured medical personnel’s use of MDI and spacers. Kelling et al evaluated solo MDI use in house staff and attending physicians. They found that 40% of study participants could perform more than four of seven steps with correct technique. Only 10% of house officers and none of attending staff performed perfectly. Guidry et al reported 65% of house officers, and 50% of non-pulmonary physicians performed at least four of seven steps correctly with solo MDI, while nurses and respiratory therapists had superior performance. Mas et al reported only 10% of paediatric residents with at least nine months of postgraduate training
could use a solo MDI with perfect technique. Havania et al, from whom our scoring method derives, found that many house staff lack rudimentary skills with inhalational devices. All groups had particular difficulty with step 7, the coordination of actuation with inhalation using the solo MDI. Similar results were found with tube spacers, as we found as well. Respiratory therapists had better technique than house staff or nurses. Kesten et al reported similar results in pharmacists using the three devices. Interiano et al reported that 43% of medical staff had good technique, defined as performance of five or six steps out of a possible seven with solo MDI. Amirav et al found that paediatric house staff had significant deficiencies in using MDI and spacers. Plaza et al found that 15% of nurses and 26% of physicians showed correct inhalation technique. Similarly, Tsang et al, O’Donnell et al, and Chafin et al describe similarly low rates of adequate MDI technique by medical personnel. 16–18

Two studies have investigated methods of training house staff in MDI and spacer use. Resnick et al found that 26% of pediatric house staff had perfect MDI technique on initial testing, but an improvement in percent with perfect in four of seven MDIs was found two months after a one-on-one training session. Interestingly, some house staff with perfect technique on first testing actually had a decrement in technique on second testing. A controlled study by Rebuck et al showed significant improvement in house staff scores with MDI, tube spacer, and dry powder inhaler after an eight month period after a nurse directed education session when compared with an untreated house staff group. Our measurement methods are similar to theirs. Our results confirm previous work in this area and add additional information regarding the collapsible spacer device.

This study has methodological limitations. It was an observational study, and was neither blinded nor controlled. The person who assessed technique was also the house staff trainer, an obvious source of bias. The study lacks a control group; ideally, we would have had a group of interns who received no training whatsoever, in order to compare them to the lecture and intensive training session. Perhaps the improvement in technique might have occurred without any intervention, since more advanced residents and other clinical faculty might have trained the incoming interns informally and accomplished the same effect without an organised teaching effort. While we acknowledge the lack of control group, we emphasise that the reason we initiated the training was because house staff in previous years appeared to have very poor technique, even well into their residency. The training programme was designed specifically to remedy this problem. House staff had not appeared to learn the devices in an unstructured training environment.

One methodological flaw is that we did not compare the lecture format directly against the one-on-one training method alone. Ideally, we would have compared an untrained control group, with groups trained with a lecture alone and another group with one-on-one training alone. We believe that the lecture was not essential to the success of the one-on-one session, since we had been unable to train house staff by lecture alone in prior years. In addition, our data collection methods could have been improved by videotaping each testing session to allow for blinded scoring by several observers. Gray et al report issues related to interrater and intrarater reliability in the evaluation of MDI technique. 19 The addition of a flow and actuation sensor to the MDI and spacer would also have allowed completely objective measurement of certain aspects of inhaler use. 20 Finally, four interns out of the original group of 52 tested were not trained or further tested. Properly, this group could have been included into statistical analysis, but to simplify methodology we have chosen not to do this. We doubt that these four subjects would have altered our results.

Our study leaves unanswered questions. First, does improvement of house staff proficiency in the use of the MDI translate into improved patients’ ability to use these devices? Clearly, physicians must themselves be proficient before they can train a patient to use the device. However, mere proficiency does not guarantee that the physician can successfully teach the use of an MDI to a patient, since transfer of knowledge requires a complex set of communication skills which we did not examine. Second, is the training durable? We did not test house staff technique beyond four weeks after one-on-one training, and it is possible that proficiency might decline. We found a decrement in technique in several house officers four weeks after the one-on-one training session, similar to that found in other studies of house officers and patients. We speculate that good MDI and spacer technique will remain with the house officers who use their knowledge regularly to train patients. Those who do not will probably experience a decline in ability to use the devices. Finally, it is possible that alternative training may have similar one-on-one teaching is very labour intensive and it is possible that several house officers be trained simultaneously.

In summary, faculty who train medical houses staff should anticipate that new interns have minimal ability to use metered dose inhalers and spacers properly. A group lecture may improve this situation, and individualised training is very effective, but not completely so. Technique of using the tube spacer appears to be easier to learn than the collapsible spacer. A significant number of house officers will continue to have problems coordinating inhalation and actuation when using an MDI without a spacer. A small number of house staff has continuing problems in learning the correct technique, despite intensive individualisation instruction. This programme was labour intensive for the faculty, but can be justified in training programmes that serve areas of high asthma prevalence. Further research is needed to determine how best to train house staff in transferring newly acquired knowledge to patients with asthma.
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FELLOWSHIP AFFAIRS

Dr Barry Hoffbrand

Last year, Barry Hoffbrand demitted office as a member of the editorial board of the Fellowship of Postgraduate Medicine on retiring from full time clinical practice.

Barry joined the editorial board 30 years ago; for 14 of these (1980–94), he was editor of this journal during a formative period and he created a viable and successful clinical educational journal to rival the best. It is a reflection of his industry, dedication to quality and accuracy, and his wise editorial judgment that the journal occupies its present successful position in the medical publishing world.

Originally a source of printed lectures which had been organised by the Fellowship after the first world war, the journal has evolved and during Barry’s editorial tenure not only has there been a flowering in original, review, and special topic papers but a number of supplements on therapeutic and pharmacological advances have been published improving both circulation and finances of the journal. In addition, Festschriften—for which he chose his editors carefully—have been a feature as supplements to the monthly publications (for example, that for Professor Margaret Turner-Warwick was the fourth supplement to volume 64) and supplements reporting the conferences organised by the Fellowship on European Postgraduate Medical Education.

In the period when the Fellowship offices were high up at St Andrew’s Place, it was a familiar late afternoon sight to see Barry, both arms full of manuscripts—accepted/not accepted/for revision—arriving up the steep, narrow stairs to Jean Coops’ office where the journal was assembled and proofread. This was concurrent with his busy clinical workload at the Whittington Hospital and maintaining his work at officer level in the clinical section of the Royal Society of Medicine, and a medicolegal practice.

He maintained firm views on the presentation and display while keeping a detailed grasp of the publisher’s needs. I like to think that he has ensured the success of our unique publication which has no specialist association to feed or support it.

He was a valued, at times outspoken, member of Council cutting logically through vague or deceptive proposals and his sense of historical continuity was well illustrated by the 60th Anniversary Issue of October, 1985 particularly with his editorial and choice of contributors.

He has given of his personal time and energy generously over these 30 years and there are many to whom the Fellowship owes much, but none has done more to ensure the success of the journal in particular than Barry and it is a pleasure at this time to thank him for that and wish him well in his future professional interests.—Michael Nicholls, Fellowship of Postgraduate Medicine