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CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE (COPD) is a composite disease with significant extrapulmonary effects that may contribute to the degree of severity in individual patients. Peripheral muscle dysfunction is one of these effects and constitutes a key outcome (7, 14), as reduced quadriceps muscle strength and mass have been linked to the patient prognosis (33, 51). The reduction in muscle mass is closely related to the reduction in fiber cross-sectional area (CSA) (19). In addition, a loss in muscle oxidative capacity, which is characterized by a reduction in type I fiber proportion, is another well-documented feature of COPD peripheral muscle (20, 53) directly impacting patient endurance (53).

Yet, the picture is complexified by the great heterogeneity of the muscle structure in COPD, with patients showing a wide variability in both fiber CSA and type I fiber proportion (20). Studies have suggested that the reduction in the fiber CSA and in the type I fiber proportion were not related (34, 53). Moreover, while a significant proportion of COPD patients shows normal muscle structure (20), small fiber size and type I fiber regression can even be observed in healthy subjects (47) [older and sedentary subjects, in particular (21)]. This heterogeneity in peripheral muscle dysfunction and structure has limited research studies, as well as clinical care. Indeed, the variability in parameter values has made it difficult to identify the cellular mechanisms of fiber atrophy and type I fiber regression in COPD patients. In particular, it is unknown whether muscle oxidative stress, which has been incriminated in the muscle weakness (6) and impaired endurance (30), is specifically associated with the muscle fiber atrophy in COPD patients (17, 45). Second, patients with fiber atrophy, who present a worse prognosis, may be more responsive to specific therapeutics like muscle electromystimulation (3). However, these patients remain generally unrecognized in routine care.

Using unsupervised clustering methods, recent studies have demonstrated that the clinical heterogeneity in COPD is the consequence of the different phenotypes of the disease (9, 10, 18). Phenotypes are homogeneous patient subgroups within the wide spectrum of COPD, with “unique prognostic or therapeutic characteristics” (24).

Previous studies in COPD have isolated a cluster characterized by the specific occurrence of a weight and fat-free mass loss and/or muscle weakness, indicating a muscle atrophy (9, 10, 16, 51), and thus, a possible link between the clinical phenotype and the muscle structure (45). However, in a recent study (34), COPD patients with fiber atrophy did not show reduced muscle mass and strength, but a better exercise capacity, as compared to COPD patient without fiber atrophy. These discrepancies with other studies (9, 10, 18) could be explained by the use of a supervised clustering approach, leading to misclassification of subjects. In addition, the clusters isolated cannot be considered as a “phenotype” because not prospec-
tively validated (24). Therefore, the aim of this study was to
test the hypothesis that—using unsupervised clustering meth-
ods—the muscle fiber atrophy and increased oxidative stress
constitute the attributes of validated COPD phenotypes that
differs from phenotypes characterized by the reduction of type
I fibers. Because of the redundancy in the multidimensional
datasets obtained in COPD patients and healthy subjects of the
same age and physical activity level, cluster analysis was
performed on both populations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study population. Sedentary healthy subjects (SHS) were recruited
on the basis of the following criteria: age from 50 to 75 yr, no disease,
and less than 150 min of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity per
week (35). COPD patients were defined on the basis of the following
criteria: dyspnea, chronic cough or sputum production, and/or a
history of exposure to risk factors for the disease, and diagnosis
confirmed by spirometry (postbronchodilator forced expiratory vol-
ume in 1 s/forced vital capacity (FEV1/FVC) < 70%) (43). Exclusion
criteria were other respiratory diagnosis, decompensated comorbidity,
and exacerbation in the last 2 mo. The severity of breathlessness was
assessed via the Medical Research Council (MRC) scale (8). All
subjects and patients performed the tests in INSERM U-1046, CHRU
Montpellier, France, or at the “La Solane” and “La Vallonie” Pulmo-

dary Rehabilitation Centers in Osseja and Lodève, France, respect-
ively. An informed written consent was obtained from all subjects,
and the research protocol was approved by the institutional ethics
committee of the Montpellier University Hospitals (no. 2008-03-
ESSS-V2 and no. 2009-04-BPCO-V2) and conducted in accordance
with the Helsinki Declaration and the European Guidelines for “good
clinical practice.”

Physical activity. In order to assess the physical activity (PA) level
of our sedentary-selected healthy population, we used the Voorrips
questionnaire (modified Baeecke’s questionnaire) validated and used in
this indication (22, 56). “Objective” PA level was assessed in 25
COPD patients and 22 SHS who wore a triaxial accelerometer for 7
consecutive days (Triract RT3 Research, Stayhealthy, Monrovia, CA).
This triaxial accelerometer is worn at the waist and records the
acceleration in the three axes of the space (x, y, z), every minute. The
parameter analysis is the Vector Magnitude Unit (VMU) or activity
counts: VMU = \sqrt{(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)} and has been validated in
COPD (50).

The QUANTAP interview-administered survey is a computer-
assisted tool designed to determine PA over a lifetime in four
dimensions (sports at school, leisure sports, occupation, daily activi-
ties). This questionnaire is reliable to assess lifetime PA and has been
validated for use in elderly French subjects and in the context of
COPD (23).

Pulmonary function tests and arterial blood gases. All subjects
underwent whole body plethysmography (Transmural Bodybox 2800;
Sensomedics, Yorba Linda, CA). FEV1, FVC, functional residual
capacity (FRC), total lung capacity (TLC), and residual volume (RV)
were measured. The FEV1/FVC, RV/TLC and FRC/TLC ratios were
calculated. The values were compared with normal values (44).
Arterial blood samples were obtained while breathing room air. PaO2,
as measured with a blood gas analyzer (Roche OMNI S, Roche
Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany).

Exercise capacity. The 6-min walking test (6MWT), which is
routinely used by our group (39), was performed in a 30-m corridor.
The distance walked during the test (6MWD) was compared with
reference values (1). Arterial oxygen saturation (SpO2) and heart rate
(HR) were monitored using a pulse oximeter (Nonin 8500 M; Nonin
Medical, Minneapolis, MN).

Participants performed an incremental cycle ergometric test until
exhaustion on an electrically braked cycle ergometer (Ergoselect
200P, Ergolyne, Bitz, Germany) following the individualized protocol
usually used in our laboratory (46), and according to the international
standards (2). Oxygen consumption (VO2) and carbon dioxide pro-
duction (VCO2) were measured and calculated from breath-by-breath
analysis (Sensormedics, Vmax 229, Autobox, Yorba Linda, CA).
Maximal power output was the maximal workload sustainable, and
symptom-limited (VO2sl) was the mean value during the last 20 s of
the test. The ventilatory threshold was blindly and independently
assessed for each subject by two experienced practitioners on the basis
of noninvasive methods (ventilatory equivalent and V-slope methods),
as recommended (2).

Muscle function assessment. The maximal voluntary contraction
(MVC) and measurement to task failure time (T.lim) of the knee
extensor were assessed with the usual methods of our group (14, 26,
42). Briefly, the MVC was measured at 90° on a bench (Kettler,
Germany). Three reproducible measurements (within 10%) of the
force of the dominant leg were recorded and the best value was
retained as the MVC. The T.lim was then measured as the time (in s)
during which the subjects were able to maintain a contraction at 30% of
MVC, and at the rate of 10 movements per minute to exhaustion.
Because it is a volitional test, a reduction in MVC by 10% in 1 min was
mandatory to validate the test. The fat-free mass index (FFMI)
calculated from the fat-free mass determined with multifrequency
bioelectrical impedancemetry (BIA) (QuadScan 4000, Bodystat, Isle
of Man, UK) (19), using the validated equations of Kyle et al. (31).

Blood sample and muscle biopsy analysis. Venous blood was
sampled in standard, sterile, heparinized tubes and muscle biopsies
were performed in the vastus lateralis of the quadriceps using the
usual methodology (25). Plasma-free and esterified isoprostanes
(F2-IsOP) were evaluated as markers of lipid (15). Muscle biopsies
were performed in the vastus lateralis of the quadriceps. Muscle fiber type
and CSA were assessed by immunohistochemistry on frozen sections
from the muscle biopsies using a panel of antibodies (16) as previ-
ously described (3). Muscle oxidative stress markers were assessed by
immunoblotting determination of protein and myosin heavy chains
oxidation, lipid peroxidation, and the protein level of three enzymatic
antioxidants (Mn superoxide dismutase, glutathione reductase, cata-
lase) (5, 13, 32), as previously described (3). Blots were scanned and
the optical densities (OD) of specific proteins were quantified with
ImageJ.

Pulmonary rehabilitation in COPD patients. We analyzed the
response to exercise training, in terms of exercise capacity (6MWD
and VO2sl) in COPD patients only. The exercise training sessions
were part of a multicomponent and comprehensive pulmonary reha-
bilitation course, including an education program, as recommended
(36) and previously described (22). Briefly, twenty sessions of endur-
ance exercise (stationary cycling, walking) were condensed into 4–6
wk. The training sessions were performed 3 or 4 times per week on a
cycloergometer or a treadmill. The exercise intensity was set as the
heart rate at the ventilatory or dyspnea threshold (36, 42, 52) assessed
during the exercise test. This intensity was continuously monitored with
a cardiofrequency meter. The duration of the training session was
progressively increased to 1 h 30 min, with a maximum of 45 min of
endurance training (10 min of work at the intensity of the ventilatory
threshold followed by 5 min of active recovery, repeated 3 times)
completed by strength-building exercise (8–10 exercises, with sets of
10–15 repetitions). The load for the resistance exercise was initially
set at 40% of the isotonic one-repetition maximum (1-RM) of each
muscle (deltoid, biceps, triceps, and quadriceps), and then progres-
sively increased using a perceived exertion scale [with a target of 5–6
on a 10-point scale (35)]. All sessions were supervised by an experi-
cenced clinician, and the training intensity was increased during the
training protocol.

Prospective follow-up of the COPD patients. We performed a
prospective assessment of clinically relevant outcomes (all-cause
mortality, hospital admissions, and acute exacerbations) up to March
1, 2013, in COPD patients. Acute exacerbations and admissions were
obtained from the patients and verified with their medical doctors and respiratory practitioners. Survival status was obtained from direct interview of the patients or their relatives.

**Statistical analysis.** The explorative analysis was simplified using principal component analysis (PCA). Linear combinations of the variables formed new independent variables or components (28, 38). Components with eigenvalues >1 were kept. Results were visualized through a graph or map, in which the original variables or individuals are displayed, allowing easy visual interpretation of their relationships (9). Then, a cluster analysis based on the significant components of the PCA analysis was performed in individuals. Cluster analysis was performed using Ward’s method. Next, the variables of the clusters of COPD patients and SHS were compared using one-way analysis of variance (12) or the Kruskall-Wallis test. Least significant differences were assessed with post hoc analysis (Bonferroni or Dunn). The level of significance was established at \( P < 0.05 \). Statistical analysis was performed using the R statistical package, version 2.7.0.

**RESULTS**

**Principal component analysis.** The characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. PCA analysis was performed on 28 clinical and functional variables and muscle characteristics in 64 COPD patients and 27 SHS (Table 2). The four principal components significantly explained 61% of the information of the dataset. Figure 1 shows the projection of the variables on componentssignificantly explained 61% of the information of 64 COPD patients and 27 SHS (Table 2). The four principal components formed new independent variables or components (28, 38).

Principal component analysis. The characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. PCA analysis was performed on 28 clinical and functional variables and muscle characteristics in 64 patients (30 [25–32] vs. 52 [44 –70]; \( P < 0.001 \)). The fiber CSA was significantly reduced in the females of cluster 3 compared with the males of cluster 4. Regarding the COPD patients, cluster 1 was characterized by a significant reduction in the fiber CSA and a more severe reduction in the proportion of type I fibers. If the FEV1 (%predicted) was lower in cluster 1 vs. cluster 2 COPD patients (30 [25–32] vs. 52 [44 –70]; \( P < 0.001 \)), there was no statistical difference between the age of the two clusters (60.4 ± 8.8 vs. 60.8 ± 9.0 yr old; \( P = 0.87 \)).

**Table 1. Table of characteristics of the COPD patients and sedentary healthy subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COPD Patients</th>
<th>Sedentary Healthy Subjects</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex, M/F:0</td>
<td>45/19</td>
<td>14/13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, yr</td>
<td>59.5 [54.0–66.0]</td>
<td>62.0 [58.3–66.0]</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorbidities, n</td>
<td>2.0 [1.0–3.0]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA level, Voorrips score</td>
<td>3.5 [2.1–7.3]</td>
<td>4.3 [3.0–5.8]</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA level, activity counts in AU</td>
<td>136.8 ± 52.9</td>
<td>134.1 ± 47.8</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA during past 15 yr, metabolic equivalents</td>
<td>14,948.5 ± 9,469.5</td>
<td>12,341.2 ± 5,201</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathlessness, MRC</td>
<td>2.0 [1.0–3.5]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLD stage I/II/III/IV, %</td>
<td>11/274/12/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, kg</td>
<td>67.4 ± 12.6</td>
<td>74.0 ± 13.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg</td>
<td>23.9 [20.1–26.6]</td>
<td>25.6 [23.8–27.1]</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMI, kg/m²</td>
<td>17.8 ± 2.1</td>
<td>18.8 ± 2.7</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁ %pred</td>
<td>42.0 [30.0–58.5]</td>
<td>105.0 [95.0–114.0]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV, %pred</td>
<td>187.0 [156.5–205.0]</td>
<td>106.0 [93.0–120.8]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC, %pred</td>
<td>157.0 [133.3–172.0]</td>
<td>108.0 [92.0–120.8]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC, %pred</td>
<td>119.5 ± 14.3</td>
<td>105.2 ± 11.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV/TLC, %</td>
<td>54.8 [45.0–63.4]</td>
<td>36.4 [34.6–42.1]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaO₂, mmHg</td>
<td>70.4 ± 9.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6MWD, m</td>
<td>455.0 [332.5–545.8]</td>
<td>613.0 [585.5–643.0]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6MWD, %pred</td>
<td>69.6 [57.0–81.0]</td>
<td>94.0 [84.9–102.5]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂sl, ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹</td>
<td>16.5 ± 5.2</td>
<td>26.0 ± 5.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂sl, %pred</td>
<td>61.5 ± 19.1</td>
<td>108.3 ± 14.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT, %pred VO₂max</td>
<td>47.3 ± 10.8</td>
<td>63.5 ± 9.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle mass, kg</td>
<td>24.8 ± 5.7</td>
<td>25.5 ± 7.8</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qMVC, kg</td>
<td>16.5 ± 8.7</td>
<td>21.5 ± 8.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qMVC/BMI</td>
<td>0.67 [0.51–0.88]</td>
<td>0.79 [0.55–1.00]</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlim, s</td>
<td>236.0 [134.5–306.0]</td>
<td>340.0 [231.0–636.0]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I, %</td>
<td>33.3 ± 15.1</td>
<td>44.3 ± 13.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber CSA, µm²</td>
<td>4,564.3 ± 1,499.7</td>
<td>4,506.6 ± 1,636.0</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results are expressed in means ± SD or median [interquartile range (IQR)]. Definition of abbreviations: M, male; F, female; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; SHS, sedentary healthy subjects; MRC, Medical Research Council; BMI, body mass index; %pred, % of the predicted value; FFMI, fat-free mass index; FEV₁, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; RV, residual volume; FRC, functional residual capacity; TLC, total lung capacity; PaO₂, arterial oxygen partial pressure; 6MWD, 6-minute walking distance; VO₂sl, symptom-limited oxygen uptake; VT, ventilatory threshold; VO₂max, maximum oxygen uptake; qMVC: quadriceps maximal voluntary contraction; Tlim, endurance time; fiber CSA, fiber cross-sectional area.
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Table 2. Correlations of the original variables with the four main components derived from the principal component analysis in the 91 subjects/COPD patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex M:1/F:0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease status, COPD: 1/SHS: 0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, yr</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorbidities, n</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute exacerbations, n</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathlessness, MRC</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, kg</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMI, kg/m²</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁, %pred</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV, %pred</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRC, %pred</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC, %pred</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR/TLC, %</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaO₂, mmHg</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6MWD, m</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximal power output, %pred</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂sl, ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂sl, %pred</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT, %pred VO₂max</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle mass, kg</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qMVC, kg</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qMVC/BMI</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.lim, s</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I, %</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber CSA, µm²</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations of the original variables with the three main components derived from the principal component analysis in the 91 individuals. The variance of components 1, 2, 3 and 4 were 14.2, 30.6, 9.3 and 6.5%, respectively.

When comparisons were made with the SHS, taking into account the sex, reduction in the fiber CSA occurred only in male COPD patients in cluster 1, and not in male COPD patients in cluster 2, vs. the healthy males of cluster 4 (3,715 ± 1,316 vs. 5,657 ± 1,098 vs. 5,725 ± 1,164 µm², respectively; P < 0.05). In females, we found no significant difference in fiber CSA in clusters 1 and 2 vs. the healthy females of cluster 3. Nevertheless, compared with the SHS clusters, both COPD clusters showed significantly reduced type I fiber proportion (P < 0.05). In summary, the main muscle features in the clusters of COPD patients were a reduction in the type I fiber proportion with preserved fiber size for cluster 2, and both fiber atrophy and severe type I fiber loss in cluster 1.

Validation of the phenotypes of COPD patients. Exercise training was performed at the intensity of the ventilatory (n = 27/34) or dyspnea (n = 7/34) threshold in COPD patients only (n = 34/64). After training, we observed a significant improvement of the 6MWD (n = 34) and VO₂sl (n = 19) in patients (45 ± 47 ml; P < 0.001 and 1.5 ± 2.5 ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹; P < 0.05, respectively). If we did not observe a significant greater relative improvement of the 6MWD in cluster 1 vs. cluster 2 (+15.2 ± 28.2% vs. +6.5 ± 6.3%; P = 0.21), there was a greater relative improvement of the VO₂sl after training in cluster 1 vs. cluster 2 (+24 ± 16% vs. +6 ± 13%; P < 0.01). The relative improvement of the VO₂sl was significantly correlated with the pretraining VO₂sl (r = -0.53; P < 0.05, n = 19, Fig. 3). If the improvement of VO₂sl was higher in cluster 1 vs. cluster 2, the training intensity (in % of the predicted maxVO₂) was even lower in cluster 1 vs. cluster 2 (40 ± 4.6% vs. 49.9 ± 10.7%; P < 0.05).

The mean length of the follow-up in COPD patients was 1,040 ± 418 days (n = 54/64). At 1,500 days of follow-up, the higher all-cause mortality in cluster 1 vs. cluster 2 was not significant (log-rank: 1.15; P = 0.26). Kaplan-Meier analysis of hospital admissions and exacerbations between the 2 clus-
Oxidative stress in clusters. We observed a significant increase in plasma isoprostane in cluster 1 of COPD patients ($P < 0.05$) compared with the others (Table 4). Given the differences regarding the plasma and muscle oxidative stress between males and females, comparisons between clusters were performed per sex. In males only, we observed a significant increase in protein carbonylation (iIC%) of COPD patients in cluster 1 compared with clusters 2 and SHS in cluster 4 [197.5 [106.3–214.9] vs. 80.8 [65.2–98.9] and 87.1 [70.9–103.9]; $P < 0.05$). A similar increase in MHC oxidation (iIC%) was found in cluster 1 (117.5 [98.2–171.0] vs. 53.1 [30.3–124.5] and 62.5 [43.1–94.8]; $P < 0.05$). Cluster comparisons in females revealed no significant difference for any marker of oxidative stress. The level of total muscle protein carbonylation and MHC oxidation was correlated with qMVC in the clusters of COPD patients ($r = -0.60; P < 0.01$ and $r = -0.54; P < 0.01$; Fig. 5A). Moreover, total protein and MHC carbonylation were inversely correlated with fiber CSA in COPD patients ($r = -0.64; P < 0.001$ and $r = -0.67; P < 0.05$; Fig. 5B), as was catalase expression level ($r = -0.45; P < 0.05$).

**DISCUSSION**

Using unsupervised cluster analysis, we identified and validated two phenotypes of COPD patients (with different outcomes and response to exercise training) showing a different peripheral muscle histomorphology and level of oxidative stress. While cluster 1 “atrophic” COPD patients showed reduced BMI,

---

**Table 3. Clinical, functional, and muscle characteristics in clusters of subjects/patients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COPD/SHS</td>
<td>26/0</td>
<td>36/0</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>0/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, yr</td>
<td>60.4 ± 8.8</td>
<td>60.8 ± 9.0</td>
<td>61.2 ± 6.4</td>
<td>62.1 ± 4.4</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, M/F</td>
<td>20/6</td>
<td>25/11</td>
<td>0/17</td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV1, %pred</td>
<td>30 [25–32]*</td>
<td>52 [44–70]*#</td>
<td>102 [91–116]</td>
<td>105 [99–112]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorbidities, n</td>
<td>1.5 [1.0–3.0]*</td>
<td>2.0 [1.0–3.0]*</td>
<td>0.0 [0.0–0.75]</td>
<td>0.0 [0.0–1.0]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV, %pred</td>
<td>207 [191–224]*</td>
<td>162 [143–187]*#</td>
<td>116 [94–129]</td>
<td>103 [93–111]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaO2, mmHg</td>
<td>70.5 ± 11.0</td>
<td>69.9 ± 8.4</td>
<td>24.2 ± 2.3</td>
<td>26.5 ± 3.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg/m²</td>
<td>21.5 ± 3.4*</td>
<td>25.3 ± 4.1</td>
<td>18.6 ± 2.1*#</td>
<td>16.5 ± 1.0*</td>
<td>20.7 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMI, kg/m²</td>
<td>16.9 ± 1.8*</td>
<td>18.6 ± 2.1*#</td>
<td>16.5 ± 1.0*</td>
<td>20.7 ± 2.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathlessness, MRC</td>
<td>3.0 [2.0–5.0]</td>
<td>1.0 [1.0–2.0]*</td>
<td>106.3 ± 13.9</td>
<td>108.6 ± 15.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO2sl, %pred</td>
<td>46.7 ± 17.7*</td>
<td>68.3 ± 12.1*#</td>
<td>106.3 ± 13.9</td>
<td>108.6 ± 15.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT, %pred VO2 max</td>
<td>42.0 [37.5–45.3]*</td>
<td>47.0 [42.0–50.0]*</td>
<td>63.5 [58.0–67.0]*</td>
<td>62.0 [54.0–73.0]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlim, s</td>
<td>178 [129–248]*</td>
<td>243 [139–328]*</td>
<td>260 [177–352]*</td>
<td>496 [285–847]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6MWD, %pred</td>
<td>55.9 [31.8–62.3]*</td>
<td>80.0 [70.6–81.6]*#</td>
<td>80.0 [73.3–82.2]*</td>
<td>93.3 [84.2–101.0]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qMVC, kg</td>
<td>12.6 [7.6–20.0]*</td>
<td>17.6 [14.0–22.0]*#</td>
<td>11.9 [10.5–18.0]*</td>
<td>26.6 [24.4–30.9]</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type I, %</td>
<td>26.0 ± 13.976*</td>
<td>39.8 ± 12.6*#</td>
<td>42.1 ± 11.0</td>
<td>47.5 ± 14.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber CSA, µm²</td>
<td>3731 ± 1233*</td>
<td>5657 ± 1098</td>
<td>3212 ± 799*</td>
<td>5725 ± 1164</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results are expressed in means ± SD or median [interquartile range (IQR)]. *$P < 0.05$ vs. cluster 4. #$P < 0.05$ vs. cluster 1.
FFMI, fiber CSA, and increased oxidative stress, cluster 2 COPD patients showed a moderate fiber switch. Thus our study robustly demonstrates that the muscle heterogeneity is the translation of different phenotypes of the disease.

Clusters of COPD patients correspond to different disease’s phenotypes. If COPD patients with a reduction in their type I fiber proportion and without fiber atrophy have previously shown different attributes in previous studies (9, 10, 18, 34, 54), it cannot be considered as a proof of different disease’s phenotype. Indeed, a COPD phenotype is “a single or combination of disease attributes that describe differences between individuals with COPD as they relate to clinically meaningful outcomes [...] The ultimate goal of phenotyping in medicine is to allow the identification of patient groups with unique prognostic or therapeutic characteristics” (24). Our clusters of COPD patients match this definition, because they showed a different response to a therapeutic intervention (i.e., exercise training): cluster 1 atrophic COPD showed a greater improvement of their relative VO2sl, which was significantly correlated with their baseline VO2sl. A similar result can be found in a recent study: the cachectic COPD patients with a reduced FFMI (matching the FFMI of our cluster 1 COPD patients) showed a greater relative improvement in the mean 6MWD compared with their noncachectic counterparts (55).

In addition, our clusters of COPD patients showed a different occurrence of clinically relevant outcomes: cluster 1 of COPD patients had more frequent hospitalizations and exacerbations. However, if no significant difference was detected...
after adjustment for FEV\textsubscript{1} in the occurrence of exacerbations and hospital admissions because of a small sample size (n = 54), the observed FEV\textsubscript{1}-adjusted hazard ratio for exacerbations is in agreement with the higher frequency of exacerbations in COPD patients with reduced muscle mass or strength (11). In addition, a higher risk of hospital admission in the phenotype COPD patients with the lowest FFMI has already been observed, independently of the FEV\textsubscript{1} (18). More generally, in terms of BMI, FFMI, and/or muscle weakness, our cluster 1 of COPD patients match a “cachectic” COPD population already isolated in five previous studies (9, 10, 18, 54, 55), and prospectively validated in one of them (18).

A last observation argues for a difference of phenotypes, and not for a simple difference in the disease severity between groups. It was striking to note that the “cachectic” patients in cluster 1 (with body and fat-free mass loss) were not older than those in cluster 2 (60.4 ± 8.8 vs. 60.8 ± 9.0 yr; \(P = 0.87\)). Another study also showed that the most cachectic phenotype was the youngest (9). In a larger population of COPD patients (n = 121) recruited at the same time and place and on the basis of the same inclusion criteria as the COPD patients of the present study, we found no significant difference for the age at breathlessness onset or the age of diagnosis, between clusters 1 and 2 (47.5 ± 14.1 vs. 47.3 ± 13.6 yr, \(P = 0.97\); and 54.3 ± 11.3 vs. 52.3 ± 11.8 yr, \(P = 0.48\)). Then, assuming a similar age of disease onset, the disease course must have been more rapid in the “cachectic” patients of cluster 1 than in cluster 2. This hypothesis has been confirmed by the longitudinal study of FEV\textsubscript{1} decline in COPD patients: the “rapid decliner” phenotype was the most cachectic, like our cluster 1 (37). Moreover, a longitudinal study of qMVC and FFMI also showed faster decline in the patients with the lowest muscle mass (27). Last, oxidative stress has been shown to alter the decline in FEV\textsubscript{1} (29). Therefore, the course of the disease in the cluster 1 cachectic patients with increased levels of oxidative stress (plasma isoprostan) must have been much more rapid. Altogether, with a specific time course, cluster 1 cannot be considered as the successive step from cluster 2 in the disease’s time course, but rather as a specific COPD phenotype.

**COPD patient clusters: different mechanisms in muscle?** In our study, the COPD patients in cluster 1 showed fiber atrophy which was not observed in cluster 2 patients. We identified an increase in markers of plasma and muscle oxidative stress (protein oxidation) only in cluster 1. This specific increase in the atrophic fibers of cluster 1 COPD patients may indicate a specific mechanism leading to the fiber atrophy in cluster 1 COPD patients, adding more evidence that cluster 1 COPD constitutes a real COPD phenotype. Indeed, it is currently admitted that oxidative stress has deleterious effects on muscle/fiber mass in COPD (6, 7, 17, 40). In addition, *in vitro* studies have shown that increased protein oxidation directly results in the activation of the calpain-dependent proteolysis pathway (40, 47, 48) and the acceleration of myofibrillar degradation. An increased level of oxidative stress and activation of this pathway have been incriminated in various atrophy-related conditions (6, 48, 49), and the significant correlations between total protein and MHC carbonylation and fiber CSA observed in our study support that this mechanism has occurred in the

| Table 4. Oxidative stress markers in clusters of subjects/patients |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                  | Cluster 1        | Cluster 2        | Cluster 3        | Cluster 4        |
| Plasma isoprostan| 394.3 ± 57.1*    | 313.5 ± 88.1     | 295.9 ± 69.3     | 248.9 ± 72.7     |
| Muscle protein carbonylation | 131.5 [83.6–200.3] | 83.0 [88.3–105.1] | 103.7 [88.5–111.5] | 91.8 [74.3–126]  |
| Muscle oxidized MHC | 117.5 [98.2–171.0] | 53.2 [30.3–124.5] | 51.3 [31.3–120.3] | 54.5 [42.2–89.7]  |
| trans-4-Hydroxy-2-nonenal (HNE) | 1.16 ± 0.486 | 1.032 ± 0.246 | 1.151 ± 0.381 | 1.028 ± 0.217 |
| MnSOD/GAPDH | 2.10 ± 0.84 | 1.76 ± 0.97 | 1.67 ± 0.74 | 1.47 ± 0.51 |
| Glutathione reductase/GAPDH | 0.78 ± 0.49 | 0.96 ± 0.36 | 0.93 ± 0.34 | 0.92 ± 0.22 |
| Catalase/GAPDH | 59.9 ± 27.9 | 35.5 ± 17.1 | 43.9 ± 32.1 | 45.4 ± 34.9 |

Results are expressed in median [IQR]. MHC, myosin heavy chains; MnSOD, manganese superoxide dismutase; GAPDH, glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase. *\(P < 0.05\) in post hoc analysis.
skeletal muscle of our COPD patients. Therefore, although we provide simple correlations and not a cause-effect relationship, cluster 1 COPD patients with fiber atrophy may have experienced a specific mechanism of accelerated oxidative stress-induced myofibrillar proteolysis (40). As “Phenotypes should exhibit [...] a similar underlying biologic or physiologic mechanism” (24), our results regarding oxidative stress markers argue also in favor of a phenotype grouping. Last, this observation appears relevant for the design of future studies exploring the mechanisms of the muscle atrophy in COPD. Indeed, our study showed that the combination of a poor lung function, a low exercise capacity, and a reduction of muscle mass or strength, rather than the use of a single parameter (4, 55), accurately isolated patients in which the specific processes leading to fiber atrophy are likely to occur.

Study critique. Our study was not designed to isolate all the potential phenotypes in COPD, because our aim was rather to test whether the fiber atrophy and type I fiber switch were the attributes of different phenotypes. Accordingly, the sampling size of our cluster analysis appears adequate (41) and consistent with previous published studies [number of subjects to the number of variables = 3.27 vs. 2.28 (18)]. However, the question of potential unidentified phenotypes can be addressed. Indeed, in contrast with our observations and the study of Garcia-Aymerich et al. (18), two COPD phenotypes with evidence of muscle atrophy (high prevalence of muscle weakness) have been isolated in the study of Burgel et al. (10). Nonetheless, increasing the sample size could have allowed the isolation of an additional phenotype. Yet, regarding the similar level of muscle weakness (indicating similar degree of muscle atrophy) in phenotypes 2 and 3 in the study of Burgel et al. (10), it is probable that other COPD phenotypes would have a similar muscle structure.

A second limitation is the missing data, in particular for the PA level assessment. If most of the healthy subject had objective accelerometry recordings (22/27), 25 of the 64 COPD patients had this objective assessment. However, several precautions have been taken in order to include sedentary healthy controls (accelerometry, Voorrips score, clinical interview, QUANTAP system), and in COPD patients, the VMU and Voorrips score were equally distributed between cluster 1 and cluster 2 of COPD patients (VMU, n = 12 vs. n = 13; and Voorrips score, n = 15 vs. n = 17).

In conclusion, we identified and validated two phenotypes of COPD patients differing in terms of muscle dysfunction and histomorphology, with a specific occurrence of fiber atrophy in one of them. Thus our study demonstrates that the muscle heterogeneity is the translation of different phenotypes of the disease. The increased level of muscle oxidative stress in the phenotype with fiber atrophy suggests a specific pathobiological mechanism. The definition of these phenotypes may improve the identification of COPD patients requiring specific muscle interventions, as well as the identification of the cellular pathways involved in the muscle remodeling.
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