临床研究

# 喘可治注射液雾化吸入对比肌肉注射治疗慢性阻塞性肺病急性加重期的疗效和安全性观察

张治国 薛智文 张卓红 张莉莉 吴艳梅
(西电集团医院呼吸内科,陕西 西安 710077)

**摘 要:目的** 对比观察喘可治注射液雾化吸入与肌肉注射治疗慢性慢性阻塞性肺病急性加重期(AECOPD)患者临床疗效和安全性。**方法** 选取 2015 年 3 月~2017 年 5 月我院收治的 98 例 AECOPD 患者为研究对象,采用信封法随机分为治疗组和对照组,每组 49 例,所有患者均接受吸氧、止咳、平喘、抗感染及纠正酸碱平衡等常规治疗。在常规治疗基础上,对照组给予喘可治肌肉注射给药,试验组给予喘可治雾化吸入给药,疗程均为 7 天。观察两组的临床总有效率和不良反应发生率,治疗前后肺功能和生活质量改善程度。**结果** 治疗组和对照组的临床总有效率分别为 69.39 %和 75.5 1%,不良反应发生率分别为 2.04 %和 12.24 %,差异性比较无统计学意义($P$>0.05);治疗前,两组患者 $FEV_1$、$FEV_1$/FVC、呼吸困难评分和 6 min 步行距离(6WMT)差异性比较无统计学意义($P$>0.05),治疗 7 天后两组患者所有指标均显著改善,组内差异性比较均有统计学意义($P$<0.05),但组间差异性比较均无统计学意义($P$>0.05)。**结论** 喘可治注射液雾化吸入治疗 AECOPD 的临床疗效和安全性、肺功能及生活质量改善程度均与肌肉注射相当,值得临床推广使用。

**关键词:**喘可治注射液;雾化吸入;肌肉注射;慢性阻塞性肺病
**中图分类号:** R 563 **文献标识码:**A **文章编号:**1672-0571(2017)03-0013-03
DOI:10.13424/j.cnki.mtcm.2017.06.006

# Comparative Observation on Clinical Effect and Safety of Aerosol Inhalation and Intramuscular Injection of Chuankezhi in Treating Acute Exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

**Zhang Zhiguo Xue Zhiwen Zhang Zhuohong Zhang Lili Wu Yanmei**
(Respiratory Medicine Department of Xi'an XD Group Hospital, Xi'an 710077, China)

**Abstract Objective** to observe comparatively the clinical effect and safety of aerosol inhalation and intramuscular injection of Chuankezhi in Treating AECOPD. **Method** 98 AECOPD patients treated by Xi'an XD Group Hospital from March 2015 to May 2017 were selected and randomly divided into treatment group and control group with 49 cases in each by the envelop method. All the patients received conventional therapy such as oxygen inhalation, cough relief, antiasthma, anti-infection and acid-base balance correction. Based on that, cases in control group were given intramuscular injection of Chuankezhi while the treatment group were given aerosol inhalation of Chuankezhi. The course for each group were 7 days. Clinical efficacy rate, incidence of adverse reactions, improvement of lung function and quality of life before and after treatment of both groups were observed. **Result** Clinical efficacy rates of treatment group and control group were 69.39% and 75.51%, respectively, incidences of adverse reactions of the two groups were 2.04% and 12.24%, respectively, the differences had no statistical significance($P$>0.05). Before the treatment, the difference of FEV1, FEV1/FVC, dyspnea scores and 6WMT of the two groups had no statistical significance($P$>0.05). After 7 days of treatment, all the indicators of the two groups had significantly improved, the difference within the same group was statistically significant($P$<0.05), but the difference between the two groups had no statistical significance($P$>0.05). **Conclusion** The clinical effect, safety, the improvement of lung function and life quality of aerosol inhalation and