

## 0180

## Mandibular Advancement Versus CPAP on Quality-of-Life in Obstructive Sleep Apnea

J. T. Colpani<sup>1</sup>, Y. Ou<sup>2</sup>, A. V. Thakumar<sup>3</sup>, C. Cheong<sup>2</sup>, W. Loke<sup>1</sup>, E. Shih<sup>2</sup>, S. Chan<sup>2</sup>, P. A. Cistulli<sup>4</sup>, L. Nan<sup>3</sup>, C. Lee<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Dentistry, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore, Singapore, <sup>2</sup>Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore, Singapore, <sup>3</sup>School of Public Health, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore, Singapore, <sup>4</sup>Medical School, The University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

**Objectives** We recently reported in the CRESCENT trial that mandibular advancement devices (MAD) are non-inferior to CPAP in reducing blood pressure in patients with obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) and hypertension. This pre-specified analysis aims to compare the relative effectiveness of MAD versus CPAP in improving quality-of-life (QoL) at a 6-month follow-up.

Methods Between October 2019 and December 2022, 220 participants recruited from 3 Singapore public hospitals with OSA (apnea-hypopnea index [AHI] ≥15 events/hour) were randomly assigned to MAD or CPAP (1:1 ratio). QoL questionnaires (Epworth Sleepiness Scale [ESS], SAQLI, FOSQ-30, SF-36, and EQ-5D) were administered at baseline and at 6 months.

**Results** The MAD and CPAP groups were well balanced (85% male, median age 61 [interquartile range (IQR) 56-65] years, body mass index 27.5 [25.3-30.6] kg/m<sup>2</sup>, AHI 38.2 [24.5-51.7] events/hour). MAD protrusion averaged  $9.4 \pm 2.0$  mm, while CPAP pressure averaged  $10.3 \pm 2.5$  mmHg. Treatment adherence for MAD and CPAP was 5.4 [3.7-6.7] hours and 4.9 [3.0-5.9] hours, respectively. A total of 100 participants in each group completed the 6-month follow-up (91% completion rate). Both MAD and CPAP groups showed improvements in ESS, SAQLI, FOSQ, and SF-36 (domains: role-physical, bodily pain, general health, vitality, and role-emotional) (p<0.005 for all). CPAP (p=0.013), but not the MAD group, improved SF-36 (domain: physical functioning). In the between-group analysis, while the CPAP group was more effective than the MAD group in improving ESS (mean difference: 1.45 [95% CI: 0.44-2.46, p=0.005]), no between-group differences were observed in the improvement of SAQLI (-0.08, p=0.475), FOSQ-30 (-0.51, p=0.127), SF-36 (domains ranging from -0.41 to 2.95 with p-values ranging from 0.115 to 0.795), and EQ-5D (-0.03, p=0.322).

**Conclusions** Both MAD and CPAP were effective in improving QoL at the 6-month follow-up. The relative effectiveness was similar, except CPAP was slightly more effective in improving ESS.