



Aquichan

ISSN: 1657-5997

ISSN: 2027-5374

Universidad de La Sabana

Betancourt-Peña, Jhonatan; Ávila-Valencia, Juan Carlos; Facundo-Duarte, Arley  
Effects of Pulmonary Rehabilitation in Men Compared to Women  
with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in Colombia  
Aquichan, vol. 21, no. 1, e2116, 2021, January-March  
Universidad de La Sabana

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5294/aqui.2021.21.1.6>

Available in: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=74168260006>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's webpage in redalyc.org

UNEM redalyc.org

Scientific Information System Redalyc

Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Project academic non-profit, developed under the open access initiative

# Effects of Pulmonary Rehabilitation in Men Compared to Women with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in Colombia

**Theme:** Chronic care.

**Contribution to the subject:** Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) generates disability and deterioration of quality of life because it impairs the level of functional independence, thus increasing the care demands and the assistance provided by the health personnel, especially that of Nursing and the rehabilitation-related professions, due to the high level of dependence in the self-care activities and the frequent administration of medications seeking to control bronchial obstruction. This study helps to understand the major importance of the interdisciplinary team to promote assistance to patients with COPD in the pulmonary rehabilitation programs. In addition, it allows differentiating the effects of the interventions according to the patients' gender on the improvement of the aerobic capacity, dyspnea, quality of life, and level of functional independence.

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To determine the effects of pulmonary rehabilitation in men and women with a COPD diagnosis in a Colombian clinic. **Method:** A longitudinal and descriptive study was conducted with 75 COPD patients who entered a pulmonary rehabilitation program during 2018 and 2019. The population was divided into groups according to gender and some sociodemographic characteristics were assessed, such as spirometry expressed in percentage of the predicted value, body mass index, mMRC dyspnea, and capacity for physical exercise,

DOI: 10.5294/aqui.2021.21.1.6

## To reference this article / Para citar este artículo / Para citar este artigo

Betancourt-Peña J, Ávila-Valencia JC, Facundo-Duarte A. Effects of pulmonary rehabilitation in men compared to women with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in Colombia. *Aquichan*. 2021;21(1):e2116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5294/aqui.2021.21.1.6>

1 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7292-7628>. Institución Universitaria Escuela Nacional del Deporte, Colombia. [jhonatan.betancourt@endeporte.edu.co](mailto:jhonatan.betancourt@endeporte.edu.co)

2 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3642-6428>. Institución Universitaria Escuela Nacional del Deporte, Colombia. [juanc.avila@endeporte.edu.co](mailto:juanc.avila@endeporte.edu.co)

3 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4403-7780>. Institución Universitaria Escuela Nacional del Deporte, Colombia. [arley.facundo@endeporte.edu.co](mailto:arley.facundo@endeporte.edu.co)

Received: 19/06/2020  
Sent to peers: 13/07/2020  
Approved by peers: 01/12/2020  
Accepted: 28/01/2021

as well as some physiological variables with the six-minute walk test, anxiety-depression (HADS) and quality of life (SGRQ). A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. **Results:** The cigarette packs smoked per year index was higher in men,  $34 \pm 29.11$  ( $p < 0.001$ ), whereas the exposure to firewood smoke was five times higher in women ( $p = 0.037$ ). All the variables related to the capacity for physical exercise improved significantly ( $p < 0.021$ ), with distance covered standing out:  $63.26 \pm 60.03$  vs.  $51.53 \pm 61.02$  in favor of women. mMRC dyspnea was initially higher in women when compared to men,  $0.709 \pm 0.287$ , and presented a greater change in women with  $1.294 \pm 0.415$  when compared to men,  $0.736 \pm 0.880$ , at the end of pulmonary rehabilitation. **Conclusion:** Pulmonary rehabilitation in women shows an increase of 63.26 meters in the distance covered and a 1.294-point reduction in dyspnea; while, for men, these figures were 51.53 meters and 0.736 points, respectively, as well as an improvement in quality of life in men by 11.47 SGRQ points when compared to women: 0.600.

KEYWORDS (SOURCE: DeCS)

Rehabilitation; lung diseases; sex; dyspnea; quality of life; exercise.

# *Efectos de la rehabilitación pulmonar en hombres vs. mujeres con enfermedad pulmonar obstructiva crónica en Colombia*

## RESUMEN

**Objetivo:** determinar los efectos de la rehabilitación pulmonar en hombres y mujeres con diagnóstico de EPOC en una clínica de Colombia. **Método:** estudio descriptivo longitudinal en 75 pacientes con EPOC que ingresaron a un programa de rehabilitación pulmonar durante el año 2018 y 2019. La población se dividió en grupos según el sexo y se evaluaron algunas características sociodemográficas, la espirometría en porcentaje del predicho, el índice de masa corporal, la disnea mMRC, la capacidad de ejercicio y algunas variables fisiológicas con el test de la caminata de los seis minutos, la ansiedad-depresión (HADS) y la calidad de vida (SGRQ). Se tuvo un valor  $p < 0,05$  como estadísticamente significativo. **Resultados:** el índice paquetes fumados por año fue mayor en hombres  $34 \pm 29,11$  ( $p < 0,001$ ), mientras que la exposición al humo de leña fue cinco veces mayor en las mujeres ( $p = 0,037$ ). Todas las variables de capacidad de ejercicio mejoraron significativamente ( $p < 0,021$ ), sobresaliendo la distancia recorrida  $63,26 \pm 60,03$  versus  $51,53 \pm 61,02$  a favor de las mujeres. La disnea mMRC fue inicialmente mayor en las mujeres comparado con hombres  $0,709 \pm 0,287$  y evidenció un mayor cambio en las mujeres  $1,294 \pm 0,415$  versus hombres  $0,736 \pm 0,880$  al final de la rehabilitación pulmonar. **Conclusión:** la rehabilitación pulmonar en mujeres muestra un incremento en la distancia recorrida de 63,26 metros, disminución de 1,294 puntos en la disnea, para hombres 51,53 metros y 0,736 puntos respectivamente, y una mejoría en la calidad de vida en hombres de 11,47 puntos SGRQ con respecto con mujeres de 0,600.

## PALABRAS CLAVE (FUENTE DECS)

Rehabilitación; enfermedades pulmonares; sexo; disnea; calidad de vida; ejercicio físico.

# Efeitos da reabilitação pulmonar em homens vs. mulheres com doença pulmonar obstrutiva crônica na Colômbia

## RESUMO

**Objetivo:** determinar os efeitos da reabilitação pulmonar em homens e mulheres com diagnóstico de DPOC em uma clínica na Colômbia. **Método:** estudo descritivo longitudinal em 75 pacientes com DPOC que ingressaram em programa de reabilitação pulmonar durante os anos de 2018 e 2019. A população foi dividida em grupos de acordo com o sexo e foram avaliadas algumas características sociodemográficas, espirometria em porcentagem do previsto, índice de massa corporal, mMRC dispneia, capacidade de exercício e algumas variáveis fisiológicas com o teste de caminhada de seis minutos, ansiedade-depressão (HADS) e qualidade de vida (SGRQ). Considerou-se o valor de  $p < 0,05$  como estatisticamente significativo. **Resultados:** a taxa de fumaça de maços por ano foi maior nos homens  $34 \pm 29,11$  ( $p < 0,001$ ), enquanto a exposição à fumaça de lenha foi cinco vezes maior nas mulheres ( $p = 0,037$ ). Todas as variáveis da capacidade de exercício melhoraram significativamente ( $p < 0,021$ ), destacando-se a distância percorrida  $63,26 \pm 60,03$  versus  $51,53 \pm 61,02$  a favor das mulheres. O mMRC dispneia foi inicialmente maior nas mulheres em relação aos homens  $0,709 \pm 0,287$  e evidenciou maior alteração nas mulheres  $1,294 \pm 0,415$  versus homens  $0,736 \pm 0,880$  ao final da reabilitação pulmonar. **Conclusão:** a reabilitação pulmonar em mulheres mostra um aumento na distância percorrida de 63,26 metros e uma diminuição de 1.294 pontos na dispneia, enquanto para os homens os valores obtidos foram 51,53 metros e 0,736 pontos, respectivamente, e uma melhoria na qualidade de vida nos homens de 11,47 pontos do SGRQ em relação às mulheres, onde foi de 0,600 pontos.

## PALAVRAS-CHAVE (FONTE: DeCS)

Reabilitação; pneumopatias; sexo; dispneia; qualidade de vida; exercício físico.

## Introduction

Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) has historically had a connotation of male predominance, mainly associated with the smoking habit (1). On the other hand, it has been described that the prevalence of COPD is higher in men than in women in any age group (2); furthermore, in countries like China, its prevalence is two-fold in men (3). However, in other countries, the smoking habit can even be stronger in women, and higher prevalence is evidenced in this population (2,4).

It is important to consider that, in patients with COPD, two types of interventions are recommended: pharmacological and non-pharmacological, this latter being of great relevance as it includes pulmonary rehabilitation; however, it has been evidenced that the medical personnel can better diagnose COPD in men than in women, which affects treatment, allowing men greater access to the health services (4,5,6).

Several authors suggest that COPD has different physiological and psychological impacts in men than in women (5,7). The evidence indicates that men and women can be phenotypically different in their response to the smoke from tobacco, and even to other risk factors of the disease, reason why their intervention needs could vary according to the clinical and functional condition (8). Although the benefits of the interventions are equally manifested both in men and for women, it is important to consider that the effects of pulmonary rehabilitation can bring about different outcomes according to gender, which renders it necessary that, in some conditions, individualization of the interventions be indispensable to denote benefits in similar proportions (8).

On the other hand, in Latin America, the studies investigating COPD considering the patients' gender are scarce; and it is even rarer to find studies in which there is evidence of the changes in the aerobic capacity, anxiety or depression, and quality of life, the latter being related to the health of male and female patients who undergo pulmonary rehabilitation (PR). For this reason, the objective of this study was to determine the effects of pulmonary rehabilitation in men and women with a COPD diagnosis in a clinic in the city of Cali, Colombia.

## Methods

This is a longitudinal and descriptive study. It was conducted from July 2018 to July 2019 and two groups of patients with COPD were linked according to gender (men and women), which was corroborated by the patients' medical record.

## Participants

A total of 75 male and female patients with a medical diagnosis of COPD (chronic bronchitis and pulmonary emphysema types) were included in the study. They underwent pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) in the city of Cali, Colombia. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the clinic and adopted the norms outlined in Resolution 8,430 of the Ministry of Health and Social Protection and the Declaration of Helsinki. The following were adopted as inclusion criteria: a) patients who signed the informed consent; b) diagnosis by post-bronchodilator spirometry, according to the American Thoracic Society guidelines (9); and c) first-time participation in a PR program. Whereas the exclusion criteria were as follows: a) cognitive change which limited assessment; and b) uncontrolled heart or metabolic diseases.

## Instruments and materials

The following variables were taken into account in this study: age, gender, socioeconomic status, marital status, a smoking habit with its respective index of packs smoked per year (P/Y), exposure to firewood smoke, use of home oxygen, FEV<sub>1</sub>, FVC, FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC in post-bronchodilator spirometry expressed in percentage of the predicted value, Body Mass Index (BMI), and modified Medical Research Council (mMRC) dyspnea in the activities of daily living (10). In turn, the Six-Minute Walk Test (6MWT) was performed at the beginning and the end of PR following all the ATS (11) recommendations and recording the following data: distance covered, estimated Oxygen Consumption (VO<sub>2</sub>), METS, respiratory frequency, Borg's dyspnea and fatigue in the lower limbs according to Borg's modified scale, SpO<sub>2</sub> at the beginning and at the end, and degree of desaturation at the end of the stop test during the 6MWT.

Once the 6MWT was finished, the patients answered the *Anxiety and Depression* questionnaire, assessed with the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), which has 14 items and

2 subscales with 7 items each; one for anxiety and the other for depression. In this way, scores over 11 points are indicative of clinical problems; scores between 8 and 10 points are considered probable, and results below 8 points are considered normal (12).

Subsequently, the *Saint George's Respiratory Questionnaire* (SGRQ) (13) for health-related quality of life (HRQoL) was administered, which consists of 50 questions grouped into three domains: symptoms (8 items), activity (16 items), and impact (26 items). The results are expressed as percentages and the final score varies from zero (best performance) to one hundred (worst performance) (12).

## Pulmonary rehabilitation program

All the patients are assessed by a pulmonologist before entering the program. This professional determines the inclusion criteria for the PR program; once the patients are referred to the program, they are assessed by a physiotherapist specialized in cardiac and pulmonary rehabilitation that defines the intervention objectives for each of them. The PR program was conducted during 24 sessions distributed in 3 sessions per week for a total of 8 weeks. Physical exercise activities were performed in each PR session. They presented the following routine: general warming and muscle strengthening exercises (4 series of 12 repetitions) in the first weeks with 50 % of maximum resistance (MR) for upper and lower limbs, and MR was increased to 60 % after 4 weeks. The estimation of MR was carried out based on the number of times that the patients managed to make each movement assessed using the correct technique (14); subsequently, the continuous exercise was executed on a treadmill for 30 minutes, beginning at 60 % of the estimated  $\text{VO}_2$  reached in the aerobic capacity test (6MWT).

The estimation of  $\text{VO}_2$  was calculated with the following formula:  $\text{VO}_2 = 3.5 \text{ ml/kg/min} + (\text{Speed m/min} \times 0.1)$  and, in turn, the calculation of the METS was performed by  $\text{METS} = \text{VO}_2/3.5$  (15), which allowed prescribing physical exercises in a precise manner for each of the participants. The progression in the intensity of the continuous exercise on the treadmill was guided considering Borg's modified scale; for this, speed and angle were changed, maintaining a score between 3 (moderate) and 5 (severe) (16) for each of the sessions. The educational component was also implemented, which consisted of individual and group sessions

on topics such as knowledge of the disease, importance of quitting smoking, inhalators and their adequate use technique, recognition of the alert signs, home oxygen, adequate nutrition, measures against panic and anxiety, and home breathing exercises (14,17). The individual sessions were conducted during the PR sessions; and the group sessions, once a week, were attended by patients and family members.

## Data analysis

A descriptive analysis of all the variables was performed. The qualitative variables are presented as frequency and percentage, whereas the behavior of each quantitative variable was assessed using normality tests using Kolmogorov-Smirnov's test, which presents results in mean values and standard deviations. The difference between the data found according to gender at the beginning and the end of the program was determined from the Student's t-test for independent samples; on the other hand, to determine the changes presented by the men and women after PR, the Student's t-test for paired samples was applied. A p-value below 0.05 was considered statistically significant for the variables analyzed at the beginning and the end of the study.

## Results

Table 1 shows the patients' sociodemographic characteristics. The total population consisted of 75 patients, mainly men (55). In the men, the mean age was  $70.78 \pm (8.636)$  and, in the women,  $70.85 \pm (10.36)$ . More than 90 % of the participants live in the city of Cali and less than half of the men (43.6 %) and the women (45 %) presented excess weight. The marital status of most of the men was stable union (70.9 %), in opposition to the women, who were mostly in unstable relationships ( $p=0.01$ ). Concerning the smoking habit, most of the men (90.9 %) and women (65 %) were smokers ( $p=0.019$ ). Also, it was found that more than half of the men (54.4 %) and the women (65 %) belonged to the middle and high socioeconomic strata, which identifies the access capacity to the rehabilitation services of the population with more resources. They belonged to the contributive health regime (81.8 % vs. 85 %), did not use home oxygen (52.7 % vs. 50 %), had been admitted to urgency departments (69.1 % vs. 70 %), and hospitalized (58.2 % vs. 50 %) in the last year, respectively. In addition, although exposure to firewood smoke was relatively low in the total population, it was observed that 40 % of the women were exposed, against 16.4 % of the men.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of the men and women

| Variables                         | Men n=55        | Women n=20      | p-value |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| Age                               | 70.78 ± (8.636) | 70.85 ± (10.36) | 0.977   |
| <b>Grouped marital status</b>     |                 |                 |         |
| Stable union                      | 39 (70.9 %)     | 7 (35.0 %)      | 0.010   |
| No stable union                   | 16 (29.1 %)     | 13 (65.0 %)     |         |
| <b>Grouped place of residence</b> |                 |                 |         |
| Cali                              | 50 (90.0 %)     | 19 (95.0 %)     | 0.923   |
| Outside Cali                      | 5 (9.1 %)       | 1 (5.0 %)       |         |
| <b>Stratum</b>                    |                 |                 |         |
| Low                               | 25 (45.5 %)     | 7 (35.0 %)      | 0.585   |
| Middle/High                       | 30 (54.5 %)     | 13 (65.0 %)     |         |
| <b>HPE</b>                        |                 |                 |         |
| Subsidized                        | 10 (18.2 %)     | 3 (15.0 %)      | 0.982   |
| Contributive                      | 45 (81.8 %)     | 17 (85.0 %)     |         |
| <b>Home oxygen</b>                |                 |                 |         |
| Yes                               | 26 (47.3 %)     | 10 (50.0 %)     | 0.958   |
| No                                | 29 (52.7 %)     | 10 (50.0 %)     |         |
| <b>Urgency departments</b>        |                 |                 |         |
| Yes                               | 38 (69.1 %)     | 14 (70.0 %)     | 0.836   |
| No                                | 17 (30.9 %)     | 6 (30.0 %)      |         |
| <b>Hospitalization</b>            |                 |                 |         |
| Yes                               | 32 (58.2 %)     | 10 (50.0 %)     | 0.712   |
| No                                | 23 (41.8 %)     | 10 (50.0 %)     |         |
| <b>BMI classification</b>         |                 |                 |         |
| Thin                              | 6 (10.9 %)      | 1 (5.0 %)       | 0.742   |
| Normal                            | 25 (45.5 %)     | 10 (50.0 %)     |         |
| Excess weight/Obesity             | 24 (43.6 %)     | 9 (45.0 %)      |         |
| <b>Smoked</b>                     |                 |                 |         |
| Yes                               | 50 (90.9 %)     | 13 (65.0 %)     | 0.019   |
| No                                | 5 (9.1 %)       | 7 (35.0 %)      |         |
| <b>Exposure to firewood smoke</b> |                 |                 |         |
| Yes                               | 9 (16.4 %)      | 8 (40.0 %)      | 0.064   |
| No                                | 46 (83.6 %)     | 12 (60.0 %)     |         |



Meanwhile, Table 2 shows a comparison of the clinical factors between men and women. The mean of the pack/year index was significantly higher in men than in women ( $34.07 \pm 29.11$  vs.  $9.7 \pm 12.01$ , with an SE of means difference of  $24.37 \pm 4.758$  and a  $p$ -value  $< 0.001$ ). The mean time of exposure to firewood smoke in years was also lower in men ( $1.36 \pm 3.941$  vs.  $6.15 \pm 9.315$ ) with an SE of means difference of  $-4.786 \pm 1.524$  and a  $p$ -value  $< 0.037$ . Both the visits to urgency departments ( $2.70 \pm 4.835$  vs.  $0.98 \pm 0.991$ ) and the hospitalizations ( $1.10 \pm 1.832$  vs.  $0.78 \pm 0.994$ ) in the last year presented a higher mean value in the women, whereas the number of hospitalization days was higher in the men ( $8.62 \pm 11.62$  vs.  $6.40 \pm 8.016$ ).  $FEV_1$  ( $44.23 \pm 14.89$  vs.  $43.54 \pm 12.92$ ), FVC ( $69.80 \pm 18.78$  vs.  $67.32 \pm 17.82$ ), and  $FEV_1/FVC$  ( $61.24 \pm 10.34$  vs.  $63.25 \pm 6.144$ ) were similar to those of the women.

In relation to the changes presented in Table 3 after pulmonary rehabilitation, a clinical improvement with statistical significance ( $p < 0.05$ ) was found in men and women in distance covered ( $51.53 \pm 113.7$  meters vs.  $63.26 \pm 60.03$  meters), speed ( $7.320 \pm 13.73$  meters/minute vs.  $8.144 \pm 14.5$  meters/minute), estimated  $VO_2$  ( $1.4 \pm 2.229$  ml/kg/min vs.  $0.806 \pm 1.452$  ml/kg/min), METS ( $0.399 \pm 0.633$  METS vs.  $0.234 \pm 0.415$  METS) and mMRC dyspnea ( $0.736 \pm 0.88$  vs.  $1.294 \pm 0.415$ ). Initial mMRC dyspnea was significantly higher in women ( $3.6 \pm 1.273$  vs.  $2.89 \pm 1.031$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

There were also clinically positive results in both groups for HAD Anxiety ( $1.212 \pm 4.021$  vs.  $1.294 \pm 3.158$ ) and HRQoL (SGRQ Total [ $11.47 \pm 14.31$  vs.  $0.6 \pm 12.07$ ], SGRQ Symptoms [ $12.30 \pm 21.59$

vs.  $13.2 \pm 24.11$ ], SGRQ Activities [ $10.37 \pm 23.25$  vs.  $6.8 \pm 15.49$ ]), although statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) only in men. The SGRQ total showed statistical significance ( $p = 0.000$ ) with an important clinical improvement only in men, whereas it remained almost unchanged in women ( $11.47 \pm 14.31$  vs.  $0.6 \pm 12.07$ ). The SGRQ presented similar results in men and women in the symptoms ( $49.22 \pm 20.06$  vs.  $47.45 \pm 22.38$ ) and activities ( $61.07 \pm 22.51$  vs.  $61 \pm 24.78$ ) items, but worse in men in the impact ( $41.04 \pm 17.98$  vs.  $32.82 \pm 15.4$ ) and total ( $50.65 \pm 16.3$  vs.  $45.18 \pm 15.41$ ) items, with statistical significance only the group of men, possibly associated to the sample of women being smaller.

Arterial  $O_2$  saturation at rest presented statistical significance in men ( $p = 0.012$ ), although it did not vary in a significant manner between the two groups ( $-0.887 \pm 2.486$  vs.  $-0.278 \pm 1.127$ ). Arterial  $O_2$  saturation at the end of the 6MWT in women presented a slight increase with statistical significance ( $p = 0.035$ ), whereas the clinical impact was limited in men ( $1.333 \pm 2.473$  vs.  $-0.094 \pm 4.198$ ). Although not reaching statistical significance, the desaturation percentage during the 6MWT at the beginning and the end of pulmonary rehabilitation did present clinical importance in men ( $6.53 \pm 5.228$  vs.  $6.95 \pm 5.880$ ) and in women ( $4.85 \pm 3.843$  vs.  $5.85 \pm 5.412$ ), although the means differences only showed a slight increase of desaturation in women ( $-1.0 \pm 3.261$ ). In the number of stops during the 6MWT, the means difference was statistically significant in the men ( $0.135 \pm 0.397$ ) and did not vary in the women ( $0.0 \pm 1.118$ ). Variables such as respiratory frequency, heart rate, and fatigue did not show important clinical or statistically significant changes in any group.

**Table 2.** Clinical comparison between men and women with COPD

| Variables                                      | Men n=55            | Women n=20          | SE of means difference | p-value   |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Visits to urgency departments in the last year | $0.98 \pm (0.991)$  | $2.70 \pm (4.835)$  | $-1.718 \pm (3.994)$   | 0.131     |
| Hospitalizations in the last year              | $0.78 \pm (0.994)$  | $1.10 \pm (1.832)$  | $-0.318 \pm (1.210)$   | 0.468     |
| Days hospitalized                              | $8.62 \pm (11.62)$  | $6.40 \pm (8.016)$  | $2.218 \pm (3.405)$    | 0.434     |
| $FEV_1$  | $44.23 \pm (14.89)$ | $43.54 \pm (12.92)$ | $0.696 \pm (6.801)$    | 0.854     |
| FVC  | $69.80 \pm (18.78)$ | $67.32 \pm (17.82)$ | $2.473 \pm (7.176)$    | 0.611     |
| $FEV_1/FVC$                                    | $61.24 \pm (10.34)$ | $63.25 \pm (6.144)$ | $-2.003 \pm (5.924)$   | 0.311     |
| P/Y index                                      | $34.07 \pm (29.11)$ | $9.700 \pm (12.01)$ | $24.37 \pm (4.758)$    | $< 0.001$ |
| Time of exposure to firewood smoke in years    | $1.36 \pm (3.941)$  | $6.15 \pm (9.315)$  | $-4.786 \pm (1.524)$   | 0.037     |

**Table 3.** Changes in men and women with COPD after pulmonary rehabilitation

| Variable                                | Men n=55<br>Pre-PR | Men n=55<br>Post-PR | SE of means<br>difference | p-value | Women n=20<br>Pre-PR | Women n=20<br>Post-PR | SE of means<br>difference | p-value |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )                | 24.14 ± (4.473)    | 23.77 ± (5.511)     | 0.467 ± (3.272)           | 0.303   | 26.33 ± (6.192)      | 25.63 ± (5.750)       | 0.703 ± (2.715)           | 0.261   |
| Distance covered (meters)               | 316.2 ± (113.7)    | 369.4 ± (107.4)     | -51.53 ± (61.02)          | <0.001  | 226.1 ± (120.6)      | 289.4 ± (124.7)       | -63.26 ± (60.03)          | <0.001  |
| Speed (m/min)                           | 52.71 ± (18.95)    | 60.43 ± (19.61)     | -7.320 ± (13.73)          | <0.001  | 37.68 ± (20.10)      | 45.82 ± (22.93)       | -8.144 ± (14.50)          | 0.021   |
| HR at rest (bpm)                        | 82.05 ± (13.33)    | 83.42 ± (11.85)     | -1.264 ± (14.60)          | 0.531   | 82.00 ± (11.50)      | 81.06 ± (11.35)       | 0.833 ± (11.22)           | 0.757   |
| HR at the end of 6MWT (bpm)             | 107.2 ± (15.69)    | 110.2 ± (15.53)     | -3.113 ± (12.30)          | 0.071   | 104.4 ± (14.64)      | 102.3 ± (20.65)       | 2.222 ± (14.00)           | 0.510   |
| SaO <sub>2</sub> at rest (%)            | 93.38 ± (3.188)    | 94.25 ± (3.088)     | -0.887 ± (2.486)          | 0.012   | 94.50 ± (2.306)      | 94.94 ± (2.100)       | -0.278 ± (1.127)          | 0.311   |
| SaO <sub>2</sub> at the end of 6MWT (%) | 86.85 ± (6.246)    | 87.06 ± (6.954)     | -0.094 ± (4.198)          | 0.871   | 89.65 ± (4.475)      | 88.39 ± (5.992)       | 1.333 ± (2.473)           | 0.035   |
| Desaturation (%)                        | 6.53 ± (5.228)     | 6.95 ± (5.880)      | -0.418 ± (4.528)          | 0.496   | 4.85 ± (3.843)       | 5.85 ± (5.412)        | -1.000 ± (3.261)          | 0.186   |
| RF at rest (brpm)                       | 19.87 ± (4.342)    | 21.42 ± (10.60)     | -1.585 ± (10.12)          | 0.260   | 19.85 ± (3.435)      | 19.89 ± (3.197)       | 0.444 ± (5.090)           | 0.716   |
| RF at the end of 6MWT (brpm)            | 26.13 ± (4.982)    | 26.00 ± (5.446)     | 0.358 ± (4.884)           | 0.595   | 26.30 ± (3.672)      | 28.56 ± (4.985)       | -1.667 ± (5.941)          | 0.250   |
| Borg at rest                            | 0.47 ± (0.790)     | 0.30 ± (0.723)      | 0.189 ± (0.982)           | 0.168   | 0.60 ± (0.940)       | 0.29 ± (0.772)        | 0.412 ± (0.870)           | 0.069   |
| Borg at the end of 6MWT                 | 2.04 ± (1.774)     | 1.72 ± (1.524)      | 0.321 ± (1.978)           | 0.243   | 2.25 ± (1.482)       | 2.00 ± (1.904)        | 0.412 ± (2.265)           | 0.464   |
| Fatigue in LLS at rest                  | 0.40 ± (0.735)     | 0.32 ± (0.754)      | 0.094 ± (0.741)           | 0.358   | 0.90 ± (1.210)       | 0.71 ± (1.404)        | 0.353 ± (0.996)           | 0.163   |
| Fatigue in LLS at the end               | 1.51 ± (1.585)     | 1.72 ± (1.714)      | -0.245 ± (1.505)          | 0.241   | 2.30 ± (2.250)       | 1.94 ± (1.819)        | 0.353 ± (1.693)           | 0.403   |
| Stops in 6MWT                           | 0.25 ± (0.552)     | 0.12 ± (0.323)      | 0.135 ± (0.397)           | 0.018   | 0.70 ± (1.129)       | 0.70 ± (0.831)        | 0.000 ± (1.118)           | 1.000   |
| Estimated VO <sub>2</sub> (ml/kg/min)   | 8.045 ± (2.490)    | 9.445 ± (2.109)     | -1.400 ± (2.229)          | <0.001  | 7.275 ± (2.012)      | 8.082 ± (2.304)       | -0.806 ± (1.452)          | 0.022   |
| METS                                    | 2.297 ± (0.706)    | 2.697 ± (0.601)     | -0.399 ± (0.633)          | <0.001  | 2.081 ± (0.578)      | 2.315 ± (0.656)       | -0.234 ± (0.415)          | 0.021   |
| mMRC                                    | 2.89 ± (1.031)     | 2.11 ± (1.155)      | 0.736 ± (0.880)           | <0.001  | 3.60 ± (1.273)       | 2.41 ± (1.004)        | 1.294 ± (0.920)           | <0.001  |
| HAD: Anxiety                            | 5.75 ± (4.186)     | 4.62 ± (4.030)      | 1.212 ± (4.021)           | 0.034   | 7.85 ± (5.594)       | 6.65 ± (4.974)        | 1.294 ± (3.158)           | 0.110   |
| HAD: Depression                         | 4.76 ± (3.882)     | 4.15 ± (3.280)      | 0.769 ± (3.376)           | 0.107   | 4.95 ± (3.486)       | 4.06 ± (3.631)        | 0.824 ± (2.430)           | 0.181   |
| SGRQ Symptoms                           | 49.22 ± (20.06)    | 37.09 ± (19.89)     | 12.30 ± (21.59)           | <0.001  | 47.45 ± (22.38)      | 35.00 ± (24.66)       | 13.20 ± (24.11)           | 0.117   |
| SGRQ Activities                         | 61.07 ± (22.51)    | 49.60 ± (22.97)     | 10.37 ± (23.25)           | 0.002   | 61.00 ± (24.78)      | 53.00 ± (24.87)       | 6.800 ± (15.49)           | 0.198   |
| SGRQ Impact                             | 41.04 ± (17.98)    | 29.28 ± (17.55)     | 11.18 ± (15.54)           | <0.001  | 32.82 ± (15.14)      | 33.60 ± (17.18)       | -0.300 ± (8.097)          | 0.909   |
| SGRQ TOTAL                              | 50.65 ± (16.30)    | 38.60 ± (17.30)     | 11.47 ± (14.31)           | <0.001  | 45.18 ± (15.41)      | 44.50 ± (17.08)       | 0.600 ± (12.07)           | 0.879   |

When comparing the pre- and post-variables between men and women, Table 4 shows that both distance covered ( $90.18 \pm 30.17$  vs.  $80.03 \pm 29.98$ ) and speed ( $15.03 \pm 5.03$  vs.  $14.61 \pm 5.377$ ) presented important and statistically significant clinical differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) between men and women, respectively; similarly, estimated  $VO_2$  ( $0.769 \pm 0.62$  vs.  $1.363 \pm 0.564$ ) and METS ( $0.216 \pm 0.176$  vs.  $0.381 \pm 0.160$ ) presented increases, although the latter with statistical significance only at the end of

the program. Although the number of stops reached statistical significance at the end of the program, it did not present clinical relevance. SGRQ Impact ( $8.218 \pm 5.804$  vs.  $-4.317 \pm 6.033$ ) and SGRQ Total ( $5.473 \pm 5.341$  vs.  $-5.896 \pm 5.955$ ) presented a slight clinical advantage in the SE of means difference in favor of the men at the beginning of the program, and an advantage in favor of the women at the end. The rest of the variables do not show clinical or statistically significant changes.

**Table 4.** Comparisons between men and women at the beginning and the end of the pulmonary rehabilitation program

| Variable                                | Comparison of Pre-PR variables between Men and Women |         | Comparison of Post-PR variables between Men and Women |         |
|---|--|---------|---|---------|
|   | SE of means difference                               | p-value | SE of means difference                                | p-value |
| BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )                | -2.193 $\pm$ (1.299)                                 | 0.096   | -1.860 $\pm$ (1.463)                                  | 0.208   |
| Distance covered (meters)               | 90.18 $\pm$ (30.17)                                  | 0.004   | 80.03 $\pm$ (29.98)                                   | 0.009   |
| Speed (m/min)                           | 15.03 $\pm$ (5.030)                                  | 0.004   | 14.61 $\pm$ (5.377)                                   | 0.008   |
| HR at rest (bpm)                        | 0.055 $\pm$ (3.365)                                  | 0.987   | 2.360 $\pm$ (3.201)                                   | 0.464   |
| HR at the end of 6MWT (bpm)             | 2.618 $\pm$ (4.028)                                  | 0.518   | 7.894 $\pm$ (4.623)                                   | 0.092   |
| SaO <sub>2</sub> at rest (%)            | -1.118 $\pm$ (0.779)                                 | 0.156   | -0.699 $\pm$ (0.785)                                  | 0.376   |
| SaO <sub>2</sub> at the end of 6MWT (%) | -2.795 $\pm$ (1.524)                                 | 0.071   | -1.332 $\pm$ (1.836)                                  | 0.471   |
| Desaturation percentage (%)             | 1.677 $\pm$ (1.281)                                  | 0.194   | 1.095 $\pm$ (1.504)                                   | 0.469   |
| RF at rest (brpm)                       | 0.023 $\pm$ (1.078)                                  | 0.983   | 1.526 $\pm$ (2.548)                                   | 0.551   |
| RF at the end of 6MWT (brpm)            | -0.173 $\pm$ (1.221)                                 | 0.888   | -2.556 $\pm$ (1.456)                                  | 0.084   |
| Borg at rest                            | 0.127 $\pm$ (0.217)                                  | 0.560   | 0.008 $\pm$ (0.205)                                   | 0.970   |
| Borg at the end of 6MWT                 | -0.214 $\pm$ (0.445)                                 | 0.632   | -0.283 $\pm$ (0.452)                                  | 0.533   |
| Fatigue in ULs at rest                  | -0.500 $\pm$ (0.288)                                 | 0.095   | -0.385 $\pm$ (0.356)                                  | 0.293   |
| Fatigue in ULs at end of 6MWT           | 0.791 $\pm$ (0.547)                                  | 0.160   | -0.224 $\pm$ (0.485)                                  | 0.645   |
| Number of stops during 6MWT             | -0.445 $\pm$ (0.263)                                 | 0.104   | -0.649 $\pm$ (0.207)                                  | 0.006   |
| Estimated VO <sub>2</sub> (ml/kg/min)   | 0.769 $\pm$ (0.620)                                  | 0.219   | 1.363 $\pm$ (0.564)                                   | 0.018   |
| METS                                    | 0.216 $\pm$ (0.176)                                  | 0.224   | 0.381 $\pm$ (0.160)                                   | 0.020   |
| mMRC                                    | -0.709 $\pm$ (0.287)                                 | 0.016   | -0.299 $\pm$ (0.312)                                  | 0.343   |
| HAD: Anxiety                            | -2.105 $\pm$ (1.200)                                 | 0.084   | -2.032 $\pm$ (1.194)                                  | 0.094   |
| HAD: Depression                         | -0.186 $\pm$ (0.988)                                 | 0.851   | 0.095 $\pm$ (0.941)                                   | 0.920   |
| SGRQ Symptoms                           | 1.764 $\pm$ (6.752)                                  | 0.795   | 2.094 $\pm$ (7.125)                                   | 0.770   |
| SGRQ Activities                         | 0.073 $\pm$ (7.557)                                  | 0.992   | -3.396 $\pm$ (8.022)                                  | 0.674   |
| SGRQ Impact                             | 8.218 $\pm$ (5.804)                                  | 0.162   | -4.317 $\pm$ (6.033)                                  | 0.477   |
| SGRQ TOTAL                              | 5.473 $\pm$ (5.341)                                  | 0.309   | -5.896 $\pm$ (5.955)                                  | 0.326   |

## Discussion

This study allowed determining that, in the population under study, men participate more in pulmonary rehabilitation programs when compared to women; and that, despite the growing prevalence in the latter group, COPD affects both genders almost equally (18). This situation can be related to the delay in seeking medical assistance by the women (19) and to the fact that the medical personnel diagnoses the disease to more men because it is related to the smoking habit, which probably leads to more referrals to the PR programs (5,7).

It is noted that, in Colombia, there is growth in the prevalence of women with COPD, whereas the results of the PREPOCOL (20) and PUMA (21) studies reported higher prevalence in men. A more recent study showed that the prevalence between 2010 and 2015 was higher in women (22); nevertheless, this is based on the diagnoses obtained from the medical consultations of the Colombian population and could present underestimations given the difficulty in contrasting with diagnostic tests such as spirometry.

The study entitled *Proyecto Latinoamericano de Investigación en Obstrucción Pulmonar* (PLATINO) (23), conducted in five Latin American countries (Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Uruguay, and Venezuela), also showed that the prevalence of COPD was higher in men; however, in countries such as Sweden and Canada, higher prevalence is reported in women (2,24). This increase in the prevalence of COPD in women is possibly because smoking habit index in high-income countries is similar between men and women, which is in opposition to middle- and low-income countries (1) since the prevalence of COPD is directly related to that of the smoking habit. Added to this, air pollution in closed places due to the burning of wood and other biomass fuels, such as organic sources for energy production, generate gases and harmful particles, thus becoming another important occupational factor of COPD in some countries (18), this type of exposure being more common in women (25).

Regarding the sociodemographic conditions, most of the participants of this study lived in the city of Cali, which aligns with the description by some authors who state that, in our context, the patients with COPD mainly attend pulmonary rehabilitation programs located in the big cities, thus reflecting access to the PR programs (26). It has also been evidenced that the smoking habit is not an exclusive risk factor associated with COPD, as set out by the WHO, and, therefore, there are clear differences in risk factors between men and women (25,27).

In this study, the time of exposure to firewood smoke was 5 times higher in women, which is similar to the national data, where 39 % of the population over 40 years old, living in the five main cities, had cooked with firewood for more than 10 years. Consequently, the risk is higher in women due to their more frequent devotion to the art of cooking (28). This same situation has been reported in a study conducted in China, where exposure to firewood smoke is higher in women and, consequently, it is a more relevant risk factor than the smoking habit (7).

Half of the study population used home oxygen, a condition that could have been related to the severity of the airflow limitation in the total population according to the 2021 GOLD Guide (GOLD 3: severe, FEV<sub>1</sub> mean < 45 %) (18). This is supported by the conclusions of Perincek and Avci (29), who found that BMI, FEV<sub>1</sub>, and smoking habit, among others, affect the severity of COPD.

The women presented more admissions to urgency departments and hospitalizations, although the men had longer stays, data that are in agreement with those reported by other authors (19). In addition, Lisspers *et al.* (30) reported a higher risk (12 %) for early exacerbation in men and a higher number of visits to urgency departments, hospitalizations and hospital stays when considering the incidents related to COPD (23).

All the variables related to the capacity for physical exercise showed clinically and statistically significant improvements. The distance covered in the 6MWT test and the pre- and post-PR speeds were higher in the men, but it was the women that presented the most significant change at the end of the program in both variables, evidencing increases of 63.26 meters in distance covered and of 8.144 m/min in speed in the post-PR 6MWT test. In both cases, the clinically significant minimum difference of 35 meters was exceeded (31). Spielmanns *et al.* (32) also found a lower pre-PR distance in women and a greater difference in the distance covered in women post-PR, because the initial walk distance is related to the response probability, since a longer initial walk distance is in line with a reduced response probability, as was the case with the men in our study.

VO<sub>2</sub> and the METS also improved significantly in both groups, although in these two variables the gain was greater in the men since Robles *et al.* (33) reported similar results: the women presented worse pre-PR results than the men and the capacity for physical exercise improved similarly in both genders. Neverthe-

less, in one of the studies reviewed, it was reported that the average improvement did not reach clinical relevance for any of the groups (even when taking 54 m as a clinically significant distance).

Pulmonary function was homogeneous and the mMRC data presented statistical significance in both groups ( $p < 0.001$ ), with higher dyspnea numbers both at the beginning and at the end of PR. Nevertheless, a more relevant clinical difference was found pre-PR. According to these data, a systematic review sets out that, for a similar degree of airflow limitation, women present more dyspnea than men. Likewise, a clinical improvement was found in both groups, as well as greater impact in the women at the end of PR (33). However, reports were also found with similar baseline dyspnea values in both genders, such as the study by Jia G. *et al.* (7) with mMRC $_m < 2$ .

On the other hand, the initial anxiety level was higher in the women, with a similar clinical improvement post-PR. These results are similar to those reported by other authors (34), who state that women are more concerned about caring for their disease; however, it has been reported that, in PR programs, both genders showed similar anxiety levels and health statuses with similar improvements, although reduced post-PR (33).

The pre-PR depression level and the post-PR improvements presented similar behaviors in both groups. SGRQ also presented an important positive change in both groups concerning symptoms and activities, whereas the impact and total items only improved in men. The systematic review by Robles *et al.* (33) suggests that women present more probabilities of being benefited in terms of dyspnea, health, and psychological state; with respect to HRQoL, the studies did not find gender differences, reason why it is assumed that PR equally benefits men and women in relation to the quality of life (35).

As limitations of this study, it is evidenced that, in the population linkage, there could have been biases in the selection because no randomized sampling selection was performed, which was evidenced in a predominance of linked men in the study. In its turn, the instruments used do not guarantee initial homogeneity between the genders, the reason why their sensitivity to change due to this condition should be a study motivation for future research. The use of mixed-methods studies might help to better understand the results of the interventions based on physical exercise, given that, although both groups experienced significant improvements, these results may be perceived differently according to gender.

## Conclusions

In this study, it was evidenced that, when compared to the men, the women presented more dyspnea and lower aerobic capacity before the pulmonary rehabilitation. However, after PR, the women presented improvements of 1.294 points in mMRC dyspnea and 63.26 meters in distance covered related to the aerobic capacity,  $p\text{-value} = < 0.001$ ; on the other hand, the men presented reductions of 1.212 points in anxiety,  $p\text{-value} = 0.034$ , and of 11.47 points in quality of life in the total SGRQ domain,  $p\text{-value} = < 0.001$ . Given the above, a different impact is evidenced in pulmonary rehabilitation between men and women; and, for this reason, studies are suggested with interventions targeted at responding to the particular needs of the patients with COPD who require pulmonary rehabilitation.

## Acknowledgments

To the population of participants, to *Clínica de Occidente S.A.* and to *Institución Universitaria Escuela Nacional del Deporte*.

**Conflict of interests:** None declared.

## References

- Schraufnagel DE, Schraufnagel AM. The Influence of Social and Economic Conditions on Respiratory Health. In: Celedón J, editor. *Achieving Respiratory Health Equality*. Humana Press, Cham; 2017, p. 27-38. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43447-6\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43447-6_3)
- Doucet M, Rochette L, Hamel D. Incidence, Prevalence, and Mortality Trends in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Over 2001 to 2011: A Public Health Point of View of the Burden. *Can Respir J*. 2016; 1-10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/7518287>
- Wang C, Xu J, Yang L, Xu Y, Zhang X, Bai C, et al. Prevalence and risk Factors of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in China (the China Pulmonary Health [CPH] Study): a National Cross-Sectional Study. *Lancet*. 2018; 391(10131):1706-1717. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)30841-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30841-9)
- Aryal S, Diaz-Guzman E, Mannino DM. COPD and Gender Differences: An Update. *Transl Res*. 2013; 162(4):208-218. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trsl.2013.04.003>
- Delgado A, Saletti-Cuesta L, Lopez-Fernandez LA, Gil-Garrido N, Luna del Castillo JD. Gender Inequalities in COPD Decision-Making in Primary Care. *Respir Med*. 2016; 114:91-96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2016.03.017>
- Zhou Y, Zhong NS, Li X, et al. Tiotropium in Early-Stage Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2017; 377(10):923-935. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1700228>
- Jia G, Lu M, Wu R, Chen Y, Yao W. Gender Difference on the Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice of COPD Diagnosis and Treatment: A National, Multicenter, Cross-Sectional Survey in China. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis*. 2018; 13:3269-80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S176173>
- Hong Y, Ji W, An S, Han SS, Lee SJ, Kim WJ. Sex Differences of COPD Phenotypes in Nonsmoking Patients. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis*. 2016; 11:1657-1662. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S108343>
- Miller MR, Hankinson J, Brusasco V, Burgos F, Casaburi R, Coates A, et al. Standardisation of Spirometry. *Eur Respir J*. 2005; 26(2):319-338. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.05.00034805>
- Parshall MB, Schwartzstein RM, Adams L, Banzett RB, Manning HL, Bourbeau J, et al. An Official American Thoracic Society Statement: Update on the Mechanisms, Assessment, and Management of Dyspnea. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2012; 185(4): 435-452. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201111-2042ST>
- American Thoracic Society. ATS Statement: Guidelines for the Six-Minute Walk Test. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2002; 166(1):111-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.166.1.at1102>
- Betancourt-Peña J, Muñoz-Erazo B, Mora-Guerra R. Calidad de vida en pacientes con enfermedad Pulmonar obstructiva crónica al ingreso de un programa de rehabilitación pulmonar. *Rev Colomb Rehab*. 2015; 14(1):46-53. Disponible en: <https://revistas.echr.edu.co/index.php/RCCR/article/view/18/40>
- Ferrer M, Alonso J, Prieto L, Plaza V, Monso E, Marrades R, et al. Validity and Reliability of the St George's Respiratory Questionnaire After Adaptation to a Different Language and Culture: the Spanish Example. *Eur Respir J*. 1996; 9(6):1160-6. Disponible en: <https://erj.ersjournals.com/content/9/6/1160.article-info>
- Betancourt-Peña J, Tanguino-Rosero S, Rosero-Carvajal HE, Hurtado-Gutiérrez H. Diferencias de la rehabilitación pulmonar en pacientes con EPOC, con y sin indicación de oxígeno domiciliario a largo plazo. *Fisioterapia*. 2018; 40(4): 169-177. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ft.2018.03.005>
- American College of Sports Medicine, editors. *ACSM's Guidelines for Exercise Testing and Prescription*. Ninth Edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2014.
- Ávila-Valencia JC, Muñoz-Erazo BE, Sarria V, Benavides-Cordoba V, Betancourt-Peña J. Cambios en el Bode-Bodex de pacientes con EPOC al culminar un programa de rehabilitación pulmonar. *Rev Col Reh*. 2016; 15(1):40-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30788/RevColReh.v15.n1.2016.7>



17. Forgiarini-Junior LA, Esquinas AM. Pulmonary Rehabilitation in Severe COPD With Hyperinflation: Some Insights into Exercise Performance. *J bras pneumol*. 2016; 42(5): 397-8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1806-37562016000000169>
18. Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD), editors. Global Strategy for the Diagnosis, Management and Prevention of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (2021 report). Barcelona: GOLD; 2020. Disponible en: [https://goldcopd.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/GOLD-REPORT-2021-v1.1-25Nov20\\_WMV.pdf](https://goldcopd.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/GOLD-REPORT-2021-v1.1-25Nov20_WMV.pdf)
19. Tsiligianni I, Rodriguez MR, Lisspers K, LeeTan T, Infantino A. Call to Action: Improving Primary Care for Women with COPD. *NPJ Prim. Care Respir. Med*. 2017; 27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41533-017-0013-2>
20. Caballero A, Torres-Duque CA, Jaramillo C, Bolívar F, Sanabria F, Osorio P, et al. Prevalence of COPD in Five Colombian Cities Situated at Low, Medium, and High Altitude (PREPOCOL study). *Chest J*. 2008; 133(2):343-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.07-1361>
21. Casas-Herrera A, Montes de Oca M, López-Varela MV, Aguirre C, Schiavi E, Jardim JR, et al. COPD Underdiagnosis and Misdiagnosis in a High-Risk Primary Care Population in Four Latin American Countries. A Key to Enhance Disease Diagnosis: The PUMA Study. *PLoS One*. 2016; 11(4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0152266>
22. Gil Y, Torres C, Figueredo M, Hernández F, Castañeda C, Lasalvia P, Rosselli D. An Estimate of the Prevalence of COPD in Colombia Based on the Diagnoses Reported in the Individual Registry of Health Services Delivery (RIPS). *Rev Colomb Neumol* 2019; 31. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30789/rcneumologia.v31.n1.2019.325>
23. Menezes AMB, Perez-Padilla R, Jardim JB, Muiño A, Lopez MV, Valdivia G, et al. Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in Five Latin American Cities (The PLATINO Study): a Prevalence Study. *Lancet*. 2005; 366(9500):1875-1881. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)67632-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67632-5)
24. Lisspers K, Larsson K, Janson C, Stållberg B, Tsiligianni I, Gutzwiller F, et al. Gender Differences Among Swedish COPD Patients: Results From The ARCTIC, a Real-World Retrospective Cohort Study. *NPJ Prim. Care Respir. Med*. 2019; 29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41533-019-0157-3>
25. Camp PG, Ramirez-Venegas A, Sansores RH, et al. COPD Phenotypes in Biomass Smoke Versus Tobacco Smoke exposed Mexican Women. *Eur Respir J*. 2014; 43(3):725-734. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00206112>
26. Duran-Palomino D, Wilches-Luna EC, Martínez-Santa J. Descripción y análisis del estado actual de los programas asistenciales de rehabilitación pulmonar en cuatro ciudades de Colombia. *Rev Cien Salud*. 2010; 8(1):41-53. Disponible en: <https://revistas.urosario.edu.co/index.php/revsalud/article/view/1218>
27. Hong Y, Ji W, An S, Han SS, Lee SJ, Kim WJ. Sex Differences of COPD Phenotypes in Nonsmoking Patients. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis*. 2016; 11(1):1657-1662. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S108343>
28. Torres-Duque CA, García-Rodríguez MC, González-García M. Enfermedad pulmonar obstructiva crónica por humo de leña: ¿un fenotipo diferente o una entidad distinta? *Arch. Bronconeumol*. 2016; 52(8): 425-431. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arbres.2016.04.004>
29. Perincek G, Avci S. Statistical Evaluation of COPD Patients With Respect to Gender: A Cross Sectional Study. *Baqai J Health Sci*. 2018; 2:18-27. Available from: <https://baqai.edu.pk/baqaiassets/bjhs//admin/articlefiles/2019/1549274553upl0.pdf>
30. Lisspers K, Larsson K, Janson C, Stållberg B, Tsiligianni I, Gutzwiller F, et al. Gender Differences Among Swedish COPD Patients: Results From The ARCTIC, a Real-World Retrospective Cohort Study. *NPJ Prim Care Respir Med*. 2019; 29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41533-019-0157-3>
31. Puhan MA, Mador MJ, Held U, Goldstein R, Guyatt GH, Shunemann HJ. Interpretation of Treatment Changes in 6-minute Walk Distance in Patients with COPD. *Eur Respir J*. 2008; 32:637-43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00140507>
32. Spielmanns M, Gloeckl R, Schmoor C, Windisch W, Storre JH, Boensch M, Kenn K. Effects on Pulmonary Rehabilitation in Patients with COPD or ILD: a Retrospective Analysis of Clinical and Functional Predictors With Particular Emphasis on Gender. *Respir Med*. 2016; 113:8-14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2016.02.006>

33. Robles P, Brooks D, Goldstein R, Salbach N, Mathur S. Gender-Associated Differences in Pulmonary Rehabilitation Outcomes in People With Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: A Systematic Review. *J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev.* 2014; 34(2):87-97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1097/HCR.0000000000000018>
34. Raghavan D, Varkey A, Bartter T. Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: The Impact of Gender. *Curr Opin Pulm Med.* 2017; 23(2): 117-123. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MCP.0000000000000353>
35. Guerrero-Serrano PA, Bolívar-Grimaldos F, Cano-Rosales DJ, Rodríguez-Corredor LC. Efectos de la rehabilitación pulmonar en la tolerancia al ejercicio y la calidad de vida de pacientes con enfermedad pulmonar del nororiente colombiano en el año 2017. *Médicas UIS.* 2018; 31(3): 27-36. Available from: <https://revistas.uis.edu.co/index.php/revistamedicasuis/article/view/9230/9051>