



Revista Portuguesa de Pneumologia

ISSN: 0873-2159

sppneumologia@mail.telepac.pt

Sociedade Portuguesa de Pneumologia
Portugal

Vieira, T.; Belchior, I.; Almeida, J.; Hespanhol, V.; Winck, J.C.

Response to the letter "Ambulatory oxygen: Is the 6 minute walk test the best option?"

Revista Portuguesa de Pneumologia, vol. 17, núm. 6, novembro-diciembre, 2011, pp. 290-291

Sociedade Portuguesa de Pneumologia

Lisboa, Portugal

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=169722769013>

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

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System

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

Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

4. Dolmage TE, Hill K, Evans RA, Goldstein RS. Has my patient responded? Interpreting clinical measurements such as the six minute walk test. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2011 [Epub ahead of print].
5. Puente-Maestu L. Walk tests in the prescription of portable oxygen therapy. *Arch Bronconeumol*. 2005;41:591–2.
6. Ram FS, Wedzicha JA. Ambulatory oxygen for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2002;CD000238.

S. Diaz Lobato*, S. Mayoralas Alises, J.L. García C
Servicio de Neumología, Hospital Ramón y Cajal, Madrid, Spain

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: sdiazlobato@gmail.com (S. Diaz Lobato).

doi:10.1016/j.rppneu.2011.07.008

Response to the letter ‘‘Ambulatory oxygen: Is the 6 minute walk test the best option?’’

Resposta à carta ‘‘Oxigenoterapia de deambulação: será o teste de 6 minutos de marcha a melhor opção?’’

We would like to thank the authors for their comment on our article¹ about the study on the prescription of ambulatory oxygen (AO) and for raising very pertinent and important issues.

Our findings of relatively low adherence to prescribed AO are consistent with other studies, for example, a recent Italian survey² which confirmed that only 41% of the patients reported used liquid oxygen when outside the house.

In our study we clearly defined the criteria for use of AO; these consisted of exercise hypoxemia which is documented by a standardized 6-min walk test (6MWT) on air, evidence of significant desaturation (to 88% or less), the patient being responsive to oxygen, and significant daily activity. According to our data, positive response during the 6MWT did not help to predict greater use of the portable oxygen systems (POS). This led us to the conclusion, highlighted in the article, that non-adherence to AO may be closely related to the social stigma or the physical characteristics (like weight) of the POS.

The authors correctly discuss the role of the 6MWT in prescribing AO. In fact, although the ATS statement on the 6MWT³ is not very clear in relation to prescribing AO, some authors have suggested the need for up to five 6MWT. To minimize the learning effect, the first two are training sessions, one of which may be performed with the patient carrying the weight of the oxygen source,⁴ and then the oxygen titration should be performed after three 6MWT to evaluate the effect of breathing air and two different oxygen doses.⁵ However, there is no standard titration method. According to the COPD ATS Guidelines it is recommended that the resting flow rate be increased by 1L/min during exercise.⁶ We opted to perform the walk test with the highest flow possible (6 L/min) because in some studies doubling the resting dose was not sufficient to prevent hypoxemia⁴ and we wanted to make sure of providing adequate oxygenation during all activities. Moreover, we do not believe that in the real world the repetition of so many 6MWT is actually feasible and, in fact, 26% of respirologists around the world do not perform the oxygen titration test during exercise on every patient.⁷

It is important to note that the BTS recommendations published in 2006⁸ suggest that ‘‘the initial assessment

should be followed by a review after two months to assess the true value of AO can be judged by interview, diary or by monitoring oxygen usage’’. In addition home follow-up with monitoring is strongly recommended. Without this monitoring patients might use systems or settings that do not maintain adequate oxygenation and as a consequence their physical activity is restricted and the health benefits lost. In our case, if the strict protocol is not followed and so long-term compliance with AO can be affected.

We believe, therefore, that the acute assessment should be only one component of an AO evaluation. Continuous compliance of oxygen use is urgently needed and the designed Oxygen Therapy Monitoring Devices can help in the management of these patients.⁹

As we stated (because acute improvements in physiological parameters do not help predict outdoor activities) we need better tests to identify those who really respond to oxygen. As has been suggested by Vonbank et al.¹⁰ hemodynamic response to oxygen can be a better predictor. Other studies implied that the more hyperinflated COPD patients are the ones that can benefit most¹¹ or we may even have to be more stringent in the criteria for AO prescription as suggested by Leach et al.⁵ and only consider those with a 50% improvement in exercise ability!

One thing is certain, although we have to increase the consensus around AO prescription, repeated educational sessions are definitely needed to improve compliance with long-term oxygen therapy.

References

1. Vieira T, Belchior I, Almeida J, Hespanhol V, Winck J. Prevalence and patterns of ambulatory oxygen usage – experience from a university hospital. *Rev Port Pneumol*. 2011;17:159–64.
2. Neri M, Melani AS, Mioreselli AM, Zanchetta D, Bellotti C, Cinti C, et al. Educational Study Group of the Italian Association of Hospital Pulmonologists (AIPO) Long-term oxygen therapy in chronic respiratory failure: a Multicenter Study on Oxygen Therapy Adherence (MISOTA). *Respir Med*. 2006 May;100:795–806.
3. ATS Committee on Proficiency Standards for Clinical Practice. Function Laboratories ATS statement: guidelines for the six-minute walk test. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2000;161(1):111–7.
4. Nasilowski J, Przybylowski T, Zielinski J, Chazan R. Oxygen supplementary oxygen benefits from a portable oxygen concentrator and a liquid oxygen portable device during a six-minute walk test in COPD patients on long-term oxygen therapy. *Respir Med*. 2008;102 July:1021–5 [Epub 21 Mar 2008].

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

5. Leach RM, Davidson AC, Chinn S, Twort CH, Cameron IR, Bateman NT. Portable liquid oxygen and exercise ability in severe respiratory disability. *Thorax*. 1992;47 October:781–9.
 6. Standards for the diagnosis and care of patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. American Thoracic Society. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1995;152(5 Pt 2 (November)):S77–121.
 7. Wijkstra PJ, Guyatt GH, Ambrosino N, Celli BR, Güell R, Muir JF, et al. International approaches to the prescription of long-term oxygen therapy. *Eur Respir J*. 2001 Dec;18:909–13.
 8. Working Group on Home Oxygen Services, 2006 British Thoracic Society. Downloaded at: <http://www.brit-thoracic.org.uk/Portals//Clinical%20Information/Home%20Oxygen%20Service/clinical%20adultoxygenjan06.pdf>.
 9. NOWOX Oxygen Therapy Monitoring Device, <http://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00800072>.
 10. Vonbank K, Ziesche R, Higenbottam TW, Stiebellehner L, Petkov V, Schenk P, et al. Controlled prospective randomised trial on the effects on pulmonary haemodynamics of the ambulatory long term use of nitric oxide and oxygen in patients with severe COPD. *Thorax*. 2003 Apr;58:289–93.
 11. Somfay A, Porszasz J, Lee SM, Casaburi R. Dose-response of oxygen on hyperinflation and exercise endurance in hypoxaemic COPD patients. *Eur Respir J*. 2001;18:84.
- T. Vieira^a, I. Belchior^b, J. Almeida^b, V. Hespanhol^c, J.C. Winck^{c,*}
- ^a *Serviço de Imunoalergologia, Hospital de São João, Porto, Portugal*
^b *Serviço de Pneumologia, Hospital de São João, EPE Porto, Portugal*
^c *Serviço de Pneumologia, Hospital de São João, EPE Porto/Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade do Porto, Portugal*
- * Corresponding author.
E-mail address: jwinck@hsjoao.min-saude.pt (J.C. Winck).
doi:10.1016/j.rppneu.2011.09.002