Exercise Testing in Patients With Interstitial Lung Disease

To the Editor:

We commend Erbes and colleagues (January 1997)† for investigating the value of lung function tests in predicting prognosis of patients with interstitial lung disease (ILD), but are concerned that data available to them were not considered and that comments in the accompanying editorial‡ “Simple may be better” could be misinterpreted. First, the emphasis on total lung capacity (TLC) and vital capacity rather than other physiologic measures may be unwise. The normal mean FVC and low mean FEV₁/V̇̇rack found in their smoking subjects (over half of their sample) are not physiologically characteristic of the usual idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis and suggests that their patients might have a different disorder. Second, as prognostic factors, they failed to present important and relevant data available to them, such as VO₂max/VO₂ predicted and exercise physiologic dead space ventilation (V̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̆
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To the Editor:

We appreciate the comments by Hansen and Wasserman on the work of Erbes et al. and our accompanying editorial. We will leave to Erbes and colleagues to answer the issues raised regarding the specifics of their study.

Exercise testing in interstitial lung disease (ILD) remains an area for clinical investigation. Studies defining exercise pathophysiology, mechanisms of exercise limitation, cause of dyspnea, etc. offer potential for patient management. At present, however, we find no reported clinical experience that convincingly ties measures of exercise physiology to clinical decision making. Hansen and Wasserman note that “the pathophysiology is not the same in all patients with ILD” and base their claim of importance of exercise studies on a retrospective review of 42 patients studied on a single occasion. Nine patients were diagnosed with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF), only five of whom had a lung biopsy. It’s not stated whether this is a surgical biopsy or transbronchial biopsy. The other 33 patients suffered from an assortment of illnesses, including collagen vascular-associated ILD, sarcoidosis, pulmonary alveolar proteinosis, asbestosis, and pneumoconiosis. Their finding of exercise limitation defined by abnormalities of pulmonary circulation is provocative, but its importance is in stimulating further investigation and not as a mandate for the addition of exercise testing to current practice. We continue to recommend a directed assessment for management of the patient with IPF, which includes the measurement of total lung capacity, vital capacity, and diffusion of single breath at baseline and at serial follow-ups for information regarding prognosis and the course of the disease. We utilize gas...