



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Cutts, S., Burls, A., Akinlabi, K., Hurst, J. R., Mandalia, S. & Mansell, S. K. (2018). A randomised crossover trial investigating the effect of a portable positive pressure ventilation device on exercise tolerance in patients with COPD. *European Respiratory Journal*, 52(Suppl), PA2054. doi: 10.1183/13993003.congress-2018.pa2054

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/21037/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.congress-2018.pa2054>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

A randomised crossover trial investigating the effect of a portable positive pressure ventilation device on exercise tolerance in patients with COPD

Background: Dyspnoea is a common symptom in COPD and can lead to progressive decline in exercise capacity. Non-Invasive Ventilation has been shown to improve symptoms and exercise capacity but is clinically impractical due to logistical constraints. A portable ventilation device (Vitabreath) may overcome these barriers and be a useful adjunct therapy.

Aim: To investigate the effect of Vitabreath on exercise capacity in patients with COPD.

Methods: Randomised crossover design; 12 participants with COPD (FEV₁% 45±15) performed 3 Six-Minute Walk Tests using i) Vitabreath, ii) Threshold Positive Expiratory Pressure (PEP), or iii) no device. Primary outcome: six-minute walk distance (6MWD). Secondary outcomes: changes in heart rate, oxygen saturations (SpO₂), dyspnoea, and lower limb (LL) fatigue, and recovery time of each variable.

Results: Mean 6MWD was less using Vitabreath compared to no device (p=0.01). Use of Vitabreath resulted in a smaller change in dyspnoea (p=0.008) and LL fatigue scores (p=0.02), and a faster LL recovery time (p=0.01) compared to Threshold PEP. SpO₂ recovery time was faster using Vitabreath compared to both Threshold PEP (p=0.008) and no device (p=0.03). Parametric data presented as mean ±SD, Non-parametric data presented as median (IQR).

Conclusion: The data suggest no benefit in using the Vitabreath in improving exercise capacity.

	Vitabreath	Threshold PEP	No device	ANOVA p=
6MWD (m)	417 ±50	430 ±67	465 ±71	0.01
Change in Variable				
Dyspnoea (Borg)	2 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)	0.03
LL fatigue (Borg)	0 (2)	2 (1)	1 (1)	0.03
Recovery time (seconds)				
LL fatigue	0 (120)	120 (180)	120 (180)	0.014
SpO ₂	28 (62)	68 (113)	83 (83)	0.003

