

## Letter to the Editor

### **Letter to the Editor: Validity and reliability concerns associated with cardiopulmonary exercise testing young people with cystic fibrosis. Response to: Statement on Exercise Testing in Cystic Fibrosis (Hebestreit *et al.*, 2015 *Respiration* 90(4):332-51)**

Zoe L. Saynor<sup>a\*</sup>, Dr. Alan R. Barker<sup>b</sup>, Dr. Patrick J. Oades<sup>c</sup>, Owen W. Tomlinson<sup>b</sup>, Prof. Craig Anthony Williams<sup>b</sup>

Word count: 995 words

Short Title: Validity and reliability concerns associated with CPET in CF

<sup>a</sup>Department of Sport and Exercise Science, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK.

<sup>b</sup> Children's Health and Exercise Research Centre, Sport and Health Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, Devon, UK.

<sup>c</sup> Paediatric unit, Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust, Exeter, Devon, UK.

\*Correspondence to: Z.L. Saynor, Department of Sport and Exercise Science, Spinnaker Building, Cambridge Road, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, Hampshire, UK.

Tel: +44 (0)2392 843080

Email: [zoe.saynor@port.ac.uk](mailto:zoe.saynor@port.ac.uk)

1 The recent statement by Hebestreit and colleagues [1] on behalf of the European Cystic  
2 Fibrosis Society (ECFS) Exercise Working Group and endorsed by the European Respiratory  
3 Society, should be commended for their efforts to establish consensus regarding exercise  
4 testing for young people with CF. Exercise testing is a valuable investigative tool for the the  
5 clinical management and scientific investigation of children and adolescents with CF and this  
6 document provides an international standpoint regarding the importance of cardiopulmonary  
7 exercise testing (CPET) within the management of this patient group. However, it is our view  
8 that the authors have missed an opportunity to provide a contemporary and comprehensive  
9 overview of the CPET 'toolkit' currently available.

10 The authors state that this document will '*describe the current best practice*  
11 *recommendations for conducting exercise tests in patients with CF*' and '*summarises the*  
12 *information available on specific test protocols and outcome parameters (Page 2)*'. The  
13 authors recommend the Godfrey protocol [2] when using the cycle ergometer, with measures  
14 of arterial oxygen saturation and, when possible, pulmonary gas exchange and ventilation.  
15 Whilst this does represent progress from the routinely used shuttle and step tests, the authors  
16 failed to acknowledge several limitations inherent to the Godfrey protocol and the  
17 recommended use of criteria to verify a maximal test. This is surprising, given that the ECFS  
18 Clinical Trials Network Standardisation Committee recently called for research assessing the  
19 validity, reproducibility and feasibility of outcome measures utilised in the assessment of  
20 patients with CF and the most appropriate exercise test for paediatric patients [3].

21 The authors rightfully acknowledge that an issue with shuttle and step tests is that it can be  
22 difficult to determine whether a maximal effort was made. However, they then state that '*the*  
23 *Godfrey protocol provides valid information for all CF relevant indications for an exercise*  
24 *test*'. The authors recommend that since not all individuals display the tradition verification  
25 criterion of a plateau in oxygen uptake ( $\dot{V}O_2$ ) upon exhaustion, at least one of the following

26 should be used to confirm a maximal effort: the patient achieves a predicted  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  or peak  
27 power output ( $W_{\text{peak}}$ ); the patient reaches maximal heart rate ( $HR_{\text{max}}$ ), peak ventilation  
28 approaches maximal voluntary ventilation, respiratory exchange ratio (RER) is  $> 1.03$ ,  
29 exertion is 9-10 on the 0-10 scale or  $\geq 17$  on a 7-20 scale. However, our research group  
30 recently demonstrated that the use of secondary criteria to confirm a maximal effort (e.g.  
31  $RER > 1.00$  or  $1.10$ ,  $HR$  of  $180 \text{ b}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$  or  $95\%$  age-predicted  $HR_{\text{max}}$ ), in line with those  
32 recommended by Hebestreit *et al.* [1], are invalid and can drastically underreport maximal  
33  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{max}}$  in some young people with CF [4], a finding consistent with healthy children and  
34 adolescents [5]. Accepting submaximal or rejecting ‘true’ maximal values can distort the  
35 clinical application and interpretation of CPET, which is important given that  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{max}}$  is an  
36 indicator of prognosis [6,7], quality of life [8] and risk of hospitalisation for exacerbations [9]  
37 in people with CF.

38 Given the limited use of secondary verification criteria to verify a maximal CPET effort in  
39 young people with CF, we have developed an alternative protocol to do so. A procedure  
40 termed the ‘supramaximal verification phase’ ( $S_{\text{max}}$ ), in which an exhaustive ramp  
41 incremental test precedes an exhaustive individualised constant work rate test at an intensity  
42 above  $W_{\text{peak}}$ , can confirm whether a ‘true’ measure of  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{max}}$  has been obtained, which is  
43 fundamental to the utility of this outcome parameter in CF. Significantly, this finding is in  
44 line with data in healthy adults [10-18], children [5] and other paediatric clinical groups [19].  
45 Although the authors present information regarding ‘*was the test maximal?*’, they failed to  
46 reference this published evidence and presented inaccurate verification criteria as *best* CPET  
47 practice for young people with CF, which we feel should be approached with caution. This  
48 statement also provides a summary of the reliability of exercise tests for young people with  
49 CF, however again published evidence has been ignored. We recently reported both the short-  
50 and medium-term reproducibility of a valid CPET protocol for young people with CF [4],

51 which was shown to reduce the error of measurement when compared with an isolated  
52 incremental CPET to derived  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$  [20]. To the best of our knowledge we are not aware of  
53 any reproducibility or validity data for  $\dot{V}O_{2\text{max}}$  in young people with CF derived using the  
54 Godfrey protocol.

55 Whilst the focus of this letter addresses validity and reproducibility issues with the Godfrey  
56 protocol, other important issues to consider are: ‘step’ increases in work rate derived  
57 exclusively from stature can result in insufficient test durations of  $\leq 4$  minutes [21]. This  
58 procedure limits our ability to characterise the progressive increase in  $\dot{V}O_2$  during exercise  
59 and determine submaximal measures of aerobic fitness (e.g. the gas exchange threshold or  
60  $\dot{V}O_2$  mean response time) which, as highlighted in this consensus statement, may provide  
61 better predictors of mortality in adolescents with CF [22]. In accordance with others [23], we  
62 recommend a ramp incremental exercise test, which aims to reach volitional exhaustion in 8-  
63 12 minutes [24], followed by  $S_{\text{max}}$  verification of maximal CPET parameters. Not only has  
64 this testing protocol been demonstrated as safe and feasible in young people with CF in a  
65 research setting, it is also now used as part of patients’ annual clinical review with UK based  
66 CF clinics in Exeter, Southampton and Portsmouth, demonstrating the feasibility of its  
67 clinical implementation. The CF-specific linear regression model to predict  $W_{\text{peak}}$  and  
68 calculate individualised workload increments to reach volitional exhaustion in  $\sim 10$  minutes  
69 developed by Hulzebos and colleagues should help prevent short test durations [25].

70 Whilst it is recognised that there are no large scale studies directly comparing exercise testing  
71 protocols, we feel the authors could have provided a more contemporary overview of the  
72 evidence concerning the validity and reproducibility of CPET protocols available for use in  
73 young people with CF. If the clinical utility of CPET to provide a comprehensive evaluation

74 of physiological (dys)function and stratify patients with CF is to be realised, these important  
75 practical considerations must be acknowledged.

## 76 REFERENCES

- 77
- 78 1. Hebestreit H, Arets HG, Aurora P, Cerny F, Hulzebos EH, Karila C, Lands LC,  
79 Lowman JD, Swisher A, Urquart DS; European Cystic Fibrosis Exercise Working  
80 Group: Statement on exercise testing in cystic fibrosis. *Respiration* 2015;90(4):332-  
81 51.
- 82 2. Godfrey S, Davies CT, Wozniak E, Barnes CA: Cardio-respiratory response to  
83 exercise in normal children. *Clin Sci* 1971;40(5):419-31.
- 84 3. Bradley JM, Madge S, Morton AM, Quittner AL, Elborn JS: Cystic fibrosis research  
85 in allied health and nursing professions. *J Cyst Fibros* 2012;11(5):387-392.
- 86 4. Saynor ZL, Barker AR, Oades PJ, Williams CA: A protocol to determine valid  $\dot{V}O_{2max}$   
87 in young cystic fibrosis patients. *J Sci Med Sport* 2013;16(6):539-544.
- 88 5. Barker AR, Williams CA, Jones AM, Armstrong N: Establishing maximal oxygen  
89 uptake in young people during a ramp cycle test to exhaustion. *Br J Sports Med* 2011;  
90 45(6):498-503.
- 91 6. Nixon PA, Orenstein DM, Kelsey SF, Doershuk CF: The prognostic value of exercise  
92 testing in patients with cystic fibrosis. *N Engl J Med* 1992;327(25):1785-8.
- 93 7. Pianosi P, Leblanc J, Almudevar A: Peak oxygen uptake and mortality in children  
94 with cystic fibrosis. *Thorax* 2005;60(1):50-4.
- 95 8. De Jong W, Kaptein AA, van der Schans CP, Mannes GP, van Aalderen WM,  
96 Grevink RG, Koëter GH: Quality of life in patients with cystic fibrosis. *Pediatr*  
97 *Pulmonol* 1997;23(2):95-100.
- 98 9. Pérez M, Groeneveld IF, Santana-Sosa E, Fiuza-Luces C, Gonzalez-Saiz L, Villa-  
99 Asensi JR, López-Mojares LM, Rubio M, Lucia A: Aerobic fitness is associated with  
100 lower risk of hospitalization in children with cystic fibrosis. *Pediatr Pulmonol*  
101 2014;49(7):641-9.
- 102 10. Day JR, Rossiter HB, Coats EM, Skasick A, Whipp BJ: The maximally attainable  
103  $\dot{V}O_2$  during exercise in humans: the peak vs. maximum issue. *J Appl Physiol*  
104 2003;95(5):1901-1907.
- 105 11. Midgley AW, McNaughton LR, Carroll S: Verification phase as a useful tool in the  
106 determination of the maximal oxygen uptake of distance runners. *Appl Physiol Nutr*  
107 *Metab* 2006;31(5):541-8.
- 108 12. Rossiter HB, Kowalchuk JM, Whipp BJ: A test to establish maximum  $O_2$  uptake  
109 despite no plateau in the  $O_2$  uptake response to ramp incremental exercise. *J Appl*  
110 *Physiol* 2006;100(3):764-770.
- 111 13. Midgley AW, McNaughton LR, Polman R, Marchant D. Criteria for determination of  
112 maximal oxygen uptake: a brief critique and recommendations for future research.  
113 *Sports Med* 2007;37(12):1019-28.
- 114 14. Hawkins MN, Raven PB, Snell PG, Stray-Gundersen J, Levine BD. Maximal oxygen  
115 uptake as a parametric measure of cardiorespiratory capacity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*  
116 2007; 39(1):103-7.
- 117 15. Foster C, Kuffel E, Bradley N, Battista RA, Wright G, Porcari JP, Lucia A, deKoning  
118 JJ:  $VO_{2max}$  during successive maximal efforts. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2007;102(1):67-  
119 72.

- 120 16. Poole DC, Wilkerson DP, Jones AM: Validity for establishing maximal O<sub>2</sub> uptake  
121 during ramp exercise tests. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2008;102(4):403-410.
- 122 17. Midgley AW, Carrol S. Emergence of the verification phase procedure for confirming  
123 'true' VO<sub>2</sub>(max). *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2009;19(3), 313-22.
- 124 18. Scharhag-Rosenberger F, Carlsohn A, Cassel M, Mayer F, Scharhag J: How to test  
125 maximal oxygen uptake: a study on timing and testing procedure of a supramaximal  
126 verification test. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2011;36(1):153-160.
- 127 19. de Groot JF, Takken T, de Graaf S, Gooskens RH, Helders PJ, Vanhees L: Treadmill  
128 testing of children who have spina bifida and are ambulatory: does peak oxygen  
129 uptake reflect maximum oxygen uptake? *Phys Ther* 2009;89(7):679-687.
- 130 20. Saynor ZL, Barker AR, Oades PJ, Williams CA: Reproducibility of maximal  
131 cardiopulmonary exercise testing for young cystic fibrosis patients. *J Cyst Fibros*  
132 2013;12(6):644-650.
- 133 21. Kent L, O'Neill B, Davidson G, Nevill A, Murray J, Reid A, Elborn JS, Bradley JM:  
134 Cycle ergometer tests in children with cystic fibrosis: reliability and feasibility.  
135 *Pediatr Pulmonol* 2012;47(12):1226-1234.
- 136 22. Hulzebos EH, Bomhof-Roordink H, van de Weert-van Leeuwen PB, Twisk JW, Arets  
137 HG, van der Ent CK, Takken T: Prediction of mortality in adolescents with cystic  
138 fibrosis. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014;46(11):2047-52.
- 139 23. Bongers BC, van Brussel M, Hulzebos HJ, Takken T: Paediatric exercise testing in  
140 clinics and classrooms: A comparative review of different assessments. *OA*  
141 *Epidemiology* 2013;1(2):14.
- 142 24. Williams CA, Saynor ZL, Tomlinson OW, Barker AR: Cystic fibrosis and  
143 physiological responses to exercise. *Expert Rev Respir Med* 2014;8(6):751-752.
- 144 25. Hulzebos HJ, Werkman MS, van Brussel M, Takken T: Towards an individualized  
145 protocol for workload increments in cardiopulmonary exercise testing in children and  
146 adolescents with cystic fibrosis. *J Cyst Fibros* 2012;11(6):550-554.