

University of Groningen

Letter to the editor: "Nasal high-flow versus non-invasive ventilation in patients with chronic hypercapnic COPD" [Letter]

Elshof, J; Duiverman, M L

Published in:
International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

DOI:
[10.2147/COPD.S226697](https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S226697)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Elshof, J., & Duiverman, M. L. (2019). Letter to the editor: "Nasal high-flow versus non-invasive ventilation in patients with chronic hypercapnic COPD" [Letter]. *International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease*, 14, 2117-2118. <https://doi.org/10.2147/COPD.S226697>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Letter to the editor: “Nasal high-flow versus non-invasive ventilation in patients with chronic hypercapnic COPD” [Letter]

This article was published in the following Dove Press journal:
International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

J Elshof^{1,2}
ML Duiverman^{1,2}

¹Department of Pulmonary Diseases/
Home Mechanical Ventilation, University
Medical Center Groningen, University of
Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands;
²Groningen Research Institute for
Asthma and COPD (GRIAC), University
of Groningen, Groningen, The
Netherlands

Dear editor

We read with interest the recent article by Bräunlich et al entitled ‘Nasal high-flow versus non-invasive ventilation in patients with chronic hypercapnic COPD’ recently published in the *International Journal of COPD*.¹ It covers an important topic, as this is the first study comparing non-invasive ventilation (NIV) and nasal high flow (NHF) therapy in stable hypercapnic COPD patients.

Nevertheless we would like to stress some important issues with regard to the interpretation of the results. Firstly, we would like to address the non-inferiority analysis of this trial. A non-inferior trial should be considered when there is a clear advantage in any area other than effectiveness, like lower costs or fewer side effects.² This study shows that NHF is similarly effective in reducing PaCO₂ in stable hypercapnic patients, but the exact advantage of NHF over NIV is unexplained. The authors suggest that comfort may be increased by NHF since NIV is not tolerated in some patients, however, this is not represented by the results. The amount of drop-outs is comparable between groups, just like the assessment of the devices and quality of life scores. Furthermore, no data is presented about the patient’s decision on which device he or she wants to use after the study period. Therefore, based on these results, it is unclear to us why the authors conclude that NHF may be an alternative to NIV.

Secondly, we have reservations about the adequate application of both treatments. The authors state that NIV pressure settings were adjusted to achieve optimal tolerability and pCO₂ reduction. However, compliance during NIV is very limited with an average of 3.9±2.5 hrs/day questioning optimal tolerability, and the effect in PaCO₂ reduction is moderate. Therefore, we doubt whether NIV was adequately administered. An exclusion criterion was prior therapy with NIV in the last 14 days. However, no data is given about the experience with NIV at all, which could greatly influence both compliance and drop-out rate. Also the treatment of NHF was probably not optimal. The flow rate was limited to 20 L/min due to technical aspects. However, multiple studies show that the CO₂ washout effect is flow-dependent where higher flow leads to more CO₂ washout.^{3,4} The flow rate of 20 L/min is likely to be inadequate for sufficient CO₂ reduction; although the exact optimal flow in chronic care resulting in optimal effect with good compliance is unknown. A randomized controlled trial with adequate treatment settings and data

Correspondence: J Elshof
Department of Pulmonary Diseases/
Home Mechanical Ventilation, University
Medical Center Groningen, University of
Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
Email j.elshof@umcg.nl

with regard to optimal nHFT titration is needed to show whether NHF is a (superior) alternative to NIV in reducing hypercapnia and, more importantly, in achieving improvement in patient-related outcomes.

Disclosure

Miss J Elshof reports grants from Fisher & Paykel Healthcare Ltd., and Vivisol BV, outside the submitted work. Dr ML Duiverman reports grants and personal fees from Philips Respironics, ResMed Ltd., Vivisol B.V., and grants from Fisher and Paykel Ltd., outside the submitted work.

References

1. Bräunlich J, Dellweg D, Bastian A, et al. Nasal high-flow versus noninvasive ventilation in patients with chronic hypercapnic COPD. *International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease*. 2019;14:1411–1421. doi:10.2147/COPD.S206111
2. Piaggio G, Elbourne DR, Altman DG, Pocock SJ, Evans SJW. Reporting of noninferiority and equivalence randomized trials: an extension of the CONSORT statement. *Jama*. 2006;295(10):1152–1160. doi:10.1001/jama.295.10.1152
3. McKinstry S, Pilcher J, Bardsley G, et al. Nasal high flow therapy and PtCO₂ in stable COPD: A randomized controlled cross-over trial. *Respirology*. 2018;23(4):378–384. doi:10.1111/resp.13185
4. Bräunlich J, Mauersberger F, Wirtz H. Effectiveness of nasal highflow in hypercapnic COPD patients is flow and leakage dependent. *BMC Pulmonary Medicine*. 2018;18(1):14. doi:10.1186/s12890-018-0576-x

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The content of the International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the content of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the content of any letter, nor is it responsible for the content and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

The International Journal of COPD is an international, peer-reviewed journal of therapeutics and pharmacology focusing on concise rapid reporting of clinical studies and reviews in COPD. Special focus is given to the pathophysiological processes underlying the disease, intervention programs, patient focused education, and self management

protocols. This journal is indexed on PubMed Central, MedLine and CAS. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <https://www.dovepress.com/international-journal-of-chronic-obstructive-pulmonary-disease-journal>