UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Bilateral Thoracoscopic Staple Lung Volume Reduction Surgery

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6xh7013q

Journal

CHEST Journal, 113(6)

ISSN

0012-3692

Author

Brenner, Matthew

Publication Date

1998-06-01

DOI

10.1378/chest.113.6.1730-b

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Peer reviewed

Bilateral Thoracoscopic Staple Lung Volume Reduction Surgery

Does Improvement in Dyspnea Correlate With Improvement in Pulmonary Function?

To the Editor:

In the October 1997 issue of CHEST, Brenner and coworkers¹ demonstrated that lung volume reduction surgery (LVRS) produced symptomatic and spirometric improvement for 6 months in patients with inhomogeneous emphysema. However, they failed to demonstrate a significant relationship between improvement in dyspnea and improvement in pulmonary function.

Although several lines of evidences suggest a certain relation of lung functions to the reduction in dyspnea shortly after LVRS in emphysema, 2,3 the relation between symptomatic improvement and long-term results of pulmonary function has not yet been determined. 4,5 Therefore, the current findings may be very important. However, I point out that the analysis for the relation between symptomatic response and spirometric variables is not appropriate in the current study. Unfortunately, the authors evaluated the intensity of dyspnea in patients with emphysema by using the Modified Medical Research Council (MMRC) scale. Because the MMRC is not a linear scale but a grading scale,

linear regression analyses between scores on the MMRC scale and spirometric variables may be meaningless. A more quantitative analysis of dyspnea with the Borg scale or the visual analogue scale is necessary to assess the correlation between dyspnea relief and improvements of pulmonary functions.^{5,6} I believe that dyspnea response after bilateral thoracoscopic staple LVRS may be consistently observed for 6 months and that the quantitative assessment of dyspnea may reveal the close relationship between improvement in dyspnea and improvement in pulmonary function, particularly the ratio of residual volume to total lung capacity and inspiratory muscle strength.^{2,3,5}

Although the data from Brenner et al¹ were not properly analyzed, their study is still very important. There is no doubt that long-term results of objective and subjective improvements are required for determining the efficacy of LVRS for diffuse or inhomogeneous emphysema. That is why an appropriate assessment of dyspnea at rest and during exercise may provide a valuable piece of information for both physicians and surgeons. Consequently, it will clarify which of the many measurements of lung function are those that correlate with the long-term symptomatic improvement and should be monitored after LVRS.

Shinji Teramoto, MD, FCCP Department of Geriatrics Tokyo University Hospital Japan

Reprint requests: Shinji Teramoto, MD, FCCP, Dept of Geriatrics, Tokyo University Hospital, 7 3-1 Hongo Bunkyo-Ku, Tokyo 113-8655 Japan

REFERENCES

- 1 Brenner M, McKenna RJ, Gelb AF, et al. Dyspnea response following bilateral thoracoscopic staple lung volume reduction surgery. Chest 1997; 112:916-23
- 2 Sciurba FĆ, Rogers RM, Keenan RJ, et al. Improvement in pulmonary function and elastic recoil after lung-reduction surgery for diffuse emphysema. N Engl J Med 1996; 334: 1095-99
- 3 O'Donnell DE, Webb KA, Bertley JC, et al. Mechanisms of relief of exertional breathlessness following unilateral bullectomy and lung volume reduction surgery in emphysema. Chest 1996; 110:18-27
- 4 Little AG. Lung volume reduction: a breath of fresh air? [editorial]. Chest 1996; 110:2-3
- 5 Teramoto S, Matsuse T, Ouchi Y. Is the symptomatic improvement after lung volume reduction surgery correlated with ${\rm FEV_1}$ in patients with diffuse emphysema? [letter]. Chest 1997; 111:1144-45
- 6 Teramoto S, Fukuchi Y, Nagase T, et al. Quantitative assessment of dyspnea during exercise before and after bullectomy for giant bulla. Chest 1992; 102:1362-66

To the Editor:

We agree that using linear regression analysis of changes in MMRC scores after LVRS is not an ideal way to assess quantitative subjective dyspnea response. As pointed out, the MMRC scale is not necessarily linear, so assessment of changes are not expected to follow a linear pattern with response. Additionally, the MMRC scale is integral, not continuous. Thus, linear regression is of limited applicability. Nonetheless, the trends in dyspnea response after LVRS were often opposite in direction from those expected on the basis of objective pulmonary function response (irrespective of linearity of the association). These trends raise important questions regarding optimal patient selection and response criteria. The results of this study are not meant to provide definitive answers to the relation between dyspnea and

1730 Communications to the Editor

objective LVRS response because of the limitations of the methodology. Rather, the main purpose of the study was to raise questions about some currently accepted LVRS criteria that need further investigation with more specific dyspnea response analyses.

Matthew Brenner, MD, FCCP Pulmonary and Critical Care Division University of California Irvine Medical Center Orange, Calif