

- 3 Clini E, Sturani C, Rossi A, *et al.* The Italian multicentre study on noninvasive ventilation in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients. *Eur Respir J* 2002; 20: 529–538.
- 4 Garrod R, Mikelsons C, Paul EA, Wedzicha JA. Randomized controlled trial of domiciliary noninvasive positive pressure ventilation and physical training in severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2000; 162: 1335–1341.
- 5 Díaz O, Bégin P, Torrealba B, Jover E, Lisboa C. Effects of noninvasive ventilation on lung hyperinflation in stable hypercapnic COPD. *Eur Respir J* 2002; 20: 1490–1498.
- 6 Díaz O, Bégin P, Andresen M, *et al.* Physiological and clinical effects of diurnal noninvasive ventilation in hypercapnic COPD. *Eur Respir J* 2005; 26: 1016–1023.
- 7 Storre JH, Steurer B, Kabitz HJ, Dreher M, Windisch W. Monitoring of transcutaneous PCO₂ during initiation of noninvasive positive pressure ventilation. *Chest* 2007; 132: 1810–1816.
- 8 Windisch W, Kostić S, Dreher M, Virchow JC Jr, Sorichter S. Outcome of patients with stable COPD receiving controlled noninvasive positive pressure ventilation aimed at a maximal reduction of PaCO₂. *Chest* 2005; 128: 657–662.

DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00168207

From the authors:

We thank M.L. Duiverman, F.M. Struik and P.J. Wijkstra for the relevant comments and agree that development of new therapeutic options in severe-stable chronic obstructive pulmonary disease is required.

We concur that the results are based mainly on nonrandomised controlled trials that exhibited considerable heterogeneity. Furthermore, factors such as achieving effective ventilation, determining inspiratory pressures and selecting patients who benefit most are only some of the areas identified that need further study. Clearly there are knowledge gaps. Most studies reviewed limited the ability to draw conclusions, with further research needed in order to confirm positive findings related to noninvasive ventilation in severe-stable chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients. This and other techniques require testing in carefully designed and conducted trials, for which there were few.

Our rationale for conducting this review was to assess what is known and not known. Based on the existing evidence, noninvasive ventilation may have an adjunctive role in the management of chronic respiratory failure due to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

M.A. Kolodziej*, L. Jensen[#], B. Rowe[†] and D. Sin⁺

Depts of *Pulmonary Medicine, and [†]Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta Hospitals, and [#]Faculty of Nursing, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, and ⁺Division of Internal Medicine, St. Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

None declared.

DOI: 10.1183/09031936.00002708

Is air travel safe for those with lung disease?

To the Editors:

I read with interest the article of COKER *et al.* [1] regarding the safety of commercial air travel for patients with lung disease. This is an area of concern since both the prevalence of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and the number of people flying for leisure purposes are increasing. The available guidelines are based on very limited scientific evidence. Owing to the lack of data and potential adverse consequences of hypoxaemia induced by air travel, the recommendations proposed by scientific societies and panel guidelines are purposefully cautious.

The prospective evaluation of a large cohort such as the one described by COKER *et al.* [1] is of great value for increasing knowledge in this field, and potentially for the refinement of recommendations for patients planning air travel. If patients included in the study of COKER *et al.* [1] were indeed managed according to guidelines, it can be concluded that these guidelines are appropriate for predicting safe air travel. It could be argued, however, that current guidelines are too restrictive or cautious. The guidelines all recommend

avoidance of hypoxaemia below an arterial oxygen tension (P_{a,O_2}) of 6.7 kPa (50 mmHg) [2–4] or 7.3 kPa (55 mmHg) [2, 5].

Bearing this in mind, it would be of great value to the scientific community to obtain the following additional information, which is probably already available to COKER *et al.* [1]. 1) How many patients with an arterial oxygen saturation measured by pulse oximetry (S_{p,O_2}) of 92–95% underwent hypoxic challenge testing (HCT)? 2) Did all patients with a P_{a,O_2} of 6.7 kPa (50 mmHg) during HCT fly with oxygen? 3) How many patients with an S_{p,O_2} of <92% at ground level flew without oxygen?

HCT is useful for predicting the level of hypoxaemia that patients will experience during a flight. However, it is not clear which patients should undergo HCT, *i.e.* which patients are at risk of an in-flight P_{a,O_2} of <6.7 kPa (<50 mmHg). COKER *et al.* [1] reported that 19 of the 82 patients who underwent hypoxic challenge testing despite a ground-level S_{p,O_2} of $\geq 96\%$ did indeed experience severe hypoxaemia during the test. It would be interesting to characterise these patients. How do they compare to those of the same ground-level S_{p,O_2} but without