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Data obtained from cardiopulmonary exercise testing offers additional interpretive power over conventional exercise tolerance testing. When used correctly, it allows improved clinical decision-making in patients with cardiometabolic and respiratory disease.

Introduction

The following article is the conclusion to our recently published ‘...Clinician’s Guide to Cardiopulmonary Exercise Testing: Part 1 – An Introduction’ (Taylor et al., 2015) summarising the preparatory requirements for cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET). This article will focus on the interpretation of a CPET and how to accurately apply findings for the purposes of patient diagnosis and risk stratification. Readers are reminded that CPET should be treated as any other medical investigation and every care should be taken to ensure rigorous calibration and test preparation. Failure to do so will compromise data accuracy resulting in reduced test sensitivity and specificity.

Interpretation of CPET data

Peak oxygen uptake

Peak oxygen uptake ($\dot{V}O_2\text{peak}$) reflects the body’s maximal capacity to generate energy through aerobic metabolism. It can be defined using the Fick equation:

$$\dot{V}O_2 = Q \times (a-vO_2\ \text{diff})$$

Where $Q$ is cardiac output and $a-vO_2\ \text{diff}$ is the difference between arterial and venous oxygen content. $\dot{V}O_2$ is normally reported in absolute terms (L·min$^{-1}$) or relativised to body mass (ml·kg$^{-1}$·min$^{-1}$), and plotted as a function of time or workload (plot 1 of the 9-panel plot). Peak oxygen uptake is an independent predictor of mortality and has wide clinical application. The seminal paper by Mancini and colleagues (1991) was amongst the first to identify a threshold based on $\dot{V}O_2\text{peak}$ data (<14ml·kg$^{-1}$·min$^{-1}$) which could be used to guide clinical decision making for cardiac transplantation in patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction. Indeed, $\dot{V}O_2\text{peak}$ is an integral component of the Heart Failure Survival Score.
[HFSS] (Aaronson et al., 1997) and is listed in the current UK guidelines (Box 1) as criteria for referral and assessment of adults for cardiac transplantation (Banner et al., 2011).

Furthermore, Weber and colleagues (1982) developed a classification system for grading the severity of chronic heart failure (CHF), suggesting $<10 \text{ ml}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ and $>18 \text{ ml}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ to be indicative of high and low risk groups.

Integrated into most contemporary metabolic carts are decision tree algorithms designed to assist with diagnosing the cause of any exercise limitation (Wasserman et al., 2011). The first decision is to determine whether $\dot{V}O_2\text{peak}$ is abnormally low (<75% of predicted $\dot{V}O_2\text{max}$) as defined by Wasserman and colleagues (2011). However, a low $\dot{V}O_2\text{peak}$ may be due to poor patient effort, therefore criteria for evaluating maximal effort should always be

---

**Box 1: Conventional Criteria for Heart Transplantation**

- Impaired LV systolic function
- NYHA III (e.g. patient cannot climb one flight of stairs without symptoms) or IV symptoms
- Receiving optimal medical treatment (including target or maximum tolerated doses of β-adrenergic antagonists, ACE inhibitors and aldosterone antagonists)
- CRT, ICD or CRTD device implanted (if indicated)
- Evidence of a poor prognosis, for example,
  i. Cardiorespiratory exercise testing ($VO_{2\text{max}}$ <12 ml/kg/min if on β-blockade, <14ml/kg/min if not on β-blockade, ensuring respiratory quotient $> 1.05$)
  ii. Markedly elevated BNP (or NT-proBNP) serum levels despite full medical treatment
  iii. Established composite prognostic scoring system, such as the HFSS or SHFM

BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide; CRT, cardiac resynchronisation treatment; CRTD, CRT and ICD treatment; $VO_{2\text{max}}$, maximal oxygen uptake HFSS, Heart Failure Survival Score; ICD, implantable cardioverter defibrillator; LV, left ventricular; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide; NYHA class IV, New York Heart Association; SHFM, Seattle Heart Failure Model.
considered (Box 2). Alternatively, abnormally low $\dot{V}O_2_{\text{peak}}$ may suggest a cardiovascular limitation due to reduction in cardiac output, arterial $O_2$ content, muscle oxygen extraction, and/or ineffective vascular shunt. Although $\dot{V}O_2_{\text{peak}}$ quantifies cardiorespiratory fitness (CRF), it does not indicate the cause of an exercise limitation and it is necessary to conduct further assessment to determine any underlying pathophysiology.

Cardiopulmonary exercise tests are often conducted in patients with a known clinical diagnosis. In these circumstances a lower $\dot{V}O_2_{\text{peak}}$ may be expected, therefore it may be useful to compare test results with “normative” values for a specific patient group. Table 1 illustrates how CPET can distinguish between different pathologies by comparing a healthy individual with a CHF and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patient. Whilst $\dot{V}O_2_{\text{peak}}$ is considered by many to be the primary CPET-derived outcome variable, its reproducibility and prognostic power are affected by a number of factors including patient effort, test protocol design, familiarity, and disease severity. Alternative markers of aerobic capacity such as the ventilatory anaerobic threshold (VAT) can be used to improve prognostic power and assist in the quantification of CRF.

**Box 2: Maximal Effort Criteria**

- Failure of HR to increase with further increases in exercise intensity (achieving $>85\%$ of age-predicted maximal HR is a well-recognised indicator of patient effort)
- A plateau in $\dot{V}O_2$ (or failure to increase by $150 \text{ mL min}^{-1}$) with an increased workload
- A respiratory exchange ratio ($\text{RER} = \dot{V}CO_2 / \dot{V}O_2$) at peak exercise $\geq 1.10$
- A rating of perceived exertion (RPE) $> 17$ on the 6-20 Borg scale or $> 9$ on the 0-10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOT</th>
<th>HEALTHY (FIG 1)</th>
<th>CHF (FIG 2)</th>
<th>COPD (FIG 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 1</td>
<td>Peak VO$_2$ within normal predicted range (102% of predicted)</td>
<td>Peak VO$_2$ low (52% of predicted)</td>
<td>Peak VO$_2$ low (63% of predicted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta$VO$_2$/$\Delta$WR slope normal (9.8ml/min/W)</td>
<td>$\Delta$VO$_2$/$\Delta$WR slope low (5.7ml/min/W)</td>
<td>$\Delta$VO$_2$/$\Delta$WR slope low (7.3 ml/min/W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 2</td>
<td>Normal O$_2$/HR (97% of predicted)</td>
<td>O$_2$/HR flattens after 2 minutes of exercise</td>
<td>Normal O$_2$/HR (84% of predicted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal peak HR (107% of predicted)</td>
<td>Peak HR low (56% of predicted)</td>
<td>HRR High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 3</td>
<td>VAT normal (49% of predicted VO$_{2peak}$)</td>
<td>VAT low (38% of predicted VO$_{2peak}$)</td>
<td>VAT low (41% of predicted VO$_{2peak}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 4</td>
<td>Normal ventilatory equivalents</td>
<td>VE/VCO$_2$ at VAT high (44) Suggesting elevated VD/VT</td>
<td>Ventilatory equivalents high (increased VD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 6</td>
<td>Normal (&lt;34)</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 7</td>
<td>Normal partial pressures</td>
<td>Normal SPO$_2$</td>
<td>SPO$_2$ Low at peak (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 8</td>
<td>Normal RER</td>
<td>Normal RER</td>
<td>Normal RER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT 9</td>
<td>Normal BR (93)</td>
<td>Normal BR (39)</td>
<td>Low BR (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPET, Cardiopulmonary exercise test; CHF, Chronic heart failure; VO$_2$, Oxygen uptake; $\Delta$VO$_2$, Delta oxygen uptake; $\Delta$WR, Delta work rate; COPD, Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; HR, Heart rate; HRR, Heart rate reserve; VAT, Ventilatory anaerobic threshold; VE, Minute ventilation; VD, Ventilatory dead space; VT, Ventilatory tidal volume; SPO$_2$, Arterial oxygen saturation; RER, Respiratory exchange ratio; BR, Breathing reserve.
Ventilatory Anaerobic Threshold (VAT)

During CPET, $\dot{V}O_2$ and expired carbon dioxide ($\dot{V}CO_2$) increase linearly until the point where oxidative metabolism can no longer sustain the required workload. Anaerobic glycolysis is increasingly required for energy synthesis to maintain higher work rates leading to increased blood lactate accumulation. Bicarbonate buffering of associated $H^+$ ions results in increased $CO_2$ production that is ventilated to maintain pH balance. This causes a breakpoint in the linear relationship between $\dot{V}O_2$ and $\dot{V}C$ $O_2$ as shown in plot 3 the 9-panel plot. This point marks the VAT (also known as VT1).

The V-slope method is perhaps the most widely used technique for VAT determination (Beaver et al., 1986, Wasserman et al., 2011) and is achieved by plotting $\dot{V}C$ $O_2$ as a function of $\dot{V}O_2$. A trend line is drawn through the plots from the initiation of exercise to the point at which the linear relationship between $\dot{V}C$ $O_2$ and $\dot{V}O_2$ is lost (Slope slightly less than 1). A second trend line can then be drawn from the end of the test through to the deflection point. The point at which these two lines bisect indicates the VAT; a value in ml$\cdot$kg$^{-1}$$\cdot$min$^{-1}$ should be reported which can then be calculated as a percentage of $\dot{V}O_2$ peak.

The ventilatory anaerobic threshold is considered a reliable marker of aerobic capacity since a low VAT indicates decreased $O_2$ transport chain efficiency. Patients with superior CRF will have a VAT closer to their VO$_2$peak, however for most patients VAT will lie between 40-60% of their peak aerobic capacity.

A VAT <40% of peak $\dot{V}O_2$ (or predicted $\dot{V}O_2$ max) is indicative of disease pathology or significant physical deconditioning (Mezzani et al., 2009). A VAT <11 ml$\cdot$kg$^{-1}$$\cdot$min$^{-1}$ is commonly used to identify patients at higher peri-operative risk and is associated with a 5.3 fold increase in mortality (Gitt et al., 2002). However, many CHF patients have heterogeneous muscle fibre types, abnormal metabolism and compromised exercise haemodynamics. These abnormalities preclude the detection of VAT with non-detection indicative of poor prognosis (Agostoni et al., 2013).
With increasing exercise intensity above the VAT, intracellular bicarbonate is no longer able to adequately offset metabolic acidosis. At this point an increase in VE in excess of VCO₂ can be observed and marks the ventilatory compensation point (also referred to as VT₂).

**Ventilatory Compensation Point**

The ventilatory compensation point (VCP) is a marker of the upper limit of sustainable aerobic exercise effort and therefore like VAT and VO₂ peak, is an important parameter describing O₂ transport and utilisation. It is usually attained at approximately 70–80% VO₂ peak and 80–90% HR peak (Mezzani et al., 2013). The VCP is well-correlated to 'critical power' (Dekerle et al., 2003) representing the highest power sustainable in conditions of both VO₂ and lactate steady state (i.e. at the limit between high and very-high exercise intensity domains). The VCP is identifiable in plot 6 of the 9-panel plot as an inflection in VE vs VCO₂ or inflection in VE/VD CO₂ (plot 4) with a concurrently occurring deflection point in end-tidal CO₂ (PETCO₂; plot 7). It is important to note that a VCP may not be identifiable in patients who have failed to achieve a near-maximal effort during CPET.

**VE/VCO₂ slope**

The slope of the relationship between VE and VCO₂ (VE/VCO₂ slope) during incremental exercise describes ventilatory efficiency and quantifies the ventilatory rate required to eliminate 1 litre of CO₂ (plot 6 of the 9 panel plot). If an inappropriately high ventilatory response, caused by hyperactive peripheral chemoreceptors or increased VD/VT is present, PaCO₂ will drop and the VE/VCO₂ slope will steepen. Muscle ergoflex activation is also a proposed mechanism of increased VE/VCO₂ slope in patients with CHF. Mathematically, the VE/VCO₂ slope is determined by 3 factors: the amount of CO₂ produced; the physiological
dead space/tidal volume ratio ($V_D/V_T$); and PaCO$_2$. The relationship can be explained by the equation:

$$VE = 863 \times \frac{\dot{V}CO_2}{\text{PaCO}_2} (1 - \frac{V_D}{V_T})$$

Where, 863 is a constant (corrects for different environmental conditions, and assumes core temperature of 37 °C), $V_D/V_T$ is the physiological dead space/tidal volume ratio, and PaCO$_2$ is the arterial CO$_2$ partial pressure. A VE/$\dot{V}CO_2$ slope elevation is a phenomenon frequently observed in CHF patients (Sullivan et al., 1988) and discriminating whether this anomaly is a result of a respiratory or circulatory aetiology can be challenging. Clinical evaluation of past medical history and presenting diagnosis may help distinguish the likely cause.

A number of treatments have been shown to effectively lower VE/$\dot{V}CO_2$ slope including exercise training (Guazzi et al., 2004), angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors (Guazzi et al., 1999), cardiac resynchronisation therapy (Malfatto et al., 2005) and heart transplantation (Carter et al., 2006). Serial CPET may be advantageous in assessing the efficacy of such therapeutic interventions. Most contemporary metabolic carts provide automated analysis of VE/$\dot{V}CO_2$ slope however the slope can be calculated by linear regression when plotting VE as a function of $\dot{V}CO_2$. The mathematical method used to calculate this variable may make it more reproducible (Bensimhon et al., 2008) although adequate reproducibility data remains elusive. Table 1 illustrates the differences in VE/$\dot{V}CO_2$ slope observed in a healthy male, a patient with CHF and a patient with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). A VE/$\dot{V}CO_2$ slope >34 is commonly accepted as indicating poorer prognosis (Gitt et al., 2002, Arena et al., 2005, Ingle, 2007), although it is possible to further risk stratify patients according to a ventilatory classification system proposed by Arena et al (2007a). VE/$\dot{V}CO_2$ slope may also have a predictive role in the risk assessment of patients with coronary heart disease [CHD] (Van de Veire et al., 2006).
Figure 1. Adapted with permission from Lippincott Williams & Wilkins/Wolters Kluwer Health: Principles of Exercise Testing and Interpretation: Including Pathophysiology and Clinical Applications, Karlman Wasserman, James Hansen, Kathy Sietsema, Darryl Y. Sue, William W. Stringer, Xing-Guo Sun, Brian J. Whipp; Figure 10.1.1, Normal Male, 2011

VO₂, Oxygen uptake; VCO₂, Expired carbon dioxide; WR, Work rate; HR, Heart rate; VE, Minute ventilation; SBP, Systolic blood pressure; VT, Ventilatory tidal volume; VC, Vital capacity; IC, Inspiratory capacity; MVV, Maximum voluntary ventilation; PETCO₂, Partial pressure of end tidal carbon dioxide; PETCO₂, Partial pressure of end tidal oxygen; PaO₂, Partial pressure of arterial oxygen; PaCO₂, Partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide; R, Respiratory exchange ratio
Figure 2. Adapted with permission from Lippincott Williams & Wilkins/Wolters Kluwer Health: Principles of Exercise Testing and Interpretation: Including Pathophysiology and Clinical Applications, Karlman Wasserman, James Hansen, Kathy Sietsema, Darryl Y. Sue, William W. Stringer, Xing-Guo Sun, Brian J. Whipp; Figure 10.15.1, Chronic Heart Failure: Cardiomyopathy with Intraventricular Conduction Delay, 2011

VO₂, Oxygen uptake; VCO₂, Expired carbon dioxide; WR, Work rate; HR, Heart rate; VE, Minute ventilation; SBP, Systolic blood pressure; VT, Ventilatory tidal volume; VC, Vital capacity; IC, Inspiratory capacity; MVV, Maximum voluntary ventilation; PETCO₂, Partial pressure of end tidal carbon dioxide; PETCO₂, Partial pressure of end tidal oxygen; PaO₂, Partial pressure of arterial oxygen; PaCO₂, Partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide; R, Respiratory exchange ratio
Figure 3. Adapted with permission from Lippincott Williams & Wilkins/Wolters Kluwer Health: Principles of Exercise Testing and Interpretation: Including Pathophysiology and Clinical Applications, Karlman Wasserman, James Hansen, Kathy Sietsema, Darryl Y. Sue, William W. Stringer, Xing-Guo Sun, Brian J. Whipp; Figure 10.46.1, Emphysema with Mild Airway Obstruction, 2011

VO₂, Oxygen uptake; VCO₂, Expired carbon dioxide; WR, Work rate; HR, Heart rate; VE, Minute ventilation; SBP, Systolic blood pressure; VT, Ventilatory tidal volume; VC, Vital capacity; IC, Inspiratory capacity; MVV, Maximum voluntary ventilation; PETCO₂, Partial pressure of end tidal carbon dioxide; PETCO₂, Partial pressure of end tidal oxygen; PaO₂, Partial pressure of arterial oxygen; PaCO₂, Partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide; R, Respiratory exchange ratio
Measurement of circulatory function during CPET

Oxygen pulse, heart rate, and VO₂ versus work rate

Exercise-induced myocardial ischaemia diagnosed through electrocardiographic (ECG) changes has poor sensitivity and specificity (Belardinelli et al., 2003). Ischaemia-induced left ventricular (LV) dysfunction however, occurs earlier in the ‘ischaemic cascade’ and may be detectable before ECG changes or symptoms of angina due to its deleterious effect on Q. In normal (healthy) physiology (Figure 1), Q is increased via a synergistic rise in HR and stroke volume (SV). However, ischaemia-induced LV dysfunction during exercise can lead to abrupt reductions in SV and a concurrent attenuation of Q and VO₂ response during CPET.

Stroke volume can be estimated during CPET through the calculation of an exercise ‘oxygen pulse’ (O₂/HR; dividing \( \dot{V}O_2 \) by HR (units = ml O₂ per beat)) in a modification of the Fick equation (Whipp et al., 1996). Oxygen pulse normally rises progressively throughout exercise, however a shallow rise in O₂/HR, early plateau or inflection (figure 2, plot 2) suggests decreasing SV with Q being partially sustained through HR compensation at the onset of myocardial ischaemia (Chaudhry et al., 2009).

Early identification of an ischaemic threshold may also be observed with greater effect by combining O₂/HR with the \( \dot{V}O_2 \) versus work rate slope (\( \Delta \dot{V}O_2/\Delta WR \) slope). In healthy individuals, a linear \( \Delta \dot{V}O_2/\Delta WR \) slope of 10ml/min/watt is maintained until peak (Figure 1; plot 1), where at the upper limits of exercise, an inflection may occur, reflecting normal physiological limitation and \( \dot{V}O_2 \) plateau. A uniform flattening of this relationship throughout CPET suggests a general reduction in cardiovascular efficiency (figure 2, plot 1) and may be attributed to conditions such as CHF. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing has good sensitivity and specificity in detecting exercise-induced myocardial ischaemia (87% and 74% respectively). Belardinelli and colleagues (2003) established the criteria of \( \Delta \dot{V}O_2/\Delta WR \) slope inflection and concurrent O₂/HR inflection duration for the positive identification of exercise induced myocardial ischemia as compared to myocardial scintigraphy (area under the curve: 0.83). A value of 3.9ml/min/watt was selected as the strongest independent predictor of myocardial ischaemia using a hierarchical model.
The absence of $\Delta \dot{V}O_2/\Delta WR$ slope and $O_2/HR$ inflection can be considered negative criteria for myocardial ischaemia. It should be noted however that the application of this technique may be best suited to ramp protocols or protocols with small work increments for the reasons previously explained.

**Measurements of ventilatory function during CPET**

**Oxygen uptake efficiency slope and $VEqCO_2$ nadir**

Often during clinical exercise testing, true maximal criteria are not met and we therefore use the term $\dot{V}O_2$peak. However, $\dot{V}O_2$ peak can underestimate the true cardiorespiratory reserve and other key variables such as $VE/\dot{V}CO_2$ slope lose predictive power when exercise is not conducted beyond VAT (Ingle et al., 2007, Arena et al., 2007b). Results obtained from CPET that fail to elicit satisfactory patient effort may require an alternative assessment technique.

The oxygen uptake efficiency slope (OUES) is calculated by plotting $\dot{V}O_2$ against the logarithmically transformed VE (Baba et al., 1996). The exponent of the linear relationship provides an index of oxygen uptake with respect to VE and reflects both the efficiency of oxygen delivery to the muscle and mitochondrial oxygen utilisation. OUES is only minimally altered when comparing submaximal to maximal test data (Hollenberg and Tager, 2000) with results differing by as little as 1% (Davies et al., 2006) and thus allowing an accurate index of CRF to be calculated. Furthermore the reproducibility of OUES has been shown to be superior to that of the VAT and $\dot{V}O_2$peak (Van Laethem et al., 2009). An OUES of <1.4 is indicative of poor survival (hazard ratio: 4.3, 95% confidence interval: 2.4 to 7.9 p <0.001) regardless of whether VAT is reached (Arena et al., 2007b).

The $VEqCO_2$ nadir is the lowest point in the VE and CO₂ relationship when plotted over the course of a CPET and normally occurs around the VAT in most patients (plot 4). Recent work from our laboratory (Ingle et al., 2011) has shown that this variable calculated from
submaximal data has greater prognostic value than other variables collected from maximal CPET. Therefore, in patient cohorts where a maximal CPET cannot be conducted (e.g. low functional capacity groups), the OUES and VEqCO₂ nadir should be calculated to enhance risk stratification.

Exercise oscillatory ventilation

Exercise oscillatory ventilation (EOV) sometimes referred to as exercise periodic breathing (EPB) is characterised by a sino-soidal pattern of VE during incremental exercise to volitional exhaustion. It occurs in up to one third of patients with CHF and is associated with very poor outcome (Ingle et al., 2009). Whilst the genesis of EOV is unclear, two hypotheses have been postulated; the ventilatory hypothesis which is associated with abnormal chemoreceptor feedback, and the haemodynamic hypothesis which is concerned with fluctuations in cardiac output during incremental exercise.

CPET-derived prognostic scoring systems

With the advent of more powerful statistical analysis packages, there has been a move in recent years towards developing composite prognostic scoring systems and moving away from the traditional binary approach to risk stratification. The traditional approach focuses on the top performing variable(s) while discounting the additive or cumulative effect of a combination of different predictor variables. Composite risk scores, which combine the level of risk across a number of variables, have become more commonplace. The advantage of such an approach is that it allows the quantification of risk across the spectrum of abnormal responses. Increasingly, these models are beginning to utilise more data derived from CPET. For example, the Hull CPET risk score was recently developed by our laboratory. We found that individual predictors of mortality ranged from 0.60 to 0.71 (Harrell’s C statistic), but the optimal combination of EOV + VE/̇VO₂ slope + OUES + VEqCO₂ nadir reached 0.75 in patients with mild-to-moderate CHF. The Hull CPET risk score had a significantly higher area under the curve (0.78) when compared to the Heart Failure Survival Score (AUC=0.70; P<0.001) (Ingle et al., 2014). Our findings indicate that data derived solely from CPET outperforms traditional prognostic risk markers which are collected from a range of different
investigations. CPET appears to be a time efficient and cost effective modality for stratifying risk in patients with CHF.

**Patient case study**

Table 4 summarises the results of a CPET performed by a patient who attended our exercise laboratory for risk stratification and CRF assessment. The patient was a 62 year-old male (body mass index of 32kg·m⁻²) in normal sinus rhythm with an unremarkable ECG. The patient complained of dyspnoea on light exertion and had recently been diagnosed with coronary heart disease and undergone elective percutaneous coronary intervention. Incremental CPET on a treadmill was performed and breath-by-breath cardiorespiratory data collected (averaged over 15 seconds). A maximal effort was confirmed as the patient met two of the criteria in box 2.

The patient’s failure to achieve at least 75% of his predicted $\dot{V}O_{2\text{max}}$ (Wasserman et al., 2011) was consistent with reduced CRF (Guazzi et al., 2012). Using standard exercise tolerance test criteria, his 12-minute test duration would have been considered ‘normal’. The reduction in CRF may have been due to severe deconditioning, however this was excluded as his VAT was within the normal range (>40% actual/predicted $\dot{V}O_{2\text{peak}}$). Data were therefore suggestive of respiratory or cardiac limitation. Pre-test spirometry values from 3 reproducible attempts were within normal range and peak exercise breathing reserve ($VE_{\text{max}}$/estimated maximal voluntary ventilation) was also >20% suggesting adequate ventilation for the exercise intensity (Balady et al., 2010). The probability that respiratory disease was underlying exercise limitation was therefore deemed unlikely.

The rise in $O_2$/HR was blunted coinciding with a significantly steepened VO₂/HR relationship suggesting SV limitation. This pattern of LV dysfunction during exercise is consistent with myocardial ischaemia. Both the OUES and VAT were pseudo-normal, but were suggestive of a reduction in O₂ transport/utilisation. The $VE/\dot{V}CO_2$ slope however, was significantly elevated (>34) indicating inefficient ventilation and importantly, poor prognosis (30% likelihood of suffering a cardiac event within three years (Arena et al., 2007b). The most likely cause of the $VE/\dot{V}CO_2$ slope elevation was circulatory limitation, given the attenuation
of \( O_2/HR \) and compensatory response of HR in relation to \( \dot{V}O_2 \) needed to sustain Q. The absence of any overt respiratory abnormality during spirometry; normal breathing reserve at peak exercise; history of PCI; and moderately reduced ejection fraction at rest support the conclusion that the patient’s exercise limitation was due to an underlying circulatory limitation.

Conclusion

The intention of this guide is to provide a concise, uncomplicated evidence based summary of CPET and present an approach to data interpretation for clinical decision-making. For this reason, detailed description of patient preparation procedures and technical aspects of equipment calibration/test conduction is beyond the scope of this guide. We recommend that readers review other key publications providing guidance for CPET (Balady et al., 2010, American Thoracic Society/American College of Chest Physicians, 2003).

CPET is a safe, non-invasive assessment of cardiorespiratory function. It allows the determination of key prognostic variables and can distinguish pathophysiology not apparent at rest. It is able to discriminate cardiovascular, ventilatory and peripheral limitations during exercise by monitoring disturbances in key variable responses (\( \dot{V}O_2 \), VE, \( \dot{V}CO_2 \) and HR). CPET offers additional interpretive power over conventional stress testing and thus can lead to improved clinical decision-making and risk stratification in patients with cardiometabolic and respiratory disease.

5 KEY POINTS

- Multiple factors (circulatory, ventilatory and metabolic) contribute to exercise intolerance across a wide spectrum of patients with cardiovascular disease. Establishing the aetiology and prognostic importance of exercise intolerance is a significant challenge for clinicians.

- Cardiopulmonary exercise testing allows the determination of a number of powerful prognostic markers widely accepted in clinical practice
• Protocols that involve small to modest work rate increments per stage are preferred since they better preserve the relationship between oxygen uptake and work rate.

• Multiple factors can affect exercise intolerance and a methodical approach to eliminating specific possible causes should be adopted.

• Cardiopulmonary exercise testing offers a more comprehensive assessment of cardiorespiratory function than exercise tolerance tests and has been shown to have good sensitivity and specificity in the detection of exercise-induced myocardial ischaemia.
Table 4: A cardiopulmonary exercise test report showing key variables for our patient case study

**Patient Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>174.7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>97Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>31.67kg/m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waist-Hip Ratio</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood Pressure</td>
<td>100/78mmHg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>61bpm – Sinus Rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoker</td>
<td>Yes - 20 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Medical History</td>
<td>PCI, Obesity, Gout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Medications</td>
<td>Aspirin, Clopidogrel, Bisoprolol, Simvastatin, GTN Spray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported Symptoms</td>
<td>Shortness of breath on exertion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spirometry Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEF</th>
<th>7.6 ‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FVC</td>
<td>4.39 ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁</td>
<td>3.4 ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV₁/FVC Ratio</td>
<td>0.77 ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eMVV</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathing Reserve</td>
<td>44 ‡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPET Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Duration</th>
<th>Minutes: 12 ‡  Seconds: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Maximum Testing</td>
<td>HR ≥ 85% predicted HR max (age &amp; β-Blocker adjusted) ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Termination Criteria</td>
<td>Leg fatigue &amp; inability to maintain required work rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂peak</td>
<td>20.6ml/Kg (79.8% predicted maximum) ◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak HR</td>
<td>130bpm (83% of predicted maximum) ◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>13.5ml/Kg (66% VO₂peak, 52% Predicted VO₂peak) ◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUES</td>
<td>1.9 ◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE/VCO₂ Slope</td>
<td>42.19 ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂/HR</td>
<td>Blunted rise at 1minute 57 seconds ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO₂/HR Relationship</td>
<td>Elevated at 4 minutes and 28 seconds ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Segment Depression</td>
<td>1.8mm ◊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chest Pain  
Nil ‡

Breathing Reserve at Peak Exercise  
22% ‡

‡ = Within normal range; ◊ = Pseudo normal; ● = Abnormal
BMI = Body mass index; PCI = Percutaneous coronary intervention; GTN, Glyceryl trinitrate; PEF = Peak expiratory flow; FVC = Forced vital capacity; FEV₁ = Forced expiratory volume in 1 second; eMVV = estimated maximal voluntary ventilation; HR = Heart rate; VAT = Ventilatory anaerobic threshold; OUES = Oxygen uptake efficiency slope; VE = Minute ventilation; VCO₂, expired carbon dioxide; VO₂peak = peak oxygen uptake


