Beyond the numbers: What your PFT results are really telling you

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 7 September 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Pulmonary function tests (PFTs) are a cornerstone of respiratory diagnostics, but their utility extends far beyond merely categorizing results as 'normal' or 'abnormal'. A clinician's ability to interpret these tests effectively hinges on a deep understanding of their physiological underpinnings and the clinical picture of the patient. This requires moving past simplistic thresholds to a more integrated, contextual analysis.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: PFT interpretation demands a holistic approach, integrating patient history, symptoms, and demographics with numerical results.
- The Data: Reference equations, while foundational, must be applied with an understanding of their limitations and population specificities.
- The Action: Clinicians should routinely consider patterns of impairment, reversibility, and gas exchange alongside spirometry to refine diagnostic accuracy.

Pulmonary function testing provides objective measures of lung mechanics, volumes, and gas exchange. These tests are indispensable for diagnosing and monitoring a wide array of respiratory conditions, from obstructive diseases like asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) to restrictive disorders such as interstitial lung disease and neuromuscular weakness. But the raw numbers alone tell only part of the story; their true meaning emerges when viewed through the lens of individual patient characteristics and presenting symptoms. A comprehensive understanding of these tests is essential for any clinician, as detailed in resources like the Oxford Handbook of Respiratory Medicine.
The standard battery of PFTs typically includes spirometry, lung volume measurements (usually by plethysmography or gas dilution), and diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO). Spirometry assesses forced vital capacity (FVC), forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1), and the FEV1/FVC ratio. Lung volumes quantify total lung capacity (TLC), functional residual capacity (FRC), and residual volume (RV). DLCO measures the efficiency of gas transfer across the alveolar-capillary membrane. Each component offers distinct insights into respiratory physiology.

Understanding Reference Values and Variability

Interpreting PFT results begins with comparing a patient's measured values to established reference ranges. These ranges are derived from large populations of healthy individuals, stratified by age, sex, height, and ethnicity. The choice of appropriate reference equations is critical, as different equations can yield varying 'normal' limits. Using an inappropriate reference can lead to misclassification, either over-diagnosing disease in healthy individuals or missing pathology in those with subtle impairments.

But simply falling outside the 95% confidence interval of a reference population does not automatically equate to clinical disease. Biological variability exists, and a single measurement can be influenced by factors such as effort, recent bronchodilator use, or even time of day. The lower limit of normal (LLN), typically defined as the fifth percentile, is a more robust threshold than a fixed percentage of predicted, such as 80% of predicted, which can misclassify healthy individuals, particularly at the extremes of age.

Patterns of Impairment: Beyond Obstructive and Restrictive

The classic PFT interpretation framework categorizes impairments into obstructive, restrictive, or mixed patterns. An obstructive pattern is characterized by a reduced FEV1/FVC ratio, indicating airflow limitation, often accompanied by increased lung volumes (TLC, RV). A restrictive pattern shows reduced lung volumes (TLC, FVC) with a preserved or even increased FEV1/FVC ratio. Mixed patterns present features of both.

But these broad categories require further refinement. For instance, an obstructive pattern could be due to asthma, COPD, or bronchiectasis. The degree of reversibility to bronchodilators helps differentiate asthma from fixed obstruction in COPD. Similarly, a restrictive pattern could be intrinsic lung disease (e.g., interstitial fibrosis), extrinsic compression (e.g., pleural effusion, chest wall deformity), or neuromuscular weakness. The DLCO measurement often helps distinguish between these causes; a low DLCO with normal lung volumes might suggest vascular disease, while a low DLCO with reduced lung volumes points towards interstitial lung disease. Understanding these patterns is key to accurate diagnosis, as discussed in our previous coverage on AAT protein's role in lung health.

The Significance of DLCO and Gas Exchange

The diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO) provides a measure of the overall efficiency of gas transfer from the alveoli to the red blood cells. A reduced DLCO indicates impaired gas exchange, which can result from a variety of conditions affecting the alveolar-capillary membrane or the pulmonary vasculature. Common causes include emphysema (due to destruction of alveolar walls), interstitial lung diseases (due to thickening of the membrane), pulmonary vascular diseases (e.g., pulmonary hypertension, recurrent emboli), and anaemia (reduced haemoglobin available for CO binding).

An isolated reduction in DLCO, with otherwise normal spirometry and lung volumes, warrants careful consideration of pulmonary vascular disease or early interstitial lung disease. But DLCO must always be interpreted in conjunction with other PFT parameters and the clinical context. For example, a low DLCO in a patient with severe obstruction might be expected due to air trapping and ventilation-perfusion mismatch, rather than primary parenchymal disease. Conversely, a normal DLCO in a patient with significant dyspnoea should prompt investigation into non-pulmonary causes or very early-stage disease not yet impacting gas transfer significantly.

Beyond the Numbers: Clinical Context and Patient Factors

The most common error in PFT interpretation is divorcing the numbers from the patient. Age, sex, height, and ethnicity are already incorporated into reference equations, but other factors are equally important. Smoking history, occupational exposures, medication use (e.g., amiodarone, methotrexate, beta-blockers), and comorbidities (e.g., heart failure, renal failure) can all influence PFT results and must be considered.

The patient's effort during the test is also paramount. Suboptimal effort can mimic restrictive or obstructive patterns. A technician's comments on effort, along with visual inspection of flow-volume loops and volume-time curves, are

invaluable. Variability in repeated measurements can also signal poor effort or unstable disease. For example, a patient with significant obstructive sleep apnea might present with subtle PFT abnormalities that are better understood through multimodal OSA treatment approaches.

Consider a patient presenting with dyspnoea. If their PFTs show mild obstruction, but they are a lifelong non-smoker with no history of asthma, the diagnosis of COPD becomes less likely. Conversely, a patient with a long smoking history and chronic cough whose PFTs show mild obstruction is far more likely to have early COPD, even if the absolute FEV1 is still within a 'normal' range for their age. The clinical picture guides the interpretation, not just the raw data.

The Role of Bronchodilator Responsiveness

Bronchodilator responsiveness testing is a standard component of spirometry, particularly in patients with suspected obstructive lung disease. A significant improvement in FEV1 (typically defined as an increase of at least 12% and 200 mL from baseline) after bronchodilator administration indicates reversibility of airflow obstruction. This finding is characteristic of asthma, though some patients with COPD can also show partial reversibility.

But the absence of bronchodilator responsiveness does not rule out asthma, especially if the patient is already on maintenance bronchodilator therapy or has severe, chronic inflammation. Conversely, some degree of reversibility can be seen in other conditions, including bronchiectasis. The interpretation of bronchodilator response should always be integrated with the patient's clinical history, including symptom variability, triggers, and response to previous therapies. This approach helps differentiate between various obstructive lung diseases and guides appropriate treatment strategies, such as those discussed in optimising COPD outcomes with triple therapy.

Limitations and Future Directions

PFTs are effort-dependent, which is an obvious caveat. Poor patient effort or technique can lead to inaccurate results, necessitating careful supervision and quality control during testing. The interpretation also relies heavily on appropriate reference equations, which may not perfectly capture the diversity of all populations, particularly those with rare ethnic backgrounds or specific genetic predispositions. This can lead to misclassification in certain groups.

The tests provide a snapshot in time; they do not always capture the dynamic nature of some respiratory diseases. Serial PFTs are often necessary to monitor disease progression or response to treatment. But even then, subtle changes can be difficult to interpret without a clear understanding of the patient's overall clinical trajectory. The field continues to explore advanced techniques, such as forced oscillation technique and nitrogen washout, to provide more detailed insights into lung mechanics and ventilation heterogeneity, potentially offering a more complete picture beyond the standard PFTs.

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> The reliance on rigid 'normal' and 'abnormal' cut-offs for pulmonary function tests is a disservice to both patients and clinicians. These tests are diagnostic tools, not definitive pronouncements. GPs and specialists alike must move beyond a simple traffic-light system and engage with the full context of the patient's presentation.
>
> A patient's age, smoking history, and even their occupation profoundly influence how PFT results should be interpreted. Ignoring these factors in favour of a purely numerical assessment risks misdiagnosis, leading to either unnecessary investigations and anxiety or, worse, delayed treatment for genuine pathology. The art of medicine, in this instance, truly lies in integrating the science.

> For the pharmaceutical industry, this means that future drug development and trial design should consider how PFT endpoints are interpreted in real-world clinical practice. A drug that shows a statistically significant improvement in FEV1 might not translate to a clinically meaningful benefit if the baseline interpretation was flawed. Regulators should also encourage a more holistic view of PFT data rather than focusing solely on isolated metrics.
>
> The goal is not just to identify lung disease, but to understand its impact on the individual. A PFT report is a piece of a larger puzzle, and only by assembling all the pieces can clinicians arrive at an accurate diagnosis and an effective management plan. This demands a continuous commitment to clinical reasoning, even when faced with seemingly clear-cut numbers.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. VAN DE Sande DAJP, Schoots T, Hoogsteen J, Doevendans PA, Kemps HMC. O2 Pulse Patterns in Male Master Athletes with Normal and Abnormal Exercise Tests. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2019;51(1):12-18. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001772

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com