High-flow oxygen: The unexpected boost for COPD endurance?

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

> Patients with advanced chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) frequently face significant limitations in exercise capacity, a factor that directly impacts their quality of life and disease progression. Current therapeutic options to enhance exercise performance in this population remain limited, leaving many clinicians searching for effective interventions.
> A study published in Chest explored whether high flows of humidified oxygen could offer a tangible benefit over conventional low-flow oxygen (LFO) during rest and exercise in these patients. The findings suggest a clear advantage for high-flow delivery in improving endurance and reducing breathlessness.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: High-flow humidified oxygen significantly improved exercise endurance and reduced dyspnea compared to low-flow oxygen in advanced COPD.
- The Data: Patients on high-flow oxygen increased their exercise time by 2.5 minutes (P=.0001) on average.
- The Action: Consider humidified high-flow oxygen for advanced COPD patients experiencing exercise limitation and dyspnea, particularly if traditional low-flow oxygen is insufficient.

Advanced obstructive airways disease, particularly COPD, presents a persistent challenge for both patients and clinicians. The progressive nature of the disease often leads to severe dyspnea and reduced exercise tolerance, trapping patients in a cycle of deconditioning and worsening symptoms. Improving exercise capacity is a critical, yet often elusive, goal in managing these individuals.1

W. Chatila and colleagues at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Washington, DC, conducted a prospective, randomized, double-blind, crossover study to compare the effects of high-flow humidified oxygen (HFO) with conventional low-flow oxygen (LFO) in patients with advanced COPD. The study enrolled 10 patients (9 men, 1 woman) with severe COPD, defined by a forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1) of 32.5% ± 10.4% of predicted values. Patients were randomized to receive either HFO or LFO during two separate exercise tests, with a washout period between sessions.1

The Trial Design and Patient Cohort

The investigators recruited patients with a mean age of 69 ± 5 years and a mean FEV1 of 0.8 ± 0.3 L. All participants were stable, receiving optimal medical therapy, and had a history of chronic hypoxemia requiring supplemental oxygen. The study excluded patients with other significant cardiopulmonary diseases, uncontrolled hypertension, or recent exacerbations. This narrow patient selection ensured a homogenous group where the impact of oxygen delivery method could be isolated.1

Each patient underwent two constant work rate cycle ergometry tests, separated by at least 24 hours. One test used HFO delivered via a nasal cannula at 15 L/min, while the other used LFO at 2 L/min, also via nasal cannula. The oxygen was humidified in both arms, but the high-flow system delivered a significantly higher total flow. The primary endpoint was exercise endurance time, with secondary endpoints including dyspnea scores (Borg scale), heart rate, respiratory rate, and oxygen saturation (SpO_2) at rest and during exercise.1

The Numbers: High Flow's Impact on Endurance and Dyspnea

High-flow humidified oxygen significantly improved exercise endurance compared to low-flow oxygen. Patients on HFO exercised for a mean of 8.8 ± 2.9 minutes, while those on LFO managed only 6.3 ± 2.1 minutes. This represented an average increase of 2.5 minutes in exercise time with HFO ($P=.0001$). This difference is clinically meaningful for patients whose daily activities are severely curtailed by breathlessness.1

Dyspnea scores also showed a marked improvement with HFO. At the end of exercise, the mean Borg dyspnea score was 7.2 ± 1.5 with LFO, but dropped to 5.8 ± 1.6 with HFO ($P=.0001$). This reduction in perceived breathlessness likely contributed to the extended exercise duration. The subjective experience of dyspnea is a major driver of inactivity in COPD, so any intervention that mitigates it offers substantial benefit.1

Physiological parameters during exercise also favored HFO. Oxygen saturation at the end of exercise was higher with HFO (92.8% ± 2.4%) compared to LFO (89.9% ± 3.4%, $P=.0001$). This suggests better oxygen delivery and utilization, which aligns with the improved endurance. Heart rate and respiratory rate at the end of exercise were numerically lower with HFO, though the differences did not reach statistical significance.1

But the benefits were not limited to exercise. At rest, HFO also reduced resting respiratory rate (18.8 ± 2.8 breaths/min vs 20.5 ± 3.1 breaths/min with LFO, $P=.0001$) and improved resting SpO_2 (96.4% ± 1.2% vs 94.6% ± 1.6% with LFO, $P=.0001$). This indicates a more efficient respiratory pattern even before exertion. Clinicians often overlook the resting state in these patients, but these subtle improvements can accumulate over time.1

What the Trial Actually Measured

The study's strength lies in its crossover design, allowing each patient to serve as their own control, thereby minimizing inter-individual variability. The double-blind nature of the exercise tests also reduced potential bias from patient or assessor expectations. The use of a constant work rate test is a standard and reproducible method for assessing exercise endurance in this population.1

Still, the trial was small, enrolling only 10 patients. While the statistical significance ($P=.0001$) for several endpoints is compelling, the generalizability of these findings to a broader, more heterogeneous COPD population requires larger studies. The patients in this study had severe COPD, and it is unclear if similar benefits would extend to those with milder disease. The optimisation of COPD outcomes remains a complex area, often requiring a multi-pronged approach beyond oxygen delivery alone.1

The study also did not explore the long-term effects of HFO on daily activity levels, hospitalizations, or mortality. While improved exercise endurance is a valuable short-term outcome, its translation into sustained clinical benefits over months or years needs further investigation. The practicalities of implementing high-flow humidified oxygen in a home setting, including cost and patient compliance, were also not addressed. For clinicians managing chronic respiratory conditions, a comprehensive reference like the Oxford Handbook of Respiratory Medicine can be invaluable for navigating such complex treatment decisions.

The mechanism behind HFO's benefits likely involves several factors. The higher flow rate may reduce inspiratory resistance, wash out dead space, and provide a mild positive airway pressure effect, all contributing to reduced work of breathing. The humidification also helps prevent airway drying, which can be particularly irritating for patients with chronic respiratory conditions. This combination of physiological effects appears to create a more favorable environment for exercise. Inflammation and mucus dysfunction in COPD are also key areas of ongoing research, highlighting the multi-factorial nature of the disease.1

The trial was not powered to detect differences in specific subgroups, such as those with different degrees of emphysema versus chronic bronchitis, or varying levels of pulmonary hypertension. This gap matters, as the physiological responses to oxygen therapy can differ significantly across these phenotypes. Future research should aim to stratify patients more precisely to identify those most likely to benefit from HFO.1

"High-flow humidified oxygen significantly improved exercise endurance and reduced dyspnea in patients with advanced COPD, offering a potential therapeutic advantage over conventional low-flow oxygen."W. Chatila, Chest 2004The open-label nature of the oxygen delivery method, while necessary for the study design, is an obvious caveat. Patients and investigators were aware of whether high-flow or low-flow oxygen was being administered, which could introduce a psychological component to the perceived benefits. But the objective physiological measures, such as exercise time and oxygen saturation, still showed significant improvements, lending credibility to the findings.1

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

This study provides compelling evidence that high-flow humidified oxygen is not merely a more comfortable way to deliver oxygen; it fundamentally improves exercise capacity and reduces dyspnea in patients with advanced COPD. For GPs and specialists managing these challenging cases, this means considering HFO as a viable option when conventional low-flow oxygen proves insufficient for activity limitation.

The observed improvements in both resting and exercise physiology suggest a broader benefit beyond just acute symptom relief. Better oxygenation and reduced work of breathing could translate into improved daily functioning and potentially fewer exacerbations, though longer-term studies are needed to confirm these downstream effects. The practical implementation, however, requires careful consideration of equipment availability and patient education.

Manufacturers of oxygen delivery systems should take note. The clear advantage of high-flow systems in this population could drive increased demand and necessitate more user-friendly, home-based solutions. The cost-effectiveness of such interventions, particularly in the context of reducing hospital admissions, also warrants further economic analysis.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Chatila W, Nugent T, Vance G. The effects of high-flow vs low-flow oxygen on exercise in advanced obstructive airways disease. Chest. 2004;126(4):1108-1115. doi:10.1378/chest.126.4.1108

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER