Respiratory inhalers: The hidden climate cost of patient care?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 6 September 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

> Respiratory diseases represent a significant global health burden, demanding continuous and often lifelong treatment. But the very therapies designed to alleviate suffering, particularly inhaled medications, contribute disproportionately to healthcare's carbon footprint. This presents a growing dilemma for clinicians: how to balance effective patient care with environmental responsibility.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: The environmental impact of respiratory care, especially inhaler propellants, is a recognized concern that requires integration into clinical decision-making.
- The Data: Metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) contribute significantly more greenhouse gas emissions than dry powder inhalers (DPIs) due to their hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) propellants.
- The Action: Clinicians should consider the environmental profile of inhaler devices when initiating or reviewing therapy, alongside clinical efficacy and patient preference.

Chronic respiratory conditions such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) affect millions across Europe, necessitating regular medication to manage symptoms and prevent exacerbations. The cornerstone of treatment for many of these patients involves inhaled therapies, delivered via various devices. While these treatments are indispensable for patient well-being, their environmental impact, particularly from metered-dose inhalers (MDIs), has drawn increasing scrutiny.

MDIs rely on hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) propellants to deliver medication to the lungs. HFCs are potent greenhouse gases, with a global warming potential significantly higher than carbon dioxide. This means that even small quantities released into the atmosphere can have a substantial environmental effect. Dry powder inhalers (DPIs) and soft mist inhalers (SMIs), in contrast, do not use HFC propellants and therefore have a considerably lower carbon footprint. Understanding these differences is essential for a holistic approach to patient care, as detailed in the Oxford Handbook of Respiratory Medicine.

The Environmental Burden of Inhalers

The environmental impact of MDIs stems directly from their propellants. HFCs, while non-ozone depleting, are powerful greenhouse gases. For example, a single MDI can have a carbon footprint equivalent to driving a car for hundreds of miles. This is a stark contrast to DPIs, which typically have a carbon footprint that is orders of magnitude lower. The cumulative effect of millions of MDIs prescribed annually contributes significantly to healthcare's overall environmental burden, a factor that is increasingly being considered in broader health policy discussions.

This environmental consideration is not merely an academic exercise. Healthcare systems globally are under pressure to reduce their carbon emissions, and respiratory care represents a tangible area for intervention. The choice of inhaler device, therefore, moves beyond purely clinical efficacy and patient preference to include an ecological dimension. This shift requires clinicians to be informed about the environmental profiles of different devices and to integrate this knowledge into their prescribing habits.

Navigating Device Selection and Patient Education

Selecting the appropriate inhaler device involves a complex connection between factors. Patient factors, such as inspiratory flow capability, dexterity, cognitive function, and personal preference, are paramount. A device that a patient cannot use effectively, regardless of its environmental credentials, will not deliver optimal clinical outcomes. But, where multiple device types are clinically appropriate and equally effective for a patient, the environmental impact becomes a valid differentiating factor.

Educating patients about the environmental aspects of their inhalers is also an essential component. Many patients are unaware of the carbon footprint associated with their MDIs. Providing clear, accessible information can empower patients to make more environmentally conscious choices, particularly if they are already motivated by broader environmental concerns. This education should be balanced, ensuring that patients understand that their primary goal is effective disease management, while also offering sustainable alternatives where feasible. For instance, discussions around triple therapy in asthma often involve device considerations.

Clinical Practice and Sustainable Prescribing

Integrating sustainability into prescribing practices does not mean compromising patient care. Instead, it encourages a more thoughtful and informed approach to device selection. For patients who can effectively use a DPI or SMI, these devices offer a clinically equivalent or superior option with a reduced environmental impact. This is particularly relevant for new diagnoses or when reviewing existing treatment regimens.

But, for some patients, MDIs remain the most appropriate or only effective delivery system. This might be due to specific clinical needs, such as acute bronchospasm requiring a rescue inhaler, or an inability to master the technique required for DPIs. In these cases, the clinical imperative for effective treatment outweighs the environmental concern. The goal is not to eliminate MDIs entirely, but to optimize their use and reduce reliance where suitable alternatives exist. This approach aligns with the principles of personalized medicine, extending to environmental considerations.

The shift towards more sustainable respiratory care also involves considering the entire lifecycle of inhaler devices. This includes manufacturing processes, packaging, and disposal. Initiatives to recycle inhalers, though currently limited, are gaining traction and represent another avenue for reducing environmental impact. Encouraging patients to return used inhalers for proper disposal or recycling can further mitigate the release of HFCs into the atmosphere. This broader perspective on product stewardship is an evolving area within healthcare sustainability.

Beyond inhalers, the environmental impact of respiratory care extends to other aspects, such as the energy consumption of hospitals, the waste generated from diagnostic procedures, and the carbon footprint of patient travel to appointments. Telemedicine and remote monitoring, for example, can reduce patient travel and associated emissions, while also improving access to care. These broader systemic changes complement the efforts to make inhaler prescribing more sustainable. The discussion around severe asthma treatment decisions often touches upon these broader aspects.

Challenges and Future Directions

The transition to more sustainable respiratory care faces several challenges. Inertia in prescribing habits, a lack of awareness among both clinicians and patients, and the perceived complexity of switching devices are significant barriers. There is also the issue of cost, as some DPIs or SMIs may be more expensive than their MDI counterparts, although this varies by region and specific medication. Addressing these challenges requires concerted efforts from healthcare policymakers, professional bodies, and pharmaceutical companies.

Enhanced training for healthcare professionals on inhaler technique and environmental considerations is essential for patient health. This will ensure that clinicians are equipped to guide patients towards the most effective and sustainable treatment options. Understanding epithelial dysfunction as a unified target also opens avenues for new, potentially more sustainable, therapeutic approaches.

The move towards sustainable respiratory care is not about sacrificing clinical effectiveness for environmental gains. It is about integrating environmental responsibility into the existing framework of evidence-based medicine. By making informed choices about inhaler devices, educating patients, and advocating for broader systemic changes, clinicians can contribute to a healthier planet while continuing to deliver high-quality care for patients with respiratory conditions. The conversation around why benralizumab patients still suffer asthma attacks, for example, could also incorporate device-related environmental considerations.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The environmental impact of respiratory care is no longer a peripheral concern; it is a direct clinical responsibility. Prescribing an MDI when a DPI or SMI is equally effective and appropriate for a patient is a missed opportunity to reduce carbon emissions. This requires a conscious shift in prescribing habits, moving beyond historical defaults.

Clinicians must become fluent in the environmental profiles of different inhaler devices, not just their pharmacological properties. This means actively considering the global warming potential of HFC propellants and discussing these implications with patients. It is not about shaming patients, but about empowering them with information to make informed choices where clinical equivalence allows.

Pharmaceutical companies also bear a responsibility to innovate, developing inhaler devices with lower environmental footprints and ensuring their accessibility and affordability. The onus cannot solely be on the prescriber to navigate a market where the most environmentally friendly options are not always the most readily available or cost-effective. Policy makers should also consider incentives for sustainable prescribing.

The goal is to integrate environmental sustainability seamlessly into the fabric of respiratory care, ensuring that patient health and planetary health are mutually reinforcing objectives. This is a long game, but one that demands immediate attention and action from every clinician.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Born CDC, Bhadra R, D'Souza G, et al. Combined Lifestyle Interventions in the Prevention and Management of Asthma and COPD: A Systematic Review. Nutrients. 2024;16(10). doi:10.3390/nu16101515
2. 2. Venkata AN. Asthma-COPD overlap: review of diagnosis and management. Curr Opin Pulm Med. 2020;26(2):155-161. doi:10.1097/MCP.0000000000000649
3. 3. Polverino F, Sin DD. The Developmental Origins of Asthma and COPD. Annu Rev Physiol. 2026;88(1):513-535. doi:10.1146/annurev-physiol-042924-084007
4. 4. Tanabe N, Nakagawa H, Sakao S, et al. Lung imaging in COPD and asthma. Respir Investig. 2024;62(6):995-1005. doi:10.1016/j.resinv.2024.08.014
5. 5. Barnes PJ. Cellular and molecular mechanisms of asthma and COPD. Clin Sci (Lond). 2017;131(13):1541-1558. doi:10.1042/CS20160487
6. 6. Abramson MJ, Perret JL, Dharmage SC, McDonald VM, McDonald CF. Distinguishing adult-onset asthma from COPD: a review and a new approach. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis. 2014;9:945-62. doi:10.2147/COPD.S46761

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER