7. van Adrichem EJ, Meulenbroek RL, Plukker JT, Groen H, van Weert E. Comparison of two preoperative inspiratory muscle training programs to prevent pulmonary complications in patients undergoing esophagectomy: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2014;21:2353-60.
8. Licker M, Karenovics W, Diaper J, Fresard I, Triponez F, Ellenberger C, et al. Short-term preoperative high-intensity interval training in patients awaiting lung cancer surgery: a randomized controlled trial. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2017;12:323-33.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2018.09.076>

INSPIRATORY MUSCLE TRAINING FOR REDUCING POSTOPERATIVE PULMONARY COMPLICATIONS: A SIMPLE METHOD BUT

SHORT OF DATA?

Reply to the Editor:

In a letter to the Editor, Licker and Diaper¹ expressed concern about the compliance and withdrawal of inspiratory muscle training (IMT) protocol and inconsistent inclusion criteria in the meta-analysis made by Ge and colleagues.² After the exclusion of 5 studies mentioned by Licker and Diaper,¹ only 536 patients (originally 784) can be analyzed in the study. That may get a different result.

A weak point of the meta-analysis is that although 13 trials were included in the study, there were only 372 patients receiving IMT and 369 patients in the control group. In addition, there were different IMT protocols in every trial. The efficacy of IMT for preventing postoperative pulmonary complications (PPCs) is also confounded by other factors that may prevent PPCs, such as smoking cessation and correcting anemia.³ These trials may indicate that IMT is one but not the only method of preventing PPCs. In the absence of confirmation by a large, randomized controlled trial, the efficacy of IMT in PPC prevention remains doubtful. We appreciate the viewpoint of Licker and Diaper,¹ and we hope that Ge and colleagues will clarify the study result. The accompanying editorial commentary⁴ also points out that IMT is time-consuming and needs staff time. So, is IMT a simple method? Until we have standardized IMT's protocol and conducted large clinical trials with more patients, the method remains difficult.

Chien-Hong Chou, MD
Chung-Yu Chen, MD, PhD

Department of Internal Medicine
National Taiwan University Hospital Yun-Lin Branch
Yun-Lin County, Taiwan

References

1. Licker M, Diaper J. Clinical impact of preoperative inspiratory muscle training: we need further studies! *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2019;157:175-6.
2. Ge X, Wang W, Hou L, Yang K, Fa X. Inspiratory muscle training is associated with decreased postoperative pulmonary complications: evidence from randomized trials. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2018;156:1290-300.e1295.

Authors have nothing to disclose with regard to commercial support.

3. Miskovic A, Lumb AB. Postoperative pulmonary complications. *Br J Anaesth*. 2017;118:317-34.
4. Chou CH, Chen CY. Inspiratory muscle training for reducing postoperative pulmonary complications: a simple method that we hope is effective. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2018;156:1301-2.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2018.10.053>

REDUCING POSTOPERATIVE PULMONARY COMPLICATIONS: STILL A LONG WAY TO GO

Reply to the Editor:

We thank Licker and Diaper for their interest in our article.¹ Postoperative pulmonary complications (PPCs) are one of the most frequent causes of postoperative morbidity and mortality. The purpose of inspiratory muscle training (IMT) is to improve inspiratory muscle strength and endurance. No powered trials, however, can confirm that IMT can decrease the incidence of PPCs. Evidence from randomized, controlled trials was insufficient to reach definitive conclusions. Our team applied the statistical method of trial sequential analysis to complete the meta-analysis and found that preoperative IMT is associated with improved maximum inspiratory pressure and decreased PPCs in patients undergoing cardiothoracic or upper abdominal surgery.

In terms of confounding factors, Licker put forward very good questions about the factors that may contribute to the success of the intervention and the inclusion criteria. We agree that these concerns may limit widespread application and clinical effectiveness. As Chou and Chen² said in their editorial commentary, getting information from original clinical trials is a hallmark of meta-analysis, but sometimes it is not so easy. We sent email to all corresponding authors of included studies for the missing data. The study of Heynen and colleagues³ can be found in the *Diseases of the Esophagus Wiley Online Library* (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/14422050>), but the corresponding author's contact information did not show. One study was a nonrandomized trial, but it was a double-blind pilot study, and we evaluated the quality through the Cochrane risk of bias tool.⁴ The intervention in 2 studies was preoperative and postoperative IMT, which may also have had an impact on our current results.^{5,6} The study by van Adrichem and colleagues⁷ included 2 intervention groups (a high-intensity group and an endurance group), rather