

DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-202X.2023.12.016

医学生物物理

## 基于 Spiro-tiger 训练仪的肺康复对 COPD 稳定期患者呼吸力学、气道重塑的影响

丁洁<sup>1</sup>,向文海<sup>1</sup>,王启星<sup>2</sup>,龚秀玲<sup>1</sup>,杨扬<sup>1</sup>,王桂丽<sup>1</sup>,肖伟<sup>1</sup>

1. 上海瑞金医院南翔分院康复医学科,上海 201802; 2. 同济大学附属第十人民医院重症医学科,上海 200072

**【摘要】目的:**探讨慢性阻塞性肺疾病(COPD)稳定期患者采用基于 Spiro-tiger 训练仪的肺康复对呼吸力学、气道重塑的影响。**方法:**选取在上海瑞金医院南翔分院就诊的 93 例 COPD 稳定期患者,通过随机数表法分为对照组(46 例)与观察组(47 例)进行研究,对照组采用缩唇-腹式呼吸操干预,观察组在对照组基础上采用 Spiro-tiger 训练仪干预,两组均连续干预 9 周,对比两组干预前、干预 9 周后呼吸力学(呼吸频率、潮气量、每分钟通气量、呼吸道压力峰值)、气道重塑[基质金属蛋白酶-9(MMP-9)、血管内皮生长因子(VEGF)、转化生长因子(TGF-β1)]、肺功能[用力肺活量(FVC)、第 1 秒用力呼气容积(FEV1)、FEV1/FVC]、血气指标[动脉血氧分压(PaO<sub>2</sub>)、动脉血二氧化碳分压(PaCO<sub>2</sub>)]、6 min 步行距离、健康状况[Borg 分级及圣乔治呼吸问卷(SGRQ)评分],并随访 6 个月,统计 COPD 急性加重发生状况。**结果:**干预 9 周,相较于对照组,观察组的呼吸频率、呼吸道压力峰值低,潮气量高( $P<0.05$ );两组每分钟通气量比较差异无统计学意义( $P>0.05$ );相较于对照组,观察组的 MMP-9、VEGF、TGF-β1、PaCO<sub>2</sub> 水平低,FVC、FEV1、FEV1/FVC、PaO<sub>2</sub> 水平高( $P<0.05$ );相较于对照组,观察组的 6 min 步行距离长,Borg 分级评分、SGRQ 评分低于干预前,且观察组变化幅度大于对照组( $P<0.05$ );随访 6 个月,观察组 COPD 急性加重发生率(4.26%)低于对照组(19.57%)( $P<0.05$ )。**结论:**基于 Spiro-tiger 训练仪的肺康复可有效改善 COPD 稳定期患者呼吸力学、肺功能、血气指标及健康状况,减轻气道重塑,减少 COPD 急性加重。

**【关键词】**慢性阻塞性肺疾病; Spiro-tiger 训练仪; 呼吸力学; 气道重塑

【中图分类号】R318.6; R563

【文献标志码】A

【文章编号】1005-202X(2023)12-1558-06

## Effects of lung rehabilitation based on Spiro-tiger training apparatus on respiratory mechanics and airway remodeling in stable COPD patients

DING Jie<sup>1</sup>, XIANG Wenhai<sup>1</sup>, WANG Qixing<sup>2</sup>, GONG Xiuling<sup>1</sup>, YANG Yang<sup>1</sup>, WANG Guili<sup>1</sup>, XIAO Wei<sup>1</sup>

1. Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Nanxiang Branch of Shanghai Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai 201802, China; 2. Intensive Care Unit, Tenth People's Hospital of Tongji University, Shanghai 200072, China

**Abstract:** Objective To explore the effects of lung rehabilitation using Spiro-tiger training apparatus on the respiratory mechanics and airway remodeling in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) in stable stage. Methods Ninety-three stable COPD patients admitted to Nanxiang Branch of Shanghai Ruijin Hospital were randomly divided into control group (46 cases) and observation group (47 cases). Control group was treated with the training for pursed lips breathing and abdominal breathing, and observation group was trained with Spiro-tiger training apparatus in addition to the treatment given to control group. Both groups were intervened continuously for 9 weeks. The two groups were compared in terms of respiratory mechanics (respiratory frequency, tidal volume, minute ventilation, and peak respiratory pressure), airway remodeling [matrix metalloproteinase-9 (MMP-9), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), and transforming growth factor-β1 (TGF-β1)], and lung function [forced vital capacity (FVC), forced expiratory volume in the first second (FEV1), and FEV1/FVC], blood gas analysis indexes [arterial partial pressure of oxygen (PaO<sub>2</sub>), arterial partial pressure of carbon dioxide (PaCO<sub>2</sub>)], 6-minute walking distance (6MWD) and health status [Borg scale and St. George's respiratory questionnaire (SGRQ)]. The patients were followed up for 6 months, and the incidence of acute exacerbation of COPD was recorded. Results After 9 weeks of intervention, compared with control group, observation group had lower peak respiratory

【收稿日期】2023-06-11

【基金项目】上海市科委项目(16401970400);上海市嘉定区自然科学研究项目(JDKW-2020-0026)

【作者简介】丁洁,硕士,主治医师,研究方向:心肺康复,E-mail: djluck890@126.com

【通信作者】向文海,副主任医师,研究方向:康复医学,E-mail: xwh75@163.com

frequency and respiratory pressure, and higher tidal volume ( $P<0.05$ ). There was no significant difference in minute ventilation between two groups ( $P>0.05$ ). The levels of MMP-9, VEGF, TGF- $\beta$ 1 and PaCO<sub>2</sub> were lower, and FVC, FEV1, FEV1/FVC and PaO<sub>2</sub> were higher in observation group than in control group ( $P<0.05$ ). Observation group had longer 6MWD, and lower Borg score and SGRQ score as compared with control group ( $P<0.05$ ). After 6-month follow-up, the incidence of COPD acute exacerbation in observation group was lower than that in control group (4.26% vs 19.57%,  $P<0.05$ ).

**Conclusion** Lung rehabilitation using Spiro-tiger training apparatus can effectively improve respiratory mechanics, lung function, blood gas analysis indexes and health status in stable COPD patients, alleviate airway remodeling, and avoid acute exacerbation of COPD.

**Keywords:** chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; Spiro-tiger training apparatus; respiratory mechanics; airway remodeling

## 前言

慢性阻塞性肺疾病(COPD)是一种常见的慢性呼吸系统疾病。据统计,我国40岁以上人群中COPD发病率高达12.3%,预计在2030年之前,我国COPD发病率可能超过糖尿病、心肌梗死等高发疾病<sup>[1-2]</sup>。COPD主要的特征为气道阻塞与气流受限,该疾病会对肺部换气功能产生不同程度影响,而引发呼吸困难、咳嗽、咳痰等症状,随着病程延长,可引发高碳酸血症、低氧血症、呼吸性酸中毒等并发症,不仅会加重病情、造成对其他器官的严重损害,严重者危及生命安全。随着康复医学的逐步发展,当前临床对疾病的干预,逐步从诊治疾病变为疾病防控。诸多研究认为,采取积极的肺康复干预手段十分必要<sup>[3-4]</sup>。既往临床常指导COPD稳定期患者进行缩唇-腹式呼吸操训练,可在一定程度上改善机体缺氧症状,但长时间采用腹式呼吸会产生依赖性,不利于肺功能恢复<sup>[5]</sup>。Spiro-tiger训练仪是一种专用于呼吸肌训练的仪器,可帮助患者长时间安全进行呼吸训练,且不会导致头晕、换气过度的康复设备,在改善患者呼吸肌功能方面具有良好作用<sup>[6]</sup>。本研究采用基于Spiro-tiger训练仪的肺康复干预COPD稳定期患者,观察其对患者呼吸力学及气道重塑的影响,旨在为该病患者肺康复提供参考。

## 1 资料与方法

### 1.1 一般资料

纳入2021年1月~2023年1月上海瑞金医院南院分院93例COPD稳定期患者为研究对象,按照随机数表法分为对照组(46例)与观察组(47例)。两组资料比较,均衡性良好,具有可比性,见表1。

### 1.2 入组标准

纳入标准:(1)COPD符合《慢性阻塞性肺疾病诊治指南(2021年修订版)慢性阻塞性肺疾病肺气虚证候演变规律及其兼夹证专家共识》<sup>[7]</sup>中相关诊断标准;(2)病情稳定≥2个月;(3)肝肾功能基本正常;(4)

表1 两组患者一般资料比较

Table 1 Comparison of general information between two groups

| 指标        | 观察组(n=47)  | 对照组(n=46)  | t/χ <sup>2</sup> 值 | P值    |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|-------|
| 性别(男/女)   | 26/21      | 27/19      | 0.108              | 0.742 |
| 年龄/岁      | 68.53±5.81 | 69.11±6.03 | 0.472              | 0.638 |
| 病程/年      | 6.17±2.09  | 6.52±2.16  | 0.794              | 0.429 |
| 合并症[例(%)] |            |            |                    |       |
| 糖尿病       | 6(12.77)   | 7(15.22)   | 0.116              | 0.733 |
| 高血压       | 19(40.43)  | 16(34.78)  | 0.315              | 0.574 |
| 吸烟史[例(%)] |            |            | 0.104              | 0.747 |
| 有         | 22(46.81)  | 20(43.48)  |                    |       |
| 无         | 25(53.19)  | 26(56.52)  |                    |       |

患者或家属签署知情同意书。排除标准:(1)伴有严重心功能不全;(2)合并活动期肺结核;(3)近4周服用血管活性药物;(4)合并精神异常或认知障碍。

### 1.3 方法

**1.3.1 对照组** 采用缩唇-腹式呼吸操干预,患者取立位、卧位或半卧位,保持全身放松,将两手分别放在上腹部和前胸部,嘱患者采取缓慢、较深的呼吸,用鼻深吸气,升高腹部达最大隆起,用手感胸部不活动,缩唇吹哨式缓慢呼气,并用手适当加压帮助收腹,呼吸期间,保持胸廓最小活动幅度或不动,每日上下午各做操1次,每次15 min,连续干预9周。

**1.3.2 观察组** 在对照组基础上,采用Spiro-tiger训练仪干预,首先设定目标容量,目标容量从低位开始,当患者能轻松完成此目标不感到劳累时,再设定更高目标容量,患者取坐位或半卧位,嘱患者抬头挺胸,含住咬嘴,根据显示屏上的提示吸气、呼气,与训练仪节奏保持一致,呼吸时使用腹式呼吸,每日上下午各1次,每次15 min,连续干预9周。

### 1.4 观察指标

(1)呼吸力学:采用气流分析仪(VT PLUS HF)测定两组干预前、干预9周后呼吸频率、潮气量、呼吸道压力峰值,并计算每分通气量=呼吸频率×潮气量。

(2)气道重塑:采集两组干预前、干预9周后静脉血3 mL,离心(3 000 r/min)15 min,分离血清,采用酶联免疫吸附法测定基质金属蛋白酶-9(MMP-9)、血管内皮生长因子(VEGF)、转化生长因子(TGF-β1)水平。(3)肺功能:干预前、干预9周后采用德国耶格肺功能测试系统(型号、规格:MasterScreen SeS)测定两组用力肺活量(FVC)、第1秒用力呼气容积(FEV1)、FEV1/FVC。(4)血气指标:干预前、干预9周后,采集患者动脉血3 mL,通过血气分析仪(Instrumentation Laboratory GEM 3500 Premier)测定动脉血氧分压( $\text{PaO}_2$ )、动脉血二氧化碳分压( $\text{PaCO}_2$ )。(5)健康状况:干预前、干预9周后对两组实施6 min步行试验<sup>[8]</sup>,为患者提供30 m平直走廊,要求患者尽可能快速往返行走,测定6 min步行距离;采用Borg分级<sup>[9]</sup>评估两组呼吸状况,由没有任何呼吸困难症状~呼吸困难症状非常重分为0~10级,分别记0~10分,评分高则呼吸困难症状重;采用圣乔治呼吸问卷(SGRQ)<sup>[10]</sup>评估两组健康状况。

况,该量表包含症状、日常活动能力、疾病影响3个维度,共50个条目,评分范围0~100分,评分高则健康状况差。(6)对两组进行为期6个月的随访,统计COPD急性加重发生状况。

### 1.5 统计学方法

数据处理采用SPSS23.0软件,计量资料用均数±标准差表示,行t检验;计数资料用n(%)表示,行 $\chi^2$ 检验。 $P<0.05$ 为差异有统计学意义。

## 2 结果

### 2.1 两组呼吸力学比较

干预前,两组各呼吸力学指标比较,差异无统计学意义( $P>0.05$ );干预9周,两组呼吸频率、呼吸道压力峰值低于干预前,潮气量高于干预前,且观察组变化幅度大于对照组( $P<0.05$ );干预9周后,两组每分通气量比较,差异无统计学意义( $P>0.05$ )。见表2。

表2 两组呼吸力学比较( $\bar{x}\pm s$ )

Table 2 Comparison of respiratory mechanics between two groups ( $\text{Mean}\pm\text{SD}$ )

| 组别        | 呼吸频率/次·min <sup>-1</sup> |                         | 潮气量/mL       |                           | 每分通气量/L·min <sup>-1</sup> |           | 呼吸道压力峰值/cmH <sub>2</sub> O |                         |
|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
|           | 干预前                      | 干预9周                    | 干预前          | 干预9周                      | 干预前                       | 干预9周      | 干预前                        | 干预9周                    |
| 观察组(n=47) | 18.85±1.64               | 14.91±2.28 <sup>a</sup> | 402.53±39.62 | 543.57±51.79 <sup>a</sup> | 7.59±1.01                 | 8.11±1.53 | 27.06±1.89                 | 23.17±1.62 <sup>a</sup> |
| 对照组(n=46) | 19.02±1.71               | 16.22±1.97 <sup>a</sup> | 408.35±42.57 | 502.46±42.58 <sup>a</sup> | 7.77±1.08                 | 8.17±1.32 | 27.11±1.75                 | 24.85±1.78 <sup>a</sup> |
| t值        | 0.492                    | 2.946                   | 0.682        | 4.177                     | 0.817                     | 0.186     | 0.118                      | 4.762                   |
| P值        | 0.624                    | 0.004                   | 0.497        | 0.000                     | 0.416                     | 0.853     | 0.906                      | 0.000                   |

<sup>a</sup>表示与同组干预前比较, $P<0.05$

### 2.2 两组气道重塑相关指标比较

干预前,两组各气道重塑指标比较,差异无统计学

意义( $P>0.05$ );干预9周,两组MMP-9、VEGF、TGF-β1水平低于干预前,且观察组低于对照组( $P<0.05$ )。见表3。

表3 两组患者气道重塑相关指标比较( $\bar{x}\pm s$ )

Table 3 Comparison of airway remodeling related indexes between two groups ( $\text{Mean}\pm\text{SD}$ )

| 组别        | MMP-9/ $\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ |                            | VEGF/ $\text{mmol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ |                         | TGF-β1/ $\text{ng}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ |                           |
|-----------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|           | 干预前                                    | 干预9周                       | 干预前                                   | 干预9周                    | 干预前                                   | 干预9周                      |
| 观察组(n=47) | 721.53±214.59                          | 421.86±183.62 <sup>b</sup> | 81.32±9.51                            | 42.18±5.23 <sup>b</sup> | 609.14±42.67                          | 468.52±39.61 <sup>b</sup> |
| 对照组(n=46) | 728.36±226.37                          | 566.39±201.47 <sup>b</sup> | 80.76±8.96                            | 49.78±5.72 <sup>b</sup> | 613.28±46.95                          | 516.41±43.68 <sup>b</sup> |
| t值        | 0.149                                  | 3.617                      | 0.292                                 | 6.690                   | 0.445                                 | 5.542                     |
| P值        | 0.882                                  | 0.000                      | 0.771                                 | 0.000                   | 0.657                                 | 0.000                     |

<sup>b</sup>表示与同组干预前比较, $P<0.05$

### 2.3 两组肺功能比较

干预前,两组各肺功能指标比较,差异无统计学意

义( $P>0.05$ );干预9周,两组FVC、FEV1、FEV1/FVC高于干预前,且观察组高于对照组( $P<0.05$ )。见表4。

表4 两组患者肺功能比较( $\bar{x}\pm s$ )

Table 4 Comparison of lung function between two groups (Mean $\pm$ SD)

| 组别        | FVC/L           |                              | FEV1/L          |                              | FEV1/FVC/%        |                                |
|-----------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
|           | 干预前             | 干预9周                         | 干预前             | 干预9周                         | 干预前               | 干预9周                           |
| 观察组(n=47) | 2.07 $\pm$ 0.43 | 3.02 $\pm$ 0.49 <sup>c</sup> | 1.42 $\pm$ 0.29 | 2.49 $\pm$ 0.58 <sup>c</sup> | 70.06 $\pm$ 13.07 | 82.48 $\pm$ 12.72 <sup>c</sup> |
| 对照组(n=46) | 2.11 $\pm$ 0.46 | 2.68 $\pm$ 0.51 <sup>c</sup> | 1.45 $\pm$ 0.32 | 2.04 $\pm$ 0.55 <sup>c</sup> | 70.39 $\pm$ 15.31 | 75.59 $\pm$ 14.63 <sup>c</sup> |
| t值        | 0.433           | 3.279                        | 0.461           | 3.838                        | 0.113             | 2.425                          |
| P值        | 0.659           | 0.002                        | 0.646           | 0.000                        | 0.910             | 0.017                          |

<sup>c</sup>表示与同组干预前比较, $P<0.05$

### 2.4 两组血气指标比较

干预前,两组各血气指标比较,差异无统计学意义( $P>0.05$ );干预9周,两组PaO<sub>2</sub>高于干预前,PaCO<sub>2</sub>低于干预前,且观察组变化幅度大于对照组( $P<0.05$ )。见表5。

表5 两组患者血气指标比较( $\bar{x}\pm s$ ,mmHg)

Table 5 Comparison of blood gas analysis indexes between two groups (Mean $\pm$ SD, mmHg)

| 组别        | PaO <sub>2</sub> |                               | PaCO <sub>2</sub> |                               |
|-----------|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
|           | 干预前              | 干预9周                          | 干预前               | 干预9周                          |
| 观察组(n=47) | 62.94 $\pm$ 7.81 | 74.64 $\pm$ 8.12 <sup>d</sup> | 67.32 $\pm$ 9.57  | 44.57 $\pm$ 7.69 <sup>d</sup> |
| 对照组(n=46) | 63.24 $\pm$ 7.24 | 69.39 $\pm$ 7.85 <sup>d</sup> | 66.83 $\pm$ 8.72  | 49.78 $\pm$ 8.04 <sup>d</sup> |
| t值        | 0.194            | 3.167                         | 0.260             | 3.193                         |
| P值        | 0.847            | 0.002                         | 0.796             | 0.002                         |

<sup>d</sup>表示与同组干预前比较, $P<0.05$

### 2.5 两组健康状况比较

干预前,两组各健康状况指标比较,差异无统计学意义( $P>0.05$ );干预9周,两组6 min步行距离长于干预前,Borg分级评分、SGRQ评分低于干预前,且观察组变化幅度大于对照组( $P<0.05$ )。见表6。

### 2.6 两组COPD急性加重发生状况

随访6个月,观察组47例患者中发生COPD急性加重2例(4.26%),对照组46例患者中发生COPD急性加重9例(19.57%),观察组COPD急性加重发生率低于对照组( $\chi^2=5.225$ ,  $P=0.022$ )。

## 3 讨论

呼吸是一个复杂的行为,中枢神经系统控制支配呼吸的大部分调节机制。近年来对通气系统的研究包括胸廓和膈肌,改变了传统呼吸肌及神经控制的认识,认为呼吸是由主要呼吸肌、辅助呼吸肌、神经元池协同运动形成<sup>[11]</sup>。在COPD稳定期患者中,呼

表6 两组患者健康状况比较( $\bar{x}\pm s$ )

Table 6 Comparison of health status between two groups (Mean $\pm$ SD)

| 组别        | 6 min步行距离/m        |                                 | Borg分级评分/分      |                              | SGRQ评分/分         |                               |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
|           | 干预前                | 干预9周                            | 干预前             | 干预9周                         | 干预前              | 干预9周                          |
| 观察组(n=47) | 276.57 $\pm$ 47.85 | 461.30 $\pm$ 38.25 <sup>c</sup> | 6.02 $\pm$ 1.45 | 2.17 $\pm$ 0.67 <sup>c</sup> | 58.91 $\pm$ 4.65 | 21.64 $\pm$ 3.57 <sup>c</sup> |
| 对照组(n=46) | 281.13 $\pm$ 49.52 | 419.72 $\pm$ 42.76 <sup>c</sup> | 5.89 $\pm$ 1.52 | 2.85 $\pm$ 0.70 <sup>c</sup> | 59.33 $\pm$ 3.84 | 25.46 $\pm$ 4.03 <sup>c</sup> |
| t值        | 0.451              | 4.945                           | 0.421           | 4.777                        | 0.465            | 4.841                         |
| P值        | 0.653              | 0.000                           | 0.675           | 0.000                        | 0.643            | 0.000                         |

<sup>c</sup>表示与同组干预前比较, $P<0.05$

吸困难是一种较为常见的痛苦症状,也是患者就诊的主要原因。COPD会增加患者气道阻力,患者呼吸

过程中需增加呼吸肌做功以促使气体通过狭窄管腔,由此造成的呼吸肌疲劳或无力是导致患者呼吸

困难的主要原因。当患者处于运动、发热等代谢率增加情况时,换气需要增加,会进一步加重患者呼吸困难症状,造成缺氧状态,而供氧不足又可导致延髓呼吸刺激,形成恶性循环,降低患者健康状况<sup>[12-13]</sup>。

相关研究指出,肺康复训练能够提高COPD患者症状限制的氧摄取,减轻休息状态下呼吸困难症状,降低呼吸频率,改善运动耐量,降低入院率,提高生活质量<sup>[14-16]</sup>。缩唇-腹式呼吸操是目前应用较为广泛的呼吸训练方法,长时间进行该项训练不仅能够增强膈肌肌力,缓解肺通气阻力,提升通气效率,还可降低呼气流动速率,缓解气道内高压状况<sup>[17-19]</sup>。但单纯自助式呼吸训练并不能完全改善COPD稳定期患者通气功能。Spiro-tiger训练仪具有独特的气管设计,呼吸训练过程中能够保证1/3的气体来自外界,2/3气体来自气囊,可帮助患者长时间进行呼吸训练,在训练呼吸肌力量的同时还注重锻炼呼吸肌耐力。Spiro-tiger训练仪配有生物反馈信号,训练过程中可通过调节呼吸气囊大小获得理性的呼吸深度,并通过显示屏直观监测到呼吸深度、节奏是否达到预期目标。本研究采用基于Spiro-tiger训练仪的肺康复干预COPD稳定期患者,结果显示干预9周,两组呼吸频率、呼吸道压力峰值、PaCO<sub>2</sub>、Borg分级评分、SGRQ评分低于干预前,潮气量、FVC、FEV1、FEV1/FVC、PaO<sub>2</sub>高于干预前,6 min步行距离长于干预前,且观察组变化幅度大于对照组,表明基于Spiro-tiger训练仪的肺康复可改善患者呼吸力学、血气指标及健康状况,提高肺功能。Spiro-tiger训练仪是借助重复呼吸环路以保证CO<sub>2</sub>恒定,患者可以高通气量进行较长时间的重复呼吸,能够起到改善呼吸肌功能的目的。Spiro-tiger训练仪能够自由设定目标通气量,能够匹配不同患者个体化需求,且该器械带有监测装置,能够实时监控患者是否存在呼吸过浅或呼吸过深情况,确保每次训练的有效性,最终改善患者健康状况。

大多数COPD患者均存在不同程度气道重塑,主要指气道基底膜增生、气道平滑肌表现型转变、气道平滑肌细胞增生等<sup>[20-21]</sup>。蛋白酶/抗蛋白酶平衡紊乱是COPD患者气道重塑的主要原因之一,基质金属蛋白酶(MMPs)具有降解细胞外基质的功能,MMP-9为MMPs家族重要成员,几乎可降解细胞外基质的全部成分<sup>[22]</sup>。当MMP-9水平异常升高时,则表明气道受损,炎症细胞浸润气道局部,刺激VEGF活化,加快TGF-β1增生、胶原沉积,促进。Spiro-tiger训练仪是通过先进的生物反馈技术,结合呼吸生理学原理,不仅能够实时监测呼吸频率、深度与节律,且能够通过反馈信息帮助患者进行高通气量、长时间的重复呼

吸,进而达到改善呼吸肌功能的目的,进而促进预后效果的提升。

大多数COPD患者均存在不同程度气道重塑,会引发气道狭窄、气道阻力增加,而导致COPD患者气道重塑的主要因素为蛋白酶/抗蛋白酶平衡紊乱<sup>[21-22]</sup>。新血管形成,最终导致气道重塑<sup>[23-24]</sup>。本研究观察患者气道重塑相关指标发现,观察组干预9周后MMP-9、VEGF、TGF-β1水平低于对照组,提示基于Spiro-tiger训练仪的肺康复更能够减轻气道重塑。与常规肺康复训练相比,Spiro-tiger训练仪能够改变患者通气模式,减慢呼吸频率,增加潮气量,帮助患者建立更深、更慢的呼吸,促使其获取更多氧气,减轻呼吸肌疲劳,提高胸腹联合呼吸效率,有助于局部炎症吸收,维持蛋白酶/抗蛋白酶平衡,改善患者气道重塑情况<sup>[25]</sup>。对两组患者进行为期6个月的随访发现,观察组COPD急性加重发生率(4.26%)低于对照组(19.57%),表明基于Spiro-tiger训练仪的肺康复远期效果更佳。其原因主要与基于Spiro-tiger训练仪的肺康复能够改善COPD稳定期患者呼吸肌力量、耐力有关,使得患者暂停训练后仍能够保持良好通气状况,降低COPD急性加重发生。

综上所述,基于Spiro-tiger训练仪的肺康复可有效改善COPD稳定期患者呼吸力学、肺功能、血气指标及健康状况,减轻气道重塑,减少COPD急性加重,值得在临床推广。

## 【参考文献】

- [1] Guo C, Guo C, Chang LY, et al. Mortality risk attributable to classification of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and reduced lung function: a 21-year longitudinal cohort study[J]. Respir Med, 2021, 184(1): 106471.
- [2] Wu M, Zan T, Zhao Q, et al. Symptom clusters and health-related quality of life in Chinese patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease[J]. West J Nurs Res, 2020, 42(6): 437-445.
- [3] Kefala AM, Fortescue R, Alimani GS, et al. Protocol: prevalence and clinical implications of respiratory viruses in stable chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and exacerbations: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol[J]. BMJ Open, 2020, 10(4): e035640.
- [4] Martin A, Hancox RJ, Chang CL, et al. Preventing adverse cardiac events (PACE) in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD): study protocol for a double-blind, placebo controlled, randomised controlled trial of bisoprolol in COPD[J]. BMJ Open, 2021, 11(8): 053446.
- [5] Basso-Vanelli RP, Di Lorenzo VA, Labadessa IG, et al. Effects of inspiratory muscle training and calisthenics-and-breathing exercises in COPD with and without respiratory muscle weakness[J]. Respir Care, 2015, 61(1): 50-60.
- [6] 门伟,曹文渊.利用Spiro Tiger呼吸机提高中长跑运动员损伤后康复期呼吸能力的研究[J].武魂,2013,31(9): 37.  
Men W, Cao WY. Study on improving respiratory ability of middle and long distance runners after injury with Spiro Tiger ventilator[J]. Soul, 2013, 31(9): 37.
- [7] 国家中医药管理局慢性阻塞性肺疾病肺气虚证重点研究室,安徽省中医肺系病专业委员会.慢性阻塞性肺疾病诊治指南(2021年修订版)慢性阻塞性肺疾病肺气虚证候演变规律及其兼夹证专家共识[J].中华中医药杂志,2014,29(4): 1179-1180.

- State Administration of Traditional Chinese Medicine Key Laboratory of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Lung Qi Deficiency Syndrome, Anhui Province Traditional Chinese Medicine Lung Diseases Professional Committee. Guidelines for diagnosis and treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (Revised Edition 2021)-The evolution of lung Qi deficiency syndrome in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and expert consensus [J]. Chinese Journal of Traditional Chinese Medicine and Pharmacy, 2014, 29(4): 1179-1180.
- [8] Poersch K, Berton DC, Canterle DB, et al. Six-minute walk distance and work relationship with incremental treadmill cardiopulmonary exercise test in COPD[J]. Clin Respir J, 2013, 7(2): 145-152.
- [9] Pires FO, Hammond J. Manipulation effects of prior exercise intensity feedback by the Borg scale during open-loop cycling[J]. Br J Sports Med, 2012, 46(1): 18-22.
- [10] Martin AL, Marvel J, Fahrbach K, et al. The association of lung function and St. George's respiratory questionnaire with exacerbations in COPD: a systematic literature review and regression analysis[J]. Respir Res, 2016, 17(1): 1-15.
- [11] Souza YD, Suzana ME, Medeiros S, et al. Respiratory muscle weakness and its association with exercise capacity in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease[J]. Clin Respir J, 2021, 16(2): 162-166.
- [12] Polosukhin VV, Guttor SS, Du RH, et al. Small airway determinants of airflow limitation in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease[J]. Thorax, 2021, 76(11): 1079-1088.
- [13] Huang X, Du Y, Ma Z. High-flow nasal cannula oxygen versus conventional oxygen for hypercapnic chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials[J]. Clin Respir J, 2021, 15(4): 437-444.
- [14] Du Y, Lin J, Wang X, et al. Early pulmonary rehabilitation in acute exacerbation of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials[J]. COPD, 2022, 19(1): 69-80.
- [15] Gloeckl R, Schneeberger T, Jarosch I, et al. Pulmonary rehabilitation and exercise training in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease[J]. Dtsch Arztebl Int, 2018, 23(8): 117-123.
- [16] Cornelison SD, Pascual RM. Pulmonary rehabilitation in the management of chronic lung disease[J]. Med Clin North Am, 2019, 103(3): 577-584.
- [17] Lin Q, Zhuo L, Wu Z, et al. Effects of breathing exercises using home-based positive pressure in the expiratory phase in patients with COPD [J]. Postgrad Med J, 2019, 95(1127): 476-481.
- [18] 陈妙芳, 陈晓庆, 黄捷晖, 等. 缩唇腹式呼吸辅以阻力呼吸训练器对COPD稳定期老年病人肺功能和生存质量的影响[J]. 护理研究, 2019, 33(20): 3509-3512.
- Chen MF, Chen XQ, Huang JH, et al. Effect of lip contraction abdominal breathing combined with resistance breathing trainer on lung function and quality of life in elderly patients with stable COPD [J]. Chinese Nursing Research, 2019, 33(20): 3509-3512.
- [19] Charususin N, Gosselink R, Decramer M, et al. Randomised controlled trial of adjunctive inspiratory muscle training for patients with COPD [J]. Thorax, 2018, 73(10): 942-950.
- [20] Leelarungrayub J, Puntumetakul R, Sriboonreung T, et al. Preliminary study: comparative effects of lung volume therapy between slow and fast deep-breathing techniques on pulmonary function, respiratory muscle strength, oxidative stress, cytokines, 6-minute walking distance, and quality of life in persons with COPD[J]. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis, 2018, 13(5): 3909-3921.
- [21] Mei J, Zhang Y, Lu S, et al. Long non-coding RNA NNT-AS1 regulates proliferation, apoptosis, inflammation and airway remodeling of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease via targeting miR-582-5p/FBXO11 axis[J]. Biomed Pharmacother, 2020, 39(129): 110326.
- [22] Li H, Shi K, Zhao Y, et al. TIMP-1 and MMP-9 expressions in COPD patients complicated with spontaneous pneumothorax and their correlations with treatment outcomes[J]. Pak J Med Sci, 2019, 36(2): 192-197.
- [23] Agrawal H, Yadav U. MMP-2 and MMP-9 mediate cigarette smoke extract-induced epithelial-mesenchymal transition in airway epithelial cells via EGFR/Akt/GSK3 beta/beta-catenin pathway: amelioration by fisetin[J]. Chem Biol Interact, 2019, 51(314): 108846.
- [24] Huo R, Tian X, Chang Q, et al. Targeted inhibition of  $\beta$ -catenin alleviates airway inflammation and remodeling in asthma via modulating the profibrotic and anti-inflammatory actions of transforming growth factor- $\beta$ 1[J]. Ther Adv Respir Dis, 2021, 15(2): 1753466620981858.
- [25] 田景霞, 许爱国, 张伟华, 等. 肺康复训练对慢性阻塞性肺病患者肺功能及生活质量的影响[J]. 中华物理医学与康复杂志, 2020, 42(1): 84-85.
- Tian JX, Xu AG, Zhang WH, et al. Effects of pulmonary rehabilitation training on pulmonary function and quality of life in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease[J]. Chinese Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 2020, 42(1): 84-85.

(编辑:黄开颜)