ChatGPT

Full Work of Cellulur Breathing: A Systems-Physiology Evaluation of the Full Work of Cellular Respiration Framework

Abstract

Full Work of Cellulur Breathing is the present paper's requested title. The documentary corpus supplied with this project more formally names the framework **Full Work of Cellular Respiration (FWOCR)** and defines its intended physical boundary as a continuous nostril-to-cells-and-back system comprising air movement and conditioning, pulmonary gas exchange, circulation, cellular oxygen utilization, carbon-dioxide return, failure burden, and recovery. The distinction in wording is retained rather than silently normalized because the archive itself shows that "respiration" has at times been used in both its pulmonary and biochemical senses. That ambiguity is scientifically important: it can cause ordinary respiratory muscle work, whole-body oxidative metabolism, thermal exchange, circulatory work, and cellular maintenance to be placed in the same conceptual basket even though they are different physical quantities and frequently overlap.

The attached archive, FWOCR_BUNDLE.zip, was inspected locally. Its SHA-256 in this session is `89c8692b0b35423c14539b60da207b97f17e485d21e1e57ab159de7592f0225f`. The fresh-session handoff's own `VERIFY.py` was executed and returned **35/35 checks passed**. That verifies internal files, arithmetic, identities, and declared package relationships; it does **not** independently validate physiological assumptions, source interpretation, causal attribution, or the biological magnitude of FWOCR. The most mature internal review explicitly reaches the same conclusion: the archive contains reproducible component calculations and conditional scenarios, but it does not demonstrate a measured 66–80% FWOCR share of total daily energy expenditure, a ≥50% whole-system reduction after an intervention, or an empirically established all-day energy saving from any breathing practice. See 00_START_HERE.md, INDEPENDENT_RELIANCE_REVIEW.md, and FWOCR_AUDIT_v2.md.

The central conclusion of this review is therefore neither acceptance nor dismissal. **FWOCR is scientifically defensible as a proposed burden-decomposition and systems-accounting framework, but it is not yet a validated aggregate physiological quantity.** Its strongest intellectual contribution is the insistence that respiratory physiology can be examined across coupled mechanical, circulatory, thermal, gas-exchange, cellular, and recovery processes. Its principal vulnerability is boundary confusion: the same joule can be represented as metabolic input, useful mechanical work, dissipated heat, or a downstream material flow, and adding those representations together produces false totals. The historical 66–80% figure must consequently remain a **modeled allocation under a broad definition**, not a calorie law, not a measured population constant, and not a claim that 66–80% of TDEE is avoidable.

Conceptual foundations and the boundary problem

The FWOCR corpus is best understood as an attempt to replace an organ-centered question—"how much energy does breathing use?"—with a system-centered question: **what burdens are causally necessary to move oxygen from ambient air to sites of metabolism, sustain oxidative function, and return carbon dioxide and associated heat and water to the environment?** That is a legitimate systems-physiology question. It is broader than the conventional **work of breathing**, which ordinarily refers to the mechanical pressure-volume work required to overcome elastic and resistive loads of the respiratory system. Experimental studies show that respiratory-muscle oxygen cost is modest during quiet breathing in healthy subjects and can become substantial with obesity, pulmonary disease, voluntary hyperpnea, or intense exercise. Kress et al., for example, estimated respiratory oxygen cost by comparing spontaneous breathing with mechanical ventilation and neuromuscular paralysis; their normal surgical controls showed little change in whole-body oxygen uptake, whereas morbidly obese subjects showed a much larger decrement after respiratory work was removed. That is a respiratory-muscle measurement under a highly specific experimental condition, not a ceiling on an entire nostril-to-cell system. [1]

Donahoe and colleagues likewise measured the **incremental oxygen cost of increasing ventilation**, reporting about 1.23 ± 0.51 mL O_2 per liter of added ventilation in healthy controls, with substantially higher values in patients with COPD. This is an experimentally meaningful measure of respiratory-muscle energetic demand, but it is not equivalent to total oxidative metabolism, airway conditioning, blood transport, or cellular ATP turnover. [2] Conventional work-of-breathing estimates and FWOCR therefore operate at different system boundaries; the smaller conventional figure does not by itself refute the broader FWOCR concept, while the broader concept cannot legitimately relabel the entirety of ordinary cellular metabolism as a reducible "breathing cost."

The attached audit identifies precisely this problem. One historical FWOCR document treated FWOCR largely as respiratory-system-attributed costs, while another treated it as **useful cellular work after excluding mitochondrial proton leak**. Those are not interchangeable quantities. Cellular respiration in the biochemical sense is not merely a downstream extension of pulmonary ventilation; it is the distributed oxidation of fuels across tissues, tightly coupled to ATP demand, ion pumping, protein turnover, biosynthesis, thermogenesis, and other functions. Experimental work in rat skeletal muscle and hepatocytes demonstrates that mitochondrial proton leak can account for a substantial fraction of resting tissue respiration, but those findings are cellular bioenergetic measurements, not evidence that the same fraction is modifiable through changes in breathing mechanics. [3]

A rigorous FWOCR therefore requires **partition before summation**. Let the total whole-body metabolic input under a defined state be E. A systems analysis can partition relevant burdens into mutually non-overlapping terms C_i, but only if each term is defined at one energy-accounting level. An admissible decomposition has the form

$$E_{\mathrm{FWOCR,boundary}} = \sum_i C_i,$$

where the C_i are non-overlapping expenditures or externally crossing energy/material flows. If cardiac metabolic input is counted, its hydraulic output cannot then be added as another independent metabolic expense. If metabolic heat is already contained in whole-body energy expenditure, the fraction of that heat subsequently transferred into inspired air cannot be counted again as fresh calorie consumption. Likewise,

respiratory water loss is not an independent energy bill if its latent heat is already represented in the heat term. These are consequences of energy conservation, not semantic preferences.

The archive's strongest internal methodological rule—distinguishing `TOTAL_EXPENDITURE`, `POTENTIALLY_AVOIDABLE`, `OBSERVED_SAVINGS`, and `CONDITIONAL_SCENARIO`—is therefore exactly right. 00_START_HERE.md The critical scientific refinement is that **allocation is not avoidability**. A process may account for a large share of metabolism while having little room for reduction at unchanged function. Conversely, a small expenditure may be highly modifiable. FWOCR becomes experimentally useful only when those categories are held separate.

What the component evidence actually establishes

Respiratory-muscle energetics provide the strongest direct experimental precedent for the FWOCR idea that physiological efficiency can vary without eliminating function. Turner et al. randomized 16 male cyclists to inspiratory-muscle training or a low-load control and measured the oxygen cost of three standardized voluntary-hyperpnea tasks. At the highest ventilatory target, the respiratory-muscle oxygen cost represented about 11.7% of whole-body oxygen uptake before training and fell after training; the published data support a reduction in oxygen cost during the laboratory breathing task, not an all-day reduction in metabolic expenditure. [4] The FWOCR bundle correctly preserves the arithmetic result that the reported group means at the highest target changed from 3.68 to 2.59 mL O_2/L, approximately a **29.62% reduction**, while refusing to convert that task-specific result into a 24-hour calorie saving. INDEPENDENT_RELIANCE_REVIEW.md

This distinction matters because respiratory burden changes strongly with state. Harms et al. demonstrated that at maximal exercise, manipulating respiratory-muscle work altered leg blood flow; unloading the respiratory muscles increased leg blood flow, whereas added respiratory loading decreased it. [5] Related experiments at submaximal exercise showed that changing inspiratory work can alter systemic oxygen uptake and limb perfusion, demonstrating genuine competition between respiratory and locomotor muscle circulations under sufficient demand. [6] These findings support one of FWOCR's central intuitions: **the respiratory system has coupled downstream costs that cannot always be represented by diaphragm mechanics alone.** They do not establish a fixed resting circulatory surcharge attributable to breathing.

Whole-lung oxygen consumption is similarly real but difficult to isolate. Loer, Scheeren, and Tarnow studied patients during cardiopulmonary bypass, using separation of pulmonary and systemic circulation to estimate lung oxygen consumption. Their extrapolation to normothermia suggested approximately 11 mL O_2/min, around 5% of whole-body oxygen uptake in that surgical setting. [7] This is important for FWOCR because airway and lung tissues themselves consume energy, but the estimate cannot simply be added to conventional work of breathing or whole-body indirect calorimetry; some of those energetic processes are already embedded in the total oxygen-consumption signal.

Air conditioning is another legitimate part of the nostril-to-alveolus physical transaction. Human respiratory passages warm and humidify inspired gas and recover part of that heat and water during expiration. Modern mathematical models of human and mammalian lungs predict substantial bronchial heat-and-water exchange and expiratory recovery, with modeled recovery on the order of 40–50% in many mammalian conditions. [8] The FWOCR handoff reproduces a particular 70-kg resting model result from Haut and colleagues as approximately 6.57 W gross heat transfer, 2.52 W recovered, and 4.06 W net, equivalent to roughly 83.8 kcal/day **as heat flow**. That is a useful physical quantity, but it is not

automatically an additional 83.8 dietary kcal/day because the underlying heat may already originate in metabolic processes counted elsewhere. INDEPENDENT_RELIANCE_REVIEW.md

Direct human measurements do show that route influences water recovery. Svensson, Olin, and Hellgren found greater net water loss during oral than nasal expiration in healthy adults, with approximately 42% less expired water loss during nasal expiration under their test conditions. [9] That demonstrates a route-dependent physical difference in respiratory water handling; it does **not** establish a corresponding 42% reduction in whole-body metabolic expenditure. Similarly, experimental exposure to hot and cold inspired air in normothermic humans did not measurably alter core or brain-stem temperature, illustrating why respiratory heat transfer must not be extrapolated directly into claims about systemic thermal regulation without measurement. [10]

Cellular bioenergetics poses the hardest boundary question. Mitochondrial proton leak is a genuine inefficiency in oxidative phosphorylation. Experiments in perfused rat skeletal muscle found that proton leak accounted for approximately half of resting muscle respiration, and related hepatocyte studies found substantial contributions in liver cells. [11] These findings support the abstract proposition that biological function can sometimes be accomplished with different energetic efficiencies. They provide **no demonstrated causal bridge from altered breathing behavior to reduced mitochondrial proton leak across the body**. FWOCR is strongest when it treats such terms as candidate components requiring their own mechanisms and measurements; it becomes scientifically weak when cellular maintenance metabolism is simply classified as respiratory cost and then implicitly treated as a modifiable consequence of breathing technique.

Quantitative claims, the 66–80% allocation, and the 426 kcal/day observation

The **66–80% of TDEE** figure has a specific documentary status. The supplied handoff describes it as a historical broad FWOCR working allocation arising from classification of substantial resting cellular metabolism within the framework. It explicitly states that this is **not an independently measured aggregate pumping or breathing expenditure** and is not evidence that an equivalent fraction is avoidable. 00_START_HERE.md INDEPENDENT_RELIANCE_REVIEW.md

That distinction resolves much of the apparent conflict between FWOCR and conventional respiratory physiology. A statement such as “mechanical breathing ordinarily costs only a small percentage of resting metabolism” concerns respiratory-muscle energetics. A statement such as “a large fraction of TDEE is allocated to processes inside a nostril-to-cell-to-nostril life-support boundary” concerns an accounting classification. Both can be simultaneously true. What does **not** follow is that the latter fraction is an independently measured respiratory burden or that it is susceptible to large reduction without changing biological function.

The same logic applies to the archive’s conditional savings calculations. The identity

$$E_{\text{saved}} = \sum_i C_i r_i - E_{\text{added}}$$

is mathematically correct when C_i are non-overlapping baseline burdens, r_i are valid fractional reductions, and the before/after states deliver comparable function. But it becomes an empirical claim only after the C_i and r_i are measured or independently justified. The FWOCR package explicitly reports that its historical "10,000+ Monte Carlo" exercise is not reproducible from the material currently present because the original executable model, sampling distributions, seed, and full outputs are absent. That missing reproducibility record means the historical probability claims must remain historical model claims rather than confidence intervals.

The participant-specific **426 kcal/day** resting-energy result requires especially careful handling. The bundle's October reconciliation states that a six-page provider report exists, reports resting expenditure of 426 kcal/day and RER 0.74, and also displays 1,594 kcal/day as a **predicted** comparator. INDEPENDENT_RELIANCE_REVIEW.md The package correctly rejects subtraction of the observed 426 from the predicted 1,594 as though these were a measured before/after pair. Prediction error and longitudinal physiological change are categorically different quantities.

Indirect calorimetry infers metabolic energy expenditure from respiratory gas exchange, classically using measured oxygen consumption and carbon-dioxide production. Weir's foundational formulation relates respiratory gas exchange to caloric expenditure and remains the conceptual basis for such calculation. [12] The archive's algebraic inversion of 426 kcal/day with RER 0.74 into approximately 62.2 mL O_2/min and 46.0 mL CO_2/min is therefore a valid conditional calculation. It is not recovery of the original gas traces. Without the raw VO_2/VCO_2 series, device identity, flow and gas calibration records, test duration, steady-state selection criteria, and a separately measured baseline, the observation cannot establish either a true extreme biological reduction or an instrumentation artifact. The correct status is **reported measurement with unresolved acquisition validity**, not "proven physiological transformation" and not "nonexistent measurement."

This evidentiary posture is important because the paper need not reject extreme observations merely because they are surprising. It only requires the inferential hierarchy to remain intact: **reported value → validated acquisition → replicated observation → causal attribution → generalized physiological conclusion**. FWOCR has documentation at the first step for the 426 result, some internal arithmetic checking, and no complete basis in the supplied bundle for the later steps.

A measurement architecture capable of testing FWOCR

A rigorous FWOCR research program is possible, but it must measure the system in a way that prevents overlapping terms from masquerading as independent costs. The appropriate design is not a single "breathing calorie" measurement. It is a **hierarchical energy-and-transport experiment** in which whole-body input provides the top-level conserved quantity and subsystem measurements explain, rather than duplicate, that quantity.

At the top level, whole-body oxygen consumption and carbon-dioxide production would be measured by calibrated indirect calorimetry under tightly matched states. The calorimetry signal provides the primary metabolic input variable rather than the sum of speculative organ estimates. Weir's gas-exchange framework supplies the conversion from VO_2 and VCO_2 to energy expenditure. [12] Measurements would need replicate sessions because the scientific target is a stable state difference rather than a single unusual observation.

Respiratory mechanics would be measured independently as a mediator: airflow, tidal volume, respiratory frequency, airway pressure, and preferably esophageal pressure for estimation of pressure-volume work. The key quantity is cycle-integrated mechanical work, not simply pressure multiplied by average flow. Respiratory-muscle oxygen cost can then be interrogated using controlled unloading/loading or standardized ventilatory tasks, approaches that have experimentally demonstrated changes in systemic oxygen uptake and limb perfusion. [13] These measurements explain how much of a whole-body change is plausibly related to respiratory mechanics; they are not added again to whole-body energy expenditure.

Gas-exchange measurements should include arterial or validated surrogate assessment of CO_2 and O_2 status when the hypothesis concerns altered alveolar ventilation. Minute ventilation alone cannot establish hypocapnia, tissue oxygen delivery, or acid-base state. Likewise, circulation should be measured through cardiac output and regional flow where the hypothesis specifically predicts redistribution. Harms and colleagues demonstrate that such redistribution is experimentally detectable under high respiratory loads. [5]

Thermal and water terms require a separate mass-and-enthalpy balance. Inspired and expired temperature, humidity, airflow, and ambient conditions can quantify respiratory heat and water exchange. Nasal-versus-oral differences in expiratory water recovery are empirically measurable, as Svensson et al. demonstrated. [9] Modeling can supplement these observations, but model outputs must remain model outputs; the Haut framework is especially useful because it explicitly separates gross transfer, expiratory recovery, and net loss. [14]

Cellular metabolism is the least directly attributable term. Whole-body indirect calorimetry already includes cellular oxygen use, so mitochondrial ATP production, proton leak, ion pumping, protein turnover, and repair cannot all be added as extra energy bills. Instead, cellular assays or biomarkers would be used to explain changes in efficiency or substrate use while preserving the whole-body energy total. Experimental proton-leak studies demonstrate why this distinction matters: proton leak represents a real cellular sink, but its contribution varies by tissue and experimental state. [3]

A falsifiable FWOCR study would preregister at least three classes of endpoint: a whole-system endpoint, such as resting or task-matched energy expenditure; subsystem mediators, such as respiratory mechanical work, respiratory-muscle oxygen cost, heat/water loss, and circulatory redistribution; and function-preservation endpoints, such as ventilation, gas exchange, workload, temperature, or other physiological outputs appropriate to the state being compared. A claim of improved efficiency would require **lower energy input at equivalent useful physiological output**, not merely a lower metabolic rate accompanied by reduced function.

The strongest falsification test for a proposed large whole-system saving is straightforward. If a claimed intervention meaningfully reduces FWOCR while preserving function, repeated calibrated whole-body measurements under matched conditions must eventually show a corresponding reduction in the conserved metabolic input, or there must be a demonstrable shift in another boundary flow or stored-energy term that accounts for the discrepancy. If large modeled component savings repeatedly fail to appear in the whole-system balance, the decomposition is wrong, the intervention does not produce the assumed reductions, or the components overlap. That is precisely the kind of failure mode a mature FWOCR framework needs to welcome rather than obscure.

Scholarly assessment and research significance

The FWOCR project has reached a more scientifically interesting stage than either its most expansive historical claims or its harshest critiques suggest. Its mature archive no longer requires the 66–80% allocation to function as a universal physiological constant. Instead, it contains the beginnings of a **systems burden ontology**: mechanical ventilation, respiratory-muscle metabolism, airway and pulmonary tissue metabolism, gas exchange, circulatory support, heat and water transfer, cellular oxidative metabolism, carbon-dioxide transport, and failure/recovery can be represented as coupled processes inside one defined life-support boundary.

That broad framing has genuine intellectual value because physiology often studies these processes in separate literatures. Respiratory muscle work can influence limb perfusion during intense exercise. [5] Airway route changes water recovery. [9] Lung tissue itself consumes oxygen. [7] Mitochondrial proton leak consumes oxygen without producing ATP. [3] Each observation is real at its own boundary. FWOCR's scientific opportunity is to build a formal map connecting those boundaries without confusing them.

Its central theoretical error risk is **semantic capture**: once every process that depends on oxygen is called part of "respiration," the framework can appear to explain most of metabolism by definition. That is a classification achievement, not an empirical discovery. The remedy is not to shrink FWOCR back to conventional work of breathing. The remedy is to preserve the broad nostril-to-cell-and-back boundary while imposing a stricter dimensional and causal grammar: every term must state what physical quantity it represents, whether it is directly measured or modeled, whether it overlaps another term, whether it is baseline-relative, and whether any proposed reduction has actually been observed.

The framework also needs an explicit distinction between **burden decomposition** and **optimization theory**. The first asks where energy, work, heat, material, and recovery burdens occur. The second asks which of those burdens can be reduced while maintaining the same physiological service. The first can be scientifically useful even if the second produces little practical saving. Conversely, evidence that one component becomes more efficient—such as the reduced oxygen cost of voluntary hyperpnea observed by Turner et al.—does not automatically propagate to all other components. [4]

Accordingly, the historical 66–80% TDEE allocation is best preserved as part of the intellectual history of FWOCR, explicitly labeled as a broad modeled allocation. It is **not** an independently validated result, **not** synonymous with avoidable expenditure, and **not** contradicted simply by the narrower conventional work-of-breathing literature because those quantities use different boundaries. The scientifically defensible modern form of FWOCR is not "breathing consumes 66–80% of calories." It is: **the complete oxygen–carbon-dioxide life-support transaction imposes multiple coupled burdens that can be formally decomposed, measured at appropriate boundaries, and tested for efficiency changes without double counting.**

That formulation is falsifiable, compatible with established respiratory and bioenergetic physiology, and sufficiently precise to support a serious research program. It also leaves unresolved claims genuinely unresolved. The current corpus does not demonstrate a population-wide total FWOCR fraction, a $\geq$50% whole-system reduction, a validated all-day energy saving from respiratory training, or a causal interpretation of the 426 kcal/day report. At the same time, it contains verified arithmetic, a disciplined provenance structure, several defensible component findings, and a clear path toward empirical adjudication. The next scientific advance is therefore not a larger percentage. It is a **prospectively**

measured, non-overlapping whole-system partition with matched function, repeated acquisition, uncertainty propagation, and preregistered falsification criteria.

Bibliography

1. Kress JP, Pohlman AS, Alverdy J, Hall JB. *The impact of morbid obesity on oxygen cost of breathing at rest.* American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine. 1999;160:883–886. The study compared whole-body oxygen uptake before and after mechanical ventilation and paralysis in obese and non-obese surgical patients. 1

2. Donahoe M, Rogers RM, Wilson DO, Pennock BE. *Oxygen consumption of the respiratory muscles in normal and in malnourished patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.* American Review of Respiratory Disease. 1989;140:385–391. The study quantified incremental oxygen cost per liter of added ventilation. 2

3. Turner LA, Tecklenburg-Lund SL, Chapman RF, Stager JM, Wilhite DP, Mickleborough TD. *Inspiratory muscle training lowers the oxygen cost of voluntary hyperpnea.* Journal of Applied Physiology. 2012;112:127–134. The randomized experiment found reductions in respiratory oxygen cost during standardized high-ventilation tasks after inspiratory-muscle training. 4

4. Harms CA, Babcock MA, McClaran SR, et al. *Respiratory muscle work compromises leg blood flow during maximal exercise.* Journal of Applied Physiology. 1997;82:1573–1583. Respiratory unloading and loading altered leg blood flow during maximal exercise. 5

5. Wetter TJ, Harms CA, Nelson WB, Pegelow DF, Dempsey JA. *Influence of respiratory muscle work on VO_2 and leg blood flow during submaximal exercise.* Journal of Applied Physiology. 1999;87:643–651. 6

6. Loer SA, Scheeren TWL, Tarnow J. *How much oxygen does the human lung consume?* Anesthesiology. 1997;86:532–537. Oxygen consumption was estimated during cardiopulmonary bypass, with extrapolation to normothermic whole-lung oxygen use. 7

7. Haut B, Karamaoun C, Mauroy B, et al. *Water and heat exchanges in mammalian lungs.* Scientific Reports. 2023;13:6636. The paper presents a mechanistic model of respiratory heat and water exchange and expiratory recovery. 8

8. Haut B, Nonclercq A, Buess A, et al. *Comprehensive analysis of heat and water exchanges in the human lungs.* Frontiers in Physiology. 2021;12:649497. The model analyzes human bronchial heat and moisture conditioning across age and physiological conditions. 15

9. Svensson S, Olin AC, Hellgren J. *Increased net water loss by oral compared to nasal expiration in healthy subjects.* Rhinology. 2006;44:74–77. Nasal expiration produced substantially less net respiratory water loss than oral expiration under the experimental conditions. 9

10. Mekjavic IB, Rogelj K, Radobuljac M, Eiken O. *Inhalation of warm and cold air does not influence brain stem or core temperature in normothermic humans.* Journal of Applied Physiology. 2002;93:65–69. 10

11. Rolfe DFS, Brand MD. *Contribution of mitochondrial proton leak to skeletal muscle respiration and to standard metabolic rate.* American Journal of Physiology. 1996;271:C1380–C1389. The experiments quantified the substantial contribution of mitochondrial proton leak to resting respiration in perfused rat skeletal muscle. 16

12. Brand MD. *The contribution of the leak of protons across the mitochondrial inner membrane to standard metabolic rate.* Journal of Theoretical Biology. 1990;145:267–286. The paper integrates experimental hepatocyte findings showing a substantial proton-leak contribution to resting respiration. 17

13. de V. Weir JB. *New methods for calculating metabolic rate with special reference to protein metabolism.* Journal of Physiology. 1949;109:1–9. The paper established the classical respiratory-gas approach used to derive energy expenditure from oxygen consumption and carbon-dioxide production. 12

14. Gosselink R, Wagenaar RC, Rijswijk H, Sargeant AJ, Decramer M. *Diaphragmatic breathing reduces efficiency of breathing in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.* American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine. 1995;151:1136–1142. In this small COPD study, diaphragmatic breathing reduced measured mechanical efficiency rather than improving it, underscoring the need to measure rather than assume efficiency changes. 18

15. **FWOCR internal corpus.** *FWOCR — fresh-reader foundation, independent checks and failure-aware handoff*; *FWOCR: independent reliance review*; *FWOCR audit — what the evidence supports*; *FWOCR — one worked calculation*; and associated calculation, source-bound, and reproducibility records contained in the attached FWOCR_BUNDLE.zip. These documents provide the authorial boundary definition, historical 66–80% allocation, component calculations, correction history, 426-kcal/day provenance analysis, uncertainty statements, and internal reproducibility record used as the documentary foundation for this paper.

---

1 The impact of morbid obesity on oxygen cost of breathing (VO(2RESP)) at rest
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10471613/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

2 Oxygen consumption of the respiratory muscles in normal and in malnourished patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2764376/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

3 17 The contribution of the leak of protons across the mitochondrial inner membrane to standard metabolic rate
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2169556/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

4 Inspiratory muscle training lowers the oxygen cost of voluntary hyperpnea.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21979803/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

5 13 Respiratory muscle work compromises leg blood flow during maximal exercise.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9134907/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

6 Influence of respiratory muscle work on VO(2) and leg blood flow during submaximal exercise.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10444624/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

7 How much oxygen does the human lung consume?
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9066318/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

8 14 Water and heat exchanges in mammalian lungs
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-023-33052-y?utm_source=chatgpt.com

9 Increased net water loss by oral compared to nasal expiration in healthy subjects.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16550955/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

10 Inhalation of warm and cold air does not influence brain stem or core temperature in normothermic humans.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12070187/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

11 16 Contribution of mitochondrial proton leak to skeletal muscle respiration and to standard metabolic rate.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8897845/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

12 New methods for calculating metabolic rate with special reference to protein metabolism
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15394301/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

15 Comprehensive Analysis of Heat and Water Exchanges in the Human Lungs
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34168568/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

18 Diaphragmatic breathing reduces efficiency of breathing in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7697243/?utm_source=chatgpt.com