UCLA UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Expert consensus on the management of systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease.

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5g73c3jv

Journal Respiratory Research, 24(1)

Authors

Rahaghi, Franck Hsu, Vivien Kaner, Robert <u>et al.</u>

Publication Date

2023-01-09

DOI

10.1186/s12931-022-02292-3

Peer reviewed

RESEARCH





Expert consensus on the management of systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease

Franck F. Rahaghi^{1*}, Vivien M. Hsu², Robert J. Kaner³, Maureen D. Mayes⁴, Ivan O. Rosas⁵, Rajan Saggar⁶, Virginia D. Steen⁷, Mary E. Strek⁸, Elana J. Bernstein⁹, Nitin Bhatt¹⁰, Flavia V. Castelino¹¹, Lorinda Chung¹², Robyn T. Domsic¹³, Kevin R. Flaherty¹⁴, Nishant Gupta¹⁵, Bashar Kahaleh¹⁶, Fernando J. Martinez³, Lee E. Morrow¹⁷, Teng Moua¹⁸, Nina Patel^{9,19}, Oksana A. Shlobin²⁰, Brian D. Southern²¹, Elizabeth R. Volkmann⁶ and Dinesh Khanna^{14*}

Abstract

Background Systemic sclerosis (SSc) is a rare, complex, connective tissue disorder. Interstitial lung disease (ILD) is common in SSc, occurring in 35–52% of patients and accounting for 20–40% of mortality. Evolution of therapeutic options has resulted in a lack of consensus on how to manage this condition. This Delphi study was initiated to develop consensus recommendations based on expert physician insights regarding screening, progression, treatment criteria, monitoring of response, and the role of recent therapeutic advances with antifibrotics and immunosuppressants in patients with SSc-ILD.

Methods A modified Delphi process was completed by pulmonologists (n = 13) and rheumatologists (n = 12) with expertise in the management of patients with SSc-ILD. Panelists rated their agreement with each statement on a Likert scale from -5 (complete disagreement) to +5 (complete agreement). Consensus was predefined as a mean Likert scale score of ≤ -2.5 or $\ge +2.5$ with a standard deviation not crossing zero.

Results Panelists recommended that all patients with SSc be screened for ILD by chest auscultation, spirometry with diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide, high-resolution computed tomography (HRCT), and/or autoantibody testing. Treatment decisions were influenced by baseline and changes in pulmonary function tests, extent of ILD on HRCT, duration and degree of dyspnea, presence of pulmonary hypertension, and potential contribution of reflux. Treatment success was defined as stabilization or improvement of signs or symptoms of ILD and functional status. Mycophenolate mofetil was identified as the initial treatment of choice. Experts considered nintedanib a therapeutic option in patients with progressive fibrotic ILD despite immunosuppressive therapy or patients contraindicated/ unable to tolerate immunotherapy. Concomitant use of nintedanib with MMF/cyclophosphamide can be considered in patients with advanced disease at initial presentation, aggressive ILD, or significant disease progression. Although limited consensus was achieved on the use of tocilizumab, the experts considered it a therapeutic option for patients with early SSc and ILD with elevated acute-phase reactants.

*Correspondence: Franck F. Rahaghi RAHAGHF@ccf.org Dinesh Khanna khannad@umich.edu Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Conclusions This modified Delphi study generated consensus recommendations for management of patients with SSc-ILD in a real-world setting. Findings from this study provide a management algorithm that will be helpful for treating patients with SSc-ILD and addresses a significant unmet need.

Keywords Autoimmune diseases, Connective tissue diseases, Pulmonary fibrosis, Drug therapy, Algorithms

Background

Systemic sclerosis (SSc) is a rare, complex connective tissue disease of unknown etiology characterized by microvascular damage, dysregulation of innate and adaptive immunity, and generalized fibrosis in the skin and multiple internal organs [1-3]. It can target many organ systems, including the skin, lungs, heart, blood vessels, kidneys, gastrointestinal tract, and musculoskeletal system [2, 3]. While the pathogenesis of SSc is not well understood, hallmarks include inflammation, vasculopathy, and fibroblast dysfunction. Risk factors associated with the development of and/or progression of ILD include male sex, African-American race, diffuse cutaneous SSc (dcSSc), presence of anti-Scl-70/anti-topoisomerase I antibodies, and cardiac involvement [4–6].

Interstitial lung disease (ILD) occurs in 35–52% of patients with SSc and accounts for 20–40% of mortality [7–10]. The risk of developing ILD is greatest early in the course of SSc, and timely detection is important for monitoring progression and informing therapeutic decision-making [4, 11]. A European consensus statement identified chest high-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) as the primary diagnostic tool for SSc-ILD, supported by pulmonary function tests (PFTs) for screening and diagnosis [12]. Declining values for forced vital capacity (FVC) and diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide (DL_{CO}) can suggest progression of ILD [1, 4, 13].

The European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) guidelines for the management of SSc recommend cyclophosphamide (CYC) for the treatment of SSc-ILD. Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation may also be considered in patients with rapidly progressive SSc at risk of organ failure, although careful selection of patients is required due to a high risk of treatment-related side effects and mortality [14–16]. Mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) provides similar efficacy to CYC and is associated with less toxicity [17–21]. For patients who do not respond to treatment, lung transplantation may be a life-saving option [22, 23].

Antifibrotic drugs represent another class that may be considered a potential treatment option for SSc-ILD based on their efficacy in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF), a condition with pathogenic similarities. Nintedanib has been approved for the treatment of SSc-ILD and chronic fibrosing ILDs with a progressive phenotype based on the results of the SENSCIS and INBUILD trials respectively [24–26]; pirfenidone is currently under evaluation [27, 28]. In addition, tocilizumab (TCZ), an inhibitor of interleukin-6, has recently been approved for the treatment of SSc-ILD based on the results of the focuSSced trial [29, 30].

There is a growing desire among pulmonologists and rheumatologists to identify screening, detection, and monitoring strategies that are clinically meaningful and improve patient outcomes. The objective of this Delphi study was to develop consensus recommendations based on expert physician insights regarding screening, disease progression, treatment criteria, monitoring of therapeutic response, and the potential future role of antifibrotics in the treatment paradigm for patients with SSc-ILD.

Methods

This modified Delphi process was conceived and initiated by the lead and corresponding authors (FFR and DK). As moderators, FFR and DK worked with an advisory board of pulmonologists and rheumatologists with experience in treating SSc-ILD, and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc., to determine the panel selection criteria and identify potential members.

The modified Delphi process followed in this study was as follows (Fig. 1):

- The moderators and advisory board members developed Questionnaire 1 based on current clinical practice, a review of the literature, and clinical experience. This topically organized questionnaire included multiple statements relevant to screening, treatment criteria, and the potential role for antifibrotic drugs in patients with SSc-ILD. These topics were maintained through all three questionnaires. The Questionnaire was circulated via an online survey platform (Surveygizmo.com) to the Delphi panelists, who provided their independent comments for each statement and added additional statements at their discretion.
- Following review of the aggregate anonymized responses to Questionnaire 1, the moderators developed Questionnaire 2, which incorporated both the initial and additional statements from the panelists. Questionnaire 2 was circulated using the same online survey platform and the panelists rated each statement using a Likert scale ranging from -5 (strongly

Recruit panelists Conduct advisory board to develop Questionnaire 1 (FFR, DK, DZ, and advisory board members)

Main Delphi survey

Questionnaire 1

Develop based on publications, clinical experience, and judgment Circulate to panelists and collect responses

> Review and summarize responses (FFR, DK, DZ) Develop Questionnaire 2

Questionnaire 2

Includes statements from Questionnaire 1 and statements added by panelists Circulate to panelists to assess level of agreement using Likert scale (-5 to +5) Collect and analyze responses

Review and aggregate responses (FFR, DK, DZ) Amend Questionnaire 2 to incorporate any comments from panelists

Questionnaire 3

Circulate to panelists with their individual score plus the aggregate scores, for validation using Likert scale (-5 to +5)

Collect and analyze responses

Circulate and review final results (all authors)

Supplementary Delphi survey

Supplementary Questionnaire 1

Develop based on advances in SSc-ILD treatment Circulate to panelists to assess level of agreement using Likert scale (-5 to +5)

Review and aggregate responses (FFR, DK) Amend Questionnaire 2 to incorporate any comments from panelists



Fig. 1 The Delphi process employed for both the first and second Delphi analyses. SSc-ILD systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease

disagree) to +5 (strongly agree). Consensus was defined prospectively as a mean rating of ≤ -2.5 or $\geq +2.5$, with a standard deviation (SD) that did not cross zero.

- 3. The moderators refined the statements based on the aggregate results from Questionnaire 2 to create the 152-statement Questionnaire 3, again circulated using the online survey platform. To promote consensus 'for' or 'against' each statement, panelists also received separately their individual responses to Questionnaire 2 plus the panel's aggregate results (mean and SD). Additional questions regarding the role of nintedanib in the treatment of SSc-ILD were shared with the panel following publication of the SENSCIS trial results.
- 4. The aggregate results of Questionnaire 3 were circulated to the panelists for final review and comment (see Additional file 1: Table S1 for details).
- 5. Following publication of the INBUILD, RELIEF, and focuSSced trial results [25, 27, 29], a supplementary Delphi survey comprising two questionnaires focusing on the current treatment paradigm was conducted. The same approach was used as described above.

Panelists' anonymity was ensured throughout the study to prevent bias induced by influential clinicians and help ensure that all panelists were comfortable offering their opinions freely. Panelists were encouraged to provide feedback on the validity, specificity, and content of the items under consideration.

Page 4 of 16

Results

The Delphi process was initiated in 2018 with a panel comprising 25 physicians (Table 1). The panel included 13 pulmonologists and 12 rheumatologists practicing predominately in academic centers (n = 24), hospital-based clinics (n = 3), and Veterans Administration (n = 2). Some panelists practiced across multiple care settings. Their collective experience of seeing patients with SSc-ILD was 16.68 ± 9.68 (mean \pm SD) years, treating 80.04 ± 73.23 patients with SSc-ILD in the last year (Table 1). The panel reached consensus on 109 of the 239 statements (45.6%); 98 statements reached consensus 'for' and 11 reached consensus 'against.' A list of all questions and results from Questionnaire 3 and Supplementary Questionnaire 2 can be viewed in Additional file 1: Tables S1 and S2.

Screening

Panelists recommended the use of chest auscultation, full PFTs, spirometry with DL_{CO} , HRCT, and autoantibody testing to screen patients with SSc for ILD (Fig. 2, Additional file 1: Table S1). The consensus was that all patients with SSc should be screened, with greater agreement for patients with respiratory symptoms and those at high risk (e.g. dcSSc, positive for Scl-70 antibodies, African-American ethnicity, and/or a high modified Rodnan skin score [mRSS]). In addition, panelists recommended routinely screening for pulmonary hypertension (PH) in patients with SSc; the consensus to screen for this was even stronger when shortness of breath not explained by progression of ILD is observed.

Table 1 Characteristics of the Delphi panelists

Charactaristic	Number of papalists	Maan CD
	Number of panelists	mean ± 5D
Specialty		
Pulmonology	13	
Rheumatology	12	
Experience treating SSc-ILD ($n = 25$)		16.68 ± 9.68
\leq 10 years	6	
11-20 years	14	
>20 years	5	
Patients with SSc-ILD treated in entire career ($n = 24$)		369.58 ± 341.74
≤ 500	21	
501–1000	2	
>1000	1	
Patients with SSc-ILD treated last year (n $=$ 23)		80.04 ± 73.23
≤50	11	
51–150	10	
>150	2	

SD standard deviation, SSc-ILD systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease

Statement	Mean	SD					
Screening for the general scleroderma population for ILD should include:							
Chest auscultation	4.32	1.18			i	_	
PFTs	4.16	1.70		E	1		-
Spirometry with DL _{co}	4.36	1.04		1	1	_	-i-l
HRCT	4.08	1.63					i l
Autoantibody testing	2.96	1.79				_	<u> </u>
Considerations in determining which patients to screen/diagnose for ILD include:						•	
All SSc patients	3.72	2.19		£	1	-	
Patients with symptoms	4.92	0.28		1	1		-
High-risk patients (eg: dcSSc, +Scl-70 antibodies, African American ethnicity, and/or high modified Rodnan skin score) When to screen for pulmonary hypertension in patients with SSc-ILD*	4.96	0.20					ł
Once per year	4.41	0.85		1	1		
I routinely screen for pulmonary hypertension	4.59	0.73		E	1		<u> </u>
I screen for pulmonary hypertension when shortness of breath is not explained by progression of ILD	4.86	0.47	_				-1
I do not screen for pulmonary hypertension	-4.77	0.53	╊		1		
		-5	.0 —: M	2.5 Iean D	0.0 Delphi sco	2.5 pre	5.0
		I	Disagree	• 🗕		→ Ag	ree

Fig. 2 Consensus recommendations for screening criteria for SSc-ILD. *Data from the 2022 supplementary Delphi. *dcSSc* diffuse cutaneous systemic sclerosis, *DL_{CO}* diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide, *HRCT* high-resolution computed tomography, *ILD* interstitial lung disease, *PFT* pulmonary function test, *SD* standard deviation, *SSc* systemic sclerosis

Treatment criteria

Panelists reached consensus that their treatment decisions were influenced by baseline and clinically meaningful changes in PFT values, the extent of ILD or fibrosis on HRCT, the duration and degree of dyspnea, the presence of PH, and the potential contribution of reflux (Fig. 3). There was no consensus regarding the use of autoantibody status, age, presence of comorbidities, or duration of disease (Additional file 1: Table S1). The panelists recommended that treatment should be initiated in patients with abnormal or progressive findings on HRCT, FVC < 80%, or FVC>80% if accompanied by ILD in a high-risk patient or by dyspnea, by a notable decline in FVC, or accompanied by peripheral capillary oxygen desaturation (SpO₂) on exercise (Fig. 3). Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT (or>20% lung involvement), FVC and/or DL_{CO} below the normal lower limit, moderate-to-severe symptoms, early rapidly progressive dcSSc (even if accompanied by only mild abnormalities on HRCT and/or PFTs), hypoxemia at rest, and desaturation on exercise were considered sufficiently concerning to warrant immediate treatment. The panel also reached consensus that patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable PFTs, and no progression of ILD over recent years should not be treated (Additional file 1: Table S1).

Treatment sequencing

Panelists considered MMF as first-line therapy for patients with SSc-ILD at a target dose of 2000-3000 mg daily. Initial nintedanib therapy, at a target dose of 150 mg twice daily, was recommended for patients with longstanding (>5 years) SSc with ILD and evidence of progression for whom immunosuppression would not be recommended. (Fig. 4A, Additional file 1: Table S2). It was also considered as add-on therapy to MMF or CYC and following failure of MMF, CYC, and/or TCZ. However, there was no consensus on the use of CYC, rituximab, azathioprine, prednisone, or TCZ as initial therapy, nor for the use of nintedanib as initial therapy in patients other than those previously described (Additional file 1: Table S1). There was consensus against utilizing methotrexate as initial therapy for patients with SSc-ILD, and there was no consensus on the duration of treatment.

Considerations in deciding whether to treat patients for ILD Image: Consideration of the constant of the consten of the constant of the constant of the constant of th	State	ment	Mean	SD		
Exert of ULD or fibrosis on HRCT 4.56 1.08 Baseline PFT values 4.57 0.52 Clinically meaningful change (decline) in PFT values 4.76 0.52 Duration and degree of dyspnea 7.76 1.36 Potential contribution of reflux 2.52 1.58 Presence of pulmonary hypertension 3.00 1.63 Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have: Worsening HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs 4.84 0.37 > 20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 4.84 0.32 > 10% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 4.84 0.82 > 10% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 4.52 1.29 High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of 1.12 High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of 1.12 FVC <80% with 1.10 on HRCT 2.68 1.80 FVC <70% and dyspnea 3.12 1.24 Decline in FVC by 10% in 1 year 4.48 0.87 Besides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: Patients of solution MOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: Patients with ongstanding disease (close to 10 years), table FFTs and no progression of 110 Dover last few wears Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to Patients for SS-LD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than U.1 NN or no specific antibodies have to take and would would Traise me metodyney progressive due of the would Traise me metodyney progressive due of the would T	Consi	derations in deciding whether to treat patients for ILD				
Baseline PFT values 4.08 0.95 Clinically meaningful change (decline) in PFT values 4.76 0.52 Duration and degree of dyspnea 3.76 1.36 Potential contribution of reflux 2.52 1.58 Presence of pulmonary hypertension 3.08 1.63 Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have: Worsening HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs 4.84 0.37 >20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 4.48 0.82 1.09 High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mid ILD (<10%) and abnormal PFTs	menut	Extent of ILD or fibrosis on HRCT	4.56	1.08		
Baseline P-T values 4.08 0.95 Clinically meaningful change (decline) in PTT values 4.76 0.52 Duration and degree of dyspnea 3.76 1.36 Potential contribution of reflux 2.52 1.58 Presence of pulmonary hypertension 3.08 1.63 Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have: Worsening HRCT with symptoms or declining PTTs 4.84 0.37 > 20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PTTs 3.04 1.57 > 20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PTTs 4.08 1.12 High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mid L10 (c10%) 3.24 1.51 Based on NC and symptoms status (assume all patients have LLD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo-) 3.72 1.51 FVC - 80% with any degree of LD on HRCT 2.68 1.80 FVC - 40% and dyspnea 4.12 1.24 Decline in FVC by 20% in 1 year 4.48 0.37 Patients who should ND be treated for SSC-LD include: 2.52 1.81 Prise and progression of LD over last few years 3.52 1.81 Crimical or danges on PTTs 3.68 1.35 Decline in FVC by			4.50	1.00		
Clinically meaningful change (decline) in PFT values 4.76 0.52 Duration and degree of dyspnea 3.76 1.36 Potential contribution of reflux 2.52 1.58 Presence of pulmonary hypertension 3.08 1.63 Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have: Worsening HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs 4.84 0.37 >20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 3.04 1.57 >20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 3.22 1.29 High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mid LID (C10%) and abnormal PFTs 3.24 1.51 Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease), on the oth have: 7.72 1.51 FVC -80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT 2.68 1.80 7.72 1.51 FVC -80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT 2.68 1.80 7.72 1.51 Exides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: 3.72 1.51 PvC -80% and dyspnea 3.22 1.81 5.72 1.81 Presides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment broader 3.52 1.81 5.72 1.81		Baseline PFT values	4.08	0.95		
Duration and degree of dyspnea 3.76 1.36 Potential contribution of reflux 2.52 1.58 Presence of pulmonary hypertension 3.08 1.63 Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have: Worsening HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs 4.84 0.37 >20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 3.04 1.57 >20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 3.04 1.51 High-rick patients (arrly diffuse disease) with evidence of mild ILO (10%) 0.82 1.54 HRCT (10%) and abnormal PFTs 3.72 1.51 Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT (10%) and abnormal PFTs 3.72 1.51 PVC 280% with Do HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo) 3.72 1.51 FVC 480% with Do HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease) 3.72 1.54 PC 280% ord dyspnea 3.28 1.54 Decline in FVC by 10% in 1 year 4.16 0.30 Decline in FVC by 10% in 1 year 3.52 1.81 Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable treatment include: 3.52 1.81 Patients with obary attoprese of ILD on HRCT 3.82		Clinically meaningful change (decline) in PFT values	4.76	0.52		
Potential contribution of reflux 2.52 1.58 Presence of pulmonary hypertension 3.08 1.63 Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have:		Duration and degree of dyspnea	3.76	1.36		
Presence of pulmonary hypertension3.081.63Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have:Worsening HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs4.840.37>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with normal PFTs3.041.57>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs3.221.29High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of0.821.51Based on P/C and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of1.52Based on P/C and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients are treated who have:3.241.51P/C -80% with LD on HRCT2.681.80P/C -80% with LD on HRCT2.681.80P/C -80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT2.681.80P/C -80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT2.681.50Decline in FVC by spotent than measurement error (5-7%)1.560.90Decline in FVC by spotent than measurement error (5-7%)1.560.90Decline in FVC by spotent than parameters to consider when initiating restarment include:3.521.81Protist and person on Spot2.271.54Consideration on sporgersion of ILD over last few years2.762.19Protist and person on PFTs3.681.35Duration of symptoms2.721.54Consideration in gatemist includival we don't know2.762.19Work are enough concern about near-term ILD that I would stati1.20Protist and frig awaye:3.641.15Duration of		Potential contribution of reflux	2.52	1.58		
Based on HRCT, patients are treated who have: $V \text{ or sening HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs 4.84 0.37 3.04 1.57 3.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05$		Presence of pulmonary hypertension	3.08	1.63		E .
Workering HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs4.840.37>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs3.041.57>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs3.521.29High-risk patients (early diffuce disease) with evidence of mild ILD (<10%) and abnormal PFTs	Based	d on HRCT. patients are treated who have:				
Worsening interiment on HRCT with normal PFTs4.480.57>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs3.041.57>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs3.521.29High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mid ILD (c10%)0.880.82Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients are treated who have: FVC-80% with ILO on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease), Topo+13.721.51FVC-80% with ILO on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease), Topo+13.721.51FVC-80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT2.681.80FVC-70% and dyspnea4.420.90Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5-7%)4.160.90Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5-7%)4.160.90Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5-7%)1.541.54Patients with longstanding disease (lose to 10 years), stable PFTs and no progression Of ILD ore Hart few years3.521.81Fridings or changes on PFTs3.681.351.31Duration of symptoms2.721.541.54Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other attribudies than ULR PP or ospecific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know how agressive their disease will be abnormalibes on PFTS3.681.07Duration of symptoms2.721.541.54Consideration of autoantibodies han ULR PP or ospecific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know how		Worspring HPCT with symptoms or declining PETs	1 91	0.27		
S20% total lung involvement on HRC1 with abnormal PF1S 3.04 1.57 >20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PF1S 3.52 1.29 High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mid ILO (c10%) and abnormal PF1S 3.24 1.51 Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRC1, patients are treated who have: FVC-80% with ILD on HRC1 in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease), Topo+1 3.72 1.51 FVC -80% with ILD on HRC1 in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease), Topo+1 3.72 1.51 FVC -80% with any degree of ILD on HRC1 2.68 1.80 FVC -70% and dyspnea 4.12 1.24 Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (S-7%) 4.16 0.90 Decline in FVC by >10% in 1 year 4.48 0.87 Beside HRC1 and pF1S, other treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: Patients with long standing disease (lose to 10 years), stable PFTS and no progression of ILD over Ister wears 3.52 1.81 Findings or changes on PFTS 3.68 1.35 1.35 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies than UL NP or no specific antibodies have LD and HRV por pacientic antibodies have LD NP or pacientic antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know treatment rigit away: Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Consideration of autoantibodies than UL NP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know treatment rigit away: Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 C		200% total lung involvement on UDCT with a small DTT	4.04	1.57		E.
>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs4.480.82>10% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs3.521.29High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild ILO (c10%), and abnormal PFTs3.241.51Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients are treated who have: FVC >80% with ILD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo+)3.721.51FVC <80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT		>20% total lung involvement on HRC1 with normal PF1s	3.04	1.57		
>10% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs 3.52 1.29 High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild LD (c10%) and abnormal PFTs High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild LD (c10%) Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients retreated who have: FVC <80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topot) FVC <80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT C.68 1.80 FVC <80% and dyspnea A.412 Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5–7%) 4.16 0.90 Decline in FVC by spather treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: Exercional desaturation on SpO2 3.28 1.54 Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable period of the entry diffuse of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable periods of the entry diffuse disease of the entry diffuse disease of the entry diffuse disease in the disease disease and to progression of ILD over last few years Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: Patients with ongstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable priemts for Sci-LD and intil presentation in should include: Patients with organo progression of ILD over last few years Criteria to detaemine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: Patients with ong and progression of ILD over last few years Criteria to detaemine the phenotype of patients or to reat patients for Sci-LD and intil presentation in should include: Patients with other antibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for Sci-LD and intil presentation in patients with Sci, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away?: Moderate to severe sym		>20% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs	4.48	0.82		
High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild LD (c10%) and abnormal PTS4.081.12High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild LD (c10%)3.241.51Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients are treated who have: FVC <80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo+)3.721.51FVC <80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo+)3.721.51FVC <80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo+)3.721.51FVC <70% and dyspnea		>10% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs	3.52	1.29		
High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild LD (<10%)3.241.51Based on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients are treated who have: FVC <80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topot)3.721.51FVC <80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topot)3.721.51FVC <80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topot)3.721.51FVC <80% and dyspnea		High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild ILD (<10%) and abnormal PFTs	4.08	1.12		
Based on FVC cord symptom status (assume all patients have ILD on HRCT), patients are treated who have: FVC >80% with ILO on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo+) FVC <80% with land HRCT in a high-risk patient (early fVC <80% with land HRCT in a high-risk patient (early fVC <80% with land HRCT in a high-risk patient (early fVC <80% and dyspnea 3.44 1.50 FVC <70% and dyspnea 4.12 Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5–7%) decline in FVC by 10% in 1 year Besides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: Exertional desaturation on SpO ₂ 3.28 1.54 Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable FTS and no progression of ILD over last few years Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: Findings or changes on PFTS 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies in deciding whether to treat patients of SSC-ILD initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than U1 NPP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know Now aggressive their disease wilb be "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would stati treatment right away?: Moderate to severe symptoms Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities abry progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities abry rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities abry rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities abry rapidly progressive diffuse subset even w		High-risk patients (early diffuse disease) with evidence of mild UD (<10%)	3.24	1.51		
on HRCT), patients are treated who have: FVC >80% with LD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early diffuse disease, Topo+) FVC <80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT 2.68 1.80 FVC <80% and dyspnea 3.44 1.50 FVC <70% and dyspnea 4.12 1.24 Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5–7%) 4.16 0.90 Decline in FVC by >10% in 1 year 4.48 0.87 Besides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: Exertional desaturation on SpO ₂ 3.28 1.54 Patients who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: Patients who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable respond to treatment include: Findings or changes on HRCT 3.84 1.31 Findings or changes on PFTs 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies than U1 RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know how aggressive their disease will be, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away?: Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities antyporg is a trest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11	Based	d on FVC and symptom status (assume all patients have ILD				
diffuse disease, Topo+)3.721.51FVC <80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT	on HF	RCT), patients are treated who have: FVC >80% with ILD on HRCT in a high-risk patient (early				
FVC <80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT2.681.80FVC <80% and dyspnea		diffuse disease, Topo+)	3.72	1.51		
FVC <80% and dyspnea3.441.50FVC <70% and dyspnea		FVC <80% with any degree of ILD on HRCT	2.68	1.80		
FVC <70% and dyspnea4.121.24Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5–7%)4.160.90Decline in FVC by >10% in 1 year4.480.87Besides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: Exertional desaturation on SpO23.281.54Patients who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: Petrs and no progression of ILD over last few years Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: Findings or changes on PFTs3.841.31Findings or changes on PFTs3.681.35Duration of symptoms2.721.54Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies than U1 RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know wow aggressive their disease will be "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away":1.12FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td="">2.721.90Moderate to severe symptoms3.681.07Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan3.641.15Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities on PFT3.800.96Hypoxia at rest3.921.12-5.0-2.Desaturation on exercise3.841.11-5.0-2</lln<>		FVC <80% and dyspnea	3.44	1.50		
Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5–7%)4.160.90Decline in FVC by >10% in 1 year4.480.87Besides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider when initiating treatment include: Exertional desaturation on SpO23.281.54Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable PFTs and no progression of ILD over last few years Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: Findings or changes on PFTs3.841.31Findings or changes on PFTs3.681.35Duration of symptoms2.721.54Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies in deciding whether to treat patients with other antibodies well be "At initial presentation about near-term ILD that I would start" treatment right away": Moderate to severe symptoms2.762.19Moderate to severe symptoms3.681.071.12FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td="">2.721.90Moderate to severe symptoms3.681.07Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan3.601.29Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities3.800.96Hypoxia at rest3.921.12-5.0-2</lln<>		FVC <70% and dyspnea	4.12	1.24		
Decline in FVC by >10% in 1 year 4.48 0.87 Besides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider 1 1 Exertional desaturation on SpO2 3.28 1.54 Patients who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: 3.52 1.81 Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable or respond to treatment include: 3.52 1.81 Findings or changes on HRCT 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: 2.76 2.19 Patients with other antibodies than UI RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know threat reatment right away': 1.12 Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 2.50 -2.70 Desaturation on exercise 3</lln<>		Decline in FVC by greater than measurement error (5–7%)	4.16	0.90		
Besides HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider Initiating treatment include: Exertional desaturation on SpO2 3.28 1.54 Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable PFTs and no progression of ILD over last few years 3.52 1.81 Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: 3.84 1.31 Findings or changes on HRCT 3.84 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: 2.76 2.19 Matients with other antibodies than UI RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know how aggressive their disease will be 2.76 2.19 *Xt initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away'': Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT 3.80 0.96 1.29 HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 1.29 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11 -5.0 -2.0		Decline in FVC by >10% in 1 year	4.48	0.87		
when initiating treatment include: 3.28 1.54 Exertional desaturation on SpO2 3.28 1.54 Patients who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable PFTs and no progression of ILD over last few years 3.52 1.81 Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: 3.84 1.31 Findings or changes on PFTs 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: 2.76 2.19 Patients with other antibodies than UI RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know 2.76 2.19 "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away": Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 1.54 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.80 0.96</lln<>	Besid	es HRCT and PFTs, other treatment parameters to consider				
Exertional desaturation on SpO2 3.28 1.54 Patients who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable 3.52 1.81 PTis and no progression of ILD over last few years 3.52 1.81 Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: 3.84 1.31 Findings or changes on PFTs 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: 2.76 2.19 Moderate-to-severe libb on Wagressive their disease will be *** *** 1.12 Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT didu progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT didu progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT didu progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT didu progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT didu progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT didu progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PRT didu progressive diffuse subset</lln<>	when	i initiating treatment include:				
Patients who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include: Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable PFTs and no progression of ILD over last few years Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: Findings or changes on PFTs 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibidies than UI RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know how aggressive their disease will be "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away": Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln 1.90<br="" 2.72="">Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT 4.20 0.87 on PFT HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11</lln>		Exertional desaturation on SpO ₂	3.28	1.54		
Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable 3.52 1.81 PFTs and no progression of ILD over last few years 3.52 1.81 Criteria to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to respond to treatment include: 3.84 1.31 Findings or changes on HRCT 3.84 1.31 Findings or changes on PFTs 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: 2.76 2.19 Maint Patients with other antibodies than U1 RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know how aggressive their disease will be 2.76 2.19 "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away": Moderate-to-severe lLD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on NFT 3.64 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on NFT 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 0.87 Desaturation on exercise</lln<>	Patie	nts who should NOT be treated for SSc-ILD include:				
Findings or changes on HRCT 3.84 1.31 Findings or changes on PFTs 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: Patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than UJ RNP or no specific automosphere in the state of the sease will be 2.76 2.19 "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away": 4.00 1.12 Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan 3.64 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan 0.87 0.87 PHT HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 -5.0 -5.0 -2.7</lln<>	Criter respo	Patients with longstanding disease (close to 10 years), stable PFTs and no progression of ILD over last few years 'ia to determine the phenotype of patients who are likely to ond to treatment include:	3.52	1.81		
Findings or changes on PFTs 3.68 1.35 Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SS-(LD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than U1 RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know 2.76 2.19 "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away": 0 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11</lln<>		Findings or changes on HRCT	3.84	1.31		
Duration of symptoms 2.72 1.54 Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than UI RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know treatment right away': 2.76 2.19 **At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away': 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11</lln<>		Findings or changes on PFTs	3.68	1.35		
Consideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat patients for SSc-ILD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than UI RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know waggressive their disease will be "At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away": Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11</lln<>		Duration of symptoms	2.72	1.54		
patients for SSC-ILD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than UI RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know 2.76 2.19 how aggressive their disease will be "At initial presentation in patients with SSC, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away": Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln 1.90<br="" 2.72="">Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities on PFT HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11</lln>	Con	sideration of autoantibodies in deciding whether to treat	2.12	1.54		
Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT 4.00 1.12 FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan 3.64 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.80 0.96 HYpoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11</lln<>	"At caus	ents for SSC-ILD at initial presentation should include: Patients with other antibodies than U1 RNP or no specific antibodies have to be taken individually as we don't know how aggressive their disease will be initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would se me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start thent right awav ⁴ :	2.76	2.19		
FVC and/or DL _{CO} <lln< td=""> 2.72 1.90 Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities 3.64 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11</lln<>		Moderate-to-severe ILD on HRCT	4.00	1.12		
Moderate to severe symptoms 3.68 1.07 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on NRCT chest scan 3.64 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11		FVC and/or DL _{co} <lln< td=""><td>2.72</td><td>1.90</td><td></td><td></td></lln<>	2.72	1.90		
Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan 3.64 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 4.20 0.87 HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11		Moderate to severe symptoms	3 68	1.07		
abnormalities on HRCT chest scan 3.64 1.15 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities 4.20 0.87 on PFT HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11		Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild	3.00	1.07		
carry, rapidity progressive dirfuse subset even with mild abnormalities on PFT 3.60 1.29 Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities 4.20 0.87 MRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11		abnormalities on HRCT chest scan	3.64	1.15		
Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities 4.20 0.87 on PFT HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11		abnormalities on PFT	3.60	1.29		
HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement 3.80 0.96 Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11 -5.0 -2. N		Early, rapidly progressive diffuse subset even with mild abnormalities on HRCT chest scan AND mild abnormalities on PFT	4.20	0.87		
Hypoxia at rest 3.92 1.12 Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11 -5.0 -2.1 M		HRCT showing ILD >20% lung involvement	3.80	0.96		
Desaturation on exercise 3.84 1.11 -5.0 -2.1 M		Hypoxia at rest	3.92	1.12		
		Desaturation on exercise	3.84	1.11		
- 5.0 - 2 M Dicarro d				_ 0	0 -25	
					-2.5 Me	Ş:
Theadran 4				,	isagree 🔺	

Fig. 3 Consensus recommendations for SSc-ILD treatment criteria. *dcSSc* diffuse cutaneous SSc, *DL*_{CO} diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide, *FVC* forced vital capacity, *HRCT* high-resolution computed tomography, *ILD* interstitial lung disease, *LLN* lower limit of normal, *PFT* pulmonary function test, *RNP* ribonucleoprotein, *SD* standard deviation, *SpO*₂ peripheral capillary oxygen saturation, *SSc* systemic sclerosis, *Topo* topoisomerase

The potential role of antifibrotic drugs

When asked how the panel's treatment choices for patients with SSc-ILD have changed since publication of the SENS-CIS, INBUILD, and focuSSced trial results, 77% mentioned that they had increased their use of nintedanib or antifibrotics, while 45% mentioned that they now use or would consider using TCZ.

Antifibrotic drugs in general were considered potential therapeutic options based on a decline in PFTs and/or HRCT, and it was recommended that they should be used in combination with or after MMF/CYC. Following the results of the SENSCIS and INBUILD trials, the panelists reached consensus that nintedanib specifically was a therapeutic option for patients with progressive fibrotic ILD despite immunosuppressive therapy, both as monotherapy and in combination with MMF/CYC/TCZ, for patients with aggressive ILD (defined as relative FVC decline>10% in 1 year), with advanced disease at initial presentation (FVC<50%) in combination with MMF/CYC/TCZ, and for patients with contraindications to or who are unable to tolerate immunosuppression (MMF/CYC/TCZ). There was also consensus that nintedanib could be used to treat patients unable to continue with MMF, CYC, or TCZ due to adverse effects or lack of efficacy with the effective dose (Fig. 4B, Additional file 1: Table S2). The panelists' consensus was that the decision to include nintedanib in the treatment regimen should be based on lack of an effective response to MMF/CYC/TCZ, defined by a combined lack of improvement in symptoms, HRCT, and/or PFT results, or an active worsening of the patient's condition, defined by worsening of ILD on HRCT, worsening of lung function, or a combination of the two with worsening symptoms.

The potential role of TCZ

Following the results of the focuSSced trial, the panelists agreed that TCZ should be considered in patients with early SSc and ILD with elevated acute-phase reactants. Use of TCZ in patients experiencing worsening on initial therapy did not achieve consensus by the whole group. They also considered TCZ an option for patients unable to continue CYC, MMF, or antifibrotics due to adverse effects. There was no consensus agreement on how TCZ fits into the management of SSc-ILD (Fig. 4B, Additional file 1: Table S2).

Management of disease progression

Panelists reached consensus on the possibility of adding further agents for patients with progression/worsening of

Α	Statement	Mean	SD				
	The initial therapy used to treat SSc-ILD is:						
	MMF	4.72	0.74				
	Methotrexate	-2.84	2.48	E			
	The typical/target dose for MMF is:						
	2000 mg daily	2.68	1.82				_
	3000 mg daily	4.44	0.77				-
	l do not utilize MMF	-4.56	1.39	I	i.		
	The typical/target dose for azathioprine is:				1		
	2–3 mg/kg/day	2.88	2.46		- i		
	The typical/target dose for rituximab is:						
	1 g on days 0 and 15, then every 6–12 months	2.76	2.49				
	I do not utilize rituximab	-2.76	2.70				
	The typical/target dose for nintedanib is:*						
	150 mg twice daily	4.68	0.57		i.		-#
	I do not utilize nintedanib	-4.73	0.55	-			
	The typical/target dose for TCZ is:*				i.		
	162 mg/week	4.18	1.44				-
	I do not utilize TCZ	-3.36	1.89		i.		_
	Based on the following response to SSc-ILD treatment, please indicate your likely course of action:						
	With progression/worsening of ILD, I would add another agent	2.92	2.66			- H	
	With stability of ILD, I would switch to another agent	-3.12	1.88				
	With stability of ILD, I would add another agent	-3.28	1.88		i.		
	With stability of ILD, I would continue treatment as is	3.56	1.85			_	
				0 25			
			-5.	0 -2.5	0.0	2.5	5.0
				Mean	Delphi	score	
			D	isagree 🗲		► A	Agree

Fig. 4 Consensus recommendations for SSc-ILD treatment paradigm. A Treatment dosage and next steps following treatment response. B Use of nintedanib and tocilizumab. *Data from the 2022 supplementary Delphi. [†]Consensus was not reached in main Delphi analysis. CYC cyclophosphamide, *HRCT* high-resolution computed tomography, *ILD* interstitial lung disease, *MMF* mycophenolate mofetil, *PFT* pulmonary function test, *SD* standard deviation, *SSc* systemic sclerosis, *TCZ* tocilizumab

Statement	Mean	SD		
Ninteganio nis into the management of SSC-ILD as follows:				
As initial therapy for patients with longstanding SSc (>5 years) with ILD and evidence of progression for whom immunosuppression would not be recommended*	3.05	1.21	-	-
Add-on therapy after failure of				
	2.40	1 71		
	5.40	1.71	-	
	3.82	0.66		
	3.64	0.79		-
MIMF and CYC*	3.82	0.73		
	3.00	1.93		
IC2 and CYC*	3.59	0.73		
TCZ and MMF*	3.64	0.66		-
TCZ and MMF and CYC*	3.64	0.58		+
Add-on therapy to MMF/CYC*	3.77	0.81	 	
I would use nintedanib under the following conditions:				
Patients with progressive fibrotic ILD despite				
Immunosuppressive therapy	4.28	0.79		-
Immunosuppressive therapy (MMF/CYC/TCZ)*	4.55	0.80		+
Patients with progressive fibrotic ILD in combination with				
MMF/CYC	4.00	0.96		+
MMF/CYC/TCZ*	4.23	0.87		-
Patients who have contraindications to or are unable to tolerate				
Immunosuppression	3.71	1.55		
Immunosuppression (MMF/CYC/TCZ)*	4.32	0.65		+
For patients with aggressive ILD, advanced disease at initial presentation, or significant disease progression				
In combination with immunosuppressive agents (MMF/CYC)	3.68	1.28		
In combination with immunosuppressive agents (MMF/CYC/TCZ)*	* 3.95	0.84		
Lack of effective response or improvement with immunosuppressive agents as defined by lack of improvement of lung function	2			
MME/CYC	1 76†	1 76		
MMF/CYC/TCZ*	2.55	1.68		
Lack of effective response or improvement with immunosuppressive agents, defined by a combination of no improvement in symptoms; ILD on HRCT; and/or PFTs	2.55	1.00		
MMF/CYC	2.52	1.73		—
MMF/CYC/TCZ*	3.05	1.84		1
Based on inability to continue immunosuppressive treatment due to adverse effects				
MMF/CYC	2.80	1.35	_	-
MMF/CYC/TCZ*	3.14	0.94		
Based on inability to continue immunosuppressive treatment due to lack of achievement of effective dose				
MMF/CYC	2.00+	1.53		_
MMF/CYC/TCZ*	2.68	0.99	-	-
Active worsening of the patient's condition, defined by worsening of ILD on HRCT*	3.59	0.67		+
Active worsening of the patient's condition, defined by worsening of lung function*	3.86	0.56		+
Active worsening of the patient's condition, defined by a combination of worsening symptoms; ILD on HRCT; and/or PFTs*	4.05	0.49		+
I would use TCZ under the following conditions:*			i	
Patients with early SSc and ILD with elevated acute- phase reactants	3.18	0.96		+-
Based on inability to continue CYC/MMF/antifibrotics	2.59	1.97		-

Mean Delphi score

Disagree
Agree

Fig. 4 continued



deviation, SSc-ILD systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease

ILD, but did not reach consensus on switching to another agent or continuing therapy under these circumstances. Panelists agreed that patients should be weaned from therapy in cases of drug toxicity, stable lung and skin symptoms for ≥ 2 years, a patient's strong desire to discontinue treatment, or lack of efficacy (Fig. 5). Tapering/ weaning therapy should take place over 1–2 years while monitoring PFTs every 6 months, with or without a low maintenance dose of MMF, and treatment should not be withdrawn abruptly.

Consensus was reached that disease progression should be monitored using changes in PFTs (FVC or DL_{CO}), HRCT (ILD patterns or extent of fibrosis), and symptoms over time, or by presence of desaturation on exercise (Fig. 6). Conversely, stabilization or improvement of FVC, DL_{CO} , HRCT, or 6-min walk distance (6MWD), stabilization of symptoms, level of desaturation on exercise, and functional status as assessed by New York Heart Association Functional Classification or cardiopulmonary exercise testing were indicative of treatment success (Fig. 6, Additional file 1: Table S1).

Management approach based on specialty

There were subtle differences in responses between rheumatologists and pulmonologists (Table 2). Pulmonologists achieved consensus in favor of assessing 6MWD for screening, deciding whether to treat, and defining treatment success, whereas rheumatologists did not rate this assessment so highly. Conversely, pulmonologists did not reach consensus on whether FVC and/or DL_{CO} below the lower limit of normal would prompt immediate treatment. Pulmonologists aligned with panel consensus supporting consideration of reflux when deciding whether to treat; rheumatologists aligned with the panel against the use of methotrexate as an initial treatment option for SSc-ILD. Although both groups agreed that MMF should be the initial treatment of choice, rheumatologists were more comfortable using rituximab as potential therapy.

The potential use of antifibrotic drugs was more strongly supported by pulmonologists than by rheumatologists. Pulmonologists (but not rheumatologists) achieved consensus for the use of nintedanib in patients with a lack of response to MMF, CYC, or TCZ as defined by no improvement in lung function, and in any patients with connective tissue disease with clinically significant or worsening ILD. Conversely, there was consensus amongst only rheumatologists that nintedanib could be used as add-on therapy to TCZ.

Overall, rheumatologists were more comfortable than pulmonologists with defining how TCZ should be used as a treatment option for SSc-ILD. There was consensus support amongst rheumatologists (but not pulmonologists) for the use of TCZ in patients with early SSc and ILD with topoisomerase antibodies, worsening condition

Statement	Mean	SD	
Progression of disease is monitored as follows:			
Changes in PFTs over time (FVC or DL_{CO})	4.56	0.58	
Features on HRCT (ILD pattern or extent of fibrosis)	2.80	2.43	
Changes in HRCT over time	4.28	0.79	
Changes in symptoms over time	3.28	1.99	
Exertional hypoxia	2.64	1.96	
Criteria in defining success in treating SSc-ILD include:			
FVC stabilization	3.76	0.88	
FVC improvement	4.72	0.46	H I
DL _{co} stabilization	3.68	0.85	
DL _{co} improvement	4.60	0.58	
HRCT improvement	4.60	0.65	
HRCT stabilization	3.96	0.84	
Symptom stabilization/improvement	4.12	0.83	
6MWD stabilization/improvement	2.92	1.71	
O ₂ saturation with exercise	3.00	1.26	-1-
Functional status (NYHA FC or CPET)	2.52	1.90	
		-5	.0 –2.5 0.0 2.5 5.0 Mean Delphi score
		[Disagree 🗲 🔶 Agree

Fig. 6 Consensus recommendations for monitoring progression and defining treatment success in SSc-ILD. *6MWD* 6-min walk distance; *CPET* cardiopulmonary exercise testing, *DL_{CO}* diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide, *FVC* forced vital capacity, *HRCT* high-resolution computed tomography, *ILD* interstitial lung disease, *NYHA FC* New York Heart Association Functional Classification, *PFT* pulmonary function test, *SD* standard deviation, *SSc-ILD* systemic sclerosis-associated ILD

defined as deteriorating symptoms and ILD on HRCT and PFTs, and those unable to continue CYC, MMF, or antifibrotics due to adverse effects or lack of achievement with the effective dose.

In cases of progression or worsening of ILD, pulmonologists did not achieve consensus on switching to or adding another agent; rheumatologists agreed with both strategies. Regarding weaning, rheumatologists achieved consensus for doing so in cases of lack of efficacy and against stopping therapy quickly; pulmonologists did not achieve consensus on either point.

Discussion

This Delphi study was initiated to develop consensus recommendations for screening, treatment criteria, and the potential role of antifibrotic drugs in patients with SSc-ILD, building on the latest EULAR scleroderma treatment guidelines and the European consensus statement [12, 14]. The relatively low percentage of statements reaching consensus is reflective of the uncertainty amongst physicians on the appropriate management of SSc-ILD. Nevertheless, the findings from this study

Table 2 Notable differences in ratings between specialties

Statements	Rheumatologists	Pulmonologists
Which of the following would you likely perform to screen the general scleroderma population for ILD?		
6MWD	1.31 (2.69)	2.83 (2.21)
When deciding whether to treat patients for ILD do you consider		
Potential contribution of reflux?	1.92 (1.71)	3.17 (1.19)
In deciding to initiate treatment for SSc-ILD, how important are other parameters besides HRCT and PFTs?		
6MWD	1.39 (1.94)	2.67 (1.50)
"At initial presentation in patients with SSc, this condition would cause me enough concern about near-term ILD that I would start treatment right away"		
FVC and/or DL _{CO} < LLN	3.15 (1.52)	2.25 (2.22)
What initial therapy do you use once you have decided to treat SSc-ILD?		
Methotrexate	-3.31 (2.50)	-2.33 (2.46)
What is your typical/target dose for MMF?		
2000 mg daily	3.08 (0.95)	2.25 (2.42)
What is your typical/target dose for rituximab?		
1 g on days 0 and 15	3.69 (1.70)	0.17 (2.82)
l do not utilize rituximab	-3.31 (2.36)	-2.17 (3.01)
Use of antifibrotic drugs		
I see antifibrotic drugs fitting into the management of SSc-ILD after TCZ*	2.73 (1.56)	1.27 (2.33)
Use of nintedanib [following publication of SENSCIS and INBUILD trial results]		
Based on lack of effective response or improvement with immunosuppressive agents (MMF/CYC/ <i>TCZ</i>) as defined by lack of improvement of lung function	1.21 (1.89) 2.09 (2.26)*	2.45 (1.37) 3.00 (0.63)*
Any patient with CTD with clinically significant or worsening ILD	1.64 (1.91) 1.45 (1.97)*	2.36 (1.69) 2.82 (1.25)*
Based on lack of effective response or improvement with immunosuppressive agents (MMF/CYC/ <i>TCZ</i>) as defined by a combination of no improvement in symptoms; ILD on HRCT; and/or PFTs	2.14 (1.92) 2.55 (2.46)*	3.00 (1.41) <i>3.55 (0.69)*</i>
Nintedanib fits into the management of SSc-ILD as add-on therapy to TCZ*	2.64 (1.75)	1.73 (2.69)
Use of TCZ [following publication of focuSSced trial results]*		
Patients with early SSc and ILD with anti-topoisomerase antibodies	2.55 (0.93)	2.36 (1.12)
Based on active worsening of patient condition as defined by a combination of worsening symptoms; ILD on HRCT; and lung function	2.73 (1.95)	2.00 (2.49)
Based on inability to continue CYC/MMF/antifibrotics due to adverse effects	2.91 (0.94)	2.27 (2.65)
Based on inability to continue CYC/MMF/antifibrotics due to lack of achievement of effective dose with CYC/MMF/ antifibrotics	2.82 (1.40)	2.09 (2.81)
Based on the following response to SSc-ILD treatment, please indicate your likely course of action:		
With progression/worsening of ILD, I would switch to another agent	3.77 (1.01)	1.42 (3.58)
With progression/worsening of ILD, I would add another agent	3.46 (2.15)	2.33 (3.11)
What circumstances would prompt you to consider weaning a patient from therapy?		
Lack of efficacy	4.23 (1.17)	2.08 (2.64)
How do you wean patients from therapy?		
Stop therapy quickly (over weeks or "cold turkey")	-4.08 (1.19)	-2.42 (3.26)
What is success to you?		
6MWD stabilization/improvement	2.46 (2.11)	3.42 (1.00)

Results are mean (standard deviation)

6MWD 6-min walk distance, CTD connective tissue disease, CYC cyclophosphamide, DL_{CO} diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide, FVC forced vital capacity, HRCT high-resolution computed tomography, ILD interstitial lung disease, LLN lower limit of normal, MMF mycophenolate mofetil, PFT pulmonary function test, SSc systemic sclerosis, TCZ tocilizumab

*Data from the 2022 supplementary Delphi

provide an algorithm to support effective management of ILD in patients with SSc (Fig. 7), currently the leading cause of death in this population [7, 8].

The expert panelists strongly concurred with the recommendations by the British Society for Rheumatology/ British Health Professionals in Rheumatology endorsing

Screen all systemic sclerosis patients	 Chest auscultation for crackles PFTs including spirometry with DL_{co} HRCT chest scans Enquire about respiratory symptoms Routinely screen for PH and when shortness of breath is not explained by progression of ILD
Treatment criteria	 FVC <80% and any degree of ILD or symptoms >20% total lung involvement on HRCT >10% total lung involvement on HRCT with abnormal PFTs High-risk patients (early diffuse cutaneous disease) with evidence of mild ILD (<10%) Worsening HRCT with symptoms or declining PFTs May consider exertional desaturation on SpO₂
Treatment paradigm	 Initiate therapy with MMF at 2000–3000 mg/day Consider nintedanib for add-on therapy to MMF/CYC Use nintedanib in advancing, agressive or progressive ILD/ following failure of immunosupressive therapy Initiate nintedanib monotherapy in patients with longstanding ILD where immunosuppressive therapy is not recommended Consider TCZ for patients with early SSc-ILD with elevated acute-phase reactants and for those unable to continue CYC/MMF/antifibrotics due to adverse effects
Follow-up and defining success	 Follow up with: changes in PFTs (FVC or DL_{co}) and symptoms over time, features on HRCT and changes in HRCT over time, status of exertional hypoxia Success defined as stabilization or improvement of FVC, DL_{co}, HRCT chest scans, 6MWD, symptoms, and/or O₂ saturation with exercise Consider tapering/weaning therapy after stability of disease for >2 years

Fig. 7 Summary of the consensus recommendations for the management of patients with SSC-ILD. *6MWD* 6-min walk distance, *CYC* cyclophosphamide, *DL_{CO}* diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide, *FVC* forced vital capacity, *HRCT* high-resolution computed tomography, *ILD* interstitial lung disease, *MMF* mycophenolate mofetil, *PFT* pulmonary function test, *PH* pulmonary hypertension, *SpO*₂ peripheral capillary oxygen saturation, *SSc-ILD* systemic sclerosis-associated ILD, *TCZ* tocilizumab

ILD screening in all SSc patients [31]. The screening tests recommended through this Delphi process are aligned with published studies defining ILD screening criteria in the general SSc population [1, 4]. However, although HRCT is considered the gold standard for detection of ILD, only 50% of general rheumatologists and 66% of SSc expert rheumatologists order it routinely in newly

diagnosed SSc patients, with substantial global practice variation [32].

As well as acknowledging their significance when deciding whether to treat a patient, the panel identified critical thresholds for HRCT, FVC, PFTs, and desaturation on exercise. It is important to note that SpO_2 should be measured using detection methods such as forehead or ear sensors instead of finger sensors, to avoid

misinterpretation resulting from the high prevalence of Raynaud's phenomenon in this population [33]. Despite the lack of supporting literature, since most randomized controlled trials in SSc-ILD exclude such patients, the panel recommended treating ILD in patients with coexisting PH. Rheumatologists placed more value on autoantibody profiles as a prognostic marker than did pulmonologists, which may reflect differences in familiarity with such biomarkers given the autoimmune nature of many rheumatic conditions. Patients with dcSSc or anti-Scl-70/anti-topoisomerase I antibodies are at higher risk for the development of ILD, whereas patients with limited cutaneous SSc or anti-centromere antibodies are less prone to developing ILD [13]. Consensus was achieved that patients with autoantibodies other than U1 RNP or no specific antibodies should be considered individually to determine the aggressiveness of their disease. There was also consensus that patients with early, rapidly progressive diffuse SSc with mild abnormalities on HRCT and/or PFT would warrant enough concern to support initiating treatment. A broad spectrum of patient characteristics was reviewed when considering who should not be treated for SSc-ILD, with only stable, longstanding disease achieving consensus.

The 2016 EULAR guidelines recommend intravenous CYC for the treatment of SSc-ILD [14]; however, potential toxicity associated with the long-term use of CYC has led to the evaluation of MMF as an alternative. The panel's near-unanimous endorsement of MMF (with a target of 2000–3000 mg daily) as first-line therapy is supported by the results from the Scleroderma Lung Study II, in which MMF showed a superior safety profile with comparable efficacy to CYC [20]. These results also justify the lack of consensus for the use of CYC as an initial therapy.

Nintedanib (150 mg twice daily) has been approved for the management of patients with SSc-ILD based on results from the SENSCIS trial, which reported a 44% reduction in the annual rate of decline in FVC (the primary endpoint) with nintedanib compared with placebo (P=0.04) [24]. Following the INBUILD trial, it has also been approved for the treatment of patients with chronic fibrosing ILDs with a progressive phenotype, defined as either an FVC decline of \geq 10% predicted, or worsening respiratory symptoms and an increased extent of fibrosis on HRCT with or without an FVC decline of 5–10% predicted. The trial demonstrated a 57% reduction in the annual rate of FVC decline with nintedanib compared with placebo (P < 0.001) [25]. Currently, nintedanib is the only antifibrotic drug approved for both indications. In SSc-ILD, the panelists agreed that nintedanib should be considered as add-on therapy to MMF, CYC, or TCZ in patients with advancing or progressive ILD, and after failure of immunosuppressive therapy. In patients with longstanding ILD or in whom immunosuppressive therapy is not recommended or not tolerated, nintedanib may be initiated as monotherapy.

TCZ (162 mg every week) is also approved for the management of pulmonary function decline associated with SSc-ILD. This was based on the results of the focuSSced trial, a multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial that randomized 210 adults with dcSSc for ≤ 60 months and an mRSS of 10–35 to receive subcutaneous TCZ 162 mg or placebo weekly for 48 weeks in a 1:1 ratio. Although the trial failed to demonstrate a difference in the primary endpoint of mRSS between the groups (P = 0.10), the secondary analysis of FVC and the exploratory analysis of radiographically determined lung fibrosis suggest that TCZ may have the potential to preserve lung function in patients with early diffuse SSc-ILD and elevated acute-phase reactants [29]. There was very little consensus on the use of TCZ as a therapeutic option for patients with SSc-ILD, with greater consensus agreement amongst rheumatologists compared with pulmonologists. This suggests that, since its approval in 2021, pulmonologists are less comfortable than rheumatologists with using TCZ to treat patients with SSc-ILD.

Pirfenidone has been approved for use in patients with IPF, but not in other progressive fibrotic ILDs [34]. The RELIEF trial, a double-blinded, placebo-controlled, prospective phase 2b trial of pirfenidone (2403 mg every day) in patients with fibrotic ILDs other than IPF, was terminated due to futility. However, the results suggest a treatment benefit for patients whose condition deteriorates despite conventional therapy, based on a slower decline of FVC% predicted from baseline compared with placebo [27]. In addition, a trial evaluating the use of pirfenidone in combination with MMF in active and symptomatic SSc-ILD patients is ongoing [28]. These results may further shift our understanding of how antifibrotic drugs can be more appropriately used in the treatment of patients with SSc-ILD.

Predicting the course of SSc-ILD and defining therapeutic goals remain challenging. Panelists agreed that stabilization, as well as improvement, in the signs and symptoms of ILD were indicative of treatment success. Recently, new American Thoracic Society guidelines have placed SSc-ILD within a subgroup of ILDs other than IPF which can manifest progressive pulmonary fibrosis, defining progression as a combination of at least two signs based on symptomological, radiological and physiological findings [35]. For this Delphi, the panel considered changes in FVC, DL_{CO} , HRCT, and symptoms over time as key indicators of disease progression, broadly aligned with this guidance as well as previously published reports [1, 4, 25, 35]. The panel was unable to arrive at a consensus on treatment duration. However, they agreed on the conditions under which patients should be weaned off therapy, including weaning over 1-2 years while conducting PFTs every 6 months.

The differences in responses between rheumatologists and pulmonologists tended to reflect practice familiarity. The 6MWD is regularly used in pulmonology, while the use of methotrexate and rituximab is more common in rheumatologic conditions. Data comparing intravenous rituximab with monthly pulses of CYC support the rheumatologists' recommendation on this point [36]. These differences highlight the importance of multidisciplinary management of SSc-ILD, combining expertise across the multifaceted clinical manifestations of SSc.

There are limitations embedded in the Delphi process. There are no standard criteria defining consensus in Delphi studies, and given the breadth of topics investigated with this method, such standardization may not be feasible. Designed to elicit guidance when no strong evidence is available, the process is not statistically rigorous, and when consensus is reached there is no guarantee that it is generalizable or appropriate. Bias may be introduced during panel selection and development of the initial questionnaire. Anonymity, an integral component of the Delphi process, devolves panelists from accountability for their responses, with the consequence that these may be based on insufficient or minimal consideration. Equal weighting of responses means panelists with relatively less experience may have an impact on consensus disproportionate to their familiarity with the subject matter. In this study, limiting the expert panel to 25 participants to ensure a manageable process may have resulted in missing important perspectives from a larger, more representative population of physicians. Restricting participation to those practicing in the US focused recommendations on those relevant to and feasible within that locale, but limited the capture of global perspectives. Not including patients, pharmacists, payers, and other potential stakeholders (such as physicians practicing in the community) in the panel may have impacted the diversity of opinions and alignment of these recommendations with the Institute for Healthcare Improvement Triple Aim Initiative [37].

Conclusions

This modified Delphi study involving experts in pulmonology and rheumatology facilitated the development of consensus recommendations and a management algorithm for screening, treatment criteria, and the potential role of antifibrotics and TCZ in patients with SSc-ILD in a real-world setting. Pulmonologists and rheumatologists aligned for the majority of recommendations, with some subtle differences in their perspectives on treatment initiation and therapeutic approaches. These differences highlight the importance of collaborative management of patients and the clinical impact of multidisciplinary discussion groups. Findings from this study provide a management algorithm that will be critical for treating patients with SSc-ILD and help expand on the latest guidelines with clinical expertise and consideration of recently published trials in SSc-ILD.

Abbreviations

6MWD	6-Minute walk distance
CYC	Cyclophosphamide
dcSSc	Diffuse cutaneous SSc
DLCO	Diffusing capacity of the lungs for carbon monoxide
EULAR	European League Against Rheumatism
FVC	Forced vital capacity
HRCT	High-resolution computed tomography
ILD	Interstitial lung disease
IPF	Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis
MMF	Mycophenolate mofetil
mRSS	Modified Rodnan skin score
PFT	Pulmonary function test
PH	Pulmonary hypertension
SD	Standard deviation
SpO ₂	Peripheral capillary oxygen desaturation
SSc	Systemic sclerosis
TCZ	Tocilizumab

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1186/s12931-022-02292-3.

Additional file 1. Table S1. SSc-ILD Delphi Questionnaire 3 results. Table S2. SSc-ILD Delphi Supplemental Questionnaire 2 results

Acknowledgements

The authors did not receive payment related to the development of this Consensus Statement. John Howell, PhD, of AXON Communications and Hannah Cook, PhD, of Meditech Media provided writing, editorial support and formatting assistance, which was contracted and funded by BIPI. BIPI was given the opportunity to review the manuscript for medical and scientific accuracy as well as potential intellectual property considerations. The authors thank Dr. Donald Zoz, an employee of BIPI, for his assistance and collaboration with this project.

Author contributions

All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part thereof are appropriately investigated and resolved. FFR and DK made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the work. FFR, DK, VMH, RJK, MDM, IOR, RS, VDS, MES and RTD were members of the Delphi advisory board and contributed to panel selection and development of Delphi Questionnaire 1. All authors participated in at least two surveys including the final survey. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, and to drafting and revising the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript. The view-points expressed in this manuscript solely represent those of its authors.

Funding

The Delphi process leading to this Consensus Statement was facilitated by AXON Communications and Meditech Media, with support and funding from Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (BIPI). BIPI had no influence on the participating experts' opinions or final consensus.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding authors on reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

FFR reports personal fees from Boehringer Ingelheim (BI) and Genentech. VMH reports personal fees from BI, RJK reports grants and personal fees from Bl; personal fees from Galapagos, Genentech, Pliant, PureTech and United Therapeutics; and participation in clinical trials for Bellerophon, Respivant and Toray. MDM reports participation in clinical trials for Bayer, Corbus Pharmaceuticals, Eicos Sciences, Reata, Sanofi; and personal fees from Actelion Pharma, Astellas, BI, Galapagos, Medtelligence, and Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma. IOR reports personal fees from BI and participation in a clinical trial for Genentech. RS reports grants and personal fees from Acceleron Pharma, Actelion, and United Therapeutics; grants from Bellerophon; and personal fees from Third Pole. VDS reports participation in Steering Committees for studies sponsored by CSL Behring and Eicos Sciences; grants and personal fees from BI, Corbus Pharmaceuticals, CSL Behring, and Eicos Sciences; and participation in clinical trials for BI, CSL Behring, Corbus Pharmaceuticals, and Eicos Sciences. MES reports grants, personal fees and non-financial support from BI; grants from Galapagos, the National Institute of Health, and the Pulmonary Fibrosis Foundation; and personal fees from FibroGen. EJB reports grants and personal fees from BI and Eicos Sciences and grants from Corbus Pharmaceuticals and Pfizer, FVC reports personal fees from BI, LC reports participation in Steering Committees for studies sponsored by Eicos Sciences; membership of the Data and Safety Monitoring Board for studies supported by Reata; grants and personal fees from BI; and personal fees from Eicos Sciences, Genentech and Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma. RTD reports personal fees from BI, Eicos Sciences and Formation Biologics. KRF reports grants and personal fees from BI and Roche/Genentech and personal fees from Bellerophon, Blade Therapeutics, DevPro, Horizon Pharmaceuticals, PureHealth, Respivant, Shionogi, and United Therapeutics. FJM reports participation in Steering Committees for studies sponsored by Afferent/Merck, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Biogen, Chiesi, Gilead, GlaxoSmithKline, Nitto, Patara/Respivant, ProMedior/Roche, Prometic, and Veracyte; being a member of the Data and Safety Monitoring Board for studies supported by BI, Biogen, Genentech, and GlaxoSmithKline; personal fees and non-financial support from AstraZeneca, BI, the Canadian Respiratory Network, Chiesi, CSL Behring, Genentech, GlaxoSmithKline, Miller Communications, the National Society for Continuing Education, PeerView Communications, Physicians Education Resource, Sanofi/Regeneron, Sunovion, and Teva; non-financial support from ProterrixBio and Zambon; personal fees from the Academy for Continuing Healthcare Learning, American Thoracic Society, Bayer, Bridge Biotherapeutics, CME Outfitters, Dartmouth University, DevPro, Gala, Integritas, IQVIA, MD Magazine, Methodist Hospital Brooklyn, New York University, Projects in Knowledge, Rockpointe, United Therapeutics, UpToDate, Vindico, and WebMD/MedScape; grants from the National Institute for Health, ProMedior/Roche and Rare Disease Healthcare Communications; and nonfinancial interactions with AbbVie and twoXAR. NP, affiliated with Columbia University Irving Medical Center during the Delphi study, is now an employee of BI. OAS reports consulting fees from United Therapeutics, Altavant and Acceleron Pharma; and is on the speaker bureaus for United Therapeutics, Janssen Pharmaceuticals and Bayer. ERV reports grants from Corbus Pharmaceuticals, Forbius, and Kadmon, and personal fees from BI, DK reports grants and personal fees from Bayer, Bristol-Myers Squibb and Genentech/Roche; personal fees from Acceleron, Actelion, Blade Therapeutics, Eicos Sciences, Galapagos, GlaxoSmithKline, Mitsubishi Tanabe, Sanofi-Aventis/Genzyme, and UCB Pharma; and participation in clinical trials for Bayer, Bristol-Myers Squibb, GlaxoSmithKline, and Sanofi-Aventis/Genzyme. BDS, BK, LEM, NB, NG, and TM have nothing to disclose.

Author details

¹Respiratory Center, Cleveland Clinic Florida, 2950 Cleveland Clinic Blvd, Weston, FL 33331, USA. ²Rutgers-RWJ Medical School, New Brunswick, NJ, USA. ³Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA. ⁴University of Texas, Houston, TX, USA. ⁵Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA. ⁶University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA. ⁷Georgetown University, Washington,

D.C, USA. ⁸University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA. ⁹Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, NY, USA. ¹⁰Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA. ¹¹Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA. ¹²Stanford University School of Medicine and Palo Alto VA Health Care System, Stanford, CA, USA. ¹³University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. ¹⁴University of Michigan Scleroderma Clinic, Ann Arbor, MI 48105, USA. ¹⁵University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA. ¹⁶University of Toledo Medical Center, Toledo, OH, USA. ¹⁷Creighton University, Omaha, NE, USA. ¹⁸Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA. ¹⁹Present Address: Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc, Ridgefield, CT, USA. ²⁰Inova Fairfax Hospital, Falls Church, VA, USA. ²¹Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA.

Received: 28 September 2022 Accepted: 13 December 2022 Published online: 09 January 2023

References

- 1. Denton CP, Khanna D. Systemic sclerosis. Lancet. 2017;390:1685-99.
- Gabrielli A, Avvedimento EV, Krieg T. Scleroderma. N Engl J Med. 2009;360:1989–2003.
- Varga J, Abraham D. Systemic sclerosis: a prototypic multisystem fibrotic disorder. J Clin Invest. 2007;117:557–67.
- Silver KC, Silver RM. Management of systemic-sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease. Rheum Dis Clin North Am. 2015;41:439–57.
- 5. Solomon JJ, Olson AL, Fischer A, Bull T, Brown KK, Raghu G. Scleroderma lung disease. Eur Respir Rev. 2013;22:6–19.
- McNearney TA, Reveille JD, Fischbach M, Friedman AW, Lisse JR, Goel N, Tan FK, Zhou X, Ahn C, Feghali-Bostwick CA, et al. Pulmonary involvement in systemic sclerosis: associations with genetic, serologic, sociodemographic, and behavioral factors. Arthritis Rheum. 2007;57:318–26.
- Steen VD, Medsger TA. Changes in causes of death in systemic sclerosis, 1972–2002. Ann Rheum Dis. 2007;66:940–4.
- Tyndall AJ, Bannert B, Vonk M, Airo P, Cozzi F, Carreira PE, Bancel DF, Allanore Y, Muller-Ladner U, Distler O, et al. Causes and risk factors for death in systemic sclerosis: a study from the EULAR Scleroderma Trials and Research (EUSTAR) database. Ann Rheum Dis. 2010;69:1809–15.
- Hoffmann-Vold AM, Fretheim H, Halse AK, Seip M, Bitter H, Wallenius M, Garen T, Salberg A, Brunborg C, Midtvedt O, et al. Tracking impact of interstitial lung disease in systemic sclerosis in a complete nationwide cohort. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2019;200:1258–66.
- Bergamasco A, Hartmann N, Wallace L, Verpillat P. Epidemiology of systemic sclerosis and systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease. Clin Epidemiol. 2019;11:257–73.
- Cottin V, Brown KK. Interstitial lung disease associated with systemic sclerosis (SSc-ILD). Respir Res. 2019;20:13.
- Hoffmann-Vold A-M, Maher TM, Philpot EE, Ashrafzadeh A, Barake R, Barsotti S, Bruni C, Carducci P, Carreira PE, Castellví I, et al. The identification and management of interstitial lung disease in systemic sclerosis: evidence-based European consensus statements. Lancet Rheumatology. 2020;2:e71–83.
- Schoenfeld SR, Castelino FV. Interstitial lung disease in scleroderma. Rheum Dis Clin North Am. 2015;41:237–48.
- Kowal-Bielecka O, Fransen J, Avouac J, Becker M, Kulak A, Allanore Y, Distler O, Clements P, Cutolo M, Czirjak L, et al. Update of EULAR recommendations for the treatment of systemic sclerosis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2017;76:1327–39.
- Kowal-Bielecka O, Landewe R, Avouac J, Chwiesko S, Miniati I, Czirjak L, Clements P, Denton C, Farge D, Fligelstone K, et al. EULAR recommendations for the treatment of systemic sclerosis: a report from the EULAR Scleroderma Trials and Research group (EUSTAR). Ann Rheum Dis. 2009;68:620–8.
- Khanna D, Lescoat A, Roofeh D, Bernstein EJ, Kazerooni EA, Roth MD, Martinez F, Flaherty KR, Denton CP. Systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease: how to incorporate two Food and Drug Administration-approved therapies in clinical practice. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2022;74:13–27.
- Panopoulos ST, Bournia VK, Trakada G, Giavri I, Kostopoulos C, Sfikakis PP. Mycophenolate versus cyclophosphamide for progressive interstitial lung disease associated with systemic sclerosis: a 2-year case control study. Lung. 2013;191:483–9.

- Volkmann ER, Tashkin DP, Li N, Roth MD, Khanna D, Hoffmann-Vold AM, Kim G, Goldin J, Clements PJ, Furst DE, Elashoff RM. Mycophenolate mofetil versus placebo for systemic sclerosis-related interstitial lung disease: an analysis of Scleroderma Lung Studies I and II. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2017;69:1451–60.
- Gerbino AJ, Goss CH, Molitor JA. Effect of mycophenolate mofetil on pulmonary function in scleroderma-associated interstitial lung disease. Chest. 2008;133:455–60.
- Tashkin DP, Roth MD, Clements PJ, Furst DE, Khanna D, Kleerup EC, Goldin J, Arriola E, Volkmann ER, Kafaja S, et al. Mycophenolate mofetil versus oral cyclophosphamide in scleroderma-related interstitial lung disease (SLS II): a randomised controlled, double-blind, parallel group trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2016;4:708–19.
- Tashkin DP, Elashoff R, Clements PJ, Goldin J, Roth MD, Furst DE, Arriola E, Silver R, Strange C, Bolster M, et al. Cyclophosphamide versus placebo in scleroderma lung disease. N Engl J Med. 2006;354:2655–66.
- 22. Weill D, Benden C, Corris PA, Dark JH, Davis RD, Keshavjee S, Lederer DJ, Mulligan MJ, Patterson GA, Singer LG, et al. A consensus document for the selection of lung transplant candidates: 2014–an update from the Pulmonary Transplantation Council of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation. J Heart Lung Transplant. 2015;34:1–15.
- Bernstein EJ, Peterson ER, Sell JL, D'Ovidio F, Arcasoy SM, Bathon JM, Lederer DJ. Survival of adults with systemic sclerosis following lung transplantation: a nationwide cohort study. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2015;67:1314–22.
- Distler O, Highland KB, Gahlemann M, Azuma A, Fischer A, Mayes MD, Raghu G, Sauter W, Girard M, Alves M, et al. Nintedanib for systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease. N Engl J Med. 2019;380:2518–28.
- Flaherty KR, Wells AU, Cottin V, Devaraj A, Walsh SLF, Inoue Y, Richeldi L, Kolb M, Tetzlaff K, Stowasser S, et al. Nintedanib in progressive fibrosing interstitial lung diseases. N Engl J Med. 2019;381:1718–27.
- OFEV[®] (nintedanib): prescribing information. https://www.accessdata.fda. gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2020/205832s014lbl.pdf
- Behr J, Prasse A, Kreuter M, Johow J, Rabe KF, Bonella F, Bonnet R, Grohe C, Held M, Wilkens H, et al. Pirfenidone in patients with progressive fibrotic interstitial lung diseases other than idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (RELIEF): a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 2b trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2021;9:476–86.
- 28. Scleroderma Lung Study III—combining pirfenidone with mycophenolate (SLSIII) https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03221257
- Khanna D, Lin CJF, Furst DE, Goldin J, Kim G, Kuwana M, Allanore Y, Matucci-Cerinic M, Distler O, Shima Y, et al. Tocilizumab in systemic sclerosis: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2020;8:963–74.
- 30. ACTEMRA[®] (tocilizumab): prescribing information. https://www.acces sdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2021/125276s131lbl.pdf
- Denton CP, Hughes M, Gak N, Vila J, Buch MH, Chakravarty K, Fligelstone K, Gompels LL, Griffiths B, Herrick AL, et al. BSR and BHPR guideline for the treatment of systemic sclerosis. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2016;55:1906–10.
- Bernstein EJ, Khanna D, Lederer DJ. Screening High-Resolution Computed Tomography of the Chest to Detect Interstitial Lung Disease in Systemic Sclerosis: A Global Survey of Rheumatologists. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2018;70:971–2.
- Wilsher M, Good N, Hopkins R, Young P, Milne D, Gibson A, Suppiah R, Ly J, Doughty R, Dalbeth N. The six-minute walk test using forehead oximetry is reliable in the assessment of scleroderma lung disease. Respirology. 2012;17:647–52.
- ESBRIET[®] (pirfenidone): prescribing information [https://www.accessdata. fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2019/022535s012,208780s002lbl.pdf]
- Raghu G, Remy-Jardin M, Richeldi L, Thomson CC, Inoue Y, Johkoh T, Kreuter M, Lynch DA, Maher TM, Martinez FJ, et al. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (an update) and progressive pulmonary fibrosis in adults: an official ATS/ERS/JRS/ALAT clinical practice guideline. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2022;205:e18–47.
- Sircar G, Goswami RP, Sircar D, Ghosh A, Ghosh P. Intravenous cyclophosphamide vs rituximab for the treatment of early diffuse scleroderma lung disease: open label, randomized, controlled trial. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2018;57:2106–13.
- IHI Triple Aim Initiative [http://www.ihi.org/engage/initiatives/TripleAim/ Pages/default.aspx]. Accessed 8 June 2021.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

