



HAL
open science

Pulmonary toxicity of mTOR inhibitors. Comparisons of two populations: Solid organ recipients and cancer patients

Sébastien Gendarme, Jean Pastré, Eliane Billaud, Laure Gibault, Romain Guillemain, Stéphane Oudard, Jacques Medioni, Agnès Lillo-Lelouet, Dominique Israël-Biet

► To cite this version:

Sébastien Gendarme, Jean Pastré, Eliane Billaud, Laure Gibault, Romain Guillemain, et al.. Pulmonary toxicity of mTOR inhibitors. Comparisons of two populations: Solid organ recipients and cancer patients. *Therapies*, 2023, 78 (3), pp.267-278. 10.1016/j.therap.2022.05.008 . hal-04150151

HAL Id: hal-04150151

<https://hal.u-pec.fr/hal-04150151>

Submitted on 5 Jul 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Pulmonary toxicity of mTOR inhibitors. Comparisons of two populations: solid organ recipients and cancer patients

Authors : Sébastien Gendarme ¹, Jean Pastré ², Eliane M Billaud ³, Laure Gibault ⁴, Romain Guillemain ⁵, Stéphane Oudard ⁶, Jacques Medioni ⁶, Agnès Lillo-Lelouet ⁷, Dominique Israël-Biet ⁸

- ¹Service de pneumologie, centre de compétence maladies pulmonaires rares, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France. Electronic address: s-ge@hotmail.fr.
- ²Service de pneumologie, centre de compétence maladies pulmonaires rares, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France.
- ³Service de pharmacologie, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France.
- ⁴Service d'anatomopathologie et cytologie, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France.
- ⁵Unité de transplantation cardiaque et pulmonaire, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France.
- ⁶Service d'oncologie médicale, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France; Université de Paris, 75000 Paris, France.
- ⁷Centre de pharmacovigilance, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France.
- ⁸Service de pneumologie, centre de compétence maladies pulmonaires rares, hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, AP-HP, 75000 Paris, France; Université de Paris, 75000 Paris, France.

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Mammalian target of rapamycin (mTOR) inhibitors-associated pneumonitis (mTOR-IP) has long been described in solid organ recipients (T) patients but more recently in cancer (K) patients. Its overall characteristics have never been compared between these 2 populations. The aim of this study was to compare them in terms of presentation, severity and outcome in T and in K patients.

Material and Methods: We carried out a retrospective study in a single french tertiary center. Four databases were used to ensure the exhaustive collection of all mTOR-IP cases between 2001 and 2020. All clinical, biological, radiological, pathological and outcome data were reviewed.

Results: Thirty-nine patients with mTOR-IP were diagnosed during this period, 24 T and 15 K patients. The average dosage of everolimus and sirolimus was 2,65mg (\pm 1,78) and 2,75mg (\pm 0,96) in T patients, respectively, versus 8,75mg (\pm 2,26) for everolimus in K patients. The overall prevalence of mTOR-IP was 6.4% with a median time of occurrence of 7 months [IQR 3– 35 months]. mTOR-IP were significantly more frequent ($p < 0.001$) and occurred earlier ($p < 0.001$) in cancer patients. No clinical, functional, radiological, pathological nor outcome differences were otherwise observed between the 2 groups. Average everolimus blood levels at the time of mTOR-IP diagnosis were in the range of recommended therapeutic values.

Conclusion: Our study shows that mTOR-IP is comparable in terms of presentation in T and in K patients but that it occurs significantly earlier after drug introduction in the latter. This raises questions as to the potential role of the higher doses used in K patients as well as that of co-treatments in the pathogeny of the disease.

KEYWORDS : TOR Serine-Threonine Kinases; adverse drug reactions; interstitial lung disease; everolimus; sirolimus

Toxicité pulmonaire des inhibiteurs de mTOR. Comparaison de deux populations distinctes : les transplantés d'organe solide et les patients atteints de cancer

RESUME

Introduction : Les inhibiteurs de mTOR (mammalian target of rapamycin), initialement utilisés comme immunosuppresseurs en transplantation d'organe solide, ont vu leurs indications s'étendre au domaine de l'oncologie médicale en raison de leurs propriétés antitumorales. La toxicité pulmonaire des inhibiteurs de mTOR est rapportée dans les deux indications, mais peu d'études ont exploré les différences entre les pneumopathies aux inhibiteurs de mTOR (mTOR-PI) en transplantation (T) et en oncologie (K). L'objectif de notre étude est de comparer les mTOR-PI dans ces deux populations.

Méthodes : Notre étude rétrospective monocentrique a été réalisée dans un centre expert en pneumopathies interstitielles, en transplantation et en oncologie (Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou). Quatre bases de données ont été utilisées afin d'assurer la collecte exhaustive de tous les cas de mTOR-PI entre 2001 et 2020. Toutes les données cliniques, biologiques, radiologiques et pathologiques ainsi que les résultats ont été collectés et analysés.

Résultats: Trente-neuf patients atteints de mTOR-PI ont été diagnostiqués pendant cette période, 24 en transplantation (T) et 15 en oncologie (K). La posologie moyenne de l'éverolimus et du sirolimus était respectivement de 2,65 mg (\pm 1,78) et 2,75mg (\pm 0,96) en T contre 8,75mg (\pm 2,26) pour l'éverolimus en K. La prévalence globale de mTOR-PI était de 6,4 % avec un délai médian de survenue de 7 mois [IQR 3-35 mois]. Les mTOR-PI étaient significativement plus fréquentes ($p < 0,001$) et survenaient plus précocement ($p < 0,001$) chez les patients K. Aucune autre différence clinique, fonctionnelle, radiologique, pathologique ou de sévérité n'a été observée entre les deux groupes. Au moment du diagnostic de mTOR-PI, 14/18 (78%) des patients transplantés avaient un taux résiduel d'éverolimus dans les normes des valeurs thérapeutiques recommandées.

Conclusion: Les pneumopathies aux inhibiteurs de mTOR sont comparables en termes de présentation chez les patients T et K, mais elles surviennent significativement plus tôt après l'introduction du médicament chez ces derniers. Cela pourrait être en partie lié aux différences de posologie utilisées dans ces deux populations.

Pulmonary Toxicity of mTOR inhibitors

MOTS CLES : sérine-thréonine kinases TOR ; effets secondaires indésirables des médicaments ; pneumopathies interstitielles ; everolimus ; sirolimus

ABBREVIATION LIST

Mammalian target of rapamycin	mTOR
Mtor-inhibitors-associated pneumonitis	mTOR-IP
Interquartile range	IQR
Interstitial lung disease	ILD
Fructokinase-binding protein	FKBP
Cluster differentiation	CD
Computerized tomography-scan	CT-scan
Mammalian target of rapamycin complex	mTORC
Phosphoinositide 3-kinase	PI3K
Protein kinase B	AKT
Transplant patients	T
Cancer patients	K
Comité d'évaluation des protocoles de recherche observationnels de la Société de Pneumologie de langue française	CEPRO
Programme de medicalisation des systèmes d'information	PMSI
High-resolution computed tomography	HRCT
Bronchoalveolar lavage	BAL
Pulmonary function test	PFT
Intensive care unit	ICU
Transplant population	TP
Polymorphonuclear	PNN
Reactive protein C	CRP
Forced vital capacity	FVC
Diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide	DLCO
Everolimus blood concentration	EBC

INTRODUCTION

Rapamycin (sirolimus) and the rapalogs (everolimus, temsirolimus) specifically inhibit the signalling complex mTORC 1 by binding to the intracellular protein FK506-binding protein (FKBP12) [1,2]. PI3K/AKT signalling pathway mediated by mTOR regulates cell division and blocks T lymphocytes proliferation and differentiation. The mTOR pathway also mediates angiogenesis-promoting signals, notably by increasing vascular endothelial growth factors [3,4]. mTORs inhibitors have therefore immunosuppressive and antineoangiogenesis properties, explaining their wide use in oncology therapeutic strategies. Sirolimus and analogs have first been approved for the prevention of solid organ transplant rejection [5–8]. Later on, temsirolimus (CCI-779, Wyeth) and everolimus (RAD-001, Novartis Pharma AG) have been developed and approved as anti-neoplastic agents [9–16]. Adverse drug reactions (ADR) to sirolimus and analogs have already been widely reported and their well-known main side effects are haematologic, metabolic, cutaneous, gastrointestinal, renal, thromboembolic and pulmonary [17–19].

mTOR inhibitors-associated pneumonitis (mTOR-IP) is a potentially severe ADR which may require dose reduction, suspension or even permanent discontinuation of the drug [20]. mTOR-IP has been first reported with sirolimus in renal transplant recipients [21–29]. Later on, it has also been reported with analogs in other allograft types [30–32] and in patients treated for malignancies [33–38]. Since the first description of mTOR-IP in graft recipients, transplant patient's management has largely evolved with new antirejection drugs or dosages, some of which having known potential interactions with mTOR inhibitors. In addition, mTOR-IP features have been less extensively reported in the context of malignancy. Finally mTOR-IP prevalence, reported to range between 3 and 54%, actually remains largely unknown and based on previous reports [2,35,39,40]. The aim of our study was to describe mTOR-IP features in terms of prevalence, clinical, imaging, functional and outcome

characteristics and to compare them in 2 distinct groups: transplant (TP) and cancer (K) patients.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Population and databases

We carried out a retrospective study on mTOR-IP diagnosed in TP as well as in K patients in a single french university tertiary center (Centre de competence Maladies pulmonaires rares, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, University of Paris). This study was approved by Institutional Review Board of the French Learned Society for Respiratory Medicine (reference: CEPRO 2020-046).

We analysed the medical files of all patients treated in our institution with an mTOR inhibitor between 2001 and 2020 and included all patients diagnosed with mTOR-IP. In order to exhaustively report all cases of mTOR-IP in our institution, we collected and crosschecked data from four databases: 1- the hospital-discharge summaries database system (PMSI) using the coding system '*drug-induced pneumonitis*, 2- Pharmacovigilance databases for all mTOR-IP cases reported in our facility to the Pharmacovigilance center, 3- Our local pharmacology unit where all mTOR inhibitors blood levels are monitored and 4- Databases from oncological clinical trials evaluating RAD-001 molecule (everolimus) in patients with kidney or breast cancer between 2007 and 2010. Altogether, this approach allowed us to collect the files of all patients treated with mTOR inhibitors during the target period in our hospital (n=608). All files were then reviewed by 3 of the authors (SG, JP and DIB), pulmonologists with an expertise in ILDs, and only patients diagnosed with a definite diagnosis of mTOR-IP were included after exclusion of all alternative diagnosis as detailed below.

2. mTOR-IP diagnosis and data collection

Drug-induced pneumonitis diagnosis is based primarily on concordant timing of drug initiation, presence of condensations or infiltrates on chest high-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) and the absence of any alternative diagnosis [41]. In our study, mTOR-IP diagnosis was defined according to the following criteria 1- Exposure to mTOR inhibitor preceding the onset of pulmonary signs or symptoms; 2- Presence of HRCT abnormalities consistent with pulmonary ADR ; 3 - No documented pulmonary infection on respiratory samples including those obtained by endoscopic procedure; 4 - Exclusion of all other alternative pulmonary diseases including ADR due to other drugs. Medical records data were collected retrospectively including clinical, biological (including pharmacological dosages and BAL), functional (complete pulmonary function tests) and HRCT data at the time of diagnosis and at last follow-up. Pulmonary biopsies, when performed, obtained at the time of mTOR-IP diagnosis, were all reviewed by a pathologist (LG). Outcomes were evaluated through respiratory related hospitalization for mTOR-IP (whether or not in intensive care unit ICU), need for mTOR inhibitors discontinuation and/or need for steroid therapy, and mortality due to the ADR. mTOR-IP time of diagnosis was defined by the date of first abnormal chest HRCT compatible with ADR.

3. Drug exposure

All patients included had at least one month of mTOR inhibitors treatment. The mTOR inhibitors blood concentrations were assessed by Liquid Chromatography coupled to tandem Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). Blood levels were compared between the period free of lung ADR and that of mTOR-IP diagnosis. We estimated the standard mean trough everolimus blood concentration in heart and lung TP without ADR to provide a standard therapeutic range. As the number of patients with mTOR inhibitor blood levels testing in the

K population was not sufficient, the therapeutic range of mTOR concentration in K patients was taken from the literature for comparison.

4. Statistical analysis

Given the small effect sizes, quantitative variables were compared between TP and K patients using Kruskal-Wallis Rank Sum t-test and categorical variables were compared using the exact Fisher test. We applied a non-parametric approach to estimate confident intervals. We compared mTOR-IP prevalence between the two groups of patients using a Chi-2 test. Student t-test was used to compare residual everolimus concentrations at the time of ILD to standard reference values. Given the non-random characteristics of the missing data, multiple imputation methods could not be applied to the analysis and the missing data were excluded from the statistical analysis. Statistical analysis was performed using R Studio software®.

RESULTS

After reconciliation of our databases, we found that 608 patients had been treated with mTOR inhibitors in our institution between January 2001 and September 2020. Among them, 44 patients had a suspicion of drug-induced pneumonitis with the referenced diagnosis of mTOR-IP in their medical records. After reviewing all medical records and CT-scans, 5 patients were excluded: 4 due to a concomitant respiratory infection and 1 due to missing data (no CT available). Finally, 39 patients with a definite mTOR-IP were included into the study [Figure 1], 24 were solid organ recipients and 15 had an active malignancy. Mean age was 58 ± 19 years and 17 (44%) were female. Their baseline clinical characteristics as well as the type and indications of molecules used are reported in Table 1. The mTOR-IP prevalence in all patients treated with mTOR inhibitors was 6.4% and was higher in K than in TP patients (11.9% vs 5.2%, respectively; $\chi_2 = 7.31$, $p < 0.01$). mTOR indications and -IP incidence

between 2001 and 2020 are reported in Supplementary Materials. The median time between mTOR inhibitor introduction and mTOR-IP diagnosis was 7 months [IQR 3 - 35] and it was significantly different between TP and K patients (12 months [IQR = 5 - 42] vs 3 months [IQR = 2 - 6.5], respectively, $p < 0.01$) (Table 2). In the TP group, immunosuppressive co-treatments were mycophenolate mofetil (55%), tacrolimus (40%), cyclosporine (14%) or azathioprin (9%). In addition, 65% of the transplant patients were treated with corticosteroids at an average daily dosage of $3.7 (\pm 2.5)$, $4.8 (\pm 6.0)$ and $6.0 (\pm 5.5)$ mg in heart, lung and kidney allograft recipients respectively. No K patient was receiving steroids nor any other immunosuppressant at the time of mTOR-IP diagnosis. In the K population, breast cancer was the first indication associated with mTOR-IP (33% of cases) (Table 3).

As far as the respiratory condition is concerned, 80% of the patients were symptomatic at the time of diagnosis with dyspnoea (65%), cough (45%) and fever (42%) being the most frequent signs. Chest pain and expectoration were observed in less than 10% of cases. No haemoptysis was reported. No clinical difference according to mTOR inhibitor indication or co-treatment was observed [Supplementary materials].

Almost all patients had a fiberoptic bronchoscopy with bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) ($n = 35/39$, 90%). mTOR-IP was mainly associated with a lymphocytic alveolitis ($26 \pm 21\%$ of total BAL cells with a median CD4/CD8 ratio of 3.2 [0.3-6.9], Table 4). A neutrophilic alveolitis (PMN $> 20\%$) was observed in 8 cases with no bacterial documentation. Biological blood features included a moderate increase in CRP (mean = 61 ± 47 mg/L) [Supplementary materials]. The presence of CT abnormalities was one of the mTOR-IP diagnostic criteria. The main radiological abnormalities were ground glass opacities (92%), reticulations (77%), bronchiectasis (51%) and condensations (50%) (Table 4). HRCT lesions were always bilateral. Pulmonary function tests (PFT), available in 20 patients as a whole at diagnosis, are

shown in Table 4. PFT were abnormal in 15 patients (75%) with a decreased in forced vital capacity (FVC) in 9 and a decreased in the diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO) in 13. Altogether, no differences were found in terms of biological, functional or radiological data between TP and K patients. Pulmonary biopsies were performed for diagnostic purposes in 7 patients (6 TP and 1 K patient). Their pathological features were comparable and characterized by interstitial and alveolar lymphocytic infiltration with rare and poorly formed granulomas in the interalveolar walls and some organization buds in the interstitial and alveolar areas [Figure 2].

As a whole, the clinical management of mTOR-IP patients (N = 39) was on an outpatient basis for 13 patients (33%), hospitalization in 20 (51%) and transfer to an intensive care unit in 6 (15%). No difference was found in terms of biological, HRCT or pathological data between outpatients and those requiring hospitalization. In contrast, an univariate analysis of risk factors in the ICU population showed that overweight and renal impairment were associated with development of severe mTOR-IP (Table 5, $p = 0.006$ and 0.007 , respectively). The mTOR-inhibitor treatment was withdrawn in 32 patients (82%) and steroids were either largely increased (TP group) or introduced (K group) in 21 (54%) at an average dose of 0.5mg/kg for a median duration of $4.5 (\pm 3.7)$ months. Two patients died from mTOR-IP (1 K patient under sirolimus and 1 TP one under everolimus). No difference was found between TP and K patients in terms of management requirements (Table 6). After recovery from mTOR-IP, mTOR inhibitors were permanently withdrawn in 24 of 39 patients (62%). In some of the most severe patients the drug was not withdrawn but a dose reduction of 50% was operated while it remained unchanged in others. A switch from sirolimus to everolimus was performed in one case without any recurrence of the mTOR-IP thereafter. A late recurrence of mTOR-IP occurred in two patients treated with everolimus after 18 and 45 months, respectively.

Regarding pharmacological data, the everolimus trough levels (C₀) at the period free from lung ADR was firstly calculated from dosages collected in all transplanted patients treated with mTOR inhibitors between 2001 and 2020 at our pharmacology centre. No statistically significant difference was found between this reference C_{0ref}, based on the data of our centre, and C_{0mTOR-IP} found at the time of mTOR-IP diagnosis (C_{0ref} = 6.9 +/- 2.7 ng/mL, C_{0mTOR-IP} = 8.1 +/- 2.6 ng/mL, $p = 0.10$). As dosages are not routinely performed in oncology, the data are not reported. At the time of mTOR-IP diagnosis, one patient (17%) in the lung TP group and 3 (25%) in the heart TP group had an everolimus C₀ above the therapeutic range [Figure 3]. Potential interactions with other immunosuppressive drugs were evaluated in transplant patients. In the TP group, 4 and 10 patients were treated with cyclosporine and tacrolimus, respectively. No cyclosporine or tacrolimus blood levels overdose was observed in any of them. No impact of any other antirejection co-treatments was found on mTOR inhibitor dosage. In the K group, mTOR inhibitors trough levels are usually not routinely monitored and the everolimus one was assessed in only one patient. His C₀ was 21 ng/mL, largely above the theoretical average C₀ in patients with either renal (5.4 ng/mL) or breast carcinoma (13.2 ng/mL) [42].

DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first one to report the prevalence and overall characteristics of mTOR-IP in both TP and K patients. We describe here in a large group (n=39) of patients with mTOR-IP (24 TP and 15 K) the clinical, functional, radiological, management and outcome characteristics of this rare but severe ADR.

Firstly, we found a prevalence of 6.4% of mTOR-IP among all patients treated with mTOR inhibitors in a single tertiary center between 2001 and 2020. We think that this is one of the main strengths of this study in that these data have been obtained by querying four

independent databases as described in the Materials and Methods section. We found a higher prevalence of mTOR-IP in K patients than in the TP ones (11.9% versus 5.2%, $p < 0.01$, respectively) whereas their clinical presentation, management and follow-up characteristics were quite comparable. This higher prevalence in the K group might have several explanations. Firstly, the chest CT-scan monitoring might be more systematic and frequent during cancer follow-up and this could lead to a relative overdiagnosis in this population. Our study does not favor this hypothesis in that it did not show a higher prevalence of asymptomatic cases in the K group compared to the TP one. Secondly, a higher dosage of mTOR inhibitors as recommended in oncology might play a role in the development of symptomatic pulmonary ADR in this population. Thirdly, the fact that these patients do not routinely receive corticosteroids on a long term basis whether transplant recipients do might also underly part of the increased prevalence of the disease. Finally, a history of radiation therapy might also promote a pulmonary ADR particularly in patients with breast cancer.

We also show here that the main characteristics of mTOR-IP were quite comparable between the 2 groups. This might strongly argue for a common pathogeny, consistent with a pharmacological class effect, independent of the drug dosage, as developed in several studies [23]. However, a dose-dependent trigger could explain the earlier and more frequent occurrence of mTOR-IP in K patients. Indeed, different doses of active substances are now recommended or used in ongoing clinical trials for TP or K management : 0.5 – 2 mg and 5 – 10 mg, respectively [43–45] and some studies have reported a link between higher everolimus trough concentration and risk of ILD [32,46,47]. This dose-effect is also supported by clinical cases reporting mTOR-IP improvement after decreasing mTORi dosages [48]. Pharmacokinetic considerations, such as drug interactions, may also be involved in the pathogenesis of mTOR-IP. Interactions with immunosuppressive drugs used in

transplantation, in particular cyclosporine, which operates as an enzyme inhibitor and increases mTOR blood concentration, that may increase sirolimus concentration [49]. Drug interactions with azoles and long-term treatment with corticosteroids that respectively increase and decrease blood everolimus concentration, have also been reported and should be considered in transplant patients.

In our study, beside a significantly shorter delay of occurrence of mTOR-IP in the cancer population compared to the TP one, all their other characteristics were comparable and quite consistent with other drug-induced pneumonitis reported in the literature [50–52]. We noted indeed a rapidly evolving dyspnea (1 to 3 weeks), cough without expectoration and low grade fever in 50% of cases. The main biological finding was a moderate lymphocytic alveolitis exhibited by the bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) with a predominance of CD4 cells; more rarely, a minor hypereosinophilia or a low grade alveolar haemorrhage was present in BAL, as it has been reported in the literature [26,27,53]. Although not specific for drug-induced pneumonitis, BAL is a crucial tool to rule out bacterial, viral or parasitic infection especially in immunocompromised patients [54] and should always be performed whenever possible. Chest CT-scan findings were mainly reticulations, ground glass opacities with a lower frequency of condensations or traction bronchiectasis. Honeycombing or fibrotic lesions were exceptional as well as pleural effusions and/or mediastinal lymphadenopathy which should always be investigated as an alternative diagnosis. In cases of doubtful diagnosis, transbronchial biopsies may be performed especially in lung transplant patients to rule out rejection. Histological analysis of our own samples showed inflammatory infiltrates with a predominance of lymphocytes both in the alveolar walls and the interstitial spaces, with sometimes the presence of poorly formed granulomas.

About 30% of our patients could be managed on an outpatient basis and hospitalisation in an intensive care unit was required in less than 10% of cases. Treatment was based on

withdrawing the mTOR inhibitor (80% of cases) or reducing the dosage (20%). The drug could be reintroduced in 30% of cases; the recurrence rate was moderate, approximately around 5%. 18 on 21 patients (86%) who required steroids as part of the treatment of mTOR-IP had dyspnea or severe cough with oxygen requirement. Eight patients with chronic dyspnea (> 3 weeks) were not treated with corticosteroids and had a favourable outcome.

Overall, our clinical practice concerning these patients were quite in line with the guidelines for an optimal management of mTOR-IP in the breast cancer setting [55] recommending corticosteroids for a Grade 2b ADR and higher, defined by dyspnea or severe cough (48). mTOR inhibitors at a lower dose may be reintroduced if symptoms resolve to Grade 1, except for Grade 4 ILD. It should be underlined however that in the particular context of heart transplantation, the substantial risk reduction of graft loss when using everolimus [56,57] may prioritize this drug continuation along with steroids over its withdrawal if clinical symptoms are minor.

Our study also allowed us to define 2 significant risk factors for a severe outcome of ICU hospitalization, i.e. overweight and renal impairment. Indeed, our 6 cases requiring ICU were clinically characterised by a higher frequency of renal failure and/or overweight and biologically by a neutrophilic alveolitis in BAL. Renal impairment had been previously reported as a risk factor for the development mTOR-IP [58,59] and obesity is known to be associated with a poor prognosis in many situations of acute respiratory failure [60,61]. Neutrophilic alveolitis, independently of any infection documentation, might reflect a relative alveolar damage [62].

Our study has also some limitations. First of all, the diagnosis of mTOR-IP is a diagnosis of exclusion. However, diagnostic criteria used in our study are based on the princeps study by Morelon et al, used in a reference list of studies regarding mTOR-IP [2,21,40,63]. In addition,

all medical records, BAL and biopsies were reviewed by experts in interstitial diseases. We have excluded during this process all cases of concomitant infection for the sake of drug-induced pneumonitis diagnosis unicity. This might have led us to underdiagnose true cases of mTOR-IP as potential interactions with infections, especially *Pneumocystis Jiroveci*, have been mentioned [54,64,65]. The retrospective nature of our study is also a limitation because of missing data. The fact that we have not reviewed the chest CT- scans of the 608 patients under mTOR-I during the period considered (2001-2020) may have underestimated asymptomatic cases. This approach has been used in other studies, particularly in oncology, with a systematic reviewing of CT-scans performed as part of a therapeutic protocol. The prevalence of mTOR-IP was then higher, with 29% in the trials for temsirolimus and up to 54% of radiological abnormalities for everolimus in kidney cancer [2,12,35]. Again, this work had focused on patients with a clinical mTOR-IP diagnosis and not only radiological abnormalities which seemed to us far more relevant for clinicians dealing with such patients. Finally, the small size of our cohort, although larger than the majority of those in the literature, did not allow us to perform multivariate analyses, especially for severity risks factors. Despite of all of these limitations, we think that the approach we used in our retrospective study gave interesting data about presentation, prognosis, management and outcome of mTOR-IP in TP patients as well as in K ones.

CONCLUSION

Our study provides an updated overview of mTOR-IP characteristics and prevalence and points towards a common entity whatever the mTOR inhibitor indications and molecules. However, mTOR-IP occurs significantly earlier after drug introduction in K patients. This raises questions as to the potential role of the higher doses used in oncology as well as that of co-treatments in the pathogeny of the disease.

DECLARATIONS

ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

This study was approved by Institutional Review Board of the French Learned Society for Respiratory Medicine (reference: CEPRO 2020-046).

INFORM CONSENT

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects included in the study, in accordance with current recommendations.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIAL

We inform the scientific community of the availability of the datasets used in this original article and their potential future uses.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

FUNDING SOURCE

No funding

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

SG, JP and DIB analysed and interpreted the patient clinical, radiological and outcome data regarding mTOR-IP disease. LG performed the histological examination and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. EB analysed the pharmacological and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. ALL analysed epidemiological data and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Oshiro N, Yoshino K, Hidayat S, Tokunaga C, Hara K, Eguchi S, Avruch J, Yonezawa K. Dissociation of raptor from mTOR is a mechanism of rapamycin-induced inhibition of mTOR function. *Genes Cells*. 2004 Apr;9(4):359–66.
2. Willemsen AECAB, Grutters JC, Gerritsen WR, van Erp NP, van Herpen CML, Tol J. mTOR inhibitor-induced interstitial lung disease in cancer patients: Comprehensive review and a practical management algorithm. *Int J Cancer*. 2016 May 15;138(10):2312–21.
3. Pouyssegur J, Dayan F, Mazure NM. Hypoxia signalling in cancer and approaches to enforce tumour regression. *Nature*. 2006 May 25;441(7092):437–43.
4. Del Bufalo D, Ciuffreda L, Trisciuglio D, Desideri M, Cognetti F, Zupi G, Milella M. Antiangiogenic potential of the Mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitor temsirolimus. *Cancer Res*. 2006 Jun 1;66(11):5549–54.
5. Stepkowski SM, Tian L, Wang ME, Qu X, Napoli K, Kahan BD. Sirolimus in transplantation. *Arch Immunol Ther Exp (Warsz)*. 1997;45(5–6):383–90.
6. Nashan B. Review of the proliferation inhibitor everolimus. *Expert Opin Investig Drugs*. 2002 Dec;11(12):1845–57.
7. Levy G, Schmidli H, Punch J, Tuttle-Newhall E, Mayer D, Neuhaus P, Samuel D, Nashan B, Klempnauer J, Langnas A, Calmus Y, Rogiers X, Abecassis M, Freeman R, Sloof M, Roberts J, Fischer L. Safety, tolerability, and efficacy of everolimus in de novo liver transplant recipients: 12- and 36-month results. *Liver Transpl*. 2006 Nov;12(11):1640–8.
8. Snell GI, Valentine VG, Vitulo P, Glanville AR, McGiffin DC, Loyd JE, Roman A, Aris R, Sole A, Hmissi A, Pirron U, RAD B159 Study Group. Everolimus versus azathioprine in maintenance lung transplant recipients: an international, randomized, double-blind clinical trial. *Am J Transplant*. 2006 Jan;6(1):169–77.
9. Atkins MB, Hidalgo M, Stadler WM, Logan TF, Dutcher JP, Hudes GR, Park Y, Liou S-H, Marshall B, Boni JP, Dukart G, Sherman ML. Randomized phase II study of multiple dose levels of CCI-779, a novel mammalian target of rapamycin kinase inhibitor, in patients with advanced refractory renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2004 Mar 1;22(5):909–18.
10. Hidalgo M, Buckner JC, Erlichman C, Pollack MS, Boni JP, Dukart G, Marshall B, Speicher L, Moore L, Rowinsky EK. A phase I and pharmacokinetic study of temsirolimus (CCI-779) administered intravenously daily for 5 days every 2 weeks to patients with advanced cancer. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2006 Oct 1;12(19):5755–63.
11. Hudes G, Carducci M, Tomczak P, Dutcher J, Figlin R, Kapoor A, Staroslawska E, Sosman J, McDermott D, Bodrogi I, Kovacevic Z, Lesovoy V, Schmidt-Wolf IGH, Barbarash O, Gokmen E, O'Toole T, Lustgarten S, Moore L, Motzer RJ, Global ARCC Trial. Temsirolimus, interferon alfa, or both for advanced renal-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2007 May 31;356(22):2271–81.
12. Motzer RJ, Escudier B, Oudard S, Hutson TE, Porta C, Bracarda S, Grünwald V, Thompson JA, Figlin RA, Hollaender N, Urbanowitz G, Berg WJ, Kay A, Lebwohl D, Ravaud A, RECORD-1 Study Group. Efficacy of everolimus in advanced renal cell carcinoma: a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase III trial. *Lancet*. 2008 Aug 9;372(9637):449–56.
13. Baselga J, Campone M, Piccart M, Burris HA, Rugo HS, Sahnoud T, Noguchi S, Gnant M, Pritchard KI, Lebrun F, Beck JT, Ito Y, Yardley D, Deleu I, Perez A, Bachelot T, Vittori L, Xu

- Z, Mukhopadhyay P, Lebwohl D, Hortobagyi GN. Everolimus in postmenopausal hormone-receptor-positive advanced breast cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2012 Feb 9;366(6):520–9.
14. Yao JC, Shah MH, Ito T, Bohas CL, Wolin EM, Van Cutsem E, Hobday TJ, Okusaka T, Capdevila J, de Vries EGE, Tomassetti P, Pavel ME, Hoosen S, Haas T, Lincy J, Lebwohl D, Öberg K, RAD001 in Advanced Neuroendocrine Tumors, Third Trial (RADIANT-3) Study Group. Everolimus for advanced pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *N Engl J Med.* 2011 Feb 10;364(6):514–23.
 15. Yao JC, Fazio N, Singh S, Buzzoni R, Carnaghi C, Wolin E, Tomasek J, Raderer M, Lahner H, Voi M, Pacaud LB, Rouyrre N, Sachs C, Valle JW, Fave GD, Van Cutsem E, Tesselaar M, Shimada Y, Oh D-Y, Strosberg J, Kulke MH, Pavel ME, RAD001 in Advanced Neuroendocrine Tumours, Fourth Trial (RADIANT-4) Study Group. Everolimus for the treatment of advanced, non-functional neuroendocrine tumours of the lung or gastrointestinal tract (RADIANT-4): a randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3 study. *Lancet.* 2016 Mar 5;387(10022):968–77.
 16. Hess G, Herbrecht R, Romaguera J, Verhoef G, Crump M, Gisselbrecht C, Laurell A, Offner F, Strahs A, Berkenblit A, Hanushevsky O, Clancy J, Hewes B, Moore L, Coiffier B. Phase III study to evaluate temsirolimus compared with investigator's choice therapy for the treatment of relapsed or refractory mantle cell lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009 Aug 10;27(23):3822–9.
 17. Kuypers DRJ. Benefit-risk assessment of sirolimus in renal transplantation. *Drug Saf.* 2005;28(2):153–81.
 18. Meier-Kriesche HU, Kaplan B. Toxicity and efficacy of sirolimus: relationship to whole-blood concentrations. *Clin Ther.* 2000;22 Suppl B:B93-100.
 19. Nguyen LS, Vautier M, Allenbach Y, Zahr N, Benveniste O, Funck-Brentano C, Salem J-E. Sirolimus and mTOR Inhibitors: A Review of Side Effects and Specific Management in Solid Organ Transplantation. *Drug Saf.* 2019;42(7):813–25.
 20. Pneumotox » Drug » MTOR inhibitors [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jan 20]. Available from: <https://www.pneumotox.com/drug/view/458/mtor-inhibitors>
 21. Morelon E, Stern M, Kreis H. Interstitial pneumonitis associated with sirolimus therapy in renal-transplant recipients. *N Engl J Med.* 2000 Jul 20;343(3):225–6.
 22. Singer SJ, Tiernan R, Sullivan EJ. Interstitial pneumonitis associated with sirolimus therapy in renal-transplant recipients. *N Engl J Med.* 2000 Dec 14;343(24):1815–6.
 23. Pham P-TT, Pham P-CT, Danovitch GM, Ross DJ, Gritsch HA, Kendrick EA, Singer J, Shah T, Wilkinson AH. Sirolimus-associated pulmonary toxicity. *Transplantation.* 2004 Apr 27;77(8):1215–20.
 24. Champion L, Stern M, Israël-Biet D, Mamzer-Bruneel M-F, Peraldi M-N, Kreis H, Porcher R, Morelon E. Brief communication: sirolimus-associated pneumonitis: 24 cases in renal transplant recipients. *Ann Intern Med.* 2006 Apr 4;144(7):505–9.
 25. Errasti P, Izquierdo D, Martín P, Errasti M, Slon F, Romero A, Lavilla FJ. Pneumonitis associated with mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitors in renal transplant recipients: a single-center experience. *Transplant Proc.* 2010 Oct;42(8):3053–4.
 26. Vlahakis NE, Rickman OB, Morgenthaler T. Sirolimus-associated diffuse alveolar hemorrhage. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2004 Apr;79(4):541–5.

27. Khalife WI, Kogoj P, Kar B. Sirolimus-induced alveolar hemorrhage. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2007 Jun;26(6):652–7.
28. Chhajed PN, Dickenmann M, Bubendorf L, Mayr M, Steiger J, Tamm M. Patterns of pulmonary complications associated with sirolimus. *Respiration*. 2006;73(3):367–74.
29. Howard L, Gopalan D, Griffiths M, Mahadeva R. Sirolimus-induced pulmonary hypersensitivity associated with a CD4 T-cell infiltrate. *Chest*. 2006 Jun;129(6):1718–21.
30. Duran I, Goebell P-J, Papazisis K, Ravaud A, Weichhart T, Rodriguez-Portal JA, Budde K. Drug-induced pneumonitis in cancer patients treated with mTOR inhibitors: management and insights into possible mechanisms. *Expert Opin Drug Saf*. 2014 Mar;13(3):361–72.
31. Alexandru S, Ortiz A, Baldovi S, Milicua JM, Ruíz-Escribano E, Egado J, Plaza JJ. Severe everolimus-associated pneumonitis in a renal transplant recipient. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2008 Oct;23(10):3353–5.
32. David S, Kümpers P, Shin H, Haller H, Fliser D. Everolimus-associated interstitial pneumonitis in a patient with a heart transplant. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2007 Nov;22(11):3363–4.
33. Bellmunt J, Szczylik C, Feingold J, Strahs A, Berkenblit A. Temsirolimus safety profile and management of toxic effects in patients with advanced renal cell carcinoma and poor prognostic features. *Ann Oncol*. 2008 Aug;19(8):1387–92.
34. White DA, Schwartz LH, Dimitrijevic S, Scala LD, Hayes W, Gross SH. Characterization of pneumonitis in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer treated with everolimus (RAD001). *J Thorac Oncol*. 2009 Nov;4(11):1357–63.
35. Maroto JP, Hudes G, Dutcher JP, Logan TF, White CS, Krygowski M, Cincotta M, Shapiro M, Duran I, Berkenblit A. Drug-related pneumonitis in patients with advanced renal cell carcinoma treated with temsirolimus. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011 May 1;29(13):1750–6.
36. Creel P, Moldawer NP. Noninfectious pneumonitis in a patient with renal cell carcinoma treated with everolimus. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 2011 Mar;38(2):125–8.
37. Saito Y, Kunugi S, Suzuki Y, Narita K, Miura Y, Minegishi Y, Kimura G, Kondo Y, Azuma A, Fukuda Y, Gemma A. Granuloma-forming interstitial pneumonia occurring one year after the start of everolimus therapy. *Intern Med*. 2013;52(2):263–7.
38. Fehrenbach U, Rodríguez-Laval V, Jann H, Fernández CMP, Pavel M, Denecke T. Everolimus-induced pneumonitis in neuroendocrine neoplasms: correlation of CT findings and clinical signs. *Acta Radiol*. 2020 Aug 20;284185120950100.
39. Iacovelli R, Palazzo A, Mezi S, Morano F, Naso G, Cortesi E. Incidence and risk of pulmonary toxicity in patients treated with mTOR inhibitors for malignancy. A meta-analysis of published trials. *Acta Oncol*. 2012 Sep;51(7):873–9.
40. Albiges L, Chamming's F, Ducloux B, Stern M, Motzer RJ, Ravaud A, Camus P. Incidence and management of mTOR inhibitor-associated pneumonitis in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Ann Oncol*. 2012 Aug;23(8):1943–53.
41. Camus P, Fanton A, Bonniaud P, Camus C, Foucher P. Interstitial lung disease induced by drugs and radiation. *Respiration*. 2004 Aug;71(4):301–26.
42. O'Donnell A, Faivre S, Burris HA, Rea D, Papadimitrakopoulou V, Shand N, Lane HA, Hazell K, Zoellner U, Kovarik JM, Brock C, Jones S, Raymond E, Judson I. Phase I pharmacokinetic

- and pharmacodynamic study of the oral mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitor everolimus in patients with advanced solid tumors. *J Clin Oncol*. 2008 Apr 1;26(10):1588–95.
43. Kirchner GI, Meier-Wiedenbach I, Manns MP. Clinical pharmacokinetics of everolimus. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2004;43(2):83–95.
 44. Thiery-Vuillemin A, Mouillet G, Nguyen Tan Hon T, Montcuquet P, Maurina T, Almotlak H, Stein U, Montange D, Foubert A, Nerich V, Pivot X, Royer B. Impact of everolimus blood concentration on its anti-cancer activity in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol*. 2014 May;73(5):999–1007.
 45. Verheijen RB, Atrafi F, Schellens JHM, Beijnen JH, Huitema ADR, Mathijssen RHJ, Steeghs N. Pharmacokinetic Optimization of Everolimus Dosing in Oncology: A Randomized Crossover Trial. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2018;57(5):637–44.
 46. Solazzo A, Botta C, Nava F, Baisi A, Bonucchi D, Cappelli G. Interstitial Lung Disease After Kidney Transplantation and the Role of Everolimus. *Transplant Proc*. 2016 Mar;48(2):349–51.
 47. Morath C, Schwenger V, Ksoll-Rudek D, Sommerer C, Beimler J, Schmidt J, Zeier M. Four cases of sirolimus-associated interstitial pneumonitis: identification of risk factors. *Transplant Proc*. 2007 Feb;39(1):99–102.
 48. Bauer C, Lidove O, Lamotte C, Petit T, Lieberherr D, Chauveheid MP, Legendre C, Crestani B, Dombret MC, Laissy JP, Antoine C, Pegaz-Fiornet B, Papo T. [Sirolimus-associated interstitial pneumonitis in a renal transplant patient]. *Rev Med Interne*. 2006 Mar;27(3):248–52.
 49. Piao SG, Bae SK, Lim SW, Song J-H, Chung BH, Choi BS, Yang CW. Drug interaction between cyclosporine and mTOR inhibitors in experimental model of chronic cyclosporine nephrotoxicity and pancreatic islet dysfunction. *Transplantation*. 2012 Feb 27;93(4):383–9.
 50. Shah RR. Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitor-Induced Interstitial Lung Disease: Clinical Features, Diagnostic Challenges, and Therapeutic Dilemmas. *Drug Saf*. 2016 Nov;39(11):1073–91.
 51. Delaunay M, Cadranet J, Lusque A, Meyer N, Gounant V, Moro-Sibilot D, Michot J-M, Raimbourg J, Girard N, Guisier F, Planchard D, Metivier A-C, Tomasini P, Dansin E, Pérol M, Campana M, Gautschi O, Früh M, Fumet J-D, Audigier-Valette C, Couraud S, Dalle S, Leccia M-T, Jaffro M, Collot S, Prévot G, Milia J, Mazieres J. Immune-checkpoint inhibitors associated with interstitial lung disease in cancer patients. *Eur Respir J*. 2017 Aug;50(2).
 52. Bonniaud P, Georges M, Favrolt N, Camus P. [Drug-induced interstitial lung diseases]. *Rev Prat*. 2014 Sep;64(7):951–6.
 53. Balcan B, Simsek E, Ugurlu AO, Demiralay E, Sahin S. Sirolimus-Induced Diffuse Alveolar Hemorrhage: A Case Report. *Am J Ther*. 2016 Dec;23(6):e1938–41.
 54. Ghadimi M, Mohammadpour Z, Dashti-Khavidaki S, Milajerdi A. m-TOR inhibitors and risk of *Pneumocystis pneumonia* after solid organ transplantation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 2019 Nov;75(11):1471–80.
 55. Alvarez RH, Bechara RI, Naughton MJ, Adachi JA, Reuben JM. Emerging Perspectives on mTOR Inhibitor-Associated Pneumonitis in Breast Cancer. *Oncologist*. 2018;23(6):660–9.
 56. Deuse T, Bara C, Barten MJ, Hirt SW, Doesch AO, Knosalla C, Grinninger C, Stypmann J, Garbade J, Wimmer P, May C, Porstner M, Schulz U. The MANDELA study: A multicenter, randomized, open-label, parallel group trial to refine the use of everolimus after heart transplantation. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2015 Nov;45(Pt B):356–63.

57. Eisen HJ, Kobashigawa J, Starling RC, Pauly DF, Kfoury A, Ross H, Wang S-S, Cantin B, Van Bakel A, Ewald G, Hirt S, Lehmkuhl H, Keogh A, Rinaldi M, Potena L, Zuckermann A, Dong G, Cornu-Artis C, Lopez P. Everolimus versus mycophenolate mofetil in heart transplantation: a randomized, multicenter trial. *Am J Transplant*. 2013 May;13(5):1203–16.
58. Molas-Ferrer G, Soy-Muner D, Anglada-Martínez H, Riu-Viladoms G, Estefanell-Tejero A, Ribas-Sala J. Interstitial pneumonitis as an adverse reaction to mTOR inhibitors. *Nefrologia*. 2013;33(3):297–300.
59. Weiner SM, Sellin L, Vonend O, Schenker P, Buchner NJ, Flecken M, Viebahn R, Rump LC. Pneumonitis associated with sirolimus: clinical characteristics, risk factors and outcome--a single-centre experience and review of the literature. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2007 Dec;22(12):3631–7.
60. Pickkers P, de Keizer N, Dusseljee J, Weerheijm D, van der Hoeven JG, Peek N. Body mass index is associated with hospital mortality in critically ill patients: an observational cohort study. *Crit Care Med*. 2013 Aug;41(8):1878–83.
61. Lemyze M, Granier M. [The obese patient and acute respiratory failure, a challenge for intensive care]. *Rev Mal Respir*. 2019 Oct;36(8):971–84.
62. Bonaccorsi A, Cancellieri A, Chilosi M, Trisolini R, Boaron M, Crimi N, Poletti V. Acute interstitial pneumonia: report of a series. *Eur Respir J*. 2003 Jan;21(1):187–91.
63. White DA, Camus P, Endo M, Escudier B, Calvo E, Akaza H, Uemura H, Kpamegan E, Kay A, Robson M, Ravaud A, Motzer RJ. Noninfectious pneumonitis after everolimus therapy for advanced renal cell carcinoma. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2010 Aug 1;182(3):396–403.
64. Carbonnaux M, Molin Y, Souquet P-J, Tantin A, Lombard-Bohas C, Walter T. Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia under everolimus in two patients with metastatic pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *Invest New Drugs*. 2014 Dec;32(6):1308–10.
65. Suzuki T, Tada Y, Tsushima K, Terada J, Sakurai T, Watanabe A, Kasahara Y, Tanabe N, Tatsumi K. Pneumocystis pneumonia in everolimus therapy: An indistinguishable case from drug induced interstitial lung disease. *Respir Med Case Rep*. 2013;10:27–30.

Table 1 – Patients demographic and clinical characteristics at baseline

CHARACTERISTICS	Overall population (OP) N = 39	Cancer population (K) N = 15	Transplantation population (TP) N = 24	p-value
<i>Female sex - N (%)</i>	17 (44%)	7 (47%)	10 (42%)	1.000
<i>Age - Yr (± sd)</i>	58 (± 19)	69 (± 9)	51 (± 20)	0.002
<i>Smoker - N (%)</i>	14 (36%)	4 (27%)	10 (42%)	0.544
Comorbidities - N (%)				
<i>Arterial Hypertension</i>	22 (56%)	7 (47%)	15 (63%)	0.523
<i>Diabetes</i>	7 (18%)	1 (7%)	6 (25%)	0.306
<i>Dyslipidemia</i>	14 (36%)	5 (33%)	9 (38%)	1.000
<i>Stroke</i>	2 (5%)	1 (7%)	1 (4%)	1.000
<i>Heart attack</i>	5 (13%)	2(13%)	3 (13%)	1.000
<i>Renal Failure</i>	11 (29%)	3 (21%)	8 (33%)	0.682
mTORi indication - N (%)				
<i>Heart allograft rejection</i>	-	-	13 (54%)	-
<i>Lung allograft rejection</i>	-	-	6 (25%)	-
<i>Renal allograft rejection</i>	-	-	5 (21%)	-
<i>Renal cancer</i>	-	8 (53%)	-	-
<i>Breast cancer</i>	-	5 (33%)	-	-
<i>Neuroendocrine cancer</i>	-	2 (13%)	-	-
mTORi molecule - N (%)				0.057
<i>Everolimus</i>	33 (85%)	13 (87%)	20 (83%)	
<i>Sirolimus</i>	4 (10%)	0 (0)	4 (17%)	
<i>Temsirolimus</i>	2 (5%)	2 (13%)	0 (0)	
mTOR inhibitor dose - mean (± sd) (mg)				
<i>Everolimus</i>		8.75 (± 2.26)	2.65 (± 1.78)	< 0.001
<i>Sirolimus</i>		-	2.75 (± 0.96)	
<i>Temsirolimus</i>		NA	-	

Abbreviations: OP (Overall population) ; K (Cancer population) ; TP (Transplantation population) ; N (number) ; Yr (Year) ; sd (standard deviation) ; mTORi (mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitor) ; mg (milligrams).

Table 2 - Time between mTOR inhibitors introduction and mTOR-IP development according to type of molecule and indication (months)

<i>POPULATION</i>	<i>Time between mTOR introduction and mTOR-IP Median [IQR]</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Overall population	7 [3 – 35]	
By indication		< 0.001
Transplantation population	12 [5 – 42]	
Cancer population	3 [2 – 6.5]	
By treatment		< 0.47
Everolimus	8 [4 – 37]	
Sirolimus/Temsirolimus	4 [2 – 10]	

Abbreviations: mTOR-IP (mTOR-inhibitors-associated pneumonitis) ; IQR (Interquartil Range)

Table 3 – Prevalence of mTOR-induced IP according to indications and type of molecules

	<i>Overall population N</i>	<i>mTOR-IP N</i>	<i>Prevalence - %</i>	
ALL PATIENTS	608	39	6.4%	Abbreviations: mTOR-IP (mTOR- inhibitors- associated pneumonitis) ; sd (standard deviation)
BY INDICATION				
TRANSPLANTATION	465	24	5.2%	
<i>Heart transplantation</i>	238	13	5.5%	
<i>Kidney transplantation</i>	91	5	5.5%	
<i>Lung transplantation</i>	132	6	4.5%	
<i>Other transplantation</i>	4	0	-	
CANCER	119	15	12.6%	
<i>Renal cancer</i>	99	8	8.1%	
<i>Breast cancer</i>	15	5	33.3%	
<i>Other cancer</i>	5	2	-	
OTHER INDICATIONS	24	0		
BY TREATMENT				
<i>EVEROLIMUS</i>	515	33	6.4%	
<i>SIROLIMUS</i>	64	4	6.3%	
<i>TEMSIROLIMUS</i>	29	2	6.9%	

Table 4 – Biological, radiological and functional characteristics of patients with mTOR-IP

	<i>Overall population (OP)</i>	<i>Cancer population (K)</i>	<i>Transplantation population (TP)</i>	<i>p-value</i>
BRONCHOALVEOLAR CHARACTERISTICS	N = 29	N = 11	N = 18	
<i>Cellularity (.10³ cells/ml) – mean (± sd)</i>	380 (± 271)	378 (± 285)	381 (± 271)	0.848
<i>Lymphocytes – mean (± sd)</i>	26 (± 21)	33 (± 24)	22 (± 19)	0.271
<i>CD4/CD8 report- mean (± sd)</i>	3 (± 2)	4 (± 2)	2 (± 2)	0.234
RADIOLOGICAL FUNDINGS	N = 39	N = 15	N = 24	
<i>Ground glass opacities – N (%)</i>	36 (92%)	15 (100%)	21 (88%)	0.271
<i>Reticulations – N (%)</i>	30 (77%)	14 (93%)	16 (67%)	0.115
<i>Condensations – N (%)</i>	19 (50%)	9 (64%)	10 (42%)	0.313
<i>Bronchiectasis – N (%)</i>	20 (51%)	11 (73%)	9 (38%)	0.048
RESPIRATORY FUNCTIONS TESTS	N = 20	N = 8	N = 12	
<i>FVC (%) – median [IQR]</i>	80 [69 – 91]	96 [81 – 111]	78 [60 – 80]	0.011
<i>DLCO (%) – median [IQR]</i>	52 [41 – 60]	63 [41 – 75]	52 [39 – 52]	0.155
<i>KCO (%) – median [IQR]</i>	66 [57 – 80]	68 [64 – 89]	58 [54 – 74]	0.203

Abbreviations: mTOR-IP (mTOR-inhibitors-associated pneumonitis) ; OP (Overall population) ; K (Cancer population) ; TP (Transplantation population) ; N (number) ; ml (millilitres) ; sd (standard deviation) ; CD (cluster of differentiation) ; FCV (Forced Vital Capacity, % predicted) ; DLCO (diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide, % predicted) ; KCO (volume standardized measure of DLCO, predicted).

Table 5 - Risk factors for severe mTOR-IP (univariate analysis)

INTENSIVE CARE UNIT HOSPITALISATION	YES (N = 6) N (%)	NO (N = 33) N (%)	P-VALUE (UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS)
BMI > 30 KG/M ² - N (%)	3 (50%)	1 (3%)	0.006
BAL PNN > 30% - N (%)	3 (50%)	2 (7%)	0.007
GLOBULAR FILTRATION RATE < 30 ML/MIN/1.73M ² - N (%)	5 (83%)	6 (19%)	0.007

Abbreviations: mTOR-IP (mTOR-inhibitors-associated pneumonitis) ; BMI (Body Mass Index) ; BAL (bronchoalveolar lavage) ; PNN (polymorphonuclear) ; kg (kilograms) ; m (meters) ; N (number) ; ml (millilitres).

Table 6 - Management of mTOR-IP

	Overall population (OP) (N = 39)	Cancer population (K) (N = 15)	Transplantation population (TP) (N = 24)	p-value
Place of care - N (%)				0.745
Outpatient	13 (33%)	4 (27%)	9 (38%)	
Conventional hospitalisation	20 (51%)	9 (60%)	11 (46%)	
Intensive care unit	6 (15%)	2 (13%)	4 (17%)	
Treatment - N (%)				
Oxygen	12 (31%)	6 (40%)	6 (25%)	0.478
Non-invasive ventilation	4 (10%)	2 (13%)	2 (8%)	0.631
Invasive ventilation	3 (8%)	1 (7%)	2 (8%)	1.000
Corticosteroids	21 (54%)	6 (40%)	15 (63%)	0.203
Dose (mg/kg) -mean (± sd)	0.5 (± 0.5)	0.4 (± 0.6)	0.5 (± 0.5)	0.454
mTORi management - N (%)				0.818
Stop	32 (82%)	13 (86%)	19 (79%)	
Continued	7 (18%)	2 (14%)	5 (21%)	
Intra-hospital mortality - N (%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	1.000

Abbreviations: mTOR-IP (mTOR-inhibitors-associated pneumonitis) ; OP (Overall population) ; K (Cancer population) ; TP (Transplantation population) ; N (number) ; mg (milligrams) ; kg (kilograms) ; mTORi (mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitor).

Figure 1 – Flow-Chart: selection of the target, eligible and study population

Figure 2 – Pathological characteristics of mTOR-IP: transbronchial biopsy

Figure 3 - Evolution of everolimus C0 blood levels at the time of mTOR-IP diagnosis and during the two previous everolimus blood levels assessment (D-1 and D-2) in the lung (N= 6) and heart (N = 12) transplantation population (TP)