The new guidelines for diagnosis and management of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis (IPF) constitute a valuable aid for the clinician because they clarify several “dark” points that have been brought up during the last decade by intense research and an increasing body of evidence in IPF. As such we could mention:

1) The ability to diagnose IPF without the need of histologic confirmation when typical clinical and radiological findings in high-resolution computed tomography are present as well as the ability to make the diagnosis of IPF based on a number of combinations of HRCT and surgical lung biopsy patterns in a background of multidisciplinary discussion between pulmonologists, radiologists and pathologists.

2) The variety of “natural histories” of IPF: IPF can progress slowly for more than five years or progress rapidly within 2 years and in any time may be complicated by a subacute/acute deterioration of respiratory function without any evident cause, which is defined as IPF acute exacerbation.

3) The role that co-morbid conditions such as pulmonary emphysema, pulmonary hypertension, gastroesophageal reflux, obstructive sleep apnea syndrome and obesity could play in the progression of IPF.

4) The realization that all drugs tested up to now have failed. This is considered a very important step forward since it’s the first time that the scientific community based on research evidence has decided to abandon the positive recommendation for immunosuppressive/immunomodulatory treatment either with corticosteroids or colchicine alone or with the combination of corticosteroids and azathioprine, cyclosporin A or interferon-γ 1b that have been used for decades in IPF without any proven benefit but with the cost of grave side effects such as drug toxicity and infections. Recommendations have also been negative for endothelin-1 receptor antagonists and anti-TNF factors in IPF.

However, in the new IPF guidelines there is a major discordance between the recommendation for treatment of acute exacerbation of IPF and the one concerning stable IPF. The committee advises the administration of corticosteroids for the exacerbations of IPF based on anecdotal reports of benefit and the high mortality of IPF acute exacerbation although it is clearly stated that there are no controlled trials on which to judge efficacy of such treatment. In stable IPF it is recommended not to use corticosteroids (and...
all other immunosuppressants) in the majority of patients based on the lack of randomized controlled trials as well as on the steroid treatment related morbidity and very low-quality evidence for the potential improvement in pulmonary function. This discordance implies different pathophysiologic mechanisms in stable and in exacerbated IPF which are not however further explained.

IPF acute exacerbation criteria include an unexplained worsening of dyspnea within 1 month, evidence of hypoxemia as defined by worsened or severely impaired gas exchange, new radiographic alveolar infiltrates and an absence of an alternative explanation such as infection, pulmonary embolism, pneumothorax or heart failure. Thus the definition of IPF exacerbation defines it as an "idiopathic" exacerbation of an "idiopathic" disease. The best etiological hypothesis for IPF acute exacerbation is that of a clinically "occult" infection that finally develops triggered by a number of undefined patient-related or
environmental factors such as the commonly and unjustified administration of immunosuppressants, that precipitates the usual interstitial pneumonia (UIP) scarred lung to diffuse alveolar damage (DAD) with the development of acute lung injury (ALI)/ acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS)6.

The clinician that treats an IPF patient presenting in the emergency department with subacute/acute dyspnea should identify if possible the cause of the deterioration6. This could be either the progression to the final end of the disease where the architectural distortion of lung parenchyma and the change in the mechanical properties of the lung render spontaneous breathing unbearable, or the coexistence of treatable causes or the acute exacerbation of IPF when all the above scenarios have been excluded (Figure1).

As in ARDS the treatment of IPF exacerbations should consist of excellent supportive care, intense investigation for the possibility of reversible causes and immediate cessation of any immunosuppressive medication7. The rapid deterioration of IPF should be considered to be exactly this: an ARDS of known/proven or unknown/unproven (acute exacerbation of IPF) cause upon UIP lung8,9.

Research concerning the natural history and the acute exacerbation of IPF has always been based on IPF patients participating in their vast majority in immunosuppressive treatment protocols. The evaluation and study of IPF patient populations receiving immunosuppressive treatment on the one hand and those being treatment naive on the other could help to distinguish which of the IPF complications that are considered part of the natural history of the disease could be partly attributed to the use of off-label immunosuppressive treatment.
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