Thorax Online First, published on January 28, 2014 as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

OPEN ACCESS

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Connective tissue disease related interstitial lung diseases and idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: provisional core sets of domains and instruments for use in clinical trials

Lesley Ann Saketkoo,[1] Shikha Mittoo,[2] Dörte Huscher,[3,4] Dinesh Khanna,[5] Paul F Dellaripa,[6] Oliver Distler,[7] Kevin R Flaherty,[5] Sid Frankel,[8] Chester V Oddis,[9] Christopher P Denton,[10] Aryeh Fischer,[11] Otylia M Kowal-Bielecka,[12] Daphne LeSage,[13] Peter A Merkel,[14] Kristine Phillips,[5] David Pittrow,[15] Jeffrey Swigris,[11] Katerina Antoniou,[16] Robert P Baughman,[17] Flavia V Castelino,[18] Romy B Christmann,[19] Lisa Christopher-Stine,[20] Harold R Collard,[21] Vincent Cottin,[22] Sonye Danoff,[20] Kristin B Highland,[23] Laura Hummers,[20] Ami A Shah,[20] Dong Soon Kim,[24] David A Lynch,[11] Frederick W Miller,[25] Susanna M Proudman,[26] Luca Richeldi,[27] Jay H Ryu,[28] Nora Sandorfi,[14] Catherine Sarver,[29] Athol U Wells,[30] Vibeke Strand,[31] Eric L Matteson,[28] Kevin K Brown,[11] James R Seibold[32]

▶ Additional material is published online only. To view please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202).

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to
Dr Lesley Ann Saketkoo, Department of Medicine, Sections of Rheumatology and Pulmonary Medicine and Critical Care, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center—New Orleans, LSU Scleroderma and Sarcoidosis Patient Care and Research Center, 1542 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, LA 70112, USA; ctd.ild@gmail.com, lsake1@lsuhsc.edu

Received 19 July 2013
Revised 22 October 2013
Accepted 11 November 2013

To cite: Saketkoo LA, Mittoo S, Huscher D, *et al*. *Thorax* Published Online First: [*please include* Day Month Year] doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202

ABSTRACT

Rationale Clinical trial design in interstitial lung diseases (ILDs) has been hampered by lack of consensus on appropriate outcome measures for reliably assessing treatment response. In the setting of connective tissue diseases (CTDs), some measures of ILD disease activity and severity may be confounded by non-pulmonary comorbidities.

Methods The Connective Tissue Disease associated Interstitial Lung Disease (CTD-ILD) working group of Outcome Measures in Rheumatology—a non-profit international organisation dedicated to consensus methodology in identification of outcome measures—conducted a series of investigations which included a Delphi process including >248 ILD medical experts as well as patient focus groups culminating in a nominal group panel of ILD experts and patients. The goal was to define and develop a consensus on the status of outcome measure candidates for use in randomised controlled trials in CTD-ILD and idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF).

Results A core set comprising specific measures in the domains of lung physiology, lung imaging, survival, dyspnoea, cough and health-related quality of life is proposed as appropriate for consideration for use in a hypothetical 1-year multicentre clinical trial for either CTD-ILD or IPF. As many widely used instruments were found to lack full validation, an agenda for future research is proposed.

Conclusion Identification of consensus preliminary domains and instruments to measure them was attained and is a major advance anticipated to facilitate multicentre RCTs in the field.

Key messages

Why is the key question?
- ▶ Can a core set of outcome measures that are reliable and feasible be identified by experts for use in future clinical trials in connective tissue disease associated interstitial lung disease (CTD-ILD) and idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF)?

What is the bottom line?
- ▶ Using established Delphi and nominal group techniques supplemented by patient input, a preliminary core set of outcome measures in CTD-ILD and IPF have been identified.

Why read on?
- ▶ To learn the core set of clinically meaningful and feasible measures in CTD-ILD and IPF that were identified and the gaps remaining.

BACKGROUND

The diffuse idiopathic interstitial pneumonias describe a spectrum of parenchymal lung diseases sharing clinical, physiological, radiological and pathological similarities, including varying degrees of fibrosis, inflammation and vascular injury.[1] Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF) is associated with usual interstitial pneumonia (UIP), poor survival and limited treatment options.[2] Interstitial lung disease (ILD), most typically presenting as non-specific interstitial pneumonitis, is a leading cause of death in systemic sclerosis (SSc)[3] and a prominent clinical feature of other connective tissue diseases (CTDs), including idiopathic inflammatory myopathy (IIM) and Sjögren syndrome. UIP is also found in rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and IIM.[4 5]

Current evaluations of therapies focus on patient survival or markers of chronic disease progression,

Copyright Article author (or their employer) 2014. Produced by BMJ Publishing Group Ltd (& BTS) under licence.

for example, change in forced vital capacity (FVC).[6–8] Measures of patient function, for example, 6 min walk test (6MWT), and health-related quality of life (HRQoL) have been variably applied with inconsistent results.[6] Therapeutic research has been hampered by lack of consensus on and validation of outcome measures that reliably assess the likelihood of treatment response. Furthermore, extra-pulmonary CTD manifestations may confound measures of ILD activity/severity. Patient-reported dyspnoea is demonstrated to predict time to death, yet a satisfactory dyspnoea instrument for ILD has not yet been identified.[7 8] Clinically relevant, patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) exist for obstructive lung disease and, in the absence of disease-specific measures, have been utilised in trials of ILD.

The Outcome Measures in Rheumatology (OMERACT) filter[9] (see online supplement) is a dynamic and iterative process/structure through which an instrument's performance can be evaluated under three criteria or points of examination: *truth* (face, content, construct and criterion validity), *discrimination* (reliability, sensitivity to change) and *feasibility* (cost, interpretability, accessibility, safety, time). The ideal instrument satisfies all three while instruments incompletely satisfying the filter may still be immediately useful but require additional study.

The Connective Tissue Disease associated Interstitial Lung Disease (CTD-ILD) working group of the OMERACT international consensus initiative convened to define outcome measures for use in randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in CTD-ILD. Given the major clinical overlap, the same process was used in parallel for IPF. We report the results of a three-component process: medical expert Delphi exercise, patient perspective investigations and a combined medical expert and patient participant nominal group technique (NGT) meeting leading to identification of preliminary core sets of domains with corresponding instruments that are clinically meaningful and feasible in the context of a 1-year multi-centre RCT for each CTD-ILD and IPF. These sets of instruments are proposed as the minimum outcome measures to be used in future RCTs and registries.

METHODS

Medical expert Delphi process

Delphi

International experts (n=270) were identified by authorship in peer-reviewed journals, specialty society membership and peer recommendations, and invited to participate in the web-based Delphi process.[10–12] This began with an 'item-collection' stage called Tier 0, wherein participants nominated an unrestricted number of potential domains (qualities to measure) and instruments (specific tools for use as a measure) perceived as relevant for inclusion in a hypothetical 1-year RCT. This exercise produced a list of >6700 items—reduced only for redundancy, organised into 23 domains and 616 instruments and supplemented by expert advisory teams of pathologists and radiologists. The results of Tier 0 provided the content for sequential web-based surveys: Tiers 1, 2 and 3 which progressively reduced the number of voting items as the items with the lowest ratings were dismissed. Survey items for each CTD-ILD and IPF were aligned in parallel and rated along a nine-point Likert scale from 1 ('not at all important') to 9 ('absolutely important'), with 'insufficiently familiar' a voting alternative. An extensive online repository of item-related journal articles was available to participants throughout the process.

Analysis

A cut-off of <4 (median rating) was applied to ratings from the large number of voting items in Tier 1. Cluster analyses were applied to the ratings in Tiers 2 and 3 avoiding the use of an arbitrary cut-off, thus allowing items to aggregate independently providing an unbiased analysis of agreement among raters.[12] A nine-cluster analysis was initially applied and reduced to three clusters for all items during both tiers.

Patient perspective investigation

Patient participation is recognised as integral to development of outcome measures by OMERACT, the US Food and Drug Administration and European Medicines Agency.[9 13] To investigate the patient perspective in CTD-ILD, a set of qualitative studies were conducted: focus groups (60–90 min) of 8–12 consented participants with CTD-ILD were selected by convenience sampling and asked 1) how their life has changed since the diagnosis of their lung disease? and 2) how their lung disease has changed over time? Patient perspective data in 20 English-speaking patients with IPF were previously available.[14] Content was extracted from verbatim transcripts and inductive analysis was applied to minimise investigator bias.[15] Following each focus group, CTD-ILD participants (study patients with IPF were not available) rated on a seven-point Likert scale the importance of the domains identified in Tier 0 of the medical expert Delphi process.

NGT meeting

At the 2012 OMERACT 11 conference and the 2012 American Thoracic Society (ATS) International Conference, data from the Delphi and the patient perspective investigations were reviewed by medical and patient experts. Following this, a face-to-face meeting was held to apply NGT to the overall results.

At the NGT, evaluation of each domain was led by assigned teams of medical and patient participants who presented evidence-based reviews focusing on instrument validation in accordance with the OMERACT filter.[9 12] Several weeks prior to team assembly, interactive educational sessions with the patient participants examined each domain and instrument. The teams served as a resource for evidence-based information during the discussion phases.

After each team presentation, all participants engaged in a 'round-robin' discussion allowing equal speaking time per participant[10–12] over two to three rounds examining acceptance or rejection of an item, potential clinical endpoint assignment, and determination for new instrument development within that domain. Each round of discussions was followed by group voting.

All participants were requested to register a vote for each item. With participants' full knowledge, responses from all physicians and patients with CTD-ILD were tabulated for CTD-ILD, with only those from pulmonologists and patients with IPF for IPF. All votes were recorded. (The radiologist voting was tabulated as a pulmonologist.) A priori, acceptance was agreed upon as ≥70% affirmative votes.[16] Voting addressed inclusion/exclusion of items based on the OMERACT filter and whether the patient perspective and evidence-based data warranted the need for new instrument development for that corresponding domain.

RESULTS

Medical expert Delphi

A total of 254 (137 pulmonologists, 113 rheumatologists and 4 cardiologists) engaged in the Delphi process. Seventy-four per cent reported their primary field of interest being ILD. Participation through all stages exceeded 97%. Six domains identified were: *Dyspnoea*, *HRQoL*, *Lung Physiology/Function*,

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Lung Imaging and Survival, and *Medications* for each CTD-ILD and IPF. Eighteen instruments were identified for each CTD-ILD and IPF (tables 1–4).

Focus groups

Focus groups were conducted with patients (n=45) in IIM-ILD (n=11), RA-ILD (n=13), SSc-ILD (n=17) and other CTD diagnoses (n=4) (table 5). Patient participants attributed importance to cough, dyspnoea, fatigue, participation (in family, social and leisure activities, work within and outside the home), physical function, self-care and sleep in the questionnaire and the focus groups. Changes in cough were perceived as reflecting potential worsening ILD. Dyspnoea largely carried descriptors different from current instruments. Patients with IPF identified cough, dyspnoea and HRQoL effects as central symptoms.[14]

OMERACT 11/ATS 2012/Domain Team meetings

Discussions and voting at the OMERACT 11/ATS 2012/Domain Team meetings resulted in the following changes based on the patient perspective data or strong evidence in recent literature (detailed in online supplement):

- *Cough* was reintroduced, discussed and voted upon at the NGT.
- To satisfy the reintroduction of *Cough*, Leicester Cough Questionnaire (LCQ) was introduced as an interim instrument to assess *Cough*.
- The Mahler Dyspnea Index (MDI) and University of California San Diego Shortness of Breath Questionnaire (UCSD-SBQ) were reintroduced under *Dyspnoea* for use in CTD-ILD and IPF, respectively, based on substantive findings in an updated literature review.
- For feasibility, *HRQoL* would capture 'fatigue', 'participation', 'physical function', 'self-care' and 'sleep' until disease-specific investigations into these components were conducted.
- NGT voting would include whether development of new instruments for *Dyspnoea*, *Cough* and *HRQoL* are needed.
- Owing to variability of therapies, concern regarding *Medications* as a core domain was expressed. However, being identified as important in the Delphi, a statement of clarification would be constructed at the NGT.
- 'All-Cause Mortality' was introduced as an assessment of 'Survival'.

Table 1 Reduction of domains and instruments in the Delphi process

Phase yielded	Analysis method	Domains CTD-ILD/IPF	Instruments CTD-ILD/IPF	Participant Dropout (%)
Tier 0	Intense review	133 nominations >>23	>6700 nominations >>616/616	0
Tier 1	<4 median cut-off	21	71/71	2
Tier 2	cluster analysis	13	58/61	<1
Tier 3	cluster analysis	5/5	18/18	0

CTD-ILD, connective tissue disease associated interstitial lung disease; IPF, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis.

Table 2 Domain results of Tier 0

Tier 0 results of 23 domains	
Survival	Mental health
Biomarkers	Sleep
Imaging	Global assessment
Lung physiology/function	HRQoL
Lung parenchyma	Physical function
Lung vascular	Participation
Cardiac function	Employment/work productivity
Composite scores	Medication
Gastroesophageal reflux	Extra-pulmonary CTD features
Cough	Comorbidities
Dyspnoea	Barriers to care
Fatigue	

CTD, connective tissue disease; HRQoL, health-related quality of life.

NGT results

The final NGT panel included 10 pulmonary experts, 12 rheumatology experts and 1 radiology expert, with 5 patient partners (tables 6–8, and see online supplement).

Table 6 displays the voting results on instruments for CTD-ILD and IPF with striking concurrence in all domains except for *HRQoL*, for which Patient Global Assessment (PtGA) was not accepted by the pulmonary experts for IPF.

Tables 7 and 8 present the content of the NGT discussions in the context of the OMERACT filter with items of special interest highlighted below.

It was agreed that 'Medications' (ie, the incremental increase/decrease of glucocorticoid and/or immunosuppressive therapy) should be viewed as protocol specific rather than a core domain. Depending on study design, 'Medications' may be either a dichotomous interpretation of treatment efficacy/failure or a reflection of changes in disease activity.

The lack of validated biomarkers was fully discussed. No items for bio-specimen evaluation emerged from the Delphi exercise but the importance of future biomarker research was planned for during the meeting. Consensus is required to define the minimal standards for investigation-related bio-banking and systematic access to samples by investigators.[17]

Table 3 Results of the Delphi Tier 3 cluster analysis of domains with median/mean reported

Five domains identified for each CTD-ILD and IPF		
Domain name	CTD-ILD (median/mean) ratings on a 9-point scale	IPF (median/mean) ratings on a 9-point scale
Dyspnoea	(8.0/7.8)	(8.0/8.1)
Health-related quality of life	(8.0/7.7)	(8.0/7.8)
Lung imaging	(9.0/8.3)	(9.0/8.3)
Lung physiology/function	(9.0/8.7)	(9.0/8.7)
Survival	(8.0/8.2)	(9.0/8.4)
Medications	(8.0/7.2)	(7.0/7.3)

CTD-ILD, connective tissue disease associated interstitial lung disease; IPF, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis.

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Table 4 Results from Tier 3 of Delphi

Domain	Instrument	Acceptance in	
Dyspnoea	Borg Dyspnea Index	CTD-ILD	IPF
	MRC Breathlessness (Chronic Dyspnea) Scale or the Modified MRC Dyspnea Scale	CTD-ILD	IPF
	Borg Dyspnea Index pre and post exercise	CTD-ILD	–
HRQoL	Medical Outcomes Trust Short Form 36 health survey	CTD-ILD	IPF
	St George's Dyspnoea Respiratory Questionnaire	–	IPF
	Visual analogue scale of Patient Assessment of Disease Activity	CTD-ILD	IPF
	Ability to carry out activities of daily living	CTD-ILD	–
	Health Assessment Questionnaire Disability Index	CTD-ILD	–
Lung imaging	Extent of honeycombing on HRCT	CTD-ILD	IPF
	Extent of reticulation on HRCT	–	IPF
	Extent of ground glass opacities on HRCT	CTD-ILD	–
	Overall extent of ILD on HRCT	CTD-ILD	IPF
Lung physiology/ function	Supplemental oxygen requirement	CTD-ILD	IPF
	FVC on spirometry	CTD-ILD	IPF
	Diffusion capacity of lung for carbon monoxide	CTD-ILD	IPF
	6MWT with maximal desaturation on pulse oximetry	CTD-ILD	IPF
	6MWT for distance	–	IPF
Survival	Time to decline in FVC	CTD-ILD	IPF
	Progression-free survival	CTD-ILD	IPF
	Time to death	–	IPF
Medications	Increase or decrease in glucocorticoids	CTD-ILD	IPF
	Increase or decrease in concomitant immune suppressive agents	CTD-ILD	IPF

6MWT, 6 min walk test; CTD-ILD, connective tissue disease associated interstitial lung disease; FVC, forced vital capacity; HRCT, high-resolution CT; IPF, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis; HRQoL, health-related quality of life; MRC, Medical Research Council.

DISCUSSION

These comprehensive international investigations are the first to identify core sets of domains in each CTD-ILD and IPF along with a *provisional* consensus on a minimum cadre of feasible and clinically meaningful outcome measures/instruments. The proposed measures are intended to be a common denominator across future RCTs, longitudinal observational studies and natural history registries until work can be done that substantiates a truly durable framework. The rigorous consensus methodologies of OMERACT outline the overall status of the field. Importantly, this is the first study in ILD to incorporate patient participants in panel meetings or guidelines. From the synergy of these investigations, domains which require development of new instruments were also identified, thus providing guidance for imminent research.

Based on the current data, FVC (100% acceptance) was the measure that the group favoured most for each CTD-ILD and IPF. Again, we emphasise that the overarching construct of this exercise was limited to that of a hypothetical RCT of 1-year duration. FVC has been shown to be a consistently reliable serial variable in IPF. Declines in FVC correlate with increased risk of subsequent mortality,[4 7 8 18–22] although no data exist demonstrating that improvement in FVC correlates with improved survival. Thus, utilising FVC as an endpoint requires consideration of the clinically meaningful magnitude of change independent of potential impact on mortality. This is particularly relevant in studies of short duration.

While changes in FVC have been shown to be reproducible in SSc-ILD, there are insufficient RCT-derived data to evaluate this in other forms of CTD-ILDs.[3–5 20] There are confounding issues of vasculopathy, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac involvement, chest wall impairment and systemic disease activity that are often coexistent in CTD-ILDs. Nonetheless, FVC may most reliably and sensitively reflect the contribution of parenchymal disease above other endpoints.

Though a relative change from baseline predicted is preferred to absolute change from normal values, these changes are recognised as non-parametric in FVC. Thus a discrete clinically relevant threshold of minimal change was not able to be agreed upon in either IPF or CTD-ILD. Further, efforts to validate serial variables are challenged by variations in the rate of disease progression, with interval changes of FVC[20 22] more likely to represent a true change in rapidly progressive disease than in less progressive disease that crosses the same threshold. Extrapolation between two value points will provide less reliable information than continuous variables; therefore, identification of a minimal clinically important difference (MCID) would be misleading without accommodating for these non-parametric changes. Panel discussions surrounding Diffusion Capacity of Lung for Carbon Monoxide (DLCO) reflected the multiple confounders for this instrument, with ranking of FVC as being the favoured marker above DLCO. A threshold of clinically meaningful change was not determined for DLCO.

Table 5 Characteristics of patients with CTD-ILD participating in the focus groups

Group	CTD type	Location	Participants	Gender	Age (years) Mean (SD)	Race
1	Various	Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada	9 1 IIM, 2 RA, 4 SSc, 2 SLE	8 F, 1 M	53.6 (16.2)	8 C, 1 O
2	RA	Toronto, Canada	7	7 F, 0 M	64.3 (9.0)	4 C, 2 A, 1 AC
3	SSc	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	6	3 F, 3 M	58.2 (9.1)	6 C
4	IIM	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	7	4 F, 3 M	52.4 (10.5)	5 C; 2 AA
5	Various	New Orleans, Louisiana, USA	9 3 IIM, 4 RA, 1 SjS, 1 SLE	6 F; 3 M	53.8 (15.5)	4 C; 4 AA; 1 H
6	SSc	New Orleans, Louisiana, USA	7	5 F; 2 M	54.6 (5.7)	4 AA; 3 C

A, Asian; AA, African American; AC, African Caribbean; C, Caucasian; CTD-ILD, connective tissue disease associated interstitial lung disease; F, female; H, Hispanic; IIM, idiopathic inflammatory myopathy; M, male; O, other; RA, rheumatoid arthritis; SjS, Sjögren's syndrome; SLE, systemic lupus erythematosus.

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Table 6 Results of nominal group proceedings with percentage for acceptance (see online supplement for expanded voting tables)

Instrument	CTD-ILD PULM+RHEUM+patients with CTD-ILD	IPF PULM+patient with IPF
Dyspnoea		
MRC Chronic Dyspnea Scale	7/9+9/12+2/3=75%	10/11+1/1=92%
Dyspnea 12	8/10+11/12+3/3=88%	6/9+1/1=70%
UCSD-SBQ	N/A	7/9+1/1=80%
Cough		
Leicester cough questionnaire	7/10+10/12+2/2=79%	8/10+1/1=82%
HRQoL		
Short Form 36	10/10+11/11+3/3=100%	8/10+1/1=82%
SGRQ	9/10+9/11+2/2=87%	8/10+1/1=82%
VAS-PtGA	10/10+11/12+2/2=96%	N/A
Lung imaging		
Overall extent of ILD on HRCT	11/11+9/11+3/3=92%	10/10+1/1=100%
Lung physiology		
Forced vital capacity	10/10+11/11+3/3=100%	10/10+1/1=100%
Diffusion capacity of lung	10/10+8/10+3/3=91%	10/10+1/1=100%
Survival		
All-cause mortality	Unanimous agreement	Unanimous agreement

CTD-ILD, connective tissue disease associated interstitial lung disease; HRCT, high-resolution CT; HRQoL, health-related quality of life; IPF, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis; MRC, Medical Research Council; PtGA, Patient Global Assessment; PULM, pulmonary specialist; RHEUM, rheumatology specialist; SGRQ, St George's Respiratory Questionnaire; UCSD-SBQ, University of California San Diego Shortness of Breath Questionnaire; VAS, visual analogue scale.

Neither the 6MWT nor measures of oxygen desaturation survived the NGT process; although deemed feasible they were considered weak in discrimination in addition to construct and criterion validity. The need for supplemental oxygen was not accepted; changes in oxygenation, as judged partly by oxygen desaturation, are difficult to interpret since they do not correlate well with the sensation of dyspnoea or changes in disease progression in mild to moderate disease.[19 23]

The importance of patient-reported dyspnoea for assessing prognosis and disease progression are well recognised.[1 7 8] We identified the Dyspnea 12[24] and the Medical Research Council Dyspnea Scale[18 19] as the best currently available instruments in CTD-ILD and in IPF, yet data are essentially lacking in CTD-ILD. Though the MDI has some demonstrated validity in SSc-ILD[20], NGT panelists allocated this interviewer-administered instrument to the research agenda for CTD-ILD, voicing concerns of poor feasibility and uncertain reliability. The UCSD-SBQ was accepted for use in studying IPF.[21] It was agreed that development of new *Dyspnoea* instruments is warranted to specifically reflect the restrictive lung processes of CTD-ILD and IPF.

The Short Form 36 (SF-36) was recognised as a generic *HRQoL* instrument as anxiety, fatigue, participation, physical function, self-care and sleep are important to patients.[25] The St George's Respiratory Questionnaire, although endorsed, lacked specificity in CTD-ILD and IPF.[26 27] It was agreed that a new disease-specific instrument should be developed.

PtGA, previously validated across rheumatic and non-rheumatic diseases, correlates with dyspnoea in CTD-ILD[28 29] and was accepted as a measure in CTD-ILD with improvements greater than 10 mm agreed upon as an MCID. PtGA not being validated in IPF was allocated to the research agenda in IPF. PtGA may also serve as an 'anchor' to determine MCIDs for

Table 7 Relation of CTD-ILD preliminary core set instruments to aspects of OMERACT filter in CTD-ILD

CTD-ILD	Dyspnoea		Cough	HRQoL			Lung physiology		Lung imaging	Survival	
Instruments	D-12	MRC	LCQ	SGRQ	SF-36	PtGA	FVC	DLCO	HRCT—overall extent of disease	All-cause mortality	Time to decline in FVC
Truth											
Face validity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Content validity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Construct validity	Y	Y	NT	Y	Y	NT	Y	±	Y	Y	NT
Criterion validity	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	No	No	Y	Y	NT
Discrimination											
Discriminatory	Y	Y	NT	Y	Y	NT	±	±	Yes, except± for GGO	No	Y
Reliable	Y	Y	NT	NT	Y	NT	Y	N	Yes, except± for GGO	Y	NT
Reproducible	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	Y	±	Y	N/A	NT
Sensitive to change	Y	Y	NT	NT	Y	NT	Y	±	Yes but relatively slow	N/A	Y
Feasibility											
Cost effective	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	No*	Y
Interpretability	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Readily available	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Safe for patients	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	±	Y	Y
Patient-derived content†	Y	No	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

PtGA is adopted under HRQoL, though it is an independent instrument.
*Not cost effective as a primary efficacy endpoint but highly cost effective as a secondary endpoint to detect treatment toxicity—see text for discussion on 'survival'
†US Food and Drug Administration advocates patient-reported instruments be developed by qualitative data supplied by patients.[18 19]
±, ambiguous; CTD-ILD, connective tissue disease associated interstitial lung disease; D-12, Dyspnea-12; DLCO, diffusion capacity of lung for carbon monoxide; FVC, forced vital capacity; GGO, ground glass opacity; HRCT, high-resolution CT; LCQ, Leicester Cough Questionnaire; MRC, Medical Research Council Dyspnea Scale; N/A, not applicable; NT, not yet tested; OMERACT, Outcome Measures in Rheumatology; PtGA, Patient Global Disease Activity; SGRQ, St George's Respiratory Questionnaire; SF-36, Short Form 36; Y, yes.

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Table 8 Relation of IPF preliminary core set instruments to aspects of OMERACT filter in IPF

IPF	Dyspnoea		Cough		HRQoL		Lung physiology		Lung imaging	Survival
Instruments	D-12	MRC	UCSD-SBQ	LCQ	SGRQ	SF-36	FVC	DLCO	HRCT—overall extent of disease	All-cause mortality
Truth										
Face validity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Content validity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Construct validity	Y	Y	Y	NT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Criterion validity	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	No	No	Y	Y
Discrimination										
Discriminatory	NT	NT	Y	NT	NT	NT	±	±	Y	No
Reliable	NT	NT	NT	NT	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Reproducible	NT	NT	NT	NT	Y	NT	Y	±	Y	N/A
Sensitive to change	NT	NT	Y	NT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Yes but relatively slow	N/A
Feasibility										
Cost effective	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	No*
Interpretability	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Readily available	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Safe for patients	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	±	Y
Patient-derived content†	Y	No	No	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Not cost effective as a primary efficacy endpoint but highly cost effective as a secondary endpoint to detect treatment toxicity—see text for discussion on 'survival'.
†US Food and Drug Administration advocates patient-reported instruments be developed by qualitative data supplied by patients.[18 19]
±, ambiguous; D-12, Dyspnea-12; DLCO, diffusion capacity of lung for carbon monoxide; FVC, forced vital capacity; HRCT, high-resolution CT; IPF, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis; LCQ, Leicester Cough Questionnaire; MRC, Medical Research Council Dyspnea Scale; N/A, not applicable; NT, not yet tested; OMERACT, Outcome Measures in Rheumatology; SGRQ, St George's Respiratory Questionnaire; SF-36, Short Form 36; UCSD, University of San Diego Shortness of Breath Questionnaire; Y, yes.

recently developed PROMs, such as the King's Brief ILD Health Assessment Questionnaire (K-BILD).[30]

The extent of ground-glass opacities, honeycombing and/or reticulations on high-resolution CT (HRCT) scan each merited careful consideration as outcome measures. However, taken separately each was felt to incompletely capture disease progression in either CTD-ILD or IPF. The overall extent of ILD on HRCT was accepted to provisionally describe the most appropriate and feasible composite of radiological abnormalities to monitor for disease progression.[31 32] No specific assessment tool at this time was able to be confidently identified as it is not yet clear whether subjective or automated objective assessment is the more accurate approach. Though serial HRCT raises concern for patient safety, validation studies of less radio-intense methods of HRCT serial assessment[33] are underway.

Progression-free survival in IPF was agreed to have merit,[34] however the group was undecided as to the practicality of this endpoint in the context of a trial limited to 1 year's duration. Mortality was minimal or absent in two recent RCTs of SSc-ILD.[35 36] There are cogent arguments for and against survival as the primary outcome in studies of IPF.[34 37] Regardless of this unresolved debate, mortality was recognised as an essential endpoint in all treatment trials as it provides a harm signal,[34 37] with all-cause mortality identified as a valid measure of survival in CTD-ILD and IPF. The utility of other measures of progression-free survival in RCTs requires further investigation of candidate instruments before recommending their use in RCTs.

While the domain of *Cough* did not survive the Delphi process, it was important to patient participants. Additionally, there is a correlation between cough and IPF progression[38] and with ILD severity in SSc.[39] In SSc-ILD, cough adversely impacted HRQoL and improved with treatment.[39] The LCQ was selected as an interim measure as it was deemed more able to capture frequency, quality and intensity, and impact on HRQoL. It was also most feasible to administer.[40 41]

Primary and secondary endpoint status of the proposed measures were considered, intensely discussed and even voted upon during the NGT. However, at this preliminary stage and given the lack of full validation of the core measures, the consensus was to pursue further data. A more careful approach to endpoint status declarations entails ad hoc and prospective performance analyses of these measures.

Though we recommend these proposed measures for all future research ventures, continued use of measures outside this core set, for clinical practice and research purposes, is fully expected with further research into their performance anticipated and necessary. Rather, this endeavour defines the currently available, best validated and feasible instruments while providing a much needed prioritised research agenda focus to the research community.

This project applied rigorous multi-investigational processes that captured the perspectives of the international ILD expert community and the life experience of patients with ILD to identify a set of domains and measures. Participation remained robust through all tiers of the consensus process.

The importance of patient participation is supported by the incorporation of *HRQoL*, *Participation* and *Fatigue* in the RA core set for RCTs. From a practical perspective, qualitative data collection involved only English-speaking patients from North America, and results may be affected by cultural, environmental and resource-related effects requiring further investigations to follow up our reported findings. Nevertheless, the engagement of patients as partners in the iterative process was important in identifying and re-capturing areas of potentially meaningful measures of disease activity.

CONCLUSIONS

It is critical that valid and clinically useful instruments be developed and validated to assess the likelihood of treatment response in these disorders. Identification of consensus

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

preliminary domains and instruments to measure them was attained and is a major advance anticipated to facilitate multicentre RCTs in the field. However, none of the provisional endpoints were ultimately felt to be either ideal or fully validated. Feasible endpoints like FVC are not perfect; more rigorous endpoints like mortality, particularly in the setting of CTD-ILD, lack feasibility. Thus, selecting the best non-ideal endpoints from a larger group of non-ideal endpoints still leaves us with much work which includes further validation of existing and development of new instruments.

Author affiliations
[1]Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
[2]University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
[3]German Rheumatism Research Centre, Berlin, Germany
[4]Charité Universitaetsmedizin, Berlin, Germany
[5]University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
[6]Brigham and Womens Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
[7]University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
[8]University of Manitoba, Manitoba, Canada
[9]University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
[10]Royal Free Hospital, London, UK
[11]National Jewish Health, Denver, Colorado, USA
[12]Medical University of Bialystok, Bialystok, Poland
[13]Patient Research Partner, Office of Public Health, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
[14]University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
[15]University of Dresden, Dresden, Germany
[16]University of Crete, Heraklion, Greece
[17]University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
[18]Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
[19]Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
[20]Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
[21]University of California-San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA
[22]Claude Bernard University, Lyon, France
[23]Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio, USA
[24]Asan Medical Center University of Ulsan, Ulsan, South Korea
[25]National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA
[26]University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
[27]Respiratory Biomedical Research Unit, University of Southampton, UK
[28]Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, Rochester, Minnesota, USA
[29]Patient Research Partner, Maryland, USA
[30]Royal Brompton Hospital and National Heart and Lung Institute, London, UK
[31]Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, USA
[32]Scleroderma Research Consultants, LLC, Avon, Connecticut, USA

Correction notice This article has been corrected since it was published Online First. The author affiliation for Luca Richeldi has been updated.

Acknowledgements Acknowledgements of thanks for essential and gracious assistance: Kourtnie Augustin, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center – New Orleans, USA; Reed Barrios, Patient Expert, New Orleans, USA; Bennett deBoisblanc, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center – New Orleans, USA; Kerri Connolly, Scleroderma Foundation, Danvers, MA, USA; Luis R Espinoza, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center – New Orleans, USA; Daniel E and Elaine Furst, University of California – Los Angeles, CA, USA; Robert Hedlund, Patient Expert, Virginia, USA; Matthew R Lammi, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center – New Orleans, USA; Steve Nathan, Innova, Fairfax, Virginia, USA; Karen Nichols, Patient Expert, Virginia, USA; Frank Smart, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center – New Orleans; Virginia Steen, Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA; Valorie Thompson, DINORA; Pieter van den Assum, Patient Expert, Virginia, USA. Ms LeSage and Ms Sarver are co-investigators and have contributed their expertise as patients to key decision-making in the design, implementation as well as analysis and interpretation of data and thus listed as authors.

Contributors LAS: PI, methodologist and project leader of all three components, author of manuscript. SM: Co-PI of patient perspective, NGT panel member (content, data collection, analysis), manuscript reviewer (MR). DH: Steering Committee for Delphi, Joint Analysis Decision, Interpretation of Delphi Data (SC1), methodologist, designer of Delphi database, statistician to all three components, MR. DK: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. PFD: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. OD: SC1, NGT panel member, methodology, MR. KRF: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. SF: Steering Committee for Patient Perspective, Qualitative analyses, Coding, Interpretation (SC2), methodology, analysis, MR. CVO: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. CPD: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. AF: SC2, NGT panel member, MR. OMK-B: SC1, database design, NGT panel member, MR. DL: SC2, patient research partner (assist with design, analysis, interpretation), analysis, NGT panel member, MR. PAM: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. KP: SC1, MR. DP: SC1, database construction, MR. JS: SC2, NGT panel member, MR. KA: NGT panel member, MR. RPB: NGT panel member, MR. FVC: SC2, patient data collection, analysis. RBC: literature review, database content collection and assembly, MR. LC-S: SC2, patient data collection, analysis, MR. HRC: content, analysis, interpretation, MR. VC: content, analysis, interpretation, MR. SD: SC2, patient data collection, analysis, MR. KBH: NGT panel member, MR. LH: SC2, patient data collection, analysis, MR. AAS: SC2, patient data collection, analysis, MR. DSK: NGT panel member, MR. DAL: NGT panel member, MR. FWM: NGT panel member, MR. SMP: NGT panel member, MR. LR: NGT panel member, MR. JHR: NGT panel member, MR. NS: literature review, database content collection and assembly, MR. CS: SC2, patient research partner, analysis NGT panel member, MR. AUW: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. VS: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. ELM: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. KKB: SC1, NGT panel member, MR. JRS: SC1, NGT panel member, MR.

Collaborators Delphi Co-Authors: *indicates Disease Committee Member. Rohit Aggarwal*, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, USA; Gillian Ainslie, University of Cape Town & Groote Schuur Hospital, South Africa; Firas Alkassab, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Charlotte, USA; Yannick Allanore*, Université Paris Descartes, France; Marina E Anderson, University of Liverpool, UK; Andrew P Andonopoulos, University of Patras School of Medicine, Greece; Danielle Antin-Ozerkis, Yale University School of Medicine, USA; Ana Arrobas, Centro Hospitalar de Coimbra, Portugal; Dana P Ascherman*, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, USA; Shervin Assassi, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, USA; Murray Baron, Jewish General Hospital, McGill University, USA; Joan M Bathon*, Columbia University College of Physicians & Surgeons, USA; Juergen Behr, Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich, Germany; Lorenzo Beretta, Referral Center for Systemic Autoimmune Diseases-Milan, Italy; Clifton O Bingham III, Johns Hopkins University, USA; Matthew Binnie, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Canada; Surinder S Birring, King's College Hospital, UK; Francesco Boin, Johns Hopkins University; USA; Tim Bongartz*, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, USA; Arnaud Bourdin, Département de Pneumologie et Addictologie INSERM U1046 - Université Montpellier; Demosthenes Bouros, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece; Richard Brasington, Washington University, St Louis, USA; Paul Bresser, Onze Lieve Vrouwe Gasthuis, Netherlands; Maya H Buch, University of Leeds, UK; P Sherwood Burge, Birmingham Hearlands Hospital, UK; Loreto Carmona, Universidad Camilo José Cela and Institute for Musculoskeletal Health, Spain; Patricia E Carreira, Hospital Universitario, Spain; Carlos RR Carvalho, University of Sao Paulo Medical School, Brasil; Luis J Catoggio, Hospital Italiano de Buenos Aires, Argentina; Kevin M Chan, University of Michigan Health Systems, USA; Jeffrey Chapman, Cleveland Clinic, USA; Soumya Chatterjee, Cleveland Clinic, USA; Felix Chua*, St. George's Hospital NHS Trust, UK; Lorinda Chung, Stanford University School of Medicine, USA; Matthew Conron, St Vincent's Hospital, Australia; Tamera Corte, University of Sidney, Australia; Gregory Cosgrove, National Jewish Health, USA; Ulrich Costabel, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany; Gerard Cox, McMaster University, Canada; Bruno Crestani, Centre de Compétences Maladies Rares Pulmonaires, Paris, France; Leslie J Crofford, University of Kentucky College of Medicine, USA; Mary E Csuka, Medical College of Wisconsin, USA; Pablo Curbelo, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay; László Czirják, University of Pécs, Hungary; Zoe Daniil, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece; Christine L D'Arsigny, Queen's University, Canada; Gerald S Davis, College of Medicine University of Vermont, USA; Joao A de Andrade, University of Alabama at Birmingham, USA; Paul De Vuyst, Hopital Erasme, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium; Owen J Dempsey, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary Foresterhill, Scotland, UK; Chris T Derk, University of Pennsylvania, USA; Jörg Distler, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany; William G Dixon*, University of Manchester, UK; Gregory Downey, National Jewish Health, USA; Mittie K Doyle, Alexion Pharmaceuticals Inc, Cambridge, USA; Marjolein Drent, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands; Lakshmi Durairaj, Carver College of Medicine, University of Iowa, USA; Paul Emery, University of Leeds, UK; Luis R Espinoza, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, USA; Dominique Farge, St. Louis Hospital, Paris, France; Maryam Fathi, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden; Charlene D Fell, University of Calgary, Canada; Barri J Fessler, University of Alabama at Birmingham, USA; John E Fitzgerald, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, USA; Ivan Foeldvari, University of Hamburg, Germany; George A Fox, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada; Tracy M Frech, University of Utah, USA; Sara Freitas, Coimbra Hospital and University Center, Portugal; Daniel E Furst*, University of California Los Angeles, USA; Armando Gabrielli, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona, Italy; Rosario García-Vicuña, Hospital Universitario de la Princesa, IISP, Spain; Ognian B Georgiev, University Hospital Alexandrovska, Sofia, Bulgaria; Anthony Gerbino, Virginia Mason Medical Center, USA; Adrian Gillisen, General Hospital Kassel, Germany; Dafna D Gladman, University of Toronto, Canada; Marilyn Glassberg, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, USA; Bernadette R Gochuico, National Human Genome Research Institute, National Institutes of Health, USA; Athena Gogali, University Hospital of Ioannina, Greece; Nicole S Goh*, Alfred Hospitals, Melbourne, Australia; Avram Goldberg, Hofstra North Shore LIJ School of Medicine, USA; Hilary J Goldberg, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, USA; Mark F Gourley*, National Institutes of Health, USA; Leroy Griffing, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, USA; Jan C Grutters, University Medical Center Utrecht, Netherlands; Ragnar Gunnarsson, Oslo University Hospital, Norway; Eric Hachulla, Claude Huriez

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Hospital, University of Lille, France; Frances C Hall, University of Cambridge, UK; Sergio Harari, U.O. di Pneumologia Ospedale San Giuseppe MultiMedica, Milan, Italy; Ariane L Herrick, University of Manchester, UK; Erica L Herzog, Yale University School of Medicine, USA; Roger Hesselstrand, Lund University, Sweden; Nikhil Hirani, University of Edinburgh, UK; Ulla Hodgson, Helsinki University Hospital, Finland; Helen M Hollingsworth, Pulmonary Center, Boston University School of Medicine, USA; Robert J Homer, Yale University School of Medicine Department of Pathology, USA; Rachel K Hoyles, Oxford Centre for Respiratory Medicine, UK; Vivien M Hsu, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, USA; Richard B Hubbard, University of Nottingham, UK; Nicolas Hunzelmann, Deptartment of Dermatology, University of Cologne, Germany; Maria Eloisa Isasi, Hospital Maciel. Montevideo. Uruguay; Elida Susana Isasi, Hospital Maciel. Montevideo. Uruguay; Soren Jacobsen, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Denmark; Sergio A Jimenez, Jefferson University, USA; Sindhu R Johnson, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; Christine H Jones, University of Vermont College of Medicine, Fletcher Allen Health Care, USA; Bashar Kahaleh, University of Toledo Medical Center, USA; Ronaldo A Kairalla, Heart Institute (InCor), University of São Paulo Medical School, Brazil; Meena Kalluri, University of Alberta, Canada; Sanjay Kalra, Mayo Clinic, USA; Robert J Kaner, Cornell University School of Medicine, USA; Brent W Kinder, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine; USA Goksel Kiter (Kiter G), Pamukkale University, Turkey; Ross C Klingsberg, Tulane University School of Medicine, USA; Maria Kokosi, Sismanoglio General Hospital; Martin RJ Kolb, Mcmaster University, Canada; Joanna Kur-Zalewska, Military Institute of Medicine, Warsaw, Poland; Masataka Kuwana*, Keio University School of Medicine, Japan; Fiona R Lake, University of Western Australia; Edward V Lally, Brown University, USA; Joseph A Lasky, Tulane University School of Medicine, USA; Ileda M Laurindo, University of Sao Paulo, Brasil; Lawrence Able, Sanjay Gandhi Postgraduate Institute of Medical Sciences, India; Peter Lee, University of Toronto, Canada; Colm T Leonard, University Hospital of South Manchester NHS Foundation Trust, UK; Dale C Lien, University of Alberta, Canada; Andrew H Limper, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, USA; Stamatis-Nick C Liossis, University of Patras Medical School. Greece; Kristine M Lohr, University of Kentucky College of Medicine, USA; James E Loyd, Vanderbilt University, USA; Ingrid E Lundberg*, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden; Yolanda N Mageto, University of Vermont, USA; Toby M Maher, Royal Brompton Hospital, UK; Tafazzul H Mahmud, Shaikh Zayed Medical complex, Lahore, Pakistan; Helene Manganas, CHUM (Notre-Dame Hospital), Canada; Isabelle Marie, Rouen University, France; Theodore K Marras, University Health Network, Mount Sinai hospital and the University of Toronto; José Antônio Baddini Martinez, Faculdade de Medicina de Ribeirao Preto, Brasil; Fernando J Martinez, University of Michigan, USA; Alessandro Mathieu, Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Italy; Marco Matucci-Cerinic*, University of Florence, Italy; Maureen D Mayes*, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, USA; Kevin M McKown, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, USA; Thomas A Medsger, Jr., University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, USA; Richard T Meehan, National Jewish Health, USA; Mendes Ana Cristina, Serviço de Pneumologia 1, CHLN- Hospital de Santa Maria; Keith C Meyer, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, USA; Ann B Millar, University of Bristol, UK; Nesrin Moğulkoç, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey; Jerry A Molitor, University of Minnesota, USA; António Morais, Pneumology Department, Centro Hospitalar São João; Portugal Luc Mouthon, Hôpital Cochin, Paris, France; Veronika Müller, Semmelweis University, Hungary; Joachim Müller-Quernheim, University of Freiburg, Germany; Oleg Nadashkevich, Lviv National Medical University, Ukraine; Roland Nador, University of Alberta, Canada; Peter Nash, University of Queensland, Australia; Steven D Nathan, Inova Fairfax Hospital, USA; Carmen Navarro, Instituto Nacional de Enfermedades Respiratorias, Mexico; Sofia Neves, Centro Hospitalar Vila Nova de Gaia/ Espinho, Portugal; Imre Noth, University of Chicago, USA; Hilario Nunes, Avicenne Hospital, Paris, France; Amy L. Olson, National Jewish Health, USA; Christian F Opitz, DRK Kliniken Berlin-Köpenick, Berlin, Germany; Maria Padilla, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, USA; Dimitrios Pappas, Columbia University College of Physicians & Surgeons, USA; Helen Parfrey, University of Cambridge and Papworth Hospital, UK; José M Pego-Reigosa, Meixoeiro Hospital, Spain; Carlos AC Pereira, Federal University of São Paulo, Brasil; Rafael Perez, University of Louisville School of Medicine, USA; Janet E Pope*, Western University, Canada; Joanna C. Porter, University College London, UK; Elisabeth A Renzoni, Interstitial Lung Disease Unit, Royal Brompton Hospital, UK; Gabriela Riemekasten, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany; David J Riley, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, USA; Maureen Rischmueller, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and University of Adelaide, Australia; Tatiana S Rodriguez-Reyna, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición, Mexico; Rojas-Serrano, Instituto Nacional de Enfermedades Respiratorias, Mexico; Jesse Roman, University of Louisville Health Sciences Center, USA; Glenn D Rosen, Stanford University School of Medicine, USA; Milton Rossman, University of Pennsylvania, USA; Naomi Rothfield, University of Connecticut Health Center, USA; Steven A Sahn, Medical University of South Carolina, USA; Alessandro Sanduzzi, Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II", Italy; Mary Beth Scholand (Scholand MB for Medline, University of Utah, USA; Moises Selman, Instituto Nacional de Enfermedades Respiratorias, Mexico; Jean-Luc Senécal, University of Montreal, Canada; Philip Seo, Johns Hopkins University, USA; Richard M Silver*, Medical University of South Carolina, USA; Joshua J Solomon, National Jewish Health, USA; Virginia Steen*, Georgetown University, USA; Wendy Stevens, St. Vincent's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia; Charlie Strange, Medical University of South Carolina, USA; Robert Sussman, Pulmonary and Allergy Associates, Summit, NJ, USA; Evelyn D Sutton, Dalhousie University, Canada; Nadera J Sweiss, University of Illinois, Chicago, USA; Göran Tornling, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden; George E Tzelepis, University of Athens Medical School, Greece; Alvaro Undurraga, Thorax National Institute, Santiago, Chile; Allessandra Vacca, University and A.O.U. of Cagliari, Italy; Carlo Vancheri, University of Catania, Italy; Janos Varga, National Koranyi Institute of TB and Pulmonology, Hungary; Douglas J Veale, University College Dublin, Ireland; Suncica Volkov, University of Illinois, Chicago, USA; Ulrich A Walker, Basel University Deptartment of Rheumatology, Felix Platter-Spital, Switzerland; Mark Wencel, Via Christi Clinic, University of Kansas Medical Center – Wichita, USA; Lewis J Wesselius, Mayo Clinic Arizona, USA; Melissa Wickremasinghe, St. Mary's Hospital, London, UK; Pearce Wilcox, University of British Columbia, Canada; Margaret L Wilsher, Auckland District Health Board and University of Auckland, New Zealand; Frank A Wollheim, Lund University, Sweden; Wim A Wuyts, University Hospitals Leuven, Netherlands; Gordon Yung, University of California - San Diego, USA; Pietro Zanon, Ospedale di Circolo di Busto Arsizio, Italy; Christopher J Zappala, Royal Brisbane & Women's Hospital, Brisbane QLD Australia

Pathology Advisory Team Steve D Groshong, National Jewish Health, USA; Kevin O Leslie, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, USA; Jeffrey L Myers, University of Michigan, USA; Robert F Padera, Brigham and Women's Hospital, USA

Radiology Advisory Team Sujal R Desai, King's College Hospital, London, UK; Jonathan Goldin, David Geffen School of Medicine, UCLA, USA; Ella A Kazerooni, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA; Jeffrey S Klein, Fletcher Allen Health Care, University of Vermont, USA; David A Lynch, National Jewish Health, Denver, USA

Analysis and coding of patient perspective transcripts Sophia L Cenac and Harmanjot K Grewal, Louisiana State University, New Orleans, USA; Angela M Christensen and Sancia Ferguson, Tulane University, New Orleans, USA; Maithy Tran, University of Toronto, Canada

Additional Statistical Support Kevin J Keen, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, Canada

Funding Non-profit support: These studies were supported in part by the intramural division of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, National Institutes of Health; and the following non-profit organisations: Brigham and Women's Hospital, Charité Hospital—Berlin, German Rheumatism Research Centre, Ira J Fine Discovery Fund, Jonathan and Lisa Rye Scleroderma Research Foundation, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center—New Orleans, Mayo Clinic—Rochester, National Jewish Hospital Denver, Louisiana State Office of Public Health—New Orleans, OMERACT (Outcome Measures in Rheumatology), Scleroderma Foundation, Sibley Hospital Foundation, and Sonia Roth AARC Foundation. Commercial Interest Support: Abbott Laboratories Canada, Actelion, Boehringer–Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Celgene, Intermune, Sigma Tau, UCB and United Therapeutics.

Competing interests None.

Ethics approval Louisiana State University School of Medicine Institutional Review Board for all components. Patient perspective studies also included approval from Johns Hopkins University, Massachussets General Hospital, University of Manitoba and University of Toronto.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement We have made all data visible in the online supplement.

Open Access This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 3.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/

REFERENCES

1 American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society international multidisciplinary consensus classification of the idiopathic interstitial pneumonias. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2002;165:277–304.
2 Raghu G, Collard HR, Egan JJ. An official ATS/ERS/JRS/ALAT statement: idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: evidence-based guidelines for diagnosis and management. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2011;183:788–824.
3 Tyndall AJ, Bannert B, Vonk M, *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.
4 de Lauretis A, Veeraraghavan S, Renzoni E. Review series: aspects of interstitial lung disease: connective tissue disease-associated interstitial lung disease: how does it differ from IPF? How should the clinical approach differ? *Chron Respir Dis* 2011;8:53–82.
5 Olson AL, Swigris JJ, Sprunger DB, *et al*. Rheumatoid arthritis-interstitial lung disease-associated mortality. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2011;183:372–8.
6 Bajwah S, Ross JR, Peacock JL, *et al*. Interventions to improve symptoms and quality of life of patients with fibrotic interstitial lung disease: a systematic review of the literature. *Thorax* 2013;68:867–79.
7 Martinez FJ, Safrin S, Weycker D, *et al*.; IPF Study Group. The clinical course of patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;142:963–7.

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

8 Collard HR, King TE Jr, Bartelson BB, *et al*. Changes in clinical and physiologic variables predict survival in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003;168:538–42.
9 Boers M, Brooks P, Strand V, *et al*. The OMERACT filter for outcome measures in rheumatology. *J Rheumatol* 1998;25:2198–9.
10 Rand Organization. Multiple articles and chapters in PDF format by the RAND Organization. http://www.rand.org/international_programs/pardee/pubs/futures_method/delphi.html (accessed 3 Dec 2012).
11 VandeVen AH, Delbecq AL. The effectiveness of nominal, Delphi, and interacting group decision making processes. *Acad Manage J* 1974;17:605–21.
12 Distler O, Behrens F, Huscher D, *et al*. Need for improved outcome measures in pulmonary arterial hypertension related to systemic sclerosis. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2006;45:1455–7.
13 Bottomley A, Jones D, Claassens L. Patient-reported outcomes: assessment and current perspectives of the guidelines of the Food and Drug Administration and the reflection paper of the European Medicines Agency. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;45:347–53.
14 Swigris JJ, Stewert AL, Gould MK, *et al*. Patients' perspectives on how idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis affects the quality of their lives. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2005;3:61.
15 Pope C, Ziebland S, Mays N. Qualitative research in health care: analysing qualitative data. *Br Med J* 2000;320:114–16.
16 Fink A, Kosecoff J, Chassin M, *et al*. Consensus methods: characteristics and guidelines for use. http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/notes/2007/N3367.pdf (accessed 3 Dec 2012).
17 Beyer C, Distler JH, Allanore Y, *et al*.; EUSTAR Biobanking Group. EUSTAR biobanking: recommendations for the collection, storage and distribution of biospecimens in scleroderma research. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2011;70:1178–82.
18 Manali ED, Lyberopoulos P, Triantafillidou C, *et al*. MRC Chronic Dyspnea Scale: relationships with cardiopulmonary exercise testing and 6-minute walk test in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis patients: a prospective study. *BMC Pulm Med* 2010;10:32.
19 Nishiyama O, Taniguchi H, Kondoh Y, *et al*. A simple assessment of dyspnoea as a prognostic indicator in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Eur Respir J* 2010;36:1067–72.
20 Roth MD, Tseng CH, Clements PJ, *et al*.; Scleroderma Lung Study Research Group. Predicting treatment outcomes and responder subsets in scleroderma-related interstitial lung disease. *Arthritis Rheum* 2001;63:2797–808.
21 Swigris JJ, Han M, Vij R, *et al*. The UCSD Shortness of Breath Questionnaire has longitudinal construct validity in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Respir Med* 2012;106:1447–55.
22 du Bois RM, Weycker D, Albera C, *et al*. Forced vital capacity in patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: test properties and minimal clinically important difference. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2011;184:1382–9.
23 Kim DK, Jacobson FL, Washko GR, *et al*. Clinical and radiographic correlates of hypoxemia and oxygen therapy in the COPD Gene study. *Respir Med* 2011;105:1211–21.
24 Yorke J, Swigris J, Russell AM, *et al*. Dyspnea-12 is a valid and reliable measure of breathlessness in patients with interstitial lung disease. *Chest* 2011;139:159–64.
25 Swigris JJ, Brown KK, Behr J, *et al*. The SF-36 and SGRQ: validity and first look at minimum important differences in IPF. *Respir Med* 2010;104:296–304.
26 Yorke J, Jones PW, Swigris JJ. Development and validity testing of an IPF-specific version of the St George's Respiratory Questionnaire. *Thorax* 2010;65:921–6.
27 Beretta L, Santaniello A, Lemos A, *et al*. Validity of the Saint George's Respiratory Questionnaire in the evaluation of the health-related quality of life in patients with interstitial lung disease secondary to systemic sclerosis. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2007;46:296–301.
28 Swigris JJ, Yorke J, Sprunger DB, *et al*. Assessing dyspnea and its impact on patients with connective tissue disease-related interstitial lung disease. *Respir Med* 2010;104:1350–5.
29 Steen VD, Medsger TA. The value of the Health Assessment Questionnaire and special patient-generated scales to demonstrate change in systemic sclerosis patients over time. *Arthritis Rheum* 1997;40:1984–91.
30 Patel AS, Siegert RJ, Brignall K, *et al*. The development and validation of the King's Brief Interstitial Lung Disease (K-BILD) health status questionnaire. *Thorax* 2012;67:804–10.
31 Wells AU, Desai SR, Rubens MB, *et al*. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: a composite physiologic index derived from disease extent observed by computed tomography. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003;167:962–9.
32 Goh NS, Desai SR, Veeraraghavan S, *et al*. Interstitial lung disease in systemic sclerosis: a simple staging system. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2008;177:1248–54.
33 Winklehner A, Berger N, Maurer B, *et al*. Screening for interstitial lung disease in systemic sclerosis: the diagnostic accuracy of HRCT image series with high increment and reduced number of slices. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2012;71:549–52.
34 Wells AU, Behr J, Costabel U, *et al*. European IPF Consensus Group. Hot of the breath: mortality as a primary end-point in IPF treatment trials: the best is the enemy of the good. *Thorax* 2012;67:938–40.
35 Tashkin DP, Elashoff R, Clements PJ, *et al*. Cyclophosphamide versus placebo in scleroderma lung disease. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:2655–66.
36 Seibold JR, Denton C, Furst DE, *et al*. Randomized, prospective, placebo-controlled trial of bosentan in interstial lung disease secondary to systemic sclerosis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2010;62:2101–8.
37 Corte TJ, Goh NS, Glaspole IN, *et al*. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: is all-cause mortality a practical and realistic end-point for clinical trials? *Thorax* 2013;68:491–2.
38 Ryerson CJ, Abbritti M, Ley B, *et al*. Cough predicts prognosis in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Respirology* 2011;16:969–75.
39 Theodore AC, Tseng CH, Li N, *et al*. Correlation of cough with disease activity and treatment with cyclophosphamide in scleroderma interstitial lung disease: findings from the Scleroderma Lung Study. *Chest* 2012;142:614–21.
40 Key AL, Holt K, Hamilton A, *et al*. Objective cough frequency in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Cough* 2010;6:4.
41 Birring SS, Prudon B, Carr AJ, *et al*. Development of a symptom specific health status measure for patients with chronic cough: Leicester Cough Questionnaire (LCQ). *Thorax* 2003;58:339–43.

Thorax: first published as 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202 on 24 December 2013. Downloaded from http://thorax.bmj.com/ on April 23, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Correction

Saketkoo LA, Mittoo S, Huscher D, *et al*. Connective tissue disease related interstitial lung diseases and idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: provisional core sets of domains and instruments for use in clinical trials. *Thorax* 2014;69:428-36. doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202

The following collaborator group should have been included at the end of the author list: The CTD-ILD Special Interest Group. The author list now reads: Saketkoo LA, Mittoo S, Huscher D, Khanna D, Dellaripa PF, Distler O, Flaherty KR, Frankel S, Oddis CV, Denton CP, Fischer A, Kowal-Bielecka OM, LeSage D, Merkel PA, Phillips K, Pittrow D, Swigris J, Antoniou K, Baughman RP, Castelino FV, Christmann RB, Christopher-Stine L, Collard HR, Cottin V, Danoff S, Highland KB, Hummers L, Shah AA, Kim DS, Lynch DA, Miller FW, Proudman SM, Richeldi L, Ryu JH, Sandorfi N, Sarver C, Wells AU, Strand V, Matteson EL, Brown KK, Seibold JR and the The CTD-ILD Special Interest Group.

Thorax 2014;**69**:834. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204202corr1

ON-LINE SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL FOR NGT PROCEEDINGS

This supplement expands on the details and voting results of the NGT process. The voting items and results reflect end-products of an iterative process that took place over three years. The Delphi process enlisted the wide participation of the ILD medical expert community of pulmonary and rheumatology specialists, with support from an advisory panel of pathologists and radiologists to identify domains and produce a list of instruments with which to measure these domains that are acceptable to the greater community of ILD experts. **Patient Participation**: In order to proceed with the stages beyond the Delphi, patient perspective of ILD was factored into the results of the Delphi process based on focus groups with 45 patients with CTD-ILD and the results of a prior study with 20 patients with IPF (conducted by: Swigris JJ, et al. Patients' perspectives on how idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis affects the quality of their lives. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2005).

I. NGT Participation:

Voting at the NGT was done through a pre-programmed automated response system which collected voting responses onto a computer hard drive and grouped according to participant type. Fourteen pulmonary specialists, 16 rheumatology specialists, 2 radiologists and 6 CTD-ILD patient partners and 2 IPF patient partners were invited to participate with following participants in actual attendance (of which 10 pulmonary, 12 rheumatology and 1 radiology specialist participated with ultimately a patient representing each IPF, IIM-ILD, RA-ILD and SSc-ILD participating):

Patient Research Partners: Diseases represented were IPF, RA-ILD, IIM-ILD and SSc-ILD. Several patients had clinical trial experience. All patients had the experience of oxygen dependency. Three had disease severe enough to have either received or are being considered for transplantation.

Robert Hedlund
Catherine Sarver
Karen Nichols
Pieter van den Assum
Daphne LeSage (involved in the development of the NGT proceedings but unable to attend due to inclement weather resulting in airport closure)

Pulmonary ILD Specialists:

Katerina Antoniou
Robert P. Baughman
Kevin K. Brown
Kevin Flaherty
Kristin B. Highland (Trained in Rheumatology)
Dong Soon Kim
Luca Richeldi
Jay H. Ryu
Jeffrey Swigris
Athol Wells

Rheumatology Specialists:

Paul F. Dellaripa
Oliver Distler
Aryeh Fischer
Dinesh Khanna
Eric L. Matteson
Peter A. Merkel
Frederick W. Miller
Shikha Mittoo
Chester V. Oddis
Susanna Proudman
James R. Seibold
Vibeke Strand

Radiology ILD Specialist:

David Lynch (Trained in internal medicine and radiology, his votes were attributed to the Pulmonary Specialty Group, thus tabulated for both IPF and CTD-ILD)

Convener/Organiser/Methods Supervisor/Patient Educational Sessions: Lesley Ann Saketkoo

Moderation: Peter A. Merkel, Oliver Distler

II. Domain Teams:

DYSPNEA:
Robert P. Baughman
Kevin Flaherty
Dinesh Khanna
Catherine Sarver

COUGH:
Robert P. Baughman
Shikha Mittoo
Daphne LeSage
Jeffrey Swigris

HRQoL:
Aryeh Fischer
Kevin Flaherty
Dinesh Khanna
Peter A. Merkel
Karen Nichols
Susanna Proudman
Vibeke Strand
Jeffrey Swigris

LUNG PHYSIOLOGY:
Kevin Flaherty
Kristin B. Highland
Dong Soon Kim
Otylia Kowal-Bielecka
Frederick W. Miller
Susanna Proudman
Jay H. Ryu

LUNG IMAGING:
Katerina Antoniou
Oliver Distler
David Lynch
Jay H. Ryu
Athol U. Wells

SURVIVAL:
Kevin K. Brown
Paul F. Dellaripa
Robert Hedlund
Eric L. Matteson
Athol U. Wells

MEDICATIONS:
Chester V. Oddis
James R. Seibold
Vibeke Strand

DOMAIN TEAMS Oversight: Lesley Ann Saketkoo

III. OMERACT (Outcome Measures in Rheumatology [initially 'for Clinical Trials' though this is no longer part of the official title])

Background: OMERACT is an international non-profit organization established in 1992 dedicated to the identification and development of appropriate outcome measures in disease. OMERACT provides a home for many disease-based working groups investigating outcome measures for use in clinical trials. OMERACT has characterized validity in terms of a 'filter' that provides an organizational checklist for an instrument's ability to satisfy accepted components of validity.

Filter: The components of the filter are grouped under three main criteria: truth, discrimination and feasibility. While the ideal instrument would satisfy all three criteria completely, it is recognized that many useful instruments do not. The filter serves as a guide to identifying the degree to which instruments have demonstrated validity.

Glossary of Terms/Properties comprised in the OMERACT Filter:

Truth:

Face Validity: The instrument hypothetically or at 'face value' makes sense; usually brings the instrument into consideration for study.

Content Validity: The instrument has demonstrated ability to measure the intended concept/domain; i.e. the substance of a measure is acknowledged to reflect a concept /domain well in regards to relevant content and comprehension for a specific disease. This may be gleaned from prior studies or active presentation to and/or item collection from medical experts and/or patients.

Construct Validity: The instrument has been applied in real world setting and demonstrates confirmatory relationships with other accepted measures for that disease – whether the relations are convergent (correlative when anticipated to be so) or divergent (non-correlative when anticipated not to be so) with other accepted outcome measures in that disease. This operational step provides confirmation for further investigation of the instrument.

Criterion Validity: The values provided by the instrument correlate with or predict results of the accepted 'gold standard' for that disease.

Discrimination:

Discrimination: The instrument has demonstrated ability to be responsive to changes for the intended concept/domain; while remaining sufficiently unresponsive to other like or confounding situations.

Reliability: The instrument demonstrates reproducibility and, importantly, accurate values over multiple measurements.

Sensitivity to Change: The values of the instrument demonstrate incremental results that either positively or negatively correlate with changes of the disease over time; e.g. while an instrument may have tremendous diagnostic value, it may not be useful to monitor the course of a disease.

Feasibility: Focuses on logistical and practical implementation and is often the deciding factor on the utility of an instrument.

Interpretability: Analysis/computation of results is sufficiently straightforward and undemanding so as not to introduce potential errors or hardship in implementation or interpretation of results.

Accessibility: There is little or no impediment to the instrument being commonly (or potentially) available for use; and the financial costs and time burden of obtaining, implementation and interpretation of the instrument does not impose unusual hardship.

Safety: The instrument poses little or no risk to patients or personnel implementing the measure.

IV. Post-Delphi Introduction of Items

Domain or Instrument Introduced	**Support for Post-Delphi Introduction**
Domain of *Cough*	Substantiated by Patient Perspective in both CTD-ILD and IPF (Swigris et al).
Instrument of Leicester Cough Questionnaire (LCQ) as a measure of *Cough*	Identified by comparative analysis by *Cough* domain team, discussion and Delphi voting as the most appropriate measure to supply an instrument under cough.
Instrument of Mahler Dysnea Index (MDI) as measure of *Dyspnea*	Identified by updated literature review and voted upon as having substantive findings warranting NGT discussion and voting. Exclusion of this item was collectively viewed as injurious to fair representation of post-Delphi evidence.
Instrument of University of California San Diego Shortness of Breath Questionnaire (UCSD-SBQ) as measure of *Dyspnea*	Identified by updated literature review and voted upon as having substantive findings warranting NGT discussion and voting. Exclusion of this item was collectively viewed as injurious to fair representation of post-Delphi evidence.
The concepts of *Fatigue*, *Participation*, *Physical Function*, *Self-care* and *Sleep*	These concepts were identified as important in Patient Perspective studies. It was agreed that disease-specific investigations into HRQoL would incorporate these components.
The measure of All Cause Mortality as a measure of *Survival*	Identified as an important generic identifier of death in clinical trials.

V. VOTING RESULTS:

For the following series of tables the purple shaded columns are the total responses of the groups appropriated to IPF or to CTD-ILD. While the pink shaded columns are the individual groups whose votes are appropriated to the total accepted votes. Acceptance was agreed upon a priori as ≥70% with the following tabulations: **IPF Voting**: Pulmonary Specialists + IPF Patient Partners

CTD-ILD Voting: Pulmonary Specialists + Rheumatology Specialists + CTD-ILD Patient Partners

Dyspnea IPF

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**IPF Patient**
Dyspnea 12		70% (7/10)	67% (6/9)	100% (1/1)
MRC		92% (11/12)	91% (10/11)	100% (1/1)
UCSD		80% (8/10)	78% (7/9)	100% (1/1)
Borg		36% (4/11)	40% (4/10)	0% (0/1)
Possible Secondary End-Point		82% (9/11)	80% (8/10)	100% (1/1)
Need New Patient Derived Instrument		73% (8/11)	70% (7/10)	100% (1/1)
Dyspnea 12 to be further evaluated	RESEARCH	100% 23/23	Show of Hands Voting from All Groups	

Dyspnea CTD-ILD

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**Rheums**	All Physicians	**CTD ILD Patients**
Dyspnea 12		88% (22/25)	80% (8/10)	92% (11/12)	86% (19/22)	100% (3/3)
MRC		75% (18/24)	78% (7/9)	75% (9/12)	76% (16/21)	66% (2/3)
Borg		32% (8/25)	30% (3/10)	33% (4/12)	32% (7/22)	33% (1/3)
MDI		58% (14/24)	40% (4/10)	67% (8/12)	55% (12/22)	100% (2/2)
MDI for SSc		54% (13/24)	50% (5/10)	55% (6/11)	52% (11/21)	66% (2/3)
Possible Secondary End-Point		96% (24/25)	90% (9/10)	100% (12/12)	95% (21/22)	100% (3/3)
Need New Patient Derived Instrument		76% (19/25)	70% (7/10)	92% (11/12)	82% (18/22)	33% (1/3)
MDI for future study	RESEARCH	91% 21/23	Show of Hands Voting from All Groups			

Cough in IPF

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**IPF Patient**
Leicester Cough Questionnaire as Interim Instrument		82% (9/11)	80% (8/10)	100% (1/1)
Possible Secondary End-Point		Agreement without dissension		
Need New Patient Derived Instrument		73% (8/11)	70% (7/10)	100% (1/1)

Cough in CTD ILD

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**Rheums**	All Physicians	**CTD ILD Patients**
Leicester Cough Questionnaire as Interim Instrument		79% (19/24)	70% (7/10)	83% (10/12)	77% (17/22)	100% (2/2)
Possible Secondary End-Point		Agreement without dissension.				
Need New Patient Derived Instrument		64% (16/25)	60% (6/10)	75% (9/12)	68% (15/22)	33% (1/3)

Patient Global Assessment of Disease Activity in IPF

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**IPF Patient**
Pt-GA		64% (7/11)	60% (6/10)	100% (1/1)
Possible Secondary End-Point		90% (9/10)	89% (8/9)	100% (1/1)
10mm Change is Clinically Meaningful		30% (3/10)	22% (2/9)	100% (1/1)
PtGA further evaluated as Outcome Measure	RESEARCH	100% 23/23	Show of Hands Voting from all Groups	

Patient Global Assessment of Disease Activity in CTD ILD

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**Rheums**	All Physicians	**CTD ILD Patients**
Pt-GA		96% (23/24)	100% (10/10)	92% (11/12)	95% (21/22)	100% (2/2)
Possible Secondary End-Point		92% (23/25)	80% (8/10)	100% (12/12)	91% (20/22)	100% (3/3)
10mm Change is Clinically Meaningful		71% (17/24)	50% (5/10)	83% (10/12)	68% (15/22)	100 (2/2)

Health Related Quality of Life in IPF

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**IPF Patient**
SF-36		82% (9/11)	80% (8/10)	100% (1/1)
SGRQ		82% (9/11)	80% (8/10)	100% (1/1)
Possible Secondary End-Point		100% (11/11)	100% (10/10)	100% (1/1)
Need New Patient Derived Instrument		90% (9/10)	90% (9/10)	Not Voted

Health Related Quality of Life in CTD ILD

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**Rheums**	All Physicians	**CTD ILD Patients**
SF-36		100% (24/24)	100% (10/10)	100% (11/11)	100% (21/21)	100% (3/3)
SGRQ		87% (20/23)	90% (9/10)	82% (9/11)	86% (18/21)	100% (2/2)
HAQ-DI		54% (13/24)	30% (3/10)	64% (7/11)	48% (10/21)	100% (3/3)
Possible Secondary End-Point		100% (24/24)	100% 10/10	100% (11/11)	100% (21/21)	100% (3/3)
Need New Patient Derived Instrument		100% (22/22)	100% (8/8)	100% (11/11)	100% (19/19)	100% (3/3)

Lung Imaging: During the NGT, it was proposed by the Lung Imaging Team and agreed upon by the assembled group, that overall extent of disease in IPF is fibrosis and honey-combing while ground glass opacities in CTD-ILD is an uncertain pattern and based on available evidence, it was therefore adopted to proceed directly with *Overall Extent of Disease of HRCT* as the single voting item. Note: regarding an end-point *for Overall Extent of Disease on HRCT* in CTD-ILD, no voting option reached the voting threshold of 70%.

Lung Imaging in IPF

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**IPF Patient**
Overall Extent of Lung Disease on HRCT		100% (1/11)	100% (10/10)	100% (1/1)
Possible Primary End-Point		8% (1/12)	9% (1/11)	0% (0/1)
Possible Secondary End-Point		33% (4/12)	27% (3/11)	100% (1/1)
Endpoint Perceived as Difficult to Assign At This Time		58% (7/12)	64% (7/11)	0% (0/1)
End-Point		NONE		

Lung Imaging in CTD ILD

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**Rheums**	All Physicians	**CTD ILD Patients**
Overall Extent of Lung Disease on HRCT		92% (23/25)	100% (11/11)	82% (9/11)	91% (20/22)	100% (3/3)
Possible Primary Endpoint		0% (0/23)	0% (0/11)	0% (0/10)	0% (0/21)	0% (0/2)
Possible Secondary Endpoint		65% (15/23)	45% (5/11)	80% (8/10)	62% (13/21)	100% (2/2)
Endpoint Perceived as Difficult to Assign At This Time		35% (8/23)	55% (6/11)	20% (2/10)	38% (8/21)	0% (0/2)
End Point		NONE				

Lung Physiology / Function in IPF

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**IPF Patient**
FVC		100% (11/11)	100% (10/10)	100% (1/1)
FVC as Possible Primary Endpoint		82% (9/11)	80% (8/10)	100% (1/1)
DLCO		100% (11/11)	100% (10/10)	100% (1/1)
DLCO as Possible Secondary Endpoint		91% (10/11)	90% (9/10)	100% (1/1)
Supplemental O2		0% (0/11)	0% (0/10)	0% (0/1)
6MWT Max Desat		45% (5/11)	40% (4/10)	100% (1/1)
6MWT Distance		45% (5/11)	40% (4/10)	100% (1/1)

Lung Physiology / Function in CTD-ILD

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**Rheums**	All Physicians	**CTD-ILD Patients**
FVC		100% (24/24)	100% (10/10)	100% (11/11)	100% (21/21)	100% (3/3)
FVCas Possible Primary Endpoint		88% (21/24)	80% (8/10)	100% (11/11)	90% (19/21)	67% (2/3)
DLCO		100% (21/23)	100% (10/10)	80% (8/10)	90% (18/20)	100% (3/3)
DLCO as Possible Secondary Endpoint		87% (20/23)	89% (8/9)	91% (10/11)	90% (18/20)	67% (2/3)
Supplemental O2		4% (1/23)	0% (0/10)	10% (1/10)	5% (1/20)	0% (0/3)
6MWT Max Desat		42% (10/24)	40% (4/10)	36% (4/11)	38% (8/21)	67% (2/3)

Survival: During the NGT, it was proposed by the Survival Team and agreed upon by the assembled group, that *Time to Death* and *Progression Free Survival* in both IPF and CTD-ILD should immediately be tabled to *Research Agenda*, there was no dissension to this. The group opted to proceed, upon advisement of the Survival Team, directly to *All Cause Mortality* and *FVC as a Surrogate Endpoint for Survival* as the voting items.

Survival in IPF

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**IPF Patient**
All Cause Mortality as a Secondary Endpoint		92% (11/12)	100% (11/11)	0% (0/1)
All Cause Mortality as a Possible Primary Endpoint		25% (3/12)	18% (2/11)	100% (1/1)
FVC as Surrogate Endpoint for Survival		45% (5/11)	40% (4/10)	100% (1/1)
Time to Death	RESEARCH			
Progression Free Survival	RESEARCH			

Survival in CTD ILD

Instrument		**Total for Acceptance**	**Pulms**	**Rheums**	All Physicians	**CTD ILD Patients**
All Cause Mortality as a Secondary Endpoint		92% (23/25)	100% (11/11)	91% (10/11)	95% (21/22)	67% (2/3)
All-Cause Mortality as a Possible Primary Endpoint		0% (0/25) ()1/1	0% (0/11)	0% (0/11)	0% (0/22)	0% (0/3)
FVC as a Surrogate End-Point for Survival		33% (8/24)	30% (3/10)	27% (3/11)	29% (6/21)	67% (2/3)
Progression Free Survival	RESEARCH AGENDA					

Additional questions posed at the NGT Meeting:

Do you think that the CTD-ILD OMERACT group should recommend the collection of bio-samples (according to published guidelines such as the EULAR-EUSTAR biomarker guidelines) in any multicentre RCT in IPF and CTD-ILD? 23/23 Yes by Vote of Hands From All Groups.

The Instruments accepted by the NGT are approved as research agenda items. 23/23 Yes by Vote of Hands From All Groups.

VI. Further References

American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society International Multidisciplinary Consensus Classification of the Idiopathic Interstitial Pneumonias. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002;165(2): 277-304.

An official ATS/ERS/JRS/ALAT statement: idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: evidence-based guidelines for diagnosis and management. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011; 183(6):788-824.

Bajwah S, Ross JR, Peacock JL, et al. Interventions to improve symptoms and quality of life of patients with fibrotic interstitial lung disease: a systematic review of the literature. Thorax. 2013;68(9):867-79.

Bartlett SJ, Hewlett S, Bingham CO 3rd, et al. The OMERACT RA Flare Working Group. Identifying core domains to assess flare in rheumatoid arthritis: an OMERACT international patient and provider combined Delphi consensus. Ann Rheum Dis. 2012;71(11):1855-1860.

Beretta L, Santaniello A, Lemos A, et al. Validity of the Saint George's Respiratory Questionnaire in the evaluation of the health-related quality of life in patients with interstitial lung disease secondary to systemic sclerosis. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2007; 46(2):296-301.

Beyer C, Distler JH, Allanore Y, et al. EUSTAR Biobanking Group. EUSTAR biobanking: recommendations for the collection, storage and distribution of biospecimens in scleroderma research. Ann Rheum Dis. 201;70(7):1178-82.

Birring SS, Prudon B, Carr AJ, et al. Development of a symptom specific health status measure for patients with chronic cough: Leicester Cough Questionnaire (LCQ). Thorax. 2003 Apr;58(4):339-43.

Boers M, Brooks P, Strand V, et al. The OMERACT filter for outcome measures in rheumatology. J Rheumatol 1998; 25:2198-9.

Bottomley A, Jones D, Claassens L. Patient-reported outcomes: assessment and current perspectives of the guidelines of the Food and Drug Administration and the reflection paper of the European Medicines Agency. Eur J Cancer. 2009;45(3):347-53.

Collard HR, King TE Jr, Bartelson BB, et al. Changes in clinical and physiologic variables predict survival in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2003;168:538–542.

Corbin J, Strauss A. (3rd Edition) Basics of Qualitative Research - Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. California, Sage. 2008.

Corte TJ, Goh NS, Glaspole IN, et al. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: is all-cause mortality a practical and realistic end-point for clinical trials? Thorax. 2013 Jan 23 [Epub ahead of print].

Cottin V, Capron F, Grenier P, et al. Diffuse idiopathic interstitial pneumonias. International multidisciplinary consensus classification by the American Thoracic Society and the European Respiratory Society, principal clinico-pathological entities, and diagnosis. Rev Mal Respir 2004; 21: 299-318.

de Lauretis A, Veeraraghavan S, Renzoni E. Review series: Aspects of interstitial lung disease: connective tissue disease-associated interstitial lung disease: how does it differ from IPF? How should the clinical approach differ? Chron Respir Dis 2011; 8: 53-82.

Distler O, Behrens F, Huscher D, et al. Need for improved outcome measures in pulmonary arterial hypertension related to systemic sclerosis. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2006;45(12):1455-7.

du Bois R, King TE Jr. Challenges in pulmonary fibrosis x 5: The NSIP/UIP debate. Thorax 2007; 62: 1008-1012.

du Bois RM, Weycker D, Albera C, et al. Forced vital capacity in patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: test properties and minimal clinically important difference. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011;184(12):1382-9.

Eakin EG, Resnikoff PM, Prewitt LM, et al. Validation of a new dyspnea measure: the UCSD Shortness of Breath Questionnaire. University of California, San Diego. Chest. 1998;113(3):619-24.

Fink A, Kosecoff J, Chassin M, et al. Consensus methods: characteristics and guidelines for use. http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/notes/2007/N3367.pdf Last accessed 3 December 2012.

Goh NS, Desai SR, Veeraraghavan S, et al. Interstitial lung disease in systemic sclerosis: a simple staging system. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2008;177(11):1248-54.

Gresham JN. "Expressed Satisfaction with the Nominal Group Technique Among Change Agents". PhD thesis, 1986. Texas A&M University. Accessed on line last 3 December 2012.

Holland AE, Hill CJ, Conron M, et al. Short term improvement in exercise capacity and symptoms following exercise training in interstitial lung disease. Thorax. 2008;63(6):549-54.

Jones RM, Hilldrup S, Hope-Gill BD, et al. Mechanical induction of cough in Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis. Cough. 2011;10;7:2.

Key AL, Holt K, Hamilton A, et al. Objective cough frequency in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Cough. 2010;6:4.

Kim DK, Jacobson FL, Washko GR, et al. Clinical and radiographic correlates of hypoxemia and oxygen therapy in the COPD Gene study. Respir Med. 2011;105(8):1211-21.

King TE Jr, Brown KK, Raghu G, et al. BUILD-3: a randomized, controlled trial of bosentan in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011;184(1):92-9.

King TE Jr, Albera C, Bradford WZ, et al, INSPIRE Study Group. Effect of interferon gamma-1b on survival in patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (INSPIRE): a multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2009;374(9685):222-8.

Lota HK, Wells AU. The evolving pharmacotherapy of pulmonary fibrosis. Expert Opin Pharmacother 2013;14(1):79-89.

Martinez FJ, Safrin S, Weycker D, et al; IPF Study Group. The clinical course of patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Ann Intern Med 2005;142:963-7.

Manali ED, Lyberopoulos P, Triantafillidou C, et al. MRC chronic Dyspnea Scale: Relationships with cardiopulmonary exercise testing and 6-minute walk test in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis patients: a prospective study. BMC Pulm Med. 2010; 28;10:32.

Manali ED, Stathopoulos GT, Kollintza A, et al. The Medical Research Council chronic dyspnea score predicts the survival of patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Respir Med. 2008;102(4):586-92.

Minnock P, Kirwan J, Bresnihan B. Fatigue is a reliable, sensitive and unique outcome measure in rheumatoid arthritis. Rheumatology. 2009;48(12):1533-6.

Nair R, Aggarwal R, Khanna D: Methods of formal consensus in classification/diagnostic criteria and guideline development. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2001; 41: 95-105.

Nishiyama O, Taniguchi H, Kondoh Y, et al. A simple assessment of dyspnoea as a prognostic indicator in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Eur Respir J. 2010;36(5):1067-72.

O'Donnell DE, Chau LKL, Webb, KA. Qualitative aspects of exertional dyspnea in patients with interstitial lung disease. J Appl Physiol 1998;84:2000-9.

Olson AL, Swigris JJ, Sprunger DB, et al. Rheumatoid arthritis-interstitial lung disease-associated mortality. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011;183(3):372-8.

Patel AS, Siegert RJ, Brignall K, et al. The development and validation of the King's Brief Interstitial Lung Disease (K-BILD) health status questionnaire. Thorax. 2012;67(9):804-10

Pope C, Ziebland S, Mays N. Qualitative research in health care: Analysing qualitative data. Brit Med J. 2000;320:114-6.

Pope J. Measures of systemic sclerosis (scleroderma): Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) and Scleroderma HAQ (SHAQ), physician- and patient-rated global assessments, Symptom Burden Index (SBI), University of California, Los Angeles, Scleroderma Clinical Trials Consortium Gastrointestinal Scale (UCLA SCTC GIT) 2.0, Baseline Dyspnea Index (BDI) and Transition Dyspnea Index (TDI) (Mahler's Index), Cambridge Pulmonary Hypertension Outcome Review (CAMPHOR), and Raynaud's Condition Score (RCS). Arthritis Care Res. 2011;63 Suppl 11:S98-111.

Raghu G, Collard HR, Egan JJ, et al; ATS/ERS/JRS/ALAT Committee on Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis. An official ATS/ERS/JRS/ALAT statement: idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: evidence-based guidelines for diagnosis and management. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011;183(6):788-824.

RAND Organization. Multiple Articles and Chapters in PDF Format by the RAND Organization. http://www.rand.org/international_programs/pardee/pubs/futures_method/delphi.html. Last accessed 3 December 2012.

Ryerson CJ, Abbritti M, Ley B, et al. Cough predicts prognosis in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Respirology 2011; 16(6):969-975.

Richeldi L, Costabel U, Selman M, et al. Efficacy of a tyrosine kinase inhibitor in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. N Engl J Med. 2011;365(12):1079.

Roth MD, Tseng CH, Clements PJ, et al; Scleroderma Lung Study Research Group. Predicting treatment outcomes and responder subsets in scleroderma-related interstitial lung disease. Arthritis Rheum. 201;63(9):2797-808.

Saketkoo LA, Mittoo SM, Frankel S, et al. Reconciling Healthcare Professional and Patient Perspectives in the Development of Disease Activity and Response Criteria in Connective Tissue Disease Related Interstitial Lung Diseases. J Rheumatol. In press.

Saketkoo LA, Matteson EL, Brown KK, et al. Developing Disease Activity and Response Criteria in Connective Tissue Disease Related Interstitial Lung Disease. J Rheumatol. 2011 Jul;38(7):1514-8.

Seibold JR, Denton C, Furst DE, et al. Randomized, prospective, placebo-controlled trial of bosentan in interstial lung disease secondary to systemic sclerosis. Arthritis Rheum. 2010; 62: 2101-2108.

Singh JA, Yang S, Strand V, et al. Validation of pain and patient global scales in chronic gout: data from two randomised controlled trials. Ann Rheum Dis. 2011;70(7):1277-81.

Speight J, Barendse SM. FDA guidance on patient reported outcomes. BMJ. 2010;340:c2921.

Steen VD, Medsger TA. The value of the Health Assessment Questionnaire and special patient-generated scales to demonstrate change in systemic sclerosis patients over time. Arthritis Rheum 1997 40(11): 1984-91.

Steen VD, Medsger TA. Changes in causes of death in systemic sclerosis, 1972-2002. Ann Rheum Dis 2007;66:940-944.

Strand V, Chu AD. Measuring outcomes in systemic lupus erythematosus clinical trials. Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res. 2011;11(4):455-68.

Stenton C. The MRC breathlessness scale. Occup Med (Lond). 2008;58(3):226-7.

Swigris JJ, Brown KK, Behr J, et al. The SF-36 and SGRQ: validity and first look at minimum important differences in IPF. Respir Med. 2010;104(2):296-304.

Swigris JJ, Han M, Vij R, et al. The UCSD shortness of breath questionnaire has longitudinal construct validity in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Respir Med. 2012;106(10):1447-55.

Swigris JJ, Kuschner WG, Jacobs SS, et al. Health-related quality of life in patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: a systematic review. Thorax. 2005;60(7):588-94.

Swigris JJ, Stewert AL, Gould MK, et al. Patients' perspectives on how idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis affects the quality of their lives. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes. 2005;3:61.

Swigris JJ, Yorke J, Sprunger DB, et al. Assessing dyspnea and its impact on patients with connective tissue disease-related interstitial lung disease. Respir Med. 2010;104(9):1350-5.

Tashkin DP, Elashoff R, Clements PJ, et al. Cyclophosphamide versus placebo in scleroderma lung disease. N Engl J Med. 2006; 354:2655-66.

Theodore AC, Tseng CH, Li N, et al. Correlation of cough with disease activity and treatment with cyclophosphamide in scleroderma interstitial lung disease: findings from the Scleroderma Lung Study. Chest. 2012;142(3):614-21.

Tyndall AJ, Bannert B, Vonk M, 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(10):1809-15.

VandeVen AH, Delbecq AL. "The Effectiveness of Nominal, Delphi, and Interacting Group Decision Making Processes", Acad Manage J. 1974;17(4):605-621.

Wells AU, Behr J, Costabel U, et al; European IPF Consensus Group. Hot of the breath: mortality as a primary end-point in IPF treatment trials: the best is the enemy of the good. Thorax. 2012;67(11):938-40.

Wells AU, Desai SR, Rubens MB, et al. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: a composite physiologic index derived from disease extent observed by computed tomography. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2003;167(7):962-9.

Winklehner A, Berger N, Maurer B, et al. Screening for interstitial lung disease in systemic sclerosis: the diagnostic accuracy of HRCT image series with high increment and reduced number of slices. Ann Rheum Dis. 2012;71(4):549-52.

Yorke J, Jones PW, Swigris JJ. Development and validity testing of an IPF-specific version of the St George's Respiratory Questionnaire. Thorax. 2010;65(10):921-6.

Yorke J, Moosavi SH, Shuldham C, et al. Quantification of dyspnoea using descriptors: development and initial testing of the Dyspnoea-12. Thorax. 2010;65(1):21-6.

Yorke J, Swigris J, Russell AM, et al. Dyspnea-12 is a valid and reliable measure of breathlessness in patients with interstitial lung disease. Chest. 2011;139(1):159-64.