



## Population-based survey of antimycobacterial drug use among patients with non-tuberculosis mycobacterial pulmonary disease

To the Editor:

Macrolides are key drugs used to treat *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) pulmonary disease (PD) [1, 2]. Members of this complex are the most frequently isolated mycobacterial species in many countries, including Japan [3], where 93.3% of nontuberculosis mycobacterial (NTM)-PDs are due to MAC [4]. The emergence of macrolide-resistant MAC, which has likely been induced by inappropriate treatment, (*e.g.* macrolide-containing regimens without appropriate companion medications and macrolide monotherapy), constitutes a serious challenge to MAC-PD patients, such as prolonged treatment duration and high mortality rate [5, 6]. However, little is known about the treatment practices of MAC-PD patients, especially inappropriate nonstandard treatment. Thus, we conducted a population-based cross-sectional study to describe antibiotic use among NTM-PD patients in Japan.

We used the Japanese national database (NDB), which collects nationwide data for all medical claims from public and private hospitals, pharmacies, and clinics in Japan, and electronically records all medical practices involving payment, such as diagnosis and the prescription of medications. We extracted from the NDB the claims of all individuals with ICD10 codes associated with NTM-PD (A310 and A319) in both in and outpatient claims between September 2009 and December 2014. Then, we defined and identified the incident NTM-PD patients as aged ≥40 years in 2011 who: 1) had not been issued any claims from September 2009 to December 2010; 2) had been issued at least five claims for NTM-PD between January 2011 and December 2014, with at least one issued in 2011; and 3) had been issued the claims for ≥24 months. Because most NTM-PD patients in Japan have MAC-PD, as mentioned above, and since claim data do not contain strain information, we used NTM-PD as a proxy for MAC-PD.

To evaluate antibiotics use, patients were classified as one of the following: "standard treatment" patients, who had received 1) macrolide and rifamycin and ethambutol, or 2) macrolide and ethambutol; "nonstandard treatment" patients, who had received the following regimens that diverge from guideline recommendations, 1) only macrolides, 2) macrolides and rifamycin, or 3) macrolides and fluoroquinolone; and "nontreatment" patients, who had not received any of the above treatments. Nonstandard treatment was basically defined as inappropriate treatment without ethambutol based on the findings of previous studies [5, 6]. Antibiotic use of any duration was included. We summarised patients' characteristics in each treatment category with respect to sex, age and comorbidities. We performed univariate and multivariate logistic regression to determine the factors associated with nonstandard treatment using standard treatment as the baseline. The model results are presented as unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Research Institute of Tuberculosis, Tokyo (RIT/IRB25-17) and Fukujuji Hospital, Tokyo (Fukujuji/IRB14005).



## @ERSpublications

This report shows poor adherence to the recommended treatment regimen for NTM-PD patients, which may pose a potential risk for the development of macrolide resistance. The risk was highest among elderly patients, and those with rheumatoid arthritis and COPD. http://bit.ly/3aBoUzE

**Cite this article as:** Izumi K, Morimoto K, Uchimura K, *et al.* Population-based survey of antimycobacterial drug use among patients with non-tuberculosis mycobacterial pulmonary disease. *ERJ Open Res* 2020; 6: 00097-2019 [https://doi.org/10.1183/23120541.00097-2019].

Copyright ©ERS 2020. This article is open access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Licence 4.0.







We identified 22 664 incident NTM-PD patients who met the aformentioned criteria. Of these patients, 6971 (30.8%) had received standard treatment; 8460 (37.3%) had received nonstandard treatment, representing 54.8% of all treated patients; and 7233 (31.9%) had not received treatment. More female patients received treatment (n=16201; standard treatment 31.7%, nonstandard treatment 37.7%, nontreatment 30.7%) than male patients (n=6463; standard treatment 28.4%, nonstandard treatment 36.5%, nontreatment 35.1%).

The proportion of patients treated with nonstandard treatment continuously increased with increasing age (26.5% at 40--49 years, 32.0% at 50--59 years, 33.6% at 60--69 years, 38.7% at 70--79 years and 44.9% at 80 years) while the proportion of patients treated with standard treatment decreased over the same age groups (39.5%, 38.5%, 34.6%, 29.4%) and 21.9% respectively). The proportion of patients who did not receive treatment remained relatively stable with age in all age groups (34.0%, 29.6%, 31.7%, 31.9%) and 33.2%.

In the univariate analyses, the factors that were significantly associated with nonstandard treatment included male sex, age  $\geq 50$  years (when compared with age 40–49 years), and having rheumatoid arthritis (RA), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), sequelae of pulmonary tuberculosis and interstitial pneumonia (table 1). After adjustment, the factors age  $\geq 50$  years, and having RA and COPD remained significantly associated with nonstandard treatment.

One-third of the patients with incident NTM-PD were observed to be undertreated with antimycobacterial drugs. This may reflect the predominance of nodular/bronchiectatic disease among NTM-PD patients in Japan, which may drive the high proportion of mild diseases and, therefore, the low percentage of patients

Sex         Males         4.197         2.359 (56.2%)         Ref.	TABLE 1 The demographic and clinical factors associated with nonstandard treatment						
OR (95% CI)       p-value       aOR (95% CI)       p-value         Sex       Males       4197       2359 [56.2%]       Ref.       Ref.       Ref.         Females       11 234       6101 [54.3%]       0.93 [0.86-0.99]       0.035       0.98 [0.91-1.06]       0         Age years       40-49       520       209 [40.2%]       Ref.       Ref.       Ref.         50-59       1798       816 [45.4%]       1.24 [1.01-1.51]       0.036       1.23 [1.01-1.5]       0         60-69       4444       2188 [49.2%]       1.44 [1.2-1.74]       <0.001       1.42 [1.18-1.71]       <0         70-79       5568       3162 [56.8%]       1.96 [1.63-2.35]       <0.001       1.92 [1.6-2.31]       <0         ≥80       3101       2085 [67.2%]       3.05 [2.52-3.7]       <0.001       3.01 [2.49-3.65]       <0         Comorbidity         Rheumatoid arthritis       No       13998       7591 [54.2%]       Ref.       Ref.       Ref.	s Multivariate analysis	Univariate analysis		treatment	and nonstandard treatment	Variable	
Males       4197       2359 [56.2%]       Ref.       Ref.         Females       11234       6101 [54.3%]       0.93 [0.86-0.99]       0.035       0.98 [0.91-1.06]       0         Age years         40-49       520       209 [40.2%]       Ref.       Ref.       Ref.         50-59       1798       816 [45.4%]       1.24 [1.01-1.51]       0.036       1.23 [1.01-1.5]       0         60-69       4444       2188 [49.2%]       1.44 [1.2-1.74]       <0.001       1.42 [1.18-1.71]       <0         70-79       5568       3162 [56.8%]       1.96 [1.63-2.35]       <0.001       1.92 [1.6-2.31]       <0         ≥80       3101       2085 [67.2%]       3.05 [2.52-3.7]       <0.001       3.01 [2.49-3.65]       <0         Comorbidity         Rheumatoid arthritis         No       13998       7591 [54.2%]       Ref.       Ref.       Ref.	alue aOR (95% CI) p-value	p-value	OR (95% CI)	(11-0400)	(11-10-101)		
Females 11 234 6101 (54.3%) 0.93 (0.86-0.99) 0.035 0.98 (0.91-1.06) 0  Age years  40-49 520 209 (40.2%) Ref. Ref. 50-59 1798 816 (45.4%) 1.24 (1.01-1.51) 0.036 1.23 (1.01-1.5) 0 60-69 4444 2188 (49.2%) 1.44 (1.2-1.74) <0.001 1.42 (1.18-1.71) <0 70-79 5568 3162 (56.8%) 1.96 (1.63-2.35) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0 ≥80 3101 2085 (67.2%) 3.05 (2.52-3.7) <0.001 3.01 (2.49-3.65) <0  Comorbidity  Rheumatoid arthritis No 13998 7591 (54.2%) Ref. Ref.						Sex	
Age years       40-49       520       209 (40.2%)       Ref.       Ref.       Ref.         50-59       1798       816 (45.4%)       1.24 (1.01-1.51)       0.036       1.23 (1.01-1.5)       0         60-69       4444       2188 (49.2%)       1.44 (1.2-1.74)       <0.001	Ref.		Ref.	2359 (56.2%)	4197	Males	
40-49 520 209 (40.2%) Ref. Ref. Sco. 1798 816 (45.4%) 1.24 (1.01-1.51) 0.036 1.23 (1.01-1.5) 0.06-69 4444 2188 (49.2%) 1.44 (1.2-1.74) <0.001 1.42 (1.18-1.71) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31)	035 0.98 (0.91–1.06) 0.640	0.035	0.93 (0.86-0.99)	6101 (54.3%)	11 234	Females	
50–59 1798 816 (45.4%) 1.24 (1.01–1.51) 0.036 1.23 (1.01–1.5) 0 60–69 4444 2188 (49.2%) 1.44 (1.2–1.74) <0.001 1.42 (1.18–1.71) <0 70–79 5568 3162 (56.8%) 1.96 (1.63–2.35) <0.001 1.92 (1.6–2.31) <0 ≥80 3101 2085 (67.2%) 3.05 (2.52–3.7) <0.001 3.01 (2.49–3.65) <0 Comorbidity Rheumatoid arthritis No 13998 7591 (54.2%) Ref. Ref.						Age years	
60-69 4444 2188 (49.2%) 1.44 (1.2-1.74) <0.001 1.42 (1.18-1.71) << 70-79 5568 3162 (56.8%) 1.96 (1.63-2.35) <0.001 1.92 (1.6-2.31) << ≥80 3101 2085 (67.2%) 3.05 (2.52-3.7) <0.001 3.01 (2.49-3.65) <	Ref.		Ref.	209 (40.2%)	520	40-49	
70–79 5568 3162 [56.8%] 1.96 [1.63–2.35] <0.001 1.92 [1.6–2.31] <0.001	036 1.23 (1.01–1.5) 0.044	0.036	1.24 (1.01-1.51)	816 (45.4%)	1798	50-59	
≥80 3101 2085 [67.2%] 3.05 [2.52–3.7] <0.001 3.01 [2.49–3.65] <0  Comorbidity  Rheumatoid     arthritis     No 13998 7591 [54.2%] Ref. Ref.	001 1.42 (1.18–1.71) < 0.001	< 0.001	1.44 (1.2-1.74)	2188 (49.2%)	4444	60-69	
Comorbidity Rheumatoid arthritis No 13998 7591 (54.2%) Ref. Ref.	001 1.92 (1.6–2.31) < 0.001	< 0.001	1.96 (1.63-2.35)	3162 (56.8%)	5568	70-79	
Rheumatoid arthritis No 13 998 7591 (54.2%) Ref. Ref.	001 3.01 (2.49–3.65) < 0.001	< 0.001	3.05 (2.52-3.7)	2085 (67.2%)	3101	≥80	
arthritis No 13 998 7591 (54.2%) Ref. Ref.						Comorbidity	
No 13 998 7591 [54.2%] Ref. Ref.						Rheumatoid	
						arthritis	
Yes 1433 869 (60.6%) 1.30 (1.16–1.45) <0.001 1.36 (1.21–1.53) <0.001	Ref.		Ref.	7591 (54.2%)	13 998	No	
	001 1.36 (1.21–1.53) < 0.001	< 0.001	1.30 (1.16-1.45)	869 (60.6%)	1433	Yes	
Bronchiectasis						Bronchiectasis	
No 11 664 6380 [54.7%] Ref. Ref.	Ref.		Ref.	6380 (54.7%)	11 664	No	
Yes 3767 2080 [55.2%] 1.02 [0.95–1.1] 0.579 1.02 [0.95–1.1] 0	579 1.02 (0.95–1.1) 0.618	0.579	1.02 (0.95-1.1)	2080 (55.2%)	3767	Yes	
COPD						COPD	
No 14350 7783 [54.2%] Ref. Ref.	Ref.		Ref.	7783 (54.2%)	14350	No	
Yes 1081 677 (62.6%) 1.41 (1.24–1.61) <0.001 1.31 (1.14–1.49) <0.001	001 1.31 (1.14–1.49) <0.001	< 0.001	1.41 (1.24-1.61)	677 (62.6%)	1081	Yes	
Sequelae of						Sequelae of	
pulmonary TB						pulmonary TB	
No 14628 7988 [54.6%] Ref. Ref.	Ref.		Ref.	7988 (54.6%)	14 628	No	
Yes 803 472 (58.8%) 1.19 (1.03–1.37) 0.021 1.02 (0.88–1.18) 0	021 1.02 (0.88–1.18) 0.828	0.021	1.19 (1.03-1.37)	472 (58.8%)	803	Yes	
Interstitial						Interstitial	
pneumonia						pneumonia	
No 14038 7655 (54.5%) Ref. Ref.	Ref.		Ref.	7655 (54.5%)	14 038	•	
		0.020					

Patients who did not receive treatment were excluded from the regression analysis. International Classification of Diseases 10 codes for aspergillosis (B487, B449 and B441), rheumatoid arthritis (M0510, M0530, M0590, M0690, M0690, M0691, M0692, M0693, M0694, M0695, M0696, M0697, M0698 and M0800), bronchiectasis (J47, A162 and Q334), COPD (J449), sequelae of pulmonary tuberculosis (TB) (B909), lung cancer (C340, C341, C342, C343, C349, C780, C795 and Z122), interstitial pneumonia (J704, J841, J849, M0510, M330, M321, M332 and M351) and diabetes mellitus (E10 and E11). To ensure the specificity of comorbidities, a comorbidity was identified when at least five associated claims were made. aOR: adjusted odds ratio; Ref.: reference. p<0.05 was considered statistically significant.

receiving treatment [7]. Although all three drugs used in standard treatment have been covered by Japanese health insurance since 2009, many patients had been treated with nonstandard treatment. Such treatment may pose a potential risk for the development of macrolide resistance [5, 6]. This poor adherence to the recommended regimen was similar to the findings in the USA [8]. We showed the risk of nonstandard treatment was particularly prominent among elderly patients who could not probably comply with the standard treatment due to side-effects. RA and COPD were significant risk factors for receiving nonstandard treatment, implying that those patients may be intolerant to a three-drug regimen.

Some limitations may have biased the results of this study. Because the American Thoracic Society/ Infectious Diseases Society of America diagnostic criteria could not be met due to the unavailability of bacteriological and clinical information, we may have overestimated the number of patients. However, it is also possible that we slightly underestimated the true number of patients, since we defined a case when at least five claims were made, the resulting estimates seem conservative relative to those of previous studies [9–11]. A short course of macrolide monotherapy may also have been provided to treat the common cold among untreated NTM-PD patients, which may have increased the proportion of nonstandard treatment use identified in our study because a minimum duration of treatment could not be considered for the treatment definition due to data analytic limitations. However, the risk of macrolide resistance associated with a very short course of macrolide monotherapy in patients with MAC-PD is unknown.

This is the first study to describe the current status of antibiotic use among NTM-PD patients in Japan and to examine the risk factors for receiving nonstandard treatment using the data covering the entire Japanese population. We identified a significant number of patients who received inappropriate treatments, which could potentially induce macrolide resistance. Macrolide-resistant NTM-PD can increase the patient care needed and healthcare-related costs [9]. Although the use of modified regimens, particularly for elderly patients, is unavoidable, inappropriate treatment should be minimised by enhancing the awareness of guideline-recommended treatment and promoting adherence to treatment, especially elderly patients with comorbidities. More detail on treatments including the duration of therapies and transitions between regimens require study to better understand the magnitude of gaps in practice patterns.

## Kiyohiko Izumi<sup>1,6</sup>, Kozo Morimoto<sup>1,2,6</sup>, Kazuhiro Uchimura<sup>1</sup>, Manabu Ato <sup>3</sup>, Naoki Hasegawa and Satoshi Mitarai<sup>1,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Research Institute of Tuberculosis, Japan Anti-Tuberculosis Association, Tokyo, Japan. <sup>2</sup>Fukujuji Hospital, Japan Anti-Tuberculosis Association, Tokyo, Japan. <sup>3</sup>Leprosy Research Center, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan. <sup>4</sup>Keio University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan. <sup>5</sup>Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki, Japan. <sup>6</sup>These authors contributed equally.

Correspondence: Kiyohiko Izumi, Dept of Epidemiology and Clinical Research, The Research Institute of Tuberculosis, Anti-Tuberculosis Association, 3-1-24, Matsuyama, Kiyose, Tokyo 204-8533, Japan. E-mail: kizumi95@gmail.com

Received: 15 April 2019 | Accepted after revision: 12 Jan 2020

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank BIO Communications Inc. for preparing the dataset.

Conflict of interest: K. Izumi reports grants from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development, and the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, during the conduct of the study. K. Morimoto reports grants from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development during the conduct of the study; and was a coordinator of a clinical trial for Insmed outside the submitted work. K. Uchimura reports grants from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, during the conduct of the study. M. Ato reports grants from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development during the conduct of the study. N. Hasegawa reports grants from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development during the conduct of the study; and was the coordinator of a clinical trial for Insmed, and received grants from Taisho-Toyama Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd and Nikon Co. Ltd, outside the submitted work. S. Mitarai reports grants from the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development, and the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, during the conduct of the study.

Support statement: This research was supported by the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development (AMED) (grant number: JP18fk0108043). Funding information for this article has been deposited with the Crossref Funder Registry.

## References

- 1 Griffith DE, Aksamit T, Brown-Elliott BA, et al. An official ATS/IDSA statement: diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of nontuberculous mycobacterial diseases. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2007; 175: 367–416.
- van Ingen J, Kuijper EJ. Drug susceptibility testing of nontuberculous mycobacteria. Future Microbiol 2014; 9: 1095–1110.
- 3 Hoefsloot W, van Ingen J, Andrejak C, et al. The geographic diversity of nontuberculous mycobacteria isolated from pulmonary samples. Eur Respir J 2013; 42: 1604–1613.

- 4 Morimoto K, Hasegawa N, Izumi K, et al. A Laboratory-based analysis of nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease in Japan from 2012 to 2013. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2017; 14: 49–56.
- 5 Griffith DE, Brown-Elliott BA, Langsjoen B, et al. Clinical and molecular analysis of macrolide resistance in *Mycobacterium avium* complex lung disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2006; 174: 928–934.
- Morimoto K, Namkoong H, Hasegawa N, et al. Macrolide-resistant Mycobacterium avium complex lung disease: analysis of 102 consecutive cases. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2016; 13: 1904–1911.
- 7 Van Ingen J, Wagner D, Gallagher J, et al. Poor adherence to management guidelines in nontuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary diseases. Eur Respir J 2017; 49: 10–13.
- 8 Adjemian J, Prevots DR, Gallagher J, et al. Lack of adherence to evidence-based treatment guidelines for nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2014; 11: 9–16.
- 9 Diel R, Jacob J, Lampenius N, et al. Burden of non-tuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary disease in Germany. Eur Respir J 2017; 49: 1602109.
- 10 Adjemian J, Olivier KN, Seitz AE, et al. Spatial clusters of nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease in the United States. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2012; 186: 553–558.
- 11 Ringshausen FC, Wagner D, De RA, et al. Prevalence of nontuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary disease, Germany, 2009–2014. Emerging Infect Dis 2016; 22: 2014–2017.