Published in final edited form as:

J Pediatr. 2015 June ; 166(6): 1337–1341. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2015.03.042.

New Challenges in the Diagnosis and Management of Cystic Fibrosis

Hara Levy, MD and

Division of Pulmonary Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Stanley Manne Research Institute, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Philip M. Farrell, MD, PhD

Departments of Pediatrics and Population Health Sciences, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Clinical Sciences Center, Madison, Wisconsin

New challenges have arisen in the diagnosis and clinical management of children with cystic fibrosis (CF), especially during the past few years, when novel-but-confusing terminology has been introduced. We will briefly explain the origin of and hopefully clarify the new terms, including CF transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR)-related metabolic syndrome (CRMS), CFTR-related disease (CFTR-RD), CF Screen Positive, Inconclusive Diagnosis (CFSPID), and delayed CF. Traditionally, CF has relied on the clinical recognition of characteristic signs and symptoms, but newborn screening (NBS) has truly been a “game changer,” leading to routine diagnosis of asymptomatic children. CF is an autosomal-recessive disease caused by mutations in the CF transmembrane conductance regulator (*CFTR*) gene that encodes a cyclic adenosine monophosphate-regulated chloride and bicarbonate channel expressed at the apical membrane of epithelial cells. It is the most common life-threatening monogenic condition in the white population with an estimated birth prevalence of 1 in 1500–4000 newborns in European countries and European-derived populations, such as Americans, and eventually causes characteristic signs/symptoms.¹

According to consensus guidelines developed by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and published in *The Journal* in 2008, individuals identified by NBS can be diagnosed with CF by a sweat chloride value ≥ 60 mmol/L or a level of 30–59 mmol/L if they have 2 disease-causing mutations in the *CFTR* gene.¹ During the process of developing these guidelines, it was recognized that NBS introduced a new complexity and diagnostic dilemma, namely infants with abnormal screening tests as the result of elevated immunoreactive trypsinogen (IRT) levels but inconclusive sweat tests and/or DNA results.

Thus, a new disorder, although not necessarily a disease, was literally invented during another consensus conference published subsequently in *The Journal* in an article that created the label CRMS for CFTR-related metabolic syndrome.² In general, CRMS is used

to describe infants with elevated levels of IRT but inconclusive sweat and DNA test results. CRMS should be used for an infant who is asymptomatic and hypertrypsinogenemic with either a sweat chloride concentration of 30–59 mmol/L if age <6 months or 40–59 mmol/L if age ≥ 6 months, on at least 2 occasions, and completed expanded genetic analysis with fewer than 2 CF disease-causing mutations or a sweat chloride concentration <30 mmol/L if age <6 months, or <40 mmol/L if age ≥ 6 months, and 2 *CFTR* mutations, in trans, of which no more than one is known to be CF disease-causing. Although this condition is clearly not a metabolic disorder, the designation metabolic syndrome was established in part to have a medical code for billing purposes under the *International Classification of Diseases* system, namely 277.9. However, CRMS has not been accepted in Europe, where another term,³ CFSPID recently was proposed to describe infants with a normal sweat chloride (<30 mmol/L) and 2 *CFTR* mutations, at least 1 of which has unclear phenotypic consequences or an infant with an intermediate sweat chloride (30–59 mmol/L) and one or no *CFTR* mutations.

In addition, still another designation has been established for CFTR-RD to describe symptomatic individuals beyond infancy who have sweat chloride values <60 mmol/L and up to 2 *CFTR* mutations, at least one of which is not clearly categorized as a CF-causing mutation.^{4,5} Thus, CFTR-RD is a clinical entity associated with CFTR dysfunction that does not fulfill diagnostic criteria for CF but is accompanied by signs/symptoms that may include congenital bilateral absence of vas deferens, acute recurrent or chronic pancreatitis, or disseminated bronchiectasis. Finally, Groves et al⁶ have introduced in this issue of *The Journal* another term, delayed CF, to describe patients eventually diagnosed with CF after initially intermediate sweat chloride values, whose condition evolves over time to meet the criteria for a definitive diagnosis. This situation should be distinguished from patients with CF who are diagnosed after the neonatal period as the result of either false-negative NBS tests or another cause of failed screening that leads to a missed case.

With such a complex family of CFTR-associated disorders, and limited data on long-term outcomes, it is not surprising that confusion and controversy have surfaced internationally regarding both diagnosis and clinical management. Decisions about follow-up frequency and therapy are especially difficult, along with explaining the condition to parents.² Although CF is a monogenic autosomal-recessive disorder caused by mutations in the gene encoding the CFTR protein, clinical heterogeneity causes diagnostic uncertainty in infants without symptoms and in older patients with milder phenotypes. Despite the advent of NBS for CF based initially on an elevated IRT, subsequent CF diagnoses can be challenging in many circumstances, such as when intermediate and inconclusive sweat chloride values occur,⁷ when *CFTR* mutations of uncertain pathogenicity are detected,^{5,8} and because of differential expression of *CFTR* or modifier effects.^{9,10} Additionally, *CFTR* mutations that typically lead to classic cases of CF may simply not cause symptoms in infants and young children.¹¹

In this era of NBS combined with enhanced genetic information,⁵ it has become clear that the CFTR-associated phenotype ranges from the absence of disease symptoms to severe, life-shortening lung disease.^{1,12} Perhaps even more perplexing is the fact that the number of CRMS cases identified in NBS programs varies depending on the screening protocol being used, the IRT method and cutoff values, and perhaps the region being screened (eg, in New

York, the reported incidence of CRMS is approximately one-half the incidence of CF,¹³ whereas in California, the reported incidence of CRMS is nearly 3 times the incidence of CF¹⁴). Nationally, according to CF Foundation Patient Registry (CFFPR) data from 2010 to 2012, it appears that there are 10 infants diagnosed with CF for each CRMS case registered.^{13,15}

The biomarker IRT that made screening feasible is measured in dried blood spot specimens obtained during the first week of life and can be a sensitive screening test for CF, but a second tier test is needed to improve the sensitivity and specificity of the NBS protocol. Second-tier tests vary among programs and usually include DNA analysis.¹⁶ When the screening is positive, the diagnosis of CF should be confirmed by measurement of chloride concentration in sweat, after clinical assessment, and may include expanded DNA analyses.¹⁷ In some cases, the sweat chloride result may be intermediate or *CFTR* gene mutations may be identified with phenotypic consequences that are unclear.⁵ However, in the US, nearly 20% of patients with CF are being enrolled in the CFFPR without sweat chloride test results.¹³ This is disconcerting because as Amaral¹⁸ recently stated “establishment of a definite CF diagnosis requires proof of *CFTR* dysfunction....” This requirement is no different than the laboratory criterion that has been used traditionally to confirm the diagnosis, but in the NBS era in which asymptomatic patients are evaluated routinely, less attention is being given in the US to the necessity of sweat testing. Perhaps this ironic phenomenon may be attributable to the greater difficulty of performing sweat tests in newborns.^{19,20}

In addition, there may be some misinterpretation of the 2007–2008 consensus guidelines.¹ Although as part of the “Recommended CF Diagnostic Process for Screened Newborns” it states that “in the presence of 2 CF-causing mutations, a diagnosis of CF can be made,” this statement is made for the category of “infants with a positive CF NBS result and sweat chloride values in the intermediate range (30 to 59 mmol/L)...” and elsewhere that “a positive screening test result... must be followed by referral for direct diagnostic testing (ie, sweat chloride test) to confirm a diagnosis of CF.”¹ Also, it is emphasized that “CF cannot be diagnosed simply by the presence of 2 *CFTR* mutations; these 2 mutations must cause significant loss of function to result in a CF clinical phenotype.”¹

The report by Groves et al⁶ in this issue of *The Journal* provides a framework for follow-up of infants with intermediate sweat chloride values. They found that 48% of those children screened who had an elevated IRT, one copy of p.508del *CFTR* mutation on NBS, and sweat chloride values of 30–59 mmol/L evolved to a formal CF diagnosis or delayed CF, which highlights the importance of continued follow-up of infants with intermediate sweat chloride levels. The authors are to be commended for generally maintaining follow-up, monitoring the condition of their patients, and repeating the sweat tests with excellent quantitative pilocarpine iontophoresis procedures. Interestingly, those patients found to have delayed CF had less pancreatic insufficiency, less colonization with non-mucoid *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, milder obstructive lung dysfunction, and milder overall disease severity than the comparison CF group. Of concern were their nutritional outcome observations in which the body mass index and weight z scores initially were greater in the delayed CF cohort at 2 years of age but were not sustained, suggesting the onset of malnutrition.

Because of their design with a retrospective medical chart review, the authors acknowledge limitations in generalizability of their findings because of a possible bias by indication in their small sized cohort. However, the study most importantly addresses the potential likelihood (14/29 or 48%) of evolution to a formal CF diagnosis in those screened with intermediate/inconclusive sweat chloride values. Therefore, the authors conclude, and we agree, that close monitoring of these patients with intermediate sweat chloride values is warranted to determine whether these patients eventually develop further disease consistent with classical CF, a “phase shift,” or maintain milder clinical phenotypes. The observations of Groves et al⁶ in Australia differ quantitatively from those of Ren et al¹³ in the US (based on CFFPR data), but the implications are similar, namely CRMS cases need to be followed for at least 1 year or longer while they are observed for signs/symptoms of CF, as well as have repeat sweat chloride tests. The Figure illustrates the concept that there is overlap and potential progression across the spectrum of CFTR-associated conditions.

Currently, clinicians have limited information on which to base prognosis and determine the likelihood of evolution to a definitive diagnosis of CF and/or the disease severity in patients with intermediate sweat chloride values. The registry data available at this time may underestimate the potential likelihood of definitive CF diagnosis in those screened with indeterminate, inconclusive sweat chloride values based on the findings in the current paper by Groves et al.⁶ Recently established diagnostic consensus statements^{1,3,21} attempt to resolve these complexities but with mixed results in terms of understanding, implementation, and physician compliance with current guidelines. Consensus practice guidelines have been carefully developed based on recommendations from the CF Foundation and the European CF Society.^{2,4,22} However, consensus guidelines do not address the classification and treatment of asymptomatic patients with 2 *CFTR* mutations or normal sweat chloride levels or one *CFTR* mutation and intermediate sweat chloride, nor do they provide guidance on the use of new genomic technologies, including next-generation sequencing methods¹⁷ and the impact of the CFTR2 project.⁵ Furthermore, consensus guidelines on diagnosis and management are not being followed consistently and may even be obsolete, prompting the CF Foundation to convene a new consensus conference in October 2015.

Given the new challenges in diagnosis and management, some clinicians, concerned that screening is complicating their pediatric practices,²³ have questioned whether CF NBS is effective and worthwhile. In fact, outcome data show that reduced mortality,^{24,25} enhanced growth,²⁶ and unique opportunities to preempt respiratory disease and improve its management²⁷ can be achieved routinely in association with early diagnosis through NBS. Moreover, there have always been diagnostic dilemmas in CF management.²⁸

In the NBS era, continued monitoring should strike a balance between the risk of delayed diagnosis of CF, leading to inadequate treatment early in life, and the risk of “over-medicalization” of patients and families with CRMS, CFSPID, and delayed CF. With the recent successful implementation of therapy focused on *CFTR* dysfunction treated at a molecular level,^{17,29} there is uncertainty whether those patients with milder forms of CF and/or intermediate (inconclusive) sweat chloride values would benefit and, if so, when and how? Consequently, more longitudinal research is needed with sufficiently large cohorts and

comprehensive epidemiologic assessments to define better the evolution of CFTR-associated disorders. Future directions should include the influence of environmental exposures and genetic modifiers. Because the majority of patients with CF are now diagnosed through NBS, application of genomic sequencing to this population will provide an unprecedented opportunity for novel therapeutic interventions.

Finally, multinational longitudinal data may extend the definitions of CFTR-associated disorders beyond current consensus-based guidelines to provide monitoring and treatment regimens that are more appropriate to these nuanced disease categorizations, perhaps creating even better terminology than CFTR-RD, CRMS, CFSPID, and delayed CF.

Acknowledgments

Supported by the National Institutes of Health (1DP2OD007031 and DK072126).

Glossary

CF	Cystic fibrosis
CFFFPR	Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Patient Registry
CFSPID	Cystic Fibrosis Screen Positive, Inconclusive Diagnosis
CFTR	Cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator
CFTR-RD	Cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator–related disease
CRMS	CFTR-related metabolic syndrome
IRT	Immunoreactive trypsinogen
NBS	Newborn screening

References

1. Farrell PM, Rosenstein BJ, White TB, Accurso FJ, Castellani C, Cutting GR, et al. Guidelines for diagnosis of cystic fibrosis in newborns through older adults: Cystic Fibrosis Foundation consensus report. *J Pediatr*. 2008; 153:S4–14. [PubMed: 18639722]
2. Borowitz D, Parad RB, Sharp JK, Sabadosa K, Robinson KA, Rock M, et al. Cystic Fibrosis Foundation practice guidelines for the management of infants with cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator-related metabolic syndrome during the first two years of life and beyond. *J Pediatr*. 2009; 155:S106–16. [PubMed: 19914443]
3. Munck A, Mayell SJ, Winters V, Shawcross A, Derichs N, Parad R, et al. Cystic fibrosis screen positive, inconclusive diagnosis (CFSPID): a new designation and management recommendations for infants with an inconclusive diagnosis following newborn screening. *J Cyst Fibros*. 2015 in press.
4. Bombieri C, Claustres M, De Boeck K, Derichs N, Dodge J, Girodon E, et al. Recommendations for the classification of diseases as CFTR-related disorders. *J Cyst Fibros*. 2011; 10(Suppl 2):S86–102. [PubMed: 21658649]
5. Sosnay PR, Siklosi KR, Van Goor F, Kaniecki K, Yu H, Sharma N, et al. Defining the disease liability of variants in the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator gene. *Nat Genet*. 2013; 45:1160–7. [PubMed: 23974870]
6. Groves T, Robinson P, Wiley V, Fitzgerald DA. Long term outcomes of Children with Intermediate Sweat Chloride values in infancy. *J Pediatr*. 2015; 166:1469–74. [PubMed: 25812778]

7. Groman JD, Meyer ME, Wilmott RW, Zeitlin PL, Cutting GR. Variant cystic fibrosis phenotypes in the absence of CFTR mutations. *N Engl J Med*. 2002; 347:401–7. [PubMed: 12167682]
8. Sosnay PR, Cutting GR. Interpretation of genetic variants. *Thorax*. 2014; 69:295–7. [PubMed: 24343785]
9. Drumm ML, Konstan MW, Schluchter MD, Handler A, Pace R, Zou F, et al. Genetic modifiers of lung disease in cystic fibrosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2005; 353:1443–53. [PubMed: 16207846]
10. Wright FA, Strug LJ, Doshi VK, Commander CW, Blackman SM, Sun L, et al. Genome-wide association and linkage identify modifier loci of lung disease severity in cystic fibrosis at 11p13 and 20q13.2. *Nat Genet*. 2011; 43:539–46. [PubMed: 21602797]
11. Rock MJ, Levy H, Zaleski C, Farrell PM. Factors accounting for a missed diagnosis of cystic fibrosis after newborn screening. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2011; 46:1166–74. [PubMed: 22081556]
12. Castellani C, Cuppens H, Macek M Jr, Dankert Roelse J, Duff A, Farrell M, et al. Consensus on the use and interpretation of cystic fibrosis mutation analysis in clinical practice. *J Cyst Fibros*. 2009; 8:153–73. [PubMed: 19246252]
13. Ren CL, Desai H, Platt M, Dixon M. Clinical outcomes in infants with cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) related metabolic syndrome. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2011; 46:1079–84. [PubMed: 21538969]
14. Prach L, Koepke R, Kharrazi M, Keiles S, Salinas DB, Reyes MC, et al. California Cystic Fibrosis Newborn Screening Consortium. Novel CFTR variants identified during the first 3 years of cystic fibrosis newborn screening in California. *J Mol Diagn*. 2013; 15:710–22. [PubMed: 23810505]
15. Ren CL, Fink AK, Petren K, Borowitz DS, McColley SA, Sanders DB, et al. Outcomes of infants with indeterminate diagnosis detected by cystic fibrosis newborn screening. *Pediatr*. 2015 In press.
16. Fritz A, Farrell P. Estimating the annual number of false negative cystic fibrosis newborn screening tests. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2012; 47:207–8. [PubMed: 22081583]
17. Baker MW, Atkins AE, Cordovado SK, Hendrix M, Earley MC, Farrell PM. Improving newborn screening for cystic fibrosis using next-generation sequencing technology: a technical feasibility study. *Genet Med*. 2015 in press.
18. Amaral MD. Novel personalized therapies for cystic fibrosis: treating the basic defect in all patients. *J Intern Med*. 2015; 277:155–66. [PubMed: 25266997]
19. Legrys VA, McColley SA, Li Z, Farrell PM. The need for quality improvement in sweat testing infants after newborn screening for cystic fibrosis. *J Pediatr*. 2010; 157:1035–7. [PubMed: 20843526]
20. Parad RB, Comeau AM, Dorkin HL, Dovey M, Gerstle R, Martin T, et al. Sweat testing infants detected by cystic fibrosis newborn screening. *J Pediatr*. 2005; 147:S69–72. [PubMed: 16202787]
21. Borowitz D, Robinson KA, Rosenfeld M, Davis SD, Sabadosa KA, Spear SL, et al. Cystic Fibrosis Foundation evidence-based guidelines for management of infants with cystic fibrosis. *J Pediatr*. 2009; 155:S73–93. [PubMed: 19914445]
22. Castellani C, Southern KW, Brownlee K, Dankert Roelse J, Duff A, Farrell, et al. European best practice guidelines for cystic fibrosis neonatal screening. *J Cyst Fibros*. 2009; 8:153–73. [PubMed: 19246252]
23. Maclean JE, Solomon M, Corey M, Selvadurai H. Cystic fibrosis newborn screening does not delay the identification of cystic fibrosis in children with negative results. *J Cyst Fibros*. 2011; 10:333–7. [PubMed: 21536503]
24. Doull IJ, Ryley HC, Weller P, Goodchild MC. Cystic fibrosis-related deaths in infancy and the effect of newborn screening. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2001; 31:363–6. [PubMed: 11340682]
25. Grosse SD, Rosenfeld M, Devine OJ, Lai HJ, Farrell PM. Potential impact of newborn screening for cystic fibrosis on child survival: a systematic review and analysis. *J Pediatr*. 2006; 149:362–6. [PubMed: 16939748]
26. Farrell PM, Lai HJ, Li Z, Laxova A, Green CG, Collins J, et al. Evidence on improved outcomes with early diagnosis of cystic fibrosis through neonatal screening: enough is enough! *J Pediatr*. 2005; 147:S30–6. [PubMed: 16202779]
27. Accurso FJ, Sontag MK, Wagener JS. Complications associated with symptomatic diagnosis in infants with cystic fibrosis. *J Pediatr*. 2005; 147:S37–41. [PubMed: 16202780]

28. Rosenstein BJ, Cutting GR. The diagnosis of cystic fibrosis: a consensus statement. Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Consensus Panel. *J Pediatr*. 1998; 132:589–95. [PubMed: 9580754]
29. Davis PB. Therapy for cystic fibrosis—the end of the beginning? *N Engl J Med*. 2011; 365:1734–5. [PubMed: 22047565]

Figure.

Clinical descriptors capture the overlaps and distinctions among CF, CFTR, and CRMS. CFSPID and delayed CF could overlap CF and/or CFTR-RD and lead to a “phase shift,” as described in the text, or be completely distinct entities. *PI*, pancreatic insufficient; *PS*, pancreatic sufficient.