



# Inhaled Corticosteroids for Chronic Cough: Yes or FeNO?

Lorcan McGarvey<sup>1</sup>

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2024

If you're reading this, chances are you've sat in a consultation room with a chronic cough patient wondering whether to prescribe a course of inhaled corticosteroids (ICS) or not. As you ponder, you'll no doubt recall those that improved, offset somewhat by memories of patients reporting no such benefit. The truth is, despite wide recognition that cough can be the sole clinical manifestation of asthma [1] and associated with conditions such as eosinophilic bronchitis [2, 3], both of which respond well to ICS, guidance is somewhat vague. From the inception of the anatomic diagnostic protocol by Irwin and colleagues [4] to the most recent consensus on cough management [5, 6], empirical trials of ICS have been advocated but with little agreement on treatment dose and duration and how those most likely to respond might be selected. This latter issue is perhaps where most uncertainty lies. Over the last few years there has been a fashion for identifying treatable traits when managing chronic respiratory disease [7]. Chronic cough is no different and Type-2 high airway inflammation represents one such trait. In the past, sputum eosinophil counts offered some guide to initiating a trial of ICS but the technique was cumbersome and technically challenging. As an alternative, fractional exhaled nitric oxide (FeNO) has become more widely used despite variance as to what constitutes an 'elevated' FeNO level or what cut-off value is likely to predict a favorable response to corticosteroids. The recently published British Thoracic Society Clinical Statement on Chronic Cough in Adults [6] proposed that patients with a FeNO level > 25 ppb should be considered for a 4-week trial of ICS. This suggested cut-point was based on a meta-analysis and is somewhat lower than values proposed by others as being predictive of an ICS response [8]. Clearly more evidence is required.

In this edition of *Lung*, Lee and colleagues undertook a prospective open-label study of 50 adult patients with

chronic cough and an elevated FeNO level ( $\geq 25$  ppb) [9]. All participants had normal spirometry with the common causes associated with cough excluded in line with current guidelines [5, 10]. With a mean age of 58 years and almost 60% female, participant demographics were similar to those typically presenting with chronic cough although the median cough duration of 6 months was considerably shorter than those referred to specialist cough services where cough duration can be many years. Participants received 200 µg fluticasone furoate daily (2000 µg BDP equivalent) for 3–4 weeks, the dose and duration chosen to align with guidelines and systematic reviews [5, 11]. The key objectives were to evaluate the response of cough to the ICS trial and identify any factors predictive of a positive treatment effect. So, what did they find? Well, just over two-thirds had a treatment response, defined as achieving the minimal clinically important difference of > 1.3 on the Leicester Cough Questionnaire [12], a widely used measure of cough-related health status. Responders were more likely to be female and have more severe cough at baseline than non-responders. What was especially interesting was that while median FeNO levels and cough severity scores decreased with ICS treatment, there was no significant correlation between FeNO levels and cough scores, either at baseline or after treatment. This finding suggests that while reduction in FeNO level is a surrogate for the effect of ICS on T2 airway inflammation, it is not mechanistically linked to the improvement in cough. The authors proposed that ICS exert their effect on eosinophils which they speculate are associated with cough reflex sensitization. There is certainly solid evidence for how eosinophils might alter airway nerve density and function and contribute to irritant responses including cough [13].

So, how does this study help us? It clearly has limitations not least the open-label design, small size and the suspicion that some of the treatment effect simply reflected a placebo response or regression to the mean. The authors recognize these flaws but have offered us something that is pragmatic and aligns with current practice and therefore relevant to all clinicians who see patients with chronic cough. To me, it suggests that patients with chronic cough and a FeNO

✉ Lorcan McGarvey  
l.mcgarvey@qub.ac.uk

<sup>1</sup> Wellcome-Wolfson Institute for Experimental Medicine, School of Medicine, Dentistry and Biomedical Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland

above 25 ppb should be offered a 4-week trial of high-dose ICS therapy. If it helps, great; if not, then consideration may be given to a longer trial of treatment or the addition of an anti-leukotriene. Finally, it should be emphasized that any trial of therapy should be discontinued when it is clearly ineffective. A negative treatment trial should not be seen as a failure. Rather, it may represent a step along the way to making an alternative diagnosis such as refractory chronic cough and we should not be afraid to reach this point because new treatments are surely coming [14].

## Declarations

**Conflict of interest** LMG is Founding Chair and Chief Investigator of the ERS NEuroCOUGH Clinical Research Consortium. He reports honoraria from Chiesi, Bellus Health, GSK, Merck, NeRRe Therapeutics, Nocion, Trevi, Shionogi Inc and Reckitt Benckiser; grant support from Merck and Bellus Health.

## References

- Corrao WM, Braman SS, Irwin RS (1979) Chronic cough as the sole presenting manifestation of bronchial asthma. *N Engl J Med* 300(12):633–637
- Desai D, Brightling C (2010) Cough due to asthma, cough-variant asthma and non-asthmatic eosinophilic bronchitis. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am* 43(1):123–133
- Côté A, Russell RJ, Boulet LP et al (2020) chest expert cough panel. Managing chronic cough due to asthma and NAEB in adults and adolescents: CHEST guideline and expert panel report. *Chest* 158(1):68–96
- Irwin RS, Corrao WM, Pratter MR (1981) Chronic persistent cough in the adult: the spectrum and frequency of causes and successful outcome of specific therapy. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 123(4 Pt 1):413–417
- Morice AH, Millqvist E, Bieksiene K et al (2020) ERS guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of chronic cough in adults and children. *Eur Respir J* 55(1):190113
- Parker SM, Smith JA, Birring SS et al (2023) British Thoracic Society Clinical Statement on chronic cough in adults. *Thorax* 78(Suppl 6):s3–s19
- Agusti A, Bel E, Thomas M et al (2016) Treatable traits: toward precision medicine of chronic airway diseases. *Eur Respir J* 47(2):410–419
- Lee JH, Lee JH, Park SY, Koskela HO, Song WJ (2023) Is fractional exhaled nitric oxide a treatable trait in chronic cough: a narrative review. *J Thorac Dis* 15(10):5844–5855
- Lee JH, Kang SY, Yu I et al (2024) Cough response to high-dose inhaled corticosteroids in patients with chronic cough and fractional exhaled nitric oxide levels  $\geq 25$  ppb: a prospective study. *Lung* (in press)
- Song DJ, Song WJ, Kwon JW et al (2018) KAAACI evidence-based clinical practice guidelines for chronic cough in adults and children in Korea. *Allergy Asthma Immunol Res* 10(6):591–613
- Ambrosino P, Accardo M, Mosella M, Papa A, Fuschillo S, Spedicato GA, Motta A, Maniscalco M (2021) Performance of fractional exhaled nitric oxide in predicting response to inhaled corticosteroids in chronic cough: a meta-analysis. *Ann Med* 53(1):1659–1672
- Raj AA, Pavord DI, Birring SS (2009) Clinical cough IV: what is the minimal important difference for the Leicester Cough Questionnaire? *Handb Exp Pharmacol* 187:311–320
- Drake MG, Scott GD, Blum ED et al (2018) Eosinophils increase airway sensory nerve density in mice and in human asthma. *Sci Transl Med* 10(457):eaar8477
- Dicpinigaitis PV, McGarvey LP, Canning BJ (2020) P2X3-receptor antagonists as potential antitussives: summary of current clinical trials in chronic cough. *Lung* 198(4):609–616

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.