

**Tadeusz M. Zielonka**

Department of Family Medicine, Medical University of Warsaw

## **Bird fancier's lung – comment on: Kumar R., Singh M. "Bird fancier's lung: clinical-radiological presentation in 15 cases"**

**Płuco hodowców ptaków — komentarz do artykułu Kumar R., Singh M. "Bird fancier's lung: clinical-radiological presentation in 15 cases"**

The author declares no financial disclosure

**Pneumonol Alergol Pol 2015; 83: 240–242**

Recently, in Polish Pneumology and Allergology an interesting paper from India presenting 15 cases of pigeon fancier's lung was published [1]. Patients with suspected bird fancier's lung require comprehensive evaluation, hence the paper gives rise to the following remarks.

### **Clinical symptoms**

Extrinsic allergic alveolitis (EAA) is not a uniform disease entity, but rather a complex dynamic clinical syndrome that varies in its initial presentation and clinical course [2]. Fink et al. have described EAA as occurring in acute, subacute and chronic forms [3]. The authors do not however specify how many of the patients presented with the acute, subacute or chronic course of the disease. An alternative classification system that emphasises the dynamic nature of the disease with acute progressive, acute intermittent non-progressive and recurrent non-acute disease has been proposed [4]. However, the authors did not identify the course of disease in their patients. The study noted that in all of the patients crackles were audible upon respiration. Was there no wheezing heard in the patient with airway obstruction?

Characteristics of the exposure to bird specific antigens, such as time or duration are not

well documented in the study. For the majority of patients with pigeon breeder's lung in Poland contact with birds is a hobby and after diagnosis of disease avoidance of the causative antigen is usually easily achievable. It is more difficult however for patients with farmer's lung, since farmers work in harmful conditions because this work is the source of their livelihood [5]. It was not clearly stated but it would be beneficial to know; how many patients completely restricted contact with the causative antigen? It is not clear what treatment was administered following diagnosis of EAA in this group of 15 patients. Were there patients in this group treated with corticosteroids? It is important to know if patients with clinical symptoms and functional or radiological abnormalities were exposed to antigens.

### **Pulmonary function tests**

Functional evaluation is an important part of the article, hence the title of the presented paper could be: Bird fancier's lung — clinical, radiological and functional presentation of 15 cases. It is difficult to accept the presentation and interpretation of pulmonary function tests in this study. The authors diagnosed restriction in 80% of patients on the basis of spirometry. It is not possible to diagnose this pattern of ventilatory disturbances

using spirometry alone, because although it can measure VC, it cannot measure TLC. A decrease in VC does not prove a restrictive pulmonary defect. It may be suggestive of lung restriction when  $FEV_1/VC$  is normal or increased [6]. A restrictive ventilatory defect is characterised by a reduction in TLC below the 5<sup>th</sup> percentile of the predicted value, and a normal  $FEV_1/VC$  [6]. In the quoted by authors study of Morell et al. [7] restrictive defects were confirmed by body plethysmography.

Evaluation of spirometric severity of airways limitation using  $FEV_1$  in the group of patients with restrictive ventilator defect is very disputable.  $FEV_1$  is a recognized criterion of obstructive severity with decrease in  $FEV_1/VC$  below the limit. It would be more logical to use the old classification of restriction severity which, according to ATS, is based on a decrease in (F)VC with normal  $FEV_1/VC$  (mild-lower limit of the norm to 70%, moderate — 60–69%, severe-moderate — 50–59%, severe — 34–49%, very severe < 34%) or even better based on TLC (mild-lower limit of the norm — 70%, moderate — 60–69%, severe less than 60%) [8]. It would have been better to limit the presentation of spirometric data to information on how many patients had a decrease in VC and a mean value with standard deviation. Plethysmography is helpful for evaluation of RV. Air trapping, which is typical for obstructive lung diseases, was observed in 33% of patients in HRCT. It would be interesting to know the values of airway resistance and RV/TLC. The authors dedicated too little space to the evaluation of oxygen diffusion. In Table 2, only 1 patient was marked with an isolated decrease in DLco, although 13 patients had a moderate decrease in diffusion capacity [1]. The accurate elaboration of DLco was more important than presentation of  $FEV_1$  with details. Evaluation of respiratory sufficiency in these patients would have been very helpful. Arterial hypoxemia is a minor diagnostics criterion of EAA [9]. The authors indicated in Table 2 that a desaturation in the 6-min. walk test was observed in 73% of patients [1]. However, the values of  $SaO_2$  at rest and after effort were not shown in the paper. The value of  $PaO_2$  is also important in the early phase of diagnostics because it is one of the minor criteria in the diagnosis of EAA [9].

### Radiological image

The authors did not define what radiological abnormalities on the conventional chest X-ray were observed. Although HRCT is better for

precise localisation, nature and assessment of the spread of pulmonary changes, conventional chest X-ray permits detection of patients with interstitial lung diseases. It would be interesting to know how many patients had radiological changes in their chest X-ray, as well as the localisation and nature of the abnormalities. In two of the described cases mediastinal lymphadenopathy was observed. How big were these nodules? This is not a typical radiological finding for patients with EAA. In the big groups of patients with EAA shown in the paper in Table 3 lymphadenopathy was not demonstrated. It could be inferred that this lymphadenopathy was not provoked by EAA. The most important potential cause of lymphadenopathy is tuberculosis, especially since it is linked with the epidemiological situation in India [10]. One patient had multiple post-tuberculosis cavities in his lung. Was enlargement of mediastinal lymph nodules observed in this patient after antituberculous treatment? Another problem is the discrepancy between frequency of occurrences of irregular lines in HRCT — in Table 2 they were visible in as many as 80% of patients and in Table 3 in only 60% [1]. In described group of patients it was the most frequent finding on computed tomography. However, in papers quoted by the authors it was not observed [11, 12] or seen only in 29% of patients [7]. The authors did not try to explain what might be the cause of such a big difference was. It is difficult to presume that the patients with EAA in India have different radiological abnormalities. More probable is a problem with interpretation of computed tomographic findings. Unfortunately, neither of the authors of the paper is a radiologist. It would be useful to ask two independent radiologists, with experience in interstitial lung diseases, what kind of radiological changes they observed. Perhaps these irregular lines were typical for EAA inter/intra-septal thickening or a kind of discrete fibrosis.

### Immunological evaluation

Unfortunately, the authors did not evaluate the immunological aspects of the disease. Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) could have been carried out during bronchofiberscopy because a percentage of lymphocytes in the BAL fluid above 40% is one of the major criteria used to diagnose EAA [9]. Serological tests were not performed, which in spite of good sensitivity were not specific for EAA. Morelli et al. [7] discovered precipitins against bird antigens in the serum of 92% of patients with

EAA but also in 87% of pigeon fanciers without the disease. Nevertheless, in the original table of diagnostic criteria of EAA by Schuyler & Cormier there is mentioned not only evidence of antigen exposure, but also specific precipitins in sera or BAL fluid [9].

### Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

### References

1. Kumar R, Singh M. Bird fancier's lung: clinical-radiological presentation in 15 cases. *Pneumonol Alergol Pol* 2015; 83: 55–59. doi: 10.5603/PiAP.2015.0005.
2. Bourke SJ, Dalphin JC, Boyd G et al. Hypersensitivity pneumonitis: current concepts. *Eur Respir J* 2001; 18(Suppl 32): 81s–92s.
3. Fink JN, Sosman AJ, Barboriak JJ, Schleuter DP, Holmes RA. Pigeon breeder's disease: a clinical study of a hypersensitivity pneumonitis. *Ann Intern Med* 1968; 68: 1205–1219.
4. Bourke SJ, Boyd G. Pigeon fancier's lung. *BMJ* 1998; 315: 70–71.
5. Kusaka H, Ogasawara H, Munakata M et al. Two-year follow up on the protective value of dust masks against farmer's lung disease. *Intern Med* 1993; 32: 106–111.
6. Pellegrino R, Viegi G, Brusach V et al. Interpretative strategies for lung function tests. *Eur Respir J* 2005; 26: 948–968.
7. Morell F, Roger A, Reyes L, Cruz MJ, Murio C, Muñoz X. Bird fancier's lung: a series of 86 patients. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2008; 87: 110–130. doi: 10.1097/MD.0b013e31816d1dda.
8. ATS. Lung function testing: selection of reference values and interpretative strategies. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1991; 144: 1202–1218.
9. Schuyler M, Cormier Y. The diagnosis of hypersensitivity pneumonitis. *Chest* 1997; 111: 534–536.
10. WHO Report. Global Tuberculosis Control. Surveillance planning financing. WHO Press Geneva 2013.
11. Ohtani Y, Saiki S, Sumi Y et al. Clinical features of recurrent and insidious chronic bird fancier's lung. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2003; 90: 604–610.
12. Ainslie GM. Bird fancier's hypersensitivity pneumonitis in South Africa: clinical features and outcomes. *S Afr M J* 2013; 19: 48–53.