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ABSTRACT

A 51-year-old woman with eosinophilic pneumonia due to minocycline is described and a review of available literature is added. Until now, only 49 cases have been described, mainly in the Japanese population. Minocycline induced eosinophilic pneumonia is probably underreported and even underdiagnosed. This case highlights the importance of careful history taking, especially the use of drugs. Relatively safe drugs (like minocycline) can cause serious adverse events. On presentation, the disease mimics an infectious pneumonia. Peripheral eosinophilia can occur but isn’t obligatory. A bronchoalveolar lavage may provide the first (and sometimes only) sign of eosinophilic lung disease. Withdrawal of minocycline is often enough to cure the patient, in some case corticosteroids are needed.

INTRODUCTION

Minocycline induced eosinophilic pneumonia is a rare disorder but every doctor should be aware of this serious adverse event. Nowadays minocycline is often prescribed for common acne in young people. It is often forgotten in history taking because patients don’t consider it as a drug. On presentation, the disease mimics an infectious pneumonia. Peripheral eosinophilia can occur but isn’t obligatory. Cessation of minocycline is often enough to cure the patient, in some case corticosteroids are needed.

CASE REPORT

A 51-year-old woman with no significant medical history was admitted to our hospital with a history of dyspnea, dry cough, fever up to 39.9°C, vomiting and myalgia since one day. Six days before admission, she started a treatment with minocycline 50 mg twice a day for common acne.

The physical examination revealed an oxygen saturation on room air of 89% and no fever. Chest auscultation showed bilateral fine crackles.

The white blood cell count was 23.10*9/l (normal 4.0-10.0) with 90.6% of neutrophils (normal 38.0-77.0) and no eosinophils. The serum level of C-reactive protein was 340 mg/l (normal <5.0). Liver function tests were normal. On admission blood gas analysis with two liters of oxygen showed a pO2 of 66 mmHg, a pCO2 of 35 mmHg and an oxygen saturation of 94%. Chest X-ray showed minimal interstitial changes and chest computed tomography (CT) diffuse ground glass
opacities, thickening of septa and mediastinal and hilar lymphadenopathy (figure 1, 2, 3).

Differential diagnosis on admission was minocycline induced pneumonia or infectious pneumonia. Minocycline was discontinued and antibiotics were added.

A bronchoscopy with bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) was performed the day after admission. No transbronchial biopsies were taken. Differential cell analysis revealed a high total cell count (246.10^3/ml, normal 50-250) and 63.6% macrophages (normal 90.0-100.0), 4.2% lymphocytes (normal <20%), 16% neutrophils (normal <3.0%) and 16% eosinophils (normal <2%). Culture of BAL was negative. Polymerase chain reaction for Chlamydia and Mycoplasma on BAL was negative. Urinary antigen for Legionella pneumonia was also negative.

Because of the clinical presentation, the elevated eosinophilia on BAL and no signs of infection, we concluded that this case was a minocycline induced eosinophilic pneumonia. On the third day of admission she became afebrile, biochemistry on day four showed a significant decline in inflammatory parameters, cough and dyspnea disappeared after one week.

DISCUSSION

Eosinophilic lung diseases

Eosinophilic lung diseases are a diverse group of pulmonary disorders characterized by pulmonary opacities associated with peripheral eosinophilia, tissue eosinophilia confirmed at biopsy or increased eosinophils in BAL (1). They are classified as eosinophilic lung disease of unknown cause, of known cause and eosinophilic vasculitis (table 1).
History taking is an extremely valuable diagnostic tool, in particular for eosinophilic lung disease of known cause. A history of asthma may raise suspicion of allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis, Churg-Strauss syndrome, bronchocentric granulomatosis or chronic eosinophilic pneumonia. Recent travelling may suggest parasitic infections and an extensive history to rule out the use of drugs is important. A wide variety of drugs and toxic substances may induce eosinophilic disease. In the past two significant outbreaks have been reported. The first is toxic-oil syndrome, affecting > 20000 people in Spain in 1981, associated with the oral ingestion of food-grade rapeseed oil contaminated with aniline derivatives (2, 3). The second was the eosinophilia-myalgia syndrome in 1989, associated with the ingestion of L-tryptophan (4,5). The most common classes of drugs associated with pulmonary eosinophilia are the non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and antimicrobials (nitrofurantoin, minocyclin, sulphonamide, ampicilline). A number of other drugs have been implicated in greater than 20 published case reports, for example methotrexate, amiodarone, anticonvulsants, antidepressants, angiotensin-converting-enzyme-inhibitors and beta-blockers (table 2). A frequently updated website listing drugs that have been

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eosinophilic lung disease of unknown cause</th>
<th>Eosinophilic lung disease of known cause</th>
<th>Eosinophilic vasculitis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple pulmonary eosinophilia</td>
<td>Allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis</td>
<td>Churg-Strauss syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute eosinophilic pneumonia</td>
<td>Bronchocentric granulomatosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic eosinophilic pneumonia</td>
<td>Parasitic infections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiopathic hypereosinophilic syndrome</td>
<td>Drugs and toxic substance reactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs</th>
<th>Antimicrobials</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nitrofurantoin</td>
<td>anticonvulsants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minocycline</td>
<td>antidepressants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sulphonamides</td>
<td>ACE inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ampicilline</td>
<td>b-blockers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hydrochlorothiazide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sulfasalazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>radiographic contrast media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L-tryptophan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>methotrexate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amiodarone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bleomycine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>propylthiouracil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asthma</th>
<th>Peripheral eosinophilia</th>
<th>BAL fluid eosinophilia</th>
<th>Increased IgE level</th>
<th>Extrathoracic manifestations</th>
<th>Pathologic findings</th>
<th>CT findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&gt; 20%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infiltration of eosinophils into the alveolar septa and interstitium</td>
<td>Nodules with a GGO halo, transient and migratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&gt; 25%</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diffuse alveolar damage with interstitial and alveolar eosinophilia</td>
<td>Bilateral patchy areas of GGO, interlobular septal thickening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Yes(50%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&gt; 25%</td>
<td>Yes (67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infiltration of eosinophils into the alveoli and interstitium with interstitial fibrosis</td>
<td>Homogeneous peripheral airspace consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High (up to 73%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eosinophilic infiltration with disruption of architecture</td>
<td>Nodules with a GGO halo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPA</td>
<td>Yes (100%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt; 20%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bronchocentric granuloma with eosinophils, fungal hyphae.</td>
<td>Bronchiectasis with or without mucoid impaction involving the central and upper lungs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Yes (33%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt; 20%</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td>Granulomatous inflammation of bronchial and bronchiolar epithelium</td>
<td>Nonspecific: focal mass or lobular consolidation with atelectasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt; 20%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variable depending on type of parasitic infestation.</td>
<td>Variable depending on type of parasitic infestation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt; 20%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infiltration of eosinophils and macrophages into the alveoli</td>
<td>Nonspecific: peripheral airspace consolidation and GGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Yes (100%)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&gt; 30%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Necrotizing vasculitis, extravascular granulomas, eisonophilic pneumonia.</td>
<td>Subpleural consolidations with a lobular distribution, centriflobular nodules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
associated with pulmonary infiltrates and eosinophilia is being maintained by 'Les Groupes d’Etudes de la Pathologie Pulmonaire Iatrogène' (6, www.pneumotox.com).

A white blood cell differential cell count is an essential part in diagnosis although peripheral eosinophilia isn’t necessary. BAL may provide the first (and perhaps, the only) indication of an eosinophilic lung disease. Normal BAL fluid consists of less than 1% eosinophils. Eosinophilic lung diseases of unknown cause in general have a higher BAL fluid eosinophil level than eosinophilic lung diseases of known cause (table 3).

Non-specific findings may be seen at conventional chest radiography. CT chest often shows more characteristic patterns but there is still a considerable overlap among the eosinophilic lung diseases (7, 8, table 3).

**Minocycline**

Minocycline hydrochloride is a long-acting semisynthetic tetracycline derivative. In the past it has been frequently used in the treatment of respiratory and urinary tract infections. Nowadays it’s often prescribed by general practitioners and dermatologists for acne vulgaris in young people. Patients themselves do not always consider it as a real drug. Therefore it is often forgotten in history taking.

Minocycline is contra-indicated in pregnant woman because of reported congenital abnormalities (shortening of limbs) and in children under eight year because of the tooth discoloration that can occur during tooth development.

Adverse reactions of tetracyclines are light-headedness, various rashes, headache, nausea and photosensitivity. Specific minocycline associated and often more severe adverse reactions are hyperpigmentation, hypersensitivity reactions (hypersensitivity syndrome reaction (HSR), serum sickness like syndrome (SSLS) and eosinophilic pneumonia) and autoimmune reactions (drug induced lupus, autoimmune hepatitis).

Hyperpigmentation is not only seen on skin but also on oral mucosa, nails, bone, teeth, sclerae, thyroid gland and hearth valves. Even black galactorhea is reported. In some cases hyperpigmentation can diminish after cessation of minocycline (9).

Hypersensitivity reactions occur early in treatment, within weeks after starting the treatment. In HSR the patient develops fever and skin abnormalities (erythema, exfoliative dermatitis, exanthema or pustulous dermatitis), followed by internal damage. The liver is often involved, although damage to kidneys, heart and lung is described (9). SSLS is characterised by urticaria, fever, arthralgia and lymphadenopathy, in the absence of circulating antibodies (9). Eosinophilic pneumonia is discussed in the next paragraph.

Autoimmune reactions occur, in contrast to hypersensitivity reactions, after a longer period of treatment. In general, Minocycline induced lupus develops after 2 years of treatment (10, 11, 12). The symptoms are (poly)arthritis, (poly)arthralgia, morning stiffness, fever and fatigue. A blood exam shows a positive anti-nuclear antibody titer. Minocycline induced lupus can be accompanied by liver function abnormalities. Autoimmune hepatitis is seen in patients without minocycline induced lupus (13).

In relation to the number of prescriptions the number of serious adverse events of minocycline described is small but every doctor should be aware of them.

**Minocycline induced eosinophilic lung disease**

Pneumonitis due to minocycline was first reported by Ho et al in 1979 (14). Since then only a further 49 cases of reversible minocycline-related pneumonitis have been described. In only five articles more than one case is described (15, 16, 17, 18, 19). Minocycline-induced eosinophilic pneumonia is probably underreported, and even underdiagnosed.

The pathogenesis is unknown. Guillon et al reported cytotoxic CD8+ T lymphocyte-mediated specific cytotoxicity against minocycline-bearing alveolar macrophages in vitro (20). They hypothesized that T lymphocytes play a central role in the pathogenesis. However, their findings do not explain pulmonary eosinophilia, a characteristic feature of minocycline-induced pneumonitis.

On presentation minocycline induced pneumonia mimics an infectious pneumonia with high fever, dry cough and dyspnea as most frequent symptoms. Chest auscultation often reveals bilateral fine crackles. In 85% of the reported cases the symptoms presented within two weeks after the start of minocycline therapy. In general, biochemistry on admission reveals an elevated CRP, a leucocytosis with neutrophilia and often

**Table 3**

an eosinophilia. Review of available literature showed eosinophilia in 18/26 cases, proving it isn’t an obligate sign, as was the case in our patient. Blood gas analysis often reveals severe hypoxemia.

Chest X-ray shows an (often bilateral) infiltrate(s) and sometimes a pleural effusion (21, 22, 23, 24) or mediastinal/hilar lymphadenopathy (23) but can be normal.

Bronchoalveolar lavage is important in diagnosis and most frequently shows an eosinophilic formula (16/20 reported cases) but a neutrophilic/lymphocytic formula can also occur. When transbronchial biopsies are taken or an open lung biopsy is performed, further anatomicopathological examination shows elevated eosinophils but there is no pathognomonic pattern. The role of a lymphocyte stimulation test is debated. In literature we only found a positive result in 1/14 cases (25). A Japanese study of seven patients showed a negative result in 6/7 patients (19). For that reason, we did not perform a lymphocyte stimulation test in our patient.

The prognosis after withdrawal of the drug is good. No mortality has been reported. However severe transient respiratory failure necessitating ventilatory support has been described (26, 27) and corticosteroid therapy was required to control symptoms in several cases (13/29 reported cases). There are no guidelines to decide whether corticosteroids should be added or not.

Rechallenge is the ultimate test to proof the relationship between minocycline and the clinical presentation. We didn’t perform a rechallenge because of the high risk of recurrence in contrast with the few specific indications for minocycline in treatment of infections.

CONCLUSION

Minocycline-induced eosinophilic pneumonia is a rare disease so it stresses the importance of careful history taking, especially regarding the intake of drugs. In 85% of the reported cases the disease develops within 2 weeks after the start of minocycline therapy. On presentation, it mimics an infectious pneumonia. Peripheral eosinophilia can occur but isn’t obligatory. A bronchoalveolar lavage may provide the first (and sometimes only) sign of eosinophilic lung disease. Prognosis is good when the diagnosis is made on time. Cessation of minocycline is often enough, sometimes corticosteroids are needed.
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