Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## **Respiratory Medicine**

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/rmed



Original Research

# Clinical phenotypes of nontuberculous mycobacterial disease by cluster analysis based on pulmonary function

Check for updates

Nobuyoshi Hamao<sup>a</sup>, Isao Ito<sup>a,\*</sup>, Issei Oi<sup>a</sup>, Masahiro Shirata<sup>a</sup>, Kensuke Nishioka<sup>a</sup>, Yasuyuki Hayashi<sup>a</sup>, Seiichiro Imai<sup>b</sup>, Toyohiro Hirai<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Respiratory Medicine, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, 54 Shogoin-kawaracho, Sakyo, Kyoto, 606-8507, Japan
<sup>b</sup> Kyoto University Hospital Preemptive Medicine and Lifestyle-Related Disease Research Center, 53 Shogoin-kawaracho, Sakyo, Kyoto, 606-8507, Japan

ARTICLE INFO	A B S T R A C T			
Keywords: Nontuberculous mycobacterium disease Pulmonary function	<i>Background:</i> Nontuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary disease (NTM-PD) often exhibits pulmonary function impairment, such as obstructive or restrictive pattern, with variation among patients according to the damaged lesions in the lung. <i>Methods:</i> Patients with NTM-PD were consecutively enrolled between September 2019 and December 2020 at the Respiratory Infection Clinic of our hospital. Patients' data were comprehensively collected through laboratory examinations, PFT, chest computed tomography, and questionnaires for the assessment of subjective symptoms and health-related quality of life (HRQOL). Hierarchical cluster analysis was performed using PFT parameters to compare the clinical findings among clusters. <i>Results:</i> Data of 104 patients were analyzed and classified into four clusters. The restrictive pattern with decreased forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV <sub>1</sub> ) group showed high serum C-reactive protein and low albumin levels, severe radiological findings, and low HRQOL. In the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV <sub>1</sub> group, HRQOL was as low as that in the restrictive pattern with decreased FEV <sub>1</sub> group, was maintained in comparison with that in the normal group.			
	<i>Conclusion:</i> NTM-PD phenotypes were identified using cluster analysis based on PFT. Two different severe phenotypes were also observed. In the early stages of NTM-PD, PFT may be useful in recognizing disease progression.			

## 1. Introduction

Nontuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary disease (NTM-PD) is an emerging problem worldwide due to its increasing incidence and mortality [1–4]. NTM-PD is thought to initiate in the terminal bronchiole and spreads transbronchially to produce cavities, consolidations, and bronchiectasis in radiological and pathological observations [5–7]. Subjective symptoms and deterioration of pulmonary function test (PFT) were related to progression of radiological findings [8–10]. Due to variations in the extent of disease progression among patients, NTM-PD exhibits a broad spectrum of clinical presentations, ranging from localized pneumonic infiltrate to progressive lung destruction [5,11,12]. Therefore, the phenotype of NTM-PD is variable in terms of subjective symptoms, pulmonary function, radiological findings, and disease progression.

PFT is useful in assessing the severity of pulmonary disease due to its relative simplicity, and quantitative nature of its results. Deterioration in pulmonary function is associated with poor physical function and

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2024.107600

Received 26 September 2023; Received in revised form 3 March 2024; Accepted 12 March 2024 Available online 13 March 2024

0954-6111/© 2024 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).



*Abbreviations*: COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CT, computed tomography; CRP, C-reactive protein; D<sub>LCO</sub>, diffusing capacity of lung for carbon monoxide; D<sub>LCO</sub>/VA, D<sub>LCO</sub> per unit of alveolar volume; ERV, expiratory reserve volume; FEF<sub>25–75%</sub>, forced expiratory flow between 25% and 75% of vital capacity; FRC, functional residual capacity; FEV<sub>1</sub>, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; FVC, forced vital capacity; HRQOL, health-related quality of life; IC, inspiratory capacity; IQR, interquartile range; mMRC, modified Medical Research Council; NTM, nontuberculous mycobacterium; NTM-PD, nontuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary disease; PEF, peak expiratory flow; PFT, pulmonary function test; RV, residual volume; SD, standard deviation; SF-36, short form-36; SGRQ, St George's Respiratory Questionnaire; TLC, total lung capacity; VAS, visual analogue scale; VC, vital capacity.

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Department of Respiratory Medicine, Kyoto University Hospital 54 Shogoin-kawaracho, Sakyo, Kyoto, 606, Japan.

E-mail address: isaoito@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp (I. Ito).

CT scoring system for the assessment of nontuberculous mycobacterial disease.

CT findings	0	1	2	3		
Bronchiectasis (9 poin	Bronchiectasis (9 points)					
Severity (Bronchus	Absent	Mild (1–2)	Moderate	Severe (3-)		
diameter/adjacent			(2–3)			
Firstont	Abcont	1 5	6 0 comonto	> 0 comonto		
Extent	Absent	segments	0-9 segments	>9 segments		
Mucus plugging	Absent	1-5	6-9 segments	>9 segments		
1 1 1 1 00 0		segments				
Bronchiolitis (6 points	)					
Severity	Absent	Mild (<1	Moderate	Severe		
		cm from	(1–3 cm from	(extending to		
		pleura)	pleura)	central lung)		
Extent	Absent	1-5	6-9 segments	>9 segments		
		segments				
Cavity (9 points)						
Severity (diameter)	Absent	<3 cm	3–5 cm	>5 cm		
Wall thickness	Absent	<1  mm	1–5 mm	>5 mm		
Extent (number)	Absent	1–3	4–5	>5		
Nodule (3 points)	Absent	1-5	6-9 segments	>9 segments		
		segments				
Consolidation (3	Absent	1-2	3-5 segments	>5 segments		
points)		segments				

This table is cited from reference 23. CT, computed tomography.

#### Table 2

Patients' characteristics.

	N=104
Age (years), average $\pm$ SD	$69.6 \pm 8.8$
Female, n (%)	87 (83.7)
Smoking history, n (%)	23 (22.3)
Respiratory comorbidity, n (%)	17 (16.3)
Bronchial asthma, n (%)	7 (6.7)
COPD, n (%)	5 (4.8)
Interstitial pneumonia, n (%)	4 (3.8)
Old tuberculosis, n (%)	2 (1.9)
Cancer history, n (%)	24 (23.3)
Autoimmune disease, n (%)	11 (10.7)
Species*	
<i>M. avium</i> , n (%)	75 (72.1)
M. intracellulare, n (%)	31 (29.8)
M. abscessus, n (%)	5 (4.8)
Others <sup>†</sup> , n (%)	4 (3.8)
Unidentified, n (%)	2 (1.9)
Disease duration (months), median (interquartile range)	77 (33, 131.5)
Positive in sputum smear within one year, n (%)	9 (8.7)
Positive in sputum culture within one year, n (%)	13 (12.5)
Anti-NTM treatment, n(%)	71 (68.3)
Current treatment, n (%)	47 (45.2)
Former treatment (completed treatment), n (%)	14 (13.5)
Former treatment (discontinued treatment), n (%)	10 (9.6)
Radiological pattern	
NB, n (%)	75 (72.1)
NB + FC, n (%)	24 (23.1)
FC, (%)	5 (4.8)
Presence of cavities, n (%)	29 (27.9)

SD, standard deviation; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; NTM, nontuberculous mycobacterium; NB, Nodular bronchiectasis type; FC, Fibrocavitary type. \*Co-infection was included. <sup>†</sup>There was one case each infected with *M. gordonae*, *M. lentiflavum*, *M. paragordonae* and *M. shimoidei*.

survival rate in the general population [13–17]. NTM-PD shows several features on PFT according to the impairment of the lung, such as restrictive or obstructive impairment, small airway obstruction, and pulmonary diffusion capacity [10,18,19]. The correlation between pulmonary function and other findings such as radiological features and health-related quality of life (HRQOL) in NTM-PD has been reported previously [9,10]. PFT reflects disease progression and physical function in NTM-PD patients, and clinical phenotypes based on PFT would help in easily and properly evaluating the severity of NTM-PD patients.

This study aimed to propose a phenotype classification system for patients with NTM-PD using cluster analysis. Cluster analysis is a statistical method in which patients are classified into groups based on their similarities. Cluster analysis was used to classify patients, including those with bronchial asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) [20,21], and this method helped identify disease phenotypes. We performed cluster analysis according to pulmonary function and investigated the relationship between the pattern of pulmonary function and other clinical findings, such as subjective symptoms, laboratory tests, radiological findings, and HRQOL.

## 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Patients

Patients aged  $\geq 16$  years with NTM-PD were consecutively recruited from the pulmonary infection clinic at our hospital, which covered patients who were 16 years or older and suspected or diagnosed with any respiratory infection. NTM-PD was diagnosed according to the American Thoracic Society or Infectious Disease Society of America statements [22]. The exclusion criteria were active malignancy (newly diagnosed malignancies, progression of known malignancies, or treatment for malignancies within three months), pregnancy, cognitive impairment, exacerbation of lower respiratory tract infection within three months, and missing data.

## 2.2. Setting and design

The patients were enrolled between September 2019 and December 2020. This study was approved by the relevant ethics committee, and the approval number was R2067. Written informed consent was obtained from all study subjects. We prospectively collected comprehensive data on the patients' clinical characteristics, subjective symptoms, laboratory findings, PFT, chest computed tomography (CT) results, and HRQOL within three months of inclusion. A visual analog scale (VAS) was used to assess the degree of subjective symptoms. Dyspnea was assessed using the modified Medical Research Council (mMRC) dyspnea scores. The severity of the radiological findings was evaluated using the scoring system developed by Kim et al. (Table 1. [23]). CTs scans were scored by two pulmonologists with 10 and 12 years of experience, and the final decision was made by consensus. HRQOL was measured using the St George's Respiratory Questionnaire (SGRQ) and the Short Form (SF)-36 questionnaire. The primary outcome was SGRO total score, and the secondary outcome was SGRQ component score, SF-36, and the frequency of bacterial colonization and bacterial exacerbation requiring antibiotic treatment in the past one year.

## 2.3. Pulmonary function test

Patients underwent pulmonary function tests using the CHESTAC-8900 and DISCOM-51 (Chest MI Corp., Tokyo, Japan) according to the American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society recommendations [24]. Carbon monoxide diffusing capacity was measured using the single-breath method. The predicted values of each parameter were calculated according to the guidelines of the Japanese Respiratory Society [25,26].

#### 2.4. Statistical analysis

Categorical variables are expressed by frequency and percent, and continuous variables are expressed as the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation or median with interquartile range according to the normality of the distribution of the variables. Cluster analysis was performed using the Ward's minimum-variance hierarchical clustering method [27]. Variables for cluster analysis were vital capacity (VC; % predicted), forced expiratory volume in 1 s (FEV<sub>1</sub>)/forced vital capacity (FVC) ratio, forced



Fig. 1. Tree diagram for cluster analysis. Overall, 28 (26.9%) patients were classified into Cluster 1; 32 (30.8%) into Cluster 2; 17 (16.3%) into Cluster 3; and 27 (26.0%) into Cluster 4.







(b)

Fig. 2. (a) The distribution of patients according to pulmonary function test. Circle, triangle, square and cross represent patients in Clusters 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively. (b) The distribution of patients in 2-dimensional data plot. Circle, triangle, square and cross represent patients in Clusters 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

expiratory flow between 25% and 75% of vital capacity (FEF<sub>25–75%</sub>), and diffusing capacity of lung for carbon monoxide ( $D_{LCO}$ ; % predicted), which were selected as measures of restrictive and obstructive impairment, small airway obstruction and lung diffusing capacity in PFT. We determined the number of clusters by comparing the clinical features in three-to five-group models. To compare differences among clusters, analysis of variance with post hoc Tukey's tests, Kruskal-Wallis test with post hoc Steel-Dwass test or chi-square test were used for normally distributed continuous and non-normally distributed continuous or categorical variables, respectively. Spearman's rank correlation test was performed to assess the correlation between CT score and BMI, VAS

scale for subjective symptoms, mMRC, laboratory data, and pulmonary function parameters. A value of P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using JMP version 14.0.0 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

#### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Patient characteristics

A total of 110 patients were enrolled between September 2019 and December 2020. One patient without laboratory findings, one without

Comparison of pulmonary function test findings among four clusters.

	-	-			
	Cluster 1 Normal group	Cluster 2 Obstructive impairment group	Cluster 3 Restrictive pattern with preserved FEV1 group	Cluster 4 Restrictive pattern with decreased FEV1 group	<i>P</i> -value
Ν	28	32	17	27	
VC (L), average $\pm$ SD <sup>†,‡,§,   </sup>	$2.8\pm0.4$	$2.6\pm0.5$	$2.2\pm0.7$	$2.0\pm0.4$	< 0.001
%VC (%), average $\pm$ SD*, <sup>†,‡,§,</sup>   ,¶	$99.8 \pm 11.1$	$94.0\pm13.3$	$73.8 \pm 15.5$	$71.1 \pm 11.5$	< 0.001
FVC (L), average $\pm$ SD <sup>†,‡,   </sup>	$2.8\pm0.5$	$2.5\pm0.5$	$2.2\pm0.6$	$2.0\pm0.5$	< 0.001
%FVC (%), average $\pm$ SD <sup>†,‡,§,   ,¶</sup>	$100.7 \pm 12.5$	$95.2 \pm 13.8$	$75.8 \pm 14.6$	$\textbf{72.8} \pm \textbf{12.2}$	< 0.001
FEV <sub>1</sub> (L), average $\pm$ SD <sup>*,‡,§,   ,¶</sup>	$2.2\pm0.4$	$1.7\pm0.3$	$2.0\pm0.6$	$1.4\pm0.3$	< 0.001
%FEV <sub>1</sub> (%), average $\pm$ SD*, <sup>†,‡,§,   ,¶</sup>	$101.9\pm14.3$	$82.3 \pm 11.2$	$90.3 \pm 17.6$	$65.0 \pm 11.0$	< 0.001
FEV <sub>1</sub> /FVC (%), median (IQR) * <sup>,†,§,</sup>	77.5 (76.1, 79.9)	68.3 (65.4, 69.8)	92.9 (88.5, 96.1)	71.4 (63.0, 75.8)	<0.001
FEF <sub>25–75%</sub> (L/sec), median (IQR)	1.9 (1.5, 2.1)	0.9 (0.7, 1.0)	2.3 (2.0, 3.6)	0.8, (0.6, 1.1)	<0.001
FRC (L), average $\pm$ SD <sup>‡,¶</sup>	$\textbf{2.8} \pm \textbf{0.7}$	$2.7\pm0.4$	$3.0\pm0.5$	$2.4\pm0.4$	< 0.001
%FRC (%), average $\pm$ SD <sup>‡,§,   </sup>	$113.0\pm18.3$	$108.5\pm11.4$	$110.0\pm17.9$	$93.6 \pm 12.0$	< 0.001
RV (L), median (IQR) <sup>†,§,¶</sup>	1.7 (1.5, 1.9)	1.7 (1.6, 1.9)	2.1 (1.8, 2.4)	1.6 (1.4, 1.8)	< 0.001
%RV (%), median (IQR) <sup>  ,¶</sup>	112.2 (103.2,	113.4 (103.0, 120.0)	123.3 (105.1, 140.9)	100.7 (92.6, 110.9)	0.002
	128.7)				
TLC (L), average $\pm$ SD <sup>‡,   ,¶</sup>	$4.6 \pm 0.7$	$\textbf{4.4} \pm \textbf{0.7}$	$4.3\pm0.8$	$3.6\pm0.6$	< 0.001
%TLC (%), average $\pm$ SD <sup>†,‡,§,   </sup>	$114.9\pm9.3$	$111.1\pm12.5$	$98.7 \pm 16.2$	$89.0 \pm 12.0$	< 0.001
RV/TLC (%), median (IQR) <sup><math>\dagger, \ddagger, \\$, \parallel</math></sup>	39.1 (34.7, 42.5)	41.4 (35.6, 43.0)	50.4 (42.8, 54.0)	44.9 (42.3, 48.2)	< 0.001
$D_{LCO}$ (ml/min/Torr), average $\pm$ SD <sup><math>\uparrow, \ddagger, \\$, \parallel</math></sup>	$17.0\pm3.4$	$17.6\pm2.8$	$13.6\pm4.2$	$13.2\pm2.9$	<0.001
$D_{LCO}$ (%), average $\pm SD^{\dagger,\ddagger,\$,\parallel}$	$\textbf{79.7} \pm \textbf{13.1}$	$85.3 \pm 12.1$	$63.0\pm18.3$	$62.2\pm12.6$	< 0.001
$D_{LCO}/VA \text{ (ml/min/Torr/L)},$ average $\pm SD^{\$}$	$\textbf{4.68} \pm \textbf{0.77}$	$5.16\pm0.86$	$\textbf{4.07} \pm \textbf{1.15}$	$\textbf{4.74} \pm \textbf{0.91}$	0.006
%D <sub>LCO</sub> /VA (%), average $\pm$ SD <sup>§</sup>	$94.0 \pm 14.7$	$104.5\pm16.8$	$87.4\pm20.9$	$96.6\pm16.7$	0.023

FEV<sub>1</sub>, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; SD, standard deviation; IQR, interquartile range; VC, vital capacity; FVC, forced vital capacity; FEF<sub>25-75%</sub>, forced expiratory flow between 25% and 75% of vital capacity; FRC, functional residual capacity; RV, residual volume; TLC, total lung capacity; D<sub>LCO</sub>, diffusing capacity of lung for carbon monoxide; D<sub>LCO</sub>/VA, D<sub>LCO</sub> per unit of alveolar volume. \*The difference between clusters 1 and 2, †clusters 1 and 3, ‡clusters 1 and 4, § clusters 2 and 3, || clusters 2 and 4, ¶ clusters 3 and 4 were statistically significant.

SGRQ, and four without diffusing capacity of the lungs were excluded. Finally, data from 104 patients were analyzed in the present study. The patient characteristics are shown in Table 2. The average age was 69.6 years, and 87 patients (83.7%) were female. Overall, 23 (22.3%) patients had smoking history, and 17 (16.3%) had respiratory comorbidity: 7 (6.7%) bronchial asthma, 5 (4.8%) COPD, 4 (3.8%) interstitial pneumonia, and 2 (1.9%) old tuberculosis. None of the patients received home-based oxygen therapy. Seventy-one (68.3%) patients had a history of treatment with anti-nontuberculous mycobacterium (NTM) drugs.

#### 3.2. Classification by cluster analysis

The patients were divided into four groups by cluster analysis using respiratory function parameters (Figs. 1 and 2(a)). The relationship between these parameters is shown in Fig. 2(b). Each cluster exhibited a distinct respiratory function pattern (Table 3). Cluster 1 mainly included patients with %VC > 80% and 70% < FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC < 85% (Fig. 2(b)), and Cluster 1 was named as the normal group. Most patients in Cluster 2 showed %VC > 80% and FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC <70%, and was named Cluster 2 as obstructive impairment group. Most patients in Clusters 3 and 4 had % VC <80%. Cluster 3 was characterized by FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC  $\geq$ 85%. High FEV<sub>1</sub>/ FVC was observed because FVC was impaired; however, FEV1 was preserved within the normal range, namely %FEV<sub>1</sub>  $\geq$ 80%, in Cluster 3. Therefore, Cluster 3 was named as restrictive pattern with preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group. Cluster 3 comprised of patients with high FEF<sub>25-75%</sub> or low %D<sub>LCO</sub> among those with high FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC (Fig. 2(b)). Cluster 4 tended to exhibit %VC <80% and FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC <85%, which are typical restrictive patterns. We named Cluster 4 as restrictive pattern with a decreased FEV<sub>1</sub> group to express the difference between Clusters 3 and 4.

We determined the number of groups by comparing models with three to five clusters (e-Tables 1 and 2). The normal group (Cluster 1) and the obstructive impairment group (Cluster 2) were not distinguished in the three-cluster model. In the five-cluster model, the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group (Cluster 3) was divided into two

groups according to the degree of reduction in %VC. Five patients, divided from the restrictive pattern with preserved  $FEV_1$  group (Cluster 3) in the five-cluster model, had similar PFT features to those in the normal group (Cluster 1). Therefore, we adopted a four-cluster model.

#### 3.3. Features of each cluster

Restrictive pattern in the decreased FEV1 group was the most severe phenotype among the four clusters. Patients in the restrictive pattern with decreased FEV1 group complained of dyspnea more frequently than those in the other clusters (Table 4). The VAS scores for dyspnea of restrictive pattern in the decreased FEV1 group were higher than those in the normal group (P = 0.001), and the mMRC of restrictive pattern with decreased FEV<sub>1</sub> group was higher than that in the normal and obstructive impairment groups (P < 0.001). High serum C-reactive protein (CRP) and low serum albumin levels were also observed in restrictive pattern with decreased FEV<sub>1</sub> group (P < 0.001, <0.001, respectively; Table 4). Total lung capacity (TLC) in the restrictive pattern with decreased  $FEV_1$  group was the lowest among the clusters (Fig. 3). Restrictive pattern in the decreased FEV1 group had the highest CT score (P = 0.004, Fig. 4(a)). Bronchiolitis and cavity scores in the restrictive pattern with decreased FEV1 group were higher than in the normal group (P = 0.039, 0.034, respectively; Fig. 4(b) and (c)). The HRQOL of patients in the restrictive pattern with decreased FEV1 group tended to be impaired in terms of activity, impact, and total SGRQ scores (P =0.017, 0.030, and 0.010, respectively; Table 5).

Patients in the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group complained of severe symptoms as restrictive pattern with decreased FEV<sub>1</sub> group (Table 4). Among the radiological findings, consolidation was observed most frequently (Table 4), and the consolidation score was highest in the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group (P < 0.001, Fig. 4(d)). The HRQOL impairment in the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group was comparable to that in the restrictive pattern with decreased FEV<sub>1</sub> group (Table 5). Bacterial exacerbation requiring

Comparison of characteristics, subjective symptoms, laboratory data, and radiological findings among four clusters.

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Cluster 1 Normal group	Cluster 2 Obstructive impairment	Cluster 3 Restrictive pattern with preserved	Cluster 4 Restrictive pattern with decreased	P-value
N         28         32         17         27           Permler, 1(%)         69, 60-0.3, 7.8.0         740 (67.0, 7.8.0)         70.0 (64.0, 7.7.0.)         0.26           Permler, 1(%)         25 (89.3.)         29 (00.6.)         11 (64.7.)         22 (81.5.)         0.30           Height (cm), average ± 5D         157.3 ± 7.0         156.1 ± 6.7         156.6 ± 9.6         156.4 ± 9.2         0.51           BMI, average ± 5D <sup>16-11</sup> 20.1 ± 2.2         20.5 ± 2.9         17.4 ± 2.4         18.4 ± 2.6         -0.001           Respiratory combridity, n(%)         8 (28.6)         9 (28.1)         14 (82.7.4)         16 (59.3)         -0.001           Respiratory combridity, n(%)         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         5 (29.4)         1 (18.5)         0.26           Good (0.0)         3 (9.4)         2 (11.8)         0 (0.0)         0.14         0.77         0.12           Old thereal/osis, n(%)         0 (3.3.0)         7 (21.9)         3 (17.7)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Autoinnume disease, n(%)         1 (3.7)         4 (12.5)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Desce duration (nembris), median (opersyst), n(%)         0 (3.0)         1 (4.2.5)         1 (4.3.7)         1 (4.3.7)         1 (4.3.7) <td></td> <td></td> <td>group</td> <td>TEVI group</td> <td>TEVI group</td> <td></td>			group	TEVI group	TEVI group	
Age (ears), median (10,10)         96.5 (60.3, 73.8)         70.0 (66.4, 77.0)         70.0 (66.4, 77.0)         70.0 (66.4, 77.0)         0.26           Smoking history, n (%)         7 (28.9)         4 (10.5)         10.653.9         6 (22.2)         0.30           Bedy median (0.00)         10.7, 72.5, 70         16.1 ± 6.7         159.6 ± 9.6         16.6 ± 9.2         0.517           Body median (0.01)         40.7 ± 6.3         50.3 ± 9.1         45.0 ± 10.5         45.2 ± 9.1         0.051           Body median (0.01)         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         17.4 ± 2.4         18.4 ± 2.6         -0.001           Ball (1.85, n (%) <sup>1.5.4</sup> )         3 (10.7)         0 (0.0)         0 (0.0)         4 (14.8)         0.070           Other hald astma, n (%)         1 (3.0)         0 (3.0)         2 (11.8)         1 (3.0)         0 (2.5           Outh memorida (6.1%)         0 (3.0)         1 (2.5)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Outh memorida (6.1%)         0 (3.3)         7 (21.9)         3 (17.7)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Outh memorida (6.1%)         0 (3.5)         1 (2.5)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Outh memorida (6.1%)         0 (3.7)         4 (12.5)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5) <td>N</td> <td>28</td> <td>32</td> <td>17</td> <td>27</td> <td></td>	N	28	32	17	27	
Fende, n(%)22 (89.3)29 (90.6)11 (64.7)22 (81.5)0.096Bedgit (m), verage ± SD175.3 ± 7.0156.1 ± 6.7156.6 ± 9.6156.4 ± 9.20.30Height (m), verage ± SD47.7 ± 6.350.3 ± 9.145.0 ± 10.545.2 ± 9.10.051BMI, arenge ± SD <sup>(h, II)</sup> 20.1 ± 2.220.5 ± 2.917.4 ± 2.418.4 ± 2.6-0.001Respiratory contribuity, n(%)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)5 (29.4)5 (18.5)0.36Bronchiai attima, n(%)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)5 (29.4)5 (18.5)0.36Bronchiai attima, n(%)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)2 (11.8)0 (0.0)0.11Interstitial pneumonia, n(%)1 (3.5)0 (0.0)2 (11.8)0 (0.0)0.24Old thereulosis, n(%)9 (33.3)7 (21.9)3 (17.7)5 (18.5)0.36Autoimmune disease, n(%)1 (3.7)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.36Disease duration (months), median1.5 (43.8, 130.5)0 (16.2), 3 (19.3)7 (21.8)3 (17.7)5 (18.5)0.36Interstitial pneumonia, n(%)1 (3.6)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.36Pairto in spatimur culture within one yar, n(%)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.36Interstitie nongener1 (3.6)4 (12.5)2 (11.8)1 (3.7)1 (3.6)2 (6.51)0.67Pairto in spatimur culture within one yar, n(%)1 (4.12.5)2 (11.8)1 (4.2)1 (4.2)1 (4.2)1 (4.2)1 (4.2)1 (4.2)1 (4	Age (years), median (IQR)	69.5 (60.3, 73.8)	70.0 (65.3, 74.0)	74.0 (67.0, 78.0)	70.0 (64.0, 77.0)	0.26
Smoking history, n (%)         7 (25.9)         4 (12.5)         6 (53.3)         6 (22.2)         0.30           Bidly entrog = 5D         157.3         15.6 1 ± 6.7         159.6 ± 9.6         156.4 ± 9.2         0.517           Body weight (kg), average ± SD         49.7 ± 6.3         50.3 ± 9.1         45.0 ± 10.5         45.2 ± 9.1         0.051           BMI <128.5, n (%) <sup>1.6,1</sup> 8 (28.6)         9 (28.1)         17.4 ± 2.4         18.4 ± 2.6         0.000           BMI <128.5, n (%) <sup>1.6,1</sup> 8 (12.5)         5 (29.4)         16 (18.2)         0.000         3.000           BMI <128.5, n (%) <sup>1.6,1</sup> 9 (10.7)         0 (0.0)         2 (18.1)         1 (3.7)         0.03           Bornshitory, n (%)         9 (30.3)         7 (21.9)         3 (17.7)         5 (18.5)         0.53           Distesse duration (months), median         9 (15.43, 13.05         1 (22.5)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5)         0.53           Distesse duration (months), median         9 (1.5 (24.8, 13.05.0)         3 (24.1)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5)         0.53           Distesse duration (months), median         9 (1.2 (2.9)         1 (4 (43.8)         8 (7.1)         1 3 (4.8.2)         0.63           Other metrotiment (months), median         3 (10.7)         4 (12.	Female, n (%)	25 (89.3)	29 (90.6)	11 (64.7)	22 (81.5)	0.096
Height (cm), average $\pm$ SD157, $3 \pm 7.0$ 150, $1 \pm 6.7$ 159, $6 \pm 9.6$ 156, $4 \pm 9.2$ 0.517Body weight (sp), average $\pm$ SD47, $6.3$ 50, $3 \pm 9.1$ 450, $2 \pm 9.1$ 1, $652, 2 \pm 9.1$ 0.051BM, average $\pm$ SD412.01 \pm 2.220, $5 \pm 2.9$ 17, $4 \pm 2.4$ 18, $4 \pm 2.6$ 0.001Respiratory conorbidity, $n$ (%)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)5 (23.4)5 (18.5)0.36Bronchial asthma, $n$ (%)3 (10.7)0 (0.0)0 (0.0)4 (14.8)0.070OCDP, $n$ (%)1 (3.5)0 (0.0)2 (11.8)1 (3.7)0.24Old tubecrulosis, $n$ (%)9 (0.0)1 (3.1)1 (5.9)0 (0.0)0.33Cancer history, $n$ (%)9 (3.3)7 (21.9)3 (17.7)5 (18.5)0.33Autoimmune disease, $n$ (%)1 (3.7)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.36Disease duration (nonthi), medium assaw within one year, $n$ (3.6)1 (25.3)1 (7.7)5 (18.5)0.58Auti-MT treatment1 (3.6)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.58Positive in sputtum culture within one year, $n$ (3.6)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)3 (17.7)6 (22.2)Positive in sputtum culture within one year, $n$ (%)1 (3.5, 31)2 (5.5, 60)2 (6, 51)0.25Positive in sputtum culture within one year, $n$ (3.6)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)1 (18.5)1 (3.7)1 (2.2)Positive in sputtum culture within one year, $n$ (3.6)1 (5.3, 31)2 (5.5, 60)2 (6, 51)0.25Vast Settin	Smoking history, n (%)	7 (25.9)	4 (12.5)	6 (35.3)	6 (22.2)	0.30
Body weight (kg), average ± SD         49.7 ± 6.3         50.3 ± 9.1         45.0 ± 10.5         45.2 ± 9.1         0.051           BMI, average ± SD <sup>k, 1</sup> 20.1 ± 2.2         20.5 ± 2.9         17.4 ± 2.4         18.4 ± 2.6         -0.001           BMI < 18.5, n (%) <sup>1&gt;.5</sup> 6(28.6)         9(28.1)         14 (82.4)         16.(59.3)         -0.001           BMI < 18.5, n (%) <sup>1&gt;.5</sup> 0(0.0)         0(0.0)         0(0.0)         4(14.8)         0.70           COPD, n (%)         0(0.0)         1(3.1)         1.(5.9)         0(0.0)         4.3           Old indiverciolacis, n (%)         0(3.3)         7(21.9)         3(17.7)         5(18.5)         0.30           Actoimmune disease, n (%)         0.15 (43.8, 130.5)         61 (26.5, 10.9.3)         3(17.7)         5(18.5)         0.30           Disease duration (nonth), media         9.15 (43.8, 130.5)         61 (26.5, 10.9.3)         3(1.1)         0.60           n (%)         12.(42.9)         14 (12.5)         15.9         5(18.5)         0.30           Positive is sputum culture within one year, n (%)         12.(42.9)         14 (43.8)         8 (47.1)         13 (48.2)           Current treatment, n (%)         12.(42.9)         14 (12.5)         2.11.8)         1.(3.7)         treatment, 1.	Height (cm), average $\pm$ SD	$157.3\pm7.0$	$156.1\pm6.7$	$159.6\pm9.6$	$156.4 \pm 9.2$	0.517
BMI, areage ± SD <sup>1-1,1</sup> 20.1 ± 2.2         20.5 ± 2.9         17.4 ± 2.4         18.4 ± 2.6         <0.001           Respiratory comorbidity, n (%)         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         5 (23.4)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Respiratory comorbidity, n (%)         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         5 (23.4)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Bronchial astman, n (%)         0 (0.0)         3 (11.8)         0 (0.0)         4 (14.8)         0.07           COPD, n (%)         0 (0.0)         1 (3.5)         0 (0.0)         1 (13.8)         1 (3.7)         0.4           Cancer history, n (%)         0 (3.3)         7 (21.9)         3 (17.7)         5 (18.5)         0.33           Disease duration (months), m (%)         1 (3.7)         4 (12.5)         1 (5.9)         3 (11.1)         0.60           Disease duration (months), medin (norths), medin (months), medin         1 (2.6)         1 (2.5)         3 (11.1)         0.60           Disease duration (months), medin         9 (2.42.9)         4 (12.5)         3 (17.7)         5 (18.5)         0.58           Disease duration (norths), medina         1 (2.42.9)         4 (12.5)         3 (17.7)         6 (22.2)         1 (2.7)         1 (2.8)         1 (3.7)         1 (2.7)         1 (3.7)         1 (2.7)<	Body weight (kg), average $\pm$ SD	$49.7\pm 6.3$	$50.3 \pm 9.1$	$45.0\pm10.5$	$45.2\pm9.1$	0.051
BMI < 18.5, n (%) <sup>1-3</sup> 8 (28.6)         9 (28.1)         14 (82.4)         16 (59.3)         < < 0.001	BMI, average $\pm$ SD <sup>T,8,   </sup>	$20.1\pm2.2$	$20.5\pm2.9$	$17.4 \pm 2.4$	$18.4 \pm 2.6$	< 0.001
Repiratory comorbidity, n (%)         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         5 (29.4)         5 (18.5)         0.36           Branchial astimu, n (%)         0 (0.0)         0 (0.0)         4 (14.8)         0.070           COPD, n (%)         0 (0.0)         1 (3.6)         0 (0.0)         2 (11.8)         1 (3.7)         0.24           Old tuberculosis, n (%)         0 (0.0)         1 (3.1)         1 (5.9)         0 (0.0)         0.35           Autoimmune disease, n (%)         1 (3.7)         4 (12.5)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5)         0.36           Disease duration (months), median         9 (1.5 (3.8, 130.5)         6 1 (26.3, 109.3)         7 4 (33.5, 112)         102 (55, 173)         0.19           (interquartife range)         (interquartife range)         (interquartife range)         (interquartife range)         0.63           (interquartife range)         (interquartife range)         (interquartife range)         (interquartife range)         0.63           Corrent restament, n (%)         1 (2.42.9)         1 4 (43.8)         8 (47.1)         13 (48.2)           Former reatment (n (%)         1 (2.42.9)         1 4 (43.8)         8 (47.1)         1 (3.7)           Current restament, n (%)         1 (3.6)         1 (2.5, 5         1 (3.7)         2 (6, 51)         0.0<	BMI <18.5, n (%) <sup>⊺,§,¶</sup>	8 (28.6)	9 (28.1)	14 (82.4)	16 (59.3)	< 0.001
Bronchial asthma, n(%)         3 (10.7)         0 (0.0)         0 (0.0)         4 (14.8)         0.070           COPD, n(%)         0 (0.0)         3 (9.4)         2 (11.8)         0 (0.0)         1.11           Interstitial pneumonia, n(%)         1 (3.6)         0 (0.0)         2 (11.8)         1 (3.7)         0.24           Old tuberculosis, n(%)         9 (33.3)         7 (21.9)         3 (17.7)         5 (18.5)         0.30           Disease duration (months), median         91.5 (43.8, 130.5)         61 (26.3, 109.3)         74 (33.5, 112)         102 (55, 173)         0.19           Interstitue ange         1 (3.6)         4 (12.5)         1 (5.9)         3 (11.1)         0.60           n(%)         1 (3.6)         4 (12.5)         1 (5.9)         3 (11.1)         0.60           n(%)         1 (3.6)         4 (12.5)         1 (5.9)         3 (11.1)         0.60           n(%)         1 (3.6)         4 (12.5)         3 (17.7)         6 (22.2)         1.53           Current treatment, (%)         1 (3.40         1 (42.5)         3 (17.7)         6 (25.5)         2 (5.50)         2 (5.50)         2 (5.50)           VAS cough, median (QR)         13 (4, 2.30         13 (4.3, 2.33         2 (5.5.6)         2 (5.5, 5)         2	Respiratory comorbidity, n (%)	3 (10.7)	4 (12.5)	5 (29.4)	5 (18.5)	0.36
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Bronchial asthma, n (%)	3 (10.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (14.8)	0.070
	COPD, n (%)	0 (0.0)	3 (9.4)	2 (11.8)	0 (0.0)	0.11
Old tuberculosis, $n(%)$ $0(0.0)$ $1(3.1)$ $1(5.7)$ $0(0.0)$ $0.43$ Cancer history, $n(\%)$ $3(3.3)$ $7(1.9)$ $3(17.7)$ $5(18.5)$ $0.30$ Disease duration (months), median $91.5(43.8, 10.5)$ $61(26.3, 109.3)$ $74(33.5, 112)$ $102(55, 173)$ $0.19$ Disease duration (months), median $91.5(43.8, 10.5)$ $61(26.3, 109.3)$ $74(33.5, 112)$ $102(55, 173)$ $0.19$ Distive in sputum stater within one year, $1(3.6)$ $4(12.5)$ $15.9$ $3(11.1)$ $0.63$ $n(\%)$ $12(42.9)$ $14(43.8)$ $8(47.1)$ $13(48.2)$ $0.63$ Current treatment, $1.6\%$ $12(42.9)$ $14(43.8)$ $8(47.1)$ $13(4.8, 2)$ $0.63$ Treatment, $n(\%)$ $12(42.9)$ $14(43.8)$ $8(47.1)$ $13(4.2, 2)$ $0.63$ Utreatment, $n(\%)$ $3(10.7)$ $4(12.5)$ $2(11.8)$ $13(4.2)$ $0.63$ Subjective symptoms $12(4.9)$ $13(4.32.8)$ $28(55.60)$ $28(6,51)$ $0.093$ VAS ough, median (QR) $9(4, $	Interstitial pneumonia, n (%)	1 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (11.8)	1 (3.7)	0.24
Cancer history, n (%)9 (33.3)7 (21.9)3 (17.7)5 (18.5)0.53Autoimmue disses, n (%)1 (3.7)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.30Disease duration (months), median (interquartile range)91.5 (43.8, 130.5)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)102 (55, 173)0.19Positive in sputum smear within one year, n (%)1 (3.6)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)3 (11.1)0.60n (%)94.14.3)3 (9.4)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.58Positive in sputum culture within one year, n (%)4 (14.3)3 (9.4)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.58Positive in sputum culture within one year, n (%)1 (44.3)8 (4.71)13 (48.2)0.51Current treatment, (%)1 (3.6)4 (12.5)2 (11.8)1 (3.7)1 (42.2)Former treatment (isonnined)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)2 (11.8)1 (3.7)25Subjective symptoms	Old tuberculosis, n (%)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.1)	1 (5.9)	0 (0.0)	0.43
	Cancer history, n (%)	9 (33.3)	7 (21.9)	3 (17.7)	5 (18.5)	0.53
	Autoimmune disease, n (%)	1 (3.7)	4 (12.5)	1 (5.9)	5 (18.5)	0.30
Positive in sputum smear within one year, n (%)1 (3.6)4 (12.5)1 (5.9)3 (11.1)0.60n (%)11 (14.3)3 (9.4)1 (5.9)5 (18.5)0.58year, n (%)111.4 (43.8)8 (47.1)13 (48.2)0.53Gurrent treatment, n (%)12 (42.9)14 (43.8)8 (47.1)13 (48.2)13 (48.2)Former treatment (completed1 (3.7)4 (12.5)8 (47.1)13 (48.2)13 (48.2)Former treatment (discontinued3 (10.7)4 (12.5)2 (1.8)13 (3.7)13 (4.2)Subjective symptoms5522 (5.5)0.097VAS cough, median (QR)13 (4,30)13 (5.3,31)28 (5.5,60)28 (6.5)0.097VAS difficulty of expectoration, median9 (4.3)10.5 (3.3,43.8)18 (8.5,56.5)27 (7.48)0.093VAS fully, median (QR)13 (4,32)16 (6.36.8)40 (10.5,54.5)27 (7.48)0.093VAS fully, median (QR)0 (0.2)2 (0.4)4 (1.23)3 (0.18)0.032VAS fever, median (QR)13 (4.32)2 (0.1,633 (0.0,20)0.001VAS fully, median (QR)10 (0.1)0 (0.1)10 (3.5,24)3 (0.0,20)0.055mMC, median (QR)13 (4.7,70)2 (0.4)1 (1.23)3 (0.18)0.032VAS fully, median (QR) <sup>1,11</sup> 0 (0.1)0 (0.1,010 (0.5,54)2 (0.4,6,6,552 (0.4,6,6,56)3 (0.1,6)MCG (10 [3)/µl), median (QR) <sup>1,11</sup> 0 (0.0,0.1)0 (0.0,0.2)4 (0.1,0,9)0 (0.0,0.0)	Disease duration (months), median (interquartile range)	91.5 (43.8, 130.5)	61 (26.3, 109.3)	74 (33.5, 112)	102 (55, 173)	0.19
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Positive in sputum smear within one year,	1 (3.6)	4 (12.5)	1 (5.9)	3 (11.1)	0.60
Positive in sputum culture within one year, n (%)         4 (14.3)         3 (9.4)         1 (5.9)         5 (18.5)         0.58           year, n (%)	n (%)					
year, n (%)0.63Anti-NTM treatment, n (%)12 (42.9)14 (43.8)8 (47.1)13 (48.2)16.3Current treatment, n (%)13 (12.9)14 (12.5)3 (17.7)6 (2.2)17.3Former treatment (discontinued)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)2 (11.8)13 (3.7)17.3Former treatment (discontinued)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)2 (11.8)13 (3.7)28 (6.51)0.25VaS cough, median (IQR)13 (4, 30)13 (5.3, 31)28 (5.5, 60)28 (6, 51)0.63VAS difficulty of expectoration, median9 (4, 33)10.5 (3.3, 43.8)18 (8.5, 56.5)21 (3.51)0.61VAS fatigue, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)1 (0, 2.8)2 (0, 11)2 (0, 14)0.0310.031VAS fatigue, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 6.3)2 (0, 11)2 (0, 14)0.0310.031VAS fatigue, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 9.3)2 (0, 51.5)2 (0, 14)0.0310.031VAS fatigue, median (IQR) <sup>1,1</sup> 0 (0, 1)2 (0, 16.3)2 (0, 55.54)3 (0, 20.0)0.055MMRC, median (IQR) <sup>1,1</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 15.5)3 (0, 2.0)0.0310.031VAS anorexia, median (IQR) <sup>1,1</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 0, 2.1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1)0.010.001VBC (10 (5)/1), median (IQR)5.7 (4.7, 7.0)5.5 (4.2, 6.3)5.4 (4.5, 6.5)7.4 (3, 7.4)0.83CROCROCROCROCROCROCRO0.5 (4.2, 6.5)2.7 (4.5, 7.5)7.3 (6.9, 7.7)0.5 (6.5, 7.4,	Positive in sputum culture within one	4 (14.3)	3 (9.4)	1 (5.9)	5 (18.5)	0.58
Anit-MT freatment $0.63$ Curren treatment, n(%)         12 (42.9)         14 (43.8)         8 (7.7)         13 (48.2) $1.63.6$ Former treatment (completed         1 (3.6)         4 (12.5)         3 (17.7)         6 (22.2) $1.63.6$ Former treatment (alsontinued         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         3 (17.7)         6 (22.2) $1.63.7$ Former treatment (alsontinued         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         3 (17.7)         6 (22.2) $1.63.7$ Former treatment (alsontinued         3 (10.7)         4 (12.5)         3 (13.8)         13 (3.7) $1.63.7$ Subjective symptoms         Subjective symptoms         5 (4.5)         2 (6.5)         0.097 $0.097$ VAS difficulty of expectoration, median (IQR)         8 (4.5)         13 (4.3,25.8)         3 (21.5,66)         2 (6.5,51)         0.091           VAS fatigue, median (IQR)         0 (0.2)         1 (0.2.8)         2 (0.11)         2 (0.14)         0.021         0.021           VAS fatigue, median (IQR)         0 (0.2)         1 (0.2.8)         2 (0.5,54)         3 (0.18)         0.031           VAS despnea, median (IQR)         0 (0.1)         0 (0.1)         1 (0.5,52.9)         3 (0.0.2)         0.001	year, n (%)					
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Anti-NTM treatment					0.63
Former treatment (completed)1 (3.6)4 (12.5)3 (17.7)6 (22.2)Former treatment (discontinued)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)1 (1.8)1 (3.7)Former treatment (discontinued)3 (10.7)4 (12.5)2 (11.8)1 (3.7)Subjective symptomsSubjective symptoms1 (3.6, 3.1)2 (8.5, 5.6)28 (6, 51)0.25VAS sputum, median (IQR)8 (4, 51)13 (4.3, 25.8)3 (21.35, 66)25 (6, 51)0.097VAS difficulty of expectoration, median9 (4, 33)10.5 (3.3, 43.8)18 (8.5, 56.5)2 (1.3, 51)0.021VAS hemosputum, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)1 (0, 2.8)2 (0, 11)2 (0, 14)0.021VAS hemosputum, median (IQR)1 (3.4, 32.2)1 (6.6, 36.8)4 (1.23)3 (0, 18)0.034VAS dyspnea, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 4.4)4 (1.23)3 (0, 2.0)0.01VAS dyspnea, median (IQR)1 (0, 5.52 (0, 16.3)2 (0, 5.5, 54)13 (2, 27)0.001VAS dyspnea, median (IQR) <sup>1, 11</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5, 29)3 (0, 0.20)0.001Laboratory findings13.3 ± 0.813.6 ± 1.413.1 ± 1.612.8 ± 1.20.093VBC (10 [3/µl), median (IQR) <sup>1, 11</sup> 0 (0, 0, 0.2)0.4 (0, 1.0, 0.2)0.4 (0.1, 0.9)0.2 (0.0, 0.9)0.010Laboratory findings1.3 ± 0.813.6 ± 1.413.1 ± 1.612.8 ± 1.20.0930.010VBC (10 [3/µl), median (IQR) <sup>1, 11</sup> 0.00, 0.210.4 (0.1, 0.9)0.2 (0, 0, 0.9)0.501VBC (10 [3/µl	Current treatment, n (%)	12 (42.9)	14 (43.8)	8 (47.1)	13 (48.2)	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Former treatment (completed	1 (3.6)	4 (12.5)	3 (17.7)	6 (22.2)	
Former treatment (discontinued) $3 (10.7)$ $4 (12.5)$ $2 (11.8)$ $1 (3.7)$ treatment), $n (\%)$ $5$ $4 (1.2)$ $2 (1.8)$ $1 (3.7)$ $2 (1.8)$ $1 (3.7)$ Subjective symptoms $5$ $5 (5, 5)$ $28 (6, 51)$ $0.25$ VAS cough, median (IQR) $8 (4, 51)$ $13 (4.3, 25.8)$ $22 (13, 56)$ $25 (6, 51)$ $0.097$ VAS difficulty of expectoration, median $9 (4, 33)$ $10 (5.3, 43.8)$ $18 (8.5, 56.5)$ $21 (3, 51)$ $0.021$ VAS hemosputum, median (IQR) $0 (0, 2)$ $1 (0, 2.8)$ $2 (0, 11)$ $2 (0, 14)$ $0.021$ VAS fatigue, median (IQR) $0 (0, 2)$ $1 (0, 2.8)$ $2 (0, 11)$ $2 (0, 14)$ $0.031$ VAS fatigue, median (IQR) $0 (0, 2)$ $2 (0, 4)$ $4 (1, 2.3)$ $3 (0, 18)$ $0.034$ VAS dyspnea, median (IQR) $0 (0, 2)$ $2 (0, 1.6)$ $2 (0, 5.5, 54)$ $13 (2, 2.7)$ $0.001$ VAS anorexia, median (IQR) <sup>1,1</sup> $0 (0, 1)$ $0 (1, 1)$ $1 (0, 1.5)$ $1 (0, 1.2)$ $0.020$ $0.055$ mMRC, median (IQR) <sup>1,1</sup> $0 (0, 1)$ $0 (1, 1)$ $1 (0, 1.5)$ $1 (0, 1.2)$ $0.001$ $0.001$ Laboratory findings $13 (3 \pm 0.8$ $13 (5 \pm 1.4)$ $13 (\pm 1.6)$ $12.8 \pm 1.2$ $0.093$ VBC (10 $[3]/4]$ ), median (IQR) <sup>1,1</sup> $0 (0, 0.1)$ $0 (0, 0.2)$ $0 (4 (1, 0, 9)$ $0 (2 (0, 0.9)$ $0.001$ Total protein (g/d), median (IQR) <sup>1,1</sup> $0 (0, 0.1)$ $0 (0, 0.2)$ $0 (4 (1, 0, 9)$ $0 (2 (0, 0, 9)$ $0.001$ Total pro	treatment), n (%)					
treatment), n (%)           Subjective symptoms           VAS coupk, median (IQR)         13 (4, 30)         13 (4, 32)         28 (5, 5, 60)         28 (6, 51)         0.097           VAS coupk, median (IQR)         8 (4, 51)         13 (4, 32)         13 (4, 32)         13 (4, 32)         13 (4, 32)         10 (0, 1)         2 (0, 11)         2 (0, 14)         0.097           VAS femeosputum, median (IQR)         0 (0, 2)         10 (0, 1)         2 (0, 11)         2 (0, 14)         0.014)         0.093           VAS femeosputum, median (IQR)         0 (0, 2)         2 (0, 11)         2 (0, 14)         0.014)         0.014)           VAS fatigue, median (IQR)         0 (0, 2)         0 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1)         0 (0, 0, 0)           VAS dispane, median (IQR)         1 (0, 5)         2 (0, 4)         0 (0, 2)         0 (0, 0, 1)         0 (0, 0)	Former treatment (discontinued	3 (10.7)	4 (12.5)	2 (11.8)	1 (3.7)	
Subjective symptoms         VAS cough, median (IQR)         13 (4, 30)         13 (5.3, 31)         28 (5.5, 60)         28 (6, 51)         0.25           VAS ough, median (IQR)         8 (4, 51)         13 (4.3, 25.8)         32 (13.5, 66)         25 (6, 51)         0.097           VAS difficulty of expectoration, median         9 (4, 33)         10.5 (3.3, 43.8)         18 (8.5, 56.5)         21 (3, 51)         0.61           (QR)             0.021         0.021         0.012         0.011         0.02, 54.5)         21 (3, 51)         0.093           VAS fatigue, median (IQR)         0 (0, 2)         1 (0, 2.8)         2 (0, 11)         2 (0, 14)         0.021           VAS fatigue, median (IQR)         1 (4, 32)         16 (6, 36.8)         40 (10.5, 54.5)         27 (7, 48)         0.093           VAS dyspnea, median (IQR)         0 (0, 2)         2 (0, 16.3)         20 (5, 5, 54)         13 (2, 27)         0.001           VAS anorexia, median (IQR)         1 (0, 5)         2 (1, 9.8)         10 (3.5, 29)         3 (0.0.20)         .6001           MARC, median (IQR) <sup>1,1 </sup> 0 (0, 1)         0 (0, 1)         1 (0, 1.5)         10 (1)         .0001           Laboratory findings         I         I         I.3 ± 0.8	treatment), n (%)					
VAS cough, median (IQR)13 (4, 30)13 (5.3, 31)28 (5.5, 60)28 (6, 51)0.25VAS sputum, median (IQR)8 (4, 51)13 (4.3, 25.8)32 (13.5, 66)25 (6, 51)0.097VAS difficulty of expectoration, median9 (4, 33)1.05 (3.3, 43.8)18 (8.5, 56.5)21 (3, 51)0.61(IQR)9 (4, 32)1.00, 2.3, 43.8)18 (8.5, 56.5)21 (3, 51)0.021VAS hemosputum, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)1 (0, 2.8)2 (0, 11)2 (0, 14)0.021VAS fatigue, median (IQR)13 (4, 32)16 (6, 36.8)40 (10.5, 54.5)27 (7, 48)0.093VAS faver, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 16.3)2 (0, 5, 54)13 (2, 27)0.001VAS anorexia, median (IQR) <sup>1,±1</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1)<0.055	Subjective symptoms					
VAS sputum, median (IQR)8 (4, 51)13 (4.3, 25.8)32 (13.5, 66)25 (6, 51)0.097VAS difficulty of expectoration, median9 (4, 33)10.5 (3.3, 43.8)18 (8.5, 56.5)21 (3, 51)0.61(IQR)VAS hemosputum, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)1 (0, 2.8)2 (0, 11)2 (0, 14)0.021VAS fatigue, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)16 (6, 36.8)40 (10.5, 54.5)27 (7, 48)0.093VAS faver, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 4)4 (1, 23)3 (0, 18)0.034VAS abyena, median (IQR) <sup>1, il</sup> 2 (0, 5)2 (1, 9.8)10 (3.5, 29)3 (0.0.20)0.055mMRC, median (IQR) <sup>1, il</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1.5)0.093VAS anorexia, median (IQR) <sup>1, il</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1.1)<0.001	VAS cough, median (IQR)	13 (4, 30)	13 (5.3, 31)	28 (5.5, 60)	28 (6, 51)	0.25
VAS difficulty of expectoration, median9 (4, 33)10.5 (3.3, 43.8)18 (8.5, 56.5)21 (3, 51)0.61(LQR)	VAS sputum, median (IQR)	8 (4, 51)	13 (4.3, 25.8)	32 (13.5, 66)	25 (6, 51)	0.097
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } & (IQR) & (IQR) & 0 (0, 2) & 1 (0, 2.8) & 2 (0, 11) & 2 (0, 14) & 0.021 \\ VAS fatigue, median (IQR) & 13 (4, 32) & 16 (6, 36.8) & 40 (10.5, 54.5) & 27 (7, 48) & 0.093 \\ VAS fatigue, median (IQR) & 0 (0, 2) & 2 (0, 4) & 4 (1, 23) & 3 (0, 18) & 0.034 \\ VAS faver, median (IQR)^{1, 1} & 2 (0, 5) & 2 (0, 16.3) & 20 (5.5, 54) & 13 (2, 27) & 0.01 \\ VAS anorexia, median (IQR) & 1 (0, 5) & 2 (1, 9.8) & 10 (3.5, 29) & 3 (0, 0.20) & 0.055 \\ mMRC, median (IQR)^{1, 1 } & 0 (0, 1) & 0 (0, 1) & 1 (0, 1.5) & 1 (0, 1) & <0.001 \\ Laboratory findings & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	VAS difficulty of expectoration, median	9 (4, 33)	10.5 (3.3, 43.8)	18 (8.5, 56.5)	21 (3, 51)	0.61
VAS hemosputum, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)1 (0, 2.8)2 (0, 11)2 (0, 14)0.021VAS fatigue, median (IQR)13 (4, 32)16 (6, 36.8)40 (10.5, 54.5)27 (7, 48)0.093VAS fever, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 4)4 (1, 23)3 (0, 18)0.034VAS dyspnea, median (IQR) <sup>1,†</sup> 2 (0, 5)2 (0, 16.3)20 (5.5, 54)13 (2, 27)0.001VAS dyspnea, median (IQR) <sup>1,†</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)10 (3.5, 29)3 (0, 0.200.055mMRC, median (IQR) <sup>1,†</sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1)<0.001	(IQR)					
VAS fatigue, median (IQR)13 (4, 32)16 (6, 36.8)40 (10.5, 54.5)27 (7, 48)0.093VAS fever, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 4)4 (1, 23)3 (0, 18)0.034VAS dyspnea, median (IQR)2 (0, 5)2 (0, 16.3)20 (5.5, 54)13 (2, 27)0.001VAS anorexia, median (IQR)1 (0, 5)2 (1, 9.8)10 (3.5, 29)3 (0, 0.20)0.05mMRC, median (IQR)0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1)<<001	VAS hemosputum, median (IQR)	0 (0, 2)	1 (0, 2.8)	2 (0, 11)	2 (0, 14)	0.021
VAS fever, median (IQR)0 (0, 2)2 (0, 4)4 (1, 23)3 (0, 18)0.034VAS dyspnea, median (IQR) <sup>1,‡</sup> 2 (0, 5)2 (0, 16.3)20 (5.5, 54)13 (2, 27)0.001VAS anorexia, median (IQR)1 (0, 5)2 (1, 9.8)10 (3.5, 29)3 (0, 0.20)0.055mMRC, median (IQR) <sup>1,   </sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1) <d001< td="">Laboratory findings13.3 ± 0.813.6 ± 1.413.1 ± 1.612.8 ± 1.20.093WBC (10 [3]/µ], median (IQR)5.7 (4.7, 7.0)5.5 (4.2, 6.3)5.4 (4.5, 6.5)5.7 (4.3, 7.4)0.83CRP (mg/dl), median (IQR)5.7 (4.5, 7.5)7.2 (7.0, 7.5)7.3 (6.9, 7.7)0.2 (0.0, 0.9)&lt;0.001</d001<>	VAS fatigue, median (IQR)	13 (4, 32)	16 (6, 36.8)	40 (10.5, 54.5)	27 (7, 48)	0.093
VAS dyspnea, median (IQR) tit2 (0, 5)2 (0, 16.3)20 (5.5, 54)13 (2, 27)0.001VAS anorexia, median (IQR)1 (0, 5)2 (1, 9.8)10 (3.5, 29)3 (0, 0.20)0.055mMRC, median (IQR)0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1)<0.001	VAS fever, median (IQR)	0 (0, 2)	2 (0, 4)	4 (1, 23)	3 (0, 18)	0.034
VAS anorexia, median (IQR)1 (0, 5)2 (1, 9.8)10 (3.5, 29)3 (0, 0.20)0.055mMRC, median (IQR) <sup>5,   </sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1)<0.001	VAS dyspnea, median (IQR) <sup>†,‡</sup>	2 (0, 5)	2 (0, 16.3)	20 (5.5, 54)	13 (2, 27)	0.001
mMRC, median (IQR) <sup>4,   </sup> 0 (0, 1)0 (0, 1)1 (0, 1.5)1 (0, 1)<0.001Laboratory findingsHb (g/dl), average $\pm$ SD13.3 $\pm$ 0.813.6 $\pm$ 1.413.1 $\pm$ 1.612.8 $\pm$ 1.20.093WBC (10 [3]/µl), median (IQR)5.7 (4.7, 7.0)5.5 (4.2, 6.3)5.4 (4.5, 6.5)5.7 (4.3, 7.4)0.83CRP (mg/dl), median (IQR)0.0 (0.0, 0.1)0.0 (0.0, 0.2)0.4 (0.1, 0.9)0.2 (0.0, 0.9)<0.001	VAS anorexia, median (IQR)	1 (0, 5)	2 (1, 9.8)	10 (3.5, 29)	3 (0,0.20)	0.055
Laboratory findings       H0 (g/dl), average $\pm$ SD       13.3 $\pm$ 0.8       13.6 $\pm$ 1.4       13.1 $\pm$ 1.6       12.8 $\pm$ 1.2       0.093         WBC (10 [3]/µl), median (IQR)       5.7 (4.7, 7.0)       5.5 (4.2, 6.3)       5.4 (4.5, 6.5)       5.7 (4.3, 7.4)       0.83         CRP (mg/dl), median (IQR) <sup>1,   </sup> 0.0 (0.0, 0.1)       0.0 (0.0, 0.2)       0.4 (0.1, 0.9)       0.2 (0.0, 0.9)       <0.001	mMRC, median (IQR) <sup>‡,   </sup>	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1.5)	1 (0, 1)	< 0.001
Hb (g/dl), average $\pm$ SD       13.3 $\pm$ 0.8       13.6 $\pm$ 1.4       13.1 $\pm$ 1.6       12.8 $\pm$ 1.2       0.093         WBC (10 [3]/µl), median (IQR)       5.7 (4.7, 7.0)       5.5 (4.2, 6.3)       5.4 (4.5, 6.5)       5.7 (4.3, 7.4)       0.83         CRP (mg/dl), median (IQR)       0.0 (0.0, 0.1)       0.0 (0.0, 0.2)       0.4 (0.1, 0.9)       0.2 (0.0, 0.9)       <0.001         Total protein (g/dl), median (IQR)       7.2 (6.8, 7.5)       7.2 (7.0, 7.5)       7.3 (6.9, 7.7)       7.3 (6.9, 7.7)       0.50         Albumin (g/dl), average $\pm$ SD <sup>‡</sup> 4.2 $\pm$ 0.3       4.3 $\pm$ 0.3       4.0 $\pm$ 0.5       4.0 $\pm$ 0.3       0.002         Radiological findings	Laboratory findings					
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Hb (g/dl), average $\pm$ SD	$13.3\pm0.8$	$13.6\pm1.4$	$13.1 \pm 1.6$	$12.8 \pm 1.2$	0.093
$ \begin{array}{c} {\rm CRP} \ ({\rm mg/dl}), {\rm median} \ ({\rm lQR})^{\sharp,   } & 0.0 \ (0.0, 0.1) & 0.0 \ (0.0, 0.2) & 0.4 \ (0.1, 0.9) & 0.2 \ (0.0, 0.9) & < 0.001 \\ {\rm Total} \ {\rm protein} \ (g/dl), {\rm median} \ ({\rm lQR}) & 7.2 \ (6.8, 7.5) & 7.2 \ (7.0, 7.5) & 7.3 \ (6.9, 7.7) & 7.3 \ (6.9, 7.7) & 0.50 \\ {\rm Albumin} \ (g/dl), {\rm average} \ \pm {\rm SD}^{\ddagger} & 4.2 \ \pm 0.3 & 4.3 \ \pm 0.3 & 4.0 \ \pm 0.5 & 4.0 \ \pm 0.3 & 0.002 \\ {\rm Radiological findings} & & & & & & & & & \\ {\rm NB/NB} \ + {\rm FC/Fc}, {\rm n} \ (\%) & 25 \ (89.3)/2 \ (7.1)/ & 24 \ (75.0)/6 \ (18.8)/2 & 10 \ (58.8)/7 \ (41.2)/0 \ (0.0) & 16 \ (59.3)/9 \ (33.3)/2 \ (7.4) & 0.10 \\ & 1.3 \ (6.3) & & & & & & & & & \\ {\rm Presence of cavities, {\rm n} \ (\%)^{*, \dagger, \sharp} & 3 \ (10.7) & 8 \ (25.0) & 7 \ (41.2) & 11 \ (40.7) & 11 \ (40.7) & 0.047 \\ {\rm Presence of consolidation, {\rm n} \ (\%)^{*, \dagger, \sharp} & 5 \ (17.9) & 3 \ (9.4) & 10 \ (58.8) & 10 \ (7.3) & 0.001 \\ \end{array}$	WBC (10 [3]/µl), median (IQR)	5.7 (4.7, 7.0)	5.5 (4.2, 6.3)	5.4 (4.5, 6.5)	5.7 (4.3, 7.4)	0.83
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	CRP (mg/dl), median (IQR) <sup>‡,   </sup>	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.2)	0.4 (0.1, 0.9)	0.2 (0.0, 0.9)	< 0.001
$ \begin{array}{cccc} Albumin (g/d), average \pm SD^{\ddagger} & 4.2 \pm 0.3 & 4.3 \pm 0.3 & 4.0 \pm 0.5 & 4.0 \pm 0.3 & 0.002 \\ Radiological findings & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Total protein (g/dl), median (IQR)	7.2 (6.8, 7.5)	7.2 (7.0, 7.5)	7.3 (6.9, 7.7)	7.3 (6.9, 7.7)	0.50
Radiological findings       25 (89.3)/2 (7.1)/       24 (75.0)/6 (18.8)/2       10 (58.8)/7 (41.2)/0 (0.0)       16 (59.3)/9 (33.3)/2 (7.4)       0.10         NB/NB + FC/FC, n (%)       1 (3.6)       (6.3)       11 (40.7)       0.047         Presence of cavities, n (%) */i.\$       3 (10.7)       8 (25.0)       7 (41.2)       11 (40.7)       0.047         Presence of consolidation, n (%) */i.\$       5 (17.9)       3 (9.4)       10 (58.8)       10 (7.3)       0.001	Albumin (g/dl), average $\pm$ SD <sup>‡</sup>	$4.2\pm0.3$	$4.3\pm0.3$	$4.0\pm0.5$	$4.0\pm0.3$	0.002
NB/NB + FC/FC, n (%)         25 (89.3)/2 (7.1)/         24 (75.0)/6 (18.8)/2         10 (58.8)/7 (41.2)/0 (0.0)         16 (59.3)/9 (33.3)/2 (7.4)         0.10           1 (3.6)         (6.3)         1 (3.6)         1 (3.7)         8 (25.0)         7 (41.2)         11 (40.7)         0.047           Presence of consolidation, n (%) */1.5         5 (17.9)         3 (9.4)         10 (58.8)         10 (7.3)         0.001	Radiological findings					
1 (3.6)       (6.3)         Presence of cavities, n (%) * <sup>1,‡</sup> 3 (10.7)       8 (25.0)       7 (41.2)       11 (40.7) <b>0.047</b> Presence of consolidation, n (%) * <sup>1,‡</sup> 5 (17.9)       3 (9.4)       10 (58.8)       10 (7.3) <b>0.001</b>	NB/NB + FC/FC, n (%)	25 (89.3)/2 (7.1)/	24 (75.0)/6 (18.8)/2	10 (58.8)/7 (41.2)/0 (0.0)	16 (59.3)/9 (33.3)/2 (7.4)	0.10
Presence of cavities, n (%) * <sup>1,1,1</sup> 3 (10.7)         8 (25.0)         7 (41.2)         11 (40.7)         0.047           Presence of consolidation, n (%) * <sup>1,1,5,1 ,1</sup> 5 (17.9)         3 (9.4)         10 (58.8)         10 (7.3)         0.001		1 (3.6)	(6.3)			
Presence of consolidation, n (%) *.1.5,   .1 5 (17.9) 3 (9.4) 10 (58.8) 10 (7.3) 0.001	Presence of cavities, n (%) *, <sup>†,‡</sup>	3 (10.7)	8 (25.0)	7 (41.2)	11 (40.7)	0.047
	Presence of consolidation, n (%) *,†.§,   ,¶	5 (17.9)	3 (9.4)	10 (58.8)	10 (7.3)	0.001

BMI, body mass index; FEV<sub>1</sub>, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; NTM, nontuberculous mycobacterium; VAS, visual analog scale; mMRC, modified British Medical Research Council; Hb, hemoglobin; WBC, white blood cell; CRP, C-reactive protein; NB, Nodular bronchiectasis type; FC, Fibrocavitary type. \*The difference between clusters 1 and 2, †clusters 1 and 3, ‡clusters 1 and 4, § clusters 2 and 3, || clusters 2 and 4, ¶ clusters 3 and 4 were statistically significant.

antibiotic treatment other than antimycobacterial agents occurred marginally more frequently in the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group (P = 0.061, Table 5).

The obstructive impairment group was similar to the normal group in terms of subjective symptoms, laboratory data, and radiological findings. The HRQOL scores of the obstructive impairment group were not impaired compared to those of the normal group. Bronchiectasis and nodule scores on CT did not differ among the four groups (Fig. 4(e) and (f)).

We then determined the cutoff values of PFT between each group for the clinical application of the classification. Cluster 1, 2, 3 and 4 were reclassified: Group 1 as patients with %VC  $\geq$  80 and 70  $\leq$  FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC <85, Group 2 as %VC  $\geq$  80 and FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC <70, Group 3 as FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC  $\geq$ 85, and Group 4 as %VC < 80 and FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC <85 (e-Figure 1). The characteristics of each group by reclassification were similar to the results of

cluster classification (e-Table 3 and e-Figure 2).

#### 3.4. Correlation between CT score and other parameters

The result of Spearman's rank correlation test is shown in e-Table 4. High CT total score was correlated with low pulmonary function. Bronchiolitis score was associated with  $\text{FEF}_{25-75\%}$  which indicated the degree of small airway obstruction.  $\text{\%D}_{\text{LCO}}$  was correlated with CT total score, but  $\text{\%D}_{\text{LCO}}/\text{VA}$  was not. Consolidation score was inversely correlated with %VC and BMI but it was not correlated with  $\text{\%FEV}_1$  and  $\text{FEV}_1/\text{FVC}$ .

#### 4. Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to perform a



**Fig. 3.** Average lung volumes and capacities in each cluster. ERV, expiratory reserve volume; FRC, functional residual capacity; RV, residual volume; TLC, total lung capacity; TV, tidal volume.

cluster analysis based on PFT findings in patients with NTM. Clinical data were collected comprehensively, and subjective symptoms, laboratory and radiological findings, and HRQOL were compared among the clusters. Using cluster analysis, patients were divided into four clusters with distinctive features. Two severe phenotypes with different patterns of pulmonary function impairment have been identified.

In this study, FEF<sub>25-75%</sub> was selected as a variable for cluster analysis. Kubo et al. showed that air trapping in CT findings was correlated not with FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC but with FEF<sub>25-75%</sub> [18]. Asakura et al. showed the correlation between FEF<sub>25-75%</sub> and total lung volume or infiltration volume in CT findings, and the negative correlation between FEF<sub>25-75%</sub> and SGRQ score [28]. Because of these findings, FEF<sub>25-75%</sub> was selected as a variable for cluster analysis. In the classification without FEF<sub>25-75%</sub>, obstructive impairment pattern was not classified (e-Table 5). % D<sub>LCO</sub>/VA was a candidate variable for cluster analysis. However, we were concerned that %DLCO/VA was not an appropriate parameter describing lung diffusion capacity of NTM-PD. NTM infection is not diffuse but a focal or multifocal lung disease, and the diffusion capacity of lung regions without abnormalities remains normal. In addition, % D<sub>LCO</sub> is more appropriate to predict pulmonary oxygenation than %  $D_{LCO}/VA$  in interstitial pneumonia [29]. Indeed, in our study,  $D_{LCO}$ was correlated with VAS dyspnea, mMRC and SGRQ total score, but %  $D_{\text{LCO}}/\text{VA}$  was not correlated with them (e-Table 6). For these reasons, %D<sub>LCO</sub>/VA was not selected as a variable for cluster analysis. In cluster classification with %DLCO/VA, obstructive impairment group was not classified, and patients with restrictive pattern were divided into two clusters based on the degree of %D<sub>LCO</sub>/VA (e-Table 7). NTM-PD is thought to initiate in the terminal bronchiole and spreads transbronchially and gradual decline of FEV1 was observed in natural course of NTM-PD patients [30]. Obstructive impairment is an important factor in the assessment of NTM-PD. The classification without %D<sub>LCO</sub>/VA was more clinically useful than that with %D<sub>LCO</sub>/VA because the obstructive impairment group was classified.

In Cluster 4, which is the restrictive pattern with decreased  $FEV_1$  group, the HRQOL were the worst among clusters. It was previously reported that impaired HRQOL in patients with pulmonary NTM was related to a decline in FVC [31]. In our study, this relationship was evident in Cluster 4. Moreover, patients in Cluster 4 showed high serum CRP levels based on laboratory findings. It was reported that the SGRQ

and SF-36 were inversely correlated with CRP in patients with NTM [32]. The worst HRQOL of patients in Cluster 4 could be attributed not only to respiratory dysfunction, but also to inflammation.

In Cluster 3, which comprise the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV1 group, low VC, and high FRC and RV were observed. TLC was preserved in Cluster 3 compared to Cluster 4, although VC was equivalently low in both groups. This PFT pattern is commonly observed in restrictive disorders such as neuromuscular disease and underweight populations [33-36], and the BMI of this group was the lowest among the four groups. Respiratory muscle weakness and chest immobility due to low physical activity are associated with a decline in pulmonary function in patients with low BMI patients [36]. Respiratory muscle weakness and impaired chest mobility cause a decline in cough peak flow [37,38]. Respiratory muscle weakness, physical inactivity, and impaired chest wall mobility are associated with weak cough and impaired secretion clearance [37-39]. In Cluster 3, a high consolidation score in CT findings and a high frequency of bacterial exacerbation were observed. A possible explanation for these results is the impairment of secretion clearance caused by expiratory muscle weakness. In addition, exacerbation of bronchiectasis was associated with high mortality [40] and a decline in lung function [41]. Low BMI was related to disease progression and poor prognosis in patients with NTM [42,43]. Therefore, there was concern about disease progression and poor prognosis of patients in this cluster.

In Cluster 2, which is the obstructive impairment group, the HRQOL was not impaired compared to Cluster 1, the normal group. It was reported that FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEF<sub>25–75%</sub> were inversely correlated with HRQOL score [28]. Clusters 1 and 2 included radiologically early stage patients with NTM-PD. There were no significant differences in laboratory data and CT findings between Clusters 1 and 2; however, the FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC and FEF<sub>25–75%</sub> in Cluster 2 were lower than those in Cluster 1. Assessment of disease progression using PFT may enable the selection of patients with early stage NTM-PD for treatment initiation to maintain HRQOL.

Using the Spearman's rank correlation test between CT score and other parameters, we found that there was a correlation between  $FEF_{25-75\%}$  and bronchiolitis. This result supported  $FEF_{25-75\%}$  as the parameter for identifying small airway obstruction. Consolidation score was correlated with low BMI and %VC, and not correlated with %FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC. This result was compatible with the characteristics of the restrictive pattern with preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group: low BMI, low VC, preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> and high consolidation score.

The results of the comparison of clinical data in the re-classification according to the cutoff values of PFT were similar to those of the cluster classification. Cluster classification is difficult to apply directly to clinical practice because there are no criteria for the four phenotypes. Thus, we re-classified the groups by clarifying the cutoff values of PFT to distinguish among the groups and found that the clarified definition of the groups is sufficient to categorize patients with NTM-PD into four phenotypes.

This study has several limitations. First, this was a cross-sectional study, in which follow-up data were not obtained. Radiological severity was most severe in Clusters 3 and 4, moderate in Cluster 2, and mild in Cluster 1. Two severe disease phenotypes were identified by cluster analysis; however, it was unclear how NTM-PD progressed over time. A longitudinal study is required to determine the clinical course of each cluster. Second, this was a single-center cohort study. Patient characteristics differed among hospitals. This study showed a relatively low rate of underlying bronchial asthma (6.7%) and COPD (4.8%), in contrast to two previous cohorts with higher rates of underlying bronchial asthma (13.7% [44], 33.2% [45]) and COPD (37.3% [44], 25.6% [45]). To generalize the findings of our study, it is necessary to confirm whether the same results can be obtained from other populations. However, this difference in underlying diseases made it possible to compare patient groups with minimal effects of chronic airway disease.

In conclusion, patients with NTM-PD were divided into four phenotypes using cluster analysis based on PFT. Restrictive pattern with



**Fig. 4.** Histogram of CT scores in each cluster. The x-axis in the histogram is the total or each component of CT score. Radiological findings were assessed according to the CT scoring method reported by Kim et al. (Table 1). The median and interquartile range of the score were shown beneath each cluster. \*The score was higher than that of Cluster 1, and <sup>†</sup>Cluster 2.

Comparison of health-related quality of life and other outcomes among four clusters.

	Cluster 1 Normal group	Cluster 2 Obstructive impairment group	Cluster 3 Restrictive pattern with preserved FEV <sub>1</sub> group	Cluster 4 Restrictive pattern with decreased FEV <sub>1</sub> group	<i>P-</i> value
Ν	28	32	17	27	
SGRQ					
Symptom, median (IQR)	29.7 (14.6,	33.8 (19.0, 46.0)	42.1 (19.7, 67.9)	35.6 (26.8, 63.1)	0.13
	44.6)				
Activity, median (IQR)	12.0 (0.0,	21.1 (5.4, 41.7)	41.7 (20.8, 54.1)	30.4 (18.5, 48.3)	0.017
	40.0)				
Impacts, median (IQR)	12.5 (2.7,	9.4 (0.4, 21.7)	23.4 (11.5, 47.7)	22.4 (4.1, 32.3)	0.030
	19.9)				
Total, median (IQR)	14.1 (6.1,	14.6 (8.7, 29.5)	30.2 (18.2, 52.7)	29.5 (16.3, 42.3)	0.010
	27.5)				
SF-36					
Physical functioning, median (IQR)	50.3 (42.1,	51.7 (43.5, 54.4)	46.2 (31.2, 51.7)	46.2 (35.3, 51.7)	0.064
	53.7)				
Role physical, median (IQR)	49.5 (34.3,	52.4 (39.4, 56.7)	48.1 (35.1, 50.9)	45.2 (39.4, 53.8)	0.54
	56.7)				
Bodily pain, median (IQR)	48.9 (39.3,	48.4 (39.3, 53.8)	43.8 (36.6, 55.2)	49.3 (39.3, 61.1)	0.40
	53.8)				
General health, average $\pm$ SD	$45.0 \pm 8.2$	47.8 ± 8.7	$40.9 \pm 5.1$	$43.9 \pm 10.7$	0.059
Vitality, median (IQR)	52.9 (47.8,	51.4 (43.8, 55.9)	49.8 (39.2, 57.5)	49.8 (40.7, 59.0)	0.74
	59.0)	50.1 (40.0 57.7)			0.10
Social functioning, median (IQR)	57.7 (46.4,	52.1 (40.8, 57.7)	46.4 (35.2, 57.7)	46.4 (40.8, 57.7)	0.18
Polo susting 1 and ing (IOP)	57.7)		45 ( (41 0 50 1)	40.4 (04.5.5(.0)	0.00
Role emotional, median (IQR)	45.6 (34.5,	47.5 (42.8, 56.8)	45.6 (41.9, 53.1)	49.4 (34.5, 56.8)	0.89
Montol hoolth modion (IOD)	50.8) 53.0 (40.5			F2 0 (47 0 F0 6)	0.72
Mental heath, median (IQR)	52.0 (49.5,	49.5 (44.4, 01.5)	54.5 (45.7, 59.6)	52.0 (47.0, 59.6)	0.73
Posterial colonization = (0/)	59.0) 1 (2 ()	4 (10 5)	2 (11 0)	6 (22.2)	0.00
Bacterial colonization, il (%)	1(3.0)	4 (12.5)	2 (11.8)	0 (22.2)	0.23
in the past one year, n (%)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.1)	5 (17.7)	1 (3.7)	0.001

FEV<sub>1</sub>, forced expiratory volume in 1 s; SGRQ, St. George's Respiratory Questionnaire; IQR, interquartile range; SF-36, short form 36. SD, standard deviation. There was no significant difference in HRQOL score between clusters in post hoc Steel-Dwass test.

decreased FEV<sub>1</sub> group showed the most severe phenotype in terms of subjective symptoms, laboratory test, radiological findings, and HRQOL. Restrictive pattern in the preserved FEV<sub>1</sub> group was another severe phenotype with distinct features, such as a high consolidation score on chest CT and a high frequency of bacterial exacerbation. HRQOL was maintained in the obstructive impairment group, and PFT may be useful for detecting disease progression in the early phase of NTM-PD.

## 5. Summary conflict of interest statements

None.

## 6. Funding information

No funding was received for this study.

#### 7. Role of sponsors

No funding was received for this study.

## CRediT authorship contribution statement

Nobuyoshi Hamao: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. Isao Ito: Supervision, Resources, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Conceptualization. Issei Oi: Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Conceptualization. Masahiro Shirata: Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Conceptualization. Kensuke Nishioka: Investigation, Data curation. Yasuyuki Hayashi: Investigation, Data curation. Seiichiro Imai: Methodology, Conceptualization. Toyohiro Hirai: Supervision, Conceptualization.

#### Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2024.107600.

## References

- K. Morimoto, K. Iwai, K. Uchimura, et al., A steady increase in nontuberculous mycobacteriosis mortality and estimated prevalence in Japan, Ann Am Thorac Soc 11 (1) (Jan 2014) 1–8, https://doi.org/10.1513/AnnalsATS.201303-067OC.
- [2] M.J. Donohue, L. Wymer, Increasing prevalence rate of nontuberculous mycobacteria infections in five states, 2008-2013, Ann Am Thorac Soc 13 (12) (Dec 2016) 2143–2150, https://doi.org/10.1513/AnnalsATS.201605-353OC.
- [3] K. Morimoto, N. Hasegawa, K. Izumi, et al., A laboratory-based analysis of nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease in Japan from 2012 to 2013, Ann Am Thorac Soc 14 (1) (Jan 2017) 49–56, https://doi.org/10.1513/AnnalsATS.201607-573OC.
- [4] T.K. Marras, P. Chedore, A.M. Ying, F. Jamieson, Isolation prevalence of pulmonary non-tuberculous mycobacteria in Ontario, 1997 2003, Thorax 62 (8) (Aug 2007) 661–666, https://doi.org/10.1136/thx.2006.070797.
- [5] J. Fujita, Y. Ohtsuki, E. Shigeto, et al., Pathological findings of bronchiectases caused by Mycobacterium avium intracellulare complex, Respir. Med. 97 (8) (Aug 2003) 933–938, https://doi.org/10.1016/s0954-6111(03)00120-3.
- [6] Y. Obayashi, J. Fujita, I. Suemitsu, T. Kamei, M. Nii, J. Takahara, Successive followup of chest computed tomography in patients with Mycobacterium aviumintracellulare complex, Respir. Med. 93 (1) (Jan 1999) 11–15, https://doi.org/ 10.1016/s0954-6111(99)90070-7.
- [7] T.S. Kim, W.J. Koh, J. Han, et al., Hypothesis on the evolution of cavitary lesions in nontuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary infection: thin-section CT and histopathologic correlation, AJR Am. J. Roentgenol. 184 (4) (Apr 2005) 1247–1252, https://doi.org/10.2214/ajr.184.4.01841247.
- [8] B.S. Kwon, J.H. Lee, Y. Koh, et al., The natural history of non-cavitary nodular bronchiectatic Mycobacterium avium complex lung disease, Respir. Med. 150 (Apr 2019) 45–50, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2019.02.007.

- [9] J.W. Song, W.J. Koh, K.S. Lee, et al., High-resolution CT findings of Mycobacterium avium-intracellulare complex pulmonary disease: correlation with pulmonary function test results, AJR Am. J. Roentgenol. 191 (4) (Oct 2008) W160, https://doi. org/10.2214/ajr.07.3505.
- [10] K. Maekawa, Y. Ito, T. Oga, et al., High-resolution computed tomography and health-related quality of life in Mycobacterium avium complex disease, Int J Tuberc Lung Dis 17 (6) (Jun 2013) 829–835, https://doi.org/10.5588/ ijtld.12.0672.
- [11] N. Al Jarad, P. Demertzis, D.J. Jones, et al., Comparison of characteristics of patients and treatment outcome for pulmonary non-tuberculous mycobacterial infection and pulmonary tuberculosis, Thorax 51 (2) (Feb 1996) 137–139, https:// doi.org/10.1136/thx.51.2.137.
- [12] L.S. Guthertz, B. Damsker, E.J. Bottone, E.G. Ford, T.F. Midura, J.M. Janda, Mycobacterium avium and Mycobacterium intracellulare infections in patients with and without AIDS, J. Infect. Dis. 160 (6) (Dec 1989) 1037–1041, https://doi. org/10.1093/infdis/160.6.1037.
- [13] M.R. Miller, O.F. Pedersen, P. Lange, J. Vestbo, Improved survival prediction from lung function data in a large population sample, Respir. Med. 103 (3) (Mar 2009) 442–448, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2008.09.016.
- [14] M.D. Eisner, C. Iribarren, E.H. Yelin, et al., Pulmonary function and the risk of functional limitation in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, Am. J. Epidemiol. 167 (9) (May 1 2008) 1090–1101, https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwn025.
- [15] R.P. Young, R. Hopkins, T.E. Eaton, Forced expiratory volume in one second: not just a lung function test but a marker of premature death from all causes, Eur. Respir. J. 30 (4) (Oct 2007) 616–622, https://doi.org/10.1183/ 09031936.00021707.
- [16] D.B. Coultas, D. Mapel, R. Gagnon, E. Lydick, The health impact of undiagnosed airflow obstruction in a national sample of United States adults, Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 164 (3) (Aug 1 2001) 372–377, https://doi.org/10.1164/ airccm.164.3.2004029.
- [17] H.J. Schünemann, J. Dorn, B.J. Grant, W. Winkelstein Jr., M. Trevisan, Pulmonary function is a long-term predictor of mortality in the general population: 29-year follow-up of the Buffalo Health Study, Chest 118 (3) (Sep 2000) 656–664, https:// doi.org/10.1378/chest.118.3.656.
- [18] K. Kubo, Y. Yamazaki, T. Masubuchi, et al., Pulmonary infection with Mycobacterium avium-intracellulare leads to air trapping distal to the small airways, Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 158 (3) (Sep 1998) 979–984, https://doi. org/10.1164/ajrccm.158.3.9802042.
- [19] T. Kobayashi, K. Tsuyuguchi, T. Arai, et al., Change in lung function in neversmokers with nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease: a retrospective study, J Clin Tuberc Other Mycobact Dis 11 (May 2018) 17–21, https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jctube.2018.02.002.
- [20] P. Haldar, I.D. Pavord, D.E. Shaw, et al., Cluster analysis and clinical asthma phenotypes, Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 178 (3) (Aug 1 2008) 218–224, https:// doi.org/10.1164/rccm.200711-1754OC.
- [21] M. Weatherall, J. Travers, P.M. Shirtcliffe, et al., Distinct clinical phenotypes of airways disease defined by cluster analysis, Eur. Respir. J. 34 (4) (Oct 2009) 812–818, https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00174408.
- [22] D.E. Griffith, T. Aksamit, B.A. Brown-Elliott, et al., An official ATS/IDSA statement: diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of nontuberculous mycobacterial diseases, Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 175 (4) (Feb 15 2007) 367–416, https://doi.org/ 10.1164/rccm.200604-571ST.
- [23] H.S. Kim, K.S. Lee, W.J. Koh, et al., Serial CT findings of Mycobacterium massiliense pulmonary disease compared with Mycobacterium abscessus disease after treatment with antibiotic therapy, Radiology 263 (1) (Apr 2012) 260–270, https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.12111374.
- [24] M.R. Miller, J. Hankinson, V. Brusasco, et al., Standardisation of spirometry, Eur. Respir. J. 26 (2) (Aug 2005) 319–338, https://doi.org/10.1183/ 09031936.05.00034805.
- [25] [Guideline of respiratory function tests-spirometry, flow-volume curve, diffusion capacity of the lung], Nihon Kokyuki Gakkai Zasshi Suppl (Nov 2004) 1–56.
- [26] M. Kubota, H. Kobayashi, P.H. Quanjer, H. Omori, K. Tatsumi, M. Kanazawa, Reference values for spirometry, including vital capacity, in Japanese adults calculated with the LMS method and compared with previous values, Respir

Investig 52 (4) (Jul 2014) 242–250, https://doi.org/10.1016/j. resinv.2014.03.003.

- [27] W.J. Jr., Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function, J. Am. Stat. Assoc. (1963) 236–244.
- [28] T. Asakura, Y. Yamada, H. Namkoong, et al., Impact of cavity and infiltration on pulmonary function and health-related quality of life in pulmonary Mycobacterium avium complex disease: a 3-dimensional computed tomographic analysis, Respir. Med. 126 (May 2017) 9–16, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2017.03.010.
- [29] D.A. Kaminsky, T. Whitman, P.W. Callas, DLCO versus DLCO/VA as predictors of pulmonary gas exchange, Respir. Med. 101 (5) (May 2007) 989–994, https://doi. org/10.1016/j.rmed.2006.09.003.
- [30] M.R. Lee, C.Y. Yang, K.P. Chang, et al., Factors associated with lung function decline in patients with non-tuberculous mycobacterial pulmonary disease, PLoS One 8 (3) (2013) e58214, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0058214.
- [31] M. Mehta, T.K. Marras, Impaired health-related quality of life in pulmonary nontuberculous mycobacterial disease, Respir. Med. 105 (11) (Nov 2011) 1718–1725, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2011.08.004.
- [32] T. Asakura, Y. Funatsu, M. Ishii, et al., Health-related quality of life is inversely correlated with C-reactive protein and age in Mycobacterium avium complex lung disease: a cross-sectional analysis of 235 patients, Respir. Res. 16 (Dec 3 2015) 145, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12931-015-0304-5.
- [33] S.M. Kreitzer, N.A. Saunders, H.R. Tyler, R.H. Ingram Jr., Respiratory muscle function in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, Am. Rev. Respir. Dis. 117 (3) (Mar 1978) 437–447, https://doi.org/10.1164/arrd.1978.117.3.437.
- [34] A. De Troyer, S. Borenstein, R. Cordier, Analysis of lung volume restriction in patients with respiratory muscle weakness, Thorax 35 (8) (Aug 1980) 603–610, https://doi.org/10.1136/thx.35.8.603.
- [35] Y. Yamaguchi, S. Hibi, M. Ishii, et al., Pulmonary features associated with being underweight in older men, J. Am. Geriatr. Soc. 59 (8) (Aug 2011) 1558–1560, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03536.x.
- [36] J.G. Do, C.H. Park, Y.T. Lee, K.J. Yoon, Association between underweight and pulmonary function in 282,135 healthy adults: a cross-sectional study in Korean population, Sci. Rep. 9 (1) (Oct 4 2019) 14308, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-50488-3.
- [37] H. Kaneko, A. Suzuki, J. Horie, Relationship of cough strength to respiratory function, physical performance, and physical activity in older adults, Respir. Care 64 (7) (Jul 2019) 828–834, https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.06490.
- [38] A. Yawata, A. Tsubaki, H. Yawata, et al., Voluntary cough intensity and its influencing factors differ by sex in community-dwelling adults, Ther. Adv. Respir. Dis. 11 (12) (Dec 2017) 427–433, https://doi.org/10.1177/1753465817741607.
- [39] C. Perrin, J.N. Unterborn, C.D. Ambrosio, N.S. Hill, Pulmonary complications of chronic neuromuscular diseases and their management, Muscle Nerve 29 (1) (Jan 2004) 5–27, https://doi.org/10.1002/mus.10487.
- [40] J.D. Chalmers, P. Goeminne, S. Aliberti, et al., The bronchiectasis severity index. An international derivation and validation study, Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 189 (5) (Mar 1 2014) 576–585, https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201309-1575OC.
- [41] M.A. Martínez-García, J.J. Soler-Cataluña, M. Perpiñá-Tordera, P. Román-Sánchez, J. Soriano, Factors associated with lung function decline in adult patients with stable non-cystic fibrosis bronchiectasis, Chest 132 (5) (Nov 2007) 1565–1572, https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.07-0490.
- [42] J.A. Hwang, S. Kim, K.W. Jo, T.S. Shim, Natural history of Mycobacterium avium complex lung disease in untreated patients with stable course, Eur. Respir. J. 49 (3) (Mar 2017), https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.00537-2016.
  [43] M. Hayashi, N. Takayanagi, T. Kanauchi, Y. Miyahara, T. Yanagisawa, Y. Sugita,
- [43] M. Hayashi, N. Takayanagi, T. Kanauchi, Y. Miyahara, T. Yanagisawa, Y. Sugita, Prognostic factors of 634 HIV-negative patients with Mycobacterium avium complex lung disease, Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 185 (5) (Mar 1 2012) 575–583, https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201107-1203OC.
  [44] C. Andréjak, V. Thomsen, I.S. Johansen, et al., Nontuberculous pulmonary
- [44] C. Andréjak, V. Thomsen, I.S. Johansen, et al., Nontuberculous pulmonary mycobacteriosis in Denmark: incidence and prognostic factors, Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med. 181 (5) (Mar 1 2010) 514–521, https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.200905-07780C.
- [45] H.O. Kim, K. Lee, H.K. Choi, S. Ha, S.M. Lee, G.H. Seo, Incidence, comorbidities, and treatment patterns of nontuberculous mycobacterial infection in South Korea, Medicine (Baltim.) 98 (45) (Nov 2019) e17869, https://doi.org/10.1097/ md.000000000017869.