1	Real-time breath metabolomics to assess early response to CFTR modulators
2	in adults with cystic fibrosis: an open-label proof-of-concept study
3	
4	Running title: Real-time breath analysis for CF therapy
5	
6	Emmanuelle Bardin, <sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Hélène Salvator, <sup>3,5,6</sup> Camille Roquencourt, <sup>2,3</sup> Elodie Lamy, <sup>2</sup> Nicolas
7	Hunzinger, <sup>2</sup> Isabelle Sermet-Gaudelus, <sup>1,4</sup> Sandra De Miranda, <sup>6</sup> Dominique Grenet, <sup>6</sup> Philippe
8	Devillier, <sup>3,5</sup> Stanislas Grassin-Delyle <sup>2,3</sup>
9	
10	<sup>1</sup> Université Paris Cité, INSERM U1151, CNRS UMR8253, Institut Necker Enfants Malades,
11	Paris, France ; <sup>2</sup> Université Paris-Saclay, UVSQ, INSERM, Infection et inflammation (2I),
12	U1173, Département de Biotechnologie de la Santé, Montigny le Bretonneux, France ; <sup>3</sup> Hôpital
13	Foch, Exhalomics <sup>®</sup> , Suresnes, France ; <sup>4</sup> Hôpital Necker Enfants Malades, Centre de Référence
14	Maladies Rares, Paris, France ; <sup>5</sup> Université Paris-Saclay, UVSQ, UFR Simone Veil-Santé, VIM-
15	Suresnes, UMR0892, Suresnes, France ; <sup>6</sup> Hôpital Foch, Service de pneumologie, CRCM -
16	Centre de Transplantation Pulmonaire, Suresnes, France.
17	
18	Corresponding author: Stanislas Grassin-Delyle; Exhalomics, Hôpital Foch; 40, rue Worth;
19	92150 Suresnes; France; E-mail address: <u>s.grassindelyle@hopital-foch.com</u> ; Phone:
20	+33.1.46.25.73.93.
21	

# 22 ABSTRACT

23 Background: The combination of CFTR modulators ivacaftor/tezacaftor/elexacaftor (ETI) 24 achieves unprecedented improvements in clinical symptoms and respiratory function of people 25 with cystic fibrosis. Yet, evaluation is difficult in people with high baseline lung function and the 26 sweat test may vary depending on the type of CFTR mutation. Exhaled breath is a non-invasive 27 sample, rich in personalised metabolic information and breathomics has emerged as a promising 28 tool to monitor and assess therapeutic response. We hypothesised that ETI induces alterations in 29 the breath composition and that these changes may correlate with clinical readouts. **Methods:** 30 Ten adults initiating ETI were enrolled in a prospective open-label study. Exhaled breath was 31 analysed before, after one week and one month of treatment by real-time, proton transfer 32 reaction-mass spectrometry. Clinical symptoms, lung function and sweat test results were 33 recorded. Results: A total of 29 breath samples were analysed; 108 volatile organic compounds 34 (VOCs) were consistently detected. In responders (8/10), 21 VOCs were significantly modified, 35 mostly hydrocarbons or small carbonyl compounds. At baseline, these VOCs exhibited 36 significantly different concentrations compared to healthy young adults; throughout the first 37 month of treatment, their level in CF breath evolved towards that of healthy volunteers. Eight of 38 these also correlated with variations in lung function. Conclusion: Real-time breath analysis 39 identified alterations in the breath at the early stages of treatment that tended to normalise after 40 one month. These changes exhibited correlations with clinical indicators, suggesting that breath 41 VOCs may serve as early biomarkers useful for treatment monitoring.

- 42 Trial registration: NCT05295524
- 43

44 Keywords: Breathomics; cystic fibrosis; CFTR modulators; real-time mass spectrometry;
45 volatile organic compounds

46

# 47 Key messages:

# 48 What is already known on this topic

- 49 As efficient new generations of treatments are emerging for patients with CF, we are lacking
- 50 early, non-invasive, personalised biomarkers associated with response to therapies. The previous
- 51 generation of CFTR modulators modified the composition of breath within 3 months, yet nothing
- 52 was known about the early impact of the newer combinations.

# 53 What this study adds

- 54 The triple combination of CFTR modulators modifies the composition of breath in people with
- 55 CF as soon as within one week of treatment and tends to normalise basal alterations in CF
- 56 breath. These changes in breath composition may be captured with real-time mass spectrometry
- 57 and correlate with clinical outcomes.

# 58 How this study might affect research, practice or policy

- 59 Real-time breath analysis may become useful in monitoring companion biomarkers associated
- 60 with therapeutic response in patients with CF. Identification of related biological pathways could
- 61 also help to elucidate the mode of action of these drugs.

# 63 BACKGROUND

64 The development of cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) modulators is 65 transforming the therapeutic landscape for patients with cystic fibrosis (CF). The combination of 66 the potentiator ivacaftor with the two correctors tezacaftor and elexacaftor (ETI) achieves 67 unprecedented improvements in lung function and quality of life in eligible patients within a few 68 weeks [1]. Correctors support the intra-cellular processing of misfolded CFTR protein resulting 69 from class II mutations such as p.Phe508Del (F508del thereafter) whilst the potentiator improves 70 the functioning of CFTR channels positioned at the apical side of epithelial cells. In pulmonary 71 cells, the restoration of CFTR activity reinstates the ionic osmotic balance which translates into 72 rehydration of lung-lining fluids and restoration of mucociliary clearance [2]. In Europe, ETI is 73 currently approved for patients with at least one F508del mutation but should soon be extended 74 to 177 rare variants already approved in the US by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) 75 based on an *in vitro* improvement of 10% recovery of CFTR function in Fisher rat thyroid (FRT) 76 cells [3]. In the meantime, regulatory agencies in other countries such as France have allowed 77 temporary compassionate access to ETI to all CF patients not carrying F508del, aged 12 years 78 and older and with advanced CF lung disease, in order to assess possible benefits of the 79 treatment.

80 Since respiratory status still mostly determines prognosis, clinical evaluation of people with CF 81 mainly focuses on respiratory function through the monitoring the forced expiratory volume in 82 one second ( $FEV_1$ ) and forced vital capacity (FVC). However, these endpoints may fail to detect 83 clinical benefit or biological changes in certain cases, for example in people with high baseline 84 lung function and in young children unable to perform lung function tests or, conversely, in 85 people with advanced lung damage [4,5]. Whilst improvement in  $FEV_1$  may be limited in some 86 patients, they are yet likely to experience less exacerbations and to decrease their bacterial load 87 [6] - although long-term studies are still missing on the newest combinations of CFTR

88 modulators –, to normalise their inflammatory status [7] or to improve their nutritional status [8]. 89 Furthermore, there is a growing proportion of patients who have difficulties to expectorate 90 sputum which jeopardizes the detection of pulmonary infections. The measurement of sweat 91 chloride concentration (SCC) often serves as a secondary endpoint in clinical trials as a marker 92 of CFTR activity, yet it does not always correlate with clinical improvement, e.g. in respiratory 93 function and symptoms [9,10]. Therefore, there is a rationale to develop alternative tools to 94 evaluate the effects of novel therapies such as CFTR modulators in patients with a wide range of 95 mutation severity.

96 Over the last 50 years, breathomics extended to various areas of respiratory medicine and 97 emerged as a promising innovative technique. Exhaled breath is a unique biological signature of 98 the individual, rich in personalised information, reflecting subtle changes in the metabolism, and 99 can be obtained non-invasively [11]. Exhaled metabolites, known as volatile organic compounds 100 (VOCs), are thought to result from inflammatory processes, oxidation, or enzymatic reactions, 101 which may be triggered by drugs. They have been linked to pathologies, infection, ageing, 102 environmental exposure or therapeutic interventions [12]. A previous study following up 20 103 F508del-homozygous patients initiating the CFTR modulator dual therapy lumacaftor/ivacaftor 104 reported significant metabolic changes in exhaled breath profiles after three months which 105 persisted at 12 months [13]. Online proton-transfer reaction – mass spectrometry (PTR-MS) is a 106 high-sensitivity, point-of-care technology allowing real-time monitoring of VOCs which has 107 already demonstrated potential for the diagnosis of infectious or cancerous diseases [14–18]. 108 We hypothesised that ETI-induced in-depth lung metabolic modifications could be observed in 109 exhaled breath using real-time PTR-MS and that changes in the volatilomic profiles may be

110 associated with clinical and biological readouts.

111

### 112 METHODS

## 113 Study design

114 We conducted a prospective open-label study at the Foch university hospital (Suresnes, France), 115 enrolling any adult patients with CF (18 years and over) initiating ETI. Patients were 116 participating to the PHEAL-KAFTRIO study, which was approved by an ethics committee 117 (Comité de protection des personnes Sud-Est I, 2021-A03119-32, NCT05295524). All patients 118 provided written informed consent. The study included three visits following up on ETI 119 initiation: before (V1), during the first week (V2) and after one month (V3) of treatment. At each 120 visit, clinical readouts including respiratory functional symptoms (cough, sputum production, 121 dyspnea) and any episodes of exacerbation were recorded. Spirometry outcomes (FEV<sub>1</sub> and FVC 122 in absolute and percentage of predictive values (pp)) were measured according to American 123 Thoracic Society /European Respiratory Society guidelines [19]. Sweat collection was performed using a Macroduct<sup>®</sup> Sweat Collection System according to the recommendations of the European 124 125 Cystic Fibrosis Society Clinical Trial Network [20]. Response to ETI was defined by functional 126 criteria, namely an increase of 10% ppFEV<sub>1</sub> and/or a drop of more than 20 mmol/L in SCC at 127 V3; patients accessing ETI through the compassionate programme were evaluated after two 128 months by an adjudication committee, who decided whether or not to continue the treatment [9].

129

### 130 Breath analysis

At each visit, volatile metabolites in exhaled breath were analysed with real-time mass spectrometry, using a proton-transfer reaction – quadrupole – time-of-flight mass spectrometer (PTR-Qi-TOF MS; Ionicon, Innsbruck, Austria). Patients blew directly into the instrument via a single-use mouthpiece connected to a thermostatically controlled BET-med device, conveying exhaled VOCs into the instrument. The entire procedure is quick (<5min) with minimal requirement of patient cooperation. This method allows the untargeted detection of VOCs

137 according to their mass/charge ratio (m/z) in the range 15-500 m/z. Instrument settings and data 138 processing methodology were the same as previously reported [15,21].

139

# 140 Statistical analysis

141 Longitudinal univariate analyses were performed using a Fischer test and a linear mixed-effect 142 model adjusted for multiple testing thanks to the false discovery rate correction (5% risk). VOC 143 concentrations were compared to those measured with the same method in a separate cohort of 144 healthy young adults (VOC-COMPARE study, NCT06020521). Correlations were assessed 145 through a Pearson correlation test to compare the evolution of VOCs and clinical readouts 146 between timepoints. Multivariate, supervised partial least square – discriminant analysis (PLS-147 DA) was carried out on the Metaboanalyst platform (v6.0) [22] on filtered data (the 5% of 148 variables with the lowest interquartile range were excluded), after log transformation and 149 autoscaling.

150

### 151 **RESULTS**

# 152 Study population and clinical response

153 Ten participants (two females) initiating ETI, median age 34 years (interquartile range (IQR) 154 17), were enrolled in the study from March to December 2022; three patients had compassionate 155 access and two switched from monotherapy ivacaftor (Table 1). One patient had known chronic 156 hepatopathy complicated with portal hypertension and was prescribed a reduced ETI daily dose. 157 At baseline, lung disease stage was variable; all patients were infected with at least one 158 respiratory pathogen (Pseudomonas aeruginosa (5/10), Staphylococcus aureus (5/10)). Seven 159 had daily anti infectious prophylaxis (both inhaled and oral route) throughout the study (Table 160 S1). Over the course of the study, three patients experienced a mild bronchial exacerbation; two

of them were related to a coronavirus disease (COVID-19) infection and required additionalantibiotics (Table S1).

163 At V3, six patients carrying F508del experienced clinical improvement and met clinical response 164 criteria (Table 1). One patient, who was switching from ivacaftor, chose to stop ETI after one 165 month because of insomnia and the absence of significant respiratory improvement despite a 166 +8% gain in ppFEV<sub>1</sub>; his response was deemed inconclusive. Three patients were granted off-167 label access to ETI. Based on clinical outcomes at two months' treatment, the adjudication 168 committee agreed on a lack of response in one patient who discontinued the treatment, one 169 patient showed an early response, and a third patient showed a delayed response with a +10%170 increase in ppFEV1 after two months. Even though response criteria were not met yet at V3 for 171 this patient, we chose to classify him in the responder group, resulting in a total number of 8/10172 responders. Side effects were limited to rash (3/10) and insomnia (1/10). Microbiological 173 cultures in patients able to cough up sputum (8/10) were comparable to that collected at baseline.

174

#### 175 Breath analysis

### 176 *Detection of volatile organic compounds*

A total of 29 breath samples were available from the 10 participants and 108 VOCs were consistently detected. Unsupervised multivariate analysis revealed a homogeneous dataset with no obvious confounding factor, the prevailing source of variability being donors (see principal component analysis plot in Figure S1). Of note, the patient with hepatopathy showed a distinctive profile at every visit compared to the other patients (Figure S1), with some particularly intense VOC signals (see heatmap in Figure S2). Overall, PLS-DA showed a progressive shift of the overall breath profile in responder patients according to visit (Figure 1).

184

### 185 Changes in breath profiles after ETI initiation

186 Longitudinal analysis identified 21 VOCs significantly modified (p-value F-test mixed model 187 <0.05) in all responder patients upon ETI initiation (Table 2, Figure 2). Amongst the 21 modified 188 features, 20 were detected in an independent cohort of young adults and 16 VOCs exhibited 189 different levels in CF patients at baseline compared to healthy volunteers (p < 0.05) (Figure 2 and 190 Figure S3). Changes in the breath of CF patients were observed within the first days of treatment 191 and progressed gradually throughout the first month towards the level measured in healthy 192 volunteers. After one month, 13 VOCs were still differently expressed in CF patients, yet the gap 193 and significance had decreased (Figures 2 and S3).

194

### 195 Annotation of VOC biomarkers

The identification of most features of interest was supported by matching PTR-MS data with data obtained from comprehensive thermal desorption – two-dimensional gas chromatography coupled to time-of-flight mass spectrometry (TD-GCxGC-TOF-MS) analysis on breath samples collected from healthy volunteers (VOC-COMPARE, NCT06020521) and from children with CF (BIO-CFTR, NCT02965326). Propyne (m/z 41.039) and dimethylformamide (m/z 74.063) were amongst the most significant VOCs (p < 0.01) (Figure 2); most of other VOCs were identified as unsaturated hydrocarbons or small carbonyl compounds (Table 2).

203

# 204 Correlations with clinical outcomes

Correlations between the evolution of VOC concentrations on one the hand, and the evolution of ppFEV<sub>1</sub>, ppFVC or SCC on the other hand, were determined. A total of 32 VOCs were significantly associated with the evolution of one or more clinical readouts between V1 and V2 (Table 2). Variations of four and 13 VOCs robustly correlated at both timepoints (V2-V1 and V3-V1) with ppFEV<sub>1</sub> and ppFVC, respectively (statistically significant correlation range  $|r^2|=0.66-0.89$ ). Eight of these were significantly modified upon treatment in responders

211 including VOCs tentatively identified as acetic acid, methylbutene, dimethylformamide,

212 methylpentene, methylsulfanylpropene and methylpropanoic acid (see examples in Figure 2).

213 The number of SCC measurements at V3 was insufficient to reach statistical significance but

there were four VOCs significantly associated with SCC variations between V1 and V2, two of

- these also correlated with variations in ppFEV<sub>1</sub>.
- 216

# 217 **DISCUSSION**

218 This is the first study showing that ETI quickly impacts the breath composition and may 219 contribute to normalise the level of abnormal VOCs in adults with CF. Disease-specific and lung 220 pathogen-related breath signatures were previously reported in CF patients [23-29] but the 221 effects of disease-modifying CFTR modulators have been little explored. Neerincx et al. 222 previously reported changes in the concentration of 51 breath VOCs after three months' 223 lumacaftor/ivacaftor therapy using breath sampling and off-site gas chromatography – mass 224 spectrometry (GC-MS) analysis [13]. Here, we integrate early temporal information to explore 225 the response to ETI therapy, which has replaced previous combinations in most patients, using 226 direct, real-time mass spectrometry. The breath metabolome was quickly and significantly 227 modified throughout the first month, possibly indicating progressive drug-induced biological 228 changes. In addition, VOCs modified by ETI tended to return to levels measured in the healthy 229 population, supporting their relevance as biomarkers of the treatment's action. A few VOCs 230 normalised after one month mirroring a short-term impact of the treatment, whilst others 231 progressed more slowly possibly indicating a delayed effect.

Furthermore, the evolution of several breath VOCs correlated with clinical outcomes which builds upon recent findings by Woollam *et al.* Using GC-MS, they identified a set of VOCs correlating with ppFEV1 in CF patients experiencing pulmonary exacerbations [30]. In our study, eight VOCs significantly modified upon treatment were also consistently (at both V2 and

V3) associated with variations in lung function (ppFEV1 or ppFVC). Modifications within the lung environment such as mucus clearance, shifts in the microbiome, regulation of inflammation and oxidative stress, or restructuring of cell membranes can directly both influence lung mechanical function and alter breath composition. As reported in previous clinical studies [9,31], some patients experience a delayed response or a limited effect on lung function or SCC making it delicate to assess the drug efficacy and emphasising the need for complementary early biomarkers.

Additionally, dysfunctions in other organs are also likely to modulate the breath profile. Aligning with prior research on liver diseases [32], the patient with hepatopathy in the present study manifested a characteristic breath signature.

246 In our responder cohort, 21 VOCs were systematically modified following ETI initiation. ETI's 247 impact on cellular metabolism is not fully elucidated yet, and identification of such metabolites 248 may contribute to a better understanding of its mode of action. Propenal (p=0.03) – also known 249 as acrolein – , acetic acid (p=0.021) and methylpropanoic acid (p=0.048) were decreased. These 250 belong to the large range of carbonyl compounds that can be generated through lipid 251 peroxidation, and which have been repeatedly associated with oxidative stress [33]. Woollam et 252 al. also observed a downregulation of longer aldehydes (octanal and nonanal) in patients treated 253 with CFTR modulators [30]. Another significant VOC, dimethylformamide has been recently 254 associated with dysfunctions in mitochondria [34] and glucose metabolism [35]. Given ETI is 255 suspected to affect mitochondrial function [36], a decrease in dimethylformamide (p=0.005) 256 towards the healthy level may parallel a shift, or even a normalisation, in energy metabolism 257 upon ETI treatment. Finally, saturated hydrocarbons, commonly reported in breath [12], are 258 poorly detected by PTR-MS due to their weak affinity for protons [37]. Nevertheless, several 259 short chain alkens were detected: butene and methylpentene were increased whilst propadiene,

pentadiene and methylbutene were decreased. Decarboxylation of lipids may generate suchbyproducts [38] which also points toward a shift in energy metabolism.

262 Our study has strengths and limitations. First, the PTR-MS technology enables a rapid, point-of-263 care, non-invasive analysis of breath. It requires minimal patient cooperation and time, in 264 contrast to other explorations (spirometry, sweat test...) including breath sampling on desorption 265 tubes for offline analysis. Compared to GC-MS, the traditional gold standard for breath analysis, 266 PTR-MS offers complementary advantages in terms of time efficiency and clinical applicability. 267 By enabling real-time, accurate VOC quantification, PTR-MS eliminates the need for sample 268 collection, transportation, storage and preparation thereby reducing the likelihood of bias, 269 degradation and contamination. It has rapid turn-around time, requirement for consumables is 270 low and does not require qualified personnel. On the other hand, chromatographic separation and 271 electronic impact ionisation make GC-MS a powerful method for sensitive detection and 272 identification of VOCs based on their fragmentation patterns. The main limitations of this proof-273 of-concept study are related to the limited sample size and to some heterogeneity amongst 274 participants. This is due to the fact that the other adult patients from our CF centre were already 275 on ETI at the start of the study thereby preventing comparisons before and after treatment 276 initiation, and because our high-end, point-of-care real time PTR-MS instrument enables direct 277 analysis in a single centre only. Furthermore, data collected after a longer treatment period were 278 not generated. These would help to determine whether the modifications reported here are 279 enduring (as observed in the lumacaftor/ivacaftor study by Neerincx et al. [13]) and the extent to 280 which ETI may normalise breath profiles. Nevertheless, the objectives of the present study were 281 to characterise short-term changes in breath composition after treatment initiation and this cohort 282 illustrates the variety of possible response profiles, including patients with off-label mutations or 283 switching from other CFTR modulator therapies.

Since the majority of patients with CF are already on ETI in Western countries, future validation studies should target other drugs and/or populations. In this perspective, real-time breath analysis could become a quick and non-invasive means for monitoring the exposure to CFTR modulators and bring novel insights into the pathobiology of CF. This approach may also be extended to the clinical evaluation of new drug candidates for CF or of CFTR modulators in non-CF respiratory disorders, such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), asthma and non-CF bronchiectasis [39–41].

291

# 292 CONCLUSIONS

The recent advent of CFTR modulators on the market has brought unprecedented clinical improvements and hopes, but also poorly anticipated challenges, including both short- and longterm monitoring, especially as current tools have limitations for patients with less advanced disease. Real-time breath analysis may provide a quick and non-invasive alternative to monitor exposure to CFTR modulators and respiratory improvements, and could bring novel insight into physiological impact.

299

# 300 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- 301 CF: cystic fibrosis
- 302 CFTR: cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator
- 303 COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
- 304 COVID-19: coronavirus disease
- 305 ETI: elexacaftor, tezacaftor, ivacaftor combination
- 306 FDA: food and drug administration
- 307 FEV<sub>1</sub>: forced expiratory volume in one second
- 308 FRT: fisher rat thyroid

- 309 FVC: forced vital capacity
- 310 GC-MS: gas chromatography mass spectrometry
- 311 IQR: interquartile range
- 312 *m/z*: mass/charge ratio
- 313 PLS-DA: partial least square discriminant analysis
- 314 pp: percentage of predictive values
- 315 PTR-MS: proton-transfer reaction mass spectrometry
- 316 PTR-Qi-TOF MS: proton-transfer reaction quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometer
- 317 SCC: sweat chloride concentration
- 318 TD-GCxGC-TOF-MS: thermal desorption two-dimensional gas chromatography time-of-
- 319 flight mass spectrometry
- 320 VOC(s): volatile organic compound(s)
- 321

## 322 **DECLARATIONS**

# 323 Ethics approval and consent to participate

- 324 Patients were participating to the PHEAL-KAFTRIO study, which was approved by an ethics
- 325 committee (Comité de protection des personnes Sud-Est I, 2021-A03119-32, NCT05295524).
- 326 All patients provided written informed consent.
- 327

# 328 **Consent for publication**

- 329 Not applicable
- 330

## 331 Availability of data and materials

- All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article and its
- 333 supplementary information files.

### 334

# 335 Competing interests

- 336 ISG reports a Vertex Innovation Award, consulting fees and travel support from Vertex
- therapeutics. The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

338

- 339 Funding
- 340 This work was supported by Région Île de France (VolatolHom, SESAME 2016 and
- 341 MeLoMane, DIM 1HEALTH 2019), Fondation Foch, ECFS, CF Europe and Vaincre la
- 342 Mucoviscidose (RC20220503003).

343

### 344 Authors' contributions

- EB, HS, DG, SGD designed the study; SDM, DG were site investigators; CR, HS analysed the
- data; EB, HS, DG, SGD interpreted the data; EB, HS, SGD drafted the manuscript; ISG, PD
- 347 revised the manuscript; all authors read and approved the final manuscript.

348

# 349 Acknowledgments

- 350 The authors wish to acknowledge Thao Nguyen Khoa (Cochin hospital, Paris) for SCC analyses;
- 351 Antoine Bertrand, Pheal company, for assistance in clinical trial promotion; Bedra Bessaidi,
- 352 Beatrice d'Urso and Flavie Barret for technical investigation work.
- 353

### 354 **REFERENCES**

- 355 1 Middleton PG, Mall MA, Dřevínek P, et al. Elexacaftor–Tezacaftor–Ivacaftor for Cystic
- Fibrosis with a Single Phe508del Allele. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;381:1809–19. doi:
- 357 10.1056/NEJMoa1908639

- 358 2 Allen L, Allen L, Carr SB, et al. Future therapies for cystic fibrosis. Nat Commun.
- 359 2023;14:693. doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-36244-2
- 360 3 Costa E, Girotti S, Pauro F, et al. The impact of FDA and EMA regulatory decision-making
- 361 process on the access to CFTR modulators for the treatment of cystic fibrosis. Orphanet J
- 362 *Rare Dis.* 2022;17:188.
- 363 4 Aalbers BL, Mohamed Hoesein FAA, Hofland RW, et al. Radiological and long-term
- 364 clinical response to elexacaftor/tezacaftor/ivacaftor in people with cystic fibrosis with
- advanced lung disease. *Pediatric Pulmonology*. 2023;58:2317–22.
- 366 5 Schütz K, Pallenberg ST, Kontsendorn J, et al. Spirometric and anthropometric
- 367 improvements in response to elexacaftor/tezacaftor/ivacaftor depending on age and lung
- 368 disease severity. *Front Pharmacol*. 2023;14:1171544.
- 369 6 Saluzzo F, Riberi L, Messore B, et al. CFTR Modulator Therapies: Potential Impact on
- Airway Infections in Cystic Fibrosis. *Cells*. 2022;11:1243.
- 371 7 Lepissier A, Bonnel AS, Wizla N, *et al.* Moving the Dial on Airway Inflammation in
- 372 Response to Trikafta® in Adolescents with Cystic Fibrosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.*
- 373 Published Online First: 4 January 2023. doi: 10.1164/rccm.202210-1938LE
- 8 Bass R, Brownell JN, Stallings VA. The Impact of Highly Effective CFTR Modulators on
- Growth and Nutrition Status. *Nutrients*. 2021;13:2907.
- 376 9 Dreano E, Burgel PR, Hatton A, et al. Theratyping Cystic Fibrosis patients to guide
- 377 Elexacaftor-Tezacaftor-Ivacaftor out of label prescription. *European Respiratory Journal*.
- 378 Published Online First: 1 January 2023. doi: 10.1183/13993003.00110-2023
- 379 10 Fidler MC, Beusmans J, Panorchan P, et al. Correlation of sweat chloride and percent
- 380 predicted FEV1 in cystic fibrosis patients treated with ivacaftor. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*.

381 2017;16:41–4.

- 382 11 Ibrahim W, Carr L, Cordell R, et al. Breathomics for the Clinician: The use of volatile
- 383 organic compounds in respiratory diseases. *Thorax*. 2021;76:514–21.
- 384 12 Drabińska N, Flynn C, Ratcliffe N, et al. A literature survey of all volatiles from healthy
- human breath and bodily fluids: the human volatilome. *J Breath Res*. 2021;15:034001. doi:
- 386 10.1088/1752-7163/abf1d0
- 387 13 Neerincx AH, Whiteson K, Phan JL, et al. Lumacaftor/ivacaftor changes the lung
- microbiome and metabolome in cystic fibrosis patients. *ERJ Open Res.* 2021;7:00731–2020.
- 389 doi: 10.1183/23120541.00731-2020
- 390 14 Grassin-Delyle S, Roquencourt C, Moine P, et al. Metabolomics of exhaled breath in
- 391 critically ill COVID-19 patients: A pilot study. *EBioMedicine*. 2021;63:103154.
- 392 15 Roquencourt C, Salvator H, Bardin E, et al. Enhanced real-time mass spectrometry breath
- analysis for the diagnosis of COVID-19. ERJ Open Research. Published Online First: 1
- 394 January 2023. doi: 10.1183/23120541.00206-2023
- 395 16 Li J, Zhang Y, Chen Q, et al. Development and validation of a screening model for lung
- 396 cancer using machine learning: A large-scale, multi-center study of biomarkers in breath.
- *Front Oncol.* 2022;12:975563.
- 398 17 Bajtarevic A, Ager C, Pienz M, *et al.* Noninvasive detection of lung cancer by analysis of
  399 exhaled breath. *BMC Cancer*. 2009;9:348.
- 400 18 Jung YJ, Seo HS, Kim JH, et al. Advanced Diagnostic Technology of Volatile Organic
- 401 Compounds Real Time analysis Analysis From Exhaled Breath of Gastric Cancer Patients
- 402 Using Proton-Transfer-Reaction Time-of-Flight Mass Spectrometry. *Front Oncol.*
- 403 2021;11:560591.
- 404 19 Stanojevic S, Vukovojac K, Sykes J, *et al.* Projecting the impact of delayed access to
- 405 elexacaftor/tezacaftor/ivacaftor for people with Cystic Fibrosis. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*.
- 406 2020;S1569199320308092.

- 407 20 Castellani C, Duff AJA, Bell SC, et al. ECFS best practice guidelines: the 2018 revision.
- 408 *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*. 2018;17:153–78.
- 409 21 Roquencourt C, Grassin-Delyle S, Thévenot EA. ptairMS: real-time processing and analysis
- 410 of PTR-TOF-MS data for biomarker discovery in exhaled breath. *Bioinformatics*.
- 411 2022;38:1930–7.
- 412 22 Pang Z, Lu Y, Zhou G, et al. MetaboAnalyst 6.0: towards a unified platform for
- 413 metabolomics data processing, analysis and interpretation. *Nucleic Acids Research*.
- 414 2024;gkae253.
- 415 23 Barker M, Hengst M, Schmid J, et al. Volatile organic compounds in the exhaled breath of
- 416 young patients with cystic fibrosis. *Eur Respir J.* 2006;27:929–36. doi:
- 417 10.1183/09031936.06.00085105
- 418 24 Licht J-C, Seidl E, Slingers G, et al. Exhaled breath profiles to detect lung infection with
- 419 Staphylococcus aureus in children with cystic fibrosis. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*.
- 420 2023;22:888–93.
- 421 25 Weber R, Perkins N, Bruderer T, et al. Identification of Exhaled Metabolites in Children
- 422 with Cystic Fibrosis. *Metabolites*. 2022;12:980.
- 423 26 Kos R, Brinkman P, Neerincx AH, et al. Targeted exhaled breath analysis for detection of
- 424 Pseudomonas aeruginosa in cystic fibrosis patients. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*. 2022;21:e28–
- 425 34.
- 426 27 Gaisl T, Bregy L, Stebler N, *et al.* Real-time exhaled breath analysis in patients with cystic
  427 fibrosis and controls. *J Breath Res.* 2018;12:036013.
- 428 28 Barucha A, Mauch RM, Duckstein F, et al. The potential of volatile organic compound
- 429 analysis for pathogen detection and disease monitoring in patients with cystic fibrosis.
- 430 *Expert Rev Respir Med.* Published Online First: 19 July 2022. doi:
- 431 10.1080/17476348.2022.2104249

432	29	Weber R, Haas N, Baghdasaryan A, et al. Volatile organic compound breath signatures of
433		children with cystic fibrosis by real-time SESI-HRMS. ERJ Open Res. 2020;6:00171-2019.
434	30	Woollam M, Siegel AP, Grocki P, et al. Preliminary method for profiling volatile organic
435		compounds in breath that correlate with pulmonary function and other clinical traits of
436		subjects diagnosed with cystic fibrosis: a pilot study. J Breath Res. 2022;16. doi:
437		10.1088/1752-7163/ac522f
438	31	Heijerman HGM, McKone EF, Downey DG, et al. Efficacy and safety of the elexacaftor
439		plus tezacaftor plus ivacaftor combination regimen in people with cystic fibrosis
440		homozygous for the F508del mutation: a double-blind, randomised, phase 3 trial. The
441		Lancet. 2019;394:1940-8. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32597-8
442	32	De Vincentis A, Vespasiani-Gentilucci U, Sabatini A, et al. Exhaled breath analysis in
443		hepatology: State-of-the-art and perspectives. World J Gastroenterol. 2019;25:4043-50.
444	33	Sutaria SR, Gori SS, Morris JD, et al. Lipid Peroxidation Produces a Diverse Mixture of
445		Saturated and Unsaturated Aldehydes in Exhaled Breath That Can Serve as Biomarkers of
446		Lung Cancer—A Review. Metabolites. 2022;12:561. doi: 10.3390/metabo12060561
447	34	Fei C-F, Guo S-M, Yin Y, et al. Exposure of mouse oocytes to N,N-dimethylformamide
448		impairs mitochondrial functions and reduces oocyte quality. Environ Toxicol. 2022;37:1563-
449		74.
450	35	Pan L, Chang P, Jin J, et al. Dimethylformamide Inhibits Fungal Growth and Aflatoxin B1
451		Biosynthesis in Aspergillus flavus by Down-Regulating Glucose Metabolism and Amino
452		Acid Biosynthesis. Toxins (Basel). 2020;12:683.
453	36	Aridgides DS, Mellinger DL, Gwilt LL, et al. Comparative effects of CFTR modulators on
454		phagocytic, metabolic and inflammatory profiles of CF and nonCF macrophages. Sci Rep.
455		2023;13:11995. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-38300-9

- 456 37 Blake RS, Monks PS, Ellis AM. Proton-transfer reaction mass spectrometry. *Chem Rev.*
- 457 2009;109:861–96.
- 458 38 Monteiro RRC, da Silva SSO, Cavalcante CL, *et al.* Biosynthesis of alkanes/alkenes from
- 459 fatty acids or derivatives (triacylglycerols or fatty aldehydes). *Biotechnology Advances*.
- 460 2022;61:108045.
- 461 39 Solomon GM, Fu L, Rowe SM, et al. The therapeutic potential of CFTR modulators for
- 462 COPD and other airway diseases. *Curr Opin Pharmacol.* 2017;34:132–9.
- 463 40 Rowe SM, Jones I, Dransfield MT, *et al.* Efficacy and Safety of the CFTR
- 464 Potentiator Icenticaftor (QBW251) in COPD: Results from a Phase 2 Randomized Trial. Int
- 465 *J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis.* 2020;15:2399–409.
- 466 41 Patel SD, Bono TR, Rowe SM, et al. CFTR targeted therapies: recent advances in cystic
- 467 fibrosis and possibilities in other diseases of the airways. *Eur Respir Rev.* 2020;29:190068.
- 468 42 Kuo T-C, Tan C-E, Wang S-Y, *et al.* Human Breathomics Database. *Database*.
- 469 2020;2020:baz139.

Patient		01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
Sex		F	М	М	М	М	М	Μ	М	F	М
Age range (y)		26-30	41-45	36-40	31-35	51-55	31-35	21-25	46-50	21-25	66-70
Genotype		F508del/	F508del/	F508del/	F508del/	S945L(exon15)	3120G>A/	N1303K/	F508del/	F508del/	F508del/
		S1255P	F508del	F508del	S945L	/ I601F	3120G>A	N1303K	E92K	I148T	3849+10kbC>T
CFTR		Ivacaftor	-	-	-	Ivacaftor	Ivacaftor -		-	-	-
modulator											
treatment at	t V1										
Therapy acc	ess	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Off-label	Off-label	Off-label	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible
Sweat	<b>V1</b>	15	Failed	92	100	24.5	106	96	92.5	100	64
chloride	<b>V2</b>	<10	ND	17	60	28.5	124	93	38	51.5	32.5
(mmol/L)	<b>V3</b>	ND	ND	ND	58.5	<10	100.5	108	21.5	52	44
ppFEV1	<b>V1</b>	35	54	120	80	24	30	18	67	87	76
(%)	<b>V2</b>	38	66	129	91	25	28	20	74	96	78
	<b>V3</b>	43	80	137	94	25	28	21	77	96	87
ppFVC	<b>V1</b>	64	61	125	89	63	48	55	88	99	80
(%)	<b>V2</b>	68	94	128	99	51	46	61	91	103	81
	<b>V3</b>	71	103	124	100	52	46	72	94	105	91
Clinical			Cough	Cough	Cough	Fatigue		Dyspnea	Cough	Cough	Cough
improvement			Dyspnea	Sputum	Sputum	Sputum		Sputum	Dyspnea	Dyspnea	Dyspnea
at V3			+3kg		+5kg	+1kg		+1kg	Sputum	Sputum	+2kg
<b>Response to</b>	ETI	Inconclusive	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ETI		at one	No	No	No	No	at two	No	No	No	No
interruption		month					months				

**Table 1.** Cohort characteristics and clinical readouts during the study.

V1: baseline; V2: week 1; V3: month 1 of ETI treatment. ppFEV<sub>1</sub>: percent predicted in forced expiratory volume in 1 second; ppFVC: percent

predicted in forced vital capacity; ND = Not done.

	Longitudinal <i>p</i> -value	Longitudinal slope%	Correlation coefficients							
	All regressed are (n. 8)		ppFEV1 ppFVC Sweat chloride							
m/z	All respon	II responders (II=8)		(V3-V1)	(V2-V1)	(V3-V1)	(V2-V1)	(V3-V1)	Ion formula	Tentative annotations <sup>#</sup>
41.04	0.002**	-0.13							$[C_{3}H_{4}+H]^{+}$	Propadiene, propyne
41.05	$0.017^{*}$	-0.23								Unknown 1
43.02	$0.014^{*}$	-0.21	-0.75*	-0.39	$-0.79^{*}$	-0.78**	0.67	-0.21		Unknown 2
45.00	0.021*	+0.06							$[CO_2+H]^+$	Carbon dioxide
55.04	0.002**	-0.1								Unknown 3
56.06			-0.54	-0.46	-0.83**	-0.59	-0.13	-0.53		Unknown 4
57.03	0.030*	-0.18							$[C_3H_4O+H]^+$	Propenal
57.07	0.045	+0.11							$[C_4H_8+H]^+$	Butene
58.07	*		0.72*	0.58	0.46	0.42	-0.72*	0.07		Unknown 5
61.03	0.021	-0.21	-0.74	-0.27	-0.78	-0.71	0.66	-0.30	$[C_2H_4O_2+H]^+$	Acetic acid
61.05	0.008**	-0.18	-0.68	-0.17	-0.69	-0.56	0.59	-0.03		Unknown 6
63.04	0.004	-0.14			*	*				Unknown 7
67.07	*		0.53	0.53	0.74*	0.67*	-0.18	0.76		Unknown 8
69.07	0.019*	-0.12			. de de	de de de			$[C_5H_8+H]^+$	Pentadiene
71.05			-0.56	-0.58	-0.89**	-0.89***	0.70	-0.42	$\left[C_{4}H_{6}O+H\right]^{+}$	Butenal
71.09	0.037*	-0.17	-0.47	-0.60	-0.84**	-0.86**	0.22	-0.01	$[C_5H_{10}+H]^+$	Methylbutene
71.11			0.81**	$0.66^{*}$	0.66	0.40	-0.79*	-0.70		Unknown 9
73.02			0.39	0.43	$0.72^{*}$	0.03	-0.02	-0.82	$[C_{3}H_{4}O_{2}+H]^{+}$	Oxopropanal, propanedial
73.06			-0.51	-0.70	-0.87**	-0.84**	0.57	0.52	$[C_4H_8O+H]^+$	Butanone
73.09			-0.52	-0.73	-0.86**	-0.78**	0.4	0.82		Unknown 10
74.06	0.005**	-0.17	-0.43	-0.56	-0.68*	-0.80**	0.45	-0.37	$[C_3H_7NO+H]^+$	Dimethylformamide
75.07	$0.048^{*}$	-0.17								Unknown 11
79.04	$0.025^{*}$	-0.21	-0.74*	-0.29	-0.83**	-0.69*	0.69	-0.27		Unknown 12
79.05			-0.61	0.33	-0.69*	-0.02	0.20	-0.17	$[C_6H_6+H]^+$	Benzene
79.08	0.019*	-0.22								Unknown 13
80.05			-0.53	-0.50	-0.86**	-0.31	0.36	0.29	$\left[C_{5}H_{5}N+H\right]^{+}$	Pyridine
81.07			0.62	-0.50	0.33	-0.20	-0.73*	0.29	$[C_6H_8+H]^+$	Methylpentenyne, methylcyclopentadiene,

**Table 2**. VOCs significantly modified upon ETI treatment and/or correlated with variations in clinical readouts.

										cyclohexadiene
85.10	0.041*	+0.06	$0.72^{*}$	$0.76^{*}$	0.40	0.53	-0.59	-0.49	$[C_6H_{12}+H]^+$	Methylpentene, hexene
85.13			$0.71^{*}$	$0.64^{*}$	0.59	0.73	-0.43	0.20		Unknown 14
88.08			0.66	0.77	$0.99^{***}$	0.3	-0.45	-0.41	$[C_4H_9NO+H]^+$	2-methylpropanamide
89.04	$0.047^*$	-0.25	-0.58	-0.34	$-0.78^{*}$	-0.76*	0.42	-0.04	$\left[C_{4}H_{8}S+H\right]^{+}$	Methylsulfanylpropene
89.06	$0.048^{*}$	-0.28	-0.55	-0.59	-0.89**	-0.89***	0.62	-0.32	$[C_4H_8O_2+H]^+$	Methylpropanoic acid, ethyl acetate
89.09			-0.55	-0.63	-0.88**	-0.88***	0.50	-0.04	$\left[C_{5}H_{12}O{+}H\right]^{+}$	Pentanol
99.12			$0.68^{*}$	$0.67^{*}$	0.43	0.59	-0.51	0.17	$[C_7H_{14}+H]^+$	Dimethylpentene, heptene
107.08			-0.56	-0.49	-0.85**	-0.80**	0.44	0.13	$[C_8H_{10}+H]^+$	Ethylbenzene
113.06			-0.74*	-0.17	-0.41	-0.30	0.70	-0.28		Unknown 15
113 13			0.84**	0.41	0.62	0.40	-0.47	0.06	$[C_{+}H_{+}+H]^{+}$	Dimethylhexene, methylheptene, octene,
115.15			0.84	0.41	0.02	0.40	-0.47	0.00	[0811]6+11]	methylmethylidenehexane, methylideneheptane
119.09	$0.012^{*}$	-0.14							$[C_9H_{10}+H]^+$	Propenylbenzene, ethenylmethylbenzene
127.15			$0.74^{*}$	0.36	0.41	0.23	-0.42	-0.14	$[C_9H_{18}+H]^+$	Nonene
135.11			0.66	0.82	$0.85^{**}$	0.57	-0.45	-0.28	$[C_6H_{14}O_3+H]^+$	Ethoxyethoxyethanol
137.13			0.60	-0.68	0.28	-0.46	$-0.72^{*}$	0.24	$[C_{10}H_{16}+H]^+$	Dimethyloctatriene
139.08	$0.047^{*}$	-0.14							$[C_8H_{10}O_2+H]^+$	2-phenoxyethanol
139.15			0.60	0.54	$0.85^{**}$	0.49	-0.68	-0.61	$[C_{10}H_{18}+H]^+$	Dimethyloctadiene,
177.16			-0.49	-0.03	-0.69*	0.06	0.30	0.38	$[C_{13}H_{20}+H]^+$	Heptylbenzene

*p*-value obtained with a mixed model built with patients responding to ETI; longitudinal slope indicates the direction of the evolution;

correlations are calculated between variations in VOC concentrations (between V1 and V2 or between V1 and V3) and variations in clinical readouts; <sup>#</sup>tentative chemical identification is based on exact mass match with the human breathomics database [42], likelihood of compound ionisation by proton transfer reaction [37], and detection by TD-GCxGC-MS in the breath of healthy adults and/or of children with CF (VOCs in bold); \*p-value<0.05; \*\*p-value<0.01; \*\*\*p-value<0.001.

# **FIGURE LEGENDS**

**Figure 1**. PLS-DA showing the distribution of breath samples collected from responder patients at baseline in red (V1), after one week in green (V2), and one month of ETI treatment in blue (V3); dashed lines link samples taken from the same patient; \* indicates the patient with chronic hepatopathy; shaded areas represent confidence intervals (95%); R2=0.997; Q2=0.187.

**Figure 2.** Longitudinal evolution from baseline (V1), one week (V2), and one month of treatment (V3), of four VOCs significantly modified in the breath of responder patients upon ETI initiation, compared to the level measured in healthy volunteers (normalised intensities) (**A**). Corresponding graphs illustrating correlations (Pearson) between variations in VOCs and variations in ppFVC or ppFEV1 between V1 and V2, and between V1 and V3, are shown (**B**). \**p*-value<0.05; \*\**p*-value<0.01; \*\*\**p*-value<0.001; \*\*\**p*-value<0.001; ns = not significant.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Patients	Chronic anti-infectious treatments	Acute respiratory infections and other antibiotics received during the study
01	Azithomycin, oral	COVID-19, treatment with amoxicillin
	Tobramycine and aztreonam, inhaled	and ciprofloxacin
02	Azithromycin, oral	
03	None	None
04	None	None
05	Azithromycin, oral	
	Pristinamycin and amoxicillin-	
	calvulanic acid, oral	
06	Azithromycin, oral	
07	Azithromycin, oral	COVID-19, treatment with ceftazidim
	Tobramycin and colimycin, inhaled	and docycyline
08	Azithromycin, oral	
09	None	None
10	Azithromycin, oral	Viral syndrom

Table S1. List of concomitant treatments and bronchial exacerbations during the study.

**Figure S1**. Principal component analysis (PCA) representing the breath samples collected from each patient at baseline (V1), after one week (V2) and one month of ETI treatment (V3).

**Figure S2**. Heatmap of the log-transformed concentrations (ppb) of the 108 VOCs detected in the breath of the 10 patients at V1/V2/V3.

**Figure S3.** Longitudinal evolution from baseline (V1), one week (V2), and one month of treatment (V3), of additional VOCs, significantly modified in the breath of responder patients upon ETI initiation, compared to the level measured in healthy volunteers (normalised intensities). \**p*-value<0.05; \*\**p*-value<0.01; \*\*\**p*-value<0.001; \*\*\**p*-value<0.001; ns = not significant.

# Figure 1

Scores Plot PLS-DA



# Figure 2



Figure S1



Scores Plot PCA

Figure S2





ETI response 🔶 No 🔶 Yes 🔶 unconclusive

