Check for updates

REVIEW

Understanding nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease: it's been a long time coming [version 1; peer review: 4 approved]

David E. Griffith¹, Timothy R. Aksamit²¹University of Texas Health Science Center at Tyler, Tyler, Texas, USA²Mayo Clinic, Pulmonary Disease and Critical Care Medicine, Rochester, Minnesota, USA

V1 First published: 30 Nov 2016, 5(F1000 Faculty Rev):2797
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.9272.1>

Latest published: 30 Nov 2016, 5(F1000 Faculty Rev):2797
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.9272.1>

Abstract

With a surprising predictability, most studies and reviews addressing therapy for nontuberculous mycobacterial (NTM) lung disease either start or end by mentioning the paucity of data from randomized and controlled trials. That is a legitimate criticism for NTM lung disease therapy, but it also somehow seems to influence attitudes toward all aspects of NTM investigation. Certainly the study of NTM diseases in general and NTM lung disease in particular is a recent development. Previously, NTM were viewed as minor, if inconvenient, pathogens similar to *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. However, over the last three decades, NTM have emerged as increasingly important pathogens that are clearly different compared with tuberculosis. Although there has been frustratingly slow progress in the treatment of NTM diseases, in contrast there has unquestionably been impressive progress in almost every other realm of investigation into NTM disease. Our understanding of NTM lung disease a) pathophysiology, including mechanisms of organism acquisition, b) epidemiology, including estimates of disease prevalence, c) mycobacteriology, including application of molecular laboratory techniques and matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization–time of flight (MALDI–TOF) mass spectrometry, and d) even treatment strategies, including the recognition of innate drug resistance mechanisms, has immeasurably and permanently changed and advanced the landscape for NTM lung disease. It is no longer necessary to apologize for the state of NTM lung disease knowledge and understanding, but rather it is time to recognize the great distance we have travelled over the last 30 years.

Keywords

Nontuberculous , mycobacterial , lung disease ,

Open Peer Review

Approval Status

	1	2	3	4
version 1
30 Nov 2016				

Faculty Reviews are review articles written by the prestigious Members of **Faculty Opinions**. The articles are commissioned and peer reviewed before publication to ensure that the final, published version is comprehensive and accessible. The reviewers who approved the final version are listed with their names and affiliations.

1. **Won-Jung Koh**, Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine, Seoul, South Korea
2. **Anne O'Donnell**, Georgetown University Hospital, Washington DC, USA
3. **Jeffrey Glassroth**, University of Chicago, Chicago, USA
4. **Adrian M. Zelazny**, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, USA

Any comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

Corresponding author: David E. Griffith (david.griffith@uthct.edu)

Competing interests: The authors have no real or potential conflicts of interest to declare.

Grant information: The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

Copyright: © 2016 Griffith DE and Aksamit TR. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Griffith DE and Aksamit TR. **Understanding nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease: it's been a long time coming [version 1; peer review: 4 approved]** F1000Research 2016, 5(F1000 Faculty Rev):2797 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.9272.1>

First published: 30 Nov 2016, 5(F1000 Faculty Rev):2797 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.9272.1>

Introduction

In a candid indictment of the state of nontuberculous mycobacterial (NTM) lung disease knowledge, a friend, colleague, and respected NTM disease expert recently commented that he thought we had “learned nothing in the last 30 years” about NTM lung disease. The comment was made in the context of ongoing efforts to revise NTM lung disease treatment guidelines. We suspect his intent was due to frustration with the painfully slow progress of NTM lung disease therapy, the paucity of effective antibiotic agents for NTM, and a lack of randomized treatment trials for determining which of the available under-achieving agents are most effective. We don’t believe he literally meant that “nothing” had been learned about NTM disease in three decades, but we were surprised by the number of our colleagues who also heard his statement and apparently shared his frustration, as demonstrated by their approving nods. Our colleague’s statement stimulated our own sober reflections about where we are and where we have been with NTM lung disease over the last three decades.

In many ways, the evolution of NTM lung disease knowledge and understanding has been a struggle to separate and differentiate NTM pathogens from *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (MTB). The more we know about NTM respiratory pathogens, the less MTB is a pertinent model for them in the realm of therapy. Unfortunately, disseminating that message to the clinicians caring for NTM disease patients is a slow and frustrating process¹.

Species identification

Thirty years ago, NTM organisms were identified and classified using slow and insensitive phenotypic criteria that relied on colony morphology and patterns of biochemical metabolism^{2,3}. This classification system was eponymously labeled the Runyon classification system after Dr Ernest H. Runyon, who organized and promoted this important early NTM classification system. Thirty years ago, the total number of recognized NTM species was approximately 40–50^{4,5}. Clinically isolated NTM identification rapidly improved in terms of both speed and accuracy with the application of high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) and the introduction of molecular laboratory methods, including DNA probes (which were also used for early identification of MTB) and gene sequencing techniques^{6–9}. Both HPLC and DNA probes had limited utility and were restricted to identification of the most frequently isolated NTM species. NTM species identification rapidly expanded in an unprecedented manner with the widespread application of 16S rRNA gene sequencing, a gene thought to be highly preserved within NTM species¹⁰. Largely on the basis of this technique, the number of recognized NTM species has grown to nearly 200. It is also now apparent that the 16S rRNA gene is not as well preserved within species as assumed so that it is unfortunately not always a satisfactory or accurate arbiter of NTM species status^{10,11}. The process of organism identification through gene sequencing has expanded well beyond 16S rRNA sequencing and become so sophisticated that discriminating between many NTM species requires either multi-gene sequencing or whole-genome sequencing¹⁰. Interestingly, it is still not established how much difference in whole-genome sequencing is necessary for species differentiation¹⁰. Additionally, molecular laboratory methods have provided not only rapid and accurate identification of clinical NTM isolates but also windows into innate NTM antibiotic resistance mechanisms (see below).

Organism genotyping has also proven to be a useful tool for evaluating environmental niches of NTM, thereby providing insights into routes of NTM pathogen acquisition^{12,13}. This technique also allows discrimination between true disease relapses and (presumed) reinfection¹⁴.

The use of molecular laboratory methods has so completely changed the way we see NTM lung pathogens and disease that the advances have outstripped the ability and capacity of most mycobacterial laboratories to adopt these invaluable techniques. Currently, most mycobacterial laboratories in the U.S. do not utilize the new and sophisticated molecular methods or matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization–time of flight (MALDI–TOF) mass spectrometry so that NTM species identification outside of the most common species requires referral of NTM isolates to a few U.S. reference mycobacteriology laboratories.

Prevalence

Thirty years ago, the limited understanding of NTM disease epidemiology in the U.S. was based on isolation prevalence of NTM isolates sent to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for processing^{15,16}. Pulmonary NTM disease was and still remains a non-reportable disease, so the isolates received by the CDC were submitted voluntarily and serendipitously rather than as part of an organized or comprehensive national survey of NTM isolates. With this poorly defined and random approach, U.S. NTM disease prevalence was estimated to be 1–2 cases/100,000 population¹⁵. It is noteworthy that at the time there were few comparable estimates for NTM lung disease in most of the rest of the world.

The major impediment to more accurate NTM lung disease prevalence is the well-recognized observation that, contrary to MTB, a single NTM isolate is not necessarily indicative of active NTM lung disease^{5,17–20}. Unlike MTB, simple isolation prevalence of an NTM species from respiratory specimens does not indicate the actual lung disease prevalence associated with that NTM species. Patients must meet diagnostic criteria, which are sometimes difficult to ascertain in retrospect without detailed evaluation of the patient’s medical record. Investigators have begun to surmount this formidable obstacle in two ways. First, a few investigators have performed the tedious and labor-intensive retrospective analysis of patient medical records, which is necessary for accurate NTM case definition^{21–23}. Second, investigators have utilized other epidemiologic tools and approaches such as querying extensive patient databases, including those from Medicare and large HMOs^{24–26}. While acquiring data through mandatory NTM disease reporting is still the goal for NTM lung disease epidemiology research, current estimates of NTM lung disease prevalence in the U.S. are now much more reliably informative and suggest that NTM lung disease prevalence may be as high as 50 cases/100,000 population in some demographic groups²³. Equally as important, investigators in many parts of the world are using similar innovative approaches so that a clearer picture of global NTM lung disease prevalence is emerging^{26,27}. Many parts of the developing world remain largely unexplored from an NTM epidemiologic standpoint, but even those areas are becoming more accessible through the expanding use of rapid and accurate tools for TB diagnosis, such as the Xpert MTB/RIF technology^{28–30}. This technology provides a first approximation of NTM disease prevalence by identifying patients who are acid fast bacilli (AFB)

smear positive but nucleic acid amplification negative for TB. Similarly, Xpert MTB/RIF can help differentiate patients with NTM infection after TB therapy from patients with recurrent TB. As this technology spreads, the extent of NTM disease in the developing world will be illuminated further and very likely will prove to be significantly more common than is currently appreciated.

Pathophysiology

Thirty years ago, almost nothing was known about NTM disease pathophysiology, as it was assumed to be analogous to TB with the exception that NTM lung disease pathogens were known not to be transmitted between humans. It was known that NTM were environmental organisms with environmental niches, including natural water sources³¹. Some investigators speculated that naturally occurring aerosolization of the organism with subsequent inhalation was the major route of NTM lung pathogen acquisition by humans³².

More recently, there has been repeated demonstration of NTM respiratory pathogens from multiple environmental sources including household or municipal water^{12,13,33}. Further, as alluded to previously, through the utilization of organism genotyping techniques, it has also been shown that some patients with NTM lung disease have NTM respiratory isolates that are genotypically identical to NTM isolates from household or municipal water¹³. These data provide persuasive evidence that household water is the source of NTM respiratory pathogens for some patients with NTM lung disease, especially *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) lung disease associated with bronchiectasis¹³. The only environmentally identified niche for *Mycobacterium kansasii* is municipal water¹⁷ so that household water is the likely source of human infection for this organism as well. In addition to aiding our understanding of NTM lung disease pathophysiology, the recognition of NTM in municipal/household water and the demonstration of NTM acquisition from these sources create opportunities for the development of prevention strategies.

Molecular epidemiology techniques have also recently provided the first evidence consistent with human-to-human transmission of an NTM respiratory pathogen^{11,34,35}. The dogma for NTM respiratory pathogens has been that they cannot be acquired from exposure to a patient with NTM lung disease. Recent evidence has emerged consistent with transmission of a *Mycobacterium massiliense* isolate among cystic fibrosis patients. One particularly intriguing aspect of this ongoing research is the identification of *M. massiliense* isolates with a high level of genetic relatedness in cystic fibrosis patients from disparate parts of the world without any known contact among the affected patients. There are still questions that must be addressed before it can be said conclusively that NTM transmission occurs between humans, even in a vulnerable population such as cystic fibrosis sufferers, but the work so far is unquestionably provocative.

Thirty years ago, NTM lung disease was regarded as clinically similar to TB including characteristic TB radiographic manifestations with upper lobe fibrocavitary abnormalities^{4,5}. It is now well established that while NTM lung disease can present in a manner similar to reactivation TB with upper lobe fibrocavitary changes,

in the U.S. it is probably more commonly associated with non-cavitary radiographic changes, especially those associated with bronchiectasis^{17,36,37}. From a pathophysiologic perspective, this recognition has changed the way that many NTM experts view the development of NTM lung disease. Specifically, because NTM exposure is universal but NTM disease is relatively rare, it is increasingly accepted that patients require not only exposure to NTM but also likely some type of predisposition, such as the structural lung abnormalities most often associated with bronchiectasis or obstructive lung disease³⁸. This hypothesis has been dubbed the “two-hit” theory of NTM lung disease acquisition. For most patients, therefore, NTM infection is the consequence of an underlying anatomic lung disturbance or abnormality rather than a primary event. The etiology of bronchiectasis for many patients remains elusive, but recent work suggests that for at least some patients with “idiopathic” bronchiectasis, there is probably a polygenic explanation for the presence of bronchiectasis³⁹. This exciting work appears to be a particularly fertile and rapidly expanding area of NTM research. An important and as-yet-unanswered question is can vulnerable populations, such as bronchiectasis patients, avoid or even limit NTM exposure, thereby limiting their risk of acquiring NTM infection?

Treatment

Thirty years ago, the treatment of NTM respiratory pathogens was based primarily on the principles of TB therapy with a limited armamentarium of anti-TB drugs whose use was more or less guided by *in vitro* susceptibility tests with minimum inhibitory concentration breakpoints developed for MTB^{4,5,40}. In one contemporary study from a prominent NTM treatment center, it was suggested that treatment success correlated with the number of anti-TB drugs used in the treatment regimen (up to five or six), including second-line TB drugs such as ethionamide and cycloserine⁴¹. There was wide recognition of the limitations of this approach and few data demonstrating successful outcomes with traditional anti-TB medications.

In the mid 1980's, with the advent of the AIDS epidemic, a new deadly microbe, MAC, emerged⁴²⁻⁴⁵. A real sense of urgency developed to find an effective therapy for MAC as it became, at one point, the most lethal bacterial pathogen for AIDS patients⁴⁵. Many antibiotic agents and treatment regimens were tried, with newer macrolides/azalides emerging as the cornerstones of effective disseminated MAC therapy and prophylaxis^{46,47}. Ultimately, the scourge of disseminated MAC was relegated to a rare occurrence by the introduction of highly active antiretroviral therapy, but undeniable progress for effective MAC therapy was already established.

Over the next three decades, subsequent studies confirmed the utility of macrolides/azalides for treating MAC from any site, including the lung⁴⁸⁻⁵⁵. Therapy for MAC lung disease has unfortunately been relatively stagnant since the widespread adoption of macrolide-/azalide-containing MAC treatment regimens. While treatment outcomes have been generally favorable, it is still all too apparent that MAC treatment success is still lagging behind the predictably and reliably favorable TB treatment outcomes. Unfortunately, many other NTM pathogens such as *Mycobacterium xenopi*, *Mycobacterium mageritense*, *Mycobacterium abscessus*, and *Mycobacterium simiae* remain even more difficult to treat than MAC^{17,56}.

Over the last 30 years, it has become apparent that a particularly troublesome and frustrating aspect of NTM lung disease therapy is the repeatedly confirmed observation that *in vitro* susceptibility results for a specific antibiotic may not be predictive of treatment success (or failure) with that antibiotic for multiple NTM pathogens^{57,58}. For MAC, for instance, the only antibiotic agents where *in vitro* susceptibility predicts *in vivo* response are macrolides/azalides and amikacin^{16,49,59}. Those factors that are associated with antibiotic resistance not predicted by standard *in vitro* susceptibility criteria such as MICs are referred to as innate or natural drug resistance factors^{57,58}.

The new molecular laboratory tools have provided avenues for investigating the paradoxical NTM antibiotic resistance and have made us aware of multiple factors possessed by NTM that are associated with innate or natural drug resistance^{57,58}. As noted, these innate resistance factors may not be reflected in the MIC of the organism for specific drugs. This phenomenon is perhaps the most vexing characteristic of NTM lung disease for clinicians and the area where experience with TB is least helpful. Probably the best-known example of this phenomenon is the inducible macrolide resistance, or *erm*, gene, present in *M. abscessus* subspecies *abscessus* as well as other *M. abscessus* subspecies and other mycobacterial species, such as *M. tuberculosis*⁶⁰. The activity of this gene can be detected *in vitro* only by pre-incubation of the organism in the presence of macrolide/azalide. While *erm* gene activity is only one mechanism of innate NTM drug resistance, its recognition has been transformative for how we approach patients with *M. abscessus* respiratory disease. Ultimately, the future of NTM lung disease therapy will be guided by recognition of innate antibiotic resistance mechanisms, which are inevitable and unavoidable, and the discovery of ways to overcome them.

Unfortunately, the discussion of antibiotic drug resistance does not end here. Even with the background of innate drug resistance, many NTM including MAC, *M. abscessus* subspecies *abscessus*, and *M. abscessus* subspecies *massiliense* are also subject to acquired mutational drug resistance, a mechanism for acquired drug resistance well known to clinicians who treat TB. For instance, macrolides/azalides must be protected by effective companion drugs in treatment regimens for MAC as the emergence of macrolide resistance through the selection of organisms with a 23S rRNA mutation conferring macrolide/azalide resistance is associated with poor treatment response and overall outcome⁶¹. This type of drug resistance is both predictable and avoidable. All of the insights into drug resistance for NTM pathogens have come to light in the last 30 years.

Future outlook

Unquestionably, many, many weaknesses and gaps in our understanding of NTM lung disease remain. We need markers of disease activity and NTM organism virulence so that we can predict which patients will have progressive NTM lung disease and require therapy⁶². That type of marker would allow eliminating the confusing and sometimes insensitive and nonspecific NTM disease criteria. Equally important, we need to be able to identify which patients are likely to relapse after successful therapy. Overall, we need more efficient ways to define NTM lung disease. We need better ways to determine NTM lung disease prevalence and ultimately incidence. Making NTM lung disease reportable would go a long way toward alleviating this problem, but without better ways to accurately

diagnose NTM lung disease, even universal reporting of cases based on current diagnostic criteria probably still entails considerable inaccuracies. The most pressing need is for new and more effective antimicrobial agents, a process that will be driven by improved understanding of NTM drug resistance mechanisms. We will need new approaches to NTM disease prevention, a process only possible with early identification of patients at risk for developing NTM lung disease and better understanding of NTM environmental niches and the acquisition of NTM by vulnerable individuals.

This brief discussion is far from comprehensive and focuses on only a few selected areas of NTM lung disease advances. The understanding of NTM lung disease is clearly in its infancy, but with the accelerating pace of discovery and knowledge, the list of those aspects we don't understand will inevitably continue to grow in unanticipated directions. The more we learn, the more and better questions we are able to ask. It is also remarkable that the progress so far has been accomplished largely without extramural funding from national (U.S.) and international funding agencies. A major priority is educating extramural funding sources about the importance of NTM lung disease as a growing international health burden and convincing them that committing research dollars to this field will yield important and widely applicable results. Lastly, we need to convince potential private and government funding sources to provide support for prospective treatment trials so that we can begin to lay the groundwork for future study designs that are necessary for testing new drugs as they are introduced. In that context, there is movement toward trials of new as well as older but untested antibiotics on the parts of pharmaceutical companies and the FDA, but results are still several years away.

Conclusion

Have we learned nothing in 30 years? It doesn't look that way to us, and in fact the study of NTM lung disease has been completely transformed in that time in unprecedented and unanticipated ways. Perhaps the most convincing reasons to be optimistic about continued and accelerating progress with NTM lung disease are the proliferation of investigators around the world and the growing number of very talented young investigators in the field. The number of references using "nontuberculous mycobacteria" in English using an Ovid search was 39 in 1985 and 30 years later, 608 in 2015, an increase of almost 15-fold., a clear reflection of the exponential growth in NTM research. While NTM lung disease understanding has been a long time coming, all the progress that has been made and is inevitably still to come will guarantee that it just as surely will be a long time gone⁶³.

Competing interests

The authors have no real or potential conflicts of interest to declare.

Grant information

The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the unparalleled contributions of Richard J. Wallace, Jr to the field of nontuberculous mycobacterial disease.

References

1. Adjemian J, Prevots DR, Gallagher J, *et al.*: Lack of adherence to evidence-based treatment guidelines for nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease. *Ann Am Thorac Soc.* 2014; 11(1): 9–16.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
2. Runyon EH: Typical mycobacteria: their classification. *Am Rev Respir Dis.* 1965; 91: 288–9.
[PubMed Abstract](#)
3. Runyon EH: Identification of mycobacterial pathogens utilizing colony characteristics. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 1970; 54(4): 578–86.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
4. Wolinsky E: Nontuberculous mycobacteria and associated diseases. *Am Rev Respir Dis.* 1979; 119(1): 107–59.
[PubMed Abstract](#)
5. Wallace RJ, O'Brien R, Glassroth J, *et al.*: Diagnosis and treatment of disease caused by nontuberculous mycobacteria. *Am Rev Respir Dis.* 1990; 142(4): 940–53.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
6. Jost KC Jr, Dunbar DF, Barth SS, *et al.*: Identification of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* and *M. avium* complex directly from smear-positive sputum specimens and BACTEC 12B cultures by high-performance liquid chromatography with fluorescence detection and computer-driven pattern recognition models. *J Clin Microbiol.* 1995; 33(5): 1270–7.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
7. Louro AP, Waites KB, Georgescu E, *et al.*: Direct identification of *Mycobacterium avium* complex and *Mycobacterium goodii* from MB/BacT bottles using AccuProbe. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2001; 39(2): 570–3.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
8. Pauls RJ, Turenne CY, Wolfe JN, *et al.*: A high proportion of novel mycobacteria species identified by 16S rDNA analysis among slowly growing AccuProbe-negative strains in a clinical setting. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 2003; 120(4): 560–6.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
9. Cloud JL, Carroll KC, Cohen S, *et al.*: Interpretive criteria for use of AccuProbe for identification of *Mycobacterium avium* complex directly from 7H9 broth cultures. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2005; 43(7): 3474–8.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
10. Griffith DE, Brown-Elliott BA, Benwill JL, *et al.*: *Mycobacterium abscessus*. “Pleased to meet you, hope you guess my name...”. *Ann Am Thorac Soc.* 2015; 12(3): 436–9.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
11. Tettelin H, Davidson RM, Agrawal S, *et al.*: High-level relatedness among *Mycobacterium abscessus* subsp. *massiliense* strains from widely separated outbreaks. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2014; 20(3): 364–71.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
12. van Ingen J, Boeree MJ, Dekhuijzen PN, *et al.*: Environmental sources of rapid growing nontuberculous mycobacteria causing disease in humans. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2009; 15(10): 888–93.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
13. Wallace RJ Jr, Iakhiaeva E, Williams MD, *et al.*: Absence of *Mycobacterium intracellulare* and presence of *Mycobacterium chimaera* in household water and biofilm samples of patients in the United States with *Mycobacterium avium* complex respiratory disease. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2013; 51(6): 1747–52.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
14. Wallace RJ Jr, Zhang Y, Brown BA, *et al.*: Polyclonal *Mycobacterium avium* complex infections in patients with nodular bronchiectasis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 1998; 158(4): 1235–44.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
15. O'Brien RJ, Geiter LJ, Snider DE Jr: The epidemiology of nontuberculous mycobacterial diseases in the United States. Results from a national survey. *Am Rev Respir Dis.* 1987; 135(5): 1007–14.
[PubMed Abstract](#)
16. O'Brien RJ: The epidemiology of nontuberculous mycobacterial disease. *Clin Chest Med.* 1989; 10(3): 407–18.
[PubMed Abstract](#)
17. Griffith DE, Aksamit T, Brown-Elliott BA, *et al.*: An official ATS/IDSA statement: diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of nontuberculous mycobacterial diseases. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2007; 175(4): 367–416.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
18. Diagnosis and treatment of disease caused by nontuberculous mycobacteria. This official statement of the American Thoracic Society was approved by the Board of Directors, March 1997. Medical Section of the American Lung Association. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 1997; 156(2 pt 2): S1–25.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
19. Griffith DE, Brown-Elliott BA, Wallace RJ Jr: Diagnosing nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease. A process in evolution. *Infect Dis Clin North Am.* 2002; 16(1): 235–49.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
20. Jankovic M, Sabol I, Zmak L, *et al.*: Microbiological criteria in non-tuberculous mycobacteria pulmonary disease: a tool for diagnosis and epidemiology. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis.* 2016; 20(7): 934–40.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
21. Cassidy PM, Hedberg K, Saulson A, *et al.*: Nontuberculous mycobacterial disease prevalence and risk factors: a changing epidemiology. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2009; 49(12): e124–9.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
22. Winthrop KL, McNelley E, Kendall B, *et al.*: Pulmonary nontuberculous mycobacterial disease prevalence and clinical features: an emerging public health disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2010; 182(7): 977–82.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
23. Winthrop KL, Varley CD, Ory J, *et al.*: Pulmonary disease associated with nontuberculous mycobacteria, Oregon, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2011; 17(9): 1760–1.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
24. Adjemian J, Olivier KN, Seitz AE, *et al.*: Prevalence of nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease in U.S. Medicare beneficiaries. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2012; 185(8): 881–6.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
25. Prevots DR, Shaw PA, Strickland D, *et al.*: Nontuberculous mycobacterial lung disease prevalence at four integrated health care delivery systems. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2010; 182(7): 970–6.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
26. Hoefsloot W, van Ingen J, Andrejak C, *et al.*: The geographic diversity of nontuberculous mycobacteria isolated from pulmonary samples: an NTM-NET collaborative study. *Eur Respir J.* 2013; 42(6): 1604–13.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
27. Ito Y, Hirai T, Fujita K, *et al.*: Increasing patients with pulmonary *Mycobacterium avium* complex disease and associated underlying diseases in Japan. *J Infect Chemother.* 2015; 21(5): 352–6.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
28. Hu P, Bai L, Liu F, *et al.*: Evaluation of the Xpert MTB/RIF assay for diagnosis of tuberculosis and rifampin resistance in county-level laboratories in Hunan province, China. *Chin Med J (Engl).* 2014; 127(21): 3744–50.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
29. Wu J, Zhang Y, Li J, *et al.*: Increase in nontuberculous mycobacteria isolated in Shanghai, China: results from a population-based study. *PLoS One.* 2014; 9(10): e109736.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
30. Shao Y, Chen C, Song H, *et al.*: The epidemiology and geographic distribution of nontuberculous mycobacteria clinical isolates from sputum samples in the eastern region of China. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2015; 9(3): e0003623.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
31. Collins CH, Grange JM, Yates MD: Mycobacteria in water. *J Appl Bacteriol.* 1984; 57(2): 193–211.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
32. Meissner PS, Falkinham JO 3rd: Plasmid DNA profiles as epidemiological markers for clinical and environmental isolates of *Mycobacterium avium*, *Mycobacterium intracellulare*, and *Mycobacterium scrofulaceum*. *J Infect Dis.* 1986; 153(2): 325–31.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
33. Fujita K, Ito Y, Hirai T, *et al.*: Genetic relatedness of *Mycobacterium avium-intracellulare* complex isolates from patients with pulmonary MAC disease and their residential soils. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2013; 19(6): 537–41.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
34. Aitken ML, Limaye A, Pottinger P, *et al.*: Respiratory outbreak of *Mycobacterium abscessus* subspecies *massiliense* in a lung transplant and cystic fibrosis center. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2012; 185(2): 231–2.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
35. Bryant JM, Grogono DM, Greaves D, *et al.*: Whole-genome sequencing to identify transmission of *Mycobacterium abscessus* between patients with cystic fibrosis: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet.* 2013; 381(9877): 1551–60.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
36. Prince DS, Peterson DD, Steiner RM, *et al.*: Infection with *Mycobacterium avium* complex in patients without predisposing conditions. *N Engl J Med.* 1989; 321(13): 863–8.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
37. Griffith DE, Aksamit TR: Bronchiectasis and nontuberculous mycobacterial disease. *Clin Chest Med.* 2012; 33(2): 283–95.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
38. Flesher M, Olivier KN, Shaw PA, *et al.*: Mortality among patients with pulmonary non-tuberculous mycobacteria disease. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis.* 2016; 20(5): 582–7.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
39. Szymanski EP, Leung JM, Fowler CJ, *et al.*: Pulmonary Nontuberculous Mycobacterial Infection. A Multisystem, Multigenic Disease. *Am J Respir Crit*

- Care Med. 2015; **192**(5): 618–28.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
40. Iseman MD, Corpe RF, O'Brien RJ, *et al.*: Disease due to *Mycobacterium avium-intracellulare*. *Chest*. 1985; **87**(2 Suppl): 139S–49.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 41. Horsburgh CR Jr, Mason UG 3rd, Heifets LB, *et al.*: Response to therapy of pulmonary *Mycobacterium avium-intracellulare* infection correlates with results of *in vitro* susceptibility testing. *Am Rev Respir Dis*. 1987; **135**(2): 418–21.
[PubMed Abstract](#)
 42. Hawkins CC, Gold JW, Whimbey E, *et al.*: *Mycobacterium avium* complex infections in patients with the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. *Ann Intern Med*. 1986; **105**(2): 184–8.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 43. *Mycobacterioses and the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. Joint Position Paper of the American Thoracic Society and the Centers for Disease Control*. *Am Rev Respir Dis*. 1987; **136**(2): 492–6.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 44. Horsburgh CR Jr, Selik RM: The epidemiology of disseminated nontuberculous mycobacterial infection in the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). *Am Rev Respir Dis*. 1989; **139**(1): 4–7.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 45. Chin DP, Reingold AL, Stone EN, *et al.*: The impact of *Mycobacterium avium* complex bacteremia and its treatment on survival of AIDS patients—a prospective study. *J Infect Dis*. 1994; **170**(3): 578–84.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 46. Shafran SD, Singer J, Zarowny DP, *et al.*: A comparison of two regimens for the treatment of *Mycobacterium avium* complex bacteremia in AIDS: rifabutin, ethambutol, and clarithromycin versus rifampin, ethambutol, clofazimine, and ciprofloxacin. Canadian HIV Trials Network Protocol 010 Study Group. *N Engl J Med*. 1996; **335**(6): 377–83.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 47. Chaisson RE, Keiser P, Pierce M, *et al.*: Clarithromycin and ethambutol with or without clofazimine for the treatment of bacteremic *Mycobacterium avium* complex disease in patients with HIV infection. *AIDS*. 1997; **11**(3): 311–7.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 48. Wallace RJ Jr, Brown BA, Griffith DE, *et al.*: Clarithromycin regimens for pulmonary *Mycobacterium avium* complex. The first 50 patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 1996; **153**(6 Pt 1): 1766–72.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 49. Wallace RJ Jr, Brown BA, Griffith DE, *et al.*: Initial clarithromycin monotherapy for *Mycobacterium avium-intracellulare* complex lung disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 1994; **149**(5): 1335–41.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 50. Griffith DE, Brown BA, Girard WM, *et al.*: Azithromycin activity against *Mycobacterium avium* complex lung disease in patients who were not infected with human immunodeficiency virus. *Clin Infect Dis*. 1996; **23**(5): 983–9.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 51. Wallace RJ Jr, Brown-Elliott BA, McNulty S, *et al.*: Macrolide/Azalide therapy for nodular/bronchiectatic *Mycobacterium avium* complex lung disease. *Chest*. 2014; **146**(2): 276–82.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
 52. Jeong BH, Jeon K, Park HY, *et al.*: Intermittent antibiotic therapy for nodular bronchiectatic *Mycobacterium avium* complex lung disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2015; **191**(1): 96–103.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
 53. Kobashi Y, Abe M, Mouri K, *et al.*: Clinical usefulness of combination chemotherapy for pulmonary *Mycobacterium avium* complex disease. *J Infect*. 2010.
[PubMed Abstract](#)
 54. Kobashi Y, Matsushima T: The microbiological and clinical effects of combined therapy according to guidelines on the treatment of pulmonary *Mycobacterium avium* complex disease in Japan - including a follow-up study. *Respiration*. 2007; **74**(4): 394–400.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 55. Kobashi Y, Yoshida K, Miyashita N, *et al.*: Relationship between clinical efficacy of treatment of pulmonary *Mycobacterium avium* complex disease and drug-sensitivity testing of *Mycobacterium avium* complex isolates. *J Infect Chemother*. 2006; **12**(4): 195–202.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 56. van Ingen J, Ferro BE, Hoefsloot W, *et al.*: Drug treatment of pulmonary nontuberculous mycobacterial disease in HIV-negative patients: the evidence. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther*. 2013; **11**(10): 1065–77.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 57. Brown-Elliott BA, Nash KA, Wallace RJ Jr: Antimicrobial susceptibility testing, drug resistance mechanisms, and therapy of infections with nontuberculous mycobacteria. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2012; **25**(3): 545–82.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
 58. van Ingen J, Boeree MJ, van Soolingen D, *et al.*: Resistance mechanisms and drug susceptibility testing of nontuberculous mycobacteria. *Drug Resist Updat*. 2012; **15**(3): 149–61.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
 59. Brown-Elliott BA, Iakhiaeva E, Griffith DE, *et al.*: *In vitro* activity of amikacin against isolates of *Mycobacterium avium* complex with proposed MIC breakpoints and finding of a 16S rRNA gene mutation in treated isolates. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2013; **51**(10): 3389–94.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
 60. Nash KA, Brown-Elliott BA, Wallace RJ Jr: A novel gene, *erm*(41), confers inducible macrolide resistance to clinical isolates of *Mycobacterium abscessus* but is absent from *Mycobacterium chelonae*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2009; **53**(4): 1367–76.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#) | [F1000 Recommendation](#)
 61. Griffith DE, Brown-Elliott BA, Langsjoen B, *et al.*: Clinical and molecular analysis of macrolide resistance in *Mycobacterium avium* complex lung disease. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2006; **174**(8): 928–34.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 62. Boyle DP, Zembower TR, Reddy S, *et al.*: Comparison of Clinical Features, Virulence, and Relapse among *Mycobacterium avium* Complex Species. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2015; **191**(11): 1310–7.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 63. "Long Time Gone". Crosby, Stills and Nash, Atlantic Records; 1969.
[Reference Source](#)

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status:

Editorial Note on the Review Process

Faculty Reviews are review articles written by the prestigious Members of **Faculty Opinions**. The articles are commissioned and peer reviewed before publication to ensure that the final, published version is comprehensive and accessible. The reviewers who approved the final version are listed with their names and affiliations.

The reviewers who approved this article are:

Version 1

1. **Adrian M. Zelazny**
Microbiology Service, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA
Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.
2. **Jeffrey Glassroth**
Biological Sciences Division, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA
Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.
3. **Anne O'Donnell**
Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, Georgetown University Hospital, Washington DC, USA
Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.
4. **Won-Jung Koh**
Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine, Seoul, South Korea
Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

The benefits of publishing with F1000Research:

- Your article is published within days, with no editorial bias
- You can publish traditional articles, null/negative results, case reports, data notes and more
- The peer review process is transparent and collaborative
- Your article is indexed in PubMed after passing peer review
- Dedicated customer support at every stage

For pre-submission enquiries, contact research@f1000.com

F1000Research