IPF: Why new therapies are still missing the mark

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 8 September 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF) remains a devastating, progressive lung disease with a median survival of only three to five years from diagnosis. Current therapies aim to slow disease progression, but they do not halt or reverse the fibrotic process, leaving a significant unmet need for more effective interventions. The TETON Phase 3 clinical program has recently concluded, offering new evidence that warrants close examination by clinicians managing this complex condition.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: The TETON program explored novel mechanistic pathways beyond existing antifibrotic agents, seeking to address the underlying drivers of fibrosis more directly.
- The Data: Specific numerical results are not available, but the program's overall findings clarify the potential for new therapeutic approaches in IPF.
- The Action: Clinicians should remain vigilant for emerging data on novel antifibrotic mechanisms, as the current standard of care leaves substantial room for improvement.

Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis is characterized by the progressive scarring of lung tissue, leading to irreversible loss of lung function. The etiology is complex and multifactorial, involving genetic predispositions, environmental exposures, and aberrant wound healing responses. This relentless fibrotic process culminates in respiratory failure and significantly impairs quality of life for patients. Existing treatments, pirfenidone and nintedanib, have demonstrated efficacy in slowing the decline in forced vital capacity (FVC), but they do not stop the disease's progression, nor do they offer a cure. Their use is also associated with considerable side effects, limiting adherence for some patients. The need for therapies that offer greater efficacy, better tolerability, or target different pathogenic pathways is therefore acute.
The TETON Phase 3 clinical program was designed to evaluate a new investigational therapy in patients with IPF. The program enrolled a broad population of adults diagnosed with IPF, consistent with international diagnostic criteria, including patients with varying degrees of disease severity and those already on standard antifibrotic therapy. The primary endpoint typically focuses on the rate of decline in FVC, a well-established measure of disease progression in IPF trials. Secondary endpoints often include measures of respiratory-related hospitalizations, time to disease progression or death, and patient-reported outcomes related to quality of life and dyspnea. Safety and tolerability profiles are also critical components of such evaluations, given the chronic nature of the disease and the need for long-term treatment.

Understanding the Disease Mechanism

IPF pathogenesis involves a complex relationship of epithelial cell injury, fibroblast activation, and extracellular matrix deposition. Alveolar epithelial cells are thought to be key initiators, undergoing repeated injury and aberrant repair. This leads to the activation and proliferation of fibroblasts, which differentiate into myofibroblasts, the primary producers

of collagen and other extracellular matrix components. The accumulation of this matrix distorts lung architecture and impairs gas exchange. Inflammatory cells are present, but inflammation is not considered the primary driver of fibrosis in IPF, distinguishing it from other interstitial lung diseases. The diagnosis and management of interstitial lung diseases, including IPF, relies on a multidisciplinary approach involving pulmonologists, radiologists, and pathologists.
Current antifibrotic drugs, pirfenidone and nintedanib, act through different mechanisms. Pirfenidone is thought to exert its effects by inhibiting fibroblast proliferation and reducing the production of profibrotic cytokines, such as TGF-?. Nintedanib is a tyrosine kinase inhibitor that targets multiple receptors involved in fibrotic processes, including VEGFR, FGFR, and PDGFR. While these agents slow the rate of FVC decline, they do not reverse established fibrosis. This limitation highlights the ongoing search for therapies that can more profoundly impact the fibrotic cascade, perhaps by targeting upstream drivers or by promoting resolution of existing fibrosis. The TETON program aimed to explore one such novel pathway, moving beyond the established mechanisms of action.

The Clinical Trial Design

The TETON program consisted of multiple Phase 3 trials, each designed to rigorously assess the investigational therapy against a placebo or standard of care. Such trials typically employ a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled design to minimize bias. Patients are usually stratified by baseline FVC, diffusing capacity of the lung for carbon monoxide (DLCO), and prior antifibrotic use to ensure balanced groups. The duration of these trials is often 52 weeks or longer, reflecting the slow, progressive nature of IPF and the need to observe sustained effects on FVC decline. The primary endpoint, annual rate of FVC decline, is a continuous variable, allowing for sensitive detection of treatment effects. The Oxford Handbook of Respiratory Medicine provides a concise overview of these and other key diagnostic and prognostic measures in pulmonary disease.
Patient enrollment in IPF trials can be challenging due to the rarity of the disease and the need for strict diagnostic criteria. The TETON program successfully recruited a substantial cohort, allowing for robust statistical analysis. The inclusion of patients already on existing antifibrotic therapy in some arms of the program is particularly relevant, as it reflects real-world clinical practice and addresses the question of whether the investigational therapy offers additive benefits. This approach is essential for understanding the potential role of new agents in combination with, or as an alternative to, current treatments. The program's design also included rigorous safety monitoring, with regular assessments of adverse events, laboratory parameters, and vital signs, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of the drug's risk-benefit profile.

Interpreting the Outcomes

While specific numerical results from the TETON program are not available, the overall findings indicate the challenges and opportunities in IPF drug development. A therapy that significantly reduces the rate of FVC decline compared to placebo would represent a meaningful advance. Even a modest reduction in FVC decline can translate to clinically relevant improvements in patient outcomes, including reduced hospitalizations and improved quality of life. The magnitude of effect observed in the TETON program, relative to existing therapies, will dictate its potential impact on clinical practice. The program's ability to demonstrate a consistent effect across different patient subgroups, such as those with early versus advanced disease, or those with different baseline FVC values, would also be critical for broad applicability.
Safety and tolerability are paramount in a chronic disease like IPF. Any new therapy must offer a favorable risk-benefit

profile, especially if it is to be used long-term or in combination with other agents. Common side effects of existing antifibrotics include gastrointestinal disturbances, liver enzyme elevations, and photosensitivity. A new agent with a distinct and manageable safety profile could be a significant advantage, even if its efficacy is comparable to current treatments. The TETON program's safety data will therefore be scrutinized for any novel or concerning adverse events, as well as for the overall burden of side effects. Understanding patient and pulmonologist perspectives on care gaps in IPF often highlights the need for better tolerated treatments.

The TETON program's findings also contribute to the broader understanding of IPF pathophysiology. By targeting a specific pathway, the results can validate or refute hypotheses about the importance of that pathway in disease progression. Even if a trial does not meet its primary endpoint, the data can still provide valuable insights into the disease mechanism and guide future drug development efforts. The complexity of IPF means that a single therapeutic target may not be sufficient to halt the disease entirely, suggesting that combination therapies or sequential treatments targeting multiple pathways may ultimately be necessary. The data from TETON will inform these future strategies, helping to refine the approach to drug discovery in this challenging area.

Where it Falls Short

Any Phase 3 program, regardless of its outcomes, carries inherent limitations. The generalizability of results can be affected by the specific inclusion and exclusion criteria, potentially limiting applicability to patients outside the trial population. For example, patients with significant comorbidities or those with very advanced disease are often excluded, yet these are precisely the patients who may benefit most from new therapies. The duration of follow-up, while often substantial, may not fully capture the long-term effects or rare adverse events of a chronic treatment. The reliance on FVC decline as a primary endpoint, while standard, does not fully encompass the patient experience, which includes symptoms like dyspnea and cough, and overall quality of life. While these are often secondary endpoints, their weighting in regulatory decisions can vary.

The TETON program, like many others, may also face challenges in demonstrating superiority over existing standard-of-care agents, particularly if the effect size is modest. The bar for new therapies is high, requiring not just efficacy but also a compelling safety profile or a distinct advantage in specific patient populations. The trial was not powered to detect differences in rare subgroups, and that gap matters for clinicians trying to personalize treatment. The cost-effectiveness of any new therapy will also be a significant consideration, particularly in healthcare systems with finite resources. The full implications of the TETON program will only become clear once the detailed data are published and subjected to peer review, allowing for a comprehensive assessment of its strengths and weaknesses.

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> The TETON program's results, whatever their specifics, will undoubtedly shape the ongoing conversation around IPF management. If the investigational therapy demonstrated a meaningful impact on FVC decline, it would offer clinicians another tool in a limited arsenal, potentially allowing for more tailored treatment approaches. But the challenge of balancing efficacy with tolerability remains, especially for a disease requiring lifelong therapy.
>
> For patients, the prospect of new treatments brings hope, but also the burden of navigating complex treatment decisions. The current standard of care, while effective in slowing progression, does not offer a cure, and side

> effects can significantly impact daily life. Any new agent must demonstrate a clear benefit-risk profile that justifies its adoption, particularly if it is to be used in combination with existing antifibrotics.
> The pharmaceutical industry will be watching closely. Success in IPF drug development is difficult, and the TETON program's outcomes will inform future research and development strategies. Whether the data supports a new regulatory submission or points towards necessary modifications in mechanistic targets, it will contribute to the evolving understanding of this devastating disease. The ultimate goal remains to find therapies that can halt or even reverse fibrosis, a goal that continues to elude us.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Muri J, Durcová B, Slivka R, et al. Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis: Review of Current Knowledge. Physiol Res. 2024;73(4):487-497. doi:10.33549/physiolres.935322
2. 2. Moss BJ, Ryter SW, Rosas IO. Pathogenic Mechanisms Underlying Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis. Annu Rev Pathol. 2022;17:515-546. doi:10.1146/annurev-pathol-042320-030240
3. 3. Richeldi L, Collard HR, Jones MG. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Lancet. 2017;389(10082):1941-1952. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30866-8
4. 4. Koudstaal T, Wijsenbeek MS. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Presse Med. 2023;52(3):104166. doi:10.1016/j.lpm.2023.104166
5. 5. Collard HR, Ryerson CJ, Corte TJ, et al. Acute Exacerbation of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis. An International Working Group Report. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2016;194(3):265-75. doi:10.1164/rccm.201604-0801CI
6. 6. King TE Jr, Pardo A, Selman M. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Lancet. 2011;378(9807):1949-61. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60052-4

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com