Pulmonary alveolar proteinosis: Your patients deserve better

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 6 September 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Pulmonary alveolar proteinosis (PAP) is a rare lung disorder characterized by the accumulation of lipoproteinaceous material within the alveoli, impairing gas exchange. This accumulation leads to progressive dyspnea, cough, and hypoxemia, significantly impacting patient quality of life and often leading to respiratory failure. The rarity of PAP, coupled with its heterogeneous presentation, poses substantial diagnostic and therapeutic challenges for clinicians across Europe.

Despite established treatment principles, the practical application of these guidelines varies widely, creating a fragmented market for patient care. Harmonizing management strategies is not merely an academic exercise; it directly translates to equitable access to effective care and improved prognosis for patients with this debilitating condition.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: European PAP management lacks uniformity in diagnosis and treatment, necessitating a concerted effort towards standardization.
- The Data: No specific numeric data is available without real research papers, but the clinical reality points to significant variability in patient access to whole lung lavage and GM-CSF therapies.
- The Action: Clinicians should advocate for national and international collaboration to establish consistent diagnostic pathways and ensure equitable access to specialized treatment centers.

Pulmonary alveolar proteinosis (PAP) presents a unique challenge in respiratory medicine. The disease, which can be primary (autoimmune or hereditary) or secondary to other conditions, involves dysfunctional alveolar macrophages unable to clear surfactant lipids and proteins. This leads to the characteristic build-up within the alveolar spaces, progressively reducing lung compliance and diffusing capacity. Patients often present with insidious onset of symptoms, making early diagnosis difficult and frequently delaying appropriate intervention. The autoimmune form, accounting for approximately 90% of adult cases, is driven by neutralizing autoantibodies against granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF), a cytokine essential for alveolar macrophage maturation and function. Understanding this underlying pathophysiology is essential for effective management.

The current standard of care for severe PAP, particularly the autoimmune form, revolves around whole lung lavage (WLL). This procedure involves sequentially washing one lung while the other is mechanically ventilated, aiming to physically remove the accumulated lipoproteinaceous material. It is a technically demanding procedure requiring specialized equipment and experienced personnel, typically performed under general anesthesia. The frequency and

volume of lavage vary depending on disease severity and patient response, often requiring multiple sessions over time. For patients with less severe disease or those who cannot tolerate WLL, or as an adjunct therapy, recombinant human GM-CSF has been explored. This therapy aims to overcome the functional deficiency caused by autoantibodies, thereby restoring alveolar macrophage function. GM-CSF can be administered subcutaneously or by inhalation, with varying protocols and reported efficacy.

Diagnostic Hurdles and Referral Pathways

Diagnosing PAP reliably requires a combination of clinical suspicion, characteristic imaging findings, and definitive histological or serological confirmation. High-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) of the chest typically reveals a 'crazy-paving' pattern, a hallmark feature consisting of ground-glass opacities with superimposed interlobular septal thickening. While highly suggestive, this pattern is not pathognomonic and can be seen in other conditions. Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) fluid analysis often shows a milky, turbid appearance with periodic acid-Schiff (PAS)-positive lipoproteinaceous material and characteristic electron microscopy findings. The detection of anti-GM-CSF autoantibodies in serum is diagnostic for the autoimmune form of PAP, offering a less invasive confirmation. But access to these specialized serological tests is not uniform across all European healthcare systems, leading to delays and misdiagnoses.

Referral pathways for suspected PAP cases are often convoluted, reflecting the disease's rarity. Many general practitioners and even general pulmonologists may encounter only one or two cases in their entire careers, if any. This lack of familiarity can lead to prolonged diagnostic odysseys for patients, during which their lung function may continue to deteriorate. Centralized expert centers, equipped with the necessary diagnostic tools and multidisciplinary teams, are essential for timely and accurate diagnosis. But the geographical distribution of such centers is uneven, creating significant disparities in access to specialized care. Patients in regions without easy access to these centers face considerable logistical and financial burdens to receive appropriate evaluation, a challenge that similar rare lung conditions also grapple with.

Therapeutic Access and Procedural Variation

The primary therapeutic intervention, whole lung lavage, is a highly specialized procedure. Its availability is limited to tertiary or quaternary care centers with expertise in thoracic anesthesia, critical care, and bronchoscopy. The infrastructure required, including dedicated operating theatre time and skilled personnel, means that WLL is not universally accessible. Even within countries, the number of centers performing WLL can be very small, concentrating expertise but also creating bottlenecks for patient access. Variation exists in the technical aspects of WLL itself, including the volume of saline used per lavage, the number of lavages per session, and the criteria for determining treatment endpoints. These procedural differences, while perhaps subtle, can influence efficacy and patient outcomes. Without standardized protocols, comparing outcomes across different centers or regions becomes challenging.

GM-CSF therapy, while less invasive, also faces hurdles. Its off-label use for PAP in many European countries means that reimbursement policies can be inconsistent or non-existent, placing a significant financial burden on patients or healthcare systems. The optimal dose, route, and duration of GM-CSF therapy are still subjects of ongoing discussion, with various regimens employed in clinical practice. This lack of clear, universally adopted guidelines for GM-CSF administration contributes to the variability in treatment approaches. The Oxford Handbook of Respiratory Medicine

provides a concise overview of such challenges in rare lung diseases, but specific PAP guidance often requires deeper, specialized literature.

The Need for Harmonization

The disparities in PAP management across Europe are not merely theoretical; they have tangible consequences for patients. Delayed diagnosis means prolonged suffering and potentially irreversible lung damage. Unequal access to WLL or GM-CSF therapy translates to unequal chances of disease control and improved quality of life. A harmonized approach would involve several key components. First, the development and widespread adoption of European-wide diagnostic algorithms, incorporating readily available serological testing for anti-GM-CSF antibodies, would streamline diagnosis. Second, the establishment of a network of accredited expert centers for PAP, ensuring equitable geographical distribution and standardized referral pathways, is essential for patient outcomes. These centers would serve as hubs for diagnosis, WLL, and the management of complex cases.

Third, the development of consensus guidelines for WLL procedures and GM-CSF administration, based on the best available evidence and expert opinion, would help standardize therapeutic approaches. This would include recommendations on patient selection, procedural techniques, and monitoring strategies. Such guidelines would not only improve clinical practice but also facilitate data collection and research, allowing for better understanding of treatment efficacy and long-term outcomes. The experience with other rare diseases, where European Reference Networks (ERNs) have been established, offers a potential model for PAP. These networks aim to facilitate cross-border healthcare, share expertise, and develop best practices for rare and complex conditions. The challenges of managing interstitial lung diseases more broadly highlight the value of such collaborative efforts.

But harmonization is not without its difficulties. National healthcare systems, with their distinct funding models, regulatory frameworks, and cultural practices, present significant barriers to a truly unified approach. Overcoming these will require sustained political will, cross-border collaboration among clinicians and researchers, and advocacy from patient organizations. The economic implications of centralizing care and ensuring access to specialized treatments also need careful consideration. While the upfront investment might seem substantial, the long-term benefits of improved patient outcomes, reduced complications, and more efficient resource utilization could outweigh the initial costs. The lack of large-scale, prospective clinical trials in PAP, due to its rarity, means that much of the current evidence base is derived from case series and expert consensus. This makes the development of evidence-based guidelines particularly challenging, highlighting the importance of international registries and collaborative research efforts to gather data from a sufficient number of patients (n=X) with a confidence interval of Y%.

The open-label nature of many GM-CSF studies, and the inherent difficulties in blinding a procedure like WLL, are obvious caveats when interpreting existing data. The patient populations studied are often small and heterogeneous, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about optimal treatment strategies for all subtypes of PAP. Whether benefits observed in highly selected patient cohorts extend to the broader PAP population remains unclear. Long-term follow-up data on the durability of treatment responses and the incidence of late complications are often limited. These gaps in evidence highlight the need for a coordinated European research agenda for PAP, focusing on prospective studies and the collection of real-world data to inform future guidelines.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

> The current patchwork approach to PAP management across Europe is simply unsustainable. Clinicians are left navigating a system where access to definitive diagnostics and life-saving treatments depends more on geography than on clinical need. This not only creates inequity but also hinders the accumulation of robust evidence necessary to refine treatment protocols. We cannot expect every general pulmonologist to be an expert in PAP, but we must ensure they have clear pathways to refer patients to those who are.
> For patients, this means a lottery of care. Some will receive timely diagnosis and effective whole lung lavage, while others will endure prolonged diagnostic delays and struggle to access specialized therapies like GM-CSF, often facing significant out-of-pocket costs. The industry, particularly manufacturers of GM-CSF, has a role to play in advocating for consistent reimbursement policies and supporting research into optimal dosing and administration. Without a unified approach, market access remains fragmented and patient benefit suboptimal.
> The path forward demands a concerted effort. National societies and European bodies must collaborate to establish clear, evidence-based guidelines for diagnosis and treatment. This includes standardizing serological testing for anti-GM-CSF antibodies and ensuring equitable access to specialized WLL centers. Only then can we move towards a system where every patient with PAP, regardless of their location, has a fair chance at optimal care. The current variability is a disservice to both patients and the dedicated clinicians striving to treat this rare and challenging disease.

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. Trapnell BC, Nakata K, Bonella F, et al. Pulmonary alveolar proteinosis. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2019;5(1):16. doi:10.1038/s41572-019-0066-3
2. 2. WoBoszczak J, Wrze[niewska M, Hrapkowicz A, Janowska K, Szydziak J, GomuBka K. A Comprehensive Outlook on Pulmonary Alveolar Proteinosis-A Review. Int J Mol Sci. 2024;25(13). doi:10.3390/ijms25137092
3. 3. Jouneau S, Ménard C, Lederlin M. Pulmonary alveolar proteinosis. Respirology. 2020;25(8):816-826. doi:10.1111/resp.13831
4. 4. Bonella F, Borie R. Pulmonary Alveolar Proteinosis. Clin Chest Med. 2025;46(4):633-647. doi:10.1016/j.ccm.2025.07.005
5. 5. Morton C, DeBiasi E. Pulmonary Alveolar Proteinosis. Clin Chest Med. 2025;46(2):373-382. doi:10.1016/j.ccm.2025.02.014
6. 6. McCarthy C, Bonella F, O'Callaghan M, et al. European Respiratory Society guidelines for the diagnosis and management of pulmonary alveolar proteinosis. Eur Respir J. 2024;64(5). doi:10.1183/13993003.00725-2024

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