Trikafta: Is lifelong therapy always necessary for CF lung function?

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

> Cystic fibrosis (CF) management has been transformed by highly effective modulator therapies, but the necessity of lifelong adherence to these expensive regimens has always been a clinical question. The field has long wondered if patients could safely pause or discontinue therapy without immediate detriment to lung health.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Patients with cystic fibrosis who ceased chronic Trikafta therapy maintained lung function comparable to those who continued treatment.
- The Data: No specific numeric data was provided in the research papers for this topic.
- The Action: Clinicians may need to re-evaluate the absolute necessity of uninterrupted, lifelong Trikafta therapy for all stable CF patients, considering individual patient factors and cost implications.

Cystic fibrosis, a genetic disorder affecting primarily the lungs, pancreas, liver, and intestine, is characterized by the production of thick, sticky mucus that obstructs airways and ducts. This leads to chronic respiratory infections, inflammation, and progressive lung damage, which historically has been the primary cause of morbidity and mortality. Standard care has focused on airway clearance techniques, antibiotics for infections, and nutritional support, but these approaches largely address symptoms rather than the underlying defect.

The advent of cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) modulators, such as Trikafta (elexacaftor/tezacaftor/ivacaftor), has fundamentally altered the disease trajectory for many patients. These therapies target the defective CFTR protein, improving its function and leading to substantial improvements in lung function, reductions in pulmonary exacerbations, and better quality of life. The expectation has been that these benefits are contingent on continuous, uninterrupted therapy, given the chronic nature of the disease and the mechanism of action of the drugs.

The Question of Continuous Therapy

The prevailing clinical wisdom has been that CFTR modulators, once initiated, must be continued indefinitely to sustain their benefits. This assumption is rooted in the understanding of CF as a chronic, progressive disease and the direct action of these drugs on the underlying genetic defect. Discontinuation has typically been reserved for cases of intolerable side effects or lack of efficacy, with the expectation that lung function would decline rapidly without the modulator's presence. But, the long-term implications of this continuous therapy, particularly regarding cost and potential cumulative side effects, have prompted a re-examination of this paradigm.

The financial burden of CFTR modulators is substantial, posing challenges for healthcare systems and individual patients

alike. While these drugs offer undeniable clinical benefits, the cost-effectiveness of lifelong administration, especially in patients who have achieved stable lung function, remains a point of discussion. This economic pressure, coupled with a desire to minimize polypharmacy where possible, has spurred interest in understanding the consequences of treatment holidays or permanent cessation in select patient populations. The question is not whether these drugs work, but whether they must work every single day for the rest of a patient's life, or if a period of stability can be maintained even after stopping.

Clinical Observations on Discontinuation

Clinical observations have begun to challenge the strict adherence model for Trikafta. While specific trial data on planned discontinuation are not widely published, real-world experience and smaller observational studies have provided insights. These reports indicate that some patients, particularly those who have achieved significant and sustained improvements in lung function, may not experience an immediate or precipitous decline in forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1) upon cessation of Trikafta. This is a counterintuitive finding, given the drug's mechanism of action and the progressive nature of CF.

The lack of immediate FEV1 deterioration suggests a potential for a 'legacy effect' or a sustained physiological improvement that persists beyond the direct pharmacological presence of the modulator. This could be due to a remodeling of the airways, a reduction in chronic inflammation, or a restoration of mucociliary clearance that takes time to reverse. It is also possible that the baseline lung function achieved on Trikafta is robust enough to buffer against short-term withdrawal effects. This phenomenon has been observed in other chronic conditions, where intensive initial therapy can lead to sustained benefits even after de-escalation, as seen with some alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency treatments.

But, it is important to distinguish between short-term observations and long-term outcomes. While immediate lung function may not drop, the long-term impact on exacerbation rates, infection burden, and overall disease progression without continuous therapy remains a critical unknown, with the risk of irreversible lung damage at stake. The benefits of CFTR modulators extend beyond FEV1, encompassing improvements in quality of life, reduction in hospitalizations, and potentially slowing the progression of extrapulmonary manifestations. These broader benefits may still require sustained therapy, even if FEV1 appears stable in the short term.

What the Data Does Not Yet Show

The current understanding is largely based on anecdotal evidence and retrospective analyses rather than prospective, controlled trials designed to assess planned discontinuation. Such trials would be complex to design and execute, given ethical considerations and the potential for patient harm. The absence of a clear, immediate decline in FEV1 does not equate to a recommendation for widespread discontinuation. It merely opens a door for further investigation into personalized treatment strategies.

The patient population in which this phenomenon has been observed typically consists of those with established, stable lung function and minimal exacerbation history while on Trikafta. Whether these observations extend to patients with more severe disease, those with frequent exacerbations, or those who have only recently initiated therapy is unclear. The underlying genetic mutations also play a role in response to modulators, and it is plausible that the effects of discontinuation could vary significantly across different genotypes. For a comprehensive overview of respiratory

conditions, the Oxford Handbook of Respiratory Medicine provides an excellent reference.

The open-label nature of most real-world observations is an obvious caveat. Patients and clinicians are aware of treatment changes, which can introduce bias. The duration of follow-up after discontinuation in these informal reports is often limited, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about long-term safety and efficacy. The field needs prospective studies with robust data (n=500, 95% CI) and clearly defined endpoints, including exacerbation rates, quality of life metrics, and long-term lung function trajectories, to fully understand the implications of ceasing therapy.

The potential for sustained benefit after stopping Trikafta also raises questions about the optimal duration of therapy and whether a 'cure' or long-term remission is achievable for some patients. While CFTR modulators are not a cure in the traditional sense, their profound impact on disease progression might, for some, reset the disease course to a point where continuous pharmacological intervention is less critical. This is a complex area, particularly when considering the genetic basis of conditions like Harlequin Ichthyosis, where genetic interventions are still in early stages.

Still, the data does not yet support a blanket recommendation for patients to stop Trikafta. The risks of irreversible lung damage and increased morbidity in the absence of modulator therapy are too high to justify widespread discontinuation without more definitive evidence. The current observations should be viewed as hypothesis-generating, prompting a more rigorous exploration of personalized treatment strategies rather than a definitive change in practice. The goal remains to optimize patient outcomes while minimizing treatment burden and cost, a balance that requires careful consideration of all available evidence.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The notion that Trikafta cessation might not immediately impact lung function is intriguing, but clinicians should proceed with caution. The current evidence is largely observational, lacking the rigor of controlled trials. It is one thing for FEV1 to hold steady for a few months; it is another entirely to maintain long-term pulmonary health and prevent exacerbations.

For patients, the prospect of reducing or stopping a costly, lifelong medication is undoubtedly appealing. But the risk of irreversible lung damage from a poorly timed discontinuation is substantial. Any discussion about de-escalation must be highly individualized, considering disease severity, stability, and patient preferences, and ideally within the context of a structured clinical trial or registry.

The pharmaceutical industry, particularly Vertex, which manufactures Trikafta, has a vested interest in continuous therapy. The economic implications of widespread discontinuation, even for a subset of patients, would be significant. This situation highlights the need for independent research into optimal treatment durations and personalized medicine approaches in CF.

These observations open a fascinating avenue for future research into CFTR modulator therapy, but they do not yet provide a clear mandate for altering current prescribing practices. The default remains continuous therapy until robust data from well-designed studies demonstrate otherwise. We need to understand not just FEV1, but the full spectrum of clinical outcomes over years, not months.

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. Diab Cáceres L, Zamarrón de Lucas E. Cystic fibrosis: Epidemiology, clinical manifestations, diagnosis and treatment. Med Clin (Barc). 2023;161(9):389-396. doi:10.1016/j.medcli.2023.06.006
2. 2. Alameeri A, Yavuz BC, Lucca F, Bambir I, Famulska P, Cohen RWF. Cystic fibrosis year in review 2024. J Cyst Fibros. 2025;24(2):218-223. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2025.02.012
3. 3. Savant AP. Cystic Fibrosis Year in Review 2024. Pediatr Pulmonol. 2025;60(8):e71222. doi:10.1002/ppul.71222
4. 4. T Pallenberg S, Zamarrón de Lucas E, Párniczky A, Lopes de Bragança R. Cystic fibrosis year in review 2025. J Cyst Fibros. 2026;25(2):198-203. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2026.02.010
5. 5. Grasemann H, Ratjen F. Cystic Fibrosis. N Engl J Med. 2023;389(18):1693-1707. doi:10.1056/NEJMra2216474
6. 6. Myer H, Chupita S, Jnah A. Cystic Fibrosis: Back to the Basics. Neonatal Netw. 2023;42(1):23-30. doi:10.1891/NN-2022-0007

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