Asthma inflammatory phenotypes on four continents:
most asthma cases are non-eosinophilic

Lucy Pembrey[1], Collin Brooks[2], Harriet Mpairwe[3], Camila A Figueiredo[4], Aida Y. Oviedo[5], Martha Chico[5], Irene Nambuya[3], Pius Tumwesige[3], Steven Robertson[1], Susan Ring[6], Mauricio L. Barreto[4, 7], Philip J. Cooper[5,8,9], John Henderson[6*], Alvaro A. Cruz[10,11], Jeroen Douwes[2], Neil Pearce[1,2] and the WASP Study Group

[1]London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
[2]Centre for Public Health Research, Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand
[3]MRC/UVRI and LSHTM Uganda Research Unit, Entebbe, Uganda
[4]Institute of Collective Health, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil
[5]Fundacion Ecuatoriana Para Investigacion en Salud, Quito, Ecuador
[6]Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, United Kingdom
[7]Center for Data and Knowledge Integration for Health (CIDACS), Fiocruz, Bahia
[8]Universidad Internacional del Ecuador, Quito, Ecuador
[9]St George's University of London, United Kingdom
[10]ProAR, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil
[11]Institute for Health Sciences, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil
*John Henderson was deceased in 2019, but played a major role in all aspects of the study design and data collection

Correspondence:

Professor Neil Pearce
Department of Medical Statistics
Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Keppel Street
London WC1E 7HT
United Kingdom
neil.pearce@lshtm.ac.uk

August 2020

Abstract

The World Asthma Phenotypes (WASP) study is being conducted in five centres in Brazil, Ecuador, Uganda, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, with a range of prevalence levels and exposures, and a likely range of phenotype distributions. Here we present the main findings with regards to asthma inflammatory phenotypes. We recruited 998 cases and 356 controls: 204/40 in Brazil, 176/67 in Ecuador, 207/50 in Uganda, 235/132 in New Zealand, and 176/67 in the United Kingdom. All centres studied children and adolescents (age-range 8-20 years), with the exception of the UK centre which involved 26-27 year olds. The proportion of participants who produced sputum samples was 87%, with a range from 74% (Brazil) to 91% (Ecuador), and of these 62% were countable with regards to the inflammatory cell types.The proportions of asthma cases who were classified as eosinophilic or mixed granulocytic asthma (the two inflammatory phenotypes which involve eosinophilia) was 39% overall: 35% in Brazil, 32% in Ecuador, 33% in Uganda, 50% in New Zealand, and 28% in the United Kingdom. The non-eosinophilic asthmatics (NEA) had similar chronic severity (e.g. in terms of attacks in the previous year) to the eosinophilic asthmatics (EA). Of the 61% of cases with NEA, 50% showed no signs of inflammation (paucigranulocytic), with 11% having neutrophilic inflammation. This is the first time that sputum induction has been used in a standardised manner to compare asthma inflammatory phenotypes in high income countries (HICs) and low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs). It confirms that most cases are non-eosinophilic, with the proportions ranging from 50% to 72%, across these varied environments; most of these non-eosinophilic cases were paucigranulocytic, with no sign of airways inflammation.

Introduction

It is now well established in high-income countries (HICs) that there are multiple phenotypes and endotypes of asthma [1, 2], and that less than one half of asthma cases are attributable to eosinophilic airways inflammation[3, 4]. Most asthma in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) appears to be non-atopic[5], the association between atopy and asthma is much weaker than in high income countries (HICs)[5, 6], and standardised comparisons across populations or time periods also show only weak and inconsistent associations between the prevalence of atopy and the prevalence of asthma[5]. However, there have been few standardized comparisons of asthma phenotypes between HICs and LMICs. Asthma phenotypes can be defined in a number of different ways, and can include clinical, demographic and pathological characteristics of asthma[7]. Similarly, atopy can be defined and measured in a variety of ways, including skin-prick tests, serum IgE, and eosinophilic inflammation of the airways. Our focus in the current paper is on inflammatory phenotypes, defined in terms of airways inflammation.

A recent Lancet Commission report on asthma called for greater recognition of the various phenotypes with different underlying pathological mechanisms, often grouped under the non-specific label of asthma. The importance of non-eosinophilic asthma in particular was highlighted at a recent Academia Europea/Asthma UK meeting[8]. The meeting report notes that asthma was originally thought to be a disease of airways smooth muscle, but subsequent guidelines highlighted the role of eosinophilic airways inflammation and anti-inflammatory therapies (inhaled corticosteroids (ICS)), and non-eosinophilic asthma "responds only poorly to the long-standing, conventional treatments traditionally used to reduce inflammation of the airways such as ICS" [8].

Characterisation of asthma inflammatory phenotypes is therefore important to: (i) better understand the aetiological mechanisms of asthma; (ii) identify specific causes; (iii) guide the development of new therapeutic measures that are effective for all asthmatics; and (iv) enable better management and prevention of asthma in both HICs and LMICs.

For these reasons we have formed the World ASthma Phenotypes (WASP) international collaboration to investigate and characterise asthma phenotypes in more depth in HICs and LMICs. The study is initially being conducted in five countries, and the detailed rationale and protocol have been published elsewhere[7]. WASP is studying a number of different aspects of

asthma phenotypes, but in this first paper, we present the main study findings with regards to asthma inflammatory phenotypes.

Methods

The detailed study methods have been published elsewhere [7], but are briefly summarized here. The study was conducted in five centres; Bristol in the UK (Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children, ALSPAC), Wellington in New Zealand, Salvador in Brazil, Quininde in Ecuador and Entebbe in Uganda (Table 1) with a range of prevalence levels and exposures, and a likely range of phenotype distributions.

In each centre, the aim was to recruit a minimum of 200 asthma cases and 50 non-asthmatics. The focus was on defining categories within the groups of asthmatics; however, in each centre, a comparison was also made with non-asthmatics in order to check that the derived asthma inflammatory phenotypes do in fact distinguish asthmatics from non-asthmatics.

Asthmatics: Cases were identified as those with symptoms of asthma and/or use of asthma medication in the past 12 months, using the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC) or (in adults) the European Community Respiratory Health Survey (ECRHS) questionnaires (the same key questions occur in both questionnaires).

Non-asthmatics: Non-asthmatics were identified as having no previous or current history of asthma, using the ISAAC and ECRHS questionnaires.

Data collection

Information was collected using standardised methods and operational procedures. These included risk factor questionnaires, clinical characterisation, and blood, and induced sputum samples. We repeated the sputum samples after approximately three months in a sub-group of asthmatics.

Questionnaire: As well as questions on current living conditions and other risk/protective factors (not reported here), we also included questions on the frequency and severity of clinical symptoms, and on use of asthma medications. These were based on the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC) Phase II (asthma management) and Phase III (environmental risk factors) modules, and additional questions on asthma control were added (Asthma Control Questionnaire, E Juniper, UK/English version Sept 2010, Mapi Research Institute[9]). We used the standard ISAAC definition of chronic severe asthma as

those with current wheeze who have more than 4 attacks of wheezing in the last 12 months, or more than one night per week sleep disturbance, or wheeze affecting speech[10].

Skin prick tests: Skin prick tests (SPT) were carried out according to a well-defined protocol[11, 12]. Histamine and saline were used as positive and negative controls, respectively. Fifteen minutes after testing, a mean wheal size of 3mm or greater was considered positive, once reaction to the negative control has been subtracted. SPT positivity was defined as a positive SPT to at least one of a panel of at least eight commercially available allergens, including house dust mite (*Dermatophagoides pteronyssinus*), tree pollen mix, grass pollen mix, cat and dog dander, *Alternaria tenuis*, Penicillium mix, plus locally relevant allergens.

Lung function testing: Lung function testing was conducted according to American Thoracic Society (ATS) criteria. All spirometers were regularly tested and calibration checks was conducted weekly by research staff when in use. Lung function testing was carried out with participants in a sitting position. Three reproducible forced expiratory manoeuvres was performed.

Sputum induction: Sputum induction was conducted using a standardised protocol involving saline inhalation that we have used previously[13], adapted from the protocol developed by Peter Gibson et al[14]. Participants were pre-treated with 200mg salbutamol, and 4.5% hypertonic saline administered by oral inhalation using an ultrasonic nebuliser for increasing intervals from 30 seconds to 4 minutes, to a total of 15.5 minutes; at the end, participants will produce a sputum sample in a sterile plastic container. Induced sputum was processed within two hours of collection. Where possible, at least 100µl of sputum plugs was selected from the sample, and the volume measured. Dithiothreitol is then added to the selected pellet and the mixture dispersed before being filtered through a 60µm nylon mesh. The resulting suspension is centrifuged and the supernatant removed and stored at -80°C for subsequent laboratory analyses. The pellet is re-suspended and cell viability (trypan blue exclusion) and total cell count determined using a haemocytometer. A differential cell count of 400 non-squamous sputum cells was conducted using light microscopy.The sputum slides were all read in Wellington, New Zealand, with the exception of the Brazil slides which could not be shipped overseas because of restrictions on samples containing DNA: these were therefore read in Brazil, with a sample of slides being checked (via the internet) by the group in Wellington.

Results

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the study centres and participants. Overall, we recruited 998 asthma cases and 356 controls. All centres included children and adolescents (age-range 8-20 years), except for the UK centre for which the participants were 26-27 years.

Table 2 summarizes the clinical characteristics of the participants by centre. The participants were chosen to be a representative sample of asthmatics in general, rather than focussing on severe asthma, and this is reflected in the clinical indicators. Nevertheless, using the ISAAC definition[10] (which is based on symptoms in the previous year), the proportion of participants with severe asthma ranged from 45% (UK, Ecuador) to 66% (Brazil, Uganda). The proportion of cases who were skin-prick-test (SPT) positive ranged from 35% (Ecuador) to 84% (Brazil). The proportion of controls who were SPT+ ranged from 13% (Uganda) to 65% (Brazil).

Table 3 summarizes the sputum slide results by centre. The proportion of participants who produced a sputum sample ranged from 74% (Brazil) to 93% (UK). Of these, the proportion of countable sputum slides ranged from 40% (UK) to 95% (New Zealand). The proportions with eosinophilic asthma (EA), i.e. either eosinophilic or mixed granulocytic inflammatory cell types, varied greatly across the five centres. For the four centres which involved children and adolescents, the proportion with EA was one-half (50%) in New Zealand, compared with about one-third (32%-35%) in the LMIC centres; in contrast, the only centre which involved adults (Bristol) was in a HIC but had the lowest prevalence (28%) of EA. Regarding the inflammatory subtypes, the findings were reasonably consistent across centres, with a predominance of eosinophilic and paucigranulocytic asthma, neither of which involve high levels of neutrophils. The exception was Uganda, where a high proportion of non-eosinophilic cases had high levels of neutrophils. However, this proportion was higher in the controls (60%) than in the cases (35%). We also examined the repeatability of the phenotyping with a repeat sputum induction test done 3-6 months after the original test. Between 57% and 75% of participants had the same general phenotype (EA or NEA) across the two tests, with roughly equal numbers switching from EA to NEA and vice versa.

The characteristics of the four inflammatory phenotypes in each centre are given in Appendix 1. Overall, there was little difference in chronic severity in the last 12 months, using the ISAAC definition[10], across the four inflammatory phenotypes: the proportions with severe asthma were 59% for eosinophilic, 68% for mixed granulocytic, 43% for neutrophilic, and 45% for paucigranulocytic. These proportions are relatively high, given that most participants had well-controlled asthma, but this reflects the ISAAC definition which is based on

symptoms in the last year and yields higher estimates of chronic asthma severity than do other definitions which focus on acute clinical severity.

Appendix 2 shows the sputum results excluding low quality slides (those with less than 400 total non-squamous cells, and ≥30% squamous cells). The findings changed little; for example, the proportions with eosinophilic or mixed granulocytic asthma changed from 28% to 31% in the UK, 50% to 52% in New Zealand, 35% to 32% in Brazil, 32% to 33% in Ecuador, and 33% to 29% in Uganda.

Discussion

This is the first time that sputum induction has been used in a standardised manner to compare asthma inflammatory phenotypes in centres in high income countries (HICs) and low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs). There are several key findings that should be considered.

Firstly, for the four centres which involved children and adolescents, this study confirms previous research in HICs that only about one-half, or less, of current asthmatics have EA, and it shows for the first time that only about one-third of asthmatics in the centres in LMICs have EA. The proportions of asthma cases who were classified as eosinophilic or mixed granulocytic asthma (the two inflammatory phenotypes which involve eosinophilia, based on >2.5% of cells being eosinophils) was 35% in Brazil, 32% in Ecuador, 33% in Uganda, and 50% in New Zealand. However, the centre in the United Kingdom (also a high income country) yielded the lowest estimate – 28% in 26-27 year olds. It is possible that this difference between the United Kingdom and New Zealand is due to the different age-groups that were studied. However, it is reasonably consistent with the findings of the ISAAC Phase II study[5] which was conducted in 8-12 year-olds: the proportions with positive skin prick tests were 35.6% in New Zealand compared with 17.5% in the UK; the proportion of asthma cases (wheeze in the last year) that were skin-prick-test positive were 60% and 39% respectively. Thus, it is possible that this finding represents a real difference between the United Kingdom and New Zealand which warrants further investigation, given that both are high-income countries with similar levels of asthma prevalence[15].

Secondly, there was a high proportion of neutrophilic cases in Uganda. However, this was actually lower in the asthma cases (35%) than in the controls (50%). Thus it is possible that this reflects non-asthmatic neutrophilic inflammation due to environmental exposures (e.g. indoor air pollution, increased risk of infections, exposure to animals), but we do not have

information to assess this hypothesis. It is notable, however, that all centres (with the exception of Ecuador, with small numbers) actually showed a higher proportion of neutrophilia in the controls (14% overall) than in the cases (11%). It is likely therefore that most, if not all, of the neutrophilic cases have neutrophilia incidentally and it is not integral to their asthma.

Thirdly, the most striking finding is the high proportion of cases with neither eosinophilia or neutrophilia (i.e. paucigranulocytic asthma). This confirms findings from previous studies in HICs[13], which have shown that a high proportion of asthmatics appear to have no airways inflammation, thus raising the possibility that non-inflammatory mechanisms (e.g. neural mechanisms[16]) may be involved in their asthma. Two objections may be raised against this hypothesis. One is that the inflammatory phenotype is unstable, and that children with inherently eosinophilic asthma may only show eosinophilic inflammation from time to time, particularly when they are having attacks. However, previous studies have shown the non-inflammatory phenotype to be relatively stable[17-19], and we have found similar findings here: 68% had the same phenotype (EA or NEA) in the repeat sputum assessments. A second objection might be that those with paucigranulocytic asthma may not really have asthma, or may have extremely mild asthma. However, we found only small differences in chronic asthma severity between eosinophilic (59%), mixed granulocytic (68%), neutrophilic (43%) and paucigranulocytic (45%) asthma. Although the definition of chronic severity that we used (based on the ISAAC definition) produces relatively high severity estimates, we used a consistent definition across centres and inflammatory phenotypes, so it is noteworthy that we did not see major differences in severity between the phenotypes.

Some of the limitations of this study should also be acknowledged. We endeavoured to obtain random population samples of asthmatics in each centre, by taking random samples in school, and by utilizing existing cohort studies. Standardizing the data collection (particularly the sputum induction) was difficult, and not all centres could obtain readable sputum samples from a high proportion of participants. There were also difficulties in reading some of the slides (particularly those with high proportions of squamous cells). However, the findings did not change when we restricted our analyses to high quality slides (Appendix 2).

In summary, this is the first time that sputum induction has been used in a standardised manner to compare asthma inflammatory phenotypes in high income countries (HICs) and low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs). It confirms that most cases are non-eosinophilic,

with the proportions ranging from 50% to 72%, across these varied environments; most of these non-eosinophilic cases were paucigranulocytic, with no sign of airways inflammation.

Acknowledgements

The World ASthma Phenotypes (WASP) collaboration is based on the AsthmaPhenotypes study which is funded by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement no 668954.

ALSPAC: We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers, receptionists and nurses. The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 102215/2/13/2) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. Alison Elliott and Philip Cooper were funded by Wellcome Trust grant numbers 095778 and 088862, respectively. We would like to thank the participants of this study in all five WASP centres.

The WASP Study group

United Kingdom, London: Neil Pearce*, Lucy Pembrey*, Steven Robertson, Karin van Veldhoven, Sinead Langan, Sarah Thorne, Donna Davoren
United Kingdom, Bristol: John Henderson, Susan Ring, Elizabeth Brierley, Sophie Fitzgibbon, Simon Scoltock, Amanda Hill
Brazil, Leading Group: Alvaro Cruz*, Camila Figueiredo*, Mauricio Barreto*
Brazil, ProAR collaborators/associates: Cinthia Vila Nova Santana, Gabriela Pimentel, Gilvaneide Lima, Valmar Bião Lima, Jamille Fernandes
Brazil, Lab students/associates: Tamires Cana Brasil Carneiro, Candace Andrade, Gerson Queiroz, Anaque Pires, Milca Silva, Jéssica Cerqueira
Ecuador: Phil Cooper*, Martha Chido, Cristina Ardura-Garcia, Araceli Falcones, Aida Y Orviedo, Andrea Zambrano
New Zealand: Jeroen Douwes*, Collin Brooks*, Hajar Ali, Jeroen Burmanje
Uganda: Harriet Mpairwe*, Irene Nambuya, Pius Tumwesige, Milly Namutebi, Marble Nnaluwooza, Mike Mukasa
*Writing Group for this paper

References

1. Edwards, M.R., et al., *Addressing unmet needs in understanding asthma mechanisms: From the European Asthma Research and Innovation Partnership (EARIP) Work Package (WP)2 collaborators.* Eur Respir J, 2017. **49**(5).
2. Pavord, I.D., et al., *After asthma: redefining airways diseases.* Lancet, 2017.
3. Douwes, J., et al., *Non-eosinophilic asthma: importance and possible mechanisms.[comment]*. Thorax., 2002. **57**(7): p. 643-8.
4. Pearce, N., J. Pekkanen, and R. Beasley, *How much asthma is really attributable to atopy?* Thorax., 1999. **54**(3): p. 268-72.
5. Weinmayr, G., et al., *Atopic sensitization and the international variation of asthma symptom prevalence in children.* American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 2007. **176**(6): p. 565-574.
6. Barreto, M.L., et al., *Poverty, dirt, infections and non-atopic wheezing in children from a Brazilian urban center.* Respiratory Research, 2010. **11**.
7. Pembrey , L., et al., *Understanding asthma phenotypes: the World Asthma Phenotypes (WASP) international collaboration.* ERJ Open Research, 2018. **4**: p. 00013-2018.
8. *Asthma still kills: Urgent priorities for the international research community to treat, prevent and cure asthma*. 2019, Asthma UK: London.
9. Juniper, E.F., et al., *Asthma Control Questionnaire in children: validation, measurement properties, interpretation.* Eur Respir J, 2010. **36**(6): p. 1410-6.
10. Lai, C.K., et al., *Global variation in the prevalence and severity of asthma symptoms: phase three of the International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC).* Thorax, 2009. **64**(6): p. 476-83.
11. Wickens, K., et al., *Farm residence and exposures and the risk of allergic diseases in New Zealand children.* Allergy, 2002. **57**(12): p. 1171-9.
12. Weiland, S.K., et al., *Phase II of the international study of asthma and allergies in childhood (ISAAC II): rationale and methods.* European Respiratory Journal, 2004. **24**(3): p. 406-412.
13. Brooks, C.R., et al., *Absence of airway inflammation in a large proportion of adolescents with asthma.* Respirology, 2016. **21**(3): p. 460-466.
14. Gibson, P.G., et al., *Epidemiological association of airway inflammation with asthma symptoms and airway hyperresponsiveness in childhood.* Am J Respir Crit Care Med, 1998. **158**(1): p. 36-41.
15. Asher, M.I., et al., *Worldwide variations in the prevalence of asthma symptoms: International Study of Asthma and Allergies in Childhood (ISAAC).* European Respiratory Journal, 1998. **12**: p. 315-335.
16. Baroffio, M., et al., *Noninflammatory mechanisms of airway hyper-responsiveness in bronchial asthma: an overview.* Ther Adv Respir Dis, 2009. **3**(4): p. 163-74.
17. Simpson, J.L., P. McElduff, and P.G. Gibson, *Assessment and reproducibility of non-eosinophilic asthma using induced sputum.* Respiration, 2010. **79**(2): p. 147-51.
18. Simpson, J.L., et al., *Inflammatory subtypes in asthma: Assessment and identification using induced sputum.* Respirology, 2006. **11**(1): p. 54-61.
19. van Veen, I.H., et al., *Consistency of sputum eosinophilia in difficult-to-treat asthma: a 5-year follow-up study.* J Allergy Clin Immunol, 2009. **124**(3): p. 615-7, 617.e1-2.

Table 1: Collaborating studies and centres, and characteristics of study participants

Centre	Bristol, United Kingdom	Wellington, New Zealand	Salvador, Brazil	Quininde, Ecuador	Entebbe, Uganda
Characteristics	A high prevalence centre in a HIC	A high prevalence centre in a HIC	A high prevalence centre in a LMIC	A medium prevalence centre in a LMIC	A low prevalence centre in a LMIC
Study type	Birth cohort study with extensive detailed longitudinal information; new data collection at age 26-27 years	NZAZCS birth cohort; new data collection at age 16-20 years and cross-sectional study in children aged 12-16 years recruited from schools and community	SCAALA cohort; new data collection at age 11-19 years and cross-sectional study in children aged 11-19 years recruited from three schools	Population-based cohort; new data collection at age 10-12 years; and cross-sectional study in children aged 12-16 years recruited from schools	Case-control study in children aged 10-18 years recruited from schools
Recruitment: - Asthma cases - controls	 176 67	 235 132	 204 40	 176 67	 207 50
Participant characteristics					
Female (%)	177 (73%)	192 (52%)	161 (66%)	99 (41%)	183 (71%)
- among cases	131 (74%)	113 (48%)	134 (66%)	76 (43%)	155 (75%)
- among controls	46 (69%)	79 (60%)	27 (68%)	23 (34%)	28 (56%)
Age at questionnaire, years: mean (range)	26.0 (24.6 – 27.3)	14.3 (8.6 – 20.3)	18.5 (12.0 – 23.9)	11.9 (10.3 – 16.9)	15.5(10.0 – 18.9)
- among cases	25.9 (24.6 – 27.3)	14.1 (8.6 – 20.3)	18.3 (12.0 – 23.9)	12.0 (10.3 – 16.9)	15.6 (12.0 – 18.0)
- among controls	26.0 (24.6 – 27.3)	14.6 (9.0 – 19.8)	19.8 (17.3 – 23.2)	11.6 (10.6 – 12.1)	15.4 (10.0 – 18.9)

Table 2: Clinical characteristics by centre

Centre	Bristol, United Kingdom	Wellington, New Zealand	Salvador, Brazil	Quininde, Ecuador	Entebbe, Uganda
Asthma cases	N=176	N=235	N=204	N=176	N=207
Wheezing or whistling in the chest in the last 12 months	150 (85%)	191 (81%)	180 (88%)	175 (99%)	206 (99%)
Asthma diagnosis confirmed by doctor	171 (97%)	214 (91%)	150 (74%)	108 (61%)	141 (68%)
Age at asthma diagnosis, years: median (range)	-	4 (0 – 16)	6 (0 – 23)	2 (0 – 14)	8 (1 – 17)
Asthma severity in past 12 months*					
mild or moderate	97 (55%)	123 (52%)	62 (34%)	96 (55%)	71 (34%)
severe	79 (45%)	112 (48%)	118 (66%)	79 (45%)	136 (66%)
missing		0	0 (of 180 above)	1	
Number of wheezing attacks in the last 12 months					
0	6 (4%)	11 (6%)	3 (2%)	0	50 (24%)
1–3 times	74 (49%)	85 (45%)	93 (52%)	118 (67%)	79 (38%)
4–12 times	43 (29%)	58 (31%)	64 (36%)	57 (33%)	38 (18%)
>12 times	27 (18%)	36 (19%)	17 (10%)	0	39 (19%)
missing	0 (of 150 above)	1 (of 191 above)	3 (of 180 above)	1	
Sleep disturbance due to wheeze on average in last 12 months (nights/week)					
never	62 (42%)	85 (45%)	49 (28%)	147[a] (84%)	64 (31%)
less than once per week	77 (52%)	88 (46%)	71 (40%)	20 (11%)	69 (34%)

one or more nights per week	9 (6%)	17 (9%)	58 (32%)	8 (5%)	73 (35%)
missing	2	1	2 (of 180 above)	1	
Speech limited by wheeze in last 12 months	22 (15%)	40 (21%)	55 (31%)	24 (14%)	104 (50%)
missing	1	1	3 (of 180 above)	2	0
Asthma medication in past 12 months					
none	27 (15%)	13 (6%)	53 (26%)	76 (43%)	55 (27%)
ICS (preventer inhaler)	91 (52%)	159 (68%)	41 (20%)	6 (3%)	33 (16%)
corticosteroid tablets		8 (3%)	22 (11%)	4 (2%)	82 (40%)
Bronchodilator (reliever inhaler)	144 (82%)	208 (89%)	123 (60%)	27 (15%)	82 (40%)
Salbutamol tablets or aminophylline tablets/injections					112 (54%)
ACQ score (past week)	N=171	N=210	N=201	N=176	N=168
Median (IQR, range)	0.33 (0 – 1, 0 – 3)	0.67 (0.17 – 1.17, 0 – 4)	0.67 (0.17 – 1.5, 0 – 4.17)	0 (0 – 0, 0 – 2.67)	0.67 (0 – 1.58, 0 – 5)
Well controlled (score<1.5)	154 (90%)	170 (81%)	144 (72%)	168 (95%)	119 (71%)
Not well controlled (score ≥1.5)	17 (10%)	40 (19%)	57 (28%)	8 (5%)	49 (29%)
FeNO level**					
normal	-	123	-	111	113
elevated	-	111 (47%)	-	63 (36%)	84 (43%)
not measured	176	1	204	1	10
Lung function absolute values (L)	N=176	N=234	N=199	N=173	N=138

FEV_1, mean (SD) range	3.50 (0.78) 1.62 – 5.61	2.76 (0.94) 1.13 – 5.37	2.89 (0.63) 1.44 – 4.84	2.10 (0.46) 1.16 – 3.79	2.60 (0.48) 1.68 – 4.06
FVC, mean (SD) range	4.30 (1.06) 1.80 – 7.78	3.39 (1.13) 1.36 – 6.05	3.50 (0.86) 0.42 – 6.80	2.34 (0.51) 1.28 – 4.23	3.05 (0.70) 1.77 – 8.01
FEV_1/FVC, mean (SD) range	0.82 (0.08) 0.47 – 0.97	0.82 (0.07) 0.59 – 0.99	0.83 (0.10) 0.40 – 1.00	0.90 (0.06) 0.74 – 1.00	0.86 (0.09) 0.49 – 1.00
Ever rhinitis	118 (67%)	178 (76%)	187 (92%)	79 (45%)	189 (91%)
Rhinitis in past 12 mths [with conjunctivitis]	118 (67%) [99 (56%)]	178 (76%) [130 (55%)]	187 (92%) [147 (72%)]	79 (45%) [52 (30%)]	156 (76%) [100 (49%)]
Ever eczema	121 (69%)	137 (58%)	84 (41%)	13 (8%)	64 (31%)
Eczema in past 12 mths	43 (24%)	55 (23%)	77 (38%)	13 (8%)	36 (17%)
Skin prick test positive	124 (82%)	187 (80%)	168 (84%)	62 (35%)	103 (53%)
Not tested	24	1	3	0	11
Self-reported health status		-			
excellent	19 (11%)		11 (5%)	20 (11%)	4 (2%)
very good	87 (50%)		26 (13%)	26 (15%)	23 (11%)
good	53 (30%)		80 (40%)	73 (42%)	88 (43%)
fair	11 (6%)		67 (33%)	55 (31%)	62 (30%)
poor	5 (3%)		18 (9%)	2 (1%)	28 (14%)
missing	1		2	0	2
Controls	N=67	N=132	N=40	N=67	N=50
Ever rhinitis	17 (25%)	39 (30%)	23 (58%)	19 (28%)	26 (52%)
Rhinitis in past 12 mths [with conjunctivitis]	17 (25%) [10 (15%)]	39 (30%) [22 (17%)]	23 (58%) [13 (33%)]	19 (28%) [9 (13%)]	23 (46%) [12 (24%)]
Ever eczema	24 (36%)	31 (23%)	2 (5%)	3 (4%)	7 (14%)
Eczema in past 12 mths	9 (13%)	10 (8%)	2 (5%)	3 (4%)	4 (8%)
FeNO level**					
normal	-	107	-	53	41
elevated	-	23 (18%)	-	14 (21%)	5 (11%)

not measured	67	2	40	0	4
Lung function absolute values (L)	N=66	N=131	N=39	N=67	n=36
FEV_1, mean (SD) range	3.84 (0.90) 2.12 – 6.32	3.03 (0.98) 1.31 – 5.42	3.32 (0.72) 2.32 – 5.17	2.10 (0.37) 1.35 – 3.19	
FVC, mean (SD) range	4.58 (1.23) 2.40 – 8.11	3.51 (1.15) 1.44 – 6.31	3.69 (0.84) 2.74 – 6.31	2.29 (0.40) 1.53 – 3.46	
FEV_1/FVC, mean (SD) range	0.85 (0.06) 0.70 – 0.97	0.87 (0.05) 0.67 – 0.99	0.90 (0.06) 0.73 – 1.00	0.92 (0.05) 0.81 – 1.00	
Skin prick test positivity	19 (29%)	51 (40%)	26 (65%)	9 (14%)	6 (13%)
Not tested	2	3	0	1	3
Self-reported health status		-			-
excellent	16 (24%)		9 (23%)		
very good	34 (51%)		10 (25%)		
good	14 (21%)		19 (47%)		
fair	3 (4%)		2 (5%)		
poor	0		0		
missing	0		0		

* Symptoms of severe asthma are defined as those with current wheeze who, according to the written questionnaire, in the past 12 months, have had >4 attacks of wheeze, or >1 night per week sleep disturbance from wheeze, or wheeze affecting speech (Lai 2009, ISAAC Phase 3)
** Mean of two or three FeNO measurements used. Elevated if >35ppb for children <12 years or >50ppb for children ≥12 years
[a] only during acute attacks for 121

Table 3: Sputum slide results by centre

Centre	Bristol, United Kingdom	Wellington, New Zealand	Salvador, Brazil	Quininde, Ecuador	Entebbe, Uganda	Total
Number (%) of participants who provided sputum sample	229 (93%)	350 (88%)	181 (74%)	244 (91%)	221 (86%)	1225 (87%)
Number of participants with countable sputum slide(s) (% of those who provided sample)	91 (40%)	332 (95%)	137 (76%)	183 (75%)	117 (53%)	757 (62%)
Sputum inflammatory phenotype: **asthma cases**	N=65	N=207	N=115	N=125	N=98	N=610
eosinophilic	16 (25%)	99 (48%)	38 (33%)	35 (28%)	25 (25%)	213 (35%)
mixed granulocytic	2 (3%)	5 (2%)	2 (2%)	5 (4%)	8 (8%)	22 (4%)
neutrophilic	6 (9%)	14 (7%)	5 (4%)	8 (6%)	34 (35%)	67 (11%)
paucigranulocytic	41 (63%)	89 (43%)	70 (61%)	77 (62%)	31 (32%)	308 (50%)
Repeat sputum slide						
same phenotype (EA or NEA*)	4 (57%)	72 (67%)	27 (68%)	25 (69%)	9 (75%)	137 (68%)
Changed:						
EA to NEA	2	18	6	4		30 (15%)
NEA to EA	1	17	7	7	3	35 (17%)
Sputum inflammatory phenotype: **controls**	N=25	N=104	N=20	N=41	N=20	N=210
eosinophilic	4 (16%)	11 (11%)	4 (20%)	3 (7%)	2 (10%)	24 (11%)
mixed granulocytic	0	1 (1%)	0	0	1 (5%)	2 (1%)
neutrophilic	3 (12%)	11 (11%)	4 (20%)	1 (2%)	12 (60%)	31 (15%)
paucigranulocytic	18 (72%)	81 (78%)	12 (60%)	37 (90%)	5 (25%)	153 (73%)

* EA (eosinophilic or mixed); NEA (neutrophilic or paucigranulocytic)

Appendix 1: centre-specific participant and clinical characteristics by inflammatory phenotype

Bristol

Inflammatory phenotype	**eosinophilic**	**mixed granulocytic**	**neutrophilic**	**paucigranulocytic**	**Asthmatics without sputum result**	**Controls** (with sputum results)
	16	**2**	**6**	**41**	**111**	**25**
Female (%)	9 (56%)	2 (100%)	5 (83%)	33 (80%)	82 (74%)	13 (52%)
Age at questionnaire, years: mean (range)	25.8 (25.0 – 26.5)	25.8 (25.6 – 26.1)	26.0 (25.3 – 26.7)	26.0 (24.9 – 26.9)	25.9 (24.6 – 27.3)	25.9 (24.7 – 27.3)
Asthma diagnosis confirmed by doctor	15 (94%)	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	41 (100%)	107 (96%)	-
Asthma severity in past 12 months*						-
mild or moderate	7	1	5	27	57	
severe	9 (56%)	1 (50%)	1 (17%)	14 (34%)	54 (49%)	
Asthma medication in past 12 months						-
none	1 (6%)	0	0	3 (7%)	23 (21%)	
ICS (preventer inhaler)	11 (69%)	2 (100%)	4 (67%)	27 (66%)	47 (42%)	
Steroid tablets						
Bronchodilator (reliever inhaler)	15 (94%)	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	37 (90%)	84 (76%)	
ACQ score (past week)						-
Median (IQR, range)						
Well controlled (score<1.5)	13 (87%)	2 (100%)	6 (100%)	35 (85%)	98 (92%)	
Not well controlled (score ≥1.5)	2 (13%)	0	0	6 (15%)	9	

Not done	1	0	0	0	4	
Skin prick test positive	11 (92%)	2 (100%)	3 (50%)	26 (79%)	82 (82%)	9 (38%)
Not tested	4	0	0	8	12	1

New Zealand

Inflammatory phenotype	**eosinophilic**	**mixed granulocytic**	**neutrophilic**	**paucigranulocytic**	Asthmatics without sputum result	**Controls** (with sputum results)
	99	**5**	**14**	**89**	**28**	**104**
Female (%)	45 (45%)	2 (40%)	10 (71%)	46 (52%)	10 (36%)	62 (60%)
Age at questionnaire, years: mean (range)	14.0 (9.1 – 20.0)	11.8 (8.6 – 16.0)	11.8 (8.8 – 15.7)	15.1 (9.3 – 20.3)	12.6 (9.0 – 17.9)	14.9 (9.0 – 18.8)
Asthma diagnosis confirmed by doctor	94 (95%)	5 (100%)	13 (93%)	77 (87%)	25 (89%)	-
Age at asthma diagnosis, years: median (range)	3 (0 – 13)	2 (1 – 4)	4 (1 – 8)	5 (1 – 16)	3 (1 – 11)	-
missing	20	0	2	19	4	
Asthma severity in past 12 months*						-
mild or moderate	45	1	7	56	14	
severe	54 (55%)	4 (80%)	7 (50%)	33 (37%)	14 (50%)	
missing						
Asthma medication in past 12 months						-
none	2 (2%)	0	0	10 (11%)	1 (4%)	
ICS (preventer inhaler)	70 (71%)	5 (100%)	9 (64%)	56 (63%)	19 (68%)	
Bronchodilator (reliever inhaler)	90 (91%)	5 (100%)	14 (100%)	74 (83%)	25 (89%)	
ACQ score (past week)						-
Median (IQR, range)						
Well controlled (score<1.5)	67 (76%)	2 (40%)	14 (100%)	66 (84%)	21 (88%)	

Not well controlled (score ≥1.5)	21 (24%)	3 (60%)	0	13 (16%)	3 (12%)	
missing	11	0	0	10	4	
FeNO level						
normal	31	2	8	69	13	88
elevated	68 (69%)	3 (60%)	6 (43%)	19 (22%)	15 (54%)	15 (15%)
not measured	0	0	0	1	0	1
Skin prick test positive	83 (85%)	4 (80%)	11 (79%)	67 (75%)	22 (79%)	40 (39%)
Not done	1	0	0	0	0	1

Brazil

Inflammatory phenotype	**eosinophilic**	**mixed granulocytic**	**neutrophilic**	**paucigranulocytic**	Asthmatics without sputum result	**Controls** (with sputum results)
	38	**2**	**5**	**70**	**89**	**20**
Female (%)	24 (63%)	2 (100%)	4 (80%)	51 (73%)	53 (60%)	15 (75%)
Age at questionnaire, years: mean (range)	17.8 (12.5 – 23.8)	18.3 (18.0 – 18.6)	17.6 (16.3 – 19.0)	18.4 (13.1 – 23.1)	18.4 (12.0 – 23.9)	19.7 (17.3 – 23.0)
Asthma diagnosis confirmed by doctor	30 (79%)	2 (100%)	3 (60%)	44 (63%)	71 (80%)	-
Age at asthma diagnosis, years: median (range)	7 (1 – 23)	5 (5 – 5)	2 (1 – 5)	7 (1 – 20)	5 (0 – 18)	-
missing	11	1	2	29	26	
Asthma severity in past 12 months*						-
mild or moderate	6 (17%)	0	4 (80%)	20 (34%)	32 (41%)	
severe	30 (83%)	2 (100%)	1 (20%)	38 (66%)	47 (59%)	
missing	2	0	0	12	10	
Asthma medication in past 12 months						-
none	8 (21%)	0	2 (40%)	22 (31%)	21 (24%)	
ICS (preventer inhaler)	8 (21%)	1 (50%)	0	11 (16%)	21 (24%)	
Bronchodilator (reliever inhaler)	22 (58%)	1 (50%)	2 (40%)	42 (60%)	56 (63%)	
ACQ score (past week)						-
Median (IQR, range)	0.92 (0.17 – 1.83, 0 – 2.83)	1.83 (0.33 – 3.33, 0.33 – 3.33)	0.17 (0.08 – 0.33, 0 – 0.5)	1.0 (0.33 – 1.67, 0 – 3)	0.5 (0.17 – 1.33, 0 – 4.17)	

Well controlled (score<1.5)	25 (66%)	1 (50%)	4 (100%)	46 (66%)	68 (78%)	
Not well controlled (score ≥1.5)	13 (34%)	1 (50%)	0	24 (34%)	19 (22%)	
missing	0	0	1	0	2	
Skin prick test positive	37 (97%)	1 (50%)	4 (80%)	55 (79%)	71 (83%)	14 (70%)
Not done					3	

Ecuador

Inflammatory phenotype	**eosinophilic**	**mixed granulocytic**	**neutrophilic**	**paucigranulocytic**	Asthmatics without sputum result	**Controls** (with sputum results)
	35	**5**	**8**	**77**	**51**	**41**
Female (%)	10 (29%)	2 (40%)	3 (38%)	44 (57%)	17 (33%)	11 (27%)
Age at questionnaire, years: mean (range)	12.4 (10.5 – 16.2)	13.8 (11.7 – 16.8)	12.3 (10.3 – 14.6)	11.9 (10.3 – 16.9)	11.8 (10.3 – 14.3)	11.7 (11.0 – 12.1)
Asthma diagnosis confirmed by doctor	29 (83%)	5 (100%)	5 (63%)	40 (52%)	29 (57%)	-
Age at asthma diagnosis, years: median (range)	4 (0.08 – 9)	4 (0.7 – 13)	1.3 (0.3 – 6)	2 (0 – 14)	2 (0 – 10)	-
Asthma severity in past 12 months*						-
mild or moderate	20 (57%)	3 (60%)	4 (50%)	45 (59%)	24 (47%)	
severe	15 (43%)	2 (40%)	4 (50%)	31 (41%)	27 (53%)	
missing				1		
Asthma medication in past 12 months						-
none	10 (29%)	0	3 (38%)	39 (51%)	24 (47%)	
ICS (preventer inhaler)	0	0	0	6 (8%)	0	
Bronchodilator (reliever inhaler)	7 (20%)	1 (20%)	0	10 (13%)	9 (18%)	
ACQ score (past week)						
Median (IQR, range)	0 (0 – 0, 0 – 2.67)	0 (0 – 0, 0 – 2)	0 (0 – 0, 0 – 0)	0 (0 – 0, 0 – 1.5)	0 (0 – 0, 0 – 2.67)	-
Well controlled (score<1.5)	32 (91%)	4 (80%)	8 (100%)	76 (99%)	48 (94%)	
Not well controlled (score ≥1.5)	3 (9%)	1 (20%)	0	1 (1%)	3 (6%)	

FeNO level						
normal	12	3	8	60	29	32
elevated	23 (66%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	17 (22%)	21 (42%)	9 (22%)
not measured					1	
Skin prick test positive	21 (60%)	2 (40%)	2 (25%)	16 (21%)	21 (41%)	7 (17%)

Uganda

Inflammatory phenotype	**eosinophilic**	**mixed granulocytic**	**neutrophilic**	**paucigranulocytic**	**Asthmatics without sputum result**	**Controls** (with sputum results)
	25	**8**	**34**	**31**	**109**	**20**
Female (%)	14 (56%)	6 (75%)	26 (76%)	27 (87%)	82 (75%)	12 (60%)
Age at questionnaire, years: mean (range)	15.2 (12.7 – 17.9)	15.7 (13.0 – 17.5)	15.5 (12.0 – 17.8)	15.6 (12.1 – 17.9)	15.7 (12.2 – 18.0)	15.7 (13.0 – 18.9)
Asthma diagnosis confirmed by doctor	17 (68%)	6 (75%)	16 (47%)	19 (61%)	83 (76%)	-
Age at asthma diagnosis, years: median (range)	9, 1-13	5, 1-13	8, 1-16	12, 1-15	8, 1-17	-
Asthma severity in past 12 months*						-
mild or moderate	9	2	18	14	28	
severe	16 (64%)	6 (75%)	16 (47%)	17 (55%)	81 (74%)	
Asthma medication in past 12 months						-
none	6 (24%)	2 (25%)	12 (35%)	10 (32%)	25 (23%)	
ICS (preventer inhaler)	4 (16%)	2 (25%)	2 (6%)	3 (10%)	22 (20%)	
Bronchodilator (reliever inhaler)	8 (32%)	5 (63%)	6 (18%)	12 (39%)	51 (47%)	
ACQ score (past week)						
Median (IQR, range)	0.5, 0 – 1.67, 0 – 2.67	1.0, 0 – 1.92, 0 – 2.5	1.1, 0.17 – 1.5, 0 – 4	0.33, 0 – 1.5, 0 - 3	0.42, 0 – 1.6, 0 – 5	-
Well controlled (score<1.5)	17 (74%)	5 (63%)	22 (65%)	22 (71%)	53 (74%)	

Not well controlled (score ≥1.5)	6 (26%)	3 (37%)	12 (35%)	9 (29%)	19 (26%)	
Not done	2	0	0	0	37	
FeNO level						
normal	6	2	22	24	59	18
elevated	17 (74%)	6 (75%)	12 (35%)	6 (20%)	43 (42%)	2 (10%)
not measured	2	0	0	1	7	0
Skin prick test positive	21 (84%)	4 (50%)	18 (53%)	9 (30%)	51 (52%)	3 (15%)
Not tested	0	0	0	1	10	0

Appendix 2: Comparison of sputum slide results, excluding low quality slides (<400 total non-squamous cells and ≥30% squamous cells)

Centre	Bristol, United Kingdom	Bristol excluding low quality slides*	Wellington, New Zealand	Wellington, excluding low quality slides*	Salvador, Brazil	Salvador excluding low quality slides*	Quininde, Ecuador	Quininde excluding low quality slides*	Entebbe, Uganda	Entebbe excluding low quality slides*
Number (%) of participants who provided sputum sample	229 (93%)		350 (88%)		181 (74%)		244 (91%)		221 (86%)	
Number of participants with countable sputum slide(s) (% of those who provided sample)	91 (40%)		332 (95%)		137 (76%)		183 (75%)		117 (53%)	
Sputum inflammatory phenotype: **asthma cases**	N=65	N=44	N=207	N=116	N=115	N=87	N=125	N=111	N=97	N=75
eosinophilic	16 (25%)	12 (27%)	99 (48%)	57 (49%)	38 (33%)	26 (30%)	35 (28%)	31 (28%)	25 (25%)	15 (20%)
mixed granulocytic	2 (3%)	2 (4%)	5 (2%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	5 (4%)	5 (5%)	8 (8%)	7 (9%)
neutrophilic	6 (9%)	6 (14%)	14 (7%)	11 (9%)	5 (4%)	5 (6%)	8 (6%)	7 (6%)	34 (35%)	30 (40%)
paucigranulocytic	41 (63%)	24 (55%)	89 (43%)	45 (39%)	70 (61%)	54 (62%)	77 (62%)	68 (61%)	31 (32%)	23 (31%)
Repeat sputum slide										
same phenotype (EA or NEA**)	4 (57%)	3 (60%)	72 (67%)	41 (64%)	27 (68%)	22 (69%)	25 (69%)	24 (69%)	9 (75%)	9 (90%)
Changed:										
EA to NEA	2	1	18	12	6	6	4	4	0	0
NEA to EA	1	1	17	11	7	4	7	7	3	1

Sputum inflammatory phenotype: **controls**	N=25	N=19	N=104	N=64	N=20	N=11	N=41	N=39	N=20	N=17
eosinophilic	4 (16%)	2 (11%)	11 (11%)	8 (12%)	4 (20%)	2 (18%)	3 (7%)	3 (8%)	2 (10%)	1 (6%)
mixed granulocytic	0	0	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	0	0	0	0	1 (5%)	1 (6%)
neutrophilic	3 (12%)	3 (16%)	11 (11%)	6 (9%)	4 (20%)	3 (27%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	12 (60%)	10 (59%)
paucigranulocytic	18 (72%)	14 (74%)	81 (78%)	49 (77%)	12 (60%)	6 (55%)	37 (90%)	35 (90%)	5 (25%)	5 (29%)

* <400 total non-squamous cells and ≥30% squamous cells. ** EA (eosinophilic or mixed); NEA (neutrophilic or paucigranulocytic)