First Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review of Relapse in Pulmonary Sarcoidosis: Prevalence, Risk Factors, and Future Directions

Zia Hashim[1], Naresh Kumar Tripathy[2], Alok Nath[1], Mansi Gupta[1], Ajmal Khan[1], Ajit Kumar[1], Anup Kumar[3]

[1]Department of Pulmonary Medicine; [2]Department of Hematology, [3]Department of Biostatistics and Health Informatics; Sanjay Gandhi Postgraduate Institute of Medical Sciences, Lucknow, India

ABSTRACT

Background and Aim: Relapses are known to adversely affect the prognosis of patients with pulmona sarcoidosis (PS). However, a systematic review or meta-analysis on the subject is not yet available in tl literature.

Research question: What are the global prevalence and risk factors for relapse in PS patients?

Methods: We systematically searched PubMed, Google Scholar, Scopus, and Embase electronic databases collect eligible PS studies published until 31 January 2025. Eligible studies were peer-reviewed, English-langua studies reporting relapse and risk factors in PS patients. Prevalence and risk factors were analyzed usir proportions and log odds ratios (LORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Quality was assessed by Hoy et tool for prevalence studies

Results: A total of 50 studies with 5978 patients were included in this meta-analysis. Among these patients, 364 were followed up, and PS relapse was analyzed. Relapse prevalence heterogeneity was significant (Q tes p<0.01). The pooled prevalence of relapse was 0.40 (95% CI: 0.34, 0.46) in all included studies. Sensitivi analyses of the pooled prevalence estimate showed minimal variation, with estimates ranging from 35% to 41 across analyses removing outliers, performing leave-one-out, adjusting for study size, excluding lower-quali studies, and excluding studies without relapse definitions. The pooled prevalence of relapse in prospective v retrospective studies was 0.32 (95% CI: 0.26, 0.38) vs. 0.44 (95% CI: 0.36, 0.54), with a meta-regressic coefficient of 0.14 (p = 0.02). The pooled LOR of relapse was greater for patients who were black [0.91 (95% C 0.44, 1.37); p<0.001], had stage II & III disease [0.55 (95% CI: 0.07, 1.03); p=0.02], and had stage IV disea [1.04 (95% CI: 0.25, 1.83); p=0.01], whereas it was comparable for age, sex, treatment type, and PS type (isolate or systemic PS).

Conclusion: The pooled prevalence of PS relapse in all studies was 40%, but it was lower in prospective studie A black race and higher-grade radiographic stages were the underlying risk factors for disease relapse.

KEYWORDS: Pulmonary Sarcoidosis, Relapse, Risk Factors, Meta-analysis

[1]Corresponding author

[1] Alok Nath, DM
Department of Pulmonary Medicine
Sanjay Gandhi Postgraduate Institute of Medical Sciences
Raebareli Road, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh 226014, India

Take-Home Message

Research Question: What is the global occurrence and etiology of relapse among patients with pulmona sarcoidosis illness?

Interpretation:

- Our first meta-analysis of 3,646 follow-up PS patients from 50 studies revealed that the pooled prevalen of PS relapse was 40% (95% CI: 0.34–0.46).
- The relapse prevalence was lower in prospective studies than in retrospective studies (0.32 [95% CI: 0.2 0.38] vs. 0.44 [95% CI: 0.36, 0.54], with a meta-regression coefficient=0.14, p= 0.02), indicating t potential impact of study design on the occurrence or detection of relapses in patients with this disease.
- Black race (LOR: 0.91, p<0.001) and stage II & III PS (LOR: 0.55, p=0.02) and IV PS (LOR 1.04, p=0.0 were the underlying risk factors for relapse, whereas age, sex, treatment type, and type of PS (isolated systemic) had no associations.
- This research emphasizes the critical need for a consensus definition of PS relapse and prospective larg cohort studies identifying new biomarkers and treatments of relapse to improve the routine clinic practice and outcome of this disease.

INTRODUCTION

Pulmonary sarcoidosis (PS) is a nonnecrotizing granulomatous inflammatory disease that primarily affects th lungs and/or thoracic lymph nodes. It can be categorized into two types, viz. Isolated PS affects only the lung (isolated PS) or systemic PS, which, along with the lungs, can affect several other organs, including the eyes, ski liver, spleen, kidneys, heart, central nervous system, musculoskeletal system, bone marrow, and peripheral lymp nodes[1,2]. Pathologically, this disease may have a self-limiting phenotype with a good prognosis or a progressiv phenotype with a poor prognosis, including a risk of severe organ dysfunction and increased morbidity ar mortality.[3,4] Progressive disease often requires optimal treatment to prevent disease severity and mortality ar improve quality of life.[5,6]

Despite tremendous advancements in PS diagnosis and treatment, unpredictable and frequent relapses remain major challenge in the clinical management of this disease. They commonly occur at various time points aft withdrawal of treatment, including corticosteroids (CSs) or steroid-sparing agents (SSAs), and may persist f years, adversely affecting the prognosis of the disease.[7-10] Thus, comprehensive data on the prevalence of relap and underlying risk factor relapse are essential for developing strategies for the early detection and prevention relapses and improving clinical outcomes.

Currently, there is no standard definition of relapse, and different studies have reported that patients relapse different ways without clear documentation of the underlying risk factors. Furthermore, the data available in th literature on the prevalence and risk factors for PS have not yet been meta-analyzed. Therefore, this study aime to evaluate the global pooled prevalence and risk factors for relapse through a comprehensive systematic revie and meta-analysis of the data of the PS studies available in the literature to date. We hope that this analysis wi provide new insights into relapse in PS patients and lead to the development of a consensus definition of F relapse, as well as the formulation of new guidelines to improve the outcome of relapse-affected PS patients.

METHODS

Study Protocol and Registration

We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (www.prisma-statement.org). The study protocol was registered with PROSPERO, number CRD420251075384.
https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/view/CRD420251075384.

Definitions of sarcoidosis states

Sarcoidosis Relapse:

On the basis of a literature review, relapse may be defined by the following criteria: (i) worsening of pulmona and/or extrapulmonary clinical symptoms and radiological features after achieving remission requirir retreatment; (ii) significant (>20%) worsening of functional or biological features; and (iii) exclusion alternative causes for similar presentations.

Sarcoid Progression

Worsening of clinical, radiological, functional, or biological markers from baseline, including new orga involvement.

Sarcoidosis Exacerbation

An acute flare-up or acute worsening of the disease during treatment tapering or withdrawal.

***Sarcoidosis Remission*:**

The resolution of clinical symptoms, normalization or stabilization of radiological images, and normalization pulmonary functions and serum biomarkers were sustained for 1–3 months or longer.

Anti-sarcoid treatment withdrawal time:

Time when the disease is stable with no clinical, radiological, or biological signs of activity.

Search strategy:

We searched PubMed, Google Scholar, Scopus, and Embase for studies on pulmonary sarcoidosis and relapse published up to 31 January 2025. Two authors (NKT and ZH) independently used Boolean combinations of MeSH terms: (("Sarcoidosis, Pulmonary"[Mesh] OR "pulmonary sarcoidosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "lung sarcoidosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "sarcoidosis"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("Recurrence"[Mesh] OR "relapse"[Title/Abstract] OR "recurrence"[Title/Abstract] OR "flare-up"[Title/Abstract] OR "exacerbation"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("Prevalence"[Mesh] OR "prevalence"[Title/Abstract] OR "incidence"[Title/Abstract] OR "frequency"[Title/Abstract] OR "rate"[Title/Abstract] OR "Risk Factors"[Mesh] OR "risk factors"[Title/Abstract] OR "predictors"[Title/Abstract] OR "associations"[Title/Abstract] OR "determinants"[Title/Abstract])). Reference lists and citations were manually searched for additional studies.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

Eligible studies met the following criteria: (i) full-text observational or clinical studies in English, peer-reviewe journals; (ii) studies reporting relapse in PS patients treated with corticosteroids (CSs) and/or steroid-sparir agents (SSAs); and (iii) studies reporting risk factors for relapse. The exclusion criteria included non-Englis publications, non-peer-reviewed publications, reviews, case reports, studies with missing data, and studies single-organ nonpulmonary sarcoidosis.

Study Selection:

We retrieved 1432 records through electronic databases and manual searches. We imported the search results in EndNote (version 25.0, Clarivate Analytics, NY, USA) to remove duplicates. After 112 duplicates were remove 1320 records were screened by title and abstract. Among these, 79 studies were selected for full-text review, ar 1241 were excluded. Of the 79 full-text articles assessed, 50 met the inclusion criteria, while 25 studies we excluded because of missing clear relapse data, and 4 studies were excluded because full-text articles were n available (Figure 1). We used a two-level screening process to select eligible studies. First, two authors (NKT ar ZH) independently screened titles and abstracts to identify relevant full-text articles. Second, they independent

reviewed the full texts against the eligibility criteria to select studies for inclusion. Disagreements were resolve through discussion, with unresolved issues adjudicated by a third author (AN).

Data Extraction:
Two authors (NKT and ZH) extracted data from each included study's text and supplementary information via Microsoft Excel 365. The extracted data included the first author name, publication year, country, study design, patient numbers and demographics, sarcoidosis organ involvement, treatment, timing of remission and relapse, and criteria for PS diagnosis, remission, and relapse. We contacted the study authors by telephone or email for additional information when needed. The extracted variables included age (treated as continuous), sex (binary), and ethnicity (categorical: Black, White, other). Radiographic stages were categorized per the scoring criteria (I–IV). On the basis of the study definitions, acute worsening during treatment reduction or cessation may have bee categorized as a relapse in some included studies. We categorized those cases as relapses if the original studies reported them as such, but we acknowledge this variability as a limitation. (Supplementary Table 2)

Subgrouping of Studies:
The studies were categorized into the following subgroups: (i) study type, geographical location, and time perio (ii) patient age, sex, and ethnicity; (iii) radiographic stages of PS[11]; (iv) treatment types (CS, SSA, or combine CS+SSA); and (v) isolated PS and multiorgan PS.

Assessment of Quality:
We selected the Hoy et al. (2012) risk of bias tool[12] over the nine-item JBI Checklist[13] for its focus on prevalenc specific biases and validated, high-interrater-reliability framework, making it ideal for assessing prevalen studies in this meta-analysis. The tool employs a four-point response system ("yes," "no," "unclear," "n applicable") to evaluate 10 characteristics: (i) representativeness of the target population; (ii) appropriateness the sampling method; (iii) adequacy of the sample size; (iv) description of the study setting and participants; (coverage of the identified sample; (vi) validity of measurement methods; (vii) reliability of measurement method (viii) appropriateness of statistical analyses; (ix) adequacy of the response rate; and (x) management nonresponse bias. Studies earn one point per "yes" response, with scores ranging from 0 to 10. Scores ≥ validated as indicating good quality, denote a lower risk of bias suitable for meta-analyses, although contextu factors may classify some studies as moderate risk.

Statistical analysis:
The data were initially recorded in Microsoft Excel 365 and analyzed via STATA 18.0 (StataCorp, Colleg Station, TX). Prevalence was calculated as proportions with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) via the DerSimonian Laird random effects model[14] ('meta proportion, random' command). The restricted-maximum likelihood metho was chosen for dichotomous outcomes because of its robustness in handling sparse data and heterogeneit whereas Cochrane's Q was used for subgroup analyses to assess differences in pooled proportions across stu designs. Pooled log odds ratios (LORs) with 95% CIs were calculated for dichotomous outcomes via a rando effects model via the restricted-maximum likelihood method.
Subgroup analysis: Subgroups were analyzed univariately via Cochrane's Q formula to calculate pooled mea and standard deviations (SDs). Continuous variables were evaluated via the empirical Bayes method and a reported as the mean differences with 95% CIs. Continuous variables (e.g., age) were analyzed as continuo variables to avoid loss of information from categorization, with mean differences reported for age comparison For subgroup comparisons, the Z test was used for two groups, and the ANOVA-equivalent Q test was used f more than two groups.

Meta-regression: To account for multiple hypotheses across risk factors (e.g., age, sex, race, radiographic stag and treatment type), p values were interpreted cautiously, and meta-regression was used to confirm the robustne of the significant findings.[15]

Heterogeneity: The amount of heterogeneity, τ^2, was estimated via the restricted maximum likelihoc estimator.[16] In addition, the Q test for heterogeneity and the I^2 statistic were reported.[17] If any amount heterogeneity was detected (i.e., $\tau^2 > 0$, regardless of the results of the Q test), a prediction interval for th true outcomes was also calculated. Proportions were compared via LORs; if the 95% CI included zero, th difference was considered nonsignificant. Studentized residuals and Cook's distances are used to examir whether studies may be outliers or influential in the context of the model.[18] Outliers were identified using Baujat plot, which identifies studies with high contributions to heterogeneity and significant influence on th overall effect size. (Supplementary Figure 10)

Publication Bias:
We assessed publication bias visually via a funnel plot and objectively with Egger's and Begg's tests.[19,20]

Sensitivity analysis: To assess the robustness of the pooled relapse prevalence estimate, we conducted sever sensitivity analyses. First, we removed outliers from the analysis. Second, we performed a leave-one-out analys by sequentially excluding each study and recalculating the pooled prevalence estimate. Third, we excluded studi that did not specify explicit relapse criteria and repeated the analysis on the remaining studies. Fourth, to evalua the influence of sample size, we excluded studies with fewer than 50 patients in follow-up and recalculated th pooled prevalence. Fifth, we excluded studies that were assessed as having a moderate risk of bias. Finally, address potential issues with variance instability, we applied the Freeman–Tukey double arcsine transformation an alternative to the DerSimonian–Laird method. These sensitivity analyses were conducted to confirm th consistency and reliability of our pooled prevalence estimate under different methodological variations.

RESULTS

Study characteristics:
Of the 50 studies, 18 were from Europe, 18 from Asia, 12 from North America, and 2 from Africa. Twenty-ni studies were retrospective, and 21 were prospective. Studies were also classified based on the availability of relapse definition (Table 1). A consistent definition of relapse was utilized in 22 studies, whereas other autho relied on clinical observations. (Supplementary Table 1)

Quality:
A review of study quality revealed that 62% (31 of 50 studies) presented a low risk of bias, 38% (19 of 50 studie demonstrated a moderate risk of bias, and no studies were classified as having a high risk of bias. These variatior stem from a lack of proper definitions for relapse or improper reporting of various parameters and their retrospective design. (Table 2)

Table 1: Characteristics of the Included Studies

Study No.	Study	Country	Design	Total Patients	Follow-up Patients	Relapsed Patients	Time to Relapse (Months)	Definition of Remission	Relapse definition
1	Bouchut et al.	France	Retrospe	175	173	91	48-156	NA	Yes*

	(2024)[21]		ctive						
2	Guliyeva et al. (2024)[22]	Turkey	Retrospective	52	52	14	2-60	Clinical normalization	NA
3	Dhooria et al. (2023)[23]	India	Prospective	86	86	39	6-15	NA	Yes
4	Ozdemirel et al. (2023)[24]	Turkey	Retrospective	73	73	16	NA	NA	NA
5	Spyropoulos et al. (2022)[25]	Greece	Prospective	147	147	42	NA	NA	NA
6	Madan et al. (2022)[26]	India	Prospective	327	327	73	NA	NA	NA
7	Sakkat et al. (2022)[27]	Canada, UK	Retrospective	33	11	7	2-10	Clinical & biological normalization	NA
8	Morar et al. (2022)[28]	South Africa	Retrospective	102	89	54	NA	NA	NA
9	Feng et al. (2022)[29]	China	Retrospective	432	123	24	NA	NA	Yes
10	Gavrysyuk et al. (2021a)[30]	Ukraine	Prospective	143	84	28	6-12	Clinical & radiological normalization	Yes
11	Murata et al. (2021)[31,32]	Japan	Retrospective	103	103	23	NA	NA	Yes
12	Gavrysyuk et al. (2021b)[32]	Ukraine	Prospective	108	108	56	6-12	NA	Yes
13	Fang et al. (2019)[33]	China	Retrospective	60	11	2	1-30	NA	Yes
14	Nath et al. (2019)[34]	India	Retrospective	120	120	29	2-9	Clinical, radiological, & biological normalization	Yes
15	Zheng et al. (2019)[35]	China	Retrospective	203	96	30	1-36	Clinical & radiological normalization for at least 06 months after treatment withdrawal.	Yes
16	Ozyilmaz et al. (2018)[36]	Turkey	Prospective	91	29	13	NA	NA	NA
17	Belhomme et al. (2018)[37]	France	Retrospective	80	34	10	NA	NA	Yes
18	Chen et al. (2018)[38]	China	Retrospective	23	23	12	NA	Clinical, & radiological normalization	Yes
19	Mañá et al. (2017)[39]	Spain	Prospective	640	266	30	NA	NA	Yes

20	Maturu et al. (2016)[40]	India	Prospective	27	27	10	3-12	Clinical, & radiological normalization	Yes
21	Liu et al. (2016)[41]	China	Prospective	42	42	20	NA	NA	Yes
22	Polverosi et al. (2014)[42]	Italy	Retrospective	56	44	9	NA	NA	NA
23	Vorselaars et al. (2014)[43]	Netherlands	Retrospective	47	47	29	8-14	NA	Yes
24	Sharma et al. (2003)[44]	India	Retrospective	56	53	40	On CS Taper	NA	NA
25	Kiper et al. (2001)[45]	Turkey	Retrospective	15	15	6	NA	Clinical, radiological, & biological normalization	Yes
26	Sharma et al. (2001)[46]	India	Prospective	106	85	21	NA	NA	Yes
27	Baculard et al. (2001)[47]	France	Retrospective	21	21	4	On CS Taper	Radiological, & PFT normalization	Yes
28	Muller-Quernheim et al. (1999)[48]	Germany	Prospective	11	11	3	8-22	NA	NA
29	Kim et al. (1999)[49]	Korea	Prospective	27	27	4	On CS withdrawal	NA	NA
30	Baltzan et al. (1999)[50]	Canada	Prospective	23	18	8	NA	NA	Yes
31	Rizzato et al. (1998)[51]	Italy	Retrospective	702	82	30	12-36	NA	NA
32	Wyser et al. (1997)[52]	South Africa	Prospective	37	16	7	4-48	NA	Yes
33	Gottlieb et al. (1997)[53]	Israel	Prospective	337	221	86	2-12	NA	Yes
34	Lower et al. (1995)[54]	USA	Retrospective	105	40	35	NA	NA	Yes
35	Takada et al. (1993)[55]	Japan	Retrospective	295	76	36	On CS withdrawal	NA	NA
36	Chadelat et al. (1993)[56]	France	Prospective	8	8	2	NA	NA	NA
37	Prior et al. (1991)[57]	UK	Prospective	25	25	6	NA	NA	NA
38	Rizzato et al. (1991)[58]	Italy	Retrospective	40	40	4	On CS withdrawal	NA	NA
39	Baumann et al. (1990)[59]	USA	Retrospective	15	15	10	3-6	NA	NA
40	Lower et al.	USA	Retrospe	15	14	5	NA	NA	NA

	(1990)[60]		ctive						
41	Johns et al. (1986)[61]	USA	Retrospective	181	171	128	1-2	NA	NA
42	Wallaert et al. (1986)[62]	France	Prospective	12	12	8	12-18	NA	NA
43	Turner-Warwick et al. (1986)[63]	UK	Prospective	32	32	4	NA	NA	NA
44	Eule et al. (1986)[64]	Germany	Prospective	172	110	24	NA	NA	NA
45	Johns et al. (1983)[65]	USA	Retrospective	103	99	74	On CS taper or withdrawal	NA	NA
46	Rohatgi et al. (1981)[66]	USA	Prospective	35	20	6	On CS Taper	NA	NA
47	Johns et al. (1976)[67]	USA	Retrospective	192	146	102	On CS withdrawal	NA	NA
48	Johns et al. (1974)[68]	USA	Retrospective	152	145	113	On CS taper or withdrawal	NA	NA
49	Emirgil et al. (1969)[69]	USA	Retrospective	84	22	6	On CS Withdrawal	NA	NA
50	Morse et al. (1961)[70]	USA	Retrospective	7	7	4	1-3	NA	NA

Biological tests: Serological, histological or other in vitro laboratory tests for determining the sarcoid activity of involve organs. CS: Corticosteroids, NA: Not Available, PFT: Pulmonary Function Test, PS: Pulmonary Sarcoidosis, SSA: Steroi Sparing Agents, Relapse definition: Yes (available).

Relapse:
Among the 5,978 patients across 50 studies, 3,646 were followed up posttreatment, with 1,437 experiencing relapse. The pooled prevalence of relapse was 0.40 (95% CI: 0.34, 0.46), ranging from 18% to 88% (Figure 2). Most relapses (54%) were clinical, radiological, functional, or based on biomarkers, and 30% were undefined (Figure 3a). The timing of relapse was mentioned in only 58% of the studies. The overall time to relapse ranged from one month to 60 months. The median time to relapse ranged from 3 (IQR 1.8–6.5) to 13 (IQR 9.5–31.5) months (Figure 3b).
Heterogeneity: Substantial heterogeneity was observed in the prevalence of relapse, as evidenced by the Cochran's Q test ($Q(49) = 1029$, $p < 0.001$). The estimated variance of the true effect sizes was $\tau^2 = 0.04$, with a heterogeneity index of $I^2 = 95\%$. The 95% prediction interval for the true outcomes ranged from 0.008-0.787. Th positive range of this interval suggests that despite the heterogeneity, the true outcomes of the studies generally align with the direction of the estimated average outcome. We identified study number 34, 48, 41, 45, and 24 wer outliers. (Table 1, Supplementary Figure 1)

Sensitivity analysis

We assessed the robustness of the pooled relapse prevalence estimate in pulmonary sarcoidosis patients using a random-effects REML model across 50 studies. Sensitivity analyses demonstrated the following:

- After removing outliers, the pooled prevalence was 0.35 (95% CI: 0.30, 0.40) (Supplementary Figure 2).

- For studies with a relapse definition (N=22), the proportion was 0.38 (95% CI: 0.30, 0.45), and for studies without a relapse definition (N=28), it was 0.41 (95% CI: 0.33, 0.50) (Supplementary Figure 4).
- There were no significant differences in relapse proportions between studies with ≥50 patients (N=24) and those with <50 patients (N=26). Additionally, for studies with low bias risk (N=31), the proportion was 0.38 (95% CI: 0.32, 0.45), and for studies with moderate bias risk (N=19), it was 0.42 (95% CI: 0.31, 0.53) (Supplementary Figure 5).
- The Freeman–Tukey transformation yielded a proportion of 0.40 (95% CI: 0.33, 0.46) (Supplementary Figure 6).
- Leave-one-out analysis showed stable proportions ranging from 0.39 to 0.41 with a 95% CI of 0.33 to 0.4 (Supplementary Figure 9).

Despite high heterogeneity (I^2=95%, Tau^2=0.05, chi^2=1029, p=0.0), even in prospective studies (I^2=86%), the pooled relapse proportion remained stable at 40% (Figure 4, Supplementary Table 2).

Geographic location and time period of the studies:

No significant difference was found in the pooled proportions of relapses between Asian (N=18: 0.34, 95% CI: 0.26, 0.41) and non-Asian studies (N=32: 0.43, 95% CI: 0.35, 0.51; p=0.08), or between studies conducted before 2000 CE (N=23: 0.36, 95% CI: 0.29, 0.42) and after 2000 CE (N=27: 0.44, 95% CI: 0.34, 0.54; p=0.16) (Figure 4, Supplementary Figures 7-8).

Meta-regression: Meta-regression revealed that study design (prospective vs. retrospective) significantly affected relapse rates (coefficient = 0.14, p = 0.02), with pooled estimates of 0.32 (95% CI: 0.26–0.38) for prospective studies (N = 21) and 0.44 (95% CI: 0.36–0.54) for retrospective studies (N = 29). However, there were no significant associations with relapse proportions for year (coefficient = 0.08, p = 0.31), Asian population (coefficient = -0.07, p = 0.33), sample size greater than 50 years or quality of studies (coefficient = -0.03, p = 0.72). (Supplementary Table 5)

.

Patient mean age, sex and ethnicity:

In studies with data available for two groups, the pooled log odds ratios (LORs) for relapsed vs. nonrelapsed patients were not significantly different for mean age [-0.01 (95% CI: -1.47, 1.46); p=0.99] or sex [0.19 (95% CI: -0.12, 0.49); p=0.23]. The mean difference of age in the relapse group vs non-relapse -0.01 (95% CI: -1.47, 1.46); p=0.99 group was for black patients compared with white patients, 0.91 (95% CI: 0.44, 1.37) with a P value of <0.001 indicating statistical significance (Fig. 5).

Radiographic Staging of Disease

In studies with data available for two groups, the pooled LORs of relapse were greater for stage IV disease than for stage I disease [1.04 (95% CI: 0.25, 1.83); p=0.01] and for stage II and III disease than for stage I disease [0.53 (95% CI: 0.07, 1.03); p=0.02]. No significant difference was found for stage II and III vs. stage IV disease [-0.54 (95% CI: -1.39, 0.31); p=0.21] (Fig. 6).

Isolated PSs and Multiorgan PSs:

The pooled proportions of relapses in patients with isolated pulmonary sarcoidosis (PS) and multiorgan PS were not significantly different [0.35 (95% CI: 0.25, 0.46) vs. 0.41 (95% CI: 0.34, 0.48); p=0.35] (Fig. 7).

CS, SSA and combined treatment (CS+SSA):

Corticosteroids (CSs) were used in 70% of the studies, whereas steroid-sparing agent (SSA) and combined CS+SSA treatment were each used in 15% of the studies. The pooled proportions of relapse did not significantly differ across treatments: CS: 0.40 (95% CI: 0.33, 0.47); SSA: 0.47 (95% CI: 0.27, 0.66); combined CS+SSA: 0.29 (95% CI: 0.19, 0.39); p=0.11. Compared with the CS (0.40) and SSA (0.47) treatments, the combined CS+SSA treatment had the lowest pooled proportion of relapses (0.29, 95% CI: 0.19, 0.39) (Fig. 8).

Publication bias: The funnel plot was symmetrical, indicating that there was no visual publication bias. Similarl the regression-based Egger's test [intercept=0.60 (95% CI: -2.07, 3.27), p=0.645] and nonparametric Begg's test (Kendall's tau=0.07, p=0.465) showed no evidence of publication bias (Fig. 9). There was no bias due to missing data, as we excluded studies with missing data.

DISCUSSION:

This study represents the first systemic review and meta-analysis in the literature reporting the global prevalen of relapse and its underlying factors in PS. We systematically reviewed 50 studies available in the literature on P relapse to date and meta-analyzed the data of a total of 3,646 follow-up patients included in these studies. Th main findings of our present meta-analysis include a pooled prevalence of PS relapse of 40%, ranging from 10 to 87%. The sensitivity analyses for the pooled relapse prevalence estimate indicate that the estimate is robust, ranging fro 0.35 to 0.41 across various methods. The main estimate, approximately 0.40, remains stable in most analyses, but removi outliers lowers it to 0.35 and reduces heterogeneity. Other analyses, like those focusing on high-quality studies or specif relapse definitions, show slight variations around 0.38. The relapse incidence was lower in prospective studies than retrospective studies, highlighting the potential impact of study design on the occurrence or detection of relaps in patients with this disease.

Some review articles in the literature have reported that the prevalence of PS relapse ranges from 13–80%, whic is consistent with our findings.[7,10,71] The variability in relapse prevalence observed in our study, as well as in the review articles, may stem from inconsistent definitions of relapse, remission, and PS diagnosis. Over half of o included studies lacked a relapse definition. Similarly, although the WASOG and ATS criteria for the diagnosis sarcoidosis have been available since 1999.[11,53,72], most of the studies have used no standard criteria, such histological confirmation of the sarcoid diagnosis, leading to misdiagnosis of conditions resembling PS or P relapse. To overcome these issues related to PS relapse, we propose the following definitions of relapse and oth associated conditions. Relapse is defined as the reappearance or worsening of clinical, radiological, functional, biological indicators after remission, necessitating further treatment and the exclusion of alternative diagnose Disease progression is defined as the gradual worsening of the disease, including new organ involvemen Exacerbation is defined as a sudden flare-up, often during treatment tapering. Remission is defined as th sustained resolution of symptoms and stabilization of diagnostic markers for 1–3 months after treatment cessatio However, these definitions need to be validated by further large cohort multicenter studies in this area to develop consensus definition for these terms.

The timing of relapse after remission varies depending on disease severity and treatment efficacy. Our met analysis revealed that the minimum and maximum median times to relapse were 3 and 13 months, respectivel Most relapses occurred within the first three years, with approximately 10% occurring in the fourth or fifth yea suggesting the need for active patient follow-up for five years. Similarly, several studies in the literature repo relapse occurrence from 1–24 months after remission and, in certain cases, after 24 months of treatme withdrawal.[6,10,53] In accordance with our data, one study reported no further relapses in patients who remaine asymptomatic for three years after prednisone withdrawal.[51] Therefore, evidence suggests that relapse beyond th fifth year of treatment-free remission is uncommon, with most relapses occurring within three years.

The type of relapse, characterized by clinical, radiological, pulmonary function, or biochemical parameters, clinically important for improving the prognosis of patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis. Over 60% of patien

experienced symptomatic relapses with radiological, functional, or biochemical features, whereas approximate 10% experienced asymptomatic relapses, with the remainder undefined or based on other criteria. In the literatur most studies report clinical and/or radiological relapses, some report functional or biochemical relapses, and mar do not specify relapse types.[5,73] On the basis of these findings, relapse diagnosis should not rely solely on clinic parameters but should include radiological, functional, or biochemical parameters. Asymptomatic relapse detected by biomarkers, may sometimes precede clinical and/or radiological signs, facilitating early detection ar management of relapses.

Relapse-associated risk factors are crucial for determining treatment strategies for this disease but remain large unknown. In this study, we identified several potential risk factors for PS relapse. Compared with white rac black race is a well-documented risk factor for sarcoidosis and is associated with greater disease severity ar mortality.[74,75] Our observation aligns with the high severity of sarcoidosis in the Black population,[74,75] which supported by studies reporting high relapse rates in this group.[28,65,69] The increased relapse risk in Black patien may reflect genetic predispositions (HLA-DRB1*14 allele) or disparities in healthcare, warranting furth investigation.[76] There was no effect of age, gender, geographical region, or year of study—whether in Asia elsewhere, or conducted before or after 2000 CE—suggesting the cosmopolitan nature of this problem.

Additionally, we observed that higher radiographic scoring stages of the lungs (i.e., stages II, III, and IV) a important risk factors for PS relapse. The lower probability of disease resolution ranging from 0% (stage IV) 10–40% (stages II and III) than from 50–90% (stage I) supports our findings.[77] The higher relapse rate observed stage IV sarcoidosis patients (pooled LOR: 1.04, 95% CI: 0.25, 1.83) may partly reflect chronic, nonresolvir disease rather than true relapse, particularly given the retrospective nature of many included studies (58 retrospective). Some stage IV patients may remain stable without active biomarkers, suggesting that selection bi could overestimate relapse rates in this group. This distinction warrants cautious interpretation of our finding Furthermore, prior studies, including ours and others, have reported higher relapse rates in patients with advance radiographic stages, supporting these findings.[25,34,59] Parenchymal damage or fibrosis in advanced stages ma reflect persistent inflammation, increasing the likelihood of relapse.

To determine whether isolated or systemic PS could be a risk factor for relapse, we compared relapse rat between these subgroups but found no significant difference. However, previous studies have shown a lir between multiorgan involvement and relapse risk,[32,37] reporting high relapse rates in patients with lung,[24] eye[2 heart[31], musculoskeletal system[21] involvement central nervous system (CNS).[27,78]

We also explored whether different treatments, including corticosteroids (CSs; e.g., prednisone, prednisolone, ar methylprednisolone), immunosuppressive agents (SSAs; e.g., methotrexate, azathioprine, and infliximab), combined regimens (CSs + SSAs) used to treat PS, could affect the prevalence of relapse. SSAs were grouped du to limited data for stratification (15% of studies), although this includes heterogeneous agents (e.g., methotrexa vs. TNF-alpha inhibitors for severe disease), potentially masking differential relapse risks. Our data reveale comparable pooled relapse rates in PS patients treated with CS, SSA, or combined regimens, suggesting that the was no association between relapse and treatment modality. Although not significant, the lower relapse rate wi combined treatment (0.29) than with CS (0.40) or SSA monotherapy (0.47) suggests a possible synergistic effec particularly in severe cases, warranting further exploration. In contrast, several studies have reported that C monotherapy is a major risk factor for PS relapse.[10,31,53,79] However, these results were based solely on th observation of a high relapse rate in CS-treated patients, without comparisons between CS-treated and non-C treated patients. Notably, most CS-treated patients had severe disease at baseline. Thus, high disease severit rather than CS therapy, may be the underlying cause of the high relapse rate in such patients. A recent repo showing comparable outcomes between patients with CS- versus MTX-treated sarcoidosis further supports th

notion.[80] Interestingly, some reports have revealed a significantly lower relapse rate and better disease outcom in patients receiving combined treatment (CS + MTX) than in those receiving CS treatment alone.[81,82] Furth studies on the combined treatment of PS with CS + MTX or other SSAs may provide new insights into this area.

Determining the factors contributing to the variability in relapse timing among patients is critically important. Relapse rates may differ between spontaneous remission and treatment-induced remission, with the latter potentially posing a higher risk, especially after corticosteroid cessation. However, this study focused solely on treated patients[53] We hypothesize that residual disease activity (i.e., subclinical disease activity after treatment) may contribute to relapse in pulmonary sarcoidosis patients. Evidence supporting this hypothesis is found in the literature, where studies show that posttreatment residual sarcoid activity is significantly more prevalent in patients who relapse than in those who do not relapse.[51] Therefore, the occurrence of relapses may directly depen on the degree of residual sarcoid activity present in patients at the time of treatment withdrawal. Relapses may occur early in cases of moderate residual disease activity, late in cases of mild disease activity, and not at all in cases of minimal or no disease activity. Relapse timing may also depend on treatment type (e.g., corticosteroids vs. combined therapy) and duration. The variability in treatment regimens across studies (70% CS, 15% SSA, 15% CS+SSA) likely contributes to the observed range in median relapse times (3–13 months), suggesting that premature therapy cessation could lead to earlier relapses. Thus, reliable methods for measuring sarcoid activity during treatment and follow-up are needed to determine the optimal treatment duration and the best time points f tapering or withdrawing treatment to minimize or prevent relapses.

A major limitation is the significant heterogeneity [I^2 = 94%, H^2 = 16.98, Q (49) = 1032.0, p = 0.00], which was slightly lower in prospective studies (I^2 = 86%) than in retrospective studies (I^2 = 94%) but remained high. Although heterogeneity exists, the positive 95% prediction interval for true outcomes suggests that these outcom are consistent with the direction of the estimated average outcome. Heterogeneity likely stems from variable follow-up periods (1–60 months), differing relapse definitions, and patient populations (isolated vs. multiorgan sarcoidosis). Prospective studies showed lower heterogeneity than retrospective studies did, suggesting that stricter follow-up protocols reduce variability. Additionally, the studies varied widely in terms of patient populations (e.g., isolated vs. multiorgan sarcoidosis) and treatment durations (ranging from 6 months to over 1 year), making it challenging to draw consistent conclusions. Moreover, inconsistencies in relapse and remission definitions were common, with 28 of 50 studies not specifying the definition of relapse used. The follow-up periods also ranged significantly (from 1 to 60 months), and the inclusion of studies involving extrapulmonary sarcoidosis without directly correlating involved organs to relapses further complicates the interpretation of the findings. These limitations stem primarily from heterogeneous pulmonary sarcoidosis populations, inconsistent criteria for defining disease states, and the absence of essential relapse-related characteristics in the studies. We also found that retrospective studies reported more relapses than did prospective studies, possibly due to recall bias in retrospective studies or stricter follow-up in prospective cohorts. Missing data may have biased prevalenc estimates upward if nonrelapse events were misclassified. Sensitivity analyses excluding studies without explicit criteria (prevalence: 0.38–0.42) suggest robustness, but incomplete reporting of demographics or follow-up duration in some studies could limit generalizability.

To address heterogeneity, we used a random effects model in all our analyses. No study demonstrated a high ri of bias according to the quality scale. Notably, of all the studies reviewed, 31 were deemed to have a low risk bias, whereas the rest were considered to have moderate bias. Visual inspection of the funnel plot and objecti tests (Egger's and Begg's tests) revealed no evidence of publication bias. To address the issue of heterogeneit we employed four distinct methods of sensitivity analysis, all of which confirmed the validity of our result Prevalence estimates remained unaffected by sample size or quality, which is consistent with sensitivity analys excluding studies with fewer than 50 participants (prevalence: 0.41, 95% CI: 0.33, 0.50). Further substantiation

our results was achieved through a meta-regression analysis of significant factors, revealing that prospectiv design was the only significant contributor.

In conclusion, our meta-analysis revealed that the pooled prevalence of relapse in PS patients was 40% (rang 10% to 87%), with a lower prevalence of relapse in prospective (32%) studies than in retrospective (44%) studie highlighting the potential impact of study design on the relapse rate. A black race and higher-grade radiograph stages were the underlying risk factors for disease relapse. Additionally, this study provides a solid foundation f developing a consensus definition of PS relapse and other sarcoidosis-related events, including remissio exacerbation, disease progression, and optimal treatment withdrawal timing. While this study offers the be available evidence on PS relapse and its risk factors, further large-scale prospective cohort studies are essential validate these findings, identify new biomarkers and treatments for relapse, and improve routine clinical practi and patient outcomes.

Data Availability Statements: The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and its supplementary materials.

References:

1. Partin M, Clebak KT, Chen R, Helm M. Sarcoidosis: Evaluation and Treatment. *American family physician*. 2024;109(1):19–29.
2. Tavana S, Alizadeh M, Mohajerani SA, Hashemian SM. Pulmonary and extra-pulmonary manifestations of sarcoidosis. *Nigerian medical journal : journal of the Nigeria Medical Association*. 2015;56(4):258–262.
3. Judson MA. Extrapulmonary sarcoidosis. *Seminars in respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2007;28(1):83–101.
4. Gerke AK. Morbidity and mortality in sarcoidosis. *Current opinion in pulmonary medicine*. 2014;20(5):472–478.
5. Gerke AK. Treatment of Granulomatous Inflammation in Pulmonary Sarcoidosis. *J Clin Med*. 2024;13(3):738.
6. Baughman RP, Valeyre D, Korsten P, et al. ERS clinical practice guidelines on treatment of sarcoidosis. *The European respiratory journal*. 2021;58(6).
7. Thillai M, Atkins CP, Crawshaw A, et al. BTS Clinical Statement on pulmonary sarcoidosis. *Thorax*. 2021;76(1):4–20.
8. Johns CJ, Michele TM. The Clinical Management of Sarcoidosis A 50-Year Experience at the Johns Hopkins Hospital. *Medicine*. 1999;78(2).
9. Shobha V. Pulmonary sarcoidosis – Predictors of relapse: Are we there yet? *Indian Journal of Rheumatology*. 2019;14(4).
10. Baughman RP, Judson MA. Relapses of sarcoidosis: what are they and can we predict who will get them? *The European respiratory journal*. 2014;43(2):337–339.
11. Statement on sarcoidosis. Joint Statement of the American Thoracic Society (ATS), the European Respiratory Society (ERS) and the World Association of Sarcoidosis and Other Granulomatous Disorders (WASOG) adopted by the ATS Board of Directors and by the ERS Executive Committee, February 1999. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 1999;160(2):736–755.
12. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2012;65(9):934–939.
13. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. The Joanna Briggs Institute approach for conducting systematic reviews of prevalence and incidence data. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*. 2015;13(3):163–169.
14. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled clinical trials*. 1986;7(3):177–188.
15. Thompson SG, Higgins JP. How should meta-regression analyses be undertaken and interpreted? *Stat Med*. 2002;21(11):1559–1573.
16. Viechtbauer W. Bias and Efficiency of Meta-Analytic Variance Estimators in the Random-Effects Model. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*. 2005;30(3):261–293.
17. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. 2002;21(11):1539–1558.
18. Viechtbauer W, Cheung MW. Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2010;1(2):112–125.
19. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics*. 1994;50(4):1088–1101.
20. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*. 1997;315(7109):629–634.
21. Bouchut A, Lhote R, Maksud P, et al. Prognostic value of hypermetabolic bone sarcoidosis observed by 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography. *Rheumatology (Oxford, England)*. 2024.

22. Guliyeva V, Demirkan FG, Yigit RE, et al. A clinical overview of paediatric sarcoidosis: Multicentre experience from Turkey. *Modern rheumatology*. 2024;34(3):639–645.
23. Dhooria S, Sehgal IS, Agarwal R, et al. High-dose (40 mg) versus low-dose (20 mg) prednisolone for treating sarcoidosis: a randomised trial (SARCORT trial). *The European respiratory journal.* 2023;62(3).
24. Sahin Ozdemirel T, Akinci Ozyurek B, Tatci E, et al. Relationships Between Systemic Inflammatory Markers and 18F-FDG PET/CT Imaging and Clinical Findings in Pulmonary Sarcoidosis. *Cureus.* 2023;15(3):e36521.
25. Spyropoulos G, Domvri K, Manika K, Fouka E, Kontakiotis T, Papakosta D. Clinical, imaging and functional determinants of sarcoidosis phenotypes in a Greek population. *Journal of thoracic disease.* 2022;14(6):1941–1949.
26. Madan K, Sryma PB, Pattnaik B, et al. Clinical Profile of 327 patients with Sarcoidosis in India: An Ambispective Cohort Study in a Tuberculosis (TB) Endemic Population. *Lung India.* 2022;39(1):51–57.
27. Sakkat A, Cox G, Khalidi N, et al. Infliximab therapy in refractory sarcoidosis: a multicenter real-world analysis. *Respiratory research.* 2022;23(1):54.
28. Morar R, Feldman C. Sarcoidosis in Johannesburg, South Africa: A retrospective study. *Afr J Thorac Crit Care Med*. 2022;28(4):150–156.
29. Feng H, Yan L, Zhao Y, Li Z, Kang J. Neutrophils in Bronchoalveolar Lavage Fluid Indicating the Severity and Relapse of Pulmonary Sarcoidosis. *Front Med (Lausanne).* 2021;8:787681.
30. Gavrysyuk V, Merenkova I, Dziublyk Y, et al. Efficacy and Tolerability of Methotrexate and Methylprednisolone in a Comparative Assessment of the Primary and Long-Term Outcomes in Patients with Pulmonary Sarcoidosis. *Diagnostics.* 2021;11(7). https://mdpi-res.com/d_attachment/diagnostics/diagnostics-11-01289/article_deploy/diagnostics-11-01289.pdf?version=1626676520.
31. Murata O, Suzuki K, Takeuchi T, Kudo A. Incidence and baseline characteristics of relapse or exacerbation in patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis in Japan. *Sarcoidosis, vasculitis, and diffuse lung diseases : official journal of WASOG.* 2021;38(3):e2021026.
32. Gavrysyuk V, Merenkova I, Vlasova N, Bychenko O. Clinical Factors Associated with the Risk of Pulmonary Sarcoidosis Relapse. *Georgian medical news.* 2021(313):84–88.
33. Fang C, Zhang Q, Wang N, Jing X, Xu Z. Effectiveness and tolerability of methotrexate in pulmonary sarcoidosis: A single center real-world study. *Sarcoidosis, vasculitis, and diffuse lung diseases : official journal of WASOG.* 2019;36(3):217–227.
34. Nath A, Hashim Z, Khan A, et al. Experience of Sarcoidosis and Factors Predicting Relapse at a Tertiary Care Institute in North India. *Indian Journal of Rheumatology.* 2019;14(4).
35. Zheng Y, Wang H, Xu Q, et al. Risk factors of relapse in pulmonary sarcoidosis treated with corticosteroids. *Clinical rheumatology.* 2019;38(7):1993–1999.
36. Ozyilmaz E, Ozturk OG, Durmaz A, et al. Early prediction of sarcoidosis prognosis with HLA typing: a 5 year follow-up study. *Sarcoidosis, vasculitis, and diffuse lung diseases : official journal of WASOG.* 2018;35(3):184–191.
37. Belhomme N, Jouneau S, Bouzille G, et al. Role of serum immunoglobulins for predicting sarcoidosis outcome: A cohort study. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(4):e0193122.
38. Chen H, Jin R, Wang Y, Li L, Li K, He Y. The Utility of (18)F-FDG PET/CT for Monitoring Response and Predicting Prognosis after Glucocorticoids Therapy for Sarcoidosis. *Biomed Res Int.* 2018;2018(1):1823710.
39. Mañá J, Rubio-Rivas M, Villalba N, et al. Multidisciplinary approach and long-term follow-up in a series of 640 consecutive patients with sarcoidosis: Cohort study of a 40-year clinical experience at a tertiary referral center in Barcelona, Spain. *Medicine.* 2017;96(29).
40. Maturu VN, Rayamajhi SJ, Agarwal R, Aggarwal AN, Gupta D, Mittal BR. Role of serial F-18 FDG PET/CT scans in assessing treatment response and predicting relapses in patients with symptomatic sarcoidosis. *Sarcoidosis, vasculitis, and diffuse lung diseases : official journal of WASOG.* 2016;33(4):372–380.

41. Liu Y, Qiu L, Wang Y, et al. The Circulating Treg/Th17 Cell Ratio Is Correlated with Relapse and Treatment Response in Pulmonary Sarcoidosis Patients after Corticosteroid Withdrawal. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(2):e0148207.
42. Polverosi R, Russo R, Coran A, et al. Typical and atypical pattern of pulmonary sarcoidosis at high-resolution CT: relation to clinical evolution and therapeutic procedures. *Radiol Med.* 2014;119(6):384–392.
43. Vorselaars AD, Verwoerd A, van Moorsel CH, Keijsers RG, Rijkers GT, Grutters JC. Prediction of relapse after discontinuation of infliximab therapy in severe sarcoidosis. *The European respiratory journal.* 2014;43(2):602–609.
44. Sharma SK, Balamurugan A, Pandey RM, Saha PK, Mehra NK. Human leukocyte antigen-DR alleles influence the clinical course of pulmonary sarcoidosis in Asian Indians. *Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol.* 2003;29(2):225–231.
45. Kiper N, Anadol D, Ozcelik U, Gocmen A. Inhaled corticosteroids for maintenance treatment in childhood pulmonary sarcoidosis. *Acta paediatrica (Oslo, Norway : 1992).* 2001;90(8):953–956.
46. Sharma SK, Mohan A, Guleria JS. Clinical characteristics, pulmonary function abnormalities and outcome of prednisolone treatment in 106 patients with sarcoidosis. *The Journal of the Association of Physicians of India.* 2001;49:697–704.
47. Baculard A, Blanc N, Boule M, et al. Pulmonary sarcoidosis in children: a follow-up study. *The European respiratory journal.* 2001;17(4):628–635.
48. Muller-Quernheim J, Kienast K, Held M, Pfeifer S, Costabel U. Treatment of chronic sarcoidosis with an azathioprine/prednisolone regimen. *The European respiratory journal.* 1999;14(5):1117–1122.
49. Kim DS, Paik SH, Lim CM, et al. Value of ICAM-1 expression and soluble ICAM-1 level as a marker of activity in sarcoidosis. *Chest.* 1999;115(4):1059–1065.
50. Baltzan M, Mehta S, Kirkham TH, Cosio MG. Randomized trial of prolonged chloroquine therapy in advanced pulmonary sarcoidosis. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine.* 1999;160(1):192–197.
51. Rizzato G, Montemurro L, Colombo P. The late follow-up of chronic sarcoid patients previously treated with corticosteroids. *Sarcoidosis, vasculitis, and diffuse lung diseases : official journal of WASOG.* 1998;15(1):52–58.
52. Wyser CP, van Schalkwyk EM, Alheit B, Bardin PG, Joubert JR. Treatment of progressive pulmonary sarcoidosis with cyclosporin A. A randomized controlled trial. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine.* 1997;156(5):1371–1376.
53. Gottlieb JE, Israel HL, Steiner RM, Triolo J, Patrick H. Outcome in sarcoidosis. The relationship of relapse to corticosteroid therapy. *Chest.* 1997;111(3):623–631.
54. Lower EE, Baughman RP. Prolonged use of methotrexate for sarcoidosis. *Archives of internal medicine.* 1995;155(8):846–851.
55. Takada K, Ina Y, Noda M, Sato T, Yamamoto M, Morishita M. The clinical course and prognosis of patients with severe, moderate or mild sarcoidosis. *Journal of clinical epidemiology.* 1993;46(4):359–366.
56. Chadelat K, Baculard A, Grimfeld A, et al. Pulmonary sarcoidosis in children: serial evaluation of bronchoalveolar lavage cells during corticosteroid treatment. *Pediatr Pulmonol.* 1993;16(1):41–47.
57. Prior C, Haslam PL. Increased levels of serum interferon-gamma in pulmonary sarcoidosis and relationship with response to corticosteroid therapy. *Am Rev Respir Dis.* 1991;143(1):53–60.
58. Rizzato G, Fraioli P, Montemurro L. Long-term therapy with deflazacort in chronic sarcoidosis. *Chest.* 1991;99(2):301–309.
59. Baumann MH, Strange C, Sahn SA. Do chest radiographic findings reflect the clinical course of patients with sarcoidosis during corticosteroid withdrawal? *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1990;154(3):481–485.

60. Lower EE, Baughman RP. The use of low dose methotrexate in refractory sarcoidosis. *Am J Med Sci.* 1990;299(3):153–157.
61. Johns CJ, Schonfeld SA, Scott PP, Zachary JB, MacGregor MI. Longitudinal study of chronic sarcoidosis with low-dose maintenance corticosteroid therapy. Outcome and complications. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 1986;465(1):702–712.
62. Wallaert B, Ramon P, Fournier EC, et al. High-dose methylprednisolone pulse therapy in sarcoidosis. *European journal of respiratory diseases.* 1986;68(4):256–262.
63. Turner-Warwick M, McAllister W, Lawrence R, Britten A, Haslam PL. Corticosteroid treatment in pulmonary sarcoidosis: do serial lavage lymphocyte counts, serum angiotensin converting enzyme measurements, and gallium-67 scans help management? *Thorax.* 1986;41(12):903–913.
64. Eule H, Weinecke A, Roth I, Wuthe H. The possible influence of corticosteroid therapy on the natural course of pulmonary sarcoidosis. Late results of a continuing clinical study. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 1986;465(1):695–701.
65. Johns CJ, Zachary JB, MacGregor MI, Curtis JL, Scott PP, Terry PB. The longitudinal study of chronic sarcoidosis. *Transactions of the American Clinical and Climatological Association.* 1983;94:173–181.
66. Rohatgi PK, Ryan JW, Lindeman P. Value of serial measurement of serum angiotensin converting enzyme in the management of sarcoidosis. *The American journal of medicine.* 1981;70(1):44–50.
67. Johns CJ, Macgregor MI, Zachary JB, Ball WC. Extended experience in the long-term corticosteroid treatment of pulmonary sarcoidosis. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 1976;278(1):722–731.
68. Johns CJ, Zachary JB, Ball WC, Jr. A ten-year study of corticosteroid treatment of pulmonary sarcoidosis. *The Johns Hopkins medical journal.* 1974;134(5):271–283.
69. Emirgil C, Sobol BJ, Williams MH, Jr. Long-term study of pulmonary sarcoidosis. The effect of steroid therapy as evaluated by pulmonary function studies. *J Chronic Dis.* 1969;22(2):69–86.
70. Morse SI, Cohn ZA, Hirsch JG, Schaeder RW. The treatment of sarcoidosis with chloroquine. *The American journal of medicine.* 1961;30:779–784.
71. Nagai S, Handa T, Ito Y, Ohta K, Tamaya M, Izumi T. Outcome of sarcoidosis. *Clinics in chest medicine.* 2008;29(3):565–574, x.
72. Hunninghake GW, Costabel U, Ando M, et al. ATS/ERS/WASOG statement on sarcoidosis. American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society/World Association of Sarcoidosis and other Granulomatous Disorders. *Sarcoidosis, vasculitis, and diffuse lung diseases : official journal of WASOG.* 1999;16(2):149–173.
73. Crouser ED, Maier LA, Wilson KC, et al. Diagnosis and Detection of Sarcoidosis. An Official American Thoracic Society Clinical Practice Guideline. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine.* 2020;201(8):e26–e51.
74. Burke RR, Stone CH, Havstad S, Rybicki BA. Racial differences in sarcoidosis granuloma density. *Lung.* 2009;187(1):1–7.
75. Mirsaeidi M, Machado RF, Schraufnagel D, Sweiss NJ, Baughman RP. Racial difference in sarcoidosis mortality in the United States. *Chest.* 2015;147(2):438–449.
76. da Costa CH, Silva VL, Fabricio-Silva GM, Usnayo M, Rufino R, Porto LC. HLA in a cohort of Brazilian patients with sarcoidosis. *Hum Immunol.* 2013;74(10):1326–1332.
77. Scadding JG. Prognosis of intrathoracic sarcoidosis in England. A review of 136 cases after five years' observation. *British medical journal.* 1961;2(5261):1165–1172.
78. Belperio JA, Fishbein MC, Abtin F, Channick J, Balasubramanian SA, Lynch Iii JP. Pulmonary sarcoidosis: A comprehensive review: Past to present. *Journal of autoimmunity.* 2023:103107.
79. Akram MJ, Khalid U, Abu Bakar M, Butt FM, Ashraf MB. Sarcoidosis: epidemiology, characteristics, and outcomes over 10 years - a single-center study in Pakistan. *Expert review of respiratory medicine.* 2022;16(1):133–143.

80. Vis R, Mathijssen H, Keijsers RGM, et al. Prednisone vs methotrexate in treatment naive cardiac sarcoidosis. *Journal of nuclear cardiology : official publication of the American Society of Nuclear Cardiology*. 2023;30(4):1543–1553.
81. Ballul T, Borie R, Crestani B, et al. Treatment of cardiac sarcoidosis: A comparative study of steroids and steroids plus immunosuppressive drugs. *International journal of cardiology*. 2019;276:208–211.
82. Nagai S, Yokomatsu T, Tanizawa K, et al. Treatment with methotrexate and low-dose corticosteroids in sarcoidosis patients with cardiac lesions. *Internal medicine (Tokyo, Japan)*. 2014;53(5):427–433.

Figure Legends

Figure 1: PRISMA flow chart

Figure 2: Forest plot showing the pooled proportion of the incidence of sarcoidosis relapse in follow-up patients in the included studies. The blue square represents the prevalence, and the horizontal bars represent the 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The diamond at the bottom represents the pooled prevalence with a 95% CI.

Figure 3: Relapse types and time in follow-up patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis. (a) Pie chart showing different types of relapses observed in patients and (b) box plots showing the distribution of median times to relapse, with the left plot depicting the minimum median time (3 months, range 1–12 months) and the right plot depicting the maximum median time (13 months, range 2–60 months), including interquartile ranges.

Figure 4: Forest plot of subgroup meta-analyses comparing relapse proportions across study designs, definitions, populations, and methodological factors. Random-effects REML model; high heterogeneity (I^2 = 93.8%). Solid circles (●) represent point estimates; horizontal lines indicate 95% CIs.

Figure 5: Forest plot showing (a) pooled mean differences in the ages of patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis at relapse, (b) log odds ratios for the sex of patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis, and (c) log odds ratios for the race of patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis.

Figure 6: Forest plot showing pooled log odd ratios of the prevalence of relapse in pulmonary sarcoidosis patients for: Top: radiographic Stage IV vs Stage I Middle: Stage II & III vs Stage I Lower: Stage II & III combined vs Stage IV
Figure 7: Forest plots showing pooled proportions of relapses in patients with isolated single-organ pulmonary sarcoidosis and patients with multiorgan systemic pulmonary sarcoidosis.

Figure 8: Forest plot showing the pooled proportions of relapses in pulmonary sarcoidosis patients receiving steroids, steroid-sparing agents and mixed treatment (steroid+steroid-sparing agents)

Figure 9: Symmetrical funnel plot depicting no visual publication bias. The numbers adjacent to the marker depict the study numbers given in Table 1. The box at the upper right corner of the plot shows the numerical values of Egger's test and the nonparametric rank correlation (Begg) test.

Figure 10: Line graphs showing trajectories of pulmonary sarcoidosis evolution, including (A) disease progression, (B) disease exacerbation, and (D) disease relapse.

Study No	Study (Year)	Frame	Method	Size	Description	Coverage	Validity	Reliability	Analysis	Response	Bias	Score	Risk
1	Bouchut et al. (2024)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
2	Guliyeva et al. (2024)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
3	Dhooria et al. (2023)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	10	Low
4	Ozdemirel et al. (2023)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
5	Spyropoulos et al. (2022)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
6	Madan et al. (2022)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	10	Low
7	Sakkat et al. (2022)	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	6	Moderate
8	Morar et al. (2022)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
9	Feng et al. (2022)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
10	Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	10	Low
11	Murata et al. (2021)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
12	Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	10	Low
13	Fang et al. (2019)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
14	Nath et al. (2019)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
15	Zheng et al. (2019)	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
16	Ozyilmaz et al. (2018)	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
17	Belhomme et al. (2018)	Low	High	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
18	Chen et al. (2018)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
19	Mañá et al. (2017)	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
20	Maturu et al. (2016)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
21	Liu et al. (2016)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
22	Polverosi et al. (2014)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
23	Vorselaars et al. (2014)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
24	Sharma et al. (2003)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
25	Kiper et al. (2001)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
26	Sharma et al. (2001)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	10	Low
27	Baculard et al. (2001)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
28	Muller-Quernheim et al. (1999)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
29	Kim et al. (1999)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
30	Baltzan et al. (1999)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
31	Rizzato et al. (1998)	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
32	Wyser et al. (1997)	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
33	Gottlieb et al. (1997)	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	9	Low
34	Lower et al. (1995)	Low	High	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
35	Takada et al. (1993)	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
36	Chadelat et al. (1993)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
37	Prior et al. (1991)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
38	Rizzato et al. (1991)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
39	Baumann et al. (1990)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
40	Lower et al. (1990)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
41	Johns et al. (1986)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
42	Wallaert et al. (1986)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
43	Turner-Warwick et al. (1986)	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
44	Eule et al. (1986)	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
45	Johns et al. (1983)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
46	Rohatgi et al. (1981)	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
47	Johns et al. (1976)	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate
48	Johns et al. (1974)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	8	Low
49	Emirgil et al. (1969)	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	6	Moderate
50	Morse et al. (1961)	Low	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	7	Moderate

Table 2: Quality assessment of studies using the Hey et al. (2012) risk of bias tool. Columns: Study No (study identifier), Study (Year) (author, publication year), Frame (sampling frame quality), Method (study methodology rigor), Size (sample size adequacy), Description (clarity of study description), Coverage (population coverage), Validity (measurement validity), Reliability (measurement reliability), Analysis (analytical rigor), Response (response rate quality), Bias (potential bias), Score (overall quality score), Risk (risk of bias: Low, Moderate).



Fig. 1

The PRISMA flow chart shows the selection of eligible studies

Study	Number of relapses	Followed-up	Proportion with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Bouchut et al. (2024)	91	173	0.53 [0.45, 0.60]	2.23
Guliyeva et al. (2024)	14	52	0.27 [0.15, 0.39]	2.11
Dhooria et al. (2023)	39	86	0.45 [0.35, 0.56]	2.15
Ozdemirel et al. (2023)	16	73	0.22 [0.12, 0.31]	2.18
Spyropoulos et al. (2022)	42	147	0.29 [0.21, 0.36]	2.23
Madan et al. (2022)	73	327	0.22 [0.18, 0.27]	2.28
Sakkat et al. (2022)	7	11	0.64 [0.35, 0.92]	1.50
Morar et al. (2022)	54	89	0.61 [0.51, 0.71]	2.16
Feng et al. (2022)	24	123	0.20 [0.13, 0.27]	2.24
Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	28	84	0.33 [0.23, 0.43]	2.16
Murata et al. (2021)	23	103	0.22 [0.14, 0.30]	2.22
Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	56	108	0.52 [0.42, 0.61]	2.18
Fang et al. (2019)	2	11	0.18 [0.00, 0.41]	1.71
Nath et al. (2019)	29	120	0.24 [0.17, 0.32]	2.22
Zheng et al. (2019)	30	96	0.31 [0.22, 0.41]	2.19
Ozyilmaz et al. (2018)	13	29	0.45 [0.27, 0.63]	1.89
Belhomme et al. (2018)	10	34	0.29 [0.14, 0.45]	2.00
Chen et al. (2018)	12	23	0.52 [0.32, 0.73]	1.81
Mañá et al. (2017)	30	266	0.11 [0.07, 0.15]	2.29
Maturu et al. (2016)	10	27	0.37 [0.19, 0.55]	1.89
Liu et al. (2016)	20	42	0.48 [0.33, 0.63]	2.00
Polverosi et al. (2014)	9	44	0.20 [0.09, 0.32]	2.11
Vorselaars et al. (2014)	29	47	0.62 [0.48, 0.76]	2.05
Sharma et al. (2003)	40	53	0.75 [0.64, 0.87]	2.12
Kiper et al. (2001)	6	15	0.40 [0.15, 0.65]	1.64
Sharma et al. (2001)	21	85	0.25 [0.16, 0.34]	2.19
Baculard et al. (2001)	4	21	0.19 [0.02, 0.36]	1.94
Muller-Quernheim et al. (1999)	3	11	0.27 [0.01, 0.54]	1.58
Kim et al. (1999)	4	27	0.15 [0.01, 0.28]	2.06
Baltzan et al. (1999)	8	18	0.44 [0.21, 0.67]	1.71
Rizzato et al. (1998)	30	82	0.37 [0.26, 0.47]	2.15
Wyser et al. (1997)	7	16	0.44 [0.19, 0.68]	1.65
Gottlieb et al. (1997)	86	221	0.39 [0.32, 0.45]	2.25
Lower et al. (1995)	35	40	0.88 [0.77, 0.98]	2.16
Takada et al. (1993)	36	76	0.47 [0.36, 0.59]	2.13
Chadelat et al. (1993)	2	8	0.25 [0.00, 0.55]	1.44
Prior et al. (1991)	6	25	0.24 [0.07, 0.41]	1.95
Rizzato et al. (1991)	4	40	0.10 [0.01, 0.19]	2.19
Baumann et al. (1990)	10	15	0.67 [0.43, 0.91]	1.67
Lower et al. (1990)	5	14	0.36 [0.11, 0.61]	1.62
Johns et al. (1986)	128	171	0.75 [0.68, 0.81]	2.25
Wallaert et al. (1986)	8	12	0.67 [0.40, 0.93]	1.56
Turner-Warwick et al. (1986)	4	32	0.12 [0.01, 0.24]	2.12
Eule et al. (1986)	24	110	0.22 [0.14, 0.30]	2.22
Johns et al. (1983)	74	99	0.75 [0.66, 0.83]	2.20
Rohatgi et al. (1981)	6	20	0.30 [0.10, 0.50]	1.82
Johns et al. (1976)	102	146	0.70 [0.62, 0.77]	2.23
Johns et al. (1974)	113	145	0.78 [0.71, 0.85]	2.24
Emirgil et al. (1969)	6	22	0.27 [0.09, 0.46]	1.88
Morse et al. (1961)	4	7	0.57 [0.20, 0.94]	1.21
Overall			0.40 [0.34, 0.46]	

Heterogeneity: τ^2= 0.04, I^2= 93.81%, H^2= 16.16

Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(49) = 1028.61, p = 0.00

Test of θ = 0: z = 13.30, p = 0.00



Random-effects REML model

Legend for Figure 2:
Forest plot showing the pooled proportion of the prevalence of sarcoidosis relapse in follow-up patients in the included studies. The blue square represents the prevalence, and the horizontal bars represent the 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The diamond at the bottom represents the pooled prevalence with a 95% CI.



Legend for Figure 3:
Relapse types and time in follow-up patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis. (a) Pie chart showing different types of relapses observed in the patients and (b) Box plots showing the distribution of median times to relapse, with the left plot depicting the minimum median time (3 months, range 1-12 months) and the right plot depicting the maximum median time (13 months, range 2-60 months), including interquartile ranges.

Study	K	Proportion with 95% CI
Design of study		
Prospective	21	0.32 [0.26, 0.38]
Retrospective	29	0.45 [0.36, 0.54]
Test of group differences: $Q_b(1) = 6.07$, $p = 0.01$		
Relapse definition		
Yes	22	0.38 [0.30, 0.45]
No	28	0.41 [0.33, 0.50]
Test of group differences: $Q_b(1) = 0.37$, $p = 0.54$		
Year of study		
After 2000	27	0.36 [0.29, 0.42]
Before 2000	23	0.44 [0.34, 0.54]
Test of group differences: $Q_b(1) = 1.95$, $p = 0.16$		
Asian vs Non-Asian		
Asian	18	0.34 [0.26, 0.41]
Non-Asian	32	0.43 [0.35, 0.51]
Test of group differences: $Q_b(1) = 2.98$, $p = 0.08$		
Studies with patients>50		
Yes	24	0.41 [0.33, 0.50]
No	26	0.38 [0.30, 0.46]
Test of group differences: $Q_b(1) = 0.32$, $p = 0.57$		
Quality of study: Risk of bias		
Low	31	0.38 [0.32, 0.45]
Moderate	19	0.42 [0.31, 0.53]
Test of group differences: $Q_b(1) = 0.36$, $p = 0.55$		
Overall		0.40 [0.34, 0.46]
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.04$, $I^2 = 93.81\%$, $H^2 = 16.16$		
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: $Q(49) = 1028.61$, $p = 0.00$		



Random-effects REML model

Legend for Figure 4: Forest plots showing pooled proportions of the prevalence of relapse in subgroups according to study design, definition of relapse, year of study, place of study, sample size and quality



Legend to Figure 5: Forest plot showing (a) pooled mean differences in the ages of patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis at relapse, (b) log odds ratios for the sex of patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis, and (c) log odds ratios for the race of patients with pulmonary sarcoidosis

Study	Relapse	No-relapse	Relapse	No-relapse	Log odds-ratio with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Stage IV vs Stage I						
Dhooria et al. (2023)	31	37	4	9	0.63 [-0.64, 1.90]	5.83
Ozdemirel et al. (2023)	13	27	2	18	1.47 [-0.14, 3.07]	4.59
Spyropoulos et al. (2022)	31	53	10	51	1.09 [0.28, 1.90]	8.01
Murata et al. (2021)	5	34	4	20	-0.31 [-1.73, 1.12]	5.21
Nath et al. (2019)	16	66	3	14	0.12 [-1.24, 1.48]	5.46
Zheng et al. (2019)	18	51	6	11	-0.44 [-1.57, 0.70]	6.45
Kiper et al. (2001)	6	5	0	4	2.36 [-0.77, 5.50]	1.75
Baculard et al. (2001)	3	5	1	12	1.97 [-0.52, 4.47]	2.53
Eule et al. (1986)	17	52	7	34	0.46 [-0.52, 1.44]	7.16
Emirgil et al. (1969)	5	21	0	1	-0.26 [-3.60, 3.07]	1.58
Heterogeneity: τ^2= 0.10, I^2= 17.01%, H^2= 1.21					0.55 [0.07, 1.03]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(9) = 10.48, p = 0.31						
Test of θ = 0: z = 2.24, p = 0.02						
Stage II, III vs Stage I						
Dhooria et al. (2023)	4	1	4	9	2.20 [-0.29, 4.68]	2.54
Ozdemirel et al. (2023)	1	12	2	18	-0.29 [-2.80, 2.22]	2.51
Spyropoulos et al. (2022)	1	1	10	51	1.63 [-1.22, 4.48]	2.05
Murata et al. (2021)	0	6	4	20	-1.05 [-4.10, 2.00]	1.83
Nath et al. (2019)	10	11	3	14	1.45 [-0.07, 2.96]	4.90
Zheng et al. (2019)	6	4	6	11	1.01 [-0.60, 2.62]	4.57
Kiper et al. (2001)	0	0	0	4	2.20 [-2.69, 7.09]	0.80
Baculard et al. (2001)	0	0	1	12	2.12 [-2.15, 6.39]	1.02
Eule et al. (1986)	0	0	7	34	1.53 [-2.47, 5.52]	1.15
Emirgil et al. (1969)	1	8	0	1	-0.64 [-4.28, 3.00]	1.36
Heterogeneity: τ^2= 0.00, I^2= 0.00%, H^2= 1.00					1.04 [0.25, 1.83]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(9) = 5.48, p = 0.79						
Test of θ = 0: z = 2.59, p = 0.01						
Stage II, III vs Stage IV						
Dhooria et al. (2023)	31	37	4	1	-1.56 [-3.81, 0.68]	2.96
Ozdemirel et al. (2023)	13	27	1	12	1.75 [-0.39, 3.90]	3.16
Spyropoulos et al. (2022)	31	53	1	1	-0.54 [-3.34, 2.27]	2.10
Murata et al. (2021)	5	34	0	6	0.73 [-2.29, 3.74]	1.87
Nath et al. (2019)	16	66	10	11	-1.32 [-2.34, -0.31]	6.99
Zheng et al. (2019)	18	51	6	4	-1.45 [-2.82, -0.07]	5.41
Kiper et al. (2001)	6	5	0	0	0.17 [-3.91, 4.25]	1.11
Baculard et al. (2001)	3	5	0	0	-0.45 [-4.59, 3.69]	1.08
Eule et al. (1986)	17	52	0	0	-1.10 [-5.06, 2.86]	1.17
Emirgil et al. (1969)	5	21	1	8	0.64 [-1.65, 2.94]	2.86
Heterogeneity: τ^2= 0.51, I^2= 30.14%, H^2= 1.43					-0.54 [-1.39, 0.31]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(9) = 10.55, p = 0.31						
Test of θ = 0: z = -1.25, p = 0.21						
Overall					0.35 [-0.11, 0.80]	
Heterogeneity: τ^2= 0.50, I^2= 37.64%, H^2= 1.60						
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(29) = 42.39, p = 0.05						
Test of θ = 0: z = 1.50, p = 0.13						
Test of group differences: $Q_b(2)$ = 7.55, p = 0.02						



Random-effects REML model

Legend for Figure 6:
Forest plot showing pooled log odd ratios of the prevalence of relapse in pulmonary sarcoidosis patients for: Top: radiographic Stage IV vs Stage I Middle: Stage II & III vs Stage I Lower: Stage II & III combined vs Stage IV



Legend for Figure 7:

Forest plots showing pooled proportions of relapses in patients with isolated single-organ pulmonary sarcoidosis and patients with multiorgan systemic pulmonary sarcoidosis.



Legend for Figure 8:

Forest plot showing the pooled proportions of relapses in pulmonary sarcoidosis patients receiving steroids, steroid-sparing agents and mixed treatment (steroid+steroid-sparing agents)



Legend to Figure 9:
Symmetrical funnel plot depicting no visual publication bias. The numbers adjacent to the marker depict the study numbers given in Table 1. The box at the upper right corner of the plot shows the numerical values of Egger's test and the nonparametric rank correlation (Begg) test.



Fig 10: Figure 10: Line graphs showing trajectories of pulmonary sarcoidosis evolution, including (A) disease progression, (B) disease exacerbation, and (D) disease relapse.

Supplementary Figures



Supplementary Figure 1: Boujat plot with study numbers. Study number 34, 48, 41, 45 and 24 identified as outliers

Supplementary Forest plots (Figures 2-7)

Each forest plot displays the proportion of relapses with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for individual studies, alongside an overall estimate using a random-effects REML model. Studies are listed with the number of relapses and total number of followed-up patients. The size of each study's square reflects its weight (%). Heterogeneity is assessed via τ^2, I^2, and H^2, with Q and p values for study differences and z and p values for the overall effect. The x-axis represents the proportion of relapses (0 to 1).



Supplementary Figure 2: Omitting outliers, model. Study numbers 34, 48, 41, 45 and 24 were identified as outliers and hence removed



(a) Prospective studies

(b) Retrospective studies

Supplementary Figure 3: (a) Prospective studies and (b) retrospective studies



(a)



(b)

Supplementary Figure 4: (a) Studies with relapse definition (b) Studies without relapse definition



Supplementary Figure 5: (a) Studies with low risk of bias (b) Studies without moderate risk of bias



Supplementary Figure 6: (a) Studies with patient follow-up ≥50 (b) Studies with patient follow-up <50



(a)



(b)

Supplementary Figure 7: (a) Studies form Asian countries and (b) Studies form non-Asian countries



(a)



(b)

Supplementary Figure 8: (a) Studies after 2000 CE and (b) before 2000 CE



Supplementary Figure 9: Leave-one-out analysis by sequentially excluding each study and recalculating the pooled prevalence estimate

Supplementary Tables and Analysis

Search Terms: (("Sarcoidosis, Pulmonary"[Mesh] OR "pulmonary sarcoidosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "lung sarcoidosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "sarcoidosis"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("Recurrence"[Mesh] OR "relapse"[Title/Abstract] OR "recurrence"[Title/Abstract] OR "flare-up"[Title/Abstract] OR "exacerbation"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("Prevalence"[Mesh] OR "prevalence"[Title/Abstract] OR "incidence"[Title/Abstract] OR "frequency"[Title/Abstract] OR "rate"[Title/Abstract] OR "Risk Factors"[Mesh] OR "risk factors"[Title/Abstract] OR "predictors"[Title/Abstract] OR "associations"[Title/Abstract] OR "determinants"[Title/Abstract])).

Supplementary Table 1: Sarcoidosis Relapse Definitions

Study No	Study (Year)	Definition
1	Bouchut et al. (2024)	Radiological changes (e.g., new nodules or lymphadenopathy on CT) or biological markers (e.g., elevated serum ACE levels) indicating disease recurrence, necessitating treatment.
2	Guliyeva et al. (2024)	Recurrence of clinical symptoms (e.g., cough, dyspnea) or signs post-remission, after at least 6 months of absent inflammatory activity, with or without ongoing treatment.
3	Dhooria et al. (2023)	Worsening of clinical symptoms (e.g., dyspnea, fatigue), pulmonary function tests (e.g., reduced FEV1 or FVC), or radiological findings (e.g., new infiltrates on chest imaging).
8	Morar et al. (2022)	Recurrence of sarcoidosis symptoms or signs (e.g., respiratory or systemic manifestations) during tapering or discontinuation of anti-sarcoidosis medications, such as corticosteroids.
9	Feng et al. (2022)	Recurrence of sarcoidosis symptoms or signs (e.g., cough, shortness of breath, or radiological changes) after complete disease control, indicating relapse.
10	Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	Worsening of clinical symptoms (e.g., dyspnea, cough) and/or radiological findings (e.g., new lymphadenopathy or infiltrates on CT) post-normalization, requiring retreatment.
11	Murata et al. (2021)	Reappearance of symptoms (e.g., dyspnea, dry cough) or radiological signs (e.g., bilateral hilar lymphadenopathy or

Study No	Study (Year)	Definition
		parenchymal infiltration on chest X-ray/CT) post-remission, or sudden worsening of stable disease.
12	Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	Appearance of new sarcoidosis areas on CT (e.g., pulmonary infiltrates) with or without worsening clinical symptoms (e.g., cough), necessitating retreatment.
13	Fang et al. (2019)	New pulmonary sarcoidosis symptoms (e.g., cough, shortness of breath) or exacerbation of existing symptoms, confirmed by clinical or radiological assessment.
14	Nath et al. (2019)	Worsening of clinical symptoms (e.g., respiratory distress), radiological findings (e.g., new nodules on CT), or biological markers (e.g., elevated serum ACE or inflammatory markers).
15	Zheng et al. (2019)	A chest HRCT showing radiographic progression in combination of worsening of clinical symptoms to warrant retreatment following a decrease in dose or discontinuation of corticosteroids, without alternative causes such as infections, heart failure, or pulmonary embolism.
17	Belhomme et al. (2018)	Progressive disease requiring escalation of corticosteroid therapy (e.g., increased dose) or resumption of corticosteroids after cessation, due to worsening symptoms or imaging findings.
18	Chen et al. (2018)	Progression of clinical symptoms (e.g., increased cough or dyspnea) and/or radiological changes (e.g., new lesions on imaging) post-clinical and radiological normalization.
19	Mañá et al. (2017)	The reappearance of former signs or symptoms associated with pulmonary sarcoidosis after remission, such as BHL or parenchymal infiltration on chest X-rays or chest CT scans, or appearance of dyspnea or dry cough; “exacerbation” was the sudden worsening of stable disease, such as BHL, parenchymal infiltration or fibrosis on chest X-rays or chest CT scans, or increased frequency of dyspnea or dry cough; “improved,” was amelioration of signs or symptoms associated with pulmonary sarcoidosis; and “stable,” was neither “relapse,” “exacerbation” nor “improved.”

Study No	Study (Year)	Definition
20	Maturu et al. (2016)	Worsening of pulmonary or extrapulmonary symptoms (e.g., dyspnea, skin lesions) and/or radiological progression (e.g., new infiltrates) without alternative causes, requiring reintroduction of steroids or steroid-sparing agents.
25	Kiper et al. (2001)	Presence of more than two of these criteria: Worsening of radiological findings and pulmonary function tests, occurrence of hepatosplenomegaly, new eye involvement, elevation of serum globulins, alkaline phosphatase and serum ACE, hypercalcemia and hypercalciuria..
27	Baculard et al. (2001)	Return of respiratory symptoms (e.g., cough, shortness of breath) after normalization of radiological findings and pulmonary function tests (e.g., normal FEV1, FVC).
30	Baltzan et al. (1999)	A decline in lung function from time 0 (the beginning of run in) in any value of FEV1, FVC, or DLCO-SB of 15% or more for two consecutive measurements. Radiography alone was not used to define relapse.
32	Wyser et al. (1997)	Clinical deterioration (e.g., worsening respiratory symptoms) at least 3 months after treatment cessation, or failure after ≥ 9 months of treatment, requiring intervention.
33	Gottlieb et al. (1997)	Return of severe clinical symptoms (e.g., dyspnea, fatigue) warranting treatment, after > 1 month of symptom-free remission without corticosteroids.
34	Lower et al. (1995)	Increased sarcoidosis symptoms (e.g., cough, shortness of breath) or worsening pulmonary function test results (e.g., reduced FEV1 or DLCO).

ACE: Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme, BHL: Bilateral Hilar Lymphadenopathy, CS: Corticosteroids, CT: Computed Tomography, DLCO: Diffusing Capacity of the Lung for Carbon Monoxide, DLCO-SB: Diffusing Capacity of the Lung for Carbon Monoxide – Single Breath, FEV1: Forced Expiratory Volume in One Second, FVC: Forced Vital Capacity, HRCT: High-Resolution Computed Tomography.

Supplementary Table 2: Sensitivity analysis

Analysis Type	Studies	Pooled ES (95% CI)	I^2 (%)	τ^2
Leave-one-out	50	0.40 (0.33, 0.46)	95	0.05
Removing outliers	45	0.35 (0.30, 0.40)	89	0.02
Freeman-Tukey	50	0.40 (0.33, 0.46)	95	0.05
Prospective Studies	22	0.32 (0.30, 0.45)	88	0.03
Retrospective Studies	28	0.45 (0.33, 0.50)	97	0.04
Studies with relapse definition	22	0.38 (0.30, 0.45)	92	0.03
Follow-up < 50 studies	24	0.41 (0.33, 0.50)	97	0.04
High-quality studies	31	0.38 (0.32, 0.45)	97	0.04

Supplementary Table 3: Meta-regression

```
  Effect-size label: Proportion
        Effect size: _meta_es
          Std. err.: _meta_se

Random-effects meta-regression                  Number of obs  =        50
Method: REML                                    Residual heterogeneity:
                                                            tau2 =  .03502
                                                          I2 (%) =   92.37
                                                              H2 =   13.10
                                                   R-squared (%) =    9.39
                                                Wald chi2(6)    =      9.43
                                                Prob > chi2     =    0.1507
```

_meta_es	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P>|z|	[95% conf.	interval]
rel_def	-.0219262	.0734148	-0.30	0.765	-.1658166	.1219642
year	.0948448	.0784528	1.21	0.227	-.0589198	.2486094
design	.1398559	.06235	2.24	0.025	.0176521	.2620596
asian	.0705943	.0690715	1.02	0.307	-.0647833	.2059718
more_fifty	-.0464423	.0646201	-0.72	0.472	-.1730954	.0802108
quality	-.0291071	.0814531	-0.36	0.721	-.1887521	.130538
_cons	.0662692	.1720054	0.39	0.700	-.2708552	.4033937

```
Test of residual homogeneity: Q_res = chi2(43) = 569.37  Prob > Q_res = 0.0000
```

Outlier analysis: A Baujat plot is depicted in Supplementary Figure 1. On the Baujat plot, the horizontal axis denotes each study's contribution to the overall heterogeneity (Cochran Q-test), while the vertical axis indicates each study's impact on the summary effect size. To facilitate understanding, we subdivided the Baujat plot into four quadrants. Studies located in Quadrants 2 and 3, representing the far right of the horizontal axis, substantially contribute to observed heterogeneity. Data from the upper quadrants (1 and 2) exerted a considerable influence on the overall meta-analysis result. The study number 34, 48, 41, 45 and 24 were found to be outliers. After the removal of these studies, the pooled prevalence of relapse from the rest of the studies was 0.35 (95% CI: 30, 40)

Sensitivity analysis using the Freeman–Tukey double arcsine transformation for relapse proportions across 50 studies shows a random pooled effect size (ES) of 0.40 (95% CI: 0.33 to 0.46)

```
. metaprop relapse followed, random study(study) freeman ci

           Study     |     ES    [95% Conf. Interval]     % Weight
---------------------+-----------------------------------------------
1                    |      0.53        0.45         0.60    2.18
2                    |      0.27        0.17         0.40    2.09
3                    |      0.45        0.35         0.56    2.12
4                    |      0.22        0.14         0.33    2.15
5                    |      0.29        0.22         0.36    2.18
6                    |      0.22        0.18         0.27    2.22
7                    |      0.64        0.35         0.85    1.59
8                    |      0.61        0.50         0.70    2.13
9                    |      0.20        0.13         0.27    2.19
10                   |      0.33        0.24         0.44    2.13
11                   |      0.22        0.15         0.31    2.17
12                   |      0.52        0.43         0.61    2.15
13                   |      0.18        0.05         0.48    1.77
14                   |      0.24        0.17         0.33    2.18
15                   |      0.31        0.23         0.41    2.15
16                   |      0.45        0.28         0.62    1.92
17                   |      0.29        0.17         0.46    2.00
18                   |      0.52        0.33         0.71    1.85
19                   |      0.11        0.08         0.16    2.23
20                   |      0.37        0.22         0.56    1.92
21                   |      0.48        0.33         0.62    2.01
22                   |      0.20        0.11         0.35    2.09
23                   |      0.62        0.47         0.74    2.04
24                   |      0.75        0.62         0.85    2.10
25                   |      0.40        0.20         0.64    1.71
26                   |      0.25        0.17         0.35    2.15
27                   |      0.19        0.08         0.40    1.96
28                   |      0.27        0.10         0.57    1.66
29                   |      0.15        0.06         0.32    2.06
30                   |      0.44        0.25         0.66    1.77
31                   |      0.37        0.27         0.47    2.13
32                   |      0.44        0.23         0.67    1.72
33                   |      0.39        0.33         0.45    2.20
34                   |      0.88        0.74         0.95    2.13
35                   |      0.47        0.37         0.58    2.11
36                   |      0.25        0.07         0.59    1.54
37                   |      0.24        0.11         0.43    1.96
38                   |      0.10        0.04         0.23    2.15
39                   |      0.67        0.42         0.85    1.74
40                   |      0.36        0.16         0.61    1.70
41                   |      0.75        0.68         0.81    2.20
42                   |      0.67        0.39         0.86    1.65
43                   |      0.12        0.05         0.28    2.10
44                   |      0.22        0.15         0.30    2.18
45                   |      0.75        0.65         0.82    2.16
46                   |      0.30        0.15         0.52    1.86
47                   |      0.70        0.62         0.77    2.18
48                   |      0.78        0.71         0.84    2.19
49                   |      0.27        0.13         0.48    1.91
50                   |      0.57        0.25         0.84    1.33
---------------------+-----------------------------------------------
Random pooled  ES    |      0.40        0.33         0.46  100.00
---------------------+-----------------------------------------------

  Heterogeneity chi^2 =    1028.61 (d.f. = 49) p =       0.00
  I^2 (variation in ES attributable to heterogeneity) =     95.24%
  Estimate of between-study variance Tau^2 =       0.05

  Test of ES=0 : z=      11.77 p =       0.00
```

Random effect model

```
. meta summarize, random

  Effect-size label: Proportion
        Effect size: _meta_es
          Std. err.: _meta_se
        Study label: study

Meta-analysis summary                             Number of studies =     50
Random-effects model                              Heterogeneity:
Method: REML                                                 tau2 =  0.0387
                                                           I2 (%) =   93.81
                                                               H2 =   16.16
```

Study	Proportion	[95% conf. interval]		% weight
Bouchut et al. (2024)	0.526	0.452	0.600	2.23
Guliyeva et al. (2024)	0.269	0.149	0.390	2.11
Dhooria et al. (2023)	0.453	0.348	0.559	2.15
Ozdemirel et al. (2023)	0.219	0.124	0.314	2.18
Spyropoulos et al. (2022)	0.286	0.213	0.359	2.23
Madan et al. (2022)	0.223	0.178	0.268	2.28
Sakkat et al. (2022)	0.636	0.352	0.921	1.50
Morar et al. (2022)	0.607	0.505	0.708	2.16
Feng et al. (2022)	0.195	0.125	0.265	2.24
Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	0.333	0.233	0.434	2.16
Murata et al. (2021)	0.223	0.143	0.304	2.22
Gavrysyuk et al. (2021)	0.519	0.424	0.613	2.18
Fang et al. (2019)	0.182	0.000	0.410	1.71
Nath et al. (2019)	0.242	0.165	0.318	2.22
Zheng et al. (2019)	0.312	0.220	0.405	2.19
Ozyilmaz et al. (2018)	0.448	0.267	0.629	1.89
Belhomme et al. (2018)	0.294	0.141	0.447	2.00
Chen et al. (2018)	0.522	0.318	0.726	1.81
Mañá et al. (2017)	0.113	0.075	0.151	2.29
Maturu et al. (2016)	0.370	0.188	0.553	1.89
Liu et al. (2016)	0.476	0.325	0.627	2.00
Polverosi et al. (2014)	0.205	0.085	0.324	2.11
Vorselaars et al. (2014)	0.617	0.478	0.756	2.05
Sharma et al. (2003)	0.755	0.639	0.871	2.12
Kiper et al. (2001)	0.400	0.152	0.648	1.64
Sharma et al. (2001)	0.247	0.155	0.339	2.19
Baculard et al. (2001)	0.190	0.023	0.358	1.94
Muller-Quernheim et al. (1999)	0.273	0.010	0.536	1.58
Kim et al. (1999)	0.148	0.014	0.282	2.06
Baltzan et al. (1999)	0.444	0.215	0.674	1.71
Rizzato et al. (1998)	0.366	0.262	0.470	2.15
Wyser et al. (1997)	0.438	0.194	0.681	1.65
Gottlieb et al. (1997)	0.389	0.325	0.453	2.25
Lower et al. (1995)	0.875	0.773	0.977	2.16
Takada et al. (1993)	0.474	0.361	0.586	2.13
Chadelat et al. (1993)	0.250	0.000	0.550	1.44
Prior et al. (1991)	0.240	0.073	0.407	1.95
Rizzato et al. (1991)	0.100	0.007	0.193	2.19
Baumann et al. (1990)	0.667	0.428	0.905	1.67
Lower et al. (1990)	0.357	0.106	0.608	1.62
Johns et al. (1986)	0.749	0.684	0.814	2.25
Wallaert et al. (1986)	0.667	0.400	0.933	1.56
Turner-Warwick et al. (1986)	0.125	0.010	0.240	2.12
Eule et al. (1986)	0.218	0.141	0.295	2.22
Johns et al. (1983)	0.747	0.662	0.833	2.20
Rohatgi et al. (1981)	0.300	0.099	0.501	1.82
Johns et al. (1976)	0.699	0.624	0.773	2.23
Johns et al. (1974)	0.779	0.712	0.847	2.24
Emirgil et al. (1969)	0.273	0.087	0.459	1.88
Morse et al. (1961)	0.571	0.205	0.938	1.21
theta	0.398	0.339	0.456	

```
Test of theta = 0: z = 13.30                          Prob > |z| = 0.0000
Test of homogeneity: Q = chi2(49) = 1028.61             Prob > Q = 0.0000
```

```
. meta summarize, leaveoneout

  Effect-size label: Proportion
        Effect size: _meta_es
          Std. err.: _meta_se
        Study label: followed

Leave-one-out meta-analysis summary   Number of studies =     50
Random-effects model
Method: REML
```

Omitted study	Proportion	[95% conf. interval]		p-value
173	0.395	0.335	0.454	0.000
52	0.401	0.341	0.460	0.000
86	0.397	0.337	0.456	0.000
73	0.402	0.342	0.461	0.000
147	0.400	0.341	0.460	0.000
327	0.402	0.342	0.461	0.000
11	0.394	0.335	0.453	0.000
89	0.393	0.334	0.452	0.000
123	0.402	0.343	0.462	0.000
84	0.399	0.339	0.459	0.000
103	0.402	0.342	0.461	0.000
108	0.395	0.335	0.455	0.000
11	0.402	0.342	0.461	0.000
120	0.401	0.342	0.461	0.000
96	0.400	0.340	0.459	0.000
29	0.397	0.337	0.456	0.000
34	0.400	0.340	0.460	0.000
23	0.395	0.336	0.455	0.000
266	0.404	0.346	0.463	0.000
27	0.398	0.339	0.458	0.000
42	0.396	0.336	0.456	0.000
44	0.402	0.343	0.461	0.000
47	0.393	0.334	0.452	0.000
53	0.390	0.332	0.448	0.000
15	0.398	0.338	0.457	0.000
85	0.401	0.342	0.461	0.000
21	0.402	0.343	0.461	0.000
11	0.400	0.340	0.459	0.000
27	0.403	0.344	0.462	0.000
18	0.397	0.337	0.457	0.000
82	0.398	0.339	0.458	0.000
16	0.397	0.338	0.457	0.000
221	0.398	0.338	0.458	0.000
40	0.387	0.331	0.443	0.000
76	0.396	0.336	0.456	0.000
8	0.400	0.341	0.459	0.000
25	0.401	0.341	0.460	0.000
40	0.404	0.346	0.463	0.000
15	0.393	0.334	0.452	0.000
14	0.398	0.339	0.458	0.000
171	0.390	0.332	0.447	0.000
12	0.393	0.335	0.452	0.000
32	0.404	0.345	0.462	0.000
110	0.402	0.342	0.461	0.000
99	0.390	0.332	0.448	0.000
20	0.400	0.340	0.459	0.000
146	0.391	0.332	0.449	0.000
145	0.389	0.331	0.446	0.000
22	0.400	0.341	0.460	0.000
7	0.396	0.336	0.455	0.000
theta	0.398	0.339	0.456	0.000