- 1 Sivelestat Sodium in the Treatment of Patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Combined
- 2 with Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome
- **3** Hongli He<sup>1</sup>, Xiaobo Huang<sup>1\*</sup>
- 4 1. Department of Surgical Critical Care, Sichuan People's Hospital, Chengdu 610072, China.
- 5 \*Corresponding author
- 6
- 7 Abstract

8 Objectives: Neutrophil elastase (NE) plays an important role in the pathogenesis of acute respiratory
9 distress syndrome (ARDS). Sivelestat sodium, an NE inhibitor, has been approved in Japan for the
10 treatment of patients with ARDS combined with systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS).
11 This trial was designed to evaluate the role of sivelestat sodium in mild-to-moderate ARDS combined
12 with SIRS.

Methods: We conducted a multicentre, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial enrolling patients diagnosed with mild-to-moderate ARDS combined with SIRS admitted within 72 hours of ARDS onset (clinicaltrials.gov, NCT04909697). Patients were randomized in a 1:1 fashion to sivelestat or placebo. Trial drugs were administrated as a 24-hour continuous intravenous infusion at a rate of 0.2 mg/kg/h for 5 days. The primary outcome was PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio change on day 3 after randomization,

 $\label{eq:2.1} 18 \qquad \text{which was defined as } (PaO_2/FiO_2 \ \text{ratio} \ \text{on day } 3-\text{baseline } PaO_2/FiO_2 \ \text{ratio})/\text{baseline } PaO_2/FiO_2 \ \text{ratio}.$ 

19 **Results:** The study was stopped early at the recommendation of an independent Data and Safety 20 Monitoring Board, which noted a between-group difference in mortality. A total of 162 patients were 21 randomized, of whom 81 were assigned to receive sivelestat sodium and 81 placebo. On day 3, the 22 PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio improved by 41% in the sivelestat group compared to 16% in the placebo group 23 (difference, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.10 to 0.40, p=0.001). In addition, the duration of invasive mechanical 24 ventilation was significantly shorter in the sivelestat group compared to the placebo group (median 25 104.0 hours versus 170.3 hours, p=0.006). The Kaplan-Meier curves showed a significant reduction in 26 90-day mortality in patients receiving sivelestat compared to those not receiving sivelestat (hazard ratio, 27 0.51; 95% CI, 0.26 to 0.99; p=0.044).

28 Conclusion: In patients with mild-to-moderate ARDS combined with SIRS, sivelestat sodium may 29 improve oxygenation on day3, shorten the duration of mechanical ventilation, and was associated with 30 reduced 90-day mortality.

31 Keywords: acute respiratory distress syndrome; systemic inflammatory response syndrome; neutrophil

32 elastase; sivelestat sodium; oxygenation.

#### 33 Introduction

Acute lung injury (ALI) and acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), its most severe form, are the primary drivers of intensive care unit (ICU) admission and are associated with a high rate of mortality[1, 2]. During critical illness, patients are often accompanied with systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS), and these patients are also at a higher risk of ALI/ARDS[3]. Despite advances in critical care management and protective mechanical ventilation strategies[4-6], the treatment of ARDS still remains supportive, and no effective pharmacotherapies are available to improve the mortality of ARDS[7].

41 It is currently believed that the underlying pathogenesis of ARDS is diffuse injury to pulmonary 42 microvascular endothelial cells and alveolar epithelial cells caused by excessive uncontrolled 43 inflammatory response[1, 8]. Large amounts of cytokines are generated in this cascade-amplified 44 inflammatory response, resulting in direct or indirect tissue damage and consequent organ failure, 45 mediated in part by neutrophil activation and the secretion of cytotoxic substances such as neutrophil 46 elastase (NE)[9, 10]. Preclinical research has found that NE levels in alveolar lavage fluid are 47 significantly increased in animal models of endotoxin- and bacteria-induced ARDS[11-13], and clinical 48 studies have also shown that serum NE levels in patients with ARDS are closely related to the disease 49 severity[14]. Therefore, inhibition of NE would be expected to curb the cascade amplification of 50 inflammatory response in ARDS and alleviate lung injury.

51 Sivelestat sodium, a small-molecule selective NE inhibitor, was discovered in 1990s[15] and has been 52 shown in previous clinical studies to improve lung function, reduce the duration of mechanical 53 ventilation, shorten ICU stay and improve survival in ALI/ARDS patients, making it the only specific 54 treatment for ARDS currently available [16, 17]. However, most of the clinical studies to date have been 55 retrospective observational studies, and the Phase IV clinical trial of the drug was a non-randomized 56 open-label trial, and the experimental and control groups were set up according to the study sites, and 57 differential post-randomization care at each site may affect the results of the trial[18]. Therefore, we 58 conducted a multi-centre, randomized controlled study to evaluate the role of sivelestat sodium in 59 treating patients with mild to moderate ARDS combined with SIRS.

#### 60 Materials and methods

#### 61 Trial design and oversight

62 We conducted an investigator-initiated, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial at eight 63 centres across China. The ethics committee at each participating centre approved the trial protocol. All 64 patients or their surrogates provided written informed consent. Details of the rationale and design of the 65 study was available in the supplemental materials. Shanghai Huilun (Jiangsu) Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. 66 supplied the trial drugs but had no role in designing or conducting the trial, or analysing the data and 67 did not have access to the data before publication. We registered the trial at ClinicalTrials.gov 68 (NCT04909697) before recruitment began. An independent Data and Safety Monitoring Committee 69 (DSMB) reviewed the data and performed prespecified blinded interim analyses after the enrollment of 70 50% of the planned number of participants. This analysis would have led to a recommendation to stop 71 the trial if concerns about participant safety had been raised.

# 72 Study population

73 All patients who were diagnosed with ARDS were screened for eligibility. Patients were eligible if they 74 were between 18 and 75 years of age, had a  $PaO_2/FiO_2$  between 150-300 mmHg, met the criteria for 75 SIRS, and were admitted to one of the participating centres within 72 hours of ARDS onset. The main 76 exclusion criteria were pregnant or lactating women, diagnosed with neutropenia, receiving 77 immunosuppressive agents or high-dose corticosteroid therapy (>40 mg/day), with a known history of 78 severe cardiovascular, respiratory, renal or hepatic disease, or not expected to survive ICU or hospital 79 discharge in the judgement of the attending clinician. Detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria were 80 provided in the Supplementary materials.

#### 81 Randomization, blinding and interventions

Randomization was performed by means of a web-based system with the use of computer-generated, permuted-block sequences with stratification according to site. Eligible patients were randomly assigned to receive sivelestat sodium or placebo in a 1:1 ratio. Blinded medication packs were used to ensure allocation concealment. Patients, treating physicians, investigators, data collectors and outcome assessors were unware of the group assignments.

Patients in the sivelestat sodium group received a blinded 24-hour continuous intravenous infusion of
sivelastat sodium at a rate of 0.2 mg/kg/h for 5 days after randomization. Patients in the placebo group
received a blinded continuous infusion of normal saline at the same rate and according to the same

90 protocol. All other treatments were administered at the discretion of the treating physicians.

#### 91 Trial outcomes

The primary outcome was PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio change on day 3 after randomization, which was defined as (PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio on day 3 – baseline PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio)/baseline PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio. Secondary outcomes included PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio change on day 1 and day 5, duration of invasive mechanical ventilation, duration of non-invasive mechanical ventilation within 28 days, new-requirement for mechanical ventilation within 28 days, length of hospital and ICU stay, ICU and hospital-free days within 28 days, 28-day, 60-day and 90-day mortality, and plasma interleukin-6 (IL-6), NE, C-reactive protein (CRP) and IL-10 concerntrations at baseline, day 1, day 3 and day 5.

#### 99 Sample size estimation

100 On the basis of previous studies [19, 20], we hypothesised that the  $PaO_2/FiO_2$  ratio change on day 3 101 after randomization would be 20% in patients with ARDS receiving standard of care. To 102 demonstrate a 14% absolute change in the primary outcome (34% in patients receiving sivelestat 103 sodium) with 80% power at a two-sided alpha level of 0.05, we projected an estimated sample size of 104 312 participants. The sample size calculation, involving a group sequential design, was performed 105 following the approach of O'Brien and Fleming. According to this method, this trial can be finished as 106 soon as the null hypothesis is rejected in the interim data analysis while controlling the total alpha at the 107 level of 0.05. The interim analyses will take place after the enrolment of 50% patients. Meanwhile, we 108 increase the calculated sample allowing for a potential approximately 4% withdrawal. Finally, a total of 109 324 patients (162 per group) are needed. Early stopping rule in the interim data analysis (when 162 110 patients have been enrolled) is based on the O' Brien-Fleming member of the family of Lan-DeMets 111 spending function rules. The calculation was implemented using the PASS 11.0 software (PASS, NCSS 112 software, Kaysville, USA).

113 Statistical analyses

Analyses were conducted using R 4.4.1 software. Two-sided p values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Continuous data were reported as means and standard deviations (SD) when normally distributed or as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) when not normally distributed. The normality of continuous variables will be tested by checking the quantile–quantile (Q–Q) plot. Categorical data will be expressed as numbers and percentages.

119 We used generalized linear model (GLM) (family = gaussian (link = identity)) to compare the

120 difference in the PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio change on day 3 after randomization between groups. For the 121 secondary outcomes, GLM (family = gaussian or binomial (link = identity)) models were used for the 122 continuous or categorical data, respectively. Risk differences and its 95% confidence interval (CI) were 123 calculated for categorical outcomes, and mean differences (95% CI) for continuous outcomes. When 124 the assumptions of GLM models were not fulfilled, log data conversion will be made. Kaplan-Meier 125 curves were used to compare the 28-day survival curves after randomization. The difference between 126 two-groups was calculated by tested by log-rank test. Cox proportional hazards models were performed 127 to calculate the hazard ratios (HR) and associated 95% CI. We tested the assumptions of proportional 128 hazard by checking the plots of Schoenfeld residuals over time.

129 Results

#### 130 Recruitment and baseline characteristics

From February 2022 through February 2024, we screened 694 patients for eligibility. Of these, 162 patients were enrolled in the trial from six centres across China. At the interim analysis, a between-group difference in mortality was observed and the DSMB stopped recruitment and requested to unblind the data. After reviewing the unblinded data, the DSMB concluded that the trial should be stopped due to the potential mortality benefit of the trial intervention, and the trial was formally stopped. Thus, 81 patients were randomly assigned to the sivelastat sodium group and 81 to the placebo group (**Figure 1**). The numbers of cases from each site were shown in Supplemental Table 1.

138 Baseline demographics and characteristics were not significantly different between the sivelastat

sodium and placebo group (Table 1). The median age was 57 years, and 76.5% of patients were men.

140 More than half of the patients were receiving mechanical ventilation at enrollment (83/162, 51.2%).

141 The mean ( $\pm$ SD) PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio was 190.5  $\pm$  46.8 mmHg in the sivelastat sodium group and 174.8  $\pm$ 

- 142 49.6 mmHg in the placebo group.
- 143 Primary and secondary outcomes

On day 3 after randomization, the PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio improved by 41% in the sivelestat sodium group compared to 16% in the placebo group (difference, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.10 to 0.40, p = 0.001). The results were similar on day1 and day5 (**Table 2**).

The duration of invasive mechanical ventilation was significantly shorter in the sivelestat sodium group compared to the placebo group (median 104.0 hours versus 170.3 hours, p = 0.006). Ten patients (12.3%) in the sivelestat sodium group and 20 patients (24.7%) in the placebo group developed

- 150 acquired infections during the ICU stay (p = 0.043). The Kaplan-Meier curves showed a significant
- 151 reduction in 90-day mortality in patients treated with sivelestat sodium compared with those not treated
- 152 (hazard ratio, 0.51; 95% CI, 0.26 to 0.99; p=0.044) (**Figure 2**).

There were no significant differences between the two groups in new-requirement of mechanical ventilation, the duration of non-invasive mechanical ventilation, and the duration of other oxygen therapies, including high-flow nasal oxygen (HFNO), nasal catheter oxygen inhalation and mask oxygen inhalation. The length of ICU and hospital stay were both comparable between two groups (**Table 2**).

- For secondary laboratory outcomes, no difference in serum NE, IL-6, CRP and IL-10 levels was observed between groups at all the trial time points (day 1, day 3 and day 5) (**Figure 3**).
- 160 Adverse events
- 161 We observed no significant differences between the two groups in the number of patients with
- 162 prespecified adverse events. Details regarding adverse events are provided in Supplementary Table 2.
- 163 Disscussion

164 In this multicentre, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial, we compared the continuous 165 infusion of sivelestat sodium with placebo (normal saline) for improvement in oxygenation on day 3 166 after randomization in adult patients with mild-to-moderate ARDS combined with SIRS. Sivelestat 167 sodium infusion resulted in a significantly increased  $PaO_2/FiO_2$  ratio on day 3 than placebo. Moreover, 168 patients who received sivelestat sodium had a shorter duration of mechanical ventilation and a lower 169 incidence of acquired infections during the ICU stay compared to patients who did not receive 170 sivelestat sodium. Also, the 90-day mortality was significantly lower in the sivelestat sodium group 171 than in the control group.

172 In 2002 Japan was the first country to approve sivelestat for the treatment of "ALI associated with 173 SIRS". After the approval, a post-marketing clinical study was conducted at the request of the 174 Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency to re-evaluate the safety and efficacy of sivelestat in 175 actual clinical settings in Japan. This phase IV study included 404 sivelestat-treated patients and 177 176 controls. The sivelestat group showed a significant improvement in the primary endpoint of 177 ventilator-free days (VFDs) compared to the control group[18]. In addition, the adjusted 180-day 178 survival rate was significantly higher in the sivelestat group than in the control group. On the other 179 hand, the STRIVE study, conducted in six countries other than Japan, randomized 492 mechanically

ventilated patients with ALI/ARDS and failed to demonstrate the efficacy of sivelestat[21].
Furthermore, an increase in 180-day all-cause mortality was noted in the sivelestat group and the study
was halted on the recommendation of the DSMB.

183 The discrepant results between the STRIVE study and the Japanese phase IV study may be due to 184 differences in patient population and study design. The Japanese study was an open-label, 185 non-randomized clinical trial, and the experimental and control groups were set up according to the 186 study centres, and the differences between the centres in the treatment of ALI/ARDS may have 187 influenced the study results. Patients enrolled in the Japanese study had less severe respiratory function 188 and less organ dysfunction than patients in the STRIVE study, and patients with burns or trauma were 189 excluded. In addition, the Japanese study defined SIRS as an inclusion criterion, which helps to identify 190 ARDS patients with a pro-inflammatory phenotype[22], whereas the STRIVE study did not. A 191 post-hoc analysis of the STRIVE patients involving those who had a mean Lung Injury Score less than 192 2.5, showed favourable trends in mortality and VFDs in patients receiving sivelestat[23]. Therefore, it 193 is important to select appropriate patients to be treated with sivelestat. The results of these two trials 194 suggest that sivelestat may be effective in patients with relatively mild ARDS and with a typical 195 pro-inflammatory phenotype, which were the inclusion criteria for our study.

196 Since NE may also have a beneficial bactericidal effect[24], inhibiting NE may increase the risk of 197 infection. A preclinical study investigating the effect of sivelestat in an animal model of S. 198 pneumoniae-induced lung injury showed that sivelestat could reduce the bacterial counts in 199 bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) and lung interstitial tissue and preserve the host immune 200 response[13]. Clinical data further supported this finding that sivelestat did not worsen infection. In 201 both the STRIVE study and the Japanese Phase IV study, there was no significant difference in the 202 incidence of serious adverse events related to infection between the sivelestat group and the control 203 group. In addition, our study suggests that sivelestat may reduce the incidence of acquired infections 204 during ICU stay.

The study had several limitations. First, the current sample size was not powered to detect a difference in mortality, and the stopping of the trial midway further weakens the robustness of the results. Therefore, the results of this study should be interpreted with caution. Second, subjective factors contribute to the decision to wean patients from mechanical ventilation, which may bias the results of the duration of mechanical ventilation. Finally, we did not observe the effects of sivelestat on long-term

210 outcomes, such as 180-day mortality.

#### 211 Conclusion

- 212 In this trial involving adult patients with mild-to-moderate ARDS combined with SIRS, the infusion of
- 213 sivelestat sodium significantly improved oxygenation on day 3 after randomization, shortened the
- 214 duration of mechanical ventilation, and was associated with reduced 90-day mortality. Further
- 215 large-scale RCTs are warranted to confirm the effects of sivelestat sodium on mortality in patients with
- 216 ARDS combined with SIRS.

# 217 Date availability

218 All data produced in the present work are contained in the manuscript.

# 219 Ethics and approval statement

The protocol and the informed consent document have been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of all participating centers. Study investigators will provide potential participants with verbal and written information prior to inclusion in the study. Informed consent will be provided from participants or their authorized representatives. The study was registered in the ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04909697).

- 225 Funding
- 226 This study is supported by Shanghai Huilun (Jiangsu) Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., which is also
- 227 responsible for the supply of the study drug and placebo as well as distribution to the participating
- 228 centers. Funding agencyhad no input into the design, conduct, data collection, statistical analysis,
- orwriting of the manuscript.

# 230 Authorship contribution statement

- Hongli He: Patient screening, data collection and analysis and interpretation of data; Xiaobo Huang:
- 232 conceived, designed and supervised the study; analysis and interpretation of data; critical revision of the
- 233 manuscript; obtained funding. All authors have read the manuscript and approved its submission.

# 234 Declaration of competing interest

235 The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

# 236 References

- Bos LDJ, Ware LB: Acute respiratory distress syndrome: causes, pathophysiology, and
   phenotypes. *Lancet* 2022, 400(10358):1145-1156.
- 239 2. Gorman EA, O'Kane CM, McAuley DF: Acute respiratory distress syndrome in adults:

240		diagnosis, outcomes, long-term sequelae, and management. Lancet 2022, 400		
241		(10358):1157-1170.		
242	3.	Sinha P, Meyer NJ, Calfee CS: Biological Phenotyping in Sepsis and Acute Respiratory		
243		Distress Syndrome. Annu Rev Med 2023, 74:457-471.		
244	4.	Brower RG, Matthay MA, Morris A, Schoenfeld D, Thompson BT, Wheeler A:		
245		Ventilation with lower tidal volumes as compared with traditional tidal volumes for acute		
246		lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. N Engl J Med 2000,		
247		342(18):1301-1308.		
248	5.	Guérin C, Reignier J, Richard JC, Beuret P, Gacouin A, Boulain T, Mercier E, Badet M,		
249		Mercat A, Baudin O et al: Prone positioning in severe acute respiratory distress syndrome.		
250		N Engl J Med 2013, 368(23):2159-2168.		
251	6.	Papazian L, Forel JM, Gacouin A, Penot-Ragon C, Perrin G, Loundou A, Jaber S, Arnal		
252		JM, Perez D, Seghboyan JM et al: Neuromuscular blockers in early acute respiratory		
253		distress syndrome. N Engl J Med 2010, 363(12):1107-1116.		
254	7.	Cepkova M, Matthay MA: Pharmacotherapy of acute lung injury and the acute		
255		respiratory distress syndrome. J Intensive Care Med 2006, 21(3):119-143.		
256	8.	Huppert LA, Matthay MA, Ware LB: Pathogenesis of Acute Respiratory Distress		
257		Syndrome. Semin Respir Crit Care Med 2019, 40(1):31-39.		
258	9.	Fujishima S, Morisaki H, Ishizaka A, Kotake Y, Miyaki M, Yoh K, Sekine K, Sasaki J,		
259		Tasaka S, Hasegawa N et al: Neutrophil elastase and systemic inflammatory response		
260		syndrome in the initiation and development of acute lung injury among critically ill		
261		patients. Biomed Pharmacother 2008, 62(5):333-338.		
262	10.	Okeke EB, Louttit C, Fry C, Najafabadi AH, Han K, Nemzek J, Moon JJ: Inhibition of		
263		neutrophil elastase prevents neutrophil extracellular trap formation and rescues mice from		
264		endotoxic shock. Biomaterials 2020, 238:119836.		
265	11.	Kawabata K, Hagio T, Matsumoto S, Nakao S, Orita S, Aze Y, Ohno H: Delayed		
266		neutrophil elastase inhibition prevents subsequent progression of acute lung injury		
267		induced by endotoxin inhalation in hamsters. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2000,		
268		161(6):2013-2018.		
269	12.	Hagio T, Matsumoto S, Nakao S, Abiru T, Ohno H, Kawabata K: Elastase inhibition		
270		reduced death associated with acid aspiration-induced lung injury in hamsters. Eur J		
271		Pharmacol 2004, 488(1-3):173-180.		
272	13.	Hagio T, Kishikawa K, Kawabata K, Tasaka S, Hashimoto S, Hasegawa N, Ishizaka A:		
273		Inhibition of neutrophil elastase reduces lung injury and bacterial count in hamsters. <i>Pulm</i>		
274		Pharmacol Ther 2008, 21(6):884-891.		
275	14.	Donnelly SC, MacGregor I, Zamani A, Gordon MW, Robertson CE, Steedman DJ, Little		
276		K, Haslett C: Plasma elastase levels and the development of the adult respiratory distress		
277		syndrome. <i>Am J Respir Crit Care Med</i> 1995, 151(5):1428-1433.		
278	15.	Kawabata K, Suzuki M, Sugitani M, Imaki K, Toda M, Miyamoto T: ONO-5046, a novel		

inhibitor of human neutrophil elastase. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 1991,
177(2):814-820.

- 16. Kido T, Muramatsu K, Yatera K, Asakawa T, Otsubo H, Kubo T, Fujino Y, Matsuda S,
  282 Mayumi T, Mukae H: Efficacy of early sivelestat administration on acute lung injury and
  283 acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Respirology* 2017, 22(4):708-713.
- Tsuboko Y, Takeda S, Mii S, Nakazato K, Tanaka K, Uchida E, Sakamoto A: Clinical
  evaluation of sivelestat for acute lung injury/acute respiratory distress syndrome
  following surgery for abdominal sepsis. *Drug Des Devel Ther* 2012, 6:273-278.
- 18. Aikawa N, Ishizaka A, Hirasawa H, Shimazaki S, Yamamoto Y, Sugimoto H, Shinozaki
  M, Taenaka N, Endo S, Ikeda T *et al*: Reevaluation of the efficacy and safety of the
  neutrophil elastase inhibitor, Sivelestat, for the treatment of acute lung injury associated
  with systemic inflammatory response syndrome; a phase IV study. *Pulm Pharmacol Ther*2011, 24(5):549-554.
- Hayakawa M, Katabami K, Wada T, Sugano M, Hoshino H, Sawamura A, Gando S:
  Sivelestat (selective neutrophil elastase inhibitor) improves the mortality rate of sepsis
  associated with both acute respiratory distress syndrome and disseminated intravascular
  coagulation patients. *Shock* 2010, 33(1):14-18.
- 20. Gao X, Zhang R, Lei Z, Guo X, Yang Y, Tian J, Huang L: Efficacy, safety, and
  pharmacoeconomics of sivelestat sodium in the treatment of septic acute respiratory
  distress syndrome: a retrospective cohort study. *Ann Palliat Med* 2021, 10(11):11910-11917.
- Zeiher BG, Artigas A, Vincent JL, Dmitrienko A, Jackson K, Thompson BT, Bernard G:
  Neutrophil elastase inhibition in acute lung injury: results of the STRIVE study. *Crit Care Med* 2004, 32(8):1695-1702.
- 303 22. Sinha P, Kerchberger VE, Willmore A, Chambers J, Zhuo H, Abbott J, Jones C,
  304 Wickersham N, Wu N, Neyton L *et al*: Identifying molecular phenotypes in sepsis: an
  305 analysis of two prospective observational cohorts and secondary analysis of two
  306 randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Respir Med* 2023, 11(11):965-974.
- 307 23. Aikawa N, Kawasaki Y: Clinical utility of the neutrophil elastase inhibitor sivelestat for
  308 the treatment of acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Ther Clin Risk Manag* 2014,
  309 10:621-629.
- Belaaouaj A, McCarthy R, Baumann M, Gao Z, Ley TJ, Abraham SN, Shapiro SD: Mice
  lacking neutrophil elastase reveal impaired host defense against gram negative bacterial
  sepsis. *Nat Med* 1998, 4(5):615-618.
- 313

Sivelestat Sodium in the Treatment of Patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Combined

with Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome

Hongli He<sup>1</sup>, Xiaobo Huang<sup>1\*</sup>

1. Department of Surgical Critical Care, Sichuan People's Hospital, Chengdu 610072, China.

\*Corresponding author

## **Declaration of competing interest**

The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Sivelestat Sodium in the Treatment of Patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Combined

with Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome

Hongli He<sup>1</sup>, Xiaobo Huang<sup>1\*</sup>

1. Department of Surgical Critical Care, Sichuan People's Hospital, Chengdu 610072, China.

\*Corresponding author

## Ethical apprval

Organization	Ethical state	Number (no.)	Date
Sichuan People's Hospital	Approve	2022-02-07	2022-02-07
Affiliated Hospital of Chengdu University of	Approve	2022-07-14	2022-07-14
Traditional Chinese Medicine			
Chengdu Shuangliu District first People's	Approve	2022-05-12	2022-05-12
Hospital			
Chengdu Second People's Hospital	Approve	2022-06-22	2022-06-22
Chengdu Fifth People's Hospital	Approve	2022-06-02	2022-06-02
Affiliated Hospital of Chengdu University	Approve	2023-08-08	2023-08-08
Chengdu Third People's Hospital	Approve	2022-12-01	2022-12-01
Sichuan Cancer Hospital	Approve	2023-07-04	2023-07-04

- reasons) (n= 0)













# Treatment 🗕 Sivelestat sodium 斗 Placebo







	Sivelestat sodium	Placebo	
Characteristics	(N=81)	(N=81)	
Median Age (IQR), yr	58.0 (45.0-68.5)	57.0 (48.0-64.5)	
Gender, n (%)			
Women	19 (23.5)	13 (76.5)	
Men	19 (23.5)	62 (76.5)	
Median BMI (IQR), kg/m <sup>2</sup>	22.3 (21.0-23.5)	22.6 (21.1-23.0)	
Comorbidities, no. (%)			
Hypertension	25 (30.9)	30 (37.0)	
Diabetes mellitus	23 (28.4)	16 (19.8)	
Tumor	13 (16.0)	13 (16.0)	
Main diagnosis, no. (%)			
Resipratory disease	34 (42.0)	42 (51.9)	
Circulatory disease	1 (1.2)	1 (1.2)	
Digestive disease	25 (30.9)	13 (16.0)	
Other system disease	21 (25.9)	25 (30.9)	
Postoperative patients, no. (%)	22 (27.2)	13 (16.0)	
Use of mechanical ventilation, n (%)	43 (53.1)	40 (49.4)	
Use of glucocorticosteroid, n (%)	16 (19.8)	20 (24.7)	
Clinical parameters			
Mean APACHE II score±SD	24.0 <b>±</b> 4.8	22.3 <b>±</b> 6.1	
Median SOFA score (IQR)	4 (3-7)	5 (4-6)	
Median lactate (IQR), mmol/L	1.7 (1.1-2.4)	1.7 (1.3-2.3)	
Mean PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> ratio±SD	190.5 <b>±</b> 46.8	174.8 <b>±</b> 49.6	
Laboratory parameters, median (IQR)			
Serum CRP, pg/mL	3379.6 (2393.7-4533.0)	3290.4 (2508.6-4495.1)	
Serum IL-6, pg/mL	72.5 (32.7-189.2)	86.3 (49.4-172.3)	
Serum IL-10, pg/ml	15.3 (7.2-32.4)	15.8 (6.8-31.1)	
Neutrophil elastase, pg/ml	506.3 (392.1-872.5)	567.9 (309.5-1183.9)	

## Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the study subjects.

IQR denotes interquartile range, APACHE II denotes Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II, SD denotes Standard Deviation, SOFA denotes sequential organ failure assessment, CRP denotes C-reactive protein, IL-6 denotes interleukin-6, IL-10 denotes interleukin-10.

# Table 2. Primary and main secondary outcomes.

-

	Sivelestat sodium	Placebo	Difference/ Risk ratio§	P value
	(N=81)	(N=81)	(95%CI)	
Primary outcome				
PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> ratio change on day3, median (IQR)	0.41 (0.12, 0.74)	0.16 (-0.17, 0.43)	0.25 (0.10, 0.40)	0.001
Secondary outcomes				
New-requirement of mechanical ventilation within 28 days, n	5 (6.2)	11 (13.6)	-0.07 (-0.17, 0.02)	0.114
Duration of invasive mechanical ventilation, h, median (IQR)	104.0 (51.3, 188.9) <sup>#</sup>	170.3 (99.7, 263.0) ***	-57.2 (-98.8, -15.4)	0.006
Duration of non-invasive mechanical ventilation, h, mean±SD	139.5±105.1 <sup>*</sup>	126.7±126.8 <sup>**</sup>	12.8 (-37.9, 63.5)	0.616
Duration of high-flow oxygen therapy, h, median (IQR)	151.6 (31.3, 256.9)§	154.3 (105.7, 202.2) §§	-20.7 (-117.6, 88.2)	0.722
Duration of nasal catheter oxygen inhalation, h, median (IQR)	177.7 (96.0, 328.6)∥	169.8 (81.7, 261.2)Ⅲ	26.1 (-22.3, 86.2)	0.292
Duration of mask oxygen inhalation, h, median (IQR)	109.7 (47.6, 179.4)¶	192.0 (44.4, 396.5) <sup>¶¶</sup>	-69.4 (-248.0, 86.7)	0.503
Hospital free days within 28 days, d, median (IQR)	8.0 (0, 17.0)	3.0 (0, 15.0)	0 (-2.0, 0)	0.345
ICU free days within 28 days, d, median (IQR)	11.0 (2.5, 18.0)	11.0 (0, 18.0)	0 (-1.0, 4.0)	0.494
Length of hospital stay, d, median (IQR)	12.0 (9.0, 19.0)	13.0 (6.5, 19.0)	1.0 (-2.0, 3.0)	0.624
Length of ICU stay, d, median (IQR)	17.0 (10.0, 26.5)	14.0 (10.0, 25.0)	1.0 (-2.0, 4.0)	0.522

28-day mortality, n (%)	10 (12.3)	20 (24.7)	-0.12 (-0.24, -0.01)	0.040
60-day mortality, n (%)	12 (14.8)	22 (27.2)	-0.12 (-0.25, 0.0005)	0.051
90-day mortality, n (%)	12 (13.6)	23 (28.4)	-0.14 (-0.26, -0.01)	0.033
Acquired infections during ICU, n (%)	10 (12.3)	20 (24.7)	-0.12 (-0.24, -0.01)	0.043
PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> ratio change on day1, median (IQR)	0.19 (0.02, 0.54)	0.02 (-0.14, 0.35)	0.16 (0.04, 0.28)	0.009
PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> ratio change on day5, median (IQR)	0.61 (0.22, 1.13)	0.02 (-0.26, 0.49)	0.52 (0.34, 0.70)	< 0.001
PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> ratio on day1, median (IQR)	231.6 (187.5, 284.7)	168.0 (140.0, 227.0)	54.2 (33.2, 74.5)	< 0.001
PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> ratio on day3, median (IQR)	269.1 (211.2, 305.8)	187.5 (134.1, 253.3)	69.8 (41.2, 94.0)	< 0.001
PaO <sub>2</sub> /FiO <sub>2</sub> ratio on day5, median (IQR)	315.0 (243.5, 358.2)	170.0 (120.6, 241.9)	126.0 (92.7, 155.7)	< 0.001

CI denotes confidence interval. IQR denotes interquartile range.SD denotes Standard Deviation. ICU denotes intensive care unit. <sup>§</sup>Difference was shown for continuous variables and risk ratio was shown for catergorical variables. \*n=47, \*\*n=36, #n=44, ##n=60, \$n=12, \$\$n=49,  $\|n=49$ ,  $\|n=39$ ,  $\Pn=13$ ,  $\|\Pn=5$ .

Participating sites	Total	Sivelestat sodium	Placebo
Sichuan Provincial People's Hospital	68	35	33
Affiliated Hospital of Chengdu University of	5	2	3
Traditional Chinese Medicine			
Affiliated Hospital of Chengdu University	2	2	0
Chengdu Fifth People's Hospital	31	14	17
Chengdu Shuangliu District First People's Hospital	27	12	15
Chengdu Second People's Hospital	29	16	13
Total cases	162	81	81

Table S1. Numbers of cases from each site.

Table S2. Adverse events.

Adverse event	Sivelestat sodium (N=81)	Placebo (N=81)
Total no. of adverse events	9	13
Acute liver injury	4	7
Dyspnea	1	2
Leukopenia	2	3
Essential thrombocythemia	1	1
Elevated creatinine/urea	1	0