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Asthma prevalence varies among countries and even, as is the case in Spain, among different regions of the same country. We might therefore be led to interpret childhood asthma as less likely to be a single pathological entity than a syndrome, that is, a manifestation common to different diseases with a different genetic basis, different triggers, and no single inflammatory pattern. Such a syndrome might require tailored management from disease prevention through to the active phase.

Unfortunately, firm conclusions about the pathogenesis of asthma can still not be drawn. Nevertheless, bronchial inflammation remains a central aspect of asthma and is directly or indirectly responsible for disease manifestations (symptoms, bronchoconstriction, and bronchial hyperresponsiveness), crises, and even remodeling of the bronchial wall. There is no single pattern of inflammatory cells and response mediators. In fact, different inflammatory phenotypes—very similar to those reported in adults—have been described in childhood asthma. For example, inflammation may be predominantly eosinophilic (eosinophilic phenotype) or the inflammatory component may be limited (pauci-inflammatory phenotype) or even, on occasions, absent (noninflammatory phenotype). However, these inflammatory patterns do show substantial overlap and the inflammatory phenomena may be so complex that it is often difficult to determine which inflammatory phenotype is present in children—a difficulty that is further accentuated in younger subjects.

Some studies published in recent years highlight this complexity. We know that most infants with recurrent wheezing will, in most cases, be free of respiratory symptoms by the time they are 4 years old, but we also know that a large number will continue with respiratory symptoms and some will subsequently develop asthma. Sanguanli et al., using endobronchial biopsy and bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL), reported a mainly neutrophilic inflammatory response without remodeling in infants with recurrent wheezing and reversible limitation of pulmonary airflow. In contrast, when the children are a little older—at the age of 3 years—severe wheezing is associated with predominantly eosinophilic inflammation and structural changes to the airway or, in other words, remodeling.

The presence of different inflammatory patterns has doubtlessly introduced uncertainty in the pharmacological...
Indeed, more than 10 years ago, Kraft et al. reported that airway to the peripheral airway and lung parenchyma. To extrapolate the inflammatory phenomena of the proximal study technique used, and it does not seem very consistent in inflammatory phenomenon is obviously limited by the airway. Therefore, any interpretation of the BAL cannot be said to be representative of a given part of the airway. When the degree of agreement between the first 2 methods (BAL and induced sputum) is studied, we see that the correlation is satisfactory. Correlation is also satisfactory when compared with eNO, which acts as a good surrogate marker of inflammation. The association is, however, often weak when studying the degree of agreement between these techniques (BAL, induced sputum, and eNO) and bronchial biopsy. That is, endobronchial eosinophilia does not correlate with other techniques. Why might this be so?

Bush suggested that eosinophils might perhaps need other factors to express the disease. He based this suggestion on studies in which anti-interleukin-5 monoclonal antibodies suppressed eosinophils in induced sputum but did not influence asthma control or the persistence of eosinophilic inflammation without symptoms. We should also point out that the pathological and structural findings in adults and children with asthma were obtained using endobronchial biopsies, BAL, or both, the significance of which is worth reflecting on. Endobronchial samples are taken from the proximal airway, whereas the findings from BAL cannot be said to be representative of a given part of the airway. Therefore, any interpretation of the inflammatory phenomenon is obviously limited by the study technique used, and it does not seem very consistent to extrapolate the inflammatory phenomena of the proximal airway to the peripheral airway and lung parenchyma. Indeed, more than 10 years ago, Kraft et al. reported that alveolar inflammation—involving eosinophils and macrophages—and not proximal inflammation is responsible for functional changes in adults.

We can now study bronchial and alveolar eNO production in children using mathematical models of pulmonary nitric oxide dynamics in conjunction with a conventional chemoluminescence analyzer to allow the fraction of eNO to be quantified by taking single-breath on-line measurements at different expiratory flow rates (50, 100, 200, and 260 mL/s). The evaluation of proximal and distal inflammation in the airways and the response to pharmacological interventions through noninvasive monitoring of an inflammatory biomarker opens up a line of investigation that might help understand inflammatory processes in childhood asthma. The answers will surely generate new questions.
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