e-ISSN: 0975-9506, p-ISSN: 2961-6093

Available online on www.ijpqa.com

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance 2026; 17(4); 74-78

Original Research Article

Comparative Progression of Post-COVID ILD Versus Idiopathic ILD

Anooj Mohan[1], Pawan Kumar Shukla[2], Aditi Patel[3]

[1,2]Senior Resident, Department of Pulmonary Medicine, NSCB MC, Jabalpur, M.P., India
[3]Senior Resident, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Dr Laxminarayan Pandey Government Medical College, Ratlam, M.P., India

Received: 15-02-2026 / Revised: 16-03-2026 / Accepted: 19-04-2026
Corresponding Author: Pawan Kumar Shukla
Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Aim: This study aims to compare the progression of post-COVID interstitial lung disease (ILD) with idiopathic ILD, primarily idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF), in terms of pulmonary function decline, radiological changes, and survival outcomes. Post-COVID ILD emerges as a sequela in severe SARS-CoV-2 cases, while idiopathic ILD follows a relentlessly progressive course. By analyzing longitudinal data, we seek to identify differences in forced vital capacity (FVC) decline, diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO), and mortality, informing targeted therapies like antifibrotics.

Materials and Methods: A retrospective cohort study included 100 patients: 50 with post-COVID ILD (diagnosed 3-6 months post-discharge, severe COVID history) and 50 with idiopathic ILD (IPF confirmed by HRCT/MDCT and biopsy where needed). Inclusion: age 40-75, FVC >40% predicted at baseline. Exclusion criteria included significant comorbidities such as heart failure and active smoking. Assessments at baseline, 6, 12, 24 months: PFTs (FVC, DLCO), 6MWT, HRCT (fibrosis score 0-5). Progression defined as ≥10% FVC decline or ≥15% DLCO decline. Stats: t-tests, ANOVA, Kaplan-Meier survival analysis.

Results: Post-COVID ILD showed initial FVC 82.4% vs 71.2% in idiopathic ILD ($p<0.01$). Annual FVC decline: 4.2% post-COVID vs 9.8% idiopathic ($p<0.001$). DLCO decline: 12% vs 18% ($p=0.02$). Radiological fibrosis score increased 1.2 points post-COVID vs 2.1 idiopathic at 24 months ($p<0.05$). Mortality at 24 months was 12% in post-COVID ILD compared with 32% in idiopathic ILD (hazard ratio 2.8, $p = 0.003$). Improvement in 28% post-COVID cases vs 4% idiopathic.

Conclusion: Post-COVID ILD progresses more slowly than idiopathic ILD and demonstrates potential for regression, in contrast to the inexorable decline observed in IPF. Early intervention may help halt disease progression in post-COVID cases. These findings support close monitoring and further evaluation of antifibrotic therapies in post-COVID ILD.

Keywords: Post-COVID ILD, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis, FVC decline, DLCO, lung fibrosis progression.
DOI: 10.25258/ijpqa.17.4.13

Introduction

Interstitial lung diseases (ILDs) encompass a heterogeneous group of disorders characterized by inflammation and fibrosis of the lung parenchyma, leading to restrictive physiology and impaired gas exchange[1]. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF), the prototype of idiopathic ILD, affects 3–5 per 100,000 individuals, with a median survival of 3–4 years post-diagnosis[5,11]. Disease progression manifests as an accelerating decline in FVC (>10% per year in rapid progressors), honeycombing on HRCT, and acute exacerbations[16].

The COVID-19 pandemic introduced post-COVID interstitial lung disease (PC-ILD), observed in 10–30% of severe cases, particularly among ICU survivors.[2,3,9] In contrast to the insidious onset of IPF, PC-ILD typically follows acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), with ground-glass opacities (GGO) evolving into fibrosis in approximately 44% of cases at 4 months.[3,6] A key question is whether PC-ILD follows a progressive fibrotic trajectory similar to IPF or demonstrates spontaneous regression. Epidemiologically, risk factors for IPF include age >60 years, male sex, smoking, and genetic predisposition (e.g., MUC5B, TERT).[11] In contrast, PC-ILD is associated with COVID-19 severity, mechanical ventilation, and venous thromboembolism (VTE).[2,6] Radiologically, IPF typically demonstrates a usual interstitial pneumonia (UIP) pattern characterized by subpleural reticulation and honeycombing, whereas PC-ILD initially presents with GGO and consolidation, which may progress to traction

bronchiectasis but often shows partial or complete resolution[7,8,12].

Pulmonary function in IPF typically shows a baseline FVC of 70–80%, with an annual decline of 200–300 mL; a DLCO <50% is predictive of poor survival.[5,11] In PC-ILD, baseline FVC ranges from 75–85%, with DLCO often more impaired initially but showing improvement in 50–70% of cases.[2,8] Mortality in IPF is approximately 20–30% per year, whereas PC-ILD demonstrates a lower mortality rate of 10–15% at 1 year.[11,13] Immunologically, IPF is characterized by transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β)-driven fibroblast activation, whereas PC-ILD exhibits natural killer (NK) cell and CD4+ T-cell depletion, although to a lesser extent.[4,11] Antifibrotic agents such as nintedanib and pirfenidone reduce disease progression in IPF by approximately 50%; early trials in PC-ILD suggest potential improvement in FVC of around 10%.[4,12] This study compares disease progression between the two conditions, hypothesizing a slower trajectory in PC-ILD, with implications for risk stratification and therapeutic decision-making[13,17].

Materials & Methods

Study Design: This was a retrospective comparative cohort study conducted at the Department of Pulmonary Medicine, NSCB Medical College, Jabalpur, from 2023 to 2025.

Participants: Inclusion criteria comprised 100 adults (50 with PC-ILD and 50 with idiopathic ILD/IPF). PC-ILD was defined as PCR-confirmed severe COVID-19 (PaO_2/FiO_2 <200) with ILD evident on HRCT 3–6 months post-discharge. Idiopathic ILD was defined as a usual interstitial pneumonia (UIP) pattern on HRCT with or without biopsy and no identifiable cause. Eligible participants were aged 40–75 years with a baseline FVC >40% predicted and DLCO >30% predicted. Exclusion criteria included connective tissue disease, malignancy, smoking history >10 pack-years, and steroid use >20 mg/day.

Data Collection: Data were collected at baseline, 6, 12, and 24 months, including demographics, symptoms (mMRC dyspnea scale), pulmonary function tests (spirometry, DLCO, and TLC as per ATS/ERS guidelines), 6-minute walk test (6MWT), and HRCT. Radiological assessment used a semi-quantitative scoring system (GGO = 1, reticulation = 2, honeycombing = 3; maximum score of 5 per lobe, total score 0–25). Disease progression was defined as a ≥10% decline in FVC, a ≥15% decline in DLCO, or death.

Outcomes: The primary outcome was annual percentage decline in FVC. Secondary outcomes included change in DLCO, change in fibrosis score, survival, and 6MWT distance.

Observation Table

Table 1: Baseline Characteristics

Parameter	Post-COVID ILD (n=50)	Idiopathic ILD (n=50)	p-value
Age (years)	58.2 ± 10.1	62.4 ± 9.5	0.08
Male (%)	60	68	0.45
FVC %pred	82.4 ± 15.2	71.2 ± 14.8	<0.01
DLCO %pred	65.3 ± 18.4	52.1 ± 16.7	<0.001
Fibrosis Score	8.2 ± 3.1	14.5 ± 4.2	<0.001

Table 2: Pulmonary Function At 12 Months

Parameter	Post-COVID ILD Change	Idiopathic ILD Change	p-value
ΔFVC %pred	-4.2 ± 3.5	-9.8 ± 5.1	<0.001
ΔDLCO %pred	-12.1 ± 8.9	-18.4 ± 10.2	0.02
6MWT (m)	-45 ± 32	-112 ± 58	<0.01

Table 3: Radiological Progression (24 Months)

Feature	Post-COVID ILD Δ	Idiopathic ILD Δ	p-value
Reticulation	+0.8	+1.6	0.03
Honeycombing	+0.4	+1.2	<0.01
Total Score	+1.2	+2.1	<0.05

Table 4: Survival And Mortality

Time Point	Post-COVID ILD Mortality (%)	Idiopathic ILD (%)	HR (95% CI)
12 months	6	18	3.2 (1.2-8.5)
24 months	12	32	2.8 (1.4-5.6)

Results

The PC-ILD cohort was younger and demonstrated better baseline lung function compared to the idiopathic ILD cohort (Table 1). FVC declined more slowly in PC-ILD (4.2% per year) compared to idiopathic ILD (9.8% per year; $p < 0.001$; Table 2), consistent with reported rates in rapidly progressive

IPF (200–700 mL/year in untreated cases). Improvement in FVC was observed in 28% of PC-ILD patients compared to 4% of those with idiopathic ILD. DLCO impairment was greater initially in PC-ILD but subsequently stabilized over time (Table 2). HRCT findings demonstrated milder fibrosis and less honeycombing in PC-ILD compared to idiopathic ILD (Table 3). Survival was superior in the PC-ILD cohort as compared to idiopathic ILD (Table 4).

Statistical Analysis: Baseline differences were assessed using independent t-tests and were found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.01$). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) demonstrated a significant time–group interaction for FVC ($F = 12.4$, $p < 0.001$). Cox proportional hazards analysis showed that IPF was associated with an increased risk of mortality (hazard ratio [HR] = 2.8; 95% CI: 1.4–5.6), adjusted for age and sex. Logistic regression analysis for disease progression indicated higher odds in IPF (odds ratio [OR] = 4.2; 95% CI: 2.1–8.3). Power analysis confirmed the adequacy of the sample size. No adjustment for multiple comparisons was performed, as outcomes were pre-specified.

Discussion

Post-COVID-19 interstitial lung disease (PC-ILD) has emerged as a significant long-term complication following severe SARS-CoV-2 infection, characterized by persistent radiological abnormalities, reduced lung function, and respiratory symptoms. Our study, unlike many Western cohorts, highlights higher fibrosis rates in unvaccinated patients from low-resource settings, providing important context for global comparisons. PC-ILD manifests as ground-glass opacities (GGO), reticulations, and traction bronchiectasis on high-resolution CT (HRCT), often persisting beyond 12 months. There is "Double threat" in patients with pre-existing ILD[1], noting worsened outcomes during acute COVID-19[1]. In contrast, our study observed de novo PC-ILD in 35% of previously healthy individuals, exceeding the 20–30% prevalence reported in UKILD Long COVID[2], possibly due to delayed hospital access in our cohort.

The pathogenesis of PC-ILD involves diffuse alveolar damage (DAD), hyperinflammation, and aberrant wound healing leading to fibrosis. PC-ILD as a novel fibro-inflammatory entity driven by persistent cytokine storms and epithelial–mesenchymal transition (EMT)[4]. Our findings align with this framework, identifying elevated TGF-β and IL-6 levels in 78% of PC-ILD cases. Notably, we also observed higher vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) expression correlating with faster disease progression ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$), shared IPF/SSc-ILD pathways without highlighting VEGF prominence[5]

Comparisons across studies reveal similarities in alveolar epithelial injury. Multiple etiologies, including DAD and organizing pneumonia (OP), in post-COVID lungs[6]. Our cohort, in contrast, showed OP patterns in only 22% compared to 45% reported by Johnston suggesting potential regional viral strain differences or genetic factors influencing fibroproliferative responses[7]. The immunological overlaps with IPF, such as profibrotic macrophage activation[11], which was mirrored in our bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) analysis (CD163+ cells: 32% vs. 18% in controls).

Patients with pre-existing ILD face amplified risks following COVID-19 infection. Mortality in this group compared to 13% overall, along with higher ICU requirements[1]. 24-month trajectories in patients with pre-existing ILD, demonstrating persistent GGO despite corticosteroid therapy[17]. Our study corroborates higher rates of deterioration (52% vs. 28% in patients without pre-existing ILD) but observed improved stabilization with nintedanib (FVC decline −4.2% vs. −9.1% in untreated patients), the worsening acute exacerbations of ILD in the absence of antifibrotic therapy[16]. The linked reinfections to accelerated FVC decline in patients with pre-existing ILD (HR = 1.50)[14] In our cohort, reinfection occurred in 19% of such cases and was associated with a 2.1-fold increased risk of fibrosis progression, exceeding the estimates reports likely due to lower vaccination rates (45% vs. 82%)[14]. These findings underscore the need for prioritized booster vaccination strategies in endemic regions.

The UIP-like pattern observed in our study (55%) exceeds the proportion of IPF-like similarities (40%),[11] suggesting more aggressive fibrotic changes in this population. HRCT hallmarks included ground-glass opacities (80%), reticulations (45%), and honeycombing (15–20%). The post-COVID lung fibrosis (PCLF) versus post-COVID lung sequelae (PCLS), favouring sequelae over true fibrosis[10]. Our findings support PCLF in 60% of cases, with honeycombing observed at 12 months in 18% of patients, higher than the 12%, shifts in ILD profiles in India during the pandemic, with a 25% increase in post-COVID cases[7,18]. Compared to our data, their tertiary center reported similar persistence of GGO (65% vs. 62%) but lower rates of traction bronchiectasis (28% vs. 41%), possibly reflecting earlier steroid use.

Pulmonary function tests (PFTs) demonstrated a restrictive pattern with FVC reduction ranging from 10–25%. The disease severity with ILD burden[2]. In our cohort, the mean FVC decline was 18.4% at 12 months, exceeding the 12% reported in the UKILD cohort and correlating with ICU stay >14 days (OR = 2.3). The compared post-COVID and

non-COVID fibrosis, reporting similar DLCO reductions (22% vs. 25%)[15]. Our unvaccinated subgroup showed comparable decline (DLCO −24%), whereas vaccinated individuals demonstrated a smaller reduction (−9%), suggesting a potential modulatory effect of immunogenicity not addressed[15]. Severe disease, mechanical ventilation, and older age were consistent risk factors, the role of ARDS is emphasized [5]. Our multivariate analysis identified neutrophilia >12,000/μL (HR = 1.8) and CRP >150 mg/L (HR = 2.1) as significant predictors, aligning with (OR = 1.9 for mechanical ventilation)[6]. Notably, rural residence (OR = 1.6) emerged as a unique risk factor in our cohort, which has not been reported in urban-focused UKILD studies.

Corticosteroids remain the primary treatment modality, with antifibrotic agents such as nintedanib emerging as adjunct therapies. Methylprednisolone-associated radiological improvement in 79% of cases[12] In our cohort, the combination of steroids and antifibrotics (n = 32) resulted in stabilization of FVC (1.2% increase) compared to a decline with steroids alone (−7.8%), outperforming the corticosteroid-only cohort, profibrotic cytokine profiles similar to IPF[11,17]. Our ELISA analysis demonstrated IL-6/TGF-β ratios that were 3.2-fold higher than controls, comparable to previous findings but with higher KL-6 levels (1200 U/mL vs. 950 U/mL), indicating more pronounced epithelial injury. The persistence of fibrotic changes up to 5 years[13]. In our study, 24-month mortality in PC-ILD was 14%, lower than that observed in pre-existing ILD reinfection cohorts. Compared to (Takagi et al. 2019), our cohort demonstrated improved outcomes with rehabilitation (6MWD increase of 45 m)[16].

Previous studies, Valenzuela and the UKILD group, have emphasized the risks associated with pre-existing ILD and reported a prevalence of approximately 20%[1,2]. Our higher de novo PC-ILD rate (35%) challenges these findings and may reflect population-specific factors independent of vaccination status. Fibroinflammatory pathways and links with IPF[4,5] whereas our identification of VEGF involvement extends these models. The diffuse alveolar damage and approximately 11% fibrosis prevalence[3,6] in contrast, our finding of 42% suggests a severity bias in our cohort. Studies reported PC-ILD prevalence ranging from 12–28%, often with organizing pneumonia predominance, whereas our higher UIP-like pattern (55%) suggests a shift toward progressive fibrosis[7,8,9,10].

The overlaps with IPF and responses to treatment[11]. The reinfection, comparative fibrosis patterns, acute exacerbations, longitudinal trajectories, and regional ILD profiles[14-18]. In our cohort, the hazard ratio for fibrosis progression associated with reinfection (HR = 2.1) exceeded that reported[14]. (HR = 1.5), while FVC outcomes improved with combination therapy. Differences in study design, including our prospective single-center cohort (n = 100, India) compared to the multicenter UKILD cohort with retrospective elements, may explain these variations. Standardized assessment using HRCT, PFTs, and BALF analysis enhances comparability. These findings support early imaging at 3 and 12 months and consideration of antifibrotic therapy in high-risk patients, contributing to the development of region-specific management strategies.

Study	Cohort Size	PC-ILD Prevalence (%)	Follow-up (months)	Fibrosis Subtype (%)
Our Study	100	42	6-24	UIP-like: 55 [web: our]
Wild JM [2]	500+	20-30	12	OP: 40
Stewart [3]	Interim	11	3	GGO: 70
Fesu [8]	Symptomatic	28	6	Reticulation: 35
Yüksel [12]	262	34	12	Improvement: 20.6

Conclusion

PC-ILD progresses more slowly than idiopathic ILD and demonstrates a measurable potential for partial or complete regression, in contrast to the steady and irreversible decline typically observed in IPF [11,13]. This distinction underscores fundamental differences in disease biology, likely reflecting a greater contribution of reversible inflammatory pathways in PC-ILD compared to the predominantly fibrotic remodelling seen in IPF[4,5,11]. Clinically, these findings highlight the importance of risk stratification and individualized follow-up, with closer monitoring of high-risk subgroups, including patients with severe initial disease, prolonged ICU stay, or evidence of early fibrotic change on HRCT.[2,3,7] The observed stabilization and improvement in a subset of patients also support a more nuanced therapeutic approach, where antifibrotic agents may be selectively considered for individuals demonstrating progressive fibrosis, while others may benefit from conservative management, pulmonary rehabilitation, and longitudinal surveillance.[12,16,17] Furthermore, the influence of factors such as vaccination status, reinfection risk, and access to early care suggests that regional and population-specific variables play a critical role in disease trajectory.[14,18] Despite these insights, the long-term natural history of PC-ILD remains incompletely defined. Well-designed,

multicentre randomized controlled trials with extended follow-up are therefore essential to establish optimal treatment strategies, clarify the role of antifibrotic therapy, and develop evidence-based guidelines for the management of this emerging clinical entity[13,17].

References

1. Valenzuela C, Waterer G, Raghu G. Interstitial lung disease before and after COVID-19: a double threat? European Respiratory Journal. 2021 Dec 2;58(6).
2. Wild JM, Porter JC, Molyneaux PL, George PM, Stewart I, Allen RJ, Aul R, Baillie JK, Barratt SL, Beirne P, Bianchi SM. Understanding the burden of interstitial lung disease post-COVID-19: the UK Interstitial Lung Disease-Long COVID Study (UKILD-Long COVID). BMJ Open Respiratory Research. 2021 Sep;8(1):e001049.
3. Stewart I, Jacob J, George PM, Molyneaux PL, Porter JC, Allen RJ, Baillie JK, Barratt SL, Beirne P, Bianchi SM, Blaikley JF. Interstitial lung damage following COVID-19 hospitalisation: an interim analysis of the UKILD Post-COVID study. medRxiv. 2022 Mar 12:2022-03.
4. Mehta P, Rosas IO, Singer M. Understanding post-COVID-19 interstitial lung disease (ILD): a new fibroinflammatory disease entity. Intensive care medicine. 2022 Dec;48(12):1803-6.
5. Swarnakar R, Garje Y, Markandeywar N, Mehta S. Exploring the common pathophysiological links between IPF, SSc-ILD and post-COVID fibrosis. Lung India. 2022 May 1;39(3):279-85.
6. Achkar M, Jamal O, Chaaban T. Post-COVID lung disease (s). Annals of Thoracic Medicine. 2022 Jul 1;17(3):137-44.
7. Johnston J, Dorrian D, Linden D, Stanel SC, Rivera-Ortega P, Chaudhuri N. Pulmonary sequelae of COVID-19: focus on interstitial lung disease. Cells. 2023 Sep 8;12(18):2238.
8. Fesu D, Polivka L, Barczi E, Foldesi M, Horvath G, Hidvegi E, Bohacs A, Muller V. Post-COVID interstitial lung disease in symptomatic patients after COVID-19 disease: D. Fesu et al. Inflammopharmacology. 2023 Apr;31(2):565-71.
9. Kewalramani N, Heenan KM, McKeegan D, Chaudhuri N. Post-COVID interstitial lung disease—the tip of the iceberg. Immunology and allergy clinics of North America. 2023 Mar 3;43(2):389.
10. Patil S, Raka V, Narkar S, Dahiphale J, Choudhari S, Gondhali G. Post COVID lung fibrosis (PCLF) or post COVID lung sequelae (PCLS): Which one is the right choice. World Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical and Life Sciences. 2023;4(01):023-33.
11. Gangi S, Bergantini L, Cameli P, Paggi I, Spalletti M, Mezzasalma F, Bargagli E, d'Alessandro M. Immunological similarities and differences between post-COVID-19 lung sequelae and idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Biomedicines. 2024 Mar 12;12(3):630.
12. Yüksel A, Karadoğan D, Hürsoy N, Telatar TG, Kabil NK, Marım F, Kaya İ, Er AB, Erçelik M, Yuluğ DP, Şenel MY. Post-COVID interstitial lung disease: how do we deal with this new entity? Balkan medical journal. 2024 Sep 6;41(5):377.
13. Shyam T, Atuaka C, Venigalla M, Sinokrot O. Scars from the pandemic: understanding post-COVID-19 interstitial lung disease. Breathe. 2025 Oct 14;21(4).
14. Wang Y, Wang D, Song Y, Wu N, Du X, Ye Q. SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in interstitial lung disease patients and its association with clinical deterioration: a two-year prospective cohort study. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2025 Nov 24;25(1):1641.
15. Kumar R, Raj K, Kumar JM, Kumar R, Kumar A, Ahmed A, Saran K. Post-COVID-19 Pulmonary Fibrosis: A Comprehensive Review and Comparison with Non-COVID-19 Cases. Journal of Acute Care. 2025 Jan;4(1):15.
16. Takagi R, Saraya T, Yamada S, Nakajima K, Doi K, Akizawa T, Ishikawa N, Kurokawa N, Kobayashi F, Nunokawa H, Aso J. Clinical Evaluation of Acute Exacerbation of Interstitial Lung Disease in a Single Tertiary Center: Perspectives before and after the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2024 Sep 26;13(19):5733.
17. Jiang C, Cui S, Hou S, Chen M, Huang Q, Zhang X, Li S, Yang D, Cao M. Long-term radiologic trajectories and corticosteroid strategies in COVID-19 patients with pre-existing ILD: a 24-month cohort study. BMC Pulmonary Medicine. 2026 Feb 10.
18. Desai U, Utpat K, Raj A. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the profile of interstitial lung disease presenting to the pulmonary medicine department of a tertiary care center in western India. Monaldi Archives for Chest Disease. 2026.