

Macrophage Polarization across Pulmonary and Tumor Contexts

Abstract

A central question for chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research is not simply whether an output is accurate, but whether it survives scrutiny of evidence transfer. This literature-based conceptual analysis does not report a new experiment. The primary literature contributes a bounded result: the publication synthesizes low-grade inflammation, tissue remodeling, tolerance, and disease-specific pulmonary contexts. Borrowed evidence should retain the conditions that made it informative. A mechanism in one disease or model can motivate another hypothesis without validating it. List the source and destination contexts and the assumptions connecting them. Seek direct evidence at the destination before making an efficacy or diagnostic claim. The proposed comparison concerns biofilms, tumor niches, immune states; it would test whether the specific failure scenario is detected without erasing legitimate uncertainty. An integrated account should preserve the distinction between disease-specific biofilm and immune observations and any stronger downstream decision.

Reading the literature by evidence type

(Xiao Yu et al. 2026a) examines how persistent biofilms can dysregulate immunity in chronic pulmonary conditions in *Biofilm-Mediated Immune Dysregulation in Chronic Pulmonary Diseases: Mechanisms and Clinical Implications*. Its methodological basis is a review of biofilm interactions with innate and adaptive responses, including pattern recognition, extracellular traps, macrophage polarization, and T-cell differentiation. The accessible evidence is specific: the publication synthesizes low-grade inflammation, tissue remodeling, tolerance, and disease-specific pulmonary contexts. It treats biofilms as active modifiers of host immune states rather than merely a count of persisting organisms. Mechanisms vary across COPD, bronchiectasis, asthma, and other contexts; proposed combined antibiofilm/immunomodulatory strategies are not proven universal treatments. The contribution becomes relevant to evidence transfer when the workflow moves from biofilms to immune states. That transition is the review's proposed analytical focus, not a new result attributed to the source.

A useful boundary case is supplied by *Immune Niches in Brain Tumors: Glial-Immune Cell Interactions and Spatial Microdomains*, concerned with how spatial glial-immune interactions organize permissive and suppressive microdomains within brain tumors (Qian Guo et al. 2026). Its methodological basis is a review of astrocytes, microglia, oligodendrocyte-lineage cells, T cells, and myeloid cells across spatial tumor niches. The accessible evidence is specific: the abstract integrates cytokine, metabolic, hypoxic, and immunoediting mechanisms associated with immune suppression and exhaustion. It shifts attention from tumor-wide averages to interactions whose meaning depends on location and cell context. The review does not establish efficacy of a new intervention; co-location, state annotation, and functional interaction require different evidence. For evidence transfer, the important connection is the distinction between biofilms and immune states. The source informs that distinction, but a stronger conclusion would require evidence at the point where one is used to stand for the other.

The sources should be compared through the roles they play, not merged into a single performance claim. *Biofilm-Mediated Immune Dysregulation in Chronic Pulmonary Diseases: Mechanisms and Clinical Implications* addresses how persistent biofilms can dysregulate immunity in chronic pulmonary conditions (Xiao Yu et al. 2026a). By contrast, *Immune Niches in Brain Tumors: Glial-Immune Cell Interactions and*

Spatial Microdomains addresses how spatial glial-immune interactions organize permissive and suppressive microdomains within brain tumors (Qian Guo et al. 2026). That difference matters for evidence transfer: the evidence concerning biofilms is not automatically evidence concerning immune states. A successful software operation, a plausible mechanistic account, and a validated outcome are different achievements. Their integration may improve traceability, but it cannot create an unmeasured link. A coherent review should identify where the sources complement one another and where their scopes remain incompatible. Here the proposed failure scenario is a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere. The analytical value of that scenario is that it can occur without requiring any cited paper to be wrong: an otherwise valid local finding can be misused at a later interface. Preventing that misuse requires evidence about the interface itself, not simply a larger collection of local results.

The failure scenario

Biofilms and immune states occupy different positions in the evidence chain. Their relationship is the starting point for examining evidence transfer. Consider the possibility of a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere. This is a proposed stress scenario, not an observed event reported by the cited studies. Its purpose is to expose which evidence contract would be violated even if the final output looked plausible. For disease-specific biofilm and immune observations, the relevant claim must identify its population or artifact class, its time window, and the action it is supposed to support. A failure at any of these levels may persist even after a local technical improvement. The analysis therefore treats published methods as bounded evidence and asks how their limitations interact with this particular decision. An operational analogy is useful only if it keeps those limitations visible.

Borrowed evidence should retain the conditions that made it informative. A mechanism in one disease or model can motivate another hypothesis without validating it. Transfer becomes credible when the proposed bridge is stated and tested. In this article, the relevant contrast is biofilms, tumor niches, immune states. The proposed counterexample of a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere puts that contrast under pressure. List the source and destination contexts and the assumptions connecting them. Seek direct evidence at the destination before making an efficacy or diagnostic claim. A favorable finding would show that the intended interpretation of immune states remains defensible when biofilms is perturbed under the specified conditions. An unfavorable finding should narrow the claim rather than be discarded as an inconvenient case.

The transition at issue is specific to chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research. It concerns biofilms, tumor niches, immune states, and the scenario of a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere shows why a locally correct result can still become a misleading integrated claim. The input record should retain enough information to decide which part of that scenario violates the intended contract. That includes the original source type, measurement or artifact status, and the reason the proposed interpretation exceeds its support. The evaluator would compare the system's response with a qualified judgment made without seeing that response. Disagreement should be classified rather than erased by rewriting the prompt. Transfer becomes credible when the proposed bridge is stated and tested. A useful negative result would show that the interface cannot preserve this distinction under realistic use; a useful positive result would demonstrate preservation on independent cases rather than merely on the example used to develop the rule. The primary source remains relevant through its particular contribution: It treats biofilms as active modifiers of host immune states rather than merely a count of persisting organisms. That contribution should be retained even if the integrated workflow fails. Conversely, successful integration would not remove the source's limitations or turn a proposed extension into an already observed result. This asymmetric interpretation protects both the literature and the user from an unjustified all-or-nothing verdict.

Methods that constrain the claim

Replication and transparent workflows are prerequisites for reliable biomedical claims (National Academies 2019). Reproducing a calculation and independently replicating a finding are different achievements. Recoverable data and code allow one to inspect the first; independent observations and design choices inform the second. A review should avoid calling several reanalyses of one dataset separate replications. Clear reporting of analysis changes also makes a failed replication informative instead of allowing it to disappear as an implementation dispute. This is methodological support for examining evidence transfer, not a claim that the source studied chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research. A separate application-specific test is required at the interface described in this review.

FAIR principles support reusable cohorts, signals, and analysis metadata (Wilkinson et al. 2016). Reusable evidence needs more than a downloadable file. Identifiers, metadata, provenance, and meaningful access conditions help another researcher determine what an artifact contains and whether it can answer a new question. Reuse does not mean universal permission or universal scientific comparability. The information needed to judge those boundaries should travel with the artifact rather than remain in private workflow knowledge. Within chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research, this distinction is relevant to evidence transfer. The proposed failure scenario is a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere; its evaluation must preserve the original source's methodological scope.

Causal inference requires a clearly specified intervention, time order, and exchangeability assumptions (Hernán and Robins 2020). A prediction can be accurate without identifying what an intervention would change. A useful causal analysis begins by defining the hypothetical comparison, eligibility, and time zero. Its assumptions concern the process generating exposure and observation, not merely the flexibility of a fitted model. In this review, causal vocabulary is appropriate only when that comparison can be specified and defended. An implementation should expose this limitation to reviewers of disease-specific biofilm and immune observations. The result and its evidence qualification should remain recoverable even when the interface condenses them into a short report.

Epidemiologic design makes confounding, selection, and measurement error part of interpretation (Rothman, Greenland, and Lash 2008). Confounding, selection, and measurement error are distinct problems and need not move an estimate in the same direction. An analysis should describe them before deciding which adjustment is adequate. A larger dataset can reduce random error while leaving systematic error almost untouched. Precision should therefore be interpreted alongside the quality of the design and the eligibility of its population. Within chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research, this distinction is relevant to evidence transfer. The proposed failure scenario is a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere; its evaluation must preserve the original source's methodological scope.

False-discovery control is central when many molecular features are screened (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995). Multiplicity arises from the family of questions actually searched. Controlling false discoveries within a named family does not automatically cover later tissue filters, alternative endpoints, or narrative choices. The proposed audit should retain exploratory branches so the family is visible. Independent confirmation then addresses a different question from whether a discovery threshold was correctly applied during screening. For the comparison involving biofilms, tumor niches, immune states, the source supplies an analytical obligation. The review's proposed application remains a hypothesis, with the deliberately difficult scenario serving as a check on scope inflation.

Medical machine learning must fit data provenance, care pathways, and prospective evaluation (Rajkomar, Dean, and Kohane 2019). The clinical relevance of a model depends on how its output changes a care process. Development data can contain information that becomes available only after the intended

decision. A review must identify that availability boundary before comparing algorithms. Prospective use also changes who is measured and who is treated, so evaluation of a frozen historical dataset cannot establish the entire future workflow. An implementation should expose this limitation to reviewers of disease-specific biofilm and immune observations. The result and its evidence qualification should remain recoverable even when the interface condenses them into a short report.

Responsible health AI connects prediction with workflow, monitoring, and patient impact (Wiens et al. 2019). The point at which a model reaches practice is not the end of evaluation. New populations, changing measurements, and feedback can alter failure modes. A responsible deployment needs a route for recognizing deterioration and a person authorized to respond. Monitoring should be linked to feasible corrective actions; an alert that cannot change the workflow provides accountability only in a very limited sense. This is methodological support for examining evidence transfer, not a claim that the source studied chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research. A separate application-specific test is required at the interface described in this review.

Calibration separates discrimination from confidence used in clinical escalation (Guo et al. 2017). Discrimination and calibration deserve separate evaluation. A score can order cases well yet systematically overstate its certainty. Aggregate calibration can also hide local miscalibration near the threshold where action changes. An audit should retain predicted probabilities and observed outcomes rather than report only correct classifications, and it should evaluate calibration on data not reused to choose the correction. The connection to macrophage polarization across pulmonary and tumor contexts is a constraint on interpretation. It would be inappropriate to borrow the source's methodological authority as direct confirmation of the integrated domain claim.

Uncertainty can deteriorate under the site and cohort shifts common in biomedicine (Ovadia et al. 2019). Uncertainty is most valuable when a system moves beyond familiar conditions, yet those conditions can also weaken its uncertainty estimates. A warning mechanism must therefore be evaluated under shift rather than assumed to generalize because it works on ordinary held-out data. Different shifts can affect ranking, calibration, and error concentration differently. No single in-distribution curve demonstrates protection against them all. Within chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research, this distinction is relevant to evidence transfer. The proposed failure scenario is a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere; its evaluation must preserve the original source's methodological scope.

Selective prediction formalizes abstention when evidence does not support action (Geifman and El-Yaniv 2017). Abstention creates a tradeoff between coverage and residual error. Comparing systems without matching coverage can make one look safer merely because it leaves more work unfinished. Deferred cases also consume human or computational resources. The evaluation should show the risk-coverage relation and account for the fate of excluded cases, rather than treating them as though they have ceased to matter. Within chronic pulmonary immune-dysregulation research, this distinction is relevant to evidence transfer. The proposed failure scenario is a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere; its evaluation must preserve the original source's methodological scope.

Research design and stopping conditions

List the source and destination contexts and the assumptions connecting them. Seek direct evidence at the destination before making an efficacy or diagnostic claim. This would operationalize the concern with evidence transfer rather than assume it has been resolved by one successful output. These procedures are proposed, not completed. The case set would include the scenario of a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere, with its validity judged independently of the system's response. The relevant comparison axes are biofilms, tumor niches, immune states.

An evidence-role protocol would map each publication to its underlying observations and its permissible conclusions. The test cases would include reviews of the same primary study, correspondence without new data, and observations at incompatible scales. Reviewers would identify scope inflation before seeing the automated summary. An integrated system would be credited for preserving a missing link, not rewarded for making every source fit one complete narrative.

For the immune review, proposed mechanisms should be tested in their stated compartments and disease settings. Spatial association, state annotation, and intervention response would be judged separately. A useful result could expose a missing bridge in the integrated account. It would not need to confirm every part of the preferred narrative to improve scientific understanding.

What remains unverified

The cited sources still have design-specific limits even where their abstracts and methods are accessible. This review is a bounded conceptual synthesis rather than a systematic review with an exhaustive search protocol. It cannot establish the effectiveness of the proposed integrated workflow. Its specific contribution is to articulate how evidence transfer changes the interpretation of biofilms, tumor niches, immune states. Technical sources support computational comparisons only; they do not validate biological mechanisms or patient benefit. Reviews and correspondence retain their publication roles and are not counted as new experiments. Proposed stress cases are illustrative, not observed failures attributed to the papers. Future work should therefore test the weakest inference described here, preserve contrary results, and disclose the cost of checking rather than treating additional automation as intrinsically beneficial.

Conclusion

The most valuable next result would be a discriminating test of evidence transfer, including a realistic way for the preferred approach to fail. List the source and destination contexts and the assumptions connecting them. Seek direct evidence at the destination before making an efficacy or diagnostic claim. The remaining problem can be stated as a testable contrast involving biofilms, tumor niches, immune states, with a polarization label assumed to imply the same function everywhere as a deliberately challenging alternative. A stronger conclusion will require evidence at the exact interface described in the failure scenario. Repeating a source, improving fluency, or increasing execution success cannot substitute for that test.

References

1. Yu, Xiao, et al. "Biofilm-Mediated Immune Dysregulation in Chronic Pulmonary Diseases: Mechanisms and Clinical Implications." *Frontiers in Microbiology*, vol. 16, 2026, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2025.1736384>.
2. Guo, Qian, et al. "Immune Niches in Brain Tumors: Glial-Immune Cell Interactions and Spatial Microdomains." *Acta Neuropathologica Communications*, vol. 14, 2026, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40478-026-02373-0>.
3. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *Reproducibility and Replicability in Science*. National Academies Press, 2019.
4. Wilkinson, Mark D., et al. "The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship." *Scientific Data*, vol. 3, 2016, article 160018.
5. Hernán, Miguel A., and James M. Robins. *Causal Inference: What If*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2020.
6. Rothman, Kenneth J., Sander Greenland, and Timothy L. Lash. *Modern Epidemiology*. 3rd ed., Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.
7. Benjamini, Yoav, and Yosef Hochberg. "Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, vol. 57, no. 1, 1995, pp. 289-300.
8. Rajkomar, Alvin, Jeffrey Dean, and Isaac Kohane. "Machine Learning in Medicine." *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 380, 2019, pp. 1347-58.
9. Wiens, Jenna, et al. "Do No Harm: A Roadmap for Responsible Machine Learning for Health Care." *Nature Medicine*, vol. 25, 2019, pp. 1337-40.
10. Guo, Chuan, et al. "On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks." *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017, pp. 1321-30.
11. Ovadia, Yaniv, et al. "Can You Trust Your Model's Uncertainty? Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty under Dataset Shift." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
12. Geifman, Yonatan, and Ran El-Yaniv. "Selective Classification for Deep Neural Networks." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.