

Utility in Clinical Practice of Immunoglobulin A Anti-Tissue Transglutaminase Antibody for the Diagnosis of Celiac Disease

JULIAN A. ABRAMS,* PARDEEP BRAR,* BEVERLY DIAMOND,* HEIDRUN ROTTERDAM,† and PETER H. GREEN*

Departments of *Medicine and †Surgical Pathology, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, New York

Background & Aims: The diagnosis of celiac disease often relies on the anti-tissue transglutaminase (tTG) antibody test. The aim of this study was to evaluate its sensitivity and specificity in clinical practice with the use of commercial laboratories, in which the test characteristics might differ from research laboratories. **Methods:** We identified 122 patients with suspected celiac disease who had anti-tTG antibody serologies as well as upper endoscopy with duodenal biopsies. Those with celiac disease were classified as either classic (with diarrhea or other symptoms of malabsorption) or silent (asymptomatic). Biopsies from celiac disease patients were classified as either partial (Marsh IIIA) or total (Marsh IIIB or IIIC) villous atrophy. **Results:** The overall sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative predictive values of the anti-tTG antibody test were 70.6%, 65.0%, 91.1%, and 30.2%, respectively. The sensitivity was 90.0% for patients with total villous atrophy and 42.3% for patients with partial villous atrophy ($P < .0001$). There were differences in both sensitivity and specificity between the 2 most commonly used commercial laboratories. The sensitivity for Lab #1 was 40.0% versus 86.4% for Lab #2 ($P < .0001$). The specificity for Lab #1 was 100.0%, and it was 41.7% for Lab #2 ($P = .02$). **Conclusions:** The sensitivity of the anti-tTG antibody in clinical practice is not as high as previously reported in research laboratories. The sensitivity is significantly lower in patients with partial villous atrophy. There is also significant variability in test characteristics among major commercial laboratories in the United States. These results need to be confirmed in prospective studies.

Celiac disease is a genetically determined autoimmune-like disorder induced by gluten, the storage protein of wheat and similar proteins found in barley and rye.¹ The autoimmune component of the disease is evidenced by the development of autoantibodies to the endomysium, reticulin, and tissue transglutaminase.² Originally antibodies to the gliadin component of gluten were used for diagnostic purposes; however, these tests are considered to lack sensitivity and specificity.³ The endomysial antibody (EMA) has a very high specificity

for celiac disease and has become the gold standard serologic test.⁴

The recognition that the enzyme tissue transglutaminase 2 (tTG) is the main autoantigen for the EMA⁵ allowed development of automated enzyme-linked immunoassays. Initially guinea pig tTG was used as the antigen; subsequently human tTG, either recombinant or derived from red blood cells, was used in the assays. Systematic review of the available studies revealed that the IgA tTG antibody test has greater than 90% sensitivity and specificity for celiac disease.³

Celiac serologic tests have a history of not performing as well in the clinical setting as the original research studies suggested they should.⁶⁻⁹ Within the United States serologic tests are performed by a variety of commercial laboratories that use different test kits from different manufacturers. Because there are no data as to the sensitivity of the IgA anti-tTG test as used in the clinical practice setting in the United States, we determined the sensitivity of this test in a large group of patients who were undergoing biopsy for the diagnosis of celiac disease and who had serologic testing performed at commercial referral laboratories.

Methods

We identified 122 consecutive patients with suspicion for celiac disease seen between January 2000 and December 2003 at the Celiac Disease Center at Columbia University (New York, NY). Patients were selected for this study if they had IgA anti-tTG (human) antibody determination performed before upper endoscopy for duodenal biopsies. Serologic testing was performed at various commercial laboratories around the country. Patients were not included in the study if they were <16 years old at time of diagnosis, had selective IgA defi-

Abbreviations used in this paper: EMA, endomysial antibody; tTG, tissue transglutaminase

© 2006 by the American Gastroenterological Association Institute
1542-3565/06/\$32.00

doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2006.02.010

Table 1. Celiac Disease Patient Characteristics

	No. of patients	%
Total	102	100
Sex		
Male	33	32.4
Female	69	67.6
Race		
White	102	100
Other	0	0
Type of celiac disease		
Classic	44	43.1
Silent	58	56.9
Presentation ^a		
Diarrhea	44	43.1
Iron deficiency	18	17.6
Osteoporosis	14	13.7
Screening	10	9.8
Other	40	39.2
Histology		
Total villous atrophy	60	58.8
Partial villous atrophy	42	41.2
Age at diagnosis (y)	44.5 (standard deviation, 15.4)	

^aSome patients had multiple presentations.

ciency (defined as a total serum IgA level $<.05$ g/L), were already on a gluten-free diet, were taking immunosuppressants at the time of initial evaluation, or had initial serologic testing performed at more than one laboratory. All patients were included in the study if the above criteria were met, regardless of whether celiac disease was proved. To receive a diagnosis of celiac disease, patients had to exhibit either histologic or serologic improvement after 6 months on a gluten-free diet. At the time of the initial biopsy, no patients were on a reduced gluten diet. During the study period, patient information was prospectively entered into a database (Access, Microsoft Office; Microsoft Corp, Redmond, WA).

All duodenal biopsies were reviewed in a blinded fashion by a single pathologist who was unaware of the antibody status. A pathologic diagnosis of celiac disease required intraepithelial lymphocytosis and either partial villous atrophy (Marsh IIIA) or total villous atrophy (Marsh IIIB and IIIC). The control group consisted of those in whom the biopsy was normal.

The clinical presentation was classified as either classic, in which diarrhea with or without a malabsorption syndrome was present, or silent, asymptomatic. Silent or asymptomatic celiac disease included patients presenting with iron deficiency, osteoporosis, dermatitis herpetiformis, or neurologic symptoms, or patients identified by screening or with incidental findings on endoscopy of atrophic or scalloped duodenal folds.

Statistical analysis was performed by using χ^2 or Fisher exact tests for categorical variables and 2-sided *t*

tests for continuous variables. We calculated 95% confidence intervals for the sensitivities of the anti-tTG antibody. STATA Release 8 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX) was used for all data analysis.

Results

There was a total of 122 patients who met the inclusion criteria for the study (Table 1). All the patients were white; 12% had at least 1 first-degree relative already diagnosed with celiac disease. During the screening process, 6 patients were excluded from the study because of selective IgA deficiency. Celiac disease was diagnosed in 102 of the patients. Among celiac disease patients, 70.6% (72/102) tested positive for anti-tTG, whereas 65.0% (13/20) of the non-celiac disease group were negative for the antibody. The positive and negative predictive values for the anti-tTG antibodies were 91.1% and 30.2%, respectively. Within the celiac disease group, 90.0% (54/60) of patients with total villous atrophy on initial biopsy and 42.3% (18/42) of patients with partial villous atrophy had positive anti-tTG antibodies ($P < .0001$) (Table 2). The anti-tTG antibody was positive in 65.9% (29/44) of patients with classic celiac disease, compared with 74.1% (43/58) of patients with silent celiac disease ($P = .37$). There were no significant differences in sensitivity when comparing the various modes of presentation. There was a trend toward significance seen in patients diagnosed with celiac disease who initially presented with anemia, of whom 88.9% (16/18) tested positive for anti-tTG antibody compared with 66.7% (56/84) among patients with other modes of presentation ($P = .06$).

Of the various commercial laboratories used to test for anti-tTG, 108 of 122 (88.5%) of the patients' samples were tested at 1 of 2 laboratories (Lab #1 and Lab #2). The overall sensitivity was 40.0% for Lab #1 and 86.4% for Lab #2 ($P < .0001$). The specificity for Lab #1 was 100.0% and was 41.7% for Lab #2 ($P = .02$) (Table 3). Significantly more celiac disease patients had total villous atrophy in samples sent to Lab #2 (67.8%, 40/59) compared with Lab #1 (43.3%, 13/30) ($P = .03$). However,

Table 2. tTG Sensitivities by Degree of Villous Atrophy

	Sensitivity (%)	(95% confidence interval)	
Overall	70.1	(60.8–79.2)	
TVA	90.0	(79.5–96.2)	
PVA	42.9	(27.7–59.0)	$P < .0001^a$

TVA, total villous atrophy; PVA, partial villous atrophy.

^a*P* value calculated for the difference in sensitivity between TVA and PVA.

Table 3. Anti-tTG Test Characteristics at 2 Major Commercial Laboratories

	Lab #1	(95% CI)	Lab #2	(95% CI)	P value
Sensitivity	12/30 (40.0%)	(22.7–59.4)	51/59 (86.4%)	(75.0–94.0)	<.0001
Specificity	7/7 (100.0%)	(65.2–100)	5/12 (41.7%)	(15.2–72.3)	.02
PPV	12/12 (100.0%)	(77.9–100)	51/58 (87.9%)	(76.7–95.0)	.34
NPV	7/25 (28.0%)	(12.1–49.4)	5/13 (38.5%)	(13.9–68.4)	.71

CI, confidence interval; PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value.

there was still a significant difference between the sensitivities of these 2 labs in patients with both total and partial villous atrophy. Within each of the 2 primary laboratories, the difference in sensitivity between patients with total and partial villous atrophy also remained significant (Table 4).

Discussion

Our study of patients undergoing biopsy for the diagnosis of celiac disease showed that the sensitivity of the serum IgA tTG was 70%. This is considerably lower than the value of >90% reported by Rostom et al¹⁰ in their review of the literature. The lower sensitivity was due mainly to the inclusion of patients with lesser degrees of villous atrophy. The low overall sensitivity might also be due to the comparison of the results of commercial laboratory tests (as opposed to those of a research laboratory) against the gold standard duodenal biopsies, which were interpreted by a single expert histopathologist. However, this does not account for the marked difference in sensitivity between patients with total and partial villous atrophy, because the pathologist was blinded to the test results. The test had a sensitivity of 90% when total villous atrophy was present compared with 43% in the presence of partial villous atrophy. This has been noted previously for tTG^{11–13} as well as the EMA.^{7,8,13}

The disappointing sensitivity of serologic tests in the diagnosis of celiac disease in the clinical practice setting has been described^{6,9,14} and could be explained by selection bias in the initial studies from research laboratories for the tTG test, in which patients with total villous atrophy and positive EMA were included.^{15–17} These

studies often used anti-tTG assays developed in the research laboratory, adding another bias.

Our patients were representative of those seen with celiac disease in that women predominated, less than 50% had diarrhea as their primary presentation, and 60% had total villous atrophy.^{18,19} The main bias of our study is the referral nature of the population as well as the high rate of celiac disease diagnosis. However, this selection bias did not account for the difference in sensitivity between patients with total villous atrophy and partial villous atrophy, because both groups should be equally affected by this bias.

In our study, 84% of the patients were ultimately diagnosed with celiac disease. This high percentage was due to the fact that we are a referral center for celiac disease, and our patient population might not be reflective of that seen by community gastroenterologists. There also was a greater than usual number of patients who were relatives of patients with the disease. As such, interpretation of the positive and negative predictive values should be done with caution, because these values are heavily influenced by disease prevalence in the population being studied. However, the fact that this study was carried out at a referral center should have no impact on the sensitivity and specificity, because these values are inherent to the test, independent of disease prevalence.

We found no difference in the sensitivity of the tTG antibody in patients with classic, diarrhea-predominant celiac disease as compared with patients with silent or asymptomatic celiac disease. The serologic tests likely have equal utility in the diagnostic evaluation of both groups of patients. The degree of villous atrophy is the major determinant of whether the test is positive.¹² It is

Table 4. Comparison of tTG Sensitivity in Each Laboratory by Histology

	Lab 1 (% tTG+)	(95% CI)	Lab 2 (% tTG+)	(95% CI)	P value
TVA	10/13 (76.9%)	(46.2–95.0)	39/40 (97.5%)	(86.8–100)	.04
PVA	2/17 (11.8%)	(1.5–36.4)	12/19 (63.2%)	(38.4–83.7)	.002
P value ^a	.0003		.0003		

CI, confidence interval; TVA, total villous atrophy; PVA, partial villous atrophy.

^aP value for comparison of TVA vs PVA sensitivities.

interesting to note that the patients who presented with anemia tested positive for the tTG antibody more than the patients with other presentations, although this finding did not reach statistical significance.

The IgA tTG assay has replaced the EMA test in many laboratories, yet the anti-tTG test is not as specific for celiac disease as the EMA. There are many reports of the IgA tTG test being positive in the absence of celiac disease^{20–22} and in a diverse spectrum of diseases including arthritis,²³ heart failure,²⁴ chronic liver disease,^{25–27} diabetes,²⁸ and inflammatory bowel disease,^{25,27,29} even when human tTG is used as the antigen in the tests. During the period of this study only human tTG was used by the testing laboratories. The EMA and anti-tTG are not always concordant,^{6,14} indicating the value of performing both the EMA and tTG in patients at risk for celiac disease.

A source of variability in all of these studies is the sensitivity and specificity of the different test kits. Several studies have demonstrated that different test kits have different characteristics.^{30–32} This was borne out in our study in which the 2 principal laboratories in this study used different kits for the tTG test. One laboratory had high specificity and low sensitivity, whereas the other laboratory had high sensitivity and low specificity. There were significantly more patients with total villous atrophy tested at Lab #1 compared with Lab #2. This finding alone could explain the difference in overall sensitivity between the 2 laboratories. However, after analyzing the sensitivities by degree of histologic damage, there was still a difference in the tTG sensitivity between the labs. The sensitivity of the tTG antibody was lower in patients with partial villous atrophy compared with patients with total villous atrophy in both Lab #1 and Lab #2. We are not aware of how each laboratory determines cutoff values, or whether they in fact use the manufacturer's recommended values. In turn, we do not know how the manufacturers determine the normal range for their individual kits. It is not realistic for physicians in clinical practice to be aware of these subtle yet important details. Perhaps a standard assay and cutoff should be agreed on and observed by all commercial reference laboratories as has been attempted in Europe.³³ For a more valid evaluation of interlaboratory variability, future studies should compare patients' serum that is tested by using different kits commonly used in the United States. We have in fact seen patients who have had tTG tests performed at both laboratories and noted conflicting results. These patients were not included in this study. We are not aware of the applica-

bility of our results to other laboratories or the different manufacturers' kits that are used in the United States.

It is also possible, although remote, that not all the patients had celiac disease. Patients with biopsy findings similar to those found in celiac disease have been reported to spontaneously remit, suggesting the presence of an acute nonspecific enteritis that is not gluten-related.³⁴

The test sensitivity for the tTG antibody is significantly lower in patients with lesser degrees of histologic damage. The cutoffs for a positive test and the assay used to test for the antibody are not uniform across different commercial reference laboratories. The result is a marked interlaboratory variability in test sensitivity and specificity observed in clinical practice. The clinician should therefore have a very low threshold for obtaining biopsies in any patient with a negative tTG and a moderate clinical suspicion for a diagnosis of celiac disease. A significant proportion of patients with celiac disease and a negative antibody will be missed if there is no further workup. Relying on the antibody tests as the sole means of identifying patients with celiac disease will result in many missed diagnoses, in particular in patients with partial villous atrophy.

References

- Green PH, Jabri B. Coeliac disease. *Lancet* 2003;362:383–391.
- Alaedini A, Green PH. Narrative review: celiac disease: understanding a complex autoimmune disorder. *Ann Intern Med* 2005; 142:289–298.
- Rostom A, Dube C, Cranney A, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of serologic tests for celiac disease: a systematic review. *Gastroenterology* 2005;128:S38–S46.
- Kapuscinska A, Zalewski T, Chorzelski TP, et al. Disease specificity and dynamics of changes in IgA class anti-endomysial antibodies in celiac disease. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 1987;6: 529–534.
- Dieterich W, Ehnis T, Bauer M, et al. Identification of tissue transglutaminase as the autoantigen of celiac disease. *Nat Med* 1997;3:797–801.
- Dickey W, McMillan SA, Hughes DF. Sensitivity of serum tissue transglutaminase antibodies for endomysial antibody positive and negative coeliac disease. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2001;36: 511–514.
- Dickey W, Hughes DF, McMillan SA. Reliance on serum endomysial antibody testing underestimates the true prevalence of coeliac disease by one fifth. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2000;35:181–183.
- Abrams J, Diamond B, Rotterdam H, et al. Seronegative celiac disease: increased prevalence with lesser degrees of villous atrophy. *Dig Dis Sci* 2004;49:546–550.
- Rostami K, Kerckhaert J, Tiemessen R, et al. Sensitivity of anti-endomysium and antigliadin antibodies in untreated celiac disease: disappointing in clinical practice. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1999; 94:888–894.
- Rostom A, Dube C, Cranney A, et al. Celiac disease: evidence report/technology assessment no 104 (prepared by the University of Ottawa Evidence-based Practice Center, under contract no 290-02-0021)—Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Pub-

- lication no 04-E029-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2004.
11. Koop I, Ilchmann R, Izzi L, et al. Detection of autoantibodies against tissue transglutaminase in patients with celiac disease and dermatitis herpetiformis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2000;95:2009–2014.
 12. Tursi A, Brandimarte G, Giorgetti GM. Prevalence of antitissue transglutaminase antibodies in different degrees of intestinal damage in celiac disease. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2003;36:219–221.
 13. Ashabani A, Errabtea H, Shapan A, et al. Serologic markers of untreated celiac disease in Libyan children: anti gliadin, anti-transglutaminase, antiendomysial, and anticalreticulin antibodies. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2001;33:276–282.
 14. Shamir R, Lerner A, Shinar E, et al. The use of a single serological marker underestimates the prevalence of celiac disease in Israel: a study of blood donors. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002;97:2589–2594.
 15. Dieterich W, Laag E, Schopper H, et al. Autoantibodies to tissue transglutaminase as predictors of celiac disease. *Gastroenterology* 1998;115:1317–1321.
 16. Sulkanen S, Halttunen T, Laurila K, et al. Tissue transglutaminase autoantibody enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay in detecting celiac disease. *Gastroenterology* 1998;115:1322–1328.
 17. Biagi F, Ellis HJ, Yiannakou JY, et al. Tissue transglutaminase antibodies in celiac disease. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1999;94:2187–2192.
 18. Murray JA, Van Dyke C, Plevak MF, et al. Trends in the identification and clinical features of celiac disease in a North American community, 1950–2001. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2003;1:19–27.
 19. Lo W, Sano K, Lebwohl B, et al. Changing presentation of adult celiac disease. *Dig Dis Sci* 2003;48:395–398.
 20. Weiss B, Bujanover Y, Avidan B, et al. Positive tissue transglutaminase antibodies with negative endomysial antibodies: low rate of celiac disease. *Isr Med Assoc J* 2004;6:9–12.
 21. Freeman HJ. Strongly positive tissue transglutaminase antibody assays without celiac disease. *Can J Gastroenterol* 2004;18:25–28.
 22. Feighery L, Collins C, Feighery C, et al. Anti-transglutaminase antibodies and the serological diagnosis of coeliac disease. *Br J Biomed Sci* 2003;60:14–18.
 23. Spadaro A, Sorgi ML, Scrivero R, et al. [Anti-tissue transglutaminase antibodies in inflammatory and degenerative arthropathies]. *Reumatismo* 2002;54:344–350.
 24. Peracchi M, Trovato C, Longhi M, et al. Tissue transglutaminase antibodies in patients with end-stage heart failure. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002;97:2850–2854.
 25. Bizzaro N, Villalta D, Tonutti E, et al. IgA and IgG tissue transglutaminase antibody prevalence and clinical significance in connective tissue diseases, inflammatory bowel disease, and primary biliary cirrhosis. *Dig Dis Sci* 2003;48:2360–2365.
 26. Vecchi M, Folli C, Donato MF, et al. High rate of positive anti-tissue transglutaminase antibodies in chronic liver disease. Role of liver decompensation and of the antigen source. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2003;38:50–54.
 27. Carroccio A, Vitale G, Di Prima L, et al. Comparison of anti-transglutaminase ELISAs and an anti-endomysial antibody assay in the diagnosis of celiac disease: a prospective study. *Clin Chem* 2002;48:1546–1550.
 28. Leon F, Camarero C, R-Pena R, et al. Anti-transglutaminase IgA ELISA: clinical potential and drawbacks in celiac disease diagnosis. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2001;36:849–853.
 29. Di Tola M, Sabbatella L, Anania MC, et al. Anti-tissue transglutaminase antibodies in inflammatory bowel disease: new evidence. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2004;42:1092–1097.
 30. Fernandez E, Riestra S, Rodrigo L, et al. Comparison of six human anti-transglutaminase ELISA-tests in the diagnosis of celiac disease in the Saharawi population. *World J Gastroenterol* 2005;11:3762–3766.
 31. Van Meensel B, Hiele M, Hoffman I, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of ten second-generation (human) tissue transglutaminase antibody assays in celiac disease. *Clin Chem* 2004;50:2125–2135.
 32. Wong RC, Wilson RJ, Steele RH, et al. A comparison of 13 guinea pig and human anti-tissue transglutaminase antibody ELISA kits. *J Clin Pathol* 2002;55:488–494.
 33. Stern M. Comparative evaluation of serologic tests for celiac disease: a European initiative toward standardization. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2000;31:513–519.
 34. Goldstein NS. Non-gluten sensitivity-related small bowel villous flattening with increased intraepithelial lymphocytes: not all that flattens is celiac sprue. *Am J Clin Pathol* 2004;121:546–550.

Address requests for reprints to: Peter H. Green, MD, Columbia University College of Physicians & Surgeons, 161 Ft. Washington Street, Room 6-645, New York, New York 10032. e-mail: pg11@columbia.edu.; fax: (212) 305-3738.

Dr Abrams is a fellow under NIH training grant 5 R25 CA 94061-04 A1.