

HHS Public Access

J Allergy Clin Immunol. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 March 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Author manuscript

J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2019 March ; 143(3): 1237–1240.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2018.10.047.

Histologic similarities in children with eosinophilic esophagitis and PPI-responsive esophageal eosinophilia

Nathalie Nguyen, MD^{1,2}, Anna Baumgarten, MD², Benjamin L. Wright, MD^{3,4}, Kelley E. Capocelli, MD^{2,5}, Zhaoxing Pan, PhD⁶, James J. Lee, PhD³, Glenn T. Furuta, MD^{1,2}, and Joanne C. Masterson, PhD^{1,2,7}

¹Section of Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition, Digestive Health Institute, Children's Hospital Colorado, Aurora, Colorado, USA ²Gastrointestinal Eosinophilic Diseases Program, Department of Pediatrics, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado, USA ³Division of Allergy, Asthma and Clinical Immunology, Mayo Clinic in Arizona, Scottsdale Arizona, USA ⁴Division of Pulmonology, Phoenix Children's Hospital, Phoenix, Arizona, USA ⁵Department of Pathology, Children's Hospital Colorado, Aurora, Colorado, USA ⁶Research Institute, The Children's Hospital Colorado, Department of Pediatrics, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO, USA ⁷Institute of Immunology, Department of Biology, Maynooth University, Maynooth, Co Kildare, Ireland

Capsule Summary:

The EPX histologic scoring system can be used to differentiate children with EoE and PPI-REE relative to GERD, supporting the relationship between these 2 groups and enhancing current diagnostic and treatment approaches.

Keywords

Eosinophilic Oesophagitis; Pediatric; Eosinophil peroxidase; Eosinophil granule protein; Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease; Degranulation; Tissue biomarker

To the Editor:

Distinguishing between eosinophilic esophagitis (EoE), gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), and proton pump inhibitor-responsive esophageal eosinophilia (PPIREE) is difficult because symptoms overlap and there is no pathognomonic histologic feature for these disorders(1). Current EoE diagnostic guidelines define EoE as a clinicopathological

Corresponding author: Nathalie Nguyen, MD, 13123 East 16th Ave. B290, Aurora, CO 80045,

Nathalie.Nguyen@childrenscolorado.org, Phone: (720)777-5438, Fax: (720) 777-7277.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Potential Conflicts of Interest: Glenn T. Furuta is founder of EnteroTrack, received consultancy fees from Shire, and royalties from UpToDate. Nathalie Nguyen, Anna Baumgarten, Benjamin L. Wright, Kelley E. Capocelli, Zhaoxing Pan, James J. Lee, and Joanne C. Masterson have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

condition characterized by symptoms of esophageal dysfunction and > 15 eosinophils per high power field (eos/HPF) in the esophageal mucosa after ruling out other etiologies as a cause of inflammation(1). Treatment with high-dose proton pump inhibitors (PPI) had been used in clinical practice to exclude GERD and distinguish it from EoE(1). However, recent studies suggest that PPI-REE may represent a subset of patients with EoE(2), suggesting that PPIs should be considered as treatment for EoE, rather than simply part of the diagnostic algorithm. Enumeration of eosinophils using Hematoxylin & Eosin (H&E) stained biopsy sections may underestimate the extent of eosinophil involvement including features such as degranulation. We previously developed a histologic scoring system that assessed eosinophil peroxidase (EPX) to differentiate adults with EoE from GERD(3). The EPX scoring system differentiates intact eosinophils from eosinophil degranulation, as well as quantifying tissue distribution patterns of eosinophilia(3). The aim of this study was to assess the ability of the EPX scoring system to identify similarities and differences in the pattern of eosinophilic inflammation between EoE, PPI-REE and GERD in children. We hypothesized that children with EoE and PPI-REE would have similar EPX scores, whereas children with GERD would have lower scores.

We conducted a retrospective case control study of pediatric subjects cared forat Children's Hospital Colorado between 2006 and 2016 with EoE, PPI-REE, GERD and normal controls (Table). Subjects with EoE were defined according to consensus recommendations(1). Subjects with PPI-REE had 15 eos/HPF and were symptomatically and histologically responsive to high dose PPI (1-2 mg/kg/day). Subjects with EoE or PPI-REE, selected for this study, demonstrated histologic resolution of esophageal eosinophilia (< 15 eos/HPF) after 6-8 weeks of their prescribed treatment. Control subjects had gastrointestinal symptoms necessitating upper intestinal endoscopy with normal histology. Immunohistochemical staining with an EPX monoclonal antibody and scoring was performed as previously described(3). Briefly, this algorithm assesses 5 features: 1) maximum eosinophils in a single focus; 2) average number of eosinophils in five 40X high power fields; 3) level of degranulation; 4) patchiness or the extent of eosinophil infiltration and degranulation in the maximally affected biopsy; and 5) reproducibility or the extent of all biopsies with eosinophil infiltration or degranulation. The magnitude of each feature is assessed, along with a priority factor for each feature that gives a single numeric value to the global characteristics of tissue eosinophilia. (see Supplementary Table in this article's **Online Repository at www.jacionline.org**). Paired post-treatment esophageal biopsies were available for EoE and PPI-REE subjects. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Children's Hospital Colorado (IRB 07-0888). Statistical analysis of data was performed by one-way analysis of variance with Tukey's Post-hoc test and a *P*-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. GraphPad Prism 7 (GraphPad Software, LaJolla CA) was used for statistical analysis.

Paired biopsies, pre- and post-therapy, were analyzed for EoE (n=24) and PPIREE (n=9) subjects, while single biopsies were analyzed for GERD (n=28) and control (n=22) subjects. EoE patients were treated with swallowed topical corticosteroids (n=10), elimination diet (n=7), or a combination of both (n=7). The patient demographics, peak eosinophil count as measured by H&E and endoscopic findings for each group are as shown in the Table.

Treatment of EoE, with dietary elimination or topical corticosteroids, led to significant decreases in each individual parameter of the EPX histologic score (including reproducibility, patchiness, degranulation, max eosinophilic infiltrate in single focus, and average eosinophilic infiltrate), and in the total EPX score (42.0 ± 1.7 vs 5.1 ± 2.1 , *P*<0.0001) (**See** Figure). Similarly, PPI therapy in PPIREE subjects also led to significant decreases in all parameters including total EPX score (40.3 ± 2.5 vs 4.6 ± 2.3 , *P*<0.0001). No statistically significant differences were found when comparing EPX scores for EoE and PPI-REE before treatment, but EPX scores were significantly elevated in both groups compared to GERD (EoE pre-treatment vs GERD, 42.0 ± 1.7 vs. 2.7 ± 1.4 , *P*<0.0001; PPI-REE pre-treatment vs GERD, 40.3 ± 2.5 vs. 2.7 ± 1.4 , *P*<0.0001). Thus, PPI-REE and EoE scores were comparable but both uniquely discernible from GERD.

During the last decade, an accumulating body of evidence supports the view that a proportion of patients with clinical features (i.e. symptoms and endoscopic features) and histopathologic findings (i.e. mucosal eosinophilia and molecular analytes) consistent with EoE respond to PPI(2). In addition to acid-protective effects, PPIs have anti-inflammatory properties related to inhibition of eotaxin-3, a chemoattractant involved in the pathogenesis of EoE(4). As a result, up to 50% of patients with histologic findings consistent with EoE may respond to PPI therapy(5).

Previous studies have evaluated the utility of staining the esophageal epithelium for markers associated with EoE, including major basic protein, eotaxin-3, and tryptase in adults, and found that these markers are higher in EoE, but do not differentiate between EoE and PPI-REE(6). Additionally, studies found that tryptase and EPX staining may aid in differentiating between EoE and GERD in adults(3, 7). Our study sought to compare eosinophilic inflammation in EoE and PPI-REE with a previously described EPX immunohistochemical scoring system. Consistent with prior studies, the results demonstrate that eosinophilic inflammation in PPI-REE and EoE are similar pre and post-treatment. Our results also suggest that EPX staining in these two groups is different from GERD. One important strength of this study was inclusion of treatment naïve, PPI-REE subjects; a population often excluded in other studies due to the previous diagnostic algorithm, however, we acknowledge the limitation of the small sample size of PPI-REE group. Recently published updated consensus recommendations suggesting that PPIs may serve as treatment for EoE could allow future studies to identify a larger number of subjects who are PPI-naïve(2). Another limitation is that subjects with GERD had lower peak eosinophil counts than EoE and PPI-REE subjects. Previous studies have shown that esophageal eosinophil counts alone do not distinguish EoE and GERD subjects with GERD may have > 15 eos/HPF; however, this degree of eosinophilic inflammation in GERD is usually associated with erosive or microscopic esophagitis. The present study was conducted in pediatric subjects where erosive or microscopic esophagitis are less common.

With the emergence of an increasing number of methods to assess the esophagus in patients with EoE, enumeration of eosinophils in biopsies as the sole metric for inflammation may be limiting. The EPX scoring system assesses eosinophilic infiltration, density, distribution, and degranulation. An EoE Histologic Scoring System (EoEHSS) was recently developed by *Collins et al* to evaluate other pathologic features in esophageal biopsies from patients with

EoE including basal zone hyperplasia, eosinophil abscesses, eosinophil surface layering, dilated intercellular spaces, surface epithelial alteration, and dyskeratotic epithelial cells.(8) Although the EoEHSS evaluates additional pathologic features beyond peak eosinophil count, it does not assess eosinophil degranulation or tissue distribution patterns of eosinophilic inflammation in the esophagus, moreover, the EoEHSS has not been correlated with symptomatology. In contrast, EPX degranulation is a validated biomarker that correlates with pediatric dysphagia – even more strongly than eosinophil counts alone(9). While the EPX score did not outperform peak eosinophil counts in terms of diagnostic accuracy in this study, it provides a more comprehensive assessment of eosinophil activity. In summary, quantification of EPX by our EPX scoring system can be used to differentiate children with EoE and PPI-REE relative to GERD and enhance current diagnostic approaches.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Supported by: Grants from the Mayo Clinic, Phoenix Children's Hospital Foundation and Don and Kathy Levin Family Foundation (Wright BL), United States National Institutes of Health (K01- DK106315) (Masterson JC), NIH 2T32DK067009–11 (Nguyen N) 1K24DK100303 (Furuta GT) and U54AI117804 (CEGIR), which is part of the Rare Disease Clinical Research Network (RDCRN), an initiative of the Office of Rare Disease Research (ORDR), NCATS, and is funded through collaboration between NIAID, NIDDK, NCATS and patient advocacy groups including APFED, CURED, and EFC. Manuscript contents are the authors' sole responsibility and do not necessarily represent official NIH views. The study sponsors played no role in the study design in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data.

Abbreviations:

ЕоЕ	Eosinophilic esophagitis
EPX	Eosinophil peroxidase
eos/HPF	Eosinophils per high power field
GERD	Gastroesophageal reflux
H&E	Hematoxylin & Eosin
PPI	Proton pump inhibitor
PPI-REE	Proton pump inhibitor-responsive esophageal eosinophilia

References

- Liacouras CA, Furuta GT, Hirano I, Atkins D, Attwood SE, Bonis PA, et al. Eosinophilic esophagitis: updated consensus recommendations for children and adults. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2011;128(1):3–20 e6; quiz 1–2. [PubMed: 21477849]
- 2. Dellon ES, Liacouras CA, Molina-Infante J, Furuta GT, Spergel JM, Zevit N, et al. Updated international consensus diagnostic criteria for eosinophilic esophagitis: Proceedings of the AGREE conference. Gastroenterology. 2018.

- 3. Protheroe C, Woodruff SA, de Petris G, Mukkada V, Ochkur SI, Janarthanan S, et al. A novel histologic scoring system to evaluate mucosal biopsies from patients with eosinophilic esophagitis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2009;7(7):749–55 e11. [PubMed: 19345285]
- Cheng E, Zhang X, Huo X, Yu C, Zhang Q, Wang DH, et al. Omeprazole blocks eotaxin-3 expression by oesophageal squamous cells from patients with eosinophilic oesophagitis and GORD. Gut. 2013;62(6):824–32. [PubMed: 22580413]
- 5. Lucendo AJ, Arias A, Molina-Infante J. Efficacy of Proton Pump Inhibitor Drugs for Inducing Clinical and Histologic Remission in Patients With Symptomatic Esophageal Eosinophilia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Clinical gastroenterology and hepatology : the official clinical practice journal of the American Gastroenterological Association. 2016;14(1):13–22 e1. [PubMed: 26247167]
- Dellon ES, Speck O, Woodward K, Covey S, Rusin S, Gebhart JH, et al. Markers of eosinophilic inflammation for diagnosis of eosinophilic esophagitis and proton pump inhibitor-responsive esophageal eosinophilia: a prospective study. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2014;12(12):2015–22. [PubMed: 24993367]
- Dellon ES, Chen X, Miller CR, Fritchie KJ, Rubinas TC, Woosley JT, et al. Tryptase staining of mast cells may differentiate eosinophilic esophagitis from gastroesophageal reflux disease. Am J Gastroenterol. 2011;106(2):264–71. [PubMed: 20978486]
- 8. Collins MH, Martin LJ, Alexander ES, Boyd JT, Sheridan R, He H, et al. Newly developed and validated eosinophilic esophagitis histology scoring system and evidence that it outperforms peak eosinophil count for disease diagnosis and monitoring. Diseases of the esophagus : official journal of the International Society for Diseases of the Esophagus / ISDE. 2016.
- Martin LJ, Franciosi JP, Collins MH, Abonia JP, Lee JJ, Hommel KA, et al. Pediatric Eosinophilic Esophagitis Symptom Scores (PEESS v2.0) identify histologic and molecular correlates of the key clinical features of disease. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2015;135(6):1519–28 e8. [PubMed: 26051952]



Figure-

Scores for each EPX histology parameter including A) reproducibility (extent of all biopsies with eosinophil infiltration or degranulation), B) patchiness (extent of eosinophil infiltration or degranulation in maximally affected biopsy), C) level of degranulation, D) maximum eosinophils in a single focus, E) average number of eosinophils in five 40X high power fields and F) total EPX Score (EoE n=24, PPI-REE n=9, GERD n=28 and Control n=22, * P < 0.05, ****P < 0.001).

Table-

Demographics, peak eosinophil counts and endoscopic findings of subjects with EoE, PPI-REE, GERD and Control.

	EoE n=24		PPI-REE n=9		GERD n=28	Control n=22
Age Mean years ±SD	3.5 ± 1.8		7.6±5.5		3.7 ± 2.1	12 ± 5.0
Sex n (%)						
Males	20 (83%)		8 (89%)		21 (75%)	9 (41%)
Females	4(17%)		1 (11%)		7 (25%)	13 (59%)
Caucasian	22 (92%)		8 (89%)		23 (82%)	13 (59%)
Atopic Diseases n (%)						
Asthma	10 (42%)		4 (44%)		13 (46%)	0 (0%)
Eczema	12 (50%)		2 (22%)		4(14%)	1 (5%)
Food allergies	11 (46%)		3 (33%)		4(14%)	0 (0%)
Seasonal Allergies	14(58%)		2 (22%)		12 (43%)	(%0) (0%)
Peak eosinophils	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment		
Mean eos/HPF±SD	53.8 ± 31.3	1.5 ± 2.9	53.9 ± 45	1.8 ± 2.9	$0.9{\pm}2.1$	0 ± 0
Endoscopic Findings n (%)	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment		
Edema	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Rings	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%) (0%)	0 (0%)
Exudate	10 (42%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%) (0%)	0 (0%)
Furrows	16 (67%)	3 (13%)	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	(%0) 0	(%0) (0%)
Stricture	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	(%0) 0