The old and new tests for celiac disease: which is the best test combination to diagnose celiac disease in pediatric patients?
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Abstract

Background: In the diagnosis of celiac disease (CD), serum assays for anti-endomysium (EMA) and anti-transglutaminase (anti-tTG) antibodies have excellent diagnostic accuracy. However, these assays are less sensitive in young pediatric patients. Recently, a new ELISA test using deamidated gliadin peptides (DGP) as antigen has proved to be very sensitive and specific even in pediatric patients. In addition, anti-actin IgA antibodies (AAA) is another test that can be used in CD patients because antibody concentrations correlate with the degree of villous atrophy. This study evaluated the clinical accuracy of anti-tTG, EMA, AGA, anti-DGP and AAA and the effectiveness of these in different combinations for diagnosing CD in a large cohort of pediatric patients.

Methods: Sera of 150 children under 6 years of age were tested: 95 patients had a diagnosis of CD, while 55 patients who did not suffer from CD were used as controls. Anti-DGP IgA/IgG and AAA were assayed with ELISA kits, while anti-tTG IgA/IgG and AGA IgG/IgA were assayed using a quantitative fluoroimmunoassay. The EMA test was conducted by indirect immunofluorescence.

Results: Seventy-six of 95 (80%) CD patients were positive for DGP IgA and/or tTG IgA. Eighty of 95 (84.2%) patients were positive for DGP IgG and/or tTG IgA. None of the controls were positive for these antibodies. Eighty-four of 95 (88.4%) patients and 8/55 (14.5%) controls were positive for AAA and/or anti-tTG IgA.

Conclusions: In very young children, association of anti-tTG IgA with anti-DGP IgG is the best test combination for diagnosing CD, yielding a cumulative sensitivity of 84.2% and a specificity of 100%.
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Introduction

Celiac disease (CD) is an immune-mediated enteropathy triggered by gluten ingestion in genetically predisposed individuals. CD is one of the most common gastrointestinal disorders, with a prevalence of 1:100–1:200 in the general population (1–3). The large increase in CD diagnosis over recent decades is in large part due to the availability of immunoassays with excellent diagnostic accuracy, such as the IgA anti-transglutaminase (anti-tTG) antibody assay (4–8). However, discordant data between adults and children have been reported as the anti-tTG assay is less accurate in very young patients and autoantibody levels can fluctuate (9–11). In fact, the reported sensitivity for IgA anti-tTG, including all ages, ranges between 67% and 100%, with a specificity between 96% and 100% (5, 11–19), while in very young patients the sensitivity is lower, with a value ranging from 67% to 83% (11, 17, 18).

In addition to the anti-tTG assay, commercially available tests for CD diagnosis include IgA anti-endomysium antibodies (EMA) and IgA and IgG anti-gliadin antibodies (AGA). EMA sensitivity in children ranges from 83% to 100% (12, 17, 18, 20), but is lower in children under 2 years of age, being approximately 85% (17, 18, 20).

AGA, in general, have lower diagnostic accuracy than anti-tTG and EMA, since these autoantibodies can also be detected in other enteropathies as well as in healthy individuals (21–25). In children, the sensitivity of IgA AGA ranges between 52% and 95% with a specificity between 68% and 98%. IgG AGA have sensitivity similar to IgA AGA, but are affected by much lower specificity (approx. 50%) (12, 20–29).

In 2005, the North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition (NASPAGAN)
issued a guideline for the diagnosis of pediatric CD (30). Although some pediatric CD patients may test negative for EMA and for anti-tTG and positive only for AGA (10, 31–33), the use of AGA was no longer recommended, because of its poor overall diagnostic accuracy. This change weights methodological and economic factors heavily, but probably under-values the importance of diagnostic sensitivity.

Recently, a new generation of AGA tests has been developed (34–37). Schwertz et al. (38) demonstrated that an immunosassay based on deamidated synthetic gliadin peptides (DGP) bound to nitrocellulose filters were recognized by sera of CD patients. The recognition of the epitopes containing the sequence QPEQPFP showed high specificity for CD. These data were subsequently confirmed by Sugai et al. (39). A clinical study by Tonutti et al. (40) involving a large group of children with CD, some of whom were anti-tTG negative, showed that anti-DGP antibodies have very high sensitivity and specificity.

Anti-actin IgA antibodies (AAA) are other antibodies that can be found in patients with CD. Recent studies suggest that the detection of AAA can be useful in diagnosing and monitoring CD because the antibody concentration is related to the degree of intestinal damage (41–44). Indeed, AAA are detectable mainly in CD patients with Marsh 3 lesions and their presence can be considered a marker of intestinal atrophy. However, more recent studies have shown that anti-tTG IgA concentrations also correlate with histopathological findings in adult and pediatric CD patients (45–51). Subsequently, Hill and Holmes (52) have shown that a ratio > 10 to the anti-tTG level and the cut-off value is a reliable marker for the presence of Marsh ≥ 2 lesions.

Taken together, eight different assays (considering both the IgA and the IgG isotype) are currently available to diagnose and monitor CD, each one of them with its own characteristics of sensitivity and specificity and each giving different results in adult and pediatric patients (53). Should we then use all these tests? Are some of them just redundant, not providing significant additional information to other tests?

The aim of this study was to evaluate the clinical accuracy of anti-tTG, AGA, anti-DGP, EMA and AAA, both individually and in different combinations in a wide cohort of pediatric patients aged <6 years, in order to recommend a panel of tests providing the best efficiency for diagnosing CD.

Patients and methods

A total of 150 sera were studied: 95 were from consecutive patients with a new diagnosis of CD made according to the criteria of the European Society of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition (54). All CD patients were aged <6 years (range 1–5.5 years, median 4.1; 31 males and 64 females). The control group (age range 1–6 years, median 4; 22 males and 33 females) included 32 patients affected by respiratory diseases (allergic asthma and rhinitis) and 23 patients affected by digestive disease: lactose intolerance (n = 4), cow milk protein allergy (n = 9), Crohn’s disease (n = 5), indeterminate colitis (n = 2) and autoimmune hepatitis (n = 3). All patients were referred in the years 2004–2009 to the Immunopathology and Allergy Department of Palermo ‘Buccheri La Ferla’ Hospital or to the Gastroenterology Department of Palermo “Di Cristina” Children’s Hospital. Sera were frozen at –80°C and thawed only once before the serological assays were performed.

Parents of all the children gave consent for the serological investigations performed in this study.

Anti-tTG IgA/IgG and AGA IgG/IgA antibodies were detected with the EliA ImmunoCAP system (Phadia Uppsala, Sweden). The EMA IgA test was conducted by the indirect immunofluorescence method on cryostatic sections of monkey esophagus (INOA) at a starting dilution of 1:5, which was considered the threshold for positivity.

Anti-DGP IgA and IgG were assayed with a commercial enzyme immunoassay (ELISA) method using synthetic deamidated gliadin peptides containing the antigenic sequence PEQ (Quanta-Lite Gliadin IgA II and IgG II, INOA, San Diego, CA, USA).

Tests for IgA AAA were performed using a commercial ELISA method (F-Actin Smooth Muscle, INOVA) using an anti-human IgA conjugate as previously described (44). Assays were performed in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions. All sera were tested also for total IgA by nephelometry (BNII Siemens Healthcare, Munich, Germany).

Intestinal biopsy

At least three biopsy specimens of the second part of the duodenum were obtained and prepared as previously described (6). Specimens were embedded in parafin and slides were stained with hematoxylin and eosin and graded by conventional histology according to the Marsh classification (55–57). Three CD patients showed Marsh 2 histology, six patients Marsh 3a, 29 patients Marsh 3b and 57 patients Marsh 3c.

Statistical analysis

The sensitivity and the specificity of each antibody assay were calculated at the cut-off suggested by the manufacturers (seven units for anti-tTG IgA and IgG, seven units for AGA IgA and IgG, 20 units for anti-DGP IgA and IgG). Cumulative sensitivity and specificity, with 95% confidence interval (CI) of different test combinations were also calculated. The positive predictive value (PPV) and the negative predictive value (NPV) of all the assays and of their associations were also evaluated. Moreover, the relation between mean levels of anti-tTG IgA, anti-DGP IgA, anti-DGP IgG and AAA IgA antibodies and the Marsh’s score was assessed by means of the univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) test. Finally, the rate of positive results of each antibody was evaluated in relationship to the grade of intestinal atrophy. Statistical analysis was performed using the Medcalc Software Version 10.4.5 for Windows statistical package.

Cost of testing

The costs of each single assay and of a combination of assays were calculated based on the current Italian price list of laboratory tests.

Results

Anti-tTG and EMA assays

Seventy-four of the 95 children with CD (77.9%) were anti-tTG IgA positive (range, 8.9–150 units) and EMA IgA positive (range, 1.5–1:1280) (Table 1). The other 21 were
Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV) and 95% confidence interval of the various antibodies for diagnosing celiac disease in children aged < 6 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibody</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA</td>
<td>0.779 (0.698–0.850)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgG</td>
<td>0.547 (0.450–0.645)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA IgA</td>
<td>0.779 (0.698–0.850)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGP IgA</td>
<td>0.453 (0.355–0.551)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGP IgG</td>
<td>0.453 (0.355–0.551)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anti-tTG and EMA negative. Fifty-two of the 74 anti-tTG IgA positive patients were also anti-tTG IgG positive. All 55 control patients were negative for anti-tTG IgA and IgG. Anti-tTG IgA antibodies and the Marsh score of intestinal atrophy were significantly correlated (F-ratio 3.460; p = 0.02). Mean values and standard deviations of anti-tTG IgA antibodies in the Marsh groups are shown in Table 2.

As regards the correlation between anti-tTG IgA antibody assay and the severity of intestinal damage, 29 of the Marsh 3c patients (50.9%), 10 of the Marsh 3b patients (34.5%), one of the Marsh 3a patients (16.7%) and none of the Marsh two patients had IgA anti-tTG \( \geq 10^x \) the cut-off. Overall, 40/92 Marsh 3 patients were strongly positive for IgA anti-tTG (43.5%, 95% CI = 33.8–53.2).

AGA and anti-DGP assays

Forty-three of 95 (45.3%) CD patients were AGA IgA positive, 48/95 (50.5%) were AGA IgG positive, 43/95 (45.3%) were positive for anti-DGP IgA and 57/95 (60%) for anti-DGP IgG (Table 1). In the control group, 2/55 patients (3.6%) were positive for AGA IgA and 14/55 (25.4%) were positive for AGA IgG. No false-positive results were observed for anti-DGP IgA and IgG. Anti-DGP IgA and IgG antibodies and the Marsh score of intestinal atrophy were significantly correlated (F-ratio 3.821; p = 0.013 and 3.090; p = 0.031, respectively). Mean units and standard deviations of anti-DGP IgA and of anti-DGP IgG antibodies in the Marsh groups are shown in Table 2.

As regards the correlation between anti-DGP positivity and the severity of intestinal damage, 42/92 Marsh 3 patients were positive for anti-DPG IgA (45.7%, 95% CI = 35.9–56.4) and 56/92 for anti-DPG IgG (60.9%, 95% CI = 51.3–70.4).

AAA assay

IgA AAA were positive in 74 of the 95 (77.9%) untreated CD patients and 21 were negative (Table 1). Among the 32 control patients affected by respiratory diseases, only one was positive for AAA, whereas in the group with intestinal diseases, seven of 23 patients were positive. There was no significant correlation between AAA levels and the Marsh score (F-ratio 1.801; p = 0.153). Mean units and standard deviations of AAA in the Marsh groups are shown in Table 2. Forty-nine of the Marsh 3c patients (85.9%), 22 of the Marsh 3b (75.9%), three of the Marsh 3a (50%) and none of the Marsh 2 patients were AAA positive. Overall, 74/92 Marsh 3 patients were AAA positive (80.4%, 95% CI = 72.7–88.2).

Total IgA assay

None of the sera showed IgA deficiency (total serum IgA < 0.5 mg/L).

Diagnostic accuracy of combined tests

Seventy-six of 95 (80%) CD patients were positive for anti-DGP IgA and/or anti-tTG IgA. Eighty of 95 (84.2%) CD
patients were positive for DGP IgG and/or tTG IgA. Seventy-eight of 95 (82.1%) CD patients and 14/55 (25.4%) controls were positive for AGA IgG and/or tTG IgA. Seventy-four patients and two controls were positive for AGA IgA and/or tTG IgA. Seventy-four patients and nine controls were positive for AGA IgA and/or AAA. Eighty patients and nine controls were positive for AGA IgG and/or AAA. Eighty-four patients and eight controls were positive for AAA and/or tTG IgA. We did not consider the accuracy value of the combination of EMA IgA with anti-tTG IgG because all sera that were anti-tTG IgG and EMA positive were also anti-tTG IgA positive. None of the control patients were EMA IgA and anti-tTG IgA and/or IgG positive. The diagnostic performances of AGA, DGP and tTG combined tests are summarized in Table 3. Association of anti-tTG IgA with anti-DGP IgG proved to be the best test combination, with a cumulative sensitivity of 84.2% (95% CI = 71.1–91.4) and a specificity of 100%. The PPV of this combination is 100% and the NPV is 78.6% (95% CI = 70.5–86.8).

**Cost of testing**

Table 4 presents the costs of each single test and of test combinations.

If only the anti-tTG IgA assay is used as a screening test, the cost per patient is €15.51.

Given that 74 out of 95 CD patients had positive anti-tTG IgA test results, the cost for each CD diagnosis in the studied population is €18.63. However, if we use this single test approach, the additional cost of testing total serum IgA, €5.03, must be added, since this step is necessary for identifying subjects with IgA deficit. This brings the total cost per patient to €19.54 and per diagnosis to €25.08.

If, in the screening profile the anti-DGP IgG test is combined with the anti-tTG IgA test, the total cost is €25.92 per patient, with six additional patients diagnosed. Using this approach, the total cost for each diagnosis is €30.78 (an 18% increase), with no need to test for total serum IgA because IgA-deficient patients would be identified by the DGP IgG test.

**Discussion**

In the last two decades, the use of anti-tTG antibodies as more accurate markers for CD has largely replaced AGA testing for CD diagnosis (58). Although AGA testing is not recommended by the NASPHAGAN guidelines (30), it could still be considered useful in pediatric patients who test negative for anti-tTG or in IgA-deficient patients (9, 25, 59, 60) because the anti-tTG assay has insufficient sensitivity in very young children.

In recent years it has been shown that the new anti-DGP ELISA tests using deamidated gliadin peptides as antigen have a high sensitivity and a specificity comparable to those of anti-tTG and EMA and higher than AGA (25, 38–40).

In this study we evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of different combinations of several assays in CD diagnosis in a large series of very young pediatric patients, with the objective of determining the test, or combination of tests, best able to ensure the greatest diagnostic efficacy.

We confirmed that the anti-DGP tests have higher specificity (IgA 100%, IgG 100%) than AGA tests (IgA 96.4%, IgG 74.6%), as well as higher sensitivity (DGP IgA 45.3%, IgG 60.0% vs. AGA IgA 45.3%, IgG 50.5%). In this respect, it is noteworthy that none of the CD subjects that were negative for DGP IgG tested positive for AGA (either IgA or IgG). These findings confirm the widespread opinion that the AGA test has limited usefulness for the diagnosis of CD. Our data also showed that in children, EMA and anti-tTG IgA have an equal diagnostic accuracy, but the anti-tTG IgA test should be preferred because it is fully automated and it is not prone to subjective interpretation.

The most relevant aspect highlighted by our study is that the combination of anti-tTG IgA with anti-DGP IgG increases the accuracy for CD diagnosis in very young children. Indeed, by combining anti-tTG IgA with anti-DGP IgG, the clinical sensitivity increased from 77.9% of the anti-tTG IgA alone to 84.2%, maintaining, at the same time, a very high specificity (100%). The PPV and NPV (100% and 78.6%, respectively) also indicate that anti-tTG IgA plus anti-DGP IgG is the best test combination. Our findings are important because they confirm in a pediatric population the results obtained by Volta et al. (61) in adult CD patients. Furthermore, although our patient series did not include subjects with IgA deficiency, a high accuracy of the anti-DGP IgG assay has been reported in IgA-deficient CD children (62, 63), showing that this combination of diagnostic tests may enable accurate recognition even of CD patients with IgA deficiency. Even if the highest sensitivity (88.4%) and NPV (81.1%) were observed by the association of anti-tTG IgA and AAA, the specificity of these two combined assays fell to 85.5%. These findings suggest that the AAA test has limited usefulness for the diagnosis of CD and are in agreement.

### Table 2: Mean values and standard deviation (SD) of anti-tTG IgA, anti-DGP IgA and IgG, and AAA antibody concentrations in relation to the Marsh score of intestinal atrophy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marsh score</th>
<th>no.</th>
<th>tTG-IgA (Mean units ± SD)</th>
<th>DGP-IgA (Mean units ± SD)</th>
<th>DGP-IgG (Mean units ± SD)</th>
<th>AAA-IgA (Mean units ± SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0±2.6</td>
<td>12.6±1.7</td>
<td>15.3±0.9</td>
<td>3.6±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41.5±31.3</td>
<td>13.8±2.5</td>
<td>31.1±24.1</td>
<td>16.1±12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61.5±41.9</td>
<td>19.6±16.8</td>
<td>31.5±26.8</td>
<td>20.7±17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80.3±50.8</td>
<td>37.4±33.1</td>
<td>49.2±34.7</td>
<td>26.2±22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rTTG, anti-tissue transglutaminase antibodies; DGP, anti-deamidated gliadin antibodies; AAA, anti-actin antibodies.
Table 3  Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV) and 95% confidence interval of test association for diagnosing celiac disease in children aged <6 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assay</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
<th>95% CI Low</th>
<th>95% CI High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA or IgG</td>
<td>80.0 (72.2–87.8)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGP IgA or IgG</td>
<td>65.3 (55.9–74.6)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA IgA or IgG</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>60.3 (52.6–76.6)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71.6 (63.8–87.9)</td>
<td>71.6 (63.8–87.9)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IgA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+total IgA</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+DGP IgG</td>
<td>82.1 (71.5–91.4)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+AAA</td>
<td>82.1 (71.5–91.4)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGP IgG+AAA</td>
<td>82.1 (71.5–91.4)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+DGP IgA+AAA</td>
<td>82.1 (71.5–91.4)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
<td>77.9 (69.8–86.0)</td>
<td>97.4 (94.2–100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMA, anti-endomysium antibodies; tTG, anti-tissue transglutaminase antibodies; DGP, anti-deamidated gliadin antibodies; AGA, anti-gliadin antibodies; AAA, anti-actin antibodies.

Table 4 Costs of each single test and of test association for the diagnosis of celiac disease, according to the Italian list of laboratory tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assays</th>
<th>Euro (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA or IgG</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGP IgA or IgG</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA IgA or IgG</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IgA</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+total IgA</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+DGP IgG</td>
<td>25.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+AAA</td>
<td>29.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGP IgG+AAA</td>
<td>25.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTG IgA+DGP IgA+AAA</td>
<td>40.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMA, anti-endomysium antibodies; tTG, anti-tissue transglutaminase antibodies; DGP, anti-deamidated gliadin antibodies; AGA, anti-gliadin antibodies; AAA, anti-actin antibodies.

with those reported by previous studies that showed that the AAA assay cannot replace EMA and anti-tTG in the diagnostic algorithm of CD (43, 44, 59). We confirm, however, that AAA positivity is associated with severe intestinal damage, as reported by other researchers (41–44). Therefore, in the follow-up of pediatric patients with CD (i.e., monitoring the adherence to gluten-free diet), the AAA test may provide important information about mucosal status without the use of an invasive procedure (64–68). Regarding the possible use of elevated anti-tTG IgA levels as markers of severe histological damage, we confirm the data obtained by Donaldson et al. (48, 49) and Hill and Holmes (52), showing that all patients with elevated anti-tTG IgA concentrations had Marsh 3 intestinal atrophy.

In conclusion, our data suggest that the best serological approach to diagnosing CD in pediatric patients is based on combining anti-tTG IgA and anti-DGP IgG assays, with only a moderate increase of screening costs. These tests may be performed either simultaneously or sequentially. Simultaneous testing would probably be more straightforward and guarantee a faster turn-around time. A sequential approach, based on a reflex strategy (i.e., testing for anti-DGP IgG only in patients who test negative for anti-tTG IgA) could contain costs and be equally effective if supported by reflex testing automation. The use of AAA could be limited to support the diagnosis of CD when histological findings are controversial or to evaluate the adherence to diet of CD patients (44, 69). However, more data are warranted before their use in these particular situations could be recommended.
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