Disease severity in familial cases of IBD
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Abstract

Background: Phenotypic traits of familial IBD relative to sporadic cases are controversial, probably related to limited statistical power of published evidence.
1. Introduction

Familial aggregation in inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) has been documented in numerous studies.\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^4\) A positive family history of IBD increases the risk of developing Crohn’s disease (CD) and ulcerative colitis (UC). The greatest risk is in first-degree relatives, especially in siblings, and it is higher in patients with CD than in those with UC. The rate of family history in CD ranges from 2% to 14%, and in UC from 7% to 11%.\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^5\)\(^,\)\(^6\) The role of genetic factors in IBD has been shown by epidemiological, familial, and genome-wide association (GWA) studies. Previous analyses on the phenotypic differences between familial and sporadic IBD are controversial. Whereas some studies did not show phenotypic differences,\(^4\)\(^,\)\(^7\)\(^,\)\(^8\) others found that in familial cases, disease onset occurs at an earlier age and suffers from a higher disease extent than in sporadic cases.\(^9\)\(^,\)\(^10\) Provision of robust data on this aspect might prove of value in our goal to offer our patients a personalized health care.

As familial aggregation only occurs in a minority of patients with IBD, the main limitation of the published reports addressing this aspect is the limited power to evidence relevant differences in phenotype between sporadic and familial cases. To overcome these limitations we took advantage of the prospective Spanish registry of IBD cases, ENEIDA (Estudio Nacional en Enfermedad Inflamatoria intestinal sobre Determinantes genéticos y Ambientales), that included 11,983 patients at the time this study was undertaken. This represents a sample size 10-fold higher than the largest study published so far.

1.1. Patients and methods

The study included 11,983 IBD patients (48.3% UC and 51.7% CD) registered in the ENEIDA database, a Spanish database that collects prospective data of incident and prevalent cases of IBD treated at 35 Spanish hospitals since January 2006. Patients diagnosed with other types of IBD (unclassified or, indeterminate IBD or microscopic colitis) were excluded. Events occurring before inclusion of the patient in the database were acquired retrospectively from local database or case records.

1.2. Description of variables

The variables captured included: demographic data, clinical phenotype including IBD type, age at diagnosis, gender, smoking habits before and after diagnosis, family history of IBD including number of affected relatives and degree of kinship, disease location and extent, disease behavior (for CD) according to the Montreal classification,\(^11\) extraintestinal immune-related manifestations (EIMs) of IBD and surgical requirements during follow-up.

1.3. Definitions established in the database are the following

The database prospectively established the following definitions: Smokers were defined as patients who smoked more than 7 cigarettes per week. Ex-smokers were defined as patients who had given up smoking for at least 1 year. Nonsmokers were defined as patients who had never smoked more than 7 cigarettes per week.\(^12\)

1.3.1. Disease location and disease behavior

Disease location and disease behavior were determined according to at least one imaging technique (endoscopy, small bowel follow through, or a cross-sectional imaging technique). The maximal extent of involvement and the most severe form of disease behavior at any time since diagnosis was recorded. Disease phenotype was categorized according to the Montreal classification.\(^11\)

The EIMs of IBD were defined as reactive manifestations including: arthritis, erythema nodosum, pyoderma gangrenosum, aphthous stomatitis, iritis/uveitis and autoimmune diseases such as primary sclerosing cholangitis.

1.3.2. Familial IBD

Familial IBD was defined as the existence of one or more first, second and/or third degree relatives affected with
either CD or UC. The number of relatives with any IBD was registered. Patients without any relative affected with IBD were categorized as sporadic IBD. An effort was made to verify reported IBD in relatives by obtaining medical records whenever possible. All these terms were prospectively defined and categorized by the investigators in each center. The database is kept under continuous external monitoring for completeness and consistency of the data entered, but data can only be modified by each local investigator. The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee of each participating hospital and written informed consent was obtained from all patients.

2. Statistical analysis

Continuous data were compared using Student's t test and were expressed as median and interquartile range (IQR). Categorical data were analyzed by Chi square test.

Probability curves for surgery need in sporadic and familial IBD were calculated according to the Kaplan–Meier method and were compared using the log-rank test.

Linear regression was performed to assess whether familial history of IBD was an independent predictor for younger age at diagnosis in UC and CD (dependent variable). Gender, smoking at diagnosis and family history of IBD were included as independent variables. Results are reported as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). All p values were two-sided. A p value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant difference. p values of t-tests or X2 tests have not been corrected for multiple comparisons. Analyses were performed with SPSS V19.0 software package (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL).

3. Results

3.1. Study population

The study cohort included 11,983 patients with an established diagnosis of UC or CD (48.2% females, and 51.8% males); median age at diagnosis, 32 years (IQR 24–44). There were 5783 (48.3%) patients diagnosed with UC and 6200 (51.7%) patients with CD. According to family history, 10,523 patients (87.8%) had sporadic IBD, and 1460 patients (12.2%) had familial IBD. In Table 1 the demographic characteristics of patients with UC and CD are summarized.

3.2. Familial and sporadic ulcerative colitis

There were 5194 patients with sporadic UC (89.8%), and 589 cases with familial UC (10.2%); among the later group 65% had one or more first degree relatives affected by IBD and 35% had only second or third degree relatives affected. As shown in Table 2 median age at diagnosis was significantly lower in the familial group compared to the sporadic group (33 years (IQR 24–44) vs 37 years (IQR27–49); p < 0.0001), but no differences were observed in other demographic or environmental risk factors such as gender, smoking habit or previous appendectomy. Although disease extent was similar in both groups, there was a higher proportion of patients with EIMs in the familial group (17.2%) than in the sporadic group (14%) (p = 0.04). The analysis of survival time free of surgery through Kaplan–Meier analysis did not show significant differences between groups (p = 0.1). Duration of follow-up was similar in sporadic and familial cases. No differences were found between the group of patients with familial UC who had first degree relatives affected and the group of patients with only second or third degree relatives in terms of demographic and clinical characteristics.

3.3. Familial and sporadic Crohn's disease

A total of 6200 patients with CD were included in the study. In the sporadic group there were 5329 cases (86%), and the familial group comprised 871 cases (14%); 60.19% of them had at least one or more first degree relatives affected by IBD and 39.8% had only second and/or third degree relatives affected by IBD as shown in Table 4. No differences were found between the group of patients with familial CD who had first degree relatives affected and the group with only second or third degree relatives in terms of demographic and clinical characteristics. The median age at diagnosis was significantly lower in the familial group compared to the sporadic group (27 years (IQR 21–37) vs 29 years (IQR22–40); p = 0.0001) and there was a higher proportion of patients with EIMs among the familial cases (30.1%) than in the sporadic cases (23.6%) (p < 0.0001). Disease location was different in the two groups of patients. Compared to the sporadic group, familial cases had a significantly higher proportion of cases with ileocolonic location (42.7% vs 51.7%; p < 0.0001). The evaluation of disease behavior at the time of diagnosis demonstrated that the penetrating phenotype was significantly more frequent in the familial group than in the sporadic group (21% vs 17.6%; p = 0.01). Perianal disease was also more frequent at disease onset in the familial group (32% vs 27.1%; p = 0.003) (Table 4). However, the Kaplan–Meier analysis did not show significant differences in the survival time free of surgical treatment among the two groups (p = 0.3). The median duration of follow-up was significantly higher in the familial group compared to the sporadic group (106 months [IQR 45–179] vs 90 months [IQR 38–162]; p < 0.0001).

Table 1  Demographic data in ulcerative colitis (UC) and Crohn's disease (CD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total cases</th>
<th>UC patients</th>
<th>CD patients</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>Age at diagnosis (years)</td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up (months)</td>
<td>39 (28–59)</td>
<td>40 (32–59)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>38 (27–49)</td>
<td>39 (28–51)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female gender (%)</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking at diagnosis (%)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIMs (%)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial cases (%)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Interquartile range.
b Extraintestinal manifestations.
The results of regression analysis are shown in Table 3. The familial aggregation independently reduces the age at diagnosis by 4.16 years (95% CI 2.82–5.51) in UC and by 3.46 years (95% CI 2.41–4.51) in CD.

4. Discussion

The current study analyzed a large IBD registry comparing the disease phenotype at diagnosis and during follow-up in patients with CD and UC according to existence of familial aggregation. For both diseases familial cases have an earlier disease onset, and a higher prevalence of EIMs. The analysis showed that at the disease onset familial CD is more severe with a higher percentage of penetrating behavior and perianal disease than sporadic disease, and is associated with a higher prevalence of ileocolic disease location. Despite the higher prevalence of penetrating behavior and perianal disease in familial CD cases at the time of diagnosis, surgery requirements did not differ between the two groups, which may be related to initiation of early medical interventions resulting in decreased surgical needs. Differences between sporadic and familial cases were not influenced by the number of relatives affected or the degree of consanguinity (first vs second or third degree relatives).

The strength of this study relies on several facts. First, the large number of cases included in the study makes the results robust. Second, ENEIDA registry standardized data capture on phenotype characteristics of UC and CD (Montreal definition) as well as definitions of smoking and EIMs. This has the advantage of setting a benchmark for data capture and increasing the accuracy of the information obtained. Third, all data collected since January 2006 were prospective, and the information of the patients enrolled in the registry has been updated after each outpatient visit or hospital events, so the data of the disease follow-up are mostly prospective. Fourth, data are subject to external monitoring for completeness and consistency. Finally, we could directly verify familial IBD in 40% of relatives because they were also included in the ENEIDA registry. The coincidences of demographic data of the population included with that of prospective population base studies,13,14 also confirm the reliability of data captured in ENEIDA database.

The study has limitations that should not be ignored. First, this is not a true population based study. ENEIDA registry covers IBD hospital population, collecting information of cases that require either outpatient control or hospital admission, this could justify that the distribution of cases with UC and CD around 1:1 in our cohort differs from that observed in population-based studies, where the prevalence of UC cases is higher than CD by a 5:3 ratio.15

Table 2 Characteristics of UC, according to sporadic disease and familial aggregation (statistically significant results are highlighted in bold).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total patient</th>
<th>A Sporadic IBD</th>
<th>B Familial IBD</th>
<th>C 1st degree relatives affected</th>
<th>D 2nd, 3rd degree relatives affected</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up median (IQR)</td>
<td>89 (37–165)</td>
<td>100 (44–178)</td>
<td>107 (48–191)</td>
<td>100 (40–174)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at diagnosis median (IQR)</td>
<td>37 (27–49)</td>
<td>33 (24–44)</td>
<td>33 (25–44)</td>
<td>30 (23–42)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/female (%)</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokers at diagnosis (%)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendectomy (%)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIMs (%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal E1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal E2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal E3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Independent predictors of age at diagnosis in ulcerative colitis and Crohn’s disease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Ulcerative colitis</th>
<th>Crohn’s disease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 5783</td>
<td>N = 6200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient β (95% CI)</td>
<td>Coefficient β (95% CI)</td>
<td>p value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female gender</td>
<td>−3.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking at diagnosis</td>
<td>−3.55</td>
<td>−3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial aggregation</td>
<td>−4.16</td>
<td>−3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Interquartile range.
b Extraintestinal manifestations.
controversial. Some studies have demonstrated a higher prevalence of EIMs in the familial group, whereas no difference was found in another study between familial and sporadic IBD. Sensitivity analyses in subgroups of patients with CD/UC or with 1st/2nd–3rd degree relatives provide confirmatory evidence of this association in the current study. The reason for higher EIMs in familial cases is not apparent. It is known that EIMs have a familial predisposition, suggesting the existence of a strong genetic influence on this phenotypic trait. Some studies suggest that genetic load is higher in familial cases and some susceptibility genes for IBD confer also susceptibility to other immune mediated inflammatory disorders. One example of this is the HLA system which is one of the major genetic markers associated with IBD and EIMs.

Another notable aspect evaluated in this study was the assessment of familial IBD according to the degrees of consanguinity. Interestingly in both, familial UC and CD, patients had the same differences in disease characteristics when compared to sporadic cases whether they had first degree relatives or more distant relatives. Most familial aggregation studies included only first-degree relatives; there is little information about other degrees of consanguinity and IBD characteristics. This study is the first to report robust information about the effect of IBD aggregation when patients only have distant relatives affected.

Finally we want to emphasize the difference in severe phenotype at disease onset between familial CD and familial UC. There are some family data suggesting a stronger genetic influence in CD than in UC, such as more common family history or a higher proportion of concordance among homozygotic twins. But genetic risk factors explain only a fraction of the estimated heritability and there are also strong environmental factors such as smoking that increase the predisposition to CD.

5. Conclusion

The study demonstrates that when a sufficiently powered cohort of cases is interrogated, familial aggregation in IBD is associated to an earlier disease onset, more severe phenotype, and more EIMs. This feature should be taken into account in future studies aimed at establishing prognostic factors, and may also have practical implications for patient care when the predictive ability of family aggregation is gauged relative to other predictors particularly at the time of diagnosis, when information on disease characteristics is considerably limited.
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