



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijporl



The utility of bronchoalveolar lavage findings in the diagnosis of eosinophilic esophagitis in children

Robert J. Yawn^a, Mohammad Fazili^b, Gwen Provo-Bell^a, Christopher T. Wootten^{a,*}

^a Department of Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37232 USA

^b Division of Pediatric Allergy, Immunology and Pulmonary Medicine, Vanderbilt Children's Hospital, Nashville, TN 37232 USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 24 March 2015
Received in revised form 8 August 2015
Accepted 10 August 2015
Available online xxx

Keywords:

Eosinophilic esophagitis
Eosinophilia
Laryngeal inflammation
Bronchoalveolar lavage
Lipid-laden macrophage index
Asthma

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL)-nucleated cell counts and the lipid-laden alveolar macrophage index (LLMI) have been investigated in predicting chronic aspiration as well as reflux esophagitis with variable results. To date, BAL neutrophil percentages and the LLMI have not been described in patients with eosinophilic esophagitis (EoE).

Objectives: To evaluate BAL neutrophil percentages and LLMI levels in patients with EoE and compare these levels in patients with aerodigestive concerns without biopsy-proven EoE.

Methods: Retrospective review of patients referred to an aerodigestive evaluation team for overlapping aerodigestive complaints (dysphagia, stridor, subglottic stenosis, feeding intolerance, and chronic aspiration). Patients underwent microlaryngoscopy, esophagogastroduodenoscopy with biopsy, and bronchoscopy and BAL were indicated by symptoms. BAL neutrophil percentages, LLMI levels, esophageal biopsy results, and esophageal dual-probe pH/impedance were recorded and compared.

Results: Fifty-one patients were included in the study that underwent comprehensive workup for aerodigestive complaints. Patients were subdivided into two groups: (1) negative esophageal biopsy (for EoE) and (2) positive esophageal biopsy. There were no significant differences between the groups in percentage neutrophils ($p = 0.55$, unpaired t -test) or LLMI levels ($p = 0.14$, unpaired t -test).

Discussion: BAL neutrophil percentages and the LLMI are unreliable in identifying patients with silent aspiration and gastroesophageal reflux. To date, there is no report of the utility of BAL neutrophil percentages and the LLMI in diagnosing patients with EoE. Our series indicates no correlation in neutrophil percentages or LLMI in patients with EoE versus patients without EoE that are referred to tertiary centers with aerodigestive concerns.

Conclusion: BAL neutrophil percentages and LLMI levels are not a reliable predictor of eosinophilic esophagitis in children with complex aerodigestive concerns. Esophageal biopsy remains the gold standard for diagnosis of EoE and the challenge remains to find other markers that raise suspicion for EoE for the non-gastroenterologist or that stage the extent of disease beyond the esophagus.

© 2015 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In its introduction, the lipid-laden alveolar macrophage index (LLMI) showed promise in identifying chronic aspiration in patients with parenchymal lung disease. Early reports suggested a high level of sensitivity in detecting chronic aspiration, and subsequent quantitative studies appeared to have adequate sensitivity when compared to radiographic evaluation of aspiration [1–3]. Complicating the issue, later studies in children have

demonstrated that the index is elevated in children with pulmonary disease without clinical or radiographic evidence of aspiration, indicating a lack of specificity for silent aspiration [4]. Regarding gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), a small series has suggested that the LLMI does have a correlation with duration of reflux symptoms, but there is not a difference between LLMI levels in reflux patients and healthy controls [5]. Further studies have also shown in a series of 50 children that underwent simultaneous impedance testing for GERD and bronchoscopy that there was no correlation between LLMI values and acid or non-acid reflux events [6].

While there are questions regarding the utility of LLMI in aerodigestive disease as a whole, there is some utility in the

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 615 936 8176; fax: +1 615 875 0101.
E-mail address: christopher.wootten@vanderbilt.edu (C.T. Wootten).

evaluation of children with laryngeal cleft. Children with more severe laryngeal clefting were shown to have significantly higher LLMI levels [7]. A large series correlated various diagnoses (cystic fibrosis, asthma, and immunosuppression) and LLMI levels and showed significant variability between and within groups [8]. While LLMI levels have been investigated in multiple aerodigestive complaints, to date no studies exist evaluating lipid-laden alveolar macrophage index levels or Bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) neutrophil percentages in children with biopsy-proven eosinophilic esophagitis (EoE).

Bronchoalveolar lavage findings have also been investigated in a variety of pulmonary processes including chronic wheezing/cough, bacterial bronchitis, and cystic fibrosis [9–11]. Because of the high level of variability in sample technique in performing BAL, total cell counts are often unreliable in the workup and should be interpreted with caution [12]. As an alternative, percentages of cell types are often used as markers, and the cutoff of greater than 10% neutrophils has been shown to be associated with inflammation or infection [9,10,12]. As is the case with the LLMI, no study has evaluated the proportions of inflammatory nucleated cells recovered through BAL in patients with eosinophilic esophagitis.

Eosinophilic esophagitis (EoE) is a clinico-pathologic entity whose manifestations may include feeding difficulties, food impaction, dysphagia, and chest pain. Likely due to increasing disease awareness, the annual incidence of eosinophilic esophagitis rose from 1 in 10,000 in the year 2000 to 4.3 cases per 10,000 in 2003 [13]. The diagnostic criteria are both clinical and pathologic, combining upper aerodigestive symptoms with >15 intraepithelial eosinophils/high power field in one or more esophageal mucosal biopsy specimens [14]. Because eosinophils may be increased in the esophagus in the setting of GERD, the diagnosis of EoE is aided by the exclusion of GERD (although the diseases may coexist) [15]. Outside of the esophagus, several small series indicate that chronic rhinosinusitis, asthma, atopy, Eustachian tube dysfunction, sleep disordered breathing, dysphagia, and airway stenosis are present in an elevated rate in patients with EoE, possibly suggesting a systemic inflammatory disorder [16–21]. Our hypothesis was that EoE facilitates laryngeal inflammation, dysphagia, and aspiration with lower airway soilage that would manifest itself as an elevated LLMI or altered inflammatory cell count. The following study was designed to evaluate LLMI and BAL cell counts in patients with clinical symptoms of aerodigestive dysfunction (cough, chronic aspiration, dysphagia, and recurrent aspiration pneumonia) and histopathologic confirmation of eosinophilic esophagitis and compare these with similar patients that have normal esophageal biopsy.

2. Methods

After Vanderbilt University Medical Center institutional review board approval was obtained, a retrospective chart review was conducted at a single tertiary children's hospital, and children who were evaluated in the complex aerodigestive tract evaluation team (CADET) clinic and otolaryngology clinic were identified consecutively. Patients underwent direct laryngoscopy with biopsy, esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) with esophageal biopsy, and flexible bronchoscopy with bronchoalveolar lavage as indicated for a variety of upper aerodigestive complaints (dysphagia, recurrent aspiration pneumonia, recurrent croup, and asthma). Patients also underwent impedance probe testing as indicated and had videofluoroscopic swallow studies to evaluate for aspiration. Bronchoalveolar lavage samples were taken at time of bronchoscopy and cell counts, neutrophil percentages, and lipid-laden macrophage index levels were obtained and quantified. Patients were subdivided into two

groups: (1) negative esophageal biopsy (for EoE) with or without impedance testing consistent with reflux and (2) positive esophageal biopsy for EoE.

Features were summarized with means and ranges. Two statistical analyses were performed to evaluate neutrophil percentage counts and LLMI levels. Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used to compare EoE and non-EoE patients based on positive LLMI (5 or greater) versus negative LLMI (4 or less), and positive neutrophil percentage greater or less than 10%. Unpaired *t* tests were employed to evaluate differences in LLMI levels and BAL neutrophil percentages between groups as continuous variables. *P*-values of less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Demographic data

Fifty-one consecutive patients were included that underwent multi-disciplinary workup for aerodigestive complaints between 2009 and 2015. Symptoms necessitating referral to our tertiary center included cough, asthma, airway stenosis, dyspnea, dysphagia, dysphonia, and aspiration pneumonia (Table 1). Patients were subdivided into two groups based on the results of esophageal biopsy taken during EGD. Patients with EoE were significantly more likely to be male gender ($p = 0.047$). The average age of patients with normal esophageal biopsy was 3.9 years (range 0.6–15 years), and the average age of patients with biopsy-proven EoE was 5.9 years (range 1.6–16.3 years) ($p = 0.09$).

3.2. Lipid-laden alveolar macrophage indices and BAL neutrophil percentages

The average LLMI in patients with eosinophilic esophagitis was 3.4 (range 1–6) versus 4.4 (range 1–9) in patients without eosinophilic esophagitis ($p = 0.14$, unpaired *t*-test) (Fig. 1). The average BAL neutrophil percentage in patients with eosinophilic esophagitis was 40% versus 34% in patients without eosinophilic esophagitis ($p = 0.55$, unpaired *t*-test) (Fig. 2). Patients within each group were also subdivided according to a LLMI level 4 or less (not indicative of aspiration) versus 5 or greater (indicative of aspiration) and neutrophil percentages above or below 10 percent, which are used as cutoffs for normal and abnormal values at our institution. There was no difference in the incidence of low LLMI (<4) versus high (>5) in patients with EoE and normal biopsy ($p = 0.35$ Fisher's exact test). Additionally, there was no difference in BAL neutrophil percentages above versus below 10% in patients with EoE versus those without ($p = 0.63$, Chi-square test)

Table 1
Patient overview.

	Normal esophageal biopsy	Eosinophilic esophagitis
Number of patients	32	19
Males (%)	18 (56)	15 (79)
Age, years	3.9 y (0.6–15)	5.9 y (1.6–16.3)
Cough (%)	13 (41)	7 (37)
Asthma (%)	7 (22)	3 (16)
Airway stenosis (%)	7 (22)	4 (21)
Dyspnea (%)	8 (25)	7 (37)
Dysphagia (%)	18 (56)	14 (74)
Dysphonia (%)	11 (34)	3 (16)
Aspiration pneumonia (%)	12 (38)	8 (42)
BAL% neutrophil, mean (range)	34 (1–97)	40 (0–95)
LLMI, mean (range)	4.4 (1–9)	3.4 (1–6)




Fig. 1. Bar graph depicting lipid laden macrophage index levels in EoE and non-EoE patients. Error bars depict standard deviation.

4. Discussion

In children with EoE, the increased incidence of food allergy and the association with IgE-mediated disease indicates a systemic inflammatory process [18,19]. Given the degree of aerodigestive dysfunction and the varied extra-esophageal manifestations of EoE, we hypothesized that there would be derangements in the lower airway evident through BAL studies that would suggest EoE. However, the results of our retrospective data indicate that there is no difference in LLMI levels and BAL neutrophil percentages in patients undergoing a multi-disciplinary workup of aerodigestive dysfunction that have normal esophageal biopsy versus those with eosinophilic esophagitis.

The LLMI and bronchoalveolar neutrophil percentages have had numerous attempted applications in diagnostic evaluation of patients with aerodigestive dysfunction. Proposed applications in using the LLMI to detect aspiration and gastroesophageal reflux disease have had variable results [4,5]. Reilly et al. analyzed LLMI in a large population of patients with aerodigestive disorders, finding wide variability in the range of LLMI and the primary aerodigestive diagnosis [8]. As such, LLMI did not predict any specific condition. Because children with aerodigestive concerns may encounter a pulmonologist or otolaryngologist prior to or instead of seeing a gastroenterologist, airway proxies for specific esophageal conditions are needed to guide referral and therapy. To the authors' knowledge, no investigation into BAL cell counts and the LLMI in

patients with biopsy-proven EoE has been performed to date—including the study by Reilly et al. As was the case with LLMI versus GERD in several reports, our study fails to correlate LLMI and BAL neutrophil percentage with EoE. Because the clinical cutoff values of 4 (LLMI) and 10 (neutrophil percentage) are used to designate normal and abnormal, statistical analyses of LLMI and BAL neutrophil percentages were performed as continuous variables and as binomial variables based on clinical positivity during workup. Neither analysis showed correlation between LLMI/BAL neutrophil percentages and EoE. Normative LLMI data in a large pediatric population are still needed, and perhaps LLMI is simply too non-specific to specify which esophagitis is inflaming the lower airway. Likewise, neutrophil percentages on BAL may vary too broadly based on the patient's ability to mount a response to lower airway soilage and quantity and frequency of that soilage—even when all those patients in a population of study share a common esophagitis diagnosis.

There are several limitations to our study. There are inherent limitations to any retrospective review. All patients were symptomatic in that they were referred to our tertiary center for a variety of aerodigestive complaints, but there was some heterogeneity in the presenting symptoms of our patients. The patients with eosinophilic esophagitis did tend to be older (mean age 5.9 years) versus patients with normal esophageal biopsies (mean age 3.9 years) but this difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.09$). Additionally, patients with EoE were more likely to be male, but this is consistent with the literature [22]. Otherwise the groups were similar in presentation. Small sample size could also confound results, however the wide variance in LLMI and BAL neutrophil percentage in both of our patient populations imply a true lack of association in these levels between patients with normal biopsy and those with EoE.

It may yet be true that there are changes within the distal airway specific to EoE in symptomatic patients. However, the LLMI and BAL neutrophil percentages have been shown to be unreliable in making this distinction and levels should be, at best, interpreted with caution. Importantly, neither the LLMI nor the nucleated cell count derived from the BAL increase suspicion of EoE with any statistical significance. Esophageal biopsy remains the diagnostic standard.

5. Conclusion

Eosinophilic esophagitis is a complex entity that has manifestations throughout the aerodigestive tract implying a systemic disease. The lipid-laden alveolar macrophage index and bronchoalveolar lavage findings are unreliable in distinguishing patients with EoE from patients with aerodigestive dysfunction of another etiology, and esophageal biopsy is still required.

Financial material and support

No funding or other support was required for this study.

Conflict(s) of interest to declare

There are no relevant conflicts of interest to disclose.

Institutional review board approval

Vanderbilt University Institutional Review Board, Approval 131846.

References

- [1] J.L. Colombo, T.K. Hallberg, Recurrent aspiration in children: lipid-laden alveolar macrophage quantitation, *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 3 (1987) 86–89.




Fig. 2. Bar graph depicting mean BAL neutrophil percentages in EoE and non-EoE patients. Error bars depict standard deviation.

- [2] M.E. Furuya, V. Moreno-Cordova, J.L. Ramirez-Figueroa, M.H. Vargas, G. Ramon-Garcia, D.H. Ramirez-San Juan, Cutoff value of lipid-laden alveolar macrophages for diagnosing aspiration in infants and children, *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 42 (2007) 452–457.
- [3] R.W. Corwin, R.S. Irwin, The lipid-laden alveolar macrophage as a marker of aspiration in parenchymal lung disease, *Am. Rev. Respir. Dis.* 132 (1985) 576–581.
- [4] S. Knauer-Fischer, F. Ratjen, Lipid-laden macrophages in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid as a marker for pulmonary aspiration, *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 27 (1999) 419–422.
- [5] D. Koksai, B. Ozkan, C. Simsek, A.S. Koksai, Y. Agackyran, N. Sasmaz, Lipid-laden alveolar macrophage index in sputum is not useful in the differential diagnosis of pulmonary symptoms secondary to gastroesophageal reflux, *Arch. Med. Res.* 36 (2005) 485–489.
- [6] R. Rosen, J. Fritz, A. Nurko, D. Simon, S. Nurko, Lipid-laden macrophage index is not an indicator of gastroesophageal reflux-related respiratory disease in children, *Pediatrics* 121 (2008) e879–e884.
- [7] S.M. Kieran, E. Katz, R. Rosen, U. Khatwa, T. Martin, R. Rahbar, The lipid laden macrophage index as a marker of aspiration in patients with type I and II laryngeal clefts, *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* 74 (2010) 743–746.
- [8] B.K. Reilly, E.S. Katz, A.S. Misono, U. Khatwa, A. Didas, L. Huang, et al., Utilization of lipid-laden macrophage index in evaluation of aerodigestive disorders, *Laryngoscope* 121 (2011) 1055–1059.
- [9] J. Saito, W.T. Harris, J. Gelfond, T.L. Noah, M.W. Leigh, R. Johnson, et al., Physiologic, bronchoscopic, and bronchoalveolar lavage fluid findings in young children with recurrent wheeze and cough, *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 41 (2006) 709–719.
- [10] D.F. Wurzel, J.M. Marchant, S.T. Yerkovich, J.W. Upham, I.M. Mackay, I.B. Masters, et al., Prospective characterization of protracted bacterial bronchitis in children, *Chest* 145 (2014) 1271–1278.
- [11] W.T. Harris, M.S. Muhlebach, R.A. Oster, M.R. Knowles, T.L. Noah, Transforming growth factor-beta(1) in bronchoalveolar lavage fluid from children with cystic fibrosis, *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 44 (2009) 1057–1064.
- [12] J. de Blic, F. Midulla, A. Barbato, A. Clement, I. Dab, E. Eber, et al., Bronchoalveolar lavage in children. ERS task force on bronchoalveolar lavage in children. European respiratory society, *Eur. Respir. J.* 15 (2000) 217–231.
- [13] R.J. Noel, P.E. Putnam, M.E. Rothenberg, Eosinophilic esophagitis, *N. Engl. J. Med.* 351 (2004) 940–941.
- [14] E.S. Dellon, Diagnosis of eosinophilic esophagitis: current approach and future directions, *Curr. Gastroenterol. Rep.* 13 (2011) 240–246.
- [15] P.D. Karkos, R. Srivastava, S. Kaptanis, C. Vaughan, Eosinophilic esophagitis for the otolaryngologist, *Int. J. Otolaryngol.* 2012 (2012) 181402.
- [16] L.P. Smith, L. Chewaproug, J.M. Spergel, K.B. Zur, Otolaryngologists may not be doing enough to diagnose pediatric eosinophilic esophagitis, *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol.* 73 (2009) 1554–1557.
- [17] C. Blanchard, M.E. Rothenberg, Basic pathogenesis of eosinophilic esophagitis, *Gastrointest. Endosc. Clin. N. Am.* 18 (2008) 133–143.
- [18] D. Simon, H. Marti, P. Heer, H.U. Simon, L.R. Braathen, A. Straumann, Eosinophilic esophagitis is frequently associated with IgE-mediated allergic airway diseases, *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 115 (2005) 1090–1092.
- [19] J.M. Spergel, J.L. Beausoleil, M. Mascarenhas, C.A. Liacouras, The use of skin prick tests and patch tests to identify causative foods in eosinophilic esophagitis, *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 109 (2002) 363–368.
- [20] S.R. Orenstein, T.M. Shalaby, C. Di Lorenzo, P.E. Putnam, L. Sigurdsson, H. Mousa, et al., The spectrum of pediatric eosinophilic esophagitis beyond infancy: a clinical series of 30 children, *Am. J. Gastroenterol.* 95 (2000) 1422–1430.
- [21] E.H. Dauer, D.K. Freese, M. El-Youssef, D.M. Thompson, Clinical characteristics of eosinophilic esophagitis in children, *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol.* 114 (2005) 827–833.
- [22] H. Philpott, S. Nandurkar, S.G. Royce, F. Thien, P.R. Gibson, Risk factors for eosinophilic esophagitis, *Clin. Exp. Allergy* 44 (2014) 1012–1019.