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Dermatitis herpetiformis (DH) is a blistering skin disease, which is regarded as an extra-intestinal manifestation of coeliac disease. Refractory cases of coeliac disease, that do not respond to a gluten-free diet and which carry an increased risk of lymphoma, are well-known in coeliac disease. To determine whether refractory cases of DH with active rash and persistent small bowel atrophy occur we analysed our series of 403 patients with DH. Seven (1.7%) patients, who had been on a gluten-free diet for a mean of 16 years, but who still required dapsone to treat the symptoms of DH, were identified. Of these, one patient died from mucinous adenocarcinoma before re-examination. At re-examination skin immunoglobulin A (IgA) deposits were found in 5/6 refractory and 3/16 control DH patients with good dietary response. Small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarcinoma, but no lymphoma developed in any of the patients. This study documents for the first time refractory DH, in which the small bowel mucosa was studied at re-examination from 5 refractory and 8 control DH patients and was normal in all 5 refractory and 7/8 control DH patients. One refractory DH patient died from adenocarci
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had been advised to adhere to a GFD. In addition, dapsone had been started in patients with an intensive rash, and 65% of all patients had used it (14). The patients had been followed up at the out-patient clinic at 3–6-month intervals for at least 1–2 years or longer, until the rash was controlled by the GFD alone.

Until 2010 our series consisted of 483 patients with DH, of which 403 were alive. In 2013 we retrospectively analysed the records of all patients, to determine which patients had not responded to a GFD as expected. The DH patients were classified as refractory when they had been on a GFD for at least 3 years, but still needed dapsone, at least 75 mg/week, to control the rash. For each suspected refractory case 2 control patients with DH were selected, who were of the same sex and who had been diagnosed within 2 years of the index patient. They all had a good response to a GFD, i.e. no rash or dapsone use during the last 3 or more years on a strict diet. All refractory and control subjects with DH were invited to participate in the re-examination.

The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of Tampere University Hospital (R12267). All subjects provided written informed consent.

Skin symptoms and immunofluorescence biopsy

The presence or absence of typical DH rash was examined in every refractory and control patient. Dapsone treatment was stopped if no skin symptoms were seen. A 4-mm punch biopsy was taken from normal-appearing perilesional skin and, when there was no rash, from normal-appearing forearm skin. The biopsy specimens were embedded in optimal cutting temperature compound (OCT, Tissue-Tec, Miles Inc., Elkhart, IN, USA), snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at −70°C until use. Direct immunofluorescence was performed and IgA deposits in the upper papillary dermis were graded as strongly (+++), moderately (+++) or weakly (+) positive, as previously described (19).

Dietary assessment

A dietician evaluated adherence to a GFD in the refractory and control DH patients by personal inquiry and via a 3-day food record with additional questions specifically designed to uncover hidden exposure to gluten.

Antibody and HLA measurements

A commercially available enzyme-linked immunosorbsent assay (ELISA) was used to measure serum IgA antibodies to epidermal transglutaminase (TG3; Immunodiagnostic, Bensheim, Germany) and tissue transglutaminase (TG2; Celikey, Phadia, Freiburg, Germany). The optimal cut-off point for positivity was ≥25 AU/ml for TG3 and ≥3 AU/ml for TG2 antibodies (20). Serum IgA class endomysial antibodies (EmA) were determined using an indirect immunofluorescence (IIF) method with human umbilical cord endomysial antibodies (EmA) were determined using an indirect immunofluorescence (IIF) method with human umbilical cord

RESULTS

Frequency of refractory DH and dietary features before re-examination

Altogether, 16 (4.0%) of 403 patients with DH needed to continue treatment with dapsone to control the rash after adhering to a GFD for at least 3 years. Twelve patients participated at re-examination. A thorough dietary assessment revealed that 2 patients had regular lapses in their GFD, and a further 3 patients experienced no flare-up of rash when dapsone was withdrawn. The remaining 7 (1.7%) patients, 2 women and 5 men, by definition, had refractory DH. The mean age at diagnosis was 30 years in the refractory patients and 33 years in the 17 control patients (n = 13) (Table 1). Median duration of skin symptoms before diagnosis of DH was 9 (range 4–384) months in the refractory patients and 12 (range 1–60) months in the control patients. The mean daily
dose of dapsone after the diagnosis was 38 mg in the refractory and 40 mg in the control patients (Table I).

Mean duration of GFD treatment before re-examination was 16 years in the refractory patients and 23 years ($p = 0.20$) in the control patients (Table I). Two (29%) refractory and 3 (18%) control patients had been non-compliant for some time at the beginning of the GFD treatment. Three (43%) refractory and 13 (76%) control patients regularly included oats in their diet.

One refractory patient with DH died just before re-examination, from metastatic mucinous adenocarcinoma, which, according to immunological studies (CDX-2 positive immunostaining), probably originated from the intestine. Of the control patients with DH, 1 had carcinoma tumour of the colon, 1 had metastatic neuroendocrine carcinoma, probably originating from the gastrointestinal tract, and 1 had thyroid carcinoma. Regarding other autoimmune manifestations, 1 of the patients with refractory DH (patient 7) had hypothyroisis. Of the control patients with DH, 1 had psoriasis and 1 ankylosing spondylitis.

**Rash, cutaneous IgA deposits and dietary treatment at re-examination**

We had 6 refractory DH patients at re-examination since one refractory DH patient died at the beginning of the study. At re-examination the mean dose of dapsone in these patients with refractory DH was 42 mg/day and 1 patient used sulfasalazine 1–2 g/day due to dapsone hypersensitivity (Table II). Median serum dapsone concentration was 2.8 (range 0–3.5) µmol/l. All 6 refractory patients presented with typical DH rash, whereas no rash was seen in the control patients. Five refractory (83%) and 3 control patients (19%) showed cutaneous IgA deposits, all with weak or moderate fluorescence (Tables II and III).

Dietary assessment revealed that 2 patients with refractory DH had minor lapses in their otherwise strict GFD. One patient (patient 3, Table II) had a few lapses once a year during a short holiday abroad, and another patient (patient 4, Table II) had twice inadvertently eaten food containing gluten. Three (18%) control patients with DH had also minor lapses in their strict GFD; they had consumed beer or buns that contained gluten a couple of times in a year with no symptoms.

**Serology and HLA findings at re-examination**

At re-examination all 6 patients with refractory DH had no TG2 or TG3 antibodies, but 1 had a borderline positive EmA titre (Table II). Of the DH controls 2 had low levels of TG3, but none had TG2 and EmA antibodies. All 6 refractory DH patients studied carried HLA DQ2, 2 of them also HLA DQ8.

**Small bowel mucosal findings and gastrointestinal symptoms at re-examination**

All 5 refractory and 7/8 (88%) control DH patients had normal small bowel mucosal architecture (Tables II and III). The only patients with refractory DH who refused gastroscopy had undergone the procedure 16 years earlier when on a GFD and, at that time, his small bowel mucosa was normal. Of the DH controls, 7 had

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex/age at diagnosis, years</th>
<th>GFD years</th>
<th>GFD strict at present</th>
<th>Dapsone dose at diagnosis/ad present (mg/day)</th>
<th>Rash/skin IgA deposits at present</th>
<th>Small bowel histology at present</th>
<th>Serology at present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TG3-ab TG2-ab EmA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25/sulfasalazine 1–2 g</td>
<td>++/+</td>
<td>SVA/normal</td>
<td>Neg Neg Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>++/+</td>
<td>SVA/normal</td>
<td>Neg Neg Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>++/+</td>
<td>PVA/normal</td>
<td>Neg Neg Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>++/+</td>
<td>PVA/normal</td>
<td>Neg Neg Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.5/50</td>
<td>++/+</td>
<td>Normal/normal</td>
<td>Neg Neg Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25/12.5</td>
<td>++/−</td>
<td>SVA/nd</td>
<td>Neg Neg Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50/40</td>
<td>+/nd</td>
<td>nd/nd</td>
<td>nd nd nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minor faults less often than once a month.
++: moderate; +: weak; −: negative; nd: not done; SVA: subtotal villous atrophy; PVA: partial villous atrophy; TG3-ab: epidermal transglutaminase antibodies; TG2-ab: tissue transglutaminase antibodies; EmA: endomyositis antibodies.

---

Table II. Duration of gluten-free diet (GFD), dapsone dose and cutaneous, small bowel and serological antibody findings in 7 patients with refractory dermatitis herpetiformis

Table I. Demography, small bowel findings, daily dose of dapsone, duration of gluten-free diet (GFD) and use of oats in the diet in 7 refractory and 17 sex- and age-matched control patients with dermatitis herpetiformis (DH)
normal villous architecture and 1 had partial villous atrophy (Table III).

CD3+ and γδ+ IEL densities and small bowel mucosal IgA deposits were available for 3 refractory and 8 control DH patients. CD3+ IELs were increased in 2 and γδ+ IELs in 3 and 6 patients, respectively (Table III). None of the refractory or responsive DH patients had IgA deposits in the small bowel mucosa. Three patients with refractory DH were analysed for intestinal T-cell clonality, but none showed monoclonal T-cell receptor gamma gene rearrangements.

The gastrointestinal symptoms measured by GSRS were the same in the refractory (total score; mean 1.9, range 1.6–2.5) and control DH patients (mean 1.9, range 1.1–3.4). Bone mineral density measurement showed osteopaenia in 2 of the 6 patients with refractory DH, but none of them had osteoporosis. All 6 patients with refractory DH had normal blood haemoglobin and serum free thyroxine levels.

**DISCUSSION**

This study showed that refractory DH exists, but is a rare condition, as only 7 out of 403 (1.7%) patients met the criteria of active rash that was not responding to a strict GFD. Two patients who were initially suspected to have refractory DH were found to have marked lapses in the GFD, and an additional 3 patients on a strict GFD could stop dapsone without re-appearance of the rash. Previously, Garioch et al. (13) described 3 (7%) patients in their DH series who did not respond to a strict GFD and who still required dapsone to control the rash. These patients had adhered to a GFD for 4 years or longer and all had normal small bowel mucosa. In the present study, although the rash did not respond, the small bowel mucosa was normal in all 5 patients with refractory DH who underwent upper intestinal endoscopy at re-examination. This is an important finding, showing that refractory DH is different from the well-known refractory coeliac disease in which small bowel mucosa does not recover on a GFD (15–17).

The frequency of refractory DH in the present study was low (1.7%). The frequency of refractory coeliac disease was even lower (0.3%) in a recent study in Finland (26). Earlier studies of coeliac disease have found markedly higher frequencies of refractory coeliac disease and have shown that its subgroup with abnormal IELs bears a high risk for intestinal lymphoma (15–17). Lymphomas are also known to occur in DH (27, 28). Importantly, however, no lymphoma or abnormal IELs were found in the present patients with refractory DH, although one patient with refractory DH died from metastatic adenocarcinoma most probably originating from the intestine. No other obvious malignancies or complications were seen in these patients, indicating that refractory DH is a benign condition that differs from refractory coeliac disease.

At diagnosis all patients with refractory DH in the current study had pathognomonic cutaneous IgA deposits. Furthermore, all 6 patients with refractory DH studied carried the predisposing HLA-DQ2, which is carried by 95–100% of patients with DH in general (7). In agreement with the presence of rash, 5 of the 6 patients with refractory DH had IgA deposit in the papillary dermis at re-examination. Three (18%) of the control patients also showed IgA deposits, although they had been asymptomatic for a mean of 8 years on a strict GFD. The slow disappearance of IgA deposits from DH skin even after adherence to a strict GFD for several years has also been noted in earlier studies (13, 19, 29).

It can be argued that, in the patients with refractory DH in the current study, the most obvious explanation for the poor GFD response with regard to the rash would be ongoing inadvertent consumption of gluten. Indeed, this has been shown to be the reason in a proportion of non-responsive patients with coeliac disease (30). However, in the present study an experienced dietitian evaluated the strictness of adherence to the GFD, but did not find any dietary lapses in the patients with refractory DH. The fact that their small bowel mucosa had recovered, even though the villous-height to crypt-depth ratio was rather low, and TG2, TG3 and EmA antibodies were normal also supports good adherence to the GFD.

It is possible that the rash in the present patients with refractory DH was sensitive to even minute amounts of gluten hidden in their GFD. A strict GFD may contain traces of gluten, which may inhibit mucosal recovery in a proportion of patients with coeliac disease (30). There are also some reports suggesting that a few DH patients would react to dietary antigens other than gluten, such as cow’s milk (31, 32). In this study we did not find any such food antigens on careful dietary assessment of the patients with refractory DH. A trial with an elemental
diet, i.e. a diet containing defined amounts of free amino acids and short-chain polysaccharides, would have been of interest. This diet has shown a rapid effect on the activity of the rash in DH patients who have previously eaten a normal gluten-containing diet (33, 34), but patients refractory to a strict GFD have not been examined. 

The present study indicates that patients with refractory DH differ from those with refractory coeliac disease by showing a clear response to a GFD in the small bowel mucosa and occurrence of circulating coeliac-type antibodies. However, the rash remains active in patients with refractory DH, and cutaneous IgA deposits are still present. Thus, the presence of IgA deposits is a marker of continuous cutaneous activity in patients with refractory DH. Epidermal transglutaminase co-localizes with IgA deposits, suggesting that this enzyme could be an initiating factor for cutaneous inflammation leading to blister formation in DH (35, 36). Further research will reveal whether epidermal transglutaminase activity or any other specific biomarker predict the development of refractory DH.

In conclusion, in this large DH series we found 7 (1.7%) patients in whom the rash, but not the small bowel mucosa, was non-responsive to a strict GFD treatment, and termed the condition refractory DH. The patients with refractory DH did not develop any complications or lymphoma, as refractory coeliac disease is known for, but a larger series is needed to draw definite conclusions.
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