JOHN D. CLOUGH, MD

Department of Rheumatic and Immunologic Disease, The Cleveland Clinic; Editor-in-Chief, Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine

Diagnosis of lupus: A glass half full

T'S HARD TO BE DOGMATIC about the diagnosis of a disease of which the cause is unknown, the clinical presentation is extremely variable, there is no pathognomonic finding, and the diagnostic criteria are promulgated by a consensus committee. It may even be harder to differentiate between two such diseases that have some overlapping characteristics and which often coexist in the same patient.

See related article, page 143

Yet in this issue of the Journal, Dr. Blumenthal convincingly draws the line between systemic lupus erythematosus and fibromyalgia. In so doing, he correctly focuses on the features that differentiate them from each other rather than those that they share, and he points out the ambiguities that the laboratory cannot adequately resolve in many patients.

LABORATORY TESTS CAN CONFUSE

At issue are the various tests for antinuclear antibodies (ANAs) and how they sometimes confuse us. Assayed by a variety of methods, the ANA is the most frequently positive test in patients with lupus.

There are several subcategories of ANAs, notably anti-double-stranded DNA and anti-Sm, and tests for these subcategories, like the overall ANA test, may also be positive in lupus patients. If the ANA test is negative, that is strong evidence against the diagnosis of lupus. If tests for anti-double-stranded DNA or anti-Sm or both are positive, that is strong evidence in favor of the diagnosis.

But what of the many patients who have

positive ANA tests but negative results for anti-double-stranded DNA and anti-Sm? This is the situation in which the laboratory test results are not helpful, and the diagnosis has to be made on other grounds. Unfortunately, this situation is fairly frequent in fibromyalgia, and it also occurs in lupus, especially during remissions.²

USING TESTS EFFECTIVELY

It is impossible to use these tests effectively without knowledge of the positive and negative predictive values of each one for the diagnosis of lupus, and these values are methoddependent. They are well documented for some of the test methods, but not so well worked out for some of the newer methods.

Laboratories must describe the characteristics of new tests

As Dr. Blumenthal points out, many laboratory tests for ANAs have changed in recent years, and data regarding these new tests are scant. Unannounced implementation of new methods for immunologic tests without determining their diagnostic characteristics is, at best, confusing to physicians, and this is certainly not good for their patients. Laboratories introducing such assays to save cost, but in the process replacing older tests that have betterknown characteristics, have an obligation to do the necessary parallel testing so that the clinicians ordering them can interpret the results with confidence.3

Physicians must avoid 'fishing expeditions' For their part, clinicians must order responsibly; these are not tests to use on a fishing expedition, as Dr. Blumenthal points out.

To use a test effectively, you must know what it means



The Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine wants you...to help in peer review

We need internal medicine, cardiology, and other specialty reviewers to help us peer review the many articles submitted to the *CCJM*.

Reviewers are asked to comment on an article's clinical accuracy and if the article meets your needs as a reader of *CCJM*—that is, is it concise, practical, and clinically useful? We usually ask that the review be returned in writing within 3 weeks of receipt.

If interested, please mail, fax, or e-mail us the following information.

NAME	
ADDRESS	_
СІТУ	_
STATE ZIP	_
PHONE	_
FAX EMAIL	_
Type of practice: Internist Cardiologist Other (specify)	-
Areas of expertise and interest:	
Send to: Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine 9500 Euclid Avenue NA32 Cleveland, OH 44195 Email: ccjm@ccf.org Fax: 216-444-9385	

In the long run, better establishment of new test characteristics will save money, since it should reduce the need for "ANA consults" to explain unexpected test results. It should also avoid the assignment of an inappropriate diagnosis, with all the insurance hassles and other unfortunate implications this may carry for the patient. Clinical laboratories have the responsibility to work with clinicians to gather and disseminate these data before establishing new tests and discontinuing old ones.

The tests will always be imperfect, but with better knowledge of how they perform, we can look at the clinical laboratory's role in lupus diagnosis as a glass half full rather than half empty.

REFERENCES

- Blumenthal ED. Tired, aching, ANA-positive: does your patient have lupus or fibromyalgia? Cleve Clin J Med 2001; 69:143–152.
- Clough JD, Chang RK. Effectiveness of testing for anti-DNA and the complement components of iC3b, Bb, and C4 in the assessment of activity of systemic lupus erythematosus. J Clin Lab Anal 1990; 4:268–273.
- Clough JD, Chang RK. Predictive value of anti-native-DNA for systemic lupus erythematosus. Comparison of radioimmunoassay and enzyme immunoassay. J Clin Lab Anal 1989; 3:273–276.

ADDRESS: John D. Clough, MD, Editor-in-Chief, Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine, NA32, 9500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44195; e-mail ccjm@ccf.org.

Copyright Compliance and Bulk Reprints

Permission to reproduce articles from the Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine may be obtained from: Copyright Clearance Center 1-800-982-3887, ext. 2862 marketing@copyright.com www.copyright.com

Bulk reprints of articles may be ordered directly from:
Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine
tel 216-444-2661
fax 216-444-9385
ccjm@ccf.org