

La anatomía patológica descartó malignidad y no se observaron bacilos tipo *Helicobacter*. A pesar de que el número de casos fue pequeño, se trataba de una complicación grave.

La úlcera por decúbito con este tipo de sonda ya había sido descrita previamente: inicialmente, en casos aislados, y ya en 2002 y 2012 en series más amplias en las que figuraba un riesgo mayor de úlcera gástrica. Después de la publicación en la que se demuestra un aumento del riesgo de úlcera por presión de 2,27 veces, se hizo una valoración de nuestra casuística y se iniciaron los procedimientos administrativos oportunos para el cambio.

Podemos concluir que la HDA secundaria a una úlcera por decúbito de la sonda de gastrostomía con extremo distal fuera del globo es una complicación poco frecuente pero grave. Velar por la seguridad del paciente es un requisito fundamental a la hora de elegir entre los distintos tipos de sondas de gastrostomía para la nutrición enteral.

## Bibliografía

- Löser C, Aschl G, Hébuterne X, Mathus-Vliegen EM, Muscaritoli M, Niv Y, et al. ESPEN guidelines on artificial enteral nutrition-Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG). *Clin Nutr*. 2005;24:848–61.
- Rahnamai-Azar AA, Rahnamaiazar AA, Naghshizadian R, Kurtz A, Farkas DT. Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy: Indications, technique, complications and management. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2014;20:7739–51.
- Schurink CA, Tuijnman H, Scholten P, Arjaans W, Klinkenberg-Knol EC, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy: Complications and suggestions to avoid them. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2001;13:819–23.
- Schrag SP, Sharma R, Jaik NP, Seamon MJ, Lukaszcyk JJ, Martin ND, et al. Complications related to percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) tubes. A comprehensive clinical review. *J Gastrointest Liver Dis*. 2007;16:407–18.
- Hucl T, Spicak J. Complications of percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy. *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol*. 2016;30:769–81.
- Kazi S, Gunasekaran TS, Berman JH, Kavin H, Kraut JR. Gastric mucosal injuries in children from inflatable low-profile gastrostomy tubes. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*. 1997;24:75–8.
- Delatore J, Boylan JJ. Bleeding gastric ulcer: A complication from gastrostomy tube replacement. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2000;51(4 Part 1):482–4.
- Hsu YC, Tsai JJ, Perng CL, Lin HJ. Massive gastrointestinal bleeding associated with contralateral mucosal abrasion by percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy tube. *Endoscopy*. 2009;41 Suppl 2:E144.
- Kanie J, Akatsu H, Suzuki Y, Shimokata H, Iguchi A. Mechanism of the development of gastric ulcer after percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy. *Endoscopy*. 2002;34:480–2.
- Teno JM, Gozalo P, Mitchell SL, Kuo S, Fulton A, Mor V. Feeding tubes and the prevention or healing of pressure ulcers. *Arch Intern Med*. 2012;172:697–701.

Estrella Diego\*, Rebeca Sánchez, Sara Valle, Ana Manchón e Inmaculada Ortiz

*Servicio de Endocrinología y Nutrición, Hospital Universitario de Cruces, Barakaldo, Vizcaya, España*

\*Autor para correspondencia.

Correo electrónico: [estrella.diegoperajo@osakidetza.eus](mailto:estrella.diegoperajo@osakidetza.eus) (E. Diego).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.endinu.2017.11.004>  
2530-0164/

© 2017 SEEN y SED. Publicado por Elsevier España, S.L.U. Todos los derechos reservados.

## Analytical interference in the corticotropin immunoassay in patients with adrenal adenomas



### Interferencia analítica en el inmunoensayo de corticotropina en pacientes con adenomas suprarrenales

Analytical interference in the corticotropin (ACTH) assay is an uncommon event (<1%).<sup>1</sup> However, when it occurs, it can interfere with the diagnostic orientation and management of adrenal disease leading to inappropriate clinical decisions, especially when patients show alterations in imaging tests.

#### Case #1

A 79-year-old woman was referred for a right adrenal mass (23 × 16 mm) incidentally discovered in a thoracic-abdominal CT scan performed after trauma. The patient had always had cats. She did not report tachycardia, palpitations, headaches or hyperhidrosis, and did not show

any clinical sign of hypercortisolism. Hyperpigmentation was absent.

Hormone analysis showed marked hypercorticotropinemia (ACTH 242 pg/ml; normal range, *N*: 5–46) with serum cortisol (16.1 mcg/dl; *N*: 3.7–19.4), nighttime (23:00) salivary cortisol (0.1 mcg/dl; *N* < 0.28), and 24-h urinary free cortisol (UFC, 40 mcg/24 h; *N*: < 140) within the normal range. Mineralocorticoid function [aldosterone 4.4 ng/dl (*N*: 3–35.5), plasma renin activity, PRA 1.78 ng/ml/h (*N*: 0.3–7.0)] and medullary adrenal function [24-h urinary metanephrines 168 mcg/24 h (*N*: 50–825)] were also normal. A second plasma ACTH determination confirmed hypercorticotropinemia (ACTH 311 pg/ml).

The presence of hypercorticotropinemia with normal values of serum, urinary and night salivary cortisol in the absence of clinical adrenal dysfunction forced us to rule out ACTH dependent Cushing syndrome (ACTH-dependent CS) and Addison's disease. We performed a 1-mg dexamethasone (23:00 h) suppression test (serum cortisol 1.4 mcg/dl; *N* < 1.8) and a short ACTH (250 mcg iv) stimulation test (serum cortisol at 0, 30, and 60 min: 12.8, 21.3, and 23.3 mcg/dl). Antiadrenal antibodies were also negative. A normal pituitary MRI and a negative <sup>99m</sup>Tc-EDDA/HYNIC-TOC

**Table 1** Plasma ACTH (pg/ml) concentrations in plasma samples of the patients after using different analyzers.

	Immulite 2000, Siemens	Immulite 2000, Siemens + HBT, scantibodies, Shantee, CA	Liaison, Diasorin
<i>Patient # 1</i>			
ACTH (pg/ml) sample # 1	552	–	4.4
ACTH (pg/ml) sample # 2	302	142	5.2
<i>Patient # 2</i>			
ACTH (pg/ml)	187	109	6.5

scintigraphy ruled out the presence of a silent pituitary corticotropinoma and a neuroendocrine tumor, respectively.

The diagnosis of a nonfunctioning adrenal incidentaloma with hypercorticotropinemia not associated with endogenous hypercortisolism or adrenal insufficiency was established. In suspicion of possible antibody interference we pretreated plasma sample of the patient with a heterophilic antibody blocking tube (HBT, Scantibodies, Shantee, CA) that captures potential heterophilic antibodies before hormone quantification. Basal ACTH after HBT remained still high (142 pg/ml). Then ACTH was determined in the same plasma sample with other chemiluminiscent immunometric assay (Liaison, Diasorin) different from the first analyzer used (Immulite 2000, Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics), resulting in the low-normal range (4.4 pg/ml) with the first analyzer while it was disproportionately high with the latter (552 pg/ml). These results were confirmed using another separate plasma sample (5.2 pg/ml and 302 pg/ml with Liaison and Immulite 2000, respectively) (Table 1). According with these results, low-normal plasma ACTH concentrations might be associated with a slight autonomous hypersecretion of cortisol by the adenoma.

These findings were compatible with an analytical interference in ACTH measurement associated with Immulite 2000 analyzer. With the aim of determining other possible antibody interference we performed a serum protein electrophoresis for quantifying the three major classes of immunoglobulins (IgG, IgA, and IgM), which were normal. Lastly, the quantification of rheumatoid factor (RF) in the patient's serum was clearly high (RF 129 IU/ml;  $N < 40$ ), suggesting a possible antibody interference with this immunoglobulin.

## Case #2

A 71-year-old woman was referred for follow-up of a papillary thyroid carcinoma. She referred no contact with animals. An abdominal CT scan performed for follow-up of her neoplasia detected bilateral adrenal nodules (15 mm right and 11 mm left).

Initial hormone investigations showed normal urine metanephrines (120 mcg/24 h), serum aldosterone (13 ng/dl), and PRA (2.46 ng/ml/h). Her baseline cortisol (15.7 mcg/dl) and dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate (199 ng/ml) levels were also normal. However, her plasma ACTH level was

strikingly high (251 pg/ml). A second plasma ACTH determination in the Immulite instrument (Siemens) confirmed hypercorticotropinemia (ACTH 187 pg/ml). To complete the hormonal study we carry out the following investigations: urinary free cortisol, 32.5 mcg/24 h; salivary cortisol at 23:00, 0.13 mcg/dl; and serum cortisol after 1 mg dexamethasone, 2.10 mcg/dl. Plasma ACTH concentration measured on Immulite was 109 pg/ml after HBT. In this sample plasma ACTH quantified in the Liaison instrument (Diasorin) was 6.49 pg/ml. The patient had normal serum immunoglobulin concentrations, and the RF test was negative ( $< 20$  U/ml). Results of this patient suggest a slight hypersecretion of cortisol (subclinical hypercortisolism) with low serum ACTH and overnight 1 mg dexamethasone suppression test slightly above the normal value (1.8 mcg/dl).

ACTH measurement after serial dilutions of plasma samples at 1/5 and 1/10 in both patients revealed a concentration that exceeded the coefficient of variation (10%) of this method, suggesting a possible interference. Moreover, the post-polyethylene glycol recovery resulted in undetectable plasma ACTH levels not only in both patients but also in a control plasma sample.

ACTH analytical interference has been occasionally reported mainly associated to Siemens Immulite analyzers.<sup>1-4</sup> Interfering antibodies can be heterophilic antibodies, human anti-animal antibodies (HAAA), and RF.<sup>5,6</sup> Analytical interference in the first patient could be attributable to the presence of RF in plasma. However, in the second one the cause remains undetermined.

RF is present in about 5–10% of the general population and in up to 70% of patients with rheumatoid arthritis, although it may precede the disease for many years. In addition, it can appear in a large number of autoimmune systemic diseases, in various infectious diseases, and in many inflammatory conditions and malignancies.<sup>7</sup> RF can produce falsely elevated levels when immunometric methods such as enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) or multiplex immunoassays (MIA) are used.<sup>5</sup> RF has been associated with several hormonal interferences leading to erroneous high levels of thyrotropin,<sup>8,9</sup> free thyroxine,<sup>10</sup> gonadotropins (FSH, LH, HCG), and prolactin.<sup>9</sup> Recently, a single center study performed in 437 consecutive patients with incidentally discovered adrenal adenomas, a non-suppressed ACTH concentration ( $> 20$  pg/ml), and a non-suppressed cortisol concentration after 1 mg overnight dexamethasone suppression test ( $> 1.8$  mcg/dl) identified 4 patients with

antibody interference in ACTH immunoassay. In one of them RF was responsible for the interference.<sup>1</sup>

Analytical interference associated with Immulite 2000 ACTH assay might be likely due to the use of two different antibodies for ACTH quantification; one of them, a murine monoclonal anti-ACTH antibody and, the other one, a rabbit polyclonal anti-ACTH antibody that could react with serum RF or other unknown antibodies; however, Liaison ACTH immunoassay uses two monoclonal anti-ACTH antibodies which improve their specificity.

In conclusion, the interference in ACTH immunoassay due to the presence of RF or other autoantibodies in plasma can be unmasked with the use of other analyzers avoiding inappropriate clinical decisions. In the case of an unexpected analytical result a good collaboration between clinical and laboratory professionals is essential to rule out the possibility of any interference in the analytical technique.

### Ethical approval

I confirm that we have obtained written informed consent of the patients.

### Contributorship

Biochemical analysis: AGC and LJ. Interpretation of data: all authors. Manuscript writing: PI & JJD. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.

### Declaration of competing interests

None.

### Bibliografía

1. Yener S, Demir L, Demirpence M, Mahmut Baris M, Simsir IY, Ozisik S, et al. Interference in ACTH immunoassay negatively impacts the management of subclinical hypercortisolism. *Endocrine*. 2017;56:308–16.
2. Bolstad N, Kazaryan AM, Revheim ME, Distant S, Johnsrud K, Warren DJ, et al. A man with abdominal pain: enough evidence for surgery? *Clin Chem*. 2012;58:1187–90.
3. Grasko J, Williams R, Beilin J, Glendenning P, Fermoye S, Vasikaran S. A diagnostic conundrum: heterophilic antibody interference in an adrenocorticotrophic hormone immunoassay not detectable using a proprietary heterophile blocking reagent. *Ann Clin Biochem*. 2013;50:433–7.
4. Choy KW, Teng J, Wijeratne N, Tan CY, Doery JC. Immunoassay interference complicating management of Cushing's disease: the onus is on the clinician and the laboratory. *Ann Clin Biochem*. 2017;54:183–4.
5. Sturgeon CM, Viljoen A. Analytical error and interference in immunoassay: minimizing risk. *Ann Clin Biochem*. 2011;48:418–32.
6. Bolstad N, Warren DJ, Nustad K. Heterophilic antibody interference in immunometric assays. *Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2013;27:647–61.
7. Nakken B, Papp G, Bosnes V, Zeher M, Nagy G, Szodoray P. Biomarkers for rheumatoid arthritis: from molecular processes to diagnostic applications-current concepts and future perspectives. *Immunol Lett*. 2017, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.imlet.2017.05.010>, pii:S0165-2478(17)30207-9.
8. Georges A, Charrie A, Raynaud S, Lombard C, Corcuff JB. Thyroxin overdose due to rheumatoid factor interferences in thyroid-stimulating hormone assays. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2011;49:873–5.
9. Mongolu S, Armston AE, Mozley E, Nasruddin A. Heterophilic antibody interference affecting multiple hormone assays: is it due to rheumatoid factor? *Scand J Clin Lab Invest*. 2016;76:240–2.
10. Norden AG, Jackson RA, Norden LE, Griffin AJ, Barnes MA, Little JA. Misleading results from immunoassays of serum free thyroxine in the presence of rheumatoid factor. *Clin Chem*. 1997;43:957–62.

Pedro Iglesias<sup>a,\*</sup>, Ana García Cano<sup>b</sup>, Lucía Jiménez<sup>b</sup>, Juan José Díez<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Endocrinology, Hospital Ramón y Cajal, Madrid, Spain*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Biochemistry, Hospital Ramón y Cajal, Madrid, Spain*

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [piglo65@gmail.com](mailto:piglo65@gmail.com) (P. Iglesias).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.endinu.2017.11.003>  
2530-0164/

© 2017 SEEN y SED. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. All rights reserved.