Published in final edited form as:

Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2018 July ; 48(2): 219–225. doi:10.1111/apt.14825.

RNA Sequencing Confirms Similarities between PPI-Responsive Oesophageal Eosinophilia and Eosinophilic Oesophagitis

Kathryn A. Peterson, M.D.^{*}, Masaaki Yoshigi, M.D., Ph.D.^{**}, Mark W. Hazel, Ph.D.^{*}, Don A. Delker, Ph.D.^{*}, Edwin Lin, M.A.^{*}, Chaya Krishnamurthy, M.D.^{***}, Nicholas Consiglio, M.S.^{****}, Jacob Robson, M.D.^{**}, Mark Yandell, Ph.D.^{****,*****}, and Frederic Clayton, M.D.^{*****}

^{*}Gastroenterology Division, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah

^{**}Pediatrics, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah

^{***}Human Genetics, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah

^{****}Biomedical Informatics, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah

^{*****}USTAR Center for Genetic Discovery, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah

^{*****}Pathology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah

Summary

Background—Although current American guidelines distinguish proton pump inhibitor-responsive oesophageal eosinophilia (PPI-REE) from eosinophilic oesophagitis (EoE), these entities are broadly similar. While two microarray studies showed that they have similar transcriptomes, more extensive RNA sequencing studies have not been done previously.

Corresponding Author and Guarantor of Article: Kathryn Peterson, MD, MSci (Epid), 30 North 1900 East, SOM 4R118, Salt Lake City, Utah 84132, 801-581-5679, kathryn.peterson@hsc.utah.edu.
DR KATHRYN PETERSON (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-1793-6027)

Writing Assistance: Jordan Johnson B.S. Support via Utah Division of Gastroenterology.

Disclosures: None of the authors have relevant disclosures.

Transcript Profiling: Our plan is that all data will be released/deposited to GEO once publication is accepted.

Author Contributions:

Kathryn Peterson MD, MSci (epid). Contributions: study concept and design; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; obtained funding; study supervision, No conflicts of interest

Don Delker PhD. Contributions: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; administrative, technical, or material support; study supervision, No conflicts of interest.

Mark Hazel PhD. Contributions: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; administrative, technical, or material support; study supervision, No conflicts of interest.

Masaaki Yoshigi MD, PhD. Contributions: study concept and design; obtained funding; No conflicts of interest

Nicholas Consiglio, B.S. Contributions: analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis, No conflicts of interest.

Chaya Chishnamurthy MD. Clinical Associate. Utah Gastroenterology Associates. Salt Lake City, Utah. No conflicts of interest

Jacob Robson MD, MS. Contributions: critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, No conflicts of interest

Frederic Clayton MD. Contributions: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; study supervision, No conflicts of interest

All authors approved the final version of this manuscript.

Aim—To determine whether RNA sequencing identifies genetic markers distinguishing PPI-REE from EoE.

Methods—We retrospectively examined 13 PPI-REE and 14 EoE biopsies, matched for tissue eosinophil content, and 14 normal controls. Patients and controls were not PPI-treated at the time of biopsy. We did RNA sequencing on formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissue, with differential expression confirmation by quantitative PCR. We validated the use of formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded versus RNAlater-preserved tissue, and compared our formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded EoE results to a prior EoE study.

Results—By RNA sequencing, no genes were differentially expressed between the EoE and PPI-REE groups at the FDR = 0.01 level. Compared to normal controls, 1996 genes were differentially expressed in the PPI-REE group and 1306 genes in the EoE group. By less stringent criteria, only MAPK8IP2 was differentially expressed between PPI-REE and EoE (FDR=0.029, 2.2-fold less in EoE than in PPI-REE), with similar results by polymerase chain reaction (PCR). KCNJ2, which was differentially expressed in a prior study, was similar in the EoE and PPI-REE groups by both RNA sequencing and real-time polymerase chain reaction.

Conclusion—EoE and PPI-REE have comparable transcriptomes, confirming that they are part of the same disease continuum.

Keywords

Proton Pump Responsive Oesophageal Eosinophilia; Eosinophilic Oesophagitis; RNA sequencing; Transcriptomes

Background

Although a close relationship between eosinophilic oesophagitis (EoE) and proton pump inhibitor-responsive oesophageal eosinophilia (PPI-REE) has long been hypothesized,[1] American guidelines for eosinophilic oesophagitis have distinguished PPI-REE from EoE. [2, 3] Since then, extensive evidence has shown that, other than by proton pump inhibitor-response, these entities are mostly indistinguishable by clinical presentation,[4–9] endoscopic appearance,[4–7, 9] and histology.[4, 5, 7, 9] The one exception is patients with more florid[4] or more extensive[10] oesophageal eosinophil infiltrates are modestly less likely to be PPI-responsive. A recent European task force concluded that PPI-REE is highly similar to EoE and potentially an EoE treatment variant.[11] Their main qualm was that it had not yet been shown that PPI-REE cases respond to dietary exclusion and thus antigen-induced immune responses. Shortly thereafter, two studies showed that proton pump inhibitor-responsive cases can also respond to food exclusion.[12, 13] In addition to reducing gastric acidity (which reduces acid-related effects including altered permeability), PPIs, via Signal Transducer and Activator of Transcription 6 (STAT6), inhibit synthesis of eotaxin-3,[14, 15] the dominant EoE chemokine.

Prior microarray-based gene expression studies comparing PPI-REE and EoE showed modest differences in the transcriptome, but these studies were either limited to 94 transcripts[16] or studied a limited number of subjects (6 PPI-REE and 4 EoE).[17] Wen et al.[16] found that Potassium Voltage-Gated Channel Subfamily J Member 2 gene (KCNJ2)

was a potential distinguishing factor in a study with 33 EoE and 28 Pre-PPI-REE subjects. The other study failed to identify this transcript as one of 35 transcripts found to be differentially regulated.[17] To our knowledge, neither study assessed MAPK8IP2 gene (C-jun-amino-terminal kinase-interacting protein 2).

PPI-REE is worthy of study because it is a common finding. In prospective studies of patients presenting with oesophageal eosinophilia (≥ 15 eosinophils/maximal high power field (abbreviated as eos/HPF)), 36% to 69% of patients have <15 eos/HPF after proton pump inhibitor therapy.[4, 9, 18–21] RNA sequencing (RNA-Seq) quantifies a large dynamic range of gene expression levels, improving the ability to detect differential expression. We hypothesized that although PPI-REE is closely related to EoE, there still could be transcriptome differences between them. We sought to further examine whether there are previously undetected differences between these two groups.

Methods

To assess EoE and PPI-REE gene expression, under Institutional Review Board (University of Utah #63027) approval, we examined 14 subjects with EoE by consensus criteria, 13 subjects with PPI-REE, and 14 controls. Each biopsy was done prior to any proton pump inhibitor therapy. EoE patients were defined using 2011 consensus criteria[2] - requiring oesophageal eosinophilia on biopsy (≥ 15 eos/HPF) whose eosinophilia remained ≥ 15 eos/HPF after 8 weeks of double-dose proton pump inhibitor therapy. Chart review and other biopsies were also reviewed to confirm that other EoE consensus criteria were met, such as the presence of appropriate oesophageal symptoms and lack of comorbid disease such as Crohn's disease, etc. PPI-REE patients were defined as those patients with ≥ 15 eos/HPF on oesophageal biopsy prior to proton pump inhibitor therapy whose eosinophilia fell to <10 eos/HPF after 8 weeks of high-dose proton pump inhibitor therapy. Controls were age and gender-matched patients with no history of current or prior oesophageal disease whose oesophageal biopsies were histologically normal. We found 64 patients with oesophageal biopsies meeting these criteria between 2012 and 2015. Oesophageal biopsies were located on 61 patients. Biopsies were examined for depth of tissue, eosinophil counts, and gastric or other tissue contamination. Twenty samples were excluded because they either had gastric, intestinal, or glandular metaplastic tissue contamination or had extensive subepithelial tissue (extending 10 microns or more beneath the epithelium). The remaining tissues (14 EoE, 13 PPI-REE, and 14 controls) were examined by RNA sequencing. Age, atopy, serum total IgE, and gender were recorded.

RNA Isolation, Sequencing and Genome Alignment

Total RNA was isolated from 10-micron-thick, formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissue using the High Pure FFPE RNA isolation kit (Roche). DNA was removed from each RNA sample by the manufacturer's suggested DNase 1-digestion step. RNA quantity was determined with a NanoDrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific). Ribosomal RNA was removed from each RNA sample prior to cDNA library preparation using the Illumina TruSeq Stranded Total RNA Sample Prep Protocol. An Illumina HiSeq 2500 instrument was used to sequence the polymerase chain reaction amplified libraries using 50-cycle single-

read chemistry. Sequencing reads were aligned to the GRCh37/Hg19 human reference genome using the Novoalign application (Novocraft). The mean aligned read counts for the 41 formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded RNA-Sequencing datasets was 14.9 million reads.

Differential Expression and Clustering

The USeq DefinedRegionDifferentialSeq (DRDS) application was used to count reads intersecting exons of each annotated gene and score them for differential expression using DESeq2 negative binomial statistics with Benjamini-Hochberg adjustments.[22] RNA-Sequencing data were accepted as differentially expressed if they differed 2-fold or more with an adjusted p / false discovery rate (FDR) of 0.01. Visualization tracks were prepared for each sample group using the USeq application Sam2USeq and viewed using the Integrated Genome Browser (IGB). Hierarchical clustering and principal component analysis were performed using Cluster 3.0 and the R application “rgl”, respectively, to identify unique and common patterns of expression across each sample.

Formalin-Fixed Paraffin-Embedded Dataset Validation

While RNA yields from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissues are similar to those of RNAlater-preserved tissue,[23] RNA extracted from formalin-fixed tissue is degraded to smaller fragments (typically peaking at 200–300 bases) than RNA from RNAlater-preserved tissue. Our validation study compared gene expression using formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissue vs. RNAlater-preserved samples. We used Illumina sequencing chemistry based on 50-base pair reads - indicating formalin-fixed tissue would be a viable alternative. We compared 7 formalin-fixed EoE oesophageal biopsies to 6 formalin-fixed controls, and 6 EoE RNAlater-preserved biopsies to 6 RNAlater-preserved normal controls. Our full study formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded EoE and control datasets were similarly compared to those of Sherrill et al., (Fig. 1B).[24] which also used RNAlater-preserved mRNA.

Real-Time Quantitative Reverse Transcription PCR validation

Subtle biological changes could be missed by DESeq2 statistics, so we also examined genes with 2-fold differences that were significant at $p < 0.05$. Thirty of our 41 RNA-Seq-analyzed formalin-fixed RNA samples were used in Real-Time Quantitative Reverse Transcription PCR; 11 samples had an insufficient RNA after their use for RNA sequencing. Consequently, our real-time quantitative reverse transcription PCR sample set constituted these numbers per group: 12 EoE, 11 PPI-REE, and 7 Control. For these 30 RNAs, total RNA was reverse transcribed to cDNA using the Applied Biosystems High Capacity RNA-to-cDNA Kit. Relative mRNA levels for *KCNJ2*, *MAPK8IP2* and reference gene, Zinc Finger DHHC-Type Containing 5 (*ZDHHC5*) were determined using intron-spanning TaqMan gene expression assays and TaqMan Gene Expression Master Mix (Applied Biosystems). *ZDHHC5* was chosen as the reference gene for our polymerase chain reactions' relative quantitation based on its moderately high expression level and its lack of shift according to RNA sequencing reads across our sample categories. 10ul quantitative polymerase chain reactions were performed in 384-well plates and run in triplicate in a Life Technologies 12K Flex real-time PCR instrument. Fold change was determined using the CT method and statistical significance determined with the Mann Whitney U test.

Results

Clinical Studies

In our main cohort, the age and gender were not statistically different among all 3 groups (EoE, PPI-REE, and controls, shown in Table 1). The tissue eosinophil content and serum IgE of the EoE and PPI-REE groups were also similar, and both groups had similar proportions of other atopic diseases.

Validation of Formalin-Fixed versus Well-Preserved RNA Results

In our preliminary validation study of 6 to 7 subjects per group, we found very similar gene expression between formalin-fixed and RNAlater-preserved tissue, as shown by heat map (Sup. Fig 1) and in the differential expression expressed as the log 2 ratio fold change for EoE versus controls among genes significantly differentially expressed adj. P / false discovery rate 0.01 (Fig. 1A, Pearson product moment correlation $r = 0.96$). As an additional validation step, we compared the differential expression between our main study cohort (EoE versus control log 2 ratio fold change) with that of Sherrill et al.[24], the only prior EoE RNA sequencing study. This showed good correlation (Fig. 1B, $r = 0.92$). Our formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded results had extremely significant correlations with both our RNAlater data and with that of Sherrill et al.

Main Cohort Results

Analysis of the main cohort RNA sequencing data showed 1,996 genes differentially expressed between PPI-REE and controls, with 1,306 genes differentially expressed between EoE and controls. However, none of the genes were differentially expressed between EoE and PPI-REE at the adj. p / false discovery rate 0.01 level. Hierarchical clustering and principal component analysis showed no clustering that differentiated EoE from PPI-REE (Fig 2A and 2B).

Using the less strict criterion of adj. p / False Discovery Rate < 0.05 , only one gene transcript, *MAPK8IP2*, was statistically significant at adj. P/False Discovery Rate = 0.029. *MAPK8IP2* was upregulated 2.24 fold in PPI-REE vs EoE when visualized by normalized read counts in the Integrated Genome Browser. It was also significant by real-time quantitative reverse transcription PCR (Figure 3). The RNA sequencing *MAPK8IP2* PPI-REE results were 1.69-fold those of controls (False Discovery Rate 0.0049). *MAPK8IP2* EoE results were 0.76-fold those of controls (False Discovery Rate 0.20).

We evaluated Potassium voltage-gated channel subfamily J member 2 (*KCNJ2*) on real-time quantitative reverse transcription PCR, which had been previously identified as differentially expressed between PPI-REE and EoE in Wen et al.'s microarray study. *KCNJ2* mRNA expression in PPI-REE was 1.25-fold that of EoE with adj. P / False Discovery Rate = 0.68. Real-time quantitative reverse transcription PCR had a similar 1.30-fold difference which was not statistically significant ($p=0.37$) between the groups. (Fig 3).

Discussion

In short, our results show that the EoE and PPI-REE transcriptomes are nearly identical, with no significant differences at the False Discovery Rate 0.01 significance level. Only a single gene, MAPK8IP2, was different at the False Discovery Rate 0.05 significance level, a finding that was confirmed by real-time quantitative reverse transcription PCR. To our knowledge, this is the first published RNA sequencing study comparing PPI-REE with EoE.

As previously mentioned, our findings fit well with the many studies showing that PPI-REE and EoE are highly related and, by many measures, indistinguishable. [4–9] Prior microarray-based studies also found relatively modest differences. [16][17]

Strengths of this study are that it is the first RNA sequencing comparison of moderately large numbers of EoE and PPI-REE samples and that the eosinophil contents were matched in both groups. By using formalin-fixed tissue, we could confirm that the tissue was representative and avoid using cases with contaminating gastric or other spurious tissue, or deep subepithelial tissue, problems that were present in 33% of our cases. In a recently published study, 43% of biopsies contain deep tissue.[25] Recently described static jaw biopsy forceps allow a far higher rate of subepithelial sampling.[26] We only studied subjects not taking Proton Pump Inhibitors at the time of biopsy. Additionally, we compared groups of subjects that did not differ statistically from one another in regards to their oesophageal tissue eosinophil content, atopy, age, and gender. Limitations include the moderate number of subjects studied, that the deep tissue, lymph nodes, and other potentially relevant sites were not examined, and the use of formalin-fixed tissue with inherent RNA degradation. While our use of formalin-fixed tissue means that occasional genes will be poorly detected, our validation studies show excellent correlations with our RNAlater tissue as well as with Sherrill et al.'s EoE RNA-sequencing data.[24] While our results are less similar to those of Sherrill et al. than our own RNAlater cases, there are many possible reasons, including their different subject cohort and a variety of methodologic differences. However, our study has an average of 14.9 million reads per subject, while, among Sherrill et al.'s EoE group, most subjects had about 5 million reads per subject.[24] Numerous short human gene reads, rather than read lengths, appears to be a greater factor determining accurate RNA quantitation in RNA sequencing studies.[27] Finally, the RNA sequencing and real-time quantitative reverse transcription PCR results are quite similar for the two genes studied - KCNJ2 and MAPK8IP2. Earlier studies comparing formalin-fixed tissue versus well-preserved RNA for RNA sequencing have also supported the validity of formalin-fixed data.[23]

None of the genes were significantly different between EoE and PPI-REE at the False Discovery Rate 0.01 significance level. Only MAPK8IP2 had a relatively weakly significant difference (False Discovery Rate = 0.029) between the two groups. MAPK8IP2 was 2.2-fold greater in PPI-REE than in EoE, with very similar findings by real-time quantitative reverse transcription PCR analysis. Given large number of genes examined, it remains quite possible that this finding is spurious; additional validation would be needed to corroborate this finding. Further, in about half of the PPI-REE subjects, the MAPK8IP2 contents are similar to those of the EoE subjects. This broad overlap suggests that, even if

confirmed as statistically significant, this finding might be of little practical value. To our knowledge, this gene was not examined in the prior, microarray-based studies.[16, 17] MAPK8IP2 has been identified in a panel of genes predicting clinical reactivity to food sensitivity.[28] In a murine model, it was upregulated on induction of Tregs.[29]

We found no significant difference between KCNJ2 gene in PPI-REE and EoE, which was previously identified as differentially expressed in Wen et al.[16] but not Shoda et al.[17] Our care to avoid Proton Pump Inhibitor-treated subjects and gastric or deep tissue contamination could have contributed to the difference in our findings. As mentioned above, when so many genes are analyzed, it is difficult to exclude rare possible false positive findings.

These results emphasize the similarities between EoE and PPI-REE. While it remains possible that more fundamental changes will be found with further study, we theorize that PPI-REE is a subtype of EoE.

In summary, our RNA sequencing results show that EoE and PPI-REE have nearly identical transcriptomes. This corroborates abundant prior evidence that EoE and PPI-REE are closely related and appear to differ mainly in the degree of responsiveness to Proton Pump Inhibitors. Additionally, this study helps demonstrate that formalin-fixed tissue derived RNA can be used for RNA sequencing with results strongly correlating with those from well-preserved mRNA.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The research reported in this publication was supported (in part or in full) by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number UL1TR001067 with pilot funding from CCTS grant 2015. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Abbreviations

PPI-REE	Proton Pump Inhibitor Responsive Oesophageal Eosinophilia
EoE	Eosinophilic Oesophagitis
KCNJ2	Potassium Voltage-Gated Channel Subfamily J Member 2 gene
MAPK8IP2 gene	C-jun-amino-terminal kinase-interacting protein 2 gene
ZDHHC5	Zinc Finger DHHC-Type Containing 5 gene

Bibliography

1. Spechler SJ, Genta RM, Souza RF. Thoughts on the complex relationship between gastroesophageal reflux disease and eosinophilic esophagitis. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2007; 102(6):1301–6. [PubMed: 17531015]
2. Liacouras CA, et al. Eosinophilic esophagitis: updated consensus recommendations for children and adults. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2011; 128(1):3–20. [PubMed: 21477849]
3. Dellon ES, et al. ACG clinical guideline: Evidenced based approach to the diagnosis and management of esophageal eosinophilia and eosinophilic esophagitis (EoE). *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2013; 108(5):679–92. quiz 693. [PubMed: 23567357]
4. Molina-Infante J, et al. Esophageal eosinophilic infiltration responds to proton pump inhibition in most adults. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2011; 9(2):110–7. [PubMed: 20920599]
5. Warners MJ, et al. PPI-responsive esophageal eosinophilia cannot be distinguished from eosinophilic esophagitis by endoscopic signs. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2015; 27(5):506–11. [PubMed: 25822858]
6. Iwakura N, et al. Basophil infiltration in eosinophilic oesophagitis and proton pump inhibitor-responsive oesophageal eosinophilia. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2015; 41(8):776–84. [PubMed: 25693747]
7. Moawad FJ, et al. Eosinophilic oesophagitis and proton pump inhibitor-responsive oesophageal eosinophilia have similar clinical, endoscopic and histological findings. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2014; 39(6):603–8. [PubMed: 24461332]
8. Molina-Infante J, et al. Proton pump inhibitor-responsive oesophageal eosinophilia correlates with downregulation of eotaxin-3 and Th2 cytokines overexpression. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2014; 40(8):955–65. [PubMed: 25112708]
9. Dellon ES, et al. Clinical and endoscopic characteristics do not reliably differentiate PPI-responsive esophageal eosinophilia and eosinophilic esophagitis in patients undergoing upper endoscopy: a prospective cohort study. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2013; 108(12):1854–60. [PubMed: 24145677]
10. Sayej WN, et al. Treatment with high-dose proton pump inhibitors helps distinguish eosinophilic esophagitis from noneosinophilic esophagitis. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 2009; 49(4):393–9. [PubMed: 19633574]
11. Molina-Infante J, et al. Proton pump inhibitor-responsive oesophageal eosinophilia: an entity challenging current diagnostic criteria for eosinophilic oesophagitis. *Gut.* 2016; 65(3):524–31. [PubMed: 26685124]
12. Sodikoff J, Hirano I. Proton pump inhibitor-responsive esophageal eosinophilia does not preclude food-responsive eosinophilic esophagitis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2016; 137(2):631–3. [PubMed: 26318073]
13. Lucendo AJ, et al. Dual response to dietary/topical steroid and proton pump inhibitor therapy in adult patients with eosinophilic esophagitis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2016; 137(3):931–4.e2. [PubMed: 26371836]
14. Cheng E, et al. Omeprazole blocks eotaxin-3 expression by oesophageal squamous cells from patients with eosinophilic oesophagitis and GORD. *Gut.* 2013; 62(6):824–32. [PubMed: 22580413]
15. Zhang X, et al. Omeprazole blocks STAT6 binding to the eotaxin-3 promoter in eosinophilic esophagitis cells. *PLoS One.* 2012; 7(11):e50037. [PubMed: 23185525]
16. Wen T, et al. Transcriptome analysis of proton pump inhibitor-responsive esophageal eosinophilia reveals proton pump inhibitor-reversible allergic inflammation. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2015; 135(1):187–97. [PubMed: 25441638]
17. Shoda T, et al. Eosinophilic esophagitis versus proton pump inhibitor-responsive esophageal eosinophilia: Transcriptome analysis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2017; 139(6):2010–2013.e4. [PubMed: 28063872]
18. Gutierrez-Junquera C, et al. High Prevalence of Response to Proton-pump Inhibitor Treatment in Children With Esophageal Eosinophilia. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 2016; 62(5):704–10. [PubMed: 26513622]

19. Peterson KA, et al. Comparison of esomeprazole to aerosolized, swallowed fluticasone for eosinophilic esophagitis. *Dig Dis Sci*. 2010; 55(5):1313–9. [PubMed: 19533356]
20. Vazquez-Elizondo G, et al. The outcome of patients with oesophageal eosinophilic infiltration after an eight-week trial of a proton pump inhibitor. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2013; 38(10):1312–9. [PubMed: 24117619]
21. Van Rhijn BD, et al. Proton pump inhibitors partially restore mucosal integrity in patients with proton pump inhibitor-responsive esophageal eosinophilia but not eosinophilic esophagitis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2014; 12(11):1815–23.e2. [PubMed: 24657840]
22. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate - a Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B-Methodological*. 1995; 57(1):289–300.
23. Zhao W, et al. Comparison of RNA-Seq by poly (A) capture, ribosomal RNA depletion, and DNA microarray for expression profiling. *BMC Genomics*. 2014; 15:419. [PubMed: 24888378]
24. Sherrill JD, et al. Analysis and expansion of the eosinophilic esophagitis transcriptome by RNA sequencing. *Genes Immun*. 2014; 15(6):361–9. [PubMed: 24920534]
25. Wang J, et al. Obtaining Adequate Lamina Propria for Subepithelial Fibrosis Evaluation in Pediatric Eosinophilic Esophagitis. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2018
26. Bussmann C, et al. Comparison of different biopsy forceps models for tissue sampling in eosinophilic esophagitis. *Endoscopy*. 2016; 48(12):1069–1075. [PubMed: 27824401]
27. Li B, Dewey CN. RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data with or without a reference genome. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2011; 12:323. [PubMed: 21816040]
28. Martino D, et al. Blood DNA methylation biomarkers predict clinical reactivity in food-sensitized infants. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2015; 135(5):1319–28. e1–12. [PubMed: 25678091]
29. Haghikia A, et al. Dietary Fatty Acids Directly Impact Central Nervous System Autoimmunity via the Small Intestine. *Immunity*. 2015; 43(4):817–29. [PubMed: 26488817]

Biographies

Kathryn Peterson, MD, MSci (epid). *Corresponding Author.* Associate Professor of Medicine. Division of Gastroenterology. University of Utah. 50 North 1900 East SOM 4R118, Salt Lake City, Utah. 84132. 801-581-5679, Kathryn.Peterson@hsc.utah.edu, Contributions: study concept and design; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; obtained funding; study supervision, No conflicts of interest

Don Delker PhD., Associate Professor of Medicine Division of Gastroenterology. University of Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah. 84132. Contributions: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; administrative, technical, or material support; study supervision, No conflicts of interest.

Mark Hazel PhD., Lab Specialist. Division of Gastroenterology. University of Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah. 84132., Contributions: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; administrative, technical, or material support; study supervision, No conflicts of interest.

Masaaki Yoshigi MD, PhD., Research Associate Professor. Department of Pediatrics. University of Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah. Contributions: study concept and design; obtained funding; No conflicts of interest

Nicholas Consiglio. B.S., Student. Department of Medical Informatics. University of Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah. 84132. Contributions: analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis, No conflicts of interest.

Chaya Chrishnamurthy MD. Clinical Associate. Utah Gastroenterology Associates. Salt Lake City, Utah. Contributions: acquisition of data; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; No conflicts of interest

Jacob Robson MD, MS. Assistant Professor. Department of Pediatrics. University of Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah 84132. Contributions: critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, No conflicts of interest

Edwin Lin M.S., Student, Health Sciences and Human Genetics, Human Genetics University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84132, Contributions: acquisition of data; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; No conflicts of interest

Robert Yandell PhD, Professor, Human Genetics, Human Genetics University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah 84132, Contributions: analysis and interpretation of data, No conflicts of interest

Frederic Clayton MD., Associate Professor. Department of Anatomical Pathology. University of Utah. Salt Lake City, Utah 84132. Contributions: acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; study supervision, No conflicts of interest

A DE genes in FFPE vs RNA-later **B** DE genes in FFPE vs Sherrill et al.

Figure 1.

Validation Comparing EoE / Control Expression Ratios - Formalin Fixed, Paraffin Embedded Tissues versus RNA later, and formalin fixed tissues versus a Prior Study. To validate the ratios of disease to normal RNA extracted from formalin fixed tissues, we compared the EoE to control log 2 ratios for formalin fixed, paraffin embedded-extracted RNA to those of well preserved RNA. Only genes differentially expressed (DE) at the adjusted p / FDR <0.01 level are used. In each, the formalin fixed tissue results are on the x axis and well preserved RNA results on the y axis. (A) In a separate, preliminary dataset, we compared our EoE formalin fixed tissue results (n = 7 EoE and 6 controls) versus results from an RNA later group (n = 6 EoE and 6 controls). There were 1529 differentially expressed genes, with excellent correlation; Pearson product moment correlation $r = 0.96$. (B) We also compared our full formalin fixed, paraffin embedded tissue results (n = 14 EoE and 14 controls) to those of Sherrill et al.[24] (n = 10 EoE and 6 controls). There were 624 differentially expressed genes, with very good correlation; Pearson product moment correlation $r = 0.92$. Both results are highly significantly correlated ($p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ for each).

Figure 2.

Hierarchical clustering and principal component analysis (PCA) of differentially expressed genes in EoE, PPI-REE and control oesophagus. Panel A - Hierarchical clustering of 2247 genes differentially expressed (Fold = 2, FDR < 0.01) in one or more patient groups. Two distinct clusters were observed including normal oesophagus (Cluster 1, blue at right) and combined EoE and PPI-REE oesophagus (Cluster 2, red plus orange, at left), suggesting a lack of appreciable difference between the two disease groups. Panel B – Principle component analysis using the same 2247 genes shows two distinct sample groups similar to the hierarchical clustering. Principal components 1, 2 and 3 accounted for 14.8%, 5.0%, and 4.6% of the variance respectively.

Figure 3.

Real-Time Quantitative Reverse Transcription PCR results for KCNJ2 and MAPK8IP2. For KCNJ2, at top, the EoE cases were 1.30-fold those for PPI-REE, $P=0.37$. By RNA-Sequencing they were 1.36-fold different, $FDR=0.68$. For MAPK8IP2, at bottom, the EoE cases were 0.43-fold those for PPI-REE, $P=0.025$. By RNA-Sequencing they were 0.45-fold different, $FDR=0.029$. Although the PPI-REE cases were significantly higher, the EoE and PPI-REE ranges broadly overlapped.

Table 1
Clinical characteristics of EoE and PPI-REE patients

The mean age and gender of all three groups (EoE, PPI-REE, and normal controls) did not significantly differ. Additionally, the maximal oesophageal tissue eosinophil content, IgE, and clinical comorbidities did not differ significantly. Statistical comparison was done by Mann-Whitney U test for age, eosinophil counts, and serum IgE. Proportions were compared by Fisher's exact test. P=0.20 for age (EoE versus PPI-REE). For all other comparisons p 0.37).

	EoE (N=14)	PPI-REE (N=13)	Controls (N=14)
Age (years, range)	38 (22–62)	48 (24–80)	43 (18–75)
% Male	71%	69%	64%
Max.tissue eos./hpf (mean, range)	39 (16–65)	35 (22–65)	0 (0–0)
Seasonal allergic conjunctivitis	62%	54%	
Asthma	25%	15%	
Allergic rhinitis	57%	54%	
Atopic dermatitis	7%	18%	
Allergic eye symptoms	57%	54%	
IgE (IU/ml serum)	399	542	