A prospective, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial to establish a safe gluten threshold for patients with celiac disease1–3
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ABSTRACT
Background: Treatment of celiac disease (CD) is based on the avoidance of gluten-containing food. However, it is not known whether trace amounts of gluten are harmful to treated patients.

Objective: The objective was to establish the safety threshold of prolonged exposure to trace amounts of gluten (ie, contaminating gluten).

Design: This was a multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial in 49 adults with biopsy-proven CD who were being treated with a gluten-free diet (GFD) for ≥2 y. The background daily gluten intake was maintained at ≤5 mg. After a baseline evaluation (t0), patients were assigned to ingest daily for 90 d a capsule containing 0, 10, or 50 mg gluten. Clinical, serologic, and histologic evaluations of the small intestine were performed at t0 and after the gluten microchallenge (t1).

Results: At t0, the median villous height/crypt depth (Vh/Cd) in the small-intestinal mucosa was significantly lower and the intraepithelial lymphocyte (IEL) count (×100 enterocytes) significantly higher in the CD patients (Vh/Cd: 2.20; 95% CI: 2.11, 2.89; IEL: 27; 95% CI: 23, 34) than in 20 non-CD control subjects (Vh/Cd: 2.87; 95% CI: 2.50, 3.09; IEL: 22; 95% CI: 18, 24). One patient (challenged with 10 mg gluten) developed a clinical relapse. At t1, the percentage change in Vh/Cd was 9% (95% CI: 3%, 15%) in the placebo group (n = 13), −1% (−18%, 68%) in the 10-mg group (n = 13), and −20% (−22%, −13%) in the 50-mg group (n = 13). No significant differences in the IEL count were found between the 3 groups.

Conclusions: The ingestion of contaminating gluten should be kept lower than 50 mg/d in the treatment of CD.
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INTRODUCTION
Celiac disease (CD) is an immune-mediated enteropathy triggered by the ingestion of gluten—the major protein fraction contained in the cereals wheat, rye, and barley—in genetically susceptible persons. CD is a life-long disorder affecting 0.5–1% of the general population worldwide. The standard treatment of CD involves the consumption of a diet completely devoid of gluten proteins, a so-called gluten-free diet (GFD). In the long term (1–2 y), a GFD is associated with clinical, serologic, and histologic remission (1). However, it is almost impossible to maintain a diet with a zero gluten content because gluten contamination is very common in food. “Hidden” gluten (used as a protein filler) may be found in commercially available products, such as sausages, soups, soy sauces, and ice cream. Even products specifically targeted to dietary treatment of CD may contain tiny amounts of gluten proteins, either because of the cross-contamination of originally gluten-free cereals during their milling, storage, and manipulation or because of the presence of wheat starch as a major ingredient.

The potential toxicity of trace amounts of gluten is still unclear. We previously showed in treated CD patients that the 4-wk ingestion of 100–500 mg gliadin/d (roughly equivalent to 200–1000 mg gluten) is able to cause measurable changes in the architecture of the small-intestinal mucosa (2). Only limited data are available on the toxicity of lower doses of gluten (3–6). This is an important issue because the daily ingestion of contaminating gluten in apparently well-treated CD patients is most likely to range from 5 to 50 mg.

Establishing a safe threshold of gluten consumption for CD patients is a matter of major public health importance, particularly in light of the recent reports concerning the high prevalence
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SUBJECTS AND METHODS

Study design

This was a prospective, multicenter, placebo-controlled, double-blind, randomized trial performed between the years 2001 and 2004. The patients were adults with biopsy-proven CD who had consumed a GFD for ≥2 y and were in apparent good health. Patients were excluded if they (1) were younger than 18 y, (2) were poorly compliant with the GFD, (3) were positive for anti-tissue transglutaminase (tTG) antibodies or had a villous height/crypt depth (Vh/Cd) <1.5 at baseline (t0), or (4) had any associated conditions, such as selective immunoglobulin A (IgA) deficiency or other autoimmune diseases. Patients that qualified for the study were interviewed and gave their informed consent. Control subjects (only for comparison of the morphometric values at t0) were adults who were negative for serologic CD markers and for Helicobacter pylori (urea breath test) and were undergoing upper endoscopy for diagnostic purposes.

The patients qualifying for the trial underwent a screening and a dietary interview (t−1). They were asked to maintain a strict GFD during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, ie, avoidance of any possible source of gluten contamination (such as restaurant meals). The only cereal-based food they were allowed to eat was the special gluten-free products consumed during the study period, i
RESULTS

Forty-nine subjects were enrolled in the microchallenge study: 37 women and 12 men with a median age of 30.5 y (range: 19.8–55.4 y) and a median BMI of 21.9 (range: 16.8–30.1). After \( t_0 \), 7 of the 49 patients had to be excluded because of abnormal small-intestinal histology (4), development of thyroid carcinoma (1), or gastric polyposis confirmed by gastroduodenoscopy (1) or because the subject refused randomization (1). Three other cases did not complete the microchallenge because of change of residence (1 challenged with 50 mg), poor adherence to the protocol (1 challenged with 10 mg), or development of symptoms (1 challenged with 10 mg). Thirty-nine patients completed the study protocol: 30 women and 9 men with a median age of 30.6 y (range: 19.8–55.4 y) and who had consumed a GFD for a median of 10.1 y (range: 2.1–28.0 y). Of these 39 subjects, 13 were challenged with placebo, 13 with 10 mg gluten/d, and 13 with 50 mg gluten/d.

The control subjects were 20 adults (13 women and 7 men) with a median age of 34.5 y (range: 24.0–60.0 y) and a final diagnosis of functional dyspepsia (13) or gastroesophageal reflux (13) challenged with 50 mg of gluten in comparison with the placebo (\( P = 0.04 \)).

Small-bowel biopsy results

The results of the small-intestinal morphometric measures in CD patients and control subjects at baseline are shown in Table 1. The Vh/Cd ratio was significantly lower in CD patients than in control subjects, and the IEL count was significantly higher in CD patients than in control subjects. In the pooled CD group (13), the correlation between the Vh/Cd and the IEL count was significant.

Clinical and serologic evaluation

One patient challenged with 10 mg gluten/d showed typical signs of relapse (vomiting, diarrhea, and abdominal distension) after 6–8 wk of microchallenge but refused to repeat the \( t_1 \) evaluation. The comparison between the baseline and the postchallenge findings in the 39 patients completing the microchallenge did not show any significant changes in the clinical outcome between the 3 groups. The results of the serologic CD markers are shown in Figure 1. In all patients, the IgA anti-tTG and IgG AGA values were in the normal range, both at baseline and after the microchallenge. No significant difference was detected between the 3 groups at baseline (Kruskal-Wallis test; \( P = 0.30 \) and \( P = 0.45 \), respectively). After the microchallenge the IgA anti-tTG did not show any significant change (\( P = 0.12 \)), while the IgG-AGA showed a significant decrease in the group challenged with 50 mg of gluten in comparison with the placebo (\( P = 0.04 \)).

![Figure 1](https://academic.oup.com/ajcn/article-abstract/85/1/160/4649352)

**Figure 1.** Median and interquartile concentrations of serum immunoglobulin A (IgA) class anti-tissue transglutaminase (tTG) and IgG class anti-gliadin (AGA) antibodies before (1) and after (2) the gluten challenge in the 3 study groups: placebo (\( n = 13 \)), 10 mg gluten/d (\( n = 13 \)), and 50 mg gluten/d (\( n = 13 \)). No significant differences at baseline and no significant increase after the microchallenge were detected (Kruskal-Wallis test). The dashed line represents the normal cutoff. AU, arbitrary units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intestinal morphometric evaluation of the subjects before and after the gluten microchallenge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control subjects ((n = 20))</td>
<td>CD patients at baseline ((n = 39))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villous height (( \mu m ))</td>
<td>372.7 (339.5, 385.4) 354.3 (318.0, 380.5) 0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypt depth (( \mu m ))</td>
<td>135.1 (124.8, 149.4) 150.9 (134.9, 160.6) 0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vh/Cd</td>
<td>2.9 (2.5, 3.1) 2.2 (2.1, 2.9) 0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEL count (( \times 10^3 ) enterocytes)</td>
<td>22 (18, 24) 27 (23, 34) 0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) All values are medians; 95% CIs in parentheses. CD, celiac disease; Vh/Cd, villous height/crypt depth; IEL, intraepithelial lymphocyte.

\(^2\) The Wilcoxon test was used for the comparison between groups.

\(^3\) Significantly different from the control subjects, \( P < 0.05 \).
weak and not statistically significant at either baseline ($r = -0.31; 95\%\ CI: -0.56, 0.02; P = 0.06$) or after the microchallenge ($r = -0.29; 95\%\ CI: -0.55, 0.03; P = 0.07$).

The results of the gluten microchallenge are shown in Figure 2 and Table 2. No significant difference in the morphometric indexes was found at baseline between groups. After the microchallenge, the Vh/Cd index improved in 11 of 13 subjects (85%; 95\%\ CI: 55\%, 98\%) in the placebo group, in 6 of the 13 subjects (46\%; 95\%\ CI: 19\%, 75\%) in the 10-mg group, and in only 2 of the 13 subjects (15\%; 95\%\ CI: 2\%, 45\%) in the 50-mg group; the difference between the 50-mg group and the placebo group was significant. A significant improvement in the median percentage variation between $t_1$ and baseline (percentage change) of the Vh/Cd index was observed in the placebo group but not in the 10-mg and 50-mg groups. Conversely, at $t_1$, the Vh/Cd index showed a significant decrease in the group challenged with 50 mg gluten/d. The Kruskal-Wallis test showed a significant difference in the percentage change in Vh/Cd between the placebo and the 50-mg group ($P = 0.029$). An increase in IELs was observed in only 5 of the 13 subjects (38\%; 95\%\ CI: 14\%, 68\%) in the placebo group, in 6 of the 13 subjects (46\%; 95\%\ CI 19\%, 75\%) in the 10-mg group, and in 8 of the 13 subjects (61\%; 95\%\ CI: 32\%, 86\%) in the 50-mg group. No significant differences in the percentage change in IEL counts were found between the 3 groups.

Analysis of background gluten intake

The daily consumption ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) of commercially available gluten-free products was 332 $\pm$ 98 g (range: 177–574 g) in 46 adults being treated for CD. The median gluten content of the 42 gluten-free products analyzed was 5.2 ppm (ppm = mg/kg) (range: 0–50 ppm). On the basis of these values, we estimated...
that the background gluten intake from the GFD followed by our patients during the microchallenge study was <5 mg/d.

**DISCUSSION**

The morphometric analysis of the small-intestinal mucosa, particularly the evaluation of the Vh/Cd index and the IEL count, is the reference method for the quantitative assessment of gluten-induced damage in CD. The normal values found in our control subjects agree with previous data for both Vh/Cd and the IEL count (5). The IEL count is considered to be the most sensitive index of the celiac enteropathy (12). However, this paradigm has been investigated mainly in active CD but does not necessarily apply to CD patients receiving long-term dietary treatment. In our study, the analysis of the effects of the gluten microchallenge indeed suggested that the Vh/Cd index reflected more closely the damage induced by traces of gluten in the diet than did the IEL count. Despite the restricted criteria adopted in this study, the baseline duodenal biopsy results showed evidence of histologic damage (decreased median Vh/Cd and increased median IEL count) in adult CD patients receiving long-term dietary treatment. Furthermore, 4 of 49 subjects had to be excluded from the protocol because severe enteropathy (obscuring the possible effects of the gluten microchallenge) was detected at the baseline evaluation. These results confirm that an abnormal small-bowel morphology persists in a significant proportion of CD patients treated with a GFD, despite full resolution of their symptoms (13–15). This finding has been shown to be related to the ongoing ingestion of gluten, either deliberate or inadvertent, causing persistent inflammation in the small-intestinal mucosa (14, 16). This interpretation is supported by our results because we noticed a significant improvement in the intestinal architecture (Vh/Cd index) in the placebo group after 3 mo, as a consequence of the strict monitoring of the GFD imposed by the study protocol. On the other hand, neither the IgA class anti-tTG nor the IgG class AGA antibodies (which were always normal) showed a correlation with the mucosal changes found in some patients, confirming that these serologic markers are not sensitive enough to detect the residual enteropathy that can be found in apparently healthy CD patients receiving treatment with a GFD (17, 18).

The gluten microchallenge disclosed large interpatient variability in the sensitivity to gluten traces. Some CD patients showed a clear-cut worsening of the small-intestinal architecture after ingesting only 10 mg gluten/d, whereas others had an apparent improvement in mucosal histology after the 3-mo challenge with 50 mg gluten/d (Figure 2). Furthermore, one patient challenged with 10 mg gluten/d experienced clinical symptoms after a few weeks, whereas none of the 13 subjects receiving 50 mg gluten/d had clinical evidence of relapse. Despite this wide individual variability, which must be taken into account when implementing a threshold that is safe for all patients, we showed that 50 mg gluten/d, if introduced for 3 mo, were sufficient to cause a significant decrease in the Vh/Cd index in treated CD patients. This is an important new finding that must be interpreted with caution, for several reasons. Because of the limited number of patients, we were not able to reach firm conclusions about the potential toxicity of 10 mg gluten/d, which remained a “gray”

---

**TABLE 2**

Results of the 3-mo gluten microchallenge in patients with celiac disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marsh-Oberhuber grading of small-bowel histology</th>
<th>Placebo (n = 13)</th>
<th>10 mg gluten/d (n = 13)</th>
<th>50 mg gluten/d (n = 13)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Baseline | 0 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 0.263
| | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| After microchallenge | 0 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 0.433
| | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Intestinal morphometric results at baseline | Villous height (μm) | 354 (315, 437) | 318 (306, 366) | 380 (266, 396) | 0.431
| | Crypt depth (μm) | 150 (134, 165) | 161 (124, 187) | 131 (110, 159) | 0.197
| | Vh/Cd | 2.2 (2.1, 3.0) | 2.0 (1.8, 3.4) | 2.4 (2.2, 3.2) | 0.273
| | IEL count (× 100 enterocytes) | 26 (23, 45) | 29 (23, 46) | 27 (17, 48) | 0.968
| Morphometric changes after the microchallenge (%) | Villous height | 5 (–5, 13) | 9 (–9; 19) | –17 (–30, 23) | 0.198
| | Crypt depth | –2 (–16, 9) | 3 (–28, 21) | –3 (–17, 24) | 0.693
| | Vh/Cd | 9 (3, 15) | –1 (–18, 68) | –20 (–22, –13) | 0.029
| | IEL count | –4 (–22, 42) | 0 (–14, 47) | 12 (–8, 93) | 0.514

1 n = 39. Vh/Cd, villous height/crypt depth; IEL, intraepithelial lymphocyte.
2 0 = normal, 1 = infiltrative lesions (increased IEL count), 2 = hyperplastic lesions (increased IEL count and increased crypt depth).
3 Fisher’s exact test.
4 All values are medians; 95% CIs in parentheses.
5 Kruskal-Wallis test.
6 Significantly different from placebo, P < 0.05.
area. For ethical reasons we had to limit the duration of the microchallenge to 3 mo, but it is well known that mucosal deterioration may become manifest after a longer gluten challenge (19). Reactions to gluten are not only influenced by the quantity but also the quality of the ingested protein, which may change according to cereal variety (20) and food processing (raw versus cooked grain, fermentation, etc) (21).

The effects of a low gluten intake in CD patients have been investigated in a limited number of studies. Ciclitira et al (22) analyzed the toxicity and time response of a gliadin dose (the major toxic fraction of gluten) in a single patient. They concluded that 10 mg produced no change, 100 mg a very slight measurable change, 500 mg a moderate change, and 1 g extensive damage to small-intestinal morphology. The same group also reported that the ingestion of 2.4–4.8 mg gluten/d caused no change in the jejunal biopsy morphology of treated CD patients after either 1 or 6 wk (3, 23). Ejderhamn et al (4) showed that a daily intake of 4–14 mg gliadin did not affect the morphology of the small-bowel mucosa in CD patients receiving long-term treatment with a GFD. Recent Finnish studies indicate that an intake of 20–36 mg gluten/d has no detectable effect on mucosal histology (5, 6). We previously showed that a 4-wk challenge with 100 mg gliadin/d caused deterioration of the small-intestinal architecture and that the histologic changes were more pronounced in patients challenged with 500 mg gliadin/d (2). Finally, a higher gluten intake (1–5 g/d), still lower than the normal gluten intake for the non-CD population in Western countries (10–20 g/d) (24), caused relapse of disease at a clinical, laboratory, and histologic level, both in children and in adults (25–27). On the basis of the evidence from the current study and the quoted literature, it appears that 50 mg gluten/d is the minimum dose required to produce measurable damage to the small-intestinal mucosa in CD patients.

Currently, different national positions hamper the implementation of uniform guidelines on the maximum level of gluten contamination (expressed as ppm) that can be tolerated in products that are marketed for the treatment of CD. This is a “hot” topic that was recently reviewed extensively (28, 29). In Northern European countries, up to 200 ppm gluten is permitted in food for CD patients, to use wheat starch as ingredient. Conversely, a more prudent value of 20 ppm has been adopted in North American and southern European countries. On the basis of their clinical and analytic data, Finnish experts recently advocated the intermediate limit of 100 ppm (30). The decision about what the threshold is depends, however, not only on the minimum toxic dose but also on the amount of gluten-free products consumed. Our results indicate that 200 ppm is not a safe threshold because the harmful gluten intake of 50 mg/d could be reached even with a moderate consumption (≥250 g/d) of nominally gluten-free products. A 100-ppm threshold, by allowing up to 10 mg gluten/100 g product, is also probably not suitable for generalized use, especially in countries such as Italy, where consumption of wheat substitutes is occasionally as high as 500 g/d (as shown by our data). The threshold of 20 ppm keeps the intake of gluten from “special celiac food” well below the amount of 50 mg/d, which allows a safety margin for the variable gluten sensitivity and dietary habits of patients.

In conclusion, this study confirmed that an abnormal small-bowel morphology persisted in a significant proportion of CD patients being treated with a GFD, most likely because of the persistent ingestion of trace amounts of gluten. The protracted intake of 50 mg gluten/d produced significant damage in the architecture of the small intestine in patients being treated for CD. However, the sensitivity to trace intakes of gluten showed large interpatient variability, a feature that should be accounted for in the implementation of a safe gluten threshold. These findings should be confirmed by further studies in larger numbers of CD patients. Finally, the relation between the intestinal damage induced by trace intakes of gluten and the long-term complications of CD remains to be elucidated.
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