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Abstract

Some patients with chronic idiopathic diarrhea have an apparent nonspecific inflammation of colonic mucosa, even though their colons appear normal by barium enema and colonoscopy. This has been referred to as microscopic colitis. However, the significance of this finding is unclear, because the ability of pathologists to accurately distinguish mild degrees of abnormality has not been established. Furthermore, even if the mucosa of these patients is nonspecifically inflamed, it is not known whether this is associated with deranged colonic function that could contribute to the development of chronic diarrhea. To assess these questions, we first examined colonic biopsy specimens in a blinded fashion, comparing biopsy results from patients with microscopic colitis with biopsy specimens from subjects in two control groups. This analysis revealed that colonic mucosa from six patients with microscopic colitis was in fact abnormal. For example, their mucosa contained an excess of both neutrophiles and round cells in the lamina propria, cryptitis, and reactive changes. These and other differences were statistically significant. Second, colonic absorption, measured by the steady state nonabsorbable marker perfusion method, was severely depressed in the patients. For example, mean water absorption rate was 159 ml/h in normal subjects and was reduced to only 26 ml/h in six patients with microscopic colitis. Results of net and unidirectional electrolyte fluxes and of electrical potential difference suggested that colonic fluid absorption was abnormal because of reduced active and passive sodium and chloride absorption and because of reduced Cl/HCO₃ exchange. Small intestinal fluid and electrolyte absorption was abnormally reduced in two of the six patients, suggesting the possibility of coexistent small intestinal involvement in some of these patients. We conclude that nonspecific inflammation of colonic mucosa is associated with a severe reduction of colonic fluid absorption, and that the latter probably contributes to the development of chronic diarrhea.

Introduction

In 1980, we reported a clinical study of patients with diarrhea of unknown origin (1). In the course of our evaluation, we observed nonspecific inflammation in colonic biopsy samples from eight of these patients. Because there was no evidence of colitis on observation by barium enema or sigmoidoscopy/colonoscopy, we designated these patients as having “microscopic colitis.” We were, however, uncertain of the clinical significance of microscopic colitis for two reasons: First, in lacking control biopsy specimens from healthy subjects, we did not know if the colonic inflammation in these patients was truly abnormal. And, second, we did not know whether these histologic findings, even if abnormal, were associated with deranged colonic function that could contribute to the development of diarrhea.

In 1982, Kingham et al. (2) described six patients that were similar to ours, in that they had idiopathic diarrhea, a normal-appearing colon, and colonic biopsy specimens that revealed microscopic colitis. They carried out a blinded analysis of the mucosal biopsy samples, comparing their six patients with microscopic colitis to other patients with chronic diarrhea whose colon biopsy specimens had not revealed increased inflammatory cells. The increased inflammation in their patients with microscopic colitis was confirmed by this analysis. However, in our opinion, their study does not constitute strong proof of an association between microscopic colitis and diarrhea; first, because there is an inherent bias in comparing preselected normal and preselected abnormal biopsy specimens and, second, because they performed no studies to evaluate colonic function. Nevertheless, their report stimulated and enhanced interest in the possible role of microscopic colitis in patients with chronic diarrhea.

The purpose of the present paper is to report studies that were designed to further evaluate the significance of microscopic colitis in patients with chronic diarrhea. There were three main parts of our research: (a) double-blinded analysis of biopsy specimens of colonic mucosa from patients with microscopic colitis compared with prospectively obtained biopsy specimens from control subjects; (b) intestinal perfusion to evaluate water and electrolyte absorption by the colon; and (c) intestinal perfusion to evaluate water and electrolyte absorption by the small intestine.

Methods

Informed consent. This project was approved by the Institutional Review Board for Human Protection of the Baylor University Medical Center and the Subcommittee on Human Studies of the Dallas Veterans Administration Medical Center. Informed written consent was obtained from each subject.

Patients with microscopic colitis. The six patients with microscopic colitis were referred to us for evaluation of chronic idiopathic diarrhea. Before referral, each had had a negative conventional diagnostic evaluation which included normal proctosigmoidoscopy and normal double-contrast barium studies of the colon in all six patients, and in addition, normal colonoscopy in three of the patients. They underwent an in-depth diagnostic evaluation for chronic diarrhea, as previously
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described (3). No cause of diarrhea could be established. However, either in biopsy specimens obtained by us at proctosigmoidoscopy, or in biopsies reviewed by us from other institutions, we thought the colonic mucosa was nonspecifically inflamed. We therefore did two additional studies: (a) colonoscopy to obtain biopsy samples from multiple areas of the colon, and (b) segmental perfusion to measure intestinal absorption of water and electrolytes. There was no consistent order in which these two procedures were carried out.

The age and sex of the patients and duration of illness are provided in Table I. Chronic and persistent diarrhea and urgency were the major symptoms in each instance. Two of the patients also suffered from fecal incontinence, and three had lost a moderate amount of weight. The patients had some cramping abdominal discomfort associated with diarrhea, but abdominal pain was not a prominent symptom in any patient. None of the patients had ever noted gastrointestinal bleeding, and stool specimens were free of occult blood. There were no physical or laboratory findings suggestive of systemic disease; specifically hemoglobin, serum albumin, and erythrocyte sedimentation rates were normal in each instance. The patients were on no medication at the time of our research studies. However, multiple therapeutic trials had been (or were later) attempted in each patient, with no consistent benefit. One patient (no. 3) improved in association with azulfidine therapy, but this drug did not help the other five patients. Two patients were treated with oral prednisone, with questionable benefit in one instance. None of the patients has, during our follow-up, developed evidence of ulcerative colitis or Crohn's disease.

Using previously described methods (4), we determined the weight, osmolality, and electrolyte composition of stool collected quantitatively while the patients ate a normal diet (for 72 h) and while they fasted. Patients fasted for 12 h before fasting stool collections were begun. During the fast the patients ingested nothing by mouth (not even water); maintenance fluids and glucose were provided intravenously. In most instances, the period of stool collection during fasting continued for 48 h; in some instances the period of stool collection during fasting was only 24 h.

Table I shows the results of stool analysis in the six patients. The mean daily stool output when the patients ate a normal diet was 672 g and was liquid in consistency. During a period of fasting, the diarrhea improved greatly or resolved in all patients except patient 5. Stool osmolality while patients were eating a normal diet ranged from 293 to 366 mosmol/kg. A small-to-moderate sized "osmotic gap" was present (3). None of the patients had blood in the stool or steatorrhea.

Stool and/or urine was analyzed for phenolphthalein, anthraquinone, sulfate, and magnesium to rule out surreptitious laxative ingestion (3); normal results were obtained in each patient.

**Nondiarrhea control group.** Nine control subjects of a similar age underwent colonoscopy prospectively in order to obtain biopsy specimens for double-blinded comparison. Four of the subjects were recruited by advertising in the newspaper for normal women between the ages of 35 and 70. The ages of the four such women we studied were 37, 58, 68, and 70 yr, respectively. We also obtained colonic biopsy specimens from five men with normal bowel function who were undergoing colonoscopy. The ages of these five men, their reason for colonoscopy, and their colonoscopic findings were as follows: (a) 48 yr, blood per rectum,ecal hyperplastic polyp at colonoscopy; (b) 51 yr, blood per rectum,normal colonoscopy; (c) 62 yr, iron deficiency anemia, normal colonoscopy; (d) 63 yr, blood per rectum, normal colonoscopy except hemorrhoids; (e) 69 yr, follow-up for polyp that had been previously removed, normal colonoscopy. These control subjects did not undergo intestinal perfusion.

**Diarrhea control group.** After initial editorial review of this paper, we were asked to provide an additional control group of patients with chronic diarrhea without colonic inflammation (diarrhea control group). To obtain such a group, we included all other patients that we had examined for chronic diarrhea since 1979, in whom we had carried out both colonoscopy with biopsies from multiple sites and colon perfusion. The colonoscopy in these patients and the histologic interpretation of the biopsy specimens had been considered to be normal. Some current data on these patients are provided in Table II.

**Colonoscopy and histologic studies.** Subjects were prepared for colonoscopy with Golytely" lavage (Braintree Laboratories, Inc., Braintree, MA) (5). The presence or absence of mucosal edema, bleeding, friability, granularity, ulceration, exudate, abnormal visible vascular pattern, and color was noted. Biopsy specimens were taken from the cecum, ascending colon, transverse colon, descending colon, sigmoid colon, and rectum. After routine processing and embedding in paraffin, sections were cut and stained with hematoxylin and eosin. The six specimens from the colon of each subject were read by one or two pathologists (Drs. Vendrell and/or Lee) without knowledge of whether the specimens were from a patient or control subject, or the location of the colon whence the individual biopsy specimens were taken. The pathologist interpreted the colon to be normal or abnormal as regards inflammation. Furthermore, each biopsy specimen was assessed for severity of inflammation on a scale of 0 (normal), 1 (mild inflammation), 2 (moderate inflammation), and 3 (severe inflammation).

**Intestinal perfusion.** Using a balanced electrolyte solution and 0.2% 

---

**Table I. Clinical Findings in Six Patients with Microscopic Colitis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case no.</th>
<th>Age and sex of patients and duration of diarrhea</th>
<th>Diet</th>
<th>Stool Weight (g/24 h)</th>
<th>Osmolality (mosmol/liter)</th>
<th>Na (mM)</th>
<th>K (mM)</th>
<th>Cl (mM)</th>
<th>HCO3 (mM)</th>
<th>Fat (g/24 h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69, F, 13</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1,105 (liquid)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fasting</td>
<td>114 (formed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42, F, 1½</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>424 (liquid)</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fasting</td>
<td>259 (liquid)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59, F, 1½/12</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>401 (liquid)</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fasting</td>
<td>No stool</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52, F, 1½/12</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>516 (liquid)</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fasting</td>
<td>20 (soft)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57, F, 1½/12</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1,078 (liquid)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fasting</td>
<td>1,513 (liquid)</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60, M, 2½</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>509 (liquid)</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fasting</td>
<td>246 (soft)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
polystyrene glycol as a nonabsorbable marker, water and electrolyte
absorption rates in 30-cm segments of jejunum and ileum and in the
colon were measured in each patient with microscopic colitis
(4). Small bowel studies were carried out with a 3-lm tube wherein
test solution was infused continuously through one port and collected
distally 10 and 40 cm beyond the infusion site. For the colon studies,
the test solution was infused into the terminal ileum, and samples
were collected from the cecum and from the rectum. The test solution
infusion rate was 11 ml/min in the small intestine and 20 ml/min for
colon studies. The test solutions for small bowel perfusion contained
10 mM D-xylose so that small bowel absorption of this pentose could
be measured. Test solutions were isomotic to plasma and were
continuously bubbled with 5% CO₂ and 95% O₂. Collected samples
were analyzed for electrolytes and polystyrene glycol, and absorption
rates for the 30-cm jejunal and ileal test segments and for the entire
colon (cecum to rectum) were calculated as in previous reports (4). In
some instances, 3̂Cl and, if available, 2̂Na were added to the colon
perfusion solution in order to measure unidirectional flux rates of
chloride and sodium. The amounts of added isotope and the methods
of calculating unidirectional flux rates have been previously de-
scribed (6).

Normal values for these perfusion studies were established in
healthy volunteers who had been previously studied in our laboratory
by identical methods. In addition, patients in the diarrhea control
group had colon perfusion by the same method.

Electrical potential difference (PD). PD was measured in the
jejunum, ileum, cecum, and rectum by using a perfused electrolyte
solution as a flowing intraluminal electrode and a subcutaneous
reference electrode, as previously described (6). The electrodes were
connected via 3 M KCl agar bridges and calomel half-cells to the input
terminals of a battery-charged electrometer (Keithley Instruments, Inc.,
Cleveland, OH), and the output was displayed on a chart recorder
(Rikadenki, Tokyo, Japan). For jejunal and ileal studies, PD was
recorded as part of the intestinal perfusion experiment described in
the previous paragraph. Cecal PD was measured at the end of the
colon perfusion experiment; the electrolyte solution that formed the
intraluminal electrode was infused directly into the cecum. For rectal
studies, the lower colon was cleansed with a 750-ml saline enema;
after this was evacuated, 750 ml of the same solution was infused into
the lower colon over a 15-min period, and a continuous infusion of
this solution was then instituted at a rate of 10 ml/min for PD
measurement.

Results

Colonoscopy and biopsy results in patients with microscopic
colitis and nondiarrhea control group. Each of the patients and
nondiarrhea control subjects had normal-appearing colonic mucosa at the time of colonoscopy. Table III shows the results of
biased review of the six colon biopsy specimens from the six
patients and nine control subjects. It is evident that biopsies from
the patients were, as a group, readily distinguishable from biopsies from the control subjects. In most instances the
pathologists agreed on the interpretation.

Approximately 6 wk after these initial readings, without
knowledge of how well the first reading had correlated with clinical
findings or with the other pathologist, each pathologist
reread all of the coded biopsies. Pathologist A again read each
control subject as normal and each patient as abnormal; thus,
there was agreement in every instance between the first and
second reading. Pathologist B again reread one of the controls
as normal. However, this control subject was a different
subject from that read as abnormal in the first reading.
Otherwise, pathologist B interpreted each set of specimens the
same way on both occasions.

As described in Methods, each biopsy specimen was evaluated
blindly for severity of inflammation on a scale of 0 (normal) to 3 (severe inflammation). Fig. 1 shows the percentage of
biopsy specimens from each patient that were interpreted as
abnormal (on the first reading). In most but not all instances, all of the biopsy samples from a given patient were
judged to be abnormal. The average severity of inflammation
from the six specimen sites in each patient is provided in
Table IV. The average severity of inflammation in the six
patients at each of the six specimen sites is shown in Fig. 2.
As noted in this figure, the average severity of inflammation was
approximately the same at each site; however, no one
specimen site in a given patient would necessarily be representa-
tive of the average degree of inflammation throughout the
colon.

Table II. Clinical and Colon Perfusion Findings in Nine Patients with Chronic Diarrhea and Apparently Normal Colonic Mucosa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case no.</th>
<th>Age and sex of patients and duration of diarrhea</th>
<th>Stool weight</th>
<th>Final diagnosis</th>
<th>Colon absorption rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular diet</td>
<td>Fasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g/24 h</td>
<td>g/24 h</td>
<td>mL/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54, F, 4</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Idiopathic diarrhea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56, M, 8/12</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Idiopathic diarrhea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64, F, 9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Idiopathic diarrhea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65, M, 8/12</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>Idiopathic diarrhea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>72, F, 8/12</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>Idiopathic diarrhea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50, M, 15</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Irritable bowel syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36, M, 4</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pancreatic insufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37, F, 9</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Radiation ileitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57, M, 10</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pancreatic insufficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Abbreviation used in this paper: PD, potential difference.

Table III. Results of Blinded Review of Colon Biopsies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Controls (n = 9)</th>
<th>Patients (n = 6)</th>
<th>P value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathologist A</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inflammation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathologist B</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inflammation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P value by Fisher's exact test.
Fig. 1. Percentage of the six biopsy specimens from various colonic sites that were read as abnormal in a blinded analysis (first reading).

Fig. 3 shows how the pathologists agreed with each other in their first interpretation of the individual biopsy slides, and Fig. 4 shows a comparison of each pathologist’s first and second interpretation of the individual slides. The statistics for these correlations are provided in the figure legends.

The results presented above represent an analysis under strictly blinded conditions, wherein two pathologists did not know if they were reading biopsy specimens from control subjects or from patients. No preliminary discussions took place between the two pathologists to establish criteria or guidelines for normalcy or severity of inflammation. After the blinded analysis was completed, all of the authors examined the biopsy specimens in an open fashion in an attempt to determine the criteria that had been used in the blinded study to grade severity of inflammation, and in order to choose photomicrographs for illustrative purposes.

Representative photomicrographs are shown in Figs. 5–7.

In specimens read as showing mild inflammation, the lamina propria was expanded by inflammatory cells, and the surface epithelium usually had reactive changes (i.e., decreased mucus, loss of cellular polarity, and nuclear irregularity). Specimens read as showing moderate inflammation contained either more excessive inflammation of the lamina propria, or similar inflammation plus cryptitis. Two of the patients had at least one of their specimens read as severely inflamed (patients 1 and 6). These specimens had even more inflammation in the lamina propria (patient 1) or were interpreted as having a crypt abscess (patient 6). In patient 6, crypt abscesses were read in four of the six biopsies by pathologist A, and in one of the six biopsies by pathologist B.

As is evident from the previous paragraph and from the average results depicted in Table IV, the photomicrographs shown in Figs. 6 and 7 are representative of the spectrum of abnormality that was present in most of the biopsy specimens from most of the patients. A few isolated biopsies were read as showing more severe inflammation than is shown in Fig. 7, either because of more intense inflammation in the lamina propria or because of what was interpreted as a crypt abscess.

### Table IV. Average Severity of Colonic Inflammation and Results of Colonic Perfusion with a Balanced Electrolyte Solution in Patients and Healthy Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity of inflammation according to pathologist*</th>
<th>Net movement‡</th>
<th>PD§</th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Rectal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td></td>
<td>ml/h</td>
<td>meq/h</td>
<td>meq/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>-14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy subjects**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>-159</td>
<td>-24.2</td>
<td>-26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>-70, -270</td>
<td>-110, -40.2</td>
<td>-10.1, -42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Severity graded 0–4, i.e., normal to severe inflammation (see text). ‡ Net absorption; (+) net secretion; values are for entire colon. § Lumen negative. ¶ *P < 0.001 by group t test. † P < 0.01 by group t test. ** n = 23 for colonic perfusion; n = 20 for proximal colon PD; n = 10 for rectal PD.
Patients of both of Figure in inflammation is perfusion colonic pathologist B. was but read as healthy group. Approximately to submitted the from and distortion, epithelial from (P < 0.001). In the microscopic colitis (first reading). 0, normal; 1, mild inflammation; 2, moderate inflammation; 3, severe inflammation. Results from control biopsies are not shown since the vast majority were read as normal by both pathologists. P value (by \( \chi^2 \) analysis); patients only (as in figure), \( P < 0.01 \); if controls also considered, \( P < 0.001 \).

None of the biopsy specimens contained mucosal ulcerations or granulomas, and none of the biopsies contained an exudate.

Several months after the analyses described above, the slides from the nine control subjects and the six patients with microscopic colitis were recoded and reread by pathologist B with regard to 14 different histologic criteria. When the slides were decoded, the patients were found to be abnormal (by \( \chi^2 \) test) in the following nine respects: cryptitis (\( P < 0.005 \)); neutrophils in the surface epithelium (\( P < 0.001 \)); reactive changes in the surface epithelium (\( P < 0.001 \)); excess mitotic figures in the crypt epithelium (\( P < 0.005 \)); goblet cell depletion (\( P < 0.001 \)); excess inflammatory cells in the lamina propria (\( P < 0.001 \)); excess neutrophils in the lamina propria (\( P < 0.001 \)); excess lymphocytes in the lamina propria (\( P < 0.001 \)); and excess plasma cells in lamina propria (\( P < 0.001 \)). In the following five respects, the biopsy specimens from the patients were not statistically significantly different from specimens from the control group: crypt abscesses, epithelial exudate and/or ulceration, paneth cell metaplasia, crypt distortion, and granuloma formation.

Reanalysis of biopsy specimens to include diarrhea control group. Approximately 4 mo after having reviewed the slides from the microscopic colitis patients and from the healthy controls, the slides from all three groups were recoded and submitted to pathologist A for blinded reading. On the nine healthy controls and the nine diarrhea controls were all read as normal. Five of the patients with microscopic colitis were read as abnormal, and one was read as normal. This last patient had earlier been read as abnormal by pathologist A but was the same patient that had been read as normal by pathologist B. The P value for the differences in these readings was <0.01.

Colonic absorption and PD. Table IV shows the results of colonic perfusion and PD in each patient (average severity of colonic inflammation is shown for comparison). Mean net colonic water absorption rate in the six patients was 26 ml/h, which is severely reduced compared with the normal value of 159 ml/h. Net sodium and chloride absorption was also reduced, but net potassium movement was similar in the patients and normal subjects. Normally, bicarbonate is secreted by the colon; this secretion was reduced in the patients with microscopic colitis. PD values were approximately the same in the patients as in the normal subjects. The patient whose biopsy specimens were read as having the smallest amount of inflammation and whose biopsies were sometimes read as normal (patient 5) had the highest rate of colonic absorption. Otherwise, the severity of inflammation could not be well correlated with the degree of colonic malabsorption, possibly because there was so little variation in severity of inflammation and in severity of fluid malabsorption.

Unidirectional fluxes of sodium and chloride were measured in some of the patients, and the results are shown in Table V. Average lumen-to-plasma and plasma-to-lumen fluxes of sodium and chloride were reduced in the patients when compared with control subjects. The difference in chloride fluxes was statistically significant; only two studies were done with isotopic sodium, so statistical analysis of the difference in average sodium flux rates was not possible.

Fig. 8 shows individual values for colonic water absorption rate in the 23 normal subjects previously studied in our laboratory, in the nine patients in the diarrhea control group, and in the six patients with microscopic colitis. The mean absorption rate in both control groups was significantly higher than the mean absorption rate in the six patients with microscopic colitis. As previously noted in Table II, five of the patients in the diarrhea control group had idiopathic diarrhea; three of these had reduced colonic water absorption and two absorbed normally. The three patients in the diarrhea control group in whom a specific diagnosis was established, and the patient in whom we diagnosed irritable bowel syndrome, had normal colonic absorption (Table II and Fig. 8).

Small bowel studies. Water absorption rates in 30-cm segments of jejunum and ileum are shown in Table VI. Patient 5 had abnormally reduced water absorption in the jejunum, and patients 1 and 5 secreted water in the ileum. Sodium and chloride absorption or secretion rates followed the pattern depicted for water absorption rate (data not shown).

The test solutions perfused into the small bowel contained 10 mM D-xylose to serve as a marker for nonelectrolyte absorption rate. As shown in Table VI, D-xylose absorption was within the normal range in the two patients who secreted fluid in the ileum and in the jejunum of the patient who absorbed no fluid in the jejunum. Thus, the small bowel transport abnormality in these two patients was somewhat specific for electrolytes and water, and did not involve a generalized depression of absorptive function.

**Discussion**

Colonic inflammation. We evaluated whether the apparent nonspecific inflammation in colonic mucosa from patients with "microscopic colitis" (see Introduction) was actually abnormal when compared with biopsy specimens from people who had normal bowel function (non-diarrhea control group) and when compared with patients with chronic diarrhea and apparently normal colonic mucosa (diarrhea control group).
The results of a blinded evaluation clearly showed that colonic biopsy specimens from patients with microscopic colitis are abnormal. These biopsies contained neutrophils in the surface epithelium, excess neutrophils and round cells in the lamina propria, cryptitis, reactive changes, and goblet cell depletion. Although not all of the six specimens from different areas of the colon were considered abnormal in every patient, most of them were. Thus, the abnormality is best characterized as diffuse rather than patchy. None of the biopsy specimens revealed an exudate, erosion, or ulceration of the mucosa; this is consistent with the completely normal appearance of the colonic mucosa by barium x-ray and by colonoscopy.

The cause of this inflammation is not known. The observation that patients with chronic diarrhea due to noncolonic disease have normal colonic histology (cases 6–9 in Table II) suggests that chronic diarrhea per se does not cause inflammation of the colonic mucosa. If it is assumed, for the sake of discussion, that the diarrhea and the inflammation began at approximately the same time, the abrupt onset (within a week) of the diarrhea that was noted by our patients might suggest an infectious process. However, extensive and repeated cultures in our routine hospital laboratory have not revealed a pathogen. In addition, it is possible that while an infection initiated the onset of inflammation, the chronicity is due rather to host immune responses. However, no evidence for an autoimmune process has been found. Since the etiology of other chronic inflammatory bowel diseases is unknown, it is impossible to know whether our patients have a forme fruste of chronic ulcerative colitis or Crohn's disease of the colon. It should be noted, however, that some of our patients have had diarrhea for as long as 13 yr and yet none of them has developed other features of ulcerative colitis or Crohn's disease, such as rectal bleeding, fever, arthralgia, abnormal barium studies of the small or large bowel, or visual abnormality of colonic or mucosa.
rectal mucosa as seen by colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy. Therefore, if our patients do have a mild form of ulcerative colitis or Crohn’s disease, this form must be relatively nonprogressive and persistent with diarrhea as its only clinical manifestation. Furthermore, our patients do not have so-called “minimal change colitis” (7), in that patients with that particular entity often present with bloody diarrhea, have laboratory abnormalities of systemic illness (e.g., elevated sedimentation rate, anemia, and hypoalbuminemia), and have overt mucosal abnormalities seen by colonoscopy.

**Colonic absorption.** A second major part of our research dealt with the question of whether the nonspecific colonic inflammation in these patients was associated with reduced colonic absorption of water and electrolytes. Using the steady state perfusion method, we showed that colonic fluid absorption was severely impaired. We should emphasize that the healthy controls we used for perfusion studies were neither age- nor sex-matched to the patients. However, the group of normal subjects contained women and men in the same age range as our patients.

Colon absorption rate in the patients with microscopic colitis was also significantly less than in our diarrhea control group. However, three of the five patients in the diarrhea control group with idiopathic diarrhea also had decreased colonic absorption. The reason for defective colonic absorption in patients with idiopathic diarrhea and normal colonic histology is unknown, but it conceivably could be mediated by a toxin, an undetected hormone abnormality, or by abnormal nerve or paracrine activity. The findings in these three patients make it clear that normal colonic histology does not guarantee normal colonic function. On the other hand, in our experience, colonic inflammation is uniformly associated with reduced colonic absorption of water and electrolytes.

Our studies cannot establish the precise mechanism of
reduced colonic absorption in patients with microscopic colitis, but the results are consistent with three effects: (a) reduced active sodium and chloride absorption, (b) inhibition of chloride/bicarbonate exchange (8), and (c) decreased passive permeability of the mucosa. The evidence favoring reduced active ion absorption consists of the reduction of lumen-to-plasma flux of sodium and chloride. The evidence suggesting inhibition of chloride/bicarbonate exchange is the reduced bicarbonate secretion rate in association with reduced chloride absorption. The evidence for decreased passive permeability is the reduction of plasma-to-lumen flux of sodium and chloride. Our finding of a normal PD across the mucosa is consistent with these effects, in that reduced active sodium absorption would reduce PD, whereas reduced passive permeability to chloride would be expected to increase PD in response to the residual active sodium absorption; the opposing results could yield no net change in the PD.

Assuming that deranged colonic absorption in patients with microscopic colitis is due to the nonspecific inflammation, the mechanism by which inflammation results in deranged absorption is highly speculative. Possibilities would include local release of substances from inflammatory cells that inhibit active absorption and tighten mucosal barriers to passive ion movement.

In considering the meaning of the observed colonic malabsorption of water and electrolytes, it should be pointed out that the perfusion method measures colonic absorptive capacity under steady state, high flow rate conditions. The average absorptive capacity of our control subjects was ~3,800 ml/24 h (159 ml/h), whereas for our patients with microscopic colitis.

Figure 7. Biopsy specimen from a patient, read as abnormal, moderate inflammation. The surface epithelium consists of tall columnar, mucus-containing cells; the nuclei are irregular, with prominent nucleoli and normal chromatin content. The lamina propria contains excess numbers of mononuclear and polymorphonuclear cells, with extension of the infiltrate into a crypt (cryptitis, arrow). (Hematoxylin and eosin, × 119.)
the average absorptive capacity was only 624 ml/24 h (26 ml/h). Under normal conditions, 0.6–1.5 liters of fluid is delivered to the colon each day (3), probably in boluses (after meals), rather than at a steady rate; consequently, even moderate reductions in absorptive capacity (as measured by steady state perfusion) might result in diarrhea. There seems little doubt, therefore, that the severely reduced colonic absorptive capacity for water and electrolytes in our patients could contribute to the development of their diarrhea. This does not, of course, exclude a role for other contributing factors, such as abnormal small bowel function (see below) or abnormal colonic motility.

The magnitude of colon malabsorption of water and electrolytes is approximately the same in our patients with microscopic colitis as has been previously reported in patients with proctocolitis due to idiopathic inflammatory bowel disease (9). However, in Crohn's colitis, the plasma-to-lumen flux is abnormally increased (10), rather than decreased, as in microscopic colitis. Moreover, in ulcerative colitis the PD is markedly reduced (11), whereas it is normal in microscopic colitis. These results in ulcerative and Crohn’s colitis suggest abnormally increased mucosal permeability, whereas the results in microscopic colitis suggest reduced mucosal permeability. Perhaps this difference is explained by the mucosal ulceration that is characteristic of ulcerative and Crohn's colitis, whereas the epithelial lining is intact in microscopic colitis.

**Small bowel studies.** Two of our six patients had ileal secretion of water and electrolytes, and one of these also had abnormally low fluid absorption in the jejunum. In the other four patients, water and electrolyte absorption rates were within normal limits.

In the one patient with jejunal malabsorption of water and electrolytes, a jejunal biopsy specimen was interpreted retrospectively as showing a mild increase in inflammatory cells in the lamina propria. Although this was not a “blinded” analysis, as in our colon biopsy results, this finding suggests that this patient had mild inflammation of her jejunum as well as in her colon. The other five patients had a normal jejunal biopsy specimen, consistent with their normal absorption of water and electrolytes. Ileal biopsy samples were not obtained in any of the six patients, so we do not know whether or not the ileal water and electrolyte malabsorption in two of our patients was associated with inflammation.

As far as we can tell, small bowel absorption of other substances was grossly intact, since none of our patients had an abnormal xylose test, abnormal Schilling test, or steatorrhea, and since intestinal absorption of D-xylose during the small bowel perfusion was within normal range (even in the two patients who exhibited ileal secretion of water, sodium and chloride). An apparently selective malabsorption of water and electrolytes is suggestive of diarrhea produced by neuroendocrine hormones, such as vasoactive intestinal polypeptide or calcitonin. However, in all but one of our cases the jejunum was absorbing normally, and this is strong evidence against hormone-induced diarrhea (4). In addition, serum levels of vasoactive intestinal polypeptide and calcitonin were normal in each patient.

Small bowel malabsorption of water and electrolytes might have contributed to the diarrhea in some of our patients. In
this regard, it is interesting that the two patients with the most severe diarrhea had ileal malabsorption of water and electrolytes, and that the patient whose diarrhea was most severe during a fast had jejunal as well as ileal and colonic malabsorption of water and electrolytes.

**Clinical significance.** In the past, most critical clinicians and investigators have tended to disregard “mild-to-moderate, nonspecific inflammation” of intestinal (and biliary) mucosa. There are several reasons for this attitude. First, normal mucosa contains some chronic inflammatory cells, and in most instances a clear delineation of when the number and/or the type of inflammatory cells in the lamina propria becomes abnormal is not made. Second, there is usually no evidence that such changes are associated with abnormal function to explain the patient’s symptoms. Finally, there is concern that overtreatment, including inappropriate steroid therapy or surgery, might result if clinical significance were attributed to such inflammation.

It is on the background of these important considerations that we set out to evaluate the significance of an apparent nonspecific inflammation of colonic mucosa in patients with idiopathic chronic diarrhea. We have shown that this inflammation, which is called microscopic colitis, is a fact that colonic mucosa appears normal to the naked eye, actually represents a histologic abnormality, and that it is associated with colonic malabsorption of water and electrolytes. The cause of the inflammation is unknown, and it must be emphasized that our data do not prove that colonic inflammation is the primary event in this syndrome. Most likely, rigorous testing of such a hypothesis would require the isolation of a transmissible cause of the colitis so that Koch’s postulates could be applied; another alternative would be to eliminate the inflammation with an effective therapy, and see if diarrhea disappeared. Unfortunately, neither approach is possible at the present time. Therefore, on the one hand, it would be incorrect to say that microscopic colitis has been shown to be a cause of chronic diarrhea. On the other hand, the fact that microscopic colitis is associated with colonic malabsorption of water and electrolytes indicates that this histologic abnormality has clinical significance, inasmuch as such malabsorption almost certainly is a major contributing cause of the patient’s chronic diarrhea.

For the moment, we think it is best to refer to this syndrome as microscopic colitis, but to keep in mind that the abnormality may be more generalized (microscopic enterocolitis) in some patients.

Although we believe it is helpful to know that microscopic colitis has this clinical significance, we fear that our report might be used to justify prednisone therapy in these patients. In our opinion, the risks of such therapy are likely to be greater than the possible and unproved benefits.
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