

TWO COMMONLY AVAILABLE “THIRD GENERATION” ASSAYS FOR ANTIBODIES TO THE TSH RECEPTOR (TSHR) ARE SIMILAR IN SENSITIVITY AND SPECIFICITY, BUT DIFFER IN THEIR RESPONSE TO SERA CONTAINING TSHR-BLOCKING IGGs

article recently published data using this index to try to distinguish patients with untreated Graves’ disease from patients with painless thyroiditis; about 15% of the values in one group overlapped the values in the other. (1)] The patients with autoimmune painless thyroiditis also had to have laboratory results showing hyperthyroidism (reflecting transient destruction of thyroid tissue), as well as decreased uptake of ^{99m}Tc (<0.5% at 20 minutes) and/or a decreased vascularity index (<50%).

The authors also studied TSHR-blocking sera obtained from 8 patients with Graves’ disease who had spontaneously become hypothyroid. The IgG from these patients’ sera suppressed production of cAMP in TSH-stimulated pig thyrocytes by >46% (controls were <22%). These 8 sera then were tested for activity in the M22 and Mc4 assays.

RESULTS

The two assays were statistically equivalent in detecting TSHR antibodies in these patients with Graves’ disease, although 2 of the 106 Graves’ sera were negative on both assays. There also were discordant results on 10 sera: 6 were positive only on the Mc4 assay, whereas 4 were positive only on the M22 assay (so the 6 who had lost M22 positivity were false

negatives). Furthermore, there were 5 false positives in the 80 patients with painless thyroiditis: 4 on the Mc4 assay plus 1 on the M22 assay (even though all the patients with painless thyroiditis had to be negative on the screening test with the M22 assay).

In the study on the sera with TSHR-blocking activity, all eight were strongly positive on the M22 TSHR binding assay, whereas not one was positive on the Mc4 cAMP stimulation assay.

CONCLUSIONS

The Mc4 and the M22 assays had equally high sensitivity and specificity on this group of patients with untreated Graves’ disease. If one accepts that the “correct answer” was a positive test, then combining the two assays reduced the number of false negatives to 2 of 106. False positive results occurred in 5 of 80 patients with painless thyroiditis.

The sera containing TSHR-blocking antibodies reacted in the M22 assay as if they were TSHR stimulatory antibodies, since they competed with the M22 for receptors on solubilized porcine thyrocyte membranes. In contrast, none of these sera caused cAMP production in the CHO cells expressing the mutant Mc4 human TSHR.

ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY ● ● ● ● ●

The patients in this study were highly selected. One would hope for a future study that would compare the two tests prospectively on all patients with newly diagnosed hyperthyroidism and that would follow the patients longitudinally for years after therapy is completed. Knowing how TSHR-stimulating and TSHR-blocking antibody levels change over time, as well as the changes in other thyroid antibodies, in thyroid-function tests and in clinical responses such as the presence and severity of ophthalmopathy, would be important for understanding what TSHR anti-

bodies actually do. Such a study would also provide data concerning possible changes in TSHR antibody levels during the clinical course of thyrotoxicosis due to nodular thyroid diseases and in patients with a spectrum of types of painless thyroiditis.

Although these two assays are now in widespread use, a clinician may find it hard to establish which method is actually being used: Current Procedural Terminology codes can be misleading, information provided in test descriptions can be vague, references are often antiquated, and the nomenclature given to

continued on next page

TWO COMMONLY AVAILABLE “THIRD GENERATION” ASSAYS FOR ANTIBODIES TO THE TSH RECEPTOR (TSHR) ARE SIMILAR IN SENSITIVITY AND SPECIFICITY, BUT DIFFER IN THEIR RESPONSE TO SERA CONTAINING TSHR-BLOCKING IGGs

the test seems to be any random combination of the abbreviations for thyrotropin, receptor, and antibody. Nonetheless, it is important to know which test is being performed in order to know what substances can interfere with the test results.

The M22 assay recognized the blocking antibodies as if they were thyroid-stimulating antibodies, whereas the Mc4 assay did not detect any activity. Interestingly, an abstract at the recent ATA meeting (which included two of the current article’s authors), indicated that adding sera containing TSHR-blocking antibodies plus bovine TSH to Mc4-expressing CHO cells reduced the expected cAMP responses, whereas the cAMP response was augmented if TSH-stimulating antibodies were added along with the bovine TSH. This approach could become a way to measure both stimulating and blocking antibodies (2).

A new low-molecular-weight compound has just been reported that blocks the cAMP and phospholipase C responses to TSH, to M22, and to TSHR-stimulating IgG. However the compound does not substantially affect their binding to the TSHR (3). The compound also inhibited the cAMP responses in cells expressing a chimera bearing the N-terminal extracellular domain of the human LH receptor plus the transmembrane and intracellular domains of the human TSHR, whereas it was inactive on cells expressing the reverse construct. This compound may prove useful for exploring how TSHR-blocking and TSHR-stimulating antibodies act, and it even could become the basis of a new kind of therapy for Graves’ hyperthyroidism and/or orbitopathy (3).

— Stephen W. Spaulding, MD

REFERENCES

1. Kamijo K. Study on cutoff value setting for differential diagnosis between Graves’ disease and painless thyroiditis using the TRAb (Elecsys TRAb) measurement via the fully automated electrochemiluminescence immunoassay system. *Endocr J* 2010;57:895-902. Epub August 12, 2010.
2. Olivo PD, Li Y, Kim J, et al. Detection of both thyroid stimulating and blocking antibodies with one bioassay. Abstract 187, Presented at the American Thyroid Association 81st annual meeting, Indian Wells, CA, October 26-30, 2011. E-pub doi:10.1089/thy.2011.2110.abs
3. van Koppen CJ, de Gooyer ME, Karstens W-J, et al. Mechanism of action of a nanomolar potent, allosteric antagonist of the thyroid-stimulating hormone receptor. *Br J Pharmacol*. October 20, 2011 [E-pub ahead of print]. doi: 10.1111/j.1476-5381.2011.01709.x.