



# Prevalence and Regional Distribution of Autoantibodies Against GAD65Ab in a European Population Without Diabetes: The EPIC-InterAct Study

*Diabetes Care* 2015;38:e114–e115 | DOI: 10.2337/dc15-0305

Olov Rolandsson,<sup>1</sup>  
Christiane S. Hampe,<sup>2</sup>  
Patrik Wennberg,<sup>1</sup> Jared Radtke,<sup>2</sup>  
Claudia Langenberg,<sup>3</sup> and  
Nicholas Wareham,<sup>3</sup> for the EPIC-  
InterAct Study Group\*

Geographical differences in type 1 diabetes (T1D) prevalence in Europe have been well documented, but little is known about the geographical distribution of autoantibodies specific to GAD65 (GAD65Ab) in the general population without diabetes, which is reported to range between 0.4 and 3%. However, these studies used different methods to define GAD65Ab positivity with cutoff values based on the 97–99th centile or at +3 SD above the mean among healthy individuals without T1D or type 2 diabetes (T2D). In doing so, the prevalence of GAD65Ab among the study cohorts was, by definition, 1–3%. The application of different cutoff levels greatly impairs the direct comparison of prevalence data between studies. Our aims were to 1) explore the prevalence of GAD65Ab positivity using a cutoff defined by specific competition of antibody binding to radiolabeled GAD65 with added autoantigen across eight European countries and 2) compare characteristics of age, sex, and BMI in relation to GAD65Ab positivity. A center-stratified random subcohort of 16,835 (4.9%) individuals was selected from the original European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC)-InterAct study (1). After exclusion

of individuals with known diabetes, GAD65Ab were analyzed in 15,802 (men/women 5,927/9,875, mean age  $52.4 \pm 9.2$  years) samples. The cutoff for GAD65Ab positivity was determined through a competition assay at  $\geq 65$  WHO units/mL, and all samples were analyzed at a single laboratory using a radioligand binding assay (2).

In all, 316/15,802 (2.0%) samples were GAD65Ab positive. Sweden, Denmark, U.K., and Spain had the highest and France had the lowest prevalence of GAD65Ab positivity (Table 1); however, these differences were not statistically significant ( $P = 0.80$ ). We did not detect any association between GAD65Ab positivity and age, sex, or BMI.

This lack of geographical differences in GAD65Ab prevalence in healthy adults is in contrast to the established differences in incidence of T1D in children in Europe, with the Scandinavian countries having the highest incidence, while lower incidence rates are found in southern Europe with the exception of Sardinia (3). These differences have been attributed mainly to genetic, but also environmental, differences between the countries. A detailed analysis of the underlying HLA types of the

participants in our subcohort will be necessary to determine whether GAD65Ab positivity in healthy individuals is associated with distinct HLA haplotypes, as has been previously established in T1D patients (4). Moreover, in contrast to previous studies (5), we found no association between GAD65Ab positivity and age, sex, or BMI. We conclude that GAD65Ab positivity in healthy adults is not associated with geographical location, BMI, age, or sex. While the practice of defining autoantibody positivity on the basis of a distribution is useful when

**Table 1—Prevalence of GAD65Ab positivity in the subcohort by country**

	<i>n</i>	%	95% CI
Sweden	2,730	2.2	1.6–2.7
Denmark	2,092	2.2	1.5–2.8
Germany	2,045	1.5	1.0–2.0
The Netherlands	1,476	1.9	1.2–2.6
U.K.	1,301	2.2	1.4–2.9
France	580	1.2	0.3–2.1
Spain	3,570	2.2	1.8–2.7
Italy	2,008	1.9	1.3–2.5
Overall	15,802	2.0	1.8–2.2

Data are presented as total number (*n*), prevalence (%) of GAD65Ab positivity, and 95% CI.

<sup>1</sup>Division of Family Medicine, Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

<sup>2</sup>Division of Metabolism, Endocrinology and Nutrition, Department of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

<sup>3</sup>MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Institute of Metabolic Science, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Cambridge, U.K.

Corresponding author: Olov Rolandsson, olov.rolandsson@umu.se.

This article contains Supplementary Data online at <http://care.diabetesjournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.2337/dc15-0305/-/DC1>.

\*A complete list of the members of the EPIC-InterAct Study Group can be found in the Supplementary Data online.

© 2015 by the American Diabetes Association. Readers may use this article as long as the work is properly cited, the use is educational and not for profit, and the work is not altered.

comparing antibody frequencies between control subjects and patients, it is less informative when analyzing antibody levels in a population cohort or when comparing the prevalence of positivity between populations.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors thank all EPIC participants and staff for their contribution to this study. The authors thank Nicola Kerrison (MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge) for managing the data and Matt Sims (MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge) for managing the blood samples for the EPIC-InterAct project.

**Funding.** Funding for the InterAct project was provided by the EU FP6 program (grant number LSHM\_CT\_2006\_037197). The autoantibody measurement was funded by Västerbotten County Council and Umeå University, Sweden (to O.R.), the National Institutes of Health (DK26190 and DK017047) (to C.S.H.), and by the Medical Research Council (MC\_UU\_12015/1) (N.W.).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

**Duality of Interest.** No potential conflicts of interest relevant to this article were reported.

**Author Contributions.** O.R., C.S.H., C.L., and N.W. were responsible for study conception and design and acquisition of data, contributed to statistical analyses and interpretation, drafted the manuscript, and obtained funding. P.W. contributed to statistical analyses and interpretation of data and critically revised the manuscript. J.R. carried out the sample analyses and reviewed the manuscript critically. All authors gave final approval of the version of the manuscript to be published. O.R. is the guarantor of this work and, as such, had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

## References

1. Langenberg C, Sharp S, Forouhi NG, et al.; InterAct Consortium. Design and cohort description of the InterAct Project: an examination

of the interaction of genetic and lifestyle factors on the incidence of type 2 diabetes in the EPIC study. *Diabetologia* 2011;54:2272–2282

2. Hampe CS, Hall TR, Agren A, Rolandsson O. Longitudinal changes in epitope recognition of autoantibodies against glutamate decarboxylase 65 (GAD65Ab) in prediabetic adults developing diabetes. *Clin Exp Immunol* 2007;148:72–78

3. Borchers AT, Uibo R, Gershwin ME. The geoepidemiology of type 1 diabetes. *Autoimmun Rev* 2010;9:A355–A365

4. Graham J, Hagopian WA, Kockum I, et al.; Diabetes Incidence in Sweden Study Group; Swedish Childhood Diabetes Study Group. Genetic effects on age-dependent onset and islet cell autoantibody markers in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes* 2002;51:1346–1355

5. Rolandsson O, Hägg E, Hampe C, et al. Glutamate decarboxylase (GAD65) and tyrosine phosphatase-like protein (IA-2) autoantibodies index in a regional population is related to glucose intolerance and body mass index. *Diabetologia* 1999;42:555–559