

# Prevalence and association testing of antinuclear antibodies and inflammatory bowel disease in Taiwan

Tsai-Min Yang<sup>1,\*</sup>, Fang-Ting Lu<sup>2,3,\*</sup>, Hsu-Heng Yen<sup>1,4</sup> and Yang-Yuan Chen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Division of Gastroenterology, Changhua Christian Hospital, Changhua, Taiwan

<sup>2</sup> Frontier Molecular Medical Research Center in Children, Changhua Christian Children Hospital, Changhua, Taiwan

<sup>3</sup> Department of Pediatrics, Changhua Christian Children Hospital, Changhua, Taiwan

<sup>4</sup> Post-Baccalaureate Medicine, College of Medicine, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung, Taichung, Taiwan

\* These authors contributed equally to this work.

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), including Crohn's disease (CD) and ulcerative colitis (UC), are characterized by chronic inflammation of the gastrointestinal tract. Antinuclear antibodies (ANAs), which are autoantibodies directed against nuclear components, are commonly present in various autoimmune disorders. We investigated the prevalence and clinical significance of ANAs in Taiwanese patients with IBD.

**Methods:** From January 2017 to December 2024, ANA status was checked at initial diagnosis of IBD in patients from a medical center in central Taiwan. Risk factors for ANA positivity were evaluated.

**Results:** Of the 166 patients in this study, 57 had CD and 109 had UC. ANA test results were positive (titers of  $\geq 1:160$ ) in 26 patients (15.7%). Older age at disease diagnosis ( $p < 0.05$ ) and a diagnosis of UC ( $p < 0.05$ ) were statistically significant risk factors for ANA positivity. Gender ( $p = 0.31$ ), use of advanced therapy ( $p = 0.66$ ), and the presence of extraintestinal manifestations (EIMs) ( $p = 0.14$ ) were not associated with ANA positivity. The response to anti-tumor necrosis factor therapy did not differ between ANA-positive and ANA-negative patients ( $p = 0.34$ ). The most frequent ANA staining patterns were AC1, AC3, and AC4.

**Conclusions:** These findings suggest that although ANA positivity is relatively common among Taiwanese patients with IBD, particularly among older UC patients. Further validation is required to explore the clinical implications of ANA positivity in Asian population.

**Subjects** Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Rheumatology

**Keywords** Inflammatory bowel disease, Crohn's disease, Ulcerative colitis, Autoimmune, Anti-nuclear antibody

## INTRODUCTION

Inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), which comprises primarily Crohn's disease (CD) and ulcerative colitis (UC), is characterized by chronic inflammation of the gastrointestinal

Submitted 7 April 2025

Accepted 4 November 2025

Published 28 November 2025

Corresponding author

Hsu-Heng Yen,  
blaneyen@gmail.com

Academic editor

Faiza Farhan

Additional Information and  
Declarations can be found on  
page 10

DOI 10.7717/peerj.20474

© Copyright  
2025 Yang et al.

Distributed under  
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

**OPEN ACCESS**

tract, which causes debilitating symptoms such as abdominal pain, diarrhea, and weight loss. The causes of IBD are multifactorial and comprise interactions among genetic factors, environmental factors, the immune system, and microbiota ([Abraham & Medzhitov, 2011](#); [Ananthakrishnan, 2015](#); [da Rosa Utiyama et al., 2001](#)). The exact cause of IBD remains unclear, but immune dysregulation plays a pivotal role in its pathophysiologic processes. Recent studies have identified antinuclear antibodies (ANAs) as biomarkers significantly associated with autoimmune conditions, including IBD, which may reflect an aberrant immune response in affected individuals. The presence of ANAs may indicate heightened autoimmune activity and can complicate the clinical presentation of IBD. Several studies have reported that ANA positivity is more frequently observed in patients with UC than in those with CD ([Folwaczny et al., 1997](#); [García et al., 2022](#); [Zauli et al., 1985](#)). In patients with IBD, ANA positivity has also been observed both as part of the disease itself and in relation to therapy, particularly anti-tumor necrosis factor (anti-TNF) treatment, which is associated with ANA positivity in 20–45% of cases and the development of lupus-like syndrome (LLS) in up to 5% ([Vaglio et al., 2018](#)). However, data on the global prevalence of ANA in IBD, and on their associations with disease severity, treatment response, and seroconversion following biologic therapy, remain scarce ([García et al., 2022](#)).

In Taiwan, the incidence and prevalence of IBD are rising ([Huang et al., 2025](#); [Yen et al., 2024](#)). The genetic susceptibility loci identified in Western patients, such as NOD2, occur less frequently in Taiwanese populations ([Hsiao et al., 2007](#)), whereas other loci may play more prominent roles ([Tung et al., 2014](#)). In Taiwan, traditional diets rich in rice, legumes, soy products, and tea appear protective against IBD, whereas Western diets high in red meat, dairy, and ultra-processed foods have been linked to increased disease risk, underscoring cultural differences that may partly explain regional variations in IBD prevalence ([Meng et al., 2025](#)). These distinct genetic and environmental factors may contribute to differences in the prevalence of both IBD and ANA positivity between Western and Asian populations ([Guo et al., 2014](#)).

The correlation between ANA positivity and the presence of extraintestinal manifestations (EIMs), disease severity, and response to biologic therapy has been studied ([García et al., 2022](#)); however, data specific to Asian populations remain limited. To address this knowledge gap, we examined the prevalence and risk factors of ANA in a Taiwanese cohort of patients with IBD.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Patient population

This study was conducted at Changhua Christian Hospital, Changhua, Taiwan, from January 2017 to December 2024. We enrolled patients with diagnoses of IBD, including CD and UC, for whom ANA status was checked at initial diagnosis. Demographic, clinical, and laboratory data were reviewed retrospectively. Specific demographic and clinical parameters, such as disease activity, gastrointestinal tract involvement, EIMs, advanced therapy use, and treatment response, were evaluated.

## Method of ANA analysis

To measure ANA levels, we used HEp-20-10 cells (EUROIMMUN, Luebeck, Germany) in indirect immunofluorescence assay. Patients were classified as ANA positive if the titer values were  $\geq 1:160$  (García *et al.*, 2022).

## Ethical considerations

The Ethics Committee of Changhua Christian Hospital approved the study protocol (CCH IRB No.: 250114). The requirement for informed consent was waived because of the retrospective nature of the study.

## Statistical analysis

Data for categorical variables were calculated as numbers and percentages. Those for continuous variables were calculated as means and standard deviations for normally distributed data and as medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs) for nonnormally distributed data. The distribution of continuous variables was examined in a one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. To compare categorical variables, we used the chi-square or Fisher’s exact test; to compare continuous variables, we used Student’s *t* test or the Mann–Whitney *U*-test, as appropriate. Multivariable logistic regression analysis was performed to identify factors associated with ANA positivity. We used MedCalc<sup>®</sup> statistical software, version 23.0.2 (MedCalc Software Ltd, Ostend, Belgium; <https://www.medcalc.org>; 2024), to perform statistical analysis. Results with a *p* value of  $<0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

# RESULTS

## Clinical features of the study population

A total of 166 adult patients with IBD—57 with CD and 109 with UC—participated in this study. The baseline characteristics, with comparisons between CD and UC, are listed in Table 1. Joint EIMs, the most prevalent EIMs in the study population, affected similar proportions of patients with CD and UC ( $p = 0.93$ ). Patients with CD, in comparison with those with UC, had higher rates of bowel resection ( $p < 0.01$ ) and appendectomy ( $p < 0.05$ ) and received more steroids ( $p < 0.05$ ), azathioprine ( $p < 0.01$ ), and biologics ( $p < 0.01$ ). Similar biologic medications were used by patients with CD and UC; vedolizumab was used more commonly by patients with UC than by those with CD ( $p < 0.01$ ). Of the patients with CD, the majority received one line of biologics, less than one third received a second line, and a tiny minority received a third line; of those with UC, the majority received one line of biologics, and fewer received second and third lines. ANA positivity was much more common among patients with UC than among those with CD ( $p < 0.05$ ). In addition, CD was associated with certain environmental factors, such as smoking ( $p = 0.06$ ), prior bowel resection ( $p < 0.01$ ), and appendectomy ( $p < 0.05$ ).

## The clinical correlation of specific IBD with ANA positivity

In this study, a total of 26 patients (15.7%) tested positive for ANA. The baseline characteristics, with comparisons between CD and UC, are listed in Table 2. ANA-positive

**Table 1** The baseline characteristics of patients with IBD.

| Variables   | CD ( <i>n</i> = 57) | UC ( <i>n</i> = 109) | <i>p</i> value |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Median age at diagnosis (IQR), years                | 30 (20.75–53.5)     | 37 (28.75–48.5)      | 0.18           |
| Gender: male, <i>n</i>                              | 36 (63.2%)          | 68 (62.4%)           | 0.92           |
| Smoking, <i>n</i>                                   |                     |                      | 0.06           |
| Current   | 3 (5.3%)            | 2 (1.8%)             |                |
| Ever  | 2 (3.5%)            | 0 (0%)               |                |
| No  | 52 (91.2%)          | 107 (98.2%)          |                |
| Alcohol consumption, <i>n</i> (%)                   | 2 (3.5%)            | 2 (1.8%)             | 0.51           |
| CD location, <i>n</i> <sup>*</sup>                  |                     |                      | –              |
| L1  | 23 (40.4%)          | –                    |                |
| L2  | 4 (7%)              | –                    |                |
| L3  | 26 (45.6%)          | –                    |                |
| L4  | 4 (7%)              | –                    |                |
| CD behavior, <i>n</i> <sup>†</sup>                  |                     |                      | –              |
| B1  | 21 (36.8%)          | –                    |                |
| B2  | 22 (38.6%)          | –                    |                |
| B3  | 14 (24.6%)          | –                    |                |
| Perianal disease                                    | 8 (14%)             | –                    | –              |
| UC location, <i>n</i> <sup>‡</sup>                  |                     |                      | –              |
| E1  | –                   | 20 (18.3%)           |                |
| E2  | –                   | 33 (30.3%)           |                |
| E3  | –                   | 56 (51.4%)           |                |
| EIMs in joints, <i>n</i>                            | 6 (10.5%)           | 11 (10.1%)           | 0.93           |
| EIMs in skin, <i>n</i>                              | 2 (3.5%)            | 4 (3.7%)             | 0.96           |
| EIMs in eyes, <i>n</i>                              | 0 (0%)              | 0 (0%)               | –              |
| ANA positivity, <i>n</i>                            | 4 (7%)              | 22 (20.2%)           | 0.03           |
| Bowel resection, <i>n</i>                           | 15 (26.3%)          | 0 (0%)               | <0.01          |
| Appendectomy, <i>n</i>                              | 2 (3.5%)            | 0 (0%)               | <0.05          |
| Use of Steroids, <i>n</i>                           | 20 (35.1%)          | 20 (18.3%)           | 0.02           |
| Use of 5-ASA, <i>n</i>                              | 27 (47.4%)          | 72 (66.1%)           | 0.02           |
| Use of AZA, <i>n</i>                                | 23 (40.4%)          | 12 (11.0%)           | <0.01          |
| Use of any biologics, <i>n</i>                      | 38 (66.7%)          | 32 (29.4%)           | <0.01          |
| Numbers of lines of biologics used, <i>n</i>        |                     |                      | 0.50           |
| One   | 25 (65.8%)          | 21 (65.6%)           |                |
| Two   | 12 (31.6%)          | 7 (21.9%)            |                |
| Three   | 1 (2.6%)            | 4 (12.5%)            |                |
| Use of IFX, <i>n</i> <sup>§</sup>                   | 7 (18.4%)           | 5 (15.6%)            | 0.76           |
| Use of adalimumab (Humira), <i>n</i> <sup>§</sup>   | 16 (42.1%)          | 12 (37.5%)           | 0.70           |
| Use of vedolizumab, <i>n</i> <sup>§</sup>           | 16 (42.1%)          | 24 (75.0%)           | <0.01          |
| Use of ustekinumab (Stelara), <i>n</i> <sup>§</sup> | 13 (34.2%)          | 6 (18.8%)            | 0.15           |

**Notes:**
<sup>\*</sup> L1, terminal ileum; L2, colon; L3, ileocolon; L4, multiple upper gastrointestinal locations.

<sup>†</sup> B1, nonstricturing and nonpenetrating inflammation; B2, stricturing inflammation; B3, penetrating inflammation.

<sup>‡</sup> E1, proctitis; E2, left-sided colitis; E3, pancolitis.

<sup>§</sup> Proportions were calculated as the number of patients receiving a particular biologic divided by the number receiving any biologic.

ANA, antinuclear antibody; 5-ASA, 5-aminosalicylic acid; AZA, azathioprine; CD, Crohn's disease; EIM, extraintestinal manifestation; IFX, infliximab; IQR, interquartile range; UC, ulcerative colitis.

patients were generally older at diagnosis than were ANA-negative patients ( $p < 0.05$ ). We found no statistically significant differences in EIMs, surgical history, modality of medical therapy, or treatment with biologics between the two groups. Multivariate analysis identified age at diagnosis as a significant risk factor for ANA positivity (odds ratio (OR) 1.03, 95% confidence interval (CI) [1.00–1.06],  $p < 0.05$ ). In contrast, Crohn's disease was inversely associated with ANA positivity (OR 0.27, 95% CI [0.08–0.90],  $p < 0.05$ ), suggesting a lower likelihood of ANA detection in CD compared with UC. Neither the use of biologics (OR 1.30, 95% CI [0.49–3.44],  $p = 0.60$ ) nor the presence of extraintestinal manifestations (OR 2.30, 95% CI [0.76–6.96],  $p = 0.14$ ) was significantly associated with ANA status (Table 3).

When evaluating response to first-line advanced therapy, no significant association was observed between baseline ANA status and treatment outcomes. Among patients receiving anti-TNF therapy, 80.8% of ANA-negative patients and 100% of ANA-positive patients achieved a primary response ( $p = 0.34$ ). Similarly, in those treated with anti-integrin therapy, 92.0% of ANA-negative and 100% of ANA-positive patients responded ( $p = 0.48$ ) (Table 4).

### ANA pattern frequency and titers

Among the 26 ANA-positive patients (22 UC patients and four CD patients), the ANA patterns and titers were further classified into various anti-cell (AC) categories, according to the International Consensus on Antinuclear Antibody Patterns (ICAP) (Chan et al., 2015) coding of HEp-2 patterns on immunofluorescence assay (Tables 5 and 6). Of the 26 patients, 6 exhibited two AC patterns, and two exhibited three AC patterns. When stratifying patients into UC and CD groups, patients with UC demonstrated a higher frequency and broader diversity of ANA patterns. The most common pattern was AC1 ( $n = 14$ ), followed by AC4 ( $n = 4$ ), AC3 ( $n = 3$ ), and AC8 ( $n = 3$ ). Less frequent patterns included AC2, AC19, AC21, AC26, AC27, and AC6 (all  $n = 1$ –2). ANA titers in UC ranged widely from 1:160 to 1:2,560, with AC3 showing particularly high titers (median 1:640) compared with other subtypes. In contrast, Crohn's disease (CD) showed fewer ANA-positive cases and more heterogeneous patterns. AC1 was identified in two patients (titers 1:320–1:640), while single cases of AC3 (1:160), AC11 (1:2,560), and AC21 (1:2,560) were observed.

## DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, our study is one of the first studies on the prevalence and risk factors of ANA positivity among patients with IBD in Taiwan and investigation of the relationship between the presence of ANA before any treatment and the types of and response to medical therapy. We have collected data on the frequency of ANA patterns and titers in our patient population.

Our findings indicated that ANA positivity had a prevalence of 16.25% among patients with IBD. Previous studies had also shown that the prevalence of ANA positivity among patients with IBD (13.6–53.5%) was higher than that in the global healthy population (Barahona-Garrido et al., 2009; Garcia-Planella et al., 2003; García et al., 2022); however,

**Table 2** Comparison of ANA-positive and ANA-negative patients with IBD.

| Variables                                   | ANA-positive ( <i>n</i> = 26) | ANA-negative ( <i>n</i> = 140) | <i>p</i> value |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Median age at diagnosis (IQR), years        | 43 (32.0–53.0)                | 35 (25.0–48.0)                 | <0.05          |
| Gender: male, <i>n</i>                      | 14 (53.8%)                    | 90 (64.3%)                     | 0.31           |
| Disease: CD, <i>n</i>                       | 4 (15.4%)                     | 53 (37.9%)                     | 0.03           |
| Any EIM, <i>n</i>                           | 6 (23.1%)                     | 17 (12.1%)                     | 0.14           |
| EIMs of joints, <i>n</i>                    | 3 (11.5%)                     | 14 (10.0%)                     | 0.81           |
| EIMs of skin, <i>n</i>                      | 1 (3.8%)                      | 5 (3.6%)                       | 0.95           |
| EIMs of eyes, <i>n</i>                      | 0 (0%)                        | 0 (0%)                         | –              |
| Surgical history                            |                               |                                |                |
| Bowel resection, <i>n</i>                   | 0 (0%)                        | 15 (10.7%)                     | 0.08           |
| Appendectomy, <i>n</i>                      | 0 (0%)                        | 2 (1.4%)                       | 0.54           |
| Medical therapy                             |                               |                                |                |
| Use of steroids, <i>n</i>                   | 6 (23.1%)                     | 34 (24.3%)                     | 0.90           |
| Use of 5-ASA, <i>n</i>                      | 20 (76.9%)                    | 79 (56.4%)                     | 0.05           |
| Use of AZA, <i>n</i>                        | 5 (19.2%)                     | 30 (21.4%)                     | 0.80           |
| Use of any biologics, <i>n</i>              | 10 (38.5%)                    | 60 (42.9%)                     | 0.66           |
| Number of lines of biologics used, <i>n</i> |                               |                                | 0.53           |
| One   | 7 (70%)                       | 39 (65%)                       |                |
| Two   | 3 (30%)                       | 16 (26.7%)                     |                |
| Three                                       | 0 (0%)                        | 5 (8.3%)                       |                |
| CD location, <i>n</i> <sup>*</sup>          |                               |                                | 0.47           |
| L1  | 1 (25.0%)                     | 22 (41.5%)                     |                |
| L2  | 1 (25.0%)                     | 3 (5.7%)                       |                |
| L3  | 1 (50.0%)                     | 24 (45.3%)                     |                |
| L4  | 0 (0%)                        | 4 (7.5%)                       |                |
| CD behavior, <i>n</i> <sup>†</sup>          |                               |                                | 0.03           |
| B1  | 4 (100%)                      | 17 (32.1%)                     |                |
| B2  | 0 (0%)                        | 22 (41.5%)                     |                |
| B3  | 0 (0%)                        | 14 (26.4%)                     |                |
| UC location, <i>n</i> <sup>‡</sup>          |                               |                                | 0.11           |
| E1  | 1 (4.5%)                      | 19 (21.8%)                     |                |
| E2  | 6 (27.3%)                     | 27 (31.0%)                     |                |
| E3  | 15 (68.2%)                    | 41 (47.1%)                     |                |

**Notes:**

<sup>\*</sup> L1, terminal ileum; L2, colon; L3, ileocolon; L4, multiple upper gastrointestinal locations.

<sup>†</sup> B1, nonstricturing and nonpenetrating inflammation; B2, stricturing inflammation; B3, penetrating inflammation.

<sup>‡</sup> E1, proctitis; E2, left-sided colitis; E3, pancolitis.

ANA, antinuclear antibody; CD, Crohn's disease; EIM, extraintestinal manifestation; IBD, inflammatory bowel disease; IQR, interquartile range; UC, ulcerative colitis.

recent studies indicate that the prevalence of ANA titers of >1:80 is increasing in healthy populations, ranging from 14.01% to 16.1% (Dinse et al., 2022; Li et al., 2019). As ANA prevalence increases in the healthy population, clinicians must be more cautious and rigorous when interpreting the relationship between ANA positivity and autoimmunity. According to our findings, ANA positivity was not associated with gender, but it was more

**Table 3** Risk factors related to ANA positivity.

| Variables        | <i>p</i> value | OR   | 95% CI      |
|------------------|----------------|------|-------------|
| Age at diagnosis | <0.05          | 1.03 | [1.00–1.06] |
| Disease type: CD | <0.05          | 0.27 | [0.08–0.90] |
| Use of biologics | 0.60           | 1.30 | [0.45–3.44] |
| Presence of EIM  | 0.14           | 2.30 | [0.76–6.96] |

**Note:**

ANA, antinuclear antibody; CD, Crohn's disease; CI, confidence interval; EIM, extraintestinal manifestation; OR, odds ratio.

**Table 4** Response to first-line advanced therapy according to ANA status at baseline.

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| Anti-TNF as first-line medication ( <i>n</i> = 30; <i>p</i> = 0.34)      |  |   |
| Primary response   | ANA-negative patients ( <i>n</i> = 26 [86.7%]) | ANA-positive patients ( <i>n</i> = 4 [13.3%]) |
| No response  | 5 (19.2%)                                      | 0 (0%)  |
| Response   | 21 (80.8%)                                     | 4 (100%)                                      |
| Anti-integrin as first-line medication ( <i>n</i> = 31; <i>p</i> = 0.48) |  |   |
| Primary response   | ANA-negative patients ( <i>n</i> = 25 [80.6%]) | ANA-positive patients ( <i>n</i> = 6 [19.4%]) |
| No response  | 2 (8.0%)                                       | 0 (0%)  |
| Response   | 23 (92.0%)                                     | 6 (100%)                                      |

**Note:**

ANA, antinuclear antibody; TNF, tumor necrosis factor.

**Table 5** ANA patterns: frequency and titers in UC patients\*.

| Anti-cell (AC) pattern | ANA titers, <i>n</i> |             |           |            |           | <i>n</i> (%) |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|
|                        | 1:160                | 1:320       | 1:640     | 1:1,280    | 1:2,560   |              |
| AC1                    | 7                    | 3           | 0         | 3          | 1         | 14 (45.16%)  |
| AC2                    | 1                    | 1           | 0         | 0          | 0         | 2 (6.45%)    |
| AC3                    | 1                    | 0           | 1         | 1          | 0         | 3 (9.68%)    |
| AC4                    | 1                    | 3           | 0         | 0          | 0         | 4 (12.90%)   |
| AC6                    | 0                    | 1           | 0         | 0          | 0         | 1 (3.23%)    |
| AC8                    | 2                    | 1           | 0         | 0          | 0         | 3 (9.68%)    |
| AC19                   | 1                    | 0           | 0         | 0          | 0         | 1 (3.23%)    |
| AC21                   | 1                    | 0           | 0         | 0          | 1         | 1 (3.23%)    |
| AC26                   | 0                    | 1           | 0         | 0          | 0         | 1 (3.23%)    |
| AC27                   | 1                    | 0           | 0         | 0          | 0         | 1 (3.23%)    |
| <i>n</i> (%)           | 15 (48.39%)          | 10 (32.26%) | 1 (3.23%) | 4 (12.90%) | 1 (3.23%) | 31 (100%)    |

**Notes:**

\* Of the 22 ANA-positive patients, 5 had two AC patterns and 2 had three AC patterns.  
ANA, antinuclear antibody.

**Table 6** ANA patterns: frequency and titers in CD patients\*.

| Anti-cell (AC) pattern | ANA titers, <i>n</i> |         |         |         |         | <i>n</i> (%) |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|
|                        | 1:160                | 1:320   | 1:640   | 1:1,280 | 1:2,560 |              |
| AC1                    | 0                    | 1       | 1       | 0       | 0       | 2 (40%)      |
| AC3                    | 0                    | 0       | 0       | 0       | 1       | 1 (20%)      |
| AC11                   | 1                    | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       | 1 (20%)      |
| AC21                   | 0                    | 0       | 0       | 0       | 1       | 1 (20%)      |
| <i>n</i> (%)           | 1 (20%)              | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%)  | 2 (40%) | 5 (100%)     |

**Notes:**

\* Of the 4 ANA positive patients, 1 had two AC pattern.  
ANA, antinuclear antibody.

common among older individuals and among patients with UC. In the past, many investigators have reported a higher proportion of ANA positivity among patients with UC than among those with CD (Folwaczny et al., 1997; García et al., 2022; Zauli et al., 1985); however, the underlying pathophysiologic reasons remain unclear. IBD is a complex, immunologically mediated disease involving interactions among genetic, immunologic, and environmental factors and microbiota; therefore, the higher prevalence of ANA positivity in UC may reflect the autoimmune nature of the disease, whereas CD may be more genetically determined, environmentally related, or associated with autoinflammation. Our study also identified certain environmental factors, such as smoking, prior bowel resection, and appendectomy that were correlated with CD.

ANA positivity was not predictive of EIM presence in our study (Table 2). Previous studies also showed little association between ANA positivity and EIMs (Folwaczny et al., 1997; García et al., 2022). The exact relationship between IBD and EIMs remains unclear. Hypotheses regarding the pathophysiologic process of the extensive immune response include ectopic expression of adhesion molecules and chemokines outside the gut, microbial antigen cross-reactivity, microbial antigen translocation, a shift in inflammatory tone, or systemic changes in innate immune function (Faggiani et al., 2024). High titers of ANA represent high sensitivity but low specificity for immune function; thus, ANA data provide valuable clinical clues for the diagnosis of autoimmune diseases and autoimmune reactions. The negative association between ANA and EIMs may suggest that autoimmunity is less associated with EIM in our IBD patients.

In our cohort, we found no correlation between initial ANA positivity before any treatment and types of therapy (steroids, azathioprine, or any biologics). According to the official recommendations of the European Crohn's and Colitis Organization and the American Gastroenterological Association (Feuerstein et al., 2020; Gordon et al., 2024; Raine et al., 2022), the choice of medical therapy was based on disease severity, response to clinical treatment, and the physician's clinical judgment. For most autoimmune diseases, ANA, representing immune titers for the diagnosis of autoimmune disease, is not considered in the determination of disease severity. In IBD, as with other autoimmune diseases, ANA probably plays an insignificant role in disease severity and is therefore unrelated to the type of medical therapy. Furthermore, patients with IBD and ANA

positivity responded similar to both anti-TNF medication ( $p = 0.34$ ) and anti-integrin ( $p = 0.48$ ) in our study than ANA negative population. The ANA positivity was not correlated with the use of second- or third-line biologics ( $p = 0.53$ ). In contrast, ANA was previously reported to be linked to poor response to anti-TNF therapy; the poor responses included the development of adverse events ([Santos-Antunes et al., 2016](#)), infusion reactions, and shorter duration of treatment response ([Baert et al., 2003](#); [Theodoraki et al., 2022](#)). Although our study had a small sample size bias, a possible explanation for the inconsistency could be the different population characteristics, such as ethnicity and environment. The population in our study consisted entirely of Asian individuals in Taiwan; Asian ethnicity is regarded as a “low-incidence” ethnicity and Taiwan as a “low-incidence” region in the world. The genetic and environmental factors may not only reflect the different incidences of IBD but also contribute to disease severity and response to biologic therapy.

In contrast to previous studies, we not only measured ANA titers in patients with IBD but also investigated the ANA patterns according to the ICAP classifications within the population. To our knowledge, no studies to date have specifically reported ANA patterns in IBD using the ICAP classification ([García et al., 2022](#)). In our cohort, the most common ANA titer was 1:160, and the most common ANA pattern was AC1, followed by AC3 and AC4. All three ANA patterns reflect the nucleolar pattern of ANA staining. The AC1 pattern is most common in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and type 1 autoimmune hepatitis, whereas the AC3 and AC4 patterns are associated with systemic sclerosis (scleroderma). However, because of the relatively small sample size, no definitive clinical implications can be drawn from the indirect immunofluorescence findings associated with ANA positivity in our cohort. Nonetheless, our observation of AC-1, AC-3, and AC-4 as the predominant ANA patterns in IBD may indicate a partial overlap with systemic autoimmunity, but without the same clinical significance. In systemic autoimmune diseases, these patterns often serve as important diagnostic or prognostic markers ([Chan et al., 2015](#); [Damoiseaux et al., 2019](#)). In contrast, their presence in IBD most likely reflects broader immune dysregulation rather than a disease-specific signature. Thus, further larger-scale studies are required to explore the different ICAP patterns in the IBD population.

Our investigation had several limitations. First, the number of cases was relatively low because it was conducted in a single medical center and because the prevalence of IBD among the Taiwanese population is low ([Chung et al., 2025](#); [Lee, Yen & Chen, 2025](#); [Yang et al., 2022, 2024](#); [Yen et al., 2023](#)). Second, the study was retrospective, and ANA titers were not periodically monitored to observe their chronologic changes. Because ANA titers were measured at baseline, before initiation of any biologic or immunomodulator therapy, the observed ANA positivity in this Taiwanese IBD cohort likely reflects pre-existing autoimmunity rather than drug-induced autoantibody formation and thus occurred independently of TNFi exposure. In patients with undetectable ANA levels before the beginning of biologic therapy, earlier research demonstrated positive seroconversion of ANA in follow-up visits during anti-TNF therapy, which may lead to the treatment failure of anti-TNF medications ([Atzeni et al., 2005](#); [Atzeni & Sarzi-Puttini, 2008](#); [García et al.,](#)

2022; Hanauer, 1999; Theodoraki et al., 2022; Vermeire et al., 2003). Sequential reduction of ANA titers after immunomodulator therapy and during simultaneous administration of an immunomodulator and biologic therapy was reported previously (Beigel et al., 2011; García et al., 2022). We did not assess sequential changes in ANA titers with respect to age, disease severity, treatment modality particularly newer agents such as interleukin inhibitors (Chung et al., 2025) or Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors (Chen, Yen & Chen, 2025) and other potential influencing factors in the present study. Third, subsequent autoantibody workups were inconsistent because of referrals to various rheumatologists. When a patient tests positive for ANA, a rheumatologic evaluation is recommended, but further investigation may depend on individual rheumatologists' practice. Moreover, antineutrophil cytoplasmic antibody (ANCA) or other autoimmune profiles were not checked because ANA is only routinely screened at the baseline during the initial diagnosis of IBD. Except for ANA, other autoantibodies, such as ANCA, anti-CBir1, and anti-Saccharomyces cerevisiae antibody (ASCA) (Vermeire et al., 2008), are also associated with IBD. Last, we did not exclude patients with other autoimmune diseases, such as systemic lupus erythematosus, Sjögren's syndrome, and autoimmune hepatitis, from our study. Such patients may have been ANA positive as a result of underlying autoimmune disease, which would have led to statistical bias in our study.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study revealed that although ANA positivity is relatively common among Taiwanese patients with IBD, particularly older individuals and those with UC. To our knowledge, this study is the first investigation of the relationship between the presence of ANA before any treatment and the modality of medical therapy. Nevertheless, several important questions remain. Future studies should determine whether ANA positivity predicts long-term outcomes such as treatment durability, risk of adverse events, or development of other autoimmune comorbidities. In addition, prospective studies with larger multi-center Asian cohorts and longitudinal monitoring of ANA titers are needed to clarify whether ANA seroconversion during biologic therapy influences treatment response. Exploration of other autoantibodies in parallel with ANA may further refine our understanding of autoimmune profiles in Asian patients with IBD.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the preparation of this work, the authors used Copilot software and ChatGPT to enhance language and readability. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

### Funding

The authors received funding for this manuscript from the Changhua Christian Hospital (114-CCH-IRP-007, 113-CCH-IRP-007 and 112-CCH-IRP-033). The funders had no role

in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

### Grant Disclosures

The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:

Changhua Christian Hospital: 114-CCH-IRP-007, 113-CCH-IRP-007, 112-CCH-IRP-033.

### Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### Author Contributions

- Tsai-Min Yang conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Fang-Ting Lu conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Hsu-Heng Yen conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the article, and approved the final draft.
- Yang-Yuan Chen analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, and approved the final draft.

### Human Ethics

The following information was supplied relating to ethical approvals (*i.e.*, approving body and any reference numbers):

Changhua Christian Hospital.

### Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

The raw data is available in the [Supplemental Files](#).

### Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.20474#supplemental-information>.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham C, Medzhitov R. 2011. Interactions between the host innate immune system and microbes in inflammatory bowel disease. *Gastroenterology* **140**(6):1729–1737 DOI [10.1053/j.gastro.2011.02.012](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2011.02.012).
- Ananthakrishnan AN. 2015. Epidemiology and risk factors for IBD. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology* **12**(4):205–217 DOI [10.1038/nrgastro.2015.34](https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2015.34).
- Atzeni F, Ardizzone S, Sarzi-Puttini P, Colombo E, Maconi G, De Portu S, Carrabba M, Bianchi Porro G. 2005. Autoantibody profile during short-term infliximab treatment for

- Crohn's disease: a prospective cohort study. *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 22(5):453–461 DOI 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2005.02576.x.
- Atzeni F, Sarzi-Puttini P. 2008. Autoantibody production in patients treated with anti-TNF- $\alpha$ . *Expert Review of Clinical Immunology* 4(2):275–280 DOI 10.1586/1744666x.4.2.275.
- Baert F, Noman M, Vermeire S, Van Assche G, D'Haens G, Carbonez A, Rutgeerts P. 2003. Influence of immunogenicity on the long-term efficacy of infliximab in Crohn's disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 348(7):601–608 DOI 10.1056/NEJMoa020888.
- Barahona-Garrido J, Camacho-Escobedo J, García-Martínez CI, Tocay H, Cabiedes J, Yamamoto-Furusho JK. 2009. Antinuclear antibodies: a marker associated with steroid dependence in patients with ulcerative colitis. *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases* 15(7):1039–1043 DOI 10.1002/ibd.20852.
- Beigel F, Schnitzler F, Paul LR, Pfennig S, Weidinger M, Göke B, Seiderer J, Ochsenkühn T, Brand S. 2011. Formation of antinuclear and double-strand DNA antibodies and frequency of lupus-like syndrome in anti-TNF- $\alpha$  antibody-treated patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases* 17(1):91–98 DOI 10.1002/ibd.21362.
- Chan EK, Damoiseaux J, Carballo OG, Conrad K, de Melo Cruvinel W, Francescantonio PL, Fritzler MJ, Garcia-De La Torre I, Herold M, Mimori T, Satoh M, von Muhlen CA, Andrade LE. 2015. Report of the first international consensus on standardized nomenclature of antinuclear antibody HEp-2 cell patterns 2014–2015. *Frontiers in Immunology* 6:412 DOI 10.3389/fimmu.2015.00412.
- Chen CM, Yen HH, Chen YY. 2025. Case report: cryptococcal meningitis during tofacitinib therapy in ulcerative colitis: a rare opportunistic infection. *International Journal of Rheumatic Diseases* 28(10):e70419 DOI 10.1111/1756-185x.70419.
- Chung CS, Chang CH, Kuo CJ, Chou JW, Huang TY, Hsu WH, Chang CW, Le PH. 2025. Efficacy and safety of Risankizumab for moderate-to-severe Crohn's disease: first Asian real-world data (STAR trial). *Therapeutic Advances in Gastroenterology* 18(4):17562848251375844 DOI 10.1177/17562848251375844.
- da Rosa Utiyama SR, da Silva Kotze LM, Nishihara RM, Carvalho RF, de Carvalho EG, de Sena MG, de Messias Reason IJ. 2001. Spectrum of autoantibodies in celiac patients and relatives. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* 46(12):2624–2630 DOI 10.1023/a:1012702807714.
- Damoiseaux J, Andrade LEC, Carballo OG, Conrad K, Francescantonio PLC, Fritzler MJ, Garcia de la Torre I, Herold M, Klotz W, Cruvinel WM, Mimori T, von Muhlen C, Satoh M, Chan EK. 2019. Clinical relevance of HEp-2 indirect immunofluorescent patterns: the International Consensus on ANA patterns (ICAP) perspective. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 78(7):879–889 DOI 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-214436.
- Dinse GE, Parks CG, Weinberg CR, Co CA, Wilkerson J, Zeldin DC, Chan EKL, Miller FW. 2022. Increasing prevalence of antinuclear antibodies in the United States. *Arthritis & Rheumatology* 74(12):2032–2041 DOI 10.1002/art.42330.
- Faggiani I, Fanizza J, D'Amico F, Allocca M, Zilli A, Parigi TL, Barchi A, Danese S, Furfaro F. 2024. Extraintestinal manifestations in inflammatory bowel disease: from pathophysiology to treatment. *Biomedicines* 12(8):1839 DOI 10.3390/biomedicines12081839.
- Feuerstein JD, Isaacs KL, Schneider Y, Siddique SM, Falck-Ytter Y, Singh S. 2020. AGA clinical practice guidelines on the management of moderate to severe ulcerative colitis. *Gastroenterology* 158(5):1450–1461 DOI 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.01.006.
- Folwaczny C, Noehl N, Endres SP, Heldwein W, Loeschke K, Fricke H. 1997. Antinuclear autoantibodies in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: high prevalence in first-degree relatives. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* 42(8):1593–1597 DOI 10.1023/a:1018832608899.

- Garcia-Planella E, Domènech E, Esteve-Comas M, Bernal I, Cabré E, Boix J, Gassull MA. 2003. Development of antinuclear antibodies and its clinical impact in patients with Crohn's disease treated with chimeric monoclonal anti-TNFalpha antibodies (infliximab). *European Journal of Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 15(4):351–354 DOI 10.1097/00042737-200304000-00003.
- García MJ, Rodríguez-Duque JC, Pascual M, Rivas C, Castro B, Raso S, López-Hoyos M, Arias-Loste MT, Rivero M. 2022. Prevalence of antinuclear antibodies in inflammatory bowel disease and seroconversion after biological therapy. *Therapeutic Advances in Gastroenterology* 15:17562848221077837 DOI 10.1177/17562848221077837.
- Gordon H, Minozzi S, Kopylov U, Verstockt B, Chaparro M, Buskens C, Warusavitarne J, Agrawal M, Allocca M, Atreya R, Battat R, Bettenworth D, Bislenghi G, Brown SR, Burisch J, Casanova MJ, Czuber-Dochan W, de Groof J, El-Hussuna A, Ellul P, Fidalgo C, Fiorino G, Gisbert JP, Sabino JG, Hanzel J, Holubar S, Iacucci M, Iqbal N, Kapizioni C, Karmiris K, Kobayashi T, Kotze PG, Luglio G, Maaser C, Moran G, Noor N, Papamichael K, Peros G, Reenaers C, Sica G, Sigall-Boneh R, Vavricka SR, Yanai H, Myrelid P, Adamina M, Raine T. 2024. ECCO Guidelines on therapeutics in Crohn's disease: medical treatment. *Journal of Crohn's and Colitis* 18(10):1531–1555 DOI 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjae091.
- Guo YP, Wang CG, Liu X, Huang YQ, Guo DL, Jing XZ, Yuan CG, Yang S, Liu JM, Han MS, Li HX. 2014. The prevalence of antinuclear antibodies in the general population of China: a cross-sectional study. *Current Therapeutic Research - Clinical and Experimental* 76:116–119 DOI 10.1016/j.curtheres.2014.06.004.
- Hanauer SB. 1999. Review article: safety of infliximab in clinical trials. *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 13(Suppl. 4):16–22 DOI 10.1046/j.1365-2036.1999.00027.x.
- Hsiao CH, Wei SC, Wong JM, Lai HS, Chang MH, Ni YH. 2007. Pediatric Crohn disease: clinical and genetic characteristics in Taiwan. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition* 44(3):342–346 DOI 10.1097/MPG.0b013e31802c6997.
- Huang C-W, Wei S-C, Shieh M-J, Chou J-W, Chuang C-H, Wang H-Y, Chang C-W, Wu D-C, Huang T-Y, Liu Y-H, Tsai T-J, Tai W-C, Tai C-M, Chung C-S, Tsai W-S, Chang C-H, Lin C-P, Lee H-C, Chang C-C, Feng IC, Lin C-C, Cheng M-L, Yen H-H. 2025. Epidemiology and temporal trends of adult inflammatory bowel disease in Taiwan: multicenter study from the TSIBD registration. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association* 44(Suppl. A):673 DOI 10.1016/j.jfma.2025.01.018.
- Lee YA, Yen HH, Chen YY. 2025. Serological assessment of hepatitis in patients with inflammatory bowel disease in Taiwan: a retrospective cohort analysis. *Life (Basel)* 15(6):893 DOI 10.3390/life15060893.
- Li X, Liu X, Cui J, Song W, Liang Y, Hu Y, Guo Y. 2019. Epidemiological survey of antinuclear antibodies in healthy population and analysis of clinical characteristics of positive population. *Journal of Clinical Laboratory Analysis* 33(8):e22965 DOI 10.1002/jcla.22965.
- Meng MJ, Huang J, Tsou YK, Pan YB, Chiu CT, Lin YT, Le PH. 2025. Diet and the risk of inflammatory bowel disease: a retrospective cohort study in Taiwan. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association* 124(6):544–548 DOI 10.1016/j.jfma.2024.06.004.
- Raine T, Bonovas S, Burisch J, Kucharzik T, Adamina M, Annese V, Bachmann O, Bettenworth D, Chaparro M, Czuber-Dochan W, Eder P, Ellul P, Fidalgo C, Fiorino G, Gionchetti P, Gisbert JP, Gordon H, Hedin C, Holubar S, Iacucci M, Karmiris K, Katsanos K, Kopylov U, Lakatos PL, Lytras T, Lyutakov I, Noor N, Pellino G, Piovani D, Savarino E, Selvaggi F, Verstockt B, Spinelli A, Panis Y, Doherty G. 2022. ECCO guidelines on therapeutics in ulcerative colitis: medical treatment. *Journal of Crohn's and Colitis* 16(1):2–17 DOI 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjab178.

- Santos-Antunes J, Nunes AC, Lopes S, Macedo G. 2016. The relevance of vitamin D and antinuclear antibodies in patients with inflammatory bowel disease under anti-TNF treatment: a prospective study. *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases* 22(5):1101–1106 DOI 10.1097/mib.0000000000000697.
- Theodoraki E, Orfanoudaki E, Foteinogiannopoulou K, Andreou NP, Gazouli M, Koutroubakis IE. 2022. Effect of antinuclear antibodies on pharmacokinetics of anti-TNF therapy in patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *International Journal of Colorectal Disease* 37(3):639–646 DOI 10.1007/s00384-021-04091-6.
- Tung CC, Wong JM, Lee WC, Liu HH, Chang CH, Chang MC, Chang YT, Shieh MJ, Wang CY, Wei SC. 2014. Combining TNFSF15 and ASCA IgA can be used as a predictor for the stenosis/perforating phenotype of Crohn's disease. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 29(4):723–729 DOI 10.1111/jgh.12496.
- Vaglio A, Grayson PC, Fenaroli P, Gianfreda D, Boccaletti V, Ghiggeri GM, Moroni G. 2018. Drug-induced lupus: traditional and new concepts. *Autoimmunity Reviews* 17(9):912–918 DOI 10.1016/j.autrev.2018.03.016.
- Vermeire S, Noman M, Van Assche G, Baert F, Van Steen K, Esters N, Joossens S, Bossuyt X, Rutgeerts P. 2003. Autoimmunity associated with anti-tumor necrosis factor alpha treatment in Crohn's disease: a prospective cohort study. *Gastroenterology* 125(1):32–39 DOI 10.1016/s0016-5085(03)00701-7.
- Vermeire S, Vermeulen N, Van Assche G, Bossuyt X, Rutgeerts P. 2008. (Auto)antibodies in inflammatory bowel diseases. *Gastroenterology Clinics of North America* 37(2):429–438 DOI 10.1016/j.gtc.2008.03.001.
- Yang C-T, Hsu T-C, Chen Y-Y, Huang S-P, Yen H-H. 2024. Attitudes to medication and effects of IBD nursing service among patients with inflammatory bowel disease in Taiwan. *Advances in Digestive Medicine* 11(3):162–169 DOI 10.1002/aid2.13383.
- Yang CT, Yen HH, Chen YY, Su PY, Huang SP. 2022. Radiation exposure among patients with inflammatory bowel disease: a single-medical-center retrospective analysis in Taiwan. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 11(17):5050 DOI 10.3390/jcm11175050.
- Yen H-H, Hsu Y-C, Kuo C-H, Hsu T-C, Chen Y-Y. 2023. Real-world experience of adalimumab therapy for patients with ulcerative colitis: a single tertiary medical center experience in Central Taiwan. *Advances in Digestive Medicine* 10(1):28–33 DOI 10.1002/aid2.13300.
- Yen HH, Wu JF, Wang HY, Chang TA, Chang CH, Chang CW, Chao TH, Chou JW, Chou YH, Chuang CH, Hsu WH, Hsu TC, Huang TY, Hung TI, Le PH, Lin CC, Lin CC, Lin CP, Lin JK, Lin WC, Ni YH, Shieh MJ, Shih IL, Shun CT, Tsai TJ, Wang CY, Weng MT, Wong JM, Wu DC, Wei SC. 2024. Management of ulcerative colitis in Taiwan: consensus guideline of the Taiwan Society of Inflammatory Bowel Disease updated in 2023. *Intestinal Research* 22(3):213–249 DOI 10.5217/ir.2023.00050.
- Zauli D, Crespi C, Dall'Amore P, Bianchi FB, Pisi E. 1985. Antibodies to the cytoskeleton components and other autoantibodies in inflammatory bowel disease. *Digestion* 32(2):140–144 DOI 10.1159/000199232.