Giving IBD the run around!
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Confirming (idiopathic) inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) in dogs can be difficult and continues to confound in achieving a definitive diagnosis in dogs presenting with chronic enteropathies (CE). It is recognised that intestinal inflammation can vary and may not correlate with disease activity and quality of life measures (Garcia-Sancho et al. 2007, Procoli et al. 2013, Walker et al. 2013). These factors clearly contribute to the limitations in our understanding of canine CE which influences our therapeutic decision-making. One could therefore question the value of extensive investigations when the results of the tests do not invariably provide a definitive diagnosis. In dogs with severe protein-losing enteropathies, perhaps the rationale for such investigations may be much greater (Dandrieux 2016). Problems arise however in dogs that have less severe disease where the results of diagnostic investigations may be more equivocal. For example, the dog with a limited response to selected diet trials with low-grade lymphoplasmacytic inflammation on endoscopic biopsies. These dogs are all too common in practice and can lead to significant frustrations for vets and owners alike when managing them. Recently, Dandrieux (2016) presented an eloquent review of what IBD really means in dogs. This emphasised the importance of a systematic diagnostic approach, particularly in attempting to identify both food and antibiotic responsive enteropathies. Whilst this presented a very clear path for investigations, in reality the availability of non-invasive diagnostic testing is very limited. For example, serological and faecal biomarkers which are used extensively in humans for the diagnosis and management of IBD (Lopez et al. 2016, Kochhar and Lashner 2017) are of limited availability in dogs and our ability to interpret any results is imperfect (Jergens et al. 2010, Grellet et al. 2014). In addition to these limitations, the diagnostic approach to and management of dogs suffering with CE also suffers from financial, clinical and ethical limitations. This can make for difficult decision-making. Therefore, making a ‘diagnosis’ by response to therapy is often necessitated, something specialists must accept, however dissatisfying. Given that this approach has clear limitations, the realities of managing these cases must also be appreciated. It is important that trial therapy, if it is introduced, has minimal side-effects which could lead to clinical deterioration or perhaps more worrying to owners withdrawing treatment based on welfare grounds. In addition to the difficulties over diagnostic approaches and therapeutic decision-making in dogs with CE, clinical responses can also vary (Craven et al. 2004, Allenspach et al. 2007, Garcia-Sancho et al. 2007). In this issue of the VR, Huang et al. have undertaken a novel and very important study evaluating the role of exercise in managing dogs with CE. The dogs in this study were all suffering with CE and following the introduction of a structured exercise programme as part of their medical management plan, their respective disease activities were significantly improved compared with non-exercising controls after 10-weeks. This is an inspiring approach and provides an important starting point for understanding the role of novel adjunctive non-medical therapies for canine CE. There was no evidence in these dogs that the introduction of the exercise regime led to clinical deterioration. The results are compelling, leaving aside the limitations on case numbers, and elegantly introduce the concept that exercise can benefit dogs with CE. This study has great resonance for primary care practitioners given that not all dogs in the study had extensive investigations, including endoscopy to characterise their disease, yet demonstrated clinical benefit. Whilst novel in dogs, there is a significant amount of work on this area in humans with IBD. The studies to date would suggest a number of health benefits following the introduction of exercise whether this is structured or not. The benefits are seen in both immediate measures of disease activity and also in reducing the number of relapses and improving quality of life in individual patients (Packer et al. 2010, Klare et al. 2015, Shepherd 2016). Many of these benefits are understood to be directly on the immune system, which supports it’s value in dogs with CE (Nehlsen-Cannarella et al. 1991, Mackinnon 1994, Lui et al. 2015). The
dogs in Huang’s study are described as sedentary and it is therefore difficult to know how exercise might improve disease activity in dogs with CE which are taking ‘normal’ amounts of exercise. However, in support of Huang’s findings, as little as 12 weeks of low-intensity exercise in humans with sedentary lifestyles can lead to improvements in both psychological and physiological wellbeing in patients with Crohn’s disease (Loudon et al 1999). What constitutes normal exercise however and the variable amount of exercise taken by humans suffering with IBD is a consideration when assessing any intervention (Rawsthorne et al 1999, Chan et al 2014, Tew et al 2016). A recent study indicated that whilst exercise has important positive effects in humans with IBD, a significant proportion of patients reported that their disease limited their ability to take ‘normal’ exercise (Tew et al 2016). It is unclear whether similar limitations to taking voluntary exercise exist in dogs suffering with CE and this is an important consideration. If we reflect on how regular exercise effects humans with IBD, given the majority of UK dogs will be taking regular exercise, some humans will derive benefit (Jones et al 2015) and some will suffer relapses (Chan et al 2014). It is therefore vital to ensure that any exercise programme introduced is appropriate – perhaps akin to baby bear’s porridge – being ‘just right’ is the ultimate goal. As discussed above (and highlighted by Dandrieux), the dissimilarities between human IBD and canine CE means that there are some difficulties in extrapolating either the benefits or complications of exercise in non-sedentary dogs with CE. Therefore, in order to answer this question, which may be more applicable to dogs with CE in the UK, Europe and the USA, further work is required using Huang et al’s study to form the basis of an exciting new area of investigation. I would therefore like to congratulate the authors in beginning to tackle this poorly explored area in dogs with CE and I very much look forward to seeing this study serve as an important starting point for future work.
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