


Increased intestinal permeability in ankylosing spondylitis

Sir,—We read with great interest the excellent paper by Morris et al (Gut 1991; 32: 1470–2) on intestinal permeability in ankylosing spondylitis but we do not agree, however, with their conclusions.

Using the "Cr-EDTA resorption test" we recently studied gut permeability in inflammatory rheumatic disorders. Intake of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) significantly increases gut permeability irrespective of the underlying disease. Patients with ankylosing spondylitis and with other spondylarthropathies not taking NSAIDs also presented a significant increase of gut permeability compared with controls. This indicates that gut permeability is disease related.

Gut permeability was not significantly increased in patients with histological gut lesions on ileocolonoscopy, or in patients with a normal ileum, although patients with ankylosing spondylitis and chronic gut lesions (resembling Crohn's disease) showed a significant increase in gut permeability compared with patients with ankylosing spondylitis and acute gut lesions.

There are several explanations for the absence of a relationship between increased gut permeability and ileocolonoscopic evidence of gut inflammation. On ileocolonoscopy only the terminal aspect of the ileum and the colon, which is the very small part of the small bowel, can be examined. Moreover, the distribution of the observed lesions was patchy. Intake of NSAIDs causes such major disturbance of gut permeability that local and focal inflammation of the ileum would not influence the results of the "Cr-EDTA resorption test."

Inflammatory gut lesions were not found in patients with ankylosing spondylitis' taking high doses of NSAIDs for prolonged periods, while such lesions were present in more than 50 patients with spondylarthropathies who had not taken anti-inflammatory drugs. This suggests that the ileal lesion in the ankylosing spondylitis region is associated with the spondyloarthropathies, while intake of NSAIDs probably induces more extensive and diffuse functional disturbances of the entire small bowel.
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Crohn's disease after ileocolic resection

Sir,—Olaison, Smedh and Sjödahl (Gut 1992; 33: 331–5) have provided endoscopic evidence that in many cases of Crohn's disease the ileal ulceration occurs soon after surgical resection. Of 20 examined cases, 73% had either been disbelieved and therefore ignored, or considered to be related to the delayed colonic healing process. Nevertheless, the evidence in Crohn's disease is so well known and accepted that it is not surprising that in the authors' own experience this has not been observed.
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has (>80% cent considered themselves healthy, although they have been told that time-lagging effective drugs had little to offer.

J W PAULLEY
Chatsworth Park Hospital,
Ipswich IP1 3FN


Reply

Sir,—We read with interest the comments by J W Pauley on our paper. We agree that patients with Crohn's disease in addition to medical and surgical care should also have appropriate psychological management, which is within the competence of each physician. In our experience, this is best achieved if the patient has regular contact with a medical team specializing in inflammatory bowel disease treatment. Professional care will relieve much anxiety about the future with this chronic disease, and also enable the patient to cope with the symptoms that most inevitably develop. The disease, however, cannot be regarded as a psychosomatic disorder. Our studies and others clearly show that Crohn's disease is a chronic gastrointestinal process with a permanently present intestinal inflammation. There should be no antagonism between medical, surgical, and psychological therapy. The best support a patient with Crohn's disease can be given, is for the disease to be recognized as a chronic gastrointestinal disease. Present available medical and surgical treatment, although palliative, may offer a substantial reduction of symptoms. To abstain from such treatment today, using only psychotherapy for recurrent symptoms after surgery, is not adequate. The care of patients with Crohn's disease is a multidisciplinary task. At the University Hospital, Linköping, Sweden, all patients are regularly reviewed by a team including gastroenterologist, gastrointestinal surgeon, endoscopist, dietitian, stoma therapist, and specially assigned nurse. The team has a joint treatment strategy; the aim of which is to minimize the symptoms during their lifetime and all decisions on treatment are taken regarding the chronicity of the disease. Medical and surgical treatment are regarded as complementary. The treatment is governed by the patients' disease activity, intensity — that is, activity for a longer period — and aggressiveness. Psychological management is a part of the regular care.

We studied 238 patients in 1991 with Crohn's disease. The treatment outlined above resulted in clinical remission of 83% at the end of 1991 (Crohn's disease activity index <150). The patients' own experience of their disease was also, in our view, satisfying. Sixty nine per cent considered themselves healthy or almost healthy (>80% healthy, self estimation on a visual analogue scale). We believe that the best help a patient with Crohn's disease can have is the psychological, medical, and surgical support from a knowledgeable team.
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Osteomalacia after gastrectomy

Sir,—I congratulate Bisballe et al (Gut 1991; 32: 1303–7) essentially helpful postgastrectomy patients for metabolic bone disease. All too often, we, as physicians caring for patients with gastrointestinal problems that lead to abnormal bone nutrition and metabolism — that is, postgastrectomy, bone disease, small bowel malabsorption, and states of diminished oral intake, ignore the patients' developing bone disease because the process is insidious and the patients are often asymptomatic until the disease is so profound that much of it may be irreversible.

I must take issue, however, with the authors' conclusion advocating supplemental vitamin D for all postgastrectomy patients. The authors have found evidence of bone abnormalities by histomorphometry in up to 62% of 51 patients, but only eight patients were considered to have osteomalacia. It is not clear that vitamin D supplementation is beneficial in non-osteomalacia bone disorders.

The authors suggest that the low mean levels of 25-hydroxyvitamin D are relevant and thus warrant supplementation. Yet, five of eight patients with vitamin D osteomalacia had normal levels, highlighting the lack of value serum measurements may have in predicting bone disorder diagnoses. The authors do not state how many of their non-osteomalacia patients had levels that were abnormal (they state only that the mean overall was abnormal). That 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D levels, the active circulating vitamin D metabolite, were normal in these patients, underscores how complex vitamin D metabolism is and how serum values may not be predictive of an abnormality.

Although the authors agree in their final paragraph that serum biochemical results are of limited value, they use these results as the premise for a therapeutic intervention. They showed that patients who took vitamin D supplementation had higher levels of serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D. It is not sufficient to recommend vitamin D therapy simply because patients have metabolic bone disease. Vitamin D supplements in excess doses can be toxic and may not normalize serum levels. There is no indication that those patients on supplements had less bony abnormalities on histomorphometry. In fact, half of the patients with osteomalacia were using supplementation.

To determine whether vitamin D is of therapeutic benefit, a study is needed whereby vitamin D therapy is compared with placebo in a randomized blinded group of postgastrectomy patients and not where the use of vitamin D in a group of patients is compared with a non-diseased control group. Oral ingestion of dietary vitamin D needs to be controlled. Investigators of such a study would need to show that bone histomorphometry improved or did not worsen over time while on therapy. Vogelsang et al showed that, overall, a group of Crohn's disease patients randomised to vitamin D 1000 IU/day therapy did not have a statistically significant improvement in bone mineral density. Also, serum 25-hydroxydihydroxvitamin D were of no benefit and led to raised serum and urine calcium concentrations. Although low dose vitamin D therapy (400–600 IU/day) in postgastrectomy patients is likely non-toxic — that is, in terms of effects on calcium, this remains to be proved in a systematic fashion. The benefit of this therapy in postgastrectomy patients certainly needs to be proved and has not been in Bisballe et al's paper.

C N BERNSTEIN
Division of Gastroenterology, UCLA Department of Medicine, Los Angeles, California, USA


Reply

Sir,—We thank Dr Bernstein for his constructive comments on our paper on osteomalacia in postgastrectomy patients and his emphasis on the importance of the problem. We also consider bone disease after gastrectomy a problem very often ignored in daily clinical practice.

The diagnosis of osteomalacia in our study was based on very stringent histological criteria, which delineate severe mineralisation defects affecting virtually all bone surfaces. The remaining patients with abnormal bone histology revealed varying degrees of secondary hyperparathyroidism with focal areas of mineralisation defects — that is, earlier stages in the osteomalacic process. Further analysis of serum biochemistry in these patients was hampered by the lack of good parathyroid hormone assays (the study was performed before the advent of assays for intact parathyroid hormone (1–84)). Theoretically, such patients would also benefit from vitamin D supplementation, because the high turnover state associated with secondary hyperparathyroidism leads to osteopenia. We do not know, however, that the study on Crohn's disease by Vogelsang et al is of great relevance in this respect. The bone in patients with Crohn's disease is characterised by osteopenia and more discrete osteomalacia is demonstrable.

We do not advocate the use of more potent analogues (1-alpha-vitamin D, or 1,25(OH)2D3) for postgastrectomy patients. We agree with Dr Bernstein that these compounds demand close monitoring because of the risk for severe intoxication. We have, however, administered daily doses of 1800 IU calcium (D3) over a five year period to more than 200 osteoporotic women (mean age 65 years) without any cases of vitamin D-intoxication. Thus, we do not think that vitamin D supplements are dangerous as long as they are given in the form of D3 analogues in a dose range of 400–800 IU. We agree, however, that a controlled clinical study is necessary in order to test for optimal dose, efficacy and side effects.
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Crohn's disease after ileocolic resection.
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