LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Endoscopic injection therapy

EDITOR,—It is now very clear that endoscopic injection therapy has become established as an effective treatment for peptic ulcer haemorrhage. As Rutgeerts et al state (Gut 1993; 34: 348-50), we now have injection regimens in which the presence of shock at the time of admission is an important risk factor for rebleeding, yet twice as many patients who received the epinephrine-polidocanol combination were in a state of shock compared with the sham endoscopy and ethanol treated groups. This well might account for the rather disappointing results of injection therapy with epinephrine-polidocanol. Thirdly, we were struck by a paper which suggested that most patients who rebled in the sham treated group were subsequently effectively treated with the epinephrine-polidocanol combination. This is surprising if this form of injection therapy were indeed ineffective. While we dispute the conclusions of this paper, we do agree that further studies looking at different injection regimens are necessary but would like to emphasise that studies should include adequate numbers of well matched patients.

C P CHOUARDI K R PALMER Gastro-intestinal Unit, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh EH4 2UX

This success rate seems to be significant therapeutically considering that these patients did not rebled after, presumably, a single injection with an innocuous, physiological solution. The agents injected into the bleeding peptic ulcers achieve haemostasis by tamponade of the vessel, vasoconstriction, thrombosis of the vessel or by a combination of these factors. In this study, the solution used for 'sham injection' probably lacked the two properties, and therefore could have achieved haemostasis merely by causing tamponade of the vessel. The increasing interest in the field of endoscopic sclerotherapy for bleeding peptic ulcers has seen the emergence of various chemical agents. Most efforts seem to be concentrated on identifying the optimal agent for achieving haemostasis either by thrombosis of the vessel (sclerosant) or by vasoconstriction (vaso-constrictor). If the patients in the 'sham injection' group did receive injections of a physiological solution, the high rate of definitive haemostasis might reflect the importance of tamponade, an often neglected factor, during endoscopic sclerotherapy.

The comments of D S Bhandarkar on our recent paper call for some clarification. Sham injection in this study was characterised by clear identification of the non-bleeding protruding vessel, introduction of the injection needle with targeting but without actual injection.

D S BHANDARKAR
Department of Surgery, Manchester Royal Infirmary, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9WL

Reply to both letters

EDITOR,—The comments of Choudari and Palmer concerning our recent paper are interesting. In the design of a trial the calculation of the sample size is extremely important. In this paper the numbers were defined based on two assumptions: (1) an average 50% rebleeding rate of non-bleeding peptic ulcer vessels reported in published works; (2) the inclusion of a non-treated control group, which decreases the number of patients needed in a study comparing two treatment methods. Based on statistical prediction 25 patients in each treatment group seemed sufficient. From a statistical point of view significance achieved with low patient numbers carries more power than when large patient groups are necessary to show an effect. Also, to our surprise, the efficacy of epinephrine-polidocanol injection in this study was lower than in other trials1 including our own previous trial.2 There were indeed more patients with severe bleeding in the adrenaline-polidocanol group. The difference was not significant, but this might explain the lower efficacy.

We do believe that adrenaline-polidocanol is effective but it is not shown by this study. The data are as they are and we feel that it is important that they are reported as such. It might be interesting to perform meta analysis on all the reported results on adrenaline-polidocanol therapy of non-bleeding vessels in gastroduodenal ulcers.

P Rutgeerts


BOOK REVIEWS


In the preface, the three editors of this new book on hepatobiliary diseases and its various aspects in molecular biology which have had a significant impact on biomedical knowledge. As a result new concepts in cell biology have emerged . . . . The reader therefore starts the book thinking that there will be a real attempt to integrate new scientific knowledge with its ability to lead into new areas of mechanisms and the clinical syndrome development. Our knowledge of liver disease is expanding as an extraordinary rate with the application of molecular biology techniques to the viral hepatitides for instance, and there is also the other area of exciting progress in relation to genetic basis and gene product identification. Sadly this is not so and what we have is yet another textbook on liver disease.

According to the editors' hopes, it will be of use to students, postgraduates, gastroenterologists, and hepatologists in training, representing a wide range of requirements to cover. Some chapters on liver function tests do give a straightforward clinical account of the subject suitable for undergraduate students and those early in their postgraduate career, but in other areas, for instance immunology of the liver, the emphasis is much more on the findings of recent research studies.

Paediatric metabolic diseases comprises a book in itself, whereas liver transplantation is very brief and is largely an account of the author's personal experience of the Birmingham programme. The chapter on laparoscopy similarly represents the experience of one particular centre. The authors are drawn from many centres around the world and there was a chance in this volume to give an overall world perspective of liver disease, but again I was unconvinced of its success here. The book can only be described as uneven, and there is also some duplication — nodular regenerative hyperplasia, for instance, is considered in some detail in the chapter on cirrhotic aspects as well as in that of liver tumours. It would seem also that the respective authors have not read each others' contributions.

The overall presentation by Springer-Verlag is heavy and uninspiring and this reviewer has to admit to a disappointment with this volume. Nevertheless, the hepatologist or gastroenterologist in training will find that many of the
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