LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Gastric cancer cell lines lack Fas ligand (FasL) expression but kill T cells via a FasL independent pathway

EDITOR,—Bennett et al (Gut 1999;44:156–162) reported that in each of 30 paraffin wax specimens of human gastric adenocarcinomas, FasL mRNA and protein co-localised to neoplastic epithelial cells. TUNEL staining revealed that a high number of tumour infiltrating lymphocytes (TIL) displayed apoptotic features. From these results and from their findings of FasL expression in human colon and oesophageal cancer,1 the authors posulated that FasL might be a mediator of immune privilege in gastrointestinal cancers.

We studied intrinsic FasL expression in gastric cancer cell lines derived from primary (RF-1, SNU-1) or from metastatic sites (SNU-16, Kato-III, N-87, RF-48). We did not detect Fas mRNA or protein in any of the six cell lines analysed by RT-PCR and by flow cytometry (table 1).2 We then performed the JAM assay to rule out the presence of an functional FasL expression below the detection limit of our assays.3 Although we found that gastric cancer cells were able to induce DNA fragmentation in the Fas sensitive T-acute lymphocytic leukaemia cell line CEM-C7H2 (fig 1A), blocking Fasl on the effector cell site did not reduce the extent of cytotoxicity. This result was confirmed by replacing the target cell line by a subclone stably expressing the viral growth suppressor protein crmA, which inhibits activation of caspases 1 and 8 and thereby mediates resistance to Fas triggering (fig 1B).2

Owing to the discrepancy between our results (all cell lines were FasL negative) and those of Bennett et al (all 30 primary neoplasms were FasL positive), we wondered whether tissue derived factors such as tumour necrosis factor (TNF) and interferon (IFN) might upregulate FasL in vivo, thus explaining the discrepancies observed. In our setting, neither of the cytokines was able to modify FasL expression on gastric cancer cell lines (table 1). In addition, killing of T cell lines was not mediated via secretion of TNF-α as blocking the cytokine using a monoclonal antibody did not influence the result of the JAM assay (fig 1A). How can the

Table 1 Expression of FasL and Fas in gastric cancer cell lines and their sensitivity toward Fas triggering by the CH11 monoclonal antibody

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell line</th>
<th>FasL mRNA</th>
<th>Constitutive NOK-1/IIH1</th>
<th>+TNF-α (100 ng/ml)</th>
<th>+IFN-γ (100 ng/ml)</th>
<th>Fas expression</th>
<th>Control (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF-1</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.1±1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF-48</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.3±1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato-III</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0.9±1.0</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNU-1</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.1±1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNU-16</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.0±1.2</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-87</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>1.0±1.2</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1RT-PCR analysis was done as follows: total RNA from about 1×10⁶ cells was extracted by the acid guanidinium thiocyanate-phenol-chloroform protocol described by Chomczynski and Sacchi;1 1 µg RNA together with 250 ng of oligo (dT)₉ primer was diluted in a total of 14 µl, denatured by heating up to 70°C for five minutes and immediately chilled on ice. To each reaction, 6 µl RT mixture containing 4 µl 5× buffer, 2 pmol each of dATP, dCTP, dGTP and dTTP, and 200 units Moloney-murine leukaemia virus reverse transcriptase, was added (all reagents from Promega, Wisconsin, USA). For cDNA synthesis all samples were incubated at 37°C for 60 minutes. The reaction was stopped by heating the sample to 80°C for two minutes; 100 ng cDNA obtained was amplified by 50 cycles with 1° C.

2Time kinetics (1-3 days’ stimulation) were performed and values are given for day 3. Tumour necrosis factor (TNF) α and interferon (IFN) γ were purchased from R&D Systems (Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA). Flow cytometric analysis was performed using the NOK-1 monoclonal antibody.

3Cells were incubated with the CH11 monoclonal antibody (250 ng/ml) for 24 hours and the proportion of apoptotic cells was determined using the propidium iodide assay.4 Even after 72 hours’ incubation, there was only a very small increase in the percentages of apoptotic cells (e.g. in the SNU-1 cell line the increase was from 3% (control) to 5% (CH11)).
tumour cells, attracted by the expression of FasL on the killed by infiltrating neutrophils potentially included the possibility of lymphocytes being excluded the possibility of lymphocytes succumbing to apoptosis owing to either glutamate or suicide. This mechanism could well be under the (cytokine) control of the tumour as has been discussed for other diseases.9 Alternatively, lymphocytes could indeed be killed by the tumour cells by a mechanism independent of the FasL system, a hypothesis supported by our data (fig 1).

Bennet et al did not use the standard Lauren classification system.10 It has been shown that gastric carcinoma cells of the intestinal and diffuse type (according to Lauren) differ in morphology, growth pattern and risk factors, and also in their expression of molecules involved in apoptosis such as Fas or p53.11,12 This is evidence that at least in some tumour models Fas and FasL expression are under transcriptional control of p53.13 Loss-of-function mutations or deletions of p53 have been reported to be involved in gastric carcinogenesis14 and the frequency of these events differs between intestinal and diffuse gastric cancers.15 Also, a correlation between p53 mutation, Fas expression and gastric carcinoma cell differentiation has been demonstrated.16 Further studies of the impact of differentiation and p53 functional status on Fas/L expression are therefore mandatory in gastric carcinoma cells.

In sensitivity towards Fas is usually an early step in tumour development, allowing tumour cells to resist the attack of the immune system and to avoid suicide when FasL expression is acquired.17 Furthermore, a sequence of Fas resistance and FasL expression has been postulated for hepatocellular carcinoma.18 Secondary loss of the Fas gene or of its expression during continuous culture of gastric adenocarcinoma cells is unlikely for the following reasons: (i) all cell lines were resistant to Fas and thus loss of FasL expression does not seem to be a prerequisite for their survival, and (ii) to our knowledge, no data are available from other cell (line) systems that tumour cell lines lose FasL expression during long-term culture.

In conclusion, we think that Bennett et al's data suggest that CD45+ lymphocytes die in the immediate proximity of neoplastic cells. Although their data are compatible with Fas induced TIL cell death, our functional data from cell line suggest that other tumour mediated mechanisms of killing immunocompetent cells might also exist in gastric cancer. Further work clarifying the sequence of Fas/FasL expression and function during the transformation and metastatic processes is needed.

Reply

Evans—We concur with the view expressed by Tinhofer et al that Fas ligand (FasL) mediated “counterattack” against antitumour lymphocytes is not the sole mechanism of immune evasion in gastric, or indeed any other form of cancer. Tumours evolve multiple immune evasive strategies. However, there is ample in vitro and in vivo evidence that constitutive expression of FasL enables cancers to promote apoptosis of antitumour immune effector cells.1 For example, FasL has been significantly associated with apoptosis and loss of tumour infiltrating lymphocytes in human ovarian cancer2 and depletion of antitumour natural killer cells in a mouse model.3

In stomach cancer, apart from our findings of FasL expression at the mRNA and protein level in vivo in all 30 gastric adenocarcinomas examined,4 Rudi and colleagues also showed FasL mRNA in all three gastric carcinoma cell lines examined—including one cell line, KATO III, in which Tinhofer et al failed to detect FasL mRNA. This poses serious questions regarding the sensitivity of the FasL RT-PCR performed by Tinhofer et al. In fact, appropriate positive controls have not been shown to verify that their negative findings are not merely owing to the insensitivity of their assays for detecting FasL mRNA and protein in adherent cells.

Successful use of the JAM assay depends on using target cells that exhibit good sensitivity to Fas mediated apoptosis. Even different cultures of cell lines that are regarded as Fas sensitive, such as Jurkat E6 cells, can vary in their Fas sensitivity for reasons which are unclear, and Fas resistant subtypes may be generated. Tinhofer et al need to demonstrate that their cultures of CEM-C7H2 target cells were indeed susceptible to apoptosis via Fas in order to validate their negative JAM results.5 Authentic FasL mediated killing of Fas sensitive target cells is normally detectable after eight hours of co-culture with FasL expressing effector cells.6 Tinhofer et al performed a prolonged co-culture of 72 hours. It is not likely that the cell death detected in target cells at this late stage was from non-specific effects, such as exhaustion of nutrients or growth factors in the presence of proliferating effector cells rather than to specific Fas mediated apoptosis.7,8 Tinhofer et al should repeat their JAM assay for a shorter length of time with highly Fas sensitive target cells and include a proved FasL expressing effector cell line as a positive control.

Tinhofer et al’s findings that gastric carcinoma cell lines are relatively resistant to Fas mediated apoptosis is consistent with findings for several other types of cancer cell. Fas resistance is a prerequisite for expression of FasL. Colon adenocarcinoma cell lines, for example, are also Fas resistant, enabling most colon adenocarcinoma cell lines to coexpress Fas and FasL without undergoing Fas mediated apoptosis.9,10 We agree with Tinhofer et al that the sequence of Fas/FasL expression and function during gastric carcinogenesis merits further investigation. Their suggestion that these molecules should also be investigated in metastases of gastric cancer is also pertinent as recent evidence suggests that FasL contributes to the invasion of Fas sensitive organs, such as the liver, by colonic adenocarcinoma cells.11
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Vector manometry and LOS dynamics

EDITOR,—We read with interest the recent paper by Kahrilas et al on the effect of hiatus hernia on gastro-oesophageal junction pressure (Gut 1999;44:476–82). These authors used a novel technique that combined vector manometry, fluoroscopy, and endoscopic tagging of anatomical landmarks to map the differences in pressure profile between patients with and without hiatus hernia. Analysis of the vector profiles, taken at end expiration, revealed two distinct high pressure zones in each of the seven patients with hiatus hernia. These were thought to represent an axial separation of the internal and external components of the lower oesophageal sphincter (LOS). When these high pressure zones were repositioned to represent a simulated hernia, the vector profile took on the appearance of a normal sphincter. This study drew some interesting conclusions regarding the effect of hiatal herniation on LOS pressure dynamics. We would like to raise a point of agreement with the authors on the method of analysis used and the reproducibility of vector manometry.

With regard to the methodology of this paper, the numerical vector pressure analysis used rapid pull-through vector manometry (8 channel catheter, 0.7 ml/s pull-back speed). They showed that mid-LOS pressure varied from 20 to 80 mm Hg in 20 pull-throughs performed in one hour in the same patient. Kahrilas et al did not mention the number of pull-throughs for each patient or the reproducibility of vector profiling. It is therefore difficult to draw accurate conclusions on the size and position of high pressure zones, particularly when the study population is limited to seven patients.
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Mycophenolate mofetil for Crohn’s disease

EDITOR,—On the basis of a study reported recently by Neurath et al (Gut 1999;44:625–628), commentators in Gut and the Lancet suggested that mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) should be used in patients with Crohn’s disease who have either not responded to or are intolerant of azathioprine or 6-mercaptopurine. This advice is premature: firstly, because the study was flawed and, secondly, because it examined only management of acute inflammation, not the place of MMF in maintaining remission and in steroid sparing (a fact acknowledged in both commentaries).

The study by Neurath et al compared the effect of MMF 15 mg/kg daily with azathioprine 2.5 mg/kg daily, both with high dose steroids, in the treatment of active chronic Crohn’s disease (six months follow-up). The main conclusions were that activity, as measured by the Crohn’s disease activity index (CDAI), dropped further at one month in patients given MMF plus steroids than in those given azathioprine plus steroids, and that this was as a result of a faster effect in more severe disease. The major drawbacks of the study were as follows. As pointed out by the authors, neither patients nor investigators were blinded. Four (11%) of 35 patients in the MMF group were lost to follow up compared with none in the azathioprine group; thus the results may have looked different if analysed on an intention to treat basis. The MMF group had higher starting CDAIs: if the levels of CDAI reached at one month were compared between groups, rather than the fall of CDAI, the groups may not have been significantly different. The division of patients into those with moderate and severe activity was retrospective: thus conclusions based on this division should be regarded as hypothesis generating only. Finally, differences between the groups do not reach formal statistical significance if adjustments for multiple comparisons are made. Finally, steroid usage in the two groups is not recorded: one can imagine a scenario where a poor early response would lead to more steroids being given and so to a better overall result.

I agree with the authors and commentators that alternatives to azathioprine/6-mercaptopurine are needed. I also agree that the therapeutic effect of MMF in chronic active Crohn’s disease should be assessed in properly performed trials, and preferably confirm importantly that its effect in maintaining remission and in steroid sparing should be assessed. However, until then, MMF should be considered to have no clear indications for use in Crohn’s disease.

J C ATHERTON
Division of Gastroenterology, University Hospital, Nottingham NG7 2UB, UK


Reply

EDITOR,—Mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) is an immunosuppressive drug that is often used in organ transplantation. It is an active prodrug of mycophenolic acid that inhibits inosine monophosphate dehydrogenase and potently suppresses lymphocyte proliferation. Numerous various clinical trials have shown its efficacy in suppressing autoimmune and chronic inflammatory disorders, such as rheumatoid arthritis, pemphigus vulgaris, and pсорiasis. There are several case reports1 and also our controlled study indicating that MMF can be successfully used in patients with Crohn’s disease. In our study treatment of patients with moderate activity Crohn’s disease with MMF/cortisone led to a significant reduction in clinical activity score compared with treatment with azathioprine/cortisone. These data suggested that treatment of chronic active Crohn’s disease with MMF/cortisone would be effective in inducing remission. As corticosteroids were given to patients in addition to
MMF, the data available do not show unequivocally that MMF alone is effective in the maintenance of remission in Crohn’s disease. This question is currently under study in a double blind, randomised controlled trial in Europe and the USA, in which the effects of MMF on maintenance of remission will be analysed.

M NEURATH
Laboratory of Immunology, I. Medical Clinic, University of Mainz, Langenbeckstrasse, 55116 Mainz, Germany


BOOK REVIEWS


The clear task record of success of Emergence Abdominal Surgery is proved by the publication of a third edition. The authors, who are all from Aberdeen, classify themselves as general surgeons and the book is dedicated to the general surgeons of the future. As we enter the millennium, general surgery is still vital to the management of unclassified surgical emergencies, and surgeons of all disciplines need to be trained in triage. Yet, ultimately, it is probable that few of the subjects in this book will remain the province of the general surgeon and many will be within the auscultation of specialist service groups. However, although the days of the general surgeon who dealt with ruptured aneurysms may be over, but there is still a role for a surgeon to identify the physical signs and to direct the patient along the right route.

This book tackles emergencies in children as well as adults. Furthermore, the emergency presentation of vascular disease, and gynaecological and urological disorders is also discussed and the entire spectrum of general surgery as seen in the accident and emergency department of a district general hospital is comprehensively reviewed. Whether surgery in the future will follow the same pattern is open to speculation but there is currently a need for an up-to-date general surgical text for trainees and consultant surgeons.

The text is well illustrated and referenced, and I found the chapter devoted to the acute abdomen in pregnancy and the puerperium to be particularly valuable as this information is not readily available in other general surgical texts. The book achieves a good balance of guidance on when a generalist can tackle a problem safely and when it is best to stop; complex liver injuries are acknowledged as a problem best managed in a tertiary referral centre where all the available support facilities are operational.

I congratulate the authors of this book for bringing together a third edition of this text and they are to be applauded for using specialists in the areas that they no longer feel comfortable tackling themselves—that is, emergencies in children, urological emergencies, vascular emergencies, gynaecological disorders, and medical aspects of the acute abdomen. They are also to be praised for acknowledging in their preface that, nowadays, vascular surgery should be performed by specialists as should colorectal emergency surgery. Nevertheless, the emphasis in this book is on the clarity of decision making, by generalists where appropriate, and by specialists when indicated. I continue to be a valuable resource for surgeons in training as well as those in practice.

M R B KEGHLEY


The first edition of this handbook was a valuable resource to both junior hospital staff and family doctors for its practical coverage of basic gastroenterology. In the seven years since it was first published, there have been many advances in gastroenterology and these have been included in the new edition, which is a rapid reference book which the authors hope will be of interest to doctors and health professionals in clinics, accident and emergency departments.

Covering a wide range of topics, including the various aspects of hollow organ gastroenterology, liver, biliary, and pancreatic disease, the book offers comprehensive chapters on nutrition and the gut in systemic disease, areas of interest to the more experienced reader. There are also sections on essential procedures for those involved in the preparation of patients, and a comprehensive chapter on gastroenterological emergencies which should prove invaluable in accident and emergency departments.

The breadth of coverage is impressive for such a small book although some parts lack depth. However, the authors live up to their promise to include recent advances in all areas and supply a comprehensive selection of further reading for those requiring more detailed information.

The style is dogmatic and didactic and, in conjunction with clear algorithms, presents information in the clear, concise manner essential to a rapid reference text. There are few radiological or pathological illustrations but they are of good quality and are accompanied by line diagrams to aid their interpretation.

The book aims to be a rapid and comprehensive reference tool for a wide audience of health professionals. This new edition easily achieves this and will undoubtedly continue to be useful in surgeries and wards for those who work in gastroenterology but have limited practical experience of the specialty.

R A HARRY


While medical students can confidently hold forth on the mechanisms of the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome, a condition affecting one in a million of the population, they rarely have much to say about functional GI disorders (FGIDs), which can affect up to a quarter of the population at some stage in their life. Part of the reason is that the Rome process, which requires the integration of pathophysiology with psychology, and even sociology. FGIDs also suffer from having no objective measurable abnormalities, so that classifications must of necessity be symptomatic based.

The Rome process is a valiant attempt to make this area of study less confused, more consistent, and scientifically respectable. As such, it undoubtedly has had a major impact, and Rome criteria are now used for the entire gamut into most clinical trials and studies in this area. The senior chairman claims that this process has “done for functional gastrointestinal disorders what the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III) has done for psychiatry”. While this may appear grandiose, I think it just might be true.

This book provides an overview of many years’ work, which has contributed much to our understanding of functional gastrointestinal disease (FGID). This is due in no small part to the “Rome” process, which is described in detail in the book. The challenge was to create order out of chaos by agreeing criteria for the diagnosis of FGIDs. The major advantage of such a classification is that studies using agreed definitions become comparable and the next study can build on the results of the last. The major disadvantages, which the authors constantly remind the reader of, are that uncritical readers may accept these definitions as fixed in stone. This work of course simplifies important concepts.

We need to be constantly reminded that the new Rome criteria (for example, for irritable bowel syndrome), in reality excludes as many as 60% of the patients diagnosed as having IBS in clinical practice. This has the advantage of producing closely comparable patients for studies, but the disadvantage of reduced generalisability to normal clinical practice.

The excellent introductory chapter outlines the ideas behind the Rome process and emphasises the importance of the “bio-psycho-social model for IBS” for understanding how sufferers become patients. I much enjoyed the next chapter on the basic science of irritable gastroenterology, which simplifies much work and renders it in a form readily understandable to clinicians with only vague memories of neuroanatomy. There then follows a section on motility and sensation measurements, again comprehensive but suitably cautious. There are sections on psychological assessments, and a good account of the weaknesses and strengths of various psychological rating scales for non-psychiatrist. Specific functional disor-
Inflammation, and Sepsis will be held in The 5th World Congress on Trauma, Shock, and Sepsis, Florida, USA, on 17–19 February 2000. Further information from: Eugen Faist, Department of Surgery, Ludwig Maximilians University Munich, Klinikum Grosshadern, Marchioninistrasse 15, 81377 Munich, Germany. Tel: +49 89 7095 5461/2461; fax: +49 89 7095 2460; email: faist@gch.med.uni-muenchen.de

Second Annual Gastrointestinal Cancer Update: A Multidisciplinary Approach

The Second Annual Gastrointestinal Cancer Update conference will be held at the Yarrow Hotel and Conference Centre, Park City, Utah, USA, on 15–19 March 2000. Further information from: Rosalie Lammlle. Tel: +1 801 581 8664; fax: +1 801 581 3647; email: rosalie.lammlle@hsc.utah.edu

European Courses on Laparoscopic Surgery

The European Courses on Laparoscopic Surgery will be held at the University Hospital Saint Pierre, Brussels, Belgium, on 4–7 April 2000 and 7–10 November 2000. Further information from: Conference Services S.A., Drève des Tumuli, 18, B-1170 Brussels, Belgium. Tel: +32 2 375 1648; fax: +32 2 375 3299; email: conference.services@skynet.be

Third Scandinavian Course on Inflammatory Bowel Diseases

The Third Scandinavian Course on Inflammatory Bowel Diseases will be held at the Wilandersalen, Örebro Medical Centre, Örebro, Sweden, on 18–20 April 2000. Further information from: Kurskansliet, Region-sjuhuset, S-701 85 Örebro, Sweden. Tel: +46 19 15 37 05; fax: +46 19 15 37 95.

XVIIIth European Workshop on Gastroenterology and Endotherapy

The XVIIIth European Workshop on Gastroenterology and Endotherapy will be held in Brussels, Belgium, on 26–28 April 2000. Further information from: Administrative Secretariat, Ms Nancy Beauprez, Gastroenterology Department Hospital, Route de Lennik 808, B-1070 Brussels, Belgium. Tel: +32 2 555 4900; fax: +32 2 555 4901; email: beauprez@ulb.ac.be

Digestive Disease Week

The Digestive Disease Week will be held at the San Diego Convention Centre, San Diego, California, USA, on 21–24 May 2000. Further information from: DDW Administration, 7910 Woodmont Avenue, 7th Floor, Bethesda, Maryland 20814, USA. Tel: +1 301 272 0022; fax: +1 301 654 3978; website: www.ddw.org

International Hepato-Pancreato-Biliary Association 4th World Congress

The International Hepato-Pancreato-Biliary Association 4th World Congress will be held in Brisbane, Australia, from 28 May to 1 June 2000. Further information from: International Hepato-Pancreato-Biliary Association, c/o Dr. D. van Gaal, 11 Castlemaine Street, Maitland, Queensland 4064, Australia. Tel: +61 (0)7 3369 0477; fax: +61 (0)7 3369 1512; email: hpb2000@im.com.au

7th Southeast European Symposium of Paediatric Surgery: Intestinal Motility Disorders

The 7th Southeast European Symposium of Paediatric Surgery will be held at the University of Graz, Austria, on 2 and 3 June 2000. Further information from: Prof Günther Schimpl, Department of Paediatric Surgery, Auenbruggerplatz 34, A-8036 Graz, Austria. Tel: +43 316 385 3762; fax: +43 316 385 3775; email: kinderchirurgie@kfumigraz.at

Courses from the European Postgraduate Gastro-Surgical School

The Board of Directors of the European Postgraduate Gastro-Surgical School announce the following events for 2000:

- 3rd Course in Endoscopy Live will be held at the Graduate Gastro-Surgical School, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 8 and 9 June 2000. Registration fee: NLG 350.
- 9th Course in Digestive Endoscopy will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, from 31 August to 1 September 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 3rd International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 19 and 20 October 2000. Registration fee: NLG 450.
- The 8th International Colorectal Update will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 21 and 22 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 3rd International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 16 and 17 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 450.
- The 7th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 8th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 21 and 22 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 9th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 16 and 17 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 450.
- The 10th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 11th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 12th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 13th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 14th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 15th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 16th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 17th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 18th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 19th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 20th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 21st International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 22nd International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 23rd International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 24th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 25th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 26th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 27th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 28th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 29th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 30th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 31st International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 32nd International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 33rd International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
- The 34th International Update on Hepatology will be held at the Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on 23 and 24 November 2000. Registration fee: NLG 500.
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