Nevertheless, further bacteriological characterisation, including antimicrobial resistance patterns and fermentative reactions in sugars, permitted a clear distinction between six different *Clostridium difficile* species. We would recommend, therefore, that case clustering of PMC, suggestive of nosocomial cross infection, is evaluated prospectively using bacteriological typing methods.

M TVEDE, F TRAUTNER, AND J RASK-MADSEN

Department of Clinical Microbiology, Rigshospitalet, The State Serum Institute, Denmark; Department of Microbiology, and Section of Gastroenterology, Bispebjerg Hospital, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
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Reply

SIR.—Dr Tvede and colleagues expand on several of the points made in the discussion in our paper and pose questions regarding the prospective evaluation of case clusters of pseudomembranous colitis (PMC). The cases described, however, were not studied prospectively because for several reasons their epidemic nature was not initially apparent. The cases occurred in three separate hospitals in patients under the care of many clinicians, the epidemic was of a protracted rather than explosive kind and when clustering was first recognised attention focused not on the possibility of cross infection but on the prominence of exposure to the third generation cephalosporin, cefotaxime, an association previously little reported. It was only after epidemiologic investigation that the compelling evidence of person to person spread, which is documented in our paper, became clearly evident. As we stated, however, this could not be conclusively proved microbiologically. A typical view of the pathogenesis of PMC is that almost any of the ubiquitous toxin producing strains of *Clostridium difficile* may (because of alteration of flora or other factors) gain a competitive advantage after therapy with certain antibiotics. The ensuing damage to the colonic mucosa by toxin is manifested as PMC. This pattern may have occurred in the six cases described by Tvede et al. The relative frequency of isolated cases of PMC compared with cases caused by person to person spread of a particular strain is currently obscure but obviously has important prophylactic and therapeutic implications. The previous description of epidemics of PMC and in particular the latent and protracted nature of the epidemic we describe suggests to us that person to person spread may be more common than previously realised. We feel that wider recognition of the possibility of cross infection together with the use of prospective studies of the type advocated by Tvede et al are necessary to define the relative roles of cross infection and isolated cases in the epidemiology of PMC.

N P M NOLAN AND D S O’BRIAIN

St James’s Hospital, Dublin 8, Ireland.

Olsalazine and GI transit in UC

SIR.—I was most impressed with the report of Rao et al who noted an accelerated gastric emptying, mouth to caecum transit time and whole gut transit time caused by olsalazine sodium in ulcerative colitis. Although no change in bowel habits was seen among their patients, they attempted to study the diarrhoea reported to occur with olsalazine therapy in some earlier uncontrolled reports.2 I would like to emphasise, however, that diarrhoea has not yet been proved to be a definite or common problem with this therapy. In my controlled study of olsalazine sodium, diarrhoea was no more common among patients with ulcerative colitis treated with the active drug than those receiving placebo.4 Similarly, in another controlled trial, four patients receiving placebo and only two receiving active drug were withdrawn because of diarrhoea.5 In one other controlled trial, however, one patient did have increased diarrhoea thought to be caused by olsalazine sodium.6

More rigorous study design may at least partially account for the lower incidence of unwanted effects
reported in the controlled trials. It is very difficult to
differentiate the diarrhoea of therapy and that of the
colitis without a concurrently studied placebo group.
Further research will be necessary to truly determine
the incidence of this proposed complication in the
general population of ulcerative colitis patients
accepted with olsalazine

SAMUEL MEYERS

Mt Sinai School of Medicine,
Mt Sinai Hospital,
One Gustave L Levy Place,
New York, NY 10029, USA.
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Reply
sir,—We would not disagree with any of the
comments in Dr Meyer’s letter. Our paper reported a
physiological study designed to investigate one of the
possible mechanisms for the diarrhoea reported in
some clinical studies using olsalazine. We did not
attempt to review the rather conflicting evidence on
the frequency of diarrhoea in patients taking this
drug, and note with interest Dr Meyer’s own experi
cence. Our own experience is also that diarrhoea is not
a frequent side effect1 and in a further and controlled
study to be published shortly as an abstract we only
had one withdrawal because of watery diarrhoea
among 20 unselected outpatients with ulcerative
colitis given olsalazine; one of the 17 patients on
sulphasalazine also withdrew because of diarrhoea
exacerbation, in that case bloody.2 The patients on
olsalazine did, however, have more unformed stools
during treatment than those on sulphasalazine. This
is not necessarily undesirable, and could be positively
beneficial for the 27% of patients with ulcerative
colitis who develop hard stools during exacerbations.3

We agree with Dr Meyer that there is considerable
discrepancy in the reported incidence of diarrhoea on
olsalazine, and its true frequency is still not clear. In
our experience it is infrequent in the typical out-
patient with distal ulcerative colitis, responds very
rapidly to withdrawal of the drug, and is easily
distinguished from the true exacerbation of colitis
which can occur with any preparation which relies for
its therapeutic effect on the liberation of 5-aminosalicylic acid in the colon.

CD HOLDsworth, SSC RAO, AND NW READ
Royal Hallamshire Hospital,
Glossop Road,
Sheffield S10 2JF.
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Changes in gastric alkaline secretion by ulcer healing

sir,—Professor Konturek’s findings that pirenzepine
does not influence gastric bicarbonate production in
man1 has been questioned by Dr Stockbrucker (Gut
1987; 28: 1687) because the dose administered (20
µg/kg) is quite low compared with the normal
therapeutic dosage.

Several years ago we performed experiments in
10 healthy subjects in whom HCO3 secretion was
measured by Feldman’s method. Either pirenzepine
10 mg or saline were given, in randomised order,
by bolus iv injection at 0 and 60 minutes during a
120 minute continuous infusion with pentagastrin (6
µg/kg/h). The results (unpublished) showed, in
agreement with Konturek’s recent paper, that
pirenzepine exerts no direct effects on gastric
alkaline secretion in man.

On the other hand, Konturek et al have also
reported in Gut1 that intragastric instillation of
colloidal bismuth induces a significant increase in
alkaline secretion by the human stomach. This
remains in apparent disagreement with a recent