Letters

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Omeprazole in gastric and duodenal ulcers

Str,—In their interesting multicentre trial (Gut 1990; 31: 653-6), the Cooperative Study Group concluded that omeprazole 40 mg heals gastric and duodenal ulcers more rapidly than ranitidine 150 mg twice a day, and this result may be due to the more effective control of gastric acid secretion by omeprazole. Although there is no doubt that the number of gastric ulcers was small that a type II error is responsible for the lack of significant difference and, in fact, it was pointed out that the healing rates in the study are in accord with those reported by V. L. Ahman et al., who showed in a much larger trial on gastric ulcer patients that omeprazole is significantly more effective than ranitidine. We believe, however, that another critical point is worth emphasising. Once again we have a study which provides no information about the location of the ulcer crater in the stomach. In using a powerful antisecretory drug, such as omeprazole, it can be expected that its pharmacological effect is present in cases associated with increased acid secretion.

Unlike duodenal ulcers, gastric ulcers have normal or reduced levels of acid secretion compared to control subjects and, although patients who respond to antisecretory treatment, the relation between acid inhibition and gastric ulcer healing is not as clear cut as it is for duodenal ulcer. The most plausible explanation for this is that acid plays a role in the pathogenesis of gastric ulcers than in duodenal ulcers. The functional heterogeneity of gastric ulcers is particularly striking in relation to the site of the nico and, using continuous pH monitoring, we recently found that the 24 hour gastric acidity of patients with ulcers located at or above the anulus is much lower than that of control subjects matched for sex and age and of patients with prepyloric ulcers. Thus the cirrhosis of proximal gastric ulcers should be clearly distinguished from that of distal ones, and assessing the efficacy of potent antisecretory drugs in the whole group of gastric ulcers, independently of their location in the stomach, may be misleading. This seems to be confirmed by the results of another recent large clinical trial comparing omeprazole 30 mg and cimetidine 1 g/day in patients with only gastric ulcer. This trial was designed to measure difference between the healing rates obtained with the two drugs, even though the dose of 30 mg omeprazole has been shown to cause a maximal decrease in 24 hour gastric acid secretion. This means that extreme acid inhibition is of no help in conditions characterised by low acid secretion, and the differences in acid secretory patterns in the populations sampled in the various clinical trials are likely to be responsible for the conflicting results of the efficacy of omeprazole in gastric ulcers. Since we are still unable to give well defined guidelines for a sietiological treatment of peptic ulcer, antisecretory treatment should take into account at least the varying pathophysiological profiles of acid production in this heterogeneous disease. And there is increasing evidence that gastric ulcers can be subdivided according to their anatomic locations, which are associated with different circadian acidity patterns. Thus universal regimens with high doses of omeprazole, the most potent anti-secretory drug, are unlikely to be valid for all patients with gastric and duodenal ulcers. On the other hand, individualised treatment related to the predominant pathogenetic mechanism in each patient remains at present a remote possibility. Therefore, a reasonable alternative may be to tailor the antisecretory regimen to several subsets of peptic ulcers established on the basis of their site and function.
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Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gastric ulcer healing</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omeprazole:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body ulcer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10(77)</td>
<td>1(85)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepyloric ulcer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3(100)</td>
<td>0(100)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranitidine:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10(56)</td>
<td>5(83)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepyloric ulcer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6(37)</td>
<td>1(83)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L=large >15 mm; M=medium 10-15 mm; S=small 5-9 mm.

Screening for colorectal cancer in ulcerative colitis

Str,—We read with great interest Dr Glyde’s exhaustive and critical review on how to approach the risk of colon cancer in ulcerative colitis (Gut 1990; 31: 1089-92). The criticism of how scarce resources are best spent rapidly during omeprazole treatment, which may be explained by a more effective control of gastric acid secretion.

J H BARON (principal investigator)
J F LEE (principal investigator)
M J DALY (principal investigator)
Cooperative Study Group
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Reply

Str,—Savarino and colleagues ask if healing rates in our patients with gastric ulcer could have been influenced by the treatment site. The data on site and initial ulcer size are shown in the Table, but the numbers are too few for valid statistical analysis.

We agree that data from the nine prepyloric ulcers but only 20 of the 31 body ulcers had healed. There has been speculation that gastric body ulcers heal more slowly than prepyloric ulcers because they are generally larger. No conclusion can be drawn from our data, but of the four unhealed body ulcers one omeprazole and two ranitidine treated ulcers were large. The one ranitidine treated unhealed prepyloric ulcer was large.

Separation of the data for body and prepyloric ulcers gives healing figures essentially the same as those reported in our paper for the combined gastric ulcer group. The gradient of acid secretory levels in the head of duodenal, prepyloric and gastric body ulcers has been discussed for a very long time. We addressed this point in our paper by speculating that, even without initial hypersecretion, effective acid suppression in gastric ulcer patients could be achieved in the balance between aggressive and defensive factors. Because the common factor for omeprazole and ranitidine is the ability to inhibit acid secretion, with omeprazole the more effective, as acknowledged by Savarino and colleagues, we adhere to our original conclusion which is still compatible with the gastric ulcer data subdivided for ulcer site. Overall these results suggest that duodenal and prepyloric ulcers heal rapidly during omeprazole treatment, which may be explained by a more effective control of gastric acid secretion.
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The basic conclusion of how scarce resources are best spent rapidly during omeprazole treatment, which may be explained by a more effective control of gastric acid secretion.
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aims the direction.

our would statistical is not. Such a study is now in progress. Meanwhile, the clinicians have to deal with the potentially worrisome problem of what to do with the patients. This is probably the main reason for the widespread use of cancer surveillance, although a lack of conformity in surveillance procedures may account for some of the different results. The leading conclusions, however, do not go as we are, but it really offers no options.

Routine clinical care’ in patients with long-standing colitis seems a vague term with ill defined aims where patient compliance might be quite low. It also runs the risk of falsely assuring doctor and patient alike that the patient’s cancer risk is being controlled when it is not.

Prophylactic colectomy in patients selected on statistical grounds (extensive disease, long duration, young age at onset), which has been advocated since the 1960s, still awaits a study proving its benefits. Even a small postoperative mortality would affect the results in a negative direction.

Although ‘cancer surveillance’ as reported from our group 1 shows good compliance, that DNA anodectomy seems a promising marker, and that a yield of inconceivable cancers is although it seems a long way to go before a consensus can be reached in the medical community on the approach to the cancer risk in ulcerative colitis.

OLLE BROSTROM
PER KARLEN
Medical Department 2,
South Hospital,
S-10664 Stockholm, Sweden
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Reply

SIR,—Dr Brostrom and colleagues are quite rightly asking ‘where do we go from here’ concerning the care of patients that are at high risk of developing cancer at a young age. I was not suggesting that we should wait till the present screening procedure using ‘dysplasia’ as a marker. I was, however, suggesting that clinicians still have an obligation to their patients to test the effectiveness of this screening procedure in reducing mortality, since proper randomised trials were not established before the introduction of the procedure on a wide scale.

Case-control studies can give valuable information, as Dr Brostrom suggests, but such studies, being non-experimental in design—that is, no randomisation with prospective follow up—are difficult to evaluate in terms of the effect of screening on mortality. These are subject to inherent biases in the groups under review which are difficult to estimate.

Case-control studies were used in some of the trials to study the effect of screening on mortality, but in receiving ‘ordinary clinical care’ (which would of course include standard investigations such as sigmoidoscopy and barium enema, when deemed necessary), and a ‘screened group.’

If such a trial were undertaken it would be necessary to obtain informed consent from each patient before randomisation. A survey among our patients has shown that few would accept random allocation and that surveillance might be restricted to sigmoidoscopy. The mortality from colorectal cancer among patients with extensive colitis who are not treated by colectomy is likely to be about 8% during the period of 10 to 25 years after the onset of disease. This figure is lower than the incidence of carcinoma because at least one third of patients who present clinically with a tumour are cured by surgery. No cancer surveillance should be started without a long-term follow-up.

The only difference between the groups is that the group conduced, however, with the exception of a separate control group, whatever they showed as markers in comparison with one another.

SN GYDE
Highcroft Hospital,
Highcroft Road,
Ervington, Mold,
Wirral CH42 6AX


SIR,—In her leading article Dr Gyde applies the logic of a public health physician. Such an approach is welcome and she is right to say that the success of a surveillance programme can be judged only by its effect on cancer mortality. In some respects, however, her logic is neither as critical nor as rigorous as it appears.

In the opening paragraph there is reference to cancer ‘screening’ among ‘apparently healthy members of the population’ and a quotation then draws an ethical distinction between investigation of patients who seek medical advice and of symptomless subjects on the initiative of doctors. The context suggests that patients with colitis fall into the second group of symptomless subjects. This is not so. Patients with colitis attending a clinic seek medical care for all aspects of their illness including advice about the cancer risk. It seems rather to use the term ‘surveillance’ for clinical supervision of patients known to be at high risk of carcinoma and ‘screening’ for investigation of the asymptomatic general population.

Dr Gyde then draws a distinction between a group of patients who are receiving ‘ordinary clinical care’ (which would of course include standard investigations such as sigmoidoscopy and barium enema, when deemed necessary), and a ‘screened group.’

The relative contribution of colonoscopy with multiple biopsies is performed in the latter. Dr Gyde advocates randomisation of patients into one of these two groups to measure the effect, if any, of colonoscopy on mortality.

If such a trial were undertaken it would be necessary to obtain informed consent from each patient before randomisation. A survey among our patients has shown that few would accept random allocation and that surveillance might be restricted to sigmoidoscopy. The mortality from colorectal cancer among patients with extensive colitis is likely to be about 8% during the period of 10 to 25 years after the onset of disease. This figure is lower than the incidence of carcinoma because at least one third of patients who present clinically with a tumour are cured by surgery. No cancer surveillance should be started without a long-term follow-up.

The only difference between the groups is that the group conduced, however, with the exception of a separate control group, whatever they showed as markers in comparison with one another.
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