Absence of antibodies stimulating H$_2$-receptor mediated cyclic adenosine monophosphate (cAMP) production in peptic ulcer disease

Sir,-We read with great interest the paper by Burman et al (Gut 1991; 32: 620-3). Using porcine gastric mucosal cells as an in vitro test system, the authors could not find any stimulatory effect on cyclic adenosine monophosphate (cAMP) production by sera or immunoglobulin (Ig) fractions of 57 patients with relapsing ulcer disease. As the authors reported, their results are in contrast with data obtained by De Lazzari et al.1 This group found in duodenal ulcer patients antibodies stimulating cAMP production in enriched guinea pig parietal cells. Thus, De Lazzari et al have suggested that duodenal ulcer disease may be caused by expression of stimulating antibodies to H$_2$-receptors, which therefore are proposed as a 'new addition to the growing list of receptor antibodies in human diseases'.

By using another in vitro test system, we have also investigated the possible role of cAMP stimulating antibodies in peptic ulcer disease. We tested the effects of Ig preparations on cAMP production in cultured human gastric tumour cells (HGT-1; kindly provided by Dr C. Geer, University of Paris, Paris). These cells have H$_2$-receptors and are considered to be a useful tool for studies of cAMP mediated gastric acid secretion.1 Igs were derived from sera of 36 peptic ulcer patients. The patients were classified as adequate (AR; n=16) and inadequate responders to ranitidine (IR; n=20) by intragastric pH monitoring.2 Sera were not tested directly because of several undefined components which decreased cell viability from 91 to 52% after four hour incubation of the cells with 20% serum. IgG was isolated by column chromatography on protein G-Sepharose and concentrated by micro-ultrafiltration. Other proteins were removed and non-IgG was precipitated by ammonium sulphate (1-6 mol/L). The Igs were tested at concentrations of 4 (IgG) and 1 (non-IgG) mg protein/ml medium. HGT-1 cells were grown as monolayers and incubated for 10, 30, 60, 180, and 360 minutes with Igs in the presence of 1 mmol/l phosphodiesterase inhibitor (IBMX). Standard IgG (Behringwerke) was used as control. The total amount of cAMP was measured by radioimmunoassay (Amersham Buchler).

The basal value of cAMP production in HGT-1 cells was mean (SD) 10-7 (1-7) pmol/mg protein and was stimulated after 10 minutes incubation (10-11 mmol/l histamine) to 80-4 (15-0) pmol/mg protein in all experiments (n=36). The stimulation could be blocked by the H$_2$-receptor antagonists cimetidine and ranitidine with IC$_{50}$ values of 0-400 and 0-034 mol/L, respectively, confirming the presence and specificity of H$_2$-receptors on this cell type.3 No statistically significant stimulation of cAMP production could be obtained after incubation of HGT-1 cells with any Ig preparation tested (see Table).

Our results agree with those of Burman et al. In neither in vitro test systems was there evidence for cAMP stimulating antibodies in peptic ulcer patients. In addition, we conclude that antibodies to H$_2$-receptors do not cause an inadequate response to H$_2$-antagonists as has been assumed.1 However, despite these results, it can not be totally ruled out that autoimmune-implural processes have a role in specific subpopulations of patients with peptic ulcer disease. Moreover, the differing results of Burman et al and our group on one hand and De Lazzari et al on the other may be caused by the different in vitro test systems used. In particular, De Lazzari et al failed to detect any cAMP stimulatory effects on antibodies, unless the parietal cell content in cell suspensions was at least 50%.
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Non-colonic symptomatology and the irritable bowel: is it really of diagnostic value?

Sir,-We read the paper by Maxton and colleagues on the diagnostic value of 'non-colonic' symptoms in the irritable bowel syndrome with interest.1 We have some major concerns about their study, however, which we hope they can clarify.

Our first concern relates to the study design. No healthy controls were included for comparison; this makes it difficult to determine the clinical significance of 'non-colonic' symptoms, which are known to be common in otherwise healthy people.1 The measurement of symptoms is also of concern because the reliability and validity of the symptom assessment tool was not documented. If the authors did not define and measure each of the symptoms carefully, these might have been interpreted in many different ways by the interviewer and the patients, and thus the discriminatory ability of
these symptoms inaccurately determined. The investigation also included patients with various organic diseases as controls. It is unclear, however, what symptoms led these patients to present, and it is likely that some of these patients also had irritable bowel syndrome (IBS). This was the gall stone group who may have had incidental gall stones discovered during their evaluation. Such misclassification could have diluted the discriminant value of symptoms between patients with irritable bowel syndrome and those with organic disease.

Our second concern relates to the statistical analyses. The authors seem to have relied largely on univariate analyses (χ² tests). As 78 tests of association (and for 13 symptoms times six comparison groups!), however, several spurious significant results could have been obtained just by chance alone. One way to adjust for the number of tests undertaken would be to multiply each of the test P values by the number of comparisons. When evaluated in this way, only p values less than 0.0006 would be significant at the 5% level. While the authors did use a multiple logistic regression analysis, it appears their analysis is likely to have seriously overestimated the discriminant ability of the symptoms identified; it is well recognised that estimates based on a single data set are typically biased towards the discriminatory groups! In the absence of a large number of symptoms under IBS, there is no easy way of preventing or excluding this possibility. As Dr Prather rightly points out, however, this would reduce rather than increase the discriminant value of the symptoms in separating organic from functional bowel disease thus making our findings more reliable. The gall stone patients included in the study all had symptoms suggestive of this disorder at first clinic attendance which improved after cholecystectomy. None had gall bladder disease as an incidental finding.

The statistical problem of multiple comparisons is well illustrated by the use of different statistical testing (without proper adjustment) to establish definitive relationships is inappropriate. In our study, however, univariate analysis was only used in the preliminary investigation of discriminant power. The main part of the study identified symptoms with a significant association with irritable bowel syndrome using multiple logistic regression, a technique which makes appropriate adjustment for the large number of symptoms under consideration. Although the numbers of subjects in each of the separate disease groups were large by the standards of previous publications, they were insufficient to allow discrimination from each control group using multiple regression analysis. As reported in the paper the effect of gender had little effect on the discriminant ability of the 'non-colonic' symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome. Socioeconomic group also did not differ significantly between irritable bowel syndrome and organic disease groups. The description of relative risk estimation was included only as an illustration of how the risks can be combined. No claim is made for the accuracy of these combined estimates (the associated confidence intervals would be wide) but they give some indication of the order of magnitude of the relative risks. We agree it would certainly be of value to test our symptom model on other groups of patients. We are continuing to do so and hope others will follow.

The answer to the question posed by Dr Prather and colleagues in the title of their letter is, yes, non-colonic symptomatology is indeed of discriminant value in separating irritable bowel syndrome from a large number of organic gastrointestinal diseases.
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BOOK REVIEW


This is a multiauthor (37), multiinational (though predominantly US) textbook on ulcerative colitis and Crohn’s disease. The editor’s aim was to produce an up to date and concise clinical overview of these inflammatory bowel diseases, their diagnosis, and treatment. It is laid out in seven sections – aetiology and epidemiology, clinical features, diagnosis, prognosis, medical and surgical management, and management problems.

The book is unanimously uneven. Contrast the first section, 40 pages on genetics and probably the best chapter in the book, with the five pages on aetiology or seven pages on inflammatory mediators. The sections on clinical features and diagnosis encompass six chapters, which between them duplicate or triplicate the routine assessment of the two conditions. Some excellent endoscopic pictures are mixed with out of focus histopathology, but histopathological appearances are presumably regarded as to recherché that the section on dysplasia is not illustrated. A number of full, worthwhile, and extensively referenced sections – for example, those on the use of corticosteroids or on the natural history of these diseases, based not on evidence but on the placebo arms of published studies – contrast strongly with, for example, the Tennessee experience on T cell apheresis. This is an uncontrolled study on 63 patients (from the reference list, I cannot see that it has appeared in any peer reviewed form) ‘in which the chances of . . . undergoing spontaneous remission was statistically zero’. Few people who have experience of inflammatory bowel disease will recognise such a group.

There are better books on inflammatory bowel diseases, from both the scientific and the clinical view point.

H J F HODGSON

All titles reviewed here are available from the BMJ Bookshop, PO Box 295, London WC1H 9TE. Prices include postage in the UK and for members of the British Forces Overseas, but overseas customers should add £2 per item for postage and packing. Payment can be made by cheque in sterling drawn on a UK bank, or by credit card (Mastercard, Visa, or American Express), stating card number, expiry date, and full name.