LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Heliobacter pylori eradication, duodenal ulcer healing, and gastric secretory state

EDITOR,—There is little doubt that H pylori is an important factor in the pathogenesis of duodenal ulcer disease. The mechanism for this is probably multifactorial, and may include changes in gastric secretory state consequent upon H pylori associated hypergastrinaemia.

The study by El-Omar et al (Gut 1993; 34: 1060–5) attempts to examine the effect of H pylori eradication on acid secretory state in 'patients with duodenal ulcer'. The authors show a significant fall in both basal and gastric mediated acid output after H pylori eradication, and infer that this fall is, simply, because of elimination of the H pylori infection.

These results seem to be at variance with two previous studies carried out by the same group.1 2 No differences in basal and penta-gastrin stimulated acid output after H pylori eradication were noted in the first, while partial cell sensitivity to pentagastrin remained unchanged after eradication in the second. Both studies, importantly, were carried out in patients with inactive duodenal ulcer disease. The findings in the study by El-Omar et al, however, are in keeping with those reported by Moss and Calam in a group of patients with active duodenal ulcer studied before and after H pylori eradication and subsequent ulcer healing. One can but speculate as to whether the patients studied by El-Omar et al had active ulceration on entry and, if so, whether ulcer healing was achieved after three weeks' bismuth containing triple therapy. Or was a mixed group of both active and healed duodenal ulcer subjects entered into their study?

The belief that H pylori eradication is somehow linked with the reduction of gastric secretion seems to have been so seductive that El-Omar et al have chosen to overlook the reported effect of duodenal ulcer healing in itself on gastric secretory states. There is good evidence that basal, nocturnal, and stimulated acid secretion, 11 fall significantly after duodenal ulcer healing with sucralfate, the mucosal protective agent with but a modest suppressive effect on H pylori. There are only scant data on the possible effect of duodenal ulcer healing by colloid bismuth on gastric secretion, but one small study12 showed a numerical but insignificant fall in acid secretion and a significant reduction in basal and pentagastrin stimulated pepsin output.

We believe that any conclusion regarding the effect of H pylori eradication in itself on acid and pepsin secretion must await the outcome of suitably designed studies that discriminate between the effects of healing on the one hand, and eradication on the other. At the very least, readers should be unequivocally informed of the ulcer activity state in any study considering this controversial issue.
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Reply

EDITOR,—We are grateful for the opportunity to respond to the points raised by Dr Lowu and Professor Marks. They wonder if the changes in acid secretion might be secondary to some effect of ulcer healing rather than to the eradication of H pylori infection. We can reassure them that the changes could not be explained by ulcer healing as none of the patients had active ulceration when recruited into the study. All of them had an endoscopy before entering the study and any patient with an active ulcer had treatment with an H2 antagonist for six weeks and then repeat endoscopy prior to ulcer healing before the start of the study. We apologise for not mentioning this point in the paper.

Further evidence that the fall in acid secretion is not a consequence of ulcer healing is our more recent finding that the increased acid output noted in the non-ulcer subjects also resolves after eradication of the H pylori infection.

We should also like the opportunity to emphasise that our present findings of appreciable changes in gastrin releasing peptide (GRP) stimulated acid secretion are in no way inconsistent with our earlier studies in which we noted no change in pentagastrin stimulated acid secretion at one month after eradication of H pylori in duodenal ulcer patients. GRP stimulated acid secretion differs from maximal acid output to pentagastrin in the following ways: (1) GRP acts directly on the cell and provides an assessment of the combined function response of the antrum and body of the stomach, whereas pentagastrin only assesses body function; (2) although GRP that we use, we can assess acid secretion in response to physiological concentrations of gastrin that contrasts with the supraphysiological concentrations during assessment of maximal acid output to pentagastrin; (3) GRP activates not only the stimulatory pathway of acid secretion mediated by gastrin but also the inhibitory pathways mediated by other hormones such as cholecystokinin and somatostatin.

For these three reasons, GRP stimulated acid secretion provides a far more comprehensive assessment of gastric secretion and is thus more able to identify defects in its stimulation.
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Food intolerance and Crohn's disease

EDITOR,—We were delighted to read the paper from Northwick Park by Pearson et al (Gut 1993; 34: 783–7) confirming our previous reports of food intolerance in Crohn’s disease. It is possible, however, that the way this study was conducted had to some extent affected the measurement of the importance of this phenomenon.

The dietary studies did not follow the methods that we have shown to be successful. Patients were given elemental diet for four to eight weeks. In our view this is a poor test of food intolerance as food challenges must be extended for several days to provoke symptoms.

This leads to mistakes in the detection of food intolerances. We have consistently reported that wheat, milk, and yeast are the foods most likely to cause problems. In a recent survey of 114 patients successfully treated in Cambridge by diet, 39 (34%) were upset by wheat, 22 (19%) by yeast, and 35 (31%) by milk. It is therefore very surprising that among the 42 patients studied at Northwick Park, only five were upset by milk, two by wheat, and none at all by yeast. We therefore believe that the dietary studies were not carried out correctly.

We were also concerned by the claim that there was no significant difference in the duration of remission after elemental diet between patients who did identify food sensitivities and those who did not. The Northwick Park study was not a controlled trial and no evidence is presented to suggest that the Crohn’s disease in those patients with food intolerances was similar in extent and severity to those without. These results contrast sharply with the much larger study that we have recently concluded.1 2 One hundred and thirty six patients were treated with elemental diet for up to two weeks and 78 achieved remission. These were randomised to our standard food testing programme or to oral corticosteroids.

Patients receiving steroids were advised on healthy eating and diet patients received identical placebo tablets. The median survival in the diet group was 12 months compared with three in the steroid group and after two years the overall relapse rate was 59% in the diet group compared with 82% of patients receiving steroids (p<0.05).

Food intolerance is an important factor in the pathophysiology of Crohn’s disease. The management of these food intolerances is not easy, demanding determination from the patients and skill and experience from their medical and dietary advisors. Nevertheless,