LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Angina pectoris and oesophageal angina

Editor,—I enjoyed the prospective study by Cooke et al (Gut 1998;42:523–529) on the relation between oesophageal abnormalities and chest pain in patients with normal coronary angiograms and with angina pectoris. This study confirms the findings of previous studies that the oesophagus is responsible for chest pain in a high percentage of patients with coronary artery disease, and that an episode of gastro-oesophageal reflux nearly always triggers this pain.

However, no explanation for this unexpected finding has been given. The tentative provocative hypothesis is the result of a decreased angina threshold and a reflex coronary ischaemia, both induced by the contact of acid with the oesophageal mucosa, is not acceptable for two reasons: firstly, because this oesophagocardiac reflex may be the basis for linked angina but not for oesophageal angina and, secondly, because the patients should have shown simultaneous electrogastrocardiographic (ECG) abnormalities during the pain induced by the acid perfusion test.

Unfortunately, a concurrent ECG was not performed during pH monitoring. This intriguing finding gives rise to two questions: why do these patients have such a high incidence of gastro-oesophageal reflux and why does this so frequently cause them pain?

I believe that the first question can be answered by the fact that patients with angina pectoris are usually prescribed long term medication such as nifedipine or cardioselective β-blockers; these drugs are potent inhibitors of lower oesophageal sphincter tone, which is the main antireflux barrier. It would be interesting to know whether the patients with angina from Cooke and colleagues’ study had taken this type of medication for long periods, and whether their lower oesophageal sphincter tone was below normal at the time of the study. In a previous study, we measured manometrically the lower oesophageal sphincter tone in patients with angina after a drug washout, and found a significantly lower value than normal. It seems probable that the chronic consumption of spasmylic drugs may have reduced this tone, giving patients with coronary artery disease the appearance of pathological gastro-oesophageal reflux. Furthermore, it is possible that the absence of oesophageal spastic disorders, such as nutcracker oesophagus, could be attributed to the long term pharmacological suppression of oesophageal contractions.

With regard to the second question, it is very odd that patients with angina and gastro-oesophageal reflux complain mainly of retrosternal pain instead of the more common symptoms of gastro-oesophageal reflux—for example, heartburn, acid regurgitation, etc. Previous studies have shown that there is a decrease in the pain perception threshold of patients with oesophageal angina and normal coronary angiograms, but we do not know whether pain perception in patients with oesophageal angina and coronary artery disease is similarly altered. I would expect a positive result from research on this matter, because it is not unreasonable to suppose that chronic cardiac pain may have sensitised the nociceptive neurones of the dorsal horn of the spinal cord to the acid stimuli. The nociceptive C fibres coming from the oesophageal mucosa also converge, thus developing a secondary hyperalgesia allodynia. Should spinal hyperalgesia be present, episodes of gastro-oesophageal reflux that are generally not perceived to cause pain, could simulate the pain of angina.

M BORTOLATTI
Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, University of Bologna, Via Massarenti 44, 40129 Bologna, Italy
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Intrahepatic HCV levels in chronic HCV infection

Editor,—Haydon et al (Gut 1998;42:470–5) have found that hepatitis C virus (HCV) RNA is present in the liver of 87% of unselected patients with circulating anti-HCV antibodies (recombinant immunoblot assay) and negative serum HCV RNA by polymerase chain reaction (PCR). Furthermore, 70% of these patients had normal serum alanine aminotransferase (ALT) concentrations. Previous experience from both our group and others would suggest that most of these patients would be HCV RNA negative in liver tissue, whether treated or untreated. In fact, Fong and colleagues have shown that eight patients with anti-HCV antibody, persistently normal serum ALT and anti HCV reactive by recombinant immunoblot assay and negative serum HCV RNA (including one patient who was infected with HIV) were negative in serum using the SuperQuant assay: eight of these patients had raised ALT concentrations, and all had a liver biopsy sample taken.

Liver tissue samples were assayed for HCV RNA and nine patients were negative in liver tissue. Three additional patients had negative serum for HCV RNA (Roche AmpliC, Roche Molecular Systems) and had no detectable liver HCV RNA (SuperQuant). However, using the SuperQuant method amounts of HCV RNA (all less than three logs) were found in their serum. We speculate that this more sensitive assay might have amplified extrahepatic viral sequences.

Based on our data, we believe that most patients with negative HCV RNA in serum will be found to be HCV RNA negative in liver, particularly when ALT concentrations are normal. Furthermore, very sensitive assays may detect small quantities of HCV RNA (which may be extrahepatic in origin) in serum but not in liver.

M BONACINI
AG REDEKER
USC School of Medicine Liver Unit, Downey, California, USA


Reply

Editor,—We thank Drs Bonacini and Redeker for their interesting comments and data. Their study, which used a multi-cycle RT PCR assay with a detection sensitivity of 100 copies HCV RNA/ml serum, showed that only one patient out of 10 with detectable anti-HCV antibody was positive in liver tissue, when concurrently negative in serum.

Using a limiting dilution assay (which has already been proved to have significant reproducibility when multiple samples are tested in duplicate, and a significant correla- tion with three commercial assays) with a detection sensitivity of 80 HCV copies/ml of serum (in a 5 ml sample of serum), we showed that 10 out of 12 patients who were RT PCR negative in serum, were RT PCR positive in liver. Significantly, all 12 patients had ongoing inflammation, diagnosed by diagnostic laparoscopy and from liver biopsy samples.

We would be interested to know the histo- logical findings taken from the liver biopsy samples in Dr Bonacini’s study: ongoing hepatic inflammation indicates the continued presence of the virus in vivo. We maintain our hypothesis that such pa- tients are viraemic below the detection sensi- tivity level of the above assays (which is simi- lar, although the assays have not been compared), and that it is impossible to be certain that the infection has been cleared completely even at a detection sensitivity of 100 copies HCV/ml.

However, the prognostic importance of these data is that serum RT PCR negative
patients, with chronic HCV infection, need to be followed up for an indefinite period because there is no indication that they are immune from progressive liver disease in the future.

G H HAYDON
Department of Medicine,
Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh,
Edinburgh, UK


Is exposure to a patient with Crohn’s disease an environmental factor for developing the disease?

EDITOR,—A recent study of intestinal permeability in relatives of patients with Crohn’s disease included only 34 of 123 first degree relatives of 39 patients with Crohn’s disease, because many relatives had little social contact with the patients. It is only through an exhaustive search for all relatives that frequency of contact between patients with Crohn’s disease and relatives who have the same genetic predisposition towards the disease can be linked to the risk of developing the disease. Such a study may also yield helpful information on whether Crohn’s disease can resolve whether developing the disease?

M ALIC
1754 S Grant Blvd
San Mateo, CA 94402, USA


Reply

EDITOR,—We thank Dr Alic for his interesting comments on our study of intestinal permeability in relatives of patients with Crohn’s disease. We agree that Crohn’s disease may be part of an infectious process, and our study does not contradict this hypothesis. One of our conclusions was that baseline permeability may be a function of unknown environmental factors that could be directly related to contact with, or factors shared with, the patients with Crohn’s disease—for example, an infectious agent or dietary factors.

As Dr Alic suggests, we have further analysed the relation between length of exposure of the spouses and relatives to the patients with Crohn’s disease and baseline permeability of these people (table 1). We found that all spouses with an increased baseline permeability (above the 95th percentile of controls) had lived with their Crohn’s disease partner for more than 10 years. However, a study of the relatives shown in table 1 was not related to length of time living with the patient and baseline permeability. Neither group showed any correlation between permeability after ingestion of acetylsalicylic acid and time of exposure to patients.

Table 1 Number of spouses with high and low baseline intestinal permeability in relation to duration of cohabitation with patients with Crohn’s disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Cohabitation (years)</th>
<th>Number of Spouses</th>
<th>Permeability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permeability is expressed as the lactulose:mannitol ratio (L:M).*Increased number compared with less than 10 years; p=0.054; Fisher’s exact test.

We also agree that a search for all the relatives of all our patients with Crohn’s disease would provide more information. A group from Belgium has performed a thorough study of all relatives of a group of such patients1; they showed increased baseline permeability in subgroups of both first degree relatives and spouses, and suggested a common environmental factor as the cause. In conclusion, we cannot exclude a transmissible factor as the cause of increased baseline permeability, although it is not known whether this accounts for permeability provoked by acetylsalicylic acid, although our data do not indicate an environmental cause.

Does the increase in baseline, and/or stimulated permeability can trigger inflammation, but circumstantial evidence is in favour of this as a possible mechanism. Knockout mice which are deficient in N-cadherin (an adhesion molecule important for epithelial structure) develop intestinal inflammation that resembles Crohn’s disease.1 Moreover, we have found that inflammation in recurrent Crohn’s lesions is preceded by increased epithelial permeability to proteins.1 However, further studies are needed to explain the pathogenic importance of increased epithelial permeability to the development of mucosal inflammation in Crohn’s disease.

In the past 10 years, several studies have shown subgroup of relatives with increased baseline permeability,2,3 and four studies have shown increased mucosal reactivity to non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in first degree relatives.4 A multicentre follow up study of the relatives included in these studies could discover whether relatives with increased baseline and/or stimulated permeability will eventually contract disease.

J D SODERTHOLM
G OLASON
R SJODAHL
Department of Surgery,
University Hospital,
S-581 85 Linkoping, Sweden

6 May G, Sutherland L, Meldings J. Is small intestinal permeability really increased in relatives of patients with Crohn’s disease? Gut 1993;34:1627–32.

BOOK REVIEW


This interesting book arises from a series of lectures held at a meeting in Glasgow. The editors have chosen a very ambitious title, Pancreatic Disease towards the Year 2000, which an impartial reader could interpret in two ways: either the book is a review of all pancreatic diseases or it throws light on the next century. Neither is the case. The editors of the book have not placed particular value on being comprehensive, but rather treat five areas emphasised at their meeting, all of which are of particular scientific interest at present—acute pancreatitis, transplantation, chronic pancreatitis, endocrine/exocrine interactions, and pancreatic cancer. There is a scientific focus and not merely a new rendering of current knowledge from A to Z. The list of participants, identical with the list of authors, contains more than 80 names well known in the pancreatic literature. They come mostly from the United Kingdom or Germany. All reported on their specialist areas, which means that we are presented with current knowledge on each of these topics. The topics covered in each of the five areas are well balanced and representative, and include basic and clinical science as well as laboratory and clinical studies. This is equally true for the clinical studies that cover conservative and surgical treatment studies. Certain topics, continually reappear in the literature and others only seldomly, so that the reader is grateful for attention the book gives to the latter—for example, “Management of Chronic Pancreatitis: Most Severe Acute Pancreatitis” and “The Burden of Acute Pancreatitis”, and in regard to pancreatic cancers, “The Quality of Life Assessment”.

At whom is this book directed? It is not a series of recipes for diagnosis and treatment. It is, however, an excellent reference work for all non-pancreatologists who wish to inform themselves about individual pancreatic diseases, their particular problems, and the current status of knowledge. It is also a very good book for pancreatologists who are undertaking a study or have to write a review and need to take into account the latest literature (up to 1997). I have added this book to my collection without hesitation.

P G LANKISCH

NOTES

Sir Francis Avery Jones BSG Research Award 2000

Applications are invited by the Education Committee of the British Society of Gastroenterology who will recommend to Council the recipient of the 2000 Award. Applications (TWENTY COPIES) should include:

- A manuscript (2 A4 pages ONLY) describing the work conducted
- A bibliography of relevant personal publications
- An outline of the proposed content of the lecture, including title
- A written statement confirming that all or a substantial part of the work has been personally conducted in the UK or Eire.

Entrants must be 40 years or less on 31 December 1999. Further details on being comprehensive, but rather treat five areas emphasised at their meeting, all of which are of particular scientific interest at present—acute pancreatitis, transplantation, chronic pancreatitis, endocrine/exocrine interactions, and pancreatic cancer. There is a scientific focus and not merely a new rendering of current knowledge from A to Z. The list of participants, identical with the list of authors, contains more than 80 names well known in the pancreatic literature. They come mostly from the United Kingdom or Germany. All reported on their specialist areas, which means that we are presented with current knowledge on each of these topics. The topics covered in each of the five areas are well balanced and representative, and include basic and clinical science as well as laboratory and clinical studies. This is equally true for the clinical studies that cover conservative and surgical treatment studies. Certain topics, continually reappear in the literature and others only seldomly, so that the reader is grateful for attention the book gives to the latter—for example, “Management of Chronic Pancreatitis: Most Severe Acute Pancreatitis” and “The Burden of Acute Pancreatitis”, and in regard to pancreatic cancers, “The Quality of Life Assessment”.

At whom is this book directed? It is not a series of recipes for diagnosis and treatment. It is, however, an excellent reference work for all non-pancreatologists who wish to inform themselves about individual pancreatic diseases, their particular problems, and the current status of knowledge. It is also a very good book for pancreatologists who are undertaking a study or have to write a review and need to take into account the latest literature (up to 1997). I have added this book to my collection without hesitation.

P G LANKISCH

CORRECTIONS

A footnote was inadvertently omitted from the paper by Yang et al (Gut 1999;44:519–26). The footnote reads as follows: Drs Yang and Plevy contributed equally to this work.

An error has come to light in the review by Wong et al (Gut 1999;44:890–5). On page 892, column 1, paragraph 2, “In general TFF1 is associated with MUC5AC expression, TFF2 with MUC5AC and TFF3 with MUC2 (Longman et al, personal communication)” should read “In general TFF1 is associated with MUC5AC expression, TFF2 with MUC5AC and TFF3 with MUC2 (Longman et al, personal communication)”. The authors regret any confusion this may have caused.

Several errors occurred in the leading article by Frayling (Gut 1999;45:1–4). On page 2, column 2, paragraph 2, “It if pairs with thymine, a G→A mutation will result” should read “If it pairs with thymine, a G→A mutation will result”. Page 2, column 2, paragraph 2, “However, it may help us understand why loss of MMR is advantageous to a tumour cell, although there is an indication why the loss of one MMR allele might be an advantage” should read “However, it may provide a bridge in our understanding as to why the loss of MMR is actually an advantage to a tumour cell, though there are no clues, as yet, as to why loss of one MMR allele might be advantageous”. Page 3, column 2, final paragraph, “Early studies used a bank of up to a dozen different microsatellites, mostly (CA)n repeats, which were often chosen semi-randomly and carefully to avoid issues of bias due to allelic loss in tumours” should read “Early studies used a bank of up to a dozen or so different microsatellites, mostly (CA)n repeats, often chosen semi-randomly, sometimes chosen carefully to avoid issues of bias due to allelic loss in tumours”.
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