LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Is needle biopsy of the liver necessary to diagnose HCC?

Editor,—Schotman and colleagues (Gut 1999;45:626–7) reported a patient with subcutaneous seeding of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) after percutaneous needle biopsy, together with a review of 14 similar cases and correctly outlined the necessity for a critical evaluation of the role of needle biopsy in ressectable HCC.1 4

We agree with their conclusion, namely that if it is not possible to diagnose HCC by other means (namely increased a fetoprotein (AFP) concentrations, spiral computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging); in these cases, a single pass with a large needle (18 gauge) may be preferable to multiple passes with smaller calibre needles; (ii) needle biopsies are not indicated to confirm HCC in patients suitable for liver transplantation; and (iii) the entire needle tract should be resected at surgery for the primary tumour. This has been important in other skin recurrences, namely those after laparoscopic cholecystectomy for undiagnosed gall bladder carcinoma.5 6

However, we have some questions and comments concerning the reported case. Firstly, why did the authors perform tumour biopsy in a 30 year old woman with hepatitis B liver cirrhosis and raised serum AFP, showing a 2 cm diameter subcapsular nodule in segment V and two additional satellite lesions in the same segment? Adequate imaging procedures such as spiral CT in addition, subcapsular liver lesions are known to give a high rate of both subcutaneous recurrence and intraperitoneal subdiaphragmatic seeding.1 Therefore, in contrast with recurrence after laparoscopic surgery which mostly cluster around abdominal port tracts,1 simple removal of the needle tract could not be sufficient to prevent the side effects of percutaneous liver biopsy. Secondly, why did they perform right hemihepatectomy in a cirrhotic liver rather than segment V segmentectomy? The latter could be a similarly adequate procedure while preserving better residual liver function.

The authors should be congratulated for focusing once again on a very important question (to biopsy or not to biopsy liver nodules in suspected HCC in the present era of highly effective imaging) and for their collection of 15 cases, which is obviously an underestimation of what occurs in practice and is currently observed in many transplant centres. However, their message for the reader should be clearer as there is an apparent contradiction between what they state and what they actually did.
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Reply

Editor,—We read with interest the letter of Cetta et al in which they discussed our case (Gut 1999;45:626–7) of subcutaneous seeding of a hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) after percutaneous needle biopsy.

Firstly, they state that a needle biopsy was not indicated in the case presented. It must be stated that the biopsy was performed elsewhere before the patient was admitted to our hospital. Secondly, they suggest that a smaller needle biopsy could not be sufficient to prevent the side effects of percutaneous liver biopsy. We agree with their conclusion, namely that if it is not possible to diagnose HCC by other means (namely increased a fetoprotein (AFP) concentrations, spiral computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging); in these cases, a single pass with a large needle (18 gauge) may be preferable to multiple passes with smaller calibre needles; (ii) needle biopsies are not indicated to confirm HCC in patients suitable for liver transplantation; and (iii) the entire needle tract should be resected at surgery for the primary tumour. This has been important in other skin recurrences, namely those after laparoscopic cholecystectomy for undiagnosed gall bladder carcinoma.

However, we have some questions and comments concerning the reported case. Firstly, why did the authors perform tumour biopsy in a 30 year old woman with hepatitis B liver cirrhosis and raised serum AFP, showing a 2 cm diameter subcapsular nodule in segment V and two additional satellite lesions in the same segment? Adequate imaging procedures such as spiral CT in addition, subcapsular liver lesions are known to give a high rate of both subcutaneous recurrence and intraperitoneal subdiaphragmatic seeding. Therefore, in contrast with recurrence after laparoscopic surgery which mostly cluster around abdominal port tracts, simple removal of the needle tract could not be sufficient to prevent the side effects of percutaneous liver biopsy. Secondly, why did they perform right hemihepatectomy in a cirrhotic liver rather than segment V segmentectomy? The latter could be a similarly adequate procedure while preserving better residual liver function.

The authors should be congratulated for focusing once again on a very important question (to biopsy or not to biopsy liver nodules in suspected HCC in the present era of highly effective imaging) and for their collection of 15 cases, which is obviously an underestimation of what occurs in practice and is currently observed in many transplant centres. However, their message for the reader should be clearer as there is an apparent contradiction between what they state and what they actually did.
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The data in the literature do not support either of the points that have been suggested by Matsumoto et al. Although data on the use of B-RTO for the treatment of fundal varices is exciting, we look forward to randomised controlled clinical trials comparing TIPPS with B-RTO.

Reply

EDITOR.—We thank Matsumoto and colleagues for their interest in our paper. They suggest that transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic stent-shunt (TIPPS) is ineffective for the management of bleeding from fundal varices and given the haemodynamic characteristics of fundal varices, the appropriate treatment for bleeding from them is balloon occluded retrograde transvenous obliteration (B-RTO). They quote Sanyal's paper as evidence in support of their suggestion that TIPPS is unlikely to be useful in the setting of fundal varices. Sanyal et al. reported their experience of TIPPS in 12 patients who underwent this procedure for gastric varices and in six patients these varices did not disappear on follow up. The aim of treatment of bleeding varices is firstly to control bleeding and secondly to prevent rebleeding. In the paper by Sanyal et al. no data were provided about how many patients bled from gastric varices in the follow up period compared with those who rebled with oesophageal varices.

However, our previous study and that of Chau and colleagues clearly show that post-TIPPS bleeding from other oesophageal or gastric varices is a function of portal pressure and has little to do with whether bleeding is from oesophageal or gastric varices. Both Stanley and colleagues and Chau and colleagues compared the outcome of TIPPS insertion for varical bleeding from oesophageal or gastric varices. In the study by Stanley et al., 106 patients (oesophageal varices 74; gastric varices 32) underwent TIPPS for varical bleeding and during follow up variceal bleeding was similar in both groups and there was no difference in survival. In the study by Chau et al., 112 patients (oesophageal varices 84; gastric varices 28) underwent TIPPS for uncontrolled varical bleeding. Bleeding was controlled in all patients after TIPPS except for one in each group. Twenty four per cent of patients in the oesophageal varices group and 29% in the gastric varices group rebled during follow up. Most early rebleeding (within seven days after TIPPS) was related to oesophageal ulceration secondary to previous sclerotherapy. Rates of mortality were similar in both groups. These results suggest that emergency TIPPS is equally effective in the control of gastric fundal varical bleeding compared with oesophageal varical bleeding.

Matsumoto et al. also suggest that there is likely to be a place for B-RTO in the primary prophylaxis of bleeding from fundal varices and that pharmacological agents have no place in their management. Again, the data for both suggestion do not exist in the literature. We think that it is extremely difficult to suggest failure of pharmacological therapy for primary prophylaxis of fundal varices based on the assumption that portal pressure changes are unlikely to be important in the management of fundal varices.


The science, economics, and effectiveness of combination therapy for hepatitis C

EDITOR.—No one affected by hepatitis C virus (HCV) will question Professor Dush- elko's insistence on the importance of effective therapy for HCV and the funding to meet them (Gut 2000;47:159–61). With research and clinical evidence pointing to a prevalence of HCV infection far in excess of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), the issue has now become urgent. Patients and clinicians alike will await the forthcoming NICE appraisal in the hope it recommends in favour of allocating sufficient resources to cover treatment costs for those most in need and best able to benefit.

However, while a positive response will be welcome it will also uncover issues that have still to be fully addressed. These centre on who will be selected for treatment and the effects of the treatment itself.

Regarding the first issue there remains a debate around who will benefit most from treatment. The main outcome is to assess outcome in terms of genotyping, age, duration of viraemia, extent of liver damage, and other complicating factors, such as continued drug and alcohol abuse. While there may be some validity to such categorisations, they are not at all absolute and can demoralise patients. Nevertheless, and leaving such considerations aside, HCV infection is as widespread as some clinicians anticipate, it would be unrealistic to think that treatment is going to be available to treat everyone. This means that some form of treatment selection will need to be adopted. Should this occur, the question remains as to how clinicians will make choices and what criteria they will use. Furthermore, will protocols be in place to govern these criteria to ensure they are standardised nationwide?

Although Dushelko et al. cite the potential priority given by the NHS to combination therapy as the salient issue, this needs to be addressed in conjunction with the equally important matter of who should receive this treatment. Although patients are offered standard combination therapy, combination therapy with pegylated interferon (PEG IFN), or PEG IFN alone is in some ways secondary to the issue of who is actually going to be given treatment. Will it be based on disease progression or expected response to treatment, or both?

Before considering this further, a factor that needs to be implicated in discussions around HCV, but which clinicians tend to underestimate, is patient tolerance and possible lingering effects of the treatment. Although there seems to be a fairly clear cut case in favour of the greater efficacy of combination treatment, it is harder for patients to tolerate monotherapy with IFN, particularly when taken over 48 weeks. Doctors could state that the 20% (approximately) of patients who discontinue therapy before 48 weeks usually do so because of “insomnia, depression, irritability, or anaemia”. This would seem to be suggesting that those with less risk of progressive disease, and therefore less motivation to seek a cure, are more resistant to therapeutic intervention.

Notwithstanding the obvious factor of the greater and more urgent need for treatment for patients with progressive disease following HCV infection, perhaps this trend in mild HCV sufferers might offer some insight as to how patients sometimes choose for themselves—suggesting that those involved with the healthcare of HCV patients an indicator of how best to prioritise treatment should such selection prove necessary.

It is hardly surprising that the science, economics, and effectiveness of combination therapy for hepatitis C is a contentious issue. As noted by Dushelko et al. (Gut 2000;47:159–61), the HCV epidemic has affected and 30 000 new cases each year (Turkington C. et al. Prevalence of hepatitis C virus and B hepatitis in women attending an inner London obstetric department: uptake and acceptability of named antenatal testing. Gut 2000;47:277–80), which reported a prevalence of HCV infection in 1.0% of women of childbearing age who were 16–49 years old, which is a much higher rate than the previous estimate of 0.6% which was viracenic. In the US, HCV infection is reported to be possibly four times higher than HIV with 3.5 million affected and 30 000 new cases each year (Turkington C. Hepatitis C: the silent killer. Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1998:xvii).
Since then, the Health Authority has awarded us continuing revenue for this targeted screening, and included in these monies are the clinical, clerical, and nursing costs incurred in providing this service as a routine for patients in our District.
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NOTES

American College of Gastroenterology
2001 International GI Training Grants Programme

The ACG International GI Training (IGT) Grant Programme provides funding for clinical or clinical research training in gastroenterology and hepatology so that an individual can acquire or develop new cognitive knowledge or a technical skill. This newly acquired knowledge or skill would then be used to improve patient care in the applicant’s geographic area. Physicians outside of the United States and Canada are eligible to apply. At least one fellowship with a maximum of $10,000 per IGT fellowship will be awarded during 2001, for a training period of not less than six months. Awards will be made by a special committee of the ACG and will be based upon the applicant’s credentials, the merit of the proposed training by the selected training host, and the potential for enhancing the field of gastroenterology in the applicant’s home country. Application forms can be obtained from the ACG administrative address: 4900B South 31st Street, Arlington, Virginia 22206-1656. Tel: +1 703 820 7400; fax: +1 703 931 4520; website: www.acg-gi.org. Deadline for submission of application is 1 April 2001.

Redefining Priorities in Gastroenterology

This congress will be held on 11–14 April 2001 in Monte Carlo, Italy. It will be chaired by Professor Massimo Crespi (Rome, Italy) and Professor Emmon Quigley (Cork, Ireland). Further information: Maddalena Massaro, Project Leader, AISC-AIM Group, Via A Ristori 38, 00187 Rome, Italy. Tel: +39 06 8096881; fax: +39 06 80968229; email: gastro2001@aisc.it.

3rd European Federation of Autonomic Societies (EFAS)

The third European Federation of Autonomic Societies (EFAS) meeting in conjunction with the annual meeting of the sections “Autonomic nervous system” of the German Neurological Society, “Diabetes and Nervous System” of the German Neurological Society, and “Autonomic Nervous System” at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany, will be held in Erlangen, Germany on 26–28 April 2001. Further information: Professor Dr M J Hill, Department of Neurology, University or Erlangen-Nuremberg, Schwabachanlage 6, D-91054 Erlangen, Germany. Tel: +49 0131 8534444; fax: +49 9131 8534328; website: www.neurologie.med.uni-erlangen.de/oeffentliche_Veranstaltungen.html

Falk Workshop

The workshop entitled Update in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases will be held in Ljubljana, Slovenia, on 5 May 2001. Further information: Prof Dr S Markovic, University Medical Center Ljubljana, Division of Internal Medicine, Jalepova 2, 1525 Ljubljana, Slovenia. Tel: +386 (1) 231 6925; fax: +386 (1) 433 4190; email: sasa.markovic@kclj.si

EPGS Endosonography Live in Amsterdam

This European Postgraduate Gastro-Surgical School congress will take place on 31 May and 1 June 2001 in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Further information: Mrs Helma Stockmann/ Mrs Joy Goedkoop, European Postgraduate Gastro-Surgical School, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Tel: +31 20 566 3926; fax: +31 20 566 6569; email: W.J.Stockmann@amc.uva.nl; website: www.epgs.nl.

33rd European Pancreatic Club

The meeting will take place on 13–16 June 2001 in Toulouse, France. A training course will be organised on 13 June on “Genomics and post genomics: developments in biomedical sciences”. Further information: Dr Nicole Vaysse, Inserm U531, CHU Rangueil, 31403 Toulouse, France. Tel: +33 (0) 5 61 32 24 02; fax: +33 (0) 5 61 32 24 03; email: nicole.vaysse@rangueil.inserm.fr; website: www.e-p-c.org.

Gastroenterology and Endotherapy:
XIXth European Workshop

This course, to introduce the experienced gastroenterologist to the growing field of therapeutic endoscopy, will be held on 16–20 September 2001 in Brussels, Belgium. Further information: Mrs Nancy Beauprez, Gastroenterology Department, Erasme Hospital, Route de Lennik 808, B-1070 Brussels. Tel: +32 02 555 49 00; fax: +32 02 555 49 01; email: beauprez@ulb.ac.be

CORRECTION