Noninvasive *Helicobacter pylori* testing was as effective as endoscopy for managing dyspepsia


QUESTION: In patients with upper gastrointestinal symptoms presenting for investigation of dyspepsia, is treatment based on a urea breath test for *Helicobacter pylori* alone as effective as endoscopy and urea breath testing?

**Design**
Randomised (allocation concealed*†*,† unblinded,* controlled trial with 1 year of follow up.

**Setting**
A gastroenterology clinic in Glasgow, UK.

**Patients**
708 patients (mean age 37 y, 53% men) who were referred by their general practitioners for investigation of upper gastrointestinal symptoms. Exclusion criteria were age >55 years, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, or sinister symptoms. Follow up was 83%.

**Intervention**
Patients were allocated to endoscopy plus the noninvasive **14**C-urea breath test (n=352) or the breath test alone (n=356) for determination of *H pylori* status. Patients were informed of their status after the test, and patients with positive results were prescribed a 7 day course of *H pylori* eradication treatment with omeprazole; 20 mg twice daily; clarithromycin, 250 mg 3 times daily; and amoxicillin, 500 mg (or metronidazole, 400 mg) 3 times daily.

**Main outcome measures**
Change from baseline on the Glasgow Dyspepsia Severity Score (GDSS). Secondary outcomes were use of medical resources, patient assessment of the procedures, and safety.

**Main results**
Analysis was by intention to treat. At 1 year, the mean change from baseline on the GDSS was similar between groups (p=0.69) (table). The study had 90% power to detect a difference in mean change on the GDSS of 1.03 and 1.41 between the groups that were positive and negative for *H pylori*, respectively. The mean reduction in GDSS was 46% in the endoscopy group and 45% in the breath test alone group. Groups did not differ for resolution of dyspepsia (14% v 11%, p=0.25). More patients who received the breath test alone were referred for further endoscopy than those who received the breath test and endoscopy (8.2% v 1.7%, p<0.001). Groups did not differ for further nonendoscopic investigations.

**Conclusion**
In patients with upper gastrointestinal symptoms presenting for investigation of dyspepsia, a urea breath test for *Helicobacter pylori* was as effective as endoscopy plus breath test for managing dyspepsia.

*See glossary.
†Information provided by author.

![Table](https://www.evidence-basedmedicine.com/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Breath test (baseline)</th>
<th>Endoscopy plus breath test (baseline)</th>
<th>Difference in mean change from baseline (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Dyspepsia Severity Score</td>
<td>5.6 (10.2)</td>
<td>5.4 (10.2)</td>
<td>0.2 (−0.7 to 0.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CI defined in glossary.

**COMMENTARY**
Patients with dyspeptic symptoms should be managed with 2 goals in mind: early detection of malignant disease and cost-effective relief of symptoms. Patients <55 years of age without “alarm features” (eg, weight loss, dysphagia, and anemia) are at very low risk of malignancy and do not require endoscopic investigation. The question of management then turns on the relative costs and effectiveness of endoscopy, noninvasive tests, and eradication of *H pylori* and empiric acid suppression.†

The trials by McColl and Chiba and their colleagues provide important information for physicians managing patients presenting with uninvestigated dyspepsia. The study by McColl et al adds to 2 previous studies‡ that confirm the cost effectiveness of a secondary care based *H pylori* test and treat service compared with endoscopy based management. All 3 trials of test and treat compared with endoscopy based management showed equivalent effectiveness, but costs were reduced because fewer patients had endoscopy: The trial by McColl et al showed a rate of endoscopy in the year of follow up in the test and treat group of only 8%, whereas Heaney‡ showed rates nearer 30%. Patients positive for *H pylori* in both groups of the trial by McColl et al received eradication treatment. Thus, any differences caused by the eradication treatment itself were abolished. The trial can therefore be considered to address the question, "Is the cost of eradication warranted by the effect on symptoms, quality of life, and patient satisfaction of having the investigation?" The answer is "no".

The trial by Chiba et al (CADET-Hp) takes the McColl et al trial 2 steps further. Firstly, patient recruitment and the intervention took place in a primary care setting. Secondly, test and treat was compared with acid suppression alone. In contrast to the trial by McColl et al, CADET-Hp was designed to examine the effect of eradication treatment on dyspeptic symptoms, and found a substantial improvement in the proportion of patients with dyspeptic symptoms at the end of the trial. However, the difference in costs was small and not statistically significant.

The reason for the difference in costs and between CADET-Hp and McColl et al lies in the use of eradication treatment for *H pylori*. In CADET-Hp the control group patients did not receive eradication treatment and were therefore at risk of recurrent peptic ulcers that had healed initially with omeprazole.
Helicobacter pylori eradication improved dyspepsia symptoms


QUESTION: In patients with dyspepsia and a positive test result for Helicobacter pylori, is an H pylori eradication strategy more effective than placebo for improving dyspepsia symptoms?

Main outcome measures
Global overall severity (GOS) of dyspepsia symptoms assessed with a 7 point scale (1= no problem, 7=very severe problems). Treatment success was a score of 1 or 2. Secondary outcomes were proportion of asymptomatic patients and treatment success according to H pylori status.

Main results
Analysis was by intention to treat, and an analysis with all evaluable patients was also done (n=267). Patients in the eradication group had greater treatment response than did those in the placebo group (table). More patients in the eradication group were completely asymptomatic (table). Treatment was more successful in patients in whom H pylori was eradicated than in those it was not (54% v 39%, p=0.02). Eradication treatment reduced societal costs, but the difference was not statistically significant (Cdn $53, 95% CI 86 to 180).

Conclusion
In patients with dyspepsia and a positive test result for Helicobacter pylori, an H pylori eradication strategy was more effective than placebo for improving dyspepsia symptoms.

*See glossary.
†Information provided by author.

H pylori eradication v placebo for uninvestigated dyspepsia at 1 year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Eradication</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
<th>RBI (95% CI)</th>
<th>NNT (CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment success</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37% (5 to 80)</td>
<td>7 (4 to 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely asymptomatic</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>92% (21 to 205)</td>
<td>8 (5 to 24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Abbreviations defined in glossary; RBI, NNT, and CI calculated from data in article.

COMMENTARY—continued from previous page

Furthermore, patients with nonulcer dyspepsia may also benefit from H pylori eradication. A Cochrane review of 9 placebo controlled trials of H pylori eradication treatment in patients without peptic ulcers or oesophagitis at endoscopy found a number needed to treat of 11.5

The CADET-Hp trial does not show conclusively that H pylori test and treat is more cost effective in primary care than omeprazole alone, because it was only done in H pylori-positive patients. The cost effectiveness of this strategy needs to be tested by randomising patients with dyspepsia, both positive and negative for H pylori, before noninvasive testing for H pylori, to determine the effect of the management strategy on the whole group. It does, however, lend more support to the eradication of H pylori in all patients known to be infected.
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