Management of patients with uninvestigated dyspepsia

A recently published randomized controlled trial of the eradication of Helicobacter pylori in patients without ulcers who presented with functional dyspepsia was reviewed in CMAJ Clinical Update. We believe the Clinical Update oversimplifies the management of dyspepsia in that it incorrectly leads the reader to believe that these results are applicable to the management of primary care patients with uninvestigated dyspepsia, when in fact this is not the case.

It is essential to distinguish between uninvestigated and investigated dyspepsia. By definition, functional dyspepsia is a diagnosis of exclusion after investigation has ruled out organic disease such as peptic ulcer, gastroesophageal reflux and, less frequently, gastric cancer. For this, upper gastrointestinal endoscopy is the investigation of choice. Over half of patients with dyspepsia will have a normal endoscopy and they are said to have nonulcer dyspepsia.

There is indeed a lot of controversy about whether eradication of H. pylori infection in patients with functional dyspepsia leads to sustained improvement in symptoms. Although the study reviewed in the Clinical Update suggests that there is no benefit from eradication of H. pylori in patients with functional dyspepsia, a recent meta-analysis of 12 randomized controlled trials shows a modest risk reduction in dyspeptic symptoms resulting from eradication of H. pylori (risk reduction 9%, 95% confidence interval 4%–14%).

Perhaps the clinically more relevant question is what is the value of a noninvasive H. pylori test-and-treat strategy in patients with uninvestigated dyspepsia in the primary care setting. A recently completed randomized controlled trial of 294 patients showed that 50% of patients randomized to active treatment for eradication of H. pylori had improvement in symptoms at 12 months compared with 36% in the group of patients randomized to a placebo. Patients in this study did not undergo endoscopy, so it is not known how much of the improvement is attributable to patients with an ulcer diathesis.

Infection with H. pylori is also a risk factor for the development of gastric cancer. We might reasonably expect that eradication of H. pylori may provide the additional benefit of preventing some cases of gastric cancer, although there are not yet any data from randomized controlled trials to support this view.

In summary, we believe there are data to support a noninvasive H. pylori test-and-treat strategy in patients with uninvestigated dyspepsia who are less than 50 years old, who do not have alarm symptoms, who are not taking nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and who do not have symptoms suggesting reflux disease. This was clearly outlined in our recently published CMAJ supplement.
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On the trail of necrotizing fasciitis in children

Tayuee Hsieh and colleagues are to be commended for their attempt to define the pediatric presentation and outcome of necrotizing fasciitis versus cellulitis, using a case–control study design.1 One major limitation of their study is the paucity of cases of necrotizing fasciitis (8 cases in total), despite a 16-year period for the retrospective analysis. This raises a question about the accuracy of the ICD-9 coding system for identifying cases of necrotizing fasciitis or similar entities. The answer is that it is not particularly accurate. For example, the sensitivity of ICD-9-CM codes appears to be at most 58.3% for instance, the sensitivity of ICD-9-CM is that it is not particularly accurate. For example, the sensitivity of ICD-9-CM codes appears to be at most 58.3% for
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I read with interest the article by Tayuee Hsieh and colleagues describing a case–control study of necrotizing fasciitis in children.1 The authors indicated that they enrolled control subjects who were “matched to the case subjects” by date of admission and by date of birth. Although it was not specifically stated, one might assume by the wording that the control subjects were individually matched to the case subjects. The authors also noted that, for the multivariate analysis, they were unable to obtain odds ratios from conditional logistic regression (which would take the matching into account) but verified their estimates by an alternative approach that did adjust for matching.

However, it is not clear whether appropriate analyses that take matching into account were utilized in their univariate comparisons, and whether the comparisons displayed in their Table 1 represent univariate or multivariate comparisons. They indicated that they analyzed their data using Fisher’s exact test for categorical variables and the Wilcoxon rank–sum test for continuous variables. If the authors did not use matching, would the comparisons in Table 1 have been different if they had? Would this have altered the “significant” risk factors included in the multivariate analysis?
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[The authors respond:]

We agree with Joel Ray that the ICD-9 coding system may not adequately ensure retrieval of all relevant cases. To ensure that we captured