

埃索美拉唑治疗胃食管反流病临床对照观察评价

詹春光 刘少燕 李健

摘要 目的 评价埃索美拉唑(esomeprazole)治疗胃食管反流病(GERD)的临床疗效。**方法** 随机将130例确诊的GERD患者分为两组,治疗组70例,给予埃索美拉唑40mg,口服,1次/天;对照组60例,给予兰索拉唑30mg,口服,1次/天,疗程均为8周。记录治疗后患者烧心、嗳气、反酸、胸骨后灼痛等症状积分改变,按症状积分改善及内镜检查结果对比分析疗效。**结果** 治疗组GERD症状积分改善优于对照组,前2周, $P < 0.01$,4周时 $P < 0.05$,食管黏膜损害愈合率,治疗组优于对照组分别为74.3%和61.7%, $P < 0.01$,但总有效率分别为95.7%和93.3%, $P > 0.05$,两组差异无显著统计学意义。**结论** 埃索美拉唑是治疗胃食管反流病速效高效且安全的质子泵抑制剂(PPI)。

关键词 埃索美拉唑 胃食管反流病 症状积分改善 胃镜检查 临床疗效

Clinical Control Observation and Evaluation of Treatment on Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease with Esomeprazole. Zhan Chunguang, Liu Shaoyan, Li Jian. Department of Gastroenterology, Shekou (NanShan) People's Hospital (west) of Shenzhen, Guangdong 518067, China

Abstract Objective To evaluate the clinical efficacy of Esomeprazole on treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD).

Methods 130 cases of definitely diagnosed GERD patients were randomly divided into 2 groups. 70 patients in treatment group were treated with Esomeprazole 40mg, PO, Qd; 60 patients in control group were treated with lansoprazole 30mg, PO, Qd. Both treatment courses were 8 weeks. The composite score change of patient symptoms, such as heartburn, belching, sour regurgitation and burning pain behind thoracic bone were recorded. The efficacy was analyzed by comparison of composite score improvement of symptoms as well as results of endoscope inspections. **Results** Composite score improvement of symptoms in treatment group was superior to that of control group (at first 2 weeks, $P < 0.01$; at week 4, $P < 0.05$). Healing rate of esophageal mucosa damage in treatment group was superior to that of control group, with 74.3% and 61.7% respectively ($P < 0.01$). But the total effective rate of both groups was 95.7% and 93.3% respectively ($P > 0.05$). No significant statistical difference was found in both groups. **Conclusion** Esomeprazole is a quick-acting and safe proton pump inhibitor (PPI) with high-performance on treatment of GERD.

Key words Esomeprazole; Gastroesophageal reflux disease; Composite score improvement of symptoms; Gastroscopy; Clinical efficacy

胃食管反流病(gastroesophageal reflux disease, GERD)目前世界上发病率有上升趋势^[1]。临床主要表现为烧心、嗳气、反酸等症。采用质子泵抑制剂(PPI)抑酸是目前治疗GERD的主要手段^[2]。笔者采用埃索美拉唑新一代质子泵抑制剂与常用的质子泵抑制剂兰索拉唑对照,观察其对GERD的临床疗效和安全性,获得较为满意的效果,现在报告如下。

资料与方法

1. 临床资料:2008年1月~2009年9月到本院就诊的门诊患者,有典型的GERD症状如烧心、嗳气、反酸、胸骨后烧灼痛等,经内镜检查确诊有胃食管反流病,排除感染性食管炎,药物性食管炎,胃肠道恶性肿瘤等,并按内镜诊断分级为1级、2级和3级。凡入选患者均符合以下条件:①症状积分总

和应大于6分;②病程超过2个月;③年龄在15~65岁;④排除内镜检查疑有恶性病变,合并消化性溃疡,胃手术者,妊娠期妇女,严重心、肝、肾疾病患者及对本药物或同类药物有过敏史者。共入选GERD病例120例,随机平分为治疗组和对照组各60例,两组在性别、年龄、症状积分等方面基本相近,详见表1,两组基本情况具有可比性,差异无显著性, $P > 0.05$ 。

表1 两组临床资料比较

组别	例数(n)	男性/女性	年龄(岁)	症状积分(分)
治疗组	70	40/30	46.2±6.6	17.6±5.8
对照组	60	33/27	45.6±6.9	16.9±5.9

两组比较, $P > 0.05$

2. 治疗方法:治疗组(60例)给予埃索美拉唑(esomeprazole,即耐信,阿斯利康制药有限公司生产)40mg,口服,1次/天;对照组(60例)给予兰索拉唑(河南圣凡制药有限公

司)30mg,口服,1次/天,均于早餐前0.5h服用,疗程8周,两组分别辅以促胃肠动力药等治疗,于治疗前及治疗后1天、3天、7天、14天,每1~2周进行复检,记录烧心、嗳气、反酸等临床症状改善情况及不良反应。于疗程结束时进行内镜复查,对比评价。疗程结束后,随访6~12个月。

3. 疗效评判标准:主要根据内镜检查(复查)疗效指标及症状评分(积分)方法来判定^[3,4]。A. 内镜诊断分级法:0级为正常(可稍有组织学改变)积分为0分;1级为点状或条状发红、糜烂、无融合现象,积分为1分;2级为有条状发红,糜烂,并有融合,但非全周性,积分为2分;3级为病变广泛,发红、糜烂,融合呈全周性或有溃疡,积分为3分。内镜积分0分者为痊愈,内镜积分减少2分者为显效,减少1分者为有效,积分无变化或增加1分以上者为无效。B. 症状评分:①症状记分方法:0分为无症状;1分为症状轻微,不影响生活和工

作;2分为症状明显,轻度影响生活和工作;3分为症状显著,严重影响生活和工作,需要药物控制;②症状频度分级:0分为无发作,1分为1天/周,2分为症状频度较多,2~3天/周,3分为多发,4~5天/周,4分为频发,几乎每天发作。对每一个患者的每一项症状均进行评分,每一次症状的积分为症状记分和症状频度记分之和,4种症状(烧心、嗳气、反酸及胸骨后灼痛),评分之和为患者的症状积分,每种症状最高评分为7分,4种症状总积分最高为28分。

4. 统计学分析:采用SPSS10.0统计学软件处理。计量资料以 $\bar{x} \pm s$ 表示。两组资料疗效比较,采用 χ^2 检验,组间差异比较采用方差分析。

结 果

1. 治疗前后症状积分变化情况比较:详见表2。

表2 治疗前后两组症状积分改善比较($\bar{x} \pm s$)

组别	治疗前	治疗后				
		1天	3天	7天	14天	28天
治疗组(n=70)	$17.5 \pm 5.8^{\#}$	$13.7 \pm 6.1^{**}$	$10.2 \pm 5.6^{**}$	$9.2 \pm 5.3^{**}$	$8.0 \pm 3.9^{**}$	$6.6 \pm 3.9^{*}$
对照组(n=60)	16.9 ± 5.9	15.6 ± 6.0	13.1 ± 5.4	12.8 ± 4.8	11.9 ± 3.8	7.6 ± 4.1

与对照组比较, *P<0.05 或 **P<0.01, #P>0.05

2. 胃镜复查结果:详见表3。

表3 两组治疗后胃镜复查结果比较[n(%)]

组别	痊愈	显效	有效	无效	总有效率
治疗组(n=70)	52(74.3) ^{**}	13(18.6)	2(2.8)	3(4.3)	95.7 [*]
对照组(n=60)	37(61.7)	15(25.0)	4(6.7)	4(6.6)	93.3

与对照组比较, *P>0.05, **P<0.01

3. 药物不良反应:临床观察过程中未发现药物不良反应。

讨 论

GERD是一种由胃内容物反流入食管引起症状和(或)并发的疾病,其典型症状是烧心、嗳气、反流。食管并发症又有食管糜烂、狭窄、Barrett食管和食管腺癌^[5]。临床前必须认真确诊。最好采用多种方式诊断,避免误诊误治^[6],而PPI诊断治疗和实际治疗都是对GERD最合适的策略之一^[7]。

笔者选用新一代质子泵抑制剂埃索美拉唑(耐信)与常用质子泵抑制剂兰索拉唑对GERD患者130例临床对照观察,结果埃索美拉唑起效快,痊愈率高,治疗开始到2周,埃索美拉唑治疗症状快速缓解,从表2看出,其症状积分变化与兰索拉唑对照比较有明显或极明显的统计学意义。^{**P<0.01}或^{*P<0.05}。直到4周两组症状积分变化比较才接近,P>0.05。

而治疗后痊愈率分别为52(74.3%)和37(61.7%),差异极明显P<0.01,有极明显的统计学意义。但总有效率两组分别为95.7%和93.3%,P>0.05,则无明显差异。表明两组对GERD的治疗均有效。埃索美拉唑起效快且痊愈率高^[8]。

埃索美拉唑和兰索拉唑同属PPI,均作用于胃壁细胞的H⁺、K⁺、ATP酶,并与这些酶不可逆转的牢固性结合,抑制了胃酸分泌的终末途径,对空腹和餐后胃酸分泌均具较强的抑制作用。埃索美拉唑是兰索拉唑的左旋异构体,作用更好于其他PPI,可通过抑制质子泵,作用于泌酸的最终环节,强力降低胃酸分泌,提高胃内pH。其具有高度选择性,抑酸更持久,起效更迅速等特点,不仅提高胃黏膜的pH,减少溃疡的发生,还可促进溃疡愈合。文献报道服用埃索美拉唑40mg,4周的愈合率约为70%以上^[9],8周后可达93%以上。笔者临床观察结果亦相近为95.7%。

本观察未见埃索美拉唑的不良反应,为防止GERD复发,我院一般采用20mg,1次/天,长期服用埃索美拉唑作为维护治疗。3个月、6个月、1年复查未见GERD复发,可见埃索美拉唑与兰索拉唑一样(剂量减半),可作为防止GERD复发维持治疗的理想用药。

参考文献

- 1 Masaki Miyamoto, Ken Haruma, Masao Kuwabara, et al. High incidence of newly - developed gastroesophageal reflux disease in the Japanese community: A 6 - year follow - up study. *Journal of Gastroenterology and hepatology*, 2008, 23 :393 - 397
- 2 于静兰. 胃食管反流性疾病如何治疗. *农村医药报(汉)*, 2008 - 09 - 19(2)
- 3 中华医学会消化内镜学会. 反流性食管炎诊断及治疗方案(试行). *中华内科杂志*, 2000, 39(3) :210
- 4 Wang JH, Luo JY, Dong L, et al, Composite score of reflux symptoms in diagnosis of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *World J Gastroenterol*, 2004, 10 :3332 - 3335
- 5 Vakil N, Van Zanten SV, Kahrlas P, et al, The Montreal definition and classification of gastroesophageal reflux disease: A Global evidence - based consensus. *Am J Gastroenterol*, 2006, 101 :1
- 6 Van Pinxteren B, Numans ME, Bonis PA. Short - term treatment with Proton pump inhibitors, H₂ - receptor antagonists and prokinetics for gastro - esophageal reflux disease - like symptoms and endoscopy negative reflux disease. *Cochrane Database sys Rev*, 2004, 3 ;CD 002095
- 7 Ikuo H, Joel ER. ACG Practice guidelines: esophageal reflux testing. *Am J Gastroenterol*, 2007, 102 :668
- 8 Gold BD, Gunasekaran T, Tolka V, et al, Safety and symptom improvement with esomeprazole in adolescents with gastroesophageal reflux disease. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*, 2007, 45(5) :520 - 529
- 9 Li J, Zhao J, Hamer - Maansson JE, et al. Pharmacokinetic Properties of esomeprazole in adolescent patients aged 12 to 17 years with Symptoms of gastosophageal reflux disease: a randomized, openlabel study. *Clin Ther*, 2006, 28(3) :419 - 429

(收稿:2009-12-30)

(修回:2010-03-15)

自身免疫性肝炎合并肝纤维化指标 异常对疾病预后判断意义

骆定海 吴建胜 贾国葆 黄智铭 陈民新

摘要 目的 分析 32 例自身免疫性肝炎(AIH)的临床特点,探讨血清肝纤维化指标与疾病严重程度的关系,以预测预后。**方法** 收集我院自 2004 年 1 月 ~ 2009 年 8 月经确诊的 AIH 患者的住院资料,着重对临床表现进行回顾性分析。**结果** 共 32 例入组病人,其中肝纤维化指标增高者共 20 例,正常者 12 例,分别检测两组的丙氨酸氨基转氨酶(ALT)、天门冬氨酸氨基转氨酶(AST)、总胆红素(TBil)、碱性磷酸酶(AKP)、γ - 谷氨酰转肽酶(γ - GT)、凝血酶原时间(PT)、白细胞(WBC)、ANA 效价对数、IgG、IgA 水平,其中两组 ALT 值分别为 383 ± 305 U/L、 150 ± 93 U/L, AST 分别为 275 ± 139 U/L、 156 ± 140 U/L, ANA 效价对数分别为 2.07 ± 0.57 g/L、 1.60 ± 0.16 g/L, IgG 为 22.9 ± 6.45 g/L、 12.1 ± 4.17 g/L, 差异显著($P < 0.05$)。**结论** 肝纤维谱指标反映病情严重程度,与血清透明质酸、Ⅲ型前胶原末端肽正常组比较,指标偏高组临床表现重,可以指导治疗及预测预后。

关键词 自身免疫性肝炎 肝纤维化指标 病情

The Significance of Abnormal Serum Fibrosis Index to the Prognosis of Autoimmune Hepatitis. Luo Dinghai, Wu Jiansheng, Ja Guobao, Huang Zhiming, Chen Minxin. Department of Gastroenterology, the First Affiliated Hospital of Wenzhou Medical Collage, Zhejiang 325000, China

Abstract Objective To analyze the clinical features of 32 autoimmune hepatitis patients, and discuss the relationship between serum fibrosis index and the severity of disease in order to predict the prognosis. **Methods** We collected the data of the patients with autoimmune hepatitis who were diagnosed in the First Affiliated Hospital of Wenzhou Medical College from January 2004 to March 2009. And the analysis was focused on retrospective analysis of clinical manifestations. **Results** A total of 32 patients were enrolled in this study. Of those cases, liver fibrosis indexes in 20 cases were increased, and 12 patients were normal. ALT, AST, TB, AKP, γ - GT, PT, WBC, ANA titer log, IgG, IgA levels were detected in the two groups. The ALT value in two groups was 383 ± 305 U/L, 150 ± 93 U/L, respectively. The AST value in two groups was 275 ± 139 U/L, 156 ± 140 U/L respectively, and ANA titer log was 2.07 ± 0.57 , 1.60 ± 0.16 respectively, and IgG value was 22.9 ± 6.45 g/L, 12.1 ± 4.17 g/L respectively. The difference was significant($P < 0.05$). **Conclusion** Compared with normal group, the clinical manifestations of patients with high serum hyaluronic acid and Ⅲ procollagen propeptide were more

作者单位:325000 温州医学院附属第一医院

通讯作者:吴建胜,电子信箱:ldh421@126.com