Meta-analysis: esomeprazole or rabeprazole vs. first-generation pump inhibitors in the treatment of *Helicobacter pylori* infection

A. G. McNicholl^{*,†}, P. M. Linares^{*,†}, O. P. Nyssen^{*}, X. Calvet^{†,‡} & J. P. Gisbert^{*,†}

*Gastroenterology Unit, Hospital Universitario de la Princesa and Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IP), Madrid, Spain. *Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Spain. *Digestive Diseases Service, Corporació Universitària Parc Taulí, Departament de Medicina, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Sabadell, Spain.

Correspondence to:

A. G. McNicholl, Gastroenterology Unit, Hospital Universitario de la Princesa and Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IP), c/Diego de León 62 28006, Madrid, Spain. E-mail: adrian.mcn@gmail.com

Publication data

Submitted 20 March 2012 First decision 5 April 2012 Resubmitted 19 June 2012 Accepted 20 June 2012 EV Pub Online 15 July 2012

As part of AP&T's peer-review process, a technical check of this meta-analysis was performed by Dr Y. Yuan.

SUMMARY

Background

The decreasing efficacy of *H. pylori* eradication treatments over time makes the search for better regimens and adjuvant medications a priority.

Aim

To conduct a meta-analysis of studies comparing rabeprazole or esomeprazole with other proton pump inhibitors (PPI) or with each other in *H. pylori* eradication treatment.

Methods

Selection of Studies: Randomised clinical trials comparing esomeprazole or rabeprazole with first-generation PPIs (omeprazole-lansoprazole-pantoprazole) or with each other.

Results

The meta-analysis (35 studies, 5998 patients) showed higher eradication rates for esomeprazole than for first-generation PPIs: 82.3% vs. 77.6%; OR = 1.32 (1.01–1.73); NNT = 21. Rabeprazole also showed better results than first-generation PPIs: 80.5% vs. 76.2%; OR = 1.21(1.02–1.42); NNT = 23. PPI dosage subanalysis: only esomeprazole 40 mg b.d. improved results [83.5% esomeprazole vs. 72.4% first generation; OR = 2.27(1.07–4.82); NNT = 9]. Whereas rabeprazole 10 and 20 mg b.d. maintained results, esomeprazole 20 mg b.d. obtained lower efficacy. Esomeprazole vs. rabeprazole sub-analysis (five studies): no significant differences were found: 78.7% vs. 76.7%; OR = 0.90(0.70–1.17). CYP2C19 sub-analysis: Genotype did not significantly affect eradication either in first [OR = 1.76(0.99–3.12)] or new generation [OR = 1.19(0.73–1.95)] PPIs. However, sub-analysis considering only extensive metaboliser patients showed higher eradication with new-generation PPIs [OR = 1.37(1.02–1.84)].

Conclusions

Esomeprazole and rabeprazole show better overall *H. pylori* eradication rates than first-generation PPIs. This clinical benefit is more pronounced in esomeprazole 40 mg b.d. regimens. In CYP2C19 extensive metabolisers, new-generation PPIs are more effective than first-generation PPIs for *H. pylori* eradication. However, a general recommendation of using new-generation PPIs in all scenarios remains unclear.

Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2012; 36: 414-425

INTRODUCTION

Helicobacter pylori infection has been associated to the development of gastric lesions, such as chronic gastritis, gastroduodenal ulcer, preneoplastic lesions, MALT lymphoma and gastric cancer.¹ As an infection affecting over half of the world's population and as the major cause of upper gastrointestinal tract disorders, its eradication has been indicated whenever the infection is present.^{2–4} But the decreasing efficacy of *H. pylori* eradication treatments over time due to acquired antibiotic resistance by the bacterial strains makes the search for better regimens and adjuvant medications a priority for the management of gastric diseases.⁵

Proton pump inhibitors (PPI) are prodrugs derived from timoprazole, a pyridylmethylsulfinyl benzimidazole compound able to irreversibly block the proton pump (H^+/K^+ ATPase) of gastric parietal cells.⁶ As proton pump is the last step on acid secretion in the stomach, it is an ideal target for acid inhibition.

The use of PPIs combined with antibiotics in the eradication of *H. pylori* has demonstrated not only to protect the stomach but also to increase the eradication rate itself.^{6, 7} Acid inhibition increases eradication efficacy as antibiotics are more stable in less acidic gastric environments and induces a higher antibiotic sensitivity in the bacteria.⁸ Furthermore, many studies in humans have shown that differences on acid control account for differences in eradication rates and that strong acid inhibition increases the efficacy of *H. pylori* treatments⁷

Since the discovery of omeprazole several analogues have been developed and commercialised. First omeprazole, lansoprazole and pantoprazole (first-generation PPIs) were developed and several studies demonstrated their antiacid properties and their role in *H. pylori* eradication. Later, a second generation of PPIs (rabeprazole and esomeprazole) was presented demonstrating even higher acid inhibition.^{9–11} But its correlation with higher *H. pylori* eradication rates is still unclear.^{12, 13}

For this reason, it seems necessary to review the literature of controlled trials comparing the efficacy of *H. pylori* eradication treatments differing only on the PPI used.

Therefore, the aim of the present meta-analysis was to evaluate the eradication rates of the different PPI when used in association to antibiotic treatment for the eradication of *H. pylori*.

METHODS

Search strategy

A systematic computerised literature search was conducted in Medline, PubMed ISI Web of Knowledge,





Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials and EMBase online databases up to October 2011. Manual search of evidence from congress abstracts was performed for 'Digestive Disease Week', 'United European Gastroenterology Week' and the 'International Workshop on Helicobacter and Related Bacteria' from 1995 to 2011. Search and Review were conducted independently by two reviewers (AGM and PML) and discordances were resolved by a third investigator (JPG).

Boolean search was performed using MESH categories [Helicobacter OR Pylori] AND [Eradication OR Treatment] AND [PPI OR Rabeprazole OR Esomeprazole OR 'Proton Pump Inhibitor']. Search was limited to only human subjects' studies. Outcome data review followed a three-step exclusion process: Title Exclusion Step, Abstract Exclusion Step and Full Text Review.

Inclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria for articles in the meta-analysis were: (i) Reporting *H. pylori* eradication results of comparative, randomised trials, (ii) The eradication regimens had to be PPI plus two antibiotics, (iii) Including at least two arms of treatment differing only on the PPI used,

Table 1 Included studies				
Reference	Antibiotics (mg)	Length of treatment	Number of patients	Eradication (%)
Adachi (2003) ²⁷	C 400 b.d. + A 500 t.d.s.	5 days	80	R20 (90.0%) – 020 (75.0%)
Anagnostopoulos (2004) ⁴⁵	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	156	E40od (81.0%) – E40 (96.0%) – O20 (71.0%)
Catalano (2002) ²⁶	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	5 days + 5 extra days PPI	127	R40od (90.0%) - R20od (80.9%) - 040od (93.3%)
Chen (2005) ³⁷	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	104	E20 (88.5%) – 020 (82.7%)
Choi (2007) ³⁴	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	576	E40 (70.3%) - R20 (69.3%) - P40 (69.3%) - O20 (64.9%)
De los Rios (2009) ⁴⁴	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	10 days	83	E20 (63.4%) – O20 (59.5%)
Dojo (2001) ²⁸	C 400 b.d. + A 750 b.d.	7 days	170	R20 (80.2%) – 020 (78.7%)
Fernandez-Bermejo (2001) ²⁵	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	30	R20 (84.6%) – O20 (82.4%)
Hawkey (2003) ²⁴	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	174	R20 (80.5%) – O20 (70.1%)
	C 500 b.d. + M 400 b.d.	7 days	174	R20 (64.4%) – O20 (77.0%)
Hsu (2005) ⁴³	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	200	E40 (94.0%) – P40 (82.0%)
Huh (2004) ⁴²	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	112	E20 (77.1%) – O20 (74.5%)
Inaba (2002) ³⁰	C 200 t.d.s. + A 500 t.d.s.	7 days	183	R10 (76.6%) - L30 (86.7%) - O20 (83.1%)
Kang (2008) ⁴⁷	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	327	E20 (88.3%) – P40 (82.6%)
Kawabata (2003) ³¹	C 400 b.d. + A 750 b.d.	7 days	187	R10 (75.0%) – L30 (69.0%)
Kawai (2007) ³²	C 200 t.d.s. + A 500 t.d.s.	7 days	135	R10od (71.1%) – L30od (62.2%) – O20od (69.9%)
Kim (2003) ⁵⁰	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	426	E40 (78.1%) – R40 (75.3%)
Kositchaiwat (2003) ²³	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	162	R10 (84.9%) - R20 (96.3%) - O20 (83.3%)
Kumar (2007) ²²	A 750 b.d. + T 500 b.d.	14 days	92	R20 (86.7%) – P40 (78.1%) – O20 (83.3%)
Kuwayama (2001) ²¹	C 200 b.d. + A 500 t.d.s.	7 days	92	R10 (66.7%) – O20 (60.0%)
Lee (2010) ⁴⁸	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	256	E20 (67.7%) – R20 (61.1%)
Maev (2003) ⁴¹	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	80	E20 (91.3%) - E40od(89.3%) - O20 + 3W (89.6%)
Miehlke (2003) ⁴⁰	C 250 b.d. + M 400 b.d.	7 days	80	E20 (90.4%) – O20 (81.6%)
Miki (2003) ²⁹	C 400 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	145	R10 (85.4%) – R20 (83.3%) – L30 (79.6%)
Miwa (1999) ¹⁹	C 200 b.d. + A 500 t.d.s.	7 days	221	R20 (87.5%) – L30 (83.8%) – O20 (85.3%)
Miwa (2000) ²⁰	C 200 b.d. + A 500 t.d.s.	7 days	308	R10 (87.0%) – R20 (85.6%) – L30 (82.7%)
Murakami (2002) ¹⁸	C 200 b.d. + A 750 b.d.	7 days	245	R10 (93.9%) - R20 (81.8%) - L30 (78.0%)
Pan (2010) ⁴⁹	Lev 500od + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	184	E20 (85.2%) – E40 (87.1%) – R10 (75.4%)
Sheu (2005) ⁴⁶	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	200	E40 (86.0%) – O20 (79.0%)
Subei (2007) ³⁹	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	374	E20 (74.7%) – O20 + 3W (78.7%)
Tulassay (2001) ³⁸	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	446	E20 (82.9%) – O20 + 3W (85.7%)
Vakil (2004) ¹⁷	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	10 days	409	R20 (78.0%) – O20 (73.0%)
Wong (2001) ¹⁶	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	115	R10 (88.0%) – O20 (82.0%)
Wu (2007) ⁵¹	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	420	E40od (89.4%) – R20 (90.5%)
Yang (2003) ¹⁵	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	47	R20 (82.6%) – 020 (87.5%)
Zhang (2010) ³³	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	240	R10 (85.8%) – 020 (79.2%)
A, amoxicillin; b.d., twice daily pantoprazole; T	; C, clarithromycin; E, esomep ; tinidazole; t.d.s., thrice daily.	razole; ITT, Intention to treat;	L, lansoprazole; Lev, le	vofloxacin; M, metronidazole; O, omeprazole; od, once daily; P,
+3W refers to studies in which	ו one arm of treatment includ	es 3 weeks of omeprazole afte	er eradication treatmen	ţ
* Number by the letter indicat	es mg per dose. Treatment giv	en twice daily unless mention	ed otherwise.	

Reference	Antibiotics (mg)	Length	Arm*	Extensive metabolisers % (e/N)	Poor metabolisers % (e/N)
Dojo (2001) ²⁸	C 400 b.d. + A 750 b.d.	7 days	R20 O20	82.3% (51/62) 80.3% (53/66)	87.5% (14/16) 85.0% (17/20)
Inaba (2002) ³⁰	C 200 t.d.s. + A 500 t.d.s.	7 days	R10 L30 O20	76.4% (42/55) 89.8% (44/49) 83.3% (40/48)	87.5% (7/8) 88.9% (8/9) 90.0% (9/10)
Kang (2008) ⁴⁷	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	E20 P40	86.8% (105/121) 80.8% (135/167)	100% (16/16) 95.7% (22/23)
Kawabata (2003) ³¹	C 400 b.d. + A 750 b.d.	7 days	R10 L30	83.1% (69/83) 73.5% (50/68)	60.0% (6/10) 83.0% (10/12)
Kawai (2007) ³²	C 200 t.d.s. + A 500 t.d.s.	7 days	R10od L30od O20od	76.5% (26/34) 69.4% (25/36) 75.8% (25/33)	85.7% (6/7) 100% (3/3) 71.4% (5/7)
Lee (2010) ⁴⁸	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	R20 E20	76.2% (64/84) 83.6% (77/92)	81.3 (13/16) 91.7% (11/12)
Miki (2003) ²⁹	C 400 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	R10 R20 L30	92.3% (36/39) 89.7% (35/39) 84.2% (32/38)	71.4% (5/7) 83.3% (5/6) 77.8% (7/9)
Pan (2010) ⁴⁹	Lev 500od + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	E20 E40 R10	89.2% (33/37) 85.3% (29/34) 72.5% (29/40)	90.0% (9/10) 100% (12/12) 78.6% (11/14)
Sheu (2005) ⁴⁶	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	E40 O20	84.8% (67/79) 75.3% (58/77)	90.5% (19/21) 91.3% (21/23)
Zhang (2010) ³³	C 500 b.d. + A 1000 b.d.	7 days	R10 020	84.7% (83/98) 77.0% (77/100)	90.9% (20/22) 90.0% (18/20)

Table 2 | Included studies describing eradication stratified by CYP2C19 polymorphisms

A, amoxicillin; b.d., twice daily; C, clarithromycin; E, esomeprazole; e/N, number of eradications/total number of patients; L, lansoprazole; Lev, levofloxacin; M, metronidazole; O, omeprazole; od, once daily; P, pantoprazole; R, rabeprazole; T, tinidazole; t.d.s., thrice daily.

* Number by the letter indicates mg per dose. Treatment given twice daily unless mentioned otherwise.

(iv) Comparing new-generation PPI (esomeprazole or rabeprazole) between themselves or with old-generation PPI (omeprazole, lansoprazole or pantoprazole), (v) Patients had to be naïve to therapy, (vi) *H. pylori* infection had to be determined by positive histology, culture, rapid urease test and/or urea breath tests prior to treatment, (vii) Eradication had to be evaluated by histology and/or urea breath test at least 4 weeks after the end of treatment.

Data extraction

Data extraction was conducted independently by two reviewers (AGM and PML), discordances were resolved by a third investigator (JPG). Data extraction was standardised using a data extraction form. When any standardised data could not be extracted from the published text, communication with the corresponding author was done to solve queries. Data for genotype analysis were based on intention to treat when possible, if not, analysis used per protocol data.

Statistical Analysis

The primary outcome was 'intention to treat' eradication rate. For each comparison eradication rates, number needed to treat (NNT) and odds ratio (OR) with their corresponding 95% CI were calculated. As the treatments given in the studies and the populations differ between studies we assumed that individual studies estimated different treatment effects and therefore a Random Effects Model was used for the analysis. Cochrane's *Q*-test and *I*² test were performed to evaluate heterogeneity. If the Cochran's *Q*-test probability is lower than 0.05 the studies will be considered heterogeneous. *I*² test will classify heterogeneity as low ($\leq 25\%$), medium ($\approx 50\%$) or high ($\geq 75\%$).

Publication bias was evaluated for all comparisons using funnel plots. If publication bias was identified it was be mentioned in the results section. As methods for publication bias correction are not widely accepted, no correction was performed, but bias was discussed in the appropriate section.

A. G. McNicholl et al.

(a)	Rabepra	zole l	First gener	ation		Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total I	Events -	Total V	Neight	M-H, Random, 959	6 CI M-H, Random, 95% CI
Adachi 2003	36	40	30	40	1.7%	3.00 [0.85, 10.54]	
Catalano 2002 (1)	70	82	42	45	1.5%	0.42 [0.11, 1.56]	
Choi 2007	97	140	193	288	14.1%	1.11 [0.72, 1.72]	
Dojo 2001	65	81	70	89	4.8%	1.10 [0.52, 2.32]	
Fernandez-bermejo 200	1 11	13	14	17	0.7%	1.18 [0.17, 8.33]	
Hawkey 2003 (2)	70	87	61	87	5.4%	1.76 [0.87,3.54]	
Hawkey 2003b (3)	56	87	67	87	6.0%	0.54 [0.28, 1.05]	
Inaba 2002	49	64	101	119	4.6%	0.58 [0.27, 1.25]	
Kawabata 2003	/5	100	60 50	87	0.5%	1.35 [0.71, 2.56]	
Kawai 2007 Kasitabaiwat 2002	32	40	59	90	4.4%	1.29 [0.39, 2.81]	
Kumar 2007	97	20	40	54 60	3.0%	1.70 [0.00, 4.00]	
Kuwayama 2001	20	46	27	46	3.8%	1 32 [0 57 3 07]	
Miki 2003	81	96	39	49	3.4%	1 38 [0 57 3 36]	
Miwa 1999	63	72	126	149	3.9%	1.28 [0.56, 2.92]	
Miwa 2000	176	204	86	104	6.4%	1.32 [0.69, 2.51]	
Murakami 2002	85	97	116	148	5.2%	1.95 [0.95, 4.01]	
Vakil 2004	153	202	151	207	13.5%	1.16 [0.74, 1.81]	
Wong 2001	51	58	47	57	2.5%	1.55 [0.55, 4.40]	
Yang 2003	19	23	21	24	1.0%	0.68 [0.13, 3.43]	
Zhang 2010	103	120	95	120	5.8%	1.59 [0.81, 3.14]	
Total (95% CI)		1795		1969 1	00.0%	1 21 [1 02 1 19]	•
Total events	1445		1500				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² – 0	00: Chi ²	= 19 10	df = 20 (P	= 0.51)	· 1 ² = 0%		+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
Test for overall offect: 7	- 2 24 (0	= 10.10,	ui – 20 (i	- 0.51)	,1 = 070	,	0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for overall effect. Z	= 2.24 (P	= 0.02)				Fa	avours first generation Favours rabeprazole
(1) Mixing normal and low	dose rabe	eprazole	(2) Compa	rison a:	Amoxicill	in + Clarithromycin	(3) Comparison a: Clarithromycin + Metronidazole
(b) Raber	orazole 10	mg b.d.	First gen	eration		Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Study or Subaroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weiaht	M-H. Random, 9	5% CI M-H. Random, 95% CI
Inaha 2002	10	64	101	110	13.2%	0.58 [0.27, 1.25	1
Kawabata 2003	75	100	60	87	18.2%	1.35 [0.71, 2.56	
Kositchaiwat 2003	45	54	45	54	7.9%	1.00 [0.36, 2.75	i —
Kuwayama 2001	30	46	27	46	11.1%	1.32 [0.57, 3.07	j — + • — –
Miki 2003	41	48	39	49	7.2%	1.50 [0.52, 4.34]
Miwa 2000	87	100	86	104	13.0%	1.40 [0.65, 3.03]
Murakami 2002	46	49	116	148	5.4%	4.23 [1.23, 14.50]
Wong 2001	51	58	47	57	7.4%	1.55 [0.55, 4.40]
Zhang 2010	103	120	95	120	16.6%	1.59 [0.81, 3.14	
Total (95% CI)		639		784	100.0%	1.32 [0.98, 1.76	1 🔶
Total events	527		616				6.6 million 20 10 10 million
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.0	01; Chi ² =	8.64, df	= 8 (<i>P</i> = 0	.37); l ²	= 7%		
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.84 (<i>P</i> :	= 0.07)				1	avours first generation Eavours rabentazole
<pre>/ ``</pre>						r	avours mai generation i avours rabeprazule
(C) Ra	beprazole	20 mg k	o.d. First	generat	tion	Odds ra	tio Odds ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Tota	al Event	s Tot	al Wei	ght M-H, Random	, 95% CI M-H, Random, 95% CI
Adachi 2003	36	4	0 30) 4	10 2.0	6% 3.00 [0.85, 10	.54]
Choi 2007	97	14	0 19	3 28	38 21.8	8% 1.11 [0.72, 1	.72]
DUJO 2001	65 I 11	8	a 70	J 8 1 4	אט שט (.4 ער די	4% I.10[0.52,2	.02]
Hawkey 2003 (1)	70	8	3 14 7 61	+ 1 1 8	17 1. 87 84	1% 1.16[0.17, 6 4% 1.76[0.87.3	54]
Hawkey 2003b (2)	56	8	1 6	. c 7 8	35 8.4	4% 0.60 [0.30. 1	.21]+
Kositchaiwat 2003	52	5	4 4	5 5	54 1.6	6% 5.20 [1.07, 25	5.33]
Kumar 2007	26	3	0 50	0 6	62 2.3	7% 1.56 [0.46, 5	.32]
Miki 2003	40	4	8 39	94	19 3.9	9% 1.28 [0.46, 3	.59]
Miwa 1999	63	7	2 120	5 14	19 6.0	0% 1.28 [0.56, 2	.92]
Miwa 2000 Murakami 2000	89	10	4 80	o 10	14 7.4	4% 1.24 [0.59, 2	.62]
Wurakami 2002	39	20	o I1€ 2 1⊑∙	ບ 14 1 ດດ	+0 0. 17 20 0	170 1.20 [0.52, 2 0% 1.16 [0.74]	81]
Yang 2003	153	20	3 2	1 20	24 1.0	6% 0.68 [0.13. 3	.43]
Total (95% CI)		102	3	1/0	13 100 0	1 20 10 99 1	47]
Total events	816	3	106	14U 9	5 100.0	070 1.20 [U.90, I	L''
Heterogeneity: Tau ² – 0	00 · Chi ² –	11 08 6	+f = 13 (P -	- 0 60).	I ² – ∩%		
Test for overall effect: 7 -	= 1.74 (P	= 0.08)		0.00),	0 /0		0.05 0.2 1 5 20
(1) Comparison a: Amoxi	icillin + Cl	arithrom	/cin				Favours first generation Favours rabeprazole
(2) Comparison a: Clarith	nromycin 4	- Metron	idazole				

Figure 2 | (a) Overall rabeprazole vs. first-generation PPIs, (b) rabeprazole 10 mg b.d. and (c) rabeprazole 20 mg b.d.

Analysis was performed using the freeware program Review Manager (RevMan; The Cochrane Colaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark) version 5.1. RevMan statistical tests and formulae are detailed in RevMan User Guide.

RESULTS

Studies Included

Overall 35 (18.1%) studies^{14–48} of the 193 relevant references initially selected were included (4108 results on first

step of the search). A flow chart of the multi-step exclusion process is presented in Figure 1. The studies, published between 1999 and 2011, presented the overall data of 7360 infected adult patients (Table 1). Twenty studies compared rabeprazole with first-generation PPIs (1795 patients in the rabeprazole arm vs. 1969 patients with the other PPIs),^{14–33} and 12 studies compared esomeprazole with first-generation PPIs (1240 vs. 1358 patients respectively).^{33–44} Five studies compared rabeprazole with esomeprazole (772 vs. 802 patients respectively).^{33, 45–48}

Most studies³² were based on clarithromicyn plus amoxicillin regimens. Although the dosage, number of intakes per day and length of treatment varied among studies, the most used regimen (18 studies, 3850 patients) was amoxicillin 1 g plus clarithromicyn 500 mg both taken twice daily for 7 days. Data on CYP2C19 genotype was presented in 10 studies (Table 2)^{27–32, 43–46}; therefore sub-analyses were performed to evaluate the effect of this polymorphism on eradication rates among the different PPIs studied.

Six studies were excluded in the full text review step. Both Van Zanten *et al.* studies^{50, 59} (827 patients) were excluded as the presented data did not differentiate between first line and rescue treatments. The trial by Kuwayama *et al.*⁵¹ (479 patients) was excluded as it only compared different rabeprazole doses. Hong's study⁵² (2297 patients) was a retrospective protocol comparing all different PPIs. The article by Kuo *et al.*⁵³ presented the data on 190 patients randomised for rescue therapy and for this reason was also excluded. Another excluded trial⁵⁴ compared rabeprazole and omeprazole in 199 patients, but on a dual therapy with amoxicillin.

Rabeprazole vs. first-generation PPIs

Twenty studies (Figure 2a) compared rabeprazole (any dose) with first-generation PPIs showing better eradication rates for the rabeprazole arm (80.5%) than for the first-generation arm (76.2%). The OR was 1.21 (95% CI = 1.02–1.42, Q-test P = 0.51, $I^2 = 0\%$) with a calculated NNT of 23. A small improvement was found when excluding Catalano *et al.* (2002) that used a once daily rabeprazole for 5 days in normal and low doses (40 and 20 mg od) (OR = 1.22). Sub-analyses were performed for rabeprazole 10 mg b.d. (Figure 2b) and 20 mg b.d. (Figure 2c), with an OR of 1.32 (95% CI = 0.98–1.76) and 1.20 (95% CI = 0.98–1.47) respectively. No hetero-geneity was found in the sub-analyses.

Esomeprazole vs. first-Generation PPIs

Twelve studies presented data comparing esomeprazole (any dose) to first-generation PPIs showing eradication rates 82.3% and 77.6% respectively. OR was 1.32 (95% CI = 1.01-1.73), with mild heterogeneity (Q-test P = 0.11 and $I^2 = 34\%$) and a NNT of 21 (Figure 3a). This heterogeneity disappeared (Q-test P = 0.72, $I^2 = 0\%$) after excluding two included studies, Subei et al.³⁶ and Tulassay et al.³⁵ that used a 3 week omeprazole (20 mg b.d.) course after eradication treatment in the omeprazole arm. The funnel plot analysis presented asymmetry caused by these two studies. After excluding those studies, due to methodical differences, the OR was 1.52 (95% CI = 1.19-1.95). Sub-analyses by Esomeprazole dose (40 mg b.d. and 20 mg b.d.) were also performed (Figures 3b and c). Better OR were found for esomeprazole 40 mg b.d. OR = 2.27(95% CI = 1.07-4.82, NNT = 9) than for esomeprazole 20 mg b.d. OR = 1.04 (95% CI = 0.80-1.1.35), but the esomeprazole high-dose analysis (including only four studies) was highly heterogeneous (*Q*-test P = 0.02, $I^2 = 71\%$). Heterogeneity was not found in the esomeprazole 20 mg b.d. analysis (Q-test P = 0.58, $I^2 = 0\%$).

Rabeprazole vs. esomeprazole

Five studies compared the eradication rates of rabeprazole vs. esomeprazole containing therapies (772 and 802 patients respectively) (Figure 4). The comparison was not heterogeneous (*Q*-test P = 0.35, $I^2 = 11\%$) and found no statistically significant differences (OR = 0.90, 95% CI = 0.70–1.17). Eradication rates were 76.7% for rabeprazole and 78.7% for esomeprazole (NNT = 50).

CYP2C19 effect

The effect of CYP2C19 genotype on eradication rates was evaluated in four different sub-analyses: Differences between PM and EM in new-generation PPIs (Figure 5a), differences between PM and EM in firstgeneration PPIs (Figure 5b), differences between newand first-generation PPIs in PM patients (Figure 5c) and differences between new- and first-generation PPIs in EM patients (Figure 5d). In the sub-analysis considering only patients treated with first-generation PPIs, a strong tendency towards better eradication rates were found for PM than for EM patients (OR = 1.76, 95%CI = 0.99-3.12). This tendency was not as marked in the sub-analysis of patients treated with new-generation PPIs (OR = 1.19, 95% CI = 0.73-1.95). In the sub-analysis evaluating only PM patients, no differences were found between first- and new-generation PPI treatments (OR = 0.91, 95% CI = 0.41-1.98). the eradication In ΕM patients, rates were

A. G. McNicholl et al.

(a)	Esomepr	azole	First gen	eration		Odds ratio		Odd	ls ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95%	CI	M-H, Ran	dom, 95% C	4	
Anagnostopoulos 200	4 92	104	37	52	7.2%	3.11 [1.33, 7.27]					-
Chen 2005	46	52	43	52	4.7%	1.60 [0.53, 4.89]			+ · · ·		
Choi 2007	104	148	193	288	15.6%	1.16 [0.76, 1.79]		-			
De los Rios 2009	26	41	25	42	6.7%	1.18 [0.49, 2.86]			+		
Hsu 2005	94	100	82	100	5.9%	3.44 [1.30, 9.07]					_
Huh 2004	44	57	41	55	7.0%	1.16 [0.49, 2.75]			+		
kang 2008	121	137	157	190	10.4%	1.59 [0.84, 3.02]		1			
Maev 2003	46	51	26	29	2.8%	1.06 [0.23, 4.81]		<u></u>		-	
Miehlke 2003	38	42	31	38	3.5%	2.15 [0.57, 8.01]					-
Sheu 2005	86	100	79	100	8.7%	1.63 [0.78, 3.43]		-		-	
Subei 2007 (1)	139	186	148	188	14.2%	0.80 [0.49, 1.29]			-		
Tulassay 2001 (2)	184	222	192	224	13.4%	0.81 [0.48, 1.35]			+		
Total (95% CI)		1240		1358	100.0%	1.32 [1.01, 1.73]			•		
Total events	1020		1054								
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.07; Chi	$^{2} = 16.7$	'9, df = 11	(P = 0.1)	1); <i>I</i> ² = 3	34%	++	1			+
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.06 (P = 0.0	4)				0.1 0.2	2 0.5	1 2	5	10
	`						ravol	irs tirst	ravours es	omepra	azole

generation

(1) Omeprazole arm uses 3 extra weeks of PPI treatment (2) Omeprazole arm uses 3 extra weeks of PPI treatment

(b) Esomeprazole First generation Odds ratio Odds ratio Study or Subgroup Total Total Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI M-H, Random, 95% CI Events Events Chen 2005 46 52 43 52 5.4% 1.60 [0.53, 4.89] De los Rios 2009 26 41 25 42 8.5% 1.18 [0.49, 2.86] Huh 2004 44 57 41 55 8.9% 1.16 [0.49, 2.75] 1.59 [0.84, 3.02] kang 2008 121 137 190 16.2% 157 Maev 2003 46 51 26 29 2.9% 1.06 [0.23, 4.81] Miehlke 2003 38 42 38 31 3.8% 2.15 [0.57, 8.01] Subei 2007 (1) 139 186 148 188 28.8% 0.80 [0.49, 1.29] Tulassay 2001 (2) 184 222 192 224 25.5% 0.81 [0.48, 1.35] 1.04 [0.80, 1.35] Total (95% CI) 818 100.0% 788 Total events 644 663 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 5.65, df = 7 (P = 0.58); l^2 = 0% 0.5 2 0.2 5 1 Test for overall effect: Z = 0.30 (P = 0.77) Favours first Favours esomeprazole generation

(1) Omeprazole arm uses 3 extra weeks of PPI treatment (2) Omeprazole arm uses 3 extra weeks of PPI treatment

(c)	Esomepr	azole	First gen	eration		Odds ratio	0	dds ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Ra	ndom, 98	5% CI	
Anagnostopoulos 2004	4 50	52	37	52	14.8%	10.14 [2.18, 47.06]		-		
Choi 2007	104	148	193	288	34.0%	1.16 [0.76, 1.79]				
Hsu 2005	94	100	82	100	23.4%	3.44 [1.30, 9.07]		_	-	
Sheu 2005	86	100	79	100	27.9%	1.63 [0.78, 3.43]		+-	-	
Total (95% CI)		400		540	100.0%	2.27 [1.07, 4.82]				
Total events	334		391					10		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.39; Chi ²	² = 10.1	7, df = 3 (P = 0.02); $I^2 = 71$	% +				+
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.13 (P = 0.03	3)			0.02	0.1	1	10	50
							Favours first generation	Favour	rs esomepra	azole

Figure 3 | (a) Overall esomeprazole vs. first-generation PPIs, (b) esomeprazole 20 mg b.d. and (c) esomeprazole 40 mg b.d.

significantly better with the new-generation PPI treatments (84.3% vs. 79.0%, OR = 1.37, 95% CI = 1.02-1.84, NNT = 19).

DISCUSSION

The present meta-analysis aimed to pool data from clinical trials comparing the eradication rates of *H. pylori* in studies

comparing therapies differing only on the PPI used. The main finding of the study is that the new-generation PPIs (rabeprazole and esomeprazole) compared with the first-generation PPIs (omeprazole, lansoprazole and pantoprazole) increase cure rates. This small superiority of new-generation PPIs has been previously reported in reviews and retrospective studies and seems to correlate with the higher acid inhibition power of these new PPIs that has been reported to affect eradication rates,^{6–8, 12, 13, 55, 56} but the clinical advantage may be limited from a cost-effective perspective due to the higher prices of rabeprazole and esomeprazole when compared with omeprazole.

Rabeprazole obtained, overall, a higher efficacy than first-generation PPIs, but the clinical relevance was small as its NNT was quite high. This higher eradication efficacy but low clinical relevance of rabeprazole was maintained for doses of 10 mg b.d. and 20 mg b.d.. On the other hand, esomeprazole slightly improved the overall result, but this was mainly due to four studies that administered a 40 mg dose twice daily. This probably highlights the dependence of eradication rates on the level of acid inhibition. However, even though the results from the esomeprazole 40 mg b.d. seemed promising and clinically relevant (NNT = 9), only four studies were included and the heterogeneity was high, therefore this results have to be taken cautiously.

The overall results, as well as the separated subanalysis, improved the OR in favour of the new-generation PPIs when three outlier studies were excluded. Two of these studies^{35, 36} focused on ulcer healing and compared esomeprazole 20 mg b.d. vs. omeprazole 20 mg b.d. plus amoxicillin and clarithromycin for 7 days. However, the omeprazole arm added a 3 week course of PPI, whereas the esomeprazole arm was followed by placebo. Even though the eradication efficacy of monotherapy with a PPI is probably ineffective,⁵⁷ a 3 weeks post treatment, after *H. pylori* has been exposed to antibiotics, might affect the apparent eradication rate. The other outlier study used a once daily dose of PPI, what has been demonstrated to reduce the eradication rate.^{6, 58, 59}

It has been reported that CYP2C19 polymorphism can affect PPI's metabolisation and therefore their acid inhibitory capacity and consequently their effect on *H. pylori* eradication.^{6, 55, 60} The literature has reported higher eradication success in PM, homozygous for the low activity allele, although these differences were not reported for rabeprazole or esomeprazole.⁶ In our meta-analysis, rabeprazole and esomeprazole eradication rates were not affected by the CYP2C19 phenotype, whereas first-generation PPIs showed a clear tendency towards lower eradication rates in EM patients, which is in accordance with previously published data.⁶

When comparing new-generation vs. first-generation PPIs in PM patients, a small tendency towards better eradication rates was found when treatment contained first-generation PPIs. However, when evaluating only EM patients, the analysis demonstrated a significant improvement when the treatment contained new-generation PPIs. This could be explained because standard doses of any PPI achieve near maximal acid inhibition in poor metabolisers, whereas far larger doses of PPI are needed to achieve the same degree of acid inhibition in extensive metabolisers.

The main limitation of the present meta-analysis was the complex diversity of regimens; the antibiotics used, the number of intakes per day, the doses and the length of treatment. This diversity and the impossibility to meta-analyse data from more similar protocols made it hard to assume one unique effect for all studies.

	Rabepr	azole	Esomep	razole		Odds ratio		Oc	lds ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% 0	CI	M-H, Ra	ndom, 9	5% CI	
Choi 2007	104	148	97	140	23.3%	1.05 [0.63, 1.73]		_	-	-	
Kim 2003	178	228	149	198	28.3%	1.17 [0.75, 1.84]					
Lee 2010	77	126	88	130	22.5%	0.75 [0.45, 1.25]					
Pan 2010	46	61	106	123	10.6%	0.49 [0.23, 1.07]	-		-+		
Wu 2007	187	209	191	211	15.2%	0.89 [0.47, 1.68]			-		
Total (95% CI)		772		802	100.0%	0.90 [0.70, 1.17]		10			
Total events	592		631						1000		
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.01; Cl	hi ² = 4.4	7, df = 4 ((P = 0.3)	85); <i>I</i> ² = 1	1%					<u> </u>
Test for overall effect	:t: <i>Z</i> = 0.77	P = 0.	44)				0.2	0.5	1	2	5
							Favours e	esomepraz	ole Favo	ours rabe	prazole



A. G. McNicholl et al.

(a) Study or Subgroup	Poor me	tabolizers Total	Extensive r	netabolizer Tota	rs I Weight	Od M-H Bar	lds ratio	Odds ratio
Daia 0001	14	10			0.10/	1 5 1 10		
	14	16	51	62	9.1%	1.51	0.30, 7.62]	
Inaba 2002	1	6	42	55	5.1%	2.17[0.	.24, 19.28]	
kang 2008	10	10	105	121	3.0%	0.00 0	.30, 90.21]	
Kawabala 2003	6	10	69	83	3 12.2%	1.05.0	10 17 701	
Kawai 2007	6	/	26	34	+ 4.7%	1.85 [0.	.19, 17.70]	
Lee 2010	24	28	141	1/6	18.4%	1.49 [0	0.49, 4.57]	
Niiki 2003	10	13	/1	78	10.5%	0.33 [0	0.07, 1.48]	
Fall 2010 Shou 2005	32	36	91	111	17.6%	1.76[0	0.56, 5.53]	
Sileu 2005	19	21	67	79	9 9.5%	1.70[0	0.35, 8.27]	
Zhang 2010	20	22	83	98	9.9%	1.81 [0	0.38, 8.55]	
Total (95% CI)		177		897	100.0%	1.19 [0	0.73, 1.95]	+
Total events	154		746					
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.02; Ch	$i^2 = 9.28$,	df = 9 (P = 0.	41); <i>I</i> ² = 3%	6			0.01 0.1 1 10 100
	1. 2 - 0.00	(7 = 0.45	, ,					Favours EM Favours PM
(b)	D	4 - Is - I'	Enternation			0.1	lata watta	Odda uzdia
(U)	Poor me	tabolizers	Extensive	metabolize	ers		ias ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	lota	Events	l otal	weight	M-H, Rai	ndom, 95%	CI M-H, Random, 95% CI
Dojo 2001	17	20	53	63	16.6%	1.07 [(0.26, 4.34]	
Inaba 2002	17	19	84	97	13.1%	1.32 [(0.27, 6.37]	
kang 2008	22	23	135	167	7.8%	5.21 [0.	.68, 40.13]	
kawabata 2003	10	12	50	68	12.6%	1.80 [(0.36, 9.01]	
Kawai 2007	8	10	50	69	12.2%	1.52 [(0.30, 7.81]	
Miki 2003	7	9	32	38	10.1%	0.66 [0	0.11, 3.96]	
Sheu 2005	21	23	58	77	13.7%	3.44 [0.	.74, 16.05]	
Zhang 2010	18	20	77	100	13.9%	2.69 [0.	.58, 12.46]	—
Total (95% CI)		136	;	679	100.0%	1.76 [0	0.99, 3.12]	•
Total events	120		539					
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	² = 0.00; Cł	ni ² = 4.03,	df = 7 (P = 0)	78); <i>I</i> ² = 0 ⁴	%			+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
Test for overall effect	ct: Z = 1.94	(P = 0.05))					0.02 0.1 1 10 50
			,					Favours EM Favours PM
(\mathbf{c})	Now gopo	otion Ei	ot concretion		Odda	ratio		Odda ratia
Study or Subgroup	Evonte	Total E	onte Total	Woight	M-H Rando	1all0	1	M-H Bandom 95% Cl
Daia 0001	14	10101	17 00	10.00/	1 04 10 10	0 0 401	1	Ni-ri, Handoni, 3578 Or
D0j0 2001	14	0	17 20	0.4%	0.8210.06	0, 0.40j 10.621	-	
kang 2002	16	16	22 23	5.8%	2 20 [0.08	57.481		
kawabata 2003	6	10	10 12	15.7%	0 30 [0.00,	, 07.40] 4 2 16]		
Kawai 2007	6	7	8 10	8.9%	1 50 [0 11	20.681		
Miki 2003	10	13	7 9	14.8%	0.95 [0.12	2. 7.28]		
Sheu 2005	19	21	21 23	14.5%	0.90 [0.12	2. 7.071		
Zhang 2010	20	22	18 20	14.4%	1.11 [0.14	4, 8.72]		
-								
Total (95% CI)	00	113	136	100.0%	0.91 [0.4	1, 1.98]		-
I otal events	98		120					
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.00; Ch	$i^2 = 1.77$,	df = 7 (P = 0.	97); <i>I</i> ² = 0%	6	0	01 0	0 1 1 10 100
Test for overall effect	t: $Z = 0.24$	(<i>P</i> = 0.81)			F	avoure firet	generation Eavours new generation
<i>.</i>								generation i avouis new generation
(d)	New gene	ration F	irst generatio	n	Odd	ls ratio		Odds ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total E	vents Tota	I Weight	M-H, Rand	dom, 95%	CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Dojo 2001	51	62	53 66	6 10.7%	1.14 [0.4	47, 2.77]		
Inaba 2002	42	55	84 97	7 11.6%	0.50 [0.	21, 1.17]		
kang 2008	105	121	135 167	7 19.5%	1.56 [0.	81, 2.99]		
Kawabata 2003	69	83	50 68	3 13.5%	1.77 [0.	81, 3.90]		
Kawai 2007	26	34	50 69	9.3%	1.24 [0.	48, 3.20]		
Miki 2003	71	78	32 38	6.3%	1.90 [0.	59, 6.11]		
Sheu 2005	67	79	58 77	7 13.0%	1.83 [0.	82, 4.09]		
Zhang 2010	83	98	77 100	16.1%	1.65 [0.	80, 3.40]		
Total (95% CI)		610	682	2 100.0%	1.37 [1.	02, 1.841		
Total events	514		539					-
Heterogeneity: Tau2	- 0 00· Ch	j ² – 7 10	df = 7 (P = 0)	41)· 12 - 20	1/2			
Test for overall effect	+ 7-211	(P - 0.03	, (, - 0.)	,, . = 0 /	-		0.2	0.5 1 2 5
		= 0.00	,			F	avours firs	st generation Favours new generation

Figure 5 | (a) New generation: CYP2C19 poor metabolisers (PM) vs. extensive metabolisers (EM), (b) first generation: CYP2C19 poor metabolisers (PM) vs. extensive metabolisers (EM), (c) CYP2C19 poor metabolisers: new generation vs. first generation and (d) CYP2C19 extensive metabolisers: new generation vs. first generation.

Therefore, we decided to use a random effects model which allows the estimation of intervention effect without assuming one unique global effect for the intervention.⁶¹ An additional limitation of the study is that in most of the studies antibiotics are given for only 7 days. Current recommendations suggest using triple therapy

for at least 10 days or using quadruple therapies. The usefulness of strong acid inhibition in these new settings has still to be proved.

In conclusion, esomeprazole and rabeprazole obtained an overall higher eradication rate than omeprazole, lansoprazole and pantoprazole, although this difference was more marked in esomeprazole, especially when given in double doses. Moreover, new-generation PPIs' efficacy was not affected by CYP2C19 polymorphisms, and they obtained higher eradication rates that first-generation PPIs in EM patients. Therefore, new-generation PPIs might be an interesting option in countries with high proportion of EM patients. However, the cost effectiveness of a general recommendation of using new-generation PPIs has to be confirmed by pharmacoeconomic analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Declaration of personal interests: None. Declaration of funding interests: CIBERehd is funded by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III. This study was not funded by the pharmaceutical industry.

REFERENCES

- Correa P. Helicobacter pylori and gastric carcinogenesis. Am J Surg Pathol 1995; 19(Suppl. 1): S37–43.
- 2. Mones J, Gisbert JP, Borda F, *et al.* Indications, diagnostic tests and *Helicobacter pylori* eradication therapy. Recommendations by the 2nd Spanish Consensus Conference. *Rev Esp Enferm Dig* 2005; **97**: 348–74.
- Gisbert JP, Calvet X, Gomollon F, et al. Eradication treatment of *Helicobacter* pylori. Recommendations of the II Spanish Consensus Conference. Med Clin (Barc) 2005; 125: 301–16.
- Malfertheiner P, Megraud F, O'Morain C, et al. Current concepts in the management of *Helicobacter pylori* infection: the Maastricht III Consensus Report. Gut 2007; 56: 772–81.
- Hunt RH, Xiao SD, Megraud F, et al. World Gastroenterology Organization. Helicobacter pylori in developing countries. World Gastroenterology Organisation Global Guideline. J Gastrointestin Liver Dis 2011; 20: 299–304.
- Gomollon F, Calvet X. Optimising acid inhibition treatment. *Drugs* 2005; 65(Suppl. 1): 25–33.
- Boparai V, Rajagopalan J, Triadafilopoulos G. Guide to the use of proton pump inhibitors in adult patients. *Drugs* 2008; 68: 925–47.
- Calvet X, Gomollon F. What is potent acid inhibition, and how can it be achieved? *Drugs* 2005; 65(Suppl. 1): 13–23.
- Kirchheiner J, Glatt S, Fuhr U, *et al.* Relative potency of proton-pump inhibitors-comparison of effects on intragastric pH. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2009; **65**: 19–31.
- McKeage K, Blick SK, Croxtall JD, et al. Esomeprazole: a review of its use in the management of gastric acid-

related diseases in adults. *Drugs* 2008; **68**: 1571–607.

- Baldwin CM, Keam SJ. Rabeprazole: a review of its use in the management of gastric acid-related diseases in adults. *Drugs* 2009; 69: 1373–401.
- Gisbert JP, Khorrami S, Calvet X, et al. Systematic review: rabeprazole-based therapies in *Helicobacter pylori* eradication. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2003; 17: 751–64.
- Gisbert JP, Pajares JM. Esomeprazolebased therapy in *Helicobacter pylori* eradication: a meta-analysis. *Dig Liver Dis* 2004; 36: 253–9.
- 14. Yang KC, Wang GM, Chen JH, et al. Comparison of rabeprazole-based fourand seven-day triple therapy and omeprazole-based seven-day triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection in patients with peptic ulcer. J Formos Med Assoc 2003; 102: 857–62.
- Wong BC, Wong WM, Yee YK, et al. Rabeprazole-based 3-day and 7-day triple therapy vs. omeprazole-based 7-day triple therapy for the treatment of *Helicobacter pylori* infection. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2001; 15: 1959–65.
- Vakil N, Lanza F, Schwartz H, et al. Seven-day therapy for *Helicobacter* pylori in the United States. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2004; 20: 99–107.
- Murakami K, Sato R, Okimoto T, et al. Eradication rates of clarithromycinresistant *Helicobacter pylori* using either rabeprazole or lansoprazole plus amoxicillin and clarithromycin. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2002; 16: 1933–8.
- Miwa H, Ohkura R, Murai T, *et al.* Impact of rabeprazole, a new proton pump inhibitor, in triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infectioncomparison with omeprazole and lansoprazole. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 1999; **13**: 741–6.

- Miwa H, Yamada T, Sato K, *et al.* Efficacy of reduced dosage of rabeprazole in PPI/AC therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection: comparison of 20 and 40 mg rabeprazole with 60 mg lansoprazole. *Dig Dis Sci* 2000; **45**: 77–82.
- 20. Kuwayama H, Takahashi M, Takada H, et al. Comparison of standard dose rabeprazole and double dose omeprazole in PPI-based triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection - A randomized clinical trial. *Gastroenterology* 2001; **120**: A584.
- Kumar R, Tandon VR, Bano G, et al. Comparative study of proton pump inhibitors for triple therapy in *H. pylori* eradication. *Indian J Gastroenterol* 2007; 26: 100-1.
- 22. Kositchaiwat C, Ovartlarnporn B, Kachintorn U, *et al.* Low and high doses of rabeprazole vs. omeprazole for cure of *Helicobacter pylori* infection. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2003; **18**: 1017–21.
- 23. Hawkey CJ, Atherton JC, Treichel HC, et al. Safety and efficacy of 7-day rabeprazole- and omeprazole-based triple therapy regimens for the eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* in patients with documented peptic ulcer disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2003; 17: 1065–74.
- 24. Fernandez-Bermejo M, Robledo P, Dueñas C, et al. Rabeprazol vs omeprazol junto con dos antibioticos para la erradicación de H. pylori. Rev Esp Enferm Dig 2001; 93: 154.
- Catalano F, Terminella C, Branciforte G, *et al.* Eradication therapy with rabeprazole versus omeprazole in the treatment of active duodenal ulcer. *Digestion* 2002; 66: 154–9.
- 26. Adachi K, Hashimoto T, Ishihara S, et al. Comparison of five day Helicobacter pylori eradication regimens: rabeprazole-based and

omeprazole-based with and without omeprazole pretreatment. *Gastroenterology* 2003; **124**: A359–60.

- Dojo M, Azuma T, Saito T, et al. Effects of CYP2C19 gene polymorphism on cure rates for *Helicobacter pylori* infection by triple therapy with proton pump inhibitor (omeprazole or rabeprazole), amoxycillin and clarithromycin in Japan. *Dig Liver Dis* 2001; 33: 671–5.
- Miki I, Aoyama N, Sakai T, et al. Impact of clarithromycin resistance and CYP2C19 genetic polymorphism on treatment efficacy of *Helicobacter pylori* infection with lansoprazole- or rabeprazole-based triple therapy in Japan. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2003; 15: 27–33.
- 29. Inaba T, Mizuno M, Kawai K, *et al.* Randomized open trial for comparison of proton pump inhibitors in triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection in relation to CYP2C19 genotype. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2002; **17**: 748–53.
- 30. Kawabata H, Habu Y, Tomioka H, et al. Effect of different proton pump inhibitors, differences in CYP2C19 genotype and antibiotic resistance on the eradication rate of *Helicobacter* pylori infection by a 1-week regimen of proton pump inhibitor, amoxicillin and clarithromycin. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2003; 17: 259–64.
- Kawai T, Kawakami K, Mikinori K, et al. Efficacy of low-dose proton pump inhibitor (PPI) in the eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* following combination PPI/AC therapy in Japan. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2007; 54: 649– 54.
- 32. Zhang L, Mei Q, Li QS, *et al.* The effect of cytochrome P2C19 and interleukin-1 polymorphisms on *H. pylori* eradication rate of 1-week triple therapy with omeprazole or rabeprazole, amoxycillin and clarithromycin in Chinese people. *J Clin Pharm Ther* 2010; **35**: 713–22.
- 33. Choi HS, Park DI, Hwang SJ, et al. Double-dose, new-generation proton pump inhibitors do not improve *Helicobacter pylori* eradication rate. *Helicobacter* 2007; 12: 638–42.
- 34. Chen YH, Wang WM, Wang H, et al. Comparison of esomeprazole- and omeprazole-based triple therapy regimens for duodenal ulcer with *Helicobacter pylori* infection. Di Yi Jun Yi Da Xue Xue Bao 2005; 25: 1045–7.
- 35. Tulassay Z, Kryszewski A, Dite P, *et al.* One week of treatment with esomeprazole-based triple therapy eradicates *Helicobacter pylori* and heals

patients with duodenal ulcer disease. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2001; **13**: 1457–65.

- 36. Subei IM, Cardona HJ, Bachelet E, et al. One week of esomeprazole triple therapy vs 1 week of omeprazole triple therapy plus 3 weeks of omeprazole for duodenal ulcer healding in *Helicobacter* pylori-positive patients. Dig Dis Sci 2007; **52**: 1505–12.
- 37. Miehlke S, Schneider-Brachert W, Bastlein E, et al. Esomeprazole-based one-week triple therapy with clarithromycin and metronidazole is effective in eradicating Helicobacter pylori in the absence of antimicrobial resistance. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2003; 18: 799–804.
- Maev IV, Kurilo AE, V'Iuchnova ES, et al. Esomeprazole in treating duodenal ulcer in various modes of anti-Helicobacter therapy. *Ter Arkh* 2003; 75: 23–6.
- Huh KC, Lee TH, Kang YW, et al. The efficacy of esomeprazole based triple therapy and low-dose clarithromycin triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* (HP). *Gastroenterology* 2004; 126: A190–1.
- 40. Hsu PI, Lai KH, Lin CK, *et al.* A prospective randomized trial of esomeprazole- versus pantoprazolebased triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* eradication. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2005; **100**: 2387–92.
- 41. De los Rios R, Pinto JL, Zegarra A, et al. Esomeprazole based triple therapy for the eradication of helicobacter pylori in patients with non-ulcer dyspepsia. Rev Gastroenterol Peru 2009; 29: 234–8.
- 42. Anagnostopoulos GK, Tsiakos S, Margantinis G, *et al.* Esomeprazole versus omeprazole for the eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* infection: results of a randomized controlled study. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2004; **38**: 503–6.
- 43. Sheu BS, Kao AW, Cheng HC, et al. Esomeprazole 40 mg twice daily in triple therapy and the efficacy of *Helicobacter pylori* eradication related to CYP2C19 metabolism. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2005; 21: 283–8.
- 44. Kang JM, Kim N, Lee DH, et al. Effect of the CYP2C19 polymorphism on the eradication rate of *Helicobacter pylori* infection by 7-day triple therapy with regular proton pump inhibitor dosage. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2008; 23: 1287–91.
- 45. Lee VW, Chau TS, Chan AK, et al. Pharmacogenetics of esomeprazole or rabeprazole-based triple therapy in *Helicobacter pylori* eradication in Hong Kong non-ulcer dyspepsia Chinese subjects. J Clin Pharm Ther 2010; 35: 343–50.

- 46. Pan X, Li Y, Qiu Y, *et al.* Efficacy and tolerability of first-line triple therapy with levofloxacin and amoxicillin plus esomeprazole or rabeprazole for the eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* infection and the effect of CYP2C19 genotype: a 1-week, randomized, openlabel study in Chinese adults. *Clin Ther* 2010; **32**: 2003–11.
- 47. Kim J, Kim J, Lee D, et al. Efficacy of Esomeprazole and Rabeprazole for *Helicobacter pylori* eradication in patients with peptic ulcer. In: 16th International Workshop on Helicobacter and Related Bacteria in Chronic Digestive Inflammation and Gastric Cancer. Stockholm. *Helicobacter* 2003; 8: 469.
- Wu IC, Wu DC, Hsu PI, et al. Rabeprazole- versus esomeprazole-based eradication regimens for *H. pylori* infection. *Helicobacter* 2007; 12: 633–7.
- 49. Veldhuyzen Van Zanten S, Lauritsen K, Delchier JC, et al. One-week triple therapy with esomeprazole provides effective eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* in duodenal ulcer disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2000; 14: 1605 -11.
- 50. Veldhuyzen Van Zanten S, Machado S, Lee J. One-week triple therapy with esomeprazole, clarithromycin and metronidazole provides effective eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* infection. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2003; 17: 1381–7.
- Kuwayama H, Asaka M, Sugiyama T, et al. Rabeprazole-based eradication therapy for *Helicobacter pylori*: a large-scale study in Japan. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2007; 25: 1105–13.
- 52. Hong EJ, Park DI, Oh SJ, et al. Comparison of *Helicobacter pylori* eradication rate in patients with nonulcer dyspepsia and peptic ulcer diseases according to proton pump inhibitors. *Korean J Gastroenterol* 2008; 52: 80–5.
- Kuo CH, Wang SS, Hsu WH, et al. Rabeprazole can overcome the impact of CYP2C19 polymorphism on quadruple therapy. *Helicobacter* 2010; 15: 265–72.
- 54. Miyoshi M, Mizuno M, Ishiki K, et al. A randomized open trial for comparison of proton pump inhibitors, omeprazole versus rabeprazole, in dual therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* infection in relation to CYP2C19 genetic polymorphism. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2001; 16: 723–8.
- 55. Sugimoto M, Furuta T, Shirai N, *et al.* Evidence that the degree and duration of acid suppression are related to

Helicobacter pylori eradication by triple therapy. *Helicobacter* 2007; **12**: 317–23.

- 56. Villoria A, Garcia P, Calvet X, et al. Meta-analysis: high-dose proton pump inhibitors vs. standard dose in triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* eradication. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2008; 28: 868–77.
- 57. D'Adda T, Bordi C, Lazzaroni M, et al. Long-term omeprazole monotherapy is ineffective against *Helicobacter pylori*

infection. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1992; **87**: 681.

- Vallve M, Vergara M, Gisbert JP, et al. Single vs. double dose of a proton pump inhibitor in triple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* eradication: a metaanalysis. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2002; 16: 1149–56.
- Gisbert JP. Potent gastric acid inhibition in *Helicobacter pylori* eradication. *Drugs* 2005; 65(Suppl. 1): 83–96.
- Klotz U. Clinical impact of CYP2C19 polymorphism on the action of proton pump inhibitors: a review of a special problem. *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2006; 44: 297–302.
- Riley RD, Higgins JP, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects metaanalyses. *BMJ* 2011; 342: d549.