

# Carbon-13 Urea Breath Test for Helicobacter Pylori Infection in Patients with Uninvestigated Ulcer-Like Dyspepsia: OHTAC Recommendation

Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee

October 2013

#### **Suggested Citation**

This report should be cited as follows:

Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee (OHTAC). Carbon-13 urea breath test for *Helicobacter pylori* infection in patients with uninvestigated ulcer-like dyspepsia: OHTAC recommendation [Internet]. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario; 2013 October. 10 p. Available from: <a href="http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/publications-and-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-technology-assessment-series/urea-breath-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-test-ohtac-recommendations/ontario-health-tes

#### **Permission Requests**

All inquiries regarding permission to reproduce any content in Health Quality Ontario reports should be directed to EvidenceInfo@hqontario.ca.

#### How to Obtain OHTAC Recommendation Reports From Health Quality Ontario

All OHTAC reports are freely available in PDF format at the following URL: <a href="http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/publications-and-ohtac-recommendations/ohtac-recommendations">http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/publications-and-ohtac-recommendations/ohtac-recommendations</a>.

#### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

All reports prepared by the Evidence Development and Standards branch at Health Quality Ontario are impartial. There are no competing interests or conflicts of interest to declare.

#### **About Health Quality Ontario**

Health Quality Ontario (HQO) is an arms-length agency of the Ontario government. It is a partner and leader in transforming Ontario's health care system so that it can deliver a better experience of care, better outcomes for Ontarians, and better value for money.

Health Quality Ontario strives to promote health care that is supported by the best available scientific evidence. The Evidence Development and Standards branch works with advisory panels, clinical experts, developers of health technologies, scientific collaborators, and field evaluation partners to provide evidence about the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of health interventions in Ontario.

To conduct its systematic reviews of health interventions, the Evidence Development and Standards branch examines the available scientific literature, making every effort to consider all relevant national and international research. If there is insufficient evidence on the safety, effectiveness, and/or cost-effectiveness of a health intervention, HQO may request that its scientific collaborators conduct economic evaluations and field evaluations related to the reviews. Field evaluation partners are research institutes focused on multicentred clinical trials and economic evaluation, as well as institutes engaged in evaluating the safety and usability of health technologies.

#### **About the Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee**

The Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee (OHTAC) is a standing advisory subcommittee of the Board of Directors of Health Quality Ontario. Based on the evidence provided by Evidence Development and Standards and its partners, OTHAC makes recommendations about the uptake, diffusion, distribution, or removal of health interventions within the provincial health system. When making its recommendations, OHTAC applies a unique decision-determinants framework that takes into account overall clinical benefit, value for money, societal and ethical considerations, and the economic and organizational feasibility of the health care intervention in Ontario.

#### **Publishing Health Quality Ontario Research**

When the evidence development process is nearly completed, draft reviews, reports, and OHTAC recommendations are posted on HQO's website for 21 days for public and professional comment. For more information, please visit: <a href="http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/evidence-process/evidence-review-process/professional-and-public-engagement-and-consultation">http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/evidence-process/evidence-review-process/professional-and-public-engagement-and-consultation</a>.

Once finalized and approved by the Board of Directors of Health Quality Ontario, the research is published as part of the *Ontario Health Technology Assessment Series*, which is indexed in MEDLINE/PubMed, Excerpta Medica/Embase, and the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination database. Corresponding OHTAC recommendations and associated reports are also published on the HQO website. Visit <a href="http://www.hqontario.ca">http://www.hqontario.ca</a> for more information.

When sufficient data are available, OHTAC tracks the ongoing use of select interventions it has previously reviewed, compiling data by time period and region. The results are published in the Ontario Health Technology Maps Project Report.

#### **Disclaimer**

This report was prepared by Health Quality Ontario or one of its research partners for the *Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee* and was developed from analysis, interpretation, and comparison of scientific research. It also incorporates, when available, Ontario data and information provided by experts and applicants to Health Quality Ontario. It is possible that relevant scientific findings may have been reported since the development of this recommendation. This report may be superseded by an updated publication on the same topic. Please check the Health Quality Ontario website for a list of all publications: <a href="http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/publications-and-ohtac-recommendations">http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/publications-and-ohtac-recommendations</a>.

# **Table of Contents**

| Background                         | 5 |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Conclusions                        |   |
| Decision Determinants              |   |
| OHTAC Recommendations              |   |
| Appendices                         | 9 |
| Appendix 1 – Decision Determinants |   |

# **Background**

An evidence-based analysis (<a href="http://www.hqontario.ca/en/documents/eds/2013/full-report-urea-breath-test.pdf">http://www.hqontario.ca/en/documents/eds/2013/full-report-urea-breath-test.pdf</a>) was conducted by the Medical Advisory Secretariat Collaboration to answer the following research question:

• What is the diagnostic accuracy and clinical utility of the carbon-13 urea breath test (<sup>13</sup>C UBT) for detecting *Helicobacter pylori* in adults with uninvestigated ulcer-like dyspepsia who have no alarm features?

### **Conclusions**

- The <sup>13</sup>C UBT is an accurate diagnostic test with high sensitivity and high specificity.
- In head-to-head comparisons with serology, the <sup>13</sup>C UBT has comparable sensitivity but higher specificity.
- There is no standardized protocol for performing the noncommercial <sup>13</sup>C UBT, and the procedure can vary according to many factors.
- Further, studies that evaluated the performance of the <sup>13</sup>C UBT used various composite reference standards.
- There is a paucity of data on the use of the <sup>13</sup>C UBT beyond test accuracy.

### **Decision Determinants**

A decision-making framework developed by the Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee (OHTAC) consists of 7 guiding principles for decision making and a decision determinants tool. When making a decision, OHTAC considers 4 explicit main criteria: overall clinical benefit, consistency with expected societal and ethical values, value for money, and feasibility of adoption into health system. For more information on the decision-making framework, please refer to the *Decision Determinants Guidance Document* (http://www.hqontario.ca/evidence/evidence-process/evidence-review-process/decision-making-framework).

The decision determinants for this recommendation are summarized in Appendix 1.

On the basis of the decision determinants, OHTAC favoured continued use of serology as the first-line diagnostic test because of less concern about false-positive results compared with false-negative results. However, for recurrent episodes in which the serology test result is unreliable, coverage has been recommended for the <sup>13</sup>C UBT.

## **OHTAC Recommendations**

- OHTAC recommends that serology remain the first-line diagnostic test for H. pylori in adults with dyspepsia who do not present with alarm features, for whom endoscopy is not indicated.
- OHTAC recommends coverage for the <sup>13</sup>C UBT in patients who have been treated successfully for a previous episode of *H. pylori* infection and now have recurrent symptoms that could be due to reinfection.

# **Appendices**

## **Appendix 1 – Decision Determinants**

| Decision<br>Criteria                             | Sub-criteria                  | Decision Determinant Considerations  |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Overall<br>Clinical<br>Benefit                   | Effectiveness                 | <sup>13</sup> C UBT appears to be an accurate test for detection of <i>Helicobacter pylori</i> infection in adults with uninvestigated dyspepsia and no alarm features. In head-to-head comparisons with serology, <sup>13</sup> C UBT has comparable sensitivity but higher specificity (GRADE: Low)  |
|  | Safety                        | No safety concerns were identified   |
|  | Burden of Illness             | Dyspepsia is a common condition reported by 29% of Canadians. <i>Helicobacter pylori</i> is one of the causes of dyspepsia. The estimated prevalence of <i>H. pylori</i> infection in Ontario is 23%, with older people and immigrants at higher risk. Approximately one third of patients presenting to primary care with dyspepsia are infected with this bacteria   |
|  | Need                          | Helicobacter pylori is an important cause of chronic gastritis, peptic ulcer disease, mucosa-<br>associated lymphoid tissue lymphoma, and gastric cancer. It is categorized as a class I<br>carcinogen by the World Health Organization  |
| Consistency<br>with Societal/<br>Ethical Values  | Societal Values               | False-positive results are associated with unnecessary treatment (i.e., personal financial burden), possible side effects, allergies, potential development of <i>Clostridium difficile</i> colitis (low risk but not zero), and fostering drug resistance. False-negative results are associated with persistent symptoms and possible progression to ulcers or gastric cancer. False-negative results are less desirable than false-positive results.  One study has shown that most primary care patients who have undergone serologic testing would be willing to undergo the <sup>13</sup> C UBT, but only if they are told that the latter is more accurate <sup>a</sup> |
|  | Ethical Values                |  |
| Value for<br>Money                               | Economic<br>Evaluation        | The commercial <sup>13</sup> C UBT kit is more expensive than serology. The additional cost to the Ontario health system of using the <sup>13</sup> C UBT is \$7.8 million   |
| Feasibility of<br>Adoption into<br>Health System | Organizational<br>Feasibility | The current standard test is serology, which is performed by public health laboratories and covered by the Ontario Health Insurance Program. With the <sup>13</sup> C UBT, commercial kits are needed to standardize processing. Further, specialized measuring equipment is necessary   |

Abbreviation: <sup>13</sup>C UBT, carbon-13 urea breath test.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>McNulty C, Whiting JW. Patients'attitudes to *Helicobacter pylori* breath and stool antigen tests compared to blood serology. J Infect. 2007;55(1):19-22.

Health Quality Ontario 130 Bloor Street West, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor Toronto, Ontario M5S 1N5 Tel: 416-323-6868

Toll Free: 1-866-623-6868 Fax: 416-323-9261

 $Email: \underline{EvidenceInfo@hqontario.ca}$ 

www.hqontario.ca

© Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2013