


D

**DIAGNOSTIC SIGNIFICANCE OF PEPSINOGEN I
AND PEPSINOGEN II IN DIFFERENT
GASTRIC DISEASES**

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR
THE M. D. DEGREE IN
CHEMICAL AND CLINICAL PATHOLOGY**



*616.0756
M.M*

BY

**MONA MOSTAFA OSMAN
M.B., B.CH., MS**

53542

SUPERVISORS

PROF. Dr. HANY SOBHI RUFAIL
PROFESSOR OF CHEMICAL AND CLINICAL PATHOLOGY
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

PROF. Dr. MOHAMED ABDEL FATAH TAHA
PROFESSOR OF INTERNAL MEDICINE
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

PROF. Dr. SAWSAN SAID HAFEZ
ASS. PROFESSOR OF CHEMICAL AND CLINICAL PATHOLOGY
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

PROF. Dr. NASHWA AHMED EL BADAWI
ASS. PROFESSOR OF CHEMICAL AND CLINICAL PATHOLOGY
AIN SHAMS UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
1996



﴿ بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم ﴾

قالوا سبحانك لا علم لنا إلا

ما علمتنا إنك أنت العليم الحكيم

﴿ صدق الله العظيم ﴾

(سورة البقرة- الآية ٣٢)

١٠



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, thanks are due to God Almighty

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and highest appreciation to *Dr. Hany Sobhi Rufail*, Prof. of Chemical and Clinical Pathology, Ain Shams University for offering me a lot of his kind support, vast experience and precious knowledge. I am grateful for his helpful supervision and fruitful criticism.

I would like to offer my thanks to *Dr. Mohamed Abdel Fatah*, Prof. of Internal Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his great effort and continuous help. He has generously offered a lot of his time and experience.

My sincere thanks are due to *Dr. Sawsan Said Hafez*, Assistant Prof. of Chemical and Clinical Pathology, Ain Shams University, for her generous honest co-operation, warm encouragement and continuous support through out every piece of this work.

I am also greatly obliged to *Dr. Nashwa Ahmed El Badawi*, Assistant Prof. of Chemical and Clinical Pathology, Ain Shams University, for her advices and fruitful criticism through out the whole work.

Also, I want to thank Bio chemist *Ahmed Kamal* for doing the statistical study of this piece of work.

At last but not least I would like to record a debt of gratitude for my husband and all members of my family.

*TO MY
FAMILY
FOR THEIR LOVE
AND
ENGOURAGEMENT*

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Ala.	:Alanine
- ALP	:Alkaline phosphatase
- ALT	:Alanine aminotrasferase
- ANOVA	:Analysis of variance
- Arg.	:Arginine
- Asn.	:Asparagine
- Asp.	:Aspartic
- AST	:Aspartate aminotrasferase
- BCP	:Bromocresol pruple
- BUN	:Blood urea nitrogen
- Cm	:Centimeter
- Cu	:Copper
- Cys.	:Cysteine
- dL	:Deciliter
- DNA	:Deoxyribonucleic acid
- ELISA	:Enzyme linked immunosorbent assay
- FN	:False negative
- FP	:False positive
- g	:gram
- GDH	:Glutamate dehydrogenase
- Gln.	:Glutamine
- Glu.	:Glutamic acid
- Gly.	:Glycine
- HCL	:Hydrochloric acid
- HCO ₃	:Bicarbonate
- His.	:Histidine
- I	:Iodine
- Ile.	:Isoleucine
- Iu.	:International unit
- K bq	:Kilo becquerel
- L	:Liter
- LDH	:Lactate dehydrogenase
- μ	:Micro
- M	:Molar

- μ Ci	:Micro Curie
- mL	:Milliliter
- mm	:millimeter
- MDH	:Malate dehydrogenase
- Met.	:Methionine
- Mg	:Magnesium
- mg	:Milligram
- N	:Normal
- n	:Number
- NaCl	:Sodium chloride
- NAD	:Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide
- ng	:nanogram
- nm	:nanometer
- PAGE	:Polyacrylamide Gel Electrophoresis
- Peps. I	:Pepsinogen I
- Peps. II	:Pepsinogen II
- Peps. I / II	:Pepsinogen I / pepsinogen II
- Phe.	:Phenylalanine
- Pro.	:Proline
- RNA	:Ribonucleic acid
- ROC curve	:Receiver operating characteristic curve
- SD	:Standard deviation
- Sens.	:Sensitivity
- Ser.	:Serine
- Spec.	:Specificity
- Tyr.	:Tyrosine
- Thr.	:Threonine
- TISP	:Total immunoreactive serum pepsinogen
- TN	:True negative
- TP	:True positive
- Val	:Valine
- X	:Mean
- +ve. pred. value	:Positive predictive value
- -ve. pred. value	:Negative predictive value.

LIST OF TABLES

Table (1)

Shows characteristics of principal gastrointestinal hormones.

Table (2)

Shows comparison of amino acids compositions among rat pepsinogen and human pepsin. I and II.

Table (3)

Shows statistical comparison between serum pepsin. I values in the healthy control group versus the six studied groups.

Table (4)

Shows statistical comparison between serum pepsin. II values in the healthy control group versus the six studied groups.

Table (5)

Shows statistical comparison between serum pepsin. I/II ratios in the healthy control group versus the six studied groups.

Table (6)

Shows statistical comparison between TISP in the healthy control group versus the six studied groups.

Table (7)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin. I for diagnosis of reflux oesophagitis at different decision levels.

Table (8)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin. II for diagnosis of reflux oesophagitis at different decision levels.

Table (9)

Shows diagnostic reliability for serum pepsin. I/II ratios for diagnosis of reflux oesophagitis at different decision levels.

Table (10)

Shows diagnostic reliability for TISP for diagnosis of reflux oesophagitis at different decision levels.

Table (11)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of reflux oesophagitis.

Table (12)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of reflux oesophagitis.

Table (13)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I for diagnosis of duodenal ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (14)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin II for diagnosis of duodenal ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (15)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I/II for diagnosis of duodenal ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (16)

Shows diagnostic reliability of TISP for diagnosis of duodenal ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (17)

Shows diagnostic reliability of individual tests for diagnosis of duodenal ulcer.

Table (18)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of duodenal ulcer.

Table (19)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I for diagnosis of gastric ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (20)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin II for diagnosis of gastric ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (21)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I/II for diagnosis of gastric ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (22)

Shows diagnostic reliability of TISP for diagnosis of gastric ulcer at different decision levels.

Table (23)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of gastric ulcer.

Table (24)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of gastric ulcer.

Table (25)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of chronic gastritis.

Table (26)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of chronic gastritis.

Table (27)

Shows diagnostic reliability for serum pepsin I for diagnosis of chronic superficial gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (28)

Shows diagnostic reliability for serum pepsin II for diagnosis of chronic superficial gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (29)

Shows diagnostic reliability for serum pepsin I/II for diagnosis of chronic superficial gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (30)

Shows diagnostic reliability for TISP for diagnosis of chronic superficial gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (31)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of chronic superficial gastritis.

Table (32)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of chronic superficial gastritis.

Table (33)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I for diagnosis of chronic atrophic gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (34)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin II for diagnosis of chronic atrophic gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (35)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I/II for diagnosis of chronic atrophic gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (36)

Shows diagnostic reliability of TISP for diagnosis of chronic atrophic gastritis at different decision levels.

Table (37)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of *chronic atrophic gastritis*.

Table (38)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of *chronic atrophic gastritis*.

Table (39)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of *cancer stomach*.

Table (40)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of *cancer stomach*.

Table (41)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I for diagnosis of *cancer stomach (diffuse type)* at different decision levels.

Table (42)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin II for diagnosis of *cancer stomach (diffuse type)* at different decision levels.

Table (43)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I/II for diagnosis of *cancer stomach (diffuse type)* at different decision levels.

Table (44)

Shows diagnostic reliability of TISP for diagnosis of *cancer stomach (diffuse type)* at different decision levels.

Table (45)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of *cancer stomach (diffuse type)*.

Table (46)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of cancer stomach (diffuse type).

Table (47)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I for diagnosis of cancer stomach(intestinal type)at different decision levels.

Table (48)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin II for diagnosis of cancer stomach(intestinal type)at different decision levels.

Table (49)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I/II for diagnosis of cancer stomach (intestinal type) at different decision levels.

Table (50)

Shows diagnostic reliability of TISP for diagnosis of cancer stomach (intestinal type) at different decision levels.

Table (51)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of cancer stomach (intestinal type).

Table (52)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of cancer stomach(intestinal type).

Table (53)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I for diagnosis of symptomatic control at different decision levels.

Table (54)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin II for diagnosis of symptomatic control at different decision levels.

Table (55)

Shows diagnostic reliability of serum pepsin I/II for diagnosis of symptomatic control at different decision levels.

Table (56)

Shows diagnostic reliability of TISP for diagnosis of symptomatic control at different decision levels.

Table (57)

Shows diagnostic reliability for individual tests for diagnosis of symptomatic control.

Table (58)

Shows diagnostic reliability for combination testing for diagnosis of symptomatic control.

Table (59)

Shows collected data (one way ANOVA) between serum pepsin I, serum pepsin II, serum pepsin I/II and TISP values in the studied groups.

Table (60)

Shows characteristics and costs of various diagnostic procedures for gastric diseases.

