- Walker MM, Talley NJ. Functional gastrointestinal disorders and the potential role of eosinophils. *Gastroenterol Clin North Am* 2008;37:383–95.
- Park MI, Camilleri M. Is there a role of food allergy in irritable bowel syndrome and functional dyspepsia? A systematic review. *Neurogastroenterol Motil* 2006;18:595–607.
- Zuo XL, Li YQ, Li WJ, *et al.* Alterations of food antigenspecific serum immunoglobulins G and E antibodies in patients with irritable bowel syndrome and functional dyspepsia. *Clin Exp Allergy* 2007;**37**:823–30.
- Talley NJ, Walker MM, Aro P, et al. Nonulcer dyspepsia and duodenal eosinophilia: an adult endoscopic population-based case–control study. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2007;5:1175–83.
- Friesen CA, Kearns GL, Andre L, et al. Clinical efficacy and pharmacokinetics of montelukast in dyspeptic children with duodenal eosinophilia. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr 2004;38:343–51.
- Haag S, Talley NJ, Holtmann G. Symptom patterns in functional dyspepsia and irritable bowel syndrome: relationship to disturbances in gastric emptying and response to a nutrient challenge in consulters and non-consulters. *Gut* 2004;53:1445–51.
- Gonenne J, Castillo EJ, Camilleri M, et al. Does the nutrient drink test accurately predict postprandial gastric volume in health and community dyspepsia? *Neurogastroenterol Motil* 2005;17:44–50.
- 31. **Boeckxstaens GE,** Hirsch DP, van den Elzen BD, *et al.* Impaired drinking capacity in patients with functional

dyspepsia: relationship with proximal stomach function. *Gastroenterology* 2001;**121**:1054–63.

- Talley NJ, Camilleri M, Chitkara DK, et al. Effects of desipramine and escitalopram on postprandial symptoms induced by the nutrient drink test in healthy volunteers: a randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled study. *Digestion* 2005;72:97–103.
- Choung RS, Cremonini F, Thapa P, et al. The effect of short-term, low-dose tricyclic and tetracyclic antidepressant treatment on satiation, postnutrient load gastrointestinal symptoms and gastric emptying: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Neurogastroenterol Motil* 2008;20:220–7.
- Taggart D, Billington BP. Fatty foods and dyspepsia. Lancet 1966;2:465–6.

Should computed tomography be the modality of choice for imaging Crohn's disease in children? The radiation risk perspective

David J Brenner

Computed tomography (CT) and, more recently, CT enterography are excellent non-invasive tools for diagnosing Crohn's disease, and for subsequent assessment of the disease, before and after therapy.¹ In this light, and given the general availability and ease of use of CT machines, it is not surprising that CT is steadily replacing barium small-bowel followthrough as the radiological modality of choice for imaging Crohn's disease.

There is, however, a potential downside, which is the radiation exposure produced by the CT scan. By their nature, CT scans result in radiation doses which are very much at the high end of those produced in diagnostic radiology, simply because a CT scan is effectively a large number of individual images that are electronically combined to produce a three-dimensional image. The effective dose involved in a CT scan is not large, but it is typically two to six times larger than that from barium small-bowel follow-through. Because of the typical longterm remission/relapse pattern of Crohn's disease, together with the fact that is predominantly a disease of young people, Crohn's disease patients are often imaged multiple times which, of course, correspondingly multiplies the radiation dose.

In this light, the report by Desmond *et al*² in this issue of the journal (see page 1524) surveying trends in radiation exposure as a result of imaging Crohn's disease, is most welcome. The study, from Cork University Hospital, Ireland, together with a corresponding report from the US,3 paints a picture of increasing lifetime radiation exposures in Crohn's disease patients, due almost entirely to the increased use of CT. For example, the Irish study² estimated that the mean cumulative effective dose per Crohn's disease patient increased by about a factor of 3 in the past decade. Correspondingly, as reported in the US (Mayo Clinic) study,³ the balance between the numbers of small-bowel followthroughs (SBFRs) and CTs performed to image Crohn's disease has moved from 90% vs 10% in 2003 in favour of SBFR, to 75% vs 25% in 2007 in favour of CT.

Should we be worried about the increased radiation exposure associated with the increased CT usage? After all, while the Irish study reports that mean cumulative radiation doses to Crohn's disease patients has increases 3-fold in the past decade (from 8 to 25 mSv), this is still not a large radiation dose. An estimate of the age-at-exposure averaged lifetime cancer mortality risk associated with a 25 mSv effective dose is about 1 in 1000, or 0.1%.⁴⁻⁶ One may, of course, ask whether such estimated radiation risks from CT are "real" or simply theoretical extrapolations from much higher-dose scenarios. In fact at

the average effective dose of 25 mSv^{2 °} (and certainly at 100 Sv or more, to which 10% of Crohn's disease patients were exposed²), there are direct epidemiological radiationassociated cancer-risk data⁷⁻⁹ from about 30 000 Japanese atomic-bomb survivors who were several miles away from the epicentres of the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and who were exposed to just this same range of low doses as the Crohn's disease patients. This low-dose group in the two Japanese cities has been followed for more than 50 years, and shows a small but statistically significant increased cancer risk.7-9 Other large-scale epidemiological studies on populations exposed in this dose range have reached the same conclusion.¹⁰ Thus, in the context of the CT doses estimated in the Irish study (and the similar doses from the US study), we have direct epidemiological evidence of a small but significant increase in cancer risk due to the radiation exposure, without the need to extrapolate cancer risk estimates from higher doses, with all the attendant uncertainties that entails.

An important point that emerges from the Irish study² relates to children. In particular, patients who were diagnosed with Crohn's disease in childhood (under 17), were twice as likely as the 17-40-yearold age group to have a high cumulative radiation exposure (>75 mSv), despite the fact that the dose per single CT scan is typically lower in children than in adults.¹¹¹² This issue of paediatric exposure is potentially important because of the increased sensitivity of children to radiation-induced cancer. For example a 10-yearold girl is, on average, about four times more sensitive to radiation-induced cancer than a 50-year-old woman.⁴ Coupling this with the observation that children with Crohn's disease are receiving higher cumulative radiation doses than adults with the disease,² it is clear that the use of CT for imaging Crohn's disease in children is of some concern. If the age-at-exposure averaged lifetime radiation-related cancer mortality risk were indeed typically 1 in 1000

Correspondence to: Dr David Brenner, Center for Radiological Research, Columbia University Medical Center, 630 West 168th Street, New York, NY 10032, USA; djb3@columbia.edu

for Crohn's disease patients imaged with CT, the increased cumulative dose, together with the increased radiation sensitivity of a paediatric Crohn's disease patient, might increase this estimated mortality risk in children to as much as 1 in 300.

Given that almost 10% of all Crohn's disease patients are children.¹³ such high radiation-associated cancer risks must be of concern. What can be done for these children? Clearly there are alternatives to CT, probably the most promising being magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).¹⁴ Until recently, MRI imaging of Crohn's disease was highly suboptimal, hindered by motion artifacts and lack of appropriate contrast agents. However, in the past few years, the technology has markedly improved,14 15 particularly in the reduction of imaging time, down to only a few seconds. In a 2003 study of contrast-enhanced MRI of the terminal ileum in children with Crohn's disease, Laghi et al16 correlated their MRI findings with ileal endoscopy and histology. and found a high sensitivity (84%) and specificity (100%) for the detection of Crohn ileitis. Likewise in a subsequent study¹⁷ using contrast-enhanced MRI, sensitivity and specificity were both >90% for the detection of Crohn's disease in the paediatric small bowel.

Thus, while further studies are needed, it appears that contrast-enhanced MRI is, or will soon be, a viable option for imaging paediatric Crohn's disease. Given the significant potential radiation risks associated with repeated paediatric CTs, MRI should perhaps be considered as a candidate to become the "first line" modality for imaging Crohn's disease in children. Of course there are also issues associated with MRI cost and availability to consider.^{14 15} But if we allow that CT remains the firstline modality for imaging adult Crohn's disease (ideally with reduced radiation doses from those currently delivered¹⁸), the necessary resources required to use MRI only for the <10% of Crohn's disease patients who are children, may become more feasible.

Competing interests: None declared.

Gut 2008;57:1489-1490. doi:10.1136/gut.2008.156265

REFERENCES

- Paulsen SR, Huprich JE, Fletcher JG, et al. CT enterography as a diagnostic tool in evaluating small bowel disorders: review of clinical experience with over 700 cases. *Radiographics* 2006;26:641–57.
- Desmond AN, O'Regan K, Curran C, et al. Crohn's disease: factors associated with exposure to high levels of diagnostic radiation. Gut 2008;57:1524–9.
- Peloquin JM, Pardi DS, Sandborn WJ, et al. Diagnostic ionizing radiation exposure in a populationbased cohort of patients with inflammatory bowel disease. Am J Gastroenterol 2008;103:1–8.
- National Research Council. Health risks from exposure to low levels of ionizing radiation – BEIR VII. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2006.
- Brenner DJ, Hall EJ. Computed tomography an increasing source of radiation exposure. N Engl J Med 2007;357:2277–84.
- Hall EJ, Brenner DJ. Cancer risks from diagnostic radiology. Br J Radiol 2008;81:362–78.

- Preston DL, Ron E, Tokuoka S, et al. Solid cancer incidence in atomic bomb survivors: 1958–1998. Radiat Res 2007;168:1–64.
- Pierce DA, Preston DL. Radiation-related cancer risks at low doses among atomic bomb survivors. *Radiat Res* 2000:154:178–86.
- Preston DL, Shimizu Y, Pierce DA, et al. Studies of mortality of atomic bomb survivors. Report 13: Solid cancer and noncancer disease mortality: 1950–1997. *Radiat Res* 2003;160:381–407.
- Cardis E, Vrijheid M, Blettner M, et al. The 15country collaborative study of cancer risk among radiation workers in the nuclear industry: Estimates of radiation-related cancer risks. *Radiat Res* 2007;167:396–416.
- Gaca AM, Jaffe TA, Delaney S, et al. Radiation doses from small-bowel follow-through and abdomen/pelvis MDCT in pediatric Crohn disease. *Pediatr Radiol* 2008;38:285–91.
- Jaffe TA, Gaca AM, Delaney S, et al. Radiation doses from small-bowel follow-through and abdominopelvic MDCT in Crohn's disease. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2007;189:1015–22.
- Gunesh S, Thomas GA, Williams GT, et al. The incidence of Crohn's disease in Cardiff over the last 75 years: an update for 1996–2005. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2008;27:211–9.
- Toma P, Granata C, Magnano G, et al. CT and MRI of paediatric Crohn disease. *Pediatr Radiol* 2007;37:1083–92.
- Lin MF, Narra V. Developing role of magnetic resonance imaging in Crohn's disease. Curr Opin Gastroenterol 2008;24:135–40.
- Laghi A, Borrelli O, Paolantonio P, et al. Contrast enhanced magnetic resonance imaging of the terminal ileum in children with Crohn's disease. Gut 2003;52:393–7.
- Darbari A, Sena L, Argani P, et al. Gadoliniumenhanced magnetic resonance imaging: a useful radiological tool in diagnosing pediatric IBD. Inflamm Bowel Dis 2004;10:67–72.
- McCollough CH, Bruesewitz MR, Kofler JM Jr. CT dose reduction and dose management tools: overview of available options. *Radiographics* 2006;26:503–12.

Branch intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms: just the tip of the iceberg?

Jürgen Weitz, Markus W Büchler

Intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms (IPMNs) of the pancreas have drawn considerable interest in recent years as we begin to learn more about the natural history of this disease. It is now commonly accepted that these tumours can be classified into two main categories according to their origin in the gland that is main duct IPMN (MD-IPMN) and branch duct IPMN (BD-IPMN). It is also well documented that IPMNs may progress through different stages of dysplasia into invasive carcinoma. It is, however, not well known whether all IPMNs ultimately progress into invasive cancer and if so what the timeline of this process is. In contrast to classical ductal adenocarcinomas of the pancreas, however, where patients always present with fully developed carcinoma with a dismal prognosis, many patients with IPMNs present early enough so that an intervention might prevent the development of pancreatic cancer. In fact, about 8–43% of patients with MD-IPMNs and 54-94% of patients with BD-IPMNs present with non-malignant lesions.1 Whereas it is well accepted that patients with MD-IPMN should undergo resection of the lesion at the time of diagnosis, current guidelines recommend non-surgical management of a certain subgroup of BD-IPMNs.1 Asymptomatic patients with tumours <30 mm in size without mural nodules and without a main duct dilation (>6 mm) fall into this category. Of note, these recommendations were not based on long-term follow-up of such patients but on the extremely low incidence of invasive cancer of patients initially presenting with these features. Recently, follow-up studies regarding this issue have been published. Salvia et al followed 89 patients with low-risk BD-IPMNs over a median of 32 months; surgery was performed in only 5 of these patients due to an increase in size, and none of the surgical specimens demonstrated malignancy.2 Tanno et al included 82 patients with low-risk BD-IPMNs in a similar

Department of Surgery, University of Heidelberg, Germany

Correspondence to: Professor Markus W Büchler, Department of Surgery, University of Heidelberg, INF 110, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany; markus.buechler@ med.uni-heidelberg.de