From Rome to Los Angeles -- The Rome III Criteria for the Functional

GI DisordersLin Chang, MDBackground and ContextFunctional gastrointestinal problems (FGIDs) have turn out to be generally extra broadly accepted asreliable diagnostic circumstances worthy of scientific consideration and scientific investigation.[1] Thesesituations are very prevalent throughout the world and remain a problem for clinicians andresearch scientists, among others.

- The Rome Foundation has taken on the challenge ofestablishing symptom-based diagnostic standards for these FGIDs due to a present lack ofdiagnostic biologic markers.
- The latest modification of the criteria, the Rome III criteria, waslately completed and presented at a symposium at this year's Digestive Diseases Week (DDW)meeting.

A collection of shows got by the Rome Foundation Board members on thesymposium and included the muse and rationale of the Rome III course of and a evaluation of theRome III diagnostic standards for functional gastroduodenal issues, functional bowel disorders,and for the group of disorders previously referred to as useful biliary disorders.

Classificationand responses of the Rome III process have been additionally mentioned and included validation of the criteriaand growth of a diagnostic questionnaire, generalizability of the factors for clinicians, andnew developments in the design of therapy trials.

Introduction

The road to Rome continued its journey by touring west to Los Angeles, California, in May 2006to unveil the newly established Rome III standards for FGIDs at this year's DDW meeting.[2] TheRome Foundation contains over one hundred international FGID experts who served on variouscommittees and helped develop standardized diagnostic standards for 28 adult and 16 pediatricFGIDs.

The imaginative and prescient of the Rome Foundation is to boost the medical recognition andlegitimization of FGIDs and to develop a greater scientific understanding of the pathophysiologicmechanisms so as to optimize treatment.

- Substantial progress has been remodeled latestyears, and thus the diagnostic criteria, the understanding of its pathophysiologic mechanisms,and pointers for therapy for these FGIDs have been updated.
- The Rome III standards have beenrevised from the Rome II standards and are largely based on findings from printed literature.
- Thecriteria shall be printed in a full-length e-book model and in addition in a condensed model on thisyear's April edition of Gastroenterology.

This work not only consists of the Rome III diagnosticstandards for the varied FGIDs, but also incorporates detailed evaluations of the literature on aconsiderable vary of topics pertaining to FGIDs, including epidemiology, pathophysiology,diagnostic testing, and remedy.The DDW symposium was chaired by Douglas Drossman, MD, who is President of the RomeFoundation.

Featured lectures on the Rome III standards, questionnaire growth, applicability topatients, and design of therapy trials were presented by the opposite Rome Foundation Boardmembers.The Functional GI

Disorders and Rome III ProcessDr. Drossman opened the symposium and laid the inspiration for the entire Rome III improvementcourse of and the rationale for the factors.

He mentioned factors that contribute to the rationale forgrowing standards for FGIDs, which include the truth that symptoms aren't defined primarily byabnormal motility but are outlined by multiple factors similar to motility disturbances, visceralhypersensitivity, irritation and mucosal immune dysfunction, brain-gut dysfunction, and earlylife and psychosocial components.

Standardized and widely accepted standards additionally presentepidemiologic support by defining symptom-based subgroups and demonstrating relatedfrequencies throughout completely different populations.

The Rome standards have additionally supplied diagnosticrequirements for both scientific trials and scientific cares and have therapy implications.

However,there are issues and limitations that have been mentioned.

The main adjustments instituted in the Rome III course of embody (1) revision of time-framerequirement to fulfill diagnostic standards, (2) adjustments in classification standards (eg, rumination is nowone of the practical gastroduodenal problems, and practical abdominal pain syndrome [FAPS]is now a separate category and never a functional bowel disorder), (3) addition of pediatricclasses (ie, Neonatal/Toddler and Child/Adolescent), (4) functional dyspepsia as a singledysfunction has been de-emphasized for research, (5) IBS bowel habit subgroup use primarily ofstool consistency to determine IBS bowel behavior subgroups (eg, diarrhea or constipationpredominance), and (6) more restrictive standards for gallbladder and sphincter of Oddi dysfunction.Future plans for the Rome Foundation include international educational packages, assist for validationresearch, partnering with regulatory agencies, working team initiatives (eg, pointers for brainimaging and pointers for severity in FGID working teams), and diversification of construction.

Criteria Development

A Paradigm Shift for Functional Gastroduodenal DisordersNicholas J. Talley, MD, PhD, mentioned how dyspepsia was defined as "pain or discomfortcentered within the upper abdomen" by the Rome I and II standards.[5] This old definition was discardedin Rome III as a result of there is no single symptom current in all patients with useful dyspepsia(FD), as a outcome of considerable variation in symptom patterns exists between patients, and becausedespite Rome II recommendations, studies nonetheless include heartburn and acid regurgitation as"dyspepsia."

- [6-8] Dyspepsia is often polysymptomatic, with 99% of sufferers reporting more than 2symptoms, over 80% reporting greater than 5 signs, and fewer than 0.1% reporting 1 symptom.
- These signs include upper belly ache, heartburn, and acid regurgitation, amongstothers.[9]FD is often referred to as pain or discomfort centered in the upper stomach with no proof oforganic disease likely to clarify symptoms.

The Rome III committee decided that the RomeII standards had been restricted for a quantity of reasons: (1) a scarcity of proof that subdividing FD bypredominant symptom is helpful in figuring out pathophysiology because of low sensitivity andspecificity[10]; (2) they have been based mostly largely on expert opinion; and (3) an element evaluation onsigns suggests that there's a meal-related syndrome not accounted for by Rome II.

Therefore, the Rome III committee beneficial the next pragmatic definition: Dyspepsia isdefined because the presence of 1 or extra dyspepsia signs which are thought of to originate fromthe gastroduodenal area, within the absence of any organic, systemic, or metabolic disease that'slikely to clarify the symptoms.[12] These signs are listed in Table 1. Thus, the oppositesymptoms that were listed in Rome II no longer fall underneath the FD umbrella.

The committeeconcluded that the "umbrella term" FD had restricted utility and that on the idea of the obtainableevidence, a meal-related grouping and pain-related grouping seem to symbolize FD as a end result ofthey are associated with distinct symptom groups and pathophysiologic mechanisms. Thesesubgroups are known as epigastric ache syndrome (EPS) and postprandial misery syndrome (PDS).

The Rome III definitions for these 2 syndromes are listed in Tables 2 and 3.

These newsyndromes were defined however stay to be validated and ought to be used for analysis functionsonly and not for clinical follow at this time. Clinicians are advised to use the definition of FDas a end result of remedy research have utilized this definition (and not these of EPS and PDA) in thetrials.

Another vital change from the Rome II criteria was that the Rome III committeerecognized that patents might meet standards for FD (and EPS or PDA) and have coexistentheartburn or IBS. On the idea of professional opinion, heartburn doesn't exclude a diagnosis of FD ifdyspepsia persists despite a trial of sufficient acid suppression.

Coexisting IBS has been provento haven't any main impression on symptom sample or putative pathophysiologic mechanisms in FD.

Fullness and early satiety represent a clear group distinct from nausea and vomiting. There are 2distinct situations that at the second are recognized syndromes in adults and have been outlined withRome III criteria: cyclic vomiting syndrome (CVS) and persistent idiopathic nausea (CIN) -- theseare separate from FD on the idea of issue evaluation and medical opinion (Tables four and 5).

The New Rome III Criteria for Functional Bowel Disorders and IBS SubgroupsNext, Robin Spiller, MD, mentioned how functional bowel disorders comprise the followingsituations: irritable bowel syndrome (IBS), useful bloating, practical constipation, functionaldiarrhea, and unspecified useful bowel dysfunction.

The main changes instituted from Rome II to Rome III criteria are: (1) introduction of a frequency threshold of signs needed to meetstandards (ie, three or more days per 30 days in the last 3 months; (2) length of signs (reduced tomore than 6 months) earlier than one can make a agency prognosis; and (3) refining the subtyping ofIBS.

The Rome III diagnostic criteria for IBS are proven in Table 6.The Rome II committee subclassified IBS on the premise of expert opinion and attempted toincorporate stool frequency, stool form, and defecation symptoms. However, because of its complexityand an absence of an evidence-based strategy, the subclassification was revised to be primarily based solelyon stool consistency, which has been supported by current research.

Subclassification of IBS isessential because it would probably be related to completely different therapy selections andpathophysiologic mechanisms.

The proposed new subtyping based mostly on stool consistency alone isIBS with constipation (IBS-C), IBS with diarrhea (IBS-D), IBS blended type (IBS-M), and IBSunsubtyped (IBS-U). Patients with IBS-M have both exhausting and unfastened stools over periods of hoursor days, whereas IBS sufferers with alternating bowel habits change subtype over intervals ofweeks and months.

Stool kind is predicated on the Bristol stool scale that categorizes stool kind andcorrelates best with colon transit occasions

Stability and association with other options, such asvisceral sensitivity and response to remedy, stay to be decided.Functional Gallbladder and Functional Sphincter of Oddi DisordersEnrico Corazziari, MD, subsequent mentioned that the principle change is that this group of issues isn't anylonger referred to as functional biliary problems; it has been renamed in accordance with the area the placethe abnormality actually happens.

This group of circumstances has been updated to practicalgallbladder dysfunction, useful biliary sphincter of Oddi disorder, and useful pancreaticsphincter of Oddi dysfunction.[18] These circumstances are not defined by structural abnormalities (eg,gallstones).

The definition of biliary-like pain was developed by consensus: (1) pain positioned within theepigastrium and/or right upper quadrant; (2) recurrent signs occurring at different intervals(not daily); and (3) episodes lasting 30 minutes or extra; ache builds up to a steady stage, and isaverage to extreme enough to interrupt the affected person's day by day activities or lead to an emergencydivision go to.

There are also supportive symptoms, such as that the ache might current with 1or more of the following: (a) associated nausea and vomiting; (b) radiating to the again and/or rightinfrasubscapular area; and (c) inflicting one to awaken from sleep in the midst of the night time.Consensus-recommended Rome III algorithm for practical gallbladder dysfunction and usefulsphincter of Oddi disorder were additionally mentioned.

Challenges and ResponsesRome III Diagnostic Questionnaire -- Development and ValidationWilliam Whitehead, PhD, discussed the targets of the questionnaire development and validationcourse of which were: (1) to develop a questionnaire that incorporates the Rome III standards as anassist to prognosis; (2) insure that questions are comprehensible; and (3) validate the questionnaireand the standards by comparing to diagnoses made by clinicians.

- Novel to the Rome course of, aquestionnaire was developed and validated via a multistep process using the expertise of theRome committee, working groups, and multicenter research websites.
- A main innovation of Rome III isthe development of an ordinal scale with individual frequency thresholds.
- One of the goals was toensure that frequency thresholds of signs had the best sensitivity and specificity forabdominal ache in IBS, which was discovered to be 2-3 days per thirty days with a sensitivity of 71% andspecificity of 88%.

The Rome III diagnostic questionnaire's reliability and specificity are excellentand sensitivity is sweet. However, further testing is needed for different FGIDs.Applicability of Rome III Criteria for Clinical PracticeW. Grant Thompson, MD, mentioned the problems and questions faced by clinicians associated

withtrying to use revealed trial and survey data to clinical follow, specifically therapy selectionfor their sufferers.

Questionnaires help within the diagnosis, and also choose topics for scientific trialsand survey populations.

Optimally, they want to be inclusive so that all sufferers with this situationare encompassed. However, algorithms and inclusion and exclusion standards utilized in aquestionnaire research can have an effect on the outcomes. Cutoffs of severity and frequency scales are necessaryand can decide who is included. Exclusions are additionally essential because sufferers with thesigns of the situation may be excluded relying on the standards requirements.

Whenreviewing scientific treatment trial data, it is important that the clinician ask the following questionsto determine whether or not the information are relevant to his/her affected person: (1) Was the questionnairealtered? (2) What was the purpose of the study? (3)

How was the research inhabitants selected? and(4) Can the proof from that trial or survey apply to my patient?

Update on Design of Treatment TrialsNext, Michel Delvaux, MD PhD, addressed the design of trials to evaluate the efficacy of latesttherapies for FGIDs, emphasizing trials in IBS and dyspepsia as a result of most research has beenundertaken in these circumstances.[19] Design of remedy trials is extremely necessary in evaluatingthe efficacy of remedy and in making use of knowledge to clinical care.

- Optimal design must be placebocontrolled, double-blind, parallel group, and randomized to therapy allocation.
- However, thereare challenges in designing medical trials in FGIDs.
- These embody high placebo response price,fluctuating symptoms, heterogeneous and complicated mechanisms, avoiding bias, contamination byover-the-counter remedies or drugs for different circumstances, and avoiding hurt given that FGIDsaren't thought-about life-threatening conditions.

The examine design should clearly outline the FGID tobe handled, the subgroups, and inclusion and exclusion standards (eg, sex, symptom severity,comorbidities, concurrent medications). Some unresolved points concern the period of theremedy intervention (eg, four vs 12 weeks), frequency of treatment (eg, day by day vs on-demand), andproblem blinding the intervention (eg, psychotherapy, hypnotherapy, sphincterotomy, or remedywith predictable results or facet effects).There are major and secondary outcome measures.

These will likely depend on the mechanismof action of the therapeutic modality. Secondary outcomes are essential for determining theefficacy of the remedy on particular person signs or nongastrointestinal outcomes, similar to healthrelated high quality of life. A definition of a responder is a 2-dimensional consequence, the amplitude of theresponse of the treatment, and the period of the response over the treatment interval.

There is asteady spectrum of response from full relief 100 percent of the time to some relief for a shortlength of time.

We at present do not know the brink for a clinically significant treatmenteffect. In summary, the Rome course of has facilitated methodologic advances that have beenessential over the last 2 a long time. However, various study designs want further validation,and outcome measures are the critical problem and deserve additional analysis.ConclusionThe Rome course of has been devoted to providing education, legitimization, and validation forthe numerous FGIDs affecting the pediatric and grownup populations.

The Rome III committees havejust lately supplied up to date reviews on the essential science, physiologic mechanisms, psychosocial,epidemiologic, diagnostic, and therapy aspects of those disorders. A new Rome III classificationsystem for FGIDs has been established with the inclusion of symptom-based criteria for medicalinvestigation and apply.

An evidence-based strategy was taken; nevertheless, in areas the place thiskind of information was missing, consensus opinion was employed. A number of issues nonethelesscontinue to challenge healthcare suppliers, analysis scientists, regulatory companies, and business,and these remain a aim of the Rome Foundation to sort out sooner or later in the evolving process ofunraveling the complexities surrounding FGIDs.Table 1.

Rome III Diagnostic Criteria for Functional DyspepsiaFunctional DyspepsiaAt least 3 months, with onset no less than 6 months beforehand, of 1 or more of the next:

- Bothersome postprandial fullness
- Early satiation
- Epigastric pain
- Epigastric burningAnd
- No evidence of structural illness (including at higher endoscopy) that's likely to clarifythe signsTable 2.

Rome III Diagnostic Criteria for Epigastric Pain SyndromeEpigastric Pain SyndromeAt least 3 months, with onset at least 6 months previously, with ALL of the following:Pain and burning that's:

- intermittent
- localized to the epigastrium of at least average severity, a minimum of once per week,
- and NOT:1. generalized or localized to different abdominal or chest regions2. relieved by defecation or flatulencethree. fulfilling criteria for gallbladder or sphincter of Oddi problemsTable 3.

Rome III Diagnostic Criteria for Postprandial Distress SyndromePostprandial Distress SyndromeAt least 3 months, with onset no less than 6 months beforehand, of 1 or more of the next:• Bothersome postprandial fullness1. occurring after ordinary-sized meals2. a minimum of a number of times every weekOr

- Early satiation1. that forestalls finishing a daily meal2. and happens at least several occasions a weekTable four. Rome III Diagnostic Criteria for Cyclic Vomiting SyndromeCyclic Vomiting SyndromeAt least 3 months, with onset no much less than 6 months beforehand of:
- Stereotypical episodes of vomiting concerning onset (acute) and length (less than 1week)
- three or more discrete episodes in the prior year

- Absence of nausea and vomiting between episodesSupportive criteria: History of migraine headaches or a family historical past of migraine complicationsTable 5.

Rome III Diagnostic Criteria for Chronic Idiopathic NauseaChronic Idiopathic NauseaAt least three months, with onset at least 6 months previously, of:

- Bothersome nausea, occurring at least several occasions per week in the final 3 months• Not normally associated with vomiting
- Absence of abnormalities at higher endoscopy or metabolic illness that explains thenauseaSeparate from FD (factor analyses)Table 6.

Rome III Diagnostic Criteria for Irritable Bowel SyndromeIrritable Bowel SyndromeAt least three months, with onset at least 6 months beforehand of recurrent belly pain ordiscomfort** associated with 2 or more of the following:

- Improvement with defecation; and/or
- Onset associated with a change in frequency of stool; and/or
- Onset related to a change in form (appearance) of stool**Discomfort means an uncomfortable sensation not described as pain.

References

1. Drossman DA, Corazziari E, Talley NJ, Thompson WG, and Whitehead WE, eds. ROMEII. The Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders. Diagnosis, Pathophysiology and Treatment:A Multinational Consensus. 2nd ed. McLean, Va: Degnon Associates; 2000.

2. Drossman DA, moderator. AGA Clinical Symposium -- Rome III: New Criteria for theFunctional GI Disorders. Program and abstracts of Digestive Disease Week; May 20-25,2006; Los Angeles, California. [Sp461-469]

3. Drossman DA. The functional gastrointestinal issues and the Rome III course of.Gastroenterology. 2006;a hundred thirty:1377-1390. Abstract

4. Drossman DA, Camilleri M, Mayer EA, Whitehead WE. AGA technical evaluate on irritablebowel syndrome. Gastroenterology. 2002;123:2108-2131. Abstract

5. Talley NJ, Stanghellini V, Heading RC, et al. Functional gastroduodenal disorders. Gut.1999;forty five:II37-II42. Abstract

6. Armstrong D, Kazim F, Gervais M, Pyzyk M. Early reduction of upper gastrointestinaldyspeptic symptoms: A survey of empirical therapy with pantoprazole in Canadian scientificapply. Can J Gastroenterol. 2002;16:439-450. Abstract

7. Peura DA, Kovacs TO, Metz DC, et al. Lansoprazole within the therapy of usefuldyspepsia: Two double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trials. Am J Med.2004;116:740-748. Abstract

8. Moayyedi P, Delaney BC, Vakil N, Forman D, Talley NJ. The efficacy of proton pumpinhibitors in nonulcer dyspepsia: A systematic review and economic analysis.Gastroenterology. 2004;127:1329-1337. Abstract

9. Thomson AB, Barkun AN, Armstrong D, et al. The prevalence of clinically vitalendoscopic findings in major care sufferers with uninvestigated dyspepsia: TheCanadian Adult Dyspepsia Empiric Treatment - Prompt Endoscopy (CADET-PE). AlimentPharmacol Ther. 2003;17:1481-1491. Abstract

10. Karamanolis G, Caenepeel P, Arts J, Tack J. Association of the predominant symptomwith medical traits and pathophysiological mechanisms in functional dyspepsia.Gastroenterology. 2006;a hundred thirty:296-303. Abstract

11. Camilleri M, Dubois D, Coulie B, et al. Prevalence and socioeconomic influence of uppergastrointestinal issues in the United States: Results of the US Upper GastrointestinalStudy. Clin Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 2005;3:543-552.

12. Tack J, Talley NJ, Camilleri M, et al. Functional gastroduodenal disorders.Gastroenterology. 2006;one hundred thirty:1466-1479. Abstract

13. Corsetti M, Caenepeel P, Fischler B, Janssens J, Tack J. Impact of coexisting irritablebowel syndrome on symptoms and pathophysiological mechanisms in functionaldyspepsia. Am J Gastroenterol. 2004;ninety nine:1152-1159. Abstract

14. Longstreth GF, Thompson WG, Chey WD, et al. Functional bowel problems.Gastroenterology. 2006;a hundred thirty:1480-1491. Abstract

15. Drossman DA, Morris CB, Hu Y, et al. A potential evaluation of bowel behavior inirritable bowel syndrome in ladies: Defining an alternator. Gastroenterology.2005;128:580-589. Abstract

16. Tillisch K, Labus JS, Naliboff BD, et al. Characterization of the alternating bowel behaviorsubtype in patients with irritable bowel syndrome. Am J Gastroenterol. 2005;100:896-904. Abstract

17. O'Donnell LJ, Virjee J, Heaton KW. Detection of pseudodiarrhoea by easy scientificevaluation of intestinal transit fee. BMJ. 1990;300:439-440. Abstract

18. Behar J, Corazziari E, Guelrud M, et al. Functional gallbladder and sphincter of oddiproblems. Gastroenterology. 2006;130:1498-1509. Abstract

19. Design of Treatment Trials Committee; Irvine EJ, Whitehead WE, Chey WD, et al. Designof treatment trials for functional gastrointestinal disorders. Gastroenterology.2006;a hundred thirty:1538-1551. Abstract

Author Information

Lin Chang, MD, Associate Professor of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, LosAngeles, California; Co-Director, Center for Neurovisceral Sciences & Women's Health at UCLA,Los Angeles, CaliforniaDisclosure: Lin Chang, MD, has disclosed that she has served as an advisor or consultant forNovartis, GlaxoSmithKline, Microbia, sanofi-aventis, and Solvay.

EditorMaria L. Gaiso, PhDEditorial Director, Medscape GastroenterologyDisclosure: Maria Gaiso has disclosed no related monetary relationships.