

Correlation between Gastrointestinal Symptoms Questionnaire and Findings of Upper Gastrointestinal Endoscopy in Gastrointestinal Disorders

Khaled Mohamed Raafat*, Khaled Hamdy Abd El Majeed, Asmaa Ibrahim Ahmed, Ahmed Samir Allam

Gastroenterology and Internal Medicine Department, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, Egypt

*Corresponding author: Khaled Mohamed Raafat, Mobile: (+20) 01221056736, E-mail: khaled.Raafat@med.asu.edu.eg

ABSTRACT

Background: Gastrointestinal diseases are among the most common problems in tropical countries and commonly manifest as diarrhea, abdominal pain, abdominal distention, gastrointestinal bleeding, intestinal obstruction, malabsorption, or malnutrition.

Objective: The aim of this work was to compare the efficacy of gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire and results of upper gastrointestinal endoscopy to create an optimally reliable tool for measuring the presence and severity of GI symptoms and to measure the symptomatic response to treatment more objectively.

Subjects and Methods: This study has been conducted on 100 patients complaining of gastrointestinal symptoms attending the Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Unit in Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University Hospital. All patients have been evaluated by upper GI endoscopy to measure the correlation between gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire and upper GI endoscopy.

Results: There was significant correlation between gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire and results of upper gastrointestinal disorders.

Conclusion: Gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire is an easy used tool, which can be used to measure the presence, severity of gastrointestinal symptoms and the symptomatic response to treatment more objectively.

Keywords: Gastrointestinal disorders, Gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire, Upper gastrointestinal endoscopy,

INTRODUCTION

Gastrointestinal diseases are among the most common problems in tropical countries and commonly manifest as diarrhea, abdominal pain, abdominal distention, gastrointestinal bleeding, intestinal obstruction, malabsorption, or malnutrition⁽¹⁾. Gastroesophageal reflux is one of the commonest GIT

which is symptomatically characterized by symptoms of heartburn, regurgitation and can lead to significant complications such as erosive esophagitis, Barrett's esophagus and esophageal adenocarcinoma⁽²⁾.

Patients with peptic ulcer disease may be symptomatic or asymptomatic. Symptomatic patients generally present with dyspepsia. Most of the time, the pain is felt in the epigastric region, but sometimes it can be in the right upper quadrant or left upper quadrant of the abdomen. The pain is burning, or dull aching in nature and can radiate to the back in the case of posterior penetrating ulcer⁽³⁾. Ulcerative colitis (UC) presents with wide spectrum of symptoms including abdominal pain, diarrhea, and hematochezia. The inflammation begins in the rectum and extends up the colon in a continuous manner till it reaches the ileum⁽⁴⁾. Crohn's disease usually presents with abdominal pain, fatigue, anemia and mineral deficiencies. Some patients will present with constitutional symptoms as fever, weight loss and growth failure among younger patients⁽⁵⁾.

In patients with gastrointestinal tract GIT symptoms, endoscopy is the gold standard and is often the primary exploration. Positive findings in upper gastrointestinal endoscopy occur in 30 to 40% in relation to a benign or malignant structural disease. Negative findings occur in 60 to 70% of cases⁽¹⁾.

The upper gastrointestinal flexible fiber optic endoscope was first used in 1968 and proved to be a major breakthrough in the diagnosis of GIT lesions⁽⁶⁾.

Upper GIT endoscopy that visualizes the upper part of the GIT up to duodenum is an established mode of investigation and treatment of wide range of upper GIT conditions. It also offers the opportunity for biopsy of neoplastic and non-neoplastic lesions. It is a simple, safe and well tolerated procedure with direct visualization of the pathologic site and biopsy leading to early detection of pathologic changes and therefore helps to start appropriate treatment⁽⁷⁾.

Gastrointestinal Symptoms Questionnaire is a widely used instruments to measure the presence and severity of GI symptoms. These questionnaires can be used to measure the symptomatic response to treatment more objectively. Furthermore, these questionnaires are widely used in trials to describe the prevalence and severity of gastrointestinal symptoms in the study population as well as to evaluate treatment outcome⁽⁸⁾.

The aim of this work was to compare the efficacy of gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire and results of upper gastrointestinal endoscopy to create an optimally reliable tool for measuring the presence and severity of GI symptoms and to measure the symptomatic response to treatment more objectively.

SUBJECTS AND METHODS

This study has been conducted on 100 patients complaining of gastrointestinal symptoms attending the Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Unit in Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University Hospital.

All patients have been evaluated by upper GI endoscopy to measure the correlation between gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire and upper GI endoscopy.

Inclusion criteria of selected patients under the study: Patient aged above 18 years old, both

genders, and patient complaining of gastrointestinal symptoms.

Exclusion criteria of selected patients under the study: Patients with previous bariatric surgeries, surgeries involving resection of any bowel loop and patients on long term NSAIDS.

Methodology

The subjects under study underwent/were exposed to the following protocol: History taking and subject interview including gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire formed of 16 questions, this questionnaire

included questions about the severity of GI symptoms during the last 4 weeks, rated 0–6, where 0 meant “no complaints” and 6 represented the worst imaginable severity of that symptom.

At the completion of the questionnaire, subjects were asked to **self-rate the severity** of their GI symptoms by marking line with a cross starting from no symptoms to unbearable symptoms.

In the current study the following table of gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire was used⁽⁹⁾:

Table (1): Gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire:

	Do you experience during the last 4 weeks	Non	Mild	Moderate	Quite a lot	Severe	Very severe	unbearable
1.	Abdominal pain -in common -postprandial -fasting -does not decline after defecation							
2.	Epigastric pain -in common -during daytime -at night/a sleep							
3.	Heartburn							
4.	Regurgitation							
5.	Abdominal rumbling							
6.	Bloating							
7.	Empty feeling							
8.	Nausea							
9.	Vomiting							
10.	Loss of appetite							
11.	Postprandial fullness							
12.	Belching							
13.	Flatulence							
14.	Hematemesis							
15.	Dysphagia 1) Liquid food 2) Solid food							
16.	Stool • Melena • Bloody • Mucous • Frequent hard • Diarrhea • Alternately solid or loose • Constipation • Frequently with pain • Urging stools • Incomplete • Steatorrhea							

Describe your abdominal or epigastric pain during the last 4 weeks by marking the line below

No complaint

unbearable symptoms

Upper gastrointestinal endoscopy: using upper GI endoscopy to visualizes the upper part of the GIT up to duodenum ⁽⁷⁾.

The following steps are done:

Informed consent taken from the patient, explanation of the procedure to the patient, suitable anesthesia given to the patient and upper GI endoscopy done to visualize the upper part of GIT up to duodenum, any lesions were observed and reported.

Data collected from gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire and upper GI endoscopy were collected and correlated with each other's.

Ethical consent:

An approval of the study was obtained from Ain Shams University Academic and Ethical Committee. Every patient signed an informed written consent for acceptance of participation in the study.

This work has been carried out in accordance with The Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki) for studies involving humans.

Statistical analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was mainly used for data entry and analysis. Qualitative data were presented as frequencies (numbers) and relative frequencies (percentages); while means, standard deviations and ranges were used to describe quantitative variables. Pearson's chi-square test was used for comparing

qualitative categorical data. P-values were taken at a pre-determined threshold probability, the significance level of 0.05 and 95% confidence limit.

RESULTS

Table (2) shows that 50 of patients were males and 50 of patients were females.

Table (2): Age and sex of the studied participants

Statistics	Mean ± SD (N=100)	Range (Minimum- Maximum)
Variables		
Age (Years):	40.2±12.9	50 (19-69)
Sex:	Number (N=100)	%
• Males	50	50.0
• Females	50	50.0

Table (3) shows association between gastrointestinal symptoms and esophagitis detected by endoscope. Reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation) was statistically significantly more prevalent among patients who had esophagitis as compared to patients who didn't have esophagitis.

The proportions of patients who complained of epigastric pain, abdominal rumbling, bloating, empty feeling, nausea, vomiting, loss of appetite, postprandial fullness, belching, flatulence, hematemesis, dysphagia and steatorrhea were higher among esophagitis as compared to non-esophagitis group. However, this was without statistical significance.

Table (3): Association between gastrointestinal symptoms and esophagitis detected by endoscope

Endoscopic finding Gastrointestinal symptoms		Esophagitis		No esophagitis		Significant test and P value
		N=50	%	N=50	N=50	
Abdominal pain	Absent	27	54.0	21	42.0	X ² =1.44 P=0.230
	Present	23	46.0	29	58.0	
Epigastric pain:	Absent	24	48.0	29	58.0	X ² =1.00 P=0.316
	Present	26	52.0	21	24.0	
Reflux syndrome:	Absent	25	50.0	38	76.0	X ² =7.25 P=0.007*
	Present	25	50.0	12	24.0	
Abdominal rumbling:	Absent	32	64.0	38	76.0	X ² =1.71 P=0.190
	Present	18	36.0	12	24.0	
Bloating:	Absent	41	82.0	44	88.0	X ² =0.71 P=0.401
	Present	9	18.0	6	12.0	
Empty feeling	Absent	33	66.0	36	72.0	X ² =0.42 P=0.517
	Present	17	34.0	14	28.0	
Nausea:	Absent	39	78.0	44	88.0	X ² =1.77 P=0.183
	Present	11	22.0	6	12.0	
Vomiting:	Absent	33	66.0	41	82.0	X ² =3.32 P=0.068
	Present	17	34.0	9	18.0	
Loss of appetite:	Absent	21	42.0	25	50.0	X ² =0.64 P=0.422
	Present	29	58.0	25	50.0	
Postprandial fullness:	Absent	32	64.0	38	76.0	X ² =1.71 P=0.190
	Present	18	36.0	12	24.0	
Belching:	Absent	39	78.0	43	86.0	X ² =1.08 P=0.190
	Present	11	22.0	7	14.0	
Flatulence:	Absent	36	72.0	40	80.0	X ² =0.87 P=0.298
	Present	14	28.0	10	20.0	
Hematemesis:	Absent	45	90.0	45	90.0	X ² =0.00 P=1.00
	Present	5	10.0	5	10.0	
Dysphagia:	Absent	47	94.0	50	100.0	X ² =3.09 P=0.079
	Present	3	6.0	0	0.0	
Melena:	Absent	46	92.0	43	86.0	X ² =0.91 P=0.338
	Present	4	8.0	7	14.0	
Constipation:	Absent	46	92.0	44	88.0	X ² =0.44 P=0.505
	Present	4	8.0	6	12.0	
Alternately solid or loose stool:	Absent	45	90.0	46	92.0	X ² =0.12 P=0.727
	Present	5	10.0	4	8.0	
Diarrhea:	Absent	47	94.0	45	90.0	X ² =0.54 P=0.461
	Present	3	6.0	5	10.0	
Steatorrhea:	Absent	47	94.0	49	98.0	X ² =1.04 P=0.307
	Present	3	6.0	1	2.0	

X²= Chi square test, *= Statistically significant difference

Table (4) shows association between gastrointestinal symptoms and incompetent cardia detected by endoscope. Reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation) was statistically significantly more prevalent among patients who had incompetent cardia as compared to patients who didn't have incompetent cardia.

Table (4): Association between gastrointestinal symptoms and incompetent cardia detected by endoscope

Endoscopic finding Gastrointestinal symptoms		Incompetent cardia		No incompetent cardia		Significant test and P value
		N=24	%	N=76	%	
Abdominal pain	Absent	12	50.0	36	47.0	X ² =0.05 P=0.822
	Present	12	50.0	40	52.6	
Epigastric pain:	Absent	11	45.8	42	55.3	X ² =0.65 P=0.420
	Present	13	54.2	34	44.7	
Reflux syndrome:	Absent	11	45.8	52	68.4	X ² =3.99 P=0.046*
	Present	13	54.2	24	31.6	
Abdominal rumbling:	Absent	18	75.0	52	68.4	X ² =0.37 P=0.540
	Present	6	25.0	24	31.6	
Bloating:	Absent	19	79.2	66	86.8	X ² =0.84 P=0.359
	Present	5	20.8	10	13.2	
Empty feeling	Absent	16	66.7	53	69.7	X ² =0.80 P=0.777
	Present	8	33.3	23	30.3	
Nausea:	Absent	20	83.3	63	82.9	X ² =0.00 P=0.960
	Present	4	16.7	13	17.1	
Vomiting:	Absent	17	70.8	57	75.0	X ² =0.16 P=0.685
	Present	7	29.2	19	25.0	
Loss of appetite:	Absent	9	37.5	37	48.7	X ² =0.91 P=0.338
	Present	15	62.5	39	51.3	
Postprandial fullness:	Absent	15	62.5	55	72.4	X ² =0.85 P=0.358
	Present	9	37.5	21	27.6	
Belching:	Absent	21	87.5	61	80.3	X ² =0.64 P=0.421
	Present	3	12.5	15	19.7	
Flatulence:	Absent	19	79.2	57	75.0	X ² =0.17 P=0.677
	Present	5	20.8	19	25.0	
Hematemesis:	Absent	22	91.7	68	89.5	X ² =0.09 P=0.755
	Present	2	8.3	8	10.5	
Dysphagia:	Absent	23	98.8	74	97.4	X ² =0.14 P=0.701
	Present	1	4.2	2	2.6	
Melena:	Absent	21	87.5	68	89.5	X ² =0.07 P=0.788
	Present	3	12.5	8	10.5	
Constipation:	Absent	21	87.5	69	90.8	X ² =0.21 P=0.640
	Present	3	12.5	7	9.2	
Alternately solid or loose stool:	Absent	23	95.8	68	89.5	X ² =0.90 P=0.343
	Present	1	4.2	8	10.5	
Diarrhea:	Absent	22	91.7	70	92.1	X ² =0.00 P=0.945
	Present	2	8.3	6	7.9	
Steatorrhea:	Absent	24	100.0	72	94.7	X ² =1.31 P=0.251
	Present	0	0.0	4	5.3	

X²= Chi square test, *= Statistically significant difference

Table (5) shows association between gastrointestinal symptoms and esophageal ulcer detected by endoscope. Reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation), epigastric pain and empty feeling were statistically significantly more prevalent among patients who had esophageal ulcer as compared to patients who didn't have esophageal ulcer.

Table (5): Association between gastrointestinal symptoms and esophageal ulcer detected by endoscope

Endoscopic finding		Esophageal ulcer		No Esophageal ulcer		Significant test and P value
		N=7	%	N=93	%	
Abdominal pain	Absent	4	57.1	44	47.3	X ² =0.25 P=0.616
	Present	3	42.9	49	52.7	
Epigastric pain:	Absent	1	14.3	52	55.9	X ² =4.52 P=0.033*
	Present	6	85.7	41	44.1	
Reflux syndrome:	Absent	1	14.3	62	66.7	X ² =7.66 P=0.006*
	Present	6	85.7	31	33.3	
Abdominal rumbling:	Absent	4	57.1	66	71.0	X ² =0.59 P=0.441
	Present	3	42.9	27	29.0	
Bloating:	Absent	6	85.7	79	84.9	X ² =0.00 P=0.956
	Present	1	14.3	14	15.1	
Empty feeling	Absent	2	28.6	67	72.0	X ² =5.75 P=0.016*
	Present	5	71.4	26	28.0	
Nausea:	Absent	6	85.7	77	82.8	X ² =0.04 P=0.843
	Present	1	14.3	16	17.2	
Vomiting:	Absent	6	85.7	68	73.1	X ² =0.53 P=0.464
	Present	1	14.3	25	26.9	
Loss of appetite:	Absent	5	71.4	41	44.1	X ² =1.95 P=0.162
	Present	2	28.6	52	55.9	
Postprandial fullness:	Absent	4	57.1	66	71.0	X ² =0.59 P=0.441
	Present	3	42.9	27	29.0	
Belching:	Absent	7	100.0	75	80.6	X ² =1.65 P=0.199
	Present	0	0.0	18	19.4	
Flatulence:	Absent	5	71.4	71	76.3	X ² =0.08 P=0.769
	Present	2	28.6	22	23.7	
Hematemesis:	Absent	7	100.0	83	89.2	X ² =0.84 P=0.360
	Present	0	0.0	10	10.8	
Dysphagia:	Absent	6	85.7	91	97.8	X ² =3.29 P=0.070
	Present	1	14.3	2	2.2	
Melena:	Absent	5	71.4	84	90.3	X ² =2.37 P=0.123
	Present	2	28.6	9	9.7	
Constipation:	Absent	7	100.0	83	89.2	X ² =0.83 P=0.360
	Present	0	0.0	10	10.8	
Alternately solid or loose stool:	Absent	5	71.4	86	92.5	X ² =3.52 P=0.061
	Present	2	28.6	7	7.5	
Diarrhea:	Absent	7	100.0	85	91.4	X ² =0.65 P=0.419
	Present	0	0.0	8	8.6	
Steatorrhea:	Absent	7	100.0	89	95.7	X ² =0.31 P=0.575
	Present	0	0.0	4	4.3	

X²= Chi square test, *= Statistically significant difference

Table (6) shows association between gastrointestinal symptoms and hiatus hernia detected by endoscope. Epigastric pain and reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation) were statistically significantly more prevalent among patients who had hiatus hernia as compared to patients who didn't have hiatus hernia. The proportions of patients who complained of loss of appetite were higher among patients with hiatus hernia as compared to patients without hiatus hernia group. However, this was without statistical significance.

Table (6): Association between gastrointestinal symptoms and hiatus hernia detected by endoscope

Endoscopic finding		Hiatus hernia		No hiatus hernia		Significant test and P value
		N=26	%	N=74	%	
Abdominal pain	Absent	16	61.5	32	43.2	X ² =2.58 P=0.108
	Present	10	38.5	42	56.8	
Epigastric pain:	Absent	8	30.8	45	60.8	X ² =6.97 P=008*
	Present	18	69.2	29	39.2	
Reflux syndrome:	Absent	11	42.3	52	70.3	X ² =6.45 P=0.011*
	Present	15	57.7	22	29.7	
Abdominal rumbling:	Absent	20	76.6	50	67.6	X ² =0.80 P=0.371
	Present	6	23.1	24	32.4	
Bloating:	Absent	24	92.3	61	82.4	X ² =1.47 P=0.225
	Present	2	7.7	13	17.6	
Empty feeling	Absent	19	73.1	50	67.6	X ² =0.27 P=0.601
	Present	7	26.9	24	32.4	
Nausea:	Absent	24	92.3	59	79.7	X ² =2.15 P=0.142
	Present	2	7.7	15	20.3	
Vomiting:	Absent	19	73.1	55	74.3	X ² =0.01 P=0.901
	Present	7	26.9	19	25.7	
Loss of appetite:	Absent	11	42.3	35	47.3	X ² =0.19 P=0.661
	Present	15	57.7	39	52.7	
Postprandial fullness:	Absent	19	73.1	51	68.9	X ² =0.15 P=0.691
	Present	7	26.9	23	31.1	
Belching:	Absent	21	80.8	61	82.4	X ² =0.03 P=0.849
	Present	5	19.2	5	17.6	
Flatulence:	Absent	19	73.1	57	77.0	X ² =0.16 P=0.685
	Present	7	26.9	17	23.0	
Hematemesis:	Absent	24	92.3	66	89.2	X ² =0.20 P=0.648
	Present	2	7.7	8	10.8	
Dysphagia:	Absent	25	96.2	72	97.3	X ² =0.08 P=0.769
	Present	1	3.8	2	2.7	
Melena:	Absent	24	92.3	65	87.8	X ² =0.39 P=0.531
	Present	2	7.7	9	12.2	
Constipation:	Absent	25	96.2	65	87.8	X ² =1.47 P=0.224
	Present	1	3.8	9	12.2	
Alternately solid or loose stool:	Absent	25	96.2	66	89.2	X ² =1.14 P=0.286
	Present	1	3.8	8	10.8	
Diarrhea:	Absent	26	100.0	66	89.2	X ² =3.05 P=0.080
	Present	0	0.0	8	10.8	
Steatorrhea:	Absent	24	92.3	72	97.3	X ² =1.24 P=0.264
	Present	2	7.7	2	2.7	

X²= Chi square test, *= Statistically significant difference

Table (7) shows association between gastrointestinal symptoms and gastritis detected by endoscope. Epigastric pain and reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation) were statistically significantly more prevalent among patients who had gastritis as compared to patients who didn't have gastritis.

Table (7): Association between gastrointestinal symptoms and gastritis detected by endoscope

Endoscopic finding		Gastritis		No gastritis		Significant test and P value
		N=78	%	N=22	%	
Abdominal pain	Absent	37	47.4	11	50.0	X ² =0.04 P=0.832
	Present	41	52.6	11	50.0	
Epigastric pain:	Absent	36	46.2	17	77.3	X ² =6.67 P=0.010*
	Present	42	53.8	5	22.7	
Reflux syndrome:	Absent	43	55.1	20	90.9	X ² =9.42 P=0.002*
	Present	35	44.9	2	9.1	
Abdominal rumbling:	Absent	54	69.2	16	72.7	X ² =0.10 P=0.752
	Present	24	30.8	6	27.7	
Bloating:	Absent	64	82.1	21	95.5	X ² =2.41 P=0.120
	Present	14	17.9	1	4.5	
Empty feeling	Absent	51	65.4	18	81.8	X ² =2.16 P=0.141
	Present	27	34.6	4	18.2	
Nausea:	Absent	64	82.1	19	86.4	X ² =0.22 P=0.634
	Present	14	17.9	3	13.6	
Vomiting:	Absent	55	70.5	19	86.4	X ² =2.24 P=0.134
	Present	23	29.5	3	13.6	
Loss of appetite:	Absent	33	42.3	13	59.1	X ² =1.94 P=0.163
	Present	45	57.7	9	40.9	
Postprandial fullness:	Absent	54	69.2	16	72.7	X ² =0.10 P=0.752
	Present	24	30.8	6	27.3	
Belching:	Absent	63	80.8	19	86.4	X ² =0.36 P=0.546
	Present	15	19.2	3	13.6	
Flatulence:	Absent	57	73.1	19	86.4	X ² =1.66 P=0.197
	Present	21	26.9	3	13.6	
Hematemesis:	Absent	73	93.6	17	77.3	X ² =5.07 P=0.024*
	Present	5	6.4	5	22.7	
Dysphagia:	Absent	75	96.2	22	100.0	X ² =0.87 P=0.350
	Present	3	3.8	0	0.0	
Melena:	Absent	71	91.0	18	81.8	X ² =1.48 P=0.223
	Present	7	9.0	4	18.2	
Constipation:	Absent	69	88.5	21	95.5	X ² =0.93 P=0.334
	Present	9	11.5	1	4.5	
Alternately solid or loose stool:	Absent	69	88.5	22	100.0	X ² =2.79 P=0.095
	Present	9	11.5	0	0.0	
Diarrhea:	Absent	71	91.0	21	95.5	X ² =0.45 P=0.499
	Present	7	9.0	1	4.5	
Steatorrhea:	Absent	75	96.2	21	95.5	X ² =0.02 P=0.882
	Present	3	3.8	1	4.5	

X²= Chi square test, *= Statistically significant difference

Table (8) shows association between gastrointestinal symptoms and gastric ulcer detected by endoscope. Postprandial fullness, loss of appetite, nausea, abdominal rumbling, bloating and melena were statistically significantly more prevalent among patients who had gastric ulcer as compared to patients who didn't have gastric ulcer.

Table (8): Association between gastrointestinal symptoms and gastric ulcer detected by endoscope

Endoscopic finding		Gastric ulcer		No gastric ulcer		Significant test and P value
		N=6	%	N=94	%	
Abdominal pain	Absent	4	66.7	44	46.8	X ² =0.89
	Present	2	33.3	50	53.2	P=0.345
Epigastric pain:	Absent	2	33.3	51	54.3	X ² =0.99
	Present	4	66.7	43	45.7	P=0.319
Reflux syndrome:	Absent	3	50.0	60	63.8	X ² =0.46
	Present	3	50.0	34	36.2	P=0.496
Abdominal rumbling:	Absent	2	33.3	68	72.3	X ² =4.08
	Present	4	66.7	26	27.7	P=0.043*
Bloating:	Absent	3	50.0	82	87.2	X ² =6.13
	Present	3	50.0	12	12.8	P=0.013*
Empty feeling	Absent	3	50.0	66	70.2	X ² =1.07
	Present	3	50.0	28	29.8	P=0.299
Nausea:	Absent	3	50.0	80	85.1	X ² =4.92
	Present	3	50.0	14	14.9	P=0.026*
Vomiting:	Absent	3	50.0	71	75.5	X ² =1.91
	Present	3	50.0	23	24.5	P=0.167
Loss of appetite:	Absent	0	0.00	46	48.9	X ² =5.43
	Present	6	100.0	48	51.1	P=0.020*
Postprandial fullness:	Absent	1	16.7	69	73.4	X ² =8.64
	Present	5	83.3	25	26.6	P=0.003*
Belching:	Absent	4	66.7	78	83.0	X ² =1.01
	Present	2	33.3	16	17.0	P=0.313
Flatulence:	Absent	4	66.7	72	76.6	X ² =0.30
	Present	2	33.3	22	23.4	P=0.581
Hematemesis:	Absent	5	83.3	85	90.4	X ² =0.31
	Present	1	16.7	9	9.6	P=0.575
Dysphagia:	Absent	6	100.0	91	96.8	X ² =0.19
	Present	0	0.0	3	3.2	P=0.657
Melena:	Absent	3	50.0	86	91.5	X ² =9.91
	Present	3	50.0	8	8.5	P=0.002*
Constipation:	Absent	5	83.3	85	90.4	X ² =0.31
	Present	1	16.7	9	9.6	P=0.575
Alternately solid or loose stool:	Absent	6	100.0	85	90.4	X ² =0.63
	Present	0	0.0	9	9.6	P=0.427
Diarrhea:	Absent	6	100.0	86	91.5	X ² =0.55
	Present	0	0.0	8	8.5	P=0.456
Steatorrhea:	Absent	6	100.0	90	95.7	X ² =0.26
	Present	0	0.0	4	4.3	P=0.606

X²= Chi square test, *= Statistically significant difference

DISCUSSION

Gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire is a simple tool for screening of gastrointestinal symptoms. This questionnaire had been developed to measure the presence and severity of GI symptoms and to measure the symptomatic response to treatment more objectively⁽⁹⁾. The current study was conducted on 100 patients complaining of gastrointestinal symptoms. The aim of the current work is to compare the efficacy of gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire and results of upper gastrointestinal endoscopy to create an optimally reliable tool for measuring the presence and severity of GI symptoms and to measure the symptomatic response to treatment more objectively.

All patients were subjected to history taking to assess the presence and degree of gastrointestinal

symptoms and upper gastrointestinal endoscopy to detect the presence of any lesions in upper gastrointestinal tract.

In the current study correlation between gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) and esophagitis was statistically significant. Reflux symptoms were more prevalent among patients who had esophagitis as compared to patients who didn't have esophagitis. Epigastric pain, abdominal rumbling, bloating, empty feeling, nausea, vomiting, loss of appetite, postprandial fullness, belching, flatulence, hematemesis, dysphagia and steatorrhea were higher among esophagitis as compared to non-esophagitis group. However, this was without statistical significance.

The previous correlation confirmed by **Badillo and Francis** ⁽¹⁰⁾ who published that GERD could manifest in a wide range of symptoms, which can be

subdivided into typical, atypical and extra-esophageal symptoms. Typical symptoms include heartburn and acid regurgitation, which have high specificity but low sensitivity for GERD. Atypical symptoms such as epigastric pain, dyspepsia, nausea, bloating, and belching may be suggestive of GERD but may overlap with other conditions in the differential diagnosis such as peptic ulcer disease, achalasia, gastritis, dyspepsia, and gastroparesis. In the current study there was statistically significant correlation between reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation) and incomplete cardia as compared to patients who did not have incomplete cardia. The proportions of patients who complained of epigastric pain and loss of appetite were higher among patients with incomplete cardia as compared to patients without incomplete cardia group. However, this was without statistical significance. This means that these symptoms are not specific for incompetent cardia and can present with other gastrointestinal lesions.

In a study done by **Falavigna *et al.*** ⁽¹¹⁾ on 150 patient, they published that pathological acid reflux was present in 43 and 71% of patients with normal or open cardia, respectively, their conclusion was that endoscopic appearance of the cardia can identify patients with pathological gastroesophageal reflux.

In the current study there was statistically significant correlation between {reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation), epigastric pain and empty feeling} and esophageal ulcer among patients who had esophageal ulcer as compared to patients who did not have esophageal ulcer.

In a study done by **Rantanen *et al.*** ⁽¹²⁾ on 2242 patient, they published that gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) seemed to be the etiologic factor for ulcer in 68 (79.0%) patients. The most common agonal symptoms were hematemesis (41.8%), abdominal pain (25.6%), and melena (22.1%).

In the current study there was statistically significant correlation between {epigastric pain and reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation)} and hiatus hernia among patients who had hiatus hernia as compared to patients who didn't have hiatus hernia.

In the current study there was statistically significant correlation between {epigastric pain and reflux syndrome (heart burn and regurgitation)} and gastritis among patients who had gastritis as compared to patients who didn't have gastritis. The proportions of patients who complained of abdominal pain, abdominal rumbling, bloating, loss of appetite, nausea, vomiting, postprandial fullness, belching, flatulence, empty feeling, dysphagia, constipation and diarrhea were higher among patients with gastritis as compared to patients who didn't have gastritis. However, this was without statistical significance. This means that these symptoms are not specific for gastritis and can present with other gastrointestinal lesions. The proportions of patients who complained of reflux syndrome (heart burn and

regurgitation), epigastric pain, hematemesis, vomiting, belching, flatulence and constipation and empty feeling were higher among patients with gastric ulcer as compared to patients who didn't have gastric ulcer. However, this was without statistical significance.

CONCLUSION

Gastrointestinal symptoms questionnaire is an easy used tool which can be used to measure the presence, severity of gastrointestinal symptoms and the symptomatic response to treatment more objectively.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Sources of funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Author contribution: Authors contributed equally in the study.

REFERENCES

1. **Ashwin N, Ramnik J (2020):** Gastrointestinal Diseases in Hunter's Tropical Medicine and Emerging Infectious Diseases. (Tenth Edition), Pp. 1172-1236. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/book/9780323555128/hunters-tropical-medicine-and-emerging-infectious-diseases>
2. **Vakil N, van Zanten S, Kahrilas P *et al.* (2006):** The Montreal definition and classification of gastroesophageal reflux disease: a global evidence-based consensus. *Am J Gastroenterol.*, 101: 1900–1920.
3. **Ahmed M (2020):** Peptic Ulcer Disease Clinical Presentation. <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/67428>
4. **Nguyen G, Chong C, Chong R (2014):** National estimates of the burden of inflammatory bowel disease among racial and ethnic groups in the United States. *J Crohns Colitis*, 8(4):288-295.
5. **Lichtenstein G, Edward V, Kim L *et al.* (2018):** ACG clinical guideline: Management of Crohn's disease in adults. *American Journal of Gastroenterology*, 113(4): 481-517.
6. **Blackstone O (1984):** Endoscopic interpretation normal and pathologic appearance of the gastrointestinal tract. Raven Press; New York, Pp. 13-15. <https://www.abebooks.com/Endoscopic-Interpretation-Normal-Pathologic-Appearances-Gastrointestinal/16952800173/bd>
7. **Gulia S, Chaudhury M, Noorunnisa N *et al.* (2012):** Interpretation of upper gastrointestinal tract endoscopic mucosa biopsies a study conducted in teaching hospital in puducherry India. *International Journal of Medical and Health Sciences*, 1(3):17-24.
8. **Guillemot F, Ducrotte P, Bueno L (2005):** Prevalence of functional gastrointestinal disorders in a population of subjects consulting for gastroesophageal reflux disease in general practice. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol.*, 29:243–246.
9. **Bovenschen H, Janssen M, Van Oijen M (2006):** Evaluation of a Gastrointestinal Symptoms Questionnaire. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*, 51:1509–1515.
10. **Badillo R, Francis D (2014):** Diagnosis and treatment of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *World J Gastrointestinal Pharmacological Therapeutics*, 5(3): 105–112.
11. **Falavigna M, Csendes Juhasz A, Henriquez A *et al.* (2006):** Comparison of the endoscopic aspect of the cardia, manometry and 24 hours pH measurement in patients with chronic gastroesophageal reflux. *Revista Médica de Chile*, 134(2):187-92.
12. **Rantanen T, Eero I, Jari V *et al.* (2015):** Esophageal ulcer as a cause of death: A population-based study. *Mortality of esophageal ulcer disease*, *Digestion*, 91(4):272-6.