

X-ray imaging of lower esophageal sphincter and its role in the diagnosis of gastroesophageal reflux disease.

Michael D. Levin, MD, PhD, DSc.

Department of Pediatric Radiology of the 1-st State Hospital, Minsk, Belarus.

Dorot. Medical Center for rehabilitation and geriatrics. Netanya. Israel.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7830-1944>

nivel70@hotmail.com;

michael.levin@dorot.health.gov.il

<http://www.anorectalmalformations.com>

Abstract

The purpose of the work is to evaluate the reliability of x-ray examination when using the highest possible pressure in the stomach. Material and methods. 60 patients were examined, including 3 adolescents. The rest were aged from 53 to 76 years (62 ± 4). They had at least one GERD symptom that they could not control, including 53 patients receiving proton pump inhibitors. Of the 39 patients undergoing endoscopy (from 1 to 4 times), only 1 (3%) was diagnosed with GERD and 18 (46%) with gastritis. In 2 cases where pH monitoring was performed, the DeMeester value was <4 . Method. The patient drink barium in a horizontal position without interruption. When the barium ends, the patient raises his straight legs, which serve as a sign to take an x-ray. After 5 minutes, a repeat radiograph is taken at rest. Increased pressure in the stomach causes increased tone of the upper and lower esophageal sphincters (LES). In healthy people, barium enters the stomach without delay. In patients with GERD, barium tightly fills the esophagus between the contracted sphincters. The length of the LES is defined as the space without contrast agent between the barium in the esophagus and the stomach. This method allows you to diagnose GERD based on functional and anatomical changes relative to the norm, including shortening of the lower esophageal sphincter relative to the age norm, dilation of the esophagus, formation of the phrenic ampulla, the presence of longitudinal folds, changes in contours, identification of functional and peptic narrowing of the esophagus. Results. The diagnosis of GERD was established in 59 of 60 patients. This made it possible to prescribe complex treatment, which in all cases led to significant improvement. Conclusion. It was shown that the proposed method has a higher diagnostic accuracy compared to pH monitoring and endoscopy.

Keywords: gastroesophageal reflux disease; lower esophageal sphincter; X-ray diagnostics; physiology of the gastroesophageal junction; high stomach pressure; esophageal pH monitoring.

1. Introduction.

1.2. Anatomy. The length and width of the esophagus depend on the age. Bott et al showed that in healthy children the mean diameter at the cranial point of measurement was 6.75 mm at the lower weight (2.6 kg) and 14 mm at 74 kg [1]. The average width of the esophagus in healthy adults is 15 mm with small individual fluctuations [2]. The lower esophageal sphincter (LES) length according to pull-through manometry with end-hole and side-hole catheter in the control group in adults was 34 ± 9 mm [3], 35 ± 4 mm [4]; 36 ± 12 mm [5]; 37 ± 1 mm [6]; 4.1 cm [8]. The length of its abdominal part was 23 ± 7 mm [4, 7]; 2.1 cm [8]. The LES pressure was well developed by 2 weeks of age. In children less than 1 year of age, mean LES pressure (43.3 ± 2.4 mmHg) was significantly greater than mean LES pressure (30.6 ± 2.3 mmHg) children older than 1 year of age and LES sphincter length increased with age [9].

1.2. Physiology. In response to esophageal distension the pressure (tonus) of the LES decreases [10,11] to pass the bolus to the stomach. During the fundus or body of the stomach is stretched the pressure (tonus) of the LES increases to prevent reflux of aggressive gastric contents into the esophagus [12,13]. Shafik et al found that "The LES balloon distension produced esophageal pressure increase ($p < 0.001$), and the esophageal electrical activity increased". They concluded that "During gastroesophageal reflux episodes, the lower esophageal sphincter dilatation appears to initiate increased esophageal peristalsis, which clears the esophagus of the refluxed acid" [14].

2. Conventional radiological diagnosis of gastroesophageal reflux disease.

2.1. Standard GI x-rays study. Until the middle of the 20th century, gastric and duodenal ulcers were the main gastroenterological problems. When gastroscopy began to be used, there were reports of frequent detection of inflammatory changes in the esophagus, which were due to the reflux of acidic stomach contents into the esophagus. This pathology was called "gastroesophageal reflux" (GER) [15, 16]. A standard X-ray examination for the diagnosis of GER was widely used. The GER was diagnosed if an episode of reflux or radiologic signs of the peptic esophagitis was detected [17]. Thus, the presence of reflux during the X-ray examination was considered evidence of GER, and there was no question of the possibility of physiological reflux. First, because it would mean a priori to recognize the EGJ function as not perfect, which is not normally observed in other sphincteric areas of the intestine, biliary and urinary systems. Secondly, with hypersecretion of hydrochloric acid, which causes ulceration in the stomach and bulb of the duodenum, which have specific protection from damage, there

is no logical explanation why the esophagus, which does not have such protection, is not damaged by refluxant.

By the last decade of the 20th century, it became clear that radiological examination based on the detection of episodes of reflux had low reliability. For example, in a significant number of patients with typical symptoms of GER, including those with a diagnosis confirmed by gastroscopy, reflux was not detected during x-ray examination (false negative diagnosis). In rare cases, episodes of reflux were observed in the absence of clinical symptoms and normal gastroscopy (false positive diagnosis) [16, 17]. Subsequently, another feature of GER was discovered: at least 20–30% of patients with GER had no obvious symptoms of the disease [6,7] or had only non-typical symptoms, for example, from the nasopharynx [15]. Comparison of the above data allows us to draw the following conclusions. (1) Standard GI x-rays studies give a high false negative rate. (2) However, the detection of barium reflux in patients without significant clinical symptoms, without signs of inflammation on gastroscopy, and at pH < 4% on pH monitoring does not mean that we are dealing with a false positive conclusion and does not mean that reflux can be physiological. First, because GER can be asymptomatic, and gastroscopy does not reveal the so-called non-erosive GER. Second, unprovoked reflux cannot be physiological.

2. 2. X-ray study with provocative tests. To increase the reliability of radiographic diagnosis of GER, researchers have begun to use provocative tests, simulating conditions that contribute to reflux. They recorded fluoroscopic observations of spontaneous reflux and of reflux elicited by coughing, the Valsalva maneuver, rolling from supine to the right lateral position, and the during water-siphon test [20,21]. Barium studies showed unprovoked, spontaneous reflux in 26% of subjects proved by pH measurements to have gastroesophageal reflux. When the water-siphon test was used, the sensitivity of fluoroscopic detection rose to 70%, with a specificity of 74% and positive predictive value of 80%. Meanwhile, clinically significant reflux was detected radiographically in five patients in whom it was not detected by pH monitoring [22].

In all articles the reliability of radiological diagnosis of GERD compare with the results of pH monitoring, which has long been considered the gold standard. This has led to the national gastroenterology guidelines do not recommend barium esophagography for the evaluation of GERD, where clearly state that “barium radiographs should not be performed to diagnose GERD; listed as a strong recommendation with a high level of evidence” [23]. Currently, pH monitoring is not recognized as the gold standard, because about 30% of patients with GERD

are not diagnosed by this method [24,25]. Moreover, it is not uncommon for proven GERD to be diagnosed by X-ray but denied by pH monitoring [22,26].

3. X-ray visualization of the lower esophageal sphincter.

3.1. Determination of the normal length of the LES. Considering that an increase in pressure in the stomach causes an increase in the tone of the LES, we applied abdominal compression while taking barium in a horizontal position. In patients without GERD symptoms, abdominal compression did not change the X-ray picture. Peristalsis of the esophagus pushed the contrast agent into the stomach without delay (**Figure 1, a, b, c**). In some patients during abdominal compression appeared a gap without contrast material between the esophagus and stomach, containing barium (**Figure 1, d**).




Figure 1. The passage of the bolus through the EGJ during abdominal compression in the horizontal position of patients. (a, b, c). In a patient without GERD symptoms, the peristaltic wave overcame the increased tone of the LES, because of which barium passed into the stomach without delay. (d). In a patient with GERD, as evidenced by longitudinal folds in the esophagus and at the level of the LES, abdominal compression resulted in LES contraction. Its length can be measured between as the X-ray negative distance between the esophagus and the stomach. Since the height of D-10 is approximately 2 cm, the true length of the LES can be calculated. It is equal to 2.4 cm.

These observations showed that in healthy individuals it is impossible to measure the length of the LES because the LES does not close under abdominal compression. At the same time, based on manometric and histological studies, it is known that in some patients with GERD the length of the LES is shorter than normal. It is shortened due to weakening and opening of the abdominal part of the LES [27,3,8,28,29]. To measure the length of the LES, eliminating the possibility of error because of the simultaneous contraction of the crural diaphragm (CD), we performed an X-ray of the EGJ after 30 seconds of abdominal compression. As Shafik et al showed that “The CD response disappeared when straining was sustained for more than 15-18 seconds (mean $16.8 \pm 1/2$) and was not evoked after frequent successive straining... due to the fact that the CD consists of striated muscle fibers which are easily fatigable and cannot remain contracted for long period” [30]. The force of pressure on the abdomen has not significance, since in any case the pressure causes a reflex contraction of the abdominal wall. At the same time, a long contraction (≈ 30 seconds) contributes to the shortening of a weak LES in cases where it did not manifest itself at an earlier date.

To determine the standards, we selected 42 studies in which abdominal compression resulted in LES contraction. These were patients with mild GERD, in whom GERD symptoms were either absent or appeared less than a month ago. Therefore, we considered that the length LES did not have time to change significantly compared to the norm. On radiographs, we measured the width of the esophagus and the length of the gap between the barium in the esophagus and stomach (see **Figure 1**). To get the true dimensions, we multiplied the readings measured on the X-ray by the projection distortion factor. The latter is equal to the ratio of the true L-1 height for a given age (from Table 1) to the height of its image on the roentgenogram [9].

Table 1. Height L-1 (cm) in children of different ages (1-15 years).

Age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
L-1	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2

The true sizes of LES in different age groups are shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Normal length LES in different age groups

Age	Length of lower esophageal sphincter (cm)					
	Up to 1 year	1–3 years	4–7 years	8–10 years	11–15 years	21–65 years
Limits	0.7 – 1.0	1.2 – 1.5	1.5– 1.8	1.9 – 2.3	2.3 – 2.9	3.2 – 4.2
M± M	0.86±0.03	1.40±0.02	1.72±0.07	2.10±0.05	2.45±0.11	3.60±0.08

We believe that the results obtained are close to the true ones, since they coincide with the normal length LES measured by the manometric method in adults (34±9 mm [3], 35±4 mm [4]; 36±12 mm [5]; 37 ±1 mm [6]; 4.1 cm [8]).

3.2. Mapping of the esophago-gastric junction (EGJ).

On some radiographs in adult patients with GERD during the contraction of the LES, it is noticeably shorter than normal both due to the opening of its proximal and distal (abdominal) parts. In such cases contracted only the segment of the LES that is in the diaphragmic (hiatal) channel. On numerous radiographs, the minimum length of this segment was 1 cm. By comparing different radiographs and determining the true dimensions, we were able to determine the different parts of the LES and their relationship with the CD, i.e., create a map of the EGJ. A typical example is shown in **Figure 2 a. b. c.**




Figure 2. Radiograph (A) and scheme to it (B) of patient with GERD was done in a horizontal position with the abdominal compression. The sharp shortening of the LES because of the opening of the supra-diaphragmatic part of the LES (yellow) and inside the abdominal part of the LES (red) is determined. Only the diaphragm part (blue) of the sphincter is closed. (C) Radiograph of this patient in an upright position taken during abdominal compression. The LES contracted in response to the increased pressure in the stomach. It is visible as two longitudinal folds between the esophagus and stomach. Since the actual height of D-10 is ≈2 cm, the actual length of the LES is ≈3.4 cm. The LES parts: red - the abdominal segment, blue

- inside the diaphragm, yellow - above the diaphragm. **(D)** Three-dimensional model of the EGJ from the article by Yassi et al [31]. The length of the LES is 3.4 cm (blue). Its abdominal part is ≈ 2 cm. About 1 cm is located at the level of the CD and 0.4 cm above the diaphragm.

4. X-ray examination of the esophagus and its sphincters at maximum pressure in the stomach.

4.1. This method can be part of an X-ray examination of the esophagus, stomach, and duodenum or as an independent study if the suspicion of GERD was not confirmed after endoscopy.

The method based on a well-known physiological pattern: an increase in pressure in the stomach causes a reflex contraction of the upper and lower esophageal sphincters [2,13]. The patient, lying on the X-ray table, continuously drinks a barium suspension through a straw from a jar standing at his head. When the barium runs out (200-250 ml), he immediately raises his straightened legs. At this moment, an x-ray is taken from the pharynx to the body of the stomach. It should be noted that a delay between the last swallow and the x-ray may necessitate a repeat examination because the x-ray will only show traces of barium in the esophagus. After the first radiograph, the subject gets up, but after 5 minutes he lies down again on the X-ray table. A second radiograph is taken at rest to determine the completeness of barium evacuation into the stomach and the possibility of free reflux (**Figure 3**).




Figure 3. Radiographs of patients with GERD, performed at high pressure in the stomach. **(a).** A sharp expansion of the esophagus and a significant shortening of the LES. **(b).** Longitudinal folds of the esophagus, indicating esophagitis. Only they remained in the esophagus due to a late picture. **(c).** Expansion of the esophagus, formation of the phrenic ampulla, shortening of the LES, uneven contours of the esophagus. **(d).** Typical functional narrowing at the level of

the aortic arch in a patient with extraesophageal symptoms that disappeared after taking a 1.9 cm tablet. (e). Above the ampulla of the esophagus, the functional proximal sphincter (PS) has contracted. The difference in the shape of the folds in the esophagus and LES (2 cm long) due to different tone.

The contraction zone (Figure 3.e) 2 cm long, which is distal to the phrenic ampulla, cannot be caused by contraction of the CD, which creates a contraction of up to 1 cm. This narrowing zone can only be caused by contraction of the LES. Therefore, as we showed earlier, (1). The LES does not shift cranially in GERD. (2) The dilatation above it is a phrenic ampulla, regardless of its size, and not a hiatal hernia. (3). The short constriction above the ampulla is a contraction of the functional PS [2,9,32].

4.2. Advantages of the proposed method: (1). The test is simple and safe. It takes only a few minutes, does not require X-ray observation, is accompanied by minimal X-ray exposure, and does not require special training of a radiologist. (2). It is scientifically based, as it is based on the etiology, pathogenesis and pathological physiology of GERD, and diagnosis is based on symptoms that distinguish pathology from the norm.

4.3. Radiological symptoms of the GERD can be divided into the functional, as well as associated with changes of the esophagus or of the LES.

4.3.1. Functional symptoms of the GERD. (1). Contraction of the LES during abdominal compression. (2). Reflux of gastric contents into the esophagus. (3). Incomplete cleansing of the esophagus from the contrast agent.

4.4.2. Changes in the esophagus with GERD. (1). Dilation of the esophagus more than 1.5 cm (2). The presence of a phrenic ampulla up to 2 cm wide or more than 2 cm wide (the so-called hiatal hernia). (3). Longitudinal folds of the esophagus. (4). Asymmetrical finely wavy contours of the esophagus. (5). Functional symmetrical narrowing above the ampulla of the diaphragm or at the level of the aortic arch. (6) Peptic asymmetrical constriction or Shatsky ring [33]. (see Fig. 3).

4.4.3. The LES changes in GERD. (1). The shortening of the LES is less than the minimum age limit. (2). Longitudinal folds at the level of the LES. (3). Small gas bubble in the stomach. (4). Obtuse angle of His (**Figure 4**).




Figure 4. (a-b). Radiographs of the left dome of the diaphragm of a healthy person **(a)** and a patient with GERD **(b)**. **(c).** Scheme of the EGJ with normal LES function (red). The angle of His **(aH)** is acute. Large gas bubble in the stomach. **(d).** In GERD, the LES is shortened because the abdominal part of the LES **(aLES)** is not functioning. This leads to an increase in the angle of His and a decrease in the gas bubble of the stomach, because of belching.

5. Clinical characteristics of patients. The maximum provocation method was used to examine 60 patients, with a slight predominance of women (55%). Except for 3 patients under the age of 20 years, the remaining patients were aged from 53 to 76 years (62 ± 4). All patients had GERD symptoms that they could not control, including 53 patients who received PPI. In 39 cases, patients underwent endoscopy from 1 to 4 times. In only one case, erosion was found in the esophagus, the benign nature of which was confirmed by histological examination. A small diaphragmatic hernia was described in two patients. In 18 patients, gastritis was diagnosed by endoscopy. Thus, only one of 39 patients was diagnosed with erosive esophagitis, confirming the diagnosis of GERD. In 38 (97%) patients, endoscopic examination without histology did not reveal evidence in favor of GERD. Even though taking PPI did not relieve patients from debilitating symptoms, only 2 patients were referred for pH monitoring. However, each of them had a DeMeester score below 4. Analysis of the medical history revealed a surprising pattern. The disease always began with heartburn. After some time, pain syndrome was recorded more often, from a pressing feeling behind the sternum to pain in the epigastrium. Heartburn occurred only after eating excess food. In most cases, refusing to consume foods containing lactose led to the disappearance of pain, including heartburn. The patients felt healthy for a long period. In some patients, symptoms returned after many years and more often than in the early period, extrasophageal symptoms (hoarseness or alteration of voice, sensation of foreign body in throat, importunate cough, etc.) were bothered. Figure 5

provides examples of low pain sensitivity of the esophagus with complete incompetence (chalasia) of the EGJ.




Figure 5. Radiographs of patients with chalasia EGJ. **(a-b).** A 68-year-old woman has been ill since her youth, when heartburn appeared. She was diagnosed with asthma when she was young. The bronchospasm attacks passed without treatment. A small amount of milk in coffee causes severe heartburn after 15-30 minutes. She takes 20 mg of PPI per day, which is enough to prevent heartburn. Repeated endoscopy always revealed only a “hiatal hernia.” **(a).** During maximum provocation, a sharp dilation of the esophagus is visible, especially in its ampullary region, as well as a sharp dilation of the esophageal opening of the diaphragm. **(b).** After 5 minutes, free reflux from the stomach into the esophagus is determined. **(c-d).** A 72-year-old man complained of a debilitating cough, change in voice, and a sensation of a foreign body in the throat for 4 months. Very rarely small pieces of food appear in the mouth. For a month he wakes up at night because he is choking on saliva. He does not feel any acid or bitterness in his mouth. He has no heartburn, pain, or dysphagia. About 15 years ago he had heartburn, which went away only after swallowing a tablet with a diameter of about 3 cm. Since then, he considered himself healthy. **(c).** A sharp shortening of the LES (1 cm), expansion of the esophageal ampulla and symmetrical narrowing of the esophagus at the level of the aortic arch (arrow) are detected. **(d).** After 5 minutes at rest, free reflux of barium from the stomach into the esophagus is determined. The patient swallowed a tablet with a diameter of 1.9 cm. After this, he stopped choking on saliva at night. This is a typical example of the formation of a functional sphincter over the aortic narrowing of the esophagus.

These typical cases show that (1) in the process of ontogenesis, the clinical symptoms of GERD can change significantly, and (2) over time the esophagus loses pain sensitivity, which can be

explained by the damage to the sensitive elements in the esophageal mucosa by the gastric juice. (3) Lactose triggers GERD symptoms without reaching the colon. Symptoms are felt more quickly with chaliasia, since excess hydrochloric acid, as soon as it appears in the stomach, immediately enters the esophagus.

6. Results.

6.1. Diagnostic results. In 59 of 60 patients with clinical symptoms, that may be in reflux, the diagnosis of GERD was not in doubt, including 38 patients in whom endoscopy did not reveal any changes in the esophagus, and in 2 patients in whom Demeester score was < 4 . In only one case radiological findings did not confirm the diagnosis of GERD (**Figure 6.a**).




Figure 6. (a). A 71-year-old woman presented with multiple symptoms a few months ago, including vomiting, persistent cough, dyspnea, weight loss. She particularly emphasized severe weakness and shortness of breath, which is very uncharacteristic of GERD. Prior to this, there were never any symptoms from the respiratory and digestive systems. Examinations with high gastric pressure. The anterior point of the traveling peristaltic wave is shown by an arrow. The esophagus is not dilated (1.7 cm) with smooth wall without ampullary expansion. The LES is open. It is significantly shorter than normal, but all sphincters shorten during opening. The diagnosis of GERD did not confirm. **(b).** A woman of 63 years old considers herself sick for 10 years with the onset of severe pain in the epigastrium. Over the course of 10 years, gastritis was diagnosed 4 times during gastroscopy. Two years ago, every morning, she was worried about a painful cough and a sore throat. Several times at night, she woke up with attacks of suffocation and with a feeling of strong acid in her mouth. At pH study Demeester score was

3.2. High pressure in the stomach led to a contraction of the LES, the length of which (1 cm) is significantly less than normal (3.4 cm). The esophagus is dilated (2.8 cm) with an uneven left contour. The phrenic ampulla is 3.3 cm wide. A sharp asymmetric narrowing at the level of the aortic arch is detected, which was not detected during subsequent gastroscopy. The significant improvement came after she increased the dose of Esomeprazole (20 mg 2 times a day) and swallowed a large tablet with 2.2 cm diameter.

First, all patients with radiological signs of GERD had clinical symptoms that can be observed with GERD. Secondly, the diagnosis of GERD was established in 2 (3%) of 59 patients in whom the DeMeester score was <4 , and in 38 (64%) patients in whom it was not detected by endoscopy, despite the frequent detection of gastritis, and duodenitis. Damage to the stomach and duodenum indicates hypersecretion of hydrochloric acid. Since the mucous membrane of the esophagus does not have protection, unlike the mucous membrane of the stomach and duodenal bulb, the very fact of these diagnoses is evidence of GERD. Third, the X-ray method is based on the contrast between the pathological and normal physiology of the EGJ, which distinguishes it from other diagnostic methods. Fourth, the X-ray examination does not interfere with the physiology of the EGJ, since it does not use intraesophageal instruments that change its physiology. Fifthly, x-ray study is visual and subject to mathematical analysis. It follows that x-ray examination with maximum provocation has a higher diagnostic accuracy than pH monitoring and endoscopy.

6.2. Results of the treatment.

Treatment has always been comprehensive, regardless of the clinical picture. It included:

1. Exclusion from the diet of foods containing lactose, which provokes hypersecretion of hydrochloric acid [34]. It was always accompanied by relief of symptoms, regardless of whether patients knew or did not know about lactose intolerance.
2. Acid Suppression. Treatment begins with PPI 20 mg x 2 per day for 4 weeks. Then 20 mg x 1 per day with a gradual reduction in the dose until complete discontinuation, except in cases of chaliasia cardia. There should always be PPI in nightstand in case of exacerbation.
3. Lifestyle modifications. The patient must reduce the volume of each meal, go to bed with an empty stomach, to avoid situations that are accompanied by an increase in pressure in the stomach (exercise after eating, use of a tight belt, bending over, etc.).

4. Antacids and protectors of the esophageal mucosa. Along with taking PPI, it is necessary to prescribe antacids, as well as protectors of the esophageal mucosa, 30 minutes after eating.

5. Dilation of the esophagus и sphincters by swallowing of a large tablet. Large tablets with a diameter of 1.9 cm or 2.3 cm are pushed by peristalsis through the LES, pyloric sphincter, and functional sphincters improving their function. Taking the tablet was especially useful in the complex treatment of GERD refractory to conventional treatment in 15 patients.

Within a few months after of my study, all patients reported significant improvement. However, as far as I know, some patients, after the symptoms disappeared, or after significant improvement, stopped following my recommendations, some of which should have become a lifelong habit. The reason for this was that I was a consultant and not an attending physician. Secondly, some patients saw a contradiction between my recommendations and information from the Internet. For example, in the literature, symptoms of GERD are rarely associated with lactose intolerance. In cases of obvious lactose intolerance, it is recommended to reduce the number of dairy products consumed to a level where symptoms no longer bother you. The goal of treatment is not only to relieve symptoms, but also prevent worsening damage to the LES and esophagus. Since it is known that the disease often occurs without obvious clinical symptoms, a recommendation to limit the number of lactose-containing products based on individual sensitivity is contrary to scientific evidence. In four patients, 1.1.5 years after the initial study, a repeat X-ray study was performed with maximum pressure in the stomach since the symptoms of GERD reappeared after stopping my recommendations. The X-ray picture was absolutely the same as during the initial study.

7. Discussion

The overproduction of acid and the associated illnesses linked to hypersecretion have a lifetime prevalence of 25-35% in the United States [34]. Numerous studies have established, that gastritis and gastric ulcers, as well as duodenal ulcers, occur mainly because of gastric hypersecretion [35,36]. Studies have shown that all people are divided into normally acid-secreting, gastric hypersecretors and hyposecretors [37]. This hypothesis has become a generally accepted theory, since up to the present day not a single study has been published that contradicts it. It served as the basis for the development and successful use of acid-suppressing drugs. For a long time, the detection of reflux in an X-ray study, was considered evidence of a disease that was called gastroesophageal reflux (GER) [38]. Inflammatory and

ulcerative processes in the esophagus, as well as the so-called hiatal hernias (HH), revealed during endoscopic examination, did not raise doubts about the presence of GER [39,40].

The modern stage in the development of gastroenterology began with the articles by DeMeester et al [41,42]. In 1974 they published an article proposing a normal range for esophageal pH monitoring. It was defined as $\text{pH} < 4$ for 4% of the 24 hours of monitoring 5 cm proximal to the LES. To do this, the authors examined 15 individuals who believed that they had no problems with the digestive system. Since then, this boundary has been called the "DeMeester score", and the proposed method of pH monitoring has long been considered the gold standard for diagnosing GERD. However, pH monitoring had no theoretical basis. The study of pH in the esophagus initially suggested the possibility of physiological reflux without any evidence. This is contrary to common sense, because it is impossible even to assume that the acid, which leads to the development of ulcerative lesions of the stomach and duodenal bulb, the mucous membrane of which has protection, may not cause a pathological process in the esophagus, which does not have such protection. Based on histological studies of Chandrasoma it has been shown that reflux begins in the penetration of hydrochloric acid into the abdominal part of the LES, which weakens and opens because of damage. At this moment, acid does not enter the esophagus. Acid enters the esophagus in a later period, when the squamo-oxyntic gap increases more than 15 mm [27]. It follows that reflux as a normal phenomenon, i.e., physiological reflux, can't be. Based on pH monitoring, it is believed that pathological reflux in infants is diagnosed when the reflux index is $> 10\%$ [42]. It follows that at reflux index $< 10\%$ when for 2.3 hours out of 24 hours of monitoring, an acid bolus with $\text{pH} < 4$ is in the esophagus, GERD can be excluded. This is contrary to studies by Salvatore et al. Esophagitis was present in 17 of 44 (39%) infants who underwent endoscopy with esophageal biopsy for suspected GERD. 38% of infants with a pathologic pH study had a normal esophageal biopsy and 53% of infants with histologic esophagitis had a normal pH study. Discordance between pH study and biopsies occurred in 14 of 44 (32%) patients" [43]. This study showed that neither endoscopy nor pH monitoring were accurate enough to reject the diagnosis of GERD, which is confirmed by our data.

Demeester et al defined the "normal" limit based on a survey of 15 individuals who denied typical symptoms of reflux disease.

1). However, it is known the overall prevalence of esophageal disorders among health individuals by GI endoscopy was 17.3% [19, 44]. As shown above, the diagnostic accuracy of

endoscopy is also not high. From which it follows that a significant percentage of people who consider themselves healthy are patients with GERD.

2). The presence of a pH probe in the esophagus represents a foreign body that interferes with the normal function of the EGJ, thereby distorting the test results.

3). It is known that the quantity and quality of food affects the amount and ingredients of gastric juice secreted. Meanwhile, the pH monitoring technique does not provide for the standardization of the patient's diet throughout the 24 hours of the study.

4) In order to select individuals without GERD as a control, it was necessary to perform an X-ray examination and endoscopy with histology. As a result of a violation of the scientific research methodology, it turned out that ambulatory 24-hour esophageal pH measurement has a false negative rate of 15% to 30% [45, 46].

As a result of violations of research methodology, pH monitoring diagnoses only severe forms of GERD. Almost 30% of patients with GERD who do not have frequent, annoying complaints are not examined because they do not fall under the Montreal definition of disease ("condition that develops when the reflux of stomach contents causes troublesome symptoms and/or complications") and these patients do not receive pathogenetic treatment until they develop a severe form that is difficult to treat. A significant number of patients with GERD with troublesome or atypical symptoms, who have a Demeester score below the norm, are diagnosed with functional disorders (hypersensitive esophagus, functional heartburn, irritable bowel syndrome and functional dyspepsia) and these patients also do not receive pathogenetic treatment. It follows from this that pH monitoring cannot serve as a criterion of truth.

Reliance on physiology we for the first time to determine the length of the LES in people of different ages using X-ray examination. These figures are probably close to the true ones since they coincide with the results of manometric studies. We used maximum provocation of dual origin. (a). Rapid uninterrupted drinking of a large volume of contrast agent. (b). With the simultaneous creation of the greatest possible pressure in the stomach, which was carried out by raising straightened legs. It turned out that this did not affect the bolus passage through the EGJ in healthy individuals. In patients with GERD, a reflex increase in the tone of the UES and LES led to their contraction, which was an important diagnostic sign of GERD. In addition, the length of the LES could be used to judge the degree of its damage. Filling the esophagus between two closed sphincters allows one to judge the actual width of the esophagus, as well as better identify functional and peptic narrowing in it. The second radiograph, taken 5 minutes

later in a calm state, determines the possibility of free reflux and the degree of clearing of the esophagus from the contrast agent.

Conclusion.

Thanks to X-ray examination with provocation of maximum pressure in the stomach, the diagnosis of GERD was established in 59(98%) of 60 patients with symptoms that occur with GERD, including in 2 (3%) of 59 patients in whom the DeMeester score was <4, and in 38 (64%) patients in whom it was not detected by endoscopy, despite the frequent detection of gastritis, and duodenitis. The X-ray method is scientifically based, since GERD is diagnosed based on the contrast with normal physiology of the EGJ, which distinguishes it from other diagnostic methods. All radiological signs are determined without disturbing the physiology of the EGJ, i.e., without the use of a pH probe or gastroscope. They are visual and subject to mathematical analysis. Complex treatment of GERD led to a significant improvement in symptoms in all patients, including refractory cases with PPI treatment. It follows that x-ray examination with maximum provocation has a higher diagnostic accuracy than pH monitoring and endoscopy. Moreover, this method is very simple, safe, and cheap.

References

1. Bott TS, von Kalle T, Schilling A, et al. Esophageal Diameters in Children Correlated to Body Weight. *Eur J Pediatr Surg.* 2019 Dec;29(6):528-532. doi: 10.1055/s-0038-1675776. (PubMed).
2. Levin MD, Korshun Z, Mendelson G. [Pathological physiology of gastroesophageal reflux disease. Hypothesis (Literature review)]. *Eksp Klin Gastroenterol.* 2013;(5):72-88. PMID: 24501951 Review. Russian. (PubMed).
3. Rådmark T, Pettersson GB. Lower esophageal sphincter pressure in normal individuals and patients with gastroesophageal reflux. A comparison between end-hole and side-hole recording techniques. *Scand J Gastroenterol.* 1989 Sep;24(7):842-50. doi: 10.3109/00365528909089224. . (PubMed).
4. Shaker R, Dodds WJ, Kahrilas PJ, et al. Relationship of intraluminal pH and pressure within the lower esophageal sphincter. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 1991 Jul;86(7):812-6. . (PubMed).

5. Narawane NM, Bhatia SJ, Mistry FP, et al. Manometric mapping of normal esophagus and definition of the transition zone. *Indian J Gastroenterol.* 1998 Apr;17(2):55-7. (PubMed).
6. Gómez R, Moreno E, Seoane J, et al. Esophageal pH monitoring of postprandial gastroesophageal reflux. Comparison between healthy subjects, patients with gastroesophageal reflux and patients treated with Nissen fundoplication. *Dig Dis.* 1993 Nov-Dec;11(6):354-62. doi: 10.1159/000171427. (PubMed).
7. Chen MH, YanK, Wang B. [Manifestation of abdominal segment of esophagus by body surface ultrasonography and determination of normal values]. *Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi.* 1994 Jul;74(7):410-2, 454-5. [Article in Chinese]. (PubMed).
8. Ackermann C, Rothenbühler JM, Martinoli S, Muller C. Esophageal manometry prior to and following anti-reflux surgery. *Schweiz Med Wochenschr.* 1991 May 25;121(21):797-800.
9. Levin MD. Reaction to articles on high resolution manometry, the length of the lower esophageal sphincter and the diagnosis of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Arq Gastroenterol.* 2019;56(2): 209-210. . (PubMed). Open access.
10. Shafik A. Esophago-sphincter inhibitory reflex: role in the deglutition mechanism and esophageal achalasia. *J Invest Surg.* 1996 Jan-Feb;9(1):37-43. doi: 10.3109/08941939609012458.
11. Manthey MW, Massey BT, Arndorfer RC, HoganWJ. Determinants of lower esophageal sphincter relaxation induced by esophageal balloon distension in humans. *Am J Physiol.* 1996 Jun;270(6 Pt 1):G1022-7. doi: 10.1152/ajpgi.1996.270.6.G1022.
12. Franzi SJ, Martin CJ, Cox MR, J DentJ. Response of canine lower esophageal sphincter to gastric distension. *Am J Physiol.* 1990 Sep;259(3 Pt 1):G380-5. doi: 10.1152/ajpgi.1990.259.3.G380.
13. Shafik A, El-Sibai O, Shafik AA, Mostafa R, Shafik I. Effect of straining on the lower esophageal sphincter: identification of the "straining-esophageal reflex" and its role in gastroesophageal competence mechanism. *J Invest Surg.* 2004 Jul-Aug;17(4):191-6. doi: 10.1080/08941930490471948.
14. Shafik A, Shafik I, El-Sibai O, Mostafa R. Effect of lower esophageal sphincter distension and acidification on esophageal pressure and electromyographic activity: the identification of the "sphinctero-esophageal excitatory reflex". *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2005 Apr;79(4):1126-31; discussion 1131. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2004.09.052.

15. Cherry J, Siegel CI, Margulies SI, Donner M. Pharyngeal localization of symptoms of gastroesophageal reflux. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol.* 1970 Oct;79(5):912-4. doi: 10.1177/000348947007900506.
16. Patrick FG. Investigation of gastroesophageal reflux in various positions with a two-lumen pH electrode. *Gut.* 1970 Aug;11(8):659-67. doi: 10.1136/gut.11.8.659.
17. Darling DB, McCauley RG, Leape LL, et al. The child with peptic esophagitis: a correlation of radiologic signs with esophageal pathology. *Radiology.* 1982 Dec;145(3):673-6. doi: 10.1148/radiology.145.3.7146395.
18. Lemire S. Assessment of clinical severity and investigation of uncomplicated gastroesophageal reflux disease and noncardiac angina-like chest pain. *Can J Gastroenterol.* 1997 Sep;11 Suppl B:37B-40B
19. Yoo SS, Lee WH, Ha J, Choi SP, Kim HJ, Kim TH, Lee OJ. The prevalence of esophageal disorders in the subjects examined for health screening. *Korean J Gastroenterol.* 2007 Nov;50(5):306-12.
20. Fransson SG, Sökjer H, Johansson KE, Tibbling L. Radiologic diagnosis of gastroesophageal reflux by means of graded abdominal compression. *Acta Radiol.* 1988 Jan-Feb;29(1):45-8.
21. Ott DT. Gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Radiol Clin North Am.* 1994 Nov;32(6):1147-66.
22. Thompson JK, Koehler RE, Richter JE. Detection of gastroesophageal reflux: value of barium studies compared with 24-hr pH monitoring. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1994 Mar;162(3):621-6. doi: 10.2214/ajr.162.3.8109509.
23. Katz PO, Gerson LB, Vela MF. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of gastroesophageal reflux disease. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2013 Mar;108(3):308-28; quiz 329. doi: 10.1038/ajg.2012.444.
24. Daniel Tseng I, Adnan Z Rizvi, M Brian Fennerty, et al. Forty-eight-hour pH monitoring increases sensitivity in detecting abnormal esophageal acid exposure. *J Gastrointest Surg.* 2005 Nov;9(8):1043-51; discussion 1051-2. doi: 10.1016/j.gassur.2005.07.011.
25. Liu S, Xu M, Yang J, et al. Research on Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease Based on Dynamic Features of Ambulatory 24-Hour Esophageal pH Monitoring. *Comput Math Methods Med.* 2017;2017:9239074. doi: 10.1155/2017/9239074.
26. Dane B, Doshi A, Khan A, Megibow A. Utility of Water Siphon Maneuver for Eliciting Gastroesophageal Reflux During Barium Esophagography: Correlation With

- Histologic Findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2018 Aug;211(2):335-339. doi: 10.2214/AJR.17.19063.
27. Chandrasoma P, DeMeester T. A New Pathologic Assessment of Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease: The Squamo-Oxyntic Gap. *Adv Exp Med Biol*. 2016;908:41-78. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-41388-4_4.
 28. Moroz SP, Espinoza J, Cumming WA, Diamant NE. Lower esophageal sphincter function in children with and without gastroesophageal reflux. *Gastroenterology*. 1976 Aug;71(2):236-41.
 29. Valdovinos Díaz MA, Flores C, Facha MT, et al. [Esophageal manometry in gastroesophageal reflux disease. Lower esophageal sphincter incompetence or esophageal dysmotility?]. *Rev Gastroenterol Mex*. 1999.
 30. Shafik A, Shafik AA, El Sibai O, Mostafa RM. Effect of straining on diaphragmatic crura with identification of the straining-crural reflex. The "reflex theory" in gastroesophageal competence. *BMC Gastroenterol*. 2004 Sep 30;4:24. doi: 10.1186/1471-230X-4-24.
 31. Yassi R, Cheng LR, Rajagopal V, et al. Modeling of the Mechanical Function of the Human Gastroesophageal Junction Using an Anatomically-Realistic Three-Dimensional Model. *J Biomech*. 2009 Aug 7; 42(11): 1604–1609. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2009.04.041
 32. Levin MD, Mendel'son G. [Schatzki ring as a symptom of gastroesophageal reflux disease]. *Vestn Rentgenol Radiol*. 2015 Jan-Feb;(1):5-15. Russian. (PubMed).
 33. Szilagyi A, Ishayek N. Lactose Intolerance, Dairy Avoidance, and Treatment Options. *Nutrients*. 2018 Dec 15;10(12):1994. doi: 10.3390/nu10121994.
 34. Kirchhoff P, Socrates T, Sidani S, et al. Zinc salts provide a novel, prolonged and rapid inhibition of gastric acid secretion. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2011 Jan;106(1):62-70. doi: 10.1038/ajg.2010.327.
 35. HUNT JN, KAY AW. The nature of gastric hypersecretion of acid in patients with duodenal ulcer. *Br Med J*. 1954 Dec 18;2(4902):1444-6. doi: 10.1136/bmj.2.4902.1444.
 36. Oderda G, Serra A, Dell'Olio D, et al. Behavior of pepsin in childhood and its correlation with gastric acid secretion. *Pediatr Med Chir*. 1982 Jan-Apr;4(1-2):127-32.

37. Bombeck CT, Nyhus LM. Gastroesophageal reflux. *Am Fam Physician GP*. 1970 Apr;1(4):68-75.
38. Zaino C. Hiatal insufficiency and hiatal hernia. In: Zaino C. ed. *The Lower esophageal Vestibular Complex*. Springfield, IL:1963:173-218.
39. Gordon C, Kang JY, Neild PJ, Maxwell JD. The role of the hiatus hernia in gastro-oesophageal reflux disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2004 Oct 1;20(7):719-32. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2004.02149.x.
40. Johnson LF, Demeester TR. Twenty-four-hour pH monitoring of the distal esophagus. A quantitative measure of gastroesophageal reflux. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 1974 Oct;62(4):325-32.
41. Demeester TR, Johnson LF, Joseph GJ, et al. Patterns of gastroesophageal reflux in health and disease. *Ann Surg*. 1976 Oct;184(4):459-70. doi: 10.1097/00000658-197610000-00009.
42. Salvatore S, Hauser B, Vandemaele K, Novario R, Vandenas Y. Gastroesophageal reflux disease in infants: how much is predictable with questionnaires, pH-metry, endoscopy and histology? *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*. 2005 Feb;40(2):210-5. doi: 10.1097/00005176-200502000-00024.
43. Stål P, Lindberg G, Ost A, Iwarzon M, Seensalu R. Gastroesophageal reflux in healthy subjects. Significance of endoscopic findings, histology, age, and sex. *Scand J Gastroenterol*. 1999 Feb;34(2):121-8. doi: 10.1080/00365529950172952
44. Tseng D, Rizvi AZ, Fennerty MB, et al. Forty-eight-hour pH monitoring increases sensitivity in detecting abnormal esophageal acid exposure. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2005 Nov;9(8):1043-51; discussion 1051-2. doi: 10.1016/j.gassur.2005.07.011.
45. Cucchiara S, Staiano A, Casali LG, et al. Value of the 24 hour intraoesophageal pH monitoring in children. *Gut*. 1990 Feb;31(2):129-33. doi: 10.1136/gut.31.2.129.