

Online Submissions: http://www.wjgnet.com/esps/ wjg@wjgnet.com doi:10.3748/wjg.v18.i40.5669 World J Gastroenterol 2012 October 28; 18(40): 5669-5678 ISSN 1007-9327 (print) ISSN 2219-2840 (online) © 2012 Baishideng, All rights reserved.

GUIDELINES FOR CLINICAL PRACTICE

Levofloxacin/amoxicillin-based schemes vs quadruple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* eradication in second-line

Simona Di Caro, Lucia Fini, Yayha Daoud, Fabio Grizzi, Antonio Gasbarrini, Antonino De Lorenzo, Laura Di Renzo, Sara McCartney, Stuart Bloom

Simona Di Caro, Sara McCartney, Stuart Bloom, Department of Gastroenterology, University College Hospital, London NW1 2PG, United Kingdom

Simona Di Caro, Antonino De Lorenzo, Laura Di Renzo, Division of Human Nutrition, University of Tor Vergata, 00173 Rome, Italy

Lucia Fini, Fabio Grizzi, Department of Gastroenterology and Laboratory of Molecular Gastroenterology, Humanitas Clinical and Research Center, Rozzano, 20089 Milan, Italy

Yayha Daoud, Antonino De Lorenzo, Baylor Health Care System, Institute for Health Care Research and Improvement, Dallas, TX 75246, United States

Antonio Gasbarrini, Department of Internal Medicine, Gemelli Hospital, Catholic University of Rome, 00168 Rome, Italy

Author contributions: Di Caro S and Fini L conceived and analyzed the data and wrote the paper; Daoud Y analyzed the data and performed statistical analyses; Grizzi F, Gasbarrini A, De Lorenzo A, Di Renzo L, McCartney S and Bloom S critically revised and edited the paper.

Correspondence to: Simona Di Caro, MD, Department of Gastroenterology, University College Hospital, 250 Euston Road, London NW12PG, United Kingdom. simonadicaro@yahoo.it Telephone: +44-20-73809126 Fax: +44-20-73809217 Received: January 14, 2012 Revised: May 29, 2012 Accepted: June 8, 2012 Published online: October 28, 2012

Abstract

Worldwide prevalence of *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*) infection is approximately 50%, with the highest being in developing countries. We compared cure rates and tolerability (SE) of second-line anti-*H. pylori* levofloxacin/amoxicillin (LA)-based triple regimens *vs* standard quadruple therapy (QT). An English language literature search was performed up to October 2010. A meta-analysis was performed including randomized clinical trials comparing 7- or 10-d LA with 7-d QT. In total, 10 articles and four abstracts were identified. Overall eradication rate in LA was 76.5% (95% CI: 64.4%-97.6%). When only 7-d regimens were in-

cluded, cure rate was 70.6% (95% CI: 40.2%-99.1%), whereas for 10-d combinations, cure rate was significantly higher (88.7%; 95% CI: 56.1%-109.9%; P < 0.05). Main eradication rate for QT was 67.4% (95% CI: 49.7%-67.9%). The 7-d LA and OT showed comparable efficacy [odds ratio (OR): 1.09; 95% CI: 0.63-1.87], whereas the 10-d LA regimen was significantly more effective than OT (OR: 5.05; 95% CI: 2.74-9.31; P < 0.001; $I^2 = 75\%$). No differences were reported in QT eradication rates among Asian and European studies, whereas LA regimens were more effective in European populations (78.3% vs 67.7%; P = 0.05). Incidence of SE was lower in LA therapy than QT (OR: 0.39; 95% CI: 0.18-0.85; P = 0.02). A higher rate of side effects was reported in Asian patients who received QT. Our findings support the use of 10-d LA as a simple second-line treatment for H. pylori eradication with an excellent eradication rate and tolerability. The optimal second-line alternative scheme might differ among countries depending on guinolone resistance.

© 2012 Baishideng. All rights reserved.

Key words: *Helicobacter pylori*; Second-line treatment; Levofloxacin; Quadruple regimen

Peer reviewers: Dr. Shahab Abid, Associate Professor, Department of Medicine, Aga Khan University, Stadium Road, PO Box 3500, Karachi 74800, Pakistan; Siegfried Wagner, Professor, Medizinische Klinik II, Klinikum Deggendorf, Perlasberger Str. 41, 94469 Deggendorf, Germany

Di Caro S, Fini L, Daoud Y, Grizzi F, Gasbarrini A, De Lorenzo A, Di Renzo L, McCartney S, Bloom S. Levofloxacin/ amoxicillin-based schemes vs quadruple therapy for *Helicobacter pylori* eradication in second-line. *World J Gastroenterol* 2012; 18(40): 5669-5678 Available from: URL: http://www. wjgnet.com/1007-9327/full/v18/i40/5669.htm DOI: http:// dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v18.i40.5669



INTRODUCTION

Since 1982, when Warren and Marshall first discovered Helicobacter pylori (H. pylori) in the stomach, eradication of the infection has being recognized as crucial for prevention and treatment of gastroduodenal and more recently even extraintestinal diseases^[1-4]. The worldwide prevalence of H. pylori infection is approximately 50%, with the highest being in developing countries^[5]. Standard first-line therapy consists of a proton pump inhibitor (PPI) plus clarithromycin and amoxicillin or metronidazole^[6] and achieves successful eradication in up to 80% of patients. During the past decade, an alarming decrease in eradication rates has been observed^[7], mostly due to antibiotic resistance to clarithromycin and metronidazole^[3,8]. Conversely, resistance to amoxicillin and tetracycline remains a rare occurrence worldwide^[9-11]. Choice of a second or even third course of therapy is more controversial^[6,9,12-14]. Recently, the concept of cumulative eradication rate has been introduced in treatment of H. pylori infection focusing on final cure rate after one or more courses of treatment. In this perspective, if the overall eradication rate is considered even after four consecutive empirical treatments, 99.5% of patients can be cured^[15]. Currently, the recommended second-line regimen is a 7-14-d complex scheme consisting of PPI, bismuth, tetracycline and metronidazole^[16,17]. However, bismuth salts, applied to decrease bacterial load, are no longer available in many countries^[18]. Eradication rate of the quadruple regimen ranges from 65% to 80% and a high incidence of side effects are noted (up to 50% of patients), with consequently poor compliance^[19-22]. For this reason, a triple therapy consisting of PPI, metronidazole and amoxicillin or tetracycline for a minimum of 7 d has been recommended as an alternative^[6]. Meanwhile, new drugs, such as levofloxacin, rifabutin, furazolidone and azithromycin have been tested in various combinations and doses to overcome falling eradication rates^[13,14,23-31].

Among those, levofloxacin-based second-line schemes represent the most promising alternative^[32,33]. In particular, association with amoxicillin has been extensively studied, due to rare *H. pylori* resistance. Currently, a 10-d triple levofloxacin (250 mg BD)/amoxicillin (LA)based therapy has been recommended as second-line therapy in Italy, and as third-line empirical treatment by European guidelines^[6,16]. However, heterogeneity in terms of dosage, combination and duration of treatment do not allow a definitive conclusion.

Moreover, in consideration of differences in quinolone resistance among countries, the ideal second-line treatment for *H. pylori* infection may differ between areas, countries and races^[10,20,34].

Here we compare eradication rates and tolerability exclusively of second-line anti-*H. pylori* LA-based triple schemes and standard quadruple therapy (QT) in European and Asian studies, in order to guide clinical decision making.

Studies providing information on use of anti-H. pylori LA-based triple therapy and standard quadruple scheme in second-line were identified through a systematic search in the MEDLINE and EMBASE databases by using various combinations of the terms "H. pylori", "levofloxacin", "amoxicillin", "quadruple", "bismuth", "second-line" and "rescue". Additionally, references of retrieved articles were screened for further studies (crossreferencing). We also performed a full manual search of all review articles, recently published editorials and all retrieved original studies presented at Digestive Disease Week, United European Gastroenterology Week, and European Helicobacter Study Group conferences. In addition, reference lists from relevant identified papers were manually searched. All original research articles and abstracts published until the 31 October 2010 were included. The search was limited to randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and studies comparing the two regimens (LA vs QT). Two investigators (Di Caro S and Fini L) independently extracted data by using a structured form. Only data from patients undergoing second-line eradication treatments were included in the analysis. There was a > 95% agreement in data extraction between the two investigators.

The following data were extracted from the articles: first author, year of publication, characteristics of study population (sample size, race, sex, age range and mean of study participants), therapy scheme (drugs, duration of treatment, dosage), intention-to-treat (ITT) and perprotocol eradication rates, incidence of side effects, discontinuation due to side effects.

Study outcomes for the meta-analysis were *H. pylori* eradication and incidence of adverse effects. Sub-analyses were performed comparing 7-d *vs* 10-d levofloxacinbased regimens in terms of efficacy and adverse events between European and Asian populations. Eradication rate analysis was based on ITT data. In the tolerability analysis, patients who discontinued treatment due to severe side effects were included.

The meta-analysis was performed using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses 2009 guidelines. Odds ratio (OR) was used as a measure of association, and summary ORs along with 95% CI were calculated based on a random-effects model using the DerSimonian and Laird methods. Heterogeneity was evaluated to establish if any clinical, methodological, or statistical variability existed among studies included. If significant heterogeneity existed, the random-effects model was used. Also, inconsistency statistic (l^2) was calculated to evaluate level of heterogeneity (0%-30%: homogeneity; 30%-50%: moderate heterogeneity; 50%-80%: substantial heterogeneity; > 80%: considerable heterogeneity). A pooled analysis was used to assess differences between levofloxacin regimens (7 d vs 10 d) and study populations. All statistical tests were two-sided and conducted at a significance level of 0.05. Independent academic biostatisticians from Baylor University Medical Center (Daoud Y) performed the statistical analysis. Data were analyzed with Review Manager (RevMan) 5.1 developed by the Cochrane collaboration.

Di Caro S et al. Levofloxacin-based/quadruple th	herapy H. pylori eradication
--	------------------------------

Table 1 Demographic data of patients, extracted from the published papers $(n = 9)$														
Ref.	Pts	Days of tp	Test confirming infection	Test confirming eradication	Age	Age (yr)		Male (%)		rs (%)	Clinic (%)			
					L+ A	Q	L + A	Q	L + A	Q	L + A	Q		
Nista et al ^[21]	140	10	UBT and/or biopsy	UBT	47 ± 10	± 10 48 ± 10	47	49	NA	NA	UD = 37;	UD = 40;		
											DD = 33;	DD = 34;		
											RD = 30	RD = 26		
Perri et al ^[29]	113	7	UBT	UBT	46 ± 16	45 ± 15	48	47	17	20	N = 63;	N = 67;		
											OE = 3;	OE = 5;		
											G = 9;	G = 2;		
											GU = 3;	GU = 0;		
											D = 10;	D = 19;		
											DU = 9;	DU = 5;		
Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^[39]	90 (40)	10	LIBT and /or biopsy	UBT	56 + 10	54 + 13	30	25	64	52	0-3 NA	NA		
Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^[28]	500 (150)	7-10	UBT	UBT	48 ±	: 13 ¹	39 ¹		23 ¹		FD = 76;			
											$DU = 24^1$			
Lee <i>et al</i> ^[80]	126 (23)	7	Rapid urea test	UBT	50 ±	14^{1}	63	63 ¹		1	GU = 44;			
											D	U = 32;		
											GA = 11;			
											A = 3; F = 1;			
TAT (1[19]	10(((1)	-	D 11 / /	LIDT	47 + 101	45 + 101	4 4 1	401	201	101	FI.	D = 9		
wong et al	106 (61)	1	Kapid urea test	UBI	47 ± 12	45 ± 13	44	42	20	19	N = 64;	N = //;		
			and/or biopsy								E = 0; CU = 6;	E = 0; CU = 0;		
											DU = 24	DU = 15		
Zhang et al ^[37]	95	7			4	9	NA	NA	NA	NA	GU/DI	U = 24;		
0											, í	G = 62;		
											G	A = 14		
Jung et al ^[42]	76	7	Rapid urea test	Rapid urea test	48 ± 12	50 ± 10	58	58	NA	NA	GU = 39;	GU = 38;		
			and/or UBT	or UBT							DU = 32;	DU = 33;		
											GA = 10;	GA = 18;		
TC (141)		-	D 11 ()	D 11	50 . 45	10 . 1 .	50	40		10	G = 19	G = 11		
Kuo et al	166	7	Rapid urea test	Kapid urea test	50 ± 12	49 ± 14	53	48	14	12	GU = 23;	GU = 25;		
			and/or biopsy or	and/or biopsy							DU = 41;	DU = 40;		
			culture	OF UD1							G = 36	G = 35		

¹Demographic data were reported together for both arms. In studies including patients after failure of more than one therapy, extrapolated data on patients pre-treated in second-line are reported in parenthesis; in those cases demographic data are referred to the entire study population. Pts: Patients (total number); L + A: Levofloxacin/amoxicillin-based therapy; Days of therapy (tp): Duration of L + A scheme; UBT: Urea breath test; Q: Quadruple standard therapy; UD: Ulcer-like dyspepsia; DD: Dysmotility-like dyspepsia; RD: Reflux-like dyspepsia; N: Normal; OE: Esophagitis; G: Gastritis; GU: Gastric ulcer; D: Duodenitis; O: Other; FD: Functional dyspepsia; DU: Duodenal ulcer; A: Adenoma; E: Erosion; GA: Gastric atrophy; F: Family history; NA: Not available.

TEN-DAY LEVOFLOXACIN SECOND-LINE SCHEMES DISPLAY SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER ERADICATION RATE AND LOWER INCIDENCE OF SIDE EFFECTS

Out of 79 titles initially generated by literature searches, 14 studies (10 articles and four abstracts) fulfilling the inclusion criteria were eligible for our analysis. All studies were published from September 2003 to May 2009 and included 677 patients in the LA-based triple therapy group and 608 subjects in the QT group. First-line therapy was a standard triple anti-*H. pylori* scheme. Tolerability data were available in seven articles. Demographic and clinical data of patients available are reported in Table 1. Studies were divided into two categories based on ethnicity of the study population (Asian and Caucasian population). In all studies, *H. pylori* infection was determined by ¹³C urea breath test (UBT), rapid urea test, histology or

culture before treatment, and histology and/or 13 C-UBT after administration of eradication therapy. Heterogeneity of data available on levofloxacin dose, ranging from 300 mg/d to 1 g/d (Table 1), does not allow a definitive conclusion.

Data on comparison of second-line levofloxacinbased triple regimens to bismuth-based QT after failure of one cycle of eradication therapy are listed in Table 2.

In our analysis, we extrapolated exclusively the data matching our strict inclusion criteria. We also re-calculated all the eradication percentages from the included studies. In all cases, the results matched the reported data, except one.

In an Italian population study, 10-d levofloxacinbased triple scheme in association with either amoxicillin or tinidazole, was superior to both 7-d and 14-d QT. Specifically, triple therapy eradication rates were 94% with amoxicillin *vs* 63% and 68% at 7 d and 14 d, respectively for QT. A high incidence of adverse events



Ref.	Ethnicity	Scheme	Success						ide effec	ts	Discontinuing therapy because of side effects			
			Yes	Total	Completing	ITT %	PP %	Yes	Total	%	Yes	Total	%	
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[21]	Caucasian	LAR (10 d; L: 500 mg OD)	66	70	70	94.3	94.3	7	70	10.0	0	70	0.0	
		Q07	44	70	64	62.9	68.8	15	70	21.4	5	70	7	
Perri et al ^[29]	Caucasian	LAP (7 d; L: 500 mg OD)	37	58	56	63.8	66.1	3	58	5.2	1	58	1.7	
		Q07	46	55	51	83.6	90.2	17	55	30.9	3	55	5.5	
Orsi et al ^{1[38]}	Caucasian	LAR (12 d; L: 500 mg OD)	43	50	47	86.0	89	4	47	8.5	NA	NA	NA	
		Q07	44	50	44	88.0	91	11	44	25	NA	NA	NA	
Bilardi et al ^[39]	Caucasian	LAP (10 d; L: 250 mg BD)	16	23	NA	69.6	NA	-	-	-	1	44		
		Q07	6	17	NA	35.3	NA	-	-	-	1	46		
Nista et al ^{1[35]}	Caucasian	LAE (10 d; L: 500 mg OD)	26	30	30	86.7	86.7	-	-	-				
		Q07	25	35	31	71.4	80.6	-	-	-				
Nista et al ^{1[36]}	Caucasian	LAR (10 d; L: 500 mg OD)	42	46	46	91.3	91.3	-	-	-				
		LAR (7 d; L: 500 mg OD)	37	50	50	74.0	74.0	-	-	-				
		Q07	34	50	46	68	73.9	-	-	-				
Gisbert et al ^[28]	Caucasian	LAO (7 or 10 d; L: 500 mg BD)	83	112	NA	74	NA	39	112	34.8	NA	NA	NA	
		Q07	21	38	NA	55	NA	6	38	15.8	NA	NA	NA	
Wong et al ^{1[44]}	Asian	LALa (7 d; L: 500 mg BD)	21	33	NA	63.6	NA	-	-	-				
		Q07	22	30	NA	73.3	NA	-	-	-				
Lee <i>et al</i> ^[80]	Asian	LAR (10 d; L: 200 mg BD)	5	9	8	55.6	62.5	-	-	-				
		Q07	4	14	10	28.6	40.0	-	-	-				
Wong et al ^[19]	Asian	LALa (7 d; L: 500 mg BD)	19	31	NA	61.3	NA	18	54^{2}	33.3	NA	NA	NA	
		Q07	26	30	NA	86.7	NA	21	52 ²	40.4	NA	NA	NA	
Zhang et al ^[43]	Asian	LAE (7 d; L: 500 mg OD)	42	49	NA	85.7	NA							
		Q07	30	44	NA	68.2	NA							
Zhang et al ^[37]	Asian	LAE (7 d; L: 500 mg OD)	42	48	46	87.5	91.3	7	48					
		Q07	33	47	34	70.2	97.0	15	47					
Jung et al ^[42]	Asian	LAP (7 d; L: 300 mg BD)	16	31	30	51.6	53.3	3	30	10.0	0	31	0.0	
		Q07	22	45	35	48.9	62.9	11	35	31.4	1	45	2.2	
Kuo et al ^[41]	Asian	LAE (7 d; L: 500 mg OD)	58	83	77	69.9	75.3	10	80	12.5	1	83		
		Q07	53	83	63	63.9	84.1	25	71	35.2	5	83		

Table 2 Levofloxacin-based second-line therapies vs quadruple bismuth-based regimens for Helicobacter pylori treatment

¹Data arisen from abstract publication; ²side effects calculated on the entire study population (not stratified for number of failed previous therapy). L: Levofloxacin; OD: Once daily; BD: Twice daily; LA/La: Levofloxacin/Lansoprazole; ITT: Intention-to-treat eradication rates; PP: Per-protocol; NA: Not available; LAR: Levofloxacin/amoxicillin/rabeprazole; LAO: Levofloxacin/amoxicillin/omeprazole; LAE: Levofloxacin/amoxicillin/esomeprazole; LAP: Levofloxacin/ amoxicillin/pantoprazole.

(33%) was observed in the 14-d QT group, although the same scheme administered for 7 d was well tolerated. Dropouts and severe adverse events were observed exclusively in the quadruple regimen^[21]. The same authors compared two 10-d levofloxacin-based (500 mg OD) triple schemes in combination with either amoxicillin or azithromycin with the standard QT regimen. Eradication rates of levofloxacin-based groups were higher, even if not significantly, compared with standard QT (86.6% and 71.4%, respectively), but incidence of side effects was significantly lower (26.6% *vs* 60%). Dropouts occurred only in the QT group^[35,36].

In terms of duration of treatment, the same researchers compared efficacy and tolerability of 7 d and 10 d levofloxacin/amoxicillin-based treatment to 7 d QT, demonstrating a higher cure rate for the triple 10-d levofloxacin regimen (91.3%) compared to both the 7-d levofloxacin-based or QT regimen (74% and 68%, respectively), with optimal tolerability^[35,36]. Zhang *et al*^[37] also confirmed similar results.

Orsi *et al*^[38] have studied efficacy of a 12-d treatment course by comparing the levofloxacin/amoxicillin-based regimen with QT. Both regimens were equally effective

(86% vs 88%) but the triple regimen was better tolerated (incidence of side effects: 8.6% vs 24%).

A drastic difference in eradication rates were observed in another Italian study in which the levofloxacinbased triple and quadruple regimens achieved an eradication rate of 70% vs 35%, respectively, in second-line, even if patients were given a full-dose course of PPI for 1 wk prior to bismuth therapy. Interestingly, levofloxacin-based triple regimen was successful in most patients with both metronidazole- and clarithromycin-resistant strains, whereas QT was less effective, particularly when metronidazole resistance occurred^[39].

Bilardi *et al*^[39] used LA-based triple therapy both in first- and second-line compared to standard first-line triple and quadruple second-line regimens, respectively. In first-line, eradication rate of levofloxacin-based and standard triple regimen was 69.8% and 74%, respectively, while as rescue regimen, levofloxacin-based therapy achieved an eradication rate of 62.5% compared to 40% for the standard QT regimen.

Gisbert et al^{40} compared 7-d levofloxacin-based therapy with a quadruple ranitidine bismuth citrate-based regimen and reported an identical eradication rate of 68% for both regimens, with similar incidence of side effects (38% *vs* 36%, respectively). Nevertheless, the antisecretory activity of ranitidine might have contributed to the eradication rate in the QT regimen. Conversely, dose of levofloxacin (500 mg BD) and duration (7 d) of treatment might have affected efficacy (shorter treatment) and tolerance (high dosage) in the triple regimen^[40].

In the study by Kuo *et al*^[41], levofloxacin triple regimen and QT eradication rates were 69.9% *vs* 63.9%, respectively, and although compliance was similar, incidence of side effects was 12.6% in the LA *vs* 35.2% in the QT groups. In this study, levofloxacin resistance was analyzed and was a crucial predictor for eradication failure (21.2% of patients).

In a Korean trial, 7 d levofloxacin-based therapy and standard QT achieved comparable but low cure rates (51.6% *vs* 48.9%), even if the triple regimen was better tolerated (adverse events incidence: 10% vs 31.4%)^[42]. Another Asian trial confirmed the high cure rate of levofloxacin-based therapy for 7 d (85.7%)^[43].

Finally, few studies have demonstrated superiority of the recommended QT regimen compared with the levo-floxacin triple regimen. QT was superior to levofloxacinbased regimen for persistent *H. pylori* infection in the study conducted by Perri *et al*^{29]} (eradication rate: 63% in the levofloxacin group). In this trial bismuth- and ranitidine/bismuth citrate-based QT regimens achieved a cure rate of 83% and 85%, respectively, although a higher incidence of side effects was observed in the bismuth-treated group (30.9% *vs* 5.1%). Conversely, adverse events occurred in 3.3% of patients treated with levofloxacin.

Wong *et al*^[44] reported an eradication rate of 73% and 64% in second-line for QT and levofloxacin-based regimens, respectively. Similarly, in a study conducted in Hong Kong, second-line 7-d triple levofloxacin-based therapy achieved an eradication rate of 61% *vs* 87% with QT, due to resistance to levofloxacin (18% of patients)^[19]. However, the study included a small sample of refractory patients and eradication rate was superior in subjects in the LA group with dual resistance to metronidazole and clarithromycin respect to antibiotics resistant patients in Q group (79% *vs* 65%, respectively). However, treatment choice was based on antibiotic susceptibility testing and might not reflect common clinical practice^[19].

Results of our meta-analysis are summarized in Figure 1. Overall eradication rate (pooled data) with levofloxacin was 76.5% (95% CI: 54.4%-97.6%). When exclusively 7-d regimens were included, cure rate was 70.6% (95% CI: 40.2%-99.1%), whereas for the 10-d regimen, eradication rate was significantly higher (88.7%; 95% CI: 56.1%-109.9%; P < 0.05). Mean eradication rate for QT was 67.4% (95% CI: 42.4%-91.6%).

The meta-analysis showed a trend indicating superiority of any LA regimens (7, 10 or 12 d) to QT (OR: 1.59; 95% CI: 0.98-2.58; P = 0.06; Figure 1A). Both 7-d LA and QT regimens showed comparable efficacy (OR: 1.09; 95% CI: 0.63-1.87; P = 0.40; Figure 1B), whereas the 10-d LA regimen was significantly more effective (OR: 5.05; 95% CI: 2.74-9.31; P < 0.00 001; Figure 1C).

No differences were reported in QT eradication rates between Asian and European studies, whereas LA regimens were more effective in Caucasians (78.3% vs 67.7%; P = 0.05). Of note, if data on comparison between LA and QT regimens were stratified by ethnicity (Figure 1A), any levofloxacin regimen was more effective in the Caucasian population (P = 0.09). Those findings were not confirmed when only 7-d levofloxacin regimens were included (Figure 1B). No data were available on 10-d levofloxacin regimens in Asian populations (Figure 1C).

Mean incidence of side effects (pooled data) was lower in LA regimens (13.7%, 95% CI: 12%-24%) compared with standard QT (27.2%, 95% CI: 24%-34%). The OR for this comparison was 0.39 (95% CI: 0.18-0.85; P = 0.02) at meta-analysis (Figure 2). When incidence of side effects (pooled data) was stratified by ethnicity, no differences were registered between the two geographical areas for the levofloxacin regimens (14.8% *vs* 12.1%, respectively in Europe and Asia), whereas a slightly higher rate was reported in the Asian population treated with QT (32.5% *vs* 23.3%, P = 0.09). Moreover, the lower risk of occurrence of side effects in the levofloxacin arms overall was mainly due to the Asian studies contribution.

DISCUSSION

Antibiotic resistance is the main cause of failure in curing *H. pylori* infection^[45-49]. Other factors determining eradication rate are: *H. pylori* strain, patient compliance, and properties of drugs administered^[2].

Levofloxacin, a second-generation fluoroquinolone, with a broad spectrum of activity against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria^[50-52], is a recognized antimicrobial alternative to the standard antibiotics used to treat H. pylori infection. Levofloxacin is mainly indicated to treat infections of respiratory and genitourinary tract, skin and skin structures^[33,51,53-55]. In recent years, its role has been successfully extended to treatment of H. pylori infection and has been included as treatment of choice in guidelines^[15,33,56]. Its optimal tolerance spectrum, with the most frequent adverse events being nausea and diarrhea, makes it a safe alternative^[57]. Only a few cases of QTc prolongation, seizures, glucose disturbances and tendonitis have been reported^[33,51,56]. Although primary resistance is infrequent, resistance to quinolones is easily acquired in areas of high consumption^[58]. In Asian countries, levofloxacin resistance has recently increased^[59,60]. In particular, in Hong Kong, Korea and Japan, estimated *H. pylori* resistance rates for levofloxacin are 11.5%, 21.5% and 15% respectively^[61,62]. In the Chinese adolescent population, all *H. pylori* strains were found to be resistant to levofloxacin^[63,64]. In Europe, such as Spain, France, Netherlands, Austria and Portugal, fluoroquinolone resistance is less than 10%^[65-69]. However, despite a reported levofloxacin resistance rate of 18%, Italian guidelines recommend levofloxacin regimens for secondline therapy, with optimal results^[16]. Moreover, antibiotic



Α	LA 7 and 10	and 12	Quadruple	therapy		Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, random, 95% CI	M-H, random, 95% CI
1.4.1 Caucasian					-		
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[21]	66	70	44	70	6.9%	9.75 [3.18, 29.87]	
Perri <i>et al</i> ^[29]	37	58	46	55	8.0%	0.34 [0.14, 0.84]	e
Orsi <i>et al</i> ^[38]	43	50	44	50	6.7%	0.84 [0.26, 2.70]	
Bilardi et al ^[39]	16	23	6	17	6.0%	4.19 [1.10, 15.90]	_
Nista et al ^[35]	26	30	25	35	6.2%	2 60 [0 72 9 38]	
Nista et al ^[36]	79	96	34	50	8.4%	2 19 [0 99 4 83]	
Cichart at $a^{[28]}$	02	112	21	20	0.470	2.15 [0.55, 4.05]	_
	05	112	21	215	0.070	2.32 [1.06, 4.99]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	250	439	220	315	50.7%	1.99 [0.90, 4.41]	
	350		220		7 770		
Test for overall effect	$= 0.87; \chi = 1.69$: Z = 1.69 (P	26.07, d ? = 0.09	ir = 6 (P = 0)	J.UUUZ); .	l = 77%		
1.4.2 Asian							
Wong et al ^[44]	21	33	22	30	7.1%	0.64 [0.22, 1.87]	
Lee <i>et al</i> ^[80]	5	9	4	14	4.5%	3.13 [0.54, 18.04]	
Wong et al ^[19]	19	31	26	30	6.2%	0.24 [0.07, 0.87]	e
Zhang <i>et al</i> ^[43]	42	49	30	44	7.3%	2 80 [1 01 7 77]	
Zhang et al ^[37]	42	48	33	47	7.2%	2.00 [1.01, 7.77]	
lung et al ^[42]	16	31	22	45	7.2%	1 12 [0 45 2 70]	
$\frac{Jung ct a}{V_{41}}$	10	02	52	CD CD	0.10/	1.12 [0.45, 2.79]	
	58	83	53	202	9.1%	1.31 [0.69, 2.51]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	202	284	100	293	49.3%	1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	
Iotal events	203		190				
Test for overall effect	= 0.35; χ ² = : <i>Ζ</i> = 0.79 (<i>P</i>	13.88, d ? = 0.43	if = 6 (<i>P</i> = ()).03); <i>1</i> *	= 57%		
Total (OE0/, CI)		772		609	100.00/-		
Total (95% CI)	552	125	410	008	100.0%	1.59 [0.96, 2.56]	-
	222	44.66	410	0.00043	7 600	,	
Heterogeneity: lau ² =	$= 0.5/; \chi^{-} = 0.5/; \chi^{-} $	41.66, d	f = 13 (P <)	0.0001)	$I^{2} = 69\%$	0	
Test for overall effect	Z = 1.86 (P)	° = 0.06)			0.	05 0.2 1 5 20
Test for subgroup diff	ferences: χ^2 =	= 0.77, c	df = 1 (<i>P</i> =	0.38); <i>I</i> ²	= 0%		Quadruple therapy LA-7 and 10 and 12
В	14-7		Quadruple	therany		Odds ratio	Odds ratio
B Study or subgroup	LA-7 Events	Total	Quadruple	therapy Total	Weight	Odds ratio	Odds ratio
B Study or subgroup	LA-7 Events	Total	Quadruple Events	therapy Total	Weight	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian	LA-7 Events	Total	Quadruple Events	therapy Total	Weight	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et a</i> ^{(21)}	LA-7 Events 0	Total 0	Quadruple Events 44	therapy Total 70	Weight	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^[21] Perri <i>et al</i> ^[29]	LA-7 Events 0 37	Total 0 58	Quadruple Events 44 46	therapy Total 70 55	Weight 12.4%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^[21] Perri <i>et a</i> ^[29] Orsi <i>et a</i> ^[38]	LA-7 Events 0 37 0	Total 0 58 0	Quadruple Events 44 46 44	therapy Total 70 55 50	Weight 12.4%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^[21] Perri <i>et al</i> ^[29] Orsi <i>et al</i> ^[38] Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^[39]	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0	Total 0 58 0 0	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 44 6	therapy Total 70 55 50 17	Weight 12.4%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]}	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0	Total 0 58 0 0 0	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35	Weight 12.4%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]}	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 0 37	Total 0 58 0 0 0 0 50	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50	Weight 12.4% 12.6%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et a</i> ^[21] Perri <i>et a</i> ^[29] Orsi <i>et a</i> ^[38] Bilardi <i>et a</i> ^[36] Nista <i>et a</i> ^[35] Nista <i>et a</i> ^[36] Gisbert <i>et a</i> ^[28]	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 0 37 0	Total 0 58 0 0 0 50 0	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et a</i> ^[21] Perri <i>et a</i> ^[29] Orsi <i>et a</i> ^[38] Bilardi <i>et a</i> ^[39] Nista <i>et a</i> ^[35] Nista <i>et a</i> ^[36] Gisbert <i>et a</i> ^[36] Subtotal (95% CI)	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 0 37 0 37 0	Total 0 58 0 0 0 50 0 108	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 37 0 37 0 74	Total 0 58 0 0 0 0 50 0 108	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(36]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\gamma^2 = 4$	Total 0 58 0 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 (P = 0.	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); <i>I</i> ² =	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{36]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{26]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 37 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -$: $Z = 0.56$ (P	Total 0 58 0 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0.$)	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -2$: $Z = 0.56$ (P	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 (<i>P</i> = 0.)	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); <i>I</i> ² =	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]}	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -$: $Z = 0.56$ (P	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0$.) 22	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); <i>I</i> ² =	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(36]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Leo <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁰⁾	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 37 0 0 37 0 24 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -$: $Z = 0.56$ (P	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0$.) 22 4	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽²¹⁾ Perri <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁹⁾ Orsi <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁸⁾ Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁵⁾ Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁶⁾ Gisbert <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁸⁾ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴⁴⁾ Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽¹⁹⁾	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -$: $Z = 0.56$ (P 21 5	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0$.) 22 4 26	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 20	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.64 [0.22, 1.87] 3.13 [0.54, 18.04]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽²¹⁾ Perri <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁹⁾ Orsi <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁸⁾ Bilardi <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁹⁾ Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁵⁾ Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁶⁾ Gisbert <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁸⁾ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴⁴⁾ Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽¹⁹⁾	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 37 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -$: Z = 0.56 (P 21 5 19 42	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0$.) 22 4 26 20	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 14 30	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(80]} Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(43]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(43]}	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 37 0 37 0 37 0 37 0 37 0	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 30 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(80]} Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(43]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(43]}	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Total 0 58 0 0 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 8	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 = 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30 33 	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); <i>I</i> ² = 30 14 30 44 47	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.64 [0.22, 1.87] 3.13 [0.54, 18.04] 0.24 [0.07, 0.87] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(36]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴²⁾ Jung <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴²⁾	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = 4$: $Z = 0.56$ (P 21 5 19 42 42 16	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30 33 22	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44 47 45	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.64 [0.22, 1.87] 3.13 [0.54, 18.04] 0.24 [0.07, 0.87] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(36]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴²⁾ Jung <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴¹⁾	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = 4$: $Z = 0.56$ (F 21 5 19 42 42 42 16 58	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44 47 45 83	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(80]} Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(37]} Jung <i>et al</i> ^{(42]} Kuo <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Subtotal (95% CI)	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 37 0 74 = $0.72; \chi^2 = 4$: $Z = 0.56$ (P 21 5 19 42 42 16 58	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0$.)) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44 47 45 83 293	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.64 [0.22, 1.87] 3.13 [0.54, 18.04] 0.24 [0.07, 0.87] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(38]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴²⁾ Kuo <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴¹⁾ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = 4$: Z = 0.56 (P 21 5 19 42 42 16 58 203	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 (P = 0.) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53 190	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44 47 45 83 293	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽²¹⁾ Perri <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁹⁾ Orsi <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁸⁾ Bilardi <i>et al</i> ⁽³³⁾ Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁵⁾ Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁵⁾ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴⁴⁾ Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴¹⁾ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ²	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -1$: Z = 0.56 (P 21 5 19 42 42 16 58 203 = 0.35; $\chi^2 = -1$	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284 13.88, d	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53 190 If = 6 ($P = 0$	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 14 30 44 47 45 83 293 0.03); I^2	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1% = 57%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 1.31 [0.54, 18.04] 0.24 [0.07, 0.87] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(36]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(80]} Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(42]} Kuo <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -4$: $Z = 0.56$ (P 21 5 19 42 42 16 58 203 = 0.35; $\chi^2 = -3$: $Z = 0.79$ (P	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284 13.88, d 2 = 0.43	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53 190 If = 6 ($P = 0$)	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 30 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44 47 45 83 293 0.03); I^2	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1% = 57%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(36]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(80]} Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(42]} Xuo <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 0 37 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = 4$: $Z = 0.56$ (P 21 5 19 42 42 16 58 203 = 0.35; $\chi^2 = 1$: $Z = 0.79$ (P	Total 0 58 0 0 50 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284 13.88, d 2 = 0.43 392	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53 190 if = 6 ($P = 0$)	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44 47 45 83 293 0.03); I^2	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1% = 57% 100.0%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(80]} Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(42]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(42]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(42]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -6$: $Z = 0.56$ (P 21 5 19 42 42 16 58 203 = 0.35; $\chi^2 = -2$: $Z = 0.79$ (P 277	Total 0 58 0 0 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284 13.88, d 2 = 0.43 392	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 = 1 ($P = 0$.) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53 190 if = 6 ($P = 0$) 410	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 44 47 45 83 293 0.03); I^2	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1% = 57% 100.0%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.64 [0.22, 1.87] 3.13 [0.54, 18.04] 0.24 [0.07, 0.87] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(21]} Perri <i>et al</i> ^{(29]} Orsi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^{(39]} Nista <i>et al</i> ^{(35]} Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^{(28]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(44]} Lee <i>et al</i> ^{(80]} Wong <i>et al</i> ^{(43]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(43]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(43]} Zhang <i>et al</i> ^{(43]} Jung <i>et al</i> ^{(41]} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = -$: $Z = 0.56$ (P 21 5 19 42 42 16 58 203 = 0.35; $\chi^2 =$: $Z = 0.79$ (P 277 = 0.41; $\varphi^2 =$	Total 0 58 0 0 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284 13.88, d 2 = 0.43 392 21.29, d	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0$.) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53 190 if = 6 ($P = 0$) 410 if = 8 ($P = 0$	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 14 30 14 30 44 47 45 83 293 0.03); I^2	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1% = 57% 100.0% 2 = 62%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.64 [0.22, 1.87] 3.13 [0.54, 18.04] 0.24 [0.07, 0.87] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI
B Study or subgroup 1.1.1 Caucasian Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽²¹⁾ Perri <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁹⁾ Orsi <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁸⁾ Bilardi <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁹⁾ Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁵⁾ Nista <i>et al</i> ⁽³⁶⁾ Gisbert <i>et al</i> ⁽²⁸⁾ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 1.1.2 Asian Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴⁴⁾ Lee <i>et al</i> ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Wong <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Zhang <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴³⁾ Jung <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴²⁾ Kuo <i>et al</i> ⁽⁴¹⁾ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	LA-7 Events 0 37 0 0 37 0 0 74 = 0.72; $\chi^2 = 4$: $Z = 0.56$ (F 21 5 19 42 42 16 58 203 = 0.35; $\chi^2 = 4$: $Z = 0.79$ (F 277 = 0.41; $\chi^2 = 3$) (F (F	Total 0 58 0 0 108 4.57, df 2 = 0.57 33 9 31 49 48 31 83 284 13.88, d 2 = 0.43 392 21.29, d 2 = 0.75	Quadruple Events 44 46 44 6 25 34 21 220 = 1 ($P = 0.$) 22 4 26 30 33 22 53 190 if = 6 ($P = 0$) 410 if = 8 ($P = 0$)	therapy Total 70 55 50 17 35 50 38 315 03); $I^2 =$ 30 14 30 17 35 50 38 30 17 30 17 30 17 30 17 30 17 30 30 17 30 17 30 30 14 30 30 30 14 30 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 50 30 30 17 50 30 30 14 30 293 0.003); I^2	Weight 12.4% 12.6% 24.9% 78% 10.7% 6.3% 9.1% 11.2% 10.9% 12.1% 14.7% 75.1% = 57% 100.0% 2 = 62%	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI Not estimable 0.34 [0.14, 0.84] Not estimable Not estimable 13.34 [0.56, 3.19] Not estimable 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 0.68 [0.18, 2.58] 2.80 [1.01, 7.77] 2.97 [1.03, 8.57] 1.12 [0.45, 2.79] 1.31 [0.69, 2.51] 1.27 [0.70, 2.31]	Odds ratio M-H, random, 95% CI

С	LA-10)	Quadruple t	herapy:		Odds ratio	Odds ratio
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, random, 95% CI	M-H, random, 95% CI
1.2.1 Caucasian							
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[21]	66	70	44	70	29.8%	9.75 [3.18, 29.87]	_
Perri <i>et al</i> ^[29]	0	0	46	55		Not estimable	
Orsi <i>et al</i> ^[38]	0	0	44	50		Not estimable	
Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^[39]	16	23	6	17	21.0%	4.19 [1.10, 15.90]	_
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[35]	26	30	25	35	22.7%	2.60 [0.72, 9.38]	
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[36]	42	46	34	50	26.6%	4.94 [1.51, 16.17]	
Gisbert <i>et al</i> ^[28]	0	0	21	38		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		169		315	100.0%	5.05 [2.74, 9.31]	•
Total events	150		220				
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 =$	$0.00; \chi^2 = 1$	2.45, df	= 3 (P = 0.4)	48); <i>I</i> ² =	0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.20 (A	° < 0.00	001)				
Total (95% CI)		169		315	100.0%	5.05 [2.74, 9.31]	•
Total events	150		220				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; $\chi^2 = 1$	2.45, df	= 3 (P = 0.4)	48); I ² =	0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.20 (A	P < 0.00	001)				0.05 0.2 1 5 20
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not	t applica	ble				Quadruple therapy LA-10

Figure 1 Meta-analysis comparing the efficacy of anti-Helicobacter pylori levofloxacin/amoxicillin-based triple therapy vs quadruple therapy 7-10 or 12 d (A), 7 d (B), 10 d (C) levofloxacin/amoxicillin regimens were considered. CI: Confidence interval; LA: Levofloxacin/amoxicillin.

resistance testing is not routinely performed to guide prescription. Therefore, even if widely used, published data on levofloxacin-based regimens for *H. pylori* eradication are extremely heterogeneous. Differences in dosages, length of treatment, drug combination, patients' demographic characteristics, and previous courses of therapy, preclude a definitive conclusion.

The present study included only studies comparing cure rate and tolerability of standard QT regimen to 7 or 10 d combination of LA-based triple therapy in secondline, to provide guidance in clinical practice. In accordance with previous reports^[70-72], our data showed that 7 d LA-based triple regimen and QT achieved similar efficacy results, whereas LA-based regimen administered for 10 d was more effective than QT. Thus, tolerability was optimal in LA-based triple therapy and patients experienced a lower rate of adverse events compared to patients treated with standard QT, with the exception of a single discordant study^[28]. However, in a multicenter study, the same author reported remarkably superior tolerability using a 10-d levofloxacin-based regimen^[38,40].

In previous studies, dose of quinolone appeared the crucial factor influencing the incidence of side effects^[70,71,73]. In most studies included in the analysis, levofloxacin has been administered at a dosage of 500 mg daily. Interestingly, a higher incidence of side effects was registered in one of the trials using 1 g in two divided doses^[28].

Statistical comparison of side effects experienced in 7-d vs 10-d groups was not consistent due to the structure of the selected studies. With the exception of the study by Gisbert *et al*^{28]}, tolerability was excellent in all other trials using levofloxacin-based regimens for 10 d or longer. Probably, acceptance of LA therapy depends on the simplicity of the therapeutic regimen itself. Although a new preparation of single three-in-one capsules containing bismuth subcitrate potassium, metronidazole, and tetracycline has been recently proposed in first-line^[74],

QT still consists of a complex scheme (12 pills/d), and bismuth salts are no longer available in many countries. On the contrary, levofloxacin-based therapy appears simple (5 pills/d), effective (10-d regimen eradication rate: 88.7%) and safe (overall side effects incidence: 13.7%). Duration of treatment appeared the unique factor influencing the efficacy^[75].

Nevertheless, considering that the ideal for *H. pylori* infection might differ between areas, countries and races^[76-78], we performed an additional analysis on efficacy in different parts of the world.

In a sub-analysis comparing Asian and European trials, QT was equally effective, while LA-based regimens were more effective in the European population. Differences in efficacy rates between Asian and European populations using LA-based schemes might be explained with primary antibiotic resistance and/or genetic background. The meta-analysis showed that the LA-based regimen was more effective in Caucasians only when any regimen was included. However, 10-d levofloxacin-based treatment has never been tested in Asian countries and efficacy increases with duration of treatment, therefore, it is difficult to establish whether differences reported depended on ethnicity or duration of therapy.

Regarding incidence of side effects, ethnicity appeared to affect tolerability of QT compared with LAbased therapy in Asian populations. However, the single outlier among European trials might bias this finding.

Apart from levofloxacin, other regimens containing fluoroquinolones have been proposed both in first- and second-line *H. pylori* treatment. Among these, moxifloxacin-based regimens appear interesting (eradication rate up to 90% and 70%, respectively in first and secondline^[72,75,79]. With respect to levofloxacin, moxifloxacin has been relatively more recently introduced on the market, with a consequent possibly lower rate of antibiotic resistance. However, it is more expensive. Nevertheless, no conclusive recommendations can be issued on which



	LA 7 and 10	and 12	Quadruple tl	herapy		Odds ratio		Odd	ds ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, random, 95%	CI	M-H, rand	dom, 95% CI	
1.4.1 Caucasian								_		
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[21]	7	70	15	70	15.2%	0.41 [0.15, 1.07]				
Perri et al ^[29]	3	58	17	55	12.8%	0.12 [0.03, 0.45]		—		
Orsi <i>et al</i> ^[38]	4	47	11	44	13.3%	0.28 [0.08, 0.96]		•		
Bilardi <i>et al</i> ^[39]	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[35]	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Nista <i>et al</i> ^[36]	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Gisbert et al ^[28]	39	112	6	38	15.3%	2.96 [1.14, 7.69]				
Subtotal (95% CI)		287		207	56.7%	0.47 [0.12, 1.85]				
Total events	54		49							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 1.63; $\chi^2 = 1$	18.68, c	f = 3 (P = 0.	.0003); 1	² = 84%					
Test for overall effect	: Z = 1.08 (P	9 = 0.28)							
1.4.2 Asian										
Wong et al ^[44]	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Lee <i>et al</i> ^[80]	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Wong et al ^[19]	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Zhang <i>et al</i> ^[43]	0	0	0	0		Not estimable				
Zhang <i>et al</i> ^[37]	7	48	15	47	12.5%	0.24 [0.06, 0.91]				
Jung <i>et al</i> ^[42]	3	30	11	35	14.5%	0.39 [0.13, 1.13]		-	-	
Kuo <i>et al^[41]</i>	10	80	25	71	16.3%	0.26 [0.12, 0.60]		•		
Subtotal (95% CI)		158		154	43.3%	0.29 [0.16, 0.52]				
Total events	20		51							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	$= 0.00; \chi^2 = 0$	0.43, df	= 2 (P = 0.8)	$(1); I^2 =$	0%					
Test for overall effect	: <i>Z</i> = 4.14 (<i>P</i>	? < 0.00	01)							
Total (95% CI)		445		361	100.0%	0.39 [0.18, 0.85]				
Total events	74		100							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	$= 0.79; \chi^2 = 2$	22.08, c	If = 13 (P = 0)	0.001); /	$T^2 = 73\%$		L	1		1
Test for overall effect	: <i>Z</i> = 2.38 (<i>P</i>	2 = 0.02)				0.05 0).2	1 5	20
Test for subgroup diff	erences: χ^2 =	= 0.41,	df = 1 (P = 0).52); <i>I</i> ²	= 0%		LA-7 and	10 and 12	Quadruple therapy	

Figure 2 Meta-analysis comparing the incidence of side effects with levofloxacin/amoxicillin-based triple therapy vs quadruple therapy for Helicobacter pylori eradication. CI: Confidence interval; LA: Levofloxacin/amoxicillin.

fluoroquinolone should be used because there are no trials comparing the two drugs.

Our results are in accordance with previous metaanalyses assessing efficacy and safety of second-generation fluoroquinolones, including levofloxacin and moxifloxacin^[13,71,72,79], for *H. pylori* eradication. However, compared to previous studies, our study included the most up to date collection of RCTs and most importantly, compared exclusively second-line treatments and analyzed geographical stratification.

Our meta-analysis had several limitations, mainly due to heterogeneity among trials (different dosing schedules and duration of treatment). Sub-analyses were mainly affected by the small sample size for each category. Finally, the lack of data available on use of 10 d LA-based therapy in Asian populations did not allow a definitive conclusion about the influence of ethnicity on treatment success. Moreover, considering the suboptimal tolerance of QT in Asian populations, alternative strategies, such as 10 d LA-based therapy, and randomized trials in this geographic setting would be desirable.

In our analysis, we selected exclusively RCTs comparing LA-based triple regimens to standard QT to provide practical useful data on a specific treatment to use as rescue regimen of choice due to the rare *H. pylori* resistance to amoxicillin.

In conclusion, this meta-analysis strongly supports

the use of 10 d LA-based triple regimen as a simple (5 pills/d) second-line treatment for *H. pylori* eradication, with an excellent eradication rate and tolerability profile in comparison to standard recommended QT in Asian and European countries. Nevertheless, quinolone resistance monitoring in different geographical areas is required.

REFERENCES

- 1 **Marshall BJ**, Warren JR. Unidentified curved bacilli in the stomach of patients with gastritis and peptic ulceration. *Lancet* 1984; **1**: 1311-1315
- 2 Snaith A, El-Omar EM. Helicobacter pylori: host genetics and disease outcomes. *Expert Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2008; 2: 577-585
- 3 Vakil N, Megraud F. Eradication therapy for Helicobacter pylori. *Gastroenterology* 2007; **133**: 985-1001
- 4 Sachs G, Scott DR. Helicobacter pylori: Eradication or Preservation. F1000 Med Rep 2012; 4: 7
- 5 Alakkari A, Zullo A, O'Connor HJ. Helicobacter pylori and nonmalignant diseases. *Helicobacter* 2011; **16** Suppl 1: 33-37
- 6 Malfertheiner P, Megraud F, O'Morain C, Bazzoli F, El-Omar E, Graham D, Hunt R, Rokkas T, Vakil N, Kuipers EJ. Current concepts in the management of Helicobacter pylori infection: the Maastricht III Consensus Report. *Gut* 2007; 56: 772-781
- 7 Zullo A, Perna F, Hassan C, Ricci C, Saracino I, Morini S, Vaira D. Primary antibiotic resistance in Helicobacter pylori strains isolated in northern and central Italy. *Aliment Phar-*

macol Ther 2007; 25: 1429-1434

- 8 Mégraud F. Detection of Helicobacter pylori and its sensitivity to antibiotics. A step forward in the use of molecular methods. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol* 2007; **31**: 790-791
- 9 Egan BJ, Katicic M, O'Connor HJ, O'Morain CA. Treatment of Helicobacter pylori. *Helicobacter* 2007; 12 Suppl 1: 31-37
- 10 Megraud F. Helicobacter pylori and antibiotic resistance. Gut 2007; 56: 1502
- 11 Wolle K, Malfertheiner P. Treatment of Helicobacter pylori. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2007; **21**: 315-324
- 12 **Cover TL**, Blaser MJ. Helicobacter pylori in health and disease. *Gastroenterology* 2009; **136**: 1863-1873
- 13 Gisbert JP. "Rescue" regimens after Helicobacter pylori treatment failure. World J Gastroenterol 2008; 14: 5385-5402
- 14 Graham DY. Efficient identification and evaluation of effective Helicobacter pylori therapies. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009; 7: 145-148
- 15 Gisbert JP, Bermejo F, Castro-Fernández M, Pérez-Aisa A, Fernández-Bermejo M, Tomas A, Barrio J, Bory F, Almela P, Sánchez-Pobre P, Cosme A, Ortiz V, Niño P, Khorrami S, Benito LM, Carneros JA, Lamas E, Modolell I, Franco A, Ortuño J, Rodrigo L, García-Durán F, O'Callaghan E, Ponce J, Valer MP, Calvet X. Second-line rescue therapy with levofloxacin after H. pylori treatment failure: a Spanish multicenter study of 300 patients. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2008; 103: 71-76
- 16 Caselli M, Zullo A, Maconi G, Parente F, Alvisi V, Casetti T, Sorrentino D, Gasbarrini G. "Cervia II Working Group Report 2006": guidelines on diagnosis and treatment of Helicobacter pylori infection in Italy. *Dig Liver Dis* 2007; 39: 782-789
- 17 Malfertheiner P, Mégraud F, O'Morain C, Hungin AP, Jones R, Axon A, Graham DY, Tytgat G. Current concepts in the management of Helicobacter pylori infection--the Maastricht 2-2000 Consensus Report. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2002; 16: 167-180
- 18 Klotz U. Pharmacokinetic considerations in the eradication of Helicobacter pylori. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2000; 38: 243-270
- 19 Wong WM, Gu Q, Chu KM, Yee YK, Fung FM, Tong TS, Chan AO, Lai KC, Chan CK, Wong BC. Lansoprazole, levofloxacin and amoxicillin triple therapy vs. quadruple therapy as second-line treatment of resistant Helicobacter pylori infection. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2006; 23: 421-427
- 20 Perna F, Zullo A, Ricci C, Hassan C, Morini S, Vaira D. Levofloxacin-based triple therapy for Helicobacter pylori retreatment: role of bacterial resistance. *Dig Liver Dis* 2007; 39: 1001-1005
- 21 Nista EC, Candelli M, Cremonini F, Cazzato IA, Di Caro S, Gabrielli M, Santarelli L, Zocco MA, Ojetti V, Carloni E, Cammarota G, Gasbarrini G, Gasbarrini A. Levofloxacinbased triple therapy vs. quadruple therapy in second-line Helicobacter pylori treatment: a randomized trial. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2003; **18**: 627-633
- 22 Fischbach LA, van Zanten S, Dickason J. Meta-analysis: the efficacy, adverse events, and adherence related to first-line anti-Helicobacter pylori quadruple therapies. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2004; **20**: 1071-1082
- 23 Gasbarrini A, Lauritano EC, Nista EC, Candelli M, Gabrielli M, Santoro M, Zocco MA, Cazzato A, Finizio R, Ojetti V, Cammarota G, Gasbarrini G. Rifaximin-based regimens for eradication of Helicobacter pylori: a pilot study. *Dig Dis* 2006; 24: 195-200
- 24 Guslandi M. Review article: alternative antibacterial agents for Helicobacter pylori eradication. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2001; 15: 1543-1547
- 25 Cammarota G, Cianci R, Cannizzaro O, Martino A, Fedeli P, Lecca PG, di Caro S, Cesaro P, Branca G, Gasbarrini G. Highdose vs low-dose clarithromycin in 1-week triple therapy, including rabeprazole and levofloxacin, for Helicobacter pylori eradication. J Clin Gastroenterol 2004; 38: 110-114

- 26 De Francesco V, Ierardi E, Hassan C, Zullo A. Furazolidone therapy for Helicobacter pylori: is it effective and safe? *World J Gastroenterol* 2009; 15: 1914-1915
- 27 Fung HB, Doan TL. Tinidazole: a nitroimidazole antiprotozoal agent. *Clin Ther* 2005; **27**: 1859-1884
- 28 Gisbert JP, Gisbert JL, Marcos S, Jimenez-Alonso I, Moreno-Otero R, Pajares JM. Empirical rescue therapy after Helicobacter pylori treatment failure: a 10-year single-centre study of 500 patients. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2008; 27: 346-354
- 29 Perri F, Festa V, Merla A, Barberani F, Pilotto A, Andriulli A. Randomized study of different 'second-line' therapies for Helicobacter pylori infection after failure of the standard 'Maastricht triple therapy'. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2003; 18: 815-820
- 30 Osato MS, Reddy SG, Piergies AA, Bochenek WJ, Testa RT, Graham DY. Comparative efficacy of new investigational agents against Helicobacter pylori. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2001; 15: 487-492
- 31 Vítor JM, Vale FF. Alternative therapies for Helicobacter pylori: probiotics and phytomedicine. *FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol* 2011; **63**: 153-164
- 32 Anderson VR, Perry CM. Levofloxacin : a review of its use as a high-dose, short-course treatment for bacterial infection. *Drugs* 2008; 68: 535-565
- 33 Wimer SM, Schoonover L, Garrison MW. Levofloxacin: a therapeutic review. *Clin Ther* 1998; **20**: 1049-1070
- 34 Kim JM, Kim JS, Kim N, Jung HC, Song IS. Distribution of fluoroquinolone MICs in Helicobacter pylori strains from Korean patients. J Antimicrob Chemother 2005; 56: 965-967
- 35 Nista EC, Candelli M, Fini L, Cazzato IA, Finizio R, Laurkano C, Cammarota C, Martino A, Gasbarrini G, Gasbarrini A. 10 days levofloxacin based triple therapy in second-line treatment for Helicobacter pylori eradication. *Gastroenterol*ogy 2004; **126** (4 Suppl 2): A-74
- 36 Nista EC, Candelli M, Santoro M, Cazzato IA, Finizio R, Fini L, Ojetti V, Zocco MA, Gabrielli M, Santarelli L, D'antona G, Cammarota G, Gasbarrini GB, Gasbarrini A. Levofloxacin base triple therapy in second-line treatment for H. pylori eradication: Update. *Gastroeneterology* 2005; **128**: A-63
- 37 Zhang Y, Wu J, Jia YG. Rescue regimen after Helicobacter pylori eradication failure with triple therapy. *Chin J Clin Pharmacol* 2008; 24: 361-363
- 38 Orsi P, Pinazzi O, Aragona G, Di Mario F. Rabeprazole/levofloxacin based triple therapy as a salvatage treatment after failure of H. pylori eradication with standard regimens. *Helicobacter* 2003; 8: 339-493
- 39 Bilardi C, Dulbecco P, Zentilin P, Reglioni S, Iiritano E, Parodi A, Accornero L, Savarino E, Mansi C, Mamone M, Vigneri S, Savarino V. A 10-day levofloxacin-based therapy in patients with resistant Helicobacter pylori infection: a controlled trial. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2004; 2: 997-1002
- 40 Gisbert JP, Gisbert JL, Marcos S, Moreno-Otero R, Pajares JM. Levofloxacin- vs. ranitidine bismuth citrate-containing therapy after H. pylori treatment failure. *Helicobacter* 2007; 12: 68-73
- 41 **Kuo CH**, Hu HM, Kuo FC, Hsu PI, Chen A, Yu FJ, Tsai PY, Wu IC, Wang SW, Li CJ, Weng BC, Chang LL, Jan CM, Wang WM, Wu DC. Efficacy of levofloxacin-based rescue therapy for Helicobacter pylori infection after standard triple therapy: a randomized controlled trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2009; **63**: 1017-1024
- 42 Jung HS, Shim KN, Baik SJ, Na YJ, Kang MJ, Jung JM, Ha CY, Jung SA, Yoo K. [Efficacy of levofloxacin-based triple therapy as second-line Helicobacter pylori eradication]. *Korean J Gastroenterol* 2008; **51**: 285-290
- 43 Zhang Y, Wu J, Jia YG. Observation on effect of levofloxacin-based therapy as a salvage therapy to Helicobacter pylori. *Chin J Dig* 2007; **19**: 320-321
- 44 **Wong WM**, Wong WM, Chu KM, Yee YK. Randomized controlled trial of lansoprazole, levofloxacin and amoxycil-



lin tryple therapy vs lansoprazole-based quadruple therapy as a rescue treatment after failure of Helicobacter pylori (H. pylori) eradication with standard triple therapies. *Gut* 2004; **53** (Suppl VI): A-124

- 45 Selgrad M, Malfertheiner P. Treatment of Helicobacter pylori. Curr Opin Gastroenterol 2011; 27: 565-570
- 46 Selgrad M, Bornschein J, Malfertheiner P. Guidelines for treatment of Helicobacter pylori in the East and West. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther* 2011; 9: 581-588
- 47 Chuah SK, Tsay FW, Hsu PI, Wu DC. A new look at anti-Helicobacter pylori therapy. World J Gastroenterol 2011; 17: 3971-3975
- 48 De Francesco V, Giorgio F, Hassan C, Manes G, Vannella L, Panella C, Ierardi E, Zullo A. Worldwide H. pylori antibiotic resistance: a systematic review. J Gastrointestin Liver Dis 2010; 19: 409-414
- 49 McNulty CA, Lasseter G, Shaw I, Nichols T, D'Arcy S, Lawson AJ, Glocker E. Is Helicobacter pylori antibiotic resistance surveillance needed and how can it be delivered? *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2012; 35: 1221-1230
- 50 Levofloxacin. Tuberculosis (Edinb) 2008; 88: 119-121
- 51 **Croom KF**, Goa KL. Levofloxacin: a review of its use in the treatment of bacterial infections in the United States. *Drugs* 2003; **63**: 2769-2802
- 52 O'Connor A, Gisbert JP, McNamara D, O'Morain C. Treatment of Helicobacter pylori infection 2011. *Helicobacter* 2011; 16 Suppl 1: 53-58
- 53 Albertson TE, Dean NC, El Solh AA, Gotfried MH, Kaplan C, Niederman MS. Fluoroquinolones in the management of community-acquired pneumonia. *Int J Clin Pract* 2010; 64: 378-388
- 54 **Schiller DS**, Parikh A. Identification, pharmacologic considerations, and management of prostatitis. *Am J Geriatr Pharmacother* 2011; **9**: 37-48
- 55 Liu HH. Safety profile of the fluoroquinolones: focus on levofloxacin. *Drug Saf* 2010; **33**: 353-369
- 56 Di Caro S, Zocco MA, Cremonini F, Candelli M, Nista EC, Bartolozzi F, Armuzzi A, Cammarota G, Santarelli L, Gasbarrini A. Levofloxacin based regimens for the eradication of Helicobacter pylori. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2002; 14: 1309-1312
- 57 **Sprandel KA**, Rodvold KA. Safety and tolerability of fluoroquinolones. *Clin Cornerstone* 2003; Suppl 3: S29-S36
- 58 Carothers JJ, Bruce MG, Hennessy TW, Bensler M, Morris JM, Reasonover AL, Hurlburt DA, Parkinson AJ, Coleman JM, McMahon BJ. The relationship between previous fluoroquinolone use and levofloxacin resistance in Helicobacter pylori infection. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007; **44**: e5-e8
- 59 Katelaris PH. Helicobacter pylori: antibiotic resistance and treatment options. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009; 24: 1155-1157
- 60 Fock KM, Katelaris P, Sugano K, Ang TL, Hunt R, Talley NJ, Lam SK, Xiao SD, Tan HJ, Wu CY, Jung HC, Hoang BH, Kachintorn U, Goh KL, Chiba T, Rani AA. Second Asia-Pacific Consensus Guidelines for Helicobacter pylori infection. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009; 24: 1587-1600
- 61 **Miyachi H**, Miki I, Aoyama N, Shirasaka D, Matsumoto Y, Toyoda M, Mitani T, Morita Y, Tamura T, Kinoshita S, Okano Y, Kumagai S, Kasuga M. Primary levofloxacin resistance and gyrA/B mutations among Helicobacter pylori in Japan. *Helicobacter* 2006; **11**: 243-249
- 62 Lee CC, Lee VW, Chan FK, Ling TK. Levofloxacin-resistant Helicobacter pylori in Hong Kong. *Chemotherapy* 2008; 54: 50-53
- 63 **Huang LP**, Zhuang ML, Gu CP. [Antimicrobial resistance of 36 strains of Helicobacter pylori in adolescents]. *Zhongguo Dangdai Erke Zazhi* 2009; **11**: 210-212
- 64 Liu G, Xu X, He L, Ding Z, Gu Y, Zhang J, Zhou L. Primary

antibiotic resistance of Helicobacter pylori isolated from Beijing children. *Helicobacter* 2011; **16**: 356-362

- 65 Cabrita J, Oleastro M, Matos R, Manhente A, Cabral J, Barros R, Lopes AI, Ramalho P, Neves BC, Guerreiro AS. Features and trends in Helicobacter pylori antibiotic resistance in Lisbon area, Portugal (1990-1999). J Antimicrob Chemother 2000; 46: 1029-1031
- 66 Fujimura S, Kato S, Iinuma K, Watanabe A. In vitro activity of fluoroquinolone and the gyrA gene mutation in Helicobacter pylori strains isolated from children. *J Med Microbiol* 2004; 53: 1019-1022
- 67 Heep M, Kist M, Strobel S, Beck D, Lehn N. Secondary resistance among 554 isolates of Helicobacter pylori after failure of therapy. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 2000; 19: 538-541
- 68 Cuadrado-Lavín A, Salcines-Caviedes JR, Carrascosa MF, Mellado P, Monteagudo I, Llorca J, Cobo M, Campos MR, Ayestarán B, Fernández-Pousa A, González-Colominas E. Antimicrobial susceptibility of Helicobacter pylori to six antibiotics currently used in Spain. J Antimicrob Chemother 2012; 67: 170-173
- 69 Vécsei A, Kipet A, Innerhofer A, Graf U, Binder C, Gizci H, Hammer K, Bruckdorfer A, Huber WD, Hirschl AM, Makristathis A. Time trends of Helicobacter pylori resistance to antibiotics in children living in Vienna, Austria. *Helicobacter* 2010; **15**: 214-220
- 70 Gisbert JP, Morena F. Systematic review and meta-analysis: levofloxacin-based rescue regimens after Helicobacter pylori treatment failure. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2006; 23: 35-44
- 71 **Saad RJ**, Schoenfeld P, Kim HM, Chey WD. Levofloxacinbased triple therapy vs bismuth-based quadruple therapy for persistent Helicobacter pylori infection: a meta-analysis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2006; **101**: 488-496
- 72 Li Y, Huang X, Yao L, Shi R, Zhang G. Advantages of Moxifloxacin and Levofloxacin-based triple therapy for secondline treatments of persistent Helicobacter pylori infection: a meta analysis. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* 2010; **122**: 413-422
- 73 Tursi A, Elisei W, Giorgetti G, Picchio M, Brandimarte G. Efficacy, tolerability, and factors affecting the efficacy of the sequential therapy in curing Helicobacter pylori infection in clinical setting. *J Investig Med* 2011; **59**: 917-920
- 74 Malfertheiner P, Bazzoli F, Delchier JC, Celiñski K, Giguère M, Rivière M, Mégraud F. Helicobacter pylori eradication with a capsule containing bismuth subcitrate potassium, metronidazole, and tetracycline given with omeprazole vs clarithromycin-based triple therapy: a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2011; **377**: 905-913
- 75 Di Caro S, Franceschi F, Mariani A, Thompson F, Raimondo D, Masci E, Testoni A, La Rocca E, Gasbarrini A. Second-line levofloxacin-based triple schemes for Helicobacter pylori eradication. *Dig Liver Dis* 2009; **41**: 480-485
- 76 Bruce MG, Maaroos HI. Epidemiology of Helicobacter pylori infection. *Helicobacter* 2008; 13 Suppl 1: 1-6
- 77 Goh KL, Chan WK, Shiota S, Yamaoka Y. Epidemiology of Helicobacter pylori infection and public health implications. *Helicobacter* 2011; 16 Suppl 1: 1-9
- 78 Hori K, Miwa H, Matsumoto T. Efficacy of 2-week, secondline Helicobacter pylori eradication therapy using rabeprazole, amoxicillin, and metronidazole for the Japanese population. *Helicobacter* 2011; 16: 234-240
- 79 Cheng HC, Chang WL, Chen WY, Yang HB, Wu JJ, Sheu BS. Levofloxacin-containing triple therapy to eradicate the persistent H. pylori after a failed conventional triple therapy. *Helicobacter* 2007; 12: 359-363
- 80 Lee JH, Hong SP, Kwon CI, Phyun LH, Lee BS, Song HU, Ko KH, Hwang SG, Park PW, Rim KS, Kim S. [The efficacy of levofloxacin based triple therapy for Helicobacter pylori eradication]. *Korean J Gastroenterol* 2006; **48**: 19-24

S- Editor Lv S L- Editor Kerr C E- Editor Xiong L

