

Oral presentations
Sunday, October 5, 2025

Opening Plenary

13:30-15:00 / Room 6.2B

of interest.

OP025

LITERATURE-BASED *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* RESISTANCE DATA INTEGRATED INTO THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG): LIMITED USEFULNESS FOR PREDICTING FIRST-LINE EMPIRICAL TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS

I. Kirrout¹, B. Nafria², Á. Pérez-Aísa³, B. Tepes⁴, I. Voynovan⁵, S.J. Martínez-Domínguez⁶, A.J. Lucendo⁷, L. Vologzhanina⁸, S. Abdulkhakov⁹, J. Tejedor-Tejada¹⁰, T. Ilchishina¹¹, B. Starostin¹², A. Sarsenbaeva¹³, M. Pavoni¹⁴, O. Zaytsev¹⁵, J.M. Huguet¹⁶, A.G. Gravina¹⁷, A. Garre¹⁸, M. Perona¹⁹, S. Alekseenko²⁰, M. Soledad Marcos²¹, M. Pabón-Carrasco²², O. Núñez Martínez²³, A. Andreev²⁴, M. Areia²⁵, J. Barrio²⁶, A. Moreno²⁷, B.J. Gómez Rodríguez²⁸, P. Bogomolov²⁹, M. Denkovski³⁰, I. Bakulin³¹, I. Ortiz Polo³², N. Bakulina³¹, M. Domínguez Cajal³³, D.S. Bordin³⁴, A. Gasbarrini³⁵, R. Pinto³⁶, M. Sánchez Alonso³⁷, R. Pajares Villarroya³⁸, I. Arteagoitia³⁹, M. Jiménez-Moreno⁴⁰, P. Parra¹⁸, O.P. Nyssen¹⁸, L. Bujanda², A. Cano-Catala⁴¹, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴², F. Mégraud⁴³, C. O'Morain⁴⁴, N. Montes¹, J. P. Gisbert¹⁸, on behalf of the Hp-EuReg investigators.

Ismail Kirrout and Beatriz Nafria, both first authors, contributed equally to the manuscript. Nuria Montes and Javier P. Gisbert, both senior authors, contributed equally to the manuscript.

¹Unidad de Metodología, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa); Servicio de Reumatología, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa; Plant Physiology, Pharmaceutical and Health Sciences Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universidad San Pablo-CEU, CEU-Universities, Boadilla del Monte, Spain,

²Department of Gastroenterology, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Department of Medicine, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), San Sebastián, Spain,

³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), Marbella, Spain,

⁴Department of Gastroenterology, DC Rogaska, Rogaska Slatina, Slovenia, ⁵A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Zaragoza, Spain, ⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General de Tomelloso, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Tomelloso, Spain, ⁸Gastrocentr, Perm, Russian Federation, ⁹Kazan (Volga region) Federal university, Kazan State Medical University, Kazan, Russian Federation, ¹⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Asturias, Spain, ¹¹Department of Gastroenterology, SM-clinic, Saint-Petersburg, Russian

Federation, ¹²Saint-Petersburg State Budgetary Institution Healthcare City Polyclinic 38, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation,

¹³Department of Gastroenterology, Chelyabinsk Regional Clinical Hospital, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation, ¹⁴Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Sant'Orsola-Malpighi University Hospital, Bologna, Italy, ¹⁵First Clinical Medical Centre, Kovrov, Russian Federation, ¹⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Valencia, Spain, ¹⁷Department of Hepatogastroenterology, University of study of Campania "L. Vanvitelli", Naples, Italy, ¹⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ¹⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Quirón Marbella, Marbella, Spain, ²⁰Far Eastern State Medical University, Khabarovsk, Russian Federation, ²¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain, ²²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Sevilla, Spain, ²³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario La Moraleja, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad CEU San Pablo, Madrid, Spain, ²⁴Russian University of Medicine, Moscow, Russian Federation, ²⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Portuguese Oncology Institute of Coimbra, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto (FMUP), RISE@CI-IPO (Health Research Network), Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO Porto), Coimbra, Portugal, ²⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Gerencia Regional de Salud de Castilla y León (SACYL), Valladolid, Spain, ²⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Sevilla, Spain, ²⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Sevilla, Spain, ²⁹Universal Clinic Private Medical Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁰Interni oddelek, Diagnostic Centre, Bled, Slovenia, ³¹Department of Gastroenterology, Mechnikov North-Western State Medical University, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ³²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario y Politécnico la Fe, Valencia, Spain, ³³Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Hospital Universitario San Jorge, Huesca, Spain, ³⁴Department of Pancreatic, Biliary and upper digestive tract disorders, A. S. Loginov Moscow clinical scientific center, Department of outpatient therapy and family medicine, Tver State Medical University, Department of propaedeutic of internal diseases and gastroenterology, Russian University of Medicine, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁵Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy, ³⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Instituto De Ciências Biomédicas de Abel Salazar, Universidade do Porto, Center for Research in Health Technologies and Information Systems (CINTESIS), Porto, Portugal, ³⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Santa Bárbara, Ciudad Real, Spain, ³⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, ³⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Cruces, Vizcaya, Spain, ⁴⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Burgos, Spain, ⁴¹Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut

de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, ⁴³INSERM U1312 BRIC, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France, ⁴⁴Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland.

Contact E-Mail Address: opn.aegredcap@aegastro.es

Introduction: *Helicobacter pylori* infection is the primary cause of gastritis, peptic ulcer disease, and gastric cancer. Without an effective vaccine, eradication therapy is essential for disease control. However, rising antibiotic resistance worldwide has compromised treatment effectiveness, highlighting the need to evaluate how literature-based resistance rate data can inform the success of eradication regimens in clinical practice.

Aims & Methods: Current study aimed to assess whether such literature-based data could reliably predict the outcomes of first-line empirical eradication therapy. Antibiotic resistance data for clarithromycin, metronidazole, and levo-floxacin were obtained through a systematic review of published studies. Resistance prevalence was calculated for three timeframes: the year of treatment, the preceding year, and a weighted average over the current and previous four years. These rates were matched with data from the European Registry on *H. pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg), a prospective, real-world study involving first-line empirical *H. pylori* treatments and their outcomes. Data collected spanned from 2008 to 2024 and encompassed 23 countries. Modified intention-to-treat analyses were conducted using multivariate logistic regression with 10,000 stratified bootstraps, adjusting for covariates such as patient age, sex, country, year of prescription, first-line treatment regimen, proton pump inhibitor dosage, treatment duration, compliance, and assigned resistance values. Additional analyses assessed whether resistance to a specific antibiotic impacted each treatment effectiveness containing that antibiotic.

Results: A total of 18,219 patients from 13 European countries were included in the final analysis. Accounting all first-line empirical treatments, resistance to clarithromycin and levofloxacin in the current year influenced treatment effectiveness in opposite directions. Clarithromycin resistance was associated with a slight increase in treatment success (OR=1.02, 95%CI 1.00-1.03); whereas levofloxacin resistance was associated with a slight decrease (OR=0.98, 95%CI 0.97-1.00, respectively). Both associations had minimal effect sizes with questionable clinical relevance. Resistance to clarithromycin from the previous year was also paradoxically associated with improved treatment effectiveness (OR=1.01, 95%CI 1.00-1.02).

For standard clarithromycin-amoxicillin triple therapy, a higher rate of clarithromycin resistance (both current and over the preceding four years) was slightly associated with reduced treatment success (OR=0.99, 95%CI 0.99-1.00).

For clarithromycin-metronidazole triple therapy, resistance rate to clarithromycin was not associated with effectiveness (OR=0.97, 95%CI 0.93-1.01); while metronidazole resistance showed a slightly association with reduced effectiveness (OR=0.96, 95%CI 0.93-1.00).

For all other regimens evaluated, no significant associations were observed between specific antibiotic resistance rates—whether current or past—and the likelihood of successful *H. pylori* eradication.

Conclusion: Despite several statistically significant associations between resistance patterns and treatment outcomes, the effect sizes were minimal and of questionable clinical relevance. Thus, the reliability of antibiotic resistance data from external (literature-based) cohorts appears negligible and of limited utility in influencing the clinical choice of first-line therapies for *H. pylori* infection in real-world settings.

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

LONG-TERM EFFECT OF MACROLIDE CONSUMPTION ON *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* ERADICATION TREATMENTS: DATA FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

O.P. Nyssen¹, G.J. Ortega², L. Jonaitis³, Á. Pérez-Aísa⁴, B. Tepes⁵, A.J. Lucendo⁶, J. Tejedor-Tejada⁷, R. Bumane⁸, A. Garre¹, J.M. Huguet⁹, M. Perona¹⁰, O. Núñez Martínez¹¹, M. Pabón-Carrasco¹², M. Castro-Fernández¹², M. Areia¹³, J. Barrio¹⁴, A. Moreno¹⁵, T. Butler¹⁶, M. Soledad Marcos¹⁷, A. Keco-Huerta¹⁸, M. Domínguez Cajal¹⁹, M. Denkovski²⁰, M. Pavoni²¹, G.M. Buzás²², F. Lerang²³, G. Losurdo²⁴, P.M. Wolfe García²⁵, P. S. Phull²⁶, S.J. Martínez-Domínguez²⁷, J. Kupcinskis³, M. Leja⁸, R. Pinto²⁸, S. Smith²⁹, A. Gasbarrini³⁰, V. Papp³¹, B.J. Gómez-Rodríguez¹⁸, M. Sánchez Alonso³², R. Pajares Villarroya³³, P. Pazo Mejide³⁴, M. Jiménez-Moreno³⁵, M. Pascual-Mato³⁶, C. Bravo-Pache³⁷, M. Montes³⁸, A. Cano-Catala³⁹, P. Parra¹, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴⁰, F. Mégraud⁴¹, C. O'Morain²⁹, L. Bujanda⁴², J. P. Gisbert¹, on behalf of the Hp-EuReg investigators. Olga P. Nyssen and Guillermo J. Ortega, both first authors, contributed equally. Luis Bujanda and Javier P. Gisbert, both senior authors, contributed equally.

¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²Unidad de Análisis de Datos, Hospital Universitario de la Princesa, CONICET, Universidad Nacional de Quilmes—Argentina, Madrid, Spain, ³Department

of Gastroenterology, Hospital 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain, ¹⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁹Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Hospital Universitario San Jorge, Huesca, Spain, ²⁰Interni oddelek, Diagnostic Centre, Bled, Slovenia, ²¹Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Sant'Orsola-Malpighi University Hospital, Bologna, Italy, ²²Department of Gastroenterology, Ferencváros Health Center, Budapest, Hungary, ²³Østfold Hospital Trust, Grålum, Norway, ²⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Department of Precision and Regenerative Medicine and Ionian Area, University of Bari, Bari, Italy, ²⁵Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Hospital Sierrallana, Torrelavega, Spain, ²⁶Department of Digestive Disorders, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Aberdeen, United Kingdom, ²⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Zaragoza, Spain, ²⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Instituto De Ciências Biomédicas de Abel Salazar, Universidade do Porto, Center for Research in Health Technologies and Information Systems (CINTESIS), Porto, Portugal, ²⁹School of Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, ³⁰Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy, ³¹Department of Surgery, Transplantation and Gastroenterology, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary, ³²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Santa Bárbara, Ciudad Real, Spain, ³³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, ³⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital de Cruces, Barakaldo,

of Gastroenterology, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania, ⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), ., Marbella, Spain, ⁵Department of Gastroenterology, DC Rogaska, Rogaska Slatina, Slovenia, ⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General de Tomelloso, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Tomelloso, Spain, ⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Asturias, Spain, ⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Digestive Diseases Centre, Institute of Clinical and Preventive Medicine, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia, ⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Valencia, Spain, ¹⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Quirón Marbella, Marbella, Spain, ¹¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario La Moraleja, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad CEU San Pablo, Madrid, Spain, ¹²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Sevilla, Spain, ¹³Department of Gastroenterology, Portuguese Oncology Institute of Coimbra, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto (FMUP), RISE@CI-IPO (Health Research Network), Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO Porto), Coimbra, Portugal, ¹⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Gerencia Regional de Salud de Castilla y León (SACYL), Valladolid, Spain, ¹⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁶Clinical Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Department of Gastroenterology, Tallaght University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland, ¹⁷Department Spain, ³⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Burgos, Spain, ³⁶Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Clinical and Translational Research in Digestive Diseases, Valdecilla Research Institute (IDIVAL), Marqués de Valdecilla University Hospital, Santander, Spain, ³⁷Centro de Salud María Auxiliadora (SERMAS), Madrid, Spain, ³⁸Department of Microbiology, Donostia University Hospital-Biodonostia Health Research Institute, San Sebastián, Spain, ³⁹Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, ⁴¹INSERM U1312 BRIC, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France, ⁴²Department of Gastroenterology, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Department of Medicine, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), San Sebastián, Spain.

Contact E-Mail Address: opn.aegredcap@aegastro.es

Introduction: Previous antibiotic use influences the antibiotic resistance of *H. pylori*. However, the specific impact of prior clarithromycin use on the success of eradication therapies remains unclear.

Aims & Methods: The objective of this study was to examine the association between prior macrolide (particularly clarithromycin) consumption in the general population and the effectiveness of *H. pylori* eradication regimens in treatment-naïve patients. A retrospective, observational, multicentre, and ecological study was conducted. Multivariate logistic regression was performed with the modified intention-to-treat effectiveness as the main outcome. Key variables included first-line clarithromycin-based treatments, therapy duration (7, 10, 14 days), proton pump inhibitor dose (low, standard, high), compliance (>90%), and clarithromycin consumption (defined daily doses/1,000 inhabitants/day, from the European Surveillance of Antimicrobial Consumption Network). Nested hierarchical models incorporated macrolide consumption, matched by year and country, and assessed the interaction between consumption and first-line empirical treatments from the European Registry on *H. pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg).

Results: The study included 27,549 naïve patients from 23 countries with macrolide consumption data from 2013 to 2022. Higher macrolide consumption, within 0 to 8 years before treatment was associated with reduced treatment effectiveness. The eradication rate consistently decreased as macrolide consumption increased, particularly within the previous four years. The efficacy of triple-clarithromycin-metronidazole, triple-clarithromycin-amoxicillin, and some bismuth-quadruple therapies containing clarithromycin decreased with higher macrolide consumption. The eradication rate decreased from 93% to 82% when clarithromycin consumption occurred 2 years before treatment. Table 1 presents the effects of macrolide consumption delays (0 to 8 years) on treatment effectiveness for each evaluated regimen, revealing consistent patterns

	Years of delay								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Triple-CA:Macrolides	0.65	0.80			0.76	0.61	0.56	0.72	0.63
Triple-CM:Macrolides	0.35	0.50	0.51	0.55		0.60	0.57		
Conco-CAT CAM:Macrolides			1.25	1.18					
Seq-CAT-CAM:Macrolides	0.78					1.18			
Quad-CAB:Macrolides		0.56	0.53			6.44		88,000	0.009

The table displays significant (<0.05) odds ratios for interaction terms in macrolide-based treatments across delay cases. A: amoxicillin; B: bismuth; C: clarithromycin; M: metronidazole; T: tinidazole.

Table 1. Effect on treatment effectiveness of the interaction between *H. pylori* eradication treatments and macrolide consumption in the community throughout the full range of delays between macrolide consumption and treatment.

Conclusion: Higher macrolide consumption in the general population negatively impacts the effectiveness of first-line *H. pylori* clarithromycin-containing eradication treatments, with the effect decreasing after 5 years of exposure.

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex. Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Poster presentations
Sunday, October 5, 2025

VONOPRAZAN IS HIGHLY EFFECTIVE AND SAFE AS AN ADJUVANT IN DIFFERENT REGIMENS IN FIRST- AND RESCUE-LINE THERAPIES FOR *H. PYLORI* INFECTION IN BRAZIL

S. Rodrigues Chaves^{1,2}, O.P. Nyssen³, J.C. Soares Veloso⁴, L. Soares da Silva⁵, J. Marinho⁶, H. Okamoto⁷, G. Coutinho Couto⁸, H. Breyer⁹, C. Alencar¹⁰, E. Comelli Jr¹¹, L.A.S. Sousa¹², M. Horn Andre¹³, M.J. Gilberto Massote¹⁴, M. Loures¹⁵, M.D.F. Pietroluongo Vidal¹⁶, R. Vicente de Paula¹⁷, L. Tenório Ribeiro¹⁸, B. Squárcio Sanches¹⁹, H. Galizzi²⁰, D. Antônio de Albuquerque Terra²¹, G. Cançado²², B. Possobon Burmann²³, J. Caetano²⁴, L. Fernando Pena²⁵, M. Augusto Moreira Decanio²⁶, H. Siffert Pereira de Souza²⁷, A. Kuniyoshi²⁸, L. Guedes², M.d.C. Friche Passos²⁹, F. Passos Marinho³⁰, I. Zanotelli Bombassaro³⁰, A. Domingues³¹, J. Garcia Barbosa³², I. Martins Nogueira³³, A.F. Passos Ramos³⁰, D. Korman²², T. Barbosa Souza³⁴, M. Chiara Barbosa³⁵, D. Chinzon³⁶, L. Lima da Silva³⁷, A. Mantovani³⁸, A. Hemerly de Almeida Freitas³⁹, C. Poncinelli⁴⁰, M. Alexandre Francato⁴¹, J. Nader Gonçalves⁴², P. Parra⁴³, A. Cano-Catala⁴⁴, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴⁵, J. P. Gisbert³, L. Coelho²⁹, on behalf of the Hp-BrazilReg investigators. Javier P. Gisbert and Luiz Coelho, both senior authors, contributed equally to the study. ¹Federal University of Minas Gerais, School of Medicine, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²Rede Mater Dei de Saúde, Gastroenterologia, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ³Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ⁴Hospital Santa Helena, Brasília, Brazil, ⁵Hospital Adventista de Manaus, Manaus, Brazil, ⁶Universidade Estadual de Ciências da Saúde de Alagoas - UNCISAL, Maceió, Brazil, ⁷Oxford Medical Center, Gastro, Sao Bento Sul, Brazil, ⁸Centro de Consultas Especializadas, Contagem, Brazil, ⁹Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul/Clinics Hospital, Gastroenterology, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ¹⁰Clinicas Reunidas São Victor, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ¹¹Clinica Castromed, Castro, Brazil, ¹²Coopeclin, Recife, Brazil, ¹³Clinica Endocentro, Florianópolis, Brazil, ¹⁴Unidade de Saude, Santos, Brazil, ¹⁵Hospita Nossa Senhora Das Graças, Curitiba, Brazil, ¹⁶Hospital Ana Costa, Santos, Brazil, ¹⁷Clinica Privada, Aracaju, Brazil, ¹⁸Hospital Universitário Prof. Alberto Antunes, Endoscopia, Maceio, Brazil, ¹⁹Biocor Instituto, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁰Hepscan, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²¹Federal University of Minas Gerais, Alfa Institute of Gastroenterology/Clinics Hospital, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²²Hospital Militar de Minas Gerais, Gastroenterologia, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²³Medplus, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ²⁴Hospital São Rafael, Gastroenterologia, Salvador, Brazil, ²⁵Socor Hospital, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁶Hospital Portugues, Salvador, Brazil, ²⁷Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Gastroenterology, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ²⁸Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Gastroenterologia, Maringá, Brazil, ²⁹Federal University of Minas Gerais/Clinics Hospital, Alfa Institute of Gastroenterology, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ³⁰Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Belo Horizonte, Gastroenterologia, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ³¹Clinica Privada, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ³²Santa Casa de Barretos, Barretos, Brazil, ³³Clinica Privada, São Paulo, Brazil, ³⁴Faculdades Integradas de Patos, Gastroenterologia, Patos de Minas, Brazil, ³⁵Clinica Privada, Arapiraca, Brazil, ³⁶University of Sao Paulo Dept. of Gastroenterology, Sao Paulo, Brazil, ³⁷Monte Sinai Hospital e Maternidade, Clínica Médica, Juiz de Fora, Brazil, ³⁸Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Gastroenterologia, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ³⁹Unimed Sul Capixaba, Cachoeiro do Itapemirim, Brazil, ⁴⁰Biogastro, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ⁴¹Hospital Municipal Antonio Giglio, Osasco, Brazil, ⁴²Federal University of Minas Gerais, Statistics, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ⁴³Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, Madrid, Spain, ⁴⁴Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) Research Group, Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁵Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions

Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Barcelona, Spain

Contact E-Mail Address: opn.aegredcap@aegastro.es

Introduction: Data about the effectiveness and safety of vonoprazan (VPZ) as an adjuvant for treating *H. pylori* are lacking in Brazil. Previous studies suggest that greater acid suppression might improve effective-ness, with an acceptable eradication rate around 90%.

Aims & Methods: To evaluate VPZ in eradication therapy in Brazil, as part of the Hp-BrazilReg, WorldHpReg's partner, a multicenter and prospective real-life registry was performed, assessing outcomes of *H. pylori* man-agement by Brazilian gastroenterologists. Data were registered at e-CRF AEG-REDCap from March 2022 to October 2024. The effectiveness was as-sessed by modified intention-to-treat (mITT) analysis. Data were subject to quality review.

Results: 2,132 Brazilian patients, with a mean age of 52 years, 61% of whom were women, were included in the mITT analysis. The main treat-ment indications were: 63% dyspepsia, 10% gastroduodenal ulcers, and 5% premalignant gastric lesions. Endoscopy was performed in 95% of the cases, using histology (90%) and/or the rapid urease test (15%) for diagnosing the infection. No pre-treatment bacterial resistance test was performed.

First-line treatments were administered to 73% (n=1,560) of cases, second-line to 18% (n=386), and rescue to 9% (n=186), with 94% of pa-tients receiving 14-day prescriptions. Low-dose (between 4.5 and 27mg of omeprazole equivalent BID), standard-dose (between 32 and 40mg of omeprazole equivalent BID), and high-dose (between 54 and 128mg of omeprazole BID) of proton pump inhibitor (PPIs) as well as 20mg BID of vonoprazan (VPZ) were used in 39%, 38%, 23%, and 15% of treatment cas-es, respectively. Probiotics were used as adjuvant in 15% of patients. Compliance (>90% drug intake) was reported in 99% of the patients. Eradication was mostly confirmed by endoscopy in 88% (histology [74%] and/or rapid urease test [14%]). The ¹⁴C-urea breath test was used in 8% of the cases. At least one adverse event was reported by 25% of patients, mainly nausea (13%), dysgeusia (8%) and diarrhea (7%).

The regimens reaching 90% eradication were: dual-VPZ+amoxicillin for first-line and rescue treatments (96% and 100%, respectively), quadru-ple VPZ+bismuth+tetracycline+metronidazole for second- and third-line treatments (92% and 90% respectively), and quadruple PPI+bis-muth+levofloxacin+amoxicillin (100%) for second-line treatment. Prescribing VPZ (vs PPI) was an independent factor associated with high-er effectiveness both in first-line (OR 2.95; IC 95%: 1.71-5.09) and in sec-ond-line and rescue treatments (OR 2.87; IC 95%: 1.69-5.13). There was no difference in adverse effects between VPZ and PPI-based regimens (p<0.01).

Conclusion: VPZ, when prescribed as an adjuvant for treating *H. pylori* infection, shows highly effective results as part of dual therapy with amox-icillin for first-line and rescue treatments, as well as in quadruple therapy with bismuth+metronidazole+ tetracycline or bismuth+amoxycillin and rifabutin for rescue treatments.

Disclosure: Nothing to disclose.

TRENDS IN THE PRESCRIPTION OF ERADICATION TREATMENTS AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS IN NAÏVE PATIENTS OVER 12 YEARS (2013-2024) IN EUROPE: DATA FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

P. Parra¹, L. Jonaitis², Á. Pérez-Aísa³, U. Mahmudov⁴, B. Tepes⁵, I. Voynovan⁶, L. Vologzhanina⁷, S.J. Martínez-Domínguez⁸, A.J. Lucendo⁹, G. Babayeva¹⁰, S. Abdulkhakov¹¹, M. Pavoni¹², J. Tejedor-Tejada¹³, M. Denkovski¹⁴, T. Ilchishina¹⁵, E. Mammadov¹⁶, G. Fadieienco¹⁶, B. Starostin¹⁷, A. Silkanovna Sarsenbaeva¹⁸, O. Zaytsev¹⁹, L. Bujanda²⁰, A. Garre¹, J.M. Huguet²¹, A.G. Gravina²², M. Perona²³, R. Hasanov²⁴, F. Guliyev²⁵, M. Pabón-Carrasco²⁶, S. Alekseenko²⁷, M. Soledad Marcos²⁸, O. Núñez Martínez²⁹, D. Andreev³⁰, E. Verdiyev³¹, M. Areia³², J. Barrio³³, O. Gridnyev¹⁶, A. Gasbarrini³⁴, J. Kupcinskas², D.S. Bordin³⁵, M. Leja³⁶, R. Pinto³⁷, R. Pajares Villarroya³⁸, I. Arteagoitia³⁹, M. Sánchez Alonso⁴⁰, A. Cano-Catala⁴¹, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴², O.P. Nysse¹, F. Mégraud⁴³, C. O'Morain⁴⁴, J. P. Gisbert¹, on behalf of the Hp-EuReg Investigators ¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²Department of Gastroenterology, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania, ³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), Marbella, Spain, ⁴Modern Hospital, Baku, Azerbaijan, ⁵Department of Gastroenterology, DC Rogaska, Rogaska Slatina, Slovenia, ⁶A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ⁷Gastrocenter, Perm, Russian Federation, ⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Zaragoza, Spain, ⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General de Tomelloso, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Tomelloso, Spain, ¹⁰Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Azerbaijan State Advanced Training Institute for Doctors named by A. Aliyev, Baku, Azerbaijan, ¹¹Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan State Medical University, Kazan, Russian Federation, ¹²Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Sant'Orsola-Malpighi University Hospital, Bologna, Italy, ¹³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Asturias, Spain, ¹⁴Interni Oddelek, Diagnostic Centre, Bled, Slovenia, ¹⁵Department of Gastroenterology, SM-clinic, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ¹⁶Departments the Division for the Study of the Digestive Diseases and its Comorbidity with Noncommunicable Diseases, Government Institution L.T. Malaya Therapy National Institute of NAMS of Ukraine, Kharkiv, Ukraine, ¹⁷Saint-Petersburg State Budgetary Institution Healthcare City Policlinic 38, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ¹⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Chelyabinsk Regional Clinical Hospital, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation, ¹⁹First Clinical Medical Centre, Kovrov, Russian Federation, ²⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Department of Medicine, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), San Sebastián, Spain, ²¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Valencia, Spain, ²²Department of Hepatogastroenterology, University of Study of Campania "L. Vanvitelli", Naples, Italy, ²³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Quirón Marbella, Marbella, Spain, ²⁴Department of Gastroenterology, German Hospital, Baku, Azerbaijan, ²⁵National Oncology Centre, Baku, Azerbaijan, ²⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Sevilla, Spain, ²⁷Far Eastern State Medical University, Khabarovsk, Russian Federation, ²⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain, ²⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario La Moraleja, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad CEU San Pablo, Madrid, Spain, ³⁰Russian University of Medicine, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³¹Department of Gastroenterology, Merkezi Klinik Xestexana, Baku, Azerbaijan,

³²Department of Gastroenterology, Portuguese Oncology Institute of Coimbra, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto (FMUP), RISE@CI-IPO (Health Research Network), Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO Porto), Coimbra, Portugal, ³³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Gerencia Regional de Salud de Castilla y León (SACYL), Valladolid, Spain, ³⁴Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy, ³⁵Department of Pancreatic, Biliary and Upper Digestive Tract Disorders, A. S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Department of Outpatient Therapy and Family Medicine, Tver State Medical University, Department of Propaedeutic of Internal Diseases and Gastroenterology, Russian University of Medicine, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Digestive Diseases Centre, Institute of Clinical and Preventive Medicine, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia, ³⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Instituto De Ciências Biomédicas de Abel Salazar, Universidade do Porto, Center for Research in Health Technologies and Information Systems (CINTESIS), Porto, Portugal, ³⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, ³⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Cruces, Vizcaya, Spain, ⁴⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Santa Bárbara, Ciudad Real, Spain, ⁴¹Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) Research Group,

Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, ⁴³INSERM U1312 BRIC, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France, ⁴⁴Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland.

Contact E-Mail Address: pablo.parra.hlp@gmail.com

Introduction: The infection by *H. pylori* can be successfully treated and eradicated if the recommendations from consensus guidelines are correctly followed. It is essential to continuously assess the applicability of these recommendations to ensure their alignment with clinical practice. **Aims & Methods:** Multicentre, prospective registry evaluating the decisions and outcomes of *Helicobacter pylori* management by European gastroenterologists (Hp-EuReg, Hp-WorldReg's partner). Data were registered at AEG-REDCap e-CRF until December 2024. Modified intention-to-treat (miITT) and time trend analyses were performed.

Results: Overall, 64,084 (84%) first-line empirical prescriptions were analysed. The total number of different therapeutic regimens prescribed exceeded 100. Triple therapy prescriptions decreased from 58% during 2013/15 to 34% in 2022/24; likewise, non-bismuth concomitant therapy use decreased from 23% in 2013/15 to 14% in 2022/24; while three-in-one single-capsule increased from 0.3% in 2013/2015 to 20% in 2022/24. An increase in the average duration of treatments, from 9.9 to 12.7 days in 2013-2024 was identified, as well as in the use of standard/high-dose of PPIs —defined as a 14-day course with standard or high-dose PPIs at >40mg omeprazole equivalent twice daily —, increasing from 36% to 61% in 2013-2024. Over 12 years of evolution, an overall improvement of ≈10% in first-line effectiveness was observed, increasing from 86% to 93%, both globally and across geographic regions (Table).

Conclusion: European gastroenterological practice is continuously adapting to the latest published evidence and recommendations—reduc-ing the use of triple therapies while increasing both treatment duration and PPI dosage—leading to a progressive improvement in overall effec-tiveness. These changes have remained consistent in recent years.

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advi-sory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/ Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Olga P. Nysen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Treatment												
Quadruple-C+A+B	1.9%	2.6%	6.5%	19%	12%	25%	13%	14%	16%	14%	17%	17%
Single-capsule*	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	14%	22%	17%	21%	19%	19%	21%	19%	20%
Quadruple-M+Tc+B	2%	1.8%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	1.3%	1.3%	1.6%	3.7%	2.4%	2.8%
Concomitant-C+A+M/T	21%	21%	27%	21%	19%	8.5%	11%	13%	14%	13%	15%	14%
Sequential-C+A+M/T	16%	9.7%	7.4%	1.9%	7.8%	7.2%	5.8%	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%	2.4%	2.1%
Triple-A+L	2.2%	2.1%	3%	1.7%	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%	2.3%	3%	2%
Triple-A+M	3.4%	2.9%	1.5%	1.5%	1.3%	0.4%	1.6%	1%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%	1.3%
Triple-C+M	3.2%	6.1%	8.1%	5.7%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%	6.4%	4.1%	3.9%	2.7%	1.7%
Triple-C+A	46%	50%	40%	29%	30%	30%	36%	33%	33%	28%	25%	21%
Therapy length												
7 days	27%	28%	23%	17%	7.3%	2.1%	2.8%	3.4%	2.9%	8.8%	3%	2.1%
10 days	57%	55%	59%	48%	52%	47%	41%	39%	43%	43%	34%	31%
14 days	17%	18%	18%	36%	40%	51%	51%	58%	54%	48%	63%	67%
PPI doses												
Low (4.5 to 27 mg omeprazole equivalents b.i.d.)	64%	55%	44%	38%	44%	31%	35%	46%	43%	37%	42%	39%
Standard (32 to 40 mg omeprazole equivalents b.i.d.)	16%	24%	24%	23%	23%	37%	29%	24%	26%	35%	31%	28%
High (54 to 128 mg omeprazole equivalents b.i.d.)	20%	22%	31%	39%	33%	32%	37%	30%	31%	29%	27%	33%
Overall effectiveness												
Eradication rate (mITT)	86%	85%	86%	88%	88%	91%	89%	89%	91%	92%	92%	93%
Effectiveness depending on geographical region												
East	92%	79%	84%	83%	82%	91%	90%	93%	93%	91%	93%	91%
East-Centre	87%	85%	86%	85%	87%	89%	89%	93%	91%	92%	94%	95%
South-West	84%	86%	86%	90%	91%	91%	88%	85%	90%	93%	92%	95%
West-Centre	89%	92%	93%	94%	89%	92%	91%	89%	89%	94%	94%	94%
North	89%	89%	89%	89%	89%	77%	84%	89%	84%	89%	77%	76%

PPI: proton pump inhibitor; mITT: modified intention-to-treat; A – amoxicillin; C – clarithromycin; M – metronidazole; T – tinidazole; L – levofloxacin B; – bismuth salts; Tc – tetracycline; East – Ukraine, Serbia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Russia, Romania, Albania, North Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Moldova, Montenegro; East-Centre – Croatia, Poland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Greece, Slovenia, Czech Rep, Azerbaijan, Slovakia, Malta, Armenia; South-West – Portugal, Spain; West-Centre – France, Austria, Belgium, Germany, Italy; North – The United Kingdom, Finland, The Netherlands, Ireland, Israel, Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark; *Three-in-one single-capsule containing metronidazole, tetracycline and bismuth.

Table. Prescriptions and effectiveness trends of first-line empirical treatments in Europe in the period 2013-2024.

EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY OF SINGLE-CAPSULE BISMUTH QUADRUPLE THERAPY IN 12,500 PATIENTS FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

P. Parra¹, Á. Pérez-Aísa², J. Tejedor-Tejada³, S.J. Martínez-Domínguez⁴, A.J. Lucendo⁵, M. Perona⁶, O. Núñez Martínez⁷, A.G. Gravina⁸, M. Soledad Marcos⁹, A. Moreno¹⁰, J.M. Huguet¹¹, F. Bermejo¹², I. Ortiz Polo¹³, A. Gasbarrini¹⁴, B.J. Gómez-Rodríguez¹⁵, M. Pavoni¹⁶, M. Pabón-Carrasco¹⁷, J. Barrio¹⁸, M. Areia¹⁹, H. Fernandes-Mendes²⁰, G. Losurdo²¹, G. Kamto²², R. Pajares Villarroya²³, E. Iyo Miyashiro²⁴, A.B. Pozo Blanco²⁵, B. Velayos²⁶, M. Planella²⁷, P. Szredzki²⁸, M. Domínguez Cajal²⁹, N. Alcaide²⁶, L. Fernández-Salazar³⁰, P. Mata-Romero³¹, V. Flores³², D. Compare³³, A. Keco-Huerga¹⁵, M. Suárez Matías³⁴, R. Rosania³⁵, A. Garre¹, R. Pinto³⁶, M. Venerito³⁵, W. Marlicz³⁷, M. Jiménez-Moreno³⁸, M. Sánchez Alonso³⁹, A. Perelló²⁴, A. Cano-Catalá⁴⁰, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴¹, O.P. Nyssen¹, F. Mégraud⁴², C. O'Morain⁴³, J. P. Gisbert¹, on behalf of the Hp-EuReg Investigators

¹Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Gastroenterology, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), Gastroenterology, Marbella, Spain, ³Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Gastroenterology, Asturias, Spain, ⁴Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Gastroenterology, Zaragoza, Spain, ⁵Hospital General de Tomelloso, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Gastroenterology, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Tomelloso, Spain, ⁶Hospital Quirón Marbella, Gastroenterology, Marbella, Spain, ⁷Hospital Universitario La Moraleja, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad CEU San Pablo, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ⁸University of Study of Campania "L. Vanvitelli", Hepatogastroenterology, Naples, Italy, ⁹Hospital 12 de Octubre, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ¹⁰Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ¹¹Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Gastroenterology, Valencia, Spain, ¹²Hospital Universitario de Fuenlabrada, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ¹³Hospital Universitario y Politécnico La Fe, Gastroenterology, Valencia, Spain, ¹⁴Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Rome, Italy, ¹⁵Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁶Sant'Orsola-Malpighi University Hospital, Medical and Surgical Sciences, Bologna, Italy, ¹⁷Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁸Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Gerencia Regional de Salud de Castilla y León (SACYL), Gastroenterology, Valladolid, Spain, ¹⁹Portuguese Oncology Institute of Coimbra, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto (FMUP), RISE@CI-IPO (Health Research Network), Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO Porto), Gastroenterology, Coimbra, Portugal,

²⁰Centro Hospitalar Universitário de Santo António, ULS de Santo António, Gastroenterology, Porto, Portugal, ²¹University of Bari, Gastroenterology and Department of Precision and Regenerative Medicine and Ionian Area, Bari, Italy, ²²Hepatic Medical, Private Medical Center, Krakow, Poland, ²³Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ²⁴Hospital Universitari Son Espases, Gastroenterology, Palma (Mallorca), Spain, ²⁵Hospital Arnau Vilanova-Lliria, Gastroenterology, Valencia, Spain, ²⁶Hospital Clínico de Valladolid, Gastroenterology, Valladolid, Spain, ²⁷Hospital Universitari Arnau de Vilanova, Institut de Recerca Biomèdica de Lleida (IRBL), Gastroenterology, Lleida, Spain, ²⁸The John Paul II City Hospital, Gastroenterology, Rzeszow, Poland, ²⁹Hospital Universitario San Jorge, Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Huesca, Spain, ³⁰Hospital Clínico de Valladolid (SACYL), Medicine Department, School of Medicine, Universidad de Valladolid, Gastroenterology, Valladolid, Spain, ³¹Hospital Universitario de Cáceres, Gastroenterology, Cáceres, Spain, ³²Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ³³University Federico II of Naples, Gastroenterology, Naples, Italy, ³⁴Hospital Virgen de la Luz, Gastroenterology, Cuenca, Spain, ³⁵Otto von Guericke University Hospital, Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Infectious Diseases, Magdeburg, Germany, ³⁶Universidade do Porto, Center for Research in Health Technologies and Information Systems (CINTESIS), Gastroenterology, Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Instituto de Ciências Biomédicas de Abel Salazar, Porto, Portugal, ³⁷Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, Centre for Digestive Diseases, Endoklinika, Gastroenterology, Szczecin, Poland, ³⁸Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Gastroenterology, Burgos, Spain, ³⁹Hospital Universitario Santa Bárbara, Gastroenterology, Ciudad Real, Spain, ⁴⁰Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) Research Group, Manresa, Spain, ⁴¹Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Barcelona, Spain, ⁴²Université de Bordeaux, INSERM U 1312 BRIC, Bordeaux, France, ⁴³Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

Contact E-Mail Address: pablo.parra.hlp@gmail.com

Introduction: The use of the three-in-one single-capsule formulation of bismuth quadruple therapy (PPI, bismuth, tetracycline, and metronidazole), introduced several years ago, has become increasingly widespread in Europe. However, the experience with this regimen should be analysed in depth.

Aims & Methods: To evaluate the effectiveness and safety of the three-in-one single-capsule in the European Registry on *Helicobacter pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg).

International, multicenter, prospective, non-interventional registry aimed to evaluate the decisions and outcomes of *H. pylori* management by European gastroenterologists (Hp-EuReg, Hp-WorldReg's partner). All infected adult patients treated with 10-day single-capsule according to data sheet (3 capsules/6 h) or alternative three times a day (4 capsules/8 h) prescriptions were systematically registered at AEG-REDCap e-CRF until December 2024. Variables included: Patient's demographics, previous eradication attempts, prescribed treatment, adverse events, compliance and effectiveness. Modified intention-to-treat (mITT) and per-protocol (PP) analyses were performed, and data were subject to quality review. **Results:** Of the 76,042 empirical patients included in the Hp-EuReg, 12,519 (16%) received single-capsule bismuth quadruple therapy. The majority of these patients were naïve (80%), with an average age of 51 years, 63% female and 11% with peptic ulcer. In both the mITT and PP analyses, the single-capsule regimen achieved an eradication rate of 92%. In first-line treatment, effectiveness (mITT) reached 93%, decreasing to 87% in second-line and to 83% in subsequent lines (3rd to 6th) (Table 1). In rescue therapy, even when the regimen was optimised with standard or high-dose PPIs, optimal (≥90%) effectiveness was never achieved. Compliance with treatment (>90% of drug intake) was reported in 97% of cases, and was the factor most closely associated with the effectiveness of treatment (OR: 7.7, 95% CI: 5.8-10.4). Adverse events (21%) were generally mild and transient; with 0.1% of patients reporting serious adverse events, leading to the discontinuation of treatment in 1.7% of patients.

*Of the total of treatments included in the Hp-EuReg up to January 2025 (i.e., N= 77,954); mITT: modified intention-to-treat; PP: per-protocol; N: total number of patients analysed; CI: confidence interval; AEs: adverse events.

Table 1. Three-in-one single-capsule effectiveness, compliance and safety in first-line and rescue treatment lines.

Conclusion: The 10-day treatment with single-capsule bismuth quadruple therapy achieves *H. pylori* eradication in approximately 90% of patients by mITT in real-world clinical practice, both as a first-line and rescue treatment, with a favourable safety profile. **Disclosure:** Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/ Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex. Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

PP0257

EFFECTIVENESS OF FIRST-LINE EMPIRICAL *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* TREATMENT OUTSIDE EUROPE: RESULTS OF 10,000 CASES FROM THE WORLD-WIDE REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (WORLDHPREG)

O.P. Nyssen¹, P. Parra², A.J. Riquelme Pérez², D. Reyes-Placencia³, L. Coelho⁴, R.-K. Vilaichone⁵, S.I. Smith⁶, L. Kamani⁷, S. Prasad Singh⁸, M. Akroush⁹, F. Alsohaibani¹⁰, M. Alborae¹¹, S. Veldhuyzen Van Zanten¹², P. Katelaris¹³, S.C. Shah¹⁴, S. Inns¹⁵, J.M. Remes-Troche¹⁶, P. Bongkotvirawan¹⁷, O. Laudanno¹⁸, S.R. Chaves¹⁹, W. Otero²⁰, R. Castaño-Llano²¹, J.C. Soares Veloso²², L. Soares da Silva²³, J. Marinho²⁴, J. Ramirez²⁵, H. Okamoto²⁶, V. Kayamba²⁷, C. von Muhlenbrock²⁸, D. Cabrera Hinojosa²⁹, G. Otoy³⁰, C. Campos Nuñez³¹, H. Breyer³², G. Coutinho Couto³³, E. Comelli³⁴, C. Alencar³⁵, R. Vicente De Paula³⁶, L. Huidobro³⁷, H. Cedron³⁸, V. G. Mohan Prasad³⁹, L.A.S. Sousa⁴⁰, C. Vargas-Alayza⁴¹, I. Hanna-Jairala⁴², M. Horn Andre⁴³, M. Kumar Sahu⁴⁴, M.J. Gilberto Massote⁴⁵, A. Ali⁴⁶, A. Cano-Catala⁴⁷, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴⁸, J. P. Gisbert¹, on behalf of the World-HpReg investigators. Olga P. Nyssen and Pablo Parra, both first authors, contributed equally to the study. Leticia Moreira Ruiz and Javier P. Gisbert, both senior authors, contributed equally to the study. ¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²Department of Gastroenterology, Faculty of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Centro para la prevención y control del cáncer (CECAN), Santiago, Chile, ³Department of Gastroenterology, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile, ⁴Instituto Alfa de Gastroenterología, Hospital das Clínicas, Eberh-UFGM, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ⁵Center of Excellence in Digestive Diseases, Department of Medicine and Thailand Science Research and Innovation Fundamental Fund 2025, Gastroenterology Unit, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand, ⁶Department of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Nigerian Institute of Medical Research, Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria, ⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Liaquat National Hospital, Karachi, Pakistan, ⁸Kalinga Gastroenterology Foundation, Cuttack, India, ⁹Faculty of Medicine, Jordan University, Amman, Jordan, ¹⁰Department of Medicine, King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Centre, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, ¹¹Department of internal medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt, ¹²Division of Gastroenterology, University of Alberta Hospital, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, ¹³Gastroenterology Department, Concord Hospital, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia,

¹⁴Division of Gastroenterology, University of California San Diego (UCSD), Gastroenterology Section, VA San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, California, United States of America, ¹⁵Department of Medicine, University of Otago, Department of Gastroenterology, Health New Zealand Te Whatu Ora Capital Coast and Hutt Valley, Wellington, New Zealand, ¹⁶Medical-Biological Research Institute, Universidad Veracruzana, Veracruz, Mexico, ¹⁷Center of Excellence in Digestive Diseases and Gastroenterology Unit, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand, ¹⁸Instituto Doctor Alfredo Lanari, Buenos Aires, Argentina, ¹⁹Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Rede Mater Dei de Saúde, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁰Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia, ²¹Gastrohepatología, Universidad de Antioquia, Cirugía, Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, Medellín, Colombia, ²²Hospital Santa Helena, Brasília, Brazil, ²³Hospital Adventista de Manaus, Manaus, Brazil, ²⁴Universidade Estadual de Ciências da Saúde de Alagoas (UNCISAL), Maceió, Brazil, ²⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Liga Contra el Cáncer, Hospital Arzobispo Loayza, Lima, Peru, ²⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Endoscopy Center, Oxford Medical Center, São Bento Sul, Santa Catarina, Brazil, ²⁷Department of Internal Medicine, Univeristy of Zambia School of Medicine, Lusaka, Zambia, ²⁸Digestive Diseases Center, Internal Medicine department, Universidad de los Andes, Hospital Clínico Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile, ²⁹Hospital Nacional Dos de Mayo, Lima, Peru, ³⁰Jefe del Servicio de Gastroenterología del Hospital Nacional "Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen", Lima, Peru, ³¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínica Bíblica, San José, Costa Rica, ³²Department of Gastroenterology in Porto Alegre Clinical Hospital, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, ³³Centro de Consultas Especializadas de Contagem, Contagem, Brazil, ³⁴Department of Surgery and Digestive System Diseases, São Camilo Hospital Center, Department of Surgery, Unimed General Hospital and Center for Endoscopy and Intestinal Motility (Castromed), Brazil, ³⁵Clínicas Reunidas São Victor, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ³⁶Hospital Santa Marcelina, São Paulo, Brazil, ³⁷Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Católica del Maule (UCM), Talca, Chile, ³⁸Clínica Anglo Americana, Lima, Peru, ³⁹Indira Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences (IGIMS), Bihar, India, ⁴⁰Private Practice, Gastroenterology Specialist, LV Consultórios Médicos, Recife, Brazil, ⁴¹Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas UPC, Lima, Peru, ⁴²Service of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Hospital Miguel H. Alcívar, Guayaquil, Ecuador, ⁴³Endocentro clinic, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil, ⁴⁴Apollo Hospitals, Odisha, India, ⁴⁵Gastroenterologist, Private Clinic, Santos, São Paulo, Brazil, ⁴⁶Gastroenterology Department, Abdali Hospital, Amman, Jordan, ⁴⁷Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitária de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain **Contact E-Mail Address:** opn.aegredcap@aegastro.es **Introduction:** *H. pylori* infection represents a significant global health challenge. Despite international efforts to standardise eradication protocols, treatment success varies substantially across regions due to differences in antibiotic resistance patterns and healthcare practices and accessibility. **Aims & Methods:** This study aimed to assess the effectiveness of empirical first-line therapies for *H. pylori* infection outside Europe. The WorldHpReg, an international, multicenter, prospective registry, was created to evaluate the management and clinical outcomes of *H. pylori* infection by gastroenterologists world-wide. Data were collected via the AEG-REDCap e-CRF from March 2022 to April 2025. Modified intention-to-treat (mITT) and per-protocol (PP) analyses were performed to assess therapy effectiveness. A regimen was considered optimally effective if the mITT cure rate was ≥90%. The data were stratified by country and by specific first-line therapeutic regimen. **Results:** A total of 9,973 cases were collected, with 7,738 (78%) first-line empirical prescriptions analysed across several non-European countries including: Latin America (LATAM), Brazil, Africa, Australia, Canada, Egypt, India, Jordan, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. Overall, 90 different first-line

therapeutic regimens were prescribed, achieving an overall mITT and PP effectiveness of 84% and 85%, respectively. Optimal ($\geq 90\%$) mITT cure rates were achieved, overall, in Australia (95%), India (99%), Jordan (96%) and Saudi Arabia (91%). Optimal treatment effectiveness was observed in LATAM with following therapies: non-bismuth quadruple therapy containing amoxicillin-clarithromycin-metronidazole (91%) or with various combinations of bismuth-containing quadruple therapies, such as amoxi-cillin-metronidazole (94%), metronidazole-doxycycline (90%), and amoxi-cillin-doxycycline (97%). Additionally, high effectiveness was achieved also in LATAM with the single-capsule formulation (94%) and with the combination of metronidazole-tetracycline in the classical format (91%), this latter also obtaining optimal results in Brazil (97%). Standard triple therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin achieved over 90% mITT cure rates in Africa (92%), Australia (95%), Egypt (100%), India (100%), and Jordan (100%), although the number of patients was still very low. The remaining regimens provided suboptimal results. Complete results by treatment scheme and country are detailed in Table 1.

Country	LATAM	Brazil	Africa	Australia	Canada	Egypt	India	Jordan	Pakistan	Saudi Arabia
Treatment ^(a)	N (% mITT)									
Triple-C+A	1,041 (107%)	1,826 (80%)	25 (92%)	19 (95%)	NA	4 (100%)	61 (100%)	14 (100%)	53 (59%)	7 (86%)
Concomitant-C+A+M	113 (91%)	1 (100%)	NA	NA	6 (83%)	NA	NA	29 (86%)	NA	NA
Dual-A	340 (86%)	116 (89%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Quadruple-A+M+B	259 (104/101%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	45 (100%)	NA	NA	12 (42%)	(100%)
Quadruple-M+D+B	201 (90%)	2 (16%)	1 (100%)	NA	1 (100%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	11 (100%)
Triple-A+L	126 (82%)	30 (97%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 (100%)
Quadruple-M+Tc+B	177 (90%)	6 (67%)	43 (67%)	19 (95%)	3 (67%)	NA	80 (99%)	1 (74%)	NA	NA
Quadruple-C+A+B	187 (78%)	NA (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (95%)	10 (80%)	76 (100%)	141 (99%)	50 (100%)	158 (67%)	(88%)
Quadruple-A+D+B	177 (91%)	NA	72 (78%)	NA	NA	NA	94 (96%)	NA	NA	3 (100%)
Triple-C+T	483 (81%)	85 (81%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	64 (100%)
Single-	104	85	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

^(a)Treatments were categorised in 11 categories encompassing over 90% of first-line prescriptions world-wide.

LATAM: Latin America; ASEAN: Association of South-East Asian Nations; A: amoxicillin; B: bismuth salts; C: clarithromycin; D: doxycycline; L: levofloxacin; M: metronidazole; T: tinidazole; Tc: tetracycline; *Three-in-one single-capsule containing metronidazole, tetracycline and bismuth; N: total number of patients analysed; %: total number of patients with *H. pylori* eradicated; mITT: modified intention-to-treat.

Table 1. Modified intention-to-treat effectiveness of most frequent first-line empirical treatments world-wide.

Conclusion: In this large, real-world cohort from several non-European countries, first-line *H. pylori* empirical eradication therapies yielded un-satisfactory overall results. However, optimal ($\geq 90\%$) eradication rates were consistently observed in Australia, India, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. In LATAM and Brazil, the highest cure rates were predominantly obtained with bismuth and non-bismuth quadruple therapies. Triple therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin remained highly effective in select-ed regions. These findings reinforce the importance of tailoring first-line empirical therapy to regional performance in order to optimise *H. pylori* eradication success.

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/ Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

INDICATIONS FOR FIRST-LINE *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* ERADICATION IN GERMANY: INSIGHTS FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG) WITH A FOCUS ON GASTRIC CANCER PREVENTION

M. Venerito¹, A. Kahraman², R. Rosania³, A. Link⁴,

R. Vasapolli⁵, A. Cano-Catala⁶, L. Moreira Ruiz⁷, P. Parra⁸,

O.P. Nyssen⁹, F. Mégraud¹⁰, C. O'Morain¹¹, J. Gisbert¹²

¹Otto-von-Guericke University, Department of Gastroenterology Hepatology and Infectious Diseases, Magdeburg, Germany, ²Max Grundig Privatklinik GmbH, Bühlerhöhe, Germany, ³Otto-von-Guericke University, Klinik für Gastroenterologie, Hepatologie und Infektiologie, Magdeburg, Germany, ⁴Otto-von-Guericke University of Magdeburg, Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Infectious Diseases, Magdeburg, Germany, ⁵University Hospital LMU Munich, Department of Medicine 2, Munich, Germany, ⁶Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Manresa, Spain,

of gastric cancer. However, real-world data on how these recommendations are implemented in clinical practice remain limited. Additionally, data on the use and effectiveness of different first-line eradication regimens in Germany are sparse.

Aims & Methods: We conducted a retrospective analysis of patients who received first-line empirical *H. pylori* eradication therapy across five German university-based centers participating in the European Registry on *H. pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg). Three centers contributed the majority of cases. Demographic and clinical data were extracted from databases. Data were collected in AEG-REDCap from June 2013 to January 2025. Indications were categorized by symptom profile, endoscopic findings, and cancer risk. A descriptive analysis was performed. Eradication rates were compared between treatment regimens and durations using the χ^2 test. A particular focus was placed on evaluating how the recommendations of the German S3 guidelines regarding gastric cancer prevention were implemented in clinical practice.

Results: Of the 448 patients (53% male, median age 55) included, the most common indications were non-investigated dyspepsia (33%) and dyspepsia with normal endoscopy (30%). Peptic ulcer disease was reported in 18%: duodenal ulcer (5%) and gastric ulcer (13%). Five percent underwent eradication for gastric cancer prevention; these included patients with preneoplastic lesions (0.4%), prior gastric cancer resection (0.9%), first-degree relatives of gastric cancer patients (2.0%), and individuals undergoing screening (1.3%). Other indications included unexplained iron deficiency anemia (4.0%), vitamin B12 deficiency (0.7%), and MALT lymphoma (0.2%). The most frequent first-line therapies were triple therapy with amoxicillin and clarithromycin (54%) and a three-in-one single-capsule containing metronidazole, tetracycline, and bismuth (41%). Therapy commonly lasted 7 (19%) or 10 days (72%). No difference in eradication rates between the two regimens was observed when given for 10 days (97.8% vs. 97.0%, respectively).

Conclusion: In this multicenter German cohort from dedicated *H. pylori* centers, most eradication therapies were prescribed for dyspeptic symptoms. Notably, a significant proportion of treatments aimed at gastric cancer prevention, aligning with the approach outlined in the current German S3 guidelines. Both recommended first-line therapies—triple therapy with amoxicillin and clarithromycin, and the three-in-one single-capsule bismuth-based quadruple therapy—were widely used and achieved similarly high eradication rates when administered for 10 days. These findings underline the importance of implementing guideline-based indications in intermediate-risk countries like Germany, where targeted eradication in high-risk individuals remains a cornerstone of gastric cancer prevention. **Disclosure:** Nothing to disclose.

⁷Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Gava, Spain, ⁸Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Madrid, Spain, ⁹Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, IIS-IP, and CIBERehd, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ¹⁰Hopital Pellegrin, Laboratoire de Bacteriologie, Bordeaux, France, ¹¹Trinity College Dublin - Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin; Dublin/IE, Faculty of Health Sciences, Dublin, Ireland, ¹²Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa and CIBEREHD, Digestive Services, Madrid, Spain

Contact E-Mail Address: m.venerito@med.ovgu.de

Introduction: *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*) infection is a well-established risk factor for gastric cancer. While high-incidence countries promote population-based test-and-treat strategies, Germany—classified as an intermediate-risk country—follows a more targeted approach. According to the latest German S3 guidelines, *H. pylori* eradication is strongly recommended in specific high-risk groups, including first-degree relatives of gastric cancer patients and individuals who have undergone surgical or endoscopic resection

Moderated posters
Sunday, October 5, 2025

PRESCRIPTION OF FIRST-LINE EMPIRICAL TREATMENTS FOR *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* INFECTION OUTSIDE EUROPE: RESULTS OF 10,000 CASES FROM THE WORLD-WIDE REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (WORLDHPREG)

O.P. Nyssen¹, P. Parra¹, A.J. Riquelme Pérez², D. Reyes-Placencia³, L. Coelho⁴, R.-K. Vilaichone⁵, S.I. Smith⁶, L. Kamani⁷, S. Prasad Singh⁸, M. Akroush⁹, F. Alsohaibani¹⁰, M. Alborai¹¹, S. Veldhuyzen Van Zanten¹², P. Katelaris¹³, S.C. Shah¹⁴, S. Inns¹⁵, J.M. Remes-Troche¹⁶, P. Bongkotvirawan¹⁷, O. Laudanno¹⁸, S.R. Chaves¹⁹, W. Otero²⁰, R. Castaño-Llano²¹, J.C. Soares Veloso²², L. Soares da Silva²³, J. Marinho²⁴, J. Ramirez²⁵, H. Okamoto²⁶, V. Kayamba²⁷, C. von Muhlenbrock²⁸, D. Cabrera Hinojosa²⁹, G. Otoy³⁰, C. Campos Nuñez³¹, H. Breyer³², G. Coutinho Couto³³, E. Comelli³⁴, C. Alencar³⁵, R. Vicente De Paula³⁶, L. Huidobro³⁷, H. Cedron³⁸, V. G. Mohan Prasad³⁹, L.A.S. Sousa⁴⁰, C. Vargas-Alayza⁴¹, I. Hanna-Jairala⁴², M. Horn Andre⁴³, M. Kumar Sahu⁴⁴, M.J. Gilberto Massote⁴⁵, A. Ali⁴⁶, A. Cano-Catala⁴⁷, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴⁸, J. P. Gisbert¹, on behalf of the World-HpReg investigators. Olga P. Nyssen and Pablo Parra, both first authors, contributed equally to the study. Leticia Moreira Ruiz and Javier P. Gisbert, both senior authors, contributed equally to the study.

¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²Department of Gastroenterology, Faculty of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Centro para la prevención y control del cáncer (CECAN), Santiago, Chile, ³Department of Gastroenterology, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile, ⁴Instituto Alfa de Gastroenterología, Hospital das Clínicas, Ebserrh-UFMG, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ⁵Center of Excellence in Digestive Diseases, Department of Medicine and Thailand Science Research and Innovation Fundamental Fund 2025, Gastroenterology Unit, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand, ⁶Department of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Nigerian Institute of Medical Research, Yaba, Lagos, Nigeria, ⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Liaquat National Hospital, Karachi, Pakistan, ⁸Kalinga Gastroenterology Foundation, Cuttack, India, ⁹Faculty of Medicine, Jordan University, Amman, Jordan, ¹⁰Department of Medicine, King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Centre, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, ¹¹Department of internal medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt, ¹²Division of Gastroenterology, University of Alberta Hospital, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, ¹³Gastroenterology Department, Concord Hospital, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia, ¹⁴Division of Gastroenterology, University of California San Diego (UCSD), Gastroenterology Section, VA San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, California, United States of America, ¹⁵Department of Medicine, University of Otago, Department of Gastroenterology, Health New Zealand Te Whatu Ora Capital Coast and Hutt Valley, Wellington, New Zealand, ¹⁶Medical-Biological Research Institute, Universidad Veracruzana, Veracruz, Mexico, ¹⁷Center of Excellence in Digestive Diseases and Gastroenterology Unit, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand, ¹⁸Instituto Doctor Alfredo Lanari, Buenos Aires, Argentina, ¹⁹Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Rede

Mater Dei de Saúde, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁰Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia, ²¹Gastrohepatología, Universidad de Antioquia, Cirugía, Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana, Medellín, Colombia, ²²Hospital Santa Helena, Brasília, Brazil, ²³Hospital Adventista de Manaus, Manaus, Brazil, ²⁴Universidade Estadual de Ciências da Saúde de Alagoas (UNCISAL), Maceió, Brazil, ²⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Liga Contra el Cáncer, Hospital Arzobispo Loayza, Lima, Peru, ²⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Endoscopy Center, Oxford Medical Center, São Bento Sul, Santa Catarina, Brazil, ²⁷Department of Internal Medicine, University of Zambia School of Medicine, Lusaka, Zambia, ²⁸Digestive Diseases Center, Internal Medicine department, Universidad de los Andes, Hospital Clínico Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile, ²⁹Hospital Nacional Dos de Mayo, Lima, Peru, ³⁰Jefe del Servicio de Gastroenterología del Hospital Nacional "Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen", Lima, Peru, ³¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínica Bíblica, San José, Costa Rica, ³²Department of Gastroenterology in Porto Alegre Clinical Hospital, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, ³³Centro de Consultas Especializadas de Contagem, Contagem, Brazil, ³⁴Department of Surgery and Digestive System Diseases, São Camilo Hospital Center, Department of Surgery, Unimed General Hospital and Center for Endoscopy and Intestinal Motility (Castromed), Brazil, ³⁵Clinicas Reunidas São Victor, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ³⁶Hospital Santa Marcelina, São Paulo, Brazil, ³⁷Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Católica del Maule (UCM), Talca, Chile, ³⁸Clínica Anglo Americana, Lima, Peru, ³⁹Indira Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences (IGIMS), Bihar, India, ⁴⁰Private Practice, Gastroenterology Specialist, LV Consultórios Médicos, Recife, Brazil, ⁴¹Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas UPC, Lima, Peru, ⁴²Service of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Hospital Miguel H. Alcívar, Guayaquil, Ecuador, ⁴³Endocentro clinic, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil, ⁴⁴Apollo Hospitals, Odisha, India, ⁴⁵Gastroenterologist, Private Clinic, Santos, São Paulo, Brazil, ⁴⁶Gastroenterology Department, Abdali Hospital, Amman, Jordan, ⁴⁷Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitária de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Contact E-Mail Address: opn.aegredcap@aegastro.es

Introduction: *H. pylori* infection remains a major global health issue, and although effective treatment exists, changing clinical practices and regional differences require ongoing review of treatment guidelines.

Aims & Methods: This study aimed to assess the various first-line empirical therapies used for *H. pylori* infection in regions outside Europe.

The WorldHpReg is a global, multicenter, prospective registry designed to assess how gastroenterologists manage *H. pylori* infection and its clinical outcomes. Data were collected at AEG-REDCap e-CRF from March 2022 to April 2025, with descriptive analyses and Chi-square tests used to evaluate associations.

Results: Overall, 9,973 cases, with 7,738 (78%) first-line empirical prescriptions were analysed across several non-European countries, including: Latin America (LATAM), Brazil, Africa, Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), Australia, Canada, Egypt, India, Jordan, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. The average patient was 50 years old, with 62% being women. Ethnicities included Caucasian (33%), Asian (15%), Black (6.1%), and others (40%). Most patients (85%) had never smoked, while 11% were cur-

rent smokers. At baseline, 38% used concurrent medications, primarily proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) (27%). Common symptoms were dyspepsia (59%) and heartburn (23%). *H. pylori* diagnosis was mainly by histology (75%), with limited use of 13C-urea breath test (5.8%), stool antigen test (4.7%), and culture (2%). A total of 90 different first-line therapeutic regimens were prescribed, with triple therapy using either Potassium-Competitive Acid Blockers (P-CABs) or PPIs plus amoxicillin-clarithromycin being the most common (41%), especially in Brazil (87% of their prescriptions), India (45%) and LATAM (27%). Quadruple non-bismuth concomitant therapy with PPI-amoxicillin-clarithromycin-metronidazole was the second most common (9% overall), with higher usage in Canada (77% of their prescriptions), Jordan (30%) and LATAM (16%). Bismuth quadruple therapy using a single-capsule formulation of PPI-metronidazole-tetracycline was prescribed in LATAM (2.7% of their prescriptions) and Saudi Arabia (60%); while bismuth quadruple therapy with P-CABs or PPIs and other antibiotic combinations was less common (3% globally). Region-specific alternatives like triple therapy with PPI-amoxicillin-levofloxacin were prescribed in LATAM or Egypt, and PPI-clarithromycin-tinidazole was more frequent in Africa. Dual therapy with P-CAB or PPI plus amoxicillin was prescribed overall in 6.2% of cases, mainly in LATAM and Brazil (Table 1). Most treatments lasted 14 days (86%), with PPIs prescribed at either low-dose (20 mg omeprazole equivalent b.i.d.) in 42% of cases or high-dose (80 mg omeprazole equivalent b.i.d.) in 36% of cases. Vonoprazan, tegoprazan and fexuprazan were prescribed in 5%, 2% and 1.3% of cases.

Country Treatment ^(a)	LATAM	Brazil	Africa	ASEAN	Australia	Canada	Egypt	India	Jordan	Pakistan	Saudi Arabia
Triple-C+A	3,187 (41%)	1,069 (27%)	1,907 (87%)	39 (17%)	NA	19 (100%)	1 (3.2%)	4 (5.1%)	69 (45%)	15 (14%)	53 (34%)
Concomitant-	692	635	1	1		24			31		
C+A+M	(8.9%)	(16%)	(0%)	NA	(0.1%)	NA	(77%)	NA	NA	(30%)	NA
Dual-A	476	360	116	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Quadruple-A+M+B	(6.2%) 273 (3.5%)	(9.2%) 273 (7%)	(5.3%) NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Quadruple-M+D+B	272 (3.5%)	269 (6.9%)	2 (0.1%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 (1.3%)
Triple-A+L	221 (2.9%)	133 (3.4%)	16 (0.7%)	NA	NA	NA	(59%)		(1%)	(7.6%)	(16.3%)
Quadruple-M+T+B	221 (2.9%)	178 (4.5%)	1 (0.4%)	NA	NA	1 (3.2%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	3 (3.8%)
Quadruple-C+A+B	204 (2.6%)	197 (5%)	6 (0.3%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 (0.7%)	NA	NA	NA
Quadruple-A+D+B	177 (2.3%)	177 (4.5%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Single-capsule*	153 (2%)	104 (2.7%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 (1%)	NA	48 (60%)
Triple-C+T	128 (1.7%)	NA	128 (57%)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Overall	7,736 (100%)	3,916 (51%)	2,183 (28%)	224 (2.9%)	791** (10%)	19 (0.2%)	31 (0.4%)	78 (1%)	152 (2%)	104 (1.3%)	158 (2%)

^(a)Treatments were categorised in 11 categories encompassing over 90% of first-line prescriptions world-wide; LATAM: Latin America; ASEAN: Association of South-East Asian Nations; A: amoxicillin; B: bismuth salts; C: clarithromycin; D: doxycycline; L: levofloxacin; M: metronidazole; T: tinidazole; Tc: tetracycline. *Three-in-one single-capsule containing metronidazole, tetracycline and bismuth; N: number of prescriptions; NA: non-available. **From other treatment combinations.

Table 1. Most frequent first-line empirical treatments worldwide.

Conclusion: WorldHpReg reveals substantial heterogeneity in first-line empirical *H. pylori* treatments, with standard triple therapy predominating mainly in Africa, India, Pakistan, Latin America and Brazil; while quadruple therapies were underutilised in most regions except in Latin America, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Canada. These findings highlight a critical need for region-specific protocols to optimise *H. pylori* eradication outcomes globally.

MP506

EFFECTIVENESS OF *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* ERADICATION TREATMENTS IN PRIMARY CARE: INSIGHTS FROM A NATIONAL REAL-WORLD COHORT

O.P. Nyssen¹, E. Fernández-Antón², G. Alonso-Martínez², P. Parra¹, F. J. de Abajo^{2,3}, J. P. Gisbert¹, Olga P. Nyssen and Encarnación Fernández-Antón, both first authors contributed equally to the study. Francisco J. de Abajo and Javier P. Gisbert, both senior authors contributed equally to the study.
¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²Department of Biomedical Sciences (Pharmacology), School of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Alcalá (IRYCIS), 28805 Alcalá de Henares, Spain, ³Clinical Pharmacology Unit, University Hospital Príncipe de Asturias, 28805 Alcalá de Henares, Spain

Contact E-Mail Address: pablo.parra.hlp@gmail.com
Introduction: *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*) infection is the most prevalent infection worldwide, affecting more than half of the global population. It is the primary cause of chronic gastritis, peptic ulcer disease, and gastric cancer. Currently, most *H. pylori* eradication treatments are prescribed in Primary Care settings and are highly heterogeneous. However, the effectiveness of these treatments in real-world Primary Care settings remains suboptimal. Therefore, evaluating their effectiveness is essential to ensure optimal patient outcomes.

Aims & Methods: To assess the effectiveness of the different eradication treatment combinations prescribed in Primary Care, we conducted an epidemiological cohort study using data from BIFAP, a Spanish healthcare database containing real-world data on the clinical practice of Primary Care physicians. A cohort study was conducted using real-world data from patients aged ≥18 years with a recorded *H. pylori* infection and a concomitant treatment prescription between 2003 and 2023. Treatment regimens were based on

guideline-based recommendations compiled from Spanish and European Consensus Conferences between 1997 and 2022. Validated algorithms identified *H. pylori* infections and treatment patterns. Effectiveness was assessed based on stool antigen or breath test results documented within 12 months following treatment completion. A validation process was conducted to confirm the accuracy of laboratory test records through a manual review of a random sample of electronic health records. Effectiveness comparisons among treatments were made using

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex. Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex. Pearson's χ^2 test.

A logistic regression was conducted to adjust for clinical factors associated with the success of each treatment combination. First-line treatment effectiveness was compared with that of the European Registry on *H. pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg) to contrast Primary and Specialised (Gastroenterologists) Care.

Results: A total of 211,972 patients with a recorded *H. pylori* infection, and, at least, one prescribed treatment pattern, were identified. Of these, 30,693 subjects (14%) met the criteria for inclusion in the effectiveness analysis. The median age was 55 years (IQR, 44–66), and 65% were women.

The most frequently prescribed first-line regimen in both Primary and Specialised Care was proton pump inhibitor plus a single-capsule with bismuth, tetracycline and metronidazole (Pylera®) (PPI+ScBQT). Pearson's χ^2 test confirmed significant ($p < 0.01$) differences in eradication rates among the regimens. PPI+ScBQT had the highest eradication rate (91%), followed by PPI + clarithromycin (C) + amoxicillin (A) + metronidazole (M) (88%), PPI+C+A (70%), and PPI+C+M (61%).

The results aligned with data from Specialised care in the context of the Hp-EuReg. A logistic regression analysis was conducted to assess treatment effectiveness adjusted for relevant covariates, including age, sex, obesity, history of peptic ulcer, chronic kidney disease, and smoking status.

After adjustment, PPI+ScBQT was confirmed as the most effective option, with significantly higher odds of eradication compared to the other regimens. The adjusted odds ratios (AOR) [95% confidence intervals] were: 0.15 [0.13–0.19] compared to PPI+C+M; 0.23 [0.21–0.24] compared to PPI+C+A; and 0.72 [0.66–0.79] compared to PPI+C+A+M.

Conclusion: In the Primary Care setting, single-capsule bismuth quadruple therapy showed the highest effectiveness, followed by non-bismuth concomitant quadruple therapy (PPI+C+A+M). These results were consistent with those reported in the Gastroenterology setting.

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

MP507

EFFECTIVENESS OF REPEATED USE OF AMOXICILLIN–CLARITHROMYCIN TRIPLE THERAPY AND BISMUTH QUADRUPLE THERAPY AFTER PRIOR FAILURE: PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

E. Cantú-Germano¹, L. Moreira Ruiz¹, L. Jonaitis², Á. Pérez-Aísa³, B. Tepes⁴, U. Mahmudov⁵, S.J. Martínez-Domínguez⁶, G. Babayeva⁷, J. Tejedor-Tejada⁸, A.J. Lucendo⁹, S. Abdulkhakov¹⁰, L. Vologzhanina¹¹, P. Bogomolov¹², E. Mammadov⁷, B.J. Gómez Rodríguez¹³, M. Perona¹⁴, M. Denkovski¹⁵, A. Moreno¹⁶, I. Voynovan¹⁷, M. Pabón-Carrasco¹⁸, T. Butler¹⁹, R. Hasanov²⁰, O. Núñez Martínez²¹, T. Ilchishina²², F. Guliyev²³, A. Gasbarrini²⁴, J.M. Huguet²⁵, M. Areia²⁶, A.G. Gravina²⁷, S. Alekseenko²⁸, M. Soledad Marcos²⁹, J. Barrio³⁰, F. Bermejo³¹, D. Andreev³², L. Bujanda³³, J. Kupcinskas², M. Leja³⁴, D.S. Bordin³⁵, S. Smith³⁶, R. Pinto³⁷, M. Sánchez Alonso³⁸, R. Pajares Villarroja³⁹, M. Jiménez-Moreno⁴⁰, I. Arteagoitia⁴¹, A. Cano-Catala⁴², P. Parra⁴³, O.P. Nyssen⁴⁴, F. Mégraud⁴⁴, C. O'Morain³⁶, J. P. Gisbert⁴³, On behalf of the Hp-EuReg investigators.

¹Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Barcelona, Spain, ²Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Gastroenterology, Kaunas, Lithuania, ³Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), Gastroenterology, Marbella, Spain, ⁴DC Rogaska, Gastroenterology, Rogaska Slatina, Slovenia, ⁵Modern Hospital, Baku, Azerbaijan, ⁶Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Gastroenterology, Zaragoza, Spain, ⁷Azerbaijan State Advanced Training Institute for Doctors named by A. Aliyev, Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Baku, Azerbaijan, ⁸Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Gastroenterology, Gijón, Asturias, Spain, ⁹Hospital General de Tomelloso, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa

(IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Gastroenterology, Tomelloso, Spain, ¹⁰Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kazan State Medical University, Kazan, Russian Federation, ¹¹Gastrocentr, Perm, Russian Federation, ¹²Universal Clinic Private Medical Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ¹³Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁴Hospital Quirón Marbella, Gastroenterology, Marbella, Spain, ¹⁵Interni Oddelek, Diagnostic Centre, Bled, Slovenia, ¹⁶Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁷A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ¹⁸Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁹Clinical Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Tallaght University Hospital, Gastroenterology, Dublin, Ireland, ²⁰German Hospital, Gastroenterology, Baku, Azerbaijan, ²¹Hospital Universitario La Moraleja, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad CEU San Pablo, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ²²SM-clinic, Gastroenterology, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ²³National Oncology Centre, Baku, Azerbaijan, ²⁴Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Rome, Italy, ²⁵Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Gastroenterology, Valencia, Spain, ²⁶Portuguese Oncology Institute of Coimbra, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto (FMUP), RISE@CI-IPO (Health Research Network), Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO Porto), Gastroenterology, Coimbra, Portugal, ²⁷University of study of Campania "L. Vanvitelli", Hepatogastroenterology, Naples, Italy, ²⁸Far Estern State Medical University, Khabarovsk, Russian Federation, ²⁹Hospital 12 de Octubre, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ³⁰Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Gerencia Regional de Salud de Castilla y León (SACYL), Gastroenterology, Valladolid, Spain, ³¹Hospital Universitario de Fuenlabrada, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ³²Russian University of Medicine, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³³Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Department of Medicine, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Gastroenterology, San Sebastián, Spain, ³⁴Digestive Diseases Centre, Institute of Clinical and Preventive Medicine, University of Latvia, Gastroenterology, Riga, Latvia, ³⁵A. S. Loginov Moscow clinical scientific center, Department of outpatient therapy and family medicine, Tver State Medical University, Department of propaedeutic of internal diseases and gastroenterology, Department of pancreatic, biliary and upper GI diseases, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁶Trinity College Dublin, School of Medicine, Dublin, Ireland, ³⁷Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Instituto De Ciências Biomédicas de Abel Salazar, Universidade do Porto, Center for Research in Health Technologies and Information Systems (CINTESIS), Gastroenterology, Porto, Portugal, ³⁸Hospital Universitario Santa Bárbara, Gastroenterology, Ciudad Real, Spain, ³⁹Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ⁴⁰Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Gastroenterology, Burgos, Spain, ⁴¹Hospital Universitario de Cruces, Gastroenterology, Vizcaya, Spain, ⁴²Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴³Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación

Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ⁴⁴INSERM U1312, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France

Contact E-Mail Address: elisa.germano@hotmail.com

Introduction: After an initial attempt to eradicate *Helicobacter pylori* (Hp), around 20% of patients remain infected. As treatment failures accumulate, the effectiveness of subsequent Hp therapies tends to decrease. Therefore, current clinical guidelines discourage repeated use of the same treatment regimen following an initial failure.

Aims & Methods: To evaluate the use and effectiveness of the triple therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin and of the bismuth quadruple therapy (either classical and as single-capsule format) when empirically prescribed as retreatment, despite previous eradication failure with the same regimen.

All patients registered at e-CRF AEG-REDCap as part of the European Registry on Hp management (Hp-EuReg) from 2013–2024, who had received triple therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin or bismuth quadruple therapy (either classical or as single-capsule) in at least 2 different treatment lines (not necessarily consecutive), were analysed separately.

Results: Triple therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin: Out of 518 patients treated with triple therapy from 2nd to 6th rescue treatment line, 230 cases received the same therapy at least in 2 different treatment lines: 199 re-treatments in 2nd line having previously failed in 1st line with this therapy; 19 re-treatments in 3rd line (of which 9 had previously received the same therapy only in the 1st line and 10 had received the same therapy in both 1st and 2nd line); 4 in 4th line; 5 in 5th line; and further 3 in 6th line. The overall effectiveness of triple therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin when empirically prescribed repeatedly in 2nd line was 74%. When the effectiveness was subanalysed by treatment length, there were increasing efficacy rates according to it: 50% with 7 days, 72% with 10 days, and 82% with 14 days. The cases retreated in 3rd line had an overall effectiveness of 56%.

Bismuth quadruple classical therapy: Out of 672 patients treated with bismuth quadruple classical therapy from 2nd to 6th rescue treatment line, 13 cases received the same therapy at least in 2 different treatment lines: 6 re-treatments in 2nd line, having previously failed in 1st line; 2 re-treatments in 3rd line, both had previously received the same therapy in 2nd line; 2 in 4th line; 1 in 5th line; and further 2 in 6th line. The effectiveness of bismuth quadruple classical therapy when empirically prescribed repeatedly in the 2nd line was 69%, although the number of patients in this cohort was limited.

Bismuth quadruple therapy as single-capsule: Out of 2,579 patients treated with the single-capsule from 2nd to 6th rescue treatment line, 101 cases received the same therapy at least in 2 different treatment lines: 67 re-treatments in 2nd line having previously failed in 1st line with the single-capsule; 16 re-treatments in 3rd line, of which 12 had previously received this same therapy in 2nd line; 11 in 4th line; 4 in 5th line; and further 3 in 6th line. The effectiveness of bismuth quadruple therapy as single-capsule when empirically prescribed repeatedly in 2nd line was over 90%, and achieved almost 80% in all cases retreated in the 3rd line.

Conclusion: Repeated use of triple therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin in patients with prior eradication failures with the same regimen demonstrated notable success rates, particularly in 2nd line re-treatments lasting 14 days (>80%). On the other hand, bismuth quadruple therapy as single-capsule, when prescribed as re-treatment in 2nd line after previous failure with the same therapy, achieved optimal effectiveness (>90%).

References:

1. Malfertheiner P, Megraud F, Rokkas T, Gisbert JP, Liou JM, Schulz C, et al. Management of *Helicobacter pylori* infection: the Maastricht VI/Florence consensus report. Gut. 2022;71(9):1724–62.

2. Nyssen OP, Vaira D, Pérez Aísa Á, Rodrigo L, Castro-Fernandez M, Jonaitis L, et al. Empirical Second-Line Therapy in 5000 Patients of the European Registry on *Helicobacter pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg). Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2022;20(10):2243–57.

Disclosure: Olga P. Nyssen has served as a speaker or has received research funding from Allergan, Mayoly Spindler, Richen, Biocodex and Juvisé.

Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé, Biocodex.

The remaining authors declare no conflicts of interest.

MP508

THE NEED TO OPTIMISE *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* MANAGEMENT IN THE UK – RESULTS FROM 462 PATIENTS FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

J. Bornschein^{1,2}, I. Beales³, M. Cavlina Sevo¹, O.P. Nyssen⁴, A. Cano-Catala⁵, P. Parra⁴, L. Moreira Ruiz⁶, F. Mégraud⁷, C. O'Morain⁸, J. Gisbert⁴, P. Phull⁹, Hp-EuReg

¹Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Oxford, United Kingdom,

²University of Oxford, Weatherall Institute of Molecular Medicine (WIMM), Medical Research Council Translational Immune Discovery Unit (MRC TIDU), Oxford, United Kingdom,

³Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital, Gastroenterology, Norwich, United Kingdom,

⁴Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, IIS-IP, and CIBERehd, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain,

⁵Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain,

⁶Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Gava, Spain,

⁷Université de Bordeaux, INSERM U1312 BRIC, Bordeaux, France,

⁸Trinity College Dublin - Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin; Dublin/IE, Faculty of Health Sciences, Dublin, Ireland,

⁹Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Department of Digestive Disorders, Aberdeen, United Kingdom

Contact E-Mail Address: jan.bornschein@ndm.ox.ac.uk

Introduction: Although national guidance on the management of *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*) infection in the UK is reviewed regularly, the recommendations on treatment and follow-up are not aligned with guidance in the rest of Europe. This is mainly due to the issue that there are no up to date data available on *H. pylori* prevalence or primary resistance to drugs usually used in eradication regimens.

Aims & Methods: Aim of this study was to analyse the current UK practice on *H. pylori* management to highlight areas that warrant improvement. UK data collected at AEG-REDCap e-CRF until January 2025 from the European Registry on *H. pylori* management (Hp-EuReg) were analysed. Modified intention-to-treat (mITT) and per protocol (PP) analyses were performed and the Fisher's exact test was used for comparison of categorical data (significance for p<0.05).

Results: Data on 462 patients from 3 different centres across the UK was analysed. The mean age of the patients was 55 years (SD 16 years). The indication to test for *H. pylori* was non-investigated dyspepsia in 47%, dyspepsia with normal endoscopy in 21%, iron deficiency anaemia in 10%, duodenal ulcer in 9.7%, gastric ulcer in 6.9%, and gastric preneoplastic conditions in 1.3%. Of the 257 patients for whom data on regular concurrent medication was available, 222 (87%) took proton pump inhibitors (PPI) daily. Standard triple therapy regimens were given in 97.6% with 90.9% of these having undergone a 7-day regimen, 1.7% a 10-day regimen

and 7.4% a 14-day regimen. Most commonly prescribed regimens were amoxicillin-clarithromycin-PPI (75.5%), amoxicillin-metronidazole-PPI (11.1%) and clarithromycin-metronidazole-PPI (9.1%). In the majority of cases, PPI was prescribed at low dose (76%); standard dose was given in 21%, and high dose in 3% of patients. The incidence of at least one adverse event due to treatment was reported in 31% of cases. Tests to confirm eradication success were done in 85% of patients, with practice varying between the different sites ($p < 0.001$).

This was also confirmed for the length of prescribed treatment ($p < 0.001$) and the PPI dose used ($p < 0.001$). Eradication was successful in 71% in the mITT analysis, and in 71% of the PP analysis. Patients treated for 7 days showed treatment success in 70% in the mITT analysis, and 69.4% in the PP analysis, compared to 93% (both mITT and PP) in those treated for 14 days ($p < 0.01$). Adverse events were associated with reduced eradication treatment success (mITT: 62 vs 76%; PP: 63 vs 76%; $p < 0.01$).

The effect was more pronounced for compliance, with only 5 patients having reported not to have completed >90% of their course of treatment (PP: 29% vs 80%, $p < 0.05$). Second-line treatment was documented for 109 patients, with 20 different regimens having been prescribed. The overall mITT success of second-line treatment was 48.5%.

Conclusion: Clarithromycin-based triple therapy remains the standard in the UK, despite a treatment failure of $\approx 30\%$. While adherence to national British or European guidelines on treatment duration and PPI dosage varies by centre, this does not uniformly affect treatment success. Despite British guidance advocating to assess treatment success based on symptom response, eradication was confirmed in the majority of patients.

A review of national guidance on *H. pylori* management in the UK is required, along with efforts to generate national data on prevalence and resistance patterns.

Disclosure: JB: Advisory fee by Flynn Pharma LTD UK and Juvise Pharmaceuticals France

OPN: Speaker fee or research funding from Allergan, Mayoly Spindler, Richen, Biocodex and Juvisé.

JPG: Speaker or consultancy fees, advisory board member or research funding from Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé, Biocodex. IB, MCS, ACC, PP, LM, FM, COM, and PP have no conflict of interest to declare.

MP509

IMPACT OF DRUG DOSAGES ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FIRST-LINE BISMUTH QUADRUPLE THERAPY: RESULTS FROM 11,000 PATIENTS FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

S.J. Martínez-Domínguez^{1,2,3}, A. Lanas^{2,3,1}, E. Ceamanos^{1,2}, I. Voynovan⁴, L. Jonaitis⁵, L. Vologzhanina⁶, A. Sarsenbaeva⁷, A.J. Lucendo⁸, G. Fadieienco⁹, B.D. Starostin¹⁰, O. Zaytsev¹¹, U. Mahmudov¹², S. Abdulkhakov¹³, S. Sagdati¹⁴, T. Ilchishina¹⁵, I. Bakulin¹⁶, S. Alekseenko¹⁷, L.V. Morkovkina¹⁸, O. Gridnyev¹⁹, G. Babayeva²⁰, A. Garre^{21,22,23}, Á. Pérez-Aisa²⁴, A. Kononova²⁵, P. Bogomolov²⁶, G. Tarasova²⁷, J. Barrio²⁸, D. Andreev²⁹, O. Núñez Martínez³⁰, E. Mammadov³¹, M. Pabón-Carrasco³², M. Castro-Fernández³³, L. Bujanda Fernández de Piérola³⁴, H. Simsek³⁵, F. Guliyev³⁶, D.S. Bordin³⁷, J. Kupcinkas³⁸, V. Milivojevic³⁹, C. Simsek⁴⁰, M. Sánchez Alonso⁴¹, R. Pajares Villarroya⁴², B.J. Gómez-Rodríguez⁴³, M. Jiménez-Moreno⁴⁴, P. Pazo Mejide⁴⁵, A. Cano-Catala⁴⁶, P. Parra⁴⁷, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴⁸, F. Mégraud⁴⁹, C. O'Morain⁵⁰, J. P. Gisbert^{47,51}, O.P. Nyssen^{47,51}, on behalf of the Hp-EuReg investigators

¹Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Zaragoza, Spain, ²Aragón Health Research Institute, Zaragoza, Spain, ³University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain, ⁴2A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania, ⁶Gastrocentr, Perm, Russian Federation, ⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Chelyabinsk Regional Clinical Hospital, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation, ⁸Hospital General de Tomelloso, Tomelloso, Spain, ⁹National therapy institute named after L.T. Malaya under the Ukraine Academy of Medical Sciences, Kharkiv, Ukraine, ¹⁰Saint-Petersburg State Budgetary Institution Healthcare City Polyclinic 38,, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ¹¹First Clinical Medical Centre, Kovrov, Russian Federation, ¹²Modern Hospital, Baku, Azerbaijan, ¹³Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russian Federation, ¹⁴OB Novi Pazar, Gastroenterology, Novi Pazar, Serbia, ¹⁵SM Clinic, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ¹⁶North-Western State Medical University n.a. I.I. Mechnikov, Propedeutics of Internal Diseases, Gastroenterology and Dietology n.a. S.M. Riss, Moscow, Russian Federation, ¹⁷Fare Estern State Medical University, Internal Medicine, Khabarovsk, Russian Federation, ¹⁸Republican Gastroenterology Center, Republican Clinical Hospital of the Ministry of Health and Social Development of Chuvashia, Cheboksary, Russian Federation, ¹⁹National institute of therapy named L.T. Malaya NAMS of Ukraine, Department of the Study of Digestive System Diseases and their Comorbidity with Non-communicable Diseases, Kharkiv, Ukraine, ²⁰Azerbaijan State Advanced Training Institute for doctors named after A.ALIYEV, Terapiya, Baku, Azerbaijan, ²¹Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Madrid, Spain, ²²Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Madrid, Spain, ²³Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM) and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²⁴Agencia Sanitaria Costa del Sol, ., Marbella, Spain, ²⁵Tver State Medical University, Tver, Russia; ²⁶Universal Clinic Private Medical Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ²⁷Universal Clinic Private Medical Center/Regional Research Clinical Institute. M.F. Vladimirovskogo, Moscow, Russian Federation, ²⁸Rostov State Medical University, Gastroenterology, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation, ²⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Valladolid, Spain, ³⁰Moscow State University of Medicine

and Dentistry named aker A.I. Evdokimov, Internal diseases propedeutics and gastroenterology, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁰Hospital Sanitas La Moraleja, Gastroenterology, San Sebastian

De Los Reyes, Spain, ³¹Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Azerbaijan State Advanced Training Institute for Doctors named by A. Aliyev, Baku, Azerbaijan, ³²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Sevilla, Spain, ³³Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Sevilla, Spain, ³⁴Instituto Bionostia, San Sebastián, Spain, ³⁵HC International Clinic, Ankara, Türkiye, ³⁶National Center Of Oncology, Baku, Azerbaijan, ³⁷A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Department of pancreatic, biliary and upper GI diseases, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁸Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Department of Gastroenterology, Kaunas, Lithuania, ³⁹Clinical Centar of Serbia, Belgrade University, Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Belgrade, Serbia, ⁴⁰Hacettepe University, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Endoscopy, Ankara, Türkiye, ⁴¹Ciudad Real General Hospital, Gastroenterology, Ciudad Real, Spain, ⁴²Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofia, Madrid, Spain, ⁴³Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Sevilla, Spain, ⁴⁴Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Gastroenterology&Hepatology; Department, Burgos, Spain, ⁴⁵Hospital de Cruces, Barakaldo, Spain, ⁴⁶Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central, Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ⁴⁸Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Gava, Spain, ⁴⁹Hopital Pellegrin, Laboratoire de Bacteriologie, Bordeaux, France, ⁵⁰Trinity College Dublin - Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin; Dublin/IE, Faculty of Health Sciences, Dublin, Ireland, ⁵¹*Both senior authors contributed equally to the study, Madrid, Spain

Contact E-Mail Address: opn.aegredcap@aegastro.es

Introduction: There is limited evidence regarding how the dosage of each individual drug affects the effectiveness of the different first-line bis-muth-based quadruple therapy regimens.

Aims & Methods: To analyse the effectiveness of first-line bismuth quadruple regimens according to the dosage of the different drugs used. Prospective, non-interventional registry of the clinical practice of European gastroenterologists on the management of *H. pylori* infection (Hp-EuReg) between 2013 and 2024. Only first-line bismuth quadruple regimens with more than 100 cases were included, and effectiveness was analysed by modified intention-to-treat (mITT) based on the different dosages.

Results: A total of 10,767 first-line records were analysed (Table 1). The clarithromycin-amoxicillin-bismuth (CAB) quadruple regimen showed effectiveness >90% regardless of the daily dose of bismuth, using A and C at standard doses. The tetracycline-metronidazole-bismuth (TMB) quadruple regimen achieved effectiveness >90% with T doses of at least 1,500 mg/day, M 1,500 mg/day, and bismuth at least 480 mg/day, with no improvement seen when the bismuth dose was increased further. The amoxicillin-metronidazole-bismuth (AMB) quadruple regimen showed mITT >90% with A at 2,000 mg/day, M at least 1,000 mg/day, and bismuth at 480 mg/day, without relevant improvement when increasing the M dose. The clarithromycin-metronidazole-bismuth (CMB) regimen showed mITT ≥90% with M doses of 800 mg/day or higher, C 1,000 mg/day, and bismuth 480 mg/day, with no improvement seen with higher daily doses of bismuth. In the amoxicillin-levofloxacin-bismuth (ALB) quadruple therapy,

mITT was >90% across all regimens, with no differences observed when increasing the L dose above 500 mg/day. The rest of the regimens studied did not reach mITT >90%.

Scheme (N)	Dose of antibiotic/bismuth per intake (mg)/number of intakes (total daily dose in mg/day)	mITT success n (%)	p-value
Dosage description [n (%)]			
CAB (N= 7.471)	Bi 120 mg/2 times (240 mg/day)	113 (95.8)	
	Bi 120 mg/3 times (360 mg/day)	411 (99.0)	
7,439 (99.6%) C 1,000 mg/day	Bi 120 mg/4 times (480 mg/day)	706 (95.4)	<0.001
7,416 (99.3%) A 2,000 mg/day	Bi 240 mg/2 times (480 mg/day)	4,517 (92.7)	
	Bi 240 mg/3 times (720 mg/day)	129 (100.0)	
TMB (N= 963)			
227 (23.6%) M 1,500 mg/day and T 1,500 mg	Bi 420 mg/4 times (1,680 mg/day)	109 (92.4)	-
	Bi 240 mg/2 times (480 mg/day)	90 (94.7)	
511 (53.1%) M 1,500 mg/day and T 2,000 mg/day	Bi 120 mg/4 times (480 mg/day)	254 (93.0)	<0.001
	Bi 262 mg/4 times (1,048 mg/day)	69 (77.5)	
ABJ (N= 712)*			
704 (98.9%) Bi 480 mg/día		612 (88.3%)	-
696 (97.8%) J 2,000 mg/día			
710 (99.7%) A 2,000 mg/día			
AMB (N= 609)			
	Bi 240 mg/2 times (480 mg/day)	52 (85.2)	0.093 ^a
383 (62.3%) A 2,000 mg/day and M 1,000 mg/day	Bi 120 mg/4 times (480 mg/day)	32 (97.0)	
	Bi 240 mg/2 times (480 mg/day)	66 (88.0)	0.038
161 (26.4%) A 2,000 mg/day and M 1,500 mg/day	Bi 120 mg/4 times (480 mg/day)	68 (97.1)	
CMB (N= 504)			
188 (37.3%) C 1,000 mg/day and M 800 mg/day	Bi 240 mg/2 times (480 mg/day)	93 (94.9)	-
	Bi 120 mg/3 times (360 mg/day)	52 (92.9)	1.000 ^a
183 (36.3%) C 1,000 mg/day and M 1,000 mg/day	Bi 240 mg/2 times + 120 mg/4 times (480 mg/day)**	80 (89.9)	
	Bi 240 mg/2 times + 120 mg/4 times (480 mg/day)**	84 (94.4)	-
93 (18.5%) C 1,000 mg/day and M 1,200 mg/day			
ALB (N= 310)	L 500 mg/day (Bi 240 mg/2 times (480 mg/day) in 129 cases [90.2%])	73 (92.4)	
299 (96.5%) A 2,000 mg/day		128 (94.1)	0.572***
	L 1,000 mg/day (Bi 480 mg/day in 137 cases [84%])		
MDB (N= 101)			
91 (90.1%) D 200 mg/day	M 500 mg/2 times + 250 mg/4 times (1,000 mg/day)	38 (84.4)	0.006
90 (89%) Bi 480 mg/day	M 500 mg/3 times + 250 mg/6 times (1,500 mg/day)	11 (52.4)	
BAT (N= 97)			
93 (95.9%) A 2,000 mg/day	Bi 120 mg/4 times	14 (77.8)	0.479 ^a
81 (84%) T 2,000 mg/day	Bi 300 mg/4 times	58 (85.3)	

Conclusion: Several first-line bismuth quadruple regimens (CAB, TMB, AMB, CMB, and ALB) are highly effective (>90%) in clinical practice in Europe. Increasing the daily dose of bismuth above 480 mg did not yield additional benefit, supporting the use of standard bismuth dosages in routine management.

Disclosure: Dr. Javier P. Gisbert has served as a speaker, a consultant and advisory member for or has received research funding from Mayoly, Allergan, Diasorin, Biocodex, Juvisé and Richen. Dr. Olga P. Nyssen has served as a speaker or has received research funding from Mayoly, Allergan, Diasorin, Biocodex, Juvisé and Richen. Dr. Samuel J. Martínez-Domínguez has served as a speaker for Juvisé. Dr. Ángel Lanas has served as a speaker for Juvisé. The remaining authors declare no conflicts of interest.

MP510

PRESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF ALTERNATIVE AND INFREQUENT *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* ERADICATION REGIMENS: INSIGHTS FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

I. Luzko Scheid¹, S. Sagdati², G.M. Buzás³, Á. Pérez-Aísa⁴, A. Garre⁵, S. Georgopoulos⁶, S. Abdulkhakov⁷, T. Butler⁸, N. Bakulina⁹, T. Ilchishina¹⁰, I. Bakulin⁹, U. Mahmudov¹¹, L.V. Jonaitis¹², I. Voynovan¹³, A. Mestrovic¹⁴, D. Boltin¹⁵, O. Zaytsev¹⁶, S.J. Martínez-Domínguez¹⁷, N. Dekhnic¹⁸, L. Bujanda Fernández de Piérola¹⁹, G. Tarasova²⁰, I.V. Savilova⁹, I. Nagorni²¹, M. Kovacheva-Slavova²², J. Barrio Andrés²³, B. Starostin²⁴, L. Vologzhanina²⁵, D. Compare²⁶, E. Verdiyev²⁷, A.J. Lucendo²⁸, G. Babayeva²⁹, V. Milivojevic³⁰, V. Papp³¹, T. Rokkas³², D.S. Bordin³³, S. Smith³⁴, J. Kupcinskas¹², L. Boyanova³⁵, A. Gasbarrini³⁶, M. Leja³⁷, R. Pajares Villarroya³⁸, I. Arteagoitia³⁹, M. Jiménez-Moreno⁴⁰, A. Cano-Catala⁴¹, P. Parra⁵, O.P. Nyssen⁵, F. Mégraud⁴², C. O'Morain⁴³, L. Moreira Ruiz¹, J. P. Gisbert⁵, on behalf of the Hp-EuReg Investigators. Leticia Moreira Ruiz and Javier P. Gisbert, Both Senior Authors, Contributed Equally to the Study

¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, ²Department of Gastroenterology and Endoscopy, Gastromedica GM, Gastroenterology, Novi Pazar, Serbia, ³Department of Gastroenterology, Ferencváros Health Center, Dr., Budapest, Hungary, ⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), Marbella, Spain, ⁵Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Department of Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ⁶Athens Medical Centre, Paleo Faliron Hospital, Gastroenterology/Hepatology, Piraeus, Greece, ⁷Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan State Medical University, Kazan, Russian Federation, ⁸Clinical Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Department of Gastroenterology, Tallaght University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland, ⁹Mechnikov North-Western State Medical University, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation, ¹⁰Department of Gastroenterology, SM-Clinic, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ¹¹Modern Hospital, Baku, Azerbaijan, ¹²Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Gastroenterology, Kaunas, Lithuania, ¹³A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ¹⁴University Hospital of Split, Department of Gastroenterology, Split, Croatia, ¹⁵Rabin Medical Center, Tel Aviv University, Gastroenterology, Tel Aviv, Israel, ¹⁶First Clinical Medical Centre, Kovrov, Russian Federation, ¹⁷Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Department of Gastroenterology, Zaragoza, Spain, ¹⁸Smolensk State Medical University, Smolensk, Russian Federation, ¹⁹Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Gastroenterology, San Sebastián, Spain, ²⁰Rostov State Medical University, Gastroenterology, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation,

²¹Clinical Centre of Nis, Gastroenterology, Nis, Serbia, ²²University Hospital Tsaritsa Ioanna-ISUL, Gastroenterology, Sofia, Bulgaria, ²³Hospital Universitario Río Hortega Gerencia Regional de Salud de Castilla y León (SACYL), Gastroenterology, Valladolid, Spain, ²⁴Saint-Petersburg State Budgetary Institution Healthcare City Polyclinic 38, Gastroenterology, St.Petersburg, Russian Federation, ²⁵Gastrocenter, Perm, Russia, Moscow, Russian Federation, ²⁶University Federico II, Pharmaceutic Clinical and Experimental Medicine, Naples, Italy, ²⁷Merkezi Klinik Xestexana, Department of Gastroenterology, Baku,, Azerbaijan, ²⁸Hospital General de Tomelloso. Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Dept. de Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ²⁹Azerbaijan State Advanced Training Institute for doctors named after A.ALIYEV, Terapiya, Baku, Azerbaijan, ³⁰Clinical Center of Serbia, Belgrade University, Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Belgrade, Serbia, ³¹Semmelweis University, Department of Surgery, Transplantation and Gastroenterology, Batorbágy, Hungary, ³²Henry Dunant Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology, Athens, Greece, ³³A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Department of Pancreatic, Biliary and Upper GI Diseases, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁴Trinity College Dublin, Clinical Medicine (Trinity College Dublin) & Gastroenterology (Tallaght University Hospital), Dublin, Ireland, ³⁵Department of Medical Microbiology, Medical University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria, ³⁶Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Gemelli IRCCS, Università Cattolica, Internal Medicine, Gastroenterology and Liver Diseases, Rome, Italy, ³⁷Digestive Diseases Centre, Institute of Clinical and Preventive Medicine, University of Latvia, Department of Gastroenterology, Riga, Latvia, ³⁸Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Department of Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ³⁹Hospital Universitario de Cruces, Department of Gastroenterology, Vizcaya, Spain, ⁴⁰Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Gastroenterology, Burgos, Spain, ⁴¹Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) Research Group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴²INSERM U1312 BRIC, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France, ⁴³Trinity College Dublin - Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin; Dublin/IE, Faculty of Health Sciences, Dublin, Ireland

Contact E-Mail Address: Luzko@clinic.cat

Introduction: Despite the availability of clinical guidelines, a wide range of alternative *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*) eradication regimens continue to be used in routine clinical practice. Data on the frequency and effectiveness of these less frequently prescribed regimens remain limited.

Aims & Methods: **Aim:** To evaluate the prescription patterns and effectiveness of less frequently prescribed eradication regimens within the European Registry on *Helicobacter pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg).

Methods: International, multicentre, prospective, non-interventional registry on the management of *H. pylori* infection, ongoing since 2013. For this analysis, treatment regimens prescribed in fewer than 5% of all cases were classified as 'less frequently prescribed'. Additionally, therapies not previously categorized in the registry database were also included. Treatment effectiveness was assessed using modified intention-to-treat (mITT) and per-protocol (PP) analyses.

Results: Overall, 260 less frequently prescribed regimens were identified, representing 5.5% of all recorded prescriptions (82,510). A total of 2,853 (63%) of these regimens were used as first-line therapy. Among these less

frequently prescribed regimens, the most frequently used first-line treatments encompassed bismuth-containing quadruple therapy with PPI–clarithromycin–metronidazole–bismuth (20%), followed by non-bismuth hybrid quadruple therapy with clarithromycin–amoxicillin–metronidazole (9.5%), and dual therapy with PPI–amoxicillin (8.6%). In second-line, the most common regimens were triple therapies, such as the PPI–amoxicillin–moxifloxacin (16%), PPI–clarithromycin–levofloxacin (11%), and PPI–metronidazole–levofloxacin (9.5%). In third-line, the most frequently used regimes were bismuth-based quadruple regimens including PPI–metronidazole–doxycycline–bismuth (27%), followed by triple therapies with PPI–clarithromycin–levofloxacin (6.8%) and PPI–amoxicillin–moxifloxacin (5.6%). In the fourth-line, the most frequent prescriptions were: bismuth-based quadruple therapies including PPI–amoxicillin–rifabutin–bismuth (30%) and PPI–metronidazole–doxycycline–bismuth (11%). Finally, the fifth treatment-line accounted for some less common treatments, such as the dual therapy with PPI–amoxicillin (19%) and the triple therapy with PPI–amoxicillin–bismuth (18%). Effectiveness and frequency of use in first-, second- and third-line of treatment are described in Table 1. Antibiotic-free regimens such as the combination of a PPI with a probiotic—generally *Lactobacillus bulgaricus* or *Lactobacillus reuteri*—were prescribed as alternative therapeutic approaches in 104 cases (2.3%), achieving 74% mITT and 76% PP overall effectiveness.

		Frequency, n (%)	Effectiveness mITT	Effectiveness PP
Overall	Quadruple-PPI+C+M+B	597 (13.2)	90.4%	90.7%
	Dual-PPI+A	339 (7.5)	70.8%	70.8%
	Quadruple-PPI+M+D+B	309 (6.8)	67.1%	67.7%
First-line	Quadruple-PPI+C+M+B	580 (20.3)	90.2%	90.5%
	Hybrid-PPI+C+A+M	270 (9.5)	94.2%	94.2%
	Dual-PPI+A	244 (8.6)	76.1%	76.1%
Second-line	Triple-PPI+A+Mx	153 (15.8)	91.8%	91.8%
	Triple-PPI+C+L	104 (10.7)	76.9%	76.7%
	Triple-PPI+M+L	92 (9.5)	75%	75%
Third-line	Quadruple-PPI+M+D+B	106 (26.8)	62.7%	63.3%
	Triple-PPI+C+L	27 (6.8)	52%	50%
	Triple-PPI+A+Mx	22 (5.6)	63.3%	63.3%
Antibiotic free-regimens	PPI+ <i>Lactobacillus bulgaricus</i>	55 (52.8)	87.3%	87.3%
	PPI+ <i>Lactobacillus reuteri</i>	22 (21.15)	40%	40.9%

n, number of patients receiving a prescription; C, clarithromycin; M, metronidazole; B, bismuth; A, amoxicillin; D, doxycycline; L, levofloxacin; Mx, moxifloxacin; R, rifabutin; PPI, proton pump inhibitor; mITT, modified intention to treat; PP, per protocol.

Table 1. Frequency of use and effectiveness of alternative and infrequent prescriptions in first-, second- and third-line treatments.

Conclusion: Among the various less frequently used *H. pylori* eradication regimens, only a few (such as the PPI–clarithromycin–metronidazole–bismuth regimen and the hybrid regimen including clarithromycin–amoxicillin–metronidazole) achieved first-line eradication rates above 90%. In subsequent treatment lines, effectiveness was highly variable and often suboptimal. These findings highlight the importance of evidence-based treatment selection to optimize treatment outcomes.

Disclosure: Conflict of interest statement

Olga P. Nyssen has served as a speaker or has received research funding from Allergan, Mayoly Spindler, Richen, Biocodex and Juvisé.

Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé, Biocodex.

The remaining authors declare no conflicts of interest.

MP511

EMPIRICAL SECOND-LINE TREATMENTS IN EUROPE: DATA FROM 9,000 CASES FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

O.P. Nyssen¹, L. Jonaitis², Á. Pérez-Aísa³, M. Pavoni⁴, S.J. Martínez-Domínguez⁵, B. Tepes⁶, L. Vologzhanina⁷, G. Fiorini⁸, I. Voynovan⁹, A.J. Lucendo¹⁰, J. Tejedor-Tejada¹¹, M. Pabón-Carrasco¹², L. Bujanda¹³, J.M. Huguet¹⁴, I. Ortiz Polo¹⁵, F. Lerang¹⁶, J. Barrio¹⁷, F. Bermejo¹⁸, G. Losurdo¹⁹, B.J. Gómez Rodríguez²⁰, T. Butler²¹, M. Areia²², A. Sarsenbaeva²³, O. Núñez Martínez²⁴, I. Beales²⁵, H. Fernandes-Mendes²⁶, S. Abdulkhakov²⁷, A. Gasbarrini²⁸, M. Denkovski²⁹, A. Keco-Huerga³⁰, M. Perona³⁰, P. S. Phull³¹, G. Kamto³², S. Alekseenko³³, S.M. Smith³⁴, W. Marlicz³⁵, J. Kupcinskas², D.S. Bordin³⁶, M. Leja³⁷, R. Pinto³⁸, R. Pajares Villarroja³⁹, M. Jiménez-Moreno⁴⁰, I. Arteagoitia⁴¹, M. Sánchez Alonso⁴², A. Cano-Catala⁴³, P. Parra¹, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴⁴, F. Mégraud⁴⁵, C. O'Morain⁴⁶, J. P. Gisbert¹, on behalf of the Hp-EuReg investigators.

¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ²Department of Gastroenterology, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania, ³Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), , Marbella, Spain, ⁴Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Sant'Orsola-Malpighi University Hospital, Bologna, Italy, ⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Zaragoza, Spain, ⁶Department of Gastroenterology, DC Rogaska, Rogaska Slatina, Slovenia, ⁷Gastrocentr, Perm, Russian Federation,

⁸Cardiovascular Medicine Unit, Heart, Chest and Vascular Dept., IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Hypertension and Cardiovascular Risk Research Center, Medical and Surgical Sciences Dept., Alma Mater Studiorum University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy, ⁹A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ¹⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General de Tomelloso, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Tomelloso, Spain, ¹¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Asturias, Spain, ¹²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Sevilla, Spain, ¹³Department of Gastroenterology, Biodonostia Health Research Institute, Department of Medicine, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), San Sebastián, Spain, ¹⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Valencia, Spain, ¹⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario y Politécnico la Fe, Valencia, Spain, ¹⁶Østfold Hospital Trust, Grålum, Norway, ¹⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Gerencia Regional de Salud de Castilla y León (SACYL), Valladolid, Spain, ¹⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital

Universitario de Fuenlabrada, Madrid, Spain, ¹⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Department of Precision and Regenerative Medicine and Ionian Area, University of Bari, Bari, Italy, ²⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Sevilla, Spain, ²¹Clinical Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Department of Gastroenterology, Tallaght University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland, ²²Department of Gastroenterology, Portuguese Oncology Institute of Coimbra, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto (FMUP), RISE@CI-IPO (Health Research Network), Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO Porto), Coimbra, Portugal, ²³Department of Gastroenterology, Chelyabinsk Regional Clinical Hospital, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation, ²⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario La Moraleja, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad CEU San Pablo, Madrid, Spain, ²⁵Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom, ²⁶Department of Gastroenterology, Centro Hospitalar Universitário de Santo António, ULS de Santo António, Porto, Portugal, ²⁷Kazan (Volga region) Federal university, Kazan State Medical University, Kazan, Russian Federation, ²⁸Department of Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy, ²⁹Interni oddelek, Diagnostic Centre, Bled, Slovenia, ³⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Quirón Marbella, Marbella, Spain, ³¹Department of Digestive Disorders, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Aberdeen, United Kingdom, ³²Hepatic Medical, Private Medical Center, Krakow, Poland, ³³Far Eastern State Medical University, Khabarovsk, Russian Federation, ³⁴School of Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, ³⁵Department of Gastroenterology, Pomeranian Medical University in Szczecin, The Centre for Digestive Diseases, Endoklinika, Szczecin, Poland, ³⁶Department of Pancreatic, Biliary and upper digestive tract disorders, A. S. Loginov Moscow clinical scientific center, Department of outpatient therapy and family medicine, Tver State Medical University, Department of propaedeutic of internal diseases and gastroenterology, Russian University of Medicine, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³⁷Department of Gastroenterology, Digestive Diseases Centre, Institute of Clinical and Preventive Medicine, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia, ³⁸Department of Gastroenterology, Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Instituto De Ciências Biomédicas de Abel Salazar, Universidade do Porto, Center for Research in Health Technologies and Information Systems (CINTESIS), Porto, Portugal, ³⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofia, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, ⁴⁰Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Burgos, Spain, ⁴¹Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de Cruces, Vizcaya, Spain, ⁴²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario Santa Bárbara, Ciudad Real, Spain, ⁴³Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain, ⁴⁵INSERM U1312 BRIC, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France, ⁴⁶Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

Contact E-Mail Address: pablo.parra.hlp@gmail.com
Introduction: After a first eradication attempt, a relevant proportion of patients fail to cure *Helicobacter pylori* infection.

Aims & Methods: To evaluate the effectiveness of second-line empirical treatment.
A systematic, prospective, registry of the clinical practice of European gastroenterologists (38 countries) on *H. pylori* management was established (Hp-EuReg, Hp-WorldReg's partner).
All infected adult patients were systematically registered at AEG-REDCap e-CRF until January 2025. Modified intention-to-treat (mITT) and per-protocol (PP) analyses were performed.
Results: Overall, 8,901 patients received a second-line empirical therapy. Mean age was 51 years, 67% were women, and 4.7% had penicillin allergy. Most frequent treatment indications were dyspepsia (74%) and gastroduodenal ulcer (13%). Overall effectiveness was 82% (both by mITT and PP). Overall, 96.5% of patients were compliant. Adverse events were reported in 19% of the cases, most of them mild. The overall effectiveness of most frequent empirical second-line treatments is shown in Table 1, showing that uniquely bismuth quadruple therapies, either with metronidazole-tetracycline or clarithromycin-amoxicillin, when prescribed for 14 days and with high-dose PPIs provided over 90% success rates. After failure of first-line clarithromycin-containing therapy, the most effective second-line treatments were triple therapy with amoxicillin and either rifabutin or levofloxacin providing 85% and 80% effectiveness, respectively. Additionally, bismuth quadruple therapy with regimens containing tetracycline-metronidazole in single-capsule and classical formulation, with clarithromycin-amoxicillin and with levofloxacin-amoxicillin achieved 87%, 84%, 88% and 85% cure rates, respectively. Within the same subgroup but in patients receiving optimised therapy —defined as a 14-day course with standard or high-dose PPIs at >40mg omeprazole equivalent twice daily —, certain regimens yielded even higher cure rates. Among these, triple therapy with amoxicillin-levofloxacin obtained 87% success rate, while non-bismuth concomitant therapy with amoxicillin-clarithromycin-metronidazole reached 86%. Bismuth quadruple therapy with either tetracycline-metronidazole (administered either as a single capsule or in the classical prescription) reported 89% success; but with amoxicillin-metronidazole or clarithromycin-amoxicillin highest effectiveness was reported, that is, 91% and 92%, respectively. After failure of bismuth quadruple therapy either in the classical format or when prescribed as the single-capsule, bismuth quadruple therapy with clarithromycin-amoxicillin achieved 95.5% and 95% cure rates, respectively; whereas, the single capsule obtained 93% and 89%, respectively.

Treatment	N	Use (%)	mITT, N (%)	(95% CI)	PP, N (%)	(95% CI)
Triple-A+L	2,100	24	1,853 (79%)	(78-81)	1,831 (80%)	(78-82)
Single-capsule*	1,850	21	1,721 (87%)	(85-89)	1,684 (88%)	(86-89)
Quadruple-A+L+B	1,271	14	1,022 (86%)	(83-88)	1,002 (86%)	(84-88)
Quadruple-C+A+M	553	6.2	527 (81%)	(78-85)	514 (82%)	(79-86)
Quadruple-M+Tc+B	480	5.4	426 (84%)**	(80-88)	407 (86%)	(82-89)
Triple-C+A	436	4.9	344 (74%)	(69-79)	338 (74%)	(69-79)
Quadruple-C+A+B	390	4.4	267 (89%)**	(85-93)	257 (89%)	(86-93)
Triple-A+R	218	2.4	195 (82%)	(76-87)	193 (82%)	(76-88)
Triple-A+M	204	2.3	178 (57%)	(50-65)	177 (58%)	(50-65)
Other	1,229	14	NA	NA	NA	NA
Overall	8,731	100	7,601 (82%)	(81-83)	7,451 (82%)	(81-83)
Overall (optimised conditions)	1,913	22	1,641 (87%)	(85-89)	1,604 (87%)	(86-89)
East	1,404	16	1,147 (83%)	(81-86)	1,111 (84%)	(81-86)
East-Centre	1,645	18	1,158 (85%)	(83-87)	1,145 (85%)	(83-87)
South-West	4,046	45	3,834 (81%)	(80-83)	3,756 (82%)	(81-83)
West-Centre	1,163	13	1,043 (84%)	(82-86)	1,028 (84%)	(82-87)
North	643	7.2	566 (70%)	(66-74)	548 (72%)	(68-75)
Total	8,901	100	7,748 (82%)	(81-83)	7,588 (82%)	(81-83)

95% CI – confidence interval; mITT: modified intention-to-treat; PP: per-protocol; N: total number of patients analysed; C – clarithromycin; M – metronidazole; A – amoxicillin; L – levofloxacin; B – bismuth salts; Tc – tetracycline; R – rifabutin; Other – Other second-line empirical treatments with less than 150 patients treated in each category; East – Ukraine, Serbia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Russia, Romania, Albania, North Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Moldova, Montenegro; East-Centre – Croatia, Poland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Greece, Slovenia, Czech Rep, Azerbaijan, Slovakia, Malta, Armenia; South-West – Portugal, Spain; West-Centre – France, Austria, Belgium, Germany, Italy; North – The United Kingdom, Finland, The Netherlands, Ireland, Israel, Norway, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark; *three-in-one single-capsule containing tetracycline, metronidazole and bismuth; **achieved over 90% effectiveness when optimised (high-dose PPIs and 14-days).

Table 1. Second-line empirical treatment prescriptions and effectiveness by treatment scheme and geographical region.

Conclusion: In Europe, empirical second-line treatment overall effectiveness is generally suboptimal (<90%); however, successful results were obtained with bismuth quadruple therapies, either with tetracycline-metronidazole or clarithromycin-amoxicillin, when prescribed for 14 days and with high-dose PPIs. Optimization of regimen selection, treatment duration, and PPI dosing is necessary after first-line therapy failure.

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

MP513

EMPIRICAL ERADICATION THERAPY FOR *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* INFECTION IN SECOND AND SUBSEQUENT TREATMENT LINES: EXPERIENCE FROM 500 CASES OF THE BRAZILIAN REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-BRAZILREG)

B. Sanches¹, O.P. Nyssen², S. Chaves¹, J.C. Veloso³, J. Marinho⁴, L. Silva⁵, H. Okamoto⁶, G. Couto⁷, H. Breyer⁸, C. Alencar⁹, E. Comelli¹⁰, L.A.S. Sousa¹¹, M. Horn¹², M.J. Massote¹³, M. Loures¹⁴, M.D.F. Pietroluongo Vidal¹⁵, R. Paula¹⁶, L. Ribeiro¹⁷, H. Galizzi¹⁸, D. Terra¹⁹, G. Cançado²⁰, B. Burmann²¹, J. Caetano²², L. Pena²³, M. Decanio²⁴, H. Siffert Pereira de Souza²⁵, A. Kuniyoshi²⁶, L. Guedes²⁷, M.d.C. Friche Passos²⁸, F. Passos Marinho²⁰, I. Bombassaro²⁹, A. Domingues³⁰, J. Garcia³¹, I. Nogueira³², A. Ramos³³, D. Korman³⁴, T. Souza³⁵, M.C. Barbosa³⁶, D. Chinzon³⁷, L. Lima da Silva³⁸, A. Montovani³⁹, A.H. Freitas⁴⁰, C. Poncinelli⁴¹, M. Francato⁴², J. Gonçalves⁴³, P. Parra⁴⁴, A. Cano Català⁴⁵, L. Moreira Ruiz⁴⁶, J. Gisbert², L. Coelho¹, on behalf of the Hp-BrazilReg investigators. Javier P. Gisbert and Luiz Coelho, both senior authors, contributed equally to the study.

¹Federal University of Minas Gerais, Alfa Institute of Gastroenterology/Clinics Hospital, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ³Hospital Santa Helena, Brasília, Brazil, ⁴Universidade Estadual de Ciências da Saúde de Alagoas - UNCISAL, Maceio, Brazil, ⁵Hospital Adventista de Manaus, Gastroenterologia, Manaus, Brazil, ⁶Oxford Medical Center, Gastro, Sao Bento Sul, Brazil, ⁷Centro de Consultas Especializadas, Contagem, Brazil, ⁸Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul/Clinics Hospital, Gastroenterology, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ⁹Chrismed, Emergency, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ¹⁰Clinica Castromed, Castro, Brazil, ¹¹Coopeclin, Recife, Brazil, ¹²Clinica Endocentro, Florianópolis, Brazil, ¹³Unidade de Saude, Santos, Brazil, ¹⁴Hospita Nossa Senhora Das Graças, Curitiba, Brazil, ¹⁵Hospital Ana Costa, Santos, Brazil, ¹⁶Clinica Privada, Aracaju, Brazil, ¹⁷Hospital Universitário Prof. Alberto Antunes, Endoscopia, Maceio, Brazil, ¹⁸Hepscan, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ¹⁹Hospital Militar de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁰Federal University of Minas Gerais/Clinics Hospital, Alfa Institute of Gastroenterology, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²¹Medplus, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ²²Hospital São Rafael, Gastroenterologia, Salvador, Brazil, ²³Socor Hospital, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁴Hospital Portugues, Salvador, Brazil, ²⁵Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Gastroenterology, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ²⁶Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Gastroenterologia, Maringá, Brazil, ²⁷Rede Mater Dei de Saúde, Gastroenterologia, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁸Hospital das Clinicas, UFMG, Gastroenterology, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ²⁹Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ³⁰GRD GASTRO, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, ³¹Santa Casa de Barretos, Barretos, Vol. 13 | October 2025

Brazil, ³²Clinica Privada, São Paulo, Brazil, ³³Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Belo Horizonte, Gastroenterologia, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ³⁴Hospital Militar de Minas Gerais, Gastroenterologia,

Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ³⁵Faculdades Integradas de Patos, Gastroenterologia, Patos, Brazil, ³⁶Clinica Privada, Arapiraca, Brazil, ³⁷University of Sao Paulo, Gastroenterology, Sao Paulo, Brazil, ³⁸Monte Sinai Hospital e Maternidade, Clínica Médica, Juiz de Fora, Brazil, ³⁹Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Gastroenterologia, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ⁴⁰Unimed Sul Capixaba, Cachoeiro do Itapemirim, Brazil, ⁴¹Biogastro, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ⁴²Hospital Municipal Antonio Giglio, Osasco, Brazil, ⁴³Federal University of Minas Gerais, Statistics, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, ⁴⁴Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Madrid, Spain, ⁴⁵Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) Research Group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁶Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Gava, Spain

Contact E-Mail Address: opn.aegredcap@aegastro.es

Introduction: The effectiveness of anti-*Helicobacter pylori* treatment decreases as therapy failure accumulates. Different consensus recommend knowing the regional performance of therapeutic regimens to achieve better eradication results in real clinical practice.

Aims & Methods: To evaluate the effectiveness of empirical therapy in second and subsequent treatment lines in Brazil.

Real-life, multicenter, prospective, non-interventional registry evaluating outcomes of *H. pylori* management by Brazilian gastroenterologists (Hp-BrazilReg, WorldHpReg's partner). Data were registered at e-CRF AEG-RedCap from March 2022 to October 2024. The effectiveness was evaluated by modified intention-to-treat (mITT) analysis. Data were subject to quality review.

Results: 572 patients, with a mean age of 52 years, 64% women, were evaluated. The main treatment indications were dyspepsia (64%) and gastroduodenal ulcer (9.2%). 386 (67%) patients received a second-line therapy, and 186 (32%) received third-line or subsequent therapy. Low-dose (between 4.5 and 27 mg of omeprazole equivalent BID), standard-dose (between 32 and 40 mg of omeprazole equivalent BID), and high-dose (between 54 and 128 mg of omeprazole BID) proton pump inhibitor (PPIs) were used in 40%, 10%, and 24%, respectively. Vonoprazan (VPZ) 20 mg BID, was used in 26% of cases. With the second-line treatment, the overall eradication rate was 74%. The most frequently used regimen was the triple therapy with PPI+amoxicillin+levofloxacin for 10-14 days, in 55% of the patients. This regimen, recommended as an alternative by the Brazilian Consensus, achieved an eradication rate of 84% (14 days) and 55% (10 days). By adding bismuth to this same 14-day regimen the effectiveness increased to 100% (p=0.016). Regarding the third-line, the regimen containing PPI-bismuth-tetracycline-metronidazole was used in 24% of the cases, achieving 87% mITT cure rate. Within the fourth-line, dual therapy including amoxicillin-VPZ was the most common regimen (33%), achieving 100% eradication, followed by bismuth quadruple therapy with PPI+bismuth+amoxicillin+rifabutin (14%), showing 100% effectiveness. Dual therapy with VPZ+amoxicillin was also the most used regimen in the fifth-line and subsequent treatment lines, encompassing 43% of the cases, and achieving also 100% effectiveness. Overall, 23% of the patients presented mild adverse events being nausea the most frequent (14%), and compliance was 99%.

Conclusion: In Brazil, the overall effectiveness of second-line therapy showed suboptimal (≤90%) cure rate; however, the combination of bismuth-amoxicillin-levofloxacin prescribed for 14 days reported successful effectiveness. In the third-line, the classical bismuth-quadruple therapy

with metronidazole-tetracycline provided encouraging results (87%). Alternatively, dual therapy with VPZ and amoxicillin and rifabutin-based bismuth quadruple therapy showed promising results in third- and fifth-line rescue treatment.

Disclosure: Nothing to disclose.

MP514

HELICOBACTER PYLORI ERADICATION PRESCRIPTIONS IN PRIMARY CARE: INSIGHTS FROM OVER 200,000 PATIENTS IN A NATIONAL REAL-WORLD COHORT

E. Fernández-Antón¹, O.P. Nyssen², G. Alonso-Martínez¹, P. Parra², J. P. Gisbert², F. J. de Abajo^{1,3}, Encarnación Fernández-Antón and Olga P. Nyssen, both first authors contributed equally to the study. Javier P. Gisbert and Francisco J. de Abajo, both senior authors contributed equally to the study.

¹Department of Biomedical Sciences (Pharmacology), School of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Alcalá (IRYCIS), 28805 Alcalá de Henares, Spain, ²Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ³Clinical Pharmacology Unit, University Hospital Príncipe de Asturias, 28805 Alcalá de Henares, Spain

Contact E-Mail Address: pablo.parra.hlp@gmail.com

Introduction: *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*) is the most widespread infection globally and the main cause of chronic gastritis, peptic ulcer disease, and gastric cancer. Its eradication is primarily managed in primary care. Assessing real-world clinical management practices of *H. pylori* infection and their adherence to clinical guidelines is essential to inform and optimize treatment strategies.

Aims & Methods: To assess the current *H. pylori* management strategies followed in Primary Care, we conducted an epidemiological cohort study using data from BIFAP, a Spanish healthcare database containing real-world data on the clinical practice of Primary Care physicians.

Patients aged ≥ 18 years with a recorded *H. pylori* infection between January 1, 2003, and June 30, 2023, and a prescription for infection treatment were selected. Two algorithms were developed: one to identify potential cases of *H. pylori* infection, based on ICD-9/10, and SNOMED CT codes, supplemented by clue words; and another to detect prescribed treatment patterns, constructed from guideline-based recommendations compiled from Spanish and European Consensus Conferences between 1997 and 2022, encompassing 19 possible combinations. A validation process was conducted to confirm the accuracy of infection records through manual review of a random sample of electronic health records. Treatment prescriptions were validated based on active ingredients recorded.

We analysed the treatment prevalence stratified by clinical and demographic factors. Continuous and categorical variables were summarized using medians and proportions, respectively. First-line treatments were compared with those of the European Registry on *H. pylori* Management (Hp-EuReg) to contrast Primary and Specialised (that is, gastroenterologists) Care, respectively.

Results: A total of 211,972 subjects were identified with a *H. pylori* infection record and, at least, one of the possible treatment patterns. The median age at infection diagnosis was 55 years (IQR, 44-66), with women representing 65%. The most frequent first-line treatments included: proton pump inhibitor (PPI) plus a single-capsule containing bismuth, tetracycline and metronidazole (Pylera®) (PPI+ScBQT) with 36% of cases; PPI, clarithromycin, amoxicillin (PPI+C+A) with 30%; and the combination PPI, clarithromycin, amoxicillin, metronidazole (PPI+C+A+M), with 26%. The most commonly used first-line combination among individuals aged 18-

64 years was PPI+ScBQT, as well as in those with a recorded diagnosis of obesity, chronic kidney disease, and in current smokers. However, among individuals aged ≥ 65 years, as well as in those with a recorded diagnosis of peptic ulcer, the most frequent first-line treatment was PPI+C+A. Comparison between Specialised and Primary Care showed that, since 2013, the use of PPI+C+A by Gastroenterologists has decreased from 40% to less than 1% by 2023, with a similar trend observed in Primary Care, although it remains prescribed in over 10% of cases in 2023. The use of non-bismuth quadruple therapy (PPI+C+A+M) significantly increased since 2015, with a higher proportion in Specialised (40%) compared to Primary Care (30%). ScBQT is currently the most widely prescribed regimen, accounting for approximately 60% of prescriptions in both settings.

Conclusion: *H. pylori* eradication treatments in Primary Care are heterogeneous, with single-capsule bismuth quadruple therapy being the most prescribed. The use of first-line treatment guidelines has generally aligned with Spanish and European recommendations, although their adoption in Primary Care has been slower than in Specialised Care.

Disclosure: Javier P. Gisbert has served as speaker, consultant, and advisory member for or has received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Diasorin, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

Olga P. Nyssen received research funding from: Mayoly, Allergan/Abbvie, Richen, Juvisé and Biocodex.

MP734

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE LACK OF FOLLOW-UP IN *HELICOBACTER PYLORI* ERADICATION TREATMENT: RESULTS FROM THE EUROPEAN REGISTRY ON *H. PYLORI* MANAGEMENT (HP-EUREG)

E. Cantú Germano Dutra¹, L. Moreira Ruiz¹, Á. Pérez-Aísa², S.J. Martínez-Domínguez³, I. Voynovan⁴, L. Bujanda Fernández de Piérola⁵, L.V. Jonaitis⁶, B. Tepes⁷, A. Garre⁸, A.J. Lucendo⁹, F. Lerang¹⁰, T. Butler¹¹, U. Mahmudov¹², J.M. Huguet¹³, J. Tejedor-Tejada¹⁴, P. Bogomolov¹⁵, I. Beales¹⁶, P. Phull¹⁷, M. Pabón-Carrasco¹⁸, M. Castro-Fernández¹⁸, S. Alekseenko¹⁹, M. Pavoni²⁰, O. Zaytsev²¹, R. Bumane²², M. Denkovski²³, M. Domínguez Cajal²⁴, T. Ilchishina²⁵, M. Areia²⁶, A. Keco-Huerga¹⁸, G. Babayeva²⁷, F. Bermejo²⁸, H. Simsek²⁹, G. Losurdo³⁰, D.S. Bordin³¹, J. Kupcinskas³², S. Smith³³, A. Gasbarrini³⁴, M. Leja²², R. Pinto³⁵, C. Simsek³⁶, B.J. Gómez Rodríguez³⁷, P. Pazo Mejide³⁸, R. Pajares Villarroya³⁹, M. Sánchez Alonso⁴⁰, A. Cano-Catala⁴¹, P. Parra⁸, F. Mégraud⁴², C. O'Morain³³, O.P. Nyssen⁸, J. P. Gisbert⁸, On behalf of the Hp-EuReg investigators. Olga P. Nyssen and Javier P. Gisbert, both senior authors, contributed equally to the study.

¹Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), University of Barcelona, Gastroenterology, Barcelona, Spain, ²Hospital Universitario Costa del Sol, Red de Investigación en Cronicidad, Atención Primaria y Prevención y Promoción de la Salud (RICAPPS), Gastroenterology, Marbella, Spain, ³Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Gastroenterology, Zaragoza, Spain, ⁴A.S. Loginov Moscow Clinical Scientific Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ⁵Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Gastroenterology, San Sebastián, Spain, ⁶Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Gastroenterology, Kaunas, Lithuania, ⁷DC Rogaska, Gastroenterology, Rogaska Slatina, Slovenia, ⁸Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM), and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain, ⁹Hospital General de Tomelloso, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Princesa (IIS-Princesa), Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Dept. de Gastroenterology, Tomelloso, Spain, ¹⁰Østfold Hospital Trust, Medicine, Grålum, Norway, ¹¹Clinical Medicine, Trinity College Dublin, Department of Gastroenterology, Tallaght University Hospital, Gastroenterology, Dublin, Ireland, ¹²Modern Hospital, Baku, Azerbaijan, ¹³Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Gastroenterology, Valencia, Spain, ¹⁴Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Gastroenterology, Gijón, Asturias, Spain, ¹⁵Universal Clinic Private Medical Center, Moscow, Russian Federation, ¹⁶Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom, ¹⁷Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Digestive Disorders, Aberdeen, United Kingdom, ¹⁸Hospital Universitario Virgen de Valme, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ¹⁹Fare Estern State Medical University, Internal Medicine, Khabarovsk, Russian Federation, ²⁰Sant'Orsola-Malpighi University Hospital, Medical and Surgical Sciences, Bologna, Italy, ²¹First Clinical Medical Centre, Kovrov,

Russian Federation, ²²Digestive Diseases Centre, Institute of Clinical and Preventive Medicine, University of Latvia, Gastroenterology, Riga, Latvia, ²³Interni Oddelek, Diagnostic Centre, Bled, Slovenia, ²⁴Hospital Universitario San Jorge, Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Huesca, Spain, ²⁵SM-clinic, Gastroenterology, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation, ²⁶Portuguese Oncology Institute of Coimbra, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Porto (FMUP), RISE@CI-IPO (Health Research Network), Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO Porto), Gastroenterology, Coimbra, Portugal, ²⁷Azerbaijan State Advanced Training Institute for doctors named after A.ALIYEV, Terapiya, Baku, Azerbaijan, ²⁸Hospital Universitario de Fuenlabrada, Gastroenterology, Madrid, Spain, ²⁹Hacettepe University, Department of Gastroenterology, HC International Clinic, Gastroenterology, Ankara, Türkiye, ³⁰University of Bari, Department of Gastroenterology, Department of Precision and Regenerative Medicine and Ionian Area, Bari, Italy, ³¹A. S. Loginov Moscow clinical scientific center, Department of outpatient therapy and family medicine, Tver State Medical University, Department of propaedeutic of internal diseases and gastroenterology, Department of pancreatic, biliary and upper GI diseases, Moscow, Russian Federation, ³²Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Department of Gastroenterology, Kaunas, Lithuania, ³³Trinity College Dublin, School of Medicine, Dublin, Ireland, ³⁴Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Gemelli IRCCS, Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology, Rome, Italy, ³⁵Centro Hospitalar do Porto, Universidade do Porto, Instituto De Ciências Biomédicas de Abel Salazar, Center for Research in Health Technologies and Information Systems (CINTESIS), Gastroenterology, Porto, Portugal, ³⁶Hacettepe University, Mehmet Akif Inan, Health Sciences University, Medical Center, HC International Clinic, Gastroenterology, Ankara, Türkiye, ³⁷Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Gastroenterology, Sevilla, Spain, ³⁸Hospital de Cruces, Gastroenterology, Barakaldo, Spain, ³⁹Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad Europea de Madrid, Gastroenterology, San Sebastián de los Reyes, Spain, ⁴⁰Hospital Universitario Santa Bárbara, Gastroenterology, Puertollano, Spain, ⁴¹Gastrointestinal Oncology, Endoscopy and Surgery (GOES) research group, Althaia Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut de la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), Manresa, Spain, ⁴²INSERM U1312, Université de Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France

Contact E-Mail Address: elisa.germano@hotmail.com

Introduction: The Maastricht VI/Florence Consensus recommends eradication of all *Helicobacter pylori* (*Hp*) infections. However, retreatment strategies after therapeutic failure remain inconsistent.

Aims & Methods: To evaluate the reasons and associated factors for non-retreatment after a failure of *Hp* eradication treatment.

Systematic, prospective, multicenter, non-interventional registry of clinical practice by European gastroenterologists on the management of *Hp* infection (Hp-EuReg). Patients who failed eradication treatment between 2013-2024 and were registered in AEG-REDCap were analysed and categorised into two groups: retreatment (control group) and non-retreatment. Reasons for no retreatment were also classified according to either the medical or the patient perspective. Multivariate logistic regression was conducted to identify factors associated with no retreatment from both the patient and medical perspectives, each compared with the control group.

Results: Overall, 6,904 patients were evaluated; 950 (14%) were not retreated: 41% due to a medical decision, 50% due to a patient decision, and 9% due to other reasons. The most frequent reasons for no retreatment were: previous poor tolerance, unclear indication, multiple prior eradica-

tion attempts, and previous non-compliance. From the medical perspective, factors significantly associated with no retreatment were: age ≥ 71 years (OR 1.49; 95% CI 1.04-2.13), previous non-compliance (OR 4.27; 95% CI 2.64-6.93), number of previous attempts (OR 2.07-9.25; 95% CI from 1.57-2.73 to 6.15-13.93) and previous treatment discontinuation due to adverse events (OR 2.06; 95% CI 1.19-3.56). From the patient perspective, the factors significantly associated with no retreatment included: being male (OR 1.34; 95% CI 1.10-1.63), having undergone two to four previous eradication attempts (OR 1.69-3.60; 95% CI from 1.16-2.44 to 1.75-7.41) and previous non-compliance (OR 10.04; 95% CI 7.37-13.68).

	No retreatment		P value	No retreatment		P value	No retreatment		P value
	Retreatment N=5,954	Overall N=950	OR (95% CI) if applicable	Medical perspective N=393	OR (95% CI) if applicable		Patient perspective N=474	OR (95% CI) if applicable	
Sex									
Male	2,100 (35.3%)	386 (40.6%)	0.000	147 (37.4%)	0.116		206 (43.5%)		0.004
Female	3,850 (64.7%)	564 (59.4%)	1.30 (1.12-1.50)	246 (62.6%)	-		268 (56.5%)	1.34 (1.10-1.63)	
Age									
18-70	5,455 (91.6%)	851 (89.5%)	0.015	350 (89.1%)	0.028		430 (90.7%)		0.282
> 70	475 (7.9%)	96 (10.1%)	1.35 (1.06-1.72)	40 (10.2%)	1.49 (1.04-2.13)		44 (9.3%)	-	
Number of previous eradication attempts			p < 0.05 in all		p < 0.05 in all			p < 0.05 only in 2-4 attempts	
One	1,054 (17.7%)	181 (19.1%)	1.57 (1.30-1.89)	82 (20.9%)	2.07 (1.57-2.73)		82 (17.3%)	-	
Two	334 (5.6%)	105 (11.1%)	2.82 (2.21-3.61)	61 (15.5%)	4.89 (3.54-6.74)		26 (5.5%)	1.69 (1.16-2.44)	
Three	115 (1.9%)	63 (6.6%)	5.05 (3.63-7.03)	39 (9.9%)	9.25 (6.15-13.93)		21 (4.4%)	2.91 (1.78-4.76)	
Four	42 (0.7%)	27 (2.8%)	6.00 (3.61-9.96)	12 (3.1%)	7.84 (3.96-15.53)		10 (2.1%)	3.60 (1.75-7.41)	
Five	28 (0.5%)	13 (1.4%)	4.04 (4.97-7.41)	5 (1.3%)	4.73 (1.75-12.77)		5 (1.1%)	-	
Treatment compliance*	5,647 (94.8%)	739 (77.8%)	0.000 6.07 (4.97-7.41)	303 (77.1%)	0.000 4.27 (2.64-6.93)		358 (75.5%)	0.000 10.04 (7.37-13.68)	
Interruption due to AE	183 (3.1%)	109 (11.5%)	0.053	68 (17.3%)	0.010 2.06 (1.19-3.56)		39 (8.2%)	0.000 0.34 (0.22-0.55)	

