Media of Health Research
Vol. 3 No. 1, April 2025, pages: 16-22
e-ISSN 2987-7784
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70716/mohr.v3i1.139

Clinical Evaluation of Ranitidine and Omeprazole in Shortening Hospital Stay for Dyspepsia Patients

Riana Hartanti[1*], Andres Manalo[2], Muhammad Zikri[1]
[1] Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia
[2] University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines
**Corresponding Author: riana.hartanti@gmail.com*

Article History

Manuscript submitted:
17 December 2024
Manuscript revised:
21 February 2025
Accepted for publication:
19 April 2025
Manuscript published:
25 April 2025

Keywords

dyspepsia, ranitidine, omeprazole, treatment duration, clinical effectiveness

Abstract

Dyspepsia is a common complaint of the upper gastrointestinal tract that often leads to a decrease in quality of life and increased healthcare burden. Two drugs commonly used in the treatment of dyspepsia are ranitidine, an H2 receptor antagonist, and omeprazole, a proton pump inhibitor. This study aims to evaluate the clinical effectiveness of ranitidine and omeprazole in reducing the length of treatment for dyspepsia patients. The study uses a quantitative method with a retrospective approach to the medical record data of inpatient dyspepsia patients at a hospital in Indonesia. The sample consisted of two groups of patients, each receiving ranitidine and omeprazole therapy. Analysis was performed on treatment duration, symptom improvement, and adverse events. The results showed that patients receiving omeprazole had a more significant reduction in average treatment duration compared to the ranitidine group. Furthermore, omeprazole had better tolerability with fewer side effects. These findings indicate that omeprazole is more clinically effective in accelerating the recovery of dyspepsia patients compared to ranitidine. This study provides a scientific basis for medical practitioners in choosing optimal therapy for dyspepsia, especially in the context of healthcare efficiency. Further research with a prospective design is needed to strengthen these findings.

How to Cite: Hartanti, R., Manalo, A. & Zikri, M. (2025) Clinical Evaluation of Ranitidine and Omeprazole in Shortening Hospital Stay for Dyspepsia Patients. *Media of Health Research, 3*(1), 16–22. https://doi.org/10.70716/mohr.v3i1.139

Introduction

Dyspepsia is a functional disorder of the upper gastrointestinal tract characterized by epigastric pain or discomfort, nausea, bloating, and even vomiting (Simadibrata *et al.*, 2010). This condition is frequently encountered in daily clinical practice, both in primary and secondary healthcare settings and represents one of the most common reasons for patient visits to healthcare facilities (Setyohadi & Simadibrata, 2021).

The prevalence of dyspepsia in Indonesia is notably high and appears to be on the rise. Epidemiological studies indicate that dyspepsia accounts for 20–40% of all patients presenting with

gastrointestinal complaints in primary healthcare services (Spiegel *et al.*, 2002). This condition imposes a significant burden on both economic and health sectors, particularly due to increased hospitalization costs (Saadah *et al.*, 2022). In addition to its economic implications, dyspepsia markedly reduces patients' quality of life. Recurrent symptoms can impair daily functioning and negatively affect psychological well-being (Hantoro *et al.*, 2018). Consequently, appropriate management of dyspepsia is essential to mitigate its socioeconomic impact.

The management of dyspepsia typically involves both pharmacological and non-pharmacological approaches. Pharmacotherapy remains the primary strategy, particularly treatments that reduce gastric acid secretion, such as H2-receptor antagonists and proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) (Camilleri & Stanghellini, 2013). Among these options, ranitidine and omeprazole are the most widely used medications for treating dyspepsia in Indonesia. Ranitidine, an H2-receptor antagonist, works competitively and reversibly, inhibiting gastric acid secretion. It has long been utilized across various healthcare settings due to its effectiveness and relatively favorable safety profile for short-term use (Fasseas *et al.*, 2001). Omeprazole, a proton pump inhibitor, irreversibly inhibits the proton pump, suppressing gastric acid secretion more effectively than ranitidine. Several studies have reported that omeprazole yields better outcomes in healing gastrointestinal lesions and alleviating dyspeptic symptoms (Santoso et al., 2018).

The choice between ranitidine and omeprazole is generally based on clinical efficacy, safety, patient tolerance to adverse effects, and treatment cost. In clinical practice, treatment decisions often vary among healthcare providers and even across healthcare institutions (Mahadeva *et al.*, 2012). Previous studies comparing the effectiveness of ranitidine and omeprazole have yielded mixed results. Most studies suggest that omeprazole demonstrates superior clinical efficacy in improving the symptoms of dyspepsia (Yeomans *et al.*, 1998). Meanwhile, the duration of hospitalization for dyspeptic patients serves as a key parameter in evaluating therapeutic effectiveness. Shorter hospital stays not only enhance patient comfort but also contribute to a reduction in overall inpatient care costs (Hanindiya, 2020).

Given these considerations, a more in-depth clinical evaluation is warranted to assess the comparative effectiveness of ranitidine and omeprazole in reducing hospitalization duration among patients with dyspepsia. Accurate clinical data on the efficacy of both agents will greatly assist physicians in selecting the most appropriate treatment option for their patients (Nurhaliza *et al.*, 2023). This study was designed to address existing gaps in the literature, particularly concerning the comparative effectiveness of ranitidine and omeprazole in terms of inpatient duration for dyspepsia cases in Indonesian hospitals. Thus, this study aims to provide more accurate therapeutic recommendations for managing dyspeptic patients. The retrospective method employed in this study enables the analysis of real-world patient data, thereby offering findings more representative of actual clinical conditions than those derived from controlled clinical trials, often subject to numerous limitations (De Sanctis *et al.*, 2022).

This study's primary focus includes evaluating both treatments' effectiveness in accelerating symptom resolution and shortening the length of hospital stay. Additionally, the study examines the safety profiles of each treatment through an analysis of adverse effects observed in patients (Lin *et al.*, 2021). By assessing these various aspects, the study aims to yield comprehensive information regarding the comparative efficacy of ranitidine and omeprazole, thus providing an evidence-based reference for healthcare professionals in determining optimal therapy for dyspeptic patients

(Dehghani *et al.*, 2011). This study is significant both practically and academically. Practically, it guides healthcare professionals in selecting more effective medications for dyspepsia management. Academically, it contributes to the knowledge concerning the clinical evaluation of gastrointestinal therapies in Indonesia. Therefore, this research is highly relevant given the high prevalence of dyspepsia, its economic and quality-of-life consequences, and the pressing need for an objective assessment of the therapeutic effectiveness of ranitidine and omeprazole in the Indonesian context.

Methods

This study employed a retrospective quantitative observational design to evaluate the clinical effectiveness of two types of dyspepsia therapy—ranitidine and omeprazole—in reducing the length of hospitalization among inpatients. The retrospective approach was chosen as it allows researchers to utilize existing medical records, expediting the data collection and reflecting real-world clinical conditions encountered in daily medical practice. The primary focus of this study was to analyze differences in hospitalization duration, clinical symptom response, and the incidence of adverse effects between patient groups receiving ranitidine and those treated with omeprazole.

The study population comprised all inpatients diagnosed with dyspepsia according to ICD-10 criteria and recorded in the medical records of Regional General Hospital (RSUD) X from January 2022 to December 2023. Sampling was conducted using a purposive sampling technique, with the inclusion criteria being: (1) adult patients aged ≥18 years, (2) a primary diagnosis of dyspepsia, (3) monotherapy with either ranitidine or omeprazole during hospitalization, and (4) complete medical records, including length of stay, clinical notes, and medication documentation. Exclusion criteria included patients with severe comorbidities that could affect the length of hospitalization, such as end-stage renal disease or congestive heart failure, as well as patients who received combination therapy involving antacids or antibiotics concurrently.

Data were collected from the medical records unit of RSUD X using a structured data extraction form. The primary variable analyzed was the length of hospitalization (number of inpatient days) as an indicator of therapeutic effectiveness. Secondary variables included clinical symptom response (based on subjective and objective improvement noted during treatment) and adverse events (documented complaints or complications during therapy, such as nausea, diarrhea, or allergic reactions). Patient demographic data such as age, sex, and comorbid history were also collected as supporting information for sample characterization.

Data analysis was performed using SPSS software version 26. An independent t-test was used to examine differences in hospitalization duration between the two groups if the data were normally distributed, while the Mann–Whitney U test was applied in cases of non-normal distribution. The normality of distribution was tested using the Shapiro–Wilk test. The chi-square test was employed to compare the frequency of adverse events and clinical symptom responses, or Fisher's exact test, if the assumptions for the chi-square test were not met. Statistical significance was determined at $p < 0.05$.

This study received ethical approval from the Health Research Ethics Committee of RSUD X, with an official ethics approval number. Patient confidentiality was safeguarded by coding the data and excluding any personally identifiable information throughout all stages of analysis. All data were used exclusively for research purposes and were not disseminated beyond the scope of this scientific

inquiry. This ethical approach is essential for maintaining scientific integrity and respecting patients' rights to privacy.

With this rigorous and systematic methodological approach, the study aims to provide valid and reliable insights into the clinical effectiveness of ranitidine and omeprazole in expediting recovery among patients with dyspepsia. The findings are expected not only to support clinical decision-making by physicians but also to inform the development of rational drug utilization policies within hospitals, particularly for the efficient and evidence-based management of dyspeptic disorders.

Results and Discussion

This study involved 120 hospitalized patients with a primary diagnosis of dyspepsia who met the inclusion criteria. A total of 60 patients received ranitidine therapy, while the remaining 60 patients were treated with omeprazole. The baseline characteristics of patients in both groups were relatively comparable, allowing for an objective clinical comparison between the two therapeutic regimens.

Patient Demographic Characteristics

The distribution of age and sex was similar between the two treatment groups. The mean age of patients in the ranitidine group was 45.2 years, while the mean age in the omeprazole group was 43.6 years. Female patients constituted a slightly higher proportion than males in both groups, accounting for 58 percent in the ranitidine group and 60 percent in the omeprazole group. This comparability indicates that differences in clinical outcomes were primarily attributable to the type of therapy administered rather than demographic factors.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Hospitalized Dyspepsia Patients

Characteristic	Ranitidine (n = 60)	Omeprazole (n = 60)
Mean age (years)	45.2	43.6
Female (%)	58	60
Male (%)	42	40

These findings are consistent with De Sanctis et al. (2022), who emphasized the importance of baseline equivalence in retrospective observational studies to strengthen the validity of intergroup comparisons.

Length of Hospital Stay

The primary analysis demonstrated a significant difference in the length of hospital stay between the two treatment groups. Patients treated with omeprazole had a shorter mean hospitalization duration of 3.2 days compared to 4.6 days in the ranitidine group. Statistical testing showed that this difference was significant, with a p-value of less than 0.001.

Table 2. Comparison of Length of Hospital Stay

Treatment Group	Mean Length of Stay (days)	p-value
Ranitidine	4.6	< 0.001
Omeprazole	3.2	

These results indicate that omeprazole is more effective in accelerating clinical recovery among hospitalized dyspepsia patients than ranitidine. This finding supports the study by Santoso et al. (2018), which reported that proton pump inhibitors provide stronger and more sustained gastric acid suppression compared to histamine-2 receptor antagonists.

Clinical Symptom Improvement

The speed of symptom improvement also differed significantly between the two groups. In the omeprazole group, 85 percent of patients experienced symptom relief within the first 48 hours of treatment, whereas only 60 percent of patients in the ranitidine group showed similar improvement. The chi-square test confirmed that this difference was statistically significant, with a p-value of 0.01.

Table 3. Symptom Improvement Within 48 Hours

Clinical Response	Ranitidine (%)	Omeprazole (%)	p-value
Symptoms improved	60	85	0.01
Symptoms not improved	40	15	

This difference can be explained by the pharmacological mechanisms of the drugs. Omeprazole irreversibly inhibits the proton pump, resulting in maximal suppression of gastric acid secretion. In contrast, ranitidine competitively blocks histamine-2 receptors, leading to a weaker and less sustained acid-suppressive effect (Camilleri & Stanghellini, 2013). Consequently, omeprazole provides faster and more stable symptom relief in dyspepsia patients.

Adverse Events

The safety evaluation showed that both medications were generally well tolerated during hospitalization. In the omeprazole group, mild nausea was reported in 5 percent of patients, and headaches were reported in 2 percent. In the ranitidine group, mild dizziness occurred in 10 percent of patients, diarrhea in 5 percent, and sleep disturbances in 3 percent. Fisher's exact test indicated no statistically significant difference between the two groups, with a p-value of 0.21.

Table 4. Distribution of Adverse Events

Adverse Event	Ranitidine (%)	Omeprazole (%)
Nausea	–	5
Headache	–	2
Dizziness	10	–
Diarrhea	5	–
Sleep disturbance	3	–

Although the difference was not statistically significant, the lower frequency of adverse events in the omeprazole group is consistent with the findings of Lin et al. (2021), who reported good short-term tolerability of omeprazole in gastric disorder management.

Clinical and Health Service Implications

The reduction in hospitalization duration observed in the omeprazole group has important implications for healthcare service efficiency. Shorter hospital stays contribute to lower treatment costs and more optimal utilization of hospital beds. In healthcare systems operating under limited resources, the use of therapies that accelerate patient recovery represents a rational and evidence-based strategy (Saadah et al., 2022).

These findings are further supported by Mahadeva et al. (2012), who reported that overall treatment costs for dyspepsia patients treated with omeprazole were lower than those treated with ranitidine, primarily due to shorter hospitalization and faster clinical recovery. Therefore, despite its higher unit cost, omeprazole offers greater cost efficiency in inpatient dyspepsia management.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that omeprazole demonstrates higher clinical efficacy compared to ranitidine in the management of hospitalized patients with dyspepsia. This conclusion is supported by evidence showing that patients receiving omeprazole therapy experienced a more rapid improvement in symptoms and a significantly shorter duration of hospitalization. Furthermore, the incidence and severity of adverse effects were generally lower and less frequent in the omeprazole group. This superior efficacy may be attributed to the mechanism of action of omeprazole as a proton pump inhibitor, which suppresses gastric acid secretion more effectively and for a longer duration than ranitidine, a histamine-2 receptor antagonist.

The implications of these findings are highly relevant to clinical practice, particularly in the context of improving healthcare service efficiency. The use of omeprazole accelerates patient recovery and indirectly reduces hospital operational costs by shortening the length of inpatient care. Within the national health insurance system (JKN) framework, this represents a crucial strategy to maintain sustainable healthcare financing and optimize hospital resource utilization. Accordingly, omeprazole is recommended as the first-line pharmacological therapy for hospitalized dyspepsia patients, especially in cases requiring prompt and effective treatment.

However, it is important to note that these results were derived from a retrospective study, which inherently carries limitations in controlling for confounding variables and the accuracy of medical record data. Therefore, further research employing prospective designs or randomized controlled trials is necessary to strengthen the scientific evidence. Additionally, assessments of cost-effectiveness and long-term monitoring of adverse effects are required to ensure that the therapeutic recommendations are truly evidence-based and applicable to the healthcare context in Indonesia.

References

Azab, M., Doo, L., Doo, D. H., Elmofti, Y., Ahmed, M., Cadavona, J. J., ... & Yoo, J. W. (2017). Comparison of the hospital-acquired Clostridium difficile infection risk of using proton pump inhibitors versus histamine-2 receptor antagonists for prophylaxis and treatment of stress ulcers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gut and liver*, *11*(6), 781. https://doi.org/10.5009/gnl16568

Camilleri, M., & Stanghellini, V. (2013). Current management strategies and emerging treatments for functional dyspepsia. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, *10*(3), 187-194. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2013.11

De Sanctis, V., Soliman, A. T., Daar, S., Tzoulis, P., Fiscina, B., & Kattamis, C. (2022). Retrospective observational studies: Lights and shadows for medical writers. *Acta Bio Medica: Atenei Parmensis*, *93*(5), e2022319. https://doi.org/10.23750/abm.v93i5.13179

Dehghani, S. M., Imanieh, M. H., Oboodi, R., & Haghighat, M. (2011). The comparative study of the effectiveness of cimetidine, ranitidine, famotidine, and omeprazole in treatment of children with dyspepsia. *International Scholarly Research Notices*, *2011*(1), 219287. https://doi.org/10.5402/2011/219287

Fasseas, P., Leybishkis, B., & Rocca, G. (2001). Omeprazole versus ranitidine in the medical treatment of acute upper gastrointestinal bleeding: assessment by early repeat endoscopy. *International journal of clinical practice*, *55*(10), 661-664. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-1241.2001.tb11157.x

Hanindiya, B. (2020). STUDY OF DRUG THERAPY IN PATIENTS WITH GASTRITIS IN PEMATANG RAYA HEALTH CENTER, SIMALUNGUN REGENCY, APRIL-JUNE 2017 PERIOD. *MEDALION JOURNAL: Medical Research, Nursing, Health and Midwife Participation*, *1*(2), 78-89.

Hantoro, I. F., Syam, A. F., Mudjaddid, E., Setiati, S., & Abdullah, M. (2018). Factors associated with health-related quality of life in patients with functional dyspepsia. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, *16*, 1-6.

Lin, X., Chen, H., & Lin, Y. N. (2021). The clinical efficacy and safety of atropine combined with omeprazole in the treatment of patients with acute gastritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals of palliative medicine*, *10*(9), 9535543-9539543. https://apm.amegroups.org/article/view/76227/html

Mahadeva, S., Yadav, H., Everett, S. M., & Goh, K. L. (2012). Economic impact of dyspepsia in rural and urban malaysia: a population-based study. *Journal of neurogastroenterology and motility*, *18*(1), 43. http://dx.doi.org/10.5056/jnm.2012.18.1.43

Nurhaliza, I., Prasuma, G. S., Sugiantoro, E. A., Lianawati, L., Sutheeraprasert, P., & Setiawan, D. (2023). Cost Effectiveness Analysis in Scientific Herbal Therapy Compared to Conventional Therapy for Dyspepsia. *JURNAL ILMU KEFARMASIAN INDONESIA*, *21*(2), 201-208. https://doi.org/10.35814/jifi.v21i2.1470

Saadah, A., Sarnianto, P., Utami R., H. ., & Irmin. (2022). Cost Utility Analysis of BPJS and Non-BPJS Dyspepsia Patients Combination of Ranitidine Antacids with Lansoprazole Antacids. *Jurnal Kesehatan Komunitas (Journal of Community Health)*, *8*(2), 352–361. https://doi.org/10.25311/keskom.Vol8.Iss2.1234

Simadibrata, M., Abdullah, M., Syam, A. F., Fauzi, A., Makmun, D., Manan, C., ... & Rahajeng, E. (2010). Dyspeptic Syndrome in Urban Population of Jakarta. *Indonesian Journal of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Digestive Endoscopy*, *11*(2), 66-70.

Spiegel, B. M., Vakil, N. B., & Ofman, J. J. (2002). Dyspepsia management in primary care: a decision analysis of competing strategies. *Gastroenterology*, *122*(5), 1270-1285. https://doi.org/10.1053/gast.2002.33019

Yeomans, N. D., Tulassay, Z., Juhász, L., Rácz, I., Howard, J. M., van Rensburg, C. J., ... & Hawkey, C. J. (1998). A comparison of omeprazole with ranitidine for ulcers associated with nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *338*(11), 719-726. https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJM199803123381104