Acute Appendicitis

A Sudy Carried out in Zawia Teaching Hospital

Dr Mohamed A Zarrouk Department of General Surgery Faculty of Medicine⁻ Zawia University

Abstract:

<u>Background:</u> Acute appendicitis is a common cause of acute abdomen and commonly affect young adults and children. Acute appendicitis diagnosed reliably by clinical symptomes and signs. Delay of diagnosis and treatment increase the morbidity of appendicitis.307 Patients with acute appendicitis studied prospectively from 1st January 2014 to 31st may 2015 in Zawia teaching Hosopital, The study evaluated demographics of the patients, clinical state and operation related findings.The commonist ages affected were in the 1st and 2nd decades. Abdominal pain was the

- 24 -

commonist symptom. The majority of patients were phlegmonous appendicitis. Perforated appendicitis reported in 20.8% of cases. Antibiotics reduce the morbidity of acue appendicitis .This study concluded that acute appendicitis remain a common clinical diagnosis and appendectomy still the standard treatment for appendicitis.

1.Introduction.

Acute appendicitis is an inflammation of the vermiform appendix $^{(1)}$, it is the most common cause of acute abdomen^(2, 3, 4) and a common surgical emergency $^{(5, 6)}$, which needs admission $^{(7, 8)}$.

Acute appendicitis affects 1 in each 15 people ⁽⁹⁾ with a lifetime risk varies from 6 to 9 $\%^{(10, 11, 12)}$, and perforation of acute appendicitis occurs in 15 to 30 % of patients ⁽¹³⁾.

Clinical symptoms are enough to initiate the diagnosis, of acute appendicitis which is a common cause of abdominal pain ⁽¹⁴⁾, and other accompanying symptoms may include nausea, vomiting, or fever ⁽¹⁵⁾.

In the elderly the usual signs and symptoms may be atypical or abscent which leads to a higher rate of perforation ⁽¹⁶⁾.

In patients with delayed diagnosis the risk of complications are increased ⁽¹⁷⁾.

To reduce morbidity associated with acute appendicitis it is necessary to decrease delays of the proper treatment ⁽¹⁸⁾ because there is a causal relationship between delayed treatment and poor outcome⁽¹⁹⁾. Aggressive approach is recommended when acute appendicitis is suspected⁽²⁰⁾.

- 25 -

Appendectomy since it was first reported by Mc Burney in 1889⁽²¹⁾ is the standard treatment of acute appendicitis⁽²²⁾ because appendicitis is a coomon surgical disease.appendictomy is a common emergency surgery⁽²³⁾.

Laparoscopy has a diagnostic and therapeutic roles especially in women ⁽²⁴⁾ since the first report of laproscopic appendectomy by Semm 1983 ⁽²⁵⁾.

Wound infection and intraabdominal abscess following appendectomy are still ongoing complications ⁽²⁶⁾.

The aim of this study is analysis and evaluation of all patients admitted with acute appendicitis which had been operated.

METHODS:

The present study was a prospective study of 307 patients with acute appendicitis who were admitted to Zawia teaching Hospital, Zawia University, Libya, from the 1st of January 2014 to the 31st of may.

The variables in this research include demographic characteristics, clinical presentations, laboratory finding, operative findings, the type of operation and its complications, the use of antibiotics and the duration of hospital stay, Tables 1, 2, 3.

The diagnosis of appendicitis was made on a clinical basis mainly.

| | 0 | - | | - |
|-------------------|------|--------|-------|------------|
| Decade | Male | Female | Total | Percentage |
| 0 to <10 year | 44 | 22 | 66 | 21.4 |
| 10to < 20 year | 84 | 49 | 133 | 43.3 |
| 20 to < 30 year | 36 | 23 | 59 | 19.2 |
| 30 to < 40 year | 14 | 15 | 29 | 9.4 |
| 40 to < 50 year | 10 | 7 | 17 | 5.5 |
| 50 to < 60 year | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.65 |
| 60 to < 70 year | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.32 |
| Total number | 191 | 116 | 307 | 100 |
| Pecentage | 62.2 | 37, 7 | 100 | |

Table 1.Demographic distribution of the patients

Table 2.Clinical data of the patients

| Clinical state | 2 | Number of patients | percentage |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------|------------|
| Duration | One day | 183 | 59.6 |
| of | Two days | 49 | 15.9 |
| complaints | Three days | 40 | 13 |
| | >3days | 35 | 11 |
| Abdominal p | pain | 302 | 98 |
| Nausea and/ | or vomitting | 240 | 78 |
| Anorexia | | 31 | 10 |
| Fever | | 102 | 33 |
| Tachycardia | | 36 | 11.7 |
| Tenderness | | 238 | 77.5 |
| Rebound ten | derness | 270 | 87.9 |
| Guarding | | 65 | 21 |
| Rigidity | | 14 | 4.5 |
| Leucocytosis | | 229 | 74.5 |

- 27 -

| Appendix related state | | Number of | percentage |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| | | patients | |
| Types of | catarrhal | 31 | 10 |
| appendicitis | phlegmonous | 187 | 60.9 |
| | gangrenous | 21 | 6.8 |
| | perforated | 64 | 20.8 |
| | mass | 9 | 2.9 |
| Types of operations | Open appendictomy | 300 | 97.7 |
| | Laparoscopic appendictomy | 2 | 0.65 |
| | Laparotomy | 5 | 1.6 |
| Abdominal pain | | 104 | 33.8 |
| Preoperative antibiotics | | 201 | 65.4 |
| Postoperative antibiotics | | 307 | 100 |
| Wound infection | | 2 | 0.65 |
| Duration of | One day | 37 | 12 |
| hospital stay | Two days | 116 | 37.7 |
| | Three days | 84 | 27.3 |
| | >3days | 70 | 22.8 |

Table 3. Operative data, usage of antibiotics, and duration of hospital stay

RESULTS:

It is clear that the highest incidence of appendicitis was observed in people aged below 20 years (64.7%) and males were more affected (62.2%) than females (37.7%) Table 1.such findings were consistent with the finding in other studies.

About 60 % of patients present to the medical consultations witin one day and nearly a quarter of patients present at or after 3 days (24%).

| - 28 - | |
|--------|--|
|--------|--|

The most common clinical presentations were abdominal pain (98%), nausea and/or vomiting (78%), tenderness (77, 5%), rebound tenderness (87.9%) and leucocytosis (74.5%) Table 2.

The majority of patients were had phlegmonous appendicitis (60.9%), and perforated appendicitis found in 20.8% of patients, such incidence of perforated appendicitis is comparable to other studies 23 table 4, among these patients with perforated appendicitis there were 2 pregnant women. The greater number of patients with perforate appendicitis had duration of complaints 3 days or more.

| Author | Rate |
|--|-------|
| Heller group et al | 27.5% |
| Khalili T M et al 16 in Surg.1999Oct. 65(10).965.7 | 29% |
| Baruni et al | 20.1% |

Table 4.Over all perforation rate in different studies

Open appendectomy had been done for 99% of patients, laparoscopic appendectomy done for two patients only because lack of facilities during all times of the duty, and laparotomy done for 5 patients (1.6%). Abdominal drains were used for33.8% of patients who had pus collection and those with significant oozing

Preoperative antibiotics used in 65.4% of patients for whom appendicttomy were decided and continued posoperatively either as a prophylactic or therapeutic drugs.

Wound infections recorded in two patients during the same admission.

Nearly half of patients stayed for two days or less and nearly half of patients stayed three days or more

DISCUSSION:

Acute appendicitis remains a common clinical diagnosis ⁽²⁷⁾ and can be reliably diagnosed clinically in most cases ⁽²⁸⁾. The highest incidence of appendicitis is in the 1st and 2nd decades ⁽²⁹⁾.

Acute appendicitis is an emergency condition that requires urgent intervention $^{(30)}$, and significant delay of diagnosis associated with morbidity and even mortality $^{(31, 32)}$.

Although clinical diagnosis is feasible scoring for diagnosing appendicitis is fast and easily available $^{(33)}$. In pregnancy the diagnosis of appendicitis is difficult because of the anatomic and physiologic changes that occur during the pregnancy, for these reasons the incidence of perforated appendicitis in pregnancy (43%) is higher than in the general population (19%) $^{(34)}$

Appendectomy remains the standard treatment for acute appendicitis.Laparoscopic appendectomy shown relevant advantages compared to open appendectomy ⁽³⁵⁾ among these advantages are decreased incidence of wound infection, reduced analgesic requirements, and earlier return to oral intake ⁽³⁶⁾.

Patients with acute appendicitis require preoperative broad spectrum antibiotics once the decision of treatment is taken, and continued for 3-5 days in cases of perforated appendicitis ⁽³⁷⁾ preoperative antibiotics reduces the incidence of wound infection ⁽³⁸⁾.

Although conservative antibiotic primary treatment has been investigated ⁽³⁹⁾, and found to be safe and effective ⁽⁴⁰⁾ for noncomplicated appendicitis, but still the current treatment is appendectomy ⁽⁴¹⁾.

CONCLUSION:

The commonist ages at which acute appendicitis presents are in the 1^{st} and 2^{nd} decades

Acute appendicitis is a common cause of acute abdomen that rquires urgent intervention

Antibiotics reduce the complications of complicated appendicitis Appendectomy is still the treatment of choice.

Laparoscopic appendectomy should be the ideal operative treatment for which facilities and requirements in our hospital must be provided.

References

- 1.Gerard J. Fitzmaurice et al. Antibiotics versus appendectomy in the management of acute appendicitis: a review of the current eviden. Can J Surg, 2011; 54: 307-14.
- 2.Mohamed Al-Omran et al. Epidemiologic features of acute appendicitis in Ontario, Canada.Can J Surg.2003 ; 46: 263-8.
- 3. Efstathios T. Pavlidis et al. Brief Useful Comments on Laparoscopic Surgery in Acute Abdomen. Pavidas et al; BJMMR, 2015;5(12):1465-9.
- 4.Sanoop K Zachariah.Feasibility of single-incision laparocopic surgery for appendicitis in abnormal anatomic locations: Asingle surgeons initial experience. J Minim Access Surg ;2013 ;9: 13-18.
- 5.Mostafa Hosseini et al. The Frequency of Different Clinical Presentation of Appendicitis, Complications and Prognosis in Elderly Ann Res &Review in Biology ;2014: 4(24): 4381-8
- 6.Eric Bergeron. Clinical judgment remains of great value in the diagnosis of acute ppendicitis.Can J Surg, 2006 ; 49: 96-100.

- 31 -

- 7. Rodney P. J Jones. An Unexpected Increase In Adult Appendicitis in England (2000/01 to 2012/13): Could Cytomegalovirus (CMV) be A Risk Factor ? BJMMR ;2015: 063: 5(5);XXX-XXX.
- 8.W. Farooqui et al. THE DIAGNOSTIC VALUE OF A PANEL OF SEROLOGICAL MARKERS IN ACUTE APPENDICITIS. Scan J Surg 2014; 104: 72-8.
- 9.Chad G. Ball et al.The impact of an acute care surgery clinical care pathway for suspected appendicitis on the use of CT in the emergency department.Can J Surg ;57: 194-8.
- 10.Henna E Sammalkorpi et al.A new adult appendicitis score improves diagnostic accuracy of acute appendicitis – a prospective study. BMC Gastroenterology.2014;14:114.
- 11.K. Daskalakis et al.THE USE OF PRE- OR POSTOPERATVE ANTIBIOTICS IN SURGERY FOR APPENDICITIS: A SYSTEMIC REVIEW.Scand J Surg 2013 ; 103:14-20.
- 12. T. Slotboom et al. INTRAOPERATIVE MOTIVE FOR PERFORMING A LAPAROSCOPIC APPENDICTOMY ON A POSTOPERATIVE HISTOLOGICAL PROVEN NORMAL APPENDIX. Scand J Surg 2013; 103: 245-248.
- 13. K. Daskalakis et al, opcit., p.14.
- 14. W. Farooqui et al, opcit., p.73.
- 15. Felix U. Uduma et al. Re-emphasis on Imaging of Acute Abdomin in Surgical and Gynaecological Practice with Pictorial Depictions: A Review. BJAST. 2015; 8(1): 1-9.
- 16. Mostafa Hosseini et al, opcit., p.4382.

- 32 -

- 17. Jun Chul Chung et al. Clinical out comes compared between laparoscopic and open appendectomy in pregnant women. Can J Surg 2013; 56:341-6.
- 18. V Y Kong et al. Understanding the reasons for delay definitive surgical care of patients with acute appendicitis in rural South Africa. SAJS 2014;52: 2-5.
- 19. Victor Y. Kong et al. The accuracy of the Alvarado score in predicting acute appendicitis in the black South African population needs to be validated. Can J Surg 2014; 57: 121-5.
- 20. Jun Chul Chung et al, opcit., p.342.
- 21. Krishna K Varadhan et al. Safety and efficacy of antibiotics compared with appendectomy for treatment of uncomplicated acute appendicitis: meta-analysi of randomized controlled trials. BMJ 2012 ;344:e2156 dol: 10. 1136/bmj.e2156.
- 22. Jan F. Svennsson et al. Nonoperative Treatment With Antibiotics Versus Surgery for Acute Nonperforated Appendicitis in Children. A Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial.Ann Surg 2015;261: 67-71.
- 23. Andrea Ciarrocchi et al.Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy in obese patients: A meta-analysis of prospective and retrospective studies. J Min Acc Surg 2014;10: 4-9.
- 24. Vishwanath V Shindholimath et al. Laparoscopic management of appendicular mass. J Min Acc Surg 2011;7: 136-40.
- 25. Ashraf A Mohamed et al. Laparoscopic appendectomy in complicated appendicitis: Is it safe ?. J Min Acc Surg 2013 ; 9: 55-8.
- 26. Sigmund H. Ein et al. Open appendectomy for pediatric ruptured appendicitis: a historical clinical review of the prophylaxis of wound

- 33 -

infection and postoperative intra-abdomina abscess.Can J Surg 2013 ;56: E7-E12.

- 27. Victor Y. Kong et al, opcit., p. E125.
- 28. V. Kalliakmanis et al. ACUTE APPENDICITIS: THE RELIABILITY OF DIAGNOSIS BY CLINICAL ASSESSMENT ALONE.Scand J Surg 2005; 94: 201-6.
- 29. Mohamed Al-Omran et al, opcit., p.267.
- 30. Felix U. Uduma et al, opcit., p.2.
- 31. G. A. Baruni et al. Incidence of perforated appendix in 307 cases of acute appendicitis admitted to TMC from July to December 1998. LMJ 2001; 1: 30-2.
- 32. V Y Kong et al. Developing a clinical model to predict the need for relaparotomy in severe intra-abdominal sepsis secondary to complicated appendicitis. SAJS 2014 ;52: 91-5.
- 33. Henna E Sammalkorpi et al, opcit., p.2 of 7.
- 34. Jun Chul Chung et al, opcit., p.344.
- 35. Ashraf A Mohamed et al, opcit., p.58.
- *36.Ibid.*, *p.57*.
- 37. K. Daskalakis et al, opcit., p.18.
- 38. Sigmund H. Ein et al, opcit., E10.
- 39. K. Daskalakis et al, opcit., p.18.
- 40. Krishna K Varadhan et al., opcit., p. 7 of 15.
- 41. Gerard J. Fitzmaurice et al, opcit., p.317.

| - 34 - | |
|--------|--|
|--------|--|