

## A Pre-Operative and Post-Operative Comparative Analysis of Different Anatomical Position, Clinical Presentation and USG Findings of Appendix in Patients of Appendicitis in a Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital.

Krishna Kumar<sup>1\*</sup>, Abdul Hai<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Radio-diagnosis, <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery, TeerthankerMahaveer Medical College & Research Centre, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, INDIA.

### Article History

Received: 22 Oct 2015

Revised: 27 Oct2015

Accepted: 29 Oct2015

### \*Correspondence to:

Dr. Krishna Kumar,  
Associate Professor,  
Department of  
Radiodiagnosis,  
TMMC & RC, Moradabad,  
Uttar Pradesh, INDIA.  
dr.kkumar6@rediffmail.com

### ABSTRACT

**Background:** The appendix is regarded as a vestigial organ, useless to man, with no known important function, but can be a real nuisance at times, when it may become the seat of infection. The diagnosis of appendicitis can be difficult, occasionally taxing the skills of the most experienced clinician. The objective of this study was to find out and compare accuracy of USG findings with that of per-operative findings of location & status of appendix.

**Methods:** The present prospective study was carried out in surgery and radiology department of TeerthankerMahaveer Medical College & Research Centre from January 2013 till February 2014. A total of 50 cases were selected on the basis of inclusion and exclusion criteria and subjected to ultrasound examination by a qualified radiologist to exclude any other associated pathology and also to confirm the diagnosis. During surgery the Position of the appendix was first identified and the specimen was sent to histopathological examination.

**Results:** Out of 50 cases, a total of 31 cases presented with clinical features suggestive of retrocaecal appendicitis, out of which 25 had typical presentation & 6 had atypical presentation with overall sensitivity of 72.9%, followed by pelvic position which had a sensitivity of 15.29% in which 4 patients had typical presentation & 4 had atypical presentation. All modalities (clinical presentation + lab investigations + USG + intra operative + histopathology) patients were 24; with clinical presentation + lab investigations + USG + intra operative patients were 26; with clinical presentation + lab investigations + USG patients were 28; with clinical presentation + lab investigations patients were 35 and with only clinical presentation patients were 42.

**Conclusions:** A total of five modalities that were used for the diagnosis of position of appendix & appendicitis, i.e. clinical features, lab Ix, ultrasound, intraoperative findings & histopathology, only 47% of cases all the modalities were positive. So the diagnosis of position of appendix & appendicitis is a combination of all the modalities and not just dependent on one basis.

**KEYWORDS:** Appendix, Clinical examination, USG, Laboratory investigations.

### INTRODUCTION

Appendicitis is a common sometimes confusing, and treacherous cause of acute abdomen at all ages. The appendix is regarded as a vestigial organ, useless to man, with no known important function, but can be a real nuisance at times, when it may become the seat of infection. The diagnosis of appendicitis can be difficult, occasionally taxing the skills of the most experienced clinician. The delays in the diagnosis arise from errors either from the patient or physicians. The most common

position of the appendix is variously described by many authors Wakeley et al. as retrocaecal (65.3%),<sup>1</sup> Collins et al. as pelvic (78.5%)<sup>2</sup> and Pickens G et al. as postileal.<sup>3</sup> Guidry SP et al. have concluded that anatomic variations of the location of appendix are often responsible for delays in the diagnosis of appendicitis.<sup>4</sup> Poole GV has stated that the paucity of symptoms and signs, in patients with hidden appendix, is responsible for the delayed diagnosis of appendicitis before perforation.<sup>5</sup> Varshneyet

al have concluded that the retrocaecal position of the appendix is less prone to infection,<sup>6</sup> whereas Collins et al have described higher incidence of perforation and serious complications in acute appendicitis,<sup>7</sup> other studies one prospective<sup>8</sup> and two retrospective studies have established that the retrocaecal position of the appendix does not alter the clinical course of acute appendicitis.<sup>9,10</sup> From the above information it is evident that there are lots of controversies regarding the various positions of appendix and also clinical presentation of appendicitis, in relation to different positions. Hence there is a need for the study of the various positions of appendix in patients with appendicitis and also the clinical picture and complication in the various positions.

Our study is performed in clinical cases representing the inflamed appendix group, in this group the relation between the various positions of the appendix, the clinical presentation, laboratory & radiology investigations, intra operative findings and histopathology is studied.

### MATERIALS & METHODS

The study was carried out in Surgery and Radiology department of TeerthankerMahaveer Medical College & Research Centre from January 2013 till February 2014.

The study was prospective, observational and longitudinal. Study protocol of the procedure was formed along with proforma. A total of 50 cases were included in our study on the basis of inclusion and exclusion criteria and subjected to clinical assessment using signs, symptoms and laboratory criteria, histopathology and also the position of the appendix, which were recorded in the proforma. All patients were subjected to ultrasound examination by a qualified radiologist to exclude any other associated pathology and also to confirm the diagnosis. Surgery was done either under general anesthesia or spinal anesthesia. Abdomen was opened with Lanz or Mc Burney's, or right lower Para median incision. At surgery the Position of the appendix was first identified before disturbing the structures and the position of the appendix identified and recorded together with the length of the appendix and also whether it was fixed or freely mobile in the peritoneal cavity, peri-appendiceal collection, presence of perforation or other complications of appendicitis. Also a note was made of the status surrounding organs. After completion of the appendectomy the specimen was subjected to histopathological examination by the qualified pathologist only those cases, which were proved as, appendicitis by the histopathology were included in the study.

**Table 1: Comparison between position of appendix with clinical presentation and intra operative findings.**

Position of appendix	Clinical presentation	Intra operative	Sensitivity
Retrocaecal	31	27	87.09
Paracaecal	2	2	100.0
Post-ileal	3	2	80.00
Pre-ileal	1	2	50.00
Pelvic	6	8	76.47
Sub-hepatic	0	1	00.00
Sub-caecal	1	2	50.00
Left sided	0	0	00.00
Total	44	44	

**Table 2: Comparison between position of appendix with USG findings and intra operative finding.**

Position of appendix	USG finding	Intra operative	Sensitivity
Retrocaecal	21	23	85.41
Paracaecal	1	2	50.00
Post- ileal	2	1	100.0
Pre-ileal	2	1	20.00
Pelvic	8	7	88.88
Sub-hepatic	1	1	50.00
Sub-caecal	1	1	33.33
Left sided	0	0	00.00
Total	36	36	100

### RESULTS

Out of 50 patients in the study; 27 were Male and 23 were Female. Appendicitis was more common during the 3rd decade (36%), followed by the 4th decade (23%). A total of 31 cases presented with clinical features suggestive of retrocaecal appendicitis, out of which 25

had typical presentation & 6 had atypical presentation with overall sensitivity of 72.9%, followed by pelvic position which had a sensitivity of 15.29% in which 2 patients had typical presentation & 1 had atypical presentation. The clinical presentation of retrocaecal type

has sensitivity of 87.09% as compared with the pelvic type as shown in table 1. On comparing the position of appendix with USG and intra operative findings; USG has sensitivity of 88.88%

in detection of pelvic type followed by 85.41% in retrocaecal type appendicitis as shown in table 2.

The following pie chart shows that; on the basis of individual modality 85% were suspected to have appendicitis on clinical presentation, 78% were suspected to have appendicitis on lab Ix, 69% were ultrasound proven appendicitis and histopathology proved appendicitis in all the cases (100%).

On comparison of laboratory investigations (Ix) with clinical presentation; leukocytosis was present in 32 patients with acute presentation as compared with 2

patients of subacute and 4 patients of recurrent appendicitis, with neutrophils being predominantly elevated as shown in table 3.

Comparison of HPE with intra operative findings suggested that; out of 50 patients 37 were suspected to have acute appendicitis but histopathology showed 32 cases of acute type, 5 were suspected to have subacute appendicitis but histopathology revealed 12 cases & 8 were suspected to have recurrent appendicitis but histopathology showed 6 as shown in table 4. When different modalities are combined for the diagnosis of appendicitis; the diagnosis becomes more accurate and specific as in our study; on combination of all five modalities 24 patients had all the modalities suggestive of appendicitis which can be judged from the table 5.

**Table 3: Association between presentations of appendix with laboratory investigations.**

Presentation of appendix	Laboratory Investigation				
	TLC			DC	
	Elevated	Normal	Total No.	Neutrophilia	Lymphocytosis
Acute	32	5	37	34	
Subacute	2	3	5	2	4
Recurrent	4	3	7	5	
<b>Total</b>	38	11	49	41	13

**Table 4: Association between histopathology & intraoperative findings of appendicitis.**

Types of appendix	Histopathology	Intraoperative	Sensitivity
Acute	32	37	86.68
Subacute	12	5	100
Recurrent	6	8	68.75
<b>Total</b>	50	50	

**Table 5: Association between different modalities that are used for diagnosis of appendicitis.**

Diagnosis of appendix on basis of various modalities	No. of cases
All modalities (clinical presentation + lab ix + USG + intra operative + histopathology)	24
Clinical presentation + lab ix + USG + intra operative	26
Clinical presentation + lab ix + USG	28
Clinical presentation + lab ix	35
Only clinical presentation	42

## DISCUSSION

Although surgeons have been confronting acute appendicitis as a clinical entity for over a hundred years, an accurate preoperative diagnosis remains a challenge because of the various other conditions, which mimic appendicitis. The problem is further compounded by the variations in the position of the appendix and the associated varied clinical picture of the appendicitis. In our series appendicitis was more common during the 3rd

decade (36%), followed by the 4th decade (23%). Appendicitis is slightly more common in males, (57%) in our series. Lewis et al.<sup>11</sup> (1975) in their study found that the 2nd and 3rd decades to be the most common age groups for acute appendicitis. Men outnumbered women in our study, men are believed to suffer from appendicitis more often because, probably the male is being subjected to more stress and strain, as highlighted

by Boyd (1961). Addis et al & Korner et al, have reported a slight male preponderance (with male to female ratio of 1.2 to 1.3:1).<sup>12, 13</sup>

All the patients with acute appendicitis had pain and most of the patients had pain in the right iliac fossa. Even though many of the patients presented with atypical symptoms 17 of the 50 cases (34%). The site of maximum pain was in the right iliac fossa in 45 of 50 cases. Only 6 cases had maximal pain at a site other than right iliac fossa. In pelvic appendix patients had suprapubic pain, in retro-caecal appendix patient had pain in the right lumbar region or right flank, in sub-hepatic position the patients had pain in the right hypochondriac region. Atypical pain was more common in cases of fixed retro-caecal appendix and in cases of pelvic appendicitis.

Anorexia was seen in 66% of the cases, while nausea is less constant is seen in 46% of the cases. Vomiting is seen in (41%) and is usually few episodes. Incidence and severity of vomiting is more in patients with complicated appendicitis as compared to simple acute appendicitis. Vomiting usually does not relieve pain. Lewis et al,<sup>11</sup> in his analysis, found anorexia, nausea or vomiting to be present in 66% of the cases. Fever is commonly encountered among patients in our study, being present in 52% of our patients; the fever was usually mild degree except in cases of abscess and generalized peritonitis. Berry et al.<sup>14</sup> in 1984 have in their analysis; found that temperature elevation is rarely more than 2°C. Changes of greater magnitude suggest complication.

Tenderness in the right iliac fossa is a constant feature in all the cases of appendicitis. The site of maximum tenderness was in the right iliac fossa in 89 of 100 cases even though few had tenderness at other sites leading to difficulty in the diagnosis. Only 6 cases had maximal tenderness at a site other than right iliac fossa. In retro-caecal position tenderness may be present in the right flank or in the right lumbar region more so if the appendix is fixed either by the adhesions or because of its extra-peritoneal location (in these cases tenderness will be more in this region rather than right iliac fossa). In case of pelvic position tenderness may be present in the suprapubic region or the patient may have rectal tenderness. In sub-hepatic position patient may have tenderness in the right hypochondriac region. Leukocytosis or neutrophilia was present in 39 of the 50 cases, with an accuracy of 78%.

The position of the appendix and its relation to the clinical presentation and course of acute appendicitis has been a subject of controversy with various authors giving various results and conclusions. A total of 31 cases presented with clinical features suggestive of retrocaecal appendicitis, out of which 26 had typical presentation & 5 had atypical presentation with overall sensitivity of 72.9%, followed by pelvic position which had a sensitivity of 15.29% in which 8 patients had

typical presentation & 2 had atypical presentation. The clinical presentation of retrocaecal type when compared with intraoperative has sensitivity of 87.09% as compared with the pelvic type which has sensitivity of 76.47% in our series.

Varshney et al.<sup>6</sup> have described that advanced appendicitis (perforation or gangrene) is more common in those with retro-caecal appendicitis. They have given the explanation that some early cases may have been misdiagnosed, as urinary tract infection, leading to delay in the diagnosis, and increased incidence of complications. In Collins<sup>7</sup> series of 751 patients with retro-caecal appendicitis, only 19% had typical symptoms, 18% had non-localizing pain, 28% had right flank pain and 12% had right shoulder pain. In his series 53% of the cases were perforated. Guidry S et al.<sup>4</sup> in 1994, have concluded that the patients with gangrene and perforation were more likely to have pain and tenderness at a site other than right lower quadrant. The appendix was in hidden location (retro-caecal, retro-ileal, pelvic appendicitis as compared with 68% of the patients with gangrenous or perforated appendicitis.

On comparison with intraoperative findings Ultrasound has sensitivity of 88.88% in detection of pelvic type followed by 85.41% in retrocaecal type appendicitis.

All these patients who underwent appendicectomy the specimen was sent for histopathology examination for conformation of the type of appendicitis. Out of 50 patients 37 were suspected to have acute appendicitis but histopathology showed 32 cases of acute type (86.68%), 5 were suspected to have subacute appendicitis but histopathology revealed 12 cases (sensitivity >100) & 8 were suspected to have recurrent but histopathology showed 6 (68.75%) On the basis of individual modality 85% were suspected to have appendicitis on clinical presentation, 78% were suspected to have appendicitis on lab Ix, 69% were ultrasound proven appendicitis and histopathology proved appendicitis in all the cases (100%).

In our study the Retrocaecal appendix was found to be most common (63%) position followed by pelvic (18%), post-ileal (7%), paracaecal (5%), subcaecal (3%), pre-ileal (2%) & sub-hepatic (2%) when seen intraoperatively. In our study a total of five modalities are used for the diagnosis and confirmation of appendicitis. Out of which 85% were suspected to have appendicitis based on clinical presentation. 69% were suspected to have appendicitis on combining clinical presentation with laboratory investigations. On combining clinical presentation, lab Ix and USG 57% were suspected to have appendicitis. On combination of clinical presentation, lab Ix, USG with intraoperative findings 51% had appendicitis. And on combination of above mentioned four modalities with histopathology only 47% had appendicitis i.e. all five modalities were suggestive of appendicitis.

## CONCLUSION

Appendicitis is a very common surgical entity with a wide of complications and post appendicectomy symptoms. The accurate diagnosis of appendicitis still remains a challenge for the surgeon and the rate of negative appendicectomy with post appendicectomy symptoms are increasing due to inaccurate diagnosis. In our study we used a total of five modalities for the diagnosis of position of appendix & appendicitis, i.e. clinical features, lab Ix, ultrasound, intraoperative findings & histopathology, only 47% of cases all the modalities were positive. So the accurate diagnosis of position of appendix & appendicitis is a combination of all the modalities and not just dependent on one basis in order to prevent post appendicectomy complications and symptoms.

## REFERENCES

1. Wakeley CPG. The position of vermiform appendix as ascertained by the analysis of 10,000 cases. *J Anat* 1933; 67: 277-283.
2. Collins DC. 71,000 human appendix specimens: a final report, summarizing 40 years study. *Am J Proctol* 1963; 14:365-381.
3. Pickens G, Ellis H. The normal vermiform appendix at C.T visualization and anatomical location. *Clin. Anat.* 1993; 6:9.
4. Guidry SP, Poole GV. The anatomy of appendicitis. *Am Surg.* 1994 Jan; 60(1): 68-71
5. Poole GV. Anatomic basis for delayed diagnosis of appendicitis. *South Med J.* 1990 Jul; 83(7): 771-773.
6. Varshney S, Jhonson CD, Rangnekar GV. Retrocaecal appendix appears to be less prone to infection. *Br J Surg* 1996; 83:223-224.
7. Collins DC, Acute retro-caecal appendicitis. *Arch Surg.* 1938; 36:729-743.
8. Shen GK, Wong R, Daller J, Melcer S, Tsen A, Awry S, et al. Does the retrocaecal position of the vermiform appendix alter the clinical course of acute appendicitis? *Arch Surg.* 1991; 126:569-570.
9. Williamson WA, Bush RD, William LF. Retrocaecal appendicitis. *Am J Surg* 1981; 141:507-509.
10. Grunditz T, Rayden CI, Janzon L. Does the retrocaecal position influence the course of acute appendicitis? *ActaChir Scand.* 1983;249:707-710.
11. Lewis FR, Holcroft JW, Boey, et al. Appendicitis: a critical review of the diagnosis and treatment in 1000 cases. *Arch Surg* 1975;110:677-684.
12. Addis DG, Shaffer N, Fowler BS. The epidemiology of acute appendicitis in United States. *Am J Epidemiol* 1990;132:910.
13. Korner H, Sondenna K, Soreide JA. Incidence of acute non-perforated and perforated appendicitis: Age specific and sex specific analysis. *World J Surg.* 1997; 21:313.
14. Berry J, Malt RA. Appendicitis near its centenary. *Ann Surg* 1984; 200:567.
15. Collins DC. Acute retro-caecal appendicitis. *Arch Surg.* 1938; 36:729-743.

**Copyright:** © the author(s) and publisher IJM RP. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**How to cite the article:** Krishna Kumar, Abdul Hai. A Pre-Operative and Post-Operative Comparative Analysis of Different Anatomical Position, Clinical Presentation and USG Findings of Appendix in Patients of Appendicitis in a Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital. *Int J Med Res Prof.* 2015, 1(3); 10-14.