



A Study of Incidence of Various Etiology for Appendicitis in Emergency Appendicectomy by Laproscopic Method

Authors

Dr Ravichandran K¹, Dr K.C.M. Rajkumar²

^{1,2}Dept of Surgery Rajah Muthiah Medical College, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu

Abstract

Background: Appendicitis is one of the most common cause of acute abdomen. laparoscopic appendicectomy performed as emergency procedure in many centres as changing trends.

Aims: To study the various outcome of findings in cases with acute appendicitis performed within 24 hours by laparoscopic methods.

Patients and Methods: This is a retrospective hospital based study. 50- symptomatic patients diagnosed as acute appendicitis and findings were observed by laparoscopic appendicectomy.

Results: laparoscopic appendicectomy done as emergency procedure (within 24 hours) revealed different pathological findings 46(92%) out of 50 patients, presented with acute appendicitis.

Conclusion: laparoscopic appendicectomy as an emergency procedure revealed appendicular pathology responsible for symptoms.

Keywords: Faecolith, Appendicular mass, Worms, Carcinoma Caecum.

Introduction

Appendix is considered by the most to be vestigial organ, its importance in surgery results only in its propensity for inflammation which results in clinical syndrome known as acute appendicitis. It is a blind muscular tube with mucosal, submucosal, muscular and serosal layers. Decreased dietary fibres and increased consumption of refined carbohydrates may be important, while appendix is clearly associated with bacterial proliferation within appendix. No single organism is responsible, mixed growth of aerobic and anaerobic organisms are usual.

Obstruction of appendicular lumen has been widely held to be important and some form of

luminal obstruction either by faecolith or stricture is found in majority of cases. A faecolith is composed of inspissated faecal material, calcium phosphates, bacteria, debris, rarely a foreign body incorporated in to the mass. Obstruction of appendicular orifice by tumor particularly caecum is an occasional case of middle age and elderly patients. Intestinal parasites particularly oxyuria vermicularis (pin worm) can proliferate in appendix and occlude the lumen. Obstruction of appendicular lumen seems to be essential for the development of appendicular gangrene and perforation. Lymphoid hyperplasia leads to narrowing lumen of appendix leading to obstruction.

Review of literature

Emergency Appendicectomy done by laproscopic methods were done in one study and the findings were detected in 100 patients.

In another study 72% of 100 patients had pathologies in appendix detected by laproscopic method while performing emergency appendicectomy.

Another study, laparoscopic methods performed as an emergency procedure and the findings were faecolith 12(24%), appendicular perforation 4(8%), appendicular mass 4(8%),and impending gangrene 5(10%).

A study conducted between 2012 -2014 ,where 150 patients enrolled and findings of lap appendicectomy done as emergency procedure were faecolith 24(48%), appendicular mass12 (24%), Ca.caecum 4(8%), fibrotic stricture 10(20%), and appendicular abscess 12(24%)and intestinal worms 14(28%).

Objectives

1. To study the various outcome of findings in patients with acute appendicitis undergoing lap appendicectomy.

Patients and Methods

This study was a retrospective study conducted during the period of 2014 -2016 .50 patients were included, the data have been collected from Medical Records Department at Rajah Muthiah Medical College.

Results:

50 patients were included in the study.the findings were 4(8%) had normal appendix,46(92%) had different pathologies in appendix.

Serial no:	Lap.findings	No:of subjects	percentage
1	Faecolith	14	28%
2	Appendicular mass	6	12%
3	Intestinal worms	6	12%
4	Perforation	5	10%
5	Gangrene	5	10%
6	Foreignbody	5	10%
7	Ca.caecum	1	2%

Discussion

In this study, lap appendicectomy was done as an emergency procedure (within 24 hours) and the findings were faecolith present in 14 patients, appendicular mass present in 6 patients, worms in 6 patients. Perforation, Gangrene, Foreign Body in 5 patients respectively. Ca.caecum in 1 patient.

Reference

1. Semm K. Endoscopic appendectomy. Endoscopy. 1983;15:59–64. [PubMed]
2. Majeed AW, Troy G, Nicholl JP, et al. Randomized, prospective, single-blind comparison of laparoscopic versus small-incision cholecystectomy. Lancet. 1996; 347:989–994. [PubMed]
3. McBurney C. The incision made in the abdominal wall in case of appendicitis with a description of a new method of operating. Ann Surg. 1894;20–38. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
4. Guller U, Hervey S, Purves H, et al. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy: outcomes comparison based on a large administrative database. Ann Surg. 2004; 239:43–52. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
5. Attwood SE, Hill AD, Murphy PG, et al. A prospective randomized trial of laparoscopic versus open appendectomy. Surgery. 1992;112:497–501. [PubMed]
6. Cox MR, McCall JL, Toouli J, et al. Prospective randomized comparison of open versus laparoscopic appendectomy in men. World J Surg. 1996;20:263–266. [PubMed]
7. Frazee RC, Roberts JW, Symmonds RE, et al. A prospective randomized trial comparing open versus laparoscopic appendectomy. Ann Surg. 1994;219:725–728. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
8. Hansen JB, Smithers BM, Schache D, et al. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy: prospective randomized trial. World J Surg. 1996;20:17–20. [PubMed]

9. Heikkinen TJ, Haukipuro K, Hulkko A. Cost-effective appendectomy: open or laparoscopic? a prospective randomized study. *Surg Endosc.* 1998;12:1204–1208. [PubMed]
10. Hellberg A, Rudberg C, Kullman E, et al. Prospective randomized multicentre study of laparoscopic versus open appendectomy. *Br J Surg.* 1999;86:48–53. [PubMed]
11. Ignacio RC, Burke R, Spencer D, et al. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy: what is the real difference? results of a prospective randomized double-blinded trial. *Surg Endosc.* 2004;18:334–337. [PubMed]
12. Kazemier G, De Zeeuw GR, Lange JF, et al. Laparoscopic vs. open appendectomy: a randomized clinical trial. *Surg Endosc.* 1997;11:336–340. [PubMed]
13. Klingler A, Henle KP, Beller S, et al. Laparoscopic appendectomy does not change the incidence of postoperative infectious complications. *Am J Surg.* 1998;175:232–235. [PubMed]
14. Kum CK, Ngoi SS, Goh PM, et al. Randomized controlled trial comparing laparoscopic and open appendectomy. *Br JSurg.* 1993;80:1599–1600. [PubMed]
15. Laine S, Rantala A, Gullichsen R, et al. Laparoscopic appendectomy: is it worthwhile? a prospective, randomized study in young women. *Surg Endosc.* 1997;11:95–97. [PubMed]
16. Larsson PG, Henriksson G, Olsson M, et al. Laparoscopy reduces unnecessary appendectomies and improves diagnosis in fertile women: a randomized study. *Surg Endosc.* 2001;15:200–202. [PubMed]
17. Long KH, Bannon MP, Zietlow SP, et al. Laparoscopic Appendectomy Interest Group: a prospective randomized comparison of laparoscopic appendectomy with open appendectomy: clinical and economic analyses. *Surgery.* 2001;129:390–400. [PubMed]