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Abstract

Introduction: Acute appendicitis is one of the most common causes of abdominal pain of adult patients referred to the emergency department. Despite its prevalence, the diagnosis of appendicitis can be elusive and fraught with pitfalls because of the absence of a pathognomonic sign or symptom and the poor predictive value of laboratory testing. So following the significant advances in accuracy, ultrasonography has become an important part of the modern work-up of acute appendicitis.

Objective: To evaluate the role and accuracy of ultrasonography in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis.

Materials and Methods: A total number of 110 cases (65 men and 45 women), with clinical suspicion of appendicitis, were subjected to abdominal ultrasonographic examination. All ultrasonographic positive cases and a few of ultrasonographic negative cases were subjected to operative intervention. The accuracy of ultrasonography in the diagnosis of appendicitis was compared with the clinical diagnosis, operative findings and histopathological examination reports. The statistical analysis was done by using SPSS10.

Results: Among 110 cases, 77 cases were sonographically positive for appendicitis and 5 cases were appendicular masses. The cardinal signs were right lower abdominal tenderness, rebound tenderness and positive Rovsing’s sign. The specificity of Ultrasound was 74.28%, sensitivity 90.66%, positive predictive value 88.31%, negative predictive value 78.79% and accuracy was 85.45% in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis.

Conclusion

So far the cost reduction of treatment and negative laparotomies are concerned, the ultrasonography is still an useful tool in the diagnosis of appendicitis in spite of more recent investigations like CT abdomen and Laparoscopy.
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Introduction

Abdominal ultrasonography (USG) has a definitive role in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis because it establishes an alternative diagnosis in patient with acute right lower abdominal pain and reduces the number of negative laparotomies. Delay in the diagnosis and surgery in some atypical cases of appendicitis may result in perforation. This occurs in 17-39% of patients with appendicitis. The elderly and very young are at a higher risk. Acute appendicitis is still the most common indicator to emergency abdominal surgery. The clinical diagnosis of appendicitis is difficult in a few cases. Approximately 20.33% of patients will present atypically. The inflamed appendix is seen as a blind ended tubular structure with laminated wall arising from the base of cecum. Puylaert reported the sensitivity of 89% and specificity 100% in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis by ultrasonography. However the diagnosis is still based on clinical features. The aim of this study was to evaluate the role of ultrasonography to find out its accuracy to diagnose the appendicitis by comparing with clinical assessment and histopathological reports.
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Materials and Methods
This observational study was carried out in the department of Radiology and Imaging in collaboration with the department of Surgery in MCWH at Uttara, Dhaka and Catharsis Hospital, Pubail, Dhaka over a period of 2 years from May 2014 to April 2016. A total of 110 patients (65 men and 45 women, age range from 10 years to 65 years) who presented with pain in the right lower abdomen, in whom acute appendicitis was suspected basing on clinical features, were subjected to abdominal USG examination.

Inclusion Criteria:
• Male and female patients with age group of 10 to 65 years.
• Pain in right iliac fossa.
• Fever.
• Increased leucocytes count.
• Mass in right iliac fossa.
• Patients with recurrent appendicitis were also included.

Exclusion Criteria:
• Patients below 10 and above 65 years of age.
• History of previous laparotomy.
• Chronic infectious disease like ileoceleal tuberculosis. Carcinoid tumors and other neoplastic lesions of the appendix.
• Patients with 3rd trimester of pregnancy.

Sonographic Criteria:
The following accepted criteria were considered for the diagnosis of an inflamed appendix.
  a. A peristaltic non compressive appendix as a blind ending tubular structure.
  b. Diffuse hypoechoegenecity (associated with a higher incidence of perforation)
  c. Target appearance of ≥ 6 mm (6 millimeters) in the total diameter on cross section (81%) in aximal mural wall thickness ≥ 2mm.
  d. Localized periappendicular fluid collection.
  e. Lumen may be distended with an echoic/ hyper echoic material.
  f. Visualization of appendicolith
  g. Free pelvic fluid.
  h. Prominent hyperechoic mesoappendix/ pericaecal fat.

The criteria of Negativity:
Negative appendix was defined as normal looking appendix on operation and absence of acute inflammation on histopathology. All cases were sent for histopathology and the ones in which histopathological examination (HPE) was negative, were considered as true negatives.

Results
It has been shown that all of the patients included in the study had history of abdominal pain which was considered to be of strong clinical suspicion of acute appendicitis. Tenderness over right iliac fossa (RIF) was the most common sign elicited in all 110 cases (100%). Migration of pain to RIF was found in 80 (72.72%), vomiting was found in 70 (63.63%) cases, rebound tenderness in 85 (77.27%), Rovsing’s sign in 49 (44.54%) and fever in 45 (40.90%) cases (Table-I).

Table-I: Clinical signs and symptoms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptoms</th>
<th>Cases(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pain in abdomen</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration of pain</td>
<td>80  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fever</td>
<td>45  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vomiting</td>
<td>70  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhoea</td>
<td>9  8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysuria</td>
<td>6  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sign
  RIF Tenderness  110
  Rebound tenderness  85  7
  Guarding  27  2
  Tachycardia  55
  Rovsing’s sign  49  4
  Leukocytosis  80  7
  Neutrophilia  90  8
  Pus cell and RBC in urine  18  1

Total white cell count rose significantly in 72.72% in our patients. This result was comparable to the study done by Lewis et al14.The outer diameter of the appendix was greater than 6mm in all 77 cases (70%). It is lower than the criteria letdown by Jeffrey et al14.

Table-II: USG diagnosis of RIF pain (n=110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathology</th>
<th>Cases(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acute appendicitis</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right ureteric colic</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvic inflammatory disease</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian cyst</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendicular mass</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ectopic pregnancy</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive findings</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All 77 cases which were sonologically positive underwent operative treatment and out of these 77 cases, 68 cases were histopathologically (HPE) positive and 09 cases were HPE negative (Table-III).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Histopathological diagnosis</th>
<th>Cases (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enditis among USG positive cases</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enditis among USG negative cases</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericteitis</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperplasia</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sonologically negative cases were managed conservatively but in this group of 33 cases due to the persistence of symptoms and or surgeon’s suspicion 11 cases were operated upon. Out of these 11 cases 07 were HPE positive (Table-IV). Lewis et al noted that pain abdomen which localized in right lower quadrant contributed to the maximum number of patients which was similar to our study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation of HPE Diagnosis with HPE</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Case Operated</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Case Operated</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, tenderness in right lower fossa was seen in 100% cases whereas rebound tenderness at McBurney’s point was noted in 92% which is similar to the findings shown by Taura et al. Observation shows that the overall sensitivity was 90.66%, specificity was 74.28%, positive predictive value (PPV) 88.31%, negative predictive value (NPV) 78.79% and diagnostic accuracy 85.45%.
Discussion

Ultrasoundography (USG) is a widely available and inexpensive modality of investigation that has the potential for highly accurate imaging in patients with suspected acute appendicitis. Diagnosis of acute appendicitis is not always straightforward. Sometimes the presentation of the disease is so atypical that even the most experienced surgeon may remove normal appendix or sit on the perforated one. The advantage of USG over computed tomography (CT) is that it allows precise correlation of the USG findings with the area of maximum tenderness or with a palpable mass. The PPV in this study is 88.31% which is relatively low compared with other studies and can be explained by the study design. This study mainly focused on the screening value of sonography with the sonograms interpreted in a manner to avoid missing any cases with positive findings. Therefore, subtle but non-specific signs that might have indicated acute appendicitis, such as fluids in right paracolic gutter, were interpreted as positive results. These results are comparable to a Korean meta-analysis on the role of USG in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis which shows sensitivity and specificity 86.7% and 90.0% respectively.

This study is compared with study of Tauro et al, Jo Shi et al, Ida chan et al and Rioux et al which has been shown in Table-VI whose sensitivity values varied from 83 to 90% and specificity ranges from 88.09 to 95%. In this study overall accuracy of sonography was 85.45% and the results were comparable to the studies of Tarzan z et al, Hahn et al and Skanne et al.

The Table-V summarizes the results of our study compared with the results of similar studies in different parts of the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Study</td>
<td>90.66</td>
<td>74.28</td>
<td>88.31</td>
<td>78.79</td>
<td>85.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauro LF et al</td>
<td>91.37</td>
<td>88.09</td>
<td>91.37</td>
<td>88.09</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan et al</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Shi et al</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rioux et al</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations and Drawbacks of the study

There are certain drawbacks in using ultrasoundography for diagnosing acute appendicitis. The foremost important is the experience of the sonologist as the procedure is highly operator dependent. Considering the cost factor of the contrast CT study, it was not included for the accurate diagnosis of dubious cases.

Conclusion

The gold standard for the diagnosis of appendicitis still remains pathologic confirmation after appendectomy. The accuracy of USG in this aspect is extremely variable due to many reasons, including lack of operator skill, increased bowel gas content, obesity, anatomic variants and limitations to explore patients with previous laparotomies. It is inexpensive, safe and widely available. Diagnostic accuracy is reported to range from 71% to 97% So USG remains our first line method in the evaluation of patients referred with clinically suspected acute appendicitis. Nevertheless, due to variable diagnostic accuracy, individual skill is requested not only to perform successful examination but also to warrant computed tomography (CT) for equivocal cases to reduce the rate of fatal consequences like perforations.
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