

A STUDY OF INCIDENCE OF VARIOUS ETIOLOGY FOR APPENDICITIS IN EMERGENCY APPENDICECTOMY BY LAPROSCOPIC METHOD

Dr P. Shivaramlu¹, Dr Maku Venkat Ravinder², Dr Manepalli Uma Mounica¹

¹Associate professor SURABHI INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES SIDDIPET

²Assistant professor SURABHI INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES SIDDIPET

Corresponding Author

Dr Manepalli Uma Mounica,
Associate professor SURABHI
INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL
SCIENCES SIDDIPET

Article History:

Received: 08-10-2024

Accepted: 25-11-2024

Available Online: 29-11-2024

How to Cite the Article:

Dr P. Shivaramlu, et al. A STUDY OF INCIDENCE OF VARIOUS ETIOLOGY FOR APPENDICITIS IN EMERGENCY APPENDICECTOMY BY LAPROSCOPIC METHOD, Anesthesia and Pain Medicine. 2024; 19(4):

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

Mast cell remains an enigmatic, fascinating and highly engineered cell more than 100 years after its discovery by Paul 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, submu cosal, 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 ca 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.

Aim A study of incidence of various etiology for appendicitis in emergency appendicectomy by laproscopic method

OBJECTIVES

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

MATERIAL 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 patients	percentage
1	Faecolith	18	36
2	Appendicular mass	10	20
3	Intestinal worms	06	12
4	Perforation	05	12
5	Gangrene	05	10
6	Foreignbody	05	10
7	calcaecum	01	04

DISCUSSION

In this study, lap appendectomy was done as an emergency procedure (within 24 hours) and the findings were faecolith present in 18 patients, appendicular mass present in 10 patients, worms in 6 patients. Perforation, Gangrene, Foreign Body in 5 patients respectively. Ca.caecum in 1 patient. Emergency Appendectomy 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 appendectomy. Another study, laproscopic 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 appendectomy 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%). Similarly Murphy PG, et al. A 50 patients were included in the study,the findings were 4(8%) had normal appendix,46(92%) had different pathologies in appendix. No:of subjects Faecolith percentage 14 Appendicular mass 6 28% 12% Intestinal worms 6 12% Perforation 5 5 Gangrene 10% 5 6 Foreignbody 10% 5 7 Ca.caecum 10% 1 2% prospective randomized trial of laproscopic versus open appendectomy. our study is in conjunction with many other studies and common notable finding was laproscopic appendectomy as an emergency procedure revealed appendicular pathology responsible for symptoms

Conclusion: laproscopic appendectomy as an emergency procedure revealed appendicular pathology responsible for symptoms

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 laproscopic 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. Laproscopic versus open appendectomy: outcomes comparison based on a large administrative database. Ann Surg. 2004; 239:43–52. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
4. Attwood SE, Hill AD, Surgery. 1992;112:497–501. [PubMed]

5. 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] A
6. Frazee RC, Roberts JW, Symmonds RE, et al. prospective randomized trial comparing open versus laparoscopic appendectomy. *Ann Surg.* 1994;219:725–728. [PMC free article] [PubMed]
7. Hansen JB, Smithers BM, Schache D, et al. Laparoscopic versus open appendectomy: prospective randomized trial. *World J Surg.* 1996;20:17–20. [PubMed] Dr Ravichandran K et al *JMSCR* Volume 05 Issue 01 January 2017
8. Heikkinen TJ, Haukipuro K, Hulkko A. Cost-effective appendectomy: open or laparoscopic? a prospective randomized study. *Surg Endosc.* 1998;12:1204–1208. [PubMed] 2017 economic analyses. *Surgery.* 2001;129:390–400. [PubMed]
9. 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]
10. 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]
11. Kazemier G, De Zeeuw GR, Lange JF, et al. Laparoscopic vs. open appendectomy: a randomized clinical trial. *Surg Endosc.* 1997;11:336–340. [PubMed]