

“ФУНДАМЕНТАЛЬНАЯ НАУКА В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ МЕДИЦИНЕ 2017”



**Сборник материалов
сателитной дистанционной научно-практической
конференции
студентов и молодых ученых**

УДК 61:001(043.2)

ББК 5:72

Ф 94

Рецензенты: докт. мед. наук, проф. Артишевский Н.И.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Беспальчук П. И.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Борис А.Н.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Борисенко Л.Г.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Борисова Т.С.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Буцель А.Ч.; докт. мед. наук, проф. Висмонт Ф.И.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Гриб В.М.; канд. биол. наук, доц. Замбржицкий О.Н.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Журавков Ю.Л.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Курак Т.А.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Логинова И.А.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Месникова И.Л.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Павлович Т. П.; докт. мед. наук, проф. Походенько-Чудакова И.О.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Романенко З.В.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Савченко М.А.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Солтан М.М.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Статкевич Т.В.; докт. мед. наук, проф. Терехова Т.В.; докт. мед. наук, проф. Трисветова Е.Л.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Хомич С.Ф.; канд. мед. наук, доц. Якубовский С.В.

Редакционный совет: Д.А. Соловьёв, А.Р. Сидорович, Е.В. Мовкаленко, А.В. Давидян, А.А. Рачинская, И. Ю. Пристром, Е.А. Подголина, С.Г. Лепешко, П.А. Парейко, Д.В. Парамонов

Фундаментальная наука в современной медицине 2017: материалы сателл. дистанционной науч.- практич. конф. студентов и молодых ученых / под. ред. А.В. Сикорского, О.К. Дорониной, Т.В. Горлачёвой, Ф.И. Висмонта - Минск : БГМУ, 2017 -

ISBN 978-985-567-689-9

Сборник содержит научные статьи, отражающие результаты собственных исследований молодых учёных и студентов, посвящённые актуальным вопросам современной медицины.

ISBN 978-985-567-689-9



УДК 61:001(043.2)

ББК 5:72

Ф 94

Кордунян А.Э. АНГИОТЕНЗИОРЕОПЛЕТИЗМОГРАФИЯ – СОВРЕМЕННЫЙ МЕТОД ДИАГНОСТИКИ И КОНТРОЛЯ ЛЕЧЕНИЯ БОЛЬНЫХ С АРТЕРИАЛЬНЫМИ ГИПЕРТЕНЗИЯМИ	147
Костенко М. К., Дороженкова Т.Е. ЭПИДЕМИЧЕСКИЙ ПРОЦЕСС ПЕДИКУЛЕЗА В ГОРОДЕ МИНСКЕ ЗА 2005-2016 ГОДА.....	152
Krechun ¹ Anastasiya, Mykchailenko ² Olga, Kovalev ¹ Vladimir PRIMARY SCREENING OF COMPOSITION OF IRIS HUNGARICA (WALDST ET KIT.) THE BIOLOGICAL ACTIVE SUBSTANCES	158
Курганская Ю.И., Гайдук А.Р., Саросек В.Г. ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ СОВРЕМЕННЫХ ТЕХНОЛОГИЙ ЛУЧЕВОЙ ДИАГНОСТИКИ В ОНКОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПРАКТИКЕ	161
Khomko B.O.*, Randiuk R.Y., Khomko O.Y., Sydorhuk R.I., Knut R.P. MORPHOLOGICAL CHANGES IN PURULENT-NECROTIC PROCESSES OF SOFT TISSUES IN PATIENTS IN LOCAL APPLICATION OF SORBENT-ANTIBIOTIC COMPOSITION.....	166
Khomko B.O.*, Randiuk R.Y., Sydorhuk R.I., Kyfiak P.V., Khomko O.Y. AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY FOR CALCULATING PATIENTS SEVERITY STATUS IN EMERGENCY SURGERY	170
Khomko B.O.*, Randiuk R.Y., Sydorhuk R.I., Kyfiak P.V., Khomko O.Y. ABDOMINAL SEPSIS AND ACUTE RESPIRATORY DYSFUNCTION.....	173
Лабузко А.В., Гомзякова М.А.* ПРИЧИНЫ РАЗВИТИЯ ГИДРОЦЕФАЛИИ У ДЕТЕЙ	176
Лойко В.С., Ланкевич Т.С., Дронина А.М., Бандацкая М.И., Рашкевич * И.И., Крамник ** Т.И. ДИНАМИКА ЭПИДЕМИЧЕСКОГО ПРОЦЕССА СКАРЛАТИНЫ В ПЕРВОМАЙСКОМ И ПАРТИЗАНСКОМ РАЙОНАХ Г. МИНСКА	182
Мазуркевич Д.А., Неверов П.С. ЭКСТРЕННАЯ МЕДИЦИНСКАЯ ПОМОЩЬ И ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ОТСРОЧЕННЫХ ВМЕШАТЕЛЬСТВ ПРИ КРОВОТЕЧЕНИЯХ ИЗ ВАРИКОЗНО РАСШИРЕННЫХ ВЕН ПИЩЕВОДА.....	188

Khomko B.O., Randiuk R.Y., Sydoruk R.I., Kyfiak P.V., Khomko O.Y.*

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY FOR CALCULATING PATIENTS SEVERITY STATUS IN EMERGENCY SURGERY

Higher education institution in Ukraine "Bukovinian State Medical University"

Department of General Surgery

**RMI "Emergency Hospital"*

Chernivtsi, Ukraine

Ключевые слова: apache, apache ii, mip, абдоминальный сепсис.

Резюме. Прогностическая оценка эффективности скоринга патологических состояний была изучена путём моделирования абдоминального сепсиса в эксперименте. Применение скоринговых систем с прогностической целью целесообразно для использования в клинических условиях. Целесообразно сочетать различные системы оценки с целью повышения надёжности прогнозирования и оптимизации тактики лечения.

Key words: apache, apache ii, mip, abdominal sepsis.

Resume¹. Prognostic evaluation of the effectiveness of scoring pathologic conditions was studied by simulating abdominal sepsis in experiment. The application of scoring systems with a prognostic purpose is advisable for using under clinical conditions. It is expedient to combine different evaluation systems with the aim of enhancing prognostic reliability and optimizing the treatment tactics.

Introduction. Practical experience shows that in many patients the clinical course of surgical diseases depends not only on local peculiarities of pathological process (locus morbi), for example the degree of peritoneal inflammation and damage of peritoneum in peritonitis, but also on many other factors associated with age, concomitant pathological changes, specific and nonspecific immune resistance, endocrine status, etc. Therefore, severity of status assessment standardization in surgical patients using multimodal scoring systems that can more accurately and objectively determine treatment policy, the surgical tactics is urgent [4]. Today, there are many rating scales, and nomograms, which are often not consistent. Their scope is constantly expanding and currently covers the diagnosis, prognosis, treatment, and surveillance for many diseases and injuries.

Scaling or scoring system is usually based on a numerical evaluation of clinical, physiological, laboratory, and other parameters [3-5]. The presence of clinical symptoms or disorders of physiological, biochemical parameters compared to normal values are determined by the number and value regarding one patient includes in the overall scale. The resulting numerical value gives an estimation of some given properties of the pathological process of each patient. No doubt, this approach is the basis for individual surgical treatment.


Among of the scoring systems of the patient's condition severity (SSPCS), the largest distribution prevalence belongs to following [2, 4]: APACHE (Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation), APACHE II, APACHE III, PSS, MIP, SOFA, ASA. However, the question of necessity and usefulness of various score evaluation systems remains a subject of vivid debate, as numerous studies confirm that there are still no universal definitions and criteria.

The aim of the study is to determine the feasibility of using the most common scoring systems in comparative aspects in acute experiments.

Tasks: 1. Determine the feasibility of using the most common scoring systems in comparative aspects in acute experiments.

Material and methods. The object of the study were 19 inbred dogs weighing 8-15 kg (12.39 ± 1.47 kg). Prognostic evaluation of the effectiveness of scoring pathologic conditions was studied by simulating an acute pathological process (peritonitis) according to self-developed experimental technique by introducing mixture of pathogenic and conditionally pathogenic microorganisms into peritoneal cavity with the addition of adjuvants, which allowed simulating different degrees of severity of the pathological process and progress. To assess the functional state of the organism we determined heart rate (HR), respiratory rate (RR), arterial blood oxygenation indices (PaO_2), arterial blood pH, ionogramm indicators, hematocrit, creatinine, peripheral blood WBC count and formula, conducted a macroscopic assessment of the pathological process development. Statistical analysis performed using the MS® Excel software [1].

Results and discussion. The first stage of the experiment was simulation of acute peritonitis. In 6 (31.6%) dogs modeled local limited peritonitis (1st group), 7 (36.8%) - diffuse (2nd group), and in 6 (31.6%) – caused general peritonitis (3rd group). Twelve and 24 h after initiation of a pathological process defined physiological and laboratory parameters and calculated severity for different SSPCS systems (APACHE, APACHE II, MIP). The calculated results are presented in Fig. 1-3.



Total points for all systems in the different groups of experimental animals were appropriate. For APACHE and APACHE II mean values before modeling pathologi-

cal process were respectively: in group 1 – 6.71 ± 0.35 and 3.07 ± 0.12 points, in group 2 – 7.01 ± 1.03 and 2.98 ± 0.29 points in the 3rd group – 6.87 ± 0.92 and 3.16 ± 0.24 points.

During the development of experimental peritonitis significant changes of the body's vital signs, which affected the values of the prognostic coefficients took place. However, in group 1 APACHE and MIP indices in contrast to APACHE II decreased after 24 h of the experiment. This may be because APACHE and MIP are more sensitive to the development of compensatory reactions that take place within limited forms of peritonitis.

Attention draws the fact that APACHE indices in group 2 after 24 h and 3rd group after 12 h were almost identical, taking into account that disease duration is not included in the APACHE scoring system. This can be a source of diagnostic errors in the clinical setting because, as shown in Fig. 1-3, predictive value of scoring systems largely depends on the duration of the disease, and not on the time of the patient's admission to the hospital.

Predicted mortality [3, 5] among animals of the 1st group was to be 0% (MIP) or 0-5% (APACHE II and APACHE), 2nd – 29% (MIP) and 5-25% (APACHE II and APACHE). Mortality in the 3rd group was predicted to be 100% (MIP) and 25-100% (APACHE II and APACHE). Actual mortality was in the group 1 – 0% in 2nd – 28.6% (2 dogs died on the 3rd and 4th day of the experiment), the 3rd – 83.3%.

Conclusion. 1. The use of SSPCS systems as prognostic tool is expedient for practical application in clinical settings. 2. In order to increase the probability of forecasting and optimization of treatment strategy it is rational to combine different evaluation scoring systems.

Literature

1. Devore J.L. Probability and Statistics for Engineering and the Sciences. 4th ed. – Wadsworth Publishing, NY. – 1995. – 945p.
2. Dupont H., Carbon C., Carlet J. Monotherapy with a broad-spectrum beta-lactam is as effective as its combination with an aminoglycoside in treatment of severe generalized peritonitis: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. The Severe Generalized Peritonitis Study Group // *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* – 2000. – Vol.44, №8. – P. 2028-2033.
3. Nyström P.O., Richard B., Dellinger E. Proposed definitions for diagnosis, severity scoring, stratification and outcome for trials on intraabdominal infections // *W. J. Surgery.* – 1991. – 15. – P. 148-158.
4. Reed R.L. IInd. Contemporary issues with bacterial infection in the intensive care unit // *Surg. Clin. North Am.* – 2000. – Vol.80, №3. – P. 895-909.
5. Steeb G, Wang Y.Z, Siegrist B., O'Leary J.P. Infections within the peritoneal cavity: a historical perspective // *Am. J. Surg.* – 2000. – Vol.66, №2. – P. 98-104.