



Egyptian Society of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine  
**The Egyptian Journal of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine**

[www.elsevier.com/locate/ejrn](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ejrn)  
[www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)



## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# Immediate operation versus percutaneous drainage for treatment of appendicular abscess



Hany M.A. Seif <sup>a,\*</sup>, Hesham A. Reyad <sup>b</sup>, Mohamed Korany <sup>b</sup>, Mohamed Metwally <sup>b</sup>,  
 Ahmed I. Ahmed <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Radiology, Assiut University Hospital & Faculty of Medicine, Assiut 71517, Egypt

<sup>b</sup> Department of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt

<sup>c</sup> Department of Radiology, South Egypt Cancer Institute, Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt

Received 28 February 2015; accepted 15 June 2015

Available online 10 July 2015

### KEYWORDS

Appendicular abscess;  
 Appendectomy;  
 Percutaneous drainage

**Abstract** *Aim:* This study aims to compare the outcomes, morbidity and hospital stay in patients who underwent emergency surgery, and those who underwent percutaneous drainage for treatment of appendicular abscess.

*Patients and methods:* From April 2013 to October 2014, we recruited 40 patients with appendicular abscesses for this study. These patients were randomized into two groups: group 1 (20 patients) for emergency surgery and group 2 (20 patients) for percutaneous drainage. Preoperative data, hospital stay, functional recovery and postoperative complications were analyzed.

*Results:* Functional recovery was  $2.2 \pm 1$  days in group 1 and  $1 \pm 0$  day in group 2. Hospital stay in group 1 was  $7.7 \pm 3.5$  days and in group 2 was  $4 \pm 1$  days. Postoperative complications in group 1 were noted in 8 (40%) patients. No complications were recorded in group 2.

*Conclusions:* Appendicular abscesses may be safely and effectively treated by US-guided percutaneous drainage with high technical and clinical success rates, low incidence of complications and shorter hospital stay.

© 2015 The Authors. The Egyptian Society of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Appendicitis is the most common cause of pain requiring surgery. Appendicitis manifests itself with complex features such as an abscess or mass in 2–7% of the patients (1–3). Emergency surgery is not preferred on such cases because it

carries out risk of, inflammation spread in a wide area within the abdominal cavity, adhesion of the intestines, sepsis after surgery, and delayed healing of surgical wounds (4,5). Some authors advocated performing conservative treatments such as, ultrasound-guided percutaneous drainage and antibiotic treatments first, followed by interval appendectomy after a certain time (3,6). In addition, it was reported that the recurrence rate of appendicitis after conservative treatment about 7%, thus, after successful conservative treatments, an interval appendectomy is not always necessary (7,8). We conducted this study to compare the outcomes, morbidity and hospital stay in

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [hanyseifrad@yahoo.com](mailto:hanyseifrad@yahoo.com) (H.M.A. Seif).

Peer review under responsibility of Egyptian Society of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrn.2015.06.010>

0378-603X © 2015 The Authors. The Egyptian Society of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

patients who underwent emergency surgery, and those who underwent percutaneous drainage for treatment of appendicular abscess.

## 2. Patients and methods

This prospective randomized study was carried out throughout the period from April 2013 to October 2014 at the Department of General Surgery and the Department of Radiology, in Assiut University Hospital. It included 40 patients with appendicular abscess. The study was approved by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University and informed consent was taken from all participants.

On admission detailed history and abdominal examination were performed. Ultrasound examination was enough to diagnose appendicular abscess in all except two patients: those last two patients; the diagnosis was confirmed by Computerized tomography. After diagnosis, all patients were given intravenous antibiotics and analgesics during the period of hospital stay till the result of culture and sensitivity was obtained, then antibiotics were continued accordingly. Various combinations were used to cover both gram negative and gram positive pathogens plus added cover for anaerobes. Various antibiotic combinations were used; cefuroxime, and metronidazole combination; penicillin, gentamicin and metronidazole combination; or amoxicillin-clavulanate and metronidazole combination. On discharge, we shift to oral antibiotics for two weeks.

We divide the patients into two groups: Patients who underwent emergency surgery (group 1) which composed of 20 patients (12 males and 8 females) with their ages ranged from 9 to 59 years; and patients treated with conservative management through ultrasound-guided percutaneous drainage (group 2) which composed of 20 patients, (12 males and 8 females) with their ages ranged from 5 to 50 years.

### 2.1. Surgical drainage of group 1

All patients of this group were admitted and treated in the Department of General Surgery. Physical fitness assessment included CBC, random blood glucose, blood urea and creatinine, prothrombin time and concentration, liver function, hepatitis markers, and ECG. Surgical steps included appendectomy, evacuation of all gross pus and exudates, and thorough lavage with warm saline until the effluent was clear of contamination and the operation bed was clean. A tube drain was fixed into the appendectomy site through a separate incision, anchored with a stitch and connected to a sterile bag. Another drain was inserted and exited separately from the main incision. The main incision wound was closed in layers with interrupted stitches up to the fascia and the skin. Then, we used dressing soaked in povidone 10% solution to cover the wound. A patient's progress questionnaire, and the consistency and amount of fluid in the drain reservoir were estimated and recorded daily during the follow-up period. The wounds were inspected and their status was noted with daily dressing by povidone iodine. Abdominal ultrasonographic examination was performed every other day or on demand. The drains were extracted after stoppage of pus discharge and US revealed no residual collection. All patients were discharged when fever

subsided, white blood cell count normalized and oral feeding started.

### 2.2. Drainage procedure for group 2

All patients of this group were treated in the interventional unite of the Radiology Department. All procedures were performed under local anesthesia (lignocaine hydrochloride). Sedation with valium or midazolam was required in 4 patients. We used a spinal needle 22G for injection of the local anesthetics. The needle was placed in the capsule of the abscess under US guidance, and then the local anesthetics were injected while the needle was being withdrawn up to the subcutaneous tissues and also intradermal. We used Seldinger technique for abscess drainage. A puncture needle 18G was introduced under sonographic guidance into the abscess cavity, followed by aspiration of 10 cc of abscess contents for culture and sensitivity study. A J-shaped guide wire was introduced and the needle was then removed. After sequential dilatation to 7 French using Teflon dilators, a pigtail drainage catheter 8 French was introduced over the wire. The contents of the abscess were evacuated manually then the catheter was fixed to skin using 0- silk suture, and was connected to an evacuation bag. The catheter was left in-place and daily washout with sodium chloride 10 ml was routinely performed. We removed the catheter when the clinical manifestations (especially fever) subsided, the bag stopped drainage of pus or drained <5 cc serous fluid for 3 consecutive days, and ultrasound examinations showed no residual fluid in the abscess cavity.

The follow-up observation period was from the day of the first visit to the most recent visit to our outpatient clinic. The clinical characteristics of patients, the type of surgery, and the follow-up observation were analyzed based on electronic medical records. For statistical analysis, the SPSS ver. 20 was used. For statistical validation, the Student's t-test, Pearson's chi-square test, and Fisher's exact test were used.  $P < 0.05$  was determined to be statistically significant. The clinical characteristics; patients gender, age, major symptoms, duration of pain prior to admission, body temperature at the time of admission, heart rate, leukocytic counts, size of abscess; the hospital stay, the functional recovery, and the postoperative complications were analyzed.

For group 1, technical success was defined as the ability for complete evacuation of the abscess and doing appendectomy. Clinical success meant cure of all symptoms, and absence of complications or the need for new surgery.

For group 2, technical success was defined as the ability to insert a drainage catheter into the abscess cavity and complete evacuation of the abscess cavity. Clinical success meant subsidence of all symptoms, and absence of major complication or the need for surgical evacuation.

## 3. Results

This study included 40 patients. The mean age of the patients was 26.3 years. The emergency surgery group (group 1) included 20 patients and the conservative treatment group (group 2) included 20 patients. Right iliac fossa pain was the main symptom in both groups, which was noted in all patients. Other symptoms such as nausea, vomiting, fever, and anorexia were also noted (Table 1).

**Table 1** Comparison of clinical characteristics and outcome between the emergency operation (group 1) and the conservative management (group 2).

Clinical character	Group 1 (n = 20)	Group 2 (n = 20)	P-value
Mean age (ys)	30 ± 17.5	22.7 ± 17	0.227
Mean duration of symptoms before presentation (days)	6.8 ± 5.5	9.7 ± 6.9	0.059
Right abdominal pain	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	1.00
Anorexia	14 (70%)	12 (60%)	0.59
Nausea and vomiting	10 (50%)	6 (30%)	0.35
Abdominal mass	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	0.55
Fever	8 (40%)	7 (35%)	0.83
Right iliac tenderness	20 (100%)	20 (100%)	1.00
Leucocytosis	18 (90%)	16 (80%)	0.354
Tachycardia	14 (70%)	10 (50%)	0.265
US Finding			
Abscess	18 (90%)	16 (80%)	0.354
Mass and liquefaction	2 (10%)	4 (20%)	0.125
Associated diseases			
Hypertension	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	0.345
Diabetes	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	0.125
Mean hospital stay (days)	7.7 ± 3.5	4 ± 1	0.02
Mean period of functional recovery (days)	2.2 ± 1	1 ± 0	0.00
Complications	8 (40%)	0	0.000
Technical success	90%	100%	0.245
Clinical success	60%	100%	0.007

For group 1, the average body temperature at admission was  $38.1 \pm 0.38$ , the mean heart rate was 87.5 beats/minute and the mean leukocytic count was  $15.7 \pm 3.6$ . On ultrasonography, an abscess in the periappendix was noted in 18 patients (90%) and a mass with central liquefaction area in 2 patients (10%), and the average size of the abscess was  $6.3 \pm 1.5$  cm. Four patients have systemic diseases, hypertension ( $n = 2$ ) and diabetes mellitus ( $n = 2$ ).

In group 2, at the time of admission, the average body temperature was  $37.9 \pm 0.41$ , the average heart rate was 85.7 beats/minute, and the average leukocytic count was  $16.6 \pm 4 \times 10^3$ . On ultrasonography, 16 patients (80%) were diagnosed as having an abscess in the periappendix, and 4 patients (20%) were diagnosed as having a mass with central area of liquefaction, and the average abscess size was  $6.7 \pm 3.4$  cm. Only 2 patients (20%) had diabetes mellitus.

There was significant difference between patients of group 2 who regained their functional recovery in the 1st day, in the form of starting oral intake and practice normal habits, and those patients of group 1 who regained their functional recovery during a mean period of  $2.2 \pm 1$  days. The period of hospital stay for patient of group 2 was  $4 \pm 1$  days which is significantly lesser than that of group 2 ( $7.7 \pm 3.5$  days).

No major complications were noted in group 2. Only abdominal discomfort and pain site of catheter insertion were noted and managed by analgesic. On the contrary, 8 patients (40%) of group 1 show major complications in the form of wound infection ( $n = 6$ ), and burst abdomen ( $n = 2$ ).

In all patients of group 2, we could insert a drainage catheter and evacuated the abscess completely (technical success 100%) with no complications or the need for further surgical evacuation (clinical success 100%). Six (30%) of them underwent appendicectomy through McBurney's incision

within 2–3 months after removal of the drainage catheter. The other 14 patients refused surgery and followed up fully conservative. Only two (14%) of those patients had recurrent appendicitis after 7 and 9 months consequently and both underwent appendicectomy. Failure of doing appendicectomy in 2 patients of group 1 made technical success for this group 90%. Only 12 patients cured without major complication or resurgery (clinical success 60%) (Table 1).

#### 4. Discussion

If surgery is performed under the condition that inflammation due to appendicitis has spread to adjacent areas, the inflammation may have spread over a wide area. In addition, because of edema and the vulnerability of the adjacent small intestine and large intestine, secondary fistulas may develop. The incidence of complications was reported to be up to 26% (8,9). Furthermore, in emergency surgeries, the approach to the appendix is difficult due to inflamed tissues, and surgery may be technically difficult due to deformation of anatomical structures and location. For such cases, instead of completing surgery after a simple appendectomy, many cases may require simultaneous ileocecectomy or right colectomy (6,8). The reported advantages of performing emergency surgery are that frequent follow-ups and tests are not required in comparison with conservative managements and that re-hospitalization after a certain time for the planned surgery is not required (10,11).

In many studies, appendicitis associated with abscess could be treated conservatively with success rates ranging from 76% to 97%, with low incidence of complications. Thus, non-surgical treatments, such as antibiotic treatments and ultrasound-guided percutaneous drainage, during the initial period have been proven to be effective and safe (6,12,13).

In our study, 8 patients (40%) developed complications (wound infection in 6 (30%) patients and burst abdomen in 2 (10%) patients) after emergency surgery, while in the conservative group, no complications were recorded. Similarly, Olsen et al. (14), in 2014 studied 67 patients (35 treated by emergency surgery and 32 treated by conservative percutaneous drainage), the incidence of complications was high in the emergency group (40%) in the form of wound infections (25%), fecal fistula (10%) and burst abdomen (10%) while no complications were reported in the emergency group.

The necessity of interval surgery after the improvement of symptoms through initial conservative management for appendicitis associated with an abscess is still controversial. Recurrence after conservative treatment is prevalent within 2 years of the development of initial symptoms, after which recurrence rate decreases (6,15,16). The reported recurrence rate after conservative treatments ranged from 5% to 37%. In studies showing relatively high recurrence rates, interval surgery to remove the risk of recurrence was recommended (17–19). On the other side, in a random prospective study that was conducted by Kumar and Jain (20) the recurrence rate of appendicitis in the group that underwent only observation without surgery after conservative management was 10%. In our study only 2 of 14 patients (14%) treated by percutaneous drainage and refused surgery, developed recurrence of appendicitis. Also, the incidence of complications has been shown to be approximately 12–23% in patients who underwent interval

surgery performed after inflamed areas (6,21). In addition, because recurrence occurs several months after the first insult, inflammations will be subsided and appendicitis could be performed safely. Thus, intensive follow-up observation without interval surgery might be useful.

In our study both the technical and clinical success rates were 100% in group 2, while in group 1 the technical success rate was 90% and the clinical success rate was 60%. The differences between the results of both groups were statistically significant and in favor of percutaneous drainage. These results agree with or better than those of Brown et al. (22), who reported that technical and clinical success rates for percutaneous drainage of the appendicular abscess range from 85% to 90% and 81% to 100%, respectively.

## 5. Conclusion

Appendicular abscesses may be safely and effectively treated by US-guided percutaneous drainage with high technical and clinical success rates, low incidence of complications and shorter hospital stay. Interval appendectomy could be reserved for recurrent cases or patients with high possibility of underlying malignancy.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflict of interest.

## References

- (1) Bagi P, Dueholm S. Nonoperative management of the ultrasonically evaluated appendiceal mass. *Surgery* 1987;101(5):602–5.
- (2) Bagi P, Dueholm S, Karstrup S. Percutaneous drainage of appendiceal abscess. An alternative to conventional treatment. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1987;30(7):532–5.
- (3) Bradley 3rd EL, Isaacs J. Appendiceal abscess revisited. *Arch Surg* 1978;113(2):130–2.
- (4) Jebbin NJ. Local anaesthesia for appendectomy: one surgeon's experience. *Niger J Med* 2007;16(1):31–3.
- (5) Shipsey MR, O'Donnell B. Conservative management of appendix mass in children. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 1985;67(1):23–4.
- (6) Willemsen PJ et al. The need for interval appendectomy after resolution of an appendiceal mass questioned. *Dig Surg* 2002;19(3):216–20, discussion 221.
- (7) Hurme T, Nylamo E. Conservative versus operative treatment of appendicular abscess. Experience of 147 consecutive patients. *Ann Chir Gynaecol* 1995;84(1):33–6.
- (8) Tingstedt B et al. Management of appendiceal masses. *Eur J Surg* 2002;168(11):579–82.
- (9) Erdogan D et al. Comparison of two methods for the management of appendicular mass in children. *Pediatr Surg Int* 2005;21(2):81–3.
- (10) Foran B, Berne TV, Rosoff L. Management of the appendiceal mass. *Arch Surg* 1978;113(10):1144–5.
- (11) Samuel M, Hosie G, Holmes K. Prospective evaluation of nonsurgical versus surgical management of appendiceal mass. *J Pediatr Surg* 2002;37(6):882–6.
- (12) Skoubo-Kristensen E, Hvid I. The appendiceal mass: results of conservative management. *Ann Surg* 1982;196(5):584–7.
- (13) Jordan JS, Kovalcik PJ, Schwab CW. Appendicitis with a palpable mass. *Ann Surg* 1981;193(2):227–9.
- (14) Olsen J et al. Treatment of appendiceal mass—a qualitative systematic review. *Dan Med J* 2014;61(8):A4881.
- (15) Poon RT, Chu KW. Inflammatory cecal masses in patients presenting with appendicitis. *World J Surg* 1999;23(7):713–6, discussion 716.
- (16) Kaminski A et al. Routine interval appendectomy is not justified after initial nonoperative treatment of acute appendicitis. *Arch Surg* 2005;140(9):897–901.
- (17) Gillick J, Velayudham M, Puri P. Conservative management of appendix mass in children. *Br J Surg* 2001;88(11):1539–42.
- (18) Brown CV et al. Appendiceal abscess: immediate operation or percutaneous drainage? *Am Surg* 2003;69(10):829–32.
- (19) Bufo AJ et al. Interval appendectomy for perforated appendicitis in children. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A* 1998;8(4):209–14.
- (20) Kumar S, Jain S. Treatment of appendiceal mass: prospective, randomized clinical trial. *Indian J Gastroenterol* 2004;23(5):165–7.
- (21) Oliak D et al. Initial nonoperative management for periappendiceal abscess. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2001;44(7):936–41.
- (22) Brown C, Kang L, Kim ST. Percutaneous drainage of abdominal and pelvic abscesses in children. *Semin Intervent Radiol* 2012;29(4):286–94.