

E-ISSN: 2616-3470  
P-ISSN: 2616-3462  
© Surgery Science  
www.surgeryscience.com  
2019; 3(4): 397-399  
Received: 19-08-2019  
Accepted: 23-09-2019

**Dr. SK Manoj**  
Assistant Professor, Department of  
Surgery, Trichy SRM Medical  
College Hospital & Research  
Centre, Irungalur, Trichy, Tamil  
Nadu, India

**Dr. K Rajachidamaram**  
Professor, Department of Surgery,  
Trichy SRM Medical College  
Hospital & Research Centre,  
Irungalur, Trichy, Tamil Nadu,  
India

**Dr. A Zahir Hussain**  
Associated Professor, Department  
of Surgery, Trichy SRM Medical  
College Hospital & Research  
Centre, Irungalur, Trichy, Tamil  
Nadu, India

**Dr. Sai Thaejesvi**  
M.B.B.S, Department of Surgery,  
Trichy SRM Medical College  
Hospital & Research Centre,  
Irungalur, Trichy, Tamil Nadu,  
India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Dr. SK Manoj**  
Assistant Professor, Department of  
Surgery, Trichy SRM Medical  
College Hospital & Research  
Centre, Irungalur, Trichy, Tamil  
Nadu, India

## Evaluation of modified alvarado scoring system regarding early diagnosis of acute appendicitis and in reduction of negative appendicectomies

**Dr. SK Manoj, Dr. K Rajachidamaram, Dr. A Zahir Hussain and Dr. Sai Thaejesvi**

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.33545/surgery.2019.v3.i4g.277>

### Abstract

**Aim:** To compare and evaluate diagnostic accuracy of Modified Alvarado score in co-relation to histopathology report for diagnosis of acute appendicitis.

### Materials and methods

**Study Design:** A Cross Sectional Study of 100 patients with complaint of Lower Abdominal pain.

**Place of Study:** Trichy SRM medical hospital and research centre period of study – January 2017 to January 2019.

### Inclusion criteria

- Patients hospitalized with abdominal pain suggestive of acute appendicitis.
- Age range of 15 - 50 years
- Both males and females
- Ability to understand and give consent

### Exclusion criteria

- Patients less than 15 years of age and older than 50 years.
- Patients who have undergone Appendectomy previously.
- Chronic/Subacute/Recurrent Appendicitis

### Results

1. Histopathological diagnosis was accepted as the final confirmation of the diagnosis.
2. Though large number of consultants were involved in clinical diagnosis of acute appendicitis, no significance was attached to the inter observer variation.

**Conclusion:** The study concludes that establishing diagnosis in cases of suspected acute appendicitis might require a combination of different diagnostic tools such as modified Alvarado score, investigative modalities such as ultrasonography and the indispensable clinical judgment.

**Keywords:** Acute abdomen, appendicitis, alvarado scoring, acute surgical abdomen

### Introduction

The acute surgical abdomen an important problem facing surgeons and radiologist alike. The wide range of cause and varied patient presentation pose a formidable diagnostic and therapeutic challenge. As with all new developments however, enthusiasm for the new and modern techniques has sometimes overwhelmed good clinical judgment. Acute appendicitis is the most common cause of acute surgical abdomen with a life long risk of 7% [1]. Classic clinical and laboratory findings usually allow for prompt diagnosis and treatment. However some patients have atypical and frequently confusing presentation leading to misdiagnosis.

Diagnosis of Acute Appendicitis remains challenging despite improvement in history taking, clinical examination, new computer aided decision support system, clinical diagnostic sourcing and new imaging technique.

Diagnostic scores are useful and easy methods which help in surgical decision to reach. These scores make use of clinical, analytical and radiological findings to produce a rationalized model of clinical decision-making. Presently several such diagnostic scoring system have been proposed to aid diagnosis of acute appendicitis. The description of modified Alvarado scoring system was introduced in 1994 has greatly improved ability to diagnosis [4].

Plain abdominal films and barium studies considered to be of limited value. New technology could lower the rate of delayed diagnosis. Graded compression ultrasonography in diagnosis of acute appendicitis has greatly improved the ability to diagnose acute appendicitis with ultrasound [5]. Ultrasonography is critically operator dependant, and care to be taken to avoid over interpreting a technically inadequate examination. Graded compression sonography plays an important role in reducing the number of negative surgical exploration for acute appendicitis. The accuracy offered by sonography should keep negative laparotomy ratio at approximately 10% which is improvement over the rate achieved by instinct alone [6]. CT scan is complimentary to sonography. However CT scan is associated with greater cost, exposure ionizing radiation and exposure to contrast agents. In our hospital acute appendicitis remains one of the most common acute Abdominal emergencies warranting surgery in patients presenting with atypical clinical finding. So diagnosis has become difficult. Modified Alvarado scoring system plays a definite role in diagnosis of acute appendicitis. Till now in our hospital no one has done a study to evaluate diagnostic accuracy of modified Alvarado score in acute appendicitis. Hence this study is undertaken.

## Objectives

### Primary objective

To compare and evaluate diagnostic accuracy of Modified Alvarado score in co-relation to histopathology report for diagnosis of acute appendicitis

### Scoring systems for acute appendices

Despite advances in other diagnostic modalities, appendicitis remains a diagnosis based primarily on history and physical examination. A study evaluated the performance of 10 different diagnostic scoring systems for acute appendicitis. 20 The scoring system was applied to a data base of 1254 patients to compare the patients scoring result with published data. The author's believed that an adequate scoring system should fulfill the following criteria.

A negative appendectomy rate less than 15% A perforated appendix rate less than 35% A missed perforation rate less than 15% A missed appendicitis rate less than 5%. Alvarado followed up patients admitted to surgical unit at the Nazareth Hospital in Philadelphia with suspected acute, appendicitis until surgery confirmed or refuted diagnosis. Alvarado found that eight criteria had high diagnostic accuracy for acute appendicitis.<sup>21</sup> These criteria were grouped as:

1. Migration of pain
2. Anorexia
3. Nausea, vomiting
4. Tenderness right iliac fossa.
5. Rebound Pain
6. Raised temp. ( $\geq 37.3^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
7. Leucocytosis
8. Shift to left in leucocyte count (neutrophil  $\geq 75\%$ )

Kalen M proposed modified Alvarado score and conducted a prospective study on evaluation of modified Alvarado score in diagnosis of acute appendicitis [4] The elements of modified Alvarado score were:

1. Migration of pain
2. Anorexia
3. Nausea/vomiting
4. Tenderness in right iliac fossa
5. Rebound tenderness
6. Temperature  $\geq 37.3^{\circ}\text{C}$

7. WBC count  $\geq 10 \times 10^9/\text{L}$

## Methodology

### Study design

A Cross Sectional Study

Sample size:

Sample size = 100 patients with complaint of Lower Abdominal pain.

Trichy SRM Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, irungalur, Trichy Patients whoever satisfy the study criteria will be included in the study.

### Inclusion criteria

Patients hospitalized with abdominal pain suggestive of acute appendicitis.

- Age range of 15 - 50 years
- Both males and females
- Ability to understand and give consent

### Exclusion criteria

- Patients less than 15 years of age and older than 50 years.
- Patients who have undergone Appendicectomy previously.
- Chronic/Subacute/Recurrent Appendicitis

Data including age, sex, symptoms, physical signs and laboratory findings such as white blood cell total and differential count were recorded in modified Alvarado form Urine for routine examination (R/E) was done for all cases.

Plain X-ray Kidney-Urinary bladder (KUB) region was done in selected cases. Ultra-sonogram (USG) of abdomen was performed when diagnosis was doubtful, especially in female patients to exclude gynecological disease.

The diagnosis of acute appendicitis was made clinically and the decision for appendicectomy was taken by the qualified surgeon. Subsequently, the score of each patient was correlated with the clinical, operative and histopathological findings.

**Table:** Shows Clinical Features and Scores

Clinical Features		Scores
Symptoms	Migratory right Iliac Fossa pain	1
	Anorexia	1
	Nausea/Vomiting	1
Signs	Tenderness in Right Iliac Fossa	2
	Rebound Tenderness	1
	Elevated Temperature	1
	Extra sign (s), e.g. cough test and/or Rovsing's sign and/or rectal tenderness	1
Laboratory	Leucocytosis	2
Total Score		10

Modified Alvarado score more than or equal to 7 are considered acute appendicitis i.e. positive and scores less than or equal to 6 are considered negative. The appendix specimen is sent for histopathology report and the report is noted. Histopathological diagnosis is considered as final. The modified Alvarado score and ultrasonography findings are compared to histopathology report.

When a positive modified Alvarado score case has histopathological positive report, the cases are considered as true positive and the modified Alvarado score negative cases are considered as true negative.

Histologically negative cases among modified Alvarado score positive cases are false positive and histologically positive cases among modified Alvarado score negative are false negative cases.

## Results

Before analysis of data certain assumption were made.

1. Histopathological diagnosis was accepted as the final confirmation of the diagnosis.
2. Though large number of consultants were involved in clinical diagnosis of acute appendicitis, no significance was attached to the inter observer variation.

**Table 1:** Sex Distribution

Sex	No. of Patients
Male	74
Female	26

**Table 2:** Age Distribution

Age	No. of patients
15-20	28
21-30	55
31-40	13
41-50	4

**Table 3:** Histopathological Findings

HPE Positive	HPE Negative
74	26

**Table 4:** Modified Alvarado score

Modified Alvarado Score	No. of Patients
>= 7	62
<= 6	38

**Table 5:** Statistics A

Alverado Score	Histopathological Findings	
	Positive	Negative
Positive	A (True Positive)	C (False Negative)
Negative	C (False Negative)	D (True Positive)

**Table 6:** Statistics B

Alverado Score	Histopathological Findings	
	Positive	Negative
Positive	64	25
Negative	10	3

Diagnostic Sensitivity

$$= \frac{A}{A+C} \times 100$$

$$= 86.48\%$$

## Discussion

The diagnosis of acute appendicitis continues to be difficult due to variable presentation of the disease and lack of reliable diagnostic test. History and clinical examination provide useful information regarding diagnosis but even than different possibilities are there. These days the diagnosis of appendicitis is mainly clinical.

The surgeon is the best person who decides the best management in cost effective manner, of course the more experienced the surgeon is more will be the diagnostic accuracy. But the junior surgeon has to make the initial assessment and decision to operate or no. Thus there is need of a complementary aid in difficult decision. Different diagnostic aids have appeared recently and among these laparoscopy and ultrasonography have shown good results, but they also have limitation and drawback [2]. Clinical scoring systems have proved useful in management of number of surgical condition. In past few years various scores have been developed to aid the diagnosis of acute appendicitis.

The Alvarado score is simple scoring system that can be instituted easily the Alvarado score was modified by Kalen and proposed modified Alvarado score.

The present study has shown better sensitivity, as it is a cross sectional study and short comings of retrospective study are ruled out like good documentation is needed, lack of recording of modified Alvarado score may indicate in complete recording in case notes of some patients rather than true absence of modified Alvarado score finding. Modified Alvarado scoring system is a dynamic one allowing observation and critical evaluation of the clinical picture. Its application improved diagnostic accuracy and reduces negative exploration and complication rates. Thus modified Alvarado score is a useful tool in clinical decision making especially when ultrasonography is unavailable. As imaging technique are considered to be expensive in India, Scoring system should be used in selection of patients for further work-up.

## Conclusion

Acute appendicitis is the most common acute abdominal condition necessitating surgery. There is high prevalence among young age in adults. Diagnosis of acute appendicitis remains challenge. Although ultrasonography is method used frequently for diagnosis of acute appendicitis, using modified Alvarado score is a useful tool in clinical decision making. As modified Alvarado score is simple, easily applicable in peripheral hospitals where back up facilities are sparse. It can be useful for junior doctors in patients of abdominal emergencies. Thus we conclude that establishing diagnosis in cases of suspected acute appendicitis might require a combination of different diagnostic tools such as modified Alvarado score, investigative modalities such as ultrasonography and the indispensable clinical judgment

## References

1. Hardin DM. Acute Appendicitis: Review and update. Am Fam Physician. 1999; 60:2027-34.
2. Hoffmann J, Rasmussen OO. Aids in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis Br S Surg. 1989; 76:774-9.
3. Borushok KF, Jeffrey RB, Laing FC, Townsend RR. Sonographic diagnosis of perforation in patients with acute appendicitis AJR Am J Roentgenol. 1990; 154:275-8.
4. Kalen M, Rich AJ, Talbot DR, Canlitie WJ. Evaluation of modified Alvarado score in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. A prospective study Ann R Coll Surg. Eng. 1994; 76:418-9.
5. Puylaert JBCM. Acute Appendicitis: Ultrasound sonography evaluation using graded compression. Radiology. 1986; 158:35-60.
6. Jaffrey RB, Laing FC, Lewis FR. Acute appendicitis high resolution real time ultrasound findings. Radiology. 1987; 163:11-4.
7. Yale SH, Musana KA. Famous names and medical eponyms CM & R, 2005; 3(3):187-9.
8. Russel RCG, Williams NS, Bulstrode CJK. Bailey and Loves short practice of surgery. 24th Ed. London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 2004.
9. Schumperick V, Dreau B, Ophoff K, Prescher A. Appendix and caecum: Embryology, anatomy and surgical applications. Surg Clin North Am. 2000; 80:295-318
10. Chevre F, Gillet M, Vuilleumier H. Agencies of the vermiciform appendix. Surg Lap End Percut Tech. 2000; 10:110-2.