Original Research Paper

Volume - 12 | Issue - 12 | December - 2022 | PRINT ISSN No. 2249 - 555X | DOI : 10.36106/ijar

General Surgery

EVALUATION OF SERUM C REACTIVE PROTEIN IN ACUTE APPENDICITIS AND ITS CORRELATION WITH HISTOPATHOLOGY

Dr K. Karthik MBBS MS DNB Surgical Oncology, Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, Government General Hospital, Nizamabad.

Dr. M. Shravan Kumar* MBBS DNB General Surgery, Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, Government General Hospital, Nizamabad. *Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT **Background:** Acute appendicitis is the most common abdominal surgical emergency, but its diagnosis remains an enigmatic challenge, plagued by a high rate of negative explorations. There is no single reliable test with satisfactory sensitivity and specificity. Ultrasonography is not often available at a rural surgical setup. **Aim:** This study is intended to evaluate the importance of serum C-reactive protein (CRP) level estimation in diagnosis of acute appendicitis, by comparing with histopathology report. **Methods:** In a prospective study,100 patients clinically diagnosed as acute appendicitis were selected by purposive sampling method and evaluated as per criteria for serum CRP levels, leucocyte count preoperatively and were followed up postoperatively with histopathology reports. The data was analysed for finding the significance of serum CRP in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. **Results:** CRP was positive in 75 of the 77 patients who had histologically proven acute appendicitis and in 3 with normal appendix. The sensitivity, specificity and diagnostic accuracy were 97.4%, 86.96% and 95% respectively. Leucocytosis and neutrophilia when used alone were not specific for acute appendicitis, but when combined with CRP value, diagnostic accuracy was high. Ultrasonography was useful in establishing alternative diagnoses, but had low sensitivity for acute appendicitis. **Interpretation & Conclusion:** CRP contains important diagnostic information and hence should always be included in the diagnostic workup of acute appendicitis. Since acute appendicitis is very unlikely in those patients with normal WBC count and CRP value, conservative treatment is advised.This study does not undercut the skill of an experienced surgeon in diagnosing acute appendicitis, but CRP estimation compliments clinical diagnosis.

KEYWORDS : Appendicitis, Appendectomy, C reactive protein, inflammatory variables

AIMS & OBJECTIVES

AIM

To evaluate serum c reactive protein in Acute appendicitis and its correlation with histopathology.

METHODOLOGY

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Type Of Study:

The present study is a non-randomized, prospective study. Hundred patients who reported to the surgical OPD or emergency Department Government General Hospital, Nizamabad with history of abdominal pain in whom the clinical diagnosis was acute appendicitis participated. Their serum CRP was determined pre operatively and results were compared with histo pathology.

Study Period

This study was performed during the period from August-2021 to July 2022 in Government General Hospital, Nizamabad.

Source Of Data:

Data for the study was collected from the patients attending Department of General Surgery, Government General Hospital, Nizamabad clinically suspected to be having acute appendicitis.

Maintenance Of Records And Collection Of Data

All the observations during the study of each subject were recorded in an individual case proforma (CP) (annexure) signed by the investigator. The CP contained all information regarding the admission details, general particulars like name, age, sex and address, clinical history of the patients, general examination which included pulse, temperature, at the time of examination physical examination details, investigations-WBC count and ultrasound examination, operative findings, final histopathology report. The principal investigator maintained the entire record.

Inclusion Criteria:

1) Patients clinically suspected to be having acute appendicitis.
2) Patients aged 15 - 75 years irrespective of sex.
3) Cases with history of recurrent appendicitis
4) Cases of acute appendicitis with early pregnancy were also included in this study.

Exclusion Criteria:

1) All other causes of acute abdomen.
2) Cases with recurrent appendicitis not presenting with acute symptoms.
3) Cases of acute appendicitis diagnosed clinically and sonologically but not willing for further management were excluded from the study.
4) Patients with co-morbid conditions
5) Patients who were managed conservatively

Clinical Diagnosis:

Clinical diagnosis of acute appendicitis was made based on symptoms of pain, migration, nausea and vomiting, anorexia, fever and signs of peritoneal inflammation like right iliac fossa tenderness, rebound tenderness and guarding.

Once acute appendicitis was suspected, patient was subjected to routine investigations as per the hospital protocol.

Total leucocyte count and differential count was done in all cases.

Ultrasonography of abdomen was done in most of the cases to ruleout alternative diagnoses in accordance with the consultant's decision.
Urine microscopy was performed in all cases.

Renal function and liver function parameters were evaluated in few patients.

Plain X-ray abdomen was done in some cases.

Elderly patients were subjected to further investigations as part of pre-anaesthetic work up including X-ray chest, ECG

Serum C-Reactive Protein Estimation:

Serum C-reactive protein estimation was done in all these cases. Two ml of whole blood was collected; serum separated. The specimen was tested within one hour of collection.

CRP was estimated by using latex agglutination slide test method using a Humatex CRP test kit (Figure 11). The test is based on immunological reaction between CRP in patients serum and anti-CRP antibodies bound to latex particle.

A positive reaction indicates a CRP content of more than 6mg/l in the serum, and is denoted by a distinctly visible agglutination of the latex particles in the test cell of the slide.

Patients with strong suspicion of acute appendicitis were advised emergency appendicectomy. After obtaining consent, patient was operated, and the appendicectomy specimen was sent for histopathological examination. The histopathology report was considered as the final diagnosis.

CRP And Histopathological Correlation:
Preoperative clinical findings, serum CRP status of patients with Acute appendicitis were correlated with that of Histopathological examination

Statistical Analysis:
The histopathologically positive cases among CRP positive group were considered true positives. The histopathologically negative cases in the same group were considered as false positives. The histopathologically positive cases among CRP negative group were considered false negatives. The histopathologically negative cases in the same group were considered as true negatives.

The evaluation of CRP estimation in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis is done as follows.

TABLE 1

Acute appendicitis Histopathology		
	Inflamed appendix	Normal appendix
CRP positive	a True positive	b False positive
CRP Negative	c False negative	d True negative

$$\text{Diagnostic sensitivity} : \frac{a}{a+c} \times 100$$

$$\text{Diagnostic specificity} : \frac{d}{b+d} \times 100$$

$$\text{Predictive value of positive test} : \frac{a}{a+b} \times 100$$

$$\text{Predictive value of negative test} : \frac{d}{c+d} \times 100$$

$$\text{Diagnostic accuracy} : \frac{a+d}{a+b+c+d} \times 100$$

$$\text{False positive error rate} : \frac{b}{b+d} \times 100$$

$$\text{False negative error rate} : \frac{c}{a+c} \times 100$$

$$\text{Likelihood ratio positive} : \frac{a/a+c}{b/a+b}$$

$$\text{Likelihood ratio negative} : \frac{c/a+c}{d/b+d}$$

The patients were meticulously monitored in the post-operative period for any complications. All patients were followed up in the outpatient department for a period of two months. The case study was done as per a detailed proforma which is shown in the annexure. The hospital ethical committee clearance was obtained prior to undertaking the study.

RESULTS

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Before analysis of the collected data, a few assumptions were made.

1. Histopathological diagnosis was accepted as final confirmation of diagnosis.
2. Technical errors in serum CRP estimation were not assigned any significance, since all laboratory technicians were well experienced and the test kit was provided by standard manufacturers.

Considering these assumptions were true, we have analysed the data obtained, to seek the efficacy of serum C-reactive protein estimation in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis by evaluating the sensitivity, specificity, predictive values, diagnostic accuracy, error rates, and likelihood ratios of the same.

The prevalence of acute appendicitis is highest in the 15 - 19 years age group followed by the 20 - 24 years age group. There is a slight male predominance in the total number of cases.

Out of the 100 cases included in the study, 78 patients had positive serum CRP. 75 of these patients had histopathologically proven acute appendicitis, where as 3 were found to be normal histologically. Of the 22 patients with negative serum CRP, 2 patients had histological inflamed appendix and 20 had normal appendix.

TABLE 2

CRP positive	78
CRP negative	22
Histological acute appendicitis	77
Histological normal appendix	23
Total number of cases	100

Results

TABLE 3

Histopathology			Total no. of cases
	Inflamed appendix	Normal appendix	
CRP positive	(a) True positive: 75	(b) False positive: 3	78
CRP Negative	(c) False negative: 2	(d) True negative: 20	22
Total no. of cases	77	23	100

Validity refers to what extent the test accurately measures which it purports to measure. This has two components i.e. sensitivity and specificity. The sensitivity, specificity, predictive values, error rates, diagnostic accuracy and likelihood ratios of this study are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Evaluation of serum CRP estimation	Values
Sensitivity	97.4%
Specificity	86.96%
Positive predictive value	96.15%
Negative predictive value	90.9%
Diagnostic accuracy	95%
False positive error rate	13.04%
False negative error rate	2.6%
Likelihood ratio positive	25.36%
Likelihood ratio negative	0.03

This table shows the statistical significance of serum CRP estimation in diagnosis of acute appendicitis. The overall sensitivity is 97.4%, specificity is 86.96%, and diagnostic accuracy is 95%. The positive predictive value is 96.15% and the negative predictive value is 90.9% . The false positive error rate is 13.04% and the false negative error rate is 2.6%. The positive likelihood ratio is 25.36 and the negative likelihood ratio is 0.03.

Pain abdomen was the commonest clinical symptom and was present in all 100 patients. Migration of pain from the umbilical region to right lower quadrant was present in 47% cases. Nausea or vomiting was a predominant symptom which was present in 60% cases. Fever was present in only 34% of patients. Murphy's triad of symptoms i.e. pain abdomen, vomiting and fever, was seen in 28% of the cases. Anorexia was reported by 59% of patients . Other symptoms like dysuria were present in 2 cases probably due to the pelvic position of appendix, and diarrhoea in 2 cases, which can be explained due to the postileal position of appendix.



Chart 1

Among clinical signs, right iliac fossa tenderness was seen in all the cases. Rebound tenderness was present in 76% cases and is more specific in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. Guarding was seen in only 50% of cases and it reflects the severity of inflammation. Other peritoneal signs like Rovsing's sign were elicited in 13% cases and Psoas sign in only 1 case. Tachycardia was seen in 54% cases. 34% cases were febrile with temperature above 99.1oF.

Urine microscopic examination showed presence of pus cells in 8% cases

Total leucocyte count revealed leucocytosis i.e. WBC count greater than 10 x

10^9/l, in 66% of cases. Among these, WBC count was greater than 15 x 10^9/l in 14 cases. Differential leucocyte count showed neutrophilia in 59% cases. 15% cases had neutrophilia in the absence of appreciable leucocytosis

Evaluation of inflammatory variables like WBC count and serum CRP in combination yielded a high sensitivity and specificity of 100% and 90.48% respectively (Table 5, Chart 2).

TABLE 5
Evaluation Of Inflammatory Variables
(Combined Leucocytosis and CRP positive)

Sensitivity	100%
Specificity	90.48%



Chart 2

All the 100 cases underwent appendicectomy and specimens were sent for histopathological examination. The histopathology report was considered as the final confirmation of diagnosis. Table 6 elucidates the various histopathology reports obtained for all 100 cases.

TABLE 6

Histopathological Diagnosis		No. of cases
Acute Appendicitis	Inflamed appendix	74
	Gangrenous appendicitis	3
Normal Appendix	Chronic appendicitis with fibrosis	7
	Lymphoid hyperplasia in appendix	7
	Normal appendix	9

77 cases had histologically proven acute appendicitis; 74 specimens were reported as inflamed appendix and 3 as gangrenous appendix. Of the 23 cases considered as negative for acute appendicitis, 9 were reported as normal appendix, 7 as chronicappendicitis with fibrosis and 7 as lymphoid hyperplasia in appendix.

Clinical diagnosis was correct in 77% cases and negative appendicectomy rate based on clinical diagnosis was high at 23%.

CONCLUSION

- Serum CRP estimation has an overall sensitivity of 97.4%, specificity of 86.96%, and diagnostic accuracy of 95%.
- Increased serum CRP levels correlate well with diagnosis of Acute Appendicitis ; as proved by histopathology.
- Being an inflammatory marker, CRP may be elevated in other inflammatory conditions as well. The false positive rate was 13.04% in the present study.
- False negative rate of 2.6% is probably due to pitfalls in latex agglutination qualitative testing and can be avoided by performing qualitative assessments on serial dilutions.
- Serum CRP estimations can be a good diagnostic tool in cases of Acute Appendicitis (though it does not undercut the skill of an experienced surgeon, but compliments it in cases of diagnostic dialamma.).

SUMMARY

Acute appendicitis is the most common abdominal surgical emergency, but its diagnosis remains an enigmatic challenge, plagued by a high rate of negative explorations. This study is intended to evaluate the importance of serum CRP level estimation in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis, by comparing with final histopathology report. In a prospective study, 100 patients clinically diagnosed as acute appendicitis in SVS Medical College Hospital,Mahabubnagar, were selected by purposive sampling method and evaluated as per criteria for serum CRP levels, leucocyte count preoperatively and were followed up postoperatively with histopathology reports. The data was analysed for finding the significance of serum CRP in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis.

CRP was positive in 75 of the 77 patients who had histologically proven acute appendicitis and in 3 with normal appendix. The sensitivity, specificity and diagnostic accuracy were 97.4%, 86.96% and 95% respectively. Leucocytosis and neutrophilia when used alone were not specific for acute appendicitis, but when combined with CRP value, diagnostic accuracy was high. Ultrasonography was useful in establishing alternative diagnoses, but had low sensitivity (52.87%) for acute appendicitis.

CRP contains important diagnostic information and hence should always be included in the diagnostic workup of acute appendicitis. Since acute appendicitis is very unlikely in those patients with normal WBC count and CRP level, conservative treatment is recommended. This study does not undercut the skill of an experienced surgeon in diagnosing acute appendicitis, but CRP estimation is a cost-effective investigation which compliments clinical diagnosis.

REFERENCES

1. Abbey RK, Gupta R, Sharma RK et al. Acute appendicitis an unusual cause. Indian J Med Sci 1999;53:108-10.
2. Abu-Yousuf MM, Bleicher JJ, Maher JW et al. High resolution sonography of acute appendicitis. AJR 1987;149:53-8.
3. Agha FP, Ghahremani GG, Panella JS et al. Appendicitis as initial manifestation of Crohn's disease. Radiologic features and prognosis. AJR 1987;149:515-8.
4. Allan Clain. Hamilton Bailey's demonstration of physical signs in clinical surgery. 16th ed. 1980;288-94.
5. Al-Mahmeed T, Mac Farlene JK, Filipenko D. Ischemic Meckel diverticulum and acute appendicitis: Can J Surg 2000;43:146-7
6. Al-Mulhim AA. Acute appendicitis in pregnancy: A review of 5 cases. Int Surg 1996;81:295-7.
7. Alvarado A. A practical score for the early diagnosis of acute appendicitis. Ann Emerg Med 1986;15:557-64.
8. Andersson RE, Hugander AP et al. Diagnostic value of disease history, clinical presentation, and inflammatory parameters of appendicitis World J Surg 1999 Feb;23(2):133-40.
9. Asfar S, Safar H et al. Would measurement of C-reactive protein reduce the rate of negative exploration for acute appendicitis? JR Coll Surg Edin 2000 Feb;45(1):21-4
10. Balthazar EJ, Rofsky NM, Zucker R. Appendicitis: The impact of computed
11. tomography imaging on negative appendectomy and perforation rates. Amn J Gastroenterol 1998;93:768-71.
12. Balthazar EJ, Birnbaum BA, Yee J et al. Acute appendicitis: CT and US correlation in 100 patients. Radiology 1994;190:31-5.
13. Bau A, Atri M. Acute female pelvic pain. Ultrasound evaluation. Semin Ultrasound CT MR 2000;21:78-93.
14. Birnbaum BA, Wilson SR. Appendicitis at the millenium. Radiology. 2000;215:337-48.
15. Borushok KF, Jeffrey RB Jr, Laing FC et al. Sonographic diagnosis of perforation in patients with acute appendicitis. AJR 1990;154:275-8.
16. Brasel KJ, Burgstrom DC, Weigelt JA. Cost utility analysis of contaminated appendectomy wounds. J Am Coll Surg 1997;184:23-30.
17. Brooks DW, Killen DA. Roentgenographic findings in acute appendicitis. Surgery. 1965;57:377.
18. Caldwell MT, Watson RG. Peritoneal aspiration cytology as a diagnostic aid in acute appendicitis. Br J Surg 1994;81:276.
19. Carr NJ. The pathology of acute appendicitis. Ann Diagn Pathol 2000:4:46-58.
20. Chevre F, Gillet M, Vuilleumier H. Agenesis of the vermiform appendix. Surg Lap End Percut Tech. 2000;10:110-2.
21. Chew DK, Borromeo JR, Gabriel YA et al. Duplication of the vermiform appendix. J Paed Surg. 2000; 35:617-8.
22. Courtney M, Kevin P, Charles S. Appendix. Sabiston Textbook of Surgery. Harcourt Asia Pte Ltd. 16th ed. 2001;45:917-28
23. Cox. MR, Me Call JL, Wilson TG et al. Laparoscopic appendectomy: a prospective analysis. Aust NZ J Surg 1993;63:840-7.
24. Cushieri A, Giles GR, Moossa AR. The Small Intestine and Vermiform Appendix. Essential Surgical Practice. Butterworth - Heinemann. 3rd ed. 1997;76:1297-328.
25. Deans GT, Spense RA. Neoplastic lesions of the appendix. Br J Surg 1995;82:229-306.
26. Doraiswamy NV. Leucocyte counts in the diagnosis and prognosis of acute appendicitis in children. Br J Surg 1979;66:782.
27. Dunning PG, Goidman MD. The incidence and value of rectal examination in children with suspected appendicitis. Ann R Coll Surg Engl 1991;73:233-4.
28. Enestrom L, Fenvo G. Appendectomy: assessment of stump invagination versus simple ligation - a prospective randomized study. Br J Surg 1985;72:971
29. Erkasap S, Ates E. Diagnostic value of interleukin-6 and C-reactive protein in acute

appendicitis. Swiss Surg. 2000;6(4):169-72
30. Fitz, R. Perforating inflammation of the vermiform appendix, with special reference to its early diagnosis and treatment. Transactions of the Association of American Physicians; 1886; Philadelphia; 1:107-44
31. Fitz RH. Perforating inflammation of vermiform appendix, with special reference to its early diagnosis and treatment. Trans Assoc Phys 1986;1:107-43.
32. Fujwara H, NomuraH, Yasuda K et al. Acute appendicitis complicated with necrotizing soft tissue infection in the elderly. Hepatogastroenterology. 1999;46:1702-05.
33. Garbutt JM, Soper NJ, Shannon WD et al. Meta analysis of randomized controlled trials comparing laparoscopic and open appendectomy. Surg Laparosc Endosc 1999;9:17-26.
34. Gershov D, Kim S. C-Reactive protein binds to apoptotic cells, protects the cells from assembly of the terminal complement components, and sustains an antiinflammatory innate immune response: implications for systemic autoimmunity. J Exp Med. 2000 Nov 6;192(9):1353-64.
35. Gewurz H, Mold C, Siegel J, Fiedel B.C-reactive protein and the acute phase response. Adv Intern Med. 1982;27:345-72.
36. Gorenstin A, Serour F, Katz R et al. Appendiceal colic in children: A true clinical entity. J Am Coll Surg 1996;182:246-50.
37. Goletti O, Lippolis PV et al. Percutaneous ultrasound – guided drainage of intra - abdominal abscesses. Br J Surg 1993;80:336.
38. Gronroos JM, Gronroos P. Leucocyte count and C-reactive protein in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. Br J Surg 1999 Apr;86(4):501-4.
39. Grace S, Rozyeki. Surgeon performed ultrasound: Its use in clinical practice. Surg Clin North Am 1998;78:179-217.
40. Gurleyik E, Gurleyik G, Unalmiser S. Accuracy of serum C-reactive protein measurements in diagnosis of acute appendicitis compared with surgeon's clinical impression. Dis Colon Rectum 1995;38:1270.
41. Hahn HB, Hoepner FU, Kalle T et al. Sonography of acute appendicitis in children: 7 years experience. Paediatr Radiol 1998;28:147-51.
42. Hale DA, Molloy M, Pearl RH et al. Appendectomy - A contemporary appraisal. Ann Surg 1997;225:252-61.
43. Hardin DM Jr. Acute appendicitis: review and update. Am Fam Physician 1999;60:2027-34.
44. Heister, Laurence. Medical, Chirurgical, and Anatomical Cases and Observations. Translated by Wirgman G. London; 1755; 136.
45. Hodgkin, Thomas. Lectures on the Morbid Anatomy of the Serous and Mucous Membranes. London: Sherwood; 1836.
46. Hoffmann J, Rasmussen O. Aids in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. Br J Surg 1989;76:774-9.
47. Horwitz JR, Gursoy MF, Jaksic T et al. Importance of diarrhea as presenting symptom of appendicitis in very young children. Am J Sur 1997;173:80-2.
48. Incesu L, Coskun A, Selcuk M.B et al. MR imaging and sonographic correlation. AJR Am J Roentgenol 1997;168:669-74.
49. Khanna AK. Appendix vermiformis duplex. Postgrad Med J 1983;59:69.
50. Kipper SL, Rypins EB, Evans DG et al. Neutrophil-specific 99mTc- labeled anti- CD15 monoclonal antibody imaging for diagnosis of equivocal appendicitis. J Nucl Med 2000;41:449-55.
51. Kulke MH, Meyer RJ. Carcinoid tumors. N Engl J Med 1999;340:858-68.
52. Mattei P, Sala JE, Yeo CJ. Chronic and recurrent appendicitis are uncommon entities often misdiagnosed. J Am Coll Surg 1994;178;385-9.
53. McBurney C. Experience with early operative interference in cases of disease of the vermiform appendix. NY Med J 1889;50:676.
54. McBurney C. The incision made in the abdominal wall in cases of appendicitis, with a description of a new method of operating. Ann Surg 1894;20:38-43.
55. Ng KC, Lai SW. Clinical analysis of the related factors in acute appendicitis. Yale J Biol Med 2002 Jan-Feb;75(1):41-5
56. Michsler W, Wunderbaldinger P, Novacek G et al. Mechanic intestinal obstruction - a possible presentation of perforated appendicitis. Z Gastroenterol 2000;38:39-43.
57. Mourad J, Elliott JP, Erickson L et al. Appendicitis in pregnancy: new information that contradicts long-held clinical beliefs. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2000;182:1027-9.
58. Mueller BA, Daling JR, Moore DE, et al. Appendectomy and the risk of tubal infertility. N Engl J Med 1986;315:1506-8.
59. Nitecki S, Assalia A, Schein M. Contemporary management of the appendiceal mass. Br J Surg 1993;80:18.
60. Ochsner, A J. The cause of diffuse peritonitis complicating appendicitis and itsprevention. J Am Med Assoc 1901;25:1747-54
61. Ohmann C et al. Clinical benefit of a diagnostic score for appendicitis. Results of a prospective interventional study. Arch Surg September 1999;134:993-6.
62. Paterson-Brown S, Thompson JN, et al. Which patients with suspected appendicitis should undergo laparoscopy? Br Med J 1988;296-363.
63. Patriquin HB, Garcier JM, Lafortune M et al. Appendicitis in children and young adults. Doppler sonographic- pathologic correlation. AJR Am J Roentgenol 1996;166:629-33.
64. Puyiaert JB. Acute appendicitis: Ultrasound evaluation using graded compression. Radiology 1986;158:355-60.
65. Rioux M. Sonographic detection of the normal and abnormal appendix. AJR 1992;158:778-887.
66. Russell RCG, Williams NS, Bulstrode CJK. The Vermiform appendix. Bailey and Love's Short Practice of Surgery. Arnold publishers 23rd ed. 2000;59:1076-92.
67. Shakhatresh HS. The accuracy of C-reactive protein in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis compared with that of clinical diagnosis. Med Arh 2000;54(2):109-10
68. Shrive AK, Cheetham GM, Holden D, Myles DA, Turnell WG, Volanakis JE, Pepys MB, Bloomer AC, Greenhough TJ. Three dimensional structure of human C-reactive protein. Nat Struct Biol 1996;3:346-54.
69. Schumpelick V, Dreua B, Ophoff K et al. Appendix and caecum: Embryology, anatomy and surgical applications. Surg Clin North Am 2000;80:295-318.
70. Skanne P, Amiand PF et al. Ultrasonography in patients with suspected acute appendicitis. A prospective study. Br J Radiol 1990;63:787-93.
71. Skanne P, Schistad O et al. Routine ultrasonography in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis: a valuable tool in daily practice? Am Surg 1997;63:937-42.
72. Smith DE, Kirchmer NA et al. Use of barium enema in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis and its complications. Am J Surg 1979;138:829.
73. Stein MP, Edberg JC. C-reactive protein binding to Fcgamma RIIa on human monocytes and neutrophils is allele-specific. J Clin Invest 2000 Feb;105(3):369-76.
74. Storen ED, Awegui ME. Ultrasound for the surgeon. 1997:24-5.
75. Tarjan Z, Mako E, Winternitz T et al. The value of ultrasonic diagnosis in acute appendicitis. Orv Hetil 1995;136:713-17.
76. Tillet W, Francis T. Serological reactions in pneumonia with nonprotein somatic fraction of pnuemococcus. 1930;52:561.
77. Vermeulen B, Morabia A, Unger PP. Influence of white cell count on surgical decision making in patients with abdominal pain in the right lower quadrant. Eur J Surg 1995;161:483-6.
78. Wakeley, CPG. The position of the vermiform appendix as ascertained by an analysis of 10,000 cases. J Anat Physiol 1933;67:277-83.
79. William Silen. Appendicitis: Silen Cope's early diagnosis of the acute abdomen. Oxford University Press. 20th ed. 2000:6;65-81.
80. Wilcox RT, Travesco LW. Have the evaluation and treatment of acute appendicitis changed with new technology? Surg Clin North Am 1997;77:1355-70.
81. Williamson WA, Bush RD et al. Retrocecal appendicitis. Am J Surg 1981;141:507.
82. Weirich E, Rabin RL, Maldonado Y, et al, Neutrophil CD11b expression as a diagnostic marker for early onset neonatal infection, J Pediatr 1998;132:445-51.
83. Zinner MJ, Ellis H et al. Appendix and Appendectomy. Maingot's Abdominal Operations. Appleton and Lange 10th ed. 1997;39:1191-227.