

A Prospective Assessment of Enteric Perforation with Peritonitis In Relation To Epidemiology, Surgical Treatment And Outcome

Nitish Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, Shree Narayan Medical Institute & Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India.

Received: 20-12-2021 / Revised: 28-01-2022 / Accepted: 24-02-2022

Corresponding author: Dr. Nitish Kumar

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract

Aim: To study enteric perforation with peritonitis in relation to epidemiology, surgical treatment and outcome

Methodology: The present prospective study was performed on 50 patients of enteric perforation with peritonitis admitted to Shree Narayan Medical institute and Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India for 12 months. All patients of enteric perforation peritonitis were included in this study. All patients of perforation peritonitis were evaluated by detailed history, Clinical examination and all vital parameters recorded. Apart from routine blood investigations, Widal test was done. Radiological examination includes flat plate abdomen in erect posture and X-ray chest. Biopsy from perforation margin was taken for histopathological examination. After initial resuscitation patient were treated by operative procedures. Postoperatively progress report, morbidity and mortality were observed. After confirmation of diagnosis of perforation, decision was taken regarding the operative intervention after considering the following points: time elapsed after acute onset of abdominal pain, general condition of patient.

Results: In this study, mean age of patients was 29.64 ± 3.64 years (range; 18-60 years). The maximum number of patients with typhoid perforation (76%) was presented in 2nd & 3rd decade of life. Out of 50 patients, 38 were males and 12 were females with a ratio of 3:1. Incidence of typhoid perforation was maximum (50%) during the month of June to September. Rainy season favors the feco-oral route of transmission of typhoid bacilli. According to socioeconomic status, 44% cases were of middle class and 56% of lower class and none from higher socio-economic status. Of the 50 patients, exteriorization of the perforation as loop ileostomy was done in 30 patients (60%), primary repair was done in 6 patients (12%) and primary repair with proximal loop ileostomy was done in 11 patients (22%). Resection of perforated ileum with ileo ileal anastomosis was done in 2 cases (4%), resection of terminal ileum with end ileostomy was done in 1 case (2%). Mortality was highest in patients who underwent primary repair and proximal loop ileostomy (27.3%).

Conclusion: The time interval between occurrence of perforation and starting of specific therapy is the most important factor in deciding the ultimate outcome of the typhoid perforation patient and operative procedure is another important factor in deciding the outcome.

Keywords: peritonitis, intestinal perforation, enteric fever.

This is an Open Access article that uses a fund-ing model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided

Introduction

Typhoid fever is a public health challenge, mostly occurring in impoverished, overcrowded areas of the developing world, with lack of safe drinking and sanitation [1]. Although there is some evidence that typhoid fever incidence rates have declined over the past several decades, still the global estimation of typhoid fever episodes in 2010 was of 13.5 million [2]. The majority of disease burden has been observed in South and South-East Asia [3] and in sub-Saharan Africa, primarily in the low income neighborhoods of the capital cities but also in rural areas [3, 4]. Data collection is substantially underestimating the morbidity and mortality of typhoid [5, 6]

Intestinal perforation is a common surgical problem, which need proper attention. It stands fifth among the acute abdominal emergencies. It is essential to have a correct pre-operative etiological diagnosis because prognosis ultimate depends on the cause of the perforation. Typhoid is the most common cause of bowel perforation, which mainly affects the small intestine [7]. The commonest site of enteric perforation is terminal part of ileum.

Globally, typhoid fever has a case-fatality rate of 10%-30% without effective treatment, reduced to 1%-4% with appropriate management [7]. The true incidence of complications is unknown [8], but alarming problems may arise in 10% to 15 % of patients, especially when the disease is lasting for two or more weeks [9]. The commonest GI complication is intestinal bleeding, usually not severe and managed conservatively [10], while typhoid intestinal perforation (TIP) is the most serious one [10]. It has been reported in 0.8% to 39% of patients [11, 12], with a

striking difference between high-income and poor resources countries [13].

With the concept of a correct diagnosis of perforation in reference to its etiology and further study of etiological factor (typhoid) in relation to epidemiology, surgical treatment and outcome, the present study has been undertaken.

Materials and Methods

The present prospective study was performed on 50 patients of enteric perforation peritonitis admitted to Shree Narayan Medical institute and Hospital, Saharsa, Bihar, India for 12 months.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

All patients of enteric perforation peritonitis were included in this study. Patient with history of traumatic perforation and immunocompromised, were excluded.

Methodology

All patients of perforation peritonitis were evaluated by detailed history. Clinical examination done and all vital parameters recorded. Apart from routine blood investigations, Widal test was done. Radiological examination includes flat plate abdomen in erect posture and X-ray chest. Biopsy from perforation margin was taken for histopathological examination.

After initial resuscitation patient were treated by operative procedures. Postoperatively progress report, morbidity and mortality were observed. After confirmation of diagnosis of perforation, decision was taken regarding the operative intervention after considering the following points: time elapsed after acute

onset of abdominal pain, general condition of patient.

When general condition was poor, the patient was treated by inserting an abdominal drainage tube, intravenous fluid, blood transfusion and broad spectrum antibiotics. If much time had elapsed after acute pain or general condition of the patient was not fit for surgery under GA then surgery was carried out under LA through laparotomy via Rutherford-Morrison incision.

Operative treatment

After appropriate resuscitation patient underwent surgery. Surgery was conducted under general anaesthesia. Exploratory laparotomy was carried out through either right paramedian incision or lower midline incision. Peritoneal cavity was almost always found contaminated with fecopurulent fluid. The infected peritoneal fluid was cleared with suction and peritoneal lavage done with normal saline. Then the site of perforation was identified and various operative procedures used in enteric perforation were: simple repair by single layer or double layer interrupted suture by 3-0 vicryl or 3-0 silk, repair of distal perforations and loop ileostomy from proximal perforation, loop ileostomy.

Biopsy from the edges of the perforation was taken and sent for histopathological examination. The tube drain was put in the pouch of Douglas and abdomen was closed in layers. Postoperatively all patients were kept NBM and continued Ryle's tube aspiration till 5th or 6th postoperative days when bowel sounds are heard or patient passed flatus.

During postoperative period patients were intensively observed for development complications like wound infection, burst abdomen, paralytic ileus, faecal fistula, repair or anastomotic leakage, pulmonary complication, toxemia, renal failure, intraperitoneal abscesses, enteric encephalopathy etc. Those patients who

developed leakage of repair or anastomosis were lately converted to ileostomy. Ryle's tube was taken out usually on 5th postoperative day when there was no abdominal distension, bowel sounds were present, patient had passed flatus, 24 hours nasogastric tube aspirate was less than 100 ml and patient was able to take oral. Drains were removed on postoperative day 5th or 6th when output was less than 100 ml and it was of serous nature. After removal of Ryle's tube the patient was given liquid diet on the same day.

Semisolid diet was started on the next day and solid diet was started when patient was tolerating the semisolid diet well. Patient with ileostomy were usually readmitted after 6-8 weeks, when the patient general condition had improved. Either ileostomy closure or end-to-end anastomosis is performed in double layer.

Results:

In this study, mean age of patients was 29.64 ± 3.64 years (range; 18-60 years). The maximum number of patients with typhoid perforation (76%) was presented in 2nd & 3rd decade of life. Out of 50 patients, 38 were males and 12 were females with a ratio of 3:1.

Incidence of typhoid perforation was maximum (50%) during the month of June to September. Rainy season favors the feco-oral route of transmission of typhoid bacilli. According to socioeconomic status, 44% cases were of middle class and 56% of lower class and none from higher socio-economic status. This shows that enteric perforation is more common in patients with poor nutritional status.

Most of the patients of enteric perforation were from the rural area. In our study, 64% cases were from rural areas and rest 36% were from urban areas. Around 92 % cases used well or water tank as their water supply. This observation showed that typhoid infection is transmitted by infected water.

Maximum patients (76%) with enteric perforation reported within 72 hours of illness. Pain abdomen was the most common (100%) presenting complaint followed by abdominal distension, vomiting and constipation. Abdominal tenderness was the presenting sign in all cases (100%). Rigidity, guarding and fever, obliteration of liver, dullness were presented in more than 95% of cases of enteric perforation. Tachycardia, tachypnoea and high temperature were present in majority of the cases. Widal test was done in 50 patients, in which 34 patients (68%) showed positive result.

Biopsy from edge of enteric perforation was taken in all the cases. In 96% patients, biopsy from the edge of perforation revealed acute and chronic inflammatory cells and mononuclear

cells infiltration. In intra-operative findings peritoneal fluid was feculent in 68% cases, single perforation was presented in 86% cases.

Various operative procedures were performed in enteric perforation. Of the 50 patients, exteriorization of the perforation as loop ileostomy was done in 30 patients (60%), primary repair was done in 6 patients (12%) and primary repair with proximal loop ileostomy was done in 11 patients (22%). Resection of perforated ileum with ileo-ileal anastomosis was done in 2 cases (4%), resection of terminal ileum with end ileostomy was done in 1 case (2%). Mortality was highest in patients who underwent primary repair and proximal loop ileostomy (27.3%).

Table 1: Mortality rate of various operative procedures

Operative procedure	Number of patients	Mortality (%)
Primary repair with peritoneal drainage	6	1 (16.7)
Distal perforation repair with proximal loop ileostomy	11	3 (27.3)
Loop ileostomy	30	3 (10)
Resection terminal ileum with end ileostomy	2	0 (0)
RA terminal ileum	1	1 (100)

Table 2: Mortality rate in relation to duration of illness

Duration of illness (in hours.)	Number of patients	Mortality (%)
0-12	2	0 (0)
13-24	11	0 (0)
25-48	10	1 (10)
49-72	11	1 (9.1)
73-96	7	2 (28.6)
≥ 5 days	9	4 (44.4)

Wound infection was the most common complication (34%), followed by chest complications (26%), toxemia (10%), paralytic ileus (12%), thrombophlebitis (8%) and burst abdomen (10%). In our study, mortality rate was 50% in patients presenting after 5 days of illness, while no mortality seen

in patients presented within 24 hours of illness.

Discussion:

Many textbooks stress that typhoid perforation usually occurs in the third week of fever while many reports find that it occurs in the first week [14]. Most of the patients of enteric perforation were presented in 2nd and 3rd decade of life as compared to peptic perforation, which occur in 4th and 5th decade [15-17]. In our experience the maximum incidence of typhoid perforation

was in the second week from 11-15 days in confirmation of the report of Bhansali (1967). The leucocytosis we encountered in contrast to other series [18, 19] is probably because of late presentation leading to bacterial contamination and septicaemia.

In this study, all cases were diagnosed as perforation peritonitis by clinical examination and X-ray FPA abdomen. Of the 50 patients, 44 patients were diagnosed by gas under diaphragm in X-ray FPA and rest 6 patients were diagnosed by clinical examination. Incidence of typhoid perforation was maximum in rainy season which favors the feco-oral route of transmission of typhoid bacilli. Socio-economically the enteric perforation patients belong to lower class (56%) and (44%) to middle class based on three variables- education, occupation and residential address (Kuppuswamy scale) [20].

Park mentioned that enteric fever was common where water supplies and sanitation were sub-standard [21]. The Widal test in diagnosis of enteric perforation was not of much value because it taken long time to appear, negative results are of no value and within two hours of antibiotic therapy the test rendered negative. This test was positive in approximately 72% cases in other series [22]. In present series, diagnosis of enteric perforation was done mainly by the clinical features, which was also mentioned in other studies [23].

All perforations were presented at antimesenteric border. Kaul et al advised the ileostomy because the causes of majority of postoperative complications appear to be the toxic intestinal contents which are either spilled into the peritoneal cavity or absorbed from previously paralyzed intestine [24]. Ileostomy through the site of perforation, as described is simple, safe and short procedure in a critically ill patient with necrotic bowel. In contrast, Franklin [25] favours a surgical approach as closure of perforation eliminates continuous contamination and peritoneal

toilet gradually lessens toxemia enhancing the recovery of the patient. Modern antibiotics, modern anaesthesia, better blood transfusion facilities and better surgical techniques have swung the pendulum in favour of surgical intervention rather than conservative therapy. In the series of Olurin et al [14], the mortality was 79% in conservative treatment and 31% in operated cases.[26]

Conclusion:

The time interval between occurrence of perforation and starting of specific therapy is the most important factor in deciding the ultimate outcome of the typhoid perforation patient and operative procedure is another important factor in deciding the outcome.

References:

1. Ochiai RL, Acosta CJ, Danovaro-Holliday MC, Baiqing D, Bhattacharya SK, Agtini MD, Bhutta ZA, Canh DG, Ali M, Shin S, et al. A study of typhoid fever in five Asian countries: disease burden and implications for controls. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2008;86:260–268.
2. Buckle GC, Walker CL, Black RE. Typhoid fever and paratyphoid fever: Systematic review to estimate global morbidity and mortality for 2010. *J Glob Health.* 2012;2:010401.
3. Azmatullah A, Qamar FN, Thaver D, Zaidi AK, Bhutta ZA. Systematic review of the global epidemiology, clinical and laboratory profile of enteric fever. *J Glob Health.* 2015;5:020407.
4. Slayton RB, Date KA, Mintz ED. Vaccination for typhoid fever in sub-Saharan Africa. *Hum Vaccin Immunother.* 2013;9:903–906.
5. Lozano R, Naghavi M, Foreman K, Lim S, Shibuya K, Aboyans V, Abraham J, Adair T, Aggarwal R, Ahn SY, et al. Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the

- Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet*. 2012;380:2095–2128.
6. Obaro SK, Iroh Tam PY, Mintz ED. The unrecognized burden of typhoid fever. *Expert Rev Vaccines*. 2017;16:249–260.
 7. Nair SK, Singhal VS. Non-traumatic intestinal perforation. *Indian J Surg*. 1981;43(5):371-7.
 8. Qamar FN, Azmatullah A, Bhutta ZA. Challenges in measuring complications and death due to invasive *Salmonella* infections. *Vaccine*. 2015;33 Suppl 3:C16–C20.
 9. Sümer A, Kemik O, Dülger AC, Olmez A, Hasirci I, Kişli E, Bayrak V, Bulut G, Kotan C. Outcome of surgical treatment of intestinal perforation in typhoid fever. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2010;16:4164–4168.
 10. Parry CM, Hien TT, Dougan G, White NJ, Farrar JJ. Typhoid fever. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:1770–1782.
 11. Eggleston FC, Santoshi B, Singh CM. Typhoid perforation of the bowel. Experiences in 78 cases. *Ann Surg*. 1979;190:31–35.
 12. Butler T, Knight J, Nath SK, Speelman P, Roy SK, Azad MA. Typhoid fever complicated by intestinal perforation: a persisting fatal disease requiring surgical management. *Rev Infect Dis*. 1985;7:244–256.
 13. Worku B. Typhoid fever in an Ethiopian children's hospital: 1984-1995. *Ethiop J Health Dev*. 2000;14:311–316.
 14. Olurin, E.O., Ajavi, O.O. & Bohrer, S.P. Typhoid perforation. *Journal of Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh*, 1972: 17, 353.
 15. Mishra SB, Prusty PN, Mishra BP. Surgical treatment of acute perforated duodenal ulcer. *US*. 1982;5:705-9.
 16. Dickson JAS, Cole GJ. Perforation of terminal ileum, a review of 38 cases. *BJS*. 1964;51:893-7.
 17. Matsukara Y. Clinical research on patients with typhoid and paratyphoid fever. *Japan Assoc Inf Dis*. 1991;65(6):710-7.
 18. Bhansali, S.K. Gastrointestinal perforation: A clinical study of 96 cases. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine*, 1967:13, 1.
 19. Chouhan, M.K. & Pande, S.K. Typhoid enteric perforation. *British Journal of Surgery*, 1982:69, 173.
 20. Park K. Preventive & Social Medicine, 23rd Edition, Kuppaswamy's Socioeconomic Status Scale; 2015: 690.
 21. Park K. Preventive & social medicine. 16th Edition; Banarsidas Bhanot Publishers, India; 2000: 176.
 22. Kenfuni, M. M. ., Gallouo, M. ., alafifi, mahmoud, Tsikambu, A. C. D., Alafifi, R, Moataz, A. ., Dakir, M. ., Debbagh, A. ., & Aboutaieb, R. . (2022). Pyonephrose : Risk factors, clinical, para-clinical and anatomopathological profile about 19 cases. *Journal of Medical Research and Health Sciences*, 5(2), 1770–1773.
 23. Vaidyanathan S. Surgical management of typhoid ileal perforation. *Indian J Surg*. 1986;48:335-41.
 24. Vyas PN. A study of 15 cases of intestinal perforation in enteric fever. *Indian J Surg*. 1964;26:1-8.
 25. Kaul BK. Operative management of typhoid perforation in children. *Int Surg*. 1975;60:407-10.
 26. Franklin, W.P. Li. (1963) Surgical treatment of typhoid perforation of the intestine. *British Journal of Surgery*, 50, 976.