RESEARCH PAPER

Surgical Management of Acute Appendicitis: Evolving Concepts and Controversies

Dr. Divya Subramanian[1*], Dr.(Col) Subhash Chawla[2]

[1]Junior Resident 3, Department of General Surgery, MM Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana, India. Email: divyasbrmnn@gmail.com (***Corresponding Author**)

[2]Professor and HOD, Department of General Surgery, MM Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana, India.

ABSTRACT

Background

Acute appendicitis is one of the most common surgical emergencies, traditionally managed with prompt appendectomy. However, advances in imaging, antibiotics, and minimally invasive techniques have challenged this long-standing paradigm, leading to evolving concepts and ongoing controversies in its management.

Objective

To review current evidence on the surgical management of acute appendicitis, with particular focus on timing of surgery, choice of surgical approach, and the role of non-operative management.

Methods

A narrative review of the literature was performed, drawing on randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, and large observational studies. Emphasis was placed on contemporary evidence addressing early versus delayed appendectomy, laparoscopic versus open techniques, and antibiotic-first strategies.

Results

Emerging data suggest that short, in-hospital delays in surgery are safe in selected patients with uncomplicated appendicitis and do not increase the risk of perforation. Laparoscopic appendectomy has become the preferred approach due to reduced postoperative pain, shorter hospital stay, and faster recovery, although open surgery remains relevant in specific scenarios. Non-operative management with antibiotics alone demonstrates reasonable short-term success in carefully selected patients, but is associated with a risk of recurrence and requires careful follow-up.

Conclusion

The management of acute appendicitis is shifting toward a more individualized, patient-centered approach. While appendectomy—particularly via laparoscopy—remains the gold standard, selective delay in surgery and non-operative management are viable options in appropriate clinical settings. Decision-making should be guided by disease severity, patient factors, and available resources, with an emphasis on balanced, evidence-based care.

Keywords: Acute appendicitis; appendectomy; laparoscopy; open surgery; delayed surgery; antibiotics; non-operative management.

How to cite this article: Subramanian D, Chawla S. Surgical Management of Acute Appendicitis: Evolving Concepts and Controversies. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(57s): 79-90. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.57s.11

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None.

Introduction

Acute appendicitis remains one of the most frequently encountered surgical emergencies and continues to impose a considerable burden on healthcare systems worldwide. The disease shows a characteristic age distribution, with incidence peaking in adolescent males and young adult females, followed by a smaller rise in older age groups [1]. In high-income settings, annual incidence exceeds 100 cases per 100,000 population, and globally it contributes meaningfully to hospital admissions, disability-adjusted life years, and healthcare expenditure [2-4]. Although mortality is low, a significant proportion of patients still experience complications, underscoring that appendicitis is far from a trivial condition [3-5].

Traditionally, the management of acute appendicitis was relatively straightforward-early appendectomy following diagnosis. This approach was grounded in the long-standing belief that appendicitis follows a predictable, progressive course culminating in perforation if surgery is delayed. As a result, appendectomy became the standard of care and was often performed on an urgent basis, sometimes

irrespective of disease severity at presentation [6].

However, this classical view has been increasingly challenged. Clinical experience and contemporary studies suggest that appendicitis does not behave as a uniform disease. Instead, it represents a spectrum ranging from mild, self-limiting inflammation to rapidly progressive complicated disease. Many patients remain clinically stable for a period after presentation, and not all cases inevitably progress to perforation [5,7]. This evolving understanding has led to a more nuanced classification into uncomplicated and complicated appendicitis, which now forms the basis of most management decisions.

At the same time, advances in diagnostic strategies have significantly improved the ability to stratify patients. Imaging modalities such as ultrasonography and computed tomography, along with clinical scoring systems like the Alvarado score and Appendicitis Inflammatory Response (AIR) score, have enhanced diagnostic accuracy and reduced uncertainty [7,9]. In particular, low clinical scores can reliably exclude appendicitis, while imaging findings help identify complications such as perforation or abscess formation. This improved precision has reduced reliance on purely clinical judgment and has allowed more selective approaches to management.

As diagnostic clarity has improved, the traditional “operate immediately” approach has begun to evolve. Increasing evidence suggests that short in-hospital delays-often required for imaging, resuscitation, or logistical reasons-may not adversely affect outcomes in selected patients [5,10]. This has shifted the focus from urgency alone to appropriateness and timing of intervention based on disease severity.

Similarly, the choice of surgical technique has undergone substantial change. Laparoscopic appendectomy has become widely adopted due to advantages such as reduced postoperative pain, shorter hospital stay, and faster recovery. Nevertheless, open appendectomy continues to have a role in specific clinical scenarios, particularly in complicated cases or where resources are limited [12,13].

Perhaps the most significant paradigm shift has been the emergence of non-operative management. Antibiotic-first strategies for uncomplicated appendicitis have gained increasing attention, with several randomized studies demonstrating acceptable short-term success rates. However, concerns regarding recurrence, patient selection, and long-term outcomes continue to limit universal adoption [14-16].

Importantly, these evolving concepts have introduced considerable variability in clinical practice. Differences in healthcare infrastructure, availability of imaging, surgical expertise, and institutional protocols contribute to heterogeneity in management across regions [2]. Consequently, despite a large body of evidence, no single approach can be universally applied to all patients.

In this context, acute appendicitis should no longer be viewed through a single, rigid treatment lens. Instead, it requires an individualized approach that integrates clinical assessment, diagnostic findings, and evolving evidence. This narrative review aims to examine the current concepts and ongoing controversies in the surgical management of acute appendicitis, with particular focus on timing of surgery, choice of surgical technique, and the role of non-operative management.

Pathophysiology and Disease Spectrum

The classical understanding of acute appendicitis centers on luminal obstruction as the initiating event. In this model, blockage of the appendiceal lumen-most commonly by a fecalith-leads to increased intraluminal pressure, venous congestion, bacterial overgrowth, and subsequent inflammation. If unchecked, this process may progress to ischemia, necrosis, and ultimately perforation [8]. This framework has long supported the rationale for early surgical intervention.

However, this explanation does not fully account for the variability seen in clinical practice. Appendicoliths, for instance, are frequently identified in individuals without any signs of appendicitis, suggesting that obstruction alone may not be sufficient to trigger disease [8]. This has led to the recognition that appendicitis is not a single-pathway condition but rather a heterogeneous process with multiple possible trajectories. Some patients develop rapidly

progressive disease, while others experience a more indolent or even self-limiting course.

Within this evolving understanding, the distinction between uncomplicated and complicated appendicitis has become central. Uncomplicated appendicitis typically refers to localized inflammation without evidence of perforation, abscess, or generalized peritonitis. In contrast, complicated appendicitis encompasses a spectrum that includes perforation, gangrene, phlegmon, and abscess formation. This classification is not merely descriptive-it has direct implications for management, influencing decisions regarding timing of surgery, choice of approach, and even the consideration of non-operative strategies.

The role of appendicoliths remains particularly relevant in this context. Their presence has been consistently associated with a higher risk of perforation and treatment failure in conservative management. Larger fecaliths, by causing persistent obstruction, may amplify the inflammatory cascade and predispose to more severe disease. At the same time, the relationship between obstruction and disease progression is not absolute, reinforcing the idea that additional factors-such as host immune response and microbial dynamics-likely contribute to disease behavior.

Interestingly, differences have also been observed in recurrence patterns. Obstructive appendicitis appears to have a lower recurrence rate following conservative treatment compared to non-obstructive forms. In contrast, non-obstructive appendicitis has been associated with a substantial risk of recurrence, with some studies reporting rates approaching 50% within five years. This distinction becomes clinically relevant when considering non-operative management, as it may help identify patients more likely to benefit from definitive surgical treatment.

Overall, the concept of appendicitis as a heterogeneous disease has important implications. It challenges the traditional “one pathway, one treatment” model and supports a more individualized approach. Recognizing differences in pathophysiology and disease spectrum not only improves diagnostic accuracy but also allows for more tailored and rational decision-making in clinical practice.

Diagnostic Advances and Risk Stratification

Accurate diagnosis and early risk stratification now sit at the center of appendicitis management, guiding not only whether to operate but also when and how to intervene. Over time, reliance on purely clinical judgment has been supplemented-and in many cases refined-by structured scoring systems, laboratory parameters, and imaging modalities.

Clinical scoring systems such as the Alvarado score and the Appendicitis Inflammatory Response (AIR) score are widely used to estimate the likelihood of appendicitis and, importantly, to assess disease severity. The Alvarado score, ranging from 0 to 10, remains a simple and practical bedside tool. Lower scores (typically <5) are associated with a low probability of appendicitis and may justify observation or discharge, whereas higher scores (>8) strongly support the need for surgical intervention [9]. However, beyond diagnosis, these scores are increasingly valued for their ability to help identify patients at risk of complicated disease.

The integration of laboratory markers has further improved the predictive value of these systems. Elevated white blood cell (WBC) count and C-reactive protein (CRP) levels correlate with inflammatory severity and are particularly useful in distinguishing uncomplicated from complicated appendicitis. The AIR score incorporates these parameters, offering better discrimination for advanced disease and supporting more informed clinical decisions [9]. In practice, this combination of clinical assessment and laboratory data provides a more nuanced picture than either alone.

Imaging has become an essential component of modern appendicitis evaluation. Ultrasonography is often used as the first-line modality, particularly in children and pregnant patients, as it avoids ionizing radiation. It can identify key features such as a non-compressible appendix, appendicolith, periappendiceal fluid, and surrounding fat stranding. However, its diagnostic accuracy is operator-dependent and generally lower than that of computed tomography (CT) [7]. CT scanning, where available, offers superior sensitivity and specificity and is particularly valuable in detecting complications such as perforation, abscess, or phlegmon. Radiological findings,

especially the presence of an appendicolith and periappendiceal inflammatory changes, play a crucial role in stratifying disease severity.

Importantly, the goal of these diagnostic tools is not merely to confirm appendicitis but to characterize its extent. Identifying whether the disease is uncomplicated or complicated has direct implications for management. Patients with uncomplicated appendicitis may be candidates for delayed surgery or even non-operative management, whereas those with evidence of perforation or sepsis require urgent intervention.

These advances have also influenced perspectives on surgical timing. Several studies indicate that short delays-typically in the range of 6-8 hours-do not increase the risk of perforation or adverse outcomes, provided patients are appropriately monitored and treated with supportive measures such as antibiotics and fluids. Interestingly, some retrospective analyses have suggested higher complication rates in surgeries performed overnight compared to daytime procedures, highlighting the importance of operative conditions and perioperative care. Together, these findings support a shift toward a "timely but not necessarily immediate" approach to intervention.

Overall, improved diagnostic accuracy and risk stratification have allowed for more individualized management of acute appendicitis. Rather than a uniform pathway, treatment decisions are now increasingly guided by a combination of clinical, laboratory, and imaging findings, enabling clinicians to balance urgency with appropriateness in each case.

Timing of Surgery: Early versus Delayed Appendectomy

For decades, appendectomy for acute appendicitis was treated as a true surgical emergency. The underlying assumption was simple-appendicitis progresses in a linear fashion toward perforation, and any delay would inevitably increase complications. This belief drove the practice of immediate surgery, often irrespective of patient condition or operative setting.

Over time, this concept has been increasingly questioned. A growing body of evidence suggests that the relationship between time and perforation is not as straightforward as once thought. Several studies have shown that short, in-hospital delays-ranging from a few hours up to 24 hours-do not significantly increase the risk of perforation or postoperative complications in most patients [10]. Instead, the severity of disease at presentation appears to be a more important determinant of outcome than the duration of in-hospital waiting alone.

That said, the timeline from symptom onset still matters. Delays extending beyond 36-72 hours from the onset of symptoms are consistently associated with a higher likelihood of complicated appendicitis, including perforation and abscess formation [10]. In contrast, once the patient is admitted and appropriately managed, a short delay to surgery-particularly for diagnostic clarification or logistical reasons-does not seem to adversely affect outcomes in well-selected cases [11].

An important factor supporting this shift is the role of preoperative optimization. The use of intravenous antibiotics, fluid resuscitation, and close clinical monitoring can stabilize patients during this interval, allowing time for imaging, risk stratification, and appropriate surgical planning. In many centers, this has translated into a more pragmatic approach, where surgery is performed under optimal conditions rather than as an immediate response to diagnosis.

The debate around night-time versus daytime surgery further highlights this shift. Some retrospective studies suggest that procedures performed overnight may be associated with higher complication rates, potentially reflecting factors such as reduced staffing, fatigue, or limited resources. While these findings are not uniform, they have contributed to a growing acceptance that, in stable patients, postponing surgery until daytime hours may be both safe and beneficial.

Overall, the contemporary approach emphasizes "timely" rather than "immediate" intervention. Urgent surgery remains essential in patients with signs of perforation, generalized peritonitis, or sepsis. However, in uncomplicated cases, a short, carefully monitored delay is now widely considered acceptable. This shift reflects a broader move toward individualized care, where decisions are guided by disease severity, patient

stability, and available resources rather than rigid timelines alone.

Surgical Approach: Laparoscopic versus Open Appendectomy

The surgical management of appendicitis has undergone a significant transformation over the past few decades, largely driven by the adoption of minimally invasive techniques. Open appendectomy, once the standard approach, has gradually been supplemented-and in many settings replaced-by laparoscopic appendectomy.

Laparoscopic appendectomy offers several well-recognized advantages. Patients typically experience less postoperative pain, shorter hospital stays, and a quicker return to normal activity. Improved visualization of the abdominal cavity also allows for better diagnostic assessment, particularly in atypical presentations. Randomized trials have consistently shown that laparoscopic surgery is associated with faster recovery and earlier return of bowel function compared to the open approach [12].

Despite these benefits, laparoscopy is not without limitations. It requires specific expertise, infrastructure, and may involve higher initial costs. Operative time can be slightly longer in some cases, particularly during the learning curve. Moreover, in the setting of complicated appendicitis with extensive inflammation or adhesions, the procedure can be technically challenging.

Open appendectomy, therefore, continues to have a role in selected situations. These include cases with hemodynamic instability, extensive intra-abdominal contamination, or when laparoscopic resources or expertise are not readily available. In some low-resource settings, it remains the primary approach. Thus, while laparoscopy is widely preferred, it is not universally applicable.

Importantly, the evolving understanding of appendicitis as a heterogeneous condition has influenced how these techniques are applied. The choice of surgical approach is no longer purely procedural but is increasingly tailored to disease severity and patient factors. Special populations-such as pediatric, elderly, pregnant, and obese patients-may benefit differently from each approach, further emphasizing the need for individualized decision-making.

At the same time, it is worth noting that delays in surgery, particularly when poorly managed, can still lead to adverse outcomes. High rates of perforated appendicitis in certain settings highlight that both excessive delay and unplanned urgency can be harmful. The challenge, therefore, lies in balancing timely intervention with appropriate preparation, ensuring that surgery is performed under optimal conditions without compromising patient safety [13].

In summary, laparoscopic appendectomy has become the preferred approach in most modern surgical practices, but open surgery remains relevant. The decision between the two should be guided not only by evidence but also by clinical context, surgeon expertise, and available resources.

Non-Operative Management (Antibiotic-First Strategy)

The idea of treating acute appendicitis without surgery would have seemed counterintuitive not long ago. However, with a better understanding of disease heterogeneity and improved diagnostic accuracy, non-operative management (NOM) has emerged as a reasonable option in carefully selected patients-particularly those with uncomplicated appendicitis.

The rationale is straightforward. If a subset of appendicitis represents a localized inflammatory process rather than a relentlessly progressive one, then controlling that inflammation with antibiotics may be sufficient, at least in the short term. Early randomized controlled trials laid the groundwork for this approach, and subsequent studies have continued to support its feasibility.

Across these studies, antibiotic-first treatment has shown initial success rates in the range of 60-90%, with a proportion of patients avoiding surgery altogether during the follow-up period [14]. At the same time, recurrence remains a key concern. Reported rates of re-appendicectomy range from 10-30%, often within the first year, although longer-term data suggest that recurrence may continue beyond this period [14-16].

Because of this variability, patient selection becomes critical. The best candidates are those with imaging-confirmed uncomplicated appendicitis, minimal peri-appendiceal fluid, absence of an appendicolith, and relatively low clinical scores such as Alvarado or AIR. Patients should also be clinically stable and able to comply with follow-up, as early recognition of treatment failure is essential. Lack of clinical improvement or worsening symptoms typically warrants prompt surgical intervention.

When successful, non-operative management offers several advantages. It avoids general anesthesia and operative risks, reduces the likelihood of negative appendectomy, and in some cases shortens initial hospital stay [17]. It also provides the option of interval appendectomy if recurrence occurs, allowing treatment to be staged rather than immediate [18,19]. For some patients, especially those with comorbidities or higher surgical risk, this can be an attractive alternative.

That said, the limitations are equally important. Recurrence remains the most significant drawback, often leading to uncertainty for both patient and clinician. Some patients ultimately require surgery after an initial period of recovery, which can prolong the overall disease course. Repeated or prolonged antibiotic use, the need for close follow-up, and the potential risk of missed or evolving complicated appendicitis also need to be considered. There is also a psychological component-many patients find reassurance in definitive surgical treatment rather than living with the possibility of recurrence.

In current practice, non-operative management has not replaced appendectomy but rather complements it. Surgery remains the definitive treatment, particularly in patients with complicated disease or those unsuitable for conservative care. However, in selected patients with uncomplicated appendicitis, an antibiotic-first strategy is increasingly being offered as an alternative, often within a shared decision-making framework. The challenge lies in balancing short-term benefits against long-term uncertainty, and in identifying which patients are most likely to benefit from this approach.

Management of Complicated Appendicitis

Complicated appendicitis represents the more severe end of the disease spectrum and includes presentations such as perforation, generalized peritonitis, appendicular abscess, and phlegmon. These cases are associated with higher morbidity and require a more nuanced and often multidisciplinary approach.

Traditionally, immediate surgery was considered mandatory in all such cases. However, as with uncomplicated appendicitis, this approach has been re-evaluated. It is now recognized that complicated appendicitis encompasses a heterogeneous group of conditions, and not all patients benefit from the same strategy. Some may require urgent surgical intervention, while others may be managed initially with antibiotics and, where appropriate, image-guided drainage [20,21].

In cases of generalized peritonitis or sepsis, emergency surgery remains the standard of care. Early source control is critical, and delays can lead to significant morbidity. On the other hand, in patients presenting with a well-defined appendicular abscess or phlegmon, initial conservative management with intravenous antibiotics-with or without percutaneous drainage-has shown good outcomes. This approach allows inflammation to subside, potentially making subsequent surgery safer if needed.

The role of interval appendectomy in these cases continues to be debated. While traditionally recommended to prevent recurrence, more recent evidence suggests that routine interval appendectomy may not be necessary in all patients, particularly if they remain asymptomatic after initial treatment. Instead, a more selective approach is now being adopted.

Timing of surgery in complicated appendicitis is therefore not uniform. It depends on clinical presentation, imaging findings, and response to initial therapy. Importantly, these decisions must also consider patient-specific factors, including age, comorbidities, and overall physiological status.

Beyond clinical considerations, the broader impact of complicated appendicitis should not be overlooked. It carries significant healthcare costs and may have long-term implications, including effects on fertility and the need for future abdominal surgeries. Moreover, variations in healthcare resources across regions influence

management strategies, contributing to global differences in practice [22].

Overall, the management of complicated appendicitis reflects the broader shift in appendicitis care-from a single standardized approach to a more individualized, context-dependent strategy.

Special Clinical Scenarios

While general principles guide most cases of appendicitis, certain patient groups present unique challenges where standard approaches may not always apply. In these scenarios, both diagnosis and management require additional caution and often a more tailored strategy.

Appendicitis during pregnancy is a classic example. Anatomical displacement of the appendix, along with physiological and hormonal changes, can obscure the clinical picture and delay diagnosis. This is particularly important given that appendicitis remains the most common non-obstetric surgical emergency in pregnancy [23]. Imaging plays a key role here-ultrasound is usually the first step, with magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) increasingly used when ultrasound is inconclusive, as it avoids radiation exposure. Importantly, delaying surgery in pregnancy carries significant risks, including perforation and fetal loss. As a result, once diagnosed, appendectomy remains the treatment of choice, with laparoscopy being widely accepted as safe in experienced hands [24].

In the pediatric population, appendicitis often presents differently. Younger children may have atypical symptoms, limited ability to communicate, and a higher risk of rapid progression to perforation. At the same time, there has been growing interest in non-operative management in selected pediatric cases, particularly for uncomplicated appendicitis. However, concerns about recurrence and diagnostic uncertainty remain, and clinical judgment continues to play a central role.

Elderly patients represent another high-risk group. They often present late, with less specific symptoms and a higher likelihood of complicated appendicitis at diagnosis. Comorbidities further increase perioperative risk, and delays in treatment can significantly worsen outcomes. In these patients, a lower threshold for imaging and a more cautious, individualized approach to management are generally warranted.

Immunocompromised patients pose additional challenges. Due to a blunted inflammatory response, classical signs of appendicitis may be absent or subtle, leading to delayed diagnosis. As a result, these patients are more likely to present with advanced or complicated disease. A high index of suspicion, early imaging, and prompt intervention are essential in this group.

Another consideration is incidental appendectomy, performed during other abdominal or pelvic procedures. While historically more common, its role remains debated. In some cases, the presence of chronic inflammation on histopathology may justify removal, particularly if future access to surgical care is uncertain. However, routine incidental appendectomy is no longer universally recommended and should be considered selectively.

Overall, these special scenarios highlight the importance of flexibility in management. A standardized approach may not be appropriate in all patients, and decisions must account for physiological differences, diagnostic limitations, and potential risks unique to each group.

Emerging Trends and Innovations

The management of acute appendicitis continues to evolve, not only in terms of treatment strategies but also in perioperative care and technological advancements. These developments reflect a broader shift toward improving patient outcomes, reducing hospital stay, and optimizing resource utilization.

Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) protocols have gained increasing attention in this context. These evidence-based pathways aim to minimize surgical stress and accelerate recovery through measures such as multimodal analgesia, reduced opioid use, early mobilization, and early oral intake. In appendicitis, ERAS protocols have been shown to be both safe and effective in reducing hospital stay and improving recovery. However, outcomes may vary in certain groups, particularly in very young, elderly, or comorbid patients, where a more individualized adaptation of ERAS principles may be necessary [25,26].

Another evolving concept is day-care or ambulatory appendectomy. With improvements in anesthesia, minimally invasive techniques, and perioperative care, selected patients with uncomplicated appendicitis can undergo surgery and be discharged on the same day. While still not universally practiced, this approach has shown promising results in appropriately selected populations.

Robotic-assisted appendectomy is also being explored, although its role remains limited. Potential advantages include improved dexterity, better visualization, and lower conversion rates in complex cases. However, high costs and limited evidence currently restrict its widespread adoption.

Artificial intelligence (AI) is emerging as a supportive tool in diagnosis and clinical decision-making. AI-based models can assist in interpreting imaging, predicting disease severity, and reducing unnecessary investigations. While it cannot replace clinical judgment, it may help streamline workflows, especially in high-volume or resource-constrained settings.

Perhaps the most important shift is toward personalized management. Rather than applying a uniform protocol, treatment decisions are increasingly guided by patient-specific factors such as age, comorbidities, clinical presentation, laboratory values, and imaging findings. This individualized approach aligns with the broader trend in modern medicine, aiming to balance effectiveness, safety, and patient preference.

Taken together, these innovations suggest that the future of appendicitis management will be less about rigid algorithms and more about adaptable, patient-centered care pathways.

Controversies and Ongoing Debates

Despite being one of the most well-known surgical conditions, the management of acute appendicitis is still far from settled. In fact, many of the traditional principles that guided treatment for decades are now being actively re-examined. What was once a straightforward “diagnose and operate” condition has become an area of ongoing debate, driven by evolving evidence and changing clinical practice.

One of the most fundamental questions is whether surgery is always necessary. The classical view strongly favored immediate appendectomy, based on the assumption that appendicitis inevitably progresses to perforation. However, more recent cohort studies and trials suggest that this is not always the case. A proportion of patients-particularly those with uncomplicated appendicitis-may remain clinically stable and respond well to antibiotics alone, at least in the short term [27-29]. This challenges the idea that surgery is universally required and opens the door to more selective approaches.

Closely related to this is the question of the long-term effectiveness of antibiotic therapy. While short-term outcomes with non-operative management are encouraging, concerns remain regarding recurrence. Although many patients avoid surgery initially, a subset will eventually require appendectomy, sometimes after repeated episodes. This creates uncertainty when counseling patients, as the choice is often between immediate definitive treatment and the possibility of delayed recurrence [30,31].

Another key issue is the balance between overtreatment and undertreatment. Performing surgery in all cases may expose some patients-particularly those with mild or self-limiting disease-to unnecessary operative risks. On the other hand, delaying or avoiding surgery inappropriately may lead to progression of disease in others. Striking this balance is challenging and depends heavily on accurate diagnosis, risk stratification, and clinical judgment.

Variations in global practice further highlight this uncertainty. Management strategies differ widely across regions, influenced by factors such as access to imaging, availability of laparoscopic expertise, healthcare infrastructure, and institutional protocols. In some settings, early surgery remains the norm, while in others, non-operative management is increasingly adopted. These differences reflect not only resource variability but also the absence of a universally accepted standard of care [27,32].

Cost-effectiveness is another important consideration. While non-operative management may reduce immediate surgical costs and hospital stay, the potential for recurrence, repeated hospital visits, and delayed surgery can offset these benefits over time. Conversely, early appendectomy offers definitive treatment but involves operative costs and resource utilization.

Determining which approach is more cost-effective in the long term remains an area of ongoing research.

Interestingly, some studies have also challenged the traditional link between delayed surgery and increased perforation risk. Evidence suggests that perforation may be more closely related to disease severity at presentation rather than in-hospital delay. In fact, certain analyses have reported no increased rate of perforation in patients initially managed with antibiotics, while higher complication rates have been observed in some patients undergoing delayed surgery under suboptimal conditions, such as overnight procedures [29-32]. These findings add further complexity to decision-making.

Overall, these controversies reflect a broader shift in how appendicitis is understood and managed. Rather than a single uniform approach, there is increasing recognition that treatment should be individualized, balancing risks, benefits, and patient preferences. While significant progress has been made, many questions remain unresolved, and ongoing research continues to shape the future direction of care.

Discussion

The management of acute appendicitis has undergone a noticeable shift over the past two decades, moving away from a uniform, surgery-first model toward a more nuanced and individualized approach. When the available evidence across timing of surgery, operative technique, and non-operative strategies is considered together, a consistent theme emerges: appendicitis is not a single disease entity, and therefore, it does not lend itself to a single standardized treatment pathway.

A key driver of this transition has been the improved ability to stratify disease severity. The distinction between uncomplicated and complicated appendicitis-supported by clinical scoring systems, laboratory markers, and imaging-has become central to decision-making. This has allowed clinicians to tailor management more appropriately, reserving urgent surgery for those with advanced disease while considering delayed or even non-operative strategies in selected patients [7,9]. In this context, the traditional emphasis on immediacy has been replaced by a more balanced concept of "appropriate timing," guided by clinical status rather than rigid timelines [10,11].

At the same time, evidence comparing laparoscopic and open appendectomy has reinforced the role of minimally invasive surgery as the preferred approach in most settings, without completely eliminating the relevance of open techniques [12,13]. Similarly, randomized trials evaluating antibiotic-first strategies have demonstrated that non-operative management can be effective in carefully selected patients, although recurrence and long-term uncertainty remain important limitations [14-16,31]. Taken together, these findings support a more flexible treatment paradigm, where multiple valid options may exist for the same clinical presentation.

This evolving landscape underscores the importance of individualized, patient-centered care. Factors such as age, comorbidities, disease severity, imaging findings, and patient preference all play a role in determining the most appropriate course of action. In practice, this often involves shared decision-making, particularly when considering non-operative management versus surgery. For example, a young, otherwise healthy patient may prefer definitive surgical treatment to avoid recurrence, whereas an older patient with comorbidities may opt for an antibiotic-first approach.

However, this shift toward individualization also introduces complexity. Clinical guidelines, while useful, cannot fully account for the variability seen in real-world practice. Over-reliance on protocols may limit flexibility, whereas deviation from evidence-based recommendations without sound reasoning risks inconsistency and potential harm. In this setting, clinical judgment remains indispensable-serving as the bridge between evidence and patient-specific decision-making [33].

Despite the growing body of literature, several limitations persist. Many studies on non-operative management have relatively short follow-up periods, making it difficult to assess long-term outcomes such as recurrence beyond a few years. Variability in study design, patient selection criteria, and definitions of "success" further complicates interpretation and comparison of results. Additionally, most randomized trials have focused on uncomplicated appendicitis, leaving important gaps in the management of complicated disease.

Another challenge lies in the heterogeneity of appendicitis itself. The traditional binary classification into uncomplicated and complicated forms, while clinically useful, may oversimplify a more complex biological spectrum. Emerging evidence suggests that appendicitis may exist along a continuum, influenced by factors such as host immune response, microbiological environment, and degree of obstruction [20-22]. A more refined classification system may improve both prognostication and treatment selection in the future.

Uncertainty also persists regarding optimal timing of surgery. While short in-hospital delays appear safe, the precise threshold beyond which outcomes worsen is not clearly defined. Similarly, the long-term cost-effectiveness of non-operative management compared to early appendectomy remains an area of ongoing debate, particularly when recurrence and repeated healthcare utilization are considered [27-32].

Overall, the current evidence supports a shift away from rigid treatment algorithms toward a more adaptive, patient-specific approach. However, this flexibility must be balanced with careful clinical assessment and adherence to evidence-based principles to ensure optimal outcomes.

Future Directions

Looking ahead, several areas require further investigation to refine the management of acute appendicitis. One of the most important needs is robust long-term outcome data, particularly for patients managed non-operatively. While short-term success rates are well documented, the true incidence of recurrence, late complications, and overall patient satisfaction over extended follow-up periods remains less clearly defined.

There is also a growing need for more precise predictive tools. The development of validated models incorporating clinical, laboratory, and imaging parameters could improve risk stratification and help identify patients most likely to benefit from specific treatment strategies. Biomarkers capable of distinguishing between uncomplicated and complicated disease at an early stage would be particularly valuable.

Standardization of treatment pathways represents another important goal. While flexibility is necessary, the wide variation in global practice highlights the need for consensus-driven guidelines that can be adapted to different healthcare settings. Multicentric and international collaborative studies will play a crucial role in achieving this, ensuring that recommendations are both evidence-based and broadly applicable.

Advances in diagnostic imaging and artificial intelligence may further enhance decision-making by improving accuracy and reducing unnecessary interventions. At the same time, continued evaluation of cost-effectiveness will be essential, particularly in resource-limited settings where healthcare allocation must be carefully balanced.

It is also worth noting that management strategies may differ across specific populations. Increasing evidence suggests that non-operative approaches are being successfully applied in selected pediatric and pregnant patients, although careful patient selection remains essential. Economic analyses have also indicated that, in certain scenarios, antibiotic therapy may offer outcomes comparable to surgery, influencing patient preference and clinical practice [34].

Despite these developments, appendectomy remains the most definitive and widely accepted treatment, with consistently low mortality and predictable outcomes [1]. The challenge moving forward is not to replace surgery entirely but to refine when and in whom it should be performed.

In summary, the future of appendicitis management lies in better stratification, stronger evidence, and more personalized care. Continued research, combined with thoughtful integration of emerging data into clinical practice, will be key to resolving existing uncertainties and improving patient outcomes.

Conclusion

Acute appendicitis remains one of the most common surgical emergencies, but its management has clearly evolved beyond a uniform, surgery-for-all approach. While appendectomy continues to be the cornerstone and most definitive treatment, contemporary practice reflects a more nuanced understanding of the disease.

The laparoscopic approach is generally preferred due to its advantages, including reduced postoperative pain, lower wound complications, shorter hospital stay, and faster recovery. However, open appendectomy still has a role in selected clinical situations, particularly in complicated cases or where resources are limited.

The concept of surgical timing has also shifted. Immediate intervention is no longer mandatory in every case, and short, well-monitored delays are considered safe in stable patients. This allows for better diagnostic clarification, patient optimization, and resource utilization without compromising outcomes.

At the same time, non-operative management has emerged as a viable alternative in carefully selected patients with uncomplicated appendicitis. While promising, this approach remains selective due to concerns regarding recurrence and long-term outcomes.

Overall, the management of acute appendicitis is moving toward a more individualized, patient-centered model. Decisions should be guided by disease severity, clinical context, and patient preferences, with an emphasis on balanced, evidence-based clinical judgment rather than rigid protocols.

References

1. Sartelli M, Baiocchi GL, Di Saverio S, Ferrara F, et al. Prospective observational study on acute appendicitis worldwide (POSAW). 2018.
2. Boland P, Donlon NE, Kelly ME, Nugent T, et al. Current opinions and practices for the management of acute appendicitis: an international survey. 2021.
3. Guan L, Liu Z, Pan G, Zhang B, Wu Y, Gan T, Ouyang G. The global, regional, and national burden of appendicitis in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. BMC Gastroenterol. 2023;23(1):44.
4. Yang L, Zheng R, Li H, Ren Y, Chen H. The burden of appendicitis and surgical site infection of appendectomy worldwide. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2023;17(3):367-373.
5. Jalava K, Sallinen V, Lampela H, Malmi H, et al. Role of preoperative in-hospital delay on appendiceal perforation while awaiting appendicectomy (PERFECT): a Nordic multicentre study. Lancet. 2023.
6. Alnuaymah F, Etonyeaku AC, Alsaeed HS, AlSamani AN, et al. Clinical, radiological and pathological appraisal of acute appendicitis: a single-center retrospective analysis. 2022.
7. Shogilev DJ, Duus N, Odom SR, Shapiro NI. Diagnosing appendicitis: evidence-based review of the diagnostic approach. 2014.
8. Federico C, Paola F, Massimo S, Enrico C, et al. Conservative treatment of acute appendicitis. 2018.
9. Fujiwara K, Abe A, Masatsugu T, Hirano T, et al. Usefulness of clinical scoring models in preoperative diagnosis of complicated appendicitis. 2021.
10. Claydon O, Down B, Kumar S. Patient outcomes related to in-hospital delays in appendicectomy for appendicitis: a retrospective study. 2022.
11. Kluger Y, Ben-Ishay O, Sartelli M, Ansaloni L, et al. World Society of Emergency Surgery study group initiative on timing of acute care surgery classification (TACS). 2013.
12. Shaikh AR, Sangrasi AK, Shaikh GA. Clinical outcomes of laparoscopic versus open appendectomy. 2009.
13. Prabhu SP. A comparative study of laparoscopic versus open appendectomy in terms of postoperative outcomes. 2016.
14. Xing X, Shi H, Feng S. Does surgical treatment produce better outcomes than conservative treatment? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. 2020.
15. Yadao S, Lamture Y, Huse S. Uses of antibiotics alone in uncomplicated appendicitis. Cureus. 2022.
16. Adams SE, Perera MRS, Fung S, et al. Non-operative management of uncomplicated appendicitis in children: a randomized controlled trial. ANZ J Surg. 2024.
17. Tanaka M, Itoi E, Sato K, Hamada J, et al. Factors related to successful outcome of conservative treatment. 2010.

18. Weledji EP, Zisuh AV, Ngounou E. Management of appendicitis: appendicectomy, antibiotic therapy, or both? Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2023;85:897-901.
19. Wang J, Yin J, Wang C, Zhu Y. Safety and efficacy of appendectomy versus antibiotic treatment for uncomplicated appendicitis. BMC Surg. 2025.
20. Mizuta N, Nakanishi T, Tsunemi K. Stump appendicitis after laparoscopic appendectomy: a case report. 2020.
21. Ahmed A, Feroz SH, Dominic JL, Muralidharan A, et al. Emergency versus elective appendicectomy for appendiceal phlegmon: a review. 2020.
22. Shinde N, Devani R, Abdul Baseer M, Desai K. Management of appendicular abscess in children. 2020.
23. Zheng JT, Thong XR, Lau KY, Balasubramaniam S, et al. Acute appendicitis: advances and controversies. 2021.
24. Fugazzola P, Ceresoli M, Agnoletti V, Agresta F, et al. Guidelines for diagnosis and treatment of acute appendicitis in the elderly. 2020.
25. Afonso AM, McCormick PJ, Assel MJ, Rieth EF, et al. Enhanced recovery programs in surgery. 2021.
26. Dean H, Carter F, Francis NK. Modern perioperative medicine-past, present, and future. 2019.
27. Charani E, Ahmad R, Tarrant C, Birgand G, et al. Opportunities for system-level improvement in antibiotic use across the surgical pathway. 2017.
28. Mogharab V, Ostovar M, Ruszkowski J, et al. Global burden of patient-related delay in emergency healthcare: systematic review. Global Health. 2022;18(1):58.
29. Sandborn WJ, Lawendy N, Danese S, et al. Safety and efficacy of tofacitinib for ulcerative colitis: long-term analysis. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2022;55(4):464-478.
30. Males I, Boban Z, Kumric M, et al. Explainable machine learning model to reduce negative appendectomies in pediatric patients. Sci Rep. 2024;14:12772.
31. Brucchi F, Bracchetti G, Fugazzola P, et al. Nonoperative versus operative management for uncomplicated appendicitis: meta-analysis of randomized trials. World J Emerg Surg. 2024;19(1):2.
32. Shah AA, Al-Zoubi RM, Al-Qudimat AR, et al. Daytime versus nighttime laparoscopic appendectomy: a retrospective study. Heliyon. 2022;8(12).
33. Lulin Z, Yiranbon E, Antwi HA. Complementarity of clinician judgment and evidence-based models in medical decision-making. 2016.
34. Bass GA, Mohseni S, Ryan É, Forssten MP, et al. Clinical practice selectively follows acute appendicitis guidelines. 2023.
35. Jumah S, Wester T. Non-operative management of acute appendicitis in children. 2022.