

# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

#### STUDY OF PROGNOSIS OF PATIENTS WITH PERITONITIS USING MANNHEIM PERITONITISINDEXSCORINGSYSTEM

#### Dr. K. Prasad M.S Gen. Surgery<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Y. Chirimala M.S Gen. Surgery<sup>2</sup> and Dr. A. Pratap Kumar M.S Gen. Surgery<sup>3</sup>

1. Assistant Professor ACSR. Govt. General Hospital & Medical College, Nellore, AP, India.

2 Assistant Professor ACSR. Govt. General Hospital & Medical College, Nellore, AP, India.

3. AssistantProfessor ACSR. Govt. General Hospital & Medical College, Nellore, AP, India.

-

## Manuscript Info

#### Abstract

Copy Right, IJAR, 2023,. All rights reserved.

.....

## Introduction:-

Aim of mystudy wereas follows:

1. Tostudythevalidityofthescoringsystem, presently being studied worldwide.i.e : . Mannheimperitonitis index. Mannheim peritonitis index (MPI) is a **specificscoringsystem** that facilitates early identification of patients with severe peritonitis for aggressive surgical approach and improved outcomes.

#### Aim:-

Tostudytheprognostic factor which determines the outcome of the disease.

Patientfactors:-Age, Sex,GeneralHealth.

Diseaseprocess Siteofperforationii.Durationofperforation iii.The extentof peritonealcontamination. EffectofGeneralsystemiccomplicationslike Respiratoryii.CVSsystemiii.Shock iv.Multi-organ failure

#### Corresponding Author:- Dr. Y. Chirimala M.S Gen. Surgery

Address:- 6-12-9/A2, 2nd floor K.B. Layout, Near Padmavathi park, Tirupati, 517501 AP,India.(Phone: 9247401893,8978248063).

## Mannheimperitonitisindex(MPI)

Risk factor	Score
Age >50 years	5
Female sex	5
Organ failure*	7
Malignancy	4
Preoperative duration of peritonitis >24 h	4
Origin of sepsis not colonic	4
Diffuse generalized peritonitis	6
Exudates:	
Clear	0
Cloudy, purulent	6
Fecal	12

#### History:

#### Surgicalanatomyofperitoneumandperitonealcavity:

hyperdynamic

The anatomic relationship within the abdomen isessential in determining possible source and routes ofspread of infection. In man, the peritoneal cavity is aclosed space. In women, it is perforated by the freeends of the fallopian tubes. Anteriority the peritoneal cavity reflects onto the posterior aspect of the anterior abdominal musculature. Posteriorly, the peritoneal lining lies superficial to the retroperitoneal viscera, including aorta, venacava, ureters, and kidneys. The anterior and posterior peritoneal layers are described collectively as the parietal peritoneum. The visceral peritoneum represents the mesothelial lining cells that are reflected onto the surface of the viscera.

Theperitoneumiscoveringtheintestinestheserosa of the bowel. Peritoneal reflections andthemesentericattachmentscompartmentalizetheintraperitoneal space and route. spreading exudates tositesthatareoftendistantfrom thesource. The transverse mesocolondivides the peritone alcavity horizontally into an upper and lower space. а The greater omentum, extending from the transverse meso colon and the lower border of the stomach, covers the storage of thelower peritoneal cavity.

Theperitonealcavityhasseveral recesses into which exudates may be come loculated. The most dependent recess of the peritone alcavity in the supine position is in the pelvis. In women, the uterus and fallopian tubes project into the pelvic recess.

## **MaterialsAnd Methods:-**

All patients of peritonitis are admitted to GovernmentGeneralHospital,SiddharthaMedicalCollege,Vijayawada or who have peritonitis due to variouscauses after being in a patient between the period ofDecember 2016toDecember 2018.

## Methodology:-

## InclusionExclusion Criteria:

Patientswithclinicalsuspicionandinvestigatory support for the diagnosis of peritonitisdue tohollow viscousperforationare included.

## **ExclusionCriteria:**

Patientswithassociated injuriesto otherorgans Patientswithassociatedvascular,neurogenicinjuries Patientswithanyothersignificantillnesswhichislikely toaffecttheoutcome morethanthedisease in the study. Agebelow12yearsandabove75years. Samplesize :100Patients

## **Results:-**

PatientswithperitonitisadmittedinGovernmentGeneralHospital,SiddharthaMedicalCollege,Vijayawadawerestudiedfro mDecember2016toDecember 2018, total number cases reviewed were100.

Study of Patient factors : age, sexAge:-

Thepatientswithagerangingfrom17years-75yearswereconsidered.ThemaximumnumberofpatientswereinMiddleage(21-50years)-64patients.Butthemortalityrate was more in extremesof age that is>50years group. The mortality rate of the elderly patientwas100% (1patient).

#### Sex:-

A maximum number of patients were male –86, butthe mortality rate was more in males(100%). Since maximum patients were males, the number of patients died were maximum male patients.

#### Studyofthediseaseprocess

Mortalityv/stime of presentation: The time of presentation of patients ranged from

<24hoursto>12days.Maximumpatientspresentedin1-3days(41%). Mortality increased correspondingly with the delay inperforation.Itwas0% for<24hours,80%>9days, and 100% for more than 9 days.

#### AGE&SEX :

Age	Survived	Died	Total
Male	81 (94%) (85%)	5 (6%) (100%)	86 (86%)
Female	14 (100%) (15%)	0	14 (14%)
Total	95 (95%) (100%)	5 (5%) (100%)	100 (100%)
Age	Survived	Died	Total
< 20	17 (100%) (18%)	0	17 (17%)
21 - 30	28 (100%) (29%)	0	28 (28%)
31 - 40	17 (100%) (18%)	0	17 (17%)
41 - 50	19 (100%) (19%)	0	19 (19%)
51 60	7 (70%) (7%)	3 (30%) (60%)	10 (10%)
61 – 70	7 (89%) (7%)	1 (13%) (20%)	8 (8%)
>71	0	1 (100%) (20%)	1 (1%)
Total	95 (95%) (100%)	5 (5%) (100%)	100 (100%)

## **DurationOfPresentation:**

MortalityVs.typeofperforation:Perforationsweregroupedintoeightaetiologies.Appendicularperforationwasthecommonestcause(29%)followedbygastricandenteric.ThemortalityrateofGastricperforations100%.Anothertypeofperforationsduodenal,entericandappendicularperforationscontributed0%mortality.

Etiology	Survived	Died	Total
Duodenal	7 (100%)	0	7
Perforation	(7%)		(7%)
Enteric	17 (100%)	0	17
Perforation	(18%)		(17%)
Tubercular	6 (100%)	0	6
Perforation	(6%)		(6%)
Traumatic	16(100%)	0	16
Perforation	(17%)		(16%)
Malignant	2(100%)	0	2
Perforation	(2%)		(2%)
Non-specific lleal	3(100%)	0	3
	(3%)		(3%)
Stomach	15 (75%)	5 (25%)	20
	(16%)	(100%)	(20%)
Appendicular			
perforation	29 (100%)	0	29
	(30%)		(29%)
Total	(95%)	(5%)	100
	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)

## **EvaluationOfScoringSystem**

ResultsofMPI:-

Theminimumscore of the presentation was ten while the maximum was 47. Maximum patients were in the rage 20-

29.Themortality increased exponentially for a score more than 26. While the range of 10-19 had 0% mortality, the range 20-29 had 19(28%) mortality. It jumped to 79% for score 30-39, and only one case who had ascoreofabove40died(100%).Toanalyze the mortality rate more critically, an arbitrary cutoff point of MPI score 26 was taken 3 5. Sixty-five patients were inscore <26 while 40 had more than 26. The mortality rate was as low as 5(7%) with ascore of <26 while it was as high as 35(86%) in patients with a score of more than 26.

MPI	Survived	Died	Total
≤ 26	49 (98%)	1 (2%)	50
	(52%)	(20%)	(50%)
> 26	46 (92%)	4(8%)	50
	(48%)	(80%)	(50%)
Total	95	5	100
	(95%)	(5%)	(100%)

MPI, of  $\leq 26$  MPI, 25% of  $\leq 20$  sepsis score, 7% of patients  $\leq 24$  hr duration stayed more than 20 days. It was reversed in 71% in age >50 years, 100% in MPI>26,91% insepsis score>20 and 47% duration>24 hrs.

## **Discussion:-**

Peritonitisisadreadedcomplicationandifnottreatedintime,canterminatefatallyinourstudyon100patientsinGovernmentGe neralHospital,Siddhartha Medical College, Vijayawada. We foundvariousfactorlikeage,associatedmedicalillness,shockatthetimeofadmission,andextentofperitoneal contamination as an important prognosticfactor in the outcome of these patients. The data weobtained were tabulated and the percentage calculatedwherever necessary, the significance of the differenceinvariousgroupswascalculatedusing 22test,student-t-testandother statisticalmethods.

#### Studyofpatientfactors

Age:Ageseemstobeanimportantfactorindeterminingtheoutcome.Extremesofagehadincreased mortality rates. This is in agreement withstudiesbyDellingeretal.

#### Sex :

As in most studies males out number femalesby 9:1. Mortality rate was higher infemales This difference is not significant, (p < 0.05) may be because of very less number of females in our study (only 10).

Adegreeoffreedom:1 chi-square:0

#### Studyofthediseaseprocess

Mortality Vs. time of presentation: In our study, theduration of perforations from the time of presentationseemed to have the major impact. it can be seen thatmortalityforpatientspresentingwithin24hrswas0%. And upto 100% for delayed presentation formore than one week. This is in complete agreement with the result of most other studies.

Onfurtheranalysis of the data using the X2 test (30.15) for group data the P < 0.001, confirming that the difference inmortality is highly significant. Hence, delay in presentation is associated with the corresponding increase in mortality.

#### MortalityVs.typeofperforations

AswithmoststudiesGastricperforationfromcontributedmaximumMortalityofthecases(20/100). They contributed as much as100% to themortality. They had a mortality rate of 100%. Entericperforationhadthemortalityof0% eventhough delaying presentation, typical clinical features, the general complication of typhoid seem to contribute to higher mortality rate comparison of MORTALITY with other studies.

Etiology	Our Study	Nair <sup>33</sup>	Mishra	Tripathi <sup>31</sup>	Golighe r	Delinger <sup>2</sup>
Duodenal perforation	0 %	-	-	16.6%	-	41%
Enteric	0%	48%	-	32%		-
Tubercular	0%	100%	30%	-	-	-
Malignant perforation	0%	-	-	-	71%	-
Traumatic perforation	0%	-	-	33%	-	-
Gastric Perforatio n	5%	-	-	-	-	-

Foreachanalysis,thefactorisdividedintotwogroups. **Survivorgroup:** 

Age ≤ 50 years, MPI ≤ 26, Perforation duration ≤ 24 hrs.

#### **Mortality group :**

Age > 50 years, MPI > 26,(High-risk group)Perforationduration>24hrs.

Inourstudywefoundthatinsurvivorgroupofpatients tend to have less General complication and less serious local complications like fecal fistula, deepseated abscess.

Complications	Our study	Tripathi et al. <sup>32</sup>
Fecal fistula	7 %	7.5 %
Wound sepsis	24 %	26 %
MOF	15 %	11 %

An interesting aspect in our study was in perforationduration, patients presenting with24 hours had a verygoodprognosiswithfewercomplicationsbothgeneral and local. This is in agreement with currentstudiesWe advocate needing for further studies onMannheimPeritonitisindextoincludeacolonicorigin of sepsis and to remove female sex as variablesof adverse outcomein MannheimPeritonitisindex.

## **Conclusion:-**

The prospective study was done on 100 patients inGovernmentGeneralHospital,SiddharthaMedicalCollege, Vijayawada.

Extremes of age ( $\leq 20$  yrs, > 50 yrs) seem to hurthe outcome - other comorbidities likeHIV and renalfailure.

Type, Time and extent of peritoneal contaminationseem to have a bearing on mortality. Patients withdiffuseperitonitis, fecal contamination worse.

 $\label{eq:associated} Associated factors like diabetes, cardiovas cular problems add to mortality.$ 

There is wides cope for the use of Mannheim periton it is index, in the present context. It helps in determine the risk of patient preoperatively.

#### surgicaldecision.

definitivesurgerycanbedonesafelyinlowscorepatient.

Aggressive, newer modalities of treatment need to be tried in high score patients to improve mortality by Intensive therapyunit&dialysis.

To compare the efficacy of various treatmentcanbeaccuratelycomparedbytakingintoconsideration their effect on mortality with respect to their scores.

Patient with high scores needs to be managedinsurgicalICUcenterswhichareadequatelyequipped and well equipped with trained personneland facilities.

Only adequate Health education, proper referralmechanism canhelpinreducing this.

Peritonitis and its sequalae management involvelots of skill, expensive modalities of monitoring andtreatment which has to be utilized judiciously basedon riskstratification.

#### **References:-**

- 1. Billing A, Frohlich D, Schildberg F.W., Predictionof outcome using the Mannheim peritonitis index in2003patients.Peritonitisstudygroup.Br.J.Surg1994Feb:81(2):209-13.
- 2. Dellinger P.E. et al. Surgical infection stratificationsystemforintraabdominalinfection.Arch.Surg.1985Jan;120:21.
- 3. PacelliF,etal.Prognosisinintra-abdominalinfectins. Multivariate analysis on 604 patients. ArchSurg.1996June; 131(6):641-5

- 4. DurhamH.Themechanismofreactiontoperitoneal infection. J. Pathol.Bacteriol. 1897;4:338-82.
- 5. MelaneyF.L.OlipJ,etal.Peritonitis:II.Synergism of bacteria commonly found in peritonealexudates.ArchSurg.1932;25:709.
- 6. FryD.E.GarrisonR.N.etal.Determinantsofdeath in patients with the intra-abdominal abscess.Surgery.1980;88:517.
- 7. Elebute E.A., Stoner H.B. The grading of sepsis.Br.J. Surg. 1983;70:2931.
- 8. PineR.W.WertzM.J.et.Al.Determinantsoforganmalfunctionordeathinpatientswithintra-abdominalsepsis. Arch Surg.1983;118:242-249.
- 9. StevensL.E.Gaugingtheseverityofsurgicalsepsis.ArchSurg.1983;118:1190-1192.
- 10. KnausW.A, DraperE.A, WagnerD.P. et al. Prognosisina cuteorgan-system failure. Ann. Surg. 1985;202:685-693.