# **Case Report**

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2349-2902.isj20184664

# Appendicitis presenting as LUQ pain in an anatomically normal patient: a case study

Baillie W. C. Ferris\*

Department of Surgery, Ipswich General Hospital, Ipswich, Qeensland, Australia

**Received:** 05 September 2018 **Accepted:** 09 October 2018

\*Correspondence:
Dr. Baillie W. C. Ferris.

E-mail: baillie\_ferris@hotmail.com

**Copyright:** © the author(s), publisher and licensee Medip Academy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### **ABSTRACT**

Appendicitis typically presents with right sided pain, but some patients present with left sided symptoms. This is most commonly due to anatomical abnormalities such as intestinal malrotation or Situs Inversus. In this case study I present a case where an anatomically normal patient presented with Left Upper Quadrant (LUQ) pain. I hypothesize that the reason for this is incorrect interpretation of visceral nociceptive afferents by the Central Nervous System (CNS). I review the literature in regard to the "visceral homunculus." I also review the literature with regards to left sided abdomical pain and Appendicitis. This case highlights the importance of considering Appendicitis in LUQ pain.

**Keywords:** Appendicitis, Left upper quadrant, Mucocele

## INTRODUCTION

Appendicitis is one of the most common causes of abdominal pain. It most commonly presents with right sided abdominal pain, although it can rarely present with left sided pain, most commonly due to anatomical abnormalities such as situs inversus or malrotation. Authors present a case of a patient who presented with left upper quadrant (LUQ) pain and Appendicitis, despite normal anatomy, and discuss my hypothesis for the mechanism of this.

# **CASE REPORT**

A 27 yo F presented with acute onset LUQ squeezing pain associated with nausea vomiting. She had mild LUQ tenderness which settled with analgesia. She had a white cell count (WCC) of 16.7 with a neutrophilia. She had a history of urinary tract infection, but Urine microscopy was normal. A Computed Topography (CT) scan was ordered which revealed a mucocele of the appendix, with

several appendicoliths, and questionable surrounding stranding. Given the lack of right sided symptoms the patient was sent home with analgesia and Cephalexin for a presumed Urinary Tract Infection and planned for an outpatient colonoscopy to investigate the mucocele. Twenty-four hours later she represented with left and right lower quadrant pain and tenderness. Her WCC count had in-creased to 19.0. A decision was made to perform a laparoscopy. The patient then progressed to a Laparoscopic Stapled Appendicectomy.

At laparoscopy she was found to have perforated appendicitis with four quadrant pus. After removal of the specimen, she had a four-quadrant washout, and a drain was placed. Post operatively she made an uneventful recovery and was discharged on oral antibiotics. Histology of the appendix showed acute suppurative appendicitis and peri appendicitis. There was no evidence of malignancy. Cytology of peritoneal fluid was also sent, which also showed no evidence of malignancy. Postoperatively she had a further three days of

intravenous antibiotics (Piperacillin+Tazobactam) and was subsequently discharged on oral Augmentin Duo Forte for five days.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Appendicitis is the most common reason for emergency abdominal surgery.<sup>3</sup> Typical presentation is with right sided symptoms but left sided pain can occur. This is commonly believed to be as a result of congenital abnormalities. A review of 95 cases of patients with left-sided appendicitis showed 66 patients had situs inversus, 23 had intestinal malrotation (24%) and only 7 had normal anatomy (7.3%).<sup>4</sup>



Figure 1: CT at presentation.

Those with normal anatomy occasionally have a reason they present with LUQ pain. For example, in one case the patient had a hypermobile caecum, that was in the LUQ.<sup>5</sup> However, there remains a subset of people such as the one in this case, with no obvious anatomical rea-son for her pain to be localised to the LUQ.

Authors hypothesize that the reason for this is incorrect interpretation of visceral nociceptive afferents by the Central Nervous System (CNS).

In opposition to somatic sensation, which is localized precisely to the site of origin, visceral sensation is vague, often referred to somatic structures and radiates to one or other side of the body.<sup>6</sup> There are several hypotheses as to the reason for this difference including:

- Most visceral afferents synapse on spinal neurons that also receive projections from somatic afferents <sup>7</sup>
- Visceral afferents have a much greater rostrocaudal distribution within the spinal cord than somatic afferents <sup>8</sup>

• Different cortical processing that alters the perception of afferent inputs <sup>9</sup>

This difference is most clearly shown by the oesophagus, which retains both somatic and visceral innervation, due to its development. Upper third oesophageal pain is well localised to the upper chest in the midline, whereas lower third oesophageal pain is felt diffusely in the lower chest, some-times localising to one side. In a similar mechanism to this, the midgut is a visceral structure containing the appendix and continuing into the LUQ. Authors hypothesise that in rare cases the CNS interprets appendiceal pain as LUQ pain due to misinterpretation of visceral afferents from the midgut.

Research is emerging about a visceral homunculus and the sensory locations in the brain for each part of the gastrointestinal tract, and the many different afferent inputs, including nociception. Pain appears to be processed and thus perceived differently in the different sections of the GI tract.<sup>10</sup>

In addition to highlighting this interesting field of research, this case emphasizes the importance of considering Appendicitis in patients presenting with LUQ pain.

Funding: No funding sources Conflict of interest: None declared Ethical approval: Not required

#### REFERENCES

- Miettinen, Pasanen P, Latrinen P, Alhava JE. Acute abdominal pain in adults. Ann Chir Gynaecol. 1996;85(1):5-9.
- Akbulut S, Caliskan A, Ekin A, Yagmur Y. Left-sided acute appendicitis with situs inversus totalis: review of 63 published cases and report of two cases. J Gastrointestinal Surg. 2010;14(9):1422-8.
- 3. Irvin TT. Abdominal pain: a surgical audit of 1190 emergency admissions. Br J Surg. 1989;76(11):1121.
- 4. Akbulut S, Ulku A, Senol A, Tas M, Yagmur Y. Left-sided appendicitis: review of 95 published cases and a case report. World J Gastroenterol. 2010;16(44):5598-602.
- Nordt SP, Bowns C, Moran J, Kelleher, Brendan. Swadron, Stuart. Left Upper Quadrant Abdominal Pain. West J Emerg Med. 2012.13(6). Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC35555 78/
- Aziz Q, Thompson DG, Ng VW, Hamdy S, Sarkar S, Brammer MJ, et al. Cortical processing of human somatic and visceral sensation. J Neuro Sci. 2000:20(7):2657-63.
- 7. Foreman RD, Blair RW, Weber RN. Viscerosomatic convergence onto T2–T4 spinoreticular, spinoreticular-spinothalamic, and spinothalamic tract neurons in the cat. Experimental neurology. 1984;85(3):597-619.
- 8. Traub RJ, Sengupta JN, Gebhart GF. Differential c-fos expression in the nucleus of the solitary tract and

- spinal cord following noxious gastric distention in the rat. Neuroscience. 1996;74(3):873-84.
- 9. Bruggemann J, Shi T, Apkarian AV. Squirrel monkey lateral thalamus. II. Viscerosomatic convergent representation of urinary bladder, colon, and esophagus. J Neuro Sci. 1994;14(11):6796-814.
- 10. Drewes AM, Dimcevski G, Sami SA, Funch-Jensen P, Huynh KD, Le Pera D, et al. The "human visceral homunculus" to pain evoked in the oesophagus,

stomach, duodenum and sigmoid colon. Experimental brain research. 2006;174(3):443-52.

**Cite this article as:** Ferris BWC. Appendicitis presenting as LUQ pain in an anatomically normal patient: a case study. Int Surg J 2018;5:3775-7.