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Abstract
The diagnosis of acute appendicitis is mainly based on clinical examination and various diagnostic scores are available. We compared Alvarado and RIPASA scoring systems for the diagnosis of acute appendicitis and their negative appendectomy rate in 100 patients of appendicitis.
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1. Introduction
Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha Appendicitis (RIPASA) is a new scoring system which has been developed for a better diagnosis of acute appendicitis. This score includes 14 clinical parameters which have higher sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy than Alvarado scoring system, especially in the Asian population [1].

It was developed in the Department of Surgery at Raja Isteri Pengiran Anak Saleha Hospital, Brunei Darussalam.

We compared RIPASA and ALVARADO scoring systems for the diagnosis of acute appendicitis their negative appendectomy rate.

2. Materials and Methods
2.1 Study design: Prospective observational comparative study in 100 patients admitted in RRMC.

2.2 Inclusion criteria: All patients suspected clinically to have appendicitis.

Exclusion criteria:
1. Age <20 and >60 years excluded from the study
2. Patient with appendicular lump
3. Patient with appendicular perforation
4. Pregnancy with appendicitis

Confirmation of acute appendicitis as the final diagnosis was obtained from histopathological analysis of the resected appendix and data was analysed using Chi Square test and respective P (<0.005) values to draw conclusion

3. Results
In our study, 83% patients were of <40yrs of age and 67% were males. All the patients presented with complaint of pain in Right iliac fossa. Migration of pain to right iliac fossa, anorexia, nausea-vomiting and fever were present in 94%, 88%, 78% and 36% patients respectively. All the patients were having tenderness and rebound tenderness.

When ALVARADO score was applied to all patients, 80 patients had their score ≥7 i.e. 80% patients had acute appendicitis and when RIPASA score was applied, 99 patients had their score >7.5 indicating that 99% patients had acute appendicitis.

A total of 100 patients under study were operated for appendicitis and according to ALVARADO SCORING SYSTEM it was confirmed histopathologically in 91 patients. 9 patients did not have evidence of appendicitis and were considered to have normal appendix histopathology.
According to Alvarado score >7, 80 patients were diagnosed to have appendicitis. Out of these 80 patients, only 75 patients had evidence of appendicitis histopathologically. 5 patients were falsely diagnosed to have appendicitis by Alvarado scoring system.
Out of 20 patients diagnosed by Alvarado score <7 as not having appendicitis, 16 patients were missed by this scoring system. However the findings were not statistically significant (Table no. 1).

According to RIPASA score >7.5, 99 patients were diagnosed to have appendicitis. Out of these 99, 91 patients had evidence of appendicitis histopathologically. 8 patients were falsely diagnosed to have appendicitis by RIPASA scoring system.
According to RIPASA score <7.5 Appendicitis was not found to be present in the only patient who was diagnosed on RIPASA scoring system as not having appendicitis. The findings were statistically significant (Table no. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P VALUE</th>
<th>0.0546 (&lt; 0.05)</th>
<th>NOT SIGNIFICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado score</td>
<td>NO OF PATIENTS</td>
<td>HPE NORMAL APPENDIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;7</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥7</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P VALUE</th>
<th>0.001394 (&lt; 0.05)</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIPASA score</td>
<td>No of Patients</td>
<td>HPE NORMAL APPENDIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;7.5</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥7.5</td>
<td>99 (100%)</td>
<td>8 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitivity of the Alvarado scoring system in the study was 82.42% and specificity came out to be 44.44%. The positive and negative predictive values were 93.75% and 20% respectively. Accuracy of the Alvarado scoring system was 79% in the studied population.
Sensitivity of the RIPASA scoring system in the study was 100% and specificity came out to be 11.11%. The positive and negative predictive values were 91.92% and 100% respectively. Accuracy of the RIPASA scoring system was 92% in the studied population.
The negative appendectomy rate was higher for the RIPASA scoring system (8.1%) as compared to the Alvarado scoring system (6.3%) with respect to the histopathology findings (Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATISTICAL PARAMETERS</th>
<th>ALVARADO SCORE</th>
<th>RIPASA SCORE</th>
<th>CHANG et al (N=144)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>82.42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive predictive value</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>91.92%</td>
<td>86.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative predictive value</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Appendectomy Rate</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Discussion
Appendicitis is a condition characterized by inflammation of appendix and prevalence rate of approximately 1 in 7 [2].
The first description of a case of appendicitis was by Fennel in 1554 [3]. In our study, the most common type of appendicitis was periappendicitis.
Several scoring systems, such as the Alvarado and modified Alvarado scoring system, have been introduced since 1986 to help with the clinical decision-making process in achieving an accurate diagnosis of acute appendicitis in the fastest and cheapest way [4, 5].
However, these two scoring systems were created in the West, and when applied in different environments, such as the Middle East and Asia, the sensitivity and specificity levels achieved were very low [6, 7].
Khan et al. applied the Alvarado scoring system in an Asian population and only achieved a sensitivity and specificity of 59% and 23%, respectively, with a negative appendectomy rate of 15.6% [7].
The accuracy in ALVARADO score was 79% which was similar to the studies done by Jawaid et al. and Erdem et al. and lower in the study done by Chong et al. Similarly and accuracy RIPASA score was 92% which was similar to the studies done by Chong et al. and Alnjadat et al. and higher than in the studies done by Erdem et al. [8, 9, 10].
Both the Alvarado and modified Alvarado scores lack parameters that have been shown to be important determinants in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis, such as age, gender and the duration of symptoms. Wani et al. have shown that the sensitivity and specificity of the Alvarado scoring system vary with age, gender and the duration of symptoms [11].
RIPASA scoring system was more sensitive but less specific than ALVARADO scoring system in diagnosis of acute appendicitis.
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