https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.10.2024.6087-6092



duration and residual abscess volume at discharge did not differ significantly between treatment groups. Notably, pigtail catheterization reduced hospital stay for abscesses >150 ml but prolonged it for abscesses <150 ml.

Conclusion

Percutaneous pigtail catheter drainage should be considered for managing liver abscesses. Specifically, its use in abscesses >150 ml showed improved clinical outcomes.

Keywords: liver abscess, pyogenic, amoebic, pigtail catheter drainage, percutaneous needle aspiration.

Volume 6, Issue 10, 2024

Received : 17 Apr 2024

Accepted : 09 Jun 2024

doi: 10.48047/AFJBS.6.10.2024.6087-6092

Introduction

A liver abscess is a collection of pus within the liver, typically caused by microorganisms transferred through the bloodstream or the biliary system. The primary causes are amoebic or pyogenic infections, and occasionally a combination of both. In developed countries, polymicrobial pyogenic abscesses are frequent, whereas in tropical countries, amoebic abscesses predominate. Despite improvements in health care standards, both amoebic and pyogenic liver abscesses remain significant causes of morbidity and mortality in tropical and subtropical regions worldwide. [1]

The primary modality of treatment for liver abscesses is antimicrobial therapy, with additional radiologically guided drainage procedures when needed. However, approximately one-fifth of patients do not respond adequately to antibiotics alone. Modern diagnostic tools such as ultrasound and CT scans have significantly improved early detection and treatment of liver abscesses.[2]

Pigtail catheter drainage (PCD) and percutaneous needle aspiration (PNA) are increasingly recognized as effective interventions, especially for large abscess cavities, that do not respond to conservative antibiotic treatment. Current evidence supports a preference for pigtail catheterization in managing liver abscesses.[3]

Materials and methods

Our study is record based and includes patients admitted and treated from January 2022 to June 2023 at Department of surgery at MIMS Teaching hospital. A total of 62 patient records with confirmed liver abscess diagnoses were considered. Data of clinical features, suspected risk factors, investigation reports, treatment modalities and outcomes were collected. Patients who were serology positive for E. histolytica, negative pus c/s reports, positive stool microscopy for amoebic trophozoites and cysts and USG characteristics of smooth wall homogenous cavity with no internal echoes, had been treated as amoebic etiology. Positive pus culture and/or blood culture for bacteria and ultrasonography characteristics of poorly demarcated hypoechoic cavity with internal echoes had been treated as of pyogenic origin. Mixed etiology (amoebic and pyogenic) was considered if both were positive.

All patients had received empirical antibiotics i.e. i.v ceftriaxone (1 gm bid) and metronidazole (500 mg tid) during hospitalization. Antibiotics had been modified as per culture sensitivity and when nonresponsive to empirical therapy. Records were pooled into 3 groups based on the treatment undergone.

Group A is of patients who had received conservative management in the form of intravenous antibiotics only, Group B includes patients who underwent percutaneous needle aspiration (PNA) and Group C includes those who underwent pigtail catheter drainage (PCD). Details of post procedure recovery, residual collection in the abscess cavity on USG and duration of hospital stay in days were noted for outcome analysis. Records of Patients aged <18 years and of those undergoing surgical intervention in the form of laparotomy or laparoscopy for ruptured liver abscess were excluded.

All patients recovered and were discharged, with the duration of hospital stay in days used for outcome assessment.

Statistical analysis of data was performed using SPSS version 2.0 (IBM Corp). Continuous variables were expressed as mean (\pm standard deviation), while categorical variables were presented as numbers and percentages. The ANOVA test and Pearson's coefficient were used to find out the statistical significance and assess associations of variables.

Results

A Total of 96 patients diagnosed and treated for liver abscess were analysed. The mean age of the study population was 41.16 ± 17 years, with a predominance of males (93.75%). Alcohol intake and smoking were the most commonly associated risk factors. Abdominal pain was the predominant presenting complaint (84.3%), followed by fever (78%). The most common sign was right hypochondrial tenderness (Table 1).

Table 1

Total Patients: 96	Parameters	Number
Gender	Male	90 (93.75%)
	Female	6 (6.25%)
Risk Factors	Alcoholic	59 (61.8%)
	Smoking	57 (59.4%)
	Diabetic	9 (9.4%)
	Amoebic	75 (78%)
Etiology	Pyogenic	9 (9.38%)
	Mixed	12 (12.5%)
	Pain abdomen	81 (84.3%)
Symptoms	Fever	75 (78%)
	Anorexia	60 (62.5%)
	Nausea/vomiting	39 (40.6%)
	Weight loss	39 (40.6%)
Signs	Pallor	8 (8.3%)
	Icterus	8 (8.3%)
	Ascites	12 (12.5%)
	Pleural effusion	29 (30.2%)

Demography, etiology, and clinical profile of patients with a liver abscess

Right lobe was the commonest site of abscess (80%), followed by bi-lobar involvement (8%), and multiple abscesses were observed in 12% of patients. The etiology was identified as amoebic infection in 78%, pyogenic bacteria in 9.4%, and mixed in 12.5%. All patients received antibiotic therapy.

Percutaneous needle aspiration (PNA) was performed in 12 patients (18.8%), and pigtail drainage was used in 35 patients (54.7%). The decision for intervention was based on clinical judgment involving both the clinician and interventional radiologist.

Demographic, laboratory, and management data were analyzed across three treatment groups (Table 2). The mean abscess volume in Group C (330 ± 224.6 ml) was significantly higher compared to Group A (110 ± 64.1 ml; p=0.03) and Group B (151 ± 142.7 ; p=0.024). However,

there was no significant difference in abscess volume between Group A and Group B (p=0.26). The duration of hospital stay and residual abscess volume at discharge did not show significant differences between the treatment groups (Table 2).

Comparative analysis of data between treatment strategies groups						
Variable	Total (96)	Group A(26)	Group B(18)	Group C(52)	P Value	
Age	43±16.7	40±18.6	43±16.2	44±15.6	0.57	
Duration of	17.1 ± 10	13.7±14	17±7.4	19.1±8.7	0.28	
Hospital Stay						
Hb	11.1±2.2	13.4±1.8	11.2±1.5	10.8±2.2	0.003	
TLC	15211±6125	14047±6212	12221±6024	16221±5008	0.16	
Total Bilirubin	1.5±1.0	0.8±0.7	1.2±0.9	1.7±1.2	0.22	
Abscess Volume	240 ± 197.6	110±64.1	151±142.7	330±224.6	0.001	
at admission						
Abscess Volume	22±14	15±17.2	14.6±14.2	20.7±16.1	0.28	
at Discharge						
Duration Of iv	23±8	20±7.1	24±8	25±9	0.27	
Antibiotics						

Table 2

Comparative analysis of data between treatment strategies groups

On analyzing the association between duration of hospital stay and treatment strategies based on liver abscess volume at admission, pigtail catheter drainage (PCD) for abscess volumes < 150 ml was significantly associated with an increased duration of hospital stay (p = 0.012). However, PCD for abscess volumes between 150-300 ml did not show a significant increase in hospital stay duration.

Discussion

Liver abscesses are a critical health concern in tropical regions. They are commonly caused by E. histolytica (amoebic), bacteria (pyogenic), and Mycobacterium tuberculosis.[5] Amoebic liver abscesses are particularly prevalent in these areas, with over 50 million cases and 100,000 deaths annually.[6-7] In this study, 80% of cases involved the right lobe, consistent with previous research. The etiology was 78% amoebic. The disease is more common in younger individuals, highlighting the need for effective treatment to reduce morbidity and mortality in this age group. Common symptoms include abdominal pain, fever, loss of appetite, and weight loss.[9] Ultrasound has made diagnosing liver abscesses easier, Interventional radiology has made percutaneous treatments like needle aspiration (PNA) or catheter drainage (PCD) for managing liver abscesses, preferable. In this study, Group C (PCD group) had a significantly larger mean cavity volume compared to Groups A and B, yet had similar hospital stays and antibiotic therapy durations. Various randomized control trials have compared PCD and PNA, with mixed results. Three trials found PCD preferable for abscesses larger than 10 cm.[10,13,14] Yu et al. found no significant difference in hospital stay and clinical outcomes between PCD and PNA for abscesses around 5 cm, while Zerem and Hadzic preferred PNA for smaller abscesses. [11,12] A meta-analysis by Cai YL favoured PCD, citing a lower success rate for PNA due to the need for multiple aspirations in larger abscesses and the risk of re-accumulation. [4]. The success rate of PNA is probably low due to the need for multiple aspirations in larger cavity sized abscesses and the risk of re-accumulation. On analysis of effect of abscess volume and treatment strategies on the duration of hospital stay, PCD was found to be effective for abscess drainage if the volume was >150 ml. However in abscess volumes <150 ml, it was associated with higher duration of hospital stay. Kulhari M et al. reported better clinical outcomes with PCD over PNA in the patients with approximately similar volumes of liver abscess (293.2±130.3 mL in the PCD group and 291.4±138.8 mL in the PNA group, P = 0.925)[14]. Rajak et al. also showed that higher abscess volume was associated with PNA failure [10].

In this study, conservative management was not found to be inferior to PNA for the duration of hospitalization and duration of antibiotics used even when abscess volume was similar in both groups (110 ± 64.1 vs 151 ± 142.7 ml, p = 0.28).

PCD-related complications were major issues in previous reports [17]. There were no significant complications found due to PCD in this study. The recent studies also favour that complication rates were not significantly different in PCD vs PNA in the management of liver abscesses [18], while PCD reduces cavity size and abscess volume faster and is associated with fewer complications than PNA.

Retrospective nature of this study and selection bias regarding the preferable use of pigtail catheterization in patients with large abscess volumes are its major limitations.

Conclusions

Liver abscess commonly affects young and middle-aged men. Percutaneous drainage can shorten the duration of antibiotic treatment and hospital stays. Percutaneous catheter drainage (PCD) has become the preferred method for managing liver abscesses. Both pigtail catheterization and percutaneous needle aspiration (PNA) improve clinical outcomes and reduce morbidity for abscess volumes greater than 150 ml. Pigtail catheterization is particularly more effective than PNA for abscesses larger than 300 ml.

References

1. Treatment of liver abscess: prospective randomized comparison of catheter drainage and needle aspiration. Singh S, Chaudhary P, Saxena N, Khandelwal S, Poddar DD, Biswal UC. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3959473/ *Ann*

Gastroenterol. 2013;26:332–339. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

2. Liver abscesses: factors that influence outcome of percutaneous drainage. Haider SJ, Tarulli M, McNulty NJ, Hoffer EK. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2017;209:205–213. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

3. Sayek I, Onat D. *Surgical and Evidence-Based and Problem-Oriented*. Munich: Zuckschwerdt; 2001. Pyogenic and amebic liver abscess. [Google Scholar]

4. Percutaneous needle aspiration versus catheter drainage in the management of liver abscess: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Cai YL, Xiong XZ, Lu J, et al. *HPB* (*Oxford*) 2015;17:195–201. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

5. Clinical, laboratory, and management profile in patients of liver abscess from northern India. Ghosh S, Sharma S, Gadpayle AK, Gupta HK, Mahajan RK, Sahoo R, Kumar N. *J Trop Med.* 2014;2014:142382. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

6. Estimating the impact of amebiasis on health. Petri WA, Haque R, Lyerly D, Vines RR. *Trends Parasitol*. 2000;16:320–321. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

7. Amebic liver abscess. Hughes MA, Petri WA. *Infect Dis Clin North Am.* 2000;14:565–582. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

8. Percutaneous treatment of large pyogenic liver abscess. Abusedera MA, El-Badry AM. *Egypt J RadiolNucl Med.* 2014;45:109–115. [Google Scholar]

9. Liver abscess in adults: ten years experience in a UK centre. Mohsen AH, Green ST, Read RC, McKendrick MW. *QJM*. 2002;95:797–802. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

10. Percutaneous treatment of liver abscesses: needle aspiration versus catheter drainage. Rajak CL, Gupta S, Jain S, Chawla Y, Gulati M, Suri S. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1998;170:1035–1039. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

11. Treatment of pyogenic liver abscess: prospective randomized comparison of catheter drainage and needle aspiration. Yu SC, Ho SS, Lau WY, Yeung DT, Yuen EH, Lee PS, Metreweli C. *Hepatology*. 2004;39:932–938. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

12. Sonographically guided percutaneous catheter drainage versus needle aspiration in the management of pyogenic liver abscess. Zerem E, Hadzic A. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2007;189:0–42. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

13. Comparative study of catheter drainage and needle aspiration in management of large liver abscesses. Singh O, Gupta S, Moses S, Jain DK. *Indian J Gastroenterol*. 2009;28:88–92. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

14. Prospective randomized comparative study of pigtail catheter drainage versus percutaneous needle aspiration in treatment of liver abscess. Kulhari M, Mandia R. *ANZ J Surg.* 2019;89:0–6. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

15. Amoebic liver abscess: a comparative study of needle aspiration versus conservative treatment. Zafar A, Ahmed S. https://ayubmed.edu.pk/JAMC/PAST/14-1/Arshad.htm *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad*. 2002;14:10–12. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

16. Outcomes of a conservative approach to management in amoebic liver abscess. Kale S, Nanavati AJ, Borle N, Nagral S. *J Postgrad Med.* 2017;63:16–20. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

17. A comparative study of conservative management versus ultrasound-guided aspiration of small amoebic liver abscess. Musa O, Khan MF, Shukla BN, Ansari NA, Rathore B. *Era J. Med. Res.* 2020;7:165–171. [Google Scholar]

18. Amoebic liver abscess: presentation and complications. Mukhopadhyay M, Saha AK, Sarkar A, Mukherjee S. *Indian J Surg.* 2010;72:37–41. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]