

University of Dundee

Spot urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid is not an ideal diagnostic test for acute appendicitis

Rao, Ahsan ; Wilson, Michael; Kennedy, Gwen; Mittapalli, Devender; Tait, Iain; Alijani, Afshin

Published in:
American Journal of Emergency Medicine

DOI:
[10.1016/j.ajem.2016.05.059](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2016.05.059)

Publication date:
2016

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Rao, A., Wilson, M., Kennedy, G., Mittapalli, D., Tait, I., & Alijani, A. (2016). Spot urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid is not an ideal diagnostic test for acute appendicitis. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 34(9), 1750-1753. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2016.05.059>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Spot urinary 5-HIAA is not an ideal diagnostic test for acute appendicitis

Ahsan Rao¹, Michael Wilson¹, Gwen Kennedy², Devender Mittapalli¹, Iain Tait¹, Afshin Alijani¹

1. Department of Surgery, Ninewells hospital and Medical School, Dundee, UK, DD2 9SY
2. Immunoassay Biomarker Core Laboratory, School of Medicine, Ninewells Hospital and Medical School, Dundee, DD1 9SY

Corresponding author:

Mr. Ahsan Rao, Department of Surgery, Ninewells hospital and Medical School, Dundee, UK, DD2 9SY

Tel: 00 44 7505307503 Fax: 00 44 1382 646042 email: a.rao@imperial.ac.uk

Funding: The research project was funded by National Health Service Tayside and University of Dundee Medical School, Dundee, UK.

Type of submission: original article

Keywords: Acute appendicitis, diagnostic test, urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid

Short title: 5-HIAA is not an ideal test for appendicitis

Conflict of interest: None declared

Spot urinary 5-HIAA is not an ideal diagnostic test for acute appendicitis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Abstract**

2
3
4 **Background and purpose of the study**

5
6 There is growing evidence to suggest the use of urinary 5-HIAA (5-hydroxyindoleacetic
7 acid) test to help with the diagnosis of appendicitis. The aim of our study was to establish
8 whether urinary 5-HIAA could be used as an effective diagnostic test for acute
9 appendicitis.
10

11
12
13 **Design and Methods**

14
15 A prospective double-blinded study was carried out from December 2014 to October
16 2015. Patients admitted to the emergency surgical ward of a teaching hospital with
17 suspected appendicitis were included in the study. The diagnostic accuracy of the test
18 was measured by ROC curve.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Results**

25
26
27 Ninety-seven patients were divided into two groups: acute appendicitis (n=38) and other
28 diagnosis (n=59). The median value of urinary 5-HIAA was 24.19 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ (range 5.39-
29 138.27) for acute appendicitis vs. 18.87 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ (range 2.27-120.59) for other diagnosis
30 group (p 0.038). The sensitivity and specificity of urinary 5-HIAA at a cut-off value of 19
31 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ was 71% and 50% respectively. ROC analysis showed that the area under curve
32 (AUC) was 0.64 (CI 0.513 – 0.737) for urinary 5-HIAA, which was lower than white blood
33 cell count (0.69, CI 0.574 – 0.797), neutrophil count (0.68, CI 0.565 – 0.792) and C-
34 reactive protein (0.76, CI 0.657 – 0.857). There was no significant difference in the
35 median values of 5-HIAA between different grades of severity of appendicitis (p 0.704).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Conclusion**

45
46 Urinary 5-HIAA is not an ideal test for the diagnosis of acute appendicitis.
47
48

49 **Keywords**

50
51
52 Acute appendicitis, diagnostic test, urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

1
2
3 Acute appendicitis is one of the most common surgical emergency, especially in children
4
5 and young adults (1, 2). Seven percent of the population will develop appendicitis at
6
7 some point during their lifetime (1). This condition is treated urgently because
8
9 progression of the disease leads to life-threatening complications like sepsis, perforation
10
11 and peritonitis (3, 4). The standard treatment of appendicitis is appendectomy.
12
13
14

15
16 The diagnosis of appendicitis is difficult and only half of the cases are correctly identified
17
18 (5). The Alvarado scoring system, based on clinical observations and biochemistry
19
20 measurements, has been used to aid in diagnosis of appendicitis (6). However, the
21
22 presenting signs and symptoms vary according to the position of appendix and non-
23
24 classical symptoms are common (7). Many patients undergo unnecessary appendectomy
25
26 and are found to have a normal appendix (8). Computed tomography imaging has high
27
28 sensitivity but it exposes children and women of childbearing age to extensive ionising
29
30 radiation⁹. Ultrasound is associated with low sensitivity and specificity (9, 10).
31
32
33
34
35

36 Previous studies have indicated that appendix is enriched with enterochromaffin cells
37
38 (11). These cells are densely concentrated with serotonin. Ninety-five percent of
39
40 serotonin is secreted from enterochromaffin cells in the gut (11). In addition, lamina
41
42 propria of appendix also contains enterochromaffin cells secreting serotonin. Once
43
44 serotonin is secreted in the system, 90% is metabolised in the liver and remaining in
45
46 lung and kidney. 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid (5-HIAA) is the main metabolite of
47
48 serotonin and mainly discarded in the urine (12).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

High levels of serotonin and 5-HIAA are associated with appendicular pathology (12).

1
2 Induced appendicitis in rabbits causes a significant rise in 5-HIAA compared to controls
3
4 (12). There is growing evidence to suggest the use of spot urinary 5-HIAA test to
5
6 diagnose appendicitis (13). The aim of our study was to establish whether urinary 5-
7
8 HIAA could be used as an effective diagnostic test for appendicitis. Our second objective
9
10 was to determine if there was an association between urinary 5-HIAA and the degree of
11
12 inflammation of appendicitis based on histopathological grading and Alvarado score.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Methods

Participants

1 This was a double-blinded prospective study conducted from December 2014 to October
2
3
4 2015 at the emergency surgical unit in a large teaching hospital. All patients admitted
5
6 with right iliac fossa pain and presumptive diagnosis of acute appendicitis were asked to
7
8 participate in the study. Patients were excluded if they were taking drugs interfering
9
10 with serotonin levels, such as, Monoamine Oxidase Inhibitors (MAOI), Serotonin and
11
12 Norepinephrine Re-uptake Inhibitors (SNRI), and Lithium. Past medical and drug history
13
14 was noted. Patient consent to participate was obtained once the patient had received
15
16 initial treatment, and necessary blood and urine tests were taken. The urine samples
17
18 were collected within 24 hours of the time of admission and before any surgery was
19
20 performed. The ethical approval to conduct the study was obtained from National Ethics
21
22 Committee, Health Research Authority UK.
23
24
25
26
27

Samples

28
29 Once collected, the urine samples were acidified by 12N HCl and stored at -70 C.
30
31
32 Samples were analysed using ELISA (enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay) technique.
33
34
35 The sample analysis was conducted on ALPCO 5-HIAA ELISA. When compared to HPLC
36
37 (high performance liquid chromatography), its methodology has shown strong
38
39 correlation ($r=0.99$, $n=47$). The sample size of 35 patients was estimated¹¹ to provide
40
41 sensitivity of 98% with confidence interval of 95% and accuracy of 0.05% for urinary 5-
42
43 HIAA.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Other diagnostic tests used to aid in diagnosis of acute appendicitis were also recorded;
52
53 white cell count (wcc), neutrophil count, C-reactive protein (CRP) and Alvarado score.
54
55 Alvarado score is based on clinical observations and biochemistry measurements and
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

ranges from 1 to 10; a score of 5 or 6 are suggestive of appendicitis, while score of more than 7 indicates high probability of acute appendicitis.

Data analysis

Medical information was retrieved from the admission records. This included patient's presenting complaint, duration of symptoms, age, past medical history, current medications, and final diagnosis. Results from haematological and biochemical tests along with histopathology reports were acquired from electronic medical records.

Grading of acute appendicitis was based on the same staging system used in earlier studies (11, 14). The categories of acute appendicitis were mild acute appendicitis, acute appendicitis with peritonitis/perforation, acute necrotising appendicitis, and acute gangrenous appendicitis (11, 14).

SPSS v.22 program was used to perform statistical analysis. A descriptive analysis was obtained for patients included in the study. Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted to check for normal distribution of dependent variables, such as, urinary 5-HIAA, wcc, neutrophil count, CRP and Alvarado score ($P < 0.001$). It showed that the data was non-parametric. Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis test was used for comparison of two and more than two groups respectively. Receiver Operating Characteristic curve (ROC curve) was used to plot graph for sensitivity and specificity of urinary 5-HIAA test and other diagnostic tests. Patients who underwent laparoscopy and appendectomy, intra-operative findings and histopathology of specimen were used as gold standard tests to check diagnostic accuracy of urinary 5-HIAA and other biochemistry tests, however, for those who did not have an operation, CT scan was used. In order to measure sensitivity

and specificity of combination of more than two diagnostic tests, binary logistic regression analysis was performed and the combined predictive score derived from it was used to generate ROC curve (15). The graph of ROC was plotted for sensitivity against specificity, and the area under curve (AUC) was calculated. It measured the probability of correctly diagnosing a patient in a test group. The value of AUC ranged from 0.5 to 1.0. The ability of diagnostic test to identify patients with appendicitis was considered optimal as AUC value reached closer to 1.0.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

104 patients were initially recruited, 7 subsequently withdrew consent. The outcome of 97 patients is presented in *Figure 1*. The study population included 33 males and 64 female participants. The average age of patient population was 35.86.

There were 38 cases of acute appendicitis based on intra-operative, CT or histological findings. Of those, 37 cases were treated with appendectomy and one patient was treated with intravenous antibiotics. Based on clinical findings these patients required diagnostic laparoscopy, however, intra-operatively, 12 cases were found to have mild appendicitis and underwent appendectomy. The final diagnoses in the comparison group of 59 patients included: non-specific abdominal pain (n=33), ruptured ovarian cyst (n=5), constipation (n=4), renal colic (n=3), urinary tract infection (n=3), mittelschmerz (n=2), gastroenteritis (n=2), chronic abdominal pain (n=1), intra-abdominal adhesions (n=1), irritable bowel syndrome (n=1), mesenteric adenitis (n=1), gastritis (n=1), colitis (n=1), and tubo-ovarian abscess (n=1). Most of these patients (n=51) were treated conservatively, which involved supportive treatment with fluid resuscitation, analgesia and anti-emetic. Patients with urinary tract infection were also given antibiotics and those with constipation were administered laxatives. The remaining 8 patients who underwent diagnostic laparoscopy were found to have a normal appendix. Half of them had other intra-abdominal pathology that required surgical intervention. None of these patients developed intra-operative complication, however, one of these patients developed post-operative chest infection. The patient was successfully treated with antibiotics.

1 The comparison was made between 2 groups: acute appendicitis and other diagnosis
2 (*Table 1*). The median value of urinary 5-HIAA was 24.19 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ (range 5.39-138.27) for
3 acute appendicitis vs. 18.87 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ (range 2.27-120.59) for other diagnosis group (p
4 0.038).

5
6
7
8 The sensitivity and specificity of urinary 5-HIAA at cut-off value of 19 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ was 71%
9 and 50% respectively. The cut-off value was chosen to provide optimum combination of
10 sensitivity and specificity. The sensitivity and specificity of other blood tests are also
11 shown in *Table 2*. The ROC analysis showed that AUC was 0.64 (CI 0.513 – 0.737) for
12 urinary 5-HIAA test, which was lower than wcc (0.69 CI 0.574 – 0.797), neutrophil count
13 (0.68 CI 0.565 – 0.792) and CRP (0.76 CI 0.657 – 0.857) (*Figure 2*).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 The ROC analysis showed that AUC was 0.76 (CI 0.663 – 0.868) for combination of other
27 diagnostic tests (wcc, neutrophil count, CRP). The AUC value was 0.77 (CI 0.654 – 0.858)
28 when 5-HIAA was combined with other diagnostic tests (wcc, neutrophil count and CRP).
29
30 Sensitivity and specificity for the combination of diagnostic test were 71% and 74%
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

	Final diagnosis				
	Other diagnosis		Acute appendicitis		P value
	Median	Range	Median	Range	
5-HIAA ($\mu\text{mol/L}$)	18.87	(2.27-120.59)	24.19	(5.29-138.27)	0.038
White cell count ($\times 10^9/\text{L}$)	9.50	(5.20-20.20)	12.50	(3.80-23.90)	0.002
Neutrophil count ($\times 10^9/\text{L}$)	6.25	(3.40-17.10)	10.55	(1.80-20.90)	0.002
CRP (mg/L)	4.00	(4.00-334.00)	38.00	(4.00-434.00)	<0.001

Table 1. Comparison of mean values of different diagnostic tests in two groups.

Diagnostic test	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	AUC
5-HIAA ($\mu\text{mol/L}$)	71%	50%	49%	76%	0.64
WCC ($\times 10^9/\text{L}$)	68%	52%	47%	58%	0.69
CRP (mg/L)	84%	59%	56%	85%	0.76
Neutrophil count ($\times 10^9/\text{L}$)	55%	84%	69%	74%	0.69
Alvarado score	68%	64%	52%	76%	0.64

Table 2. Sensitivity and specificity of different diagnostic test for acute appendicitis (PPV: positive predictive value, NPV: negative predictive value, AUC: area under curve).

Grade of Appendicitis	Median	N	Range
Mild	31.11	12	(5.29-89.35)
Peritonitis	20.85	21	(5.66-138.27)
Necrotizing	27.36	4	(19.07-44.47)
Gangrenous	9.58	1	-

Table 3. Median value of urinary 5-HIAA for different grades of acute appendicitis (p 0.328).

Discussion

1
2 There was no significant difference in median values of urinary 5-HIAA for patients with
3
4 acute appendicitis and those with other diagnosis. The diagnostic test had low sensitivity
5
6 and specificity, and its combination with other diagnostic tests did not improve its
7
8 diagnostic ability. Similarly, there was no significant correlation between the levels of 5-
9
10 HIAA and degree of severity of acute appendicitis.
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 Previous studies have reported various sensitivity and specificity values for urinary 5-
18
19 HIAA. Most of the earliest evidence supporting the use of urinary 5-HIAA was obtained
20
21 from animal studies (12, 16). Studies conducted on human participants compared
22
23 patients with acute appendicitis to normal healthy individuals (13). This was not an ideal
24
25 comparative group, as the test should distinguish true acute appendicitis from other
26
27 diagnoses with a similar clinical presentation. Most previous studies did not mention the
28
29 use of statistical tests to evaluate the predictive ability of the test (17). They had merely
30
31 calculated differences of mean of 5-HIAA between different groups (17). Moreover, they
32
33 chose different cut-off values for 5-HIAA to predict sensitivity and specificity to provide
34
35 optimum results (17).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The results from our study were similar to a recent study that has evaluated diagnostic
45
46 ability of urinary 5-HIAA for acute appendicitis (11). The diagnostic test was found to
47
48 have low sensitivity and specificity. Jangjoo *et al.* compared urinary 5-HIAA levels of
49
50 patients with acute appendicitis and those with similar clinical presentation. It showed
51
52 sensitivity and specificity of 44% and 81%, respectively, at cut-off value of 27.56 $\mu\text{mol/L}$
53
54
55
56 (11).
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 However, the study was based on only 70 participants and assumed sample distribution
2
3 to be parametric without mentioning outcome of appropriate statistical test.
4
5
6
7

8 Area under curve (AUC) value used in ROC curve was an important statistical test to
9 suggest whether or not a test had strong diagnostic ability (13). AUC Value of 0.60 - 0.70
10 and 0.70 – 0.80 for a test indicates poor and fair diagnostic ability respectively. On the
11 other hand, AUC value of 0.80 and above suggests good diagnostic ability. The AUC value
12 for urinary 5-HIAA test was only 0.64. When combined with other tests, the diagnostic
13 ability improved with the AUC value of 0.77. However, 5-HIAA test was not a significant
14 contributor to improvement in AUC value as the combination of WCC, neutrophil count
15 and CRP test without 5-HIAA has the AUC value of 0.76. Hence, 5-HIAA only caused the
16 increase in AUC value from 0.76 to 0.77 when combined with other tests. In our study,
17 CRP had higher sensitivity (84%) than 5-HIAA test and the specificity of 5-HIAA test was
18 lowest of all tests.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Evidence for the use of urinary 5-HIAA was based on cytopathology evidence that the
39 appendix contains numerous serotonin secreting cells (18). 5-HIAA levels should rise
40 with severity of inflammation but then fall once the appendix becomes gangrenous and
41 serotonin-secreting cells die. In our study, there was no significant difference between
42 median values of different stages of acute appendicitis. There was only one case of
43 gangrenous appendix, which showed low levels of urinary 5-HIAA. Similarly, there was
44 no association between inflammatory markers (WCC and CRP) and levels of urinary 5-
45 HIAA in patients with acute appendicitis.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Our study had certain limitations. We did not perform analysis on healthy individuals;
2
3 however, our intention was to evaluate the diagnostic role of urinary 5-HIAA to
4
5 distinguish acute appendicitis from its differential diagnosis with similar clinical
6
7 presentation. Since the study was not randomised, it was prone to selection bias. The
8
9 cut-off for diagnostic test of 5-HIAA differed from previous studies. In a previous study,
10
11 the cut-off value for the diagnostic test was 20 $\mu\text{mol/L}$, however, the comparison was
12
13 made between patients with acute appendicitis and healthy individuals (19). The cut-off
14
15 value of 5-HIAA in the study was obtained from ROC curve to provide optimum
16
17 sensitivity and specificity.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In conclusion, urinary 5-HIAA test does not aid in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis.
27
28 Even when used in combination with other routine diagnostic tests, its clinical usefulness
29
30 is of no benefit.
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Acknowledgement**

37
38
39 We would like to thank Professor Jill Belch for her support with applying for funding and
40
41 organizing research laboratory facilities for the analysis to be conducted.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Reference

1. Chandrasekaran TV, Johnson N. Acute appendicitis. *Surgery (United Kingdom)*. 2014;**32**:413-17.
2. Cheong LH, Emil S. Outcomes of pediatric appendicitis: An international comparison of the united states and canada. *JAMA Surgery*. 2014;**149**:50-55.
3. Sahm M, Pross M, Lippert H. Acute appendicitis - changes in epidemiology, diagnosis and therapy. *Zentralblatt fur Chirurgie - Zeitschrift fur Allgemeine, Viszeral- und Gefasschirurgie*. 2011;**136**:18-24.
4. Markar SR, Pinto D, Penna M, Karthikesalingam A, Bulathsinghala BK, Kumaran K, et al. A comparative international study on the management of acute appendicitis between a developed country and a middle income country. *International Journal of Surgery*. 2014;**12**:357-60.
5. Jones PF. Suspected acute appendicitis: Trends in management over 30 years. *Br J Surg*. 2001;**88**:1570-77.
6. Douglas CD, Macpherson NE, Davidson PM, Gani JS. Randomised controlled trial of ultrasonography in diagnosis of acute appendicitis, incorporating the alvarado score. *Br Med J*. 2000;**321**:919-22A.
7. See TC, Watson CJE, Arends MJ, Ng CS. Atypical appendicitis: The impact of CT and its management. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Oncology*. 2008;**52**:140-47.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
8. Khairy G. Acute appendicitis: Is removal of a normal appendix still existing and can we reduce its rate? *Saudi Journal of Gastroenterology*. 2009;**15**:167-70.
 9. Bachar I, Perry ZH, Dukhno L, Mizrahi S, Kirshtein B. Diagnostic value of laparoscopy, abdominal computed tomography, and ultrasonography in acute appendicitis. *Journal of Laparoendoscopic and Advanced Surgical Techniques*. 2013;**23**:982-89.
 10. Schreiner M, Spazier M, Wayand W. Diagnosis of acute appendicitis over two decades - effects of increasing number of imaging procedures on costs, preoperative reliability and patient outcome. *Zentralblatt fur Chirurgie - Zeitschrift fur Allgemeine, Viszeral- und Gefasschirurgie*. 2010;**135**:336-39.
 11. Jangjoo A, Varasteh A, Bahar MM, Meibodi TN, Esmaili H, Nazeri N, et al. Is urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid helpful for early diagnosis of acute appendicitis? *Am J Emerg Med*. 2012;**30**:540-44.
 12. Apak S, Kazez A, Ozel SK, Ustundag B, Akpolat N, Kizirgil A. Spot urine 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid levels in the early diagnosis of acute appendicitis. *J Pediatr Surg*. 2005;**40**:1436-39.
 13. Bolandparvaz S, Vasei M, Owji AA, Ata-Ee N, Amin A, Daneshbod Y, et al. Urinary 5-hydroxy indole acetic acid as a test for early diagnosis of acute appendicitis. *Clin Biochem*. 2004;**37**:985-89.
 14. Herd ME, Cross PA, Dutt S. Histological audit of acute appendicitis. *J Clin Pathol*. 1992;**45**:456-58.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
15. Hanley JA. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) methodology: The state of the art. *Crit Rev Diagn Imaging*. 1989;**29**:307-35.
16. Menten O, Eryilmaz M, Halak A, Yaman H, Yigit T, Ongoru O, et al. The importance of urine 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid levels in the early diagnosis of acute appendicitis. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2009;**27**:409-12.
17. Sarhan HH, Hatroosh AF, Alobaidi AH. The role of urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid determination in diagnosis of acute appendicitis. *Journal of Investigational Biochemistry*. 2013;**2**:1-5.
18. Singh SM, Dean HG, Dedombal FT, Wilson DH, Flowers MW. Concentrations of serotonin in plasma - a test for appendicitis. *Clin Chem*. 1988;**34**:2572-74.
19. Hernandez R, Jain A, Rosiere L, Henderson S. A prospective clinical trial evaluating urinary 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid (5-HIAA) levels in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2006;**48**:S47-S48.

1
2 **Figure/table legends**
3
4

5 *Table 1. Comparison of mean values of different diagnostic tests in two groups.*
6

7
8 *Table 2. Sensitivity and specificity of different diagnostic test for acute appendicitis (PPV: positive predictive value, NPV: negative predictive value, AUC: area under curve).*
9

10
11 *Table 3. Median value of urinary 5-HIAA for different grades of acute appendicitis (p 0.328).*
12
13

14
15 *Figure 1. Patient recruitment to study groups and their final diagnosis.*
16

17
18 *Figure 2. ROC curve for urinary 5-HIAA compared to other diagnostic test. The curve more towards top left corner shows increased area under curve (AUC) and, hence, more predictive accuracy of diagnosis.*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 1. Patient recruitment to study groups and their final diagnosis.




Figure 2. ROC curve for urinary 5HIAA compared to other diagnostic test. The curve more towards top left corner shows increased area under curve (AUC) and, hence, more predictive accuracy of diagnosis.