Factors Affecting Outcome in Patients of Fournier’s Gangrene- A Study

Authors

Dr Chandan Tiwari¹, Dr Ashutosh Silodia², Dr Dhananjaya Sharma³

¹M.S., Senior Resident, Department of Surgery, N.S.C.B. Medical College and Hospital, Jabalpur, India.
Contact: +91-8085201097, Email: drchandan80@gmail.com

²M.S., Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, N.S.C.B. Medical College and Hospital, Jabalpur, India

³M. S., PhD, DSc, FRCS (Glasgow), FRCS (Ireland), FRCS-T (Hon), FRCS (Edin), Professor and Head
Department of General Surgery, N.S.C.B. Medical College and Hospital, Jabalpur, India
Contact: +91-9425156445, Email: dhanshar@gmail.com
Corresponding Author

Dr A Silodia
M.S., Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, N.S.C.B. Medical College and Hospital, Jabalpur, India
Contact: + 91-9826178486, Email: silodiaashu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Fournier’s gangrene is a rapidly progressive necrotising fasciitis of genitalia, perineum and abdominal wall, that primarily involves subcutaneous tissue up to deep fascia. It is a vascular gangrene of infective origin. It is polymicrobial, synergistic infection caused by aerobic and anaerobic organism from colorectal, genitourinary or cutaneous infection. It has got high mortality rate and multiple factors on patient and treatment part affect outcome.

Material and Method: 74 patients with diagnosis of Fournier’s gangrene admitted from September 2014 to September 2015 and also which were admitted in last 10 years in our facility were studied by records. The variables studied were age, haemoglobin, haematocrit, TLC, duration between start of illness and presentation, random blood sugar, comorbidity, serum sodium, potassium, bicarbonate, creatinine, blood urea, pulse and respiratory rate, BP with history of hypertension, area involved, fever. Blood transfusion, pus culture, antibiotics given. All patients underwent extensive debridement and empirically antibiotics covering gram positive gram negative and anaerobes used subsequently changed after culture sensitivity. Demographic, Disease and Treatment related data is collected and analysed. Variables were compared in survivor and non-survivor group by using statistical methods.

Result & Conclusion: The most commonly affected were 40 and 70 years aged males. Disease affecting in early age was found more aggressive and extensive. Prognosis was found poor in patients presented with age > 45 years, lower mean haemoglobin and haematocrit, mean TLC value>15000/cumm, uncontrolled diabetes, high blood urea and creatinine, electrolyte imbalance. Ecoli was found to be most common organism. Elective use of more than one antibiotic covering whole spectrum of aerobic and anaerobic organism gives good outcome. The overall mortality came out to be 5.4%. Result indicates that aggressive management in these patients improves outcome.
Introduction
Fournier’s gangrene is a rapidly progressive necrotising fasciitis involving subcutaneous tissue of genital, perineum and abdominal wall. It was named after French dermatologist Alfred Fournier who first described it. It is a vascular gangrene having infective origin. Its a polymicrobial infection synergistically caused by aerobic and anaerobic organism from colorectal, genitourinary or cutaneous infection of genitals, perineum or anus. The organisms most commonly involved are Haemolytic streptococci, Staphylococci, E.coli, Clostridium welchii, Bacteroides fragillis. 

conditions predisposing for Fournier’s gangrene are
Generalised debilitating disease like-
- Diabetes mellitus,
- Chronic alcoholism,
- Malignancy,
- Radiotherapy and Chemotherapy,
- Aids/immunosuppression,
- Prolonged recumbency
- Chronic renal failure
Also few local factors which initiate disease are
- Local trauma,
- Periurethral urine leak.
- Perineal surgery,
- Paraphimosis.

Its incidence is maximum in middle and old age but can be seen in young age also.
Fournier’s gangrene involves scrotum, perineum, thighs, inguinal areas, abdominal wall, and chest wall up to axilla. 

Presentation
- Pain involving perineum,
- Scrotal and perineal edema,
- Erythema and crepitation
- Rapidly spreading cellulitis of scrotal, penile and perineal skin up to anterior abdominal wall.
- Pyrexia with other signs of sepsis.

Pathogenesis
Infection progresses and spread in potential space between superficial and deep fascia but spread is limited by attachment of these fascias. Disease involves structures present in this potential space like Inferior epigastric artery, Deep circumflex iliac artery and External pudendal artery which lie in campers fascia. Localized infection adjacent to a portal of entry is the inciting event in the development. Ultimately an obliterative endarteritis develops and the ensuing cutaneous and subcutaneous vascular necrosis leads to localized ischemia with tissue and fascial destruction at rate as high as 2-3 cm/hr. and further bacterial proliferation leading to sepsis.

There seems to be various factors which affect outcome in these patients and also few studies have done for this disease in which mortality rates varies from 5-20% enhance we studied patients of Fournier’s gangrene admitted in our hospital for same purpose to asses factors affecting outcome and mortality rate in our hospital.

Material and Method
Patients admitted in surgical ward from September 2014 to September 2015 along with available documents of patients who were treated in last 10 years in our facility were studied. The variables studied were
- Age,
- Haemoglobin,
- Haematocrit,
- TLC,
- Random blood sugar at presentation,
- Associated comorbidities,
- Serum sodium,
- Serum potassium,
- Serum bicarbonate,
- Serum creatinine,
- Blood urea,
- Pulse rate,
- Respiratory rate,
- BP with h/o hypertension,
- Area involved at presentation,
- Fever during stay,
- H/o of blood transfusion,
- Pus culture & antibiotics given.
Patients admitted during study period underwent extensive debridement of involved necrotic tissue at earliest and empirically given combination of antibiotics covering gram positive, negative and anaerobes and subsequently changed after culture and sensitivity results. Some patients needed multiple debridement while single patient also required diversion colostomy.

Data of patients who were treated previously in facility was collected and analysed from records including demographic, disease and treatment.

Two ends of study are kept i.e. survivors and non survivors groups. Various risk factors were compared in survivor and non-survivor group by using statistical methods. The data was compiled and entered in the Microsoft excel sheet. It was analysed using statistical software SPSS IBM (Chicago) version 21. The data was represented in tables and charts. The frequency was displayed of all variables and mean and standard deviation was calculated for quantitative variables.

Unpaired student t test was applied for comparing means of quantitative data and chi square test was applied for qualitative data.

The test was considered significant if p<0.05, at 95% confidence limit.

Results
During the study period total of 85 patients were included and their data collected. Among these 85 patients 11 were excluded from study as they took incomplete treatment. Hence finally total of 74 patients were included in study.

Baseline characteristics of both groups are shown in table form.

The most common age group involved was between 40 and 70 years i.e middle age group were more susceptible,

All patients found were males.

It was found that if disease occur in early age group it has more aggressive course with extensive involvement.

Patients belonging to higher age group i.e. above 45 years had poor outcome.

Mean haemoglobin and haematocrit values were found lower in case of non survivors group compared to survivors but p value in study does not came out to be significant.

Mean TLC value of survivors was lower than non survivors i.e. in non survivors mean TLC values came out to be >15000/cu mm but again p value does not came out to be significant.

High blood sugar with uncontrolled diabetes was found as predisposing factor and high Random blood sugar at time of admission warrants poor outcome also p value came out to be significant.

Among associated comorbidities Diabetes was most common while others were long standing hydrocele, paraplegia either traumatic or due to CVA, urinary fistulas, rectal prolapse but they cannot be used as predictor of outcome.

High blood urea and high creatinine i.e. presence of renal failure had poor outcome and p value came out to be significant.

Electrolyte imbalance at the time of admission predicts poor outcome also p value came out to be significant.

Debridement and other surgeries were carried out in both groups with equal frequency.

E.coli was found to be most common organism in pus culture.

Elective use of more than one antibiotic covering whole spectrum of aerobic and anaerobic organism preferably broad spectrum is done and gives good outcome.

The overall mortality came out to be 5.4%.
| S.NO | Parameter                                      | Mean Value In Survivors | Mean Value In Non Survivors | Normal range                  | Range in study patients | Z        | Significance     |
|------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------|
| 1    | Age                                           | 50.70                   | 56.25                       | NA                            | 20-70 years             | 0.48     | Not Significant  |
| 2    | Duration Between Start Of Illness And Presentation | 12.59                   | 12.50                       | NA                            | 1-15days                | 0.99     | Not Significant  |
| 3    | Haematocrit                                   | 31.73                   | 25.75                       | 37-47%                        | 16.5-50.1               | 0.25     | Not Significant  |
| 4    | Haemoglobin                                   | 10.30                   | 9.25                        | 11.5-16.5gm/dl                | 2.5-16.6                | 0.44     | Not Significant  |
| 5    | Total Leucocyte Count                         | 13128                   | 16050                       | 3000-11000cells/cumm          | 4200-35200              | 0.41     | Not Significant  |
| 6    | Random Blood Sugar                            | 121.57                  | 205.57                      | 80-140mg/dl                   | 61-419                  | .034     | Significant      |
| 7    | Serum Creatinine                              | 1.20                    | 2.75                        | 0.5-1.4mg/dl                  | 0.65-3.81               | <.001    | Significant      |
| 8    | Serum Sodium                                  | 140.54                  | 134.50                      | 135-155mmol/lt                | 133-150                 | .001     | Significant      |
| 9    | Serum Potassium                               | 4.16                    | 5.50                        | 3.8-5.0mmol/lit               | 3.5-5.6                 |          |                  |
| 10   | Blood Urea                                    | 50.81                   | 80.75                       | <40meq/dl                     | 18.7-137                | .022     | Significant      |
| 11   | SHOCK( With BP Recording)                     | Less Common             | More Common                 | Systolic bp>100mmhg           | 60 mm hg systolic-160/100mmhg | +/-     | Significant      |
| 12   | Area Involved At Presentation                 | Scrotum                 | Scrotum With Abdominal Wall And Thigh | NA            | NA            |          | Significant      |
| 13   | Fever During Stay                             | 94.3%                   | 5.7%                        | NA                            | NA                       | 0.63     | Not Significant  |
| 14   | Debridement Surgery                           | Done In 100% pts        | Done In 100% pts            | NA                            | NA                       |          | Difference Could Not Be Found |

**FOURNIERS GANGRENE-PRE OP PIC**
Discussion

Fournier’s gangrene is a rapidly progressing necrotising fasciitis of unknown aetiology. Outcome in these cases varies from 4-80% and depends on various factors which involve both patients’ part and treatment part. Among patient part middle age, predisposing factors like DM with high blood sugar level, renal dysfunction, Electrolyte imbalance and in treatment side early initiation of treatment, extensive debridement with antibiotic coverage using more than one antibiotics. Aggressive management of blood sugar level, electrolytes and renal function monitoring and management can improve survival.

Hari gopal Vyas et al1 concluded that Age>55years, higher the extent of area involved, Presence of septic shock at admission, TLC>15000/cu mm, visual analogue scale score>7 and FGSI score at admission>8 were significantly associated with higher mortality.

David Kearney2 found disease to be more common in old age and associated with comorbidities like immunosuppression, diabetes and alcoholism. Most common source of infection was genital and perineal infection. And disease is polymicrobial.

Feyzullah ersoz et al3 concluded that despite aggressive intervention such as multiple debridement, combination antibiotics therapy and various type of supportive treatment disease continue to have higher mortality. They also concluded that presence of chronic renal failure and high TLC at first presentation were influencing mortality whereas age, gender were not and neither DM even though it was leading predisposing factor.

Bulent Erol et al done study in 18 pts with Fournier’s gangrene treated and followed up. There clinical data were collected in terms of medical history, symptoms and physical examination, the biochemical, hematologic and bacteriologic study results at admission and at the final evaluation. The physical examination findings, the timing and extent of surgical debridement, and the antibiotic therapy was also recorded, the Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) and FGSI were also evaluated stratified by survival. individual laboratory parameters such as hypomagnesaeimia low haemoglobin and haematocrit, high alkaline phosphatase, creatinine and heart and respiratory rate were associated with worse prognosis.in addition a FGSI>9, rectal involvement, colostomy diversion and high CCI score were associated with high mortality. They concluded that low magnesium levels might be a new prognostic marker for worse prognosis. High CCI and FGSI score might be associated with poor prognosis a FGSI threshold of 9 was predictor of mortality during their assessment.

Adriano Antonio Mehl et al analysing gender, age, predisposing factors. aetiology, lesion, location ,laboratory test, surgical procedure, antibiotic use and hyperbaric oxygen therapy and concluded that most common source of infection was Ano-rectal origin while most common etiological agent was E.coli, the most important predisposing factor was DIABETES. Majority of patients were male. All underwent surgical debridement, 17 underwent colostomy and 2 with associated cystostomy. All patients received antibiotics and usually more than 1 antibiotics were given most common being metronidazole and gentamicin.20 pts underwent hyperbaric therapy. Despite the overall mortality came out to be 20%.

Conclusion

In patients with Fournier’s gangrene on study of all parameters included it was found that these few alterations in serum values affect outcome in these patients. Among all studied parameters it was found that High Random blood sugar i.e. uncontrolled diabetes, Low Serum Sodium conc., High Serum Potassium conc. i.e. Electrolyte imbalance, High Blood urea and High Serum creatinine i.e. altered renal function at time of presentation predicts poor outcome.

Also in patients with disease need extensive debridement with removal of all necrotic tissue at earliest with few patients may need second look or third look surgery or a serial debridement to get
rid of pus and dead tissue. Early approach to surgical facility with proper debridement and empirical initiation of antibiotic therapy covering gram +ve, gram-ve and anaerobic coverage should be done followed by culture/sensitivity of pus and shifting to specific antibiotics. Diabetes control along with close monitoring of electrolytes and renal function should be done with intervention if needed. So the patients in whom these parameters are deranged should be monitored closely and managed aggressively.

Bibliography

1. Vyas H.G., Kumar A, Bhandari V. et al: Prospective evaluation of risk factors for mortality in patients of Fournier’s gangrene: A single centre experience. Indian journal of urology jul-sep 2013 vol 29, issue 3.

2. David Kearney: Fournier’s gangrene: Diagnostic and Therapeutic Considerations: www.intechopen.com, 2011

3. Feyzullah Ersoz, Sari, S Soykan, Arikan: Factors affecting mortality in Fournier’s gangrene: experience with fifty two patients. Singapore Med J 2012

4. Adriano Antonio Mehl et al: Management of Fournier's gangrene: experience of a university hospital of Curitiba; Rev. Col. Bras. Cir. vol.37 no.6. Rio de Janeiro. Nov. /Dec. 2010

5. Erol B, Tunsel A, Hanci V, Tokgoz H, Yildiz A, Akduman B et al: Fournier’s gangrene : Overview of prognostic factors and definition of new prognostic parameters. Urology 2010:75:1193-8

6. Kara E, Muezzinglot, Temeltas G, Dincer L Kaya Y Sayakara A et al: Evaluation of risk factors and severity of life threatening surgical emergency FOURNIERS GANGRENE [ a report of 15 cases]

7. Sorenson MD, Krieger JN, Rivara FP, Klien MB, Wessels H: FOURNIERS GANGRENE: Management and mortality predictors in a population based study. J urol 2009:1782:742-7

8. Unalp HR, Kamer E, Derici H, Atahan K, Balci U, Demirdovan C et al.: Fourniers Gangrene evaluation of 68 pts and analysis of prognostic variables. j postgraduate med 2008:54:102-5

9. Corman JM, Moody JA, Aronson WJ. Fournier’s gangrene in modern surgical setting: Improved survival with aggressive management. BJU Int 1999:84-85 8

10. Jeong HJ, Park SC, Seoy IY, Rim JS: Prognostic factors in Fournier’s gangrene. INT urol 2005:12:1041-4

11. Brig Gurjit Singh et al: Aggressiveness - the key to a successful outcome in Fournier’s Gangrene

12. Ruiz-Towarj, Cordoba L, Devens JM: Prognostic factors in Fournier’s gangrene. Asian.j.surg 2012:35:37-41

13. Anzai AK: Fournier’s gangrene – a Urologic emergency

14. Korkut M1, Içöz G, Dayanagç M, Akgün E, Yeniay L, Erdoğan O, Cal C: Outcome analysis in patients with Fournier's gangrene: report of 45 cases; Dis Colon Rectum. 2003 May 46(5):649-52

15. El Bachir Benjelloun, Tarik S, Nadia Y, Abdelmalek, Ousadden et al: Fournier’s gangrene: our experience with 50 patients and analysis of factors affecting mortality; World Journal of Emergency Surgery 2013, 8:13 doi10.1186/1749-7922-8-13

16. Tuncel A, Aydin O, Tekdogen U, Nalcacioglu V, Capa Y, Atan A: Fournier’s gangrene : Three years of experience with 20 pts and validity of the FGSI EUR UROL 2006 :50:838-43

17. Yenicol CO, Suelogen T, Arslan M, Ayder M: Fourniers Gangrene: Experience with 25 pts and use of Fournier’s gangrene severity index score

18. Vick R, Carson CC 3rd : FOURNIERS GANGRENE University Clinic north AM 1999:26:841-9
19. Mehl AA, Nogueira Filho DC, Mantovani LM, Gripa MM, Berger Krauss D et al: Management of Fourniers Gangrene; Experience of University Hospital of Curitiva. Rev Col Bras Cir 2010:37:435-41
20. Altarac S, Katusin D, Papes D, Razkovik Z, Arsalani N: Fourniers gangrene: Etiology and outcome analysis of 41 patients. Urology Int 2012:88:289-93
21. Fournier JA (1832-1914). Gangrene foudroyante de la verge [overwhelming gangrene] Sem Med 1883 Dis Colon Rectum 1988, 31, 984-8
22. EKE N, Fournier’s gangrene: A review of 1726 cases. Br j surg 2000, 87 718-28
23. Carvalho JP, Hazan A, Cavalcanti AG, Favorito LA: Relation between the area affected by Fournier’s gangrene and the type of reconstructive surgery used. A study with 80 patients. Int Braz j urol 2007:8733, 510-4
24. Sallami S, Maalla R, Gammoudi A, Ben Jdidia G, Tarhouni L Horchani A; Fournier's gangrene: what are the prognostic factors? Our experience with 40 patients. Tunis Med. 2012 Oct;90(10):708-14.
25. Mallikarjuna MN., Abhishek V, Patil V, and Shivswamy BS; Fournier’s Gangrene: Current Practices: ISRN Surgery Volume 2012, Article ID 942437, doi:10.5402/2012/942437
26. Jimenez-Pacheco A, Arrablo-Polo MA, Arias-Santiago, Noguerasocunha M, Zulunga. A Fournier’s gangrene; description of 37 cases and analysis of associated health care costs.
27. Lujan M, BUDIA S, Di Capua, Broseta E, Jimenez Cruz F, Evaluation of severity score to predict the prognosis of Fournier’s gangrene. BJU int 2010.
28. Kabay S, Yucel M, Yaylak F, Algin MC, Haciglu A. The clinical features of Fournier’s gangrene and predictivity of Fournier’s Gangrene Severity Index its outcome.: Int Urol and Nephrol 2008:40:997-1004
29. Spirnak JP, Resnik ML, Persky L: Fourniers GANGRENE Report of 20 pts. J Urol 1984 131:289-91
30. Morpurgo E, Galanduik S: Fourniers GANGRENE Surgelin North Am 2002:82:1213-24