Penetrating gunshot injury to the chest with unusual intraluminal passage of the bullet
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Abstract

The authors present an unusual case of penetrating chest trauma. This serves to remind clinicians that all possibilities should be considered when managing trauma victims and that seemingly serious injuries are increasingly treated in a conservative manner with a successful outcome.
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Introduction

Gunshot injuries are increasing in frequency in the UK. Injuries to the mediastinum have a wide spectrum of clinical sequelae ranging from no clinical significance to immediate death[1, 2]. A case is reported of a 26-year-old man with a gunshot injury to the chest. The patient passed the bullet in his stool 4 days later with no significant adverse clinical outcome. This case is interesting because it is not clear when and how the bullet entered the lumen of the gastrointestinal tract.

Case report

A 26-year-old man was brought to the Accident & Emergency department of a local district general hospital, having been shot from behind. On arrival he had an entry wound 1 cm in diameter on the right side of the back of his chest between the spinous process of T7 and the angle of the scapula. There was no obvious exit wound. There was no active bleeding or other evident injury. On primary survey, he was conscious and co-operative. He was haemodynamically stable with a pulse of 70 and blood pressure of 170/95 mmHg. Oxygen saturation (SaO₂) was 100% on room air and the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) was 15/15. On secondary survey, he had bilateral normal and equal air entry, normal heart sounds and a soft, non-tender abdomen. He was admitted for further evaluation and observation. On admission all blood tests were within normal limits (full blood count, urea and electrolytes, liver function tests and coagulation screen). A plain abdominal X-ray showed the bullet at the level of the L3 vertebreum (Fig. 1). A plain abdominal X-ray performed a few hours later showed an opacity consistent with a bullet in the right iliac fossa suggesting passage of the projectile, possibly via the lumen of the gastrointestinal tract (Fig. 2). A CT scan of the abdomen and chest

This paper is available online at http://www.grandrounds-e-med.com. In the event of a change in the URL address, please use the DOI provided to locate the paper.
Fig. 1. Plain abdominal X-ray demonstrating bullet at L3 level.

Fig. 2. Plain abdominal film showing migration of bullet to the right iliac fossa.

was performed to gain more information, which showed a linear gunshot tract running in the medial aspect of the right lower lobe of the lung (Fig. 3). There was also a small pneumomediastinum and haemopneumothorax on the right side. The bullet in this CT examination was seen in the right iliac fossa seemingly within the lumen of the caecum (Fig. 4). All the intra-abdominal organs were normal. During this period of observation he remained stable but reported one episode of minor haemoptysis. He was transferred to a level 1 trauma centre with a possible diagnosis of perforation of the oesophagus. A water soluble contrast study of the oesophagus and stomach was performed. There was free flow of contrast into the small bowel and no evidence of an oesophageal leak. The CT scan was reviewed and the results of the earlier study were confirmed. He remained well clinically and tolerated an oral intake well. Four days later a bullet was recovered from his stool, confirming its presence within the gastrointestinal tract, and was preserved for forensic examination. He was discharged the following day. He has remained well since.

Discussion

Gunshot wounds that traverse the mediastinum frequently cause serious injury to the cardiac, vascular, pulmonary and digestive structures contained within. Most patients either die immediately or present with unstable vital signs signifying the need for emergency operation\textsuperscript{3}. Occasionally patients will present with stable vital signs. These 'stable' patients can be uninjured, may have sustained contained vascular injuries or may have injuries to the oesophagus or tracheobronchial tree\textsuperscript{1}. There is no difference in vital signs or blood gas examination to indicate which patients presenting in a stable condition will go on to have serious injury\textsuperscript{3}. Close clinical
observation and methodical investigation are advocated to avoid missing an injury with disastrous consequences.

Investigation of these patients includes chest X-ray, US scan, CT scan of the chest and abdomen and organ specific investigations. The plain chest X-ray shows the location of the bullet, heart size, pneumomediastinum, pneumothorax or haemothorax. The US scan helps detect cardiac tamponade as well as abdominal solid organ injury associated with travel of the projectile. In haemodynamically stable patients, the nature and order of investigations is a matter of debate. The most accepted order is aortic imaging followed by investigation for oesophageal or tracheobronchial tree injury (i.e. contrast study, endoscopy)[2]. Cornwell et al.[4] challenged this order of investigations in a retrospective study and suggested that delay in intervention for oesophageal injury, due to delay in investigation, is the principal cause of septic complications. Contrast enhanced helical CT scanning is a safe, efficient and cost-effective diagnostic tool. Further organ specific evaluation can be performed on the basis of the information provided by the CT scan[1, 2, 5, 6]. If there is no significant finding on the CT scan, patients can be observed safely without further investigations.

Patients with massive bleeding from intercostal drains, or with cardiac tamponade who become unstable during the period of observation or patients with obvious injury demonstrated during the course of investigation go on to surgery. All other patients can be treated conservatively until full recovery[2].

In this particular case it is very difficult to be sure about the exact path of the bullet. There are two possible mechanisms. First, a bullet entered the mediastinum, hit the right side of the lower oesophagus, entered into the lumen, travelled the entire distance of the gastrointestinal tract and came out in the stool. An opening in the lower oesophagus presumably spontaneously sealed off immediately and hence the patient did not develop mediastinitis and remained well. Contusion of
the bronchus and/or lung could explain the episode of haemoptysis. Spontaneous sealing of an opening in the oesophageal wall, of the size that can admit a bullet, is extremely unlikely and has not been reported before. However, three cases of oesophageal injury followed by transluminal migration of the bullet have been reported. All these three patients needed surgical treatment\cite{7,8}. Patients with such injuries usually need early intervention to prevent sepsis and probable death\cite{9}. The second explanation is that the bullet hit the right bronchus, entered the lumen and was coughed up into the nasopharynx from where it was swallowed. Spontaneous endobronchial erosion and expectoration of a retained bullet has been reported before\cite{10}. Choh and Adler\cite{11} reported a case where an intrabronchial bullet was removed with a rigid bronchoscope. This patient did not require a thoracotomy.

In summary this patient had a penetrating wound to his thorax, resulting in the bullet traversing his gastrointestinal tract without further injury or intervention. However, the method by which the bullet entered his gut remains a mystery.

**Learning point**

Low energy transfer rounds can often take surprisingly devious courses through the body and the trauma surgeon must be alert to all possibilities and make no assumptions about the intactness or otherwise of any intrathoracic or intra-abdominal organ until satisfactory screening investigations have been completed. In this respect a spiral CT is a good investigation. A gastroscopy in this case was contraindicated—it would have been a shame if there had been a sealed perforation of the oesophagus and this were disrupted by the instrumentation.
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