

# Association of the Moore sign with the presence of deep neck abscess of retropharyngeal space

## Asociación del signo de Moore con la presencia de absceso profundo de cuello de espacio retrofaríngeo

María A. Ruiz-Ruiz<sup>1</sup>, Luis García-Covarrubias<sup>2\*</sup>, Carlos A. Romero-Gameros<sup>1</sup>, Arturo Reding-Berna<sup>3</sup>, Juan C. Hernández-Rivera<sup>4</sup>, and Gabriela Angulo-Pérez<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Otolaryngology Department, High Specialty Medical Unit (UMAE), Specialty Hospital, Siglo XXI National Medical Center, Mexican Social Security Institute (IMSS, Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social); <sup>2</sup>Gastro-Surgery Department, UMAE, Specialty Hospital, Siglo XXI National Medical Center, IMSS; <sup>3</sup>Research Department, Dr. Eduardo Liceaga General Hospital of Mexico; <sup>4</sup>Department of Nephrological Research, UMAE, Specialty Hospital, Siglo XXI National Medical Center, IMSS; <sup>5</sup>Head and Neck Surgery Department, UMAE, Specialty Hospital, Siglo XXI National Medical Center, IMSS. Mexico City, Mexico

### Abstract

**Background:** Deep neck abscesses can cause life-threatening complications. They are diagnosed by physical examination, and contrasted tomography as the gold standard. There are no studies about the association of Moore's sign with infections of the retropharyngeal space. **Objective:** To determine the usefulness of Moore's sign in the diagnosis of deep retropharyngeal abscess. **Method:** Observational, analytical, cross-sectional, study of patients with deep neck abscess, from May 1, 2019, to August 30, 2021, with report of Moore's sign. **Results:** 87 patients were included, 49 (56.3%) males ( $p = 0.45$ ). Of those who developed complications, 77.8% had a negative Moore's sign ( $p = 0.001$ ). Of those admitted to the ICU, 72% had a negative Moore's sign ( $p = 0.001$ ). The sensitivity of the absence of the sign with retropharyngeal involvement was 95.4%, and the specificity was 86.3%. By logistic regression, it was found that those with retropharyngeal involvement are 467 times more likely to present a negative sign ( $p < 0.05$ ). **Conclusions:** The presence of abscess in the retropharynx is associated with complications and a worse prognosis. The evaluation of Moore's sign can be a useful tool to suspect compromise of this space.

**Keywords:** Neck. Deep abscess. Retropharyngeal space. Sign. Physical exam.

### Resumen

**Antecedentes:** Los abscesos profundos de cuello pueden ocasionar complicaciones letales. Se diagnostican por exploración física, y la tomografía contrastada es el método de referencia. No existen estudios de asociación del signo de Moore con infecciones del espacio retrofaríngeo. **Objetivo:** Determinar la utilidad del signo de Moore en el diagnóstico de absceso profundo en el espacio retrofaríngeo. **Método:** Estudio observacional, transversal y analítico, de pacientes con absceso profundo de cuello, del 1 de mayo de 2019 al 30 de agosto de 2021, con reporte de signo de Moore. **Resultados:** Se incluyeron 87 pacientes, de los cuales 49 (56.3%) eran de sexo masculino ( $p = 0.45$ ). De los que desarrollaron complicaciones, el 77.8%, tenían el signo de Moore negativo ( $p = 0.001$ ). De los que ingresaron a la unidad de cuidados intensivos, el 72% tenían negativo el signo de Moore ( $p = 0.001$ ). La sensibilidad de la ausencia del signo con afección del espacio retrofaríngeo fue del 95.4%, y la especificidad del 86.3%. Por regresión logística se encontró que aquellos con afección del espacio

#### \*Correspondence:

Luis García-Covarrubias  
E-mail: asfa@live.com.mx

Date of reception: 01-01-2022

Date of acceptance: 02-02-2022

DOI: 10.24875/CIRUE.M23000456

Cir Cir (Eng). 2022;90(5):642-647

Contents available at PubMed

www.cirugiaycirujanos.com

2444-0507/© 2022 Academia Mexicana de Cirugía. Published by Permanyer. This is an open access article under the terms of the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

*retrofaríngeo tienen 467 veces más posibilidades de presentar signo negativo ( $p < 0.05$ ). Conclusiones: La presencia de un absceso en el espacio retrofaríngeo se asocia a complicaciones y peor pronóstico. La evaluación del signo de Moore puede ser una herramienta útil para sospechar compromiso de ese espacio.*

**Palabras clave:** Cuello. Absceso profundo. Espacio retrofaríngeo. Signo. Exploración física.

## Introduction

Deep neck abscesses can lead to complications such as mediastinitis, airway obstruction, empyema, and sepsis, causing death<sup>1-3</sup>. They occur more frequently in males<sup>4,5</sup> (55.63%) and at an average age of 40 years<sup>6,7</sup>. The characteristic symptoms consist of fever, increased volume, general malaise, dysphagia, trismus, dysphonia, and dyspnea<sup>1,7</sup>. The involvement of two or more spaces is the most frequent presentation (34.9%)<sup>1</sup>, which may affect the retropharyngeal space (RPS)<sup>8,9</sup>. Examination reveals increased volume and tenderness, and there may be Moore's sign<sup>9-11</sup>, which consists of pushing the thyroid cartilage posteriorly, making a movement from one side to the other and palpating the crepitation produced by the friction of this structure with the vertebral bodies (normal finding), reporting this as positive if it is present<sup>12</sup>. Contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT) of the neck is the imaging study of choice for the diagnosis of a deep neck abscess<sup>13,14</sup>, with a sensitivity of RPS involvement of 88-91%. To date, there are no studies that evaluate the association of Moore's sign with the presence of deep neck abscess in RPS.

The objective of this study was to determine the association of Moore's sign with the presence of deep neck abscess of RPS.

## Method

An observational, cross-sectional, and analytical study was carried out. The study population was patients admitted to the head and neck surgery department, over 18 years of age, with a diagnosis of deep neck abscess in the period from March 1, 2019 to August 30, 2021. The inclusion criteria were patients with a complete clinical record, with Moore's sign in the initial evaluation note, with a neck CT and report of surgical findings. The elimination criteria were patients who did not have a tomographic report or previous neck surgery.

In the statistical analysis, for continuous variables without assumption of normality, a Mann-Whitney U test

was performed to identify differences between groups (positive sign or negative sign). For the dichotomous variables, the  $\chi^2$  test or Fisher's exact test between groups was used. The sensitivity and specificity of the sign with respect to RPS involvement were calculated, and at the end a multiple logistic regression model was performed to identify the variables associated with the absence of the sign. A value of  $p < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant. To analyze the data, the STATA 15.1 software (StataCorp 2017. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX, USA) was used.

In accordance with Article 17 of the Regulations of the General Health Law on Research (Ley General de Salud en Materia de Investigación), the present study is considered risk-free research. All procedures performed on patients are part of the usual treatment of this pathology, following the Good Clinical Practice guidelines and the regulations in force at the Mexican Social Security Institute. The study was approved by the institution's local research committee.

## Results

87 patients were included, of which 38 (43.7%) were female and 49 (56.3%) were male ( $p = 0.45$ ). There was no age group with a higher prevalence: 29 (33.3%) were under 40 years of age, 33 (37.9%) were between 40 and 60 years of age, and 25 (28.7%) were over 60 years of age. On a bivariate basis, differences were found between the mean days of hospitalization, of  $7.9 \pm 6.1$  and  $11.4 \pm 7.0$ , for those who presented the positive and the negative sign, respectively ( $p = 0.019$ ) (Table 1). Regarding symptoms, 29 (33.3%) patients reported dysphagia, of which 19 (65.5%) had a negative Moore's sign and presence of abscess in the RPS, being significant with respect to those who did not present dysphagia (48 [82.8%]) with a positive Moore's sign, and absence of abscess in the RPS ( $p = 0.01$ ) (Table 1).

Of the patients who developed complications, 77.8% had a negative Moore's sign ( $p = 0.001$ ). Of the patient total, 25 (28.7%) required admission to the ICU, and of them, 18 (72%) had a negative Moore's sign

Table 1. Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics

| Variable                              | Total (n = 87) | Moore's sign      |                   | p                    |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
|                                       |                | Positive (n = 58) | Negative (n = 29) |                      |
| Age, A (SD)                           | 49.3 ± 16.9    | 47.7 ± 17.1       | 52.3 ± 16.5       | 0.298 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Urea, A (SD)                          | 42.0 ± 29.0    | 37.5 ± 21.7       | 51.0 ± 38.7       | 0.054 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Glucose, A (SD)                       | 155.5 ± 107.0  | 154.8 ± 114.9     | 156.9 ± 91.0      | 0.066 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Hemoglobin, A (SD)                    | 13.5 ± 2.3     | 13.9 ± 2.0        | 12.8 ± 2.8        | 0.150 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Hematocrit, A (SD)                    | 41.1 ± 9.0     | 42.4 ± 8.6        | 38.5 ± 9.2        | 0.173 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Platelets, A (SD)                     | 318.2 ± 134.1  | 316.8 ± 124.1     | 321.0 ± 154.6     | 0.659 <sup>a</sup>   |
| White blood cells, A (SD)             | 13.5 ± 5.0     | 13.1 ± 5.0        | 14.3 ± 4.9        | 0.366 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Neutrophils, A (SD)                   | 10.7 ± 4.7     | 10.2 ± 4.7        | 11.6 ± 4.6        | 0.199 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Neutrophil/lymphocyte ratio, A (SD)   | 9.1 ± 7.1      | 8.7 ± 7.0         | 9.9 ± 7.3         | 0.224 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Days of hospital stay, A (SD)         | 9.0 ± 6.6      | 7.9 ± 6.1         | 11.4 ± 7.0        | 0.019 <sup>a</sup>   |
| Sex, n (%)                            |                |                   |                   |                      |
| Female                                | 38 (43.7)      | 27 (46.6)         | 11 (37.9)         | 0.445 <sup>b</sup>   |
| Male                                  | 49 (56.3)      | 31 (53.4)         | 18 (62.1)         |                      |
| CT, n (%)                             |                |                   |                   |                      |
| RPS positive                          | 21 (24.1)      | 1 (1.7)           | 20 (69.0)         | < 0.001 <sup>c</sup> |
| RPS negative                          | 66 (75.9)      | 57 (98.3)         | 9 (31.0)          |                      |
| Death, n (%)                          |                |                   |                   |                      |
| No                                    | 83 (95.4)      | 55 (94.8)         | 28 (96.1)         | 1.000 <sup>c</sup>   |
| Yes                                   | 4 (4.6)        | 3 (5.2)           | 1 (3.4)           |                      |
| ICU admission, n (%)                  |                |                   |                   |                      |
| No                                    | 69 (79.3)      | 54 (93.1)         | 15 (51.7)         | < 0.001 <sup>c</sup> |
| Yes                                   | 18 (20.7)      | 4 (6.9)           | 14 (48.3)         |                      |
| Complications, n (%)                  |                |                   |                   |                      |
| No                                    | 62 (71.3)      | 51 (87.9)         | 11 (37.9)         | < 0.001 <sup>b</sup> |
| Yes                                   | 25 (28.7)      | 7 (12.1)          | 18 (62.1)         |                      |
| Dysphagia, n (%)                      |                |                   |                   |                      |
| No                                    | 58 (66.7)      | 48 (82.8)         | 10 (34.5)         | 0.001 <sup>b</sup>   |
| Yes                                   | 29 (33.3)      | 10 (17.2)         | 19 (65.5)         |                      |
| Type 2 diabetes mellitus, n (%)       |                |                   |                   |                      |
| No                                    | 55 (63.2)      | 36 (62.1)         | 19 (65.5)         | 0.753 <sup>b</sup>   |
| Yes                                   | 32 (36.8)      | 22 (37.9)         | 10 (34.5)         |                      |
| Systemic arterial hypertension, n (%) |                |                   |                   |                      |
| No                                    | 64 (73.6)      | 42 (72.4)         | 22 (75.9)         | 0.731 <sup>b</sup>   |
| Yes                                   | 23 (26.4)      | 16 (27.6)         | 7 (24.1)          |                      |

SD: standard deviation; RPS: retropharyngeal space; A: average; CT: computed tomography; ICU: intensive care unit.

<sup>a</sup>Mann-Whitney U test for independent samples.<sup>b</sup>χ<sup>2</sup> test.<sup>c</sup>Fisher's exact test.

(p = 0.001). Mortality was 4.6%, with no difference between presenting the sign or not (p = NS). When calculating the sensitivity of the absence of the sign to the exploration with the involvement of the RPS by CT, it was 95.4%, with a specificity of 86.3%, a positive predictive value of 70% and a negative predictive value of 98%. The deep neck space most frequently involved

was the submandibular one, in 64 (73.6%) of the patients. Of those with RPS involvement, 21 (72.4%) had a negative Moore's sign (Table 2).

In the logistic regression model, it was found that, for each unit increase in the urea level, the possibility of presenting negative sign increases by 4% (odds ratio [OR]: 1.04; p < 0.05), and that people with RPS

**Table 2. Spaces that were found to be affected during surgery**

| Space              | Total (n = 87) n (%) | Moore's sign            |                         | p                  |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
|                    |                      | Positive (n = 58) n (%) | Negative (n = 29) n (%) |                    |
| Sublingual         |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 83 (95.4)            | 56 (96.6)               | 27 (93.1)               | 0.598 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 4 (4.6)              | 2 (3.4)                 | 2 (6.9)                 |                    |
| Peritonsillar      |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 85 (97.7)            | 57 (98.3)               | 28 (96.6)               | 1.000 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 2 (2.3)              | 1 (1.7)                 | 1 (3.4)                 |                    |
| Masticator         |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 75 (86.2)            | 53 (91.4)               | 22 (75.9)               | 0.048 <sup>b</sup> |
| Yes                | 12 (13.8)            | 5 (8.6)                 | 7 (24.1)                |                    |
| Oral               |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 82 (94.3)            | 56 (96.6)               | 26 (89.7)               | 0.328 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 5 (5.7)              | 2 (3.4)                 | 3 (10.3)                |                    |
| Parotid            |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 79 (90.8)            | 53 (91.4)               | 26 (89.7)               | 1.000 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 8 (9.2)              | 5 (8.6)                 | 3 (10.3)                |                    |
| Posterior triangle |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 83 (95.4)            | 56 (96.6)               | 27 (93.1)               | 0.598 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 4 (4.6)              | 2 (3.4)                 | 2 (6.9)                 |                    |
| Retropharyngeal    |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 65 (74.7)            | 57 (98.3)               | 8 (27.6)                | 0.001 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 22 (25.3)            | 1 (1.7)                 | 21 (72.4)               |                    |
| Visceral           |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 64 (73.6)            | 47 (81.0)               | 17 (58.6)               | 0.025 <sup>b</sup> |
| Yes                | 23 (26.4)            | 11 (19.0)               | 12 (41.4)               |                    |
| Submental          |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 72 (82.8)            | 45 (77.6)               | 27 (93.1)               | 0.080 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 15 (17.2)            | 13 (22.4)               | 2 (6.9)                 |                    |
| Pharyngeal mucosal |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 80 (92.0)            | 56 (96.6)               | 24 (82.8)               | 0.039 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 7 (8.0)              | 2 (3.4)                 | 5 (17.2)                |                    |
| Vascular           |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 80 (92.0)            | 57 (98.3)               | 23 (79.3)               | 0.005 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 7 (8.0)              | 1 (1.7)                 | 6 (20.7)                |                    |
| Parapharyngeal     |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 59 (67.8)            | 45 (77.6)               | 14 (48.3)               | 0.006 <sup>b</sup> |
| Yes                | 28 (32.2)            | 13 (22.4)               | 15 (51.7)               |                    |
| Submandibular      |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 23 (26.4)            | 14 (24.1)               | 9 (31.0)                | 0.492 <sup>b</sup> |
| Yes                | 64 (73.6)            | 44 (75.9)               | 20 (69.0)               |                    |
| Prevertebral       |                      |                         |                         |                    |
| No                 | 86 (98.9)            | 58 (100)                | 28 (96.6)               | 0.333 <sup>a</sup> |
| Yes                | 1 (1.1)              | 0 (0.0)                 | 1 (3.4)                 |                    |

<sup>a</sup>Fisher's exact test.<sup>b</sup> $\chi^2$  test.

**Table 3. Logistic regression model to identify variables associated with not presenting the sign**

| Variable           | OR    | p <sup>a</sup> | 95%CI       |
|--------------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
| Sex                |       |                |             |
| Female             | 1.0   |                |             |
| Male               | 5.0   | 0.096          | 0.7-34.0    |
| CT                 |       |                |             |
| RPS negative       | 1.0   |                |             |
| RPS positive       | 467.3 | < 0.001        | 32.9-6627.9 |
| Urea               | 1.04  | 0.038          | 1.00-1.07   |
| Sublingual         |       |                |             |
| No                 | 1.0   |                |             |
| Yes                | 13.9  | 0.036          | 1.2-161.7   |
| Pharyngeal mucosal | 1.0   |                |             |
| No                 | 26.9  | 0.013          | 2.0-359.8   |
| Yes                |       |                |             |

RPS: retropharyngeal space; 95%CI: 95% confidence interval; OR: odds ratio;

CT: computed tomography.

<sup>a</sup>p significant value < 0.05.

involvement by CT are 467 times more likely to present a negative sign than those with CT without RPS involvement (OR: 467.3;  $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 3).

## Discussion

87 patients with a mean age of 49.3 years were analyzed. 56.3% were men, which is in line with the literature (55.63% of cases)<sup>15</sup>. The diagnosis of abscess in the RPS is accompanied by variable and non-specific symptoms<sup>16</sup>. The clinical presentation coincides with that reported in the literature<sup>17</sup>, which mentions that there are no specific symptoms. Dysphagia was identified in 33.3% of the patients, of which 65.5% did not present Moore's sign, showing that dysphagia suggests the presence of an abscess in the RPS. It was evident that patients with a negative Moore's sign had a higher rate of complications and ICU requirements, as described in the literature<sup>17</sup>, and the mortality rate with any type of affected space was 4.6%, slightly higher than that reported by Harkani et al.<sup>17</sup> in 234 patients in Germany, where it was 2.6%. Regarding the sensitivity and specificity of the Moore's sign for the diagnosis of retropharyngeal abscess, they were similar to those reported by Seer Yee et al.<sup>18</sup> by CT, with a sensitivity of 98.6%, a positive predictive value of 94.7% and a specificity of 67.2%. Patients with RPS involvement showed increased levels of serum urea, which represents protein catabolism and, when elevated, would serve as a marker in patients

with the absence of Moore's sign ( $p = 0.054$ ), which is corroborated with the logistic regression. We must consider that the patients were evaluated by different doctors, and there may be variation in the interpretation of Moore's sign among them. Likewise, the surgical findings could differ since they are determined by the surgeon according to their perspective and experience. To validate our results, we would recommend conducting a new prospective study with a larger sample size.

## Conclusions

Retropharyngeal abscess is an emergency due to the complications that may occur if it is not treated in a timely manner. The presence of an abscess in the RPS appears to be associated with a higher rate of complications and a worse prognosis than abscesses located in other deep spaces of the neck. The evaluation of Moore's sign in the emergency room can be a useful tool in combination with imaging studies to diagnose RPS involvement, be able to refer patients to a tertiary center or achieve adequate surgical planning, reducing time and costs of care.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank the clinical archive service for the support provided for the review of records.

## Funding

This article was prepared with the authors' own resources, with no extra economic resources obtained or required.

## Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

## Ethical disclosures

**Protection of people and animals.** The authors declare that no experiments were carried out on humans or animals for this research.

**Data confidentiality.** The authors declare that they have followed their center's protocols on the publication of patient data.

**Right to privacy and informed consent.** The authors declare that no patient data appear in this article.

## References

1. Yang W, Hu L, Wang Z. Deep neck infection: a review of 130 cases in Southern China. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2015;94:e994.
2. Pesis M, Bar-Droma E, Ilgiyaev A. Deep neck infections are life threatening infections of dental origin: a presentation and management of selected cases. *Isr Med Assoc J*. 2019;21:806-11.
3. Ismi O, Yeşilova M, Özcan C. Difficult cases of odontogenic deep neck infections: a report of three patients. *Balkan Med J*. 2017;34:172-9.
4. Olejniczak I, Bojanowska-Poźniak K, Pietruszewska W. Deep neck infections — still important diagnostic and therapeutic problem. *Otolaryngol Pol*. 2016;70:25-30.
5. Adil E, Tarshish Y, Roberson D. The public health impact of pediatric deep neck space infections. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2015;153:1036-41.
6. Ko HH, Chien WC, Lin YH, Chung CH, Cheng SJ. Examining the correlation between diabetes and odontogenic infection: a nationwide, retrospective, matched-cohort study in Taiwan. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0178941.
7. Buckley J, Harris AS, Addams-Williams J. Ten years of deep neck space abscesses. *J Laryngol Otol*. 2019;133:324-8.
8. Gavid M, Dumollard JM, Habougit C. Anatomical and histological study of the deep neck fasciae: does the alar fascia exist? *Surg Radiol Anat*. 2018;40:917-22.
9. Kitamura S. Anatomy of the fasciae and fascial spaces of the maxillofacial and the anterior neck regions. *Anat Sci Int*. 2018;93:1-13.
10. Rubin JA, Wesolowski JR. Neck MR imaging anatomy. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2011;19:457-73.
11. Russell MD, Russell MS. Urgent infections of the head and neck. *Med Clin North Am*. 2018;102:1109-20.
12. Zúñiga AC, Parada Pérez MF, Peschard Rodríguez VG. Guía APS. Atención Primaria en Salud. México: Intersistemas; 2017. 3403 p.
13. Maroldi R, Farina D, Ravanelli M. Emergency imaging assessment of deep neck space infections. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR*. 2012;33:432-42.
14. Kirse DJ, Roberson DW. Surgical management of retropharyngeal space infections in children. *Laryngoscope*. 2001;111:1413-22.
15. Freling N, Roele E, Schaefer-Prokop C. Prediction of deep neck abscesses by contrast-enhanced computerized tomography in 76 clinically suspect consecutive patients. *Laryngoscope*. 2009;119:1745-52.
16. Sakthivel P, Yogal R, Verma H. Acute retropharyngeal abscess masquerading as meningitis. *JNMA J Nepal Med Assoc*. 2017;56:186-8.
17. Harkani A, Hassani R, Ziad T, Aderdour L, Nouri H, Rochdi Y, et al. Retropharyngeal abscess in adults: five case reports and review of the literature. *ScientificWorldJournal*. 2011;11:1623-9.
18. Seer Yee ML, Rahim NA, Ngah NA. Predicting neck abscess with contrast-enhanced computed tomography. *Adv Otolaryngol*. 2014;1:1-8.