

LETTER

Ultrasound performs better than radiographs

We applaud the British Thoracic Society (BTS) for its efforts to improve patient care through scientific evidence. We thus recognise the recent guidelines on pleural procedures and thoracic ultrasound (TUS) as an important attempt to develop a rational approach to chest sonography.¹ However, we are concerned that the BTS has reached conclusions based on a less complete review of TUS.

The guidelines state that 'the utility of thoracic ultrasound for diagnosing a pneumothorax is limited in hospital practice due to the ready availability of chest x-rays (CXR) and conflicting data from published reports'.¹ This conclusion appears to be based on a small (but landmark) study of 11 patients from 1986 to 1989, two small studies with only four pneumothoraces in one and another small series whose ultrasounds were retrospectively reviewed. Against these small and somewhat dated studies, a large number of recent investigations support a quite different conclusion.

Many well-performed retrospective reviews and a number of prospective studies have compared TUS to chest radiographs (CXR) in the detection of pneumothoraces using CXR as the criterion standard. Noting the limitations of CXR in detecting pneumothoraces, we feel that only prospective studies utilising CT as the reference criterion are valid to assess the relative merits of ultrasound versus radiography. Although methodology and populations have varied, at least nine comparative trials, conducted in the last decade, have noted a higher sensitivity for TUS than CXR in the detection of pneumothorax. While the widely reported sensitivities (49%–100%) for TUS detection of pneumothoraces has not been explained, a more important point is that, in each of these studies, the sensitivity of TUS was significantly higher than CXR. Sonographic specificities were not significantly different from those of CXR, ranging from 94% to 100%. Furthermore, in the studies where it is reported, the likelihood ratios have ranged from 36 to 153.^{2–4} Since a typical benchmark of a useful test is one that can generate positive likelihood ratios of greater than 10,

these test characteristics have persuaded many, including the authors of two systematic reviews, that TUS is a more accurate test than supine anteroposterior CXR for the detection of pneumothorax. Finally, we would also like to take issue with the assumptions underlying the phrase 'ready availability of chest x-rays'. For many critical care and emergency department patients with sudden unexplained dyspnoea, the delay involved in obtaining a 'stat' portable CXR can be lethal. For such patients, bedside TUS may allow for rapid initiation of life-saving interventions.

We are keenly aware that TUS has pitfalls, and that its use requires due caution by properly trained sonologists. However, recognising that guidelines are living documents reflecting best evidence,⁵ we respectfully submit that the BTS guidelines in question are thus somewhat incomplete. In our view, after further review and consensus development according to the GRADE criteria, data reported from the 21st century, far from being conflicted, provide strong and consistent evidence regarding the superiority of sonography over CXR in the diagnosis of pneumothorax (see online supplement).

The World Interactive Network Focused on Critical Ultrasound (WINFOCUS) International Liaison Committee on Pleural and Lung Ultrasound (ILCPLUS) is constituted by experts in pleural and lung ultrasound and clinical epidemiology experts in the process of evidence assessment, including GRADE and RAND Appropriateness Methodologies for the development of evidence-based clinical recommendations and consensus statements.

Eustachio Agricola,¹ Charlotte Arbelot,² Michael Blaivas,³ Belaid Bouhemad,² Roberto Copetti,⁴ Anthony Dean,⁵ Scott Dulchavsky,⁶ Mahmoud Elbarbary,⁷ Luna Gargani,⁸ Richard Hoppmann,⁹ Andrew W Kirkpatrick,¹⁰ Daniel Lichtenstein,¹¹ Andrew Liteplo,¹² Gebhard Mathis,¹³ Lawrence Melniker,¹⁴ Luca Neri,¹⁵ Vicki E Noble,¹² Tomislav Petrovic,¹⁶ Angelika Reissig,¹⁷ Jean Jacques Rouby,² Armin Seibel,¹⁸ Gino Soldati,¹⁹ Enrico Storti,¹⁵ James W Tsung,²⁰ Gabriele Via,²¹ Giovanni Volpicelli²²

¹San Raffaele Hospital, Milan, Italy; ²Pitie Salpêtrière Hospital, Pierre et Marie Curie University-Paris 6, France; ³Northside Hospital Forsyth, Cumming, Georgia, USA; ⁴Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy; ⁵University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,

USA; ⁶Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Michigan, USA; ⁷King Saud University for Health Sciences, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; ⁸National Council of Research, Pisa, Italy; ⁹University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, USA; ¹⁰Regional Trauma Services, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada; ¹¹Paris-Ouest University, Paris, France; ¹²Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ¹³University of Innsbruck, Rankweil, Austria; ¹⁴New York Methodist Hospital, Brooklyn, New York, USA; ¹⁵Ospedale Niguarda Ca' Granda, Milan, Italy; ¹⁶University PARIS XIII, Paris, France; ¹⁷Friedrich Schiller University, Jena, Germany; ¹⁸Diakonie Klinikum Jung-Stilling, Germany; ¹⁹Valle del Serchio General Hospital, Lucca, Italy; ²⁰Mount Sinai Medical Center, New York, New York, USA; ²¹Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy; ²²San Luigi Gonzaga University Hospital, Torino, Italy

Correspondence to Andrew W Kirkpatrick, Regional Trauma Services, Foothills Medical Centre, 1403 29 St NW, Calgary, Alberta, T2N 2T9, Canada; andrew.kirkpatrick@albertahealthservices.ca

► Additional materials are published online only. To view these files please visit the journal online (<http://thorax.bmj.com>).

Competing interests This letter is being written on behalf of the WINFOCUS International Liaison Committee on Pleural and Lung Ultrasound (ILCPLUS). The goal of this group is to promote the use of point of care ultrasound although none of the members has any specific financial conflicts.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; not externally peer reviewed.

Accepted 13 November 2010

Thorax 2010; 65:1. doi:10.1136/thx.2010.153239

REFERENCES

1. **Havelock T**, Teoh R, Laws D, *et al*. Pleural procedures and thoracic ultrasound: British Thoracic Society pleural disease guideline 2010. *Thorax* 2010;**65** (Suppl 2):ii61–76.
2. **Kirkpatrick AW**, Sirois M, Laupland KB, *et al*. Hand-held thoracic sonography for detecting post-traumatic pneumothoraces: the Extended Focused Assessment with Sonography for Trauma (EFAST). *J Trauma* 2004;**57**:288–95.
3. **Soldati G**, Testa A, Sher S, *et al*. Occult traumatic pneumothorax: diagnostic accuracy of lung ultrasonography in the emergency department. *Chest* 2008;**133**:204–11.
4. **Soldati G**, Testa A, Pignataro G, *et al*. The ultrasonographic deep sulcus sign in traumatic pneumothorax. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2006;**32**:1157–63.
5. **Elbarbary M**, Melniker L, Volpicelli G. Development of evidence based clinical recommendations and consensus statements in the critical ultrasound field: why and how? *Crit Ultrasound J*. Published Online First: 2 December 2010. doi:10.1007/s13089-010-0050-3.

THORAX

Ultrasound performs better than radiographs

Eustachio Agricola, Charlotte Arbelot, Michael Blaivas, Belaid Bouhemad, Roberto Copetti, Anthony Dean, Scott Dulchavsky, Mahmoud Elbarbary, Luna Gargani, Richard Hoppmann, Andrew W Kirkpatrick, Daniel Lichtenstein, Andrew Liteplo, Gebhard Mathis, Lawrence Melniker, Luca Neri, Vicki E Noble, Tomislav Petrovic, Angelika Reissig, Jean Jacques Rouby, Armin Seibel, Gino Soldati, Enrico Storti, James W Tsung, Gabriele Via and Giovanni Volpicelli

Thorax published online December 30, 2010

Updated information and services can be found at:

<http://thorax.bmj.com/content/early/2010/12/29/thx.2010.153239>

These include:

References

This article cites 4 articles, 0 of which you can access for free at:

<http://thorax.bmj.com/content/early/2010/12/29/thx.2010.153239#BIBL>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Notes

To request permissions go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions>

To order reprints go to:

<http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to BMJ go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/>