

Chest CT Images for COVID-19: Radiologists and Computer-based detection

Qingli Dou MD^{a#}, Jiangping Liu MD^{a#}, Wenwu Zhang MD^a, Yanan Gu MD^a, Wan-Ting Hsu MS^b, Kuan-Ching Ho MBBS, MMed^c, Hoi Sin Tong BSc^d, Wing Yan Yu MMedSc^d, Chien-Chang Lee MD, ScD^{e*}

^aDepartment of Emergency Medicine, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China

^bDepartment of Epidemiology, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

^cRadiology Department, St George Hospital Sydney, Kogarah, NSW, Australia

^dLi Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

^eDepartment of Emergency Medicine, National Taiwan University Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan

Qingli Dou and Jiangping Liu contributed equally to this article

***Correspondence and reprints requests:** Chien-Chang Lee, MD, ScD. Health Data Science Research Group, National Taiwan University Hospital

Department of Emergency Medicine, National Taiwan University Hospital

Add: No.7, Chung Shan S. Rd., Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City 100, Taiwan

Tel: +886-2-2312-3456 ext. 63485

Fax: +886-2-2322-3150

E-mail: clee100@gmail.com/ hit3transparency@gmail.com

Publishable disclosure statement of potential conflict of interest: The authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

Funding: None.

Word counts for the abstract: 295 words

Word counts for the text: 1181 words

Number of references: 15

Number of tables: 3

Number of figures: 0

ABSTRACT

Background

Characteristic chest computed tomography (CT) manifestation of 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) was added as a diagnostic criterion in the Chinese National COVID-19 management guideline. Whether the characteristic findings of Chest CT could differentiate confirmed COVID-19 cases from other positive nucleic acid test (NAT)-negative patients has not been rigorously evaluated.

Purpose

We aim to test whether chest computed tomography (CT) manifestation of 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) can be differentiated by a radiologist or a computer-based CT image analysis system.

Methods

We conducted a retrospective case-control study that included 52 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 patients and 80 non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia patients between 20 December, 2019 and 10 February, 2020. The chest CT images were evaluated by radiologists in a double blind fashion. A computer-based image analysis system (uAI system, Lianying Inc., Shanghai, China) detected the lesions in 18 lung segments defined by Boyden classification system and calculated the infected volume in each segment. The number and volume of lesions detected by radiologist and computer system was compared with Chi-square test or Mann-Whitney U test as appropriate.

Results

The main CT manifestations of COVID-19 were multi-lobar/segmental peripheral ground-glass opacities and patchy air space infiltrates. The case and control groups were similar in demographics, comorbidity, and clinical manifestations. There was no significant difference in eight radiologist identified CT image features between the two groups of patients. There was also no difference in the absolute and relative volume of infected regions in each lung segment.

Conclusions

We documented the non-differentiating nature of initial chest CT image between COVID-19 and other viral pneumonia with suspected symptoms. Our results do not support CT findings replacing microbiological diagnosis as a critical criterion for COVID-19 diagnosis. Our findings may prompt re-evaluation of isolated patients without laboratory confirmation.

Keywords: COVID-19; 2019-nCoV; chest computed tomography; computer-aided detection; computer-based detection

INTRODUCTION

Due to high transmissibility and so far lack of proven treatment, the 2019 novel coronavirus disease, 2019-nCoV, has quickly disseminated worldwide.^{4,5} As symptoms of COVID-19 are similar to other acute respiratory infections, diagnosis relies on positive nucleic acid test (NAT). Given the long turnaround time and suboptimal sensitivity of NAT, chest computed tomography (CT) was proposed as a first line diagnostic tool by the Chinese national guideline (trial version 5).⁷ After the new definition implementation, 14,840 new cases with 242 deaths were reported on February 13th, which was the record by far reported in a single day since the outbreak.

Several case series have reported characteristic CT findings of COVID-19, including ground glass opacities in bilateral peripheral lung, crazy-paving changes, reticular thickening, or consolidations.^{8,9} We aim to evaluate whether radiologists or a computer-based image analysis system can reliably differentiate COVID-19 cases from non-COVID-19 but suspected patients.

METHODS

Study population

From 20 December, 2019 to 10 February, 2020, 52 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 patients in Shenzhen were identified that fulfilled the diagnostic criteria of Chinese national guideline.¹⁰ The criteria for a confirmed case include documented laboratory evidence, compatible clinical symptoms, and exposure history. Documented laboratory evidence is defined by positive NAT result either from respiratory tract, bronchoalveolar lavage fluid, or blood sample. Compatible clinical symptoms refer to fever, cough,

imaging characteristics of pneumonia, and/or normal or decreased white blood cells count or decreased lymphocyte count. Exposure history includes travel/residence history in Wuhan city, contact history with laboratory-confirmed patients, or contact history with patients with fever or respiratory symptoms from Wuhan and its surrounding areas or endemic communities, within 14 days before the onset of illness. We randomly selected 80 laboratory-confirmed non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia patients as controls. These presented with suspected symptoms and exposure history and underwent NAT and chest CT exams in the same period. These patients must have at least two negative NAT results and a laboratory evidence of other respiratory virus infection.

Chest CT evaluation by radiologists

All CT images were independently retrospectively analyzed using a structured form by two experienced radiologists in a double blinded fashion without knowing the clinical diagnosis. A third senior radiologist was consulted to solve any discrepancy by consensus. Evaluation was focused on the presence of ground glass opacities, patchy infiltration, patchy consolidation, pleural effusion, mediastinal lymphadenopathy, air bronchogram, pleural thickening, and Interstitial change.

Machine-learning based CT lesion detection and quantification system

We used the uAI image analysis system (Lianying Intelligent Medical Technology Co Ltd, Shanghai, China) for detection and quantification of chest CT lesions (Computer-based detection in Appendix). The system classifies the lung fields into five lung lobes and 18 lung segments based on Boyden classification, detected infected regions in each anatomical region, and quantified the cumulative and relative infected volume. The

infected volumes between the two groups were also compared in four different CT windows. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Second Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables were expressed as number and proportion and compared with a Chi-square test. Continuous variables were presented with mean \pm standard deviation for data with a normal distribution and tested by Student t test. Data with non-normal distribution were presented with median with interquartile range and compared with independent sample Mann-Whitney U test. All tests in this study were two-sided, and P <0.05 was deemed statistically significant. Data were analyzed using SPSS 23.0 software.

RESULTS

Study patients

There was no significant difference between case and control cases in all categories (Table 1).

Comparison of CT interpretation by radiologists

In both COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia patients, ground-glass opacity (Supplemental Figures 1A and 1B) and patchy airspace infiltrates (Supplemental Figures 2A and 2B) were the major findings. The lesions could be found in multiple lobes or segments, more often bilateral. There was no statistical significance between the distribution of lesions identified by radiologists in the two groups (Table 2).

Comparison of computer system detected infected lung volume

Compared between COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia patients, there was no significant difference in the computer system detected infected lung volume /percentage in 5 lung lobes and in different lung segments (Table 3). Similarly, there was no significant difference in the absolute or relative infected lung volume between the two groups of patients (Table S1).

Sensitivity analysis under different radiodensity windows for machine detection.

The lesions' infection volume/percentage for COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 patients were stratified by four different CT number ranges (Table S2). Lesions in the [-750, -300) Hounsfield units (HU) range were arbitrarily chosen to reflect ground-glass opacity, while those with CT numbers in the [-300, 50) range were considered as denser airspace infiltrates and consolidation. Anything less than -750 becomes harder to differentiate from normal lung tissue. An extreme number 50 was chosen, beyond which infection becomes unlikely, though not impossible, as the number starts to get into the soft tissue mass range. No statistically significant difference in the infected volumes between the two groups was found in any of the four ranges.

DISCUSSION

Chen et al. studied 29 patients with COVID-19 showed that the chest image lesions were mostly bilateral and multiple with patchy shadows and ground glass opacities.^{11, 12} Pan et al reported CT images of COVID-19 are diverse in the early stages, which may present ground-glass opacities, pulmonary consolidation and nodules.¹³ These studies were case series without suitable control groups.^{8,9,13-15} We found Radiologists' interpretation

alone or computer-based lesion detection cannot differentiate COVID-19 from other viral pneumonia. Such findings were robust under different anatomic sites or CT density ranges.

There are pros and cons using clinical diagnosis as a case definition. Clinical diagnosis allows early isolation with initial false negative NAT, slows transmission, and implements treatment early. However, the use of chest CT as a first line diagnostic method may miss early/mild disease, promote cross-infection in the CT room, increase radiation exposure, and consume enormous resources of disinfection.

Our findings have multiple implications. First, clinicians should not rely on initial chest CT findings to diagnose COVID-19 in the absence of laboratory confirmation. Second, patients who had been diagnosed with COVID-19 based on the clinical grounds should be re-evaluated with serum antibody tests. Third, patients who were isolated and cohorted with laboratory-confirmed cases in the temporary COVID-19 hospitals of Hubei province may need to be reevaluated aiming for further laboratory evidence including repeated NAT or serum antibody test.

Results of study should be interpreted in light of its shortfalls. Due to the constraints in time and patient number, we could not perform independent validation with an external sample. We did not compare serial imaging changes. We used a commercial image analysis system based on deep learning. The system does not provide flexibility in adjustment of machine-learning model or hyperparameters selection. We do not exclude future tailor trained machine learning systems that can differentiate chest CT of

COVID-19 from other suspected patients.

CONCLUSION

We documented the non-differentiating nature of initial chest CT between COVID-19 and other viral pneumonia with suspected symptoms. Our results do not support CT findings replacing microbiological diagnosis as a critical criterion for COVID-19 diagnosis. Our findings may prompt re-evaluation of isolated patients without laboratory confirmation.

Conflict(s) of Interest/Disclosure(s)

The authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Qingli Dou, Jiangping Liu.

Data curation: Qingli Dou, Jiangping Liu.

Formal analysis: Qingli Dou, Jiangping Liu.

Methodology: Qingli Dou, Jiangping Liu, Wenwu Zhang, Yanan Gu

Project administration: Wan-Ting Hsu, Hoi Sin Tong, Wing Yan Yu.

Resources: Qingli Dou, Jiangping Liu, Chien-Chang Lee.

Supervision: Qingli Dou, Chien-Chang Lee.

Writing – original draft: Qingli Dou, Jiangping Liu, Wenwu Zhang, Yanan Gu, Chien-Chang Lee.

Writing – review & editing: Qingli Dou, Jiangping Liu, Kuan-Ching Ho, Hoi Sin Tong, Wing Yan Yu, Chien-Chang Lee.

Acknowledgement

We are indebted to Dr. Anuj Pareek at Department of Radiology, Stanford University for his constructive comments on the manuscript.

References

1. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020.
2. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. *The Lancet* 2020.
3. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The Lancet* 2020.
4. Bogoch II, Watts A, Thomas-Bachli A, Huber C, Kraemer MU, Khan K. Potential for global spread of a novel coronavirus from China. *Journal of travel medicine* 2020.

5. Dong E, , Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020.
6. Coronavirus COVID-19 Global Cases by John Hopkins. The Center for Systems Science and Engineering at Johns Hopkins University, 2020. (Accessed February 16, 2020, 2020, at <https://gisanddata.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd40299423467b48e9ecf6>.)
7. Ai J-W, Zhang H-C, Xu T, et al. Optimizing diagnostic strategy for novel coronavirus pneumonia, a multi-center study in Eastern China. medRxiv 2020.
8. Fang Y, Zhang H, Xu Y, Xie J, Pang P, Ji W. CT Manifestations of Two Cases of 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Pneumonia. *Radiology* 2020:200280.
9. Lei J, Li J, Li X, Qi X. CT Imaging of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Pneumonia. *Radiology* 2020:200236.
10. Lin L, Li T. Interpretation of" Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Infection by the National Health Commission (Trial Version 5)". *Zhonghua yi xue za zhi* 2020;100:E001.
11. Fang Y, Zhang H, Xie J, et al. Sensitivity of Chest CT for COVID-19: Comparison to RT-PCR. *Radiology* 2020.
12. Chan JF-W, Yuan S, Kok K-H, et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *The Lancet* 2020.
13. Pan Y, Guan H. Imaging changes in patients with 2019-nCov. Springer; 2020.
14. Kanne JP. Chest CT Findings in 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Infections from Wuhan, China: Key Points for the Radiologist. *Radiology* 2020:200241.
15. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *The Lancet* 2020.

Table 1. Patients characteristics between case and control patients [n(%)]

Characteristic	COVID-19 (N=52)	non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia (N =80)	P Value
Age	45.61±14.19	48.69±14.62	0.12
Sex			
Female	32(61.54%)	58(72.50%)	0.44
Male	20(38.46%)	22(27.50%)	0.73
Course of disease	5.61±2.19	8.32±1.82	0.61
Onset of symptom to CT examination	4.32±0.82	6.87±1.89	0.06
Symptoms			
Fever	47(90.38)	71(88.75)	0.24
Fatigue	44(84.61)	68(85.00)	0.08
Dry cough	31(59.62)	48(60.00)	0.16
Dyspnea	15(28.85)	27(33.75)	0.67
Sore throat	28(53.85)	49(61.25)	0.48
Comorbidities			
Hypertension	24(46.15)	39(48.75)	0.89
Chronic heart failure	10(19.23)	17(21.25)	0.85
Diabetes	14(26.92)	20(25.00)	0.52
Cerebrovascular disease	9(17.31)	19(23.75)	0.37
COPD	11(21.15)	16(20.00)	0.94
Chronic kidney disease	4(7.69)	8(10.00)	0.30
Laboratory results			
White blood cell count (10 ⁹ /L)	13.60±5.38	11.35±5.88	0.39
Neutrophil percentage (%)	20.43±5.86	18.20±5.05	0.59
Lymphocyte percentage (%)	82.45±14.54	85.69±10.08	0.20
C-reactive protein (mg/dL)	93.20±24.01	106.59±29.29	0.10
Lactate (mmol/L)	2.71±1.38	2.58±1.20	0.16

Table 2. Radiologist interpretation of chest CT before NAT results [n(%)]

	COVID-19 (N=52)	non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia (N =80)	<i>P</i> Value
Ground glass opacities	38(73.07)	57(71.25)	0.27
Patch infiltration	30(57.69)	48(60.00)	0.08
Patch consolidation	15(28.84)	28(35.00)	0.15
Pleural effusion	4(7.69)	9(11.25)	0.54
Mediastinal lymphadenopathy	3(5.78)	5(6.25)	0.71
Air bronchogram	11(21.15)	15(18.75)	0.19
Pleural thickening	4(7.69)	6(7.50)	0.57
Interstitial change	10(19.23)	16(20.00)	0.29

Table 3. Difference in lesions distribution between COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia patients

Affected Lung field	COVID-19		non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia		<i>p</i> ^a	<i>p</i> ^b
	Infection volume(cm ³)	Percentage of infection(%)	Infection volume(cm ³)	Percentage of infection(%)		
Right upper lobe	29.55±10.41	3.93±1.11	40.76±13.24	11.66±3.67	0.70	0.71
Right middle lobe	11.61±6.64	0.63±0.20	25.35±7.51	4.57±1.90	0.22	0.20
Right lower lobe	45.93±18.40	7.19±3.41	80.61±41.47	15.56±7.38	0.37	0.93
Left upper lobe	22.17±8.54	1.19±0.11	34.60±10.41	8.67±2.00	0.90	0.79
Left lower lobe	48.42±22.98	8.67±1.45	105.76±32.03	22.15±8.02	0.52	0.75

Note: a: Comparison of the infection volume in COVID-19 group and non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia; b: Comparison of the infection ratio of the affected sites in COVID-19 group and non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia group.