

1 **Point-of-Care Ultrasound (POCUS) Predicts Clinical Outcomes in Patients with COVID-**
2 **19.**

3
4 Andre Kumar, MD, MEd¹, Isabel Weng², MS, Sally Graglia, MD, MPH³, Thomas Lew, MD¹,
5 Kavita Gandhi, MD, PhD³, Farhan Lalani, MD⁴, David Chia, MD⁴, Youyou Duanmu, MD,
6 MPH⁵, Trevor Jenson, MD⁴, Viveta Lobo, MD⁵, Jeffrey Nahn, MD³, Nicholas Iverson, MD⁴,
7 Molly Rosenthal, MD⁴, June Gordon, MD¹, John Kugler, MD¹, Minh Chi Tran, MD¹, Xiaolin
8 Jia, MD¹, Charles Liao, MD¹, Alice Cha, MD¹, Evan Baum, MD¹, Douglas Halket, MD¹, Jai
9 Madhok, MD¹, Muhammad Fazal, MD¹

- 10
11 1. Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA
12 2. Quantitative Sciences Unit, Stanford University, Stanford CA
13 3. Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco,
14 CA
15 4. Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
16 5. Department of Emergency Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA

17
18 Corresponding Author:

19 Andre Kumar, MD
20 Stanford University School of Medicine
21 300 Pasteur Drive
22 Stanford, CA 95401
23 Akumar3@stanford.edu
24 Phone- 650-723-2300

25
26 Tables List:

- 27 Table 1. Patient Demographics
28 Table 2: POCUS Findings and Primary Outcome
29 Table 3. Secondary Outcomes and POCUS findings

30
31 Figures List:

32 Figure 1. Scanning Protocol and Lung Ultrasound Findings in COVID-19 Patients.

33
34 Keywords: POCUS, ultrasound, Covid-19, coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, Mortality, ICU, outcomes
35 Running Title: POCUS Outcomes COVID

36
37 Word Count—
38 Title Page: 221
39 Abstract: 244
40 Body: 2,365

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80

Abstract

Introduction: Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) may detect the cardiopulmonary manifestations of COVID-19 and expediently predict patient outcomes.

Methods: We conducted a prospective cohort study at four medical centers from 3/2020-1/2021 to evaluate POCUS findings and clinical outcomes with COVID-19. Our inclusion criteria included adult patients hospitalized for COVID-19 who received cardiac or lung POCUS with a 12-zone protocol. Images were interpreted by two reviewers blinded to clinical outcomes. Our primary outcome was ICU admission incidence. Secondary outcomes included intubation and supplemental oxygen usage.

Results: N=160 patients (N=201 scans) were included. Scans were collected a median 23 hours (IQR:7-80) from emergency department triage. Triage POCUS findings associated with ICU admission included B-lines (OR 4.41 [95% CI:1.71-14.30]; $p<0.01$) or consolidation (OR 2.49 [95% CI:1.35-4.86]; $p<0.01$). B-lines were associated with intubation (OR 3.10 [95% CI:1.15-10.27]; $p=0.02$) and supplemental oxygen usage (OR 3.74 [95% CI:1.63-8.63; $p<0.01$). Consolidations present on triage were associated with the need for oxygen at discharge (OR 2.16 [95% CI: 1.01-4.70]; $p=0.047$). A normal lung triage scan was protective for ICU admission (OR 0.28 [95% CI:0.09-0.75; $p<0.01$) or need for supplemental oxygen during the hospitalization (OR 0.26 [95% CI:0.11-0.61]; $p<0.01$). Triage cardiac POCUS scans were not associated with any outcomes.

Discussion: Lung POCUS findings detected early in the hospitalization may provide expedient risk stratification for important COVID-19 clinical outcomes, including ICU admission, intubation, or need for oxygen on discharge. A normal admission scan appears protective against adverse outcomes, which may aid in triage decisions of patients.

81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126

Introduction

There is an urgent need to employ diagnostic modalities on the frontline of COVID-19 that are expedient, accurate, and cost-effective. Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) has garnered substantial interest as a potential modality to meet these needs for providers.¹⁻³ POCUS devices are cheaper than traditional imaging equipment, such as X-ray or computed tomography (CT) machines, which makes POCUS ideal for surge scenarios and other resource-limited settings.⁴ Since providers using POCUS are concomitantly at the bedside assessing patients, POCUS permits an immediate and augmented evaluation of the patient, while potentially reducing personal protective equipment usage by radiology technicians and the need to decontaminate larger radiographic equipment.⁵ Despite the potential for POCUS to improve clinical care for COVID-19, there is limited understanding on whether POCUS can predict clinical outcomes or impending deterioration.^{6,7} In contrast, CT and X-ray findings predict important outcomes such as mechanical ventilation or death,⁸⁻¹⁰ which support a broader trend of using imaging modalities to provide risk stratification with COVID-19.

Previously described cardiopulmonary manifestations of COVID-19 include pulmonary edema, consolidation, pleural-line irregularities, and cardiomyopathy.¹¹⁻¹³ POCUS can diagnose these pathological states with similar accuracy to computed tomography and echocardiography.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ When compared to the “gold standard” of computed tomography, POCUS has a sensitivity and specificity of 83.2% and 90.3% for alveolar-interstitial syndromes and 82.7% and 90.2% for consolidation, respectively.¹⁸ When compared to X-ray, POCUS is more sensitive at detecting the pulmonary manifestations of COVID-19.¹⁹ The sonographic manifestations of COVID-19 pneumonia include bilateral B-lines, subpleural consolidations, pleural thickening, yet with surprising absence of pleural effusions.²⁰⁻²² These findings correlate with findings highly specific for COVID-19 observed with computed tomography (see Appendix for a full description of these sonographic findings and their CT correlates).^{20,22}

There are few studies that examine the predictive utility of POCUS for COVID-19 despite recent findings that suggest imaging modalities may aid in risk stratification. In this study, we examine whether cardiopulmonary POCUS findings correlate with important clinical outcomes such as intensive care admission or need for supplemental oxygen usage, which carry substantial resource constraints. We also examine whether these findings, if detected early, are predictive of future clinical outcomes in the subsequent hospital course.

Methods:

Participants & Setting

This was a prospective cohort study conducted at four tertiary care centers in the United States from 3/2020 – 1/2021. Our inclusion criteria included adults hospitalized with COVID-19 (based on symptomatology²³ plus a confirmatory nasopharyngeal PCR for SARS-CoV-2) who received a POCUS examination. Patients who did not receive a POCUS scan were excluded. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of Stanford University and the University of California, San Francisco. A waiver of consent was obtained by both institutions.

127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172

Outcomes

In this exploratory analysis, previously described POCUS features for COVID-19 were compared against primary and secondary outcomes of clinical interest.¹¹⁻¹³ Our primary outcome was the incidence of ICU admission vs. not among patients who received a scan. Secondary outcomes included the incidence of intubation, supplemental oxygen usage during the hospitalization or discharge, and 30-day readmission.

Scanning Protocol and Interpretation

All patients included in this study were scanned during their initial evaluation in the emergency department or subsequent hospital days. Physician discretion determined whether to perform an initial or follow-up POCUS examination for each patient. For example, if a physician determined that a patient was clinically stable and there was no reason to perform a repeat scan, then the examination was deferred to avoid unnecessary physician exposure. Physicians were instructed to use a 12-zone scanning protocol for pulmonary views (Figure 1) and save 6 second clips of each lung zone.²⁴ If a 12-zone protocol could not be performed due to the patient’s condition (e.g. the posterior lung zones were not accessible due to intubation), then a modified 8-zone protocol capturing the anterior and lateral lung fields was performed.²⁴ This study utilized several POCUS devices, including Butterfly IQ™, Vave™, Lumify™, Mindray™, GE™, and Sonosite™, which represent the commercially-available portable machines at our institutions. All devices were set to the “lung” preset for lung scanning. In addition, providers acquired cardiac POCUS images using standard echocardiographic views (parasternal long axis, short axis, apical four-chamber, and subcostal) and “cardiac” presets for scanning. All collected images were saved to a local picture archiving and communication system (PACS) that was used for research purposes.

The POCUS scans were obtained by physicians credentialed in POCUS for patient care at their respective institutions. The physicians involved in scanning completed a 30-minute orientation to review the scanning protocol. A core group of researchers at each site interpreted the archived images based on consensus guidelines for LUS developed by the researchers (Appendix).²⁴⁻²⁶ A full description of the credentials and experience of the scanners and image interpreters can be found in the Appendix. The researchers were blinded to patient outcomes when interpreting the images.

Previous investigations have demonstrated moderate to excellent interrater reliability (IRR) for LUS across different experience levels and probe types.²⁷⁻²⁹ Nonetheless, we conducted our own IRR analysis within the context of COVID-19 and LUS. We found that LUS has moderate-to-substantial IRR for LUS among COVID-19 for the findings included in this study.³⁰ Based on our IRR findings, we developed an interpretation protocol. First, two researchers would independently apply the consensus guidelines (Appendix) to create a standardized approach to image interpretation. Next, they would input their findings into separate electronic forms. The researchers would then meet to compare their interpretations. If there was disagreement in interpretation, the two researchers would attempt to reach a consensus. If no consensus could be reached, then the data was excluded from the final database.

173

174

175 *Analysis*

176 Our calculated sample size for this study was 94 patients based on reasonable assumptions (15%
177 event rate, 80% power, alpha 0.05). Event rates were based on internal data from our hospitals at
178 the time of study design. For the main analysis comparing ICU admission vs. not, the unit of
179 analysis was on each scan. Therefore, the analytical set could include multiple scans for one
180 patient that met inclusion criteria. Subgroup analysis was limited to the initial scan per patient.
181 Chi-square and Fisher exact testing were performed for categorical variables (depending on
182 sample size), and t-tests for continuous variables. Mann Whitney tests were performed for non-
183 normal distributed continuous variables instead of t-tests with median and interquartile ranges
184 (IQR) reported. Odds ratios, corresponding 95% confidence intervals and p values from the
185 models were reported. For POCUS features with low or high rates (<5%, >95%) of events, we
186 performed Firth logistic regressions instead to obtain more reliable estimates. Poisson regression
187 models were performed for POCUS ultrasound count features. All analysis was performed with
188 R statistical programming languages version 4.0.3 (Vienna, Austria).

189

190 **Results**

191 *A. Patients & Scans*

192 The study was sufficiently powered to analyze the primary outcome. There were N=160 patients
193 (N=201 lung ultrasounds and N=89 cardiac ultrasounds) included in the study (Tables 1 and 2).
194 Approximately N=32 patients received multiple LUS scans on separate days, which accounts for
195 the greater number of LUS scans than patients. All scans were collected a median 23 hours (IQR
196 7-80 hours) after initial evaluation in the emergency department.

197

198 *B. Primary Outcome: ICU Admission*

199 Several LUS features were more common in patients who experienced ICU admission (Table 2).
200 To assess the predictive utility of POCUS for ICU admission, we analyzed scans collected within
201 24 hours of ER triage or before ICU admission (n=153 scans). Several early POCUS features
202 were again associated with ICU admission (Table 2). These included the absolute presence of B-
203 lines (OR 4.41 [95% CI: 1.71-14.30]; p<0.01) or consolidation (OR 2.49 [95% CI 1.35-4.86];
204 p<0.01). The presence of either bilateral, anterior, or lateral B-lines or consolidations were
205 similarly associated with ICU admission (Table 2). Protective factors against ICU admission
206 included the presence of a normal lung scan (OR 0.28 [95% CI: 0.09-0.75]; p<0.01) or the
207 presence of an A-line pattern in the majority of lung fields (OR 0.42 [95% CI: 0.21-0.81;
208 p<0.01]. None of the patients who had an initially normal LUS within 24 hours of ED evaluation
209 were admitted to the ICU in the subsequent 28 days.

210

211 *C. Secondary Outcomes: Intubation, Oxygen Usage, Readmission*

212 To assess the predictive utility of POCUS on secondary outcomes, scans that were collected
213 within 24 hours of ER triage or before ICU admission (n=153 scans) were analyzed. Early LUS
214 findings (Table 3) associated with intubation included anterior B-lines (OR 3.10 [95% CI: 1.15-
215 10.27]; p=0.02) and anterior consolidation (OR 6.40 [95% CI: 1.80-34.01]; p<0.01).
216 Supplemental oxygen usage during the hospitalization was associated with B-lines at triage (OR
217 3.74 [95% CI: 1.63-8.63]; p<0.01), while a normal LUS at the time of triage was protective
218 against oxygen usage for the hospitalization (OR 0.26 [95% CI: 0.11-0.61]; p<0.01).

219 Consolidations present on triage scans were associated with the need for oxygen at discharge
220 (OR 2.16 [95% CI: 1.01-4.70]; p=0.047). No POCUS findings were significantly associated with
221 30-day readmission, although there were several trends among specific patterns of B-lines or
222 consolidations (Appendix).

223

224 *D. Stability of Lung Ultrasound Findings Over Time*

225 The following analysis examined whether lung POCUS findings dynamically change over 28
226 days from symptom onset. Patient scans (N=201) were stratified into quartiles by time since
227 symptom onset to their scan (Days 0-6, 7-13, 14-20, and 21-28). All scans were collected a
228 median 9 days (IQR: 5, 14.5) from symptom onset and did not differ from patients who
229 experienced ICU admission vs. not (Table 1). Notably, POCUS findings did not significantly
230 change over the 28-day period (Appendix). This stability was also observed for patients who
231 experienced ICU admission vs. not (Appendix). Similarly, there was no difference when
232 comparing early (days 0-7) vs. late (days 21+) scans (Appendix).

233

234 **Discussion**

235 In this prospective cohort study conducted at four medical centers, we characterize lung and
236 cardiac POCUS findings present among patients hospitalized with COVID-19 and examine the
237 predictive utility of these findings on clinical outcomes such as ICU admission. Several lung
238 findings, including B-lines or consolidations, were associated with worsened outcomes such as
239 ICU admission, intubation, or supplemental oxygen usage. Other findings, including a normal
240 lung ultrasound or predominance of A-lines, were protective against several of these outcomes.
241 When we confined our analysis to scans collected within 24 hours of ED triage, these findings
242 were also predictive of clinical outcomes for the subsequent hospital course. Finally, these
243 findings did not dynamically change over a 28-day window, suggesting that their presence,
244 regardless of when they are detected, may be important clinical predictors.

245

246 POCUS is an expedient and cost-effective diagnostic modality that can be used in busy clinical
247 departments to rapidly detect the cardiopulmonary manifestations of COVID-19.^{5,31} POCUS may
248 have similar predictive utility for outcomes compared to risk stratification systems that use
249 radiographical or laboratory markers.⁸⁻¹⁰ Previously described manifestations of COVID-19
250 pneumonia include B-lines, subpleural consolidations, and a low frequency of pleural
251 effusions.^{5,31} These findings correlate with findings observed with COVID-19 with computed
252 tomography (Appendix).^{20,22} Several investigators have begun to develop scoring systems to
253 stratify patients at risk for clinical deterioration using these POCUS findings.^{6,7,20,32} Many of
254 these scoring systems have demonstrable predictive utility,^{6,7} but they also incorporate
255 cumbersome scanning protocols of multiple zones and may only be utilized by highly motivated
256 users. In contrast, our findings suggest that findings of meaningful predictive utility are located
257 primarily in the anterior or lateral lungs, which can be successfully performed by providers with
258 more limited experience.³³ Several of the findings (especially B-lines) have excellent interrater
259 reliability and can be expediently learned.^{30,34,35} Based on the results of this study, a rapid
260 assessment of the anterior lungs may provide sufficient risk stratification and warrants further
261 study.

262

263 A challenge for providers is what to do if a scan demonstrates high-risk features, yet the patient
264 does not require critical care. In the COVID-19 era, it is not feasible for overcrowded ICUs to

265 accept patients who are “at risk” for deterioration. In this study, we observed that POCUS
266 findings remained stable over the 28-day scanning period, which is consistent with previous
267 observations for POCUS and COVID-19.^{36,37} Therefore, the detection of these findings at any
268 time point may be concerning and warrant close observation. A potential application for POCUS
269 in COVID-19 is for augmented risk stratification for the need for admission or discharge.² Based
270 on our results, if an otherwise stable patient presents with a normal lung ultrasound, a provider
271 may be reassured for discharge, especially since POCUS findings for COVID-19 may remain
272 stable over time. This practice may be supported by CT data that demonstrate pulmonary
273 opacities often appear before symptomatology or clinical deterioration, suggesting that imaging
274 findings can predict whether a patient will clinically worsen, even before becoming
275 symptomatic.³⁸ Further studies are needed to assess the feasibility of POCUS to guide admission
276 or discharge decisions.

277
278 There are several limitations to this study. Certain patient conditions, such as intubation or
279 patient mobility, prevented the provider from acquiring all 12 zones, particularly the posterior
280 zones. Therefore, not all patients received a 12-zone scan, which limits the generalizability of the
281 findings’ frequencies by location. Patients were scanned based on provider discretion, but it is
282 possible that patients with certain features on X-ray or CT were more likely to receive a LUS.
283 We did not control for patient health conditions that may have confounded the sonographic
284 findings (e.g. interstitial lung disease), although these diseases had low prevalence in our
285 population (Table 1). Finally, our population included only patients hospitalized for COVID-19.
286 Therefore, our findings may not be generalizable to outpatient or triage settings, although other
287 studies have examined the utility of POCUS in these venues.^{2,7,19}

288
289 In conclusion, POCUS may provide expedient risk stratification for patients hospitalized with
290 COVID-19, and it may have similar utility as other scoring systems that utilize radiographical or
291 laboratory markers. Several POCUS findings, including B-lines and consolidations, were
292 predictive of ICU admission, intubation, subsequent supplemental oxygen usage, or the need for
293 oxygen on discharge. The predictive utility of these findings was also present when we limited
294 our analysis to scans collected within 24 hours of admission. Importantly, a normal lung
295 ultrasound was protective against these outcomes, even among scans collected early in the
296 hospitalization. Future studies should determine if POCUS can be utilized to appropriate triage
297 or discharge patients with COVID-19, especially if a simplified protocol capturing the anterior or
298 lateral lungs is used.

299
300

30 References

302. Johri AM, Galen B, Kirkpatrick JN, Lanspa M, Mulvagh S, Thamman R. ASE Statement on
303 Point-of-Care Ultrasound during the 2019 Novel Coronavirus Pandemic. J Am Soc
304 Echocardiogr. 2020 Jun 1;33(6):670–3.
305. Calvo-Cebrián A, Alonso-Roca R, Rodríguez-Contreras FJ, Rodríguez-Pascual M de LN,
306 Calderín-Morales MDP. Usefulness of Lung Ultrasound Examinations Performed by Primary
307 Care Physicians in Patients With Suspected COVID-19. J Ultrasound Med [Internet]. 2020 Aug
308 27; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jum.15444>

309. Mathews BK, Koenig S, Kurian L, Galen B, Mints G, Liu G, et al. Clinical Progress Note: Point-
310 of-Care Ultrasound Applications in COVID-19. J Hosp Med. 2020 Jun;15(6):353–5.
314. Reynolds TA, Amato S, Kulola I, Chen C-JJ, Mfinanga J, Sawe HR. Impact of point-of-care
312 ultrasound on clinical decision-making at an urban emergency department in Tanzania. PLoS
313 One. 2018 Apr 25;13(4):e0194774.
314. Fox S, Dugar S. Point-of-care ultrasound and COVID-19. Cleve Clin J Med [Internet]. 2020 May
315 14; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3949/ccjm.87a.ccc019>
316. Lu X, Zhang M, Qian A, Tang L, Xu S. Lung ultrasound score in establishing the timing of
317 intubation in COVID-19 interstitial pneumonia: A preliminary retrospective observational study.
318 PLoS One. 2020 Sep 3;15(9):e0238679.
319. Lichter Y, Topilsky Y, Taieb P, Banai A, Hochstadt A, Merdler I, et al. Lung ultrasound predicts
320 clinical course and outcomes in COVID-19 patients. Intensive Care Med [Internet]. 2020 Aug
321 28; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-020-06212-1>
322. Chon Y, Kim JY, Suh YJ, Lee JY, Park JS, Moon SM, et al. Adverse Initial CT Findings
323 Associated with Poor Prognosis of Coronavirus Disease. J Korean Med Sci. 2020 Aug
324 31;35(34):e316.
325. Liang W, Liang H, Ou L, Chen B, Chen A, Li C, et al. Development and Validation of a Clinical
326 Risk Score to Predict the Occurrence of Critical Illness in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19.
327 JAMA Intern Med [Internet]. 2020 May 12; Available from:
328 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2033>
329. Lanza E, Muglia R, Bolengo I, Santonocito OG, Lisi C, Angelotti G, et al. Quantitative chest CT
330 analysis in COVID-19 to predict the need for oxygenation support and intubation. Eur Radiol
331 [Internet]. 2020 Jun 26; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00330-020-07013-2>
332. Grillo F, Barisione E, Ball L, Mastracci L, Fiocca R. Lung fibrosis: an undervalued finding in
333 COVID-19 pathological series. Lancet Infect Dis [Internet]. 2020 Jul 28; Available from:
334 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30582-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30582-X)
335. Argulian E, Sud K, Vogel B, Bohra C, Garg VP, Talebi S, et al. Right Ventricular Dilation in
336 Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19 Infection. JACC Cardiovasc Imaging [Internet]. 2020 May
337 15; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcmg.2020.05.010>
338. Pagnesi M, Baldetti L, Beneduce A, Calvo F, Gramegna M, Pazzanese V, et al. Pulmonary
339 hypertension and right ventricular involvement in hospitalised patients with COVID-19. Heart.
340 2020 Sep;106(17):1324–31.
341. Lucas BP, Candotti C, Margeta B, Evans AT, Mba B, Baru J, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of
342 hospitalist-performed hand-carried ultrasound echocardiography after a brief training program. J
343 Hosp Med. 2009 Jul;4(6):340–9.

3445. Alzahrani SA, Al-Salamah MA, Al-Madani WH, Elbarbary MA. Systematic review and meta-
345 analysis for the use of ultrasound versus radiology in diagnosing of pneumonia. Crit Ultrasound
346 J. 2017 Dec;9(1):6.
3476. Lichtenstein DA. BLUE-protocol and FALLS-protocol: two applications of lung ultrasound in
348 the critically ill. Chest. 2015 Jun;147(6):1659–70.
3497. Grifoni S, Olivotto I, Cecchini P, Pieralli F, Camaiti A, Santoro G, et al. Utility of an integrated
350 clinical, echocardiographic, and venous ultrasonographic approach for triage of patients with
351 suspected pulmonary embolism. Am J Cardiol. 1998 Nov 15;82(10):1230–5.
3528. Chiumello D, Umbrello M, Sferrazza Papa GF, Angileri A, Gurgitano M, Formenti P, et al.
353 Global and Regional Diagnostic Accuracy of Lung Ultrasound Compared to CT in Patients With
354 Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. Crit Care Med. 2019 Nov;47(11):1599–606.
3559. Pare JR, Camelo I, Mayo KC, Leo MM, Dugas JN, Nelson KP, et al. Point-of-care Lung
356 Ultrasound Is More Sensitive than Chest Radiograph for Evaluation of COVID-19. West J
357 Emerg Med. 2020 Jun 19;21(4):771–8.
3580. Ottaviani S, Franc M, Ebstein E, Demaria L, Lheure C, Debray MP, et al. Lung ultrasonography
359 in patients with COVID-19: comparison with CT. Clin Radiol [Internet]. 2020 Aug 12; Available
360 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.crad.2020.07.024>
3621. Dini FL, Bergamini C, Allegrini A, Scopelliti M, Secco G, Miccoli M, et al. Bedside wireless
362 lung ultrasound for the evaluation of COVID-19 lung injury in senior nursing home residents.
363 Monaldi Arch Chest Dis [Internet]. 2020 Sep 2;90(3). Available from:
364 <http://dx.doi.org/10.4081/monaldi.2020.1446>
3652. Fiala MJ. Ultrasound in COVID-19: a timeline of ultrasound findings in relation to CT. Clin
366 Radiol. 2020 Jul;75(7):553–4.
3673. CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and
368 Prevention. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 29]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/hcp/clinical-criteria.html)
369 [nCoV/hcp/clinical-criteria.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-nCoV/hcp/clinical-criteria.html)
3704. Doerschug KC, Schmidt GA. Intensive care ultrasound: III. Lung and pleural ultrasound for the
371 intensivist. Ann Am Thorac Soc. 2013 Dec;10(6):708–12.
3725. Reuss J. Sonography of the pleura. Ultraschall Med. 2010 Feb;31(1):8–22, quiz 23–5.
3736. Lobo V, Weingrow D, Perera P, Williams SR, Gharahbaghian L. Thoracic ultrasonography. Crit
374 Care Clin. 2014 Jan;30(1):93–117, v – vi.
3757. Gomond-Le Goff C, Vivalda L, Foligno S, Loi B, Yousef N, De Luca D. Effect of Different
376 Probes and Expertise on the Interpretation Reliability of Point-of-Care Lung Ultrasound. Chest.
377 2020 Apr;157(4):924–31.

3728. Chiem AT, Chan CH, Ander DS, Kobylivker AN, Manson WC. Comparison of expert and
379 novice sonographers' performance in focused lung ultrasonography in dyspnea (FLUID) to
380 diagnose patients with acute heart failure syndrome. Acad Emerg Med. 2015 May;22(5):564–73.
3829. Vieira JR, Castro MR de, Guimarães T de P, Pinheiro AJT, Figueiredo ACTC, Martins BJ, et al.
382 Evaluation of pulmonary B lines by different intensive care physicians using bedside
383 ultrasonography: a reliability study. Rev Bras Ter Intensiva. 2019 Oct 14;31(3):354–60.
3840. Kumar A, Weng Y, Graglia S, Chung S, Duanmu Y, Lalani F, et al. Interobserver agreement of
385 lung ultrasound findings of COVID-19. J Ultrasound Med [Internet]. 2021 Jan 11; Available
386 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jum.15620>
3871. Sorlini C, Femia M, Nattino G, Bellone P, Gesu E, Francione P, et al. The role of lung
388 ultrasound as a frontline diagnostic tool in the era of COVID-19 outbreak. Intern Emerg Med
389 [Internet]. 2020 Oct 22; Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11739-020-02524-8>
3902. García Cruz E, Manzur Sandoval D, Rascón Sabido R, Gopar Nieto R, Barajas Campos
391 RL, Jordán Ríos A, et al. Critical care ultrasonography during COVID-19 pandemic: The
392 ORACLE protocol. Echocardiography. 2020 Aug 29;33:670.
3933. Lim JS, Lee S, Do HH, Oh KH. Can Limited Education of Lung Ultrasound Be Conducted to
394 Medical Students Properly? A Pilot Study. Biomed Res Int. 2017 Mar 28;2017:8147075.
3954. Shumbusho JP, Duanmu Y, Kim SH, Bassett IV, Boyer EW, Ruutiainen AT, et al. Accuracy of
396 Resident-Performed Point-of-Care Lung Ultrasound Examinations Versus Chest Radiography in
397 Pneumothorax Follow-up After Tube Thoracostomy in Rwanda. J Ultrasound Med. 2020
398 Mar;39(3):499–506.
3995. Kumar A, Weng Y, Wang L, Bentley J, Almli M, Hom J, et al. Portable Ultrasound Device
400 Usage and Learning Outcomes Among Internal Medicine Trainees: A Parallel-Group
401 Randomized Trial. J Hosp Med. 2020 Feb 11;15(2):e1–6.
4026. Zhang Y, Xue H, Wang M, He N, Lv Z, Cui L. Lung Ultrasound Findings in Patients With
403 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2020 Jul 22;1–5.
4047. Kumar AD, Chung S, Duanmu Y, Graglia S, Lalani F, Gandhi K, et al. Lung Ultrasound
405 Findings in Patients Hospitalized with Covid-19 [Internet]. Infectious Diseases (except
406 HIV/AIDS). medRxiv; 2020. Available from:
407 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.25.20140392v1.abstract>
4088. Inui S, Fujikawa A, Jitsu M, Kunishima N, Watanabe S, Suzuki Y, et al. Chest CT Findings in
409 Cases from the Cruise Ship Diamond Princess with Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19).
410 Radiology: Cardiothoracic Imaging. 2020 Apr 1;2(2):e200110.

411

412

413

414

415

416

Characteristic	All COVID-19 Patients	Non-ICU Patients	ICU Patients	p-value
Number of Patients	160	106 (66%)	54 (34%)	-
Median Age (IQR)	58 (45-71)	55 (46-69)	60 (43-71)	0.85
Female	65 (41%)	46 (43%)	19 (35%)	0.45
Median BMI (IQR)	28.9 (25-34)	28 (25- 34)	31 (26-36)	0.2
Mechanical Ventilation	24 (15%)	-	24 (44%)	-
Death	7 (4%)	-	7 (13%)	-
Median Length of Stay (IQR)	5 (3-12)	4 (2-6)	16 (9-25)	<0.001
Supplemental Oxygen Usage	102 (64%)	48 (64%)	54 (100%)	<0.001
Discharged on Oxygen	37 (42%)	15 (27%)	22 (65%)	<0.001
Symptoms to Triage, Days (IQR)	6 [3-9]	7.0 [3.0,10.0]	6.0 [3.3,8.8]	0.60
Symptoms to Scan, Days (IQR)	9 [5-14.5]	9.0 [5.0,12.0]	11.0 [5.6,17.0]	0.08
Readmission at 30 Days	14 (16%)	10 (16%)	4 (15%)	1.00
Medical Comorbidities				
Hypertension	68 (43%)	39 (37%)	29 (54%)	0.06
Diabetes	62 (39%)	38 (36%)	24 (44%)	0.38
Hyperlipidemia	57 (36%)	32 (30%)	25 (46%)	0.07
Chronic Kidney Disease	22 (14%)	12 (11%)	10 (19%)	0.31
Coronary Artery Disease	20 (13%)	15 (14%)	5 (9%)	0.53
Asthma	17 (11%)	12 (11%)	5 (9%)	0.89
Current Smoker	17 (11%)	11 (10%)	3 (6%)	1.00
History of Cancer	15 (9.4%)	10 (9%)	5 (9%)	1.00
Congestive Heart Failure	15 (9%)	11 (10%)	4 (7%)	0.75
COPD	11 (7%)	9 (9%)	2 (4%)	0.42
History of CVA	8 (5%)	7 (7%)	1 (2%)	0.36

417 Table 1. Patient Demographics. Bold items denote findings of statistical significance (p<0.05).
 418 ICU, Intensive Care Unit; BMI, Body-Mass Index; COPD, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary
 419 Disease; CVA, Cerebrovascular Accident; IQR, interquartile range.

420

421

422

423

424

425

Characteristic	All Patients	Non-ICU Patients	ICU Patients	P-value	OR (95% CI) From Early Scans	P-value
No. of Scans	201	132 (66%)	69 (34%)	-	153	-
No. of 12-Zone Scans	115 (57%)	77 (58%)	38 (55%)	-	51 (33%)	-
Anterior Zone Scans	198 (99%)	130 (98%)	68 (99%)	-	153 (100%)	-
Lateral Zone Scans	188 (94%)	121 (92%)	67 (97%)	-	153 (100%)	-
Posterior Zone Scans	115 (57%)	77 (58%)	38 (55%)	-	51 (33%)	-
Normal Cardiac POCUS	78 (39%)	53 (40%)	25 (36%)	0.70	0.89 [0.48-1.64]	0.72
Normal Lung POCUS	31 (15%)	27 (20%)	4 (6%)	0.01	0.28 [0.09-0.75]	<0.01
Majority A-Line Pattern	65 (32%)	51 (39%)	14 (20%)	0.01	0.42 [0.21-0.81]	<0.01
B-Lines	165 (82%)	100 (76%)	65 (94%)	<0.01	4.41 [1.71-14.30]	<0.01
Bilateral	124 (62%)	71 (54%)	53 (77%)	<0.01	2.63 [1.39-5.17]	<0.01
Anterior	121 (61%)	68 (52%)	53 (78%)	<0.01	2.97 [1.55-5.93]	<0.01
Lateral	132 (70%)	82 (68%)	50 (74%)	0.41	1.33 [0.69-2.63]	0.41
Posterior	84 (72%)	51 (66%)	33 (85%)	0.06	2.4 [0.95-6.80]	0.07
Consolidation	108 (54%)	60 (46%)	48 (70%)	<0.01	2.49 [1.35-4.68]	<0.01
Translobar	5 (3%)	2 (2%)	3 (6%)	0.50	2.59 [0.49-16.00]	0.26
Subpleural	100 (52%)	59 (47%)	41 (62%)	0.06	1.68 [0.92-3.12]	0.09
Bilateral (any)	61 (30%)	31 (24%)	30 (44%)	<0.01	2.35 [1.26-4.41]	<0.01
Anterior (any)	53 (54%)	21 (39%)	32 (71%)	<0.01	3.81 [1.66-9.17]	<0.01
Lateral (any)	69 (68%)	32 (55%)	37 (84%)	<0.01	3.71 [1.50-10.09]	<0.01
Posterior (any)	56 (82%)	39 (87%)	17 (74%)	0.33	0.45 [0.13-1.57]	0.21

426 Table 2. POCUS Findings and Primary Outcome. POCUS findings were compared between
 427 patients admitted to the ICU vs. not. On sub-analysis, scans were analyzed if they were collected
 428 within 24 hours of emergency department triage and ICU admission to examine the predictive
 429 utility of early POCUS scans (expressed as odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals). Bold
 430 items denote findings of statistical significance (p<0.05). ICU, intensive care unit; OR, odds
 431 ratio; POCUS, point-of-care ultrasound.

432

433

434

435

436


437
438
439
440

Characteristic	Intubation OR [95% CI]	p-value	Required Supplemental O ₂ OR {95% CI]	p-value	Required O ₂ at discharge OR [95% CI]	p-value
Normal Cardiac POCUS	1.78 [0.76-4.18]	0.18	1.36 [0.6-3.27]	0.75	0.5 [0.19-1.22]	0.13
Normal Lung POCUS	0.32 [0.03-1.32]	0.13	0.26 [0.11-0.61]	<0.01	0.58 [0.20-1.56]	0.29
Majority A-Line Pattern	0.53 [0.18-1.35]	0.19	0.9 [0.42-1.98]	0.79	0.67 [0.29-1.52]	0.35
B-Lines	3.82 [0.93-35.07]	0.07	3.74 [1.63-8.63]	<0.01	1.58 [0.61-4.35]	0.35
Bilateral	1.01 [0.43-2.48]	0.98	1.63 [0.78-3.43]	0.19	1.63 [0.76-3.58]	0.21
Anterior	3.10 [1.15-10.27]	0.02	2.93 [1.39-6.34]	<0.01	1.93 [0.88-4.4]	0.10
Lateral	0.76 [0.32-1.96]	0.56	2.21 [1.01-4.81]	0.046	1.27 [0.56-2.95]	0.57
Posterior	1.92 [0.53-10.32]	0.34	1.43 [0.47-4.24]	0.53	1.35 [0.41-4.51]	0.62
Consolidation	2.18 [0.91-5.70]	0.08	1.85 [0.88-4.05]	0.11	2.16 [1.01-4.70]	0.047
Translobar	6.38 [0.99-35.75]	0.05	1.07 [0.19-10.01]	0.95	2.47 [0.32-27.69]	0.38
Subpleural	1.19 [0.51-2.89]	0.69	1.67 [0.79-5.30]	0.19	1.62 [0.76-3.50]	0.21
Bilateral (any)	2.09 [0.88-4.92]	0.09	1.92 [0.79-5.3]	0.16	3.25 [1.35-8.11]	<0.01
Anterior (any)	6.40 [1.80-34.01]	<0.01	2.71 [0.82-9.67]	0.10	2.85 [0.89-9.81]	0.08
Lateral (any)	2.75 [0.76-14.74]	0.13	2.38 [0.64-8.5]	0.19	2.93 [0.83-11.66]	0.10
Posterior (any)	0.55 [0.12-3.33]	0.48	0.8 [0.07-4.95]	0.82	1.53 [0.25-10.87]	0.64

441
442 Table 3. Secondary Outcomes by POCUS Findings. Scans were analyzed if they were collected
443 within 24 hours of emergency department triage to examine the predictive utility of early
444 POCUS scans (expressed as odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals). Bold items denote
445 findings of statistical significance (p<0.05). ICU, intensive care unit; OR, odds ratio; POCUS,
446 point-of-care ultrasound.

447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459

Scanning Protocol



460
 461 Figure 1. Scanning Protocol and Lung Ultrasound Findings in COVID-19 Patients. This study
 462 utilized a 12-zone protocol. On each hemithorax, there are 6 zones. The exam begins on the
 463 patient's right side. Zones 1-2 (anterior zones) are between the parasternal margin (PSM) and the
 464 anterior axillary line (AAL) and are best obtained in the mid-clavicular line. Zones 3-4 (lateral
 465 zones) are between the anterior axillary line (AAL) and posterior axillary line (PAL) and are best
 466 obtained in the mid-axillary line. The nipple line serves as a bisecting area between these zones.
 467 Zones 5-6 (posterior zones) are medial to the scapular line (SL) and are bisected by the inferior
 468 scapular margin (ISM). The zone areas are repeated on the contralateral hemithorax (starting
 469 with zone 7). If a 12-zone protocol could not be obtained, then an eight-zone protocol (which
 470 excludes Zones 5-6) was obtained. This figure contains an overview of the observed ultrasound
 471 findings based on previously described terminology (Appendix).