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

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

1. Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA
2. Quantitative Sciences Unit, Stanford University, Stanford CA
3. Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
4. Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
5. Department of Emergency Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA

Corresponding Author:

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

Tables List:

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

Figures List:

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

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

Word Count—

Title Page: 221

Abstract: 244

Body: 2,365

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.

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.

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 IQTM, VaveTM, LumifyTM, MindrayTM, GETM, and SonositeTM, 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.

Analysis

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

Results

A. Patients & Scans

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

B. Primary Outcome: ICU Admission

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

C. Secondary Outcomes: Intubation, Oxygen Usage, Readmission

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

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

D. Stability of Lung Ultrasound Findings Over Time

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

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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, Sferazza 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, Ruutinen 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

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

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

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
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459

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

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

Scanning Protocol

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