

## PERSPECTIVE

General/surgery/internal

# Computerized tomography of the Thorax for surgical patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: Was it useful?

## Abstract

**Objectives:** Diagnostic challenges during the corona virus disease (COVID-19) pandemic forced the radiology regulating body to adopt the use of CT Chest as a triage and diagnostic tool, which was subsequently abandoned. The Royal Wolverhampton hospital followed both protocols. Here, we investigate the evidence behind this decision within the context of surgical admissions during the COVID-19 peak in our hospital.

**Methods:** Retrospective data collection and analysis of all surgical admissions between the 1st of March to the 31st of May. Data were collected from the radiology and electronic portal looking into patients undergoing CT chest to diagnose the presence of COVID-19 as well as swab results.

**Results:** Seventy-eight patients fulfilled our inclusion criteria. The scan either confirmed the presence or absence (4, 63 patients) of COVID-19 but was sometimes inconclusive (11 patients). Comparing these to the results of the swabs; CT showed sensitivity 42.86%, Specificity 97.92%, and accuracy 90.91%. In the inconclusive CT report group, chances of having a positive swab result were 45%: None of the scan results changed any of the surgical planning. Lymphocyte count in the context of surgical presentation did not have any statistical significance to predict the presence of COVID-19 ( $P = .7$ ). Cost implications on our cohort of patients for adding the chest CT is estimated to be around £31 000.

**Conclusion:** CT Thorax during the pandemic was a good negative predictor but had limited diagnostic value and did not change patient management. Newer, faster techniques of PCR swabs and antibody testing would be a better and cheaper alternative.

diagnostic challenges were encountered because of the absence of expertise, as well as logistical difficulties in obtaining enough testing kits. The initial turnaround time for a confirmed PCR swab result in the UK was around 4 days; Thoracic CT offered a quicker and more promising alternative to diagnose and triage the disease.

The British Society of Thoracic Imaging (BSTI) issued their first statement on 11th March 2020 stating,<sup>1</sup> "BSTI have been discussing this with NHS England. The current position is that there is no recommended use of CT, beyond 'routine clinical care'. We are reassured that this has so far also been the position taken by the American College of Radiology, in recommendations published on 22nd/March/2020. In a situation where numbers rise very rapidly, with increasingly ill patients requiring hospital admission, the role of CT may turn towards risk stratification and assessment of disease burden. Again, these discussions are ongoing with the Royal College of Radiologists and NHS England. We also have dialogue with our Italian colleagues." However, the following statement was released on 22nd May 2020, stating "As community prevalence of COVID-19 has dropped; and availability of RT-PCR has improved (including rapid tests generating results in 45-90 minutes), [so] the need for an alternative (ie, CT chest) has diminished. Most acute hospitals will now receive RT-PCR results before the decision regarding operative management. Acute abdominopelvic CT already includes the lung bases; the incremental benefit of full thoracic scanning where RT-PCR is negative and community prevalence is dropping is likely to be negligible. We therefore suggest that there is no longer a need for routine CT of the entire thorax for patients undergoing acute abdominopelvic imaging.<sup>1</sup> The Royal College of Radiology had similar views to those mentioned above and they released their own statement.<sup>2</sup>

The surgical department at the Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust decided to investigate our own outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic to see if CT Thorax added any value to the management of patients with general surgical conditions.

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

Every medical institution around the world was compelled to rise to the immense challenges posed by the corona virus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. In August 2020, it had infected over 22 million worldwide and caused the death of almost 800 000 and by June 2021, the figures continued to exponentially rose to 174 million infections and 3.7 million deaths. At the beginning of the pandemic,

## 2 | METHODS

Retrospective data were collected and analysed from all admissions between 1st March 2020 and 31st May 2020, that is, starting from the rise of the pandemic in Royal Wolverhampton Hospital and the implementation of the new guidelines regarding CT scanning of the chest as a tool to triage or to investigate patient for possible

COVID-19. Our inclusion criteria included all surgical admissions, emergency or elective, any gender and any age, those with a scan of their thorax, with or without a scan of the abdomen and pelvis to investigate their surgical pathology. The exclusion criterion was patients not undergoing CT Thorax. Data were collected from our electronic clinical portal and scanned documents.

The protocol used was non-contrast material-enhanced chest CT, unless CT pulmonary angiography was required to detect pulmonary embolism (PE). Reports on the scan was stratified into either 1- positive for COVID-19 and these usually showed consolidation with ground glass opacities either in one or both lungs, 2- Negative for COVID-19 where no abnormalities were found or 3- Inconclusive where the radiological changes were not able to confirm the presence or absence of COVID-19.

### 3 | RESULTS

Seventy-eight patients fulfilled the inclusion criteria, our age range was 26-92 years, with a median of 72.5. All patients admitted had a suspected surgical pathology. Seventy-two patients were emergency admissions while only 6 were elective, for cancer resection.

Data collected investigated patient's comorbidities including hypertension, diabetes and ischaemic heart disease (Chart 1).

COVID-19 nasopharyngeal swabs were sent on admission for 66 patients with available results. 12 patients did not have a swab (with no documented reason) and 21 patients (26.9%) had clinical and radiological signs of chest infection during their surgical admission. All these 21 patients had COVID-19 swabs sent except one who died and was not for escalation because of frailty (Table 1).

CT Thorax offered to the 78 patients were reported by radiologists of varying grades, but all were counter-checked by a consultant within 24 hours if reported initially by a registrar. Reports reviewed by the collecting team were categorised into confirmed negative, confirmed positive and inconclusive (Table 2).

All the results were compared with the results of the swabs (Table 3), excluding the 12 patients who did not have swabs sent,

**Comorbidities**




Chart 1

CHART 1 Comorbidities

TABLE 1 Number of PCR swabs

Swab positive		Swab negative		Swab not done	
12	15.3%	54	69.4%	12	15.3%

TABLE 2 CT reporting

CT reported positive	4	5%
CT reported negative	63	81%
CT reported inconclusive	11	14%

TABLE 3 Summing up of CT vs swab results

CT reports	Swab positive	Swab negative
CT reported positive	4	3
CT reported negative	51	47
CT reported inconclusive	11	6
Total	66	54

TABLE 4 Statistical calculations

Statistic	Value	95% CI
Sensitivity	42.86%	9.90%-81.59%
Specificity	97.92%	88.93%-99.95%
Positive likelihood ratio	20.57%	2.47-171.34
Negative likelihood ratio	0.58	0.31-1.11
Disease prevalence	12.73	5.27%-24.48%
Positive predictive value	75%	26.48%-96.15%
Negative predictive value	92.16%	86.07%-95.72%
Accuracy	90.91%	80.05%-96.98%

testing for sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy (Table 4). Forty-five percent of patients with CT reports that were inconclusive had a positive COVID-19 swab.

The number of patients requiring surgical intervention in our data capture were 22 (28%). Out of these, seven patients were positive for COVID-19 and CT failed to identify all of them, although six were reported as inconclusive. Ten of these patients required ITU admission post-operatively, but only one was because of COVID-19 pneumonia. One patient died a few days after surgical intervention, but he was COVID-19 negative on PCR and CT (Table 5).

Assessing mortality in our cohort of patients, 6 patients (7%) died in the first 30 days from admission, out of which one was related to COVID-19 pneumonia confirmed by CT Chest and swab. However, their management did not require surgical intervention. The rest had normal CT Chest findings, three had negative swabs results and two had no swabs sent at all (Table 6).

Exploring whether lymphocyte count plays a role in the context of surgical admission to predict COVID-19 status, they were found to be below the normal range in 56 patients (71%). From these, eight

TABLE 5 Patients requiring operative interventions

Operations	Positive swab	CT positive	CT inconclusive	ITU admission	ITU for Covid	Mortality	Mortality from C-19
22	7	0	6	10	1	1	0

TABLE 6 Mortality outcomes

Mortality	Positive swab	Negative swab	No swab	CT negative	CT positive	ITU	Operation
6	1	3	2	5	1	1	1

had a positive swab, nine did not have a swab and the rest were negative. No statistical correlation was found on a linear regression between lymphocyte level and swab status [ $P$  value = (.7)].

Estimating the cost implication on our hospital from the use of CT Chest scans during the pandemic was difficult as the tariff was based on rental, but it has been estimated to add at least £400 for each patient. This adds up to £31, 000 of extra cost, compared with the cost of PCR C-19 swabs which range from £75-150 per test. Furthermore, turnover time for the swab results is much quicker and hence is considered more efficient.

## 4 | DISCUSSION

The SARS-CoV-2 virus is not the first to cause a global pandemic, but it is certainly the one which has overstretched all existing medical resources, whether it be labour or financial. There is a general lack of scientific evidence in the global management of this pandemic on both medical and social aspects and although more pieces of evidence are currently being populated, many are yet to be validated.

Regarding our subject of discussion: the benefit of CT Thorax as a triage or diagnostic tool during the pandemic, there were multiple meta-analyses with interesting results.

Meng et al had investigated and done meta-analysis for 103 studies with 5673 patients dating from January 1st, 2020, to April 3rd, 2020. Sixty-four studies estimated the sensitivity of chest CT imaging in COVID-19 to be 96% (95% CI, 0.93-0.99). The sensitivity of CT scan in confirmed patients under 18 years old was only 66% (95% CI, 0.15-1.00). The most common imaging manifestation was ground-glass opacities (GGO) which was found in 75% (95% CI, 0.68-0.82) of the patients. The pooled probability of bilateral involvement was 84% (95% CI, 0.81-0.88). The most involved lobes were the right lower lobe (84%, 95% CI, 0.78-0.90) and left lower lobe (81%, 95% CI, 0.74-0.87). They described the quality of evidence as low.<sup>3</sup>

Kim et al investigated the same subject as well and analysed 68 articles. The pooled sensitivity was 94% (95% CI: 91%, 96%;  $I^2 = 95%$ ) for chest CT and 89% (95% CI: 81%, 94%;  $I^2 = 90%$ ) for RT-PCR. The pooled specificity was 37% (95% CI: 26%, 50%;  $I^2 = 83%$ ) for chest CT. For chest CT scans, the positive predictive value (PPV) ranged from 1.5% to 30.7%, and the negative predictive value (NPV) ranged from 95.4% to 99.8%. For RT-PCR, the PPV ranged from 47.3% to 96.4%, while the NPV ranged from 96.8% to 99.9%. The

sensitivity of CT was affected by the distribution of disease severity, the proportion of patients with comorbidities, and the proportion of asymptomatic patients (all  $P < .05$ ). The sensitivity of RT-PCR was negatively associated with the proportion of elderly patients ( $P = .01$ ).<sup>4</sup>

All the patients in our cohort that were diagnosed positive on CT scan and confirmed by PCR swab had clear radiological features of consolidation and ground-glass opacities in both lungs. Nevertheless, patients whose CT scans were inconclusive, but swabs were positive, showed patchy consolidation with no evidence of ground-glass opacities which made the diagnosis very difficult.

Zhu et al meta-analysis examined different appearances on CT scanning in COVID-19 patients. Their analysis included 34 retrospective studies, involving a total of 4121 patients with SARS-CoV-2. Seventy-three-point eight percent of patients of patients had bilateral lung involvement (95% confidence interval [CI]: 65.9%-81.1%), 67.3% had multi-lobe involvement (95% CI: 54.8%-78.7%) and just a few (8.4%) patients showed normal CT findings. The most common changes in lesion density were ground-glass opacities (68.1%, 95% CI: 56.9%-78.2%). Other changes in density included air bronchogram sign (44.7%), crazy-paving pattern (35.6%), and consolidation (32.0%). Patchy (40.3%), spider web sign (39.5%), cord-like (36.8%) and nodular (20.5%) were common lesion shapes in patients with C-19, too. Pleural thickening (27.1%) was found in some patients. Lymphadenopathy (5.4%) and pleural effusion (5.3%) were rare.<sup>5</sup>

Similarly, Wan et al reported a total of 14 articles including 1115 patients. In the lesion patterns on chest CTs, pure GGO (69%, 95% CI 58%-80%), consolidation (47%, 35%-60%) and "air bronchogram sign" (46%, 25%-66%) were more common than the atypical lesion of "crazy-paving pattern" (15%, 8%-22%). Seventy percent (95% CI 46%-95%) of cases showed a location preference for the right lower lobe, 65% (58%-73%) of patients presented with more or equal 3 lobes involvement. Meanwhile, 42% (32%-53%) of patients had all five lobes involved, and 67% (55%-78%) showed a predominant peripheral distribution.<sup>6</sup>

In conclusion, as proven in our cohort of surgical patients, CT is an expensive tool that is good to rule out SARS-CoV-2 virus but is not advisable to be used as a diagnostic tool. PCR swabs, especially the new generation, is a quick, safe test with no exposure to radiation.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data available on request from the authors.

Ahmed Ismail<sup>1</sup>  
Priya Sarkar<sup>2</sup>  
Balasundaram Muthiah<sup>3</sup>  
Nuha Yassin<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Speciality Registrar General Surgery, New Cross Hospital,  
Wolverhampton, UK

<sup>2</sup>Foundation Doctor, New Cross Hospital, Wolverhampton, UK

<sup>3</sup>Consultant Upper GI Surgery, New Cross Hospital,  
Wolverhampton, UK

<sup>4</sup>Consultant Colorectal Surgery, New Cross Hospital,  
Wolverhampton, UK

#### Correspondence

Ahmed Ismail, Speciality Registrar General Surgery, New  
Cross Hospital, Wolverhampton, UK.  
Email: ahmed.ismail@nhs.net

#### REFERENCES

1. Rodrigues JCL, Hare SS, Edey A, et al. An update on COVID-19 for the radiologist - A British society of Thoracic Imaging statement. *Clinical radiology*. 2020;75(5):323–325. 10.1016/j.crad.2020.03.003
2. <https://www.rcr.ac.uk/posts/statement-use-ct-chest-screen-covid-19-pre-operative-patients-30-april-2020>
3. Lv M, Wang M, Yang N, et al. Chest computed tomography for the diagnosis of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a rapid review and meta-analysis. *Ann Transl Med*. 2020;8(10):622.
4. Kim H, Hong H, Yoon SH. Diagnostic performance of CT and reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction for coronavirus disease 2019: a meta-analysis. *Radiology*. 2020;17:201343.
5. Zhu J, Zhong Z, Li H, et al. CT imaging features of 4121 patients with COVID-19: a meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2020;92(7):891-902.
6. Wan S, Li M, Ye Z, et al. CT manifestations and clinical characteristics of 1115 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acad Radiol*. 2020;27(7):910-921.

**How to cite this article:** Ismail A, Sarkar P, Muthiah B, Yassin N. Computerized tomography of the Thorax for surgical patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: Was it useful? *Int J Clin Pract*. 2021;75:e14774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.14774>