



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Roberts, J;Watts, S;Klim, S;Ritchie, P;Kelly, AM

Title:

Yield of serious axial injury from pan scans after blunt trauma in haemodynamically stable low-risk trauma patients

Date:

2019-06-01

Citation:

Roberts, J., Watts, S., Klim, S., Ritchie, P. & Kelly, A. M. (2019). Yield of serious axial injury from pan scans after blunt trauma in haemodynamically stable low-risk trauma patients. *EMA Emergency Medicine Australasia*, 31 (3), pp.399-404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1742-6723.13174>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/284417>

Kelly Anne-Maree (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-4655-5023)

WBCT in trauma

Yield of serious axial injury from pan scans after blunt trauma in haemodynamically stable low risk trauma patients

Dr Jessica **ROBERTS** MBBS

Emergency Medicine Registrar, Department of Emergency Medicine, Western Health,
Footscray, Vic, Australia 3011

Dr Sara **WATTS** BSc(Hons) MBBS MRCP

Emergency Medicine Registrar, Department of Emergency Medicine, Western Health,
Footscray, Vic, Australia 3011

Mrs Sharon **KLIM** BN

Research Coordinator, Joseph Epstein Centre for Emergency Medicine Research @
Western Health, St Albans, Vic, Australia 3021

Dr Peter **RITCHIE** MBBS MPH FACEM

Emergency physician, Department of Emergency Medicine, Western Health, Sunshine, Vic,
Australia 3021

Professor Anne-Maree **KELLY** MD FACEM FCCP

Director, Joseph Epstein Centre for Emergency Medicine Research @ Western Health, St
Albans Vic 3021 and Department of Medicine, Melbourne Medical School – Western
Precinct, The University of Melbourne, St. Albans, Vic, Australia, 3021

Anne-Maree.Kelly@wh.org.au

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/1742-6723.13174](https://doi.org/10.1111/1742-6723.13174)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank Dr Wei Lim and Dr Shunkara Naidoo for assistance in developing the concept of the study and identifying the cohort, Dr Chris Paes for assistance with data collection and Dr. Michael Bryant for constructive comments on the manuscript.

Competing interests:

AMK is a member of the editorial board of EMA. The authors have no other competing interests to declare.

Funding:

This study was supported by departmental funds only.

Authors' contribution:

AMK had the concept for the study. The protocol and instruments were refined by all authors. All authors participated in data collection. AMK was primarily responsible for analysis. All authors contributed to data interpretation. AMK drafted the manuscript and all authors refined and approved the final manuscript.

ABSTRACT

Background: Whole body CT scanning (WBCT) for trauma has gained popularity but its role in low risk patients is controversial. We aimed to determine the rate of serious axial/truncal injury and emergency intervention in conscious, stable patients undergoing WBCT for blunt trauma in two non-trauma centre emergency departments in the Victorian trauma system.

Methods: Retrospective cohort study by medical record and radiology report review.

Patients were included if they were conscious, haemodynamically stable adults presenting by ambulance and having WBCT scan. Exclusion criteria were age <16 years, no history of trauma, GCS <14, systolic BP<90mmHg and intoxication with alcohol or drugs. Data collected included demographics, clinical findings, results of CT scans and emergency interventions (emergency truncal surgery, transfer to a trauma centre and/or transfusion within 24 hours). The outcomes of interest were the rate of defined serious axial/ truncal injury and emergency interventions.

Results: 104 patients were studied. Median age was 45 years; 67% were male. Median injury severity score (ISS) was 1.5 (IQR 0-5); only one patient had an ISS \geq 15. Ninety patients had no defined serious injury (87%, 78-92%). Five patients (5%) had a defined emergency intervention – four trauma centre tranfes and one transfusion. Two of these were not trauma related.

Conclusion: The rate of serious axial/ truncal injury was low. The high rate of normal scans makes it likely that the risk:benefit ratio between injury identification and radiation related cancer risk is unacceptably high. This data supports a selective CT strategy in low risk trauma patients.

WBCT in trauma

Key words: trauma, imaging, whole body CT scan

Word count: Abstract: 250, main manuscript: 1602, References: 10

Author Manuscript

BACKGROUND

Blunt trauma, including road trauma, is a common cause of death and injury. Imaging of trauma patients has been an area of evolution and controversy. Recently whole-body CT-scan (WBCT), including head and neck, chest and abdominopelvic CT-scans, has gained popularity in trauma centres for assessing patients with severe trauma. The rationale is that it affords earlier and more accurate detection of hidden injuries, allowing earlier intervention and potentially better outcome, but this has not been conclusively proven. [1] On the converse, it adds cost, carries risks of adverse events such as acute kidney injury and contrast-related allergic reaction and represents significant radiation exposure with its associated cancer risk for what is, on average, a young patient group. A recent randomised controlled trial of high risk trauma patients failed to show a reduction in mortality between WBCT and standard imaging with selected CT scans for the overall cohort and for the polytrauma and traumatic brain injury subgroups.[2] Recent studies have challenged the role of WBCT in stable patients reporting that a selective approach has similar outcomes. [3-5] While WBCT may have a role in unstable or unconscious patients, the yield for significant clinical abnormality and the risk-benefit ratio of WBCT in the lower risk trauma cohort is unclear. The practice of WBCT is probably most contentious in awake, stable patients at low risk of life-threatening injury. The State of Victoria, Australia has a well-developed trauma system. The system involves pre-hospital triage of high risk cases to major trauma centres according to a risk algorithm.[6] Patients deemed at low risk by this algorithm are transferred to the nearest appropriate emergency department (ED) which is usually not a specialist trauma centre. The Victorian trauma system has been shown to reduce mortality compared to historical controls [7] and improve outcome from patients with severe head injury comparable to a similar health system that does not have a trauma system. [8] The nett

result of the Victorian Trauma System is that most metropolitan ED receive trauma patients at low risk of serious injury. We were unable to identify any previous research specifically addressing the yield of WBCT scans in a low risk population as defined by pre-hospital trauma triage criteria.

The objective of this study was to determine the rate of serious axial/truncal injury in conscious, stable patients undergoing WBCT for blunt trauma in a metropolitan, non-trauma centre ED within the Victorian trauma system.

METHODS

This is a planned sub-study of a retrospective cohort study performed by medical record and medical imaging report review investigating use of medical imaging in trauma patients. It was conducted in two metropolitan teaching hospitals (not a designated trauma centre) with a combined annual adult ED census of approximately 85,000. The study hospitals have a trauma code alert in place. Patients who meet pre-defined mechanism or clinical criteria trigger activation of a trauma alert which primarily involves attendance by the on-call surgical registrar to participate with ED clinicians in assessment and treatment. While WBCT is not mandated for trauma patients meeting or potentially meeting trauma alert criteria, it is strongly encouraged by the surgical service.

Patients were identified for screening by a search of the Medical Imaging Department database for patients having both chest and abdominal CT scan for the period January 2015 to February 2017 inclusive. Patients were eligible for inclusion in the parent study if they were conscious, haemodynamically stable adults who presented as a result of trauma and underwent at least chest and abdomen-pelvis CT. Exclusion criteria were age <16 years, no history of trauma, GCS <14, systolic BP <90mmHg and intoxication with alcohol or drugs.

WBCT in trauma

For this sub-study patients were also excluded if they did not arrive by ambulance and / or did not undergo WBCT.

Definitions of serious injury were based on those used by Ong et al. [5] and included:

- Brain: intracranial haemorrhage or contusion, skull fracture, pneumocephalus, ocular hemorrhage/globe injury;
- Cervical spine: fracture, acute subluxation or dislocation
- Chest: greater than two rib fractures or flail segment, displaced sternal fracture, haemothorax requiring intervention, pneumothorax requiring intervention, injury to heart or great vessels, mediastinal haemorrhage, chest wall contusion with contrast extravasation, spinal fracture, intraparenchymal lung haemorrhage or clinically significant contusion (hypoxia, ventilation, LOS>2 days).
- Abdomen/pelvis: solid organ injuries, suspected hollow viscus injury, intra-abdominal or retroperitoneal haemorrhage, fracture of the spine or pelvis/acetabulum (excluding femoral and undisplaced pubic rami fractures), abdominal wall contusion with contrast extravasation.

Data was collected onto a specifically designed case record form and included patient demographics, mechanism of injury, initial vital signs, clinical findings, results of CT scans and emergency interventions defined as emergency truncal surgery, transfer to a trauma centre and/or transfusion within 24 hours of admission. Abbreviated injury score and injury severity score were calculated retrospectively by trained coders. Records of patients with defined injuries were reviewed to determine if there were clinical signs in the relevant region that would have prompted selective imaging. Data collectors were not blinded to the objectives of the study.

The outcomes of interest are the rate of serious axial/ truncal injury in patients undergoing WBCT for trauma. This is an exploratory analysis. Previous research from higher risk cohorts suggests that up to 89% of WBCT had zero or one significant findings.[5] We hypothesized that our rate of defined serious injury would be <10%. We estimated that 100 patients would provide a confidence interval width of +/- 5%.

Ethics approval was obtained from the Western Health Low Risk Ethics Panel under the provisions of the NHMRC quality assurance guidelines. (Approval number QA2017.18)

RESULTS

Derivation of the cohort is shown in Figure 1. 104 patients were included with a median age of 45 (interquartile range (IQR) 29 to 59, range 17-89) and 70 (67%) were male. Patient demographics and cause of injury are shown in Table 1. Rates of defined serious injury findings by region and overall are shown in Table 2. Ninety patients had none of the defined serious axial/ truncal injuries (87%, 95% CI 78-92%). All injuries would have been identified by selective imaging based on clinical findings (14/14, 100%, 95% CI 73-100%).

Five patients had defined emergency interventions (5%, 95% CI 2-11%). These are summarised in Table 3. There were no cases of emergency truncal surgery. The rate of trauma-related emergency intervention was 3% (3/104, 95% CI 0.8-9%), all transfers to a trauma centre. Two of these were for access to a spinal service which is not available at the study hospital. Only one transfer was for management of complex, multi-system trauma (1%, 95% CI 0.05-6%)

DISCUSSION

Recently WBCT scans have gained popularity in trauma centres for investigation of patients suffering severe trauma on the rationale that they more quickly and accurately identify injuries and allow earlier intervention if required. Their impact on patient outcome, compared to selective CT scanning, is the subject of some controversy [2-5] and the risk of adverse events is not negligible. While the logic underlying this practice might be reasonable for unconscious or critically ill patients, it is more tenuous in conscious, haemodynamically stable patients.

Our results show that patients assessed as low risk by the prehospital component of the Victorian Trauma System have a low rate of serious injury and that WBCT scan has such a low yield as to be considered unjustified in this patient group. Further the data suggests that a selective imaging approach would have identified all of the injuries.

We may in fact have overestimated the number of significant injuries by using the conservative definitions proposed by Ong et al.[5] All of the vertebral injuries identified were stable and treated conservatively as was the mildly displaced sternal fracture. If these are not regarded as significant injuries, the rate of serious injury in the cohort is 5% (5/104, 95% CI 2-11%). All multiple rib fractures were suspected clinically, none of whom required mechanical ventilation or surgical intervention.

Radiation exposure is associated with cancer risk although the impact at doses less than 100mSV is controversial.[9] Some experts believe the excess cancer risk is approximately 5% per 1000mSV and that the risk associated with lower doses can be linearly extrapolated from this figure.[9] The radiation associated with WBCT has been calculated to be 29.5mSV – about 10 times the background radiation dose.[10] This would equate to an excess cancer risk of approximately 0.15% per WBCT. It is not however appropriate to compare WBCT with

WBCT in trauma

no CT as trauma patients who undergo selective imaging will also have radiation exposure, estimated to be about 13mSV. [10] The difference is an estimated excess cancer rate of 0.065% or 6.5/10000 patients for patients undergoing WBCT versus selective imaging. Although this may seem a very small number, our data and accumulated research suggests that this additional risk is being carried for no outcome benefit. [1-5].

Our data also confirms that the Victorian Trauma System pre-hospital risk assessment algorithm is accurate with only one patient (1%) meeting major trauma criteria being transferred to our non-trauma centre ED.

This study has some limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results. The most important is that our results are not generalizable to health systems without a mature trauma system including a paramedic-based trauma triage algorithm. They do however provide additional data supporting the effectiveness of such systems. Additionally, data was collected retrospectively with the inherent issues of data omission.[11] We do not have data about the outcome of patients who were transferred. Data collectors were not blinded to the study objectives.

CONCLUSION

Our results show that patients assessed as low risk by the prehospital component of the Victorian Trauma System have a low rate of serious injury and that WBCT scan has such a low yield as to be unjustified in this patient group. Further it supports selective imaging as all defined axial/truncal injuries would be have been identified by a selective imaging approach.

REFERENCES

1. Surendran A, Mori A, Varma DK, Gruen RL. Systematic review of the benefits and harms of whole-body computed tomography in the early management of multi-trauma patients: are we getting the whole picture? *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2014;76:1122-30.
2. Sierink JC, Treskes K, Edwards MJR, Beuker BJA, den Hartog D, Hohmann J et al. Immediate total-body CT scanning versus conventional imaging and selective CT scanning in patients with severe trauma (REACT-2): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2016; 388: 673–83
3. Murphy SP, Hawthorne N, Haase D, Chiku C, Wen J, Rodriguez RM. Low yield of clinically significant injury with head-to-pelvis computed tomography in blunt trauma evaluation. *J Emerg Med* 2017 (Epub ahead of print)
4. Moussavi N, Ghani H, Davoodabadi A, Atoof F, Moravveji A, Saidfar S et al. Routine versus selective chest and abdominopelvic CT-scan in conscious blunt trauma patients: a randomized controlled study. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2017 Epub ahead of print) DOI 10.1007/s00068-017-0842-2
5. Ong AW, Moyer J, Wordofa FD, Sigal A, Sandel K, Fernandez FB. Trauma surgeon utilization of computerized tomography scanning: Room for improvement? *Am J Surg* 2016 (Epub ahead of print).
6. Department of Health. Prehospital triage guideline. (2014)
<https://www2.health.vic.gov.au/about/publications/policiesandguidelines/Prehospital-Triage-Guideline> (accessed July 2017)

7. Cameron PA, Gabbe BJ, Cooper DJ, Walker T, Judson R, McNeill J. A statewide system of trauma care in Victoria: effect on patient survival. *Med J Aust* 2008;189:546-50.
8. Gabbe BJ, Biostat GD, Lecky FE, Bouamra O, Woodford M, Jenks T, Coats TJ, Cameron PA. The effect of an organized trauma system on mortality in major trauma involving serious head injury: a comparison of the United Kingdom and Victoria, Australia. *Ann Surg.* 2011; 253:138-43.
9. Lim EC. Radiation risk from medical imaging. *Mayo Clinic Proc.* 2010; 85:1142–1146.
10. Gordic S, Alkadhi H, Hodel S, Simmen H-P, Brueesch M, Frauenfelder T et al. Whole-body CT-based imaging algorithm for multiple trauma patients: radiation dose and time to diagnosis. *Br J Radiol* 2015;88:20140616.
11. Gilbert EH, Lowenstein SR, Koziol-McLain J, Barta DC, Steiner J. Chart reviews in emergency medicine research: Where are the methods? *Ann Emerg Med.* 1996;27:305-8.

Table 1. Demographics, cause of injury and rate of serious injury

Variable	Result (N=104)
Age (years, IQR)	45 (29-59)
Gender (N male, %, 95% CI)	70, 67% (57-76%)
Cause of injury (N, %)	
Motor vehicle crash	52, 50%
High fall	13, 12%
Motorcycle crash	10, 10%
Motor vehicle rollover	6, 6%
Pedestrian vs. vehicle	5, 5%
Struck by object	5, 5%
Struck by person	4, 4%
Pedal cyclist	2, 2%
Low fall	3, 3%
Animal related	1, 1%
Other	3, 3%
Injury severity score (median, IQR)	1.5 (0-5) Range 0-26
ISS distribution (N, %, 95% CI)	
0-1	52, 50% (40-60%)
2-5	35, 34% (25-44%)
6-10	12, 12% (6-20%)
11-14	4, 4% (1-10%)
≥ 15	1, 1% (0.05-6%)

Table 2. Serious axial injury prevalence

Injury (N, %, 95% CI)	N=100
Head	
Intracranial haemorrhage	0, 0% (0-4%)
Skull fracture	0, 0% (0-4%)
Pneumocephalus	0, 0% (0-4%)
Major ocular injury	0, 0% (0-4%)
Cervical spine	
Fracture (stable)	4, 4% (1-10%)
Fracture (unstable)	0, 0% (0-4%)
Acute subluxation	0, 0% (0-4%)
Chest	
>2 rib fractures	5, 5% (2-11%)
Displaced sternal fracture	1, 1% (0.5-6%)
Haemothorax	0, 0% (0-4%)
Pneumothorax requiring intervention	0, 0% (0-4%)
Injury to heart or great vessels	0, 0% (0-4%)
Mediastinal haematoma	0, 0% (0-4%)
Chest wall injury with contrast extravasation	0, 0% (0-4%)
Spine fracture	2, 2% (0.3-7%)
Abdomen-pelvis	
Solid organ injury	0, 0% (0-4%)
Suspected hollow organ injury	0, 0% (0-4%)
Intra-abdominal or retroperitoneal haematoma	0, 0% (0-4%)
Fractured pelvis/ acetabulum (excluding hip and undisplaced pubic rami fractures)	1, 1% (0.5-6%)
Abdominal wall contusion with extravasation of contrast	0, 0% (0-4%)
Spinal fracture	3, 3% (0.8-9%)
No defined axial/ truncal injury	90, 87%, 78-92%

Table 3. Details of patients with defined adverse events

Patient no.	Demographics & mechanism	Clinical findings	Injuries	Defined adverse event	Comment
1	68 year old man with history of arrhythmia on dabigatran. Arrhythmia resulting in MVA.	Tender over sternum, tender lower cervical spine; neurologically intact	Fractured spinous process C7 (tip), undisplaced sternal fracture, pericardial effusion (increase in size)	Transfer to trauma centre	Considered too complex for community teaching hospital without cardiothoracic surgical service; injuries not reason for transfer
2	33 year old man, run down by a car	Abrasions to back with focal tenderness over lumbar spine, abdominal tenderness; neurologically intact	Fractured transverse processes L1-4 bilaterally	Transfer to trauma centre	Patient considered to require spinal service not available at community teaching hospital
3	25 year old man, MVA with rollover	Pain in thoracic spine but no focal tenderness or neurology	Minor anterior superior endplate wedge compression fractures T4,5 and 7	Transfer to trauma centre	Patient considered to require spinal service not available at community teaching hospital
4	89 year old woman hit by taxi, initially stable	Locally tender left ribs and left upper quadrant, bruising left hip	Multiple rib fractures & fractured pelvis, became haemodynamically unstable	Transfer to trauma centre	Considered too complex for community teaching hospital potentially

					requiring pelvic surgery or embolization
5	67 year old man, fall from roof	Clinically suspected fractured hip or femur	Fractured hip, undisplaced pubic rami fractures, single rib fracture	Transfusion within 24 hours	Anaemic on admission, haematemesis on day 1, dropped haemoglobin further requiring 1 unit transfusion; transfusion not related to trauma


Table 4: Presence of clinical features suggesting injury in patients with defined injuries on WBCT

Patient	Clinical suspicion of injury				CT findings	Would selective imaging have identified injury?
	Head	Neck	Chest	Abdomen/ Pelvis		
A	No	Not examined, in collar	Yes	Yes	Multiple rib fractures Pelvic fracture	Yes
B	Yes	No	Yes	No	Displaced sternal fracture	Yes
C	No	Yes	Yes	No	Thoracic wedge fractures	Yes
D	No	No	No	Yes	Bilateral lumbar spinous process fractures	Yes
E	No	No	Yes	Yes	T3 and 5 spinous process fractures	Yes
F	No	No	No	Yes	Fracture L4 & 5	Yes
G	No	No	No	Yes	Burst fracture L1	Yes
H	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	C6 fracture with strain	Yes
I	No	Yes	No	No	C5 lamina fractures, C4 spinous process	Yes
J	No	Yes	Yes	No	C7 spinous process fracture	Yes
K	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Multiple rib fractures	Yes
L	Yes	Not examined,	Yes	No	C7 fracture, multiple rib fractures	Yes

WBCT in trauma

		in collar				
M	No	No	Yes	Yes	Multiple rib fractures	Yes
N	No	No	Yes	No	Multiple rib fractures	Yes

Author Manuscript



EMAFIG300.JPG