

**DIAGNOSTIC ULTRASOUND ON CLINICALLY SUSPECTED ABDOMINAL
BLEEDING IN POLITRAUMA PATIENTS*****Uhilendarov A., A. Georgiev, L. Chervenkov, N. Siracov**

MU-Plovdiv, Dept. of Diagnostic Imaging, Plovdiv Bulgaria.

Received on: 22/06/2023

Revised on: 12/07/2023

Accepted on: 02/08/2023

Corresponding Author*Uhilendarov A.**MU-Plovdiv, Dept. of
Diagnostic Imaging, Plovdiv
Bulgaria.**ABSTRACT**

Aims and Objectives: The detection of liquid collections remains a challenge for the trauma team, especially when there is multiple trauma. We present our experience in the diagnosis, follow-up and planning therapy of free and encapsulated abdominal liquid collections by performing ultrasound examination. **Methods:** 143 emergency trauma patients /116 male and 27 female/ were examined using ultrasound for a period of 2 years. The right and left oblique and polypositioning view was used for US examination to identify free and bounded liquid collections in the abdominal cavity. The examination was performed immediately after the initial clinical survey with patients supine. Positive findings of liquid collections on US were compared with those provided by CT, punctures under US control or surgery. US machine supplied with 3.5 and 7 MHz linear and convex transducers, MDCT device, needles and catheters were used. **Results:** One hundred and fifteen /80.41%/ of all 143 US examined trauma patients had free and encapsulated liquid collections, confirmed by CT scan, surgery or clinical course. In 59 /51.30%/ patients we performed fine needle puncture under US control. There were 95 true-positives, 14 true-negatives, 2 false-positives and four false-negative results. Overall this demonstrated that ultrasonography had a sensitivity of 95.95%, specificity of 87.50% and accuracy of 94.78%. The PPV is 97.93% and the NPV – 77.77%. **Conclusion:** Our experience and literature reports support the opinion that US examination should be used as a primary method for diagnosis and follow-up of abdominal liquid collections in emergency patients.

I. Purpose

The detection of closed abdominal injury remains a challenge for the trauma team, especially when there is multiple trauma. Both false-positive and false-negative findings bear the risk of severe complications. The clinical problem is the poor reliability of the physical signs and symptoms that indicate the presence of visceral lesions and subsequent abdominal distension, especially in intubated or comatose patients. Clinical evaluation allows the detection of external hemorrhage and antero-posterior chest x-ray and tube thoracostomy are sufficient to rule out significant hemothorax.^[1,2] Emergency room abdominal ultrasound (US) may be inconclusive in quantitation of intraperitoneal free fluid and false positive studies may result from retroperitoneal hematoma that leaks blood into peritoneal cavity. Contrast enhanced spiral computed tomography (CESCT) offers a complete imaging assessment of the abdomen and pelvis with the best sensitivity and specificity, including injuries of intra- and retroperitoneal organs, soft tissues and bones,^[3,4,5] but may be harmful in unstable hemodynamic conditions.

The use of ultrasonography for precise identification of free and localized intraperitoneal or retroperitoneal fluid

in patients with blunt and penetrating trauma has been well established over the past 25 years.^[6,7,8,9]


The aim of this report is to present our experience in the diagnosis, follow-up and initial planning therapy of free and localized abdominal collections in trauma patients using conventional and interventional ultrasound.

II. METHODS AND MATERIALS

One hundred forty-three patients /116 male and 27 female/ were examined using ultrasound for a period of 2 years. All US examinations followed primary clinical examination and were done in the Emergency room or in the Department of Radiology with the patient on a supine position. Right and left oblique, transversal and multilocational views were used to detect free and localized fluid collection in the peritoneal cavity and retroperitoneal space. Positive findings of the US examination were compared with those provided by computed tomography /CT/, punctures under US control, laparoscopy or surgery.

The following materials and methods were used

- Ultrasonic equipment with 3.5 and 7 MHz linear, convex and biopsical transducers for guidance the interventional procedures.
- CT investigations and guidance were acquired using a 16-slice scanner.
- The “Chiba “needles 18,20,22,23 G catheters pig-tail 7,8F and angiographic guide wires (Figure 1a,b).



**Figure 1-a. “Chiba “needles 18,20,22,23G used for invasive procedures.
 Figure 1-b. Catheters pigtail 7,8F and angiographic guide wires.**

Methods of guiding the interventional procedures
 a/ “Free-hand” biopsy and puncture method under US control.
 b/ US guiding method using biopsical transducer.
 c/ “Free-hand” method for biopsy, puncture and drainage under CT control.

III. RESULTS

All US examinations were performed immediately after primary clinical examination with the patients on a supine position.

One hundred and fifteen of all 143 US examined trauma patients had free or localized fluid collection, which was verified by CT scan, tube laparoscopy, surgery or clinical course.

Furthermore, the US examinations of the emergency patients were classified as

Diagnostic US examinations- performed in all 143 patients. Ten of the patients were excluded from the study because tube laparoscopy had been performed prior to US examination. Altogether one hundred and fifteen %/ patients had free or localized fluid collection.



Figure 3: US image. The free liquid in the abdomen /hemoperitoneum/.

The US images of hemoperitoneum, localized hematomas and subcapsular bleeding are presented on Figures 3,4 and 5.



Figure 4: US image. Localized liquid collections/hematoma/.




Figure 5: US image of the patient with subcapsular hematoma of the spleen.

1. Diagnostic interventional procedures

FNP /fine needle punctures/ under US control were performed in 89 of all patients with detected fluid collections in the peritoneal cavity and retroperitoneal space. In 86 of them sufficient amount of liquid collection was obtained that favored diagnosis and allowed planning of the following therapy. Hemoperitoneum during puncture under US control is shown on Figure 6.



Figure 6: Hemoperitoneum during the puncture under US control.

FNP /fine needle punctures/ under CT control was used only in 5 cases with insufficient evaluation of small amount of fluid and to define a safe percutaneous

window allowing access to the collection avoiding vascular structures and bowel loop. A punctured hematoma under CT control is shown on Figure 7.



Figure 7: Patient with hematoma punctured under CT control.

Using noninvasive US examination and FNP under US or CT control of the patients with suspected abdominal liquid collections we obtained the following results: there were 95 true-positives, 14 true-negatives, 2 false-positives and fore false-negative results. Overall this demonstrated that ultrasonography had a sensitivity of 95.95%, specificity of 87.50% and accuracy of 94.78%. The PPV is 97.93% and the NPV – 77.77%.

These results demonstrated that ultrasonography can be used as a sensitive, specific and accurate diagnostic tool for detecting hemoperitoneum in clinically suspected abdominal bleeding in major trauma patients. The speed

and accuracy of US examinations with the possibilities to detect smaller amounts of peritoneal fluid collections than the other imaging methods may be of benefit in early planning the treatment of trauma patients. It is estimated that ultrasonography can detect a minimum of 15-20ml of liquid collections in the peritoneal cavity.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The choice of clinical strategy is often decisive for outcome. The most crucial early decision in a bleeding patient with abdominal trauma is to found and to treat primarily the predominant source of hemorrhage. Our

protocol emphasizes abdominal US to determine the need of laparotomy. Laparotomy was mandatory when US showed more than 1 cm of fluid strip or expanding or fluid in two or more spaces. This approach has been validated in prospective clinical series.^[10,11] and no patient of our series required emergency operative intervention for hemorrhage after a negative US.

Ultrasonography has high diagnostic performance in the screening of patients with suspected abdominal liquid collections. Abdominal US is a useful and valuable diagnostic tool after clinical evaluation in these patients. Because of its high negative predictive value, we recommend that clinical follow up is adequate for patients whose US results are negative for intraabdominal free and encapsulated liquid collections.

Our experience and literature reports support the opinion that US tomography should be used as a first method for diagnosis, follow-up and planning therapy of patients with abdominal liquid collections, as well as a control of the invasive diagnostic procedures.

REFERENCES

1. Osvaldo Chiara, Stefania Cimbanassi, Fabio Castelli, Rosario Spagnolo, Paolo Girotti. Protocol-driven approach of bleeding abdominal and pelvic trauma. *World J Emerg Surg*, 2006; 1: 17
2. Advanced Trauma Life Support, Instructor Manual, American College of Surgeons publication; Chicago IL, 1997; 206–207.
3. Yao DC, Jeffrey RB, Jr, Mirvis SE, Weekes A, Federle MP, Kim C, Lane MJ, Prabhakar P, Radin R, Ralls PW. Using contrast-enhanced helical CT to visualize arterial extravasation after blunt abdominal trauma: incidence and organ distribution. *Am J Roentgenol*, 2002; 178: 17–20.
4. Mullinix AJ, Foley WD. Multidetector computed tomography and blunt thoracoabdominal trauma. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*, 2004 Jul-Aug; 28 Suppl 1: S20-7.
5. Eastridge BJ, Starr A, Minei JP, O'Keefe GE, Scalea TM. The importance of fracture pattern in guiding therapeutic decision making in patients with hemorrhagic shock and pelvic ring disruption. *J Trauma*, 2002; 53: 446–451.
6. Stengel D, Bauwens K, Porzsolt F, Rademacher G, Mutze S, Ekkernkamp A. Emergency ultrasound for blunt abdominal trauma--meta-analysis update *Zentralbl Chir*, 2003 Dec; 128(12): 1027-37.
7. M. Valentino, C. Serra, G. Zironi, C. De Luca, P. Pavlica, and L. Barozzi. Blunt Abdominal Trauma: Emergency Contrast-Enhanced Sonography for Detection of Solid Organ Injuries. *Am. J. Roentgenol.*, May 1, 2006; 186(5): 1361 – 1367.
8. B. C. Lee, E. L. Ormsby, J. P. McGahan, G. M. Melendres, J. R. Richards. The Utility of Sonography for the Triage of Blunt Abdominal Trauma Patients to Exploratory Laparotomy. *AJR*, 2007; 188: 415-421.
9. M. Christie-Large, D. Michaelidesand, S. James. Focused assessment with sonography for trauma: the FAST scan *Trauma*, April 1, 2008; 10(2): 93 – 101.
10. Boulanger BR, McLellan BA, Brenneman FD, Ochoa J, Kirkpatrick AW. Prospective evidence of the superiority of a sonography-based algorithm in the assessment of blunt abdominal injury. *J Trauma*, 1999; 47: 632–637.
11. Branney SW, Moore EE, Cantrill SV, Burch JM, Terry SJ. Ultrasound-based key clinical pathway reduces the use of hospital resources for the evaluation of blunt abdominal trauma. *J Trauma*, 1997; 42: 1086–1090.