

1 **A Comparative Study of Target Reconstruction of Ultra-High-Resolution** 2 **CT for Patients with Corona-Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)**

3 Shao-mao Lv^{1,2}, Yu Lin¹, Jiang-he Kang¹, Shao-yin Duan¹, Wei-guo Zhang^{2*}, Jin-an Wang¹

4 ***Correspondence** wgzhang01@163.com

5 ¹Department of Radiology, Zhongshan Hospital, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361004, China

6 ²Department of Radiology, Daping Hospital, Army Medical University, Chongqing 400010, China

7

8 **Abstract**

9 **Background:** The corona-virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has caused a serious
10 public health risk. Compared with conventional high-resolution CT (C-HRCT, matrix 512),
11 ultra-high resolution CT (U-HRCT, matrix 1024) can increase the effective pixel per unit
12 volume by about 4 times. Our study is to evaluate the value of target reconstruction of U-
13 HRCT in the accurate diagnosis of COVID-19.

14 **Methods:** A total of 13 COVID-19 cases, 44 cases of other pneumonias, and 6 cases of
15 ground-glass nodules were retrospectively analyzed. The data were categorized into groups
16 A (C-HRCT) and B (U-HRCT), following which iDose⁴-3 and iDose⁴-5 were used for target
17 reconstruction, respectively. CT value, noise, and signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) in different
18 reconstructed images were measured. Two senior imaging doctors scored the image quality
19 and the structure of the lesions on a 5-point scale. Chi-square test, variance analysis, and
20 binary logistic regression analysis were used for statistical analysis.

21 **Results:** U-HRCT image can reduce noise and improve SNR with an increase of the iterative
22 reconstruction level. The SNR of U-HRCT image was lower than that of the C-HRCT image
23 of the same iDose⁴ level, and the noise of U-HRCT was higher than that of C-HRCT image;
24 the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$). Logistic regression analysis showed
25 that peripleural distribution, thickening of blood vessels and interlobular septum, and crazy-
26 paving pattern were independent indicators of the COVID-19 on U-HRCT. U-HRCT was
27 superior to C-HRCT in showing the blood vessels, bronchial wall, and interlobular septum in
28 the ground-glass opacities; the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$).

29 **Conclusions:** Peripleural distribution, thickening of blood vessels and interlobular septum,
30 and crazy-paving pattern on U-HRCT are favorable signs for COVID-19. U-HRCT is
31 superior to C-HRCT in displaying the blood vessels, bronchial walls, and interlobular
32 septum for evaluating COVID-19.

33 **Keywords:** U-HRCT, 1024 matrix, Target Reconstruction, COVID-19

34

35 **Background**

36 The outbreak of the novel corona-virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) caused by severe acute respiratory
37 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has spread worldwide[1]. The COVID-19 pandemic has caused a
38 serious public health risk. COVID-19 is characterized by high infectivity and a typical clinical features[2].
39 The diagnosis of COVID-19 relied on virus nucleic acid detection with a high false negative rate [3].

40 High resolution computed tomography (HRCT) is a convenient and accessible method for early
41 screening and diagnosis of viral pneumonia [4]. Typical chest HRCT findings for COVID-19 included the
42 ground glass lesions, enlarged blood vessels and “crazy paving signs” [5].

43 Compared with conventional high-resolution CT (C-HRCT, with matrix of 512×512), ultra-high

14 resolution CT (U-HRCT, with matrix of 1024×1024) can increase the effective pixel per unit volume by
15 about 4 times in the same field of view (FOV) [6]. The UHRCT can not only reveal each ground glass lesion
16 with sub-millimeter precision, but also quantify the extent and severity of each lesion[7,8].

17 Thus, the purpose of this study was to evaluate the value of U-HRCT in the quantitative assessment of
18 COVID-19 and to compare the radiological patterns of U-HRCT and C-HRCT.

19 **Methods**

20 **Patients**

21 The study conducted a retrospective analysis of 63 suspected COVID-19 patients examined using CT at our
22 hospital between January 22 and February 15, 2020. The patients included 35 males and 28 females aged
23 between 6–69 years, with an average age of (35 ± 10.6) years. Among them, 13 cases were confirmed as
24 COVID-19, 44 cases were diagnosed with other pneumonias, and 6 cases were diagnosed with ground-glass
25 opacities.

26 **CT scans**

27 The Ingenuity CT scanner (Philips Healthcare, the Netherlands) was used. The patient was placed in a
28 supine position with breath hold during the scan. The scanning range was from the apex to the base of the
29 lung. Scanning parameters included the following: tube voltage 120 kV; mAs: DoseRight Index 15–20;
30 collimation 64 × 0.625 mm; pitch, 1.2; slice thickness 2 mm; interval 2 mm; FOV 35 cm. The raw data
31 acquired were categorized into groups A (512 matrix) and B (1024 matrix). Each group was reconstructed
32 using iDose⁴-3 and iDose⁴-5 iterative reconstructions within the same small FOV with a slice thickness and
33 interval of 1 mm.

34 **Image analysis**

35 *Analysis of typical signs*

36 A group of images was selected at random, and the CT data of all patients were evaluated by two

70 radiologists with over 10 years of experience while blinded to each other's results. The assessment of lesions
71 included the following: (1) distribution (distance from the pleura); (2) number(single or multiple); (3)
72 density (pure ground-glass opacities, mixed ground-glass opacities, and consolidation); and (4) Internal
73 structure (air bronchograms sign, vascular thickening, interlobular septal thickening, and crazy-paving
74 patterns in the lesions).

75 *Objective scoring of image quality*

76 Each group of images was transferred to the Philips IntelliSpace Portal workstation. The relevant
77 information was locked, and the iDose3 and iDose5 groups of images were reconstructed, measured, and
78 evaluated in the fixed lung window (window width 1600 HU, window level -600 HU). A region of interest
79 (ROI) (50 mm² approximate area) in the lung tissue at the level of the tracheal carina and left atrium was
80 selected (avoiding lung markings and lesion areas), the standard deviation (SD) was measured, and the
81 average CT value was recorded to calculate the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Each ROI was measured three
82 times, and the average value was recorded. $SNR = CT_n / SD_n$, where CT_n and SD_n are the average CT and
83 SD values of the lung tissue, respectively. The SD value is the objective noise of the image.

84 *Subjective scoring of image quality*

85 The two radiologists, with over 10 years of work experience, quantitatively evaluated image quality under
86 the same magnification ratio. Differences in opinion were resolved by consensus. Image quality was scored
87 on a 5-point scale. The evaluation included image noise, presentation of the bronchovascular bundles 2 cm
88 from the pleura, presentation of the lesion and its internal structure, and feasibility of diagnosis. For scoring,
89 5 points: clear lesion and vascular structure with no artifacts; 4 points: acceptable lesion and vascular
90 structure with a small number of artifacts; 3 points: unclear lesion and vascular structure with more artifacts,
91 but diagnosis was unaffected; 2 points: unclear lesion and vascular structure with significant artifacts
92 making diagnosis unsatisfactory; 1 point: unclear lesion and vascular structure, and multiple types of
93 artifacts making diagnosis unsatisfactory.

94 *Statistical analysis*

32 The SPSS 22.0 software was used for analysis. Measurement data were expressed as $\bar{x} \pm s$. ANOVA was
33 performed on the SD and SNR values of each group of images. Differences with $p < 0.05$ were considered
34 statistically significant. Pairwise comparisons between the groups were performed. Count data were
35 expressed as number of cases and percentage, and the Pearson χ^2 test was used for comparisons between
36 groups. Binary logistic regression was used for analysis of independent risk factors of CT diagnosis of
37 COVID-19. The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was used for analysis of the sensitivity and
38 specificity of risk factors of COVID-19 prediction. Medcalc software (version 17.6) was used for
39 comparison and plotting the efficacy of the area under the curve (AUC). Differences with $p < 0.05$ were
40 considered statistically significant.

41 **Results**

42 *Clinical characteristics*

43 A total of 63 cases were included in the study. Some patients underwent CT re-examinations, and a total of
44 75 groups of CT data were obtained for analysis. The 13 confirmed cases of COVID-19 were primarily
45 imported cases or had a history of contact (12/13). There were 59 cases of other types of pneumonias and 6
46 cases of ground-glass nodules.

47 *CT presentation*

48 Analysis of the CT presentation of the lesions included the distribution and density of lesions and the
49 condition within the lesions (Table 1). With respect to lesion distribution, COVID-19 lesions were mainly
50 distributed within 2 cm of the pleura (87.5%), whereas lesion distribution was non-specific in other
51 pneumonias. COVID-19 lesions were mainly pure (75%) or mixed (18.75%) ground-glass opacities,
52 whereas lesions from other pneumonias were mainly of mixed density (64.41%). Air bronchograms,
53 vascular thickening, interlobular septal thickening, and crazy-paving signs were present in COVID-19
54 lesions, at frequencies of 81.5%, 87.5%, 87.5%, and 93.75%, respectively. Air bronchograms were also
55 common in non-COVID-19 pneumonias (57.63%). The differences in all radiological signs, except the
56 number of lesions, were statistically significant between COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 lesions ($p < 0.05$).

17 ***Logistic regression analysis***

18 Lesion distribution and density, and structural features within the lesion were entered into a logistic
19 regression analysis model to evaluate the independent risk factors of CT diagnosis of COVID-19. The
20 analysis showed that lesion distribution, vascular thickening, interlobular septal thickening, and crazy-
21 paving patterns had value for COVID-19 diagnosis (OR = 0.001, $p = 0.003$; OR = 43.212, $p = 0.008$; OR =
22 25.962, $p = 0.022$; OR = 258.081, $p = 0.0001$, respectively). However, lesion density and air bronchograms
23 had minimal predictive value, and there was no statistically significant difference between two groups
24 (Table 2).

25 ***ROC analysis***

26 ROC curve analysis showed that the AUC of lesion distribution, vascular thickening, interlobular septal
27 thickening, and crazy-paving patterns were 0.887, 0.870, 0.813, and 0.926, respectively, with sensitivities /
28 specificities of 84.8% / 77.9%, 90.1% / 81.4%, 85.1% / 92.5% and 85.4% / 91.5% (Figure 1).

29 ***C-HRCT and U-HRCT image quality scoring***

30 With respect to objective image quality scores, the SD in U-HRCT was greater than that of C-HRCT, and
31 the SNR was lower than that of C-HRCT; the difference was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) (Table 2).
32 With increased iteration levels, SD decreased, and SNR increased. At the same iteration level, the SD of U-
33 HRCT was greater than that of C-HRCT, and the SNR was lower than that of C-HRCT. Pairwise
34 comparisons showed that there was no statistically significant difference in image quality between U-HRCT
35 using iDose5 iteration and C-HRCT using iDose3 conditions ($p > 0.05$).

36 The iDose⁴⁻⁵ iteration had the highest U-HRCT score for displaying the lesion structure and vascular
37 structure of lung tissue. Except for display of lesion margins and crazy-paving patterns within the lesion, the
38 differences in subjective scores were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Pairwise comparisons showed that
39 the C-HRCT scores at high iteration levels were lower than those at low iteration levels for display of the
40 internal structure of some lesions; there was no statistically significant difference between the two iteration

11 levels ($p > 0.05$). There was no statistically significant difference in subjective scores for display of air
12 bronchograms between U-HRCT and C-HRCT ($p > 0.05$).

13 **Discussion**

14 COVID-19 is highly infectious and progresses rapidly. In severe cases, acute respiratory distress syndrome,
15 respiratory failure, and even death may occur[9]. Diagnosis depends primarily on comprehensive
16 consideration of epidemiology, clinical manifestations, and imaging and laboratory data. Chest CT,
17 especially HRCT, is valuable in the diagnosis of suspected cases of COVID-19[10,11]. Although the
18 imaging presentation of COVID-19 is similar to that of other viral pneumonias, the differential diagnosis is
19 more difficult. However, COVID-19 could manifest some characteristic imaging signs, especially when
20 ground-glass opacities were present[12,13].

21 In the confirmed COVID-19 cases in the present study, the lesions had a primarily subpleural distribution
22 and had a ground-glass appearance. Vascular thickening, air bronchograms, interlobular septal thickening,
23 and crazy-paving patterns were common in COVID-19 lesions. Air bronchograms were also common in
24 other pneumonias, and display of the bronchial walls is vital in the diagnosis. The results of small-sample
25 binary logistic regression showed that the distribution of ground-glass lesions, vascular thickening,
26 interlobular septal thickening, and crazy-paving patterns have some value for diagnosing COVID-19.
27 COVID-19 could be more accurately diagnosed when taken together with the patient's epidemiological and
28 radiological characteristics, which is generally consistent with the findings of previous studies[14].

29 Display of the internal structure of ground-glass lesions is highly valuable for the diagnosis of COVID-
30 19[15]. In practice, display of the internal details of these lesions is associated with the scanning technology
31 used. U-HRCT uses a 1024×1024 matrix, allowing it to better display the morphological characteristics of
32 pulmonary lesions[6,7,8]. Therefore, 1024 matrix U-HRCT images were retrospectively reconstructed and
33 compared with C-HRCT in order to more accurately display the internal structure of ground-glass lesions
34 and improve the accuracy of COVID-19 diagnosis. Compared to C-HRCT, U-HRCT has increased SD and
35 decreased SNR in the present study.

56 In addition, iterative reconstruction techniques can also reduce SD and improve SNR[16-17].However,
57 the reconstruction speed will be slower with higher iDose⁴ iteration level, and the densities of the lesion and
58 normal tissues tend to become homogeneous, which affects the observation of the internal structure of the
59 lesion[18].Therefore, selection of an appropriate iteration level is essential.

70 In the present study, the image quality of U-HRCT and C-HRCT with the iDose⁴-3 and iDose⁴-5 iterative
71 levels were compared and analyzed. We believe that the use of iDose⁴-5 iterative reconstruction can reduce
72 noise and improve image quality, as well as improve spatial and density resolution of images. Additionally,
73 the reconstruction speed of iDose⁴-5 is suitable for clinical applications. The iDose⁴-5 iteration level has the
74 highest U-HRCT score for displaying the lesion and vascular structures of the lung tissue; it is particularly
75 suited for vascular thickening, interlobular septal thickening, and other signs in the internal structure of the
76 lesion that are important for diagnosis (Figures 2–4).

77 There is no statistically significant difference between the C-HRCT and U-HRCT groups with respect to
78 displaying crazy-paving patterns. There may be subjective factors involved in the interpretation of signs
79 such as interlobular septal thickening and crazy-paving patterns.

30 This study had a few limitations. The number of patient samples included was small; consequently,
31 statistical analysis may be biased. Retrospective target reconstruction was used in all cases, and no
32 comparison with large-matrix U-HRCT target scan images was performed. Body mass index and radiation
33 dose were not considered while evaluating image quality.

34 **Conclusions**

35 U-HRCT image could reduce noise and improve SNR with an increase of the iDose⁴ level. The iDose⁴-5
36 level had the highest U-HRCT score for clinical applications. Peripleural distribution, thickening of blood
37 vessels and interlobular septum, and crazy-paving pattern on U-HRCT are favorable signs for COVID-19.
38 U-HRCT is superior to C-HRCT in displaying the blood vessels, bronchial walls, and interlobular septum
39 for evaluating COVID-19.

30 **Declarations**

31 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**The retrospective study was approved by the Institutional
32 Review Board of Xiamen University and patients' written consent to participate or parents/guardians (for
33 anyone under the age of 16) was also obtained.

34 **Consent to publish**Not applicable.

35 **Availability of data and materials**The datasets analyzed during the current study are fully available from
36 the corresponding author on reasonable request. We confirmed that these patients have not yet been reported
37 in any other submission by the authors.

38 **Competing interests**The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

39 **Funding**None.

40 **Authors' Contributions**All authors have made substantial contributions to all of the following: (1) the
41 conception and design of the study (LSM, LY, KJH and ZWG), or acquisition of data (LSM and LY), or
42 analysis and interpretation of data (DSY, WJA and LSM), (2) drafting the article (LSM and LY) or revising
43 it. critically for important intellectual content (ZWG and WJA), (3) final approval of the version to be
44 submitted (LSM, LY, KJH, DSY, ZWG and WJA). Furthermore, each of the authors has read and concurs
45 with the content in the manuscript.

46 **Acknowledgements**Not applicable.

47

48 **Abbreviations:**

49 **COVID-19:** Corona-virus disease 2019

10 **SARS-CoV-2:** Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

11 **HRCT:** High resolution computed tomography

12 **C-HRCT:** Conventional high resolution computed tomography

13 **U-HRCT:**Ultra high resolution computed tomography

14 **FOV:**Field of view

15 **ROI:** Region of interest

16 **SD:** Standard deviation

17 **SNR:**Signal-to-noise ratio

18 **ROC:**The receiver operating characteristic curve

19 **AUC:** Area under the curve

20


21 **References**

- 22 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019[J].
23 N Engl J Med. 2020 Feb 20;382(8):727-733
- 24 2. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in
25 Wuhan, China[J]. Lancet. 2020 Feb 15;395(10223):497-506.
- 26 3. Xie C,Jiang L,Huang G, et al. Comparison of different samples for 2019 novel coronavirus detection by
27 nucleic acid amplification tests[J]. Int J Infect Dis. 2020 Apr;93:264-267.
- 28 4. TravisWD, BrambillaE, NoguchiM, et al. International association for the study of lung cancer/
29 American thoracic society/European respiratory society: international multidisciplinary classification of
30 lung adenocarcinoma-an executive summary[J]. Proc Am Thorac Soc. 2011 Sep;8(5):381-385.

- 31 5. Chung M, Bernheim A, Mei X, et al. CT imaging features of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV).
32 Radiology. 2020 Apr;295(1):202-207
- 33 6. Hata A, Yanagawa M, Honda O, et al. Effect of matrix size on the image quality of ultra-high-resolution
34 CT of the lung: Comparison of 512×512,1024 ×1024, and 2048 ×2048. Acad Radiol. 2018
35 Jul;25(7):869-876.
- 36 7. Zhu H, Zhang L, Wang Y, et al. Improved image quality and diagnostic potential using ultra-high-
37 resolution computed tomography of the lung with small scan FOV: A prospective study. PLoS One.
38 2017 Feb 23;12(2):e0172688.
- 39 8. Yanyan Z, Dailun H, Meihong L, et al. A comparison of ultra-high-resolution CT target scan versus
40 conventional CT target reconstruction in the evaluation of groundglass-nodule-like lung
41 adenocarcinoma. Quant Imaging Med Surg. 2019 Jun;9(6):1087-1094
- 42 9. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-
43 infected pneumonia[J]. N Engl J Med. 2020 Mar 26;382(13):1199-1207.
- 44 10. Hu L, Wang C. Radiological role in the detection, diagnosis and monitoring for the coronavirus disease
45 2019 (COVID-19). Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2020 Apr;24(8):4523-4528.
- 46 11. Luo L, Luo Z, Jia Y, et al. CT differential diagnosis of COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 in symptomatic
47 suspects: a practical scoring method [J]. BMC Pulm Med. 2020 May 7;20(1):129.
- 48 12. Lei J, Li J, Li X, et al. CT imaging of the 2019 novel coronavirus (2019nCoV) pneumonia. Radiology.
49 2020 Apr;295(1):18.
- 50 13. Li X, Zeng W, Li X, et al. CT imaging changes of corona virus disease 2019(COVID-19): a multi-center
51 study in Southwest China[J]. J Transl Med. 2020 Apr 6;18(1):154.
- 52 14. Shi H, Han X, Jiang N, et al., Radiological findings from 81 patients with COVID-19 pneumonia in
53 Wuhan, China: a descriptive study[J]. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020 Apr;20(4):425-434.

- 54 15. Zhao W, Zhong Z, Xie X et al. Relation Between Chest CT Findings and Clinical Conditions of
55 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pneumonia: A Multicenter Study[J]. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2020
56 May;214(5):1072-1077.
- 57 16. Lim HJ , Chung MJ , Shin KE , et al . The Impact of Iterative Reconstruction in Low-Dose Computed
58 Tomography on the Evaluation of Diffuse Interstitial Lung Disease[J] . Korean J Radiol. 2016 Nov-
59 Dec;17(6):950-960.
- 50 17. Masahiro Yanagawa,AkinoriHata, Osamu Honda, et al.Subjective and objective comparisons of image
51 quality betweenultra-high-resolution CT and conventional area detector CT inphantoms and cadaveric
52 human lungs[J]. EurRadiol. 2018 Dec;28(12):5060-5068.
- 53 18. de Boer E, Nijholt IM, Jansen S, et al. Optimization of pulmonary emphysema quantification on CT
54 scans of COPD patients using hybrid iterative and post processing techniques: correlation with
55 pulmonary function tests[J]. Insights Imaging, 2019, 10 (1): 102.

56




57

58


Fig. 1 ROC curve of lesion distribution,density, and internal structure

59



70

71 (a)




72

73 (b)


74 **Fig. 2 Coronal reconstruction of (a) C-HRCT and(b) U-HRCT images of a female 43-year-old patient**
75 **with COVID-19. Bronchial walls and crazy-paving patterns are clearly displayed in U-HRCT but not**
76 **clearly displayed in C-HRCT**

77



78

79 (a)




30

31 (b)

32 **Fig. 3(a) C-HRCT and (b) U-HRCT images of a male 38-year-old patient with COVID-19. Crazy-**
33 **paving patterns, interlobular septal thickening, air bronchograms, and smooth bronchial margins are**

34 clearly displayed on U-HRCT image



35

36 (a)

(b)

37 **Fig. 4 C-HRCT and (b) U-HRCT images of a female 55-year-old patient with COVID-19. Air**
38 **bronchograms, smooth bronchial margins in the lesion are clearly displayed in U-HRCT**

39

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37 **Table 1** Analysis of CT signs of COVID-19 and non- COVID-19 lesions

Classification		COVID-19	non-COVID-19	χ^2	<i>p</i> -value
Lesion density	Pure ground-glass opacity	12 (75%)	12 (20.34%)	12.191	0.000
	Mixed ground-glass opacity	3 (18.75%)	38 (64.41%)		
	Consolidation	1 (6.25%)	9 (15.25%)		
Lesion distribution	≤2 cm from pleura	14 (87.5%)	6 (10.17%)	38.49	0.000
	> 2 cm from pleura	2 (12.5%)	53 (89.83%)		
Lesion number	Multiple	9 (56.25%)	30 (50.85%)	0.147	0.701
	Single	7 (43.75%)	29 (49.15%)		
Internal structure of lesions	Vascular thickening	14 (87.5%)	8 (13.56%)	33.197	0.000
	Air bronchograms	13 (81.25%)	25 (42.37%)	7.611	0.000
	Interlobular septa thickening	13 (81.25%)	11 (18.64%)	22.672	0.000
	Crazy-paving patterns	15 (93.75%)	5 (8.47%)	46.805	0.000

38

39 **Table 2** Logistic regression analysis of CT signs of COVID-19

Indicator	B-value	OR (95%CI)	<i>p</i> -value
Lesion distribution	-4.508	0.011 (0.0006,0.216)	0.003
Lesion density	-1.114	0.3289 (0.054,1.990)	0.226
Vascular thickening	3.766	43.213 (2.677,697.430)	0.008
Air bronchograms	2.235	9.342 (0.675,129.208)	0.095
Interlobular septa thickening	3.257	25.9615 (1.589,424.151)	0.022
Crazy-paving pattern	5.553	258.081 (16.502,4036.160)	0.000

40

41

42

3

4

5 **Table 3** C-HRCT and U-HRCT image quality evaluation

	Cases (n)	512 × 512		1024 × 1024		F	P
		iDose ⁴ -3	iDose ⁴ -5	iDose ⁴ -3	iDose ⁴ -5		
Noise (HU)	75	74.63 ±18.11	60.06± 18.04	95.12±14.16	79.64 ±13.99	56.569	0.000
Signal-to-noise ratio	75	12.48 ±3.15	15.53 ±4.33	9.44 ±1.73	11.31 ±2.30	50.067	0.000
Overall subjective score	75	4.59±0.50	4.28±0.72	4.10±0.59	4.79±0.41	21.152	0.000
Bronchovascular display	75	3.49±0.77	3.51±0.83	3.96±0.57	4.21±0.75	16.279	0.000
Lesion display	75	4.36±0.61	4.27±0.72	4.43±0.64	4.80±0.40	11.21	0.000
Lesion margins display	75	4.36±0.67	4.25±0.72	4.22±0.61	4.44±0.74	1.551	0.201
Air bronchograms	38	4.57±0.50	4.25±0.72	4.24±0.59	4.79±0.41	8.338	0.000
Display Crazy-paving sign	18	4.17±0.62	4.28±0.67	4.44±0.62	4.67±0.49	2.359	0.079
of Vessel	22	4.41±0.58	4.45±0.60	4.81±0.50	4.89±0.35	5.057	0.000
internal Bronchial wall	43	4.37±0.69	4.27±0.73	4.49±0.55	4.86±0.35	7.757	0.000
structure Interlobular septa	24	4.48±0.50	4.21±0.78	4.79±0.41	4.83±0.38	6.652	0.000

6

7