

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Comprehensive Physical Exam versus Lung Ultrasound for Dyspneic Patients in the Emergency

Department

Michael Secko^{*¶}, Yuwen Cheng[¶], Sonika Raj[¶], Eshani Goradia^{*¶}, Lindsay Reardon[¶], Henry C. Thode Jr[¶], Adam J. Singer[¶]

¹Department of Emergency Medicine, Renaissance School of Medicine at Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, New York, United States of America

*Eshani Goradia
eshani.goradia@stonybrookmedicine.edu

[¶] These authors contributed equally to this work

24 **ABSTRACT**

25 **Objective:** Overreliance on technology has led to dwindling physical exam (PE) skills. We
26 compared the diagnostic accuracy of a structured lung physical examination (L-PE) to structured
27 lung ultrasound (LUS) in ED patients with undifferentiated dyspnea. We also examined the
28 change in differential diagnosis and degree of certainty based on order and type of exam

29 **Methods:** This was a prospective, randomized, crossover study of a convenience sample of adult
30 ED patients with undifferentiated dyspnea. Comprehensive L-PE and LUS were performed in
31 random order followed by the other exam. An adjudication committee determined the final
32 diagnosis based on all available data and served as the criterion standard. Primary outcome was
33 diagnostic accuracy. A sample of 86 patients had 80% power to detect a 25% difference in
34 diagnostic accuracy.

35 **Results:** A total of 102 patients were enrolled. Similar accuracies were found between L-PE and
36 LUS for both COPD [75% (95% CI 65-83) vs. 76% (95% CI 67-84)] and asthma [87% (95% CI
37 79-93) vs. 87% (95 CI 79-93)]. LUS [81% (95 CI 72-88)] was slightly more accurate compared
38 to L-PE [72% (95 CI 62-80)] for diagnosis of pneumonia but not statistically significant. For
39 patients presenting with pulmonary edema, LUS was slightly [76% (95 CI 66-84)] more accurate
40 than L-PE [73% (95 CI 63-81)], but not statistically significant. Finally, for detecting pleural
41 effusions, L-PE [96% (95 CI 90-99)] was more accurate than LUS [82% (95 CI 73-89)].

42 **Conclusions:**

43 The diagnostic accuracies of comprehensive lung physical examination and focused lung
44 ultrasound were generally similar in ED patients with dyspnea and should be used concurrently
45 to maximize diagnostic accuracy.

46 INTRODUCTION

47 Since 1816, the stethoscope has been the symbol of a physician. For nearly 200 years,
48 auscultation and physical examination have been the cornerstones of chest diagnostics.^{1,2}
49 Countless educational texts have been published over centuries to guide young physician-
50 trainees towards mastering the art of the physical exam.³ Now, modern diagnostic tools including
51 point-of-care ultrasound are challenging this age-old paradigm.

52 The undifferentiated dyspneic patient is one of the more challenging cases for Emergency
53 Physicians (EP). Critically ill patients with dyspnea and hypoxia frequently present to the
54 emergency department (ED) and EPs must make rapid diagnostic decisions with limited clinical
55 information. It is imperative to maximize benefit while avoiding unnecessary and potentially
56 harmful testing and treatment strategies.^{4,5} The traditional clinical evaluation of a dyspneic
57 patient typically entailed a history and physical exam (H&P) followed by routine chest
58 radiography (CXR).⁶ Relying on the H&P has never been ideal, given that it is non-specific and
59 often inconclusive, particularly for patient with chronic dyspnea.⁷ CXR findings are also often
60 delayed, frequently misleading, and have a low sensitivity for pathology.^{4-6,8}

61 Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS), with its increasing portability and excellent imaging
62 quality, is a rapid, reliable, and noninvasive tool for the diagnosis of dyspneic patients.⁹
63 Numerous studies have compared the performance of different diagnostic tools and have

64 confirmed that POCUS is more accurate than both physical examination and CXR to diagnose
65 patients presenting to the ED with undifferentiated dyspnea.^{6,10,11} One of the arguments against
66 the reproducibility of POCUS is that most studies are done by clinicians with above-average
67 experience with sonography.⁵ Studies have shown, however, that as few as 15 quality cardiac
68 and thoracic scans are enough to train clinicians and improve their confidence in their leading
69 diagnosis.^{12,13}

70 Medical educators are now emphasizing US in the curricula for future health care
71 providers and there is momentum towards replacing the stethoscope.^{14,15} The increasing
72 availability of advanced technologies and sensitive diagnostic testing has contributed to a decline
73 in physical exam skills of medical students, interns, and residents.^{16,17} The recognition that
74 physicians are relying more on technology and less on physical exam skills has been circulating
75 since 1988.^{2,18} The few studies that have specifically compared PE versus US for respiratory
76 conditions (e.g. dyspnea), however, are limited to auscultation with a stethoscope.^{6,19,20}
77 Auscultation is only one of the many maneuvers that may be performed as part of a
78 comprehensive PE. Other techniques include inspection, palpation, and percussion, which are
79 rarely used by many physicians after medical school.

80 We compared structured comprehensive lung PE (L-PE) to structured lung ultrasound
81 (LUS) as a diagnostic tool for patients presenting to the ED with undifferentiated dyspnea. To
82 the best of our knowledge, there are no publications that explicitly compare a comprehensive L-
83 PE with a LUS protocol. We further evaluated the change in differential diagnosis and degree of
84 certainty as secondary end points, as well as patients' satisfaction and confidence level with their
85 ED assessment.

86

87 **METHODS**

88 *2.1 Study Design*

89 This is a prospective, crossover superiority study comparing a structured PE to a
90 structured US exam in convenient sample of patients who present to the ED with acute dyspnea.
91 This study was reviewed and granted approval by our institutional review board. All patients
92 gave written informed consent.

93 *2.2 Study Setting and Population*


94 The study took place between July 2018 to July 2019 in the emergency department of a
95 suburban, university-based hospital with approximately 74,000 adult ED visits per year. The
96 hospital has an ACGME accredited PGY1-PGY3 emergency medicine residency program. All
97 study members were resident (PGY1 – 3) or attending level emergency physicians. To
98 participate in the study, the resident physician had to have completed a 2-week ultrasound
99 rotation which included a 60-minute didactic on lung ultrasound as well as performed and
100 completed 25 quality assured lung ultrasounds. PGY-1 and PGY-2 were classified as junior level
101 of training and PGY3 and attending were classified as senior level of training. Attending
102 physicians had to be credentialed in point-of-care ultrasound, which requires completion of at
103 least 25 quality assured scans meeting American College Emergency Physician’s ultrasound
104 requirements for POCUS and signed off by Chairman of the department.

105 Patients were enrolled when one of the study investigators was present. Criteria for
106 enrollment included hemodynamically stable adult patients (>18 years) with chief complaint
107 (CC) of shortness of breath (SOB) or dyspnea with the capacity to give informed consent.
108 Hypoxic (<90% Oxygen saturation) patients were enrolled if they were determined clinically
109 stable and able to tolerate the exam. A legally authorized representative (LAR) was eligible to
110 give consent for patients who lacked capacity. The study excluded patients under the age of 18,
111 those requiring life-saving procedures, and patients who lacked the capacity to give informed
112 consent and had no LAR present.

113 *2.3 Study Protocol*

114 The allocation of patients in our study are found in **Figure 1**. Study investigators
115 screened electronic medical records (EMR) and identified potential subjects with a chief
116 complaint of dyspnea. The treating or research physician performed an initial screening
117 examination and stabilized patients if needed. The study investigators then obtained informed
118 consent. After consent, patients were randomized to either structured L-PE followed by
119 structured LUS (L-PE/LUS) or structured LUS followed by structured L-PE (LUS/L-PE) group.
120 A Study Coordinator directed patients to complete the Baseline Demographic/Clinical
121 Characteristic Form and Patient Survey.

122 Figure 1. Flow diagram for allocation of patients



124

125 Study physicians were not blinded to the patient’s clinical history and were provided with
126 patient’s Baseline Demographic/Clinical Characteristic Form and performed both the L-PE and
127 LUS before any further ancillary or radiologic testing were performed or resulted. Physicians
128 performed the first assigned assessment (L-PE or LUS) and completed the Structured Exam
129 Form section pertaining to the conducted exam, which included clinical figures and differential
130 diagnoses with degree of certainty. Afterward, physicians performed the second assigned
131 assessment (LUS or L-PE) and completed the corresponding section in the Structured Exam
132 Form [**Appendix**]. After both assessments, the study investigators directed patients to complete
133 the Patient Survey again.

134 The investigated and measured diagnoses focused primarily on lung pathology, including
135 asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), consolidation, pneumothorax, pleural
136 effusion, and pulmonary edema. A write-in for other diagnoses not listed was available such as
137 anemia, pericardial effusion, pulmonary embolism but was not the focus of this study since we
138 were not examining or performing ultrasound of the heart.


139 All LUS were performed using a 5-1 MHz curvilinear array transducer. Sonographers
140 used either a Mindray M9 (Mindray, Mahwah, NJ), Mindray TE7 (Mindray, Mahwah, NJ), or
141 SonoSite Edge II (Fujifilm, Bothell, WA) ultrasound system to perform and record their images.
142 All LUS exams were archived on the secure middleware software *QpathE* (British Columbia,
143 Canada) and reviewed for quality assurance by an ultrasound fellowship-trained physician
144 blinded to the clinical parameters.

145 An adjudication committee independently collected and reviewed each chart after the
146 hospital course was completed. The committee was made up of 2 attending ultrasound trained
147 EPs that were blinded to study results. Disagreements were managed by a third senior EP. They
148 had access to the entire electronic record including all lab, echocardiography, radiologic results,
149 admission notes, and hospital discharge summaries. Based on all available clinical data, the
150 committee determined the final diagnosis, which served as the criterion standard. **[Appendix]**

151 *2.4 Structured Lung Physical Exam:*

152 The study team created the structured lung and thoracic exam from Bates Guide to
153 Physical Examination and History Taking, 12e.²¹ The participating physicians were given a 10-
154 minute didactic to refresh physical examination skills acquired during their medical school
155 training. The exam consisted of 12 fields. The thorax was divided into 2 sections (anatomical
156 right and left lung). Each hemithorax was separated into 3 zones. The anterior chest wall or zone
157 1 was delineated from the sternal border to anterior axillary line; the lateral chest wall or zone 2
158 bordered between the anterior and posterior axillary line; and the posterior chest wall or zone 3
159 consisted of the area between the posterior axillary line and mid-scapular line. Each section was
160 divided into 2 partitions (upper and lower quadrant) **[Figure 2]**. Symmetrical comparisons were
161 separately noted. Structured comprehensive L-PE included inspection, palpation, percussion, and
162 auscultation in regions mentioned above. Techniques and standard characteristics were as
163 described.²¹

164 Figure 2. Structured Physical and Ultrasound Examination



165

166

167 *2.5 Structured Lung Ultrasound Exam:*

168 We followed the structured lung ultrasound exam described in The BLUE Protocol.²² The

169 exam consisted of 12 fields. The thorax was divided into anatomical right and left hemithorax.

170 Each hemithorax was divided into the anterior, lateral, and posterior zones as described above.

171 Each zone subdivided again into superior and inferior regions [Figure 2]. The lung ultrasound


172 was classified into the following categories according to previously described criteria.^{6,9,22,23}

173 Lung ultrasound artifacts include A-lines, which are horizontal lines repeating below the pleural

174 line, and B-lines or comet tails, which are vertical lines extending from and perpendicular to the

175 pleural line. Pathological B-lines obscure A-lines and reach the edge of the screen [Fig. 3a].²⁴
176 The absence of lung sliding or the presence of “lung point” defined a pneumothorax.²⁵ Alveolar–
177 interstitial syndrome was defined as the presence of equal to or greater than 3 B-lines in a given
178 lung region [Fig. 3b].⁶ Pleural effusion was defined as dependent, traditionally anechoic
179 collection limited by the diaphragm and the pleura with respiratory movement of the lung within
180 the effusion [Fig. 3c].^{6,26,27} Consolidation was defined by 1) the presence of a “shred sign” or
181 irregular border between consolidated and aerated lung, 2) hyperechoic punctiform images
182 representative of dynamic air bronchograms, and/or 3) the tissue-like pattern called
183 “hepatization” [Fig. 3 d&e].^{6,9,28}

184 Figure 3a-e. Lung ultrasound findings. (A) A-lines designated by arrows, (B) B-lines indicated
185 by arrow heads, (C) pleural effusion designated by star, (D) pneumonia labeled by arrow with
186 parapneumonic effusion designated by star, (E)



187

188

189

190 *2.6 Outcomes*

191 The primary outcomes were 1) the diagnostic accuracy of initial L-PE compared to the
192 criterion standard in dyspneic patients presenting to the ED, 2) the diagnostic accuracy of the
193 initial LUS compared to the criterion standard in dyspneic patients presenting to the ED, and 3)
194 the diagnostic accuracy of L-PE compared to LUS. Secondary outcomes included 1) physician
195 change in differential diagnosis between asthma/COPD versus pulmonary edema after the first
196 versus second assessment, 2) physician change in degree of certainty in leading diagnosis after
197 the first versus second assessment.

198 *2.7 Statistical Analysis*

199 Assuming the accuracy of structured thoracic PE is 65%^{8,29-31} in diagnosing the cause of
200 SOB (e.g., heart failure, COPD, pneumonia, pulmonary embolism), in order to achieve an 80%
201 power to detect an absolute 25% increase in the diagnostic accuracy by ultrasound with a
202 significance level <0.05, a sample of 43 patients was required in each group. Assuming a dropout
203 rate of 10%, 102 patients were sampled in total. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS
204 version 26 (IBM, Armonk, NY). Patient baseline demographics were expressed as mean ±
205 standard deviations. Diagnostic accuracy of initial structured L-PE or LUS compared to the
206 criterion standard were represented as sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy.
207 Diagnostic accuracy between structured L-PE and structured LUS were compared using the chi-
208 square test. Cohen's kappa statistics were used to calculate the physician change in differential
209 diagnosis after the first and second assessment, physician change in degree of certainty in

210 leading diagnosis after the first and second assessment, and patient change in confidence level
211 with L-PE and with LUS examination after the first and second assessment. Chi-Square testing
212 was also used to analyze the comparison of patient satisfaction with medical care in general after
213 intervention between L-PE/LUS and LUS/L-PE groups, the comparison of patient satisfaction
214 with physical examination alone between L-PE/LUS and LUS/L-PE groups, and the comparison
215 of patient satisfaction with ultrasound examination alone between L-PE/LUS and LUS/L-PE
216 groups.

217

218 RESULTS

219 3.1 Study Population

220 A total of 102 patients were enrolled. Patient demographics can be found in **Table 1**.
221 Fifty-seven patients (56%) were male and the mean age \pm SD was 63 ± 18.5 years. Hypertension
222 was the most common co-morbidity with 53 (52%) patients having the disease and 66 (65%) of
223 the patients reported a history of smoking. Of those 102 patients, 50 patients (49%) had L-PE
224 before LUS, and 52 patients (51%) had LUS before L-PE. A total of 23 EPs, 19 residents and 4
225 attending physicians participated in the study.

226

| | PE first (n=50) | US first (n=52) | P value |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| Gender, n (%) | | | .41 |
| Males | 30 (60%) | 27 (52%) | |

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------|----------|------|
| Females | 20 (40%) | 25 (48%) | |
| Mean age (SD) | 64 (18) | 62 (19) | |
| History, n (%) | | | |
| Diabetes | 12 (24%) | 10 (19%) | .63 |
| Hypertension | 26 (52%) | 27 (51%) | 1.00 |
| Renal disease | 3 (6%) | 7 (13%) | .32 |
| CHF | 11 (22%) | 14 (27%) | .65 |
| CAD | 10 (20%) | 12 (23%) | .81 |
| Asthma | 8 (16%) | 9 (17%) | 1.00 |
| COPD/emphysema | 14 (28%) | 16 (31%) | .83 |
| DVT/Pulmonary embolism | 4 (8%) | 4 (8%) | 1.00 |
| Cancer | 12 (24%) | 12 (23%) | 1.00 |
| Smoking | 35 (70%) | 31 (60%) | .31 |

227 **Table 1.** Patient Demographics

228 PE: physical examination, US: ultrasound, CHF: congestive heart failure, CAD: coronary artery
229 disease, COPD: chronic pulmonary disease, DVT: deep vein thrombosis.

230

231 3.2 Primary Outcomes

232 The adjudicated final diagnoses are noted in **Table 2**. Thirty-five patients (34%) had either
233 COPD or asthma for their final diagnosis, followed by 32 patients (31%) with pulmonary edema,
234 while 20 patients (20%) were diagnosed with pneumonia. Forty-nine patients (48%) had other

235 diagnoses not listed. With regard to the total number of final diagnosis, 69 patients (68%) had
236 only one final adjudicated diagnosis while 33 patients (32%) had 2 or more diagnoses.
237

| <i>Adjudicated Final Diagnosis</i> | <i>Number</i> |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| COPD | 29 |
| Asthma | 6 |
| Consolidation | 20 |
| Pneumothorax | 0 |
| Pleural effusion | 8 |
| Pulmonary edema | 32 |
| Other | 49 |
| | |
| <i>Number of diagnoses</i> | |
| 1 | 69 |
| 2 | 25 |
| 3 | 7 |
| 4 | 1 |

238 **Table 2.** Adjudicated Final Diagnosis

239 Sums to more than 100% because of multiple diagnoses. COPD: Chronic obstructive pulmonary
240 disease.

241 The overall accuracies of both physical exam and ultrasound for each diagnosis studied
242 can be found in **Table 3**. Similar accuracies were found between L-PE [75% (95% CI 65-83)]
243 and LUS [76% (95% CI 67-84)] for COPD as well as asthma with [87% (95% CI 79-93) vs. 87%

244 (95% CI 79-93)] for both L-PE and LUS. For diagnosing pneumonia, LUS [81% (95% CI 72-
245 88)] was slightly more accurate compared to L-PE [72% (95% CI 62-80)], but not statistically
246 significant. For detecting pleural effusions, L-PE [96% (95% CI 90-99)] was more accurate than
247 LUS [82% (95% CI 73-89)]. With regard to pulmonary edema, LUS was slightly [76% (95% CI
248 66-84)] more accurate than L-PE [73% (95% CI 63-81)] but was not statistically significant.

249

| | SENSITIVITY (95% CI) | SPECIFICITY (95% CI) | PPV (95% CI) | NPV (95% CI) | ACCURACY (95% CI) | p |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------|
| COPD | | | | | | |
| PE | 45 (27-64) | 86 (76-93) | 57 (35-76) | 80 (70-88) | 75 (65-83) | .74 |
| US | 38 (21-58) | 92 (84-96) | 65 (41-83) | 79 (69-87) | 76 (67-84) | |
| ASTHMA | | | | | | |
| PE | 67 (24-94) | 89 (80-94) | 27 (9-55) | 98 (91-99) | 87 (79-93) | 1.00 |
| US | 17 (9-64) | 92 (84-96) | 11 (1-49) | 95 (88-98) | 87 (79-93) | |
| PNEUMONIA | | | | | | |
| PE | 35 (16-59) | 80 (70-88) | 30 (14-53) | 84 (73-91) | 72 (62-80) | .10 |
| US | 60 (36-80) | 87 (77-93) | 52 (31-73) | 90 (81-95) | 81 (72-88) | |
| PLEURAL EFFUSION | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|
| PE | 63 (26-90) | 99 (94-99) | 83 (36-99) | 97 (91-99) | 96 (90-99) | .003 |
| US | 88 (47-99) | 82 (73-89) | 29 (13-51) | 99 (92-99) | 82 (73-89) | |
| PULMONARY EDEMA | | | | | | |
| PE | 25 (12-44) | 94 (85-98) | 67 (35-89) | 73 (63-82) | 73 (63-81) | .74 |
| US | 53 (35-70) | 87 (77-94) | 65 (44-82) | 80 (69-88) | 76 (66-84) | |

250 **Table 3.** Diagnostic Characteristics by Test (Regardless of Order)

251 CI: Confidence Intervals, PPV: positive predictive value; NPV: negative predictive value,
 252 COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, PE: physical examination, US: Ultrasound.

253

254 **Table 4** describes the misclassifications between COPD and pulmonary edema. There were 33
 255 (32%) patients that had an initial diagnosis of COPD/asthma. Six of these 33 subjects in the
 256 initial L-PE group and four in the initial LUS group were later adjudicated to have a different
 257 diagnosis. Of these 10 mentioned, one in each group (two total) were later diagnosed with
 258 pulmonary edema. Of the 24 patients (24%) initially diagnosed with pulmonary edema, one
 259 patient in the initial L-PE group and seven patients in the initial LUS group were later
 260 determined to have a different diagnosis. Of these eight total cases, only one case which was in
 261 the initial LUS arm (4%) changed to COPD/asthma.

| Number of cases with second diagnosis (not COPD) by test order | | |
|---|-------|-------|
| 2 nd diagnosis | PE/US | US/PE |
| Pulmonary edema | 1 | 1 |
| Consolidation | 4 | 2 |
| Pleural Effusion | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 6 | 4 |
| Number of cases with second diagnosis (not pulmonary edema) by test order | | |
| 2 nd diagnosis | PE/US | US/PE |
| COPD | 0 | 1 |
| Consolidation | 0 | 4 |
| Pleural Effusion | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 1 |

262 **Table 4.** Misclassification


263 COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, PE: physical examination, US: ultrasound.

264

265 We also stratified accuracies of LUS vs L-PE based on physician training level in **Figure**
 266 **4**. In both lower and higher training level, LUS was found to be more accurate than L-PE in
 267 diagnosing pneumonia (82% vs 73%, 78% vs 65%, respectively) and pulmonary edema (78% vs
 268 75%, 70% vs 65%, respectively), although with no statistical significance. For COPD, lower
 269 level training physicians had higher accuracy in LUS than L-PE (77% vs 67%), but opposite was

270 found in higher level training physicians (73% vs 78%), although with no statistical significance.
271 For asthma, lower level training exhibited similar accuracies in either exams (84% and 84%) and
272 there was not enough sample by higher level training physicians to provide an accuracy. For
273 pleural effusion, L-PE was found to be more accurate than LUS in lower training level with
274 statistical significance (95% vs 80%, 0.007) and in higher level training level although without
275 significance (100% vs 91%).

276 Figure 4. Accuracies based on physician level of training for lung physical exam (L-PE) and lung
277 ultrasound (LUS).



278

279

280 *3.3 Secondary Outcomes*

281 Physician confidence for their leading diagnosis is noted in **Table 5**. Physician
282 confidence in COPD and asthma was higher for the L-PE (23% and 15% respectively) than LUS
283 (17% and 9% respectively). Physician confidence in diagnosing pneumonia was equal between
284 both L-PE and LUS (23% vs. 23% respectively). Physician confidence in LUS was higher than
285 L-PE in suspecting pleural effusion (24% vs. 6%) and pulmonary edema (25% vs. 12%).

286

| Physician impression | Physical exam N (%) | US N (%) |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------|
| COPD | 23 (23%) | 17 (17%) |
| Asthma | 15 (15%) | 9 (9%) |
| Consolidation | 23 (23%) | 23 (23%) |
| Pneumothorax | 0 (0%) | 1 (1%) |
| Pleural Effusion | 6 (6%) | 24 (24%) |
| Pulmonary Edema | 12 (12%) | 26 (25%) |

287 **Table 5.** Physician impression of high confidence level by test type, regardless of order

288

289 **DISCUSSION**

290 This is the first study to compare lung point-of-care ultrasound to comprehensive lung
291 physical examination in dyspneic patients presenting to the emergency department. Previous
292 studies have compared LUS to auscultation only in respiratory conditions.^{6,19,20} The
293 comprehensive L-PE in our study was not limited to auscultation alone, but also consisted of

294 inspection, palpation, and percussion. As undifferentiated dyspnea consists a vast amount of
295 etiologies, our study focused on lung pathology and lung exams and chose 6 representative
296 respiratory conditions: asthma or COPD, consolidation, pneumothorax, pleural effusion, and
297 pulmonary edema. Many other important causes of dyspnea such as pulmonary embolism,
298 pericardial effusion, and ascites were not the focus of this study, although could easily be
299 diagnosed with the incorporation of cardiac examination and bedside echocardiography. We had
300 variable results in regard to the accuracies of comprehensive L-PE and LUS for each of six
301 studied diagnoses. We found that LUS was slightly more accurate than L-PE for diagnosing
302 pneumonia (82% and 72% respectively). Although not statistically significant ($p=0.10$), our
303 result is consistent with prior studies in which US is a superior diagnostic tool than auscultation
304 alone.^{6,19,20}

305 Surprisingly, our study found L-PE to be more accurate than LUS for detecting pleural
306 effusion (96% and 82% respectively) with statistical significance ($p=0.003$). This is discordant
307 with other studies showing lung US to be more accurate than PE for this condition.^{6,19,20}
308 However, these previous studies included only chest auscultation in their PE, whereas our study
309 included eight comprehensive physical examination maneuvers. L-PE findings that support a
310 diagnosis of pleural effusion include asymmetric chest expansion, dullness to percussion, and
311 asymmetry of tactile fremitus.^{32,33} Our inclusion of these additional PE elements might have
312 explained this discrepancy. This suggested the possibility of a comprehensive L-PE including
313 chest auscultation, percussion, and tactile fremitus being more accurate than LUS, but we cannot
314 report the feasibility of performing this extensive maneuver during a busy emergency department
315 shift. Therefore, to support the continued use of ultrasound, we cite a study by Steinmetz et al²⁷,
316 which found the odds of correctly diagnosing pleural effusion improved by five times with

317 addition of LUS to L-PE. Their diagnostic accuracy for pleural effusion also increased from 60
318 to 88% with the addition of LUS.²⁷ It is therefore likely that the addition of LUS increases the
319 diagnostic accuracy when used in combination with a thorough and comprehensive L-PE.

320 With regard to diagnosing COPD/asthma, our study found similar accuracies between L-
321 PE and LUS (75% vs. 76%, $p=0.74$) and asthma (87%, $p=1.00$), with no statistical significance
322 between the two diagnostic methods. To the best of the authors' knowledge, there has not been
323 any prior research directly comparing the two methods in diagnosing COPD/asthma. Previous
324 studies have shown that the presence or absence of comet-tails (B-lines) on LUS is useful in
325 distinguishing COPD from pulmonary edema.^{22,24} We did find LUS (76%) to be slightly more
326 accurate than L-PE (73%) for diagnosing pulmonary edema; however, it was not statistically
327 significant, and also our sensitivities and accuracy were found to be lower than previous
328 literature that has shown LUS to have higher sensitivity (94%) and specificity (92%) in
329 diagnosing cardiogenic pulmonary edema^{6,19,20,34}. This may be a result of inexperience
330 sonographers.

331 As sonography is very user-dependent, stratification of data based on physician level of
332 training was analyzed. We found that the accuracies of L-PE vs LUS in diagnosing each lung
333 pathology did not change order. However, it is difficult to draw conclusions on physician
334 experience when there was not enough participation by physicians with senior level of training,
335 particularly attending participation. Also, the senior-level training group did not encounter any
336 asthma diagnoses to allow for comparison. Therefore, it remains difficult to conclude on the
337 effect of training level on the efficacy of these diagnostic maneuvers. Finally, we did not have

338 large enough sample size to determine the effect of varying physician experience on the accuracy
339 of comprehensive L-PE or LUS and should be considered in future studies.

340 **LIMITATIONS**

341 There are some inherent limitations to our study. First of all, this was a convenience
342 sample and a study performed at a single, academic institution with resident physicians
343 performing the majority of the physical exam and ultrasound. Ultrasound is highly operator-
344 dependent and there was not enough participation by attending physicians. To help minimize the
345 variable, we stratified the data based on physician level of training and found similar results in
346 this study.

347 Moreover, there was no blinding of the LUS group or L-PE group as this can cause
348 potential bias in our study with the second evaluation being influenced by the first evaluation. To
349 help minimize the amount of bias, we randomized the order of which test was performed first.

350 Another limitation was the considerable number (48%) of patients that had diagnoses
351 other than the 6 pulmonary conditions we studied: bronchitis/upper respiratory infection,
352 pericardial effusion, viral pneumonia, pulmonary embolism, chest pain/acute coronary syndrome
353 or arrhythmias. This discrepancy revealed the multitude of other medical conditions that can cause
354 dyspnea, especially life-threatening conditions such as massive pulmonary embolism and
355 pericardial effusion with tamponade that can be diagnosed using bedside echocardiography.³⁵
356 These causes were considered but were not reported as we focused primarily on the lung
357 parenchyma and did not incorporate bedside echocardiography into this particular study. In
358 addition, a meta-analysis reports that although lung ultrasound is helpful in diagnosing
359 pulmonary embolism, but it can detect pulmonary embolism only if the lesions extend to the

360 periphery of lung. Therefore, it is inappropriate to use transthoracic lung ultrasonography to
361 diagnose pulmonary embolism currently.³⁶

362 Lastly, although previous literature demonstrates that LUS is highly accurate to diagnosis
363 patients with pneumothorax,^{37,38} we had too small of a sample size for pneumothorax to provide
364 the accuracy of L-PE and LUS for this condition. In addition, we did not take into consideration
365 whether or not the patient's body habitus affected our diagnostic abilities, nor did we ascertain
366 the effect of patient body positioning on diagnostic accuracy of patients with B-lines for L-PE or
367 LUS.³⁴

368

369 **CONCLUSION**

370 Neither L-PE nor LUS were statistically superior for most of the six medical conditions
371 we evaluated, and the accuracies were overall similar. Dependent on the pulmonary condition, L-
372 PE or LUS may be slightly more sensitive or specific over the other modality but should not be
373 used alone. We advocate for POCUS and PE to be concurrently used, as they complement each
374 another and maximize diagnostic accuracy of various pulmonary findings encountered in the ED.
375 ²⁷ Physicians should continue to learn and practice a good comprehensive physical exam and
376 incorporate ultrasound to enhance their diagnostic ability.

377

378 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

379 The authors would like to thank Mathew Lohse, MD and Jonathan Kneib, MD, for their
380 assistance with the study.

381 **REFERENCES:**

- 382 1. Majumdar SK. History of the stethoscope an overview. *Bull Indian Inst Hist Med*
383 *Hyderabad*. 2002;32(2):137-150.
- 384 2. Wilkins RL. Is the stethoscope on the verge of becoming obsolete? *Respir Care*.
385 2004;49(12):1488-1489.
- 386 3. Verghese A, Charlton B, Cotter B et al. A history of physical examination texts and the
387 conception of bedside diagnosis. *Trans Am Clin Climatol Assoc*. 2011;122:290-311.
- 388 4. Ünlüer EE, Karagöz A. Bedside lung ultrasound versus chest X-ray use in the emergency
389 department. *Interv Med Appl Sci*. 2014;6(4):175-177.
- 390 5. Wimalasena Y, Kocierz L, Strong D et al. Lung ultrasound: a useful tool in the
391 assessment of the dyspnoeic patient in the emergency department. Fact or fiction? *Emerg*
392 *Med J*. 2018;35(4):258-266.
- 393 6. Lichtenstein D, Goldstein I, Mourgeon E et al. Comparative diagnostic performances of
394 auscultation, chest radiography, and lung ultrasonography in acute respiratory distress
395 syndrome. *Anesthesiology*. 2004;100(1):9-15.
- 396 7. Ferry OR, Huang YC, Masel PJ, et al. Diagnostic approach to chronic dyspnoea in adults.
397 *J Thorac Dis*. 2019;11(Suppl 17):S2117-S2128.
- 398 8. Wipf JE, Lipsky BA, Hirschmann JV, et al. Diagnosing pneumonia by physical
399 examination: relevant or relic? *Arch Intern Med*. 1999;159(10):1082-1087.
- 400 9. Lichtenstein DA. Lung ultrasound in the critically ill. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2014;4(1):1.
- 401 10. Agricola E, Arbelot C, Blaivas M, et al. Ultrasound performs better than radiographs.
402 *Thorax*. 2011;66(9):828-829; author reply 829.

- 403 11. Ozkan B, Unluer EE, Akyol PY, et al. Stethoscope versus point-of-care ultrasound in the
404 differential diagnosis of dyspnea: a randomized trial. *Eur J Emerg Med.* 2015;22(6):440-
405 443.
- 406 12. Carrie C, Biais M, Lafitte S et al. Goal-directed ultrasound in emergency medicine:
407 evaluation of a specific training program using an ultrasonic stethoscope. *Eur J Emerg*
408 *Med.* 2015;22(6):419-425.
- 409 13. Papanagnou D, Secko M, Gullett J et al. Clinician-Performed Bedside Ultrasound in
410 Improving Diagnostic Accuracy in Patients Presenting to the ED with Acute Dyspnea.
411 *West J Emerg Med.* 2017;18(3):382-389.
- 412 14. Fakoya FA, du Plessis M, Gbenimacho IB. Ultrasound and stethoscope as tools in
413 medical education and practice: considerations for the archives. *Adv Med Educ Pract.*
414 2016;7:381-387.
- 415 15. Geria RN, Raio CC, Tayal V. Point-of-care ultrasound: not a stethoscope-a separate
416 clinical entity. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2015;34(1):172-173.
- 417 16. Fodor D, Badea R, Poanta L et al. The use of ultrasonography in learning clinical
418 examination - a pilot study involving third year medical students. *Med Ultrason.*
419 2012;14(3):177-181.
- 420 17. Mangione S, Nieman LZ. Pulmonary auscultatory skills during training in internal
421 medicine and family practice. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 1999;159(4 Pt 1):1119-1124.
- 422 18. Nardone DA, Lucas LM, Palac DM. Physical examination: a revered skill under scrutiny.
423 *South Med J.* 1988;81(6):770-773.

- 424 19. Inglis AJ, Nalos M, Sue KH, et al. Bedside lung ultrasound, mobile radiography and
425 physical examination: a comparative analysis of diagnostic tools in the critically ill. *Crit*
426 *Care Resusc.* 2016;18(2):124.
- 427 20. Vezzani A, Manca T, Brusasco C, et al. Diagnostic value of chest ultrasound after cardiac
428 surgery: a comparison with chest X-ray and auscultation. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.*
429 2014;28(6):1527-1532.
- 430 21. Bickley LS. *Bates' guide to physical examination and history taking.* Eighth edition /
431 Lynn S. Bickley, Peter G. Szilagyi. Philadelphia : Lippincott Williams & Wilkins,
432 [2003] ©2003; 2003.
- 433 22. Lichtenstein DA, Meziere GA. Relevance of lung ultrasound in the diagnosis of acute
434 respiratory failure: the BLUE protocol. *Chest.* 2008;134(1):117-125.
- 435 23. Lichtenstein DA. BLUE-protocol and FALLS-protocol: two applications of lung
436 ultrasound in the critically ill. *Chest.* 2015;147(6):1659-1670.
- 437 24. Lichtenstein D, Meziere G. A lung ultrasound sign allowing bedside distinction between
438 pulmonary edema and COPD: the comet-tail artifact. *Intensive Care Med.*
439 1998;24(12):1331-1334.
- 440 25. Lichtenstein D, Meziere G, Biderman P et al. The "lung point": an ultrasound sign
441 specific to pneumothorax. *Intensive Care Med.* 2000;26(10):1434-1440.
- 442 26. Lichtenstein D, Hulot JS, Rabiller A et al. Feasibility and safety of ultrasound-aided
443 thoracentesis in mechanically ventilated patients. *Intensive Care Med.* 1999;25(9):955-
444 958.

- 445 27. Steinmetz P, Oleskevich S, Dyachenko A et al. Accuracy of Medical Students in
446 Detecting Pleural Effusion Using Lung Ultrasound as an Adjunct to the Physical
447 Examination. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2018;37(11):2545-2552.
- 448 28. Alzahrani SA, Al-Salamah MA, Al-Madani WH et al. Systematic review and meta-
449 analysis for the use of ultrasound versus radiology in diagnosing of pneumonia. *Crit*
450 *Ultrasound J.* 2017;9(1):6.
- 451 29. Wang CS, FitzGerald JM, Schulzer M et al. Does this dyspneic patient in the emergency
452 department have congestive heart failure? *Jama.* 2005;294(15):1944-1956.
- 453 30. Damy T, Kallvikbacka-Bennett A, Zhang J, et al. Does the physical examination still
454 have a role in patients with suspected heart failure? *Eur J Heart Fail.* 2011;13(12):1340-
455 1348.
- 456 31. Rahardjo KD, Dharmaeizar, Nainggolan G et al. The diagnostic accuracy of physical
457 examination compared to lung ultrasound for determining lung congestion in
458 hemodialysis patients who have reached their dry weight. *Journal of Physics: Conference*
459 *Series.* 2017;884:012150.
- 460 32. Wong CL, Holroyd-Leduc J, Straus SE. Does this patient have a pleural effusion? *JAMA.*
461 2009;301(3):309-317.
- 462 33. Diaz-Guzman E, Budev MM. Accuracy of the physical examination in evaluating pleural
463 effusion. *Cleve Clin J Med.* 2008;75(4):297-303.
- 464 34. Al Deeb M, Barbic S, Featherstone R et al. Point-of-care ultrasonography for the
465 diagnosis of acute cardiogenic pulmonary edema in patients presenting with acute
466 dyspnea: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2014;21(8):843-852.

- 467 35. Kimura BJ. Point-of-care cardiac ultrasound techniques in the physical examination:
468 better at the bedside. *Heart*. 2017;103(13):987-994.
- 469 36. Jiang L, Ma Y, Zhao C, et al. Role of Transthoracic Lung Ultrasonography in the
470 Diagnosis of Pulmonary Embolism: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One*.
471 2015;10(6):e0129909.
- 472 37. Wilkerson RG, Stone MB. Sensitivity of bedside ultrasound and supine anteroposterior
473 chest radiographs for the identification of pneumothorax after blunt trauma. *Acad Emerg*
474 *Med*. 2010;17(1):11-17.
- 475 38. Staub LJ, Biscaro RRM, Kaszubowski E et al. Chest ultrasonography for the emergency
476 diagnosis of traumatic pneumothorax and haemothorax: A systematic review and meta-
477 analysis. *Injury*. 2018;49(3):457-466.
- 478