

MATTERS ARISING

Open Access

LUS me up: elevating ARDS diagnosis



Rogério da Hora Passos^{1,2*}, Rafaella Maria da Cunha Lyrio³, Igor Dovorake Lourenço¹, Evandro José de Almeida Figueiredo¹, Uri Adrian Prync Flato¹, Carmen Valente Barbas¹ and Arnaldo Alves da Silva¹

Abstract

Boumans et al. conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of lung ultrasound (LUS) in acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). The study found that LUS has high specificity (0.942, 95% CI 0.856–0.978) but variable sensitivity (0.631, 95% CI 0.450–0.782) for identifying ARDS-related diffuse lung pathologies. LUS demonstrates comparable or superior performance to chest radiography and CT scans, facilitating rapid bedside diagnosis and management. However, variability in operator experience and interpretation criteria, as well as challenges in detecting mild or early-stage ARDS, remain. The study highlights the need for further research to refine LUS protocols and training, enhancing its application in clinical practice and improving patient outcomes.

Introduction

Boumans et al. conducted a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis to assess the diagnostic accuracy of lung ultrasound (LUS) in acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) [1]. This study provides crucial insights into how LUS can improve diagnostic capabilities and clinical decision-making in critical care settings.

The meta-analysis by Boumans et al. underscores LUS's specificity (0.942, 95% CI 0.856–0.978) in identifying diffuse lung pathology indicative of ARDS, such as bilateral opacities and respiratory failure. These findings corroborate earlier research highlighting LUS's effectiveness in detecting consolidations and diffuse B-lines associated with severe lung injury. Moreover, LUS demonstrates comparable or superior performance to traditional imaging modalities like chest radiography (CXR) and CT

scans, although its sensitivity varies (pooled sensitivity 0.631, 95% CI 0.450–0.782) [2, 3].

In clinical practice, LUS serves as a pivotal tool for early recognition and management of ARDS. Its ability to visualize critical features such as multiple B-lines, pleural line irregularities, and consolidations enables clinicians to make timely decisions on ventilation strategies, fluid management, and positioning maneuvers. The bedside accessibility of LUS facilitates rapid diagnosis and intervention, providing distinct advantages over conventional imaging methods [2, 3].

Despite its diagnostic strengths, uncertainties surround LUS in ARDS diagnosis. Questions persist regarding its sensitivity in detecting mild or early-stage ARDS and its capability to differentiate focal and non-focal subphenotypes. Variability in operator experience, equipment settings, and interpretation criteria further impacts its diagnostic accuracy across different clinical scenarios. The standardization of LUS protocols for ARDS diagnosis remains a contentious issue, necessitating validated approaches tailored to diverse patient populations [4].

Boumans et al.'s meta-analysis significantly contributes to the literature by consolidating evidence on LUS's diagnostic accuracy in ARDS [1]. It highlights LUS's high specificity while acknowledging sensitivity and subphenotype classification challenges. This synthesis informs

This comment refers to the article available online at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-024-04985-1>.

*Correspondence:

Rogério da Hora Passos
oiregorpassos@yahoo.com.br

¹ Critical Care Unit, Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, São Paulo, Brazil

² Da Vita Tratamento Renal, São Paulo, Brazil

³ Universidade Salvador, Salvador, Brazil



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

clinical practice by guiding the appropriate use of LUS and advocating for further research to refine its diagnostic capabilities. Future studies should focus on conducting comparative analyses against gold standard imaging techniques, validating LUS across varying severities of ARDS, and optimizing operator training and protocol standardization [4].

As clinicians, we find Boumans et al.'s study compelling, particularly regarding LUS's potential to revolutionize ARDS diagnosis and management. While its specificity in detecting diffuse lung pathology is commendable, the variability in sensitivity and challenges in subphenotype classification underscore the need for continued research and standardized protocols. Integrating LUS into clinical practice has the potential to enhance patient outcomes through more precise and timely interventions. However, it is crucial to approach its application judiciously, considering both its strengths and current limitations.

In conclusion, while LUS shows promise in advancing ARDS diagnosis, addressing uncertainties and optimizing its application through standardized protocols and ongoing research are imperative. Clinicians are encouraged to harness LUS's strengths while recognizing its limitations, ensuring judicious utilization and continual improvement in critical care settings.

Abbreviations

| | |
|------|-------------------------------------|
| LUS | Lung ultrasound |
| ARDS | Acute respiratory distress syndrome |
| CXR | Chest radiography |
| CT | Computer tomography |

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the conceptualization, formal analysis of the paper, and writing of the original draft. All authors have read and approved the final version of this manuscript.

Funding

None.

Availability of data and materials

No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Boumans MMA, Aerts W, Pisani L, Bos LDJ, Smit MR, Tuinman PR. Diagnostic accuracy of lung ultrasound in diagnosis of ARDS and identification of focal or non-focal ARDS subphenotypes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care Lond Engl*. 2024;28:224.
2. Ware LB. Improving acute respiratory distress syndrome diagnosis: Is lung ultrasound the answer? *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2023;207:1548–9.
3. Smit MR, Hagens LA, Heijnen NFL, Pisani L, Cherpanath TGV, Dongelmans DA, et al. Lung ultrasound prediction model for acute respiratory distress syndrome: a multicenter prospective observational study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2023;207:1591–601.
4. Smit MR, Mayo PH, Mongodi S. Lung ultrasound for diagnosis and management of ARDS. *Intensive Care Med*. 2024;50:1143–5.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.