Value of venous color flow duplex scan as initial screening test for geriatric inpatients with clinically suspected pulmonary embolism
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Aim: The contribution of lower extremity venous duplex scan to the diagnostic strategy for pulmonary embolism has been demonstrated by many authors. However, the positive diagnostic value of this noninvasive test in clinically suspected pulmonary embolism is not very high (10%–18%). Since thromboembolic risks increase considerably in hospitalized patients with advanced age, this study aims to determine the importance of lower extremity venous color flow duplex scan in this particular subgroup of patients with clinically suspected pulmonary embolism. The effects of clinical presentation and risk factors on the results of duplex scan have been also studied.

Methods: Between July 2007 and January 2010, 95 consecutive Lebanese geriatric (≥60 years of age) inpatients with clinically suspected pulmonary embolism assessed in an academic tertiary-care center for complete lower extremity venous color flow duplex scan were retrospectively reviewed. Age varied between 60 and 96 years (mean, 79.9 years). Forty patients were males and 55 females. Absence of compressibility was the most important criteria for detecting acute venous thrombosis.

Results: Out of 95 patients, 33 patients (34.7%) were diagnosed with recent deep venous thrombosis of lower extremities (14 proximal and 19 distal) using complete venous ultrasound. Nine of these 33 patients (27.2%) had a history of venous thromboembolism and eleven (33.3%) presented with edema of lower extremities. A total of 28 patients (84.8%) with positive duplex scan had associated risk factors for venous thromboembolism.

Conclusion: Lower extremity venous color flow duplex scan appears to be a reasonable initial screening test in the diagnostic algorithm of pulmonary embolism in geriatric inpatients with clinically suspected pulmonary embolism. This is particularly true in patients with a history of venous thromboembolism, in patients with a clinical presentation suggesting venous thrombosis, in uremic patients and in patients with altered general and mental status who are not candidates for chest computed tomography.
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Introduction

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is actually the third most common cardiovascular disorder following only myocardial infarction and stroke.1 Pulmonary embolism (PE) is the most important short-term complication of acute deep vein thrombosis (DVT). Mortality after PE is high.2–4 Increased age or confinement to a hospital or nursing home are considered independent predictors of reduced early survival after PE.2,3,5 In hospitalized patients, PE is one of the most common, yet highly preventable, causes of in-hospital death. The nonspecific signs and symptoms of PE in association with risk factors are insufficient to allow for a definitive diagnosis and should prompt the
physician to further investigation. The importance of correct diagnosis and timely treatment is essential to prevent potential life-threatening consequences of PE.

Ninety percent of PE originates from lower limb DVT. Symptomatic PE accompanies approximately 10% of DVT cases. Many imaging modalities have been used in the diagnostic strategy for the detection of PE. Venous ultrasound has evolved as the initial screening test for patients with clinically suspected PE in some centers. DVT detectable by venous ultrasound for the diagnosis of PE in this high risk subgroup of patients, and on both sides in ten patients. Thrombosis was determined in both positive and negative lower extremity venous ultrasound groups. Presenting symptoms and signs were essentially dyspnea for PE, and alteration of the general status including fever and lower extremity edema.

The authors of the paper did not find in the literature any publication providing adequate information about the value of venous ultrasound in geriatric hospitalized patients with clinically suspected PE. The aim of this study is to evaluate the importance of color flow lower extremity venous ultrasound for the diagnosis of PE in this high risk subgroup of patients and to assess the role of clinical presentation and risk factors on the results of venous ultrasound.

Materials and methods
From July 2007 to January 2010, 95 consecutive Lebanese geriatric (≥60 years of age) inpatients with clinically suspected PE assessed in an academic tertiary center for lower extremity venous ultrasound. Venous thrombosis was localized on the right side in eight patients, on the left side in 15 patients, and on both sides in ten patients. Thrombosis was

Results
Of the 95 reported patients, 33 (34.7%) were diagnosed with recent acute DVT of lower extremities using complete lower extremity venous ultrasound. Venous thrombosis was localized on the right side in eight patients, on the left side in 15 patients, and on both sides in ten patients. Thrombosis was
observed at the ilio-femoral level in one patient, at the femoro-popliteal level in 13 patients, and at the calf vein level in 19 patients.

Among the 33 patients diagnosed with DVT using complete venous ultrasound, 31 (93.9%) suffered from dyspnea, which was acute in eight patients (27.2%) and nonacute in 23 patients (69.6%). Eleven patients (33.3%) presented with leg edema, which was unilateral in four patients (12.1%) and bilateral in seven patients (21.2%). Five patients (15.1%) had alteration of general and mental status. Associated risk factors for VTE were reported in 28 patients (84.8%). Seventeen patients (51.5%) had one risk factor, seven (21.2%) had two risk factors, three (9%) had three risk factors, and one (3%) had four risk factors. The most commonly observed risk factors were a history of previous VTE (27.2%), obesity (24.2%), surgery (21.1%) including hip fracture and hip surgery (12.1%), superficial venous insufficiency (9%), immobilization (9%), heart failure (9%), respiratory failure (6%), and cancer (6%). All these findings are summarized and compared with those observed in the second group of patients in whom DVT was not detected (Tables 1 and 2). Bivariate analysis demonstrated that hip surgery increased the risk for VTE (Table 2). The role of obesity in increasing VTE risks was not statistically demonstrated (Table 2). The presence of lower extremity edema was a predictor for positive venous ultrasound (Table 1). A history of VTE as a predictor for positive ultrasound did not reach statistically significant levels (Table 2). On the other side, chronic pulmonary disease and coronary artery disease were poorly correlated with the presence of VTE and consequently with a positive venous ultrasound (Table 2).

### Discussion

Suspected PE is usually managed using algorithms combining clinical probability, ventilation/perfusion scan, computed tomography (CT), and lower extremities ultrasound.

**Table 1 Clinical presentation of patients with confirmed or excluded deep vein thrombosis of lower extremities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical presentation</th>
<th>Deep vein thrombosis (n = 33)</th>
<th>No deep vein thrombosis (n = 62)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyspnea:</td>
<td>30 (93.9%)</td>
<td>48 (77.4%)</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute dyspnea</td>
<td>9 (27.2%)</td>
<td>14 (22.5%)</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacute dyspnea</td>
<td>23 (69.6%)</td>
<td>34 (54.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower extremity edema</td>
<td>11 (33.3%)</td>
<td>6 (9.6%)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral edema</td>
<td>4 (12.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral edema</td>
<td>7 (21.2%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of general status</td>
<td>5 (15.1%)</td>
<td>9 (14.5%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 Risk factors in patients with confirmed or excluded deep vein thrombosis of lower extremities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Deep vein thrombosis (n = 33)</th>
<th>No deep vein thrombosis (n = 62)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renal failure</td>
<td>14 (42.4%)</td>
<td>21 (33.8%)</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of VTE</td>
<td>9 (27.2%)</td>
<td>8 (12.9%)</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>8 (24.2%)</td>
<td>7 (11.2%)</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip fracture and surgery</td>
<td>5 (15.1%)</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficial venous</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>8 (12.9%)</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immobilization</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>6 (9.6%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (19.3%)</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent surgery</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (6.4%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory failure</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (6.4%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung infection</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (9.6%)</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepsis</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemiplegia</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute pancreatitis</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac catheterization</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic lung disease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (19.3%)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary artery disease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (19.3%)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadriplegia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg fracture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracranial bleeding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviation:** VTE, venous thromboembolism.

Multidetector-row CT (MDCT), recently introduced, has been firmly established as the first-line test for imaging patients with suspected PE.29–33

There is actually a conclusive evidence that MDCT scan if positive provides reliable confirmation of the presence of PE and more importantly if negative rules out clinically significant PE with a high negative predictor value (99.4%).34,35 However, considering ultrasound of the lower extremities in patients with high clinical suspicion for acute PE and a negative CT would appear prudent.36,37

Spiral CT scan requires a contrast bolus for vascular imaging. The most common contraindication to perform contrast enhanced spiral CT scanning is renal failure.37 Uremia increases with advanced age and in hospitalized patients, essentially when patients are admitted for acute events which decompensate their renal function. Thirty five patients (36.8%) with suspicion of PE reported in these series (Table 2) had an increased plasmatic creatinin level which precluded investigation using spiral CT scan. Fourteen patients had Alzheimer’s disease and 14 other patients presented with altered general and mental conditions preventing them to comply with the required conditions for completing a spiral CT scan examination. For these reasons, elderly patients, essentially when they are severely ill, need a less aggressive diagnostic procedure for confirming VTE.
Duplex scan of the veins of lower extremities, a cost-effective procedure essentially when unilateral symptoms are present, was an effective adjunct for PE diagnosis in this particular risk group. It could detect venous thrombosis in 34.7% of this study’s hospitalized geriatric population with suspicion of PE, a rate exceeding two times that reported in the literature for population not selected according to hospitalization and advanced age (10%–18%). Thus, the combination of advanced age and hospitalization leads to an extremely high risk for VTE, significantly exceeding the separate effect of each of these single factors.

In these series, patients having chronic lung disease (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, emphysema, asthma, and pulmonary fibrosis) and coronary artery disease (CAD) were less likely to have venous thrombosis (0% with lung disease compared with 19.3% with no lung disease, \( P = 0.007 \); and 9% with CAD compared with 19.3% with no CAD, \( P = 0.007 \)). Although dyspnea was essentially related to the underlying cardiopulmonary condition in these patients, however, duplex scan was requested to detect any possible PE which could decompensate their cardiac or lung function. On the other hand, additional major PE in patients with very critical cardiopulmonary disease could lead to a lethal complication before any possible exploration with duplex scan.

Hip surgery increased the incidence of venous thrombosis in the reported patients (15.1% in DVT compared with 3.2% in non-DVT; \( P = 0.047 \)). Obesity seems to also increase venous thrombosis, although this factor did not reach statistical significance (24.2% in DVT compared with 11.2% in non-DVT; \( P = 0.099 \)).

The presence of lower extremity edema (33.3% in DVT compared with 9.6% in non-DVT; \( P = 0.004 \)) was a predictor factor for positive ultrasound results. The role of a previous history of VTE in predicting positive ultrasound is highly suggestive but not statistically significant (27.2% in DVT compared with 12.9% in non-DVT; \( P = 0.082 \)). These results confirm the findings reported by Girard and colleagues who demonstrated by a multivariate analysis of patients with symptomatic proved PE that age \( \geq 70 \) years, the presence of symptoms and signs of DVT, and a history of VTE were independent risk factors for DVT. They emphasize the importance of duplex scan as a major contributor to the diagnostic strategy of PE in elderly hospitalized patients, essentially when symptoms and signs of DVT and/or a history of VTE are present.

This study demonstrates that lower extremity venous duplex scan is very useful in detecting venous thrombosis in geriatric inpatients with clinically suspected PE. It is a noninvasive and reproductive exam which can be performed sometimes urgently on the floor or in the intensive care unit without the need to mobilize the patient. The role of this exam becomes essential when elderly patients have a very critical condition preventing their transfer to the radiology department, a renal failure, or altered mental or general status precluding the use of spiral CT scan, the standard of reference for the diagnosis of PE. In these specific conditions, duplex scan becomes an appropriate first-line test for the diagnosis of PE.

**Conclusion**

Lower extremity color flow venous duplex scan seems to be a useful adjunct or even an appropriate initial screening test for geriatric hospitalized patients with clinically suspected DVT. This test is particularly efficient in patients with a history of VTE and/or with clinical presentation suggestive of DVT and is particularly useful in uremic patients and in patients with alteration of general and mental status who are not candidates for chest helical CT scan examination.
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