## Henry Ford Hospital Medical Journal

Volume 34 | Number 2

Article 3

6-1986

# Chest Radiographs in Surgical Intensive Care Patients: A Valuable "Routine"

H. Mathilda Horst

**Brian Fagan** 

Gordon H. Beute

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.henryford.com/hfhmedjournal Part of the Life Sciences Commons, Medical Specialties Commons, and the Public Health Commons

### **Recommended Citation**

Horst, H. Mathilda; Fagan, Brian; and Beute, Gordon H. (1986) "Chest Radiographs in Surgical Intensive Care Patients: A Valuable "Routine"," *Henry Ford Hospital Medical Journal* : Vol. 34 : No. 2 , 84-86. Available at: https://scholarlycommons.henryford.com/hfhmedjournal/vol34/iss2/3

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Henry Ford Health System Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Henry Ford Hospital Medical Journal by an authorized editor of Henry Ford Health System Scholarly Commons.

## **Chest Radiographs in Surgical Intensive Care Patients:** A Valuable "Routine"

### H. Mathilda Horst, MD,\* Brian Fagan, MD,\* and Gordon H. Beute, MD<sup>†</sup>

A total of 411 "routine" chest films were evaluated to determine their clinical value for surgical intensive care unit patients. There were 138 unexpected findings on 112 chest radiographs. These unexpected findings were equally divided between pulmonary problems (72) and device malposition (66). Of the unexpected findings, 30% were considered potentially life-threatening. On the basis of this study, we recommend "routine" chest films for monitoring in critically ill surgical intensive care patients. (Henry Ford Hosp Med J 1986;34:84-6)

**P** atients receiving life support in intensive care units have a rapidly changing clinical and physiologic status. Multiple methods, including invasive tubes and lines, are used to support and monitor these critically ill patients. Portable chest radiographs have been recommended as a valuable monitoring modality and are obtained routinely on patients in the intensive care units (1-3). It has been suggested that portable chest films are valuable in identifying complications resulting from the primary disease or its treatment (4).

In the surgical intensive care unit at Henry Ford Hospital, there is a standing order for daily chest films on intubated patients. Concern of this policy promoting overutilization of bedside chest films prompted us to evaluate the clinical usefulness of these "routine" portable chest radiographs.

#### **Materials and Methods**

The study population consisted of 262 consecutive patients admitted to a 15-bed surgical intensive care unit. Daily portable chest radiographs were obtained on these patients while they were intubated and at other times by physician order. The chest radiographs were interpreted with a staff radiologist and the intensive care unit team on a daily basis. Radiographic findings were compared to previous chest films and to clinical expectations. Data collection sheets were designed to include the following points: 1) indication for the chest radiograph, 2) endotracheal tube position, 3) central venous access position, 4) tube thoracostomy position, and 5) cardiopulmonary changes and/or disease. Findings were classified as unexpected if the changes were unanticipated by the clinician. All findings were recorded.

#### Results

During the two-month study period 411 portable chest films were obtained on 262 patients (1.6 radiographs/patient). The most common indication for obtaining a chest radiograph was a postoperative film, while the least common indication was to check line or tube placement (Table 1). The changing clinical condition of the patient was an infrequent reason for obtaining a chest film (5.6%). Only 65 chest radiographs (15.89%) showed multiple indications for obtaining the films.

There were 138 unanticipated problems recognized on a review of 133 (27%) of the 411 chest films (Table 2). These 138 problems represented 15% of the 893 abnormal radiographic findings identified in the study. The 138 unanticipated problems were almost equally divided between faulty tube or catheter position (48%) and pulmonary problems (52%) (Table 2).

A 12% incidence of malposition was discovered when monitoring the position of endotracheal and tracheostomy tubes, central venous catheters, chest tubes, and nasogastric tubes (Table 2). None of these positioning problems were anticipated. Abnormal endotracheal tube position was identified on 30 of 186 (16%) chest films on intubated patients. High placement of the endotracheal tube was seen on 12 films; the endotracheal tube was found to be placed too low on 17 films; and right main stem intubation was identified in one instance. Malposition of central venous catheters was seen on 24 of 271 radiographs (8.8%). These positional problems included finding the catheter to be in the proximal cava (6 patients), neck (4 patients), the opposite subclavian (2 patients), and the heart or inferior vena cava (4 patients), or the catheter was kinked and coiled (8 patients). Four of 31 (13%) chest tubes were found to be inappropriately placed, with two chest tubes kinked and two chest tubes with the last hole in the subcutaneous tissue outside the pleural cavity. Esophageal positioning of nasogastric tubes was identified on eight of 77 films (Table 2).

Atelectasis of varying degrees was present on 133 radiographs. In 17 of 133 (12.8%) of these chest films, the atelectasis was an unsuspected problem. Unexpected major lobar collapse General

Specific

was pres was seen and righ an unexp effusion infiltrate graphs. ent on 5 of five 1 (Table 2 gastric ( dehisce mediast Allo terventi potentia problen one rig cheal tu failures

Henry Fo

Beds

Submitted for publication: May 15, 1986.

Accepted for publication: May 29, 1986.

<sup>\*</sup>Surgical Critical Care Section, Division of Trauma Surgery, Henry Ford Hospital.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Division of Thoracic Radiology, Henry Ford Hospital. Address correspondence to Dr Horst, Division of Trauma Surgery, Henry Ford Hospital, 2799 W Grand Blvd, Detroit, MI 48202.

	Indications		Unexpected Findings
General		289	78
	Postoperative	289	16
	Routine Use of ventilator	69	25
	Preoperative	5	1
	Subtotal	5	120
Specific		22	- 11
ope	Clinical change	23	- 11
	Line position	9	2
	Intubation	2	1
	Chest tube	1	1
	Subtotal		18

Table 1

aining a showed

on a renese 138 ographic oroblems catheter 2).

ed when eostomy sogastric re anticified on 30 lacement lotracheal ight main osition of liographs e catheter s), the opvena cava patients). propriately es with the ral cavity. entified on

133 radioatelectasis ar collapse

d Hospital. / Ford Hospital,

ohs—Horst et al

was present on seven chest films (5%). Left lower lobe collapse was seen on four films, right middle lobe collapse on two films, and right lower lobe collapse on one film. Pleural effusion was an unexpected finding on 17 of 49 (35%) chest radiographs with effusion, but was minor in all instances. Clinically unsuspected infiltrates/pneumonia were identified on 12 of 56 (21.4%) radiographs. Congestive heart failure/pulmonary edema was present on 51 chest films and unsuspected in 11 cases (21.5%). Four of five pneumothoraces seen in this series were unsuspected (Table 2). Other unexpected problems were identified including gastric distension, apical hematoma, subcutaneous air, sternal dehiscence, pneumomediastinum, pneumopericardium, and mediastinal hematoma.

All of the problems identified in this study required active intervention. Of the 138 unexpected problems, 44 were considered potentially life-threatening. These potentially life-threatening problems included four pneumothoraces, seven collapsed lobes, one right main stem intubation, 12 high-positioned endotracheal tubes, three pneumonias, 11 unsuspected congestive heart failures/pulmonary edemas, and one sternal dehiscence.

#### Discussion

Bedside (portable) chest radiographs are an important tool for the evaluation of critically ill patients in the intensive care units (5-8). For patients on life-support systems, frequent portable chest films have been recommended to identify unexpected cardiopulmonary problems and to monitor invasive catheter or tube position (1-3). Portable chest films are expensive in terms of dollars, labor, and time. Excessive use of these films can increase the cost of intensive care (2,3). Because of the expense and the difficulty of defining the benefit, the value of "routine" portable chest radiographs for intensive care unit patients has been questioned (2,3,9).

The majority of the portable chest films in this study were taken for routine reasons such as preoperative or postoperative status or ventilator use (Table 1). The remaining films were obtained for specific reasons such as changing clinical condition or following line or tube placement. It is of interest that 120 of 138 (87%) unexpected findings were identified on "routine" chest films, while radiographs obtained for specific indications had only 18 unexpected findings. Our 27% overall incidence of un-

 Table 2

 Unexpected Findings on 411 Routine Chest Films

		Total Findings	Unexpected Findings	
Pulmonary				
	Atelectasis	133		(14%)
	Infiltrate/pneumonia	68	12	(18%)
	Congestive heart failure/pulmonary			
	edema	51	11	(22%)
	Effusion	49	17	(35%)
	Pneumothorax	5	4	(80%)
	Other	15	10	(67%)
	Subtotal	321	72	(22%)
Lines				
	Endotracheal tubes	186		(16%)
	Central lines	189	15	(8%)
	Pulmonary arterial			
	catheters	89	9	(10%)
	Nasogastric tubes	77	8	(10%)
	Chest tubes	31	4	(13%)
	Subtotal	572	66	(12%)
	Total	893	138	(15%)

anticipated findings is similar to the report by Greenbaum and Marschall (2). The patients monitored in this study had short intensive care unit stays which may have biased the results. The effectiveness of daily chest films on patients with longer periods of intubation or intensive care unit stay was not addressed in this study.

Pulmonary complications, a common cause of postoperative mortality, were the most frequent abnormal chest radiographic findings in our study (Table 2). Pulmonary problems are difficult to evaluate because clinical examination of the intensive care unit patient is hampered by patient position, bandages, drainage tubes, and transmission of ventilator noise to the chest wall. When chest radiographs are used to monitor the pulmonary parenchyma, the reported incidence of new, unanticipated, or worsening pulmonary problems documented by bedside chest films is 43% (2,3). Our study was limited to documenting unanticipated pulmonary problems, which explains the lower incidence (22%) of pulmonary problems encountered.

The impact of unexpected pulmonary problems is difficult to assess. In this study all instances required intervention. Certainly, an unrecognized pneumothorax is a life-threatening situation, and the four unexpected pneumothoraces identified in our study required chest tube drainage. The seven cases of lobar collapse were potentially life-threatening and required bronchoscopy. The identified cases of congestive heart failure/pulmonary edema also required therapeutic intervention.

Device malposition is an iatrogenic problem with potentially serious consequences (4,6,10). The 12% incidence of malposition reported in this study is similar to the incidence reported in the literature (3). The position of all invasive lines and tubes should be checked by a radiograph.

In summary, this study documents that the overwhelming majority of unexpected problems are identified on "routine" portable chest films and that 27% of films obtained on surgical intensive care unit patients identify unanticipated findings, some of which may be life-threatening. Based on these results, we support the use of bedside chest films as a valuable monitoring routine for critically ill patients and advise the use of the "routine" films to help reduce morbidity and mortality.

#### References

1. Weil MH, Shubin H. Critical care medicine handbook. New York: Kalen, 1974.

2. Greenbaum DM, Marschall KE. The value of routine daily chest x-rays in intubated patients in the medical intensive care unit. Crit Care Med 1982;10:29-30.

3. Henschke CI, Pasternack GS, Schroeder S, Hart KK, Herman PG. Bedside chest radiography: Diagnostic efficacy. Radiology 1983;149:23-6. 4. Savoca CJ, Gamsu G, Rohlfing BM. Chest radiography in intensive care units. West J Med 1978;129:469-74.

5. Ovenfors C, Hedgcock MW. Intensive care unit radiology. Problems of interpretation. Radiol Clin North Am 1978;16:407-39.

6. Goodman LR, Putman CE. Radiological evaluation of patients receiving assisted ventilation. JAMA 1981;245:858-60.

7. Ravin CE, Putman CE, McLoud TC. Hazards of the intensive care unit. Radiology 1976;126:423-31.

8. Marty KV, Joiner J, Shepherd RM. Management of the patient-ventilator system: A team approach. St. Louis: CV Mosby, 1979.

9. Milne ENC. Chest radiology in the surgical patient. Surg Clin North Am 1980;60:1503-18.

10. Adams FG. A simplified approach to the reporting of intensive therapy unit chest radiographs. Clin Radiol 1979;30:219-26.

# Mana A Selo

### Rebecc

Proper ity of the v duration c cated by c tritis, panmalnutriti therapy, a treatment

Alcoho

terns ran termed th hallucinc CAS is c may occi ing. Sym and/or co hours an to DT's that aggs gression DT's des DT's hallucin to 80 ho two and more (1 Over

Overl in the cr thors co agressiv

#### sants, i alcohol tributes ers (2)

Alco

ers (2). is a ma which ability. Two tifying history