



This is a repository copy of *The use of whole-body computed tomography in major trauma: variations in practice in UK trauma hospitals.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/110594/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Sammy, I.A. orcid.org/0000-0003-4265-5569, Chatha, H., Bouamra, O. et al. (3 more authors) (2017) The use of whole-body computed tomography in major trauma: variations in practice in UK trauma hospitals. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. ISSN 1472-0205

<https://doi.org/10.1136/emermed-2016-206167>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Emergency Medicine Journal

The use of whole body CT in major trauma: variations in practice in UK trauma hospitals

Journal:	<i>Emergency Medicine Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	emermed-2016-206167.R2
Article Type:	Original article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Sammy, Ian; The University of Sheffield, School of Health and Related Research; The University of the West Indies, Department of Clinical Surgical Sciences Chatha, Hridesh ; Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust, Emergency Department Bouamra, Omar; The Trauma Audit and Research Network, Fragoso-Iñiguez, Marisol; Hope Hospital, Trauma Audit and Research Network Lecky, Fiona; University of Sheffield, School of Health and Related Research Edwards, Antoinette; University of Manchester, Trauma Audit and Research Network
Keywords:	emergency department, imaging, CT/MRI, major trauma management, resuscitation, Trauma, major trauma management

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **TITLE: The use of whole body CT in major trauma: variations in practice in UK trauma hospitals**
4

5 **Ian Sammy (Corresponding Author)**
6

7 TARN doctoral research fellow
8

9 Director, MSc in Advanced Emergency Care
10

11 School of Health and Related Research
12

13 The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
14

15 (Email: ian.sammy@sheffield.ac.uk)
16
17
18

19 **Hridesh Chatha**
20

21 Clinical Research Fellow
22

23 Salford Royal Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
24

25 Manchester, United Kingdom
26
27
28

29 **Omar Bouamra**
30

31 Statistician, Trauma Audit and Research Network
32

33 Manchester, United Kingdom
34
35
36
37

38 **Marisol Fragoso Iniguez**
39

40 Database Analyst, Trauma Audit and Research Network
41

42 Manchester, United Kingdom
43
44
45

46 **Fiona Lecky**
47

48 TARN Director of Research
49

50 Clinical Professor of Emergency Medicine
51

52 School of Health and Related Research
53

54 The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
55
56
57
58
59
60

Antoinette Edwards

Director of Operations, Deputy to the Executive Director

The Trauma Audit and Research Network, The University of Manchester,

Key Words: emergency department; imaging, CT/MRI; major trauma management; resuscitation; trauma; major trauma management

Word Count: 2,994 words (excluding title page, abstract, tables, figure legends and references)

Contributorship Statement:

Ian Sammy and Hridesh Chatha conceived the original research idea, developed the research method and contributed to data analysis and interpretation. Fiona Lecky supervised and contributed substantially to the development of the research method and data interpretation. Omar Bouamra advised on the research method, analysed the data and contributed towards data interpretation. Marisol Fragoso-Iñiguez contributed to development of the research methods, data analysis and interpretation and Antoinette Edwards contributed to development of the research methods and data interpretation. All authors contributed substantially to the preparation of the final manuscript.

What is Already Known on This Subject

- The use of whole body CT in trauma varies widely from country to country
- There are no universally accepted evidence based guidelines for the use of whole body CT in trauma
- We do not know how whole body CT is used in hospitals in the United Kingdom

What This Study Adds

- This analysis of prospectively collected data from a national trauma registry showed that there are significant differences in the use of whole body CT between major trauma centres and trauma units
- There is also wide variation in the use of whole body CT between different individual hospitals in England and Wales

Abstract

Introduction

Whole body computed tomography (WBCT) use in trauma patients in England and Wales is not well documented. WBCT in trauma can reduce time to definitive care, increasing survival. However, its use varies significantly worldwide.

Methods

We performed a retrospective observational study of Trauma Audit and Research Network data from 2012 - 2014. The proportion of adult patients receiving WBCT during initial resuscitation at major trauma centres (MTCs) and trauma units/non-designated hospitals (TUs/NDHs) was compared. A model was developed that included factors associated with WBCT use, and centre effects within the model were explored to determine variation in usage beyond that expected from the model.

Results

Of the 115,664 study participants, 16.5% had WBCT. WBCT was performed 5 times more frequently in MTCs than TUs/NDHs (31% vs 6.6%). In the multivariate model, increased injury severity, low Glasgow coma score, shock, comorbidities and triage category increased the chances of having a WBCT, but there was no consistent relation with age. High falls and motor vehicle collisions also increased WBCT usage. Adjusting for casemix, there was a 13-fold intra-hospital variation in the use of WBCT between MTCs and a 30-fold variation between TUs/NDHs. The amount of variability between individual hospitals that could not be accounted for by the factors shown to impact on WBCT use was 26% (95% CI 17% - 39%) for MTCs and 17% (95% CI 13% - 21%) for TUs/NDHs.

Conclusion

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

There are significant variations in WBCT use between different hospitals in England and Wales, which require further investigation.

Confidential: For Review Only

Introduction

Whole body computerised tomography (WBCT) is an imaging strategy which uses non-contrast and contrast enhanced CT scanning of the head, neck, and torso in selected critically injured patients, with or without specific clinical signs of injury in these regions. Whole body CT has been used as a primary investigation in the management of major trauma patients for several years worldwide, though the indications for its use are without a firm evidence base (1, 2, 3).

While WBCT in trauma is widely utilised in the United States, there has been variable uptake in other countries (4, 5). Across the United Kingdom, there are no universal guidelines for the use of whole body CT in major trauma. Several authorities, including the Royal College of Radiologists (RCR) and the National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE), have proposed guidelines for WBCT in trauma, but these have not been validated, and are not used by all trauma receiving hospitals (3, 5, 6).

Several authors report improved patient survival, improved diagnostic accuracy and shorter time to definitive diagnosis and treatment with WBCT use (7-11). However, CT scanning is associated with an increased risk of cancer in later life, which must be considered when ordering such investigations (12). Consequently, there are significant variations between countries in WBCT use in trauma. The reported proportion of trauma patients receiving WBCT ranges from 85% in Sweden to 9.3% in Australia, though this variation may partly be explained by differences in patient characteristics between studies (2, 4, 13).

The degree of variation in WBCT use in the England and Wales is not documented; understanding this is an important initial step in the development and implementation of guidelines for WBCT in major trauma. We therefore undertook an analysis of TARN data, to determine the use of WBCT for adult major trauma patients (aged ≥ 16 years) in hospitals in England and Wales. The Trauma Audit and Research Network maintains a database of major trauma patients admitted to all trauma receiving hospitals in England, Wales, The Republic of Ireland and selected hospitals in Europe, to monitor the effectiveness of trauma care, using a methodology based on the TRISS model (14). TARN

1
2
3 collects information on patient characteristics (such as age, gender and injury severity) and process
4
5 factors (including use of CT scans and WBCT) (15). Patients are included in the TARN database if their
6
7 length of stay is ≥ 72 hours or they are admitted to a high dependency area or die in hospital or are
8
9 transferred to another hospital for specialist/critical care).
10

11 12 13 14 15 **Methods**

16
17
18 The primary aims of this retrospective observational study were to determine the proportion of
19
20 major trauma patients receiving whole body computerised tomography (WBCT) as part of their
21
22 Emergency Department (ED) management and to assess the variation in use between hospitals in
23
24 England and Wales, using data from the TARN database. The study also sought to identify factors
25
26 associated with WBCT use, and compare the use of WBCT in major trauma centres (MTCs) to that in
27
28 trauma units (TUs) and non-designated hospitals (NDHs). The study period extended from 1st January
29
30 2012 to 31st December 2014. This time period was chosen as it coincided with the roll-out of regional
31
32 trauma services in England, and allowed comparisons between patients admitted to major trauma
33
34 centres (MTCs) vs trauma units (TUs) and non-designated hospitals (NDHs). Trauma care in England
35
36 is currently organised on a regional basis in a hub-and-spoke arrangement, with MTCs (hospitals
37
38 equipped to manage all severities of trauma) receiving the majority of seriously injured patients,
39
40 either directly, or as secondary transfers from TUs. Trauma units (TUs) are smaller peripheral
41
42 hospitals, able to deal with less seriously injured patients but which do not have the full complement
43
44 of trauma services. Non-designated hospitals (NDHs) are hospitals not included in any structured
45
46 trauma system (for example Welsh hospitals), and therefore not designated as either MTCs or TUs.
47
48 In general they do not have the full capability of MTCs and share more in common with TUs. Patients
49
50 were excluded from our study if they were secondary admissions to an MTC from a TU or NDH.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study included all adult patients (aged ≥ 16 years) admitted to trauma receiving hospitals in
4
5 England and Wales, whose details were registered on the TARN database. Information extracted for
6
7 each patient included demographic data, injury characteristics, hospital type (MTC vs TU/NDH) and
8
9 data on CT use. For categorical data, categories were chosen to coincide with those commonly used
10
11 at TARN. Missing data were analysed as a category within the variable, in order to minimise the loss
12
13 of cases. While imputation may have been more useful, this was not pursued as some variables had
14
15 a high percentage of missing data, such as Charlson comorbidity index (19.6%), making imputation
16
17 less reliable.
18
19

20
21 The study investigated the use of WBCT during resuscitation. This did not include WBCTs performed
22
23 after initial emergency surgery or following admission to the intensive care unit. WBCT use at major
24
25 trauma centres (MTCs) was compared to its use in trauma units (TUs) and non-designated hospitals
26
27 (NDHs). We also assessed the inter-hospital variation in WBCT usage between individual trauma-
28
29 receiving hospitals.
30
31

32
33 The impact of various clinical and demographic covariates (age, gender, comorbidities, injury
34
35 severity, Glasgow coma score, systolic blood pressure, mechanism of injury, and triage category) on
36
37 the odds of having a WBCT was also determined. Using multivariate logistic regression, a model was
38
39 then constructed to determine the extent to which variations in usage of WBCT could be explained
40
41 by known variables. Only those covariates found to have an association with WBCT on univariate
42
43 analysis were included in the final multivariate analysis. Adjusted odds ratios were presented with
44
45 their 95% confidence intervals. For all comparisons, a 'p' value of $<.05$ was considered statistically
46
47 significant.
48
49

50
51 The degree of variation between individual hospitals was also calculated. Binomial regression
52
53 analysis was used to demonstrate unadjusted odds of having a whole body CT for each hospital,
54
55 compared with the overall odds for having a WBCT in MTCs and TUs/NDHs, respectively. Multi-level
56
57 modelling (using the covariates identified in the original multivariate analysis) was used to
58
59
60

1
2
3 demonstrate the variation in adjusted odds of having a whole body CT between individual MTCs and
4 TUs/NDHs, fitting centres as random intercepts in the model (16). Sensitivity analysis was performed
5 on calculations of intra-hospital variance in WBCT usage, by excluding hospitals with data
6 completeness of 50% or less. TARN defines data completeness as the proportion of cases submitted
7 to TARN compared to the number of cases identified in the HES/HSW dataset(s) that appear to meet
8 the TARN inclusion criteria. Data were analysed using SPSS (version 21) and Stata (version 14).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 TARN publishes rates of survival for all trauma receiving hospitals across England and Wales, aiding
17 clinical governance. This benchmarking activity is supported by Section 251 approval to process
18 certain information without specific informed patient consent. Data for this study came exclusively
19 from the TARN database without author access to patient records and we used the same principles
20 toward patient consent and ethical approval as described for the TARN benchmarking role.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Results

29
30
31 During the study period, 126,116 patients 16 years and older were entered onto the TARN database.
32 10,452 were transfers from TUs to MTCs, leaving 115,664 patients who fulfilled the study's inclusion
33 criteria. Of these, 46,969 (40.6%) were treated in major trauma centres (MTCs) and 68,695 (59.4%)
34 were treated in trauma units (TUs) and non-designated hospitals (NDHs). Thirty two percent (32.0%)
35 of patients had an injury severity score of >15 (36,974 patients). There were 62,748 patients aged
36 <65 years (54.3%) and 52,916 (45.7%) aged ≥65 years. 63,903 (55.2%) were male and 51,761 (44.8%)
37 were female. The most common mechanism of injury was low falls, accounting for 64,222 (55.5%)
38 patients.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The univariate associations between various factors and the likelihood of having a WBCT are shown
50 in Table 1, while multivariate associations are shown in Table 2. In the multivariate model, patients
51 admitted directly to major trauma centres were more likely to have WBCT compared to those
52 admitted to trauma units and non-designated hospitals (AOR 3.18; 95% CI 3.05 - 3.33). Further
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analysis of use of WBCT by time of day showed that the percentage of trauma patients having WBCT
4 during working hours (29.6% at MTCs and 5.6% at TUs/NDHs) was less than the percentage having
5 WBCT on evenings and weekends (32.1% at MTCs and 7.1% at TUs/NDHs).
6
7

8
9
10 Triage positive patients (those fulfilling the criteria for direct admission to a major trauma centre)
11 were significantly more likely to have a WBCT compared to triage negative patients on multivariate
12 analysis (AOR 2.66; 95% CI 2.49 - 2.84). However, 73,126 patients (63.2%) did not have their triage
13 category recorded. In addition, only 89.9% of triage-positive patients were admitted directly to an
14 MTC, while 37.7% of triage-negative patients were also admitted directly to an MTC.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 On multivariate analysis, the adjusted odds of having a WBCT was not significantly different between
23 men and women. However, there was an interaction between age and gender: younger females
24 (aged 16 – 44 years) were more likely than their male counterparts to have a whole body CT, but for
25 the older age groups, this trend was reversed. Overall, there was no significant increase in the
26 adjusted odds of having a WBCT with increasing age. Patients with a higher Charlson comorbidity
27 index (CCI) were more likely to have a WBCT than those with a CCI of 0 (Table 2).
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 In the multivariate model, injury severity, injury mechanism, systolic blood pressure and Glasgow
37 coma score were all associated with increased odds of having a WBCT. Compared to patients with an
38 ISS of <9, the adjusted odds of having a WBCT in patients with ISS of ≥ 25 was 3.95 (95% CI 3.67 –
39 4.24). The adjusted odds of having a WBCT were significantly higher for patients involved in road
40 traffic collisions (AOR 12.58; 95% CI 11.83 - 13.38) and high falls (AOR 8.43; 95% CI 7.92 – 8.96),
41 compared to low falls. Patients with a systolic blood pressure (SBP) below 110 mmHg were
42 significantly more likely to have a WBCT than those with a higher SBP, as were patients with a GCS
43 lower than 15 when compared to those with GCS 15 (Table 2).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 The overall accuracy of the multivariate model was high with an R-square statistic of 0.35 and an
55 AUROC of 0.890 (95% CI 0.887 - 0.892).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Confidential: For Review Only

	Covariate	TOTAL	WBCT (%)	Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Total		115,664	19,061 (16.5%)	
Age (years)	16-44	30,211	8,623 (28.5%)	(Reference)
	45-54	14,602	3,007 (20.6%)	0.65 (0.62 - 0.68)
	55-64	17,935	2,359 (13.2%)	0.38 (0.36 - 0.40)
	65-75	13,426	2,048 (15.3%)	0.44 (0.42 - 0.46)
	>75	39,490	3,024 (7.7%)	0.21 (0.19 - 0.21)
Gender	Male	63,903	13,554 (21.2%)	(Reference)
	Female	51,761	5,507 (10.6%)	0.44 (0.43 - 0.46)
CCI	0	63,653	12,303 (19.3%)	(Reference)
	1 to 5	28,313	3,257 (11.5%)	0.54 (0.52 - 0.57)
	6 to 10	8,008	731 (9.1%)	0.42 (0.39 - 0.45)
	>10	3,432	372 (10.8%)	0.51 (0.45 - 0.57)
	Unrecorded	12,258	2,398 (19.6%)	1.02 (0.97 - 1.07)
Triage Category	Negative	24,954	2,042 (8.2%)	(Reference)
	Positive	17,584	9,045 (51.4%)	11.88 (11.17 - 12.64)
	Unrecorded	73,126	7,974 (10.9%)	1.37 (1.31 - 1.45)
ISS	ISS <9	24,891	2,119 (8.5%)	(Reference)
	ISS 9-15	53,799	5,322 (9.9%)	1.17 (1.12 - 1.24)
	ISS 16-24	25,887	6,014 (23.2%)	3.25 (3.08 - 3.43)
	ISS ≥25	11,087	5,606 (50.6%)	10.99 (10.29 - 11.74)
MOI	Low falls	64,222	2,105 (3.3%)	(Reference)
	High falls	15,930	5,163 (32.4%)	14.15 (13.33 - 15.02)
	RTCs	24,110	10,521 (43.6%)	22.82 (21.54 - 24.23)
	Other	11,402	1,272 (11.2%)	3.71 (3.44 - 3.99)
Glasgow Coma Score	GCS 15	81,164	11,020 (13.6%)	(Reference)
	GCS 13-14	12,890	3,004 (23.3%)	1.93 (1.85 - 2.02)
	GCS 9-12	3,407	1,024 (30.1%)	2.74 (2.53 - 2.95)
	GCS 6-8	1,663	581 (35.0%)	3.43 (3.09 - 3.80)
	GCS 4-5	742	280 (37.7%)	3.86 (3.32 - 4.48)
	GCS 3	2,889	1,319 (45.7%)	5.35 (4.95 - 5.78)
	Unrecorded	12,909	1,833 (14.2%)	1.05 (1.00 - 1.11)
Systolic Blood Pressure	SBP ≥110	95,026	15,116 (15.9%)	(Reference)
	SBP <110	12,833	3,105 (24.2%)	1.69 (1.61-1.76)
	Unrecorded	7,805	840 (10.8%)	0.64 (0.59 - 0.69)
Hospital Designation	TU/NDH	68,695	4,507 (6.6%)	(Reference)
	MTC	46,969	14,554 (31%)	6.39 (6.16 - 6.64)

Table 1: Frequencies of all CT scans and WBCTs for different sub-groups of patients, with unadjusted odds ratios for usage of WBCT. 'CCI' = Charlson comorbidity index; ISS = injury severity score; MOI = mechanism of injury.

	Covariate	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	'p' value
Age	16 - 44	(Reference)	
	45 - 54	1.01 (0.94 - 1.08)	0.856
	55 - 64	0.92 (0.85 - 0.99)	0.026
	65 - 75	1.06 (0.98 - 1.15)	0.146
	>75	0.95 (0.88 - 1.04)	0.261
Gender	Male	(Reference)	
	Female	1.04 (0.97 - 1.12)	0.282
Age#Gender	16-44#Female	(Reference)	
	45 - 54#Female	0.88 (0.77 - 1.01)	0.063
	55 - 64#Female	0.87 (0.76 - 0.99)	0.041
	65 - 75#Female	0.83 (0.72 - 0.95)	0.007
	>75#Female	0.74 (0.66 - 0.84)	<0.001
CCI	0	(Reference)	
	1 to 5	1.22 (1.15 - 1.28)	<0.001
	6 to 10	1.25 (1.13 - 1.38)	<0.001
	>10	1.37 (1.20 - 1.56)	<0.001
	Unrecorded	0.94 (0.89 - 1.01)	0.074
Triage Category	Negative	(Reference)	
	Positive	2.66 (2.49 - 2.84)	<0.001
	Not recorded	1.24 (1.17 - 1.32)	<0.001
Injury Severity Score	ISS <9	(Reference)	
	ISS 9 - 15	1.19 (1.12 - 1.26)	<0.001
	ISS 16 - 25	2.16 (2.03 - 2.30)	<0.001
	ISS >25	3.95 (3.67 - 4.24)	<0.001
MOI	Low Falls	(Reference)	
	Vehicle Incident/Collision	12.58 (11.83 - 13.38)	<0.001
	Fall from Heights	8.43 (7.92 - 8.96)	<0.001
	Other	1.87 (1.72 - 2.04)	<0.001
	Glasgow Coma Score	GCS 15	(Reference)
GCS 13 - 14	1.39 (1.26 - 1.54)	<0.001	
GCS 9 -12	1.68 (1.38 - 2.03)	<0.001	
GCS 6 -8	1.59 (1.39 - 1.82)	<0.001	
GCS 4 -5	1.58 (1.43 - 1.75)	<0.001	
GCS =3	1.41 (1.33 - 1.50)	<0.001	
Not recorded	0.97 (0.90 - 1.05)	0.425	
Systolic Blood Pressure	SBP ≥110 mmHg	(Reference)	
	SBP <110 mmHg	1.21 (1.14 - 1.28)	<0.001
	Not recorded	0.58 (0.53 - 0.64)	<0.001
Hospital Designation	TU/NDH	(Reference)	
	MTC	3.18 (3.05 - 3.33)	<0.001

Table 2: Covariates and adjusted odds ratios for having a whole body CT following major trauma. 'CCI' = Charlson comorbidity index; ISS = injury severity score; MOI = mechanism of injury.

1
2
3
4
5
6 There was a wide variation in both the unadjusted and adjusted odds of having a WBCT between
7 individual hospitals within each hospital category (MTCs and TUs/NDHs) (Appendix 1 and Figure 1).
8 For MTCs, the adjusted odds ratio for having a WBCT ranged from 0.39 (95% CI 0.32 – 0.47) to 5.07
9 (95% CI 4.49 – 5.73), a 13-fold increase in odds between the MTC with the lowest usage compared to
10 that with the highest. For TUs and NDHs, the adjusted odds ratio for having a WBCT ranged from
11 0.22 (95% CI 0.10 – 0.49) to 6.78 (95% CI 4.61 – 9.97). The proportion of intra-class variability in
12 whole body CT rates not accounted for by observed patient characteristics (the covariates included
13 in the multivariate model) was 26% (95% CI 17% - 39%) for MTCs and 17% (95% confidence intervals
14 13% - 21%) for TUs. Appendix 2 lists the proportions of patients in each hospital who had WBCT, as
15 well as the intra-hospital distribution of the covariates used in the multivariate model.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Exclusion of data from hospitals with data completeness of 50% or less for any given year of the
29 study resulted in no significant difference in intra-hospital variance or the differences between MTCs
30 and TUs/NDHs.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Discussion

39 This paper demonstrated a large difference in the use of WBCT comparing MTCs to TUs and NDHs.
40 There was also a wide variation in the use of WBCT between individual trauma-receiving hospitals,
41 which needs further investigation.
42
43
44
45

46 While there is limited research on the use of WBCT for major trauma in the UK, international studies
47 have reported wide variations its use in other countries. Hsaio et al found that 9.3% of trauma
48 activations in one major trauma centre in New South Wales had WBCT, compared to 32% of German
49 patients with an ISS of >15 and 85% of trauma patients admitted to the Karolinska level 1 trauma
50 centre in Sweden (2, 7, 13). However, these differences in WBCT usage were confounded by the
51 differences in the samples used in different papers. For example, Leidner's study from Sweden
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 included all multiple trauma patients admitted to their Level 2 trauma centre, while Huber-Wagner's
4
5 paper only included patients with an ISS of >15.
6
7

8 MTCs used WBCT more than TUs, even after adjusting for demographic variables, injury severity,
9
10 physiological factors and injury mechanism. It is not clear whether this indicates an overuse of WBCT
11
12 by MTCs, or an underuse of WBCT at TUs. Opinions on the optimal use of WBCT to detect occult
13
14 injuries are divided, with some authors suggesting that protocol based criteria for ordering WBCT in
15
16 trauma patients increase the detection of unsuspected injuries, while others found no increase in
17
18 identification of previously unsuspected injuries with the implementation of similar protocols (17,
19
20 18).
21
22

23
24 The multivariate model identified several factors affecting the use of WBCT. Older women were less
25
26 likely to have WBCT than older men, but paradoxically women of childbearing age were more likely
27
28 to have this investigation than men of the same age or older women. This may reflect a gender bias
29
30 against older female trauma victims, similar to that seen in other acute conditions, such as
31
32 myocardial infarction and stroke (19, 20).
33
34

35
36 Appropriately, there was an increased likelihood of having a WBCT with increasing ISS, decreasing
37
38 GCS and lower SBP in our study. The increased use of WBCT in patients with comorbidities is also
39
40 reassuring; these patients are likely to do worse than those without comorbidities after major
41
42 trauma, and the presence of comorbidities may make them more difficult to assess (21, 22). In light
43
44 of this, the more liberal use of non-invasive investigations such as WBCT is likely to be beneficial in
45
46 this group.
47
48

49
50 The increased likelihood of having a WBCT after a road traffic collision compared to a low fall might
51
52 initially seem appropriate. However, low falls are the commonest and most lethal form of injury in
53
54 older people, with a high risk of sustaining serious injuries (23, 24). While older patients
55
56 predominantly sustain injuries to the head and spine after low falls, previous research suggests that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they are also at higher risk of injuries to other body regions, supporting the need for more
4
5 widespread imaging in these patients (24, 25). In our study, among patients with ISS >15 the rate of
6
7 polytrauma was similar between patients with low falls and those with high energy impact
8
9 mechanisms (68.3% vs 71.3%, respectively). It is possible that the low use of WBCT may have
10
11 increased the rate of missed injuries in these patients.
12

13
14 There was significant variation in the use of WBCT between individual hospitals. Much of this was
15
16 explained by risk factors included in multivariate analysis, but some correlations (for with gender
17
18 and injury mechanism) may reflect biases in the management of trauma patients rather than
19
20 decisions based on best practice. In addition, the degree of intra-hospital variance in WBCT use was
21
22 extremely high and requires further investigation. In one survey of hospitals in England and Wales,
23
24 the self-reported frequency of WBCT use in hospitals varied from less than once to more than 6
25
26 times per week. Only 41 hospitals (22.3%) had written policies guiding the use of WBCT, and these
27
28 varied significantly between hospitals (5). Such variations may provide one explanation for the high
29
30 intra-hospital variability in the use of WBCT found in our study.
31
32

33
34 While the findings of our study have important implications for the development of guidelines for
35
36 the use of WBCT in major trauma, there were some limitations. The types of patients included in this
37
38 study were limited by the TARN inclusion criteria; the study therefore only provided data on the use
39
40 of WBCT in more seriously injured patients. It is possible that the picture may have been different if
41
42 all trauma patients were included. Anecdotally, many hospitals use WBCT to facilitate discharge of
43
44 patients with a serious mechanism of injury, but who appear clinically stable. Differences in WBCT
45
46 use between patients with different triage categories should be interpreted cautiously, as this was
47
48 not recorded in a large proportion of patients. In addition, the triage criteria used by different
49
50 ambulance services differed significantly, and not all patients triaged 'positive' were directly
51
52 admitted to an MTC. Not all criteria used in current WBCT guidelines could be investigated in this
53
54 study. The TARN database does not include examination findings (apart from vital signs), but 'severe
55
56
57
58
59
60

injury on clinical assessment' is a criterion for WBCT in the RCR and other guidelines (3). Some of the correlations identified in this study (for example triage category, comorbidity score and Glasgow coma score) should also be interpreted with caution, given the relatively high rate of missing data for these parameters. In addition, patients who were intubated and ventilated prior to hospital admission were categorised as 'GCS not recorded' which may have skewed the association between GCS and WBCT. Finally, the inclusion of non-designated hospitals with trauma units may have exaggerated the differences between WBCT use between MTCs and other hospitals, if NDHs were performing significantly less WBCTs than TUs. However a sub-analysis of the rate of WBCT between TUs and NDHs showed that the rate of WBCT in NDHs was higher than in TUs (13% vs 6.2%, respectively), and the rate of WBCT for TUs and NDHs combined (6.6%) was almost identical to the rate of WBCT for TUs alone (6.2%).

This study highlights the need for more standardised algorithms for the use of WBCT, to increase its diagnostic accuracy and improve outcomes in major trauma patients. Further work is currently in progress to identify an evidence based algorithm for this, based on the sensitivity and specificity of a clinical decision tool in diagnosing patients with significant poly-trauma using WBCT. In addition, TARN is also investigating the impact of WBCT on survival in major trauma patients in England and Wales.

Table and Figure Legends:

Table 1: Frequencies of all CT scans and WBCTs for different sub-groups of patients, with unadjusted odds ratios for usage of WBCT. 'CCI' = Charlson comorbidity index; ISS = injury severity score; MOI = mechanism of injury

Table 2: Covariates and adjusted odds ratios for having a whole body CT following major trauma.

Figure 1: Adjusted odds of having a whole body CT for patients admitted directly to a trauma receiving hospital, comparing individual MTCs (above) and TUs/NDHs (below). The Red diamonds (upper graph) and blue dots (lower graph) represent the adjusted odds of having a whole body CT at individual hospitals, compared to an average hospital within the group (the red horizontal line in each graph) The Age/Gender interaction term (Age#Gender) refers to the ratio of odds of having a whole body CT between males and females for each age group. On multivariate analysis, an

1
2
3 interaction was noted between age and gender; younger females were more likely to have a
4 WBCT than males of the same age, while this gender difference was reversed in the older age
5 groups.
6

7
8 **Appendix 1: Funnel plot showing the unadjusted odds of having a whole body CT following**
9 **trauma, for individual hospitals. Upper plots show variance in major trauma centres (MTCs); all**
10 **patients on the left and patients with ISS ≥ 16 on the right. Lower plots show variance in trauma**
11 **units and non-designated hospitals (TUs/NDHs); all patients on the left and patients with ISS ≥ 16**
12 **on the right. Dotted lines on the funnel plots represent the 95% and 99% confidence limits for the**
13 **unadjusted odds of having a WBCT compared to the average for all hospitals (red horizontal line).**
14

15
16 **Appendix 2: Proportions of patients in each hospital who had WBCT, with the intra-hospital**
17 **distribution of the covariates used in the multivariate model. The 7 MTCs with less than 10**
18 **patients recorded represent paediatric trauma centres (nominal upper age limit 15 years).**
19

20 21 22 **Competing Interests**

23
24 Role of funding Source: This study received no external funding. TARN is funded by subscription from
25
26 its member hospitals in England, Wales, Republic of Ireland, Denmark and Switzerland. None of the
27
28 authors have any competing interests to declare.
29

30 31 **References**

- 32
33
34
35 1. Ptak T, Rhea J, Novelline R. Experience with a continuous, single-pass whole-body
36 multidetector CT protocol for trauma: the three-minute multiple trauma CT scan.
37 *Emergency Radiology*. 2001;8(5):250-6.
38
39 2. Leidner B, Beckman M. Standardized whole-body computed tomography as a screening
40 tool in blunt multitrauma patients. *Emergency Radiology*. 2001;8(1):20-8.
41
42 3. Standards of Practice and Guidance for Trauma Radiology in Severely Injured Patients.
43 London: The Royal College of Radiologists; 2011. Available from:
44 [https://www.rcr.ac.uk/sites/default/files/docs/radiology/pdf/BFCR\(11\)3_trauma.pdf](https://www.rcr.ac.uk/sites/default/files/docs/radiology/pdf/BFCR(11)3_trauma.pdf)
45
46 4. Self ML, Blake A-M, Whitley M, Nadalo L, Dunn E. The benefit of routine thoracic,
47 abdominal, and pelvic computed tomography to evaluate trauma patients with closed
48 head injuries. *The American journal of surgery*. 2003;186(6):609-14.
49
50 5. Smith CM, Mason S. The use of whole-body CT for trauma patients: survey of UK
51 emergency departments. *Emerg Med J* 2012;29:630-634 doi:10.1136/emj.2011.111708.
52
53 6. Glen J, Constanti M, Brohi K. Assessment and initial management of major trauma:
54 summary of NICE guidance. *British Medical Journal* 2016;353(22):i3051.
55 doi:10.1136/bmj.i3051
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 7. Huber-Wagner S, Lefering R, Qvick LM, Korner M, Kay MV, Pfeifer KJ, et al. Effect of
- 4 whole-body CT during trauma resuscitation on survival: a retrospective, multicentre
- 5 study. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9673):1455-61.
- 6
- 7 8. Hutter M, Woltmann A, Hierholzer C, Gärtner C, Bühren V, Stengel D. Association
- 8 between a single-pass whole-body computed tomography policy and survival after blunt
- 9 major trauma: a retrospective cohort study. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*.
- 10 2011;19:73.
- 11
- 12 9. Smith CM, Woolrich-Burt L, Wellings R, Costa ML. Major trauma CT scanning: the
- 13 experience of a regional trauma centre in the UK. *Emergency Medicine Journal*.
- 14 2010;emj. 2009.076414.
- 15
- 16 10. Smith CB, Barrett TW, Berger CL, Zhou C, Thurman RJ, Wrenn KD. Prediction of blunt
- 17 traumatic injury in high-acuity patients: bedside examination vs computed tomography.
- 18 *The American journal of emergency medicine*. 2011;29(1):1-10.
- 19
- 20 11. Wurmb TE, Fruhwald P, Hopfner W, Keil T, Kredel M, Brederlau J, et al. Whole-body
- 21 multislice computed tomography as the first line diagnostic tool in patients with multiple
- 22 injuries: the focus on time. *J Trauma*. 2009;66(3):658-65.
- 23
- 24 12. Mathews JD, Forsythe AV, Brady Z, Butler MW, Goergen SK, Byrnes GB, et al. Cancer risk
- 25 in 680 000 people exposed to computed tomography scans in childhood or adolescence:
- 26 data linkage study of 11 million Australians. *British Medical Journal* 2013;346:f2360.
- 27 doi:10.1136/bmj.f2360
- 28
- 29 13. Hsiao KH, Dinh MM, McNamara KP, Bein KJ, Roncal S, Saade C, et al. Whole-body
- 30 computed tomography in the initial assessment of trauma patients: is there optimal
- 31 criteria for patient selection? *Emerg Med Australas*. 2013;25(2):182-91.
- 32
- 33 14. Bouamra O, Wrotchford A, Hollis S, Vail A, Woodford M, Lecky F. A new approach to
- 34 outcome prediction in trauma: A comparison with the TRISS model. *J Trauma*.
- 35 2006;61(3):701-10.
- 36
- 37 15. Woodford M, Edwards A, White L, Lecky F. Trauma Audit and Research Network
- 38 Procedure Manual. Manchester, United Kingdom 2014. Available from:
- 39 [https://www.tarn.ac.uk/content/downloads/53/Complete%20manual%20-](https://www.tarn.ac.uk/content/downloads/53/Complete%20manual%20-%20August%202014.pdf)
- 40 [%20August%202014.pdf](https://www.tarn.ac.uk/content/downloads/53/Complete%20manual%20-%20August%202014.pdf).
- 41
- 42 16. Moore L, Hanley JA, Turgeon AF, Lavoie A. Evaluating the performance of trauma
- 43 centers: hierarchical modeling should be used. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care*
- 44 *Surgery*. 2010;69(5):1132-7.
- 45
- 46 17. Babaud J, Ridereau-Zins C, Bouhours G, Lebigot J, Le Gall R, Bertrais S, et al. Benefit of
- 47 the Vittel criteria to determine the need for whole body scanning in a severe trauma
- 48 patient. *Diagnostic and interventional imaging*. 2012;93(5):371-9.
- 49
- 50 18. Asha S, Curtis KA, Grant N, Taylor C, Lo S, Smart R, et al. Comparison of radiation
- 51 exposure of trauma patients from diagnostic radiology procedures before and after the
- 52 introduction of a panscan protocol. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*. 2012;24(1):43-51.
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

19. Gargano JW, Wehner S, Reeves M. Sex differences in acute stroke care in a statewide stroke registry. *Stroke*. 2008;39(1):24-9.
20. Anderson RD, Pepine CJ. Gender Differences in the Treatment for Acute Myocardial Infarction: Bias or Biology? *Circulation*. 2007;115(7):823-6.
21. Gabbe BJ, Magtengaard K, Hannaford AP, Cameron PA. Is the Charlson Comorbidity Index useful for predicting trauma outcomes? *Acad Emerg Med*. 2005;12(4):318-21.
22. Bouamra O, Jacques R, Edwards A, Yates DW, Lawrence T, Jenks T, et al. Prediction modelling for trauma using comorbidity and 'true' 30-day outcome. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2015;32(12):933-8.
23. Sampalis JS, Nathanson R, Vaillancourt J, Nikolis A, Liberman M, Angelopoulos J, et al. Assessment of Mortality in Older Trauma Patients Sustaining Injuries from Falls or Motor Vehicle Collisions Treated in Regional Level I Trauma Centers. *Annals of Surgery*. 2009;249(3):488-95.
24. Sterling DA, O'Connor JA, Bonadies J. Geriatric Falls: Injury Severity Is High and Disproportionate to Mechanism. *Journal of Trauma-Injury Infection & Critical Care*. 2001;50(1):116-9.
25. Spaniolas K, Cheng J, Gestring M, Sangosanya A, Stassen N, Bankey P. Ground Level Falls Are Associated With Significant Mortality in Elderly Patients. *Journal of Trauma-Injury Infection & Critical Care*. 2010;69(4):821-5.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60








Figure 1: Adjusted odds of having a whole body CT for patients admitted directly to a trauma receiving hospital, comparing individual MTCs (above) and TUs/NDHs (below). The Red diamonds (upper graph) and blue dots (lower graph) represent the adjusted odds of having a whole body CT at individual hospitals, compared to an average hospital within the group (the red horizontal line in each graph) The Age/Gender interaction term (Age#Gender) refers to the ratio of odds of having a whole body CT between males and females for each age group. On multivariate analysis, an interaction was noted between age and gender; younger females were more likely to have a WBCT than males of the same age, while this gender difference was reversed in the older age groups.

Figure 1



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table with columns: HospitalID, MHC/ TU, Direct patients, CT scan usage, Age, Gender, Charlson Comorbidity Score, Mechanism of Injury, Injury Severity Score, Glasgow Coma Score, Systolic Blood Pressure. The table contains a large volume of numerical data for each of the 60 hospital entries.