Routine point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) assessment of gastric antral content in traumatic emergency surgical patients for prevention of aspiration pneumonitis: an observational clinical trial
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Abstract

Background: Polytrauma patients are at a higher risk of delayed gastric emptying. To assess the gastric volume, a reliable diagnostic tool is needed to prevent the occurrence of aspiration pneumonia, which remains a serious complication associated with anesthesia. Gastric antral ultrasound can provide reliable information about the size of the gastric antrum in traumatized patients undergoing emergency surgery.

Methods: A prospective observational study of 45 polytrauma patients undergoing emergency surgery under general anesthesia was carried out. Prior to induction of anesthesia in the emergency department, gastric ultrasound was performed for qualitative and quantitative assessment of the gastric antrum in a supine position and right lateral decubitus (RLD) position. This was followed by routine placement of the nasogastric tube to aspirate and calculate the volume of the stomach contents.

Results: Of the 45 polytrauma patients, the risk assessment of aspiration and the anesthesia technique changed in 14 patients (31.1%) after the gastric ultrasound examination. A very good relationship existed between the expected stomach volume at the RLD position and the suction volume in the nasogastric tube. In all cases, no aspirations were documented.

Conclusion: Ultrasound examination of the stomach in polytrauma patients allows assessing the size and type of stomach contents. The data obtained can influence the choice of anesthesia technique and reduce the risk of aspiration pneumonia.

Trial registration: This trial was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov. registry number: NCT04083677 on September 6, 2019.
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Background

Pulmonary aspiration of gastric contents is rare in elective surgical groups but is more common in trauma patients requiring emergency surgery because trauma affects gastric motility and emptying [1].

The presence of residual gastric contents at the time of induction of anesthesia is an important risk factor of aspiration pneumonia. The routine use of bedside ultrasound provides valuable information about the volume and type of gastric contents. Preoperative gastric content determination helps the anesthesiologist to assess the risk of pulmonary aspiration [2, 3].

Ultrasonographic measurement of the antral cross-sectional area (CSA) may determine, based on the size of the stomach and the presence of solid particles and/or gastric volume < 15 ml/kg, the risk of occurrence of aspiration pneumonia during the perioperative period [4].

The aim of our study was to allow routine use of point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) of gastric contents to assess aspiration risk and guide anesthetic management in trauma patients.

Methods

A prospective observational study was conducted at the Ain Shams University Hospital Emergency Department.

Fig. 1 a Sagittal sonography of the gastric antrum. A = antrum; L = liver; P = pancreas; SMA = superior mesenteric artery; Ao = aorta. b Sagittal picture of the gastric antrum

Fig. 2 Sagittal sonogram of the empty antrum with a flat appearance. A = antrum; L = liver; P = pancreas; SMA = superior mesenteric artery; Ao = aorta
The approval of the Institutional Research Ethics Committee was obtained in August 2019 (approval number: FMASU R 42 / 2019). This study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (clinical trial ID NCT04083677) and carried out according to the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) 2010 statement. It was conducted from September 2019 to January 2020. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants, or from the legal guardians for patients with a disturbed level of consciousness, before enrollment. The study included 45 polytrauma patients (18–65 years old of both sexes) admitted for emergency surgery.

The ABC protocol, the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) assessment, full laboratory and radiological examinations, and complete clinical assessment (including obtaining information about fasting hours) were carried out at the time of admission.

Exclusion criteria included pregnancy, history of upper gastrointestinal disorder, including gastroesophageal reflux disease, hiatal hernia, gastrointestinal cancer and/or upper gastrointestinal surgery, marked impaired level of consciousness (Glasgow Coma Scale less than 10), fractured base of the skull, and severe bleeding.

We used Siemens low frequency curved probe (2-5 MHz) and ACUSON × 300 ultrasound system from Siemens by an experienced radiologist as part of a focused assessment with sonography in trauma (FAST) studies. All patients were examined in the supine position, and
Fig. 5 Frosted glass sign. A = antrum; L = liver; P = pancreas; Ao = aorta

Fig. 6 Flow chart of the analysis of the findings and medical decision-making based on the gastric point-of-care ultrasound.
then in the right lateral decubitus position (RLDP). The gastric antrum was determined at the level of sagittal scans in the epigastrium beneath the xiphoid and superior to the umbilicus. The liver (anteriorly), aorta, inferior vena cava and pancreas (posteriorly) were used as anatomical landmarks (Fig. 1).

The "empty" antrum appeared collapsed and "flat", as the anterior and posterior walls were too close to each other (Fig. 2) or round to ovoid shape and resembled the target of a "bull's eye" (Fig. 3).

The antrum appeared to expand in a circle when it was filled with a transparent liquid (Fig. 4). Several gas bubbles appeared as punctuated hyper-echoic regions within the hypoechoic fluid, mimicking the formation of a "starry night" (Fig. 4a).

The antrum with mixed echo contents appeared to expand when filled with solid contents, giving the film a "frosted glass" appearance (Fig. 5).

If the stomach contains clear liquids, volume measurement can help distinguish between a small volume that corresponds to baseline secretions and a larger volume than the baseline.

The antral cross-sectional area (CSA) was calculated after measuring the two antral dimensions [anteroposterior diameter (APD) and craniocaudal diameter (CCD)] according to the following equation: \[ \pi \times \text{APD} \times \text{CCD} / 4. \] The volume of the transparent fluid was calculated using the CSA measured in an RLD position and a previously published mathematical model: Volume (ml) = 27.0 + (14.6 x Right - Lat (CSA) - (1.28 x Age)). This equation accurately predicted the volume of the stomach, up to 500 ml [4].

Additionally, the antrum was classified according to a three-point rating system (Perlas score 0–2), based on the absence or presence of a clear liquid in the supine and RLD position. Grade 0 indicates that there are no contents in the antrum in the supine and RLD positions. Grade 1 indicates a clear old liquid that can only be seen in the RLD position. Grade 2 indicates a clear liquid found in both the supine and RLD positions [3].

With explanations of the stomach ultrasound results and Perlas classification, we can plot this flowchart of risk stratification and decision-making (Fig. 6) [5].

A nasogastric tube was inserted preoperatively to confirm gastric ultrasound volume calculation. The low-risk class indicated a low risk of aspiration and it might be safe to perform surgery with slow induction of anesthesia by means of a laryngeal mask or endotracheal tube.

The high-risk class indicated a high risk of aspiration, with the following categories: 1, delay of surgery depending on its urgency (which might not be acceptable); 2, acid aspiration prevention medications such as metoclopramide and drugs that neutralize stomach acid such as non-particle antacids; H2 inhibitor and proton pump inhibitor; 3, nasogastric tube for gastric drainage; 4, local anesthesia and neuraxial anesthesia; and 5, general anesthesia with rapid sequence induction up to awake fibro-optic intubation.

**Primary endpoint**

This included change in aspiration risk after gastric ultrasonographic assessment in comparison to clinical assessment.

### Table 1 Patient demographic data

| Patient demographics | N = 45 |
|----------------------|--------|
| Gender M/F           | 25 (55.5%)/20 (44.4%) |
| Age (y) (mean and standard deviation SD) | 40.22 ± 7.11 |
| Height (cm) (mean and standard deviation SD) | 161.02 ± 1.13 |
| Weight (kg) (mean and standard deviation SD) | 80.65 ± 5.66 |
| Body Mass Index (kg/m²) (mean and standard deviation SD) | 31.88 ± 2.47 |

All data were presented as mean ± SD except gender which was presented as a percentage.

### Table 2 Surgical procedures performed

| Surgical Specialty | Number of the operations | Details of the operations |
|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Neurosurgery       | 11                       | 3 cases of compound depressed fractures, 1 case of extradural hemorrhage, 2 cases of subdural hemorrhage, 2 cases of lumbar fixation, 2 cases of cervical fixation and 1 case of intracerebral hemorrhage |
| Vascular surgery   | 9                        | 4 cases of femoral vessel and 5 cases of brachial vessel exploration and repair |
| Orthopedics        | 11                       | 5 cases of femur fracture fixation, 3 cases of humerus fracture fixation, 2 cases of fracture radius fixation and 1 case of fracture tibia fixation |
| General surgery    | 7                        | 5 cases of abdominal explorations and 2 cases of deep wound repair |
| Plastic surgery    | 7                        | 7 maxillofacial surgery |
| Patient number | Fasting duration/type of food intake | Anesthetic plan after clinical assessment | Gastric ultrasound Type of content | Perlas grade | Conclusion | Anesthetic management after gastric ultrasound |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1              | 4 h/bread and cheese               | ETT: RSI                                 | solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 2              | 2 h/coffee                         | ETT: RSI                                 | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 3              | 6 h/banana                         | ETT:SI                                  | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 4              | 7 h/bread and cheese               | ETT: SI                                 | solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 5              | 4 h/water                          | ETT: SI                                 | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | ETT:SI                                       |
| 6              | 3 h/water                          | ETT: SI                                 | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | ETT:SI                                       |
| 7              | 6 h/tea and biscuit                | LMA                                      | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | LMA                                           |
| 8              | 5 h/ vegetable soap                | ETT: RSI                                 | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | LMA                                           |
| 9              | 4 h/cheese sandwich with tea       | ETT: RSI                                 | solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 10             | 2 h/water                          | ETT: SI                                 | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | ETT:SI                                       |
| 11             | 2 h/coffee with milk               | ETT: RSI                                 | CF                               | II           | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 12             | 4 h/clear juice                    | ETT: SI                                 | CF                               | 1            | Empty     | ETT:SI                                       |
| 13             | 3 h/vegetable soap                 | ETT: RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 14             | 4 h/tea and water                  | ETT: SI                                 | CF                               | I            | Empty     | ETT:SI                                       |
| 15             | 4 h/potato chips                   | ETT: RSI                                 | solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 16             | 3 h/bread and cheese with tea      | ETT: RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 17             | 2 h/coffee and water               | ETT: RSI                                 | CF                               | II           | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 18             | 5 h/banana                         | ETT: RSI                                 | solid                            | –            | Full      | RSI                                           |
| 19             | 8 h/two meat sandwiches            | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 20             | 8 h/mesh potato with rice          | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 21             | 3 h/two cheese sandwiches and tea  | Delay for 3 h                           | Solid                            | –            | Full      | Delay for 3 h                                |
| 22             | 3 h/ bread and cheese              | Delay for 3 h                           | Solid                            | –            | Full      | Delay for 3 h                                |
| 23             | 6 h/ vegetable soap                | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 24             | 4 h/cheese sandwich with tea       | ETT:RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 25             | 2 h/water                          | ETT:SI                                  | CF                               | II           | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 26             | 3 h/coffee with milk               | Delay for 1 h                           | CF                               | II           | Full      | Delay for 1 h                                |
| 27             | 3 h/clear juice                    | spinal                                   | CF                               | II           | Full      | spinal                                        |
| 28             | 6 h/ vegetable soap                | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 29             | 4 h/tea and water                  | ETT:SI                                  | CF                               | II           | Full      | Delay for 2 h                                |
| 30             | 4 h/potato chips                   | ETT:RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 31             | 5 h/ fried chicken                 | ETT:RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 32             | 3 h/ cheese sandwich               | Delay for 2 h                           | Solid                            | –            | Full      | Delay for 2 h                                |
| 33             | 3 h/ dairy meal                    | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 34             | 8 h/ meat and rice                 | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 35             | 8 h/ chicken                       | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 36             | 5 h/ rice and meat                 | ETT:RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 37             | 5 h/ fruits                        | ETT:RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 38             | 3 h/ meat                          | spinal                                   | Solid                            | –            | Full      | spinal                                        |
| 39             | 3 h/ meat sandwich                 | ETT:RSI                                 | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 40             | 4 h/ pizza                         | Spinal                                   | Solid                            | –            | Full      | spinal                                        |
| 41             | 9 h/ meat                          | ETT:SI                                  | Empty                            | 0            | Empty     | ETT:SI                                       |
| 42             | 8 h/ meat and potato               | ETT:SI                                  | Solid                            | –            | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
Secondary endpoints
These included the incidence of perioperative aspiration and the correlation between predicted volume in the RLD position and volume in the nasogastric tube.

Sample size calculation
The sample size calculation was performed, according to a study by Sabry et al. [6], to show the difference in change in aspiration risk of 45 patients after gastric ultrasonographic assessment in comparison to clinical assessment, with a confidence interval of 95%, acceptable margin of error of 5% and a power at 80%. The \( p \)-value was considered significant if < 0.05, and accordingly a minimal sample size of 45 patients was needed.

Statistical analysis
Analysis of data was done using IBM’s SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Science, version 16). The quantitative variables were described as means and standard deviations, while the qualitative variables were expressed as numbers and percentages. Statistical analysis was performed using statistical tests such as the Chi-square test, Student’s test, and table analysis. \( p \)-value < 0.05 was considered significant.

Results
Forty-five polytrauma patients (25 males, 20 females) were scheduled for emergency surgery. Their demographic data are summarized in Table 1.

An empty stomach was documented in 10 patients (22.2%). The remaining 35 patients (77.7%) showed a full stomach on gastric sonography, where 29 of them had solid content and 6 had clear fluid.

| Patient number | Fasting duration/type of food intake | Anesthetic plan after clinical assessment | Gastric ultrasound Type of content | Perlas grade | Conclusion | Anesthetic management after gastric ultrasound |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 43             | 9 h/ rice with chicken               | ETT:SI                                   | Solid                             | –           | Full      | ETT:RSI                                      |
| 44             | 6 h/ fatty meal                      | Delay for 2 h                            | Solid                             | –           | Full      | Delay for 2 h                                |
| 45             | 4 h/ 2 cheese sandwiches            | Delay for 2 h                            | Solid                             | –           | Full      | Delay for 2 h                                |

CF clear fluid, ETT:RSI Endotracheal intubation–rapid sequence induction, ETT:SI Endotracheal intubation–smooth induction, LMA Laryngeal mask airway.

Fig. 7 Results of gastric ultrasound examination of gastric contents
of excess than 1.5 ml/kg. We found changed aspiration risk stratification and anesthesia decision-making in 14 patients (31.1%) following gastric ultrasound assessment, compared to preoperative clinical examination and fasting hour assessment (Fig. 7).

Two patients (cases 2 and 8) were found to have a lower aspiration risk than anticipated by their history alone, and more liberal anesthetic techniques were used, as shown in the Table 3 and Fig. 8.

Twelve patients (cases 4, 19, 20, 23, 25, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 42 and 43) were found to have a higher aspiration risk than anticipated by their history alone, and more conservative anesthetic techniques were used, as shown in Table 3 and Fig. 8.

As shown in Table 4, the number of patients with a high risk of aspiration increased after gastric ultrasonographic examination (from 25 to 35 patients), with the difference statistically significant. The number of patients with a low risk of aspiration decreased after gastric ultrasonographic examination (from 20 to 10 patients), with the difference statistically significant. This reflects the importance of routine point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) assessment of gastric antral contents in traumatic emergency surgical patients for the prevention of aspiration pneumonitis.

Despite the fact that the statistical difference between the predicted volume in the RLD position and volume in the nasogastric tube was highly significant, a good clinical correlation was documented between them, as shown in Table 5.

**Discussion**

Aspiration pneumonia remains a serious perioperative complication [7].

The presence of residual gastric contents at the time of induction of anesthesia is one of the major risk factors of pulmonary aspiration [8].

The motility of the digestive system can be affected by stress, pain, and anxiety, as well as by the use of opioids, which makes prediction of the gastric contents difficult. Patients with a “full stomach” were at a risk of aspiration during sedation or general anesthesia, as the tone of the lower esophageal sphincter and airway reflexes were reduced. The incidence of pulmonary aspiration was greater during emergency surgery [9].

The severity of aspiration was directly proportional to the volume, type and the acidity of the contents of the stomach. Because of basal gastric acid secretion, stomach volume less than 1.5 ml/kg was common in fasting patients and considered safe [7].

Data about fasting hours may be unreliable in elderly people with poor awareness, in children, and in cases of delayed stomach emptying, as in patients with multiple traumas who underwent emergency surgery [2].

| Table 4 Change in aspiration risk after clinical assessment and gastric ultrasonography assessment |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| After clinical assessment (N = 45) | After gastric ultrasonographic assessment (N = 45) | P-value |
| High risk of aspiration | 25 (55.5%) | 35 (77.7%) | 0.0445* |
| Low risk of aspiration | 20 (44.4%) | 10 (22.2%) | 0.0444* |

All data were presented as percentages

*P-value < 0.05 = significant
In anesthesia, the use of gastric ultrasound provides more accurate information about gastric contents than the general assumption based on fasting hours [1].

Gastric ultrasound is a promising technology because it is readily available, non-invasive and relatively easy to use [10].

A retrospective study by Van de Putte et al. [11] indicated that gastric ultrasound might be a useful diagnostic tool, in addition to the standard assessment of gastric contents, if fasting guidelines were not followed in elective surgery patients. Also, this study revealed significant changes in aspiration risk stratification and anesthetic management following a standard history-based clinical assessment compared to an assessment based on gastric sonography in elective surgical patients who had not followed fasting guidelines.

We concluded, as Van de Putte et al. [11], that gastric ultrasound makes anesthetic management planning possible to prevent the risk of aspiration, but it allows routine ultrasound for trauma surgical patients when the risk of aspiration was higher.

Bouvet et al. [4] reported the prevalence of a full stomach in 56% of emergency surgery patients and suggested that preoperative ultrasound assessment of gastric contents might be particularly helpful in such cases.

Sabry et al. [6] demonstrated that gastric ultrasound could be used as a preferable method to assess the residual gastric volume in fasting diabetics compared to the healthy control for elective surgery, and reported that the residual gastric volume in diabetic patients fasting for 8 h was higher than in patients without diabetes scheduled for elective surgery.

Cubillos et al. [2] concluded that bedside ultrasound could determine the type of gastric contents (nil, clear fluid, thick fluid or solid content). This qualitative information can be useful on its own to assess aspiration risks, especially in cases where the fasting state is unknown or uncertain.

In our study, we used gastric antral ultrasonography before induction of anesthesia in polytrauma patients undergoing emergency surgery to allow qualitative and quantitative assessment of the gastric antrum in supine and right lateral decubitus position for the prevention of aspiration pneumonitis.

Also, a nasogastric tube was inserted preoperatively to aspirate the gastric contents to be compared with gastric ultrasound volume calculation, with a very good correlation between them.

Our data suggest that routine gastric ultrasound in polytrauma patients allows the personalization of aspiration risk assessment to guide anesthetic management.

Limitations

This study was subject to a number of limitations. Further studies with bigger sample sizes are needed to study and magnify the effect of gastric US in anesthetic management of polytrauma emergency patients, and to detect a larger number of patients with change in aspiration risk stratification. Also, studies with control groups are needed to fully support the results and conclusion by study data.

Conclusion

We can conclude from this study that routine preoperative gastric ultrasound is a useful, safe and non-invasive tool for the assessment of gastric contents in emergency surgical patients, and for anesthetic management planning to prevent aspiration.
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