Pulmonary Embolism, Clinical parameters versus Computed Tomography

Pulmonary Angiogram.

1. *Mahmood ul Hassan (Corresponding author)

FCPS Cardiology Professor, Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar, Pakistan mahmoodlrh@yahoo.com

2. Cheragh Hussain

FCPS Cardiology Associate Professor, Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar, Pakistan drcheragh@live.com

3. Shahsawar

FCPS Cardiology Assistant Professor, Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar, Pakistan shahsawar_pda@hotmail.com

4. Samiullah

FCPS Cardiology Assistant Professor, Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar, Pakistan sami.ullah@kgmc.edu.pk

5. Muhammad Abbas Khan

FCPS Cardiology Fellowship Interventional Cardiology, Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar, Pakistan drabbas.cardio@gmail.com

6. Bella Khan

FCPS Cardiology Fellowship Interventional Cardiology, Agha Khan University Hospital, Pakistan drabbas.cardio@gmail.com

*Corresponding author: Mahmood ul Hassan

FCPS Cardiology Hayatabad Medical Complex Peshawar, Pakistan mahmoodlrh@yahoo.com

Pulmonary Embolism, Clinical parameters versus Computed Tomography Pulmonary Angiogram.

Mahmood ul Hassan¹, Cheragh Hussain¹, Shahsawar¹, Samiullah¹, Muhammad Abbas khan¹, Bella Khan² ¹Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar, Pakistan ²Agha Khan University Hospital, Pakistan

ABSTARCT

Objective: Pulmonary embolism (PE) is a deadly disease with substantial morbidity and possibly fatal consequences. The treatment success of PE depends on prompt and accurate detection, correct risk stratification, and well-observed anticoagulation. Therefore, this study assessed the clinical manifestation and its association with outcomes in patients with pulmonary embolism.

Methodology: This descriptive cross sectional study was conducted at the coronary care unit of Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar. The duration of the study was from 15th August 2014 till 15August 2021. A total of 153 patients having age above 18 years for both genders with suspected pulmonary embolism having presenting complaint such as dyspnea, tachycardia (heart rate > 100 bpm), cyanosis, hypotension (blood pressure < 90/60 mmHg), hemoptysis, syncope with clinical evidence of DVT, postoperative status, obesity (body mass index \geq 30 kg/m2), malignancy, immobilization (bed rest for >3 days) were included in the study. Chi square test is applied to find out the association between variables and clinical outcomes. Pearson correlation was applied to correlate variables with Wells score.

Results: The mean age of the study participants was 48.03 ± 15.49 years. The correlation analysis showed that among the patient characteristics studied, weight (p=0.004), right ventricle size (p=0.005) and pulse (p<0.001) had a significant correlation with the Wells score where the correlation of all these characteristics with the Wells score was found to be positive. Among the signs and symptoms, cyanosis was significantly associated with the clinical outcome (p=0.022). Moreover, presence of hypertension was marginally insignificantly associated with the clinical outcome (p=0.061).

Conclusion: This study concluded that clinical manifestation such as cyanosis was significantly associated with clinical outcome. Most of the patients showed positive clinical signs of deep-

venous thrombosis. Despite of high and moderate probability of PE patients, mostly patients survived due to timely detection and prompt management.

Keywords: Cyanosis, deep vein thrombosis, hemoptysis, pulmonary embolism.

INTRODUCTION

Pulmonary embolism (PE) is a frequent complication of deep vein thrombosis (DVT) and can be fatal. The prevalence of pulmonary embolism (PE) ranges from 39 to 115 per 100000 individuals per annum while in case of DVT it ranges from 53 to 162 per 100,000 individuals [1-3]. Generally, mortality rate is higher in relation with, and 100,000 people die annually due to PE in the US [4]. It is predicted that PE occurs predominantly in males as compared to females [4].

Clinically, the frequent symptoms that manifest in PE are pleuritic chest pain, dyspnea, cough, blood in sputum, presyncope, or syncope. In case of central PE, dyspnea may be acute and severe, while it may be frequently mild and temporary in small peripheral PE. The most commonly reported symptom is chest pain usually caused by irritation in pleural space owing to distal emboli instigating pulmonary infarction [5]. Additionally, infrequent symptoms are arrhythmias (e.g., atrial fibrillation), syncope, and hemodynamic failure. Hemodynamic collapse is not very common but a critical manifestation, as it shows central or extensive PE with severely worsened hemodynamic backup system of body. Syncope can happen and related with a greater incidence of hemodynamic instability and right ventricular malfunction [6]. Immense PE manifests in the form of hypotension, cardiac arrest or shock. Electrocardiography (ECG) reveals fluctuations of S1Q3 pattern, S1Q3T3 pattern, inverted T waves, notched S wave in lead V1 and right bundle branch block that may be observed in patients with right heart stress [7].

Risk factors that cause PE can be categorized as acquired and genetic. Genetic risk factors involve thrombophilia like factor V Leiden mutation, prothrombin gene mutation, deficiency of protein C, deficiency of protein S, and hyperhomocysteinemia. On the other hand, acquired risk factors are bed rest for longer time period, traveling for > 4 hours (either by air, car, train or bus), and current orthopedic surgery, indwelling venous catheter, fatness, gestation, malignancy, addiction of cigarette and use of oral contraceptive medications [8].

Clinically, the risk of PE is divided on the basis of the Wells score or the Geneva score. A threetier standard of arrangement (0–1: low risk; 2–6: moderate risk; >6: high risk) supports risk stratification of pulmonary embolism in dependable method [9]. A two-tier standard of arrangement (\leq 4 PE unlikely; >4 PE likely) method advises execution of a D-dimer test on "PE unlikely" patients and a CT angiography (CTA) for "PE likely" patients [10]. D-dimer is a plasmin-derived degradation product that exhibits higher sensitivity and negative predictive value in identification of venous thromboembolic disease (VTE) [11]. A value of <500ng/mL indicating negative D-dimer test in a low or intermediary pre-test eliminates the probable chances of acute PE, thus no more tests are needed. Whereas, CTA is necessary for further evaluation in cases of positive D-dimer test [10].

Prompt diagnosis and management is mandatory to prevent the life threatening condition in pulmonary embolism. The chest X-ray is invaluable in identification of PE, as such. It is helpful to eliminate other reasons of acute chest pain like pneumonia, pneumothorax or pulmonary edema, though, quite definitive radiographic irregularities may be observed in acute chest pain [12].Therefore, the diagnosis depends on noninvasive imaging modalities owing to non-specific symptoms that correctly envisage or eliminate the detection of acute PE. Over the past decades, diagnostic approaches for predicting PE have undergone important modifications [13]. In spite of quick technical developments and three-dimensional resolution, the effectiveness of computed tomography (CT) angiography has still been documented in vascular imaging. Mainly, after the development of multi detector row CT [14], CT pulmonary angiography (CTPA) has become the imaging modality of choice in the identification of acute PE [15]. CTPA is more beneficial than conventional invasive X-ray pulmonary angiography and nuclear ventilation-perfusion (V/Q) imaging technique. CT is a commonly accessible, quick and non-invasive method that is capable to directly envisage emboli and might reveal alternate diagnoses [15].

In spite of appropriate detection and anticoagulant treatment, mortality rate following diagnosis of acute PE is still 8% to 15% [16]. The prediction of management of acute PE generally relies on remaining pulmonary circulation and the severity of right ventricular (RV) dysfunction [17]. Recently, one of the studies has revealed that CT allows the detection of acute right-sided heart collapse. Additionally, CT can also envisage the undesired clinical effect by using the RV/left ventricular (LV) diameter ratio or RV ejection fraction in PE patients [18].

In Pakistan, PE remains generally an unidentified, misdiagnosed and mismanaged clinical problem amongst hospitalized patients because of inaccessibility of targeted investigations and

unsatisfactory acquaintance among general practitioners. In fact, there scarce data exists in Pakistan on pulmonary embolism. Therefore, this study was intended to assess the clinical features and parameters, treatment strategies and outcome of pulmonary embolism (PE) in a coronary care center of Peshawar.

METHODOLOGY

This descriptive cross sectional study was performed at the coronary care unit of Hayatabad Medical Complex, Peshawar using non-probability purposive sampling technique. The duration of the study was from 15th August 2014 till 15August 2021. A total of 153 patients having age above 18 years for both genders with suspected pulmonary embolism having presenting complaint such as dyspnea, tachycardia (heart rate > 100 bpm), cyanosis, hypotension (blood pressure < 90/60 mmHg), hemoptysis, syncope with clinical evidence of DVT, postoperative condition, obesity (body mass index \geq 30 kg/m2), malignancy, immobilization (bed rest for >3 days) were included in the study. On the other hand, patients having previous known pulmonary interstitial pathologies such as Asthma, Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), interstitial lung disease (ILD), congenital heart diseases with primary or secondary pulmonary hypertension, Cardiogenic shock, acute myocardial Infarction, Congestive heart failure and pneumonia were excluded from the study.

After taking detailed history of patients with suspected pulmonary embolism, they were admitted in coronary care unit. All Patients were examined to check cyanosis, DVT, pulse rate, blood pressure and oxygen saturation. Investigative parameters including hematological tests (such as serum creatinine, D-dimers), 12 Channel ECG, chest x-ray, Echocardiography and CTPA was performed by using 64 slice helical CT machine. Doppler ultrasound of lower limb was done for DVT.

Data was analyzed by using SPSS version 23.0. For qualitative variables frequency and percentages were documented. Chi square test was used to find out the association between variables and clinical outcomes. Pearson correlation was applied to correlate variables with Wells score. P-value of <0.05 was reflected as statistically significant.

RESULTS

The mean age of the study participants was 48.03 ± 15.49 years. The correlation analysis showed that among the patient characteristics studied, weight (p=0.004), right ventricle size (p=0.005) and pulse (p<0.001) had a significant correlation with the Wells score where the correlation of all these characteristics with the Wells score was found to be positive (Table 1).

The study results further showed that among the signs and symptoms studied, only the presence of cyanosis was significantly associated with the clinical outcome (p=0.022), where those who did not have cyanosis were more likely to be alive at the end of follow up than those who had cyanosis (94.6% vs. 83.3%). Moreover, presence of hypertension was marginally insignificantly associated with the clinical outcome (p=0.061) where those who did not have hypertension were more likely to be alive at the end of follow up than those hypertension were more likely to be alive at the end of follow up than those who did not have hypertension were more likely to be alive at the end of follow up than those who had hypertension (92.2% vs. 80.0%) (Table 2).

Variables (n=153)	Wells Score		
variables (II–135)	ρ	р	
Age	-0.03	0.711	
Height	0.09	0.269	
Weight	0.229	0.004	
BMI	0.134	0.099	
Ddimer ¹	0.009	0.918	
Systolic Blood Pressure	-0.131	0.107	
Right Ventricle Size	0.225	0.005	
Pulmonary Artery Hypertension	0.102	0.21	
Pulse	0.284	< 0.001	
SPO2	-0.119	0.143	

Table 1: Correlation between Patient Characteristics and Wells Score

¹n=125

Dead Alive p Count (%) Count (%) Count (%) p Chest Pain 1 1 1 Yes 1 (6.2) 15 (93.8) 0.613 No 14 (10.2) 123 (89.8) 0.613 Quansis 1 10 (16.7) 50 (83.3) 0.022 No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 No 5 (12.5) 35 (87.5) 0.796 Hemoptysis - - - Yes 3 (11.1) 24 (88.9) 0.505 No 102 (9.5) 114 (90.5) 0.801 Obese 4 (8.2) 45 (91.8) 0.786 Overweight 7 (11.9) 52 (88.1) 0.789 No 13 (9.3) 127 (9.7) 0.479 No 13 (89.7) 0.479 No 13 (82.9) 0.741 Yes <		Clinical	Clinical Outcome		
Count (%) Count (%) Count (%) Count (%) Count (%) Chest Pain $()^{-10}$ $($	Variables (n=153)	Dead	Alive	n	
Chest Pain I I I Yes 1 (6.2) 15 (93.8) 0.613 No 14 (10.2) 123 (89.8) 0.613 Cyanosis I I I Yes 10 (16.7) 50 (83.3) 0.022 No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) I Palpitation I I I Yes 6 (9.1) 60 (90.9) 0.796 No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) I Yes 5 (12.5) 35 (87.5) 0.505 No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) I Yes 3 (11.1) 24 (88.9) 0.801 No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) I Obses 4 (8.2) 45 (91.8) 0.789 Overweight 7 (11.9) 52 (88.1) 0.789 Normal Weight 4 (8.2) 41 (91.1) I Yes 2 (15.4) 11 (84.6) 0.479 No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.479		Count	Count	Р	
Yes 1 (6.2) 15 (93.8) 0.613 No 14 (10.2) 123 (89.8) 0.613 Cyanosis 10 (16.7) 50 (83.3) 0.022 No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 Palpitation 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 Palpitation 6 (9.1) 60 (90.9) 0.796 No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) 0.796 Memoptysis - - 0.505 No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) 0.505 No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) 0.505 No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) 0.801 No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) 0.801 Obese 4 (8.2) 45 (91.8) 0.789 Normal Weight 4 (8.9) 41 (91.1) 0.789 No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.479 Yes 2 (15.4) 11 (84.6) 0.479 No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.061 Yes		(%)	(%)		
No 14 (10.2) 123 (89.8) 0.613 Cyanosis	Chest Pain				
No 14 (10.2) 123 (89.8) Cyanosis	Yes	1 (6.2)	15 (93.8)	0.613	
Yes 10 (16.7) 50 (83.3) 0.022 No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 Palpitation . . Yes 6 (9.1) 60 (90.9) 0.796 No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) 0.796 No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) 0.796 Hemoptysis . . . Yes 5 (12.5) 35 (87.5) 0.505 No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) 0.505 Mistory of Surgery . . . Yes 3 (11.1) 24 (88.9) 0.801 No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) . Obese 4 (8.2) 45 (91.8) . Overweight 7 (11.9) 52 (88.1) . Normal Weight 4 (8.9) 41 (91.1) . Diabetes Mellitus . . . Yes 2 (15.4) 11 (84.6) . No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) . <	No	14 (10.2)	123 (89.8)	0.015	
No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) 0.022 Palpitation . . Yes 6 (9.1) 60 (90.9) 0.796 No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) 0.796 Hemoptysis . . . Yes 5 (12.5) 35 (87.5) 0.505 No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) . History of Surgery . . . Yes 3 (11.1) 24 (88.9) . . No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) . . Obses 4 (8.2) 45 (91.8) . . Overweight 7 (11.9) 52 (88.1) . . No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) . . Yes 2 (15.4) 11 (84.6) . . No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) . . Yes 5 (20.0) 20 (80.0) . . No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) .	Cyanosis				
No 5 (5.4) 88 (94.6) Palpitation I I Yes 6 (9.1) 60 (90.9) 0.796 No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) 0.796 Hemoptysis I I I Yes 5 (12.5) 35 (87.5) 0.505 No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) 0.505 No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) 0.801 No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) 0.801 Obese 4 (8.2) 45 (91.8) 0.801 Overweight 7 (11.9) 52 (88.1) 0.789 Normal Weight 4 (8.9) 41 (91.1) 0.479 Mo 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.479 No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.061 No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) 0.061	Yes	10 (16.7)	50 (83.3)	0.022	
Yes 6 (9.1) 60 (90.9) 0.796 No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) 0.796 Hemoptysis 5 (12.5) 35 (87.5) 0.505 No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) 0.505 History of Surgery 1 24 (88.9) 0.505 No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) 0.801 Obesity 1 24 (88.9) 0.801 Obese 4 (8.2) 45 (91.8) 0.786 Overweight 7 (11.9) 52 (88.1) 0.789 Normal Weight 4 (8.9) 41 (91.1) 0.789 Yes 2 (15.4) 11 (84.6) 0.479 No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.479 No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.479 Yes 5 (20.0) 20 (80.0) 0.041 No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) 0.061 No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) 0.061 Yes 1 (4.2) 23 (95.8) 0.732 No 2 (6.	No	5 (5.4)	88 (94.6)	0.022	
No9 (10.3)78 (89.7) 0.796 Hemoptysis 5 35 (87.5) 0.505 No10 (8.8)103 (91.2) 0.505 No10 (8.8)103 (91.2) 0.505 History of Surgery 24 (88.9) 0.801 Yes3 (11.1)24 (88.9) 0.801 No12 (9.5)114 (90.5) 0.801 Obesity 0 12 (9.5)114 (90.5)Obese4 (8.2)45 (91.8) 0.789 Overweight7 (11.9)52 (88.1) 0.789 Normal Weight4 (8.9)41 (91.1) 0.789 Normal Weight 2 (15.4)11 (84.6) 0.479 No13 (9.3)127 (90.7) 0.479 Hypertension 2 0.061 0.061 No10 (7.8)118 (92.2) 0.061 No10 (7.8)118 (92.2) 0.732 No2 (6.2)30 (93.8) 0.732 No2 (6.2)30 (93.8) 0.732 No15 (10.3)131 (89.7) 0.372 No15 (10.3)131 (89.7) 0.098	Palpitation				
No 9 (10.3) 78 (89.7) Hemoptysis	Yes	6 (9.1)	60 (90.9)	0 706	
Yes $5 (12.5)$ $35 (87.5)$ $10 (8.8)$ 0.505 No $10 (8.8)$ $103 (91.2)$ 0.505 History of Surgery $24 (8.8)$ 0.801 Yes $3 (11.1)$ $24 (88.9)$ $114 (90.5)$ 0.801 No $12 (9.5)$ $114 (90.5)$ 0.801 Obesity 0 0.801 Obese $4 (8.2)$ $45 (91.8)$ 0.789 Overweight $7 (11.9)$ $52 (88.1)$ $41 (91.1)$ 0.789 Normal Weight $4 (8.9)$ $41 (91.1)$ Diabetes Mellitus 0.789 Yes $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ $13 (9.3)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.732 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ $ -$ Yes $1 (4.2)$ $23 (95.8)$ 0.732 0.732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 No $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.372 YesNil $7 (100)$ 0.372 0.098	No	9 (10.3)	78 (89.7)	0.790	
No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) 0.505 History of Surgery	Hemoptysis				
No 10 (8.8) 103 (91.2) History of Surgery	Yes	5 (12.5)	35 (87.5)	0.505	
Yes $3 (11.1)$ $24 (88.9)$ $114 (90.5)$ 0.801 No $12 (9.5)$ $114 (90.5)$ 0.801 Obesity $ -$ Obese $4 (8.2)$ $45 (91.8)$ $52 (88.1)$ 0.789 Overweight $7 (11.9)$ $52 (88.1)$ 0.789 Normal Weight $4 (8.9)$ $41 (91.1)$ 0.789 Diabetes Mellitus $ -$ Yes $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ $13 (9.3)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.732 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ $ -$ Yes $1 (4.2)$ $23 (95.8)$ 0.732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 No $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.372 No $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.098	No	10 (8.8)	103 (91.2)	0.505	
No 12 (9.5) 114 (90.5) 0.801 Obesity	History of Surgery				
No12 (9.5)114 (90.5)Obesity $114 (90.5)$ Obese $4 (8.2)$ $45 (91.8)$ Overweight $7 (11.9)$ $52 (88.1)$ Normal Weight $4 (8.9)$ $41 (91.1)$ Diabetes Mellitus $11 (84.6)$ 0.789 Yes $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 Hypertension $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 Kight Ventricle Enlargement ¹ 0.061 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $1 (4.2)$ $23 (95.8)$ 0.732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.372 No $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.372 Yes $3 (4.9)$ $58 (95.1)$ 0.098	Yes	3 (11.1)	24 (88.9)	0.001	
Obese $4 (8.2)$ $45 (91.8)$ $7 (11.9)$ $52 (88.1)$ $52 (88.1)$ 0.789 Normal Weight $4 (8.9)$ $41 (91.1)$ 0.789 Diabetes Mellitus $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ $13 (9.3)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 Hypertension $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.0732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 IVC Filter I I I YesNil $7 (100)$ 0.372 No $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.372 Wes $3 (4.9)$ $58 (95.1)$ 0.098	No	12 (9.5)	114 (90.5)	0.801	
Overweight $7 (11.9)$ $52 (88.1)$ 0.789 Normal Weight $4 (8.9)$ $41 (91.1)$ $4 (8.9)$ $41 (91.1)$ Diabetes Mellitus $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ 0.479 Yes $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ 0.479 No $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 Hypertension $20 (80.0)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.0732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 No $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.372 No $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.372 History of DVT $10 (7.8)$ $58 (95.1)$ 0.098	Obesity				
Normal Weight4 (8.9)41 (91.1)Diabetes Mellitus 4 (8.9)41 (91.1)Yes2 (15.4)11 (84.6) 0.479 No13 (9.3)127 (90.7) 0.479 Hypertension 1 0.479 Yes5 (20.0)20 (80.0) 0.061 No10 (7.8)118 (92.2) 0.061 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ 0.732 0.732 Yes1 (4.2)23 (95.8) 0.732 No2 (6.2)30 (93.8) 0.732 IVC Filter 15 (10.3)131 (89.7)YesNil7 (100) 0.372 No15 (10.3)58 (95.1) 0.098	Obese	4 (8.2)	45 (91.8)		
Diabetes Mellitus $2 (15.4)$ $11 (84.6)$ $13 (9.3)$ 0.479 No13 (9.3) $127 (90.7)$ 0.479 Hypertension $13 (9.3)$ $127 (90.7)$ 0.061 Yes $5 (20.0)$ $20 (80.0)$ $10 (7.8)$ 0.061 No $10 (7.8)$ $118 (92.2)$ 0.061 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ $1 (4.2)$ $23 (95.8)$ $2 (6.2)$ 0.732 No $2 (6.2)$ $30 (93.8)$ 0.732 IVC Filter $15 (10.3)$ $131 (89.7)$ 0.372 YesNil $7 (100)$ $15 (10.3)$ 0.372 History of DVT $13 (4.9)$ $58 (95.1)$ 0.098	Overweight	7 (11.9)	52 (88.1)	0.789	
Diabetes Mellitus $Yes2 (15.4)11 (84.6)0.479No13 (9.3)127 (90.7)0.479HypertensionYes5 (20.0)20 (80.0)0.061No10 (7.8)118 (92.2)0.061No10 (7.8)118 (92.2)0.061Yes1 (4.2)23 (95.8)0.732No2 (6.2)30 (93.8)0.732IVC FilterYesNil7 (100)0.372No15 (10.3)131 (89.7)0.372History of DVT<$	Normal Weight	4 (8.9)	41 (91.1)		
No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) 0.479 Hypertension - -					
No 13 (9.3) 127 (90.7) Hypertension 1 127 (90.7) Yes 5 (20.0) 20 (80.0) 0.061 No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) 0.061 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ 0.061 Yes 1 (4.2) 23 (95.8) 0.732 No 2 (6.2) 30 (93.8) 0.732 IVC Filter 0.372 No 15 (10.3) 131 (89.7) 0.372 Yes Nil 7 (100) 0.372 Yes 3 (4.9) 58 (95.1) 0.098	Yes	2 (15.4)	11 (84.6)	0.479	
Yes 5 (20.0) 20 (80.0) 0.061 No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) 0.061 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ I I I Yes 1 (4.2) 23 (95.8) 0.732 No 2 (6.2) 30 (93.8) 0.732 IVC Filter I I I I Yes Nil 7 (100) 0.372 No 15 (10.3) 131 (89.7) 0.372 History of DVT I I 0.098	No	13 (9.3)	127 (90.7)		
Yes 5 (20.0) 20 (80.0) 0.061 No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) 0.061 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ I I I Yes 1 (4.2) 23 (95.8) 0.732 No 2 (6.2) 30 (93.8) 0.732 IVC Filter I I I I Yes Nil 7 (100) 0.372 No 15 (10.3) 131 (89.7) 0.372 History of DVT I I 0.098	Hypertension				
No 10 (7.8) 118 (92.2) 0.061 Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹ 0.732 0.732 0.732 0.732 0.732 0.732 0.732 0.732 <		5 (20.0)	20 (80.0)	0.061	
Yes 1 (4.2) 23 (95.8) 0.732 No 2 (6.2) 30 (93.8) 0.732 IVC Filter Image: Constraint of the state of	No			0.061	
Yes 1 (4.2) 23 (95.8) 0.732 No 2 (6.2) 30 (93.8) 0.732 IVC Filter Image: Constraint of the state of	Right Ventricle Enlargement ¹				
No 2 (6.2) 30 (93.8) 0.732 IVC Filter Image: colored system 0.732 Yes Nil 7 (100) 0.372 No 15 (10.3) 131 (89.7) 0.372 History of DVT Image: colored system 0.098		1 (4.2)	23 (95.8)		
IVC Filter Nil 7 (100) Yes Nil 7 (100) 0.372 No 15 (10.3) 131 (89.7) 0.372 History of DVT 2000 2000 2000 Yes 3 (4.9) 58 (95.1) 0.098				0.732	
Yes Nil 7 (100) 0.372 No 15 (10.3) 131 (89.7) 0.372 History of DVT Yes 3 (4.9) 58 (95.1) 0.098		_ (0)			
No 15 (10.3) 131 (89.7) 0.372 History of DVT		Nil	7 (100)		
History of DVT 0.098 Yes 3 (4.9) 58 (95.1)			, ,	0.372	
Yes 3 (4.9) 58 (95.1) 0.098					
0.098		3 (4.9)	58 (95.1)	0.098	
	No	12 (13.0)	80 (87.0)		

Table 2: Relationship of Signs and Symptoms with Clinical Outcome

Doppler Ultrasound of Lower Limb			
DVT Present	4 (7.8)	47 (92.2)	
Normal	3 (5.8)	49 (94.2)	0.187
Not Done	8 (16.0)	42 (84.0)	
Probability of PE			
High	5 (9.4)	48 (90.6)	
Moderate	10 (10.4)	86 (89.6)	0.785
Low	Nil	4 (100)	
¹ n=56			

DISCUSSION

A quick effectual treatment of PE depends on appropriate diagnosis along with correct management [19]. Hence, clinical presentations in combination with risk factors might be responsible for valuable facts in detecting highly vulnerable PE patients. Though, clinical presentations of PE were frequently non-specific. The clinical manifestation differs, reliant on the dissemination and dimension of emboli obstructing the pulmonary vessels along with age and previous medical history of the patients [20, 21]. This study demonstrated accompanied signs and symptoms, risk factors related with the PE that were supportive for the general practitioner to diagnose this serious and probable deadly disease.

D-dimer is a fibrin degradation product produced from degradation of blood clot by the process of fibrinolysis [22]. Thrombosis can be diagnosed by the levels of D-dimer in blood [22]. Earlier researches indicated that D-dimer levels were significantly increased in patients with acute PE [23,24]. However, few researches were controversial regarding level of D-Dimer for detecting PE because D-dimer levels can be elevated due to other diseases [25, 10]. Whereas, few researches recommended that D-dimer might be used alone for PE detection to avoid CTPA scans [26]. Additionally, D-dimer levels associate with the degree of PE on CTPA scans [27]. Similarly, another research studied patients with PE and revealed that D-dimer levels were significantly elevated in patients diagnosed with PE on CTPA as compared to those patients undiagnosed with PE on scan (p=0.001)[28]. These findings were inconsistent with the present research that showed D-dimer levels were insignificantly associated with the degree of PE (p=0.918).

The identification of PE remains confusing owing to nonexistence of generally related clinical presentations in this disease. Some researchers reported the commonly associated signs and symptoms in this disease [29-34]. One of the studies found that hemoptysis along with pleuritic pain were the most common clinical presentation in patients with PE [29]. However, these findings were inconsistent with another research wherein few PE patients presented with pleuritic pain and hemoptysis [35]. Usually, hemoptysis has been considered as classical clinical presentation of PE although reported only in 11.8% patients of PE in their research [35]. Furthermore, another research explained that reduced frequency of hemoptysis can be connected to the extensive accessibility of CT scans, permitting prompt detection and appropriate anticoagulant therapy in patients with PE, consequently stopping the development of pulmonary infarction [36]. The present study was corroborated with the above reported researches and revealed that mostly PE patient clinically manifested with hemoptysis were alive due to early detection and timely management that halted the progression of disease. On the other hand, chest pain, cyanosis and palpitation were also the other classical symptoms in the presentation of PE.

Venous thromboembolism is an important, but comparatively less frequently diagnosed health dilemma [37]. The danger of PE and DVT is a regular alarming distress in the intensive care unit (ICU), hospitalized, and disabled patients. Therefore, prompt detection of DVT is needed to avoid excessive expiries from PE [37]. Similarly, a research by Agunloye *et al.* conducted in Ibadan South-Western Nigeria, on suspicious cases of DVT following Doppler sonography revealed that the clinical signs of DVT were present in only 46.6% cases [38]. These findings were opposing to another research by Ismail *et al.* performed in Kano that documented positive results in 55.8% patients [39]. Additionally, another study in Jos, North Central Nigeria by Salaam *et al.* revealed that 56.3% cases had clinical signs of DVT [40]. In contrast, a Brazilian study by Baroncini *et al.* assessed 528 suspected cases and observed decreased incidence of DVT [41]. The present study did not supported the above researches and revealed, most of the patients showed positive clinical signs of DVT following Doppler ultrasound in 47(92.2%) cases that were alive while 4(7.8%) patients were died due to delayed detection. Early detection of DVT improves the survival of patients.

Likewise, another researchon 1,090 consecutive patients who were admitted to the emergency department for suspicious cases of PE. In order to improve diagnostic capability, they grouped

the suspected cases of PE according to clinical score into high, intermediate, or low probability of PE. Out of 486 patients, 49% cases had a low probability of PE (less than or equal to 4), 50(10.3%) cases had confirmed PE. On the other hand, high probability (score >/=9) was observed in 63 patients whereas moderate probability (score of 5-8) found in 38% patients [42]. The present study was inconsistent with the above mentioned research and showed, probability of PE was high in 48(90.6\%) patients and moderate probability was observed in 86(89.6%) for survivors whereas 5 (9.4%) cases were died with high probability and 10(10.4%) were died with moderate probability.

This study had few restrictions. This research did not explore the etiological factor of PE. The clinical outcomes might be well under-represented owing to its reliance on general practitioner assessment. Therefore, more researches are needed to endorse the investigative importance of clinical features.

CONCLUSION

This study concluded that clinical manifestation such as cyanosis was significantly associated with clinical outcome. Most of the patients showed positive clinical signs of deep-venous thrombosis. Despite of high and moderate probability of PE patients, mostly patients survived due to timely detection and prompt management. Early detection of deep-venous thrombosis improves the survival of patients.Furthermore, clinical presentation of PE along with Computed Tomography Pulmonary Angiogram delivers higher sensitivity and specificity.

REFERENCES

 Jaff MR, McMurtry MS, Archer SL, Cushman M, Goldenberg N, Goldhaber SZ, et al; American Heart Association Council on Cardiopulmonary, Critical Care, Perioperative and Resuscitation; American Heart Association Council on Peripheral Vascular Disease; American Heart Association Council on Arteriosclerosis, Thrombosis and Vascular Biology. Management of massive and sub-massive pulmonary embolism, iliofemoral deep vein thrombosis, and chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2011 Apr 26; 123(16):1788-830. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0b013e318214914f.

- 2. Ruggiero A, Screaton NJ. Imaging of acute and chronic thromboembolic disease: state of the art. ClinRadiol. 2017 May; 72(5):375-388. doi: 10.1016/j.crad.2017.02.011.
- Wendelboe AM, Raskob GE. Global Burden of Thrombosis: Epidemiologic Aspects. Circ Res. 2016 Apr 29; 118(9):1340-7.
- Horlander KT, Mannino DM, Leeper KV. Pulmonary embolism mortality in the United States, 1979-1998: an analysis using multiple-cause mortality data. Arch Intern Med. 2003 Jul 28; 163(14):1711-7.
- 5. Stein PD, Henry JW. Clinical characteristics of patients with acute pulmonary embolism stratified according to their presenting syndromes. Chest. 1997 Oct; 112(4):974-9.
- Suwanwongse K, Shabarek N. Recurrent Syncope as a Presentation of Pulmonary Embolism. Cureus. 2020 Jan; 12(1): e6623. doi: 10.7759/cureus.6623.
- Zhan ZQ, Wang CQ, Nikus KC, He CR, Wang J, Mao S, et al. Electrocardiogram patterns during hemodynamic instability in patients with acute pulmonary embolism. Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol. 2014 Nov; 19(6):543-51. doi: 10.1111/anec.12163.
- Rogers MA, Levine DA, Blumberg N, Flanders SA, Chopra V, Langa KM. Triggers of hospitalization for venous thromboembolism. Circulation. 2012 May 01; 125(17):2092-9.
- Simon MA, Tan C, Hilden P, Gesner L, JuliusB.Effectiveness of Clinical Decision Tools in Predicting Pulmonary Embolism.Pulm Med. 2021; 2021: 8880893. doi: 10.1155/2021/8880893.
- Righini M, Van Es J, Den Exter PL, Roy PM, Verschuren F, Ghuysen A, et al. Ageadjusted D-dimer cutoff levels to rule out pulmonary embolism: The ADJUST-PE study. JAMA. 2014 Mar 19; 311(11):1117-24. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014.2135.
- 11. Sathe PM, Patwa UD. D Dimer in acute care.Int J CritIllnInj Sci. 2014 Jul-Sep; 4(3): 229–232. doi: 10.4103/2229-5151.141435
- Moore AJ, Wachsmann J, Chamarthy MR, Panjikaran L, Tanabe Y, Rajiah P. Imaging of acute pulmonary embolism: an update. CardiovascDiagnTher. 2018; 8(3):225-243. doi: 10.21037/cdt.2017.12.01.
- Raymakers AJ, Mayo J, Marra CA, FitzGerald M. Diagnostic strategies incorporating computed tomography angiography for pulmonary embolism: a systematic review of cost-effectiveness analyses. J Thorac Imaging. 2014 Jul; 29(4):209-16. doi: 10.1097/RTI.0b013e3182999e41.

- 14. Booij R, Budde RPJ, Dijkshoorn ML, van Strate M. Technological developments of Xray computed tomography over half a century: User's influence on protocol optimization.European Journal of Radiology. 2020 October; 131: 109261.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2020.109261.
- 15. Doğan H, de Roos A, Geleijins J, Huisman MV, Kroft LJM. The role of computed tomography in the diagnosis of acute and chronic pulmonary embolism. DiagnIntervRadiol 2015; 21: 307–316. DOI 10.5152/dir.2015.14403.
- 16. Cambron JC, Saba ES, McBane RD, Casanegra AI, Villarraga HR, Houghton DE, et al. Adverse Events and Mortality in Anticoagulated Patients with Different Categories of Pulmonary Embolism. Mayo ClinProcInnovQual Outcomes. 2020 Jun 5; 4(3):249-258. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2020.02.002.
- 17. Pinsky MR. The right ventricle: interaction with the pulmonary circulation. Crit Care.2016; 20: 266. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-016-1440-0.
- 18. Colin GC, Pouleur AC, Gerber BL, Poncelet PA, de Meester C, D'Hondt AM, et al. Pulmonary hypertension detection by computed tomography pulmonary transit time in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction. Eur Heart J Cardiovasc Imaging. 2020 Oct 20; 21(11):1291-1298. doi: 10.1093/ehjci/jez290.
- Di Nisio M, van Es N, Büller HR. Deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism. Lancet. 2016 Dec 17; 388(10063):3060-3073. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30514-1.
- Righini M, Robert-Ebadi H. Diagnosis of acute Pulmonary Embolism. Hamostaseologie.
 2018 Feb; 38(1):11-21. English. doi: 10.5482/HAMO-17-07-0023.
- Meyer G, Sanchez O, Jimenez D. Risk assessment and management of high and intermediate risk pulmonary embolism. Presse Med. 2015 Dec; 44(12 Pt 2):e401-8. doi: 10.1016/j.lpm.2015.10.009.
- 22. Adam SS, Key NS, Greenberg CS. D-dimer antigen: current concepts and future prospects. Blood. 2009 Mar 26; 113(13):2878-87. doi: 10.1182/blood-2008-06-165845.
- 23. Crawford F, Andras A, Welch K, Sheares K, Keeling D, Chappell FM. D-dimer test for excluding the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016 Aug 5; 2016(8):CD010864. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD010864.
- Le Gal G, Righini M, Wells PS. D-dimer for pulmonary embolism. JAMA. 2015 Apr 28; 313(16):1668-9. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.3703.

- 25. Schutte T, Thijs A, Smulders YM. Never ignore extremely elevated D-dimer levels: they are specific for serious illness. Neth J Med. 2016 Dec; 74(10):443-448.
- 26. Eng CW, Wansaicheong G, Goh SK, Earnest A, Sum C. Exclusion of acute pulmonary embolism: computed tomography pulmonary angiogram or D-dimer? Singapore Med J. 2009 Apr; 50(4):403-6.
- 27. Ji Y, Sun B, Juggessur-Mungur KS, Li Z, Zhang Z. Correlation of D-dimer level with the radiological severity indexes of pulmonary embolism on computed tomography pulmonary angiography. Chin Med J (Engl). 2014; 127(11):2025-9.
- 28. Gao H, Liu H,Li Y. Value of D-dimer levels for the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism: An analysis of 32 cases with computed tomography pulmonary angiography. ExpTher Med. 2018 Aug; 16(2): 1554–1560.doi: 10.3892/etm.2018.6314
- 29. Stein PD, Beemath A,Matta FD,Weg JG, Yusen RD, Hales CA, et al. Clinical characteristics of patients with acute pulmonary embolism: data from PIOPED II. Am J Med. 2007 Oct; 120(10): 871–879.doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2007.03.024.
- Cha SI, Choi KJ, Shin KM, Lim JK, Yoo SS, Lee J, et al. Clinical characteristics of insitu pulmonary artery thrombosis in Korea. Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis. 2015 Dec; 26(8):903-7. doi: 10.1097/MBC.00000000000343.
- 31. Cha SI, Choi KJ, Shin KM, Lim JK, Yoo SS, Lee J, Lee SY, Kim CH, Park JY. Clinical characteristics of pulmonary embolism with concomitant pneumonia. Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis. 2016 Apr; 27(3):281-6. doi: 10.1097/MBC.000000000000411.
- 32. Miniati M, Cenci C, Monti S, Poli D. Clinical Presentation of Acute Pulmonary Embolism: Survey of 800 Cases. PLoS ONE.2012; 7(2): e30891. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030891.
- 33. Pollack CV, Schreiber D, Goldhaber SZ, Slattery D, Fanikos J, O'Neil BJ, et al. Clinical characteristics, management, and outcomes of patients diagnosed with acute pulmonary embolism in the emergency department: initial report of EMPEROR (Multicenter Emergency Medicine Pulmonary Embolism in the Real World Registry). J Am CollCardiol. 2011 Feb 8; 57(6):700-6. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2010.05.071.
- 34. Casazza F, Becattini C, Bongarzoni A, Cuccia C, Roncon L, Favretto G, et al. Clinical features and short term outcomes of patients with acute pulmonary embolism. The Italian

Pulmonary Embolism Registry (IPER). Thromb Res. 2012 Dec; 130(6):847-52. doi: 10.1016/j.thromres.2012.08.292.

- 35. Ji QY, Wang MF, Su CM, Yang QF, Feng LF, Zhao LY, et al. A Clinical symptoms and related risk factors in pulmonary embolism patients and cluster analysis based on these symptoms. Scientific ReportS.2017; 7: 14887 | DOI: 10.1038/s41598-017-14888-7.
- 36. Tang cx,Schoepf UJ, Chowdhury SM, Fox MA, Zhang LJ, Lu GM. Multidetector computed tomography pulmonary angiography in childhood acute pulmonary embolism. PediatrRadiol. 2015 Sep; 45(10): 1431–1439.Doi: 10.1007/s00247-015-3336-6.
- 37. Nathan S, Aleem MA, Thiagarajan P, Das De S. The incidence of proximal deep vein thrombosis following total knee arthroplasty in an Asian population: a Doppler ultrasound study. J OrthopSurg (Hong Kong). 2003 Dec; 11(2):184-9. doi: 10.1177/230949900301100214.
- 38. Ibrahim MZ, Igashi JB, Lawal S, Usman B, Mubarak AZ, Suleiman HM. Doppler ultrasonographic evaluation of lower limbs deep-vein thrombosis in a teaching hospital, Northwestern Nigeria. Ann Afr Med. 2020 Jan-Mar; 19(1):8-14. doi: 10.4103/aam.aam_62_18.
- Ismail A, Tabari AM, Isyaku K. Doppler sonographic evaluation of venogenic extremity swellings: Analysis of 170 patients from Kano, Nigeria. Niger J ClinPract. 2017 Aug; 20(8):930-935. doi: 10.4103/njcp.njcp_169_16.
- 40. Salaam AJ, Danjem SM, Ibinaiye PO, Ama JT, Ekedigwe JE, Igoh EO, et al. Lower limbs Doppler vascular findings in Jos university teaching hospital. Int J Sci Res Publ. 2016; 6(4):38–44.
- 41. Baroncini LA, França GJ, de Oliveira G, Vidal EA, Del Valle CE, Stahlke PS, et al. Correlation of clinical features with the risk of lower limb deep vein thrombosis assessed by duplex ultrasound. J Vasc Bras. 2013; 12(2):118–22.
- 42. Wicki J, Perneger TV, Junod AF, Bounameaux H, Perrier A. Assessing clinical probability of pulmonary embolism in the emergency ward: a simple score. Arch Intern Med. 2001 Jan 8; 161(1):92-7. doi: 10.1001/archinte.161.1.92.