

**Tools for Practice** is proudly sponsored by the Alberta College of Family Physicians (ACFP). ACFP is a provincial, professional voluntary organization, representing more than 4,800 family physicians, family medicine residents, and medical students in Alberta. Established over sixty years ago, the ACFP strives for excellence in family practice through advocacy, continuing medical education and primary care research. [www.acfp.ca](http://www.acfp.ca)

April 27, 2020

### **COVID-19 Rapid Reviews**

*Along with regular Tools for Practice, the PEER team will be writing rapid reviews to address COVID-19 topics relevant for primary care. The evidence is changing rapidly and it is possible that as you read this, new evidence will already be available. We will try our best to stay in front and keep you up-to-date during these challenging times.*



#### **Are there tools to help assess dyspnea virtually?**

**Clinical Question: Are there any techniques (like the Roth Score) to augment a typical history when assessing dyspnea/pneumonia over the phone or by video?**

**Bottom Line: Unfortunately, no specific technique, including the Roth Score, is reliable in assuring dyspneic patients are not at risk and safe to stay home. Furthermore, no studies have evaluated dyspnea assessment in COVID-19 patients. Clinicians are encouraged to use available tools**

**(<https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m1182/infographic>) and to have a low index of suspicion.**

#### **Evidence:**

1. Roth Score for virtual (phone/video) assessment of dyspnea.<sup>1</sup> Patients count upward from "1" as quickly as possible after a single deep breath. Can repeat after 3 deep breaths. Measure highest number attained and time (seconds) to highest number. Only one study:
  - o 103 healthy people (mean age 56). In one breath:
    - 100% counted to  $\geq 15$ .
    - 94% counted to  $\geq 20$ .
  - o 93 patients with dyspnea (mean age 76) admitted to internal medicine or cardiac intensive care (conditions like heart failure and pneumonia). Roth Score compared to pulse oximetry on room air:
    - Area-under-the-curve (assesses overall test utility):

- Predicted <95% O<sub>2</sub> pulse oximetry: 0.83 (pretty good).
  - Predicting <90% O<sub>2</sub> pulse oximetry: 0.84 (pretty good).
  - Sensitivity and specificity appear to be presented incorrectly. It is impossible to determine predictive cut-offs for helping make or exclude diagnosis.
    - *[We emailed the authors twice without response].*
2. Clinical features of pneumonia: Systematic review of 13 diagnostic studies (outpatient or emergency departments) with 11,144 patients:<sup>2</sup>
    - Small-moderate help making the diagnosis of pneumonia (Likelihood Ratio ~3.5):
      - Respiratory rate ≥20/minute or fever ≥38°C.
    - No individual clinical features helpful in excluding pneumonia.
  3. Patient self-rating of dyspnea on numerical rating scale (0-10, higher=worse).
    - 253 emergency patients (mean age 61) with complaint of dyspnea.<sup>3</sup>
      - Correlated quite well with respiratory rate (r=0.77) and okay with oxygen saturation (r=0.43).
    - In 188 chronic COPD patients, did not correlate with oxygen saturation.<sup>4</sup>

#### Context:

- Dyspnea encompasses more than oxygen saturation and has no gold standard for assessment.<sup>5</sup>
- None of these studies assessed patients with COVID-19 which may have distinct clinical characteristics.
- BMJ provides a helpful resource for assessment of COVID-19 patients virtually [<https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m1182/infographic>].<sup>6</sup>

#### Authors:

G Michael Allan MD CCFP FCFP & James McCormack BSc(Pharm) PharmD

#### Disclosures:

Authors do not have any conflicts of interest to declare.

#### References:

1. Chorin E, Padegimas A, Havakuk O, et al. Clin Cardiol. 2016; 39:636-9.
2. Htun TP, Sun Y, Chua HL, Pang J. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):7600.
3. Saracino A, Weiland T, Dent A, et al. Emerg Med Australas. 2008; 20:475–81.
4. Gift AG, Narsavage G. Am J Crit Care. 1998; 7:200-4.
5. Bausewein C, Booth S, Higginson IJ. Curr Opin Support Palliat Care. 2008; 2:95-9.
6. Greenhalgh T, Koh GCH, Car J. BMJ. 2020 Mar 25; 368:m1182. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1182. <https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m1182>

**Tools for Practice** is a biweekly article summarizing medical evidence with a focus on topical issues and practice modifying information. It is coordinated by G. Michael Allan, MD, CCFP and the content is written by practising family physicians who are joined occasionally by a health professional from another medical specialty or health discipline. Each article is peer-reviewed, ensuring it maintains a high standard of quality, accuracy, and academic integrity. If you are not a member of the ACFP and would like to receive the TFP emails, please sign up for the distribution list at <http://bit.ly/signupfortfps>. Archived articles are available on the ACFP website.

This communication reflects the opinion of the authors and does not necessarily mirror the perspective and policy of the Alberta College of Family Physicians.