

Reliability of B-line quantification by different-level observers and a software algorithm using point-of-care lung ultrasound

Pičuljan, Ana; Šustić, Marko; Brumini, Gordana; Kuharić, Janja; Šustić, Alan

Source / Izvornik: **Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing, 2019, 1259 - 1264**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10877-019-00440-7>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:184:303133>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported/Imenovanje-Dijeli pod istim uvjetima 3.0](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-02-17**

Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Health Studies - FHSRI Repository](#)





Reliability of B-line quantification by different-level observers and a software algorithm using point-of-care lung ultrasound

Ana Pičuljan¹ · Marko Šustić² · Gordana Brumini³ · Janja Kuharić¹ · Alan Šustić^{1,4}

Received: 26 April 2019 / Accepted: 29 November 2019 / Published online: 10 December 2019
© Springer Nature B.V. 2019

Abstract

Quantification of B-lines on lung ultrasonographs is operator-dependent and considered a semi-quantitative method. To avoid this variability, we designed a software algorithm for counting B-lines. We compared the number of B-lines obtained in real-time by observers with three different levels of experience and by the software algorithm, and analyzed intra-rater variability in terms of the estimated number of B-lines in two successive examinations. Forty mechanically ventilated adult (≥ 18 years) intensive care unit patients were included in this prospective study. All patients underwent two consecutive ultrasound examinations for B-lines detection by three human observers (OB1 = high, OB2 = medium, OB3 = low level of experience) and by the software (OBS). Ultrasound scans were obtained on the anterior right and left thoracic side along the midclavicular line, in the second and fourth intercostal space; B-lines counting for each position lasted 10 s. To assess intra-observer variability, a second ultrasound scan was obtained 15–30 min after the first scan. For all lung zones, the intraclass correlation for B-lines counting between OB1 and OB2 was 0.663; between OB1 and OB3, 0.559; and between OB1 and OBS, 0.710. OBS had a better concordance coefficient (0.752) between the first and the second measurements than did the human observers. Our results show that the software algorithm for B-lines counting is a potentially promising alternative when observers have little lung ultrasound experience.

Keywords B-lines · Inter-observer reliability · Intra-observer reliability · Lung ultrasonography

Ana Pičuljan and Marko Šustić have contributed equally to this work.

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10877-019-00440-7>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Alan Šustić
alan.sustic@uniri.hr

- ¹ Department of Anesthesiology, Reanimatology, Intensive Care and Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Rijeka, Br. Branchetta 20, Rijeka 51000, Croatia
- ² Department of Histology and Embryology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia
- ³ Department of Basic Medical Science, Faculty of Health Studies, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia
- ⁴ Department of Clinical Medical Science II, Faculty of Health Studies, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia

1 Introduction

One of the most significant findings on lung ultrasound (LUS) are B-lines, which have also been called “comet tails” or “lung rockets.” B-lines are defined as discrete, laser-like vertical hyperechoic reverberation artifacts that arise from the pleural line (previously described as “comet tails”), extend to the bottom of the screen without fading, and move synchronously with lung sliding [1]. The cause of this phenomenon is fluid-thickening of the interlobular septa, due to increased extravascular lung water. However, this artifact of various etiologies, although most commonly associated with increased interstitial edema, has also been detected in different interstitial lung diseases. The number and frequency of B-lines correlate with the amount of extravascular lung water and the presence of pulmonary edema in critically ill patients [2, 3].

However, B-lines are a relatively operator-dependent sign, and therefore, the quantification of B-lines is defined as a semi-quantitative method [4]. It is frequently difficult to enumerate B-lines exactly in real-time, especially if

they are plentiful or if they tend to be confluent. Furthermore, there are inter-observer and intra-observer differences in the enumeration of B-lines, which are reported to range from less than 10–30% in several recent studies [4–9]. Thus, the estimated number of B-lines is somewhat uncertain and subjective [8, 9]. To avoid this variability, we designed a computer software algorithm that detects B-lines on the screen and counts them in real-time or in various time intervals [10].

The first aim of our study was to test inter-observer agreement in the estimation of the exact number of B-lines between observers with three different levels of experience and by the software algorithm in real-time. The second aim of our study was to analyze intra-observer variability in the enumeration of B-lines in two successive examinations by the same observers and by the software.

2 Materials and methods

Forty consecutive, mechanically ventilated adult (≥ 18 years) intensive care unit (ICU) patients with sepsis and septic shock were included in this prospective study [11]. The exclusion criteria were: mechanical ventilation < 24 h, inability to perform ultrasound examination due to patients' position or technical reasons, morbidly obese patients (body mass index [BMI] ≥ 40 kg/m²), and patients with pneumothorax, serious thoracic trauma, and/or major thoracic surgery. Enrollment took place between March 2017 and June 2017 in the ICU of an academic tertiary care facility, with an annual census of 400–500 ICU patients. The study was approved by the University's Hospital Ethics Committee (No.: 2170-29-02/1-16-2). The need to obtain consent was waived by the ethics committee.

2.1 Observers

All patients underwent two consecutive ultrasound examinations for the detection of B-lines by three observers with different skill-levels and by the software algorithm. The first observer (observer 1; OB1: A.Š.) had more than 15 years of experience in LUS and B-line assessment, the second observer (OB2: A.P.) had 6 months of experience with LUS, and the third observer (OB3: M.Š.) was a novice at LUS and received very brief (30 min) training on B-line assessment before the beginning of the study. B-line estimation using the software (OBS) was facilitated by bedside nurses without any previous knowledge of ultrasound, while the proper position of the transducer was guided by the attending physician who was blinded to the purposes of the study.

2.2 Chest ultrasound

All ultrasound examinations were performed using the same convex probe and ultrasound device (Shanghai United Imaging Healthcare, Shanghai, China), with the same parameters for gain, frequency (6 MHz), and depth (6–8 cm) of the ultrasound beam. The examinations were performed with patients in the supine (or near supine) position. Ultrasound scans were obtained on the anterior right and left thoracic side in the midclavicular line, in the second and fourth intercostal space, i.e., in four positions for each patient (R1; R2; L1; L2). This was chosen for its ease of application and for the concern of the patients' health condition and also because it is derived from the methodology of the BLUE protocol [2, 12, 13]. For the assessment of inter-observer variability, all examinations were performed in the order: OB1, OB2, OB3, and OBS. After the optimum ultrasound image was achieved, B-line counting for each position lasted 10 s for the observers and for the software during the whole respiratory cycle. The average estimated number of B-lines obtained in a 10-s period was compared. In each intercostal space scan, the number of B-lines was recorded separately, and observers were unaware of each other's results. For the assessment of intra-observer variability, the second ultrasound scan was obtained 15–30 min after the first scan. During the period between the first and second scan, patients did not receive any fluid, diuretics, or significant vasoactive drugs.

B-lines were recognized and counted according to the aforementioned B-line definition. In the case of confluent B-lines (B-lines separated by less than 7 mm [14]), we counted them as a single B-line, although there is no standard way to approach this and some subjectivity and discordance exists [7]. If a lung consolidation was present, the number of B-lines was counted at the nearest alternative point in order to favor the B line counting [15].

2.3 Software

We developed a software algorithm that could count B-lines and mark them on the screen [10]. The software counted the B-lines in real-time and also calculated the average number of B-lines in a 10-s period and during the total LUS examination. Input data for the counting algorithm were the ultrasound image (frame) provided by the ultrasound machine software before displaying the frame on the screen. The image data could either be raw data or the final image, after probe transformation has been applied. After the region of interest was determined, vertical integration was calculated inside region of interest boundaries and a one-dimensional array was created. Next,

on this array, in order to suppress noise, a digital low-pass filter was applied, which was present in the image data, in order to smooth the array. The next step was to use the peak-detection algorithm, which finds the local maximum in the array and creates a final array that contains the data of the detected B-lines. The numerical data in the final array are the total number of B-lines detected, and the amplitude and width of each B-line detected. The position of the B-lines detected was then overlaid on the image data and the image was displayed on the screen. Lastly, in order to make this process useful in practice, the average number of B-lines in N consecutive data frames or in N consecutive seconds (where N is a user-selectable value) was determined. Then, finally, the number of B-lines detected was displayed on the screen (Fig. 1).

2.4 Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of data was performed using Statistica for Windows, release 13.3 (Statsoft, INC., Tulsa, OK, USA) and MedCalc (MedCalc Inc., Mariakerke, Belgium). The normality of distribution of age, BMI, and time in ICU was checked using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test with the Lilliefors correction. Although these data were not normally distributed, we used mean \pm standard deviation (SD) to present the data, because it allows easier understanding and comparison with other studies. To test the differences between groups according to age, BMI, and time in the ICU, the Mann–Whitney test was used. We evaluated inter-rater reliability using intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) according to Cicchetti (less than 0.40—poor; between 0.40 and 0.59—fair; between 0.60 and 0.74—good; between 0.75

and 1.00—excellent) [16]. Two-way random-effects model with absolute agreement and multiple raters/measurements was performed [17]. Two-way random-effects model is used when the raters are randomly selected in order to generalize results to any raters with the same characteristics. Each subject was rated by the same set of raters. In order to test if all the raters assigned the same score to the same subject, absolute agreement was performed. We calculated the concordance correlation coefficient as a measure of precision and accuracy for each observer. All statistical values were considered significant at the level of $P < 0.05$.

3 Results

The study was performed on 40 adult, mechanically ventilated, ICU patients (24 males and 16 females). There was no difference between the sexes in terms of age, BMI, and length of stay in the ICU before the study. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1.

3.1 Inter-observer reproducibility

ICC for B-lines among observers for the examined lung fields is shown in Table 2. Overall, for all lung zones, the ICC between OB1 and OB2 was 0.663, between OB1 and OB3, it was 0.559, and between OB2 and OB3, it was 0.664. The ICC between OB1 and OBS was 0.710, between OB2 and OBS, it was 0.387, and between OB3 and OBS, it was 0.330.

3.2 Intra-observer reproducibility

Intra-observer reproducibility between the first and second measurements for all for lung regions was 0.723 for OB1, 0.622 for OB2, 0.648 for OB3, and 0.752 for OBS. Therefore, OBS had a better concordance coefficient (e.g., a




Fig. 1 Display of the screen with active B-line software detection mode. Central two green lines on the screen mark two B-lines. On the right side of the screen are average numerical values of B-lines in one second (Ave 1 s), 10 s (Ave 10 s), and during the entire examination (Ave total)

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of patient data

Sex ^a	n	%	Age ^b (years)	BMI ^c (kg/m ²)	ICU stay (days) ^d
			Mean \pm SD	Mean \pm SD	Mean \pm SD
Male	24	60.0	65 \pm 13	29.7 \pm 7.0	3.8 \pm 2.9
Female	16	40.0	66 \pm 15	27.2 \pm 7.7	4.4 \pm 3.7
All	40	100.0	65 \pm 14	28.7 \pm 7.3	4.0 \pm 3.2

^aThe t test for proportions did not show a significant difference according to sex ($P=0.074$)

^bThe Mann–Whitney test showed no significant difference according to age ($P=0.722$)

^cThe Mann–Whitney test showed no significant difference according to BMI ($P=0.301$)

^dThe Mann–Whitney test showed no significant difference according to ICU duration before the study ($P=0.564$)

Table 2 Intraclass correlation (ICC) for counting B-lines among observers (inter-rater reliability)

Lung field	OB1/OB2 ICC (95% CI)	OB1/OB3	OB1/OB4	OB2/OB3	OB2/OB4	OB3/OB4
R1	0.764 (0.555–0.875)	0.695 (0.263–0.858)	0.597 (0.238–0.787)	0.557 (0.031–0.786)	0.248 (–0.439–0.604)	0.150 (–0.265–0.476)
R2	0.644 (0.337–0.810)	0.532 (0.014–0.773)	0.793 (0.606–0.890)	0.751 (0.499–0.872)	0.506 (0.089–0.735)	0.382 (–0.097–0.663)
L1	0.656 (0.358–0.817)	0.456 (0.035–0.715)	0.783 (0.588–0.885)	0.710 (0.369–0.857)	0.479 (0.046–0.720)	0.252 (–0.213–0.566)
L2	0.569 (0.205–0.769)	0.495 (0.053–0.732)	0.644 (0.325–0.809)	0.656 (0.357–0.817)	0.257 (–0.320–0.593)	0.502 (0.025–0.743)
All	0.663 (0.540–0.753)	0.559 (0.177–0.740)	0.710 (0.605–0.788)	0.664 (0.428–0.788)	0.387 (0.169–0.548)	0.330 (0.007–0.541)

Two-way model for absolute agreement

Table 3 Intra-observer variability in B-line counting (intra-rater reliability)

Observer	Concordance coefficient	95% CI
1	0.723	0.641–0.788
2	0.622	0.518–0.707
3	0.648	0.549–0.729
S	0.752	0.676–0.811

similar number of B-lines) between the first and the second measurements than did the other observers (Table 3).

4 Discussion

The detection of B-lines has been suggested as a valuable, rapid, and noninvasive diagnostic tool that physicians can use to estimate index of lung interstitial syndrome and/or extravascular lung water (e.g. pulmonary edema), and the method was proved valuable as a point-of-care diagnostic tool [18].

Although identification of a B-line “pattern” has proved useful in various conditions, some doubt remains about the utility of exact counting of the B-line number in routine clinical practice [8, 19, 20]. The most important reasons for criticism of the applicability of the B-line number is that it is partly an operator-dependent sign [4, 8, 9, 19, 21]. On the other hand, several recent studies have emphasized the clinical significance of the exact number of B lines in the assessment of pulmonary edema, EVLW, or even interstitial lung disease [2, 15, 22]. Ferre et al. find an increase of exactly six Delta-B-lines at the four standardized BLUE points as the threshold value to diagnose weaning-induced pulmonary edema, while Tardella et al. find that the presence of a LUS score superior or equal to ten B-lines is predictive for the presence of significant interstitial lung disease. To address this issue, we designed a novel computer software algorithm that detects B-lines on the screen and counts them in real-time or in various time intervals [10], which leads to faster examination of the patient and spares time in the ICU

setting. In this study, we show that this algorithm had good inter-rater comparability with highly experienced observers and intra-rater reliability.

Several recent studies have demonstrated that detection of a B-line “pattern” (e.g., presence of ≥ 3 B-lines, or a similar definition) is a reproducible and easy-to-learn sign for observers with different levels of LUS experience [4, 7, 9, 20]. In a large SIMEU multicenter study, inter-observer agreement of 0.94 and intra-observer agreement of 0.97 and 0.92 were found for recognition of the B-line “pattern,” for experts and observers with limited experience, respectively [5]. On the other hand, there are less convincing data for B-line counting; Gullett et al. found overall (for all lung zones combined) agreement in counting B-lines between expert/expert and expert/novice pairs, with coefficients of 0.603 and 0.593, respectively [9]. Additionally, Sparandeo et al. reported a standard deviation higher than 33% in the assessment of B-line number among observers [8].

Two attempts at objective calculation and/or counting B-lines using computer-based analysis or an automated scoring algorithm were recently published. In both of these studies, computer-assisted analysis of B-lines was found to be a useful tool for reducing intra-observer and inter-observer discordance [23, 24].

In our study, we analyzed inter-observer and intra-observer variability in quantifying B-lines between observers with three different levels of LUS experience and specifically developed software. The design of this study was partly different from those of previously reported studies. Our study was designed to represent the intensive care medicine reality, where B-line counting and the ensuing clinical decision should be done promptly. B-line counting was performed in real-time and lasted only 10 s, which is generalizable to an acute care clinical setting. In other similar studies, the results were analyzed with a delay, by reviewing previously recorded LUS video clips, rather than in real and limited time [3, 5–7, 9, 25]. It is to be expected that a delayed review would facilitate B-line counting, thus improving accuracy and reducing inter- and intra-observer variability. Consequently, the results of our and other studies are not entirely comparable. However, agreement in counting

B-lines between the observers in our study was similar to the results obtained by Gullett et al. In our study, inter-observer agreement in B-line counting between competent observers (OB1 vs. OB2) was slightly better (0.663 vs. 0.603) than between expert and beginner (OB1 vs. OB3: 0.559 vs. 0.593) [9]. Taken together, our results show good ICC (between 0.6 and 0.8) for B-line counting between expert and other observers (including the software algorithm) in most distinct lung fields, and in the whole-lung examination (i.e., cumulative for all four lung fields).

Additionally, intra-rater variability between observers in our study was somewhat comparable with the results of Gullett et al., self-agreement in our study was 0.723 for an expert (OB1) and 0.622 for a competent observer (OB2), while in Gullett et al.'s study, self-agreement for two different experts was 0.676 and 0.586 [9]. Additionally, it is important to emphasize the good intra-rater agreement for the naïve observer (0.648) in our study and, above all, a very good concordance coefficient for the software. The good agreement of the software with the expert observer (0.710) and very good self-agreement (0.752) of the software confirms the encouraging results from comparable studies with computer-based analysis or an automated scoring algorithm for B-line counting [23, 24].

Our study had some important potential limitations. First, like similar previous studies, for technical and ethical reasons the observers' accuracy in semi-quantifying the degree of extravascular lung water by counting B-lines was not compared with results obtained by lung computed tomography, but the main purpose of the study was to compare subjectivity of three providers with different levels of experience and how it relates to the software algorithm. By no means was it supposed to be a definitive diagnostic measure and its utility will need to be compared with other diagnostic modalities before a routine use in the practice. Second, we used the persuasiveness sample of critically ill patients because there is no strength data based on previous studies. Therefore, sample size was not a priori calculated and the number of enrolled patients (examinations) was too small to yield entirely conclusive results. Third, the third observer had almost no experience in LUS at the beginning of the study, but gained experience during the study based on the steep learning curve of LUS. Therefore, the results of the third observer in counting B-lines by the end of the study period are not fully comparable with his results at the beginning of the study. Fourth, there is no "golden standard" for B-line assessment, but this is a common problem in all similar studies on this subject. Fifth, taking into consideration that enrolled patients had the diagnosis of sepsis and septic shock, we acknowledge the fact that B-lines found on ultrasound examination in this population could have been of both non-cardiogenic and cardiogenic origin. Enhanced vascular permeability due to endothelial injury of pulmonary

vasculature [26], sepsis induced myocardial stunning, including systolic and diastolic dysfunction [27–29], and possible presence of pneumonia in mechanically ventilated patients, all contribute to the formation of B-line pattern in a septic patient, but this was considered secondary to the purpose of this particular study.

5 Conclusion

In this study we determined the inter-rater and intra-rater reliability for counting B-lines between three observers with different levels of experience in LUS and a novel software algorithm. The software algorithm for B-line counting demonstrated good inter- and intra-rater reliability and is a potentially promising alternative for observers with little LUS experience. Further algorithm iterations may increase its use in both the research and clinical arenas.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Dr. Emir Festic for helpful advice and critical review of the article.

Funding The authors declare that no funding was obtained for this research.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflicts of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The study was approved by the University's Hospital Ethics Committee (KBC Rijeka, Croatia; 12/12/2016, No.: 2170-29-02/1-16-2). All data obtained were handled according to current data protection guidelines.

Informed consent The need to obtain informed consent was waived by the ethics committee.

References

1. Volpicelli G, Elbarbary M, Blaivas M, Lichtenstein DA, Mathis G, Kirkpatrick AW, et al. International evidence-based recommendations for point-of-care lung ultrasound. *Intensive Care Med.* 2012;38:577–91.
2. Enghard P, Rademacher S, Nee J, Hasper D, Engert U, Jörres A, Kruse JM. Simplified lung ultrasound protocol shows excellent prediction of extravascular lung water in ventilated intensive care patients. *Crit Care.* 2015;19:36. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-015-0756-5>.
3. Baldi G, Gargani L, Abramo A, D'Errico L, Caramella D, Picano E, Giunta F, Forfori F. Lung water assessment by lung ultrasonography in intensive care: a pilot study. *Intensive Care Med.* 2013;39:74–84.
4. Miglioranza MH, Picano E, Badano LP, Sant'Anna R, Rover M, Zaffaroni F, Sicari R, Kalil RK, Leiria TL, Gargani L. Pulmonary

- congestion evaluated by lung ultrasound predicts decompensation in heart failure outpatients. *Int J Cardiol.* 2017;240:271–8.
5. Pivetta E, Goffi A, Lupia E, Castagno D, Tozzetti C, Tizzani P, et al. Lung ultrasound-implemented diagnosis of acute decompensated heart failure in the ED: a SIMEU multicenter study. *Chest.* 2015;148:202–10.
 6. Bedetti G, Gargani L, Corbisiero A, Frassi F, Poggianti E, Motola G. Evaluation of ultrasound lung comets by hand-held echocardiography. *Cardiovasc Ultrasound.* 2006;4:34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-7120-4-34>.
 7. Anderson KL, Fields JM, Panebianco NL, Jenq KY, Marin J, Dean AJ. Inter-rater reliability of quantifying pleural B-lines using multiple counting methods. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2013;32:115–20.
 8. Sperandeo M, Trovato GM, Catalano D. Quantifying B-lines on lung sonography: insufficient evidence as an objective, constructive, and educational tool. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2014;33:362–5.
 9. Gullett J, Donnelly JP, Sinert R, Hosek B, Fuller D, Hill H, Feldman I, Galetto G, Auster M, Hoffmann B. Inter-observer agreement in the evaluation of B-lines using bedside ultrasound. *J Crit Care.* 2015;30:1395–9.
 10. Šustić A, Protić A, Jurančić J, Matić Z. Software support for precise analysis of the lung ultrasound comet-tail artifact (B-line). *Signa Vitae.* 2014;9:76.
 11. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, Shankar-Hari M, Annane D, Bauer M, et al. The third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (Sepsis-3). *JAMA.* 2016;2016(315):801–10.
 12. Lichtenstein D, Meziere G. Relevance of lung ultrasound in the diagnosis of acute respiratory failure: the BLUE protocol. *Chest.* 2008;134:117–25.
 13. Lichtenstein D, Meziere G. Diagnosis of cardiogenic pulmonary edema by sonography limited to the anterior lung. *Chest.* 2009;135:883–4.
 14. Li H, Li YD, Zhu WW, Kong LY, Ye XG, Cai QZ, et al. A simplified ultrasound comet tail grading scoring to assess pulmonary congestion in patients with heart failure. *Biomed Res Int.* 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/8474839>.
 15. Ferre A, Guillot M, Lichtenstein D, Meziere G, Richard C, Teboul JL, Monnet X. Lung ultrasound allows the diagnosis of weaning-induced pulmonary oedema. *Intensive Care Med.* 2019;45:601–8.
 16. Cicchetti DV. Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychol Assess.* 1994;6:284–90.
 17. Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. *J Chiropr Med.* 2016;15:155–63.
 18. Dietrich CF, Mathis G, Blaivas M, Volpicelli G, Seibel A, Wastl D, Atkinson NS, Cui XW, Fan M, Yi D. Lung B-line artefacts and their use. *J Thorac Dis.* 2016;8:1356–65.
 19. Soldati G, Copetti R, Sher S. Can lung comets be counted as “objects”? *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2011;4:438–9.
 20. Vizioli L, Ciccarese F, Forti P, Chiesa AM, Giovagnoli M, Mughetti M, Zompatori M, Zoli M. Integrated use of lung ultrasound and chest x-ray in the detection of interstitial lung disease. *Respiration.* 2017;93:15–22.
 21. Yamaga S, Ohshimo S, Shime N. Is lung ultrasonography really useful for diagnosing weaning-induced pulmonary oedema? *Intensive Care Med.* 2019;45:1329.
 22. Tardella M, Di Carlo M, Carotti M, Filippucci E, Grassi W, Salaffi F. Ultrasound B-lines in the evaluation of interstitial lung disease in patients with systemic sclerosis: cut-off point definition for the presence of significant pulmonary fibrosis. *Medicine.* 2018;97:18(e0566). <https://doi.org/10.1097/md.0000000000001010566>.
 23. Raso R, Tartarisco G, Matucci Cerinic M, Pioggia G, Picano E, Gargani L. A soft computing-based B-line analysis for objective classification of severity of pulmonary edema and fibrosis. *JACC Cardiovasc Imaging.* 2015;9:495–6.
 24. Brattain LJ, Telfer BA, Liteplo AS, Noble VE. Automated B-line scoring on thoracic sonography. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2013;32:2185–90.
 25. Piropanich P, Karakitsos D, Alharthy A, Gillman LM, Blaivas M, Buchanan BM, Brindley PG, Wattanatham A. Evaluating extravascular lung water in sepsis: three lung-ultrasound techniques compared against transpulmonary thermodilution. *Indian J Crit Care Med.* 2018;22:650–5.
 26. Luce JM. Pathogenesis and management of septic shock. *Chest.* 1987;91:883–8.
 27. Price S. Myocardial dysfunction in sepsis: mechanisms and therapeutic implications. *Eur Heart J.* 1999;20:715–24.
 28. Merx MW, Weber C. Sepsis and the heart. *Circulation.* 2007;116:793–802.
 29. Hunter JD, Doddi M. Sepsis and the heart. *Br J Anaesth.* 2010;104:3–11.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH (“Springer Nature”).

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users (“Users”), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use (“Terms”). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

onlineservice@springernature.com