

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

A Retrospective Study of Inter Costal Tube Drainage Vs Thoracotomy in Chest Trauma

Dr. Sunil Soran^{1*}, Dr. Jitendra Kumar Mangtani², Dr. Rushal Relia³, Dr. Hemant Sharma⁴

¹PGY-3 Traumatology and Surgery

²HOD Traumatology and Surgery

³PGY-2 Traumatology and Surgery

⁴PGY-1 Traumatology and Surgery

OPEN ACCESS

***Corresponding Author**
Dr. Sunil Soran

PGY-3 Traumatology and Surgery

Received: 02-09-2024

Accepted: 02-11-2024

Available online: 05-11-2024



©Copyright: IJMPR Journal

ABSTRACT

Trauma are the leading cause of death in the first four decades of life. Nevertheless, thoracic traumas only seldom require invasive procedures. In particular, chest drain placement is required in case of pleural disruption causing haemothorax, pneumothorax or haemopneumothorax. Although large-bore chest drains have been traditionally used in case of haemothorax, recent evidences seem to question this routine, showing good performances of small-bore and pig tail drains. Although it is a common procedure, experience and training is needed to avoid complications which might be even lethal. Surgical exploration after thoracic trauma is rare, accounting for less than 3% of traumas. Penetrating traumas more likely requiresurgical exploration compared to blunt trauma. Anterolateral thoracotomy is usually performed in this setting, but also clamshell or hemi-clamshell approach can be used. In selected patients, minimally invasive techniques can be performed. Large randomized trials are still needed to assess and standardized the role of new tools and procedures in the thoracic trauma setting.

Keywords: Chest injury, thoracotomy, trauma, hemothorax.

INTRODUCTION

Traumas are the leading cause of death in the first four decades of life and are mostly caused by traffic accidents[1]. Nevertheless, they might be related with other types of causalities, like falling or firearm injuries. Thoracic traumas might lead to severe consequences, even though less than 50% of them required a surgical revision[2]. Thoracic traumas can be divided in blunt or penetrating, according to the presence of open wound in the chest.

Blunt traumas are the most frequent type of trauma in India and Rajasthan and they are responsible for more than 1,00,000 deaths in India every year[3]. In blunt traumas, rib fractures are common and they might be associated with haemothorax, pneumothorax or haemopneumothorax that are the most typical lesions that need to be faced by trauma surgeons; moreover, lung injuries such as contusion or laceration can also be found. On the other hand, penetrating trauma are mostly related to stabbing and gunshot and they usually present with lung or other thoracic organs lesions. Mortality related to penetrating chest traumas is significantly higher than blunt traumas, and more than 90% is not able to reach the hospital alive; nevertheless, mortality for patients with no cardiac involvement is less than 1% [4]. Chest trauma can be

approached on two levels: pre-hospital and in-hospital. Pre-hospital level is usually the place where the trauma happened, with limited diagnostic facilities and possible difficulties that might make operative procedure more challenging; in-hospital level can be either in emergency room or operating theatre [4]. However, a prompt and adequate recognition and diagnosis of chest injuries is necessary and strongly influences outcomes [5]. In a large single centre study analysing different type of chest trauma, Kulshrestha and colleagues found one or more rib fractures in almost half of patients [6]. Concurrently, in only less than 20% an invasive approach was necessary. In particular, around 18% of patients required a chest drain, and in 2.6% a thoracotomy was needed. Moreover, also in case of penetrating chest trauma, intercostal drain positioning can be adequate in up to 95% of cases without requiring any further surgical exploration [4, 7, 8].

Chest Drain

Positioning of a pleural drain often represents the first step of the management of a chest trauma. The indication for the insertion of a chest drain has been clearly stated by international trauma management guidelines [9]. In particular, chest tube positioning is considered necessary in case of a pleural disruption with pneumothorax; intrapleural bleeding causing haemothorax; or in case of pneumo-haemothorax.

Although chest drain insertion is a quite common procedure, a correct training is required before being able to do it properly and safely [10]. As a matter of fact, complication rates are strictly related to the experience of the operator [4].

When to insert a chest drain

According to clinical features of the patient, chest drain can be placed on the trauma location, and therefore outside hospital, or in the trauma bay or even in the first 24 hours after hospitalization of the patient. The best timing to insert a chest drain in case of thoracic trauma depends on clinical signs and symptoms (for example: shortness of breath, reduced motion of one hemithorax).

Pre-hospital, on field chest drain insertion mostly relies on clinical examination that should reveal open or tension pneumothorax or massive haemothorax. In this context, physical examination, and in particular auscultation, have a high sensitivity and specificity (90% and 98% respectively) [10]. Nevertheless, a repeated examination is important to avoid missing a possible progression of an unrecognized pneumothorax [11].

There are two main sites of insertion that are commonly used for the positioning of chest drains: the ventral approach, on the second intercostal space on the mid-clavicular line (Monaldi approach); and the lateral approach at 4th–6th intercostal space on the anterior or mid axillary line (Bülau approach) [14, 15]. Although British guidelines suggest a preference for the Bülau approach, the use of these techniques for a trauma mainly relies on trauma scenario, operator experience and contents of the pleura. More in detail, the Monaldi approach might be preferred in case of isolated apical pneumothorax, while the lateral approach is used in case of pleural effusions or large pneumothoraxes.

Huber-Wagner and his colleagues [16] prospectively analysed outcomes in terms of complications and chest tube malposition according to the different approach in 55 trauma patients over a 1-year period: the authors did not find any statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of overall malposition, but they found a significant higher rate of intra-parenchymal placement using the ventral approach ($P=0.045$) and a higher rate of intrafissural placement using the lateral approach ($P=0.013$). Concurrently, they did not observe other complications such as empyema or organ damage in none of the groups. Finally, no differences for both malposition and complications were found when they considered only drains inserted on the trauma scene. Authors conclude that, although the Bülau approach was usually preferred by operators, both techniques might be equally considered safe and effective in a trauma scenario.

Size, type and material of chest drain Several types and measures of chest drain are available: silicon, polyvinyl chloride (PVC) or pig tails are the most commonly used. External diameter of drains is reported in French or Charrière (Fr and Ch respectively, equivalent to 0.333 mm); nevertheless, real inner diameter is dependent on the thickness of the chest tube itself [17].

There is a general lack of high-grade evidence regarding type and size of tube to be placed in case of trauma. Recommendation of Advanced Trauma Life Support (ATLS) [9] and the British Thoracic Society guidelines [15] suggest the use of a large bore chest drain (more than 28–30 Fr) in case of acute haemothorax, which could allow to better assess real blood loss. These recommendations are actually supported by physics laws: according to both Poiseuille's law and Fanning equation for the flow of fluids and gas inside a tube, a small increase in tube diameter results in a consequent exponential increase in flow. Consequently, larger bore tubes are used as they are supposed to avoid clotting of the tube, but no randomized trials support these conclusions, which mainly rely on surgeons' habits [18, 19].

On the other hand, a preclinical study did not find significant drainage capacities comparing 19- and 28-Fr chest tubes [20]. Conversely, an in vitro study [21] reports the importance of different fluids' viscosity as a main factor in the choice of drain size.

Interestingly, results of clinical cohorts seem to be consistent with the possibility of use small bore chest drains also in case of haemothorax; Inaba *et al.*, [22] prospectively compared outcomes in patients treated with (relatively) small bore (28–32 Fr) chest tube versus a large bore (36–40 Fr) for trauma; authors did not find differences in terms of chest tube output and related complication.

Moreover, they did not find a significant higher rate of retained haemothorax in smaller bore drain group (11.8% and 10.7% in small and large bore group respectively, $P=0.981$).

Another American study reports a monocentric experience comparing the use of 14-Fr pigtail drains and conventional large bore drains in case of haemothorax in trauma patients [23, 24]. In details, the authors prospectively analysed failure and effectiveness of pig tails in patients with traumatic haemothorax with or without pneumothorax. Although pig tails were more likely to be inserted in a non-emergent situation, authors found a significant higher output in the pig tail group with no differences in failure rate. On the other hand, they appreciate a higher complication rate in the pig tail group compared to traditional chest tubes. Acknowledging limitations of a single centre non-randomized study, the authors recommend a routine use of small-bore pig tail drainages in case of traumatic haemo-(pneumo-) thorax.

As far as traumatic pneumothorax is concerned, pig tail or smaller bore chest drains are generally accepted by the largest part of thoracic surgeons. A recent randomized controlled trial [25] compared the use of 14-Fr pig tail and a 28-Fr silicon chest tube in the management of uncomplicated traumatic pneumothorax among 40 patients.

Outcomes in terms of duration, complications and failures were similar between the two groups, with a significantly lower pain in patients who were treated with a pig tail.

Nevertheless, data regarding pain assessment comparing small and large bore chest drains are inconsistent and several studies did not show any significant difference [22, 26–28].

Management

A recent meta-analysis [29] compared outcomes of three randomized trials on chest tube management after traumatic haemothorax and pneumothorax focusing on the use of water seal or suction. Despite a relatively small cohort of patients and several biases influencing the resulting quality of evidence, results of meta-analysis were in favour of gentle suction. More in details, when suction was used, patients experienced a significant reduction of both chest tube duration and length of stay in the hospital; moreover, a “moderate” evidence supported suction in case of air leak, while advantage was not likewise clear in case of clotted haemothorax.

Complications

Although chest drain insertion is a common practice in hospital, several even lethal complications can plague this procedure. Complication rate may vary from 6% to 37% [30–33], that reflects the high variability of the emergency setting and a non-standardized definition of complication.

The Mayo Clinic group elaborated a Tube Thoracostomy Complication Classification System to better define complications [34]. The authors divided complications in: insertional; positional; removal; infective-immunologic and Institutional/education/equipment. Positioning complication is indeed the most frequent among all kinds of complications [33, 35] and they are more likely to happen during emergency due to the usual complexity of this setting.

When chest drain is inserted inside the pleural space, malposition might be related to an intrafissural or intraparenchymal position [36]. A retrospective single centre study evaluated clinical consequences of intrapleural chest drain malposition (either intrafissural or intraparenchymal drains) in trauma patients focusing on replacement rate [37]. The authors did not find significant differences in the number of drains that need to be replaced among the groups (correctly positioned, intrafissural or intraparenchymal). Conversely, out-of-hospital insertion and non-targeted chest tubes (which did not reach the target area) showed to be the main factors influencing the replacement rate.

On the other hand, Huber-Wagner and colleagues [16] differentiate a radiological malposition and a malposition with a clinical relevance, pointing out that replacements should be reserved only for chest tubes with a clinical malposition. Lastly, an Indian prospective study [38] on 154 trauma patients evaluating the relationship

between radiological features of drain position and a particular clinical outcome (retained haemothorax) failed to find significant correlations.

Other complications include bleeding, subcutaneous placement, dislodgement, infection and laceration or perforation of other organs [4]. Bleeding is the most common complication and it is usually related to intercostal vein or artery injury (reported to be up to 75% of serious complications). Other intrathoracic vessels can be injured as well, with lower incidence but with a significantly higher morbidity and mortality [4]. According to a survey conducted in UK among several trusts, serious hemorrhage was almost 25% of all adverse clinical events [39]. Concurrently, heart can also be damaged with a high mortality rate. As mentioned before, lung can be relatively easily perforated during chest drain insertion; Harris and colleagues described intrapulmonary placement as the most common adverse clinical events accounting for 38% complication. Beside lung, also diaphragm can be lacerated, and possible abdominal organ injury might result (liver, spleen, stomach and colon). In case of severe organ injury, surgical exploration should be required.

Thoracotomy

In case of chest trauma which cannot be treated with a chest drain alone or when the chest drain reveals a more severe injury, surgical exploration is mandatory.

In general, penetrating traumas are more likely to require a thoracotomy compared to blunt traumas. Indeed, patients with no signs of life after blunt trauma have a worst prognosis and are generally not indicated for emergency thoracotomy.

In a monocentric series of more than 1,000 patients, Kulshrestha and colleagues report that thoracotomy was needed in 2.6% of chest trauma [6]. Conversely, a more recent Turkish paper [40] on a larger cohort of patients from I level trauma centre, report a thoracotomy rate as high as 6%. This difference is the result of epidemiology of trauma which is deeply influenced by several economic and social issues.

ATLS guidelines [9] recommend immediate thoracic surgical intervention in case of blood loss more than 1,500 mL at first or more than 200 mL/hour during the first 2–4 hours from chest tube placement; in case of endobronchial blood loss or tracheobronchial injury; and in case of heart or great vessel injuries. Moreover, a review of the literature by the Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma [41], suggest thoracotomy in case of penetrating trauma with or without vital signs and do not recommend thoracotomy in case of blunt traumas without vital signs. As a matter of fact, outcomes after emergency thoracotomy are strictly dependent on a correct patients' selection [42].

Which thoracotomy?

In emergency cases, anterolateral thoracotomy at 4th–6th intercostal space is usually performed. This approach usually guarantees a safe and large enough access for all emergent procedures, even great vessel clamping which might allow to save time to reach the operating theatre when the emergency thoracotomy is performed in the emergency room [6]. Nevertheless, in up to 20% of cases anterolateral thoracotomy might not be enough to guarantee a correct view of possible lesions; in these cases, clamshell or hemi-clamshell approaches can be performed [42].

The role of video-assisted thoracic surgery (VATS) Recently, VATS has been used more and more often in the treatment of elective lung resection and showed to be beneficial compared to thoracotomy in terms of postoperative chest pain [43]. Similarly, VATS has been proposed to be used also in selected patients with stable hemodynamic conditions for persistent non-massive haemothorax, persistent air leak, diaphragmatic rupture; moreover, also trauma sequelae such as empyema can be treated with a minimally invasive technique [5].

CONCLUSIONS

Chest traumas are one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality worldwide with different epidemiology due to economic and social factors; they require a careful management by emergency doctors or thoracic surgeons.

Following the stream of recent innovations, also thoracic trauma surgery is moving towards a minimally invasive approach. Thinner chest tubes are gathering more and more evidence to be as efficient as large bore drain; and VATS is carving out a role in case of post-traumatic surgical exploration. Nevertheless, high grade evidences to support all these innovations are currently lacking. Large clinical trials are therefore needed to correctly assess the role of new minimally invasive tools in the management of chest trauma [44].

REFERENCES

1. Lozano, R., Naghavi, M., Foreman, K., Lim, S., Shibuya, K., Aboyans, V., ... & Remuzzi, G. (2012). Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The lancet*, 380(9859), 2095-2128.

2. Simon, B., Ebert, J., Bokhari, F., Capella, J., Emhoff, T., Hayward III, T., ...& Smith, L. (2012). Management of pulmonary contusion and flail chest: an Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma practice management guideline. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 73(5), S351-S361.
3. Accidents and injuries statistics. Available online: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statisticsexplained/index.php/Accidents_and_injuries_statistics#Deaths_from_accidents_2C_injuries_and_assault
4. Molnar, T. F. (2017). Thoracic trauma: which chest tube when and where?. *Thoracic surgery clinics*, 27(1), 13-23.
5. Ludwig, C., & Koryllos, A. (2017). Management of chest trauma. *Journal of thoracic disease*, 9(Suppl 3), S172-177.
6. Kulshrestha, P., Munshi, I., & Wait, R. (2004). Profile of chest trauma in a level I trauma center. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 57(3), 576-581.
7. Kong, V. Y., Oosthuizen, G. V., & Clarke, D. L. (2015). Selective conservatism in the management of thoracic trauma remains appropriate in the 21st century. *The Annals of The Royal College of Surgeons of England*, 97(3), 224-228.
8. Blyth, A. (2014). Thoracic trauma. *BMJ*, 348, g1137.
9. American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma. Advanced Trauma Life Support for Doctors (ATLS), Student Course Manual. Chicago: American College of Surgeons, 2012.
10. Havelock, T., Teoh, R., Laws, D., & Gleeson, F. (2010). Pleural procedures and thoracic ultrasound: British Thoracic Society pleural disease guideline 2010. *Thorax*, 65(Suppl 2), i61-i76.
11. Waydhas, C., & Sauerland, S. (2007). Pre-hospital pleural decompression and chest tube placement after blunt trauma: a systematic review. *Resuscitation*, 72(1), 11-25.
12. Alrajhi, K., Woo, M. Y., & Vaillancourt, C. (2012). Test characteristics of ultrasonography for the detection of pneumothorax: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Chest*, 141(3), 703-708.
13. Rodriguez, R. M., Hendey, G. W., & Mower, W. R. (2017). Selective chest imaging for blunt trauma patients: The national emergency X-ray utilization studies (NEXUS-chest algorithm). *The American journal of emergency medicine*, 35(1), 164-170.
14. Tomlinson, M. A., & Treasure, T. (1997). Insertion of a chest drain: how to do it. *Br J Hosp Med*, 58, 248-252.
15. Laws, D., Neville, E., & Duffy, J. (2003). BTS guidelines for the insertion of a chest drain. *Thorax*, 58(Suppl 2), ii53-59.
16. Huber-Wagner, S., Körner, M., Ehrt, A., Kay, M. V., Pfeifer, K. J., Mutschler, W., & Kanz, K. G. (2007). Emergency chest tube placement in trauma care—which approach is preferable?. *Resuscitation*, 72(2), 226-233.
17. Cooke, D. T., & David, E. A. (2013). Large-bore and small-bore chest tubes: types, function, and placement. *Thoracic surgery clinics*, 23(1), 17-24.
18. Shalli, S., Saeed, D., Fukamachi, K., Gillinov, A. M., Cohn, W. E., Perrault, L. P., & Boyle, E. M. (2009). Chest tube selection in cardiac and thoracic surgery: A survey of chest tube-related complications and their management. *Journal of cardiac surgery*, 24(5), 503-509.
19. Light, R. W. (2011). Pleural controversy: optimal chest tube size for drainage. *Respirology*, 16(2), 244-248.
20. Niinami, H., Tabata, M., Takeuchi, Y., & Umezu, M. (2006). Experimental assessment of the drainage capacity of small silastic chest drains. *Asian Cardiovascular and Thoracic Annals*, 14(3), 223-226.
21. Park, J. K., Kraus, F. C., & Haaga, J. R. (1993). Fluid flow during percutaneous drainage procedures: an in vitro study of the effects of fluid viscosity, catheter size, and adjunctive urokinase. *AJR. American journal of roentgenology*, 160(1), 165-169.
22. Inaba, K., Lustenberger, T., Recinos, G., Georgiou, C., Velmahos, G. C., Brown, C., ...& Rhee, P. (2012). Does size matter? A prospective analysis of 28–32 versus 36–40 French chest tube size in trauma. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 72(2), 422-427.
23. Bauman, Z. M., Kulvatunyou, N., Joseph, B., Jain, A., Friese, R. S., Gries, L., ...& Rhee, P. (2018). A prospective study of 7-year experience using percutaneous 14-French pigtail catheters for traumatic hemothorax/hemopneumothorax at a level-1 trauma center: Size still does not matter. *World Journal of Surgery*, 42(1), 107-113.
24. Kulvatunyou, N., Joseph, B., Friese, R. S., Green, D., Gries, L., O'Keeffe, T., ...& Rhee, P. (2012). 14 French pigtail catheters placed by surgeons to drain blood on trauma patients: is 14-Fr too small?. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 73(6), 1423-1427.
25. Kulvatunyou, N., Erickson, L., Vijayasekaran, A., Gries, L., Joseph, B., Friese, R. F., ...& Rhee, P. (2014). Randomized clinical trial of pigtail catheter versus chest tube in injured patients with uncomplicated traumatic pneumothorax. *Journal of British Surgery*, 101(2), 17-22.
26. Horsley, A., Jones, L., White, J., & Henry, M. (2006). Efficacy and complications of small-bore, wire-guided chest drains. *Chest*, 130(6), 1857-1863.
27. Feenstra, T. M., Dickhoff, C., & Deunk, J. (2018). Systematic review and meta-analysis of tube thoracostomy following traumatic chest injury; suction versus water seal. *European Journal of Trauma and Emergency Surgery*, 44, 819-827.
28. Bailey, R. C. (2000). Complications of tube thoracostomy in trauma. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 17(2), 111-114.

29. Deneuville, M. (2002). Morbidity of percutaneous tube thoracostomy in trauma patients. *European journal of cardio-thoracic surgery*, 22(5), 673-678.
30. Menger, R., Telford, G., Kim, P., Bergey, M. R., Foreman, J., Sarani, B., ...& Sims, C. A. (2012). Complications following thoracic trauma managed with tube thoracostomy. *Injury*, 43(1), 46-50.
31. Sritharen, Y., Hernandez, M. C., Haddad, N. N., Kong, V., Clarke, D., Zielinski, M. D., &Aho, J. M. (2018). External validation of a tube thoracostomy complication classification system. *World Journal of Surgery*, 42, 736-741.
32. Filosso, P. L., Sandri, A., Guerrero, F., Roffinella, M., Bora, G., &Solidoro, P. (2017). Management of chest drains after thoracic resections. *Thoracic Surgery Clinics*, 27(1), 7-11.
33. Filosso, P. L., Sandri, A., Guerrero, F., Ferraris, A., Marchisio, F., Bora, G., ...&Oliaro, A. (2016). When size matters: changing opinion in the management of pleural space—the rise of small-bore pleural catheters. *Journal of thoracic disease*, 8(7), E503-E510.
34. Aho, J. M., Ruparel, R. K., Rowse, P. G., Brahmabhatt, R. D., Jenkins, D., & Rivera, M. (2015). Tube thoracostomy: a structured review of case reports and a standardized format for reporting complications. *World journal of surgery*, 39, 2691-2706.
35. Hernandez, M. C., Laan, D. V., Zimmerman, S. L., Naik, N. D., Schiller, H. J., &Aho, J. M. (2016). Tube thoracostomy: increased angle of insertion is associated with complications. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 81(2), 366-370.
36. Filosso, P. L., Guerrero, F., Sandri, A., Roffinella, M., Solidoro, P., Ruffini, E., &Oliaro, A. (2017). Errors and complications in chest tube placement. *Thoracic surgery clinics*, 27(1), 57-67.
37. Struck, M. F., Ewens, S., Fakler, J. K., Hempel, G., Beilicke, A., Bernhard, M., ...&Krämer, S. (2019). Clinical consequences of chest tube malposition in trauma resuscitation: single-center experience. *European Journal of Trauma and Emergency Surgery*, 45, 687-695.
38. Kumar, S., Agarwal, N., Rattan, A., &Rathi, V. (2014). Does intrapleural length and position of the intercostal drain affect the frequency of residual hemothorax? A prospective study from north India. *Journal of Emergencies, Trauma, and Shock*, 7(4), 274-279.
39. Harris, A., O'Driscoll, B. R., &Turkington, P. M. (2010). Survey of major complications of intercostal chest drain insertion in the UK. *Postgraduate medical journal*, 86(1012), 68-72.
40. Demirhan, R., Onan, B., Oz, K., &Halezeroglu, S. (2009). Comprehensive analysis of 4205 patients with chest trauma: a 10-year experience. *Interactive cardiovascular and thoracic surgery*, 9(3), 450-453.
41. Seamon, M. J., Haut, E. R., Van Arendonk, K., Barbosa, R. R., Chiu, W. C., Dente, C. J., ... & Rhee, P. (2015). An evidence-based approach to patient selection for emergency department thoracotomy: a practice management guideline from the Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 79(1), 159-173.
42. Karmy-Jones, R., Nathens, A., Jurkovich, G. J., Shatz, D. V., Brundage, S., Wall Jr, M. J., ...& Long, W. (2004). Urgent and emergent thoracotomy for penetrating chest trauma. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 56(3), 664-669.
43. Bendixen, M., Jørgensen, O. D., Kronborg, C., Andersen, C., &Licht, P. B. (2016). Postoperative pain and quality of life after lobectomy via video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery or anterolateral thoracotomy for early stage lung cancer: a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Oncology*, 17(6), 836-844.
44. Guerrero, F., Renaud, S., Tabbò, F., &Filosso, P. L. (2017). How to design a randomized clinical trial: tips and tricks for conduct a successful study in thoracic disease domain. *Journal of thoracic disease*, 9(8), 2692-2696.