

GROUND GLASS OPACITIES IN LUNG CANCER PATIENTS POSITIVE FOR COVID-19

TARIQ F¹, IRFAN A², SATTAR A³, ASLAM MA⁴, SHEIKH R⁵

1. Department of Medicine, Sahiwal Teaching Hospital Sahiwal, Pakistan

2. Department of Emergency, Shifa International Islamabad, Pakistan

3. Department of Radiology, Nishter Medical University and hospital (NMU& H) Multan, Pakistan

4. Department of Statistical Analysis, Bahauddin Zakariya University (BZU) Multan, Pakistan

5. Department of Radiologist, Children's Hospital & University of Child Health Sciences (CH & UCHS) Lahore,

Pakistan

*Correspondence author email address: <u>adnanaslam628@yahoo.com</u>

(Received, 9th September 2022, Revised 11st January 2023, Published 13th January 2023)

Abstract: This study was designed to evaluate radiological features of COVID-19 and early lung cancer through High-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) and demonstrated the disparity between them. A retrospective was conducted in the COVID-19 ward, Oncology & Radiology ward of CH& UCHS Lahore & Shifa International Hospital Islamabad & NMU & H Multan from October 14, 2019, to October 14, 2020. A total of 100 COVID-19 patients and 300 patients with pulmonary ground-glass opacities undergoing lung surgery (control group) were included in the study. After propensity score-matched analysis, patients were divided into two groups with 80 matched pairs each. Both groups' clinical, pathological, epidemiological, and radiological characteristics (evaluated through HRCT) were compared. It was observed that COVID-19 patients presented more definite symptoms, were mostly younger men, and had higher BMI (body-mass index). After the radiological analysis of the matched patients, it was revealed that single-lesion patients constituted 17% of COVID-19 cases and 89% of lung cancer cases. Patients in both groups mainly presented peripheral lesions. COVID-19 lesions had more lobes and segments and had various types with patchy forms. On the other hand, lung cancer tended to have only one type and had an oval form. Both COVID-19 and lung cancer showed ground-glass opacities with similar but independent characteristics. These characteristics, combined with pathogen detection, short-term CT examination, and laboratory tests, will aid in improved diagnosis.

Keywords: COVID-19, Lung cancer, Radiology, Propensity score analysis, Ground-glass opacity

Introduction

Severe acute respiratory syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) caused COVID in 2019, and WHO declared it a global health emergency on January 30, 2020 (DECLARATION, 2001). The virus infected 8,525,000 people and caused 456,000 deaths till June 20, 2020. The pathogenesis of this infection usually has three stages. During the early stage, the virus binds to angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE-2), infecting nasal cells and leading to a low inflammatory response. Afterward, the virus reaches the respiratory airways, and clinical manifestations appear by this time. Lastly, the virus infects alveolar cell Type-II of the lungs by entering gas exchange units. Almost 20% of infected individuals reach this stage and have pulmonary infiltrates, severe disease

including acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), and frank lung injury develops in some cases (Wu et al., 2020). Rapidly transmitting virus calls for establishing consensus guidelines for preventing transmission and facilitating diagnosis (Miao et al., 2020). At current gold standard for its diagnosis is virus gene sequencing and Real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). Still, these procedures are time-consuming, resulting in an extended diagnostic cycle (Covid et al., 2019). Different stages of COVID-19 are remarkably demonstrated by chest high-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) (Covid et al., 2019). Consolidative pulmonary opacities or patchy ground-glass opacities (GGOs) are mainly observed on CT scans. Consolidation and



enlargement of GGOs imply an increase in pneumonia (Chung et al., 2020). Along with having a central role in the evolution of the extent of pulmonary involvement in the disease, thoracic Ct significantly detects false-negative COVID-19 patients having nucleic acid tests because diagnostic CT findings are observed in these patients (Xie et al., 2020).

Early stages of lung cancer have been effectively screened using low-dose CT (LDCT). Potentially malignant lesions are indicated by GGOs on this CT (Team, 2013). It may be difficult to distinguish early lung cancer from COVID -19 because of the similarity of CT finding in both, particularly in nucleic acid-positive and asymptomatic patients. According to some reports, patients with both COVID-19 and early lung cancer did not show symptoms of pneumonia. Few were surgically treated but had severe life-threatening pneumonia (Tian et al., 2020) Therefore, it is essential to differentiate between two diseases, which GGOs indicate. In this study, we will evaluate the radiological features of COVID-19 and early lung cancer through High-resolution computed tomography (HRCT) and demonstrate the disparity between them.

Methods

A retrospective was conducted from October 14, 2019, to October 14, 2020, in the COVID-19 ward, Oncology, and radiology ward of CH & UCHS Lahore, Shifa International Hospital Islamabad & NMU & H Multan for one year. A total of 100 COVID-19 patients and 300 patients with pulmonary ground-glass opacities undergoing lung surgery (control group) were included in the study. Epistle 2000 software was used to calculate sample size by considering the 90% power of the test. A consecutive non-probability sampling technique was used. People with neurological disorders, chronic illness, and cancer in other areas were excluded. Medical records of the patients were used to obtain demographic data, symptoms, history, CT findings, and laboratory tests. Patients were also interviewed to obtain data do not present in the record. Standard chest protocol was followed for CT examinations: the patient was laid in a supine position, arms were raised, and the patient was asked to hold their breath. The following characteristics were analyzed in each patient: lung lesion type, lesion distribution, lesion form, number of affected lobes, frequency of lobe affected, number of segments affected, frequency of segment affected, and other findings like air bronchogram, tree-in-bud, centrilobular nodules, bronchial dilation, reticular pattern, cystic change, subpleural linear opacity, pleural retraction, pleural effusion, lymphadenopathy, and vessel convergence sign. Trained radiologists evaluated CT scans. The study was conducted after approval Ref# 11-108 dated 23-09-2019 from the ethical board. Propensity score matched (PSM) analysis was performed between both groups to minimize bias resulting from non-randomized data collection. A multivariable logistic regression model with covariates was used to calculate each patient's propensity score. This model showed significant

propensity score. This model showed significant baseline differences, including age, gender, body mass index (BMI), tumor history, digestive disease, and cardio-cerebrovascular disease. Wilcoxon ranksum test was used for comparing continuous variables between both groups. These were represented as median (interquartile range (IQR)). Categorical variables were compared using Fisher's exact test or Pearson's Chi-squared test. R-software was used for statistical analysis. *P-value* <0.05 was statistically significant.

Results

A total of 300 patients with early lung cancer and 100 patients with COVID-19 were included in the study. Subjects in the COVID-19 group were younger and had higher BMI than those with lung cancer. Commodities like digestive disease, tumor history, and cardiovascular disease were much lower in patients with COVID-19. The clinical and demographic data before and after PSM are shown in Table-I. After propensity score-matched analysis, patients were divided into two groups with 80 matched pairs each. Before PSM, most COVID-19 patients had an exposure history, some traveled to pandemic areas, and some had close contact with infected patients. Pneumonia symptoms, including fever, cough, snot, dyspnea, sputum, muscle soreness, diarrhea, and chest distress, were more prevalent in COVID-19 patients than in those with lung cancer. According to laboratory tests at the time of admission, patients with COVID-19 had lower white blood cell count and lymphocyte count and higher aspartate aminotransferase than those with lung cancer. D-dimer, alanine aminotransferase, and Neutrophil count did not significantly vary between the groups. The difference in laboratory findings, the incidence of symptoms, and exposure history were consistent after PSM. Nevertheless, the incidence of muscle soreness and dyspnea were no longer much different in the two groups. D-dimer and neutrophil counts reached a significant difference.

CovID-19 n=100Lung Cancer n=300P valueCovID-19 n=80Lung Cancer n=80P ne80Sex (%)100100Male55 (55%)105 (35%)38 (48%)38 (47%)100Female45(45%)195 (65%)42 (52%)42 (53%)Age (vars), median47(37-56)59 (50-67)<.000151 (42-58)53 (42-61).77BM Lg/m2, median25 (22-27)24 (22-26).01424 (22-26)24 (23-27).71History of exposure (%)24 (30%)0.0%)Contact with an infected person31 (31%)0.0%)24 (30%)0.0%)History of travel to the epidemic area5 (5%)36 (12%).0346 (7%)5 (6%).100Digestive disease18 (18%)84 (28%).02717 (13%)18 (22%).88.88Digestive disease6 (6%)27 (9%).356 (7%)2 (2%).50.6001Endorine disease6 (6%)21 (7%).00872 (2%).6001.68Tumo history1 (1%)21 (7%).00872 (2%).00%).50Symptoms (*).00%).20%).00%).50.50.001Symptom (*).00%).20%).00%).50.50.001.50Symptom (*).00%).00%).00%).20%).00%).50.50.	Variables	Before PSM			After PSM		
Male 55 (55%) 105 (35%) 38 (48%) 38 (47%) Female 45 (45%) 195 (65%) 42 (52%) 42 (53%) Age (years), median 25 (22-27) 24 (22-26) .014 24 (22-27) .71 History of exposure (%) .0001 .014 24 (22-27) .71 History of exposure (%) .0001 .0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.0001 <.00% <.00% <.0001 <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% <.00% .0				P value			
Female 45(45%) 195 (65%) 42 (52%) 42 (53%) Age (years), median 47(37-56) 59 (50-67) <.0001 51(42-58) 53(42-61) .77 BMI kg/m2, median 25(22-27) 24(22-26) .014 24(22-26) 24(23-27) .71 BMI kg/m2, median 25(22-27) 24(22-26) .014 24(22-26) 24(23-27) .71 BMI kg/m2, median 25(22-27) .24(22-26) .014 24(22-26) 24(23-27) .71 Contact with an infected person 31 (31%) 0 (0%) .24 (30%) 0.0%) .0001 Contact with an infected person 31 (31%) 0 (0%) .45 (57%) 0 (0%) .24 (30%) 0.0%) Comorbidity (%) .027 17 (21%) 18 (22%) .88 Digestive disease 5 (5%) 36 (12%) .034 6 (7%) 3 (4%) .41 Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) .26 .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4 %)	Sex (%)			<.0001			1.00
Age (years), median 47(37-56) 59 (50-67) <.0001	Male	55 (55%)	105 (35%)		38 (48%)	38 (47%)	
BMI kg/m2, median 25(22-27) 24(22-26) .014 24(22-26) 24(23-27) .71 History of exposure (%)	Female	45(45%)	195 (65%)		42 (52%)	42 (53%)	
History of exposure (%) <	Age (years), median	47(37-56)	59 (50-67)	<.0001	51(42-58)	53(42-61)	
Contact with an infected person 31 (31%) 0 (0%) 24 (30%) 0 (0%) History of travel to the epidemic area 54 (54%) 0(0%) 46 (57%) 0 (0%) Comorbidity (%) - - - - - Cardiovascular disease 18 (18%) 84 (28%) .027 17 (21%) 18 (22%) .88 Digestive disease 5 (5%) 36 (12%) .034 6 (7%) 5 (6%) 1.00 Endocrine disease 6 (6%) 27 (9%) .35 6 (7%) 3 (4%) .41 Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) .2 (2%) .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4 %) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Tumor history 1 (1%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) .0001 57 (82%) .0001 Comoshi (2%) .0001 Comoshi (2%) .0001 So .0001 So .0001 So .0001 So .0001 So .0001 .0006 .0001	BMI kg/m2, median	25(22-27)	24(22-26)	.014	24(22-26)	24(23-27)	.71
History of travel to the epidemic area 54 (54%) 0(0%) 46 (57%) 0(0%) Comorbidity (%)	History of exposure (%)			<.0001			<.0001
epidemic area Image: Comorbidity (%) Comorbidity (%) .027 17 (21%) 18 (22%) .88 Digestive disease 5 (5%) 36 (12%) .034 6 (7%) 5 (6%) 1.00 Endocrine disease 6 (6%) 27 (9%) .35 6 (7%) 3 (4%) .41 Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) 2 (2%) .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4%) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Tumor history 1 (1%) 2 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 1.00 Symptoms (%) .0071 67 (82%) 0 (0%) <.0001 Cough 59 (5%) 15 (5%) .0001 67 (82%) 6 (7%) <.0001 Sputum 32 (32%) 6 (2%) .0001 23 (29%) 0 (0%) .0001 Sputum 32 (32%) 0 (0%) .0002 3 (4%) 0 (0%) .0001 Spate 8 (8%) 0 (0%) .0001 5 (6%) 0 (-	31 (31%)	0 (0%)		24 (30%)		
Comorbidity (%) Image: Cardiovascular disease 18 (18%) 84 (28%) .027 17 (21%) 18 (22%) .88 Digestive disease 5 (5%) 36 (12%) .034 6 (7%) 5 (6%) 1.00 Endocrine disease 6 (6%) 27 (9%) .35 6 (7%) 5 (6%) .41 Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) 2 (2%) .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4%) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Tumor history 1 (1%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 1.00 Symptoms (%) T T .0001 67 (82%) 0 (0%) <.0001 Sp(59%) 15 (5%) <.0001 46 (58%) 6 (7%) <.0001 Sputum 32 (32%) 6 (2%) .00062 3 (4%) 0 (0%) .0001 Dyspnea 2 (2%) 0(0%) .0001 5 (6%) 0 (0%) .0001 Diarrhea 8 (8%) 0(0%) .0001 5 (6%)	History of travel to the	54 (54%)	0(0%)		46 (57%)	0 (0%)	
Cardiovascular disease 18 (18%) 84 (28%) .027 17 (21%) 18 (22%) .88 Digestive disease 5 (5%) 36 (12%) .034 6 (7%) 5 (6%) 1.00 Endocrine disease 6 (6%) 27 (9%) .35 6 (7%) 3 (4%) .41 Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) 2 (2%) .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4%) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Symptoms (%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Symptoms (%)							
Digestive disease 5 (5%) 36 (12%) .034 6 (7%) 5 (6%) 1.00 Endocrine disease 6 (6%) 27 (9%) .35 6 (7%) 3 (4%) .41 Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) 2 (2%) .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4 %) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Tumor history 1 (1%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 1.00 Symptoms (%) Ever 78(78%) 3 (1%) <.0001 67 (82%) 0 (0%) <.0001 Cough 59(59%) 15 (5%) <.0001 23 (29%) 1 (2%) <.0001 Sputum 32 (32%) 6 (2%) .00062 3 (4%) 0 (0%) .0001 Dyspnea 2 (2%) 0(0%) .00062 3 (4%) 0 (0%) .020 Diarrhea 8 (8%) 0 (0%) <.0001 5 (6%) 0 (0%) .032 Laboratory findings, median 4.7 (3.7-6.1) 5.2 (4.4-6.1) .00027 <th>Comorbidity (%)</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Comorbidity (%)						
Endocrine disease 6 (%) 27 (9%) .35 6 (7%) 3 (4%) .41 Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) 2 (2%) .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4 %) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Tumor history 1 (1%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 1.00 Symptoms (%)	Cardiovascular disease	18 (18%)	84 (28%)	.027	17 (21%)	18 (22%)	.88
Neuropathy 0 (0%) 6 (2%) .19 0 (0%) 2 (2%) .50 Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4 %) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Tumor history 1 (1%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 1.00 Symptoms (%) <th>8</th> <th>5 (5%)</th> <th>36 (12%)</th> <th></th> <th>6 (7%)</th> <th>5 (6%)</th> <th>1.00</th>	8	5 (5%)	36 (12%)		6 (7%)	5 (6%)	1.00
Respiratory disease 2 (2%) 12 (4 %) .34 2 (2%) 3 (3%) .68 Tumor history 1 (1%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 1.00 Symptoms (%) 5 2 (2%) 1.00 5 Fever 78(78%) 3 (1%) <.0001	Endocrine disease	6 (6%)	27 (9%)	.35	6 (7%)	3 (4%)	.41
Tumor history 1 (1%) 21 (7%) .0087 2 (2%) 1.00 Symptoms (%)	Neuropathy	0 (0%)	6 (2%)	.19	0 (0%)		.50
Symptoms (%) Fever 78(78%) 3 (1%) <.0001	Respiratory disease	2 (2%)	12 (4 %)	.34	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	.68
Fever 78(78%) 3 (1%) <.0001	Tumor history	1 (1%)	21 (7%)	.0087	2 (2%)		1.00
Cough 59(59%) 15 (5%) c0001 46 (58%) 6 (7%) <0001	Symptoms (%)						
Sputum 32 (32%) 6 (2%) <.0001	Fever	78(78%)	3 (1%)		67 (82%)	0 (0%)	<.0001
Dyspnea 2 (2%) 0(0%) .026 2 (2%) 0(0%) .50 Snot 4(4%) 0(0%) .00062 3 (4%) 0 (0%) .060 Chest distress 10(10%) 3 (1%) <.0001	Cough	59(59%)	15 (5%)		46 (58%)	6 (7%)	<.0001
Snot 4(4%) 0(0%) .00062 3 (4%) 0 (0%) .060 Chest distress 10(10%) 3 (1%) <.0001	Sputum	32 (32%)	6 (2%)	<.0001	23 (29%)	1 (2%)	<.0001
Chest distress 10(10%) 3 (1%) <.0001	Dyspnea	2 (2%)	0(0%)	.026	2 (2%)	0(0%)	.50
Diarrhea 8 (8%) 0(0%) <.0001	Snot	4(4%)	0(0%)	.00062	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	.060
Laboratory findings, median	Chest distress	10(10%)	3 (1%)	<.0001	9(11%)	1 (2%)	.020
White blood cell 4.7 (3.7-6.1) 5.2 (4.4-6.1) .00027 4.6 (3.4-5.8) 5.5 (4.6-6.5) .0001 Neutrophil 2.65 (2.0-4.0) 2.82 (2.31-3.61) .16 2.70(1.90-4.00) 3.08 (2.50-3.70) .032 Lymphocyte 1.30 (.99-1.66) 1.71 (1.40-2.1) <.0001 1.20 (.91-1.60) 1.75 (1.51-2.11) <.0001 Alanine aminotransferase 20.1 (14.1-34.0) 20.0 (15.0-27.0) .11 18.6 (13.4-33) 20.0(15.0-30.0) .85 Aspartate aminotransferase 24.0 (20.0-35.5) 21 (18.0-26.0) <.0001 24 (20-34.5) 21.0 (17.0-25.0) <.0001 D-dimer .26 (.19-53) .25(.1938) .29 .28 (.2064) .22(.1733) .017	Diarrhea	8 (8%)	0(0%)	<.0001	5 (6%)	0 (0%)	.014
Neutrophil 2.65 (2.0-4.0) 2.82 (2.31-3.61) .16 2.70(1.90-4.00) 3.08 (2.50-3.70) .032 Lymphocyte 1.30 (.99-1.66) 1.71 (1.40-2.1) <.0001 1.20 (.91-1.60) 1.75 (1.51-2.11) <.0001 Alanine aminotransferase 20.1 (14.1-34.0) 20.0 (15.0-27.0) .11 18.6 (13.4-33) 20.0 (15.0-30.0) .85 Aspartate aminotransferase 24.0 (20.0-35.5) 21 (18.0-26.0) <.0001 24 (20-34.5) 21.0 (17.0-25.0) <.0001 D-dimer .26 (.19-53) .25 (.1938) .29 .28 (.2064) .22 (.1733) .017	Laboratory findings, median						
Lymphocyte 1.30(.99-1.66) 1.71(1.40-2.1) <.0001	White blood cell	4.7 (3.7-6.1)	5.2 (4.4-6.1)	.00027	4.6 (3.4-5.8)	5.5 (4.6-6.5)	.0001
Alanine aminotransferase 20.(14.1-34.0) 20.0(15.0-27.0) .11 18.6(13.4-33) 20.0(15.0-30.0) .85 Aspartate aminotransferase 24.0(20.0,35.5) 21 (18.0-26.0) <.0001	Neutrophil	2.65 (2.0-4.0)	2.82 (2.31-3.61)	.16	2.70(1.90-4.00)	3.08 (2.50-3.70)	.032
Aspartate aminotransferase 24.0 (20.0,35.5) 21 (18.0-26.0) <.0001		1.30 (.99-1.66)	1.71 (1.40-2.1)	<.0001	1.20 (.91-1.60)	1.75 (1.51-2.11)	<.0001
D-dimer (26 (.19-53) .25 (.1938) .29 .28 (.2064) .22 (.1733) .017	Alanine aminotransferase	20.1 (14.1-34.0)	20.0 (15.0-27.0)	.11	18.6 (13.4-33)	20.0(15.0-30.0)	.85
	Aspartate aminotransferase	24.0 (20.0-35.5)	21 (18.0-26.0)	<.0001	24 (20-34.5)	21.0 (17.0-25.0)	<.0001
Viral nucleic acid detection / 100 (100%) NA NA 80 (100%) NA NA	D-dimer	.26 (.1953)	.25(.1938)	.29	.28 (.2064)	.22(.1733)	.017
	Viral nucleic acid detection	100 (100%)	NA	NA	80 (100%)	NA	NA

Table-I: Clinical and Demographic Characters of Subjects included in the study

According to the CT scan results, ten patients with COVID-19 had negative radiological findings. One thousand lung lesions were observed in 100 COVID -19 patients. Four hundred lesions were observed in 300 lung cancer patients. Peripheral lesions were predominantly present in both groups (760/1000 in COVID-19, 296/400 in lung cancer). The proportion of consolidation, mixed GGO, and pure GGO were 15%, 59%, and 28%, respectively, in COVID-19 patients, while in lung cancer patients, these proportions were 6%, 48%, and 47%. CT findings between both groups were quantitatively compared (Table II). The form, type, number, specific features, and distribution of lesions before and after PSM were comparable. Among the matched groups, a single lesion was present in 14/80 COVID-19 patients and 71/80 patients with lung cancer. More lobes and segments were involved in COVID-19 patients compared to lung cancer patients. More than one type of lung lesion was found in the majority of COVID-19 patients (54/80, 67%), while patients with lung cancer either had mixed GGO (32/80, 40%) or pure GGO (40/80, 50%). COVID-19 patients had patchy lesions, while those with lung cancer had oval lesions. Pleural effusion and lymphadenopathy were observed in 6/80 (8%) and 3/80 (4%) patients. Cystic change and air bronchogram were present in both groups.

Table II: Radiological Findings

[Citation: Tariq, F., Irfan, A., Sattar, A., Aslam, M.A., Sheikh, R. (2023). Ground glass opacities in lung cancer patients positive for COVID-19. *Biol. Clin. Sci. Res. J.*, **2023**: 181. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.54112/bcsrj.v2023i1.181</u>]

Variables	Before PSN	1		After PSM		
	COVID-	Lung	Р	COVID-	Lung	Р
	19	cancer	value	19	cancer	value
	n=100	n=300		n=80	n=80	
Single lesion	17 (17%)	261 (87%)	<.0001			<.0001
No. of involved lobe, median	5 (2-7)	1 (1-1)	<.0001	14 (17%)		<.0001
No. of segments involved,	7 (2-13)	1 (1-1)	<.0001			<.0001
median						
Type of lesion						
Pure GGO	4 (4%)	141 (47%)	<.0001	1 (1%)	40 (50%)	<.0001
Mixed GGO	17 (17%)	126 (42%)	<.0001	17 (21%)	32 (40%)	.0013
Consolidation	3 (3%)	12 (4%)	.95	3 (4%)	2 (2%)	.45
Pure and mixed GGO	34(34%)	18 (6%)	<.0001	26 (32%)	4 (5%)	<.0001
Pure GGO and consolidation	1 (1%)	3 (1%)	1.00	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1.00
Mixed GGO and consolidation	16 (16%)	3 (1%)	<.0001	10 (12%)	2 (2%)	.0044
Pure and mixed consolidation	20 (20%)	0 (0%)	<.0001	19 (24%)	0 (0%)	<.0001
Form of lesion						
Oval	4 (4%)	189 (63%)	<.0001	4 (5%)	5 3 (66%)	<.0001
Patchy	49 (49%)	90 (30%)	<.0001	43 (54%)	24 (30%)	.00026
Oval and patchy	36 (36%)	21 (7%)	<.0001	27 (34%)	3 (4%)	<.0001
No lesion	11 (11%)	0 (0%)	<.0001	6 (7%)	0 (0%)	.0033
Distribution of lesion						
Unilateral lung	17 (17%)	285 (95%)	<.0001	75 (94%)	78 (97%)	<.0001
Bilateral lung	72 (72%)	15 (5%)	<.0001	59 (74%)	2 (3%)	<.0001
No lesion	7 (7%)	0 (0%)	<.0001	6 (7%)	0 (0%)	.0033
Lymphadenopathy	4 (4%)	0(0%)	.0011	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	.060
Pleural effusion	7 (7%)	0(0%)	<.0001	6 (8%)	1 (1%)	.014
COVID-19 patients had more	e frequent	air mu	ltinucleate	d giant cells,	vascular conges	stion, and

patients had more frequent aır bronchogram, while cystic changes were rare. Moreover, reticular pattern, bronchial dilation, tree-in-bud, and subpleural linear opacity, centrilobular nodules were observed in COVID-19 patients, while none were in lung cancer patients. On the other hand, lung cancer patients had vessel convergence signs, pleural retraction, and lobulated signs, while COVID-19 patients did not show any of these.

Discussion

Thousands of people have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic worldwide. The major challenge is ensuring the specificity and sensitivity of the diagnosis. CT scan, in addition to the nucleic acid test, is a practical diagnostic method for COVID-19. Additionally, despite the negative nucleic acid test, COVID-19 still could be present (Fang et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020). It is very important to differentiate the early stages of lung cancer from COVID-19. GGO-appearing CT scans show attenuation and damage to the alveoli. Imaging matched pathological findings results like proteinaceous exudes and alveolar edema, where multinucleated giant cells, vascular congestion, and inspissated secretion were seen in the airspaces. Additionally, alveolar activity was decreased due to the proliferation of interstitial fibroblasts and pneumocytes (Tian et al., 2020). GGO is predominantly found in the radiographic image of both early lung cancer and COVID-19. Both could demonstrate patchy or oval, unilateral or bilateral GGO in the form of multiple or single lesions, which makes it challenging to discriminate between both. This similarity can confuse the surgeons and lead to inappropriate surgical intervention.

Despite these difficulties, differentiating characteristics are found in our study that will aid in reaching the correct diagnosis. This study shows that patchy bilateral GGOs are predominantly present in COVID-19, while oval unilateral GGOs are present in lung cancer. Distribution and shape are consistent with past studies (Bernheim et al., 2020). COVID-19 can be distinguished by reticular pattern, bronchial dilation, subpleural linear opacity, tree-in-bud, and centrilobular nodules. On the other hand, lung cancer is featured by vessel convergence, cystic change, pleural retraction, and lobulated signs. During the

[Citation: Tariq, F., Irfan, A., Sattar, A., Aslam, M.A., Sheikh, R. (2023). Ground glass opacities in lung cancer patients positive for COVID-19. *Biol. Clin. Sci. Res. J.*, **2023**: *181*. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.54112/bcsrj.v2023i1.181</u>]

initial stage of COVID-19, classical GGO and occasional consolidation are observed; another study confirmed this finding (Hanif et al., 2021). After five days, lesions lesion increases in size with disease progression, and additional features like crazy paving pattern, reverse halo sign, and fibrous stripe begin to appear; an increase in GGO is related to progressing malignancies (Chang et al., 2020). Though these are subtle differences are of high value in distinguishing these diseases; however, diagnosis of COVID-19 requires thorough assessment, epidemiological investigation, laboratory tests, and clinical symptoms. Patients with shortness of breath, fever, myalgia, and cough should be focused on (Chang et al., 2020). Travel history to epidemic areas and contact with those infected with COVID-19 are also considered during diagnosis. Above all, the nucleic acid test remains the gold standard for a definite diagnosis (Nicholls et al., 2003). It is essential and clinically significant to analyze the distinction between CT findings of early lung cancer and COVID-19. GGO in CT scans can help diagnose asymptomatic COVID-19 patients and those with negative nucleic acid pneumonia, thus limiting transmission and decreasing missed diagnosis rates. Patients with lung cancer should be extensively evaluated to exclude COVID-19 before surgery. The possibility of misdiagnosing COVID-19 as lung cancer and vice versa should be reduced. Rash decision exposed the patient to COVID-19 and surgical trauma. Upon reaching a definitive

surgical trauma. Upon reaching a definitive diagnosis, treatment of COVID-19 should be prioritized (Zhang et al., 2020). COVID-19 has monopolized human and economic

COVID-19 has monopolized human and economic resources of the health system worldwide and has affected the diagnosis and treatment of lung cancer, leading to poor prognosis (Talic et al., 2021; Wong et al., 2022). COVID-19 pneumonia is more severe in oncological patients and has worse complications (Fusco et al., 2021; Mitrev et al., 2021). Despite overlapping and similar findings, the combination of radiological and clinical findings can lead to differential diagnoses. It is important to understand the classic radiological feature of COVID-19 phases on HRCT (Kostakoglu et al., 2021; Tabassum et al., 2022). Atypical findings like vessel invasion, lymphadenopathies, and unresponsiveness to therapy are associated with lung cancer. The radiological features of lung cancer and COVID-19 discussed in our study can be used for developing protocols for early diagnosis and intervention to improve life expectancy. However, this study has a few limitations like a small sample size and shorter study period, due to which more detailed studies are required to validate our results.

Conclusion

The distinctive features of GGOs in patients with early-stage lung cancer and COVID-19, along with laboratory tests, patient history, and pathogen detection, will aid in differential diagnosis and lower the rate of miss diagnosis.

Grant Support & Financial Disclosures: None. Conflict of interest

The authors declared absence of conflict of interest. **References**

- Bernheim, A., Mei, X., Huang, M., Yang, Y., Fayad,
 Z. A., Zhang, N., Diao, K., Lin, B., Zhu, X., and Li, K. (2020). Chest CT findings in coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19): relationship to duration of infection. *Radiology*.
- Chang, D., Lin, M., Wei, L., Xie, L., Zhu, G., Cruz, C. S. D., and Sharma, L. (2020).
 Epidemiologic and clinical characteristics of novel coronavirus infections involving 13 patients outside Wuhan, China. Jama 323, 1092-1093.
- Chung, M., Bernheim, A., Mei, X., Zhang, N., Huang, M., Zeng, X., Cui, J., Xu, W., Yang, Y., and Fayad, Z. A. (2020). CT imaging features of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019nCoV). *Radiology*.
- Covid, C., Pan, F., Ye, T., Sun, P., Gui, S., Liang, B., and Li, L. (2019). Time course of lung changes at chest CT during recovery. vol.
- DECLARATION, M. (2001). World Trade Organization (WTO)-DOHA ministerial 2001: ministerial declaration [November 14, 2001]+ Cite as 41 ILM 746 (2002).
- Fang, Y., Zhang, H., Xie, J., Lin, M., Ying, L., Pang, P., and Ji, W. (2020). Sensitivity of chest CT for COVID-19: comparison to RT-PCR. *Radiology*.
- Fusco, R., Grassi, R., Granata, V., Setola, S. V., Grassi, F., Cozzi, D., Pecori, B., Izzo, F., and Petrillo, A. (2021). Artificial intelligence and COVID-19 using chest CT scan and chest Xray images: machine learning and deep learning approaches for diagnosis and

[Citation: Tariq, F., Irfan, A., Sattar, A., Aslam, M.A., Sheikh, R. (2023). Ground glass opacities in lung cancer patients positive for COVID-19. *Biol. Clin. Sci. Res. J.*, **2023**: *181*. doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.54112/bcsrj.v2023i1.181</u>]

- Hanif, N., Rubi, G., Irshad, N., Ameer, S., Habib, U., and Zaidi, S. R. H. (2021). Comparison of HRCT Chest and RT-PCR in Diagnosis of COVID-19. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak 31, S1-S6.
- Huang, P., Liu, T., Huang, L., Liu, H., Lei, M., Xu, W., Hu, X., Chen, J., and Liu, B. (2020). Use of chest CT in combination with negative RT-PCR assay for the 2019 novel coronavirus but high clinical suspicion. Radiology.
- Kostakoglu, U., Kant, A., Atalar, S., Ertunc, B., Erensoy, S., Dalmanoglu, E., Yilmaz, I., Sevimli, B., Erturk, A., and Yilmaz, G. (2021). Diagnostic value of chest ct and initial real-time rt-pcr in covid-19 infection. Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences 37, 234.
- Miao, H., Li, H., Yao, Y., Wu, M., Lu, C., Wang, J., Tian, M., Li, Y., Luo, P., and Gu, J. (2020). Update on recommendations for the diagnosis and treatment of SARS-CoV-2 infection in children. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases 39, 2211-2223.
- Mitrev, L. V., Banerjee, A., and Van Helmond, N. (2021). Correlation of Country Characteristics and Government Response Measures With COVID-19 Mortality During the First Phase of the Global COVID-19 Pandemic: Worldwide Ecological Study. Cureus 13.
- Nicholls, J. M., Poon, L. L., Lee, K. C., Ng, W. F., Lai, S. T., Leung, C. Y., Chu, C. M., Hui, P. K., Mak, K. L., and Lim, W. (2003). Lung pathology of fatal severe acute respiratory syndrome. The Lancet 361, 1773-1778.
- Tabassum, S., Haider, S., and Shaukat, S. (2022). Spectrum of HRCT Scan Chest Findings in COVID-19 Patients as Categorized by Modified CO-RADS Classification. Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences 38, 838.
- Talic, S., Shah, S., Wild, H., Gasevic, D., Maharaj, A., Ademi, Z., Li, X., Xu, W., Mesa-Eguiagaray, I., and Rostron, J. (2021). Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of covid-19, SARS-Cov-2 transmission, and covid-19 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. bmj 375.
- Team, N. L. S. T. R. (2013). Results of initial lowdose computed tomographic screening for lung cancer. New England Journal of Medicine 368, 1980-1991.
- Tian, S., Hu, W., Niu, L., Liu, H., Xu, H., and Xiao, S.-Y. (2020). Pulmonary pathology of early phase SARS-COV-2 pneumonia. J Thorac *Oncol* **15**, 700-4.

Tariq et al., (2023)

- H., Li, X., Lung, D. C., Chu, A. W.-H., Ip, J. D., Chan, W.-M., and Tsoi, H.-W. (2022). Transmission of Omicron (B. 1.1. 529)-SARS-CoV-2 Variant of Concern in a designated quarantine hotel for travelers: a challenge of elimination strategy of COVID-19. The Lancet Regional Health-Western Pacific 18.
- Wu, G., Yang, P., Xie, Y., Woodruff, H. C., Rao, X., Guiot, J., Frix, A.-N., Louis, R., Moutschen, M., and Li, J. (2020). Development of a clinical decision support system for severity risk prediction and triage of COVID-19 patients at hospital admission: an international multicentre study. European Respiratory Journal 56.
- Xie, X., Zhong, Z., Zhao, W., Zheng, C., Wang, F., and Liu, J. (2020). Chest CT for typical 2019nCoV pneumonia: relationship to negative RT-PCR testing. Radiology.
- Zhang, Y.-J., Yang, W.-J., Liu, D., Cao, Y.-Q., Zheng, Y.-Y., Han, Y.-C., Jin, R.-S., Han, Y., Wang, X.-Y., and Pan, A.-S. (2020). COVID-19 and early-stage lung cancer both featuring ground-glass opacities: a propensity scorematched study. Translational Lung Cancer *Research* 9, 1516.

(i) (s) CC

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0International License, which permits use, adaptation, distribution sharing. and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licen ses/by/4.0/. © The Author(s) 2023

[Citation: Tariq, F., Irfan, A., Sattar, A., Aslam, M.A., Sheikh, R. (2023). Ground glass opacities in lung cancer patients positive for COVID-19. Biol. Clin. Sci. Res. J., 2023: 181. doi: https://doi.org/10.54112/bcsrj.v2023i1.181]