BF SYSTEMES

DEFENCE R&D DÉFENSE

UHMS Topic: "Diving/Decompression Illness: Theory and Mechanisms"

A stress index to enhance DCS risk assessment for both air and mixed gas exposures

Julien HUGON[a], Ron NISHI[b], Fethi BOUAK[c]
Jean-Eric BLATTEAU[d], Emmanuel GEMPP[e]

a BF Systemes – Technopole de la Mer, 229 chemin de la Farlède, 83500 La Seyne sur Mer, France
b Defence R&D Canada – Toronto (retired), Toronto, ON, Canada.
c Defence Research and Development Canada, Toronto Research Centre, 1133 Sheppard Avenue West, Toronto, Canada
d Institut de Recherche Biomédicale des Armées, Équipe de Recherche Subaquatique Opérationnelle, BP 600 Toulon Cedex 9, France,
e French Navy diving school, BP 311 83800 Toulon cedex 9, France

e-mail for correspondence : julien.hugon@bf-systemes.fr

UHMS Annual Scientific Meeting 2015 – Montreal - June 17th-20th

Background of Scientific Research (1/2)

There are two common ways to assess decompression-induced physiological stress for dive exposures and associated decompression procedures :

- **Statistical predictive tools calibrated with a large diving profile/DCS database (1)**

  - ➔ **<u>Interest</u>: helps to verify the adequacy of the last version of the US Navy air decompression tables in terms of DCS risk target (2)**

  - ➔ **<u>Limitation</u>: doesn't consider inter / intra individual variability *wrt* DCS susceptibility**

(1)- Weathersby PK, Homer LD, Flynn ET. On the likelihood of decompression sickness. J Appl Physiol 1984; 57: 815-825
(2) -Gerth WA, Doolette D. VVAL-18 and VVAL-18M Thalmann algorithm – Air decompression tables and procedures. Research Report 07-09. Panama City, FL: US NEDU; 2007.

Background of Scientific Research (2/2)

❖ Detection of bubbles using Doppler ultrasound

➔ DCIEM/DRDC approach (3) ; $N_{exposures}$=3234 and N_{DCS}=73



Dives	Number	Person Dives	Depth (msw)	BottomTime
Nitrox	354	1726	15-91	5-100 min
Heliox	252	1508	31-100	9-100 min
Total	606	3234	15-100	5-100 min

➔ <u>Interest</u>: method used extensively by DCIEM/DRDC Toronto Research Centre from the 80's to develop and validate decompression tables for the Royal Canadian Navy

➔ <u>Limitation</u>: doesn't consider pressure profile/decompression profile to assess DCS risk

(3)- Sawatzky KD. The relationship between intravascular Doppler-detected gas bubbles and decompression sickness after bounce diving in humans. MSc thesis, York University, Toronto; 1991

Objectives

- **We try to determine a simple composite decompression stress index combining both approaches i.e. considering :**

  - ➔ **the dive profiles**
  - ➔ **the bubble grades detected at precordial level**

- **Such combination should lead to improved DCS risk assessment and predictability compared to indices based on bubble detection alone or profile consideration alone**

Materials and Methods (1/3)

- In statistics, a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve illustrates the performance of a binary classifier system as its discrimination threshold is varied.
- ROC analysis can help to identify a relevant diagnostic test.
- ROC analysis is increasingly used in many areas (ex: medicine).
- Accuracy is measured by the area under the ROC curve (AUC) :

❖ .90-1 = excellent (A)
❖ .80-.90 = good (B)
❖ .70-.80 = fair (C)
❖ .60-.70 = poor (D)
❖ .50-.60 = fail (F)

		Condition (as determined by "Gold standard")		
		Condition positive	Condition negative	
Test outcome	Test outcome positive	True positive	False positive (Type I error)	Precision = Σ True positive / Σ Test outcome positive
	Test outcome negative	False negative (Type II error)	True negative	Negative predictive value = Σ True negative / Σ Test outcome negative
		Sensitivity = Σ True positive / Σ Condition positive	Specificity = Σ True negative / Σ Condition negative	Accuracy

Materials and Methods (2/3)

- **Several decompression stress indices based on the inert gas load, Q, in the body and the total ascent time, TAT, were investigated for single air dives (no oxygen) and mixed gas exposures (with oxygen) merging a part of DRDC database and a part of US NEDU database (4)**

	DRDC database									
	Up to 1991 (Sawatzky)					Up to 2013				
Gas	man*dives	DCS	DCS Type 1	DCS Type 2	DCS Type M	man*dives	DCS	DCS Type 1	DCS Type 2	DCS Type M
AIR/NITROX	1726	41	32	7	2	2149	58	42	10	6
HELIOX	1508	32	32	0	0	5297	41	32	3	6
TRIMIX	-	-	-	-	-	1245	7	1	6	0
ALL GAS	3234	73	64	7	2	8691	106	75	19	12

		DRDC (Pressure profile+DCS+Bubble grades)				*NMRC (Depth/BT/Ascent+DCS)*			
	Gas	**man*dives**	**DCS**	**DCS Type M**	**PDCS (CI95%)**	**man*dives**	**DCS**	**DCS Type M**	**PDCS (CI95%)**
SINGLE DIVES (No Repet /No SD)	***AIR***	1041	29	3	2.8% [1.9-4.0]	1738	200	69	11.5% [10.1-13.1]
	AIR#OXYGEN (@9m)	420	12	2	2.9% [1.6-4.9]	284	26	9	9.2% [6.3-13.1]
	HELIOX/TRIMIX#OXYGEN (@9m ; %He>40%)	3241	23	0	0.7% [0.5-1.1]	-	-	-	-
		4702	64			2022	226		

(4)- Temple DJ, Ball R, Weathersby PK, Parker EC, Survanshi SS. The dive profiles and manifestations of decompression sickness case after air and nitrogen-oxygen dives. Report NMRC 99-02 (Vol. I and Vol. II). Bethesda, MD: Naval Medical Research Center; 1999

Materials and Methods (3/3)

- **The best index obtained was then applied to DRDC database only to estimate the usefulness of bubble detections to improve DCS predictability :**

  ➔ the bubble database was used to modulate the index according to the observed DCS risk ratio between bubble grades to obtain the best ROC curves for diagnosis

Results (1/2)

The best decompression stress index identified when all the data are merged is

$$I=\beta*(Q-Q^*)/TAT^{\alpha}$$

where $Q = P\sqrt{t}$, Q*=12 a threshold value, $\alpha=0.3$ and

- β=1 for air dives
- β=0.8 for air with oxygen decompression dives
- β=0.3 for mixed gas dives



		P√t	P√t gas modulation	I
	ROC AUC (CI95%)	0.654 (+/- 0.027)	0.816 (+/- 0.018)	0.851 (+/- 0.015)
	ΔAUC z / p	-	z=9.67 ; p<0.001	z=2.94 ; p<0.005
Youden point	Value	23.5	16.3	2.7
	Sensitivity	0.79	0.94	0.90
	Specificity	0.49	0.58	0.64
	PPV	6.1%	9.3%	10.0%
	NPV	98.1%	99.6%	99.3%
	LR+	1.6	2.3	2.5
	LR-	0.45	0.09	0.16
	OR	3.5	23.9	15.7
	RR	3.4	21.8	14.2

Results (2/2)

➔ Modulation of the index according to the observed DCS risk ratio between bubble grades to obtain the best ROC curves for diagnosis (5)



	I	Ib
ROC AUC (CI95%)	0.867 (+/- 0.032)	0.895 (+/- 0.027)
ΔAUC z / p	-	z=2.14 ; p<0.05

	AIR	HELIOX/TRIMIX +OXY
Grade 0	I--->I_b=I-1,95	I--->I_b=I-0,5
Grade 1	I--->I_b=I+0,15	I--->I_b
Grade 2	I--->I_b=I+0,15	I--->I_b
Grade 3	I--->I_b=I+1,10	I--->I_b+0,3
Grade 4	I--->I_b=I+2,10	I--->I_b+1,8

Risk Ratio	AIR	HELIOX/TRIMIX +OXY
Grade 1/Grade 0	5,5	1,5
Grade 2/Grade 0	6,0	1,5
Grade 3/Grade 0	14,0	2,0
Grade 4/Grade 0	74,0	7,0

(5)- HanleyJA, McNeil. A method of comparing the areas under receiver operating characteristic curves derived from the same cases. Radiology 1983; 148: 839-843

Conclusions

- **The combination of diving profile, the gas breathed and the bubble monitoring information improves the predictability of DCS risk.**
- **The AUC obtained are adequate for diagnostic purposes, with the index qualifying as “good” to “excellent” according to statistic standards**
- **A probabilistic model calibrated using both diving profile and bubble grade observations will consequently refine DCS risk predictability at group and individual levels**

Special thanks

We would like to thank CAL DIVE INTERNATIONAL for its early and long term collaboration that helped to consolidate the analysis and the results presented here

e-mail for correspondence : julien.hugon@bf-systemes.fr

Backup slide

AIR	P√t	I	Ib
ROC AUC (CI95%)	0.684 (+/-0.032)	0.786 (+/-0.065)	0.841 (+/-0.052)
ΔAUC z / p	-	z=3.90 ; p<0.0005	z=2.16 ; p<0.05

HELIOX/TRIMIX +OXY	P√t	I	Ib
ROC AUC (CI95%)	0.872 (+/-0.046)	0.885 (+/-0.042)	0.915 (+/-0.032)
ΔAUC z / p	-	z=0.43 ; p>0.05	z=1.61 ; p>0.05



PDCS NMRI98 predictions *vs* current PDCS=f(I) approach