

the sensitivity of 72% (95% confidence interval, 63%-81%) obtained in our study.

We agree with Hernández Blasco et al that quality of the radiological study and interobserver variation are factors that can affect the diagnostic yield of the technique. We doubt, however, the role of delays in diagnosis in the results obtained in our series. In fact, the delays in diagnosis for our patients with pulmonary embolism³ were similar to those for patients in a North American multicenter registry recently published.⁴

The results reported by Hernández Blasco et al support our conclusions on the importance of *a*) validating the yield of the technique in each setting and *b*) interpreting the result based on the pretest clinical probability of the patient.

**David Jiménez Castro
and Gema Díaz Nuevo**
Servicio de Neumología,
Hospital Ramón y Cajal,
Departamento de Medicina,
Universidad de Alcalá de Henares,
Madrid, Spain

Authors' Reply

To the Editor: We appreciate the interest of Hernández Blasco et al (previous letter) in our study evaluating the diagnostic yield of single-detector computed tomography (CT) angiography of the chest in the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism.¹

Granted, CT angiography sensitivity in our study was inferior to that of the studies mentioned by Hernández Blasco et al. However, our results are comparable to those of the PIOPED II study,² the most rigorously designed prospective multicenter study to evaluate the diagnostic utility of chest CT angiography for patients with suspected pulmonary embolism. In that study, a central independent panel of radiologists interpreted multislice CT angiography and obtained a sensitivity of 82% (95% confidence interval, 77%-88%); that value shows no statistically significant difference from

1. Jiménez D, Gómez M, Herrero R, et al. Aparición de episodios tromboembólicos en pacientes con angiotomografía axial computarizada simple negativa: estudio retrospectivo de 165 pacientes. Arch Bronconeumol. 2006;42:344-8.
2. Stein PD, Fowler SE, Goodman LR, et al. Multidetector computed tomography for acute pulmonary embolism. N Engl J Med. 2006;354:2317-27.
3. Jiménez D, Sueiro A, Díaz G, et al. Prognostic significance of delays in diagnosis of pulmonary embolism. Thromb Res. [in press] 2007.
4. Elliot CG, Goldhaber SZ, Jensen RL. Delays in diagnosis of deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism. Chest. 2005;128:3372-6.