FROM VALIDATION TO INTELLIGENT INTEGRATION: FAST AND eFAST ACROSS CONTEMPORARY EMERGENCY TRAUMA SYSTEMS

Brzanov N.

[1]*University Clinic for Traumatology, Orthopedic Disease, Anesthesiology, Reanimation and Intensive Care Medicine and Emergency Department, Faculty of Medicine, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, RN Macedonia*

What Was Known: A Diagnostic Revolution

Focused Assessment with Sonography for Trauma (FAST) emerged in the 1990s as a transformative bedside innovation that redefined the tempo of trauma evaluation. By replacing diagnostic peritoneal lavage with a rapid, non-invasive ultrasonographic assessment, FAST shifted early trauma imaging from invasive confirmation toward immediate physiologic decision support. Its early validation established high specificity for clinically significant hemoperitoneum and reproducibility in hemodynamically unstable patients.

The subsequent evolution into extended FAST (eFAST), incorporating thoracic assessment for pneumothorax and hemothorax, expanded ultrasound into a multi-compartment resuscitative tool (1–3). Rather than pursuing anatomical completeness, eFAST aligns imaging with survival physiology, focusing on the detection of air or fluid as markers of life-threatening pathology. Performed concurrently with resuscitation, it preserves the primacy of airway, breathing, and circulation while enabling real-time decision-making. Its repeatability supports dynamic reassessment during evolving shock states, and in selected populations such as pregnancy, it provides radiation-free evaluation without compromising diagnostic immediacy (2).

Extended FAST (eFAST) is structured as a rapid bedside examination performed by the treating clinician during active resuscitation. By focusing on the detection of air and free fluid, it translates ultrasonography into immediate physiologic decision-making, particularly in hemodynamically unstable patients, where a positive examination may directly prompt surgical intervention. In contrast, in stable patients, computed tomography remains the gold standard for detailed evaluation of solid organ and retroperitoneal injury, while eFAST may serve as a triage or follow-up modality (2,6).

During this foundational phase, the scientific discourse was primarily concerned with validation: sensitivity, specificity, predictive values, and interobserver reliability. The central question was clear — does FAST reliably detect life-threatening fluid collections?

Early validation studies established FAST as a highly specific tool for detecting clinically significant intraperitoneal free fluid, particularly in unstable trauma. Its sensitivity, however, remained context-dependent, shaped by injury pattern, timing, and operator expertise (3–6). From the outset, FAST functioned less as a screening instrument and more as a rule-in test guiding emergent operative decision-making. Several studies also examined interobserver agreement and learning curves, demonstrating that structured training programs enabled non-radiologist clinicians — including emergency physicians and surgeons — to achieve reproducible diagnostic accuracy. This finding was pivotal, as it supported the decentralization of ultrasound from radiology departments into trauma bays and emergency settings (1,7-8). FAST marked a decisive departure from diagnostic peritoneal lavage (DPL), replacing invasive detection of bleeding with rapid, repeatable visualization that refined operative decision-making without interrupting resuscitation (9).

With the introduction of extended FAST (eFAST), further validation studies confirmed its high accuracy for pneumothorax detection, in several analyses demonstrating superior sensitivity compared with supine chest radiography in trauma patients. This expansion reinforced ultrasound's role as a multi-compartment bedside diagnostic modality rather than a purely abdominal tool (1,3,10). Contemporary systematic reviews continue to reaffirm these findings, consolidating decades of validation research and confirming the sustained diagnostic robustness of FAST/eFAST within trauma resuscitation protocols. What began as a question of diagnostic accuracy ultimately evolved into confirmation that FAST had secured its place within the trauma diagnostic armamentarium (3). The next phase of its evolution would no longer be defined by proof of accuracy, but by system-level integration.

The Present Moment: Algorithmic Integration and Systemic Deployment

By 2025–2026, the focus has shifted. FAST is no longer evaluated solely on whether it works, but on how it functions within structured trauma systems. Recent analyses examining integration within Advanced Trauma Life Support (ATLS) frameworks demonstrate that embedding FAST into predefined hemodynamic algorithms shortens time to operative intervention and refines triage pathways (1). FAST has matured from a binary diagnostic test into a decision-modifying component of trauma workflow architecture (3,11,12), effectively transitioning from an imaging modality to an operational doctrine within trauma resuscitation. Regional implementation data reinforce this paradigm. A prospective cohort study evaluating structured eFAST integration in polytrauma care demonstrated reduced diagnostic delay compared with CT-centric pathways while maintaining high concordance for thoracic and abdominal injury detection (4). Importantly, this study positioned FAST as a system-level intervention influencing workflow efficiency rather than merely diagnostic accuracy.

Yet integration demands governance. Variability in documentation, credentialing, and quality assurance remains a persistent challenge in contemporary POCUS practice (1,3,12). Thus, the modern debate surrounding FAST is no longer epistemic — it is structural.

Governance and the Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMIC) Imperative

The maturation of FAST intersects profoundly with global health policy. The World Health Organization's Essential Diagnostics List and the Lancet Commission on Global Surgery underscore persistent inequities in access to advanced imaging modalities worldwide (13,14).
In many LMICs, CT imaging may be geographically limited, financially inaccessible, or operationally delayed. In such settings, FAST is not merely complementary; it frequently becomes the primary imaging modality guiding urgent decision-making. This reality elevates the ethical responsibility for structured implementation — encompassing formal training standards, credentialing frameworks, image archiving systems, and integration into national trauma protocols (1,3,14).
When governed effectively, FAST can mitigate diagnostic inequity and accelerate access to definitive care. Without governance, variability risks undermining its reliability. The evolution of FAST therefore reflects not only technological progress but also health system design, workforce development, and policy accountability.

The Emerging Horizon: Technological Augmentation

The evolution of FAST increasingly reflects technological refinement rather than structural reinvention. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) is under investigation as an extension of conventional FAST to improve detection of solid organ injury and perfusion abnormalities (4,15). While computed tomography remains the diagnostic gold standard, CEUS may offer a radiation-sparing adjunct in selected hemodynamically stable trauma contexts. Beyond diagnostic enhancement, the contemporary trajectory of trauma ultrasound emphasizes functional integration. Serial FAST examinations enable dynamic assessment of evolving hemoperitoneum, particularly in borderline hemodynamic states, thereby extending its utility from screening to monitoring. Moreover, integration with focused cardiac and lung ultrasound facilitates hemodynamic phenotyping and resuscitation guidance, supporting more individualized damage-control decision-making.

Artificial intelligence (AI)–assisted ultrasound interpretation has entered early clinical evaluation, with emerging evidence suggesting improved detection of pathology and real-time acquisition guidance, potentially reducing operator variability (16). Parallel to algorithmic augmentation, robotic ultrasound systems represent a complementary technological frontier. Semi-autonomous robotic platforms enable controlled probe positioning, standardized acquisition, and force modulation, improving reproducibility and potentially supporting remote trauma assessment (17). The convergence of AI-driven interpretation and robotic-assisted acquisition may, in time, facilitate partially autonomous FAST protocols in prehospital and resource-limited environments. Importantly, the expanding role of ultrasound in trauma is not confined to diagnosis. It increasingly informs procedural interventions, risk stratification, and prognostic assessment, positioning FAST within the broader framework of precision resuscitation. However, technological expansion must be accompanied by governance addressing validation, regulatory oversight, algorithmic bias, and medico-legal accountability. The future of FAST will be defined not solely by enhanced imaging capability, but by responsible and system-integrated deployment.

Conclusion: Beyond Proof

FAST has undergone a substantial intellectual and clinical evolution. Initially validated as a rapid bedside tool characterized by high specificity and operational efficiency, it has matured into a structured component of trauma decision algorithms within integrated emergency systems. Its contemporary trajectory extends beyond diagnostic validation toward technological augmentation through contrast-enhanced techniques, artificial intelligence–assisted interpretation, robotic standardization, and expanded telemedical integration. The central question is no longer whether FAST is diagnostically reliable. Rather, it is whether trauma systems are sufficiently prepared — in terms of training, governance, infrastructure, and ethical oversight — to integrate emerging technologies responsibly and equitably. This transition from validation to intelligent system-level integration defines the current and future paradigm of trauma ultrasonography.

References:

1. American College of Emergency Physicians. Ultrasound Guidelines: Emergency, Point-of-Care and Clinical Ultrasound Guide- lines in Medicine. Ann. Emerg. Med. 2017, 69, e27–e54.
2. Testa, A.; Soldati, G.; Portale, G.; Pignataro, G.; Giannuzzi, R.; Silveri, N.G. EFAST: The evolution of FAST in politrauma. Emerg.Care J. 2009, 5, 7.
3. Bella FM, Bonfichi A, Esposito C, et al. Extended Focused Assessment with Sonography for Trauma in the Emergency Department: A Comprehensive Review. J Clin Med. 2025 May 15;14(10):3457. doi: 10.3390/jcm14103457.
4. Brzanov N, Brzanov AG, Kuzmanovska B, et al. Pioneering e-FAST in North Macedonia: A resource-efficient approach to polytrau- ma care (prospective cohort study). Scr Med. 2025 Nov-Dec;56(6):1095-106.

5. Brzanov N, Trpeski S, Shosholcheva M, Jovchevski V, Srceva Jovanovski M, Gavrilovska Brzanov A. Fast guided initial triage of polytrauma patients: a prospective evaluation of diagnostic timelines. MJA 2025;IX(4):39-49.
6. Kirkpatrick, A.W.; Sirois, M.; Laupland, K.B.; et al. Hand-held thoracic sonography for detecting post-traumatic pneumothoraces: The extended focused assessment with sonography for trauma (EFAST). J. Trauma Inj. Infect. Crit. Care 2004, 57, 288–295.
7. Salen, P.N.; Melanson, S.W.; Heller, M.B. The focused abdominal sonography for trauma (FAST) examination: Considerations and recommendations for training physicians in the use of a new clinical tool. Acad. Emerg. Med. 2000, 7, 162–168.
8. Neri, L.; Storti, E.; Lichtenstein, D. Toward an ultrasound curriculum for critical care medicine. Crit. Care Med. 2007, 35, S290–S304.
9. Rozycki GS, Ochsner MG, Jaffin JH, Champion HR. Prospective evaluation of surgeons' use of ultrasound in the evaluation of trauma patients. J Trauma. 1993 Apr;34(4):516-26; discussion 526-7. doi: 10.1097/00005373-199304000-00008
10. Brzanov N, Labacevski N, Antovik S, Trpevski S, Ognjenovic Lj, Gavrilovska – Brzanov A. Implementation of focused assessment with ultrasonography in trauma patients in university surgical emergency department. MJA, 2023; vol 7(3): 77-83.
11. Richards JR, McGahan JP. Focused Assessment with Sonography in Trauma (FAST) in 2017: What Radiologists Can Learn. Radiology. 2017 Apr;283(1):30-48. doi: 10.1148/radiol.2017160107.
12. Han, D.C.; Rozycki, G.S.; Schmidt, J.A.; Feliciano, D.V. Ultrasound Training during ATLS. J. Trauma Inj. Infect. Crit. Care 1996, 41, 208–213.
13. World Health Organization. WHO essential diagnostics list: 3rd edition (2021). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
14. Meara JG, Leather AJM, Hagander L, et al. Global Surgery 2030: Evidence and solutions for achieving health, welfare, and economic development. *Lancet.* 2015;386(9993):569–624. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60160-X.
15. Sidhu PS, Cantisani V, Dietrich CF, et al. The EFSUMB Guidelines and Recommendations for the Clinical Practice of Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) in Non-Hepatic Applications: Update 2017. Ultraschall Med. 2018 Apr;39(2):e2-e44. English. doi: 10.1055/a-0586-1107
16. Liu X, Faes L, Kale AU, Wagner SK, et al. A comparison of deep learning performance against health-care professionals in detecting diseases from medical imaging: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Digit Health. 2019 Oct;1(6):e271-e297. doi: 10.1016/S2589-7500(19)30123-2.
17. Jiang, Z.; Salcudean, S.E.; Navab, N. Robotic ultrasound imaging: State-of-the-art and future perspectives. Med. Image Anal. 2023, 89, 102878.