Association between Prolonged Intermittent Renal Replacement Therapy

and All-Cause Mortality in COVID-19 Patients Undergoing Invasive

Mechanical Ventilation: a Retrospective Cohort Study

Yi Yang*, Jia Shi*, Shuwang Ge*, Shuiming Guo, Xue Xing, Yanan Wang, Anying Cheng,

Qingquan Liu, Junhua Li, Yong Ning, Fan He# and Gang Xu#

Department of Nephrology, Tongji Hospital Affiliated to Tongji Medical College,

Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China

Short title: PIRRT in COVID-19 patients

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

#Correspondence Author:

Fan He and Gang Xu

Department of Nephrology

Tongji Hospital Affiliated with Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science

and Technology

1095 Jie Fang Avenue

Wuhan, Hubei 430030, China

Tel: +86-027-83662682 and +86-027-69378405

Email: fhe@tjh.tjmu.edu.cn and xugang@tjh.tjmu.edu.cn.

Number of Tables: 3

Number of Figures: 1

Word count: 2497

Keywords prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy · COVID-19 · invasive

mechanical ventilation · mortality

Abstract

Background: For the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), critically ill patients had a high mortality rate. We aimed to assess the association between prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy (PIRRT) and mortality in patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation. **Methods:** In this retrospective cohort study, we included all patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation from February 12nd to March 2nd, 2020. All patients were followed until death or March 28th, and all survivors were followed for at least 30 days. **Results:** For 36 hospitalized COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical ventilation, the mean age was 69.4 (± 10.8) years, and 30 patients (83.3%) were men. Twenty-two (61.1%) patients received PIRRT (PIRRT group) and 14 cases (38.9%) were managed with conventional strategy (non-PIRRT group). There were no differences in age, sex, comorbidities, complications, treatments and most of the laboratory findings. During median follow-up period of 9.5 (interquartile range 4.3-33.5) days, 13 of 22 (59.1%) patients in the PIRRT group and 11 of 14 (78.6%) patients in the non-PIRRT group died. Kaplan–Meier analysis demonstrated prolonged survival in patients in the PIRRT group compared with that in the non-PIRRT group (P = 0.042). The association between PIRRT and a reduced risk of mortality remained significant in three different models, with adjusted hazard ratios varying from 0.332 to 0.398. Higher levels of IL-2 receptor, TNF-α, procalcitonin, prothrombin time, and NT-proBNP were significantly associated with an increased risk of mortality in patients with PIRRT. **Conclusion:** PIRRT may be beneficial for the treatment of COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical ventilation. Further prospective multicenter studies with larger sample sizes are required.

Introduction

An outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection, officially named Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) occurred (1). In Wuhan, the fatality rate of COVID-19 was 5.1% (2538/50006). Of note, critically ill patients with COVID-19 have a high mortality rate. In a study of 52 critically ill patients in Wuhan, 32

(61.5%) patients had died after 28 days, and the mortality rate was 81.1% (30/37) in

patients requiring mechanical ventilation (2). Accumulated evidence has strongly

demonstrated that systemic inflammatory response, acute kidney injury (AKI) and fluid

overload (FO) were associated with high mortality in severe sepsis (3-5). In critically ill

patients with COVID-19, an overwhelming inflammatory response involving C-reactive

protein (CRP), interleukin (IL)-6, IL-8, IL-10, tumor necrosis factor α (TNF-α) was

observed (6-9), which is similar to that observed in patients suffering from SARS-CoV

(10) and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS)-CoV (11).

Renal replacement therapy (RRT) is a great help in treating critically ill patients not

only to control electrolyte and acid-base imbalances but also to remove inflammatory

mediators and improve oxygenation during fluid overload (12-14). RRT has been

applied to critically ill patients, including patients with SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV and other

viral infectious diseases such as Ebola virus disease (13, 15). However, the benefits of

RRT are still no consistent conclusion in critically ill patients (16). RRT significantly

reduced the level of IL-6 and decreased the hospital mortality rate in pediatric severe

sepsis, especially in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) (17). In

addition, a meta-analysis revealed that patients who received RRT had significantly

lower mortality compared to conventional therapy (18). Hoverer, RRT was associated

with increased mortality in patients with MERS-CoV (15). The relationship between RRT

and patient outcome varied in patients with different disease and was affected by the

modalities, use of anticoagulation, vascular access management, and the timing of the

initiation and intensity of RRT (16, 19, 20).

Prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy (PIRRT), as a cost-effective

alternative, has been used in the intensive care unit (ICU) (21, 22). To date, no specific

treatment has been confirmed to be effective for COVID-19, and supportive treatment

remains essential. In this retrospective cohort study, we aimed to explore the association

between PIRRT and all-cause mortality in patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive

mechanical ventilation.

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Participants

In this retrospective cohort study, we included all patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation at the Optical Valley Branch of Tongji Hospital, Wuhan, from February 12nd to March 2nd. We divided the study participants into two groups according to the use of PIRRT treatment (PIRRT group and non-PIRRT group).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

All included patients met the criteria for the diagnosis of COVID-19 according to the New Coronavirus Pneumonia Prevention and Control Program (5th edition, in Chinese) published by the National Health Commission of China (23). Invasive mechanical ventilation was defined as mechanical ventilation through an endotracheal tube or tracheostomy. There were no exclusion criteria.

Procedures

The baseline data at the beginning of invasive mechanical ventilation for each patient were collected and recorded at the start of invasive mechanical ventilation, including age, sex, comorbidities, complications, laboratory data, and treatments. All information was obtained and managed through established data collection forms. Two researchers independently reviewed and collected the data. AKI was defined as a 50% increase in serum creatinine within 7 days or a 0.3 mg/dL increase within 48 hours according to the Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) criteria (24).

PIRRT Procedures

We performed PIRRT using commercially available pump-driven machines (PrismaFlex, Gambro, Sweden; or multiFiltrate, Fresenius, Germany) and filters (M150, Gambro; Oxiris, Baxter; or AV1000s, Fresenius). For the patients with AKI, hemofiltration plus hemodialysis was performed. The blood flow rate was set at 2.5-4

mL/kg/min, and the clearance rate was set at 35-70 mL/kg/hr. The filter circuit was

prewashed with saline containing 5,000-6,250 IU/L heparin. Vascular access was

obtained with 13.5 F central venous catheters (Covidien, MA, USA) in the femoral vein.

9.1% (2/22) of patients received continuous hemodialysis. And 90.9% (20/22) of

patients received intermittent hemodialysis, 8 hours a day, once a day or every other day.

PIRRT modalities were venovenous hemodiafiltration in 22.7% (5/22) of patients and

venovenous hemofiltration in 77.3% (17/22) of patients.

The indications for PIRRT was: 1) Nonobstructive oliguria (urine output < 200

mL/12h) or anuria, or sepsis complicated by AKI; 2) Hyperkalemia (K+ > 6.5 mmol/L); 3)

Acidemia (PH < 7.1); 4) Clinically significant organ edema (especially pulmonary edema);

5) Uremic complications (pericarditis/encephalopathy/neuropathy/myopathy); 6)

Azotaemia (urea > 30 mmol/L); 7) (optional) increased inflammatory cytokines (anyone

of IL-1β, IL-2 receptor, IL-6, IL-8, or TNF-α ≥ 5 times of upper limit of normal range).

Outcomes

We followed up all patients through electronic hospital medical records. The

primary outcome was death. All patients were followed until death or March 28th, and all

survivors were followed for at least 30 days. There was no loss to follow-up for patients.

Statistical Analyses

Numerical data are presented as the means and standard deviation (SD) or medians

[interquartile range (IQR)] and were analyzed using Student's t-test or the

Mann-Whitney U test depending on the data distribution. Categorical variables were

displayed as frequencies and percentages and were analyzed using Fisher's exact test.

Paired t test or Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test was used to evaluate

differences of variables between before and after PIRRT. The Kaplan-Meier method was

used to estimate survival, and the log-rank test was used to evaluate differences between

the two groups. Univariate and multivariate Cox proportional hazards regression

analyses were performed for all-cause mortality. SPSS 23.0 (IBM Corporation, Armonk,

NY) statistical software was used for statistical analysis. GraphPad Prism 6 (GraphPad

Software, USA) was used for statistical analysis and visualization. A P-value of 0.05 or

less was considered significant.

Results

Description of the Cohort

In total, 36 COVID-19 patients subjected to invasive mechanical ventilation were

enrolled in the study. Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of the cohort patients.

There were 30 men (83.3%) and 6 women (16.7%) ranging in age from 44 to 86 years.

30 patients (83.3%) have at least one comorbidity, and the common comorbidity factors

in COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical ventilation were hypertension (n = 14,

38.9%) and cardiac disease (n = 12, 33.3%).

We divided the study participants into two groups according to PIRRT treatment.

Twenty-two patients received PIRRT (PIRRT group) while 14 patients did not

(non-PIRRT group). There was no difference between the two groups in baseline

characteristics including age, sex, acute physiology and chronic health evaluation

(APACHE) II scores, sepsis-related organ failure assessment (SOFA) scores,

comorbidities, complications, treatments or most laboratory findings, except for

patients who received PIRRT with higher levels of aspartate aminotransferase (P =

0.034) and serum creatinine (P = 0.017).

The indications for PIRRT (n = 22) were as follows: (1) AKI at stage 3 (serum

creatinine increase ≥ 3 times baseline with 7 days) with/without hyperkalemia or

pulmonary edema: n = 4; (2) hyperkalemia: n = 1; (3) acidemia: n = 1; (4) pulmonary

edema: n = 1; (5) (optional) increased inflammatory cytokines (anyone of IL-1β, IL-2

receptor, IL-6, IL-8, or TNF-α ≥ 5 times of upper limit of normal range): n = 15. There

was no definite indication of PIRRT for patients in non-PIRRT group. Our evaluation of

dialysis indications was consistent in all patients, except for inflammatory cytokines.

Furthermore, in the PIRRT group, IL-6 showed a significant difference before versus

after PIRRT (before vs. after PIRRT: median 221.35, IQR 111.23-427.40, vs. median

173 48.53, IQR 12.93-119.23, pg/mL, P = 0.001).

175 *Association between PIRRT and All-Cause Mortality in COVID-19 Patients Undergoing*

176 *Invasive Mechanical Ventilation*

177 All survivors were followed for at least 30 days. During the median follow-up period

178 of 9.5 (IQR 4.3-33.5) days, 13 of 22 (59.1%) patients in the PIRRT group and 11 of 14

179 (78.6%) patients in the non-PIRRT group died. Kaplan–Meier analysis indicated that the

180 patients in the PIRRT group had prolonged survival compared to those in the non-PIRRT

181 group (P = 0.04) (shown in Fig. 1).

182 In the Cox regression analysis, three different models were used to analyze the

183 adjusted hazard ratio for PIRRT treatment. Consistently, the association between PIRRT

184 treatment and a reduced risk of mortality remained significant and the adjusted hazard

185 ratio (aHRs) of PIRRT treatment fluctuated between 0.332 and 0.398 (Table 2).

187 *Risk Factors Associated with All-Cause Mortality for COVID-19 Patients Undergoing*

188 *Invasive Mechanical Ventilation with PIRRT Treatment*

189 We further conducted univariate Cox proportional hazard regression analyses of

190 all-cause mortality of COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation

191 with PIRRT. We found that higher levels of IL-2 receptor, TNF-α, procalcitonin,

192 prothrombin time, and NT-proBNP were significantly associated with an increased risk

193 of all-cause mortality (Table 3).

195 **Discussion**

196 To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first cohort study to estimate the

197 association between PIRRT treatment and the mortality of COVID-19 patients subjected

198 to invasive mechanical ventilation. We included 36 COVID-19 patients subjected to

199 invasive mechanical ventilation, of whom 22 patients received PIRRT. During the

200 follow-up, 59.1% of patients in the PIRRT group, and 78.6% of patients in the non-PIRRT

201 group died. PIRRT was independently associated with prolonged survival and a lower

risk of mortality in COVID-19 patients requiring invasive mechanical ventilation.

Excessive inflammation characterized by the uncontrolled release of

pro-inflammatory cytokines into circulation is the main cause of death from sepsis (25,

26), and infection with influenza virus (27), Ebola virus (28), MERS-CoV (29), and

SARS-CoV (30). In our study, we found that the cytokine storm might play a crucial role

in critical COVID-19 patients. The mean/median levels of inflammatory markers,

including IL-1β, IL-2 receptor, IL-6, IL-8, and IL-10, white blood cell count, neutrophil

count, hCRP, procalcitonin, and ferritin were higher than normal. And in our study,

univariate Cox proportional hazard regression analysis showed increased IL-6

[HR=1.004, 95% CI (1.001-1.007)] and TNF-α [HR=1.040, 95% CI (1.007-1.073)] were

both associated with increased risk of mortality of all patients with invasive mechanical

ventilation. In patients undergoing PIRRT, IL-6 showed significant difference before

versus after PIRRT: before vs. after PIRRT: 221.35 (IQR 111.23-427.40) vs. 48.53 (IQR

12.93-119.23), P=0.001.

Cytokine storms may be caused by the following aspects. First, SARS-CoV-2 infects

patients by binding human angiotensin (Ang)-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) (31, 32),

which is widely expressed in multiple organs throughout the body (33). SARS-CoV-2

might lead to multisystem inflammation through the ACE/Ang II/AT1R pathway and the

ACE2/Ang (1-7)/Mas receptor pathway (34, 35). Second, it was reported that

antibody-dependent enhancement (ADE) of SARS-CoV-2 due to prior exposure to other

coronaviruses might also be involved in COVID-19 (36). ADE can elicit sustained

inflammation, lymphopenia, and/or cytokine storm, which is a possible explanation for

the geographic limitation of severe cases. Third, combined infections may lead to a more

severe systemic inflammatory response. Indeed, in our study, some patients had

infections in other organs (e.g. urinary tract and blood) caused by other pathogens (e.g.,

influenza virus and fungi). Fourth, shock, hypoxemia and coagulation pathway

abnormalities in critical patients could aggravate the systemic inflammatory response,

which lead to a vicious cycle that is life-threatening (37, 38).

In our study, PIRRT was associated with prolonged survival in COVID-19 patients

with invasive mechanical ventilation. The primary goal of RRT is to compensate for the

loss of renal function and associated sequelae, including uremic toxicity, electrolyte

disturbances, metabolic acidosis, and volume overload (22, 39). In addition, RRT can

also remove cytokines from the bloodstream. Emerging evidence has shown that RRT

was associated with significantly lower mortality in patients with severe sepsis (17, 18,

40). Besides, in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome, RRT could remove

inflammatory mediators, modulate immune function, and regulate oxygenation, thus

improving patient prognosis (41-43). PIRRT is a widely used blood purification therapy,

that achieves a high solute clearance rate through diffusion and convection (44). PIRRT

has shown to encompass the benefits of both continuous RRT in terms of hemodynamic

stability and intermittent hemodialysis in terms of cost-efficiency in the intensive care

unit (22, 45).

However, it is controversial whether PIRRT is beneficial in viral pneumonia. RRT

was reported to have a positive effect on the treatment of adenovirus pneumonia (46).

Other studies revealed that PIRRT was a risk factor for mortality in patients with

MERS-CoV (15, 47). Yang et al also found that the proportion of nonsurvivors subjected

to RRT was higher among patients with COVID-19 (48). In our study, PIRRT was

associated with a reduced risk of mortality in COVID-19 patients requiring invasive

mechanical ventilation after adjusting for confounding factors. COVID-19 is a novel

infectious disease caused by a novel coronavirus, and the underlying pathophysiological

process associated with organ involvement is still unclear. In addition, the population

studied in our cohort was different from Yang et al., who focused on all critically ill

patients, while we focused on patients who received invasive mechanical ventilation.

Further research is needed to improve patient treatment and prognosis.

There were some limitations to our study. First, it is retrospective in design, and a

prospective double-blind randomized controlled study is warranted in the future.

Second, the sample size of this study was not large enough. Third, as it

is just a single-center study, multicenter studies are needed for further confirmation.

In summary, we demonstrated that PIRRT could improve COVID-19 patient survival

and might be an independent protective factor for COVID-19 patient survival, and might

be an independent protective factor for COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical

ventilation. Further prospective multicenter studies with larger sample sizes are

required.

Statements

Acknowledgements

The authors greatly appreciate all the hospital staff for their efforts in recruiting and

treating patients and thank all patients involved in this study.

Statement of Ethics

The study protocol and waiver of written informed consent were approved by the

Medical Ethics Committee of Tongji Hospital Affiliated to Tongji Medical College,

Huazhong University of Science and Technology (No. TJ-C20200333).

Disclosures Statement

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding Sources

This study was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC

81974089), international (regional) cooperation and exchange projects (NSFC-DFG,

Grant No. 81761138041), the Major Research Plan of the National Natural Science

Foundation of China (Grant No. 91742204), and the Science Foundation of Hubei

Province (2019CFB675).

Author Contributions

F.H., G.X., S.G. and Y.Y. conceived and designed the study. Y.N., J.L, Q.L., S.G., and F.H.

were in charge of management of patients. Y.Y., J.S., X.X., Y.W., A.C., and F.H. screened,

reviewed and recorded the data. Y.Y., J.S. and S.G. performed statistical analyses. Y.Y., J.S.

and S.G. drafted the manuscript. All authors provided critical revisions to the manuscript

text. All authors read the manuscript and approved the final version.

References

1.   Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients

with Pneumonia in China, 2019. The New England journal of medicine. 2020;382(8):727-33.

2.   Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill

patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective,

observational   study.   Lancet   Respir   Med.   2020,   Epub   ahead   of   print.

DOI:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5.

3.   Zarbock A, Gomez H, Kellum JA. Sepsis-induced acute kidney injury revisited:

pathophysiology,   prevention   and   future   therapies.   Current   opinion   in   critical   care.

2014;20(6):588-95.

4.   Vincent JL. Fluid management in the critically ill. Kidney international. 2019;96(1):52-7.

5.   Xie J, Wang H, Kang Y, Zhou L, Liu Z, Qin B, et al. The Epidemiology of Sepsis in

Chinese ICUs: A National Cross-Sectional Survey. Crit Care Med. 2020;48(3):e209-e18.

6.   Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected

with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet (London, England). 2020, Epub ahead

of print. DOI:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30183-5.

7.   Qin C, Zhou L, Hu Z, Zhang S, Yang S, Tao Y, et al. Dysregulation of immune response in

patients   with   COVID-19   in   Wuhan,   China.   Clin   Infect   Dis.   2020,   Epub   ahead   of   print.

DOI:10.1093/cid/ciaa248.

8.   Ruan Q, Yang K, Wang W, Jiang L, Song J. Clinical predictors of mortality due to

COVID-19 based on an analysis of data of 150 patients from Wuhan, China. Intensive Care

Med. 2020, Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1007/s00134-020-05991-x.

9.   Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, Liang W-h, Ou C-q, He J-x, et al. Clinical Characteristics of

Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. New Engl J Med. 2020, Epub ahead of print.

DOI:10.1056/NEJMoa2002032.

10. Wong CK, Lam CW, Wu AK, Ip WK, Lee NL, Chan IH, et al. Plasma inflammatory

cytokines and chemokines in severe acute respiratory syndrome. Clin Exp Immunol.

2004;136(1):95-103.

11. Mahallawi WH, Khabour OF, Zhang Q, Makhdoum HM, Suliman BA. MERS-CoV infection

in humans is associated with a pro-inflammatory Th1 and Th17 cytokine profile. Cytokine.

2018;104:8-13.

12. Forni LG, Joannidis M. IDEAL timing of renal replacement therapy in critical care. Nat Rev

Nephrol. 2019;15(1):5-6.

13. Wolf T, Kann G, Becker S, Stephan C, Brodt HR, de Leuw P, et al. Severe Ebola virus

disease with vascular leakage and multiorgan failure: treatment of a patient in intensive care.

Lancet (London, England). 2015;385(9976):1428-35.

14. Rewa OG, Villeneuve PM, Lachance P, Eurich DT, Stelfox HT, Gibney RTN, et al. Quality

indicators of continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) care in critically ill patients: a

systematic review. Intensive Care Med. 2017;43(6):750-63.

15. Alfaraj SH, Al-Tawfiq JA, Assiri AY, Alzahrani NA, Alanazi AA, Memish ZA. Clinical

predictors of mortality of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV)

infection: A cohort study. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2019;29:48-50.

16. Karkar A, Ronco C. Prescription of CRRT: a pathway to optimize therapy. Ann Intensive

Care. 2020;10(1):32.

17. Miao H, Shi J, Wang C, Lu G, Zhu X, Wang Y, et al. Continuous Renal Replacement

Therapy in Pediatric Severe Sepsis: A Propensity Score-Matched Prospective Multicenter

Cohort Study in the PICU. Crit Care Med. 2019;47(10):e806-e13.

18. Putzu A, Fang MX, Boscolo Berto M, Belletti A, Cabrini L, Cassina T, et al. Blood

purification with continuous veno-venous hemofiltration in patients with sepsis or ARDS: a

systematic review and meta-analysis. Minerva Anestesiol. 2017;83(8):867-77.

19. Fayad AII, Buamscha DG, Ciapponi A. Timing of renal replacement therapy initiation for

acute kidney injury. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018;12:CD010612.

20. Fayad AI, Buamscha DG, Ciapponi A. Intensity of continuous renal replacement therapy

for acute kidney injury. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016;10:CD010613.

21. Allegretti AS, Endres P, Parris T, Zhao S, May M, Sylvia-Reardon M, et al. Accelerated

Venovenous Hemofiltration as a Transitional Renal Replacement Therapy in the Intensive

Care Unit. Am J Nephrol. 2020;51(4):318-26.

22. Sethi SK, Mittal A, Nair N, Bagga A, Iyenger A, Ali U, et al. Pediatric Continuous Renal

Replacement Therapy (PCRRT) expert committee recommendation on prescribing prolonged

intermittent renal replacement therapy (PIRRT) in critically ill children. Hemodial Int. 2020,

Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1111/hdi.12821.

23. China. NHCo: the New Coronavirus Pneumonia Prevention and Control Program (5th

edition) 4 February 2020.

24. Khwaja A. KDIGO clinical practice guidelines for acute kidney injury. Nephron Clin Pract.

2012;120(4):c179-84.

25. Chousterman BG, Swirski FK, Weber GF. Cytokine storm and sepsis disease

pathogenesis. Semin Immunopathol. 2017;39(5):517-28.

26. Giamarellos-Bourboulis EJ. Failure of treatments based on the cytokine storm theory of

sepsis: time for a novel approach. Immunotherapy. 2013;5(3):207-9.

27. Chen S, Liu G, Chen J, Hu A, Zhang L, Sun W, et al. Ponatinib Protects Mice From Lethal

Influenza Infection by Suppressing Cytokine Storm. Front Immunol. 2019;10:1393.

28. Kennedy JR. Phosphatidylserine's role in Ebola's inflammatory cytokine storm and

hemorrhagic consumptive coagulopathy and the therapeutic potential of annexin V. Med

Hypotheses. 2020;135:109462.

29. Lau SKP, Lau CCY, Chan KH, Li CPY, Chen H, Jin DY, et al. Delayed induction of

proinflammatory cytokines and suppression of innate antiviral response by the novel Middle

East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: implications for pathogenesis and treatment. J Gen

Virol. 2013;94(Pt 12):2679-90.

30. Li Y, Chen M, Cao H, Zhu Y, Zheng J, Zhou H. Extraordinary GU-rich single-strand RNA

identified from SARS coronavirus contributes an excessive innate immune response. Microbes

and infection. 2013;15(2):88-95.

31. Kannan S, Shaik Syed Ali P, Sheeza A, Hemalatha K. COVID-19 (Novel Coronavirus

2019) - recent trends. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2020;24(4):2006-11.

32. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Kruger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, et al.

SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically

Proven Protease Inhibitor. Cell. 2020, Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1016/j.cell.2020.02.052.

33.   Hamming I, Timens W, Bulthuis ML, Lely AT, Navis G, van Goor H. Tissue distribution of

ACE2 protein, the functional receptor for SARS coronavirus. A first step in understanding

SARS pathogenesis. J Pathol. 2004;203(2):631-7.

34.   Santos RAS, Sampaio WO, Alzamora AC, Motta-Santos D, Alenina N, Bader M, et al.

The ACE2/Angiotensin-(1-7)/MAS Axis of the Renin-Angiotensin System: Focus on

Angiotensin-(1-7). Physiological reviews. 2018;98(1):505-53.

35.   Sun ML, Yang JM, Sun YP, Su GH. [Inhibitors of RAS Might Be a Good Choice for the

Therapy of COVID-19 Pneumonia]. Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi. 2020;43(0):E014.

36.   Tetro JA. Is COVID-19 receiving ADE from other coronaviruses? Microbes Infect. 2020,

Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1016/j.micinf.2020.02.006.

37.   Bar-Or D, Carrick MM, Mains CW, Rael LT, Slone D, Brody EN. Sepsis, oxidative stress,

and hypoxia: Are there clues to better treatment? Redox Rep. 2015;20(5):193-7.

38.   Chakraborty RK, Burns B. Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome. StatPearls.

Treasure Island (FL)2020.PMID: 31613449.

39.   Joannidis M, Forni LG. Clinical review: timing of renal replacement therapy. Crit Care.

2011;15(3):223.

40.   Matsuda K, Moriguchi T, Oda S, Hirasawa H. Efficacy of continuous hemodiafiltration with

a cytokine-adsorbing hemofilter in the treatment of acute respiratory distress syndrome.

Contrib Nephrol. 2010;166:83-92.

41.   Elbahlawan L, West NK, Avent Y, Cheng C, Liu W, Barfield RC, et al. Impact of

continuous renal replacement therapy on oxygenation in children with acute lung injury after

allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Pediatr Blood Cancer. 2010;55(3):540-5.

42. Han F, Sun R, Ni Y, Hu X, Chen X, Jiang L, et al. Early initiation of continuous renal

replacement therapy improves clinical outcomes in patients with acute respiratory distress

syndrome. Am J Med Sci. 2015;349(3):199-205.

43. DiCarlo JV, Alexander SR, Agarwal R, Schiffman JD. Continuous veno-venous

hemofiltration may improve survival from acute respiratory distress syndrome after bone

marrow transplantation or chemotherapy. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol. 2003;25(10):801-5.

44. Edrees F, Li T, Vijayan A. Prolonged Intermittent Renal Replacement Therapy. Adv

Chronic Kidney Dis. 2016;23(3):195-202.

45. Fathima N, Kashif T, Janapala RN, Jayaraj JS, Qaseem A. Single-best Choice Between

Intermittent Versus Continuous Renal Replacement Therapy: A Review. Cureus.

2019;11(9):e5558.

46. Ha SO, Kim HS, Park S, Jung KS, Jang SH, Han SJ, et al. Severe ARDS caused by

adenovirus: early initiation of ECMO plus continuous renal replacement therapy. Springerplus.

2016;5(1):1909.

47. Cha RH, Joh JS, Jeong I, Lee JY, Shin HS, Kim G, et al. Renal Complications and Their

Prognosis in Korean Patients with Middle East Respiratory Syndrome-Coronavirus from the

Central MERS-CoV Designated Hospital. J Korean Med Sci. 2015;30(12):1807-14.

48. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia Ja, Liu H, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically

ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective,

observational study. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2020, Epub ahead of print.

DOI:10.1016/s2213-2600(20)30079-5.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1. Kaplan–Meier curve of overall patient survival according to with or without PIRRT treatment. Patient survival was significantly better for PIRRT group than for non-PIRRT group (log-rank test, P=0.042).

Table 1. Comparison of baseline demographics and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation between patients with and without PIRRT treatment in the cohort

Parameters	All patients	PIRRT group	Non-PIRRT group	P
N	36	22	14	-
Age				0.167[a]
Mean, years	69.4	67.5	72.6	
SD	10.8	11.4	9.1	
Range, years	44.0-86.0	44.0-86.0	58.0-86.0	
Sex				0.658[c]
Male, n (%)	30 (83.3)	19 (86.4)	11 (78.6)	
Female, n (%)	6 (16.7)	3 (13.6)	3 (21.4)	
APACHE-II score, mean (SD)	13.7 (4.7)	13.4 (5.4)	14.1 (3.4)	0.633[a]
SOFA score, median (IQR)	6.0 (4.0-8.0)	6.0 (3.8-8.0)	6.0 (4.5-7.0)	0.994[a]
Hospitalization, median (IQR), days	6.0 (4.0-9.0)	5.5 (2.8-8.0)	7.5 (4.0-10.0)	0.171[a]
Comorbidities				
Hypertension, n (%)	14 (38.9)	8 (36.4)	6 (42.9)	0.738[c]
Diabetes, n (%)	10 (27.8)	6 (27.3)	4 (28.6)	1.000[c]
Cardiac disease, n (%)	12 (33.3)	6 (27.3)	6 (42.9)	0.472[c]
Cerebrovascular disease, n (%)	2 (5.6)	0 (0)	2 (14.3)	0.144[c]
Chronic lung disease, n (%)	7 (19.4)	4 (18.2)	3 (21.4)	1.000[c]
Malignant tumor, n (%)	2 (5.6)	2 (9.1)	0 (0)	0.511[c]
Chronic viral hepatitis, n (%)	3 (8.3)	3 (13.6)	0 (0)	0.267[c]
Any of comorbidity, n (%)	30 (83.3)	18 (81.8)	12 (85.7)	0.759[c]
Complications				
MODS, n (%)	13 (36.1)	10 (45.5)	3 (21.4)	0.175[c]
Heart failure, n (%)	7 (19.4)	5 (22.7)	2 (14.3)	0.681[c]

Acute kidney injury, n (%)	8 (22.2)	5 (22.7)	3 (21.4)	1.000[c]
Arrhythmia, n (%)	12 (33.3)	8 (36.4)	4 (28.6)	0.727[c]
ARDS, n (%)	36 (100)	22 (100)	14 (100)	1.000[c]
Laboratory findings				
White blood cell count, mean (SD), 10^9/L	14.0 (7.1)	14.3 (8.5)	13.4 (4.4)	0.700[a]
Neutrophil count, mean (SD), 10^9/L	12.7 (6.7)	13.0 (8.0)	12.2 (4.2)	0.731[a]
Lymphocyte count, mean (SD), 10^9/L	0.6 (0.3)	0.6 (0.3)	0.6 (0.3)	0.546[a]
Hemoglobin, mean (SD), g/L	122.4 (18.1)	126.8 (18.6)	115.5 (15.5)	0.066[a]
Platelet, median (IQR), 10^9/L	156.0 (99.8-213.0)	159.0 (94.0-203.0)	156.0 (110.3-221.5)	0.580[b]
Blood glucose, mean (SD), mmol/L	9.8 (3.8)	9.0 (2.8)	11.0 (4.8)	0.131[a]
Total cholesterol, mean (SD), mmol/L	3.3 (0.9)	3.3 (1.0)	3.2 (0.8)	0.669[a]
hCRP, mean (SD), mg/L	121.0 (76.1)	124.7 (77.0)	105.8 (80.9)	0.667[a]
Procalcitonin, median (IQR), ng/mL	0.32 (0.19-0.83)	0.3 (0.2-1.0)	0.3 (0.3-0.9)	0.538[b]
Ferritin, median (IQR), μg/L	1140.0 (799.0-1983.0)	1264.0 (795.4-2108.0)	1077.0 (806.4-1933.0)	0.637[b]
Prothrombin time, median (IQR), s	15.5 (14.5-16.3)	15.1 (14.1-16.3)	15.7 (14.9-16.6)	0.299[b]
Activated partial thromboplastin time, median (IQR), s	38.7 (36.0-44.7)	38.7 (35.4-43.7)	39.0 (37.0-51.9)	0.158[b]
hs-cTnI, median (IQR), pg/mL	67.7 (16.0-284.9)	79.3 (16.3-587.2)	46.3 (14.6-162.0)	0.337[b]
NT-proBNP, median (IQR), μg/mL	1.2 (0.6-3.0)	1.1 (0.6-2.8)	1.2 (0.5-3.6)	0.781[b]
Alanine aminotransferase, median (IQR), U/L	34.5 (21.5-45.5)	36.0 (29.0-53.0)	30.5 (16.0-43.3)	0.081[b]
Aspartate aminotransferase, median (IQR), U/L	30.5 (22.5-54.0)	43.5 (24.0-63.3)	29.5 (20.0-34.0)	0.034[b]*
Blood urea nitrogen, median (IQR), mmol/L	10.7 (6.7-14.4)	10.8 (6.4-14.9)	10.3 (6.9-13.6)	0.923[b]
Serum creatinine, median (IQR), μmol/L	83.5 (66.0-126.3)	94.5 (67.0-136.0)	72.0 (51.0-82.3)	0.017[b]*
Serum bicarbonate, mean (SD), mmol/L	24.7 (3.4)	24.3 (2.9)	25.4 (4.1)	0.345[a]
Potassium, median (IQR), mmol/L	4.1 (3.5-4.6)	4.1 (3.5-4.8)	4.2 (3.6-4.6)	0.968[b]
Lactic acid, median (IQR), mmol/L	2.3 (1.8-2.9)	2.4 (1.9-2.8)	2.3 (1.8-3.0)	0.811[b]
Treatments				

Moxifloxacin hydrochloride, n (%)	24 (66.7)	16 (72.7)	8 (57.1)	0.472[c]
Abidol, n (%)	28 (77.8)	17 (77.3)	11 (78.6)	1.000[c]
Lopinavir/ritonavir, n (%)	10 (27.8)	8 (36.4)	2 (14.3)	0.255[c]
Hydroxychloroquine, n (%)	3 (8.3)	2 (9.1)	1 (7.1)	1.000[c]
Other antibiotic treatment, n (%)	34 (94.4)	21 (95.5)	13 (92.9)	1.000[c]
Antifungal treatment, n (%)	5 (13.9)	5 (22.7)	0 (0)	0.134[c]
Other antiviral treatment, n (%)	4 (11.1)	1 (4.5)	3 (21.4)	0.134[c]
Traditional Chinese medicine, n (%)	20 (55.6)	12 (54.5)	8 (57.1)	1.000[c]
Glucocorticoid, n (%)	29 (80.6)	17 (77.3)	12 (85.7)	0.681[c]
Diuretics, n (%)	27 (75.0)	15 (68.2)	12 (85.7)	0.432[c]
Human albumin, n (%)	34 (94.4)	21 (95.5)	13 (92.9)	1.000[c]
Gamma globulin, n (%)	29 (80.6)	18 (81.8)	11 (78.6)	1.000[c]
Heparin, n (%)	29 (80.6)	17 (77.3)	12 (85.7)	0.681[c]
IABP, n (%)	2 (5.6)	1 (4.5)	1 (7.1)	1.000[c]
ECMO, n (%)	3 (8.3)	3 (13.6)	0 (0)	0.267[c]
Duration of invasive mechanical ventilation to initiation of PIRRT, median (IQR), days	-	3.5 (2.0-6.3)	-	-

*P<0.05. [a]t-test, [b]Whitney U test, [c]Fisher's exact test.

COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; APACHE II, acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II; SOFA, sepsis-related organ failureassessment; PIRRT, prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy; MODS, multiple organ dysfunction syndrome; IABP, intra aortic balloon counterpulsation; SD, standard deviation; IQR, interquartile range; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome; hCRP, hypersensitive C-reactive protein; hs-cTnI, high sensitive cardiac troponin I; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation.

Table 2. Models of multivariate Cox proportional hazard regression analysis for PIRRT treatment (reference group: non-PIRRT treatment) for all-cause mortality of all COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation in the cohort

PIRRT versus non-PIRRT	Adjusted Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P
Model A	0.350 (0.147, 0.830)	0.017
Model B	0.398 (0.171, 0.924)	0.032
Model C	0.332 (0.119, 0.925)	0.035

Model A: Adjusted for APACHE II scores, SOFA scores, and any of comorbidity;

Model B: Adjusted for Acute kidney injury, APACHE II scores, Sex;

Model C: Adjusted for IL-6, APACHE II scores, IL-2 receptor.

Table 3. Univariate Cox proportional hazard regression analysis for all-cause mortality of COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation with PIRRT treatment in the cohort

Parameters	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P
Age (per year)	1.048 (0.998, 1.100)	0.059
Sex (male vs. female)	0.959 (0.209, 4.397)	0.957
APACHE II score (per 1 score)	1.038 (0.942, 1.143)	0.453
SOFA score (per 1 score)	1.093 (0.948, 1.261)	0.221
Any of comorbidity (with vs. without)	1.720 (0.379, 7.816)	0.483
Acute kidney injury (with vs. without)	2.219 (0.674, 7.313)	0.190
White blood cell count (per 10^9/L)	0.980 (0.918, 1.047)	0.553
IL-2 receptor (per U/mL)	1.002 (1.001, 1.003)	0.004*
TNF-α (per pg/mL)	1.046 (1.002, 1.092)	0.041*
Procalcitonin (per ng/L)	2.306 (1.098, 4.842)	0.027*
Prothrombin time (per s)	1.808 (1.229, 2.659)	0.003*
D-dimer (per μg/mL [FEU])	1.034 (0.964, 1.109)	0.346
hs-cTnI (per pg/mL)	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)	0.257
NT-proBNP (per μg/mL)	1.181 (1.056, 1.320)	0.003*
Alanine aminotransferase (per U/L)	0.998 (0.992, 1.004)	0.479
Aspartate aminotransferase (per U/L)	0.998 (0.994, 1.003)	0.442
Plasma albumin (per g/L)	1.010 (0.856, 1.191)	0.910
Blood urea nitrogen (per mmol/L)	1.021 (0.950, 1.099)	0.569
Serum creatinine (per μmol/L)	1.000 (0.987, 1.012)	0.963

COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; PIRRT, prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy; APACHE II, acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II; SOFA, sepsis-related organ failureassessment; IL, interleukin; TNF, tumor necrosis factor; FEU, fibrinogen equivalent units; hs-cTnI, high sensitive cardiac troponin I; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide.