Title: Critical Care for Severe COVID-19: A Population-based Study from a Province with Low Case-fatality Rate in China

Authors: Xuelian Liao[1], MD*; Hong Chen[2], MD*; Bo Wang[1], MD*; Zhen Li[3], PhD*.; Zhongwei Zhang[1], MD; Weimin Li[4], MD; Zongan Liang[4], MD; Jin Tang[5], MD; Jian Wang[5], MD; Rui Shi[6, 7], MD; Xiangde Zhen[8], MD; Maojuan Wang[9], MD; Xianying Lei[10], MD; Yu Gong[11], MD; Sheng Lv[12, 13], MD; Chao Jia[14], MD; Li Chen[15], MD; Juan Shang[16], MD; Min Yang[17], MD; Hailong Wei[18], MD; Yuanjun Zhang[19], MD; Xiong Yang[20], MD; Huaqiang Shen[21], MD; Xianhua Xiao[22], MD; Jie Yang[1], MD; Chang Liu[1], MD; Qin Wu[1], MD; Wen Wang[23], Ph D; Jin Yang[1], MD; Wanhong Yin[1], MD; Xiaoqi Xie[1], MD; Yongming Tian[1], MSc; Huan Liu[1], MSc; Bingxing Shuai[24], MD; Wei Zhang[1, 25] , PhD; Xiangrong Song[1], PhD; Xiaodong Jin[1], MD*; Yan Kang, MD[#]; on behalf of the StUdy of 2019 Novel coRonavirus pneumonia Infected critically ill Patients in Sichuan provincE (SUNRISE) Investigators

*Xuelian Liao, Hong Chen, Bo Wang and Zhen Li contribute equally to this work.

Corresponding author

Yan Kang, kangyan@scu.edu.cn;

Xiaodong Jin, zh_jxd@163.com; Contributed equally.

Department of Critical Care Medicine

West China Hospital, Sichuan University

37 Guo Xue Xiang St, Chengdu, Sichuan, China, 610041

Telephone: +86-28-85422508

Affiliations

1 Department of Critical Care Medicine, West China Hospital West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu

2 Department of Critical Care Medicine, The Public Health Clinical Centre of Chengdu, Chengdu

3 Clinical Research Centre, Shanghai First Maternity and Infant Hospital, Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai

4 Department of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, West China Hospital West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu

5 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Guang'an People's Hospital, Guang'an

6 Department of Orthopaedics, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu

7 Department of Infectious Disease, Ganzi Hospital of West China Hospital, Ganzi Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture People's Hospital, Ganzi

8 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Dazhou Central Hospital, Dazhou

9 Department of Critical Care Medicine, People's Hospital of Deyang City, Deyan

10 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Affiliated Hospital of Southwest Medical University, Luzhou

11 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Suining Central Hospital, Suining

12 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Panzhihua Central Hospital, Panzhihua

13 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Yanyuan County Hospital, Liangshan Yi Autonomous Prefecture, Yanyuan

14 Department of Critical Care Medicine Mianyang Central Hospital, Mianyang

15 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Affiliated Hospital of North Sichuan Medical College, Department of Critical Care Medicine, Nanchong

16 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Nanchong Central Hospital, Nanchong

17 Department of Critical Care Medicine, People's hospital of Ya'an, Ya'an

18 Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, The People’s Hospital of Leshan, Leshan

19 Department of Critical Care Medicine, The First People’s Hospital of Ziyang

20 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Langzhong People’s Hospital, Langzhong

21 Department of Critical Care Medicine, Bazhong Central Hospital, Bazhong

22 Department of Critical Care Medicine, The Second People’s Hospital of Neijiang, Neijiang

23 Chinese Evidence-based Medicine Centre and Cochrane China Centre, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu

24 Medical Affair Department, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu

25 State Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Cancer Centre, West China Hospital, Sichuan University and Collaborative Innovation Centre of Biotherapy, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu

ABSTRACT

Background

Data regarding critical care for patients with severe COVID-19 are limited. We aimed to describe the clinical course, multi-strategy management, and respiratory support usage for the severe COVID-19 at the provincial level.

Methods

Using data from Sichuan Provincial Department of Health and the multicentre cohort study, all microbiologically confirmed COVID-19 patients in Sichuan who met the national severe criteria were included and followed-up from the day of inclusion (D1), until discharge, death, or the end of the study.

Findings

Out of 539 COVID-19 patients, 81 severe cases (15.0%) were identified. The median (IQR) age was 50 (39-65) years, 37% were female, and 53.1% had chronic comorbidities. All severe cases were identified before requiring mechanical ventilation and treated in the intensive care units (ICUs), among whom 51 (63.0%) were treated in provisional ICUs and 77 patients (95.1%) were admitted by D1. On D1, 76 (93.8%) were administered by respiratory support, including 55 (67.9%) by conventional oxygen therapy (COT), 8 (9.9%) by high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) and 13 (16.0%) by non-invasive ventilation (NIV). By D28, 53 (65.4%) were discharged, three (3.7%) were deceased, and 25 (30.9%) were still hospitalized. COT, administered to 95.1% of the patients, was the most commonly used respiratory support and met 62.7% of the

respiratory support needed, followed by HFNC (19.3%), NIV ventilation (9.4%) and IV 8.5%.

Interpretation

The multi-strategy management for severe COVID-19 patients including early identification and timely critical care may contribute to the low case-fatailty. Preparation of sufficient conventional oxygen equipment should be prioritized.

Trial registration number ChiCTR2000029758.

Main text

INTRODUCTION

As a pandemic declared by the World Health Organization, the 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has affected over two million people worldwide since its outbreak by April 15, 2020 [1], in which approximately 19% are expected to progress to severe or critical disease, constituting the high risk group for death [2]. However, up to date, no population based data has been published regarding critical care for severe COVID-19.

The reported case-fatality rates among the severe COVID-19 varied a lot across different regions. Studies in Wuhan, including 13 to 199 severe cases identified using different criteria, reported high case-fatality rate from 19.2 to 61.5% [3–5]. Recent case series from Italy [6] that included 1591 cases reported a case-fatality rate of 26% while from US [7] that included 21 patients reported a rate up to 67%. Meanwhile, data from other regions outside Wuhan in China, reported much lower case-fatality rate ranging from zero to 6.5% [8–11]. In other countries with a relatively low case-fatality rate in all COVID-19 patients, very limited data were reported regarding severe cases. These studies provided valuable data regarding epidemiological, clinical, and biological characteristics, and treatment of the severe COVID-19. However, the reason for the discrepancy in fatality rate remained unclear. As no rigorous evidence has been published regarding the effectiveness of any treatment for COVID-19, it is likely that

this discrepancy across regions could not be explained by the difference in the level of medical care or by any single therapeutic agent. Active management strategy and sufficient medical resource preparation have been proposed as two potential important factors for reducing the case-fatality rate of COVID-19 at the population level [12, 13]. However, real-world data are very limited regarding the clinical course, management, and medical resource usage for the severe COVID-19.

Sichuan province, located in the south west of China, covers a total area of 486 thousand square kilometres and is with 83 million population [14]. Since the first reported case of COVID-19 on January 16, 2020, a total of 539 cases have been confirmed in Sichuan and 3 deaths occurred among the severe cases, resulting in a 28-day case-fatality rate of 0.6% in all patients with COVID-19 and 3.7% in severe cases, which is much lower compared with that reported in most of the studies worldwide. Using data from the multicentre cohort study (StUdy of 2019 Novel coRonavirus pneumonia Infected critically ill patients in Sichuan provincE, SUNRISE), we aimed to describe and analyse the clinical course, multi-strategy management, and respiratory support resources usage for the severe COVID-19 at the provincial level.

METHODS

Study design and data collection

The SUNRISE study is a multicentre cohort study (http://www.chictr.org.cn/index.aspx, ChiCTR2000029758) focusing on COVID-19 in Sichuan Province, initiated by investigators in West China Hospital (WCH) [15]. All 21 hospitals designated for patients with severe COVID-19 in the province were included in the study. Data were prospectively collected for patients who were still in the hospital after study enrolment, and otherwise retrospectively collected, between January 16 and March 15. Daily data on COVID-19 cases reported in Sichuan province were obtained from Provincial Department of Health (SPDH) with permission. The timeline of the study is shown in the supplementary file. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the West China Hospital and the participating hospitals. Informed consent was obtained from the patient or the patient's legally authorized representative.

Detailed demographic, epidemiological, clinical and laboratory data were recorded using the electronic data capture and analysis system (EDC) (more details are provided in the supplementary file). Data entry was completed by physicians and nurses who were trained on the use of EDC and were working in the designated hospitals. Data quality was overseen by a team of senior ICU physicians and statisticians.

Arrangement of designated hospitals and provisional ICUs

Considering the potential shortage of medical resources and region-related healthcare disparities, provisional ICUs were established to enlarge the capacity for receiving

severe cases and ensure high quality care. 21 hospitals, one for each city, were planned as designated hospitals for severe COVID-19 patients in Sichuan province, after evaluating their capability of providing advanced respiratory support including high flow nasal cannula (HFNC), non-invasive (NIV), or invasive ventilation (IV). For the establishment of provisional ICUs, ICU physicians, nurses, respiratory therapists and resources were dispatched to designated hospitals under the organization of the authorities. The number of severe COVID-19 patients in each designated hospital was required to report daily. Remote multi-disciplinary consultation was arranged to discuss complicated cases daily.

Definition of severe cases

COVID-19 was diagnosed using real time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) of nasal, pharyngeal swab or sputum specimens by the local Centres for Disease Control (CDC). According to the criteria proposed by Chinese National Health Commission, confirmed COVID-19 patients who met any of the five following criteria [2] were included as severe cases: 1) dyspnoea or respiratory frequency ≥30 breaths/minute; 2) pulse oxygen saturation (SPO_2) ≤93% without oxygen therapy in resting state; 3) PaO_2:FiO_2 ratio <300 mmHg; 4) lung infiltrates >50% within 24–48 hours; 5) respiratory failure, septic shock, and/or multiple organ dysfunction. Diagnosis of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) [16], acute kidney injury (AKI) [17],

and septic shock [18] were made according to commonly used criteria (see supplementary file for details).

Follow-up and outcomes

The day of enrolment of each patient with severe COVID-19 was considered day 1 (D1). Each patient included were followed up from D1 until discharge, death, or the end of the study. Patient characteristics were shown according to the outcome by D28 (see below). The main support methods used were analysed throughout the study period.

Clinical outcomes by D28, including rapid recovery (RR), prolonged recovery (PR) and no recovery (NR), were defined as follows. 1) RR: patient fully meeting the discharge criteria before D28, with normal body temperature ≥3 days, obvious improvement in respiratory symptoms and pulmonary imaging, and twice-negative nucleic acid tests (sampling interval being at least 24 hours) on respiratory samples; 2) PR: patient partially meeting the discharge criteria on D28 and still requiring hospitalization but without advanced respiratory support; 3) NR: death or the patient still in need of advanced respiratory support on D28.

Statistics

Data management, manipulation, and analysis were conducted by a professional epidemiologist and statistician, from a third Clinical Research Centre, who did not

participate in data collection. To ensure the high quality of database, all missing data and outliers detected were checked by two clinicians independently in the medical records. Then the verified data were collected and transferred for data completion or correction. No imputation was made for missing data. Data are expressed as median (IQR) for continuous variables and number (%) for categorical variables. For continuous variables, Wilcoxon test was applied to assess the difference between patients in one group and others, Kruskal-Wallis test to assess the overall difference among the RR, PR and NR groups. For categorical variables, $\chi 2$ test or Fisher's exact test were performed according to the distribution of data. Two-sided tests with a significance level of 0.05 were applied. Needs for different respiratory support throughout the study period were assessed using person-day that denoted the use by one person in one day. All the analyses were conducted using R software version 3.6.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing). We used the tydyverse package [19] of to manage daily data and plot the daily use of main support and the pheatmap package [20] to plot the heatmap.

RESULTS

Early identification of severe COVID-19

Using the predefined criteria for severe COVID-19, 81 out of 539 patients were identified as severe cases. Among the remaining 458 patients with non-severe COVID-19, no death was observed during the study period. The median (IQR) durations from

the onset of symptoms to the first hospitalization, RT-PCR confirmation and the diagnosis of severe condition were 3 (1–6), 7 (5-10), and 9 (6–11) days, respectively. Among the five criteria, PaO_2:FiO_2 ratio, SPO_2, and dyspnoea criteria were the most commonly reported, accounting for 87.7%, 66.7% and 27.2%, respectively. On Day 1, all chest images of the patients (80 with CT scan and 1 with chest X-ray) showed bilateral lesions, though only 4 (4.9%) were diagnosed using the imaging criterion.

The main characteristics of the patients with severe COVID-19 were shown in Table 1. The median age (IQR) of the patients was 50 (39-65) years, 37.0% were female, and 50.6 % were with a body mass index (BMI) greater or equal than ≥24 kg/m^2. Chronic comorbidities were observed among 43 (53.1%) patients. The Apache II [21] and SOFA score [22] were 10 (6-10) and 3 (3-5), respectively. 30 patients (37.7%) developed ARDS, six patients developed acute kidney injury (AKI) and one met the criteria for septic shock (**Table 1**).

Centralization of patients and provisional ICUs for critical care

Out of the 21 planned designated hospitals for severe cases, 18 received severe patients during the study period. Among these hospitals, only 2 had standard ICU wards, while 16 had provisional ICUs which were transformed from general wards for infectious disease and equipped with ICU physicians and nurses. Under such situation, all 81 severe cases were centralized to the 18 designated hospitals, among whom 51 (63.0%) were treated in 16 provisional ICUs while 30 (37.0%) were treated in two standard

ICUs. Only 11(13.6%) patients were admitted directly, 70 (86.4%) were transferred from non-designated hospitals or designated hospitals for non-severe cases. In total, 77 patients (95.1%) were admitted for critical care by D1 (Figure 1).

Respiratory support during the study period

Respiratory support was the most commonly used organ support method for patients with severe COVID-19. On D1, 76 patients (93.8%) were administrated by respiratory support, including 55 (67.9%) by conventional oxygen therapy (COT) through nasal catheter or mask, 13 (16.1%) by NIV, and 8 (9.9%) by HFNC. No patient was intubated or needed ECMO (**Table 1**).

Daily respiratory support given to each patient from D1 to D28 were shown in **Figure 2**. Of the 81 patients diagnosed severe, 79 (97.5%) used COT, 31 (38.3%) used HFNC, 22 (27.2%) used NIV, 10 (12.3%) used IV, and 1 (1.2%) used ECMO (**Table 2**). Thirty-four patients (42% of 81) used only COT among which 79.4% discharged before D28. In the 25 patients who started with COT and needed escalation to advanced respiratory support methods, 12 (48.0%) were discharged by D28.

Among patients who were discharged within 28 days, the median duration (IQR) of hospitalization was 18 (14–24) days. Only COT, HFNC, and NIV were used as respiratory support, for a median duration of 10 (5–14), 0 (0–4), and 0 (0–0) days,

respectively. As for PR patients, COT, HFNC, NIV, and IV were used for 18 (7–24), 0 (0–7), 0 (0–3), and 0 (0–3) days, respectively. Concerning about the NR patients, the median duration for COT, HFNC, NIV and IV were 3 (1–10), 2.5 (0–11), 0 (0–3), and 2 (0–16) days, respectively. ECMO was used for one day by one patient.

We also analysed the usage of respiratory support along with the daily number of newly diagnosed patients with COVID-19 disease in Sichuan, newly diagnosed severe cases, and patients with severe disease hospitalized (**Figure 3**). In total, all forms of respiratory support were used 1579 person-day, of which COT took up 62.7 % (990 person-day), HFNC 19.3% (305 person-day), NIV 9.4% (149 person-day), IV 8.5% (134 person-day), and ECMO 0.06% (1 person-day). The peak needs of respiratory support, which had a significant lag of 9 days behind the peak of newly diagnosed patients in Sichuan, lasted for 20 days and paralleled with hospitalization needs for severely ill patients. During the most demanding days for respiratory support measures, 55.3% demands were COT, 21.3% were HFNC, 12.8% were NIV, and 10.6% were IV.

Other support measures and medical treatment

Some patients needed life-saving measures such as renal replacement (five patients, 6.2%), vasopressors (5, 6.2%), and blood transfusion (6, 7.4%). Other support methods included the prone position, partial parenteral nutrition therapy, analgesics and sedatives, used by 16 (19.8%), 17 (21.0%), and 13 (16.1%) patients, respectively.

Various drug treatments were given despite the absence of effective evidence-based antiviral and immunomodulates (**Table 2**).

Patient follow-up and clinical outcomes

All patients were followed up to the end of the study. Among 81 patients, 53 (65.4%) were discharged before D28 and regarded as rapid recovery (RR). Eighteen (22.2%) patients were regarded as prolonged recovery (PR), including 13 still in need of conventional oxygen therapy and 5 awaiting negative results of RT-PCR on D28. Ten patients (12.3%) were in the no recovery (NR) group, including 3 deaths and 7 still in need of advanced respiratory support on D28. Among the 3 deceased, one was a 64-year-old female with scleroderma, pulmonary fibrosis and diabetes, one was an 80-year-old female with hypertension and coronary heart disease. Both patients developed severe respiratory failure and died of multi-organ dysfunction. The third patient was a 73-year-old male with hypertension and end-stage renal disease and died from circulatory failure.

Characteristic of the patients on D1 according to the outcome were reviewed in **Table 1**. Patients in the NR group tended to be older ($p<0.001$), had higher Apache II ($p=0.01$) and SOFA scores ($p<0.001$), and were more likely to have comorbidities ($p=0.02$) including AKI ($p=0.004$) than the other groups. C-reaction protein ($p=0.02$) was higher

while lymphocyte (p=0.03) and platelet (p=0.005) were lower in the NR group (**Table 1**).

By March 15, among those who were still hospitalized on D28, 15 were discharged, 9 patients were still hospitalized, and an 81-year-old male died of end-stage chronic pulmonary disease on D45.

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, it is the first time that critical care for severe COVID-19 was described from the perspective of identification, organization, and resources using data from a population based study, where a significant lower case-fatality rate was observed than that reported elsewhere [3–5, 7, 23]. Using the five predefined criteria, severe cases were identified early, none of cases needed mechanical ventilation or ECMO on D1. Providing timely critical care by establishing provisional ICUs, conventional oxygen therapy was the most commonly used respiratory support method given to 95.1% of the patients and met 62.7% of all the respiratory support needed.

Early identification of severe COVID-2019 is a prerequisite for timely interventions for severe COVID-2019. For the diagnosis of severe cases, different criteria were used in the previous studies while some didn't reported clear criteria [3–5, 7, 23–26]. In this study, using the severe criteria proposed by Chinese National Health Commission [2],

none of the non-severe patients died during the study period, and none of severe cases needed mechanical ventilation or ECMO on the day of diagnosis. In particular, our data showed that, on the day of diagnosis of severe, up to 72.8% did not present symptoms of dyspnoea and 33.3% had an SPO_2 no less than 93%. Using only dyspnoea or SPO_2 as the diagnostic criteria would fail to identify a large number of severe cases of COVID-19 in early stage and miss the opportunity of intervening in time. With a sensitivity of 87.7%, PaO_2:FiO_2 ratio was likely a sensitive indicator for early identification of severe COVID-2019. With early identification of the severe illness, 93.8% patients in this study were receiving various respiratory support by D1, with a median PaO_2:FO_2 ratio of 204 mmHg. In the previous studies, the reported median PaO_2:FO_2 ratio on ICU admission was much lower (103.8 to 169.0 mmHg) [5, 7, 27], while many other studies didn't report the data. Similar to the strategy applied in Sichuan, all the patients outside Wuhan were less severe as demonstrated in Beijing, Shanghai, Zhejiang, Jiangsu, and Shanxi in China [28]. The use of sensitive diagnostic criteria might be crucial for improving prognosis for patients with old age or comorbidity, for whom symptoms may be more atypical and the progression of the disease may be faster than others.

Shortage of beds is one of the most challenging issues in fighting severe COVID-19 [29]. Despite very limited evidence reported in the literature, the data in our study showed that provisional ICUs may be a practical solution. By the establishment of the

provisional ICUs, the critical care capacity for COVID-19 had a significant increase at the provincial level. The beds, organ support equipment, and staffs were arranged by the number of patients and adjusted over time. Provisional ICUs were not comparable to standard ICUs, but basic critical care, including main organ supports, could meet the majority needs of patients with severe COVID-19 and be provided in time. As a result, all the patients in this study received critical care in provisional ICUs, while in another study, only 19.1% of the severe cases could be treated in ICUs [23]. In regions without stand ICUs are not available or with a shortage of resources due to outbreak of the disease, provisional ICUs may alleviate the pressure of patient flow and provide timely critical care for patients with severe COVID-19.

The shortage of advanced support equipment such as ventilators is another challenging issue [30]. As there's no definite effective drug to treat COVID-19, appropriate respiratory therapy is essential for severe cases. According to data reported in studies from Wuhan and a study from the US, IV was administered in 38.9-71% patients [7, 23, 27]. However, in our study, IV was used in only 12.3% of the patients and the case-fatality rate was much lower than that in these studies. This difference may be explained, at least in part, by the timing of intervention [12]. It is reasonable to hypothesize that hypoxemia may participate in multiple organ injury if the hypoxic compensatory period was overlooked or not treated timely [31]. Our study showed that, if severely ill patients can be identified earlier, traditional oxygen therapy and close monitoring may suffice,

as in the 42% of the patients in our study. Given that the COVID-19 outbreak is moving rapidly, this finding is of particular interest for treating newly diagnosed severe cases and for regions facing a shortage of ventilators. Preparing a large availability of conventional oxygen therapy and providing it in an early stage, in hospital or even at home, might be the most cost-efficient alternative for improving the prognosis of severe COVID-19 patients and to relieve the burden of the whole medical system.

Our study has the following limitations. First, a small part of the data was collected retrospectively, leading to potential incompleteness and inaccuracy for some variables. We mitigated this limitation by designating a team of researchers to verify and complete the data. Second, our study was mainly descriptive due to the small sample size, and more rigorous evidence is needed for illustrating the benefits of using COT in early stage. Third, the findings reported in our study might not be generalizable to populations with completely different impact of the pandemic and government strategies.

Multi-strategy management, including early identification and timely critical care provided by establishing provisional ICUs is feasible and effective in treating severe COVID-19. Respiratory support, conventional oxygen therapy in particular, should be sufficiently prepared.

REFERENCES

1. Johns Hopkins University. Coronavirus COVID-19 Global Cases by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE). https://www.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd40299423467b48e9ecf6 (accessed April 15, 2020).
2. Wu Z, McGoogan JM (2020) Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2648
3. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, et al (2020) A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with Severe Covid-19. N Engl J Med. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001282
4. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al (2020) Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet 395:497–506.
5. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, et al (2020) 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 2600:1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5
6. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, et al (2020) Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to

ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. JAMA. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.5394

7. Arentz M, Yim E, Klaff L, et al (2020) Characteristics and Outcomes of 21 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19 in Washington State. JAMA 4720:2019–2021.

8. Xu X-W, Wu X-X, Jiang X-G, et al (2020) Clinical findings in a group of patients infected with the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov-2) outside of Wuhan, China: retrospective case series. BMJ 368:m606. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m606

9. Yang W, Cao Q, Qin L, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics and imaging manifestations of the 2019 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19):A multi-center study in Wenzhou city, Zhejiang, China. J Infect 80:388–393.

10. Wan S, Xiang Y, Fang W, et al (2020) Clinical Features and Treatment of COVID-19 Patients in Northeast Chongqing. J Med Virol. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25783

11. Tian S, Hu N, Lou J, et al (2020) Characteristics of COVID-19 infection in Beijing. J Infect 80:401–406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.02.018

12. Sun Q, Qiu H, Huang M, Yang Y (2020) Lower mortality of COVID-19 by early recognition and intervention: experience from Jiangsu Province. Ann Intensive Care 10:33. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13613-020-00650-2

13. Ji Y, Ma Z, Peppelenbosch MP, Pan Q (2020) Potential association between COVID-19 mortality and health-care resource availability. Lancet Glob Heal. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30068-1

14. National Bureau of Statistics of China. China statistical year book. http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2018/indexeh.htm (accessed Mar 10, 2020).

15. Liao X, Wang B, Kang Y (2020) Novel coronavirus infection during the 2019–2020 epidemic: preparing intensive care units—the experience in Sichuan Province, China. Intensive Care Med 46:357–360.

16. Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, Thompson BT, et al (2012) Acute respiratory distress syndrome: The Berlin definition. JAMA 307:2526–2533.

17. Kellum JA, Lameire N, Aspelin P, et al (2013) Diagnosis, evaluation, and management of acute kidney injury: A KDIGO summary (Part 1). Crit Care 17:1–15.

18. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour C, et al (2016) The third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (sepsis-3). JAMA 315:801–810.

19. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, et al (2019) Welcome to the Tidyverse. J Open Source Softw 4:1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

20. Kolde R. pheatmap: Pretty Heatmaps. 2019. https://cran.r-project.org/package=pheatmap (accessed Mar 20, 2020).

21. Knaus WA, Draper EA, Wagner DP, Zimmerman JE (1985) APACHE I I: A severity of disease classification system. Crit Care Med 13:818–829.

22. Vincent JL, Moreno R, Takala J, et al (1996) The SOFA (Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment) score to describe organ dysfunction/failure. Int ensive Care Med 22:707–710.

23. Guan W-J, Ni Z-Y, Hu Y, et al (2020) Clinical Characteristics of Coron avirus Disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJ Moa2002032

24. Yao Y, Tian Y, Zhou J, et al (2020) Epidemiological characteristics of 2019-ncoV infections in Shaanxi, China by February 8, 2020. Eur Respir J. https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.00310-2020

25. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al (2020) Epidemiological and clinical ch aracteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. Lancet 395:507–513.

26. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al (2020) Articles Clinical course and risk fact ors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan , China : a retrospective cohort study. Lancet. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(2 0)30566-3

27. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al (2020) Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients with 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.1585

28. Chinese Centre for Disease Control and Prevention COVID-19. http://2019ncov.chinacdc.cn/. Accessed 30 Mar 2020

29. Grasselli G, Pesenti A, Cecconi M (2020) Critical Care Utilization for the COVID-19 Outbreak in Lombardy, Italy: Early Experience and Forecast During an Emergency Response. JAMA. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.4031

30. Emanuel EJ, Persad G, Upshur R, et al (2020) Fair Allocation of Scarce Medical Resources in the Time of Covid-19. N Engl J Med. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsb2005114

31. Schwartz RS, Eltzschig HK, Carmeliet P (2011) Mechanisms of Disease Hypoxia and Inflammation. N Engl J Med 364:656–665

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the study design, conduction, data collection, writing, examination and approval of the final manuscript.

Yan Kang, Weimin Li, Zongan Liang, Xuelian Liao, Hong Chen, Bo Wang, Xiaodong Jin, Zhen Li, Weizhong Zhang, Qin Wu, Jin Yang, Chang Liu, Wanhong Yin, Xiaoqi Xie, Yongmin Tian, Wei Zhang, Huan Liu, Xiangrong Song, Bingxing Shuai, and Wen Wang conceived and designed the study; Yan Kang, Xuelian Liao, Qin Wu, Jin Yang, Bo Wang, and Wanhong Yin wrote the protocol for project of novel coronavirus pneumonia in West China Hospital； Xiaodong Jin, Weizhong Zhang and Zongan Liang contacted with each centre and acquired the data from the government; Hong Chen, Jin Tang, Jian Wang, Rui Shi, Xiangde Zhen, Maojuan Wang, Xianying Lei, Yu Gong, Chao Jia, Sheng Lv, Li Chen, Juan Shang, Min Yang, Hailong Wei, Yuanjun Zhang, Xiong Yang, Huaqiang Shen, and Xianhua Xiao were responsible for the local research progress and ensure the data quality; Xuelian Liao, Jie Yang, and Wanhong Yin contributed to database creation and standardization; Zhen Li, Xuelian Liao, and Jie Yang analysed data or performed statistical analysis; Yan Kang, Xuelian Liao, Zhen Li, Bo Wang, and Xiaodong Jin wrote the manuscript and had primary responsibility for final content.

FUNDING

This project was supported by Project of Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia in West China Hospital.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Ms. Haixin Miao, Mr. Desong Qiu from Sichuan Zhikang Technology CO., Chengdu, for their help of establishing the electronic data capture and analysis system; We thank Ms. Yu Ma, Mr. Biwei Zhan from Chengdu Urban Planning Information Technic Centre for the localization and mapping for the designated hospital. We also thank Yi Liu, Ph D. from Shanghai, for his assistance in data visualization.

Table 1. Clinical Characteristics of the severe COVID-19 patients, according to outcome by D28

	Total (n=81)	Rapid Recovery (n=53)	No Recovery (n=10)	Prolonged Recovery (n=18)
Epidemiological and general characteristics				
Age, years	50.0 (39.0-65.0)	49.0 (39.0-63.0)	76.0 (64.0-80.0)	48.0 (37.0-60.0)
<45	28 (34.6%)	20 (37.7%)	6 (60.0%)	8 (44.4%)
45-65	30 (37.0%)	21 (39.6%)	3 (30.0%)	6 (33.4%)
≥65	23 (28.4%)	12 (22.6%)	1 (10.0%)	4 (22.2%)
Sex	..	..	..	..
Women	30 (37.0%)	19 (35.9%)	6 (60.0%)	5 (27.8%)
Current smoking	3 (3.7%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (5.6%)
BMI, kg/m^2	24.0 (21.5-27.3)	24.5 (22.3-27.7)	25.2 (21.1-27.3)	23.2 (20.0-25.2)

<18.5	8 (9.9%)	5 (9.4%)	1 (10.0%)	2 (11.1%)
18.5-23.9	32 (39.5%)	19 (35.9%)	3 (30.0%)	10 (55.5%)
24-27.9	26 (32.1%)	18 (34.0%)	5 (50.0%)	3 (16.7%)
≥28.0	15 (18.5%)	11 (20.8%)	1 (10.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Exposure to source of transmission	62 (76.5%)	42 (79.3%)	6 (60.0%)	14 (77.8%)
Family cluster	19 (23.5%)	15 (28.3%)	1 (10.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Living in or having travelled to Wuhan	37 (45.7%)	26 (49.1%)	3 (30.0%)	8 (44.4%)
Other scenarios [b]	6 (7.4%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Symptoms				
Fever (≥37.5°C)	39 (48.2%)	25 (47.2%)	5 (50.0%)	9 (50.0%)
Non-productive cough	40 (49.4%)	29 (54.7%)	3 (30.0%)	8 (44.4%)
Productive cough	38 (46.9%)	24 (45.3%)	3 (30.0%)	11 (61.1%)

Fatigue	30 (37.0%)	20 (37.7%)	2 (20.0%)	8 (44.4%)
Dyspnea	25 (30.9%)	17 (32.1%)	3 (30%)	5 (27.8%)
Other symptoms [c]	37 (45.7%)	27 (50.9%)	2 (20.0%)	8 (44.4%)
Coexisting disorders				
Any coexisting disorder	43 (53.1%)	23 (43.4%)	10 (100.0%)	10 (55.6%)
Diabetes	18 (22.2%)	8 (15.1%)	3 (30.0%)	7 (38.9%)
Hypertension	15 (18.5%)	9 (17.0%)	4 (40.0%)	2 (11.1%)
Chronic pulmonary disease	11 (13.6%)	5 (9.4%)	3 (30.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Cardiovascular or cerebrovascular disease	5 (6.2%)	2 (3.8%)	3 (30.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Congestive heart failure	4 (4.9%)	2 (3.8%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (5.6%)
Moderate to severe renal disease	3 (3.7%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)

AIDS, metastatic malignancy, or moderate to severe hepatic disease	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Other coexisting disorder	34 (42.0%)	18 (34.0%)	9 (90.0%)	7 (38.9%)
Clinical features on D1				
SOFA score	3.0 (3.0-5.0)	3.0 (3.0-4.0)	7.0 (5.0-8.0)	3.0 (2.0-4.0)
Apache II score	10.0 (6.0-13.0)	10.0 (6.0-12.0)	15.0 (11.0-17.0)	7.0 (2.0-10.0)
Vital signs				
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg	123.0 (114.0-137.0)	123.0 (113.0-137.0)	136.0 (121.0-158.0)	121.5 (118.0-130.0)
Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg	74.0 (68.0-80.0)	75.0 (68.0-84.0)	78.5 (73.0-80.0)	71.5 (67.0-78.0)
Heart rate, beats/min	88.0 (81.0-97.0)	88.0 (81.0-97.0)	87.0 (80.0-104.0)	88.0 (83.0-95.0)
Respiratory rate, breaths/min	22.0 (20.0-25.0)	22.0 (20.0-25.0)	22.0 (20.0-26.0)	21.0 (20.0-24.0)
Pulse oxygen saturation, %	96.0 (93.0-97.0)	96.0 (93.0-97.0)	96.0 (89.0-97.0)	96.5 (95.0-97.0)

Laboratory findings				
White blood cell count, × 10^9/L	6.2 (4.5-7.8)	6.3 (4.9-8.2)	6.7 (4.9-7.4)	5.9 (3.9-9.5)
<4.0	17 (21.0%)	10 (18.9%)	2 (20.0%)	5 (27.8%)
>10.0	11 (13.6%)	7 (13.2%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (22.2%)
Neutrophil count, × 10^9/L	5.0 (3.1-6.6)	4.6 (3.1-6.6)	5.4 (4.5-5.7)	4.2 (3.1-8.4)
Lymphocyte count, × 10^9/L	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	0.4 (0.3-1.1)	0.8 (0.6-1.1)
<1.5	69 (85.2%)	45 (84.9%)	9 (90.0%)	15 (83.3%)
Platelet count, × 10^9/L	166.0 (136.0-217.0)	178.0 (139.0-237.0)	124.0 (111.0-147.0)	169.5 (150.0-202.0)
<150	31 (38.2%)	19 (35.9%)	8 (80.0%)	4 (22.2%)
Total bilirubin, μmol/liter	11.7 (6.9-18.4)	12.6 (9.0-17.5)	7.9 (3.5-19.5)	10.8 (6.2-19.7)
Creatine, mg/liter	67.8 (55.3-80.0)	62.1 (53.8-78.9)	80.0 (69.0-464.0)	73.2 (59.9-84.0)
>133	5 (6.2%)	2 (3.8%)	3 (30.0%)	0 (0.0%)

C-reactive protein, mg/liter [c]	40.6 (18.7-69.3)	39.4 (24.0-71.6)	99.5 (43.0-129.0)	33.0 9.92-44.6)
PaO2, mmHg	69.2 (59.0-85.0)	69.8 (58.8-84.3)	71.6 (54.6-92.6)	66.7 (60.0-104.1)
FiO2, mmHg	33.0 (29.0-41.0)	33.0 (29.0-41.0)	33.0 (29.0-57.0)	33.0 (29.0-37.0)
D-Dimer, mg/liter[c]	0.8 (0.4-1.3)	0.7 (0.4-1.2)	1.3 (0.8-5.6)	0.6 (0.2-1.1)
Bilateral lung infiltrates	81 (100.0%)	52 (98.1%)	10 (100.0%)	19 (100.0%)
Criteria for the diagnosis of severe illness				
Dyspnea or respiratory frequency ≥30	22 (27.2%)	16 (30.2%)	2 (20.0%)	4 (22.2%)
Pulse oxygen saturation (SPO_2%) ≤93%	54 (66.7%)	34 (64.2%)	6 (60.0%)	14 (77.8%)
PaO2:FiO2, mmHg	204.0 (156.8-266.5)	204.0 (156.8-252.0)	183.6 (115.8-255.2)	224.8 (173.6-331.4)
<300	71 (87.7%)	52 (98.1%)	8 (80.0%)	11 (61.1%)
<150	16 (19.8%)	9 (17.0%)	4 (40.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Lung infiltrates >50% within 24 to 48 hours	4 (4.9%)	2 (3.8%)	2 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Respiratory failure, septic shock, and/or MOF [d]	17 (21.0%)	7 (13.2%)	5 (50.0%)	5 (27.8%)
Main organ dysfunction				
Acute respiratory distress syndrome	30 (37.7%)	20 (37.7%)	4 (40.0%)	6 (33.3%)
Acute kidney injury	6 (7.4%)	3 (5.7%)	3 (30.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Septic shock	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Main organ support				
No use	5 (6.2%)	3 (5.7%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (5.6%)
Conventional oxygen therapy through nasal catheter	51 (63.0%)	34 (64.2%)	7 (70.0%)	10 (55.6%)
Conventional oxygen therapy through mask	4 (4.9%)	3 (5.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.6%)

High flow nasal cannula	8 (9.9%)	5 (9.4%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Non-invasive ventilation	13 (16.0%)	8 (15.1%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Invasive ventilation or ECMO	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Renal-replacement therapy	5 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Vasopressors	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)

[a.] BMI was classified into 4 groups according to the criteria for Chinese population: underweight (<18.5 kg/m^2), normal (18.5-23.9 kg/m^2), overweight (24-27.9 kg/m^2), and obese (≥18 kg/m^2).

[b.] Other scenarios included having visited a designated hospital for COVID-19 patients or being in another city with confirmed COVID-19 cases during the past 14 days.

[c.] Other symptoms included muscle soreness, loss of appetite, diarrhea, abdominal pain, headache, dizziness, nausea, vomiting.

[d.] Data were missing for the measurement of C-reactive protein in 12 patients (14.8) and D-Dimer in four patients (4.9%).

Table 2. Treatment for severe COVID-19 throughout the study period, according to outcome by D28

	Total (n=81)	Rapid Recovery (n=53)	No Recovery (n=10)	Prolonged Recovery (n=18)
Respiratory Support				
Conventional oxygen therapy through nasal catheter	78 (96.3%)	52 (98.1%)	8 (80.0%)	18 (100.0%)
Conventional oxygen therapy through mask.	10 (12.3%)	6 (11.3%)	2 (20.0%)	2 (11.1%)
High flow nasal cannula	31 (38.3%)	18 (34.0%)	6 (60.0%)	7 (38.9%)
Non-invasive ventilation	22 (27.2%)	12 (24.5%)	3 (30.0%)	6 (33.3%)
Invasive ventilation	10 (12.3%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (70.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Other support				
Parenteral nutrition	17 (21.0%)	14 (26.4%)	3 (30.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Prone position therapy	16 (19.8%)	11 (20.8%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (11.1%)
Duration of prone position therapy, day	10.0 (4.0-19.5)	10.0 (2.0-20.0)	8.0 (5.0-19.0)	17.0 (3.0-32.0)
Blood transfusion	6 (7.4%)	2 (3.8%)	4 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Drugs				
Lopinavir or Ritonavir	71 (87.7%)	47 (88.7%)	6 (60.0%)	18 (100.0%)
Abidol	25 (30.9%)	13 (24.5%)	5 (50.0%)	7 (38.9%)
Ribavirin	12 (14.8%)	9 (17.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Nebulized recombinant human interferon α2b	57 (70.4%)	32 (60.4%)	9 (90.0%)	16 (88.9%)
Thymosin α	33 (40.7%)	19 (35.8%)	6 (60.0%)	8 (44.4%)
Immunoglobulin	15 (18.5%)	10 (18.9%)	2 (20.0%)	3 (16.7%)
Methylprednisolone	44 (54.3%)	27 (50.9%)	6 (60.0%)	11 (61.1%)

Maximum dose, mg	80.0 (40.0-80.0)	80.0 (40.0-80.0)	100.0 (80.0-160.0)	80.0 (40.0-80.0)
Duration, day	5.0 (4.0-7.0)	5.0 (3.0-7.0)	4.0 (3.0-8.0)	6 (4.0-9.0)
Antibiotics	58 (71.6%)	39 (73.6%)	8 (80.0%)	11 (61.1%)
Analgesics or sedatives	13 (16.1%)	5 (9.4%)	6 (60.0%)	2 (11.1%)
Neuromuscular-blocking drug	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Data are median (IQR) or n (%).



Figure 1. Distribution and referral routes of severe COVID-19 cases in Sichuan Province.

Distribution of all the 81 patients with severe COVID-19 from 13 cities and 2 minority autonomous prefectures of Sichuan province were shown in the figure. The blue dots denote the 18 designated hospital for severe cases, pink dots denote 30 designated hospital for non-severe cases, and green dots denote non-designated hospital. The red and green arrows represent the route taken by inpatient and outpatient cases, respectively.



Figure 2. Daily organ support for 81 patients with severe COVID-19 from D1 to D28.

Daily organ support, including respiratory support and renal replacement therapy, for each of the 81 patients with severe COVID-19 are shown from the day diagnosed severe (D1) to death, discharged from hospital, or D28.



Figure 3. Daily respiratory support needs for patients with severe COVID-19 from January 16 to March 15.

The bar plot shows, for each calendar day, counts of the respiratory support used for patients with severe **COVID**-19. Daily number of newly diagnosed patients with COVID-19 disease in Sichuan, newly diagnosed severe cases, and cumulative severe cases hospitalized are shown in lines.