

ASSOCIATION OF HYPERGLYCEMIA WITH HOSPITAL MORTALITY IN COVID-19 PATIENTS WITHOUT DIABETES: A COHORT STUDY

Manju Mamtani, MD^{1,*}, Ambarish M. Athavale, MD^{2,*}, Mohan Abraham, MD², Jane Vernik, MD², Amatur R Amarah MD², Juan P. Ruiz, MD², Amit J. Joshi, MD², Mathew Itteera, MD², Sara D Zhukovski, BS³, Ravi Prakash Madaiah, MS⁴, Peter Hart, MD², Hemant Kulkarni, MD¹

1 M&H Research, LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA

2 Division of Nephrology, Department of Medicine, Cook County Health, Chicago, Illinois

3 Rush Medical College, Chicago, Illinois

4 Cerner Corporation, Kansas City, Missouri

* Equal contribution as first author

SHORT RUNNING TITLE: HYPERGLYCEMIA IN COVID-19

Manuscript Word Count: 2,980

Number of Tables: 2; Number of figures: 2

Address for correspondence:

Hemant Kulkarni, MD

12023 Waterway Rdg,

M&H Research, LLC

San Antonio, Texas, 78249, USA

Email: hemant.kulkarni@mnhresearch.com

ABSTRACT

Objective: Diabetes is a known risk factor for mortality in Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients. Our objective was to identify prevalence of hyperglycemia in COVID-19 patients with and without diabetes and quantify its association with COVID-19 disease course.

Research Design and Methods: In this observational cohort study, all consecutive COVID-19 patients admitted to John H Stroger Jr. Hospital, Chicago, IL from March 15, 2020 to May 15, 2020 were included. The primary outcome was hospital mortality and the main predictor was hyperglycemia (any blood glucose ≥ 7.78 mmol/L during hospitalization).

Results: Of 403 COVID-19 patients studied, 228 (57%) developed hyperglycemia. Of these, 83 (21%) had hyperglycemia without diabetes. A total of 51 (12.7%) patients died. Compared to the reference group no-diabetes/no-hyperglycemia patients the no-diabetes/hyperglycemia patients showed higher mortality (1.8% versus 20.5%, adjusted odds ratio 21.94 (95% confidence interval 4.04-119.0), $p < 0.001$); improved prediction of death ($p=0.0162$) and faster progression to death ($p=0.0051$). Hyperglycemia within the first 24 and 48 hours was also significantly associated with mortality (odds ratio 2.15 and 3.31, respectively). Further, compared to the same reference group, no-diabetes/hyperglycemia patients had higher risk of ICU admission ($p<0.001$), mechanical ventilation ($p<0.001$) and acute respiratory distress syndrome ($p<0.001$) and a longer hospital stay in survivors ($p<0.001$).

Conclusions: Hyperglycemia in the absence of diabetes was common (21% of hospitalized COVID-19 patients) and was associated with an increased risk of and faster progression to death. Development of hyperglycemia in COVID-19 patients who do not have diabetes is an early indicator of poor prognosis.

INTRODUCTION

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-COV-2) is the novel coronavirus responsible for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic which has resulted in over 14 million cases and over 600,000 deaths globally¹. A meta-analysis² of 30 published studies showed that diabetes is associated with a higher mortality, need for intensive care, acute respiratory distress syndrome in COVID-19 disease. Diabetes (HbA_{1c} ≥6.5%) and/or uncontrolled hyperglycemia (≥2 glucose measurements >10.0 mmol/L) are associated with poor outcomes in COVID-19 patients.³ Stress hyperglycemia (defined as blood glucose values exceeding 7.78 mmol/L) in the absence of diabetes is seen in severe acute illness^{4, 5, 6}. Previous studies have shown that in critically ill patients, stress hyperglycemia is associated with poor clinical outcomes during hospitalization.⁷ Stress hyperglycemia can prolong the length of hospital stay^{8, 9} – a parameter that is closely linked with poor outcomes in COVID-19 patients¹⁰. An excess of circulating proinflammatory cytokines (common in COVID-19 patients) is associated with occurrence and consequences of hyperglycemia.¹¹⁻¹³ Sardu et al¹⁴ showed that hyperglycemia during hospitalization correlated with interleukin-6 and D-dimer concentrations in COVID-19 patients. However, whether hyperglycemia in absence of Diabetes has a potential role in COVID-19 disease course is not clear.

In this investigation, we focused on the potential of hyperglycemia detected early during hospitalization of COVID-19 as an indicator of mortality. We hypothesized that hyperglycemia even in the absence of diabetes may be associated with adverse outcomes in COVID-19 patients. Here, we report the independent association of hyperglycemia with clinical course in

COVID-19 patients using a single-center data of hospitalized COVID-19 patients from the United States of America.

METHODS

Study participants

This study was conducted at John H. Stroger, Jr Hospital of Cook County, Chicago, IL. All COVID-19 patients admitted between March 15, 2020 and May 3, 2020 and followed till the censoring date of May 15, 2020 were included. On the censoring day, 17 (4.2%) patients were still in hospital. COVID-19 was confirmed using the polymerase chain reaction for the RdRp and N genes. Clinical data of these patients was collected by chart reviews. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Cook County Health, Chicago, IL with waiver of informed consent.

Outcomes and predictors

The primary outcomes were hospital mortality and time to progress to mortality. Secondary outcomes were – admission to intensive care unit (ICU), mechanical ventilation, development of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and length of hospital stay. Outcome ascertainment was censored on May 15, 2020. Patients still in hospital who did develop an outcome under consideration were censored for computation of length of stay and time-to-event analyses.

Main predictor of interest was hyperglycemia defined as at least one BG value ≥ 7.78 mmol/L – a cutoff recommended as a treatment target in critically ill patients¹⁵ and a definition of

hyperglycemia in non-critically ill hospitalized patients¹⁶. To examine the use of hyperglycemia as an early predictor of adverse outcomes, we also considered occurrence of hyperglycemia within the first 24 hours (HG₂₄) and 48 hours (HG₄₈) of admission. BG values were retrospectively derived from the database and represented a mixture of fasting and non-fasting measurements and venous and capillary sources. Detailed information collected on socio-demographics, presenting symptoms, comorbidities, laboratory investigations, history of medications and substance use from the electronic health records. Severity of illness at admission was quantified using the qSOFA score that combines information from respiratory rate, systolic blood pressure and mental status into a single metric.¹⁷

Statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics included mean and standard deviation (for continuous variables) and proportion (for categorical variables). The association of diabetes and hyperglycemia with outcomes was tested for significance using the Pearson's chi-square test and the Kruskal-Wallis test as appropriate. The association with mortality was quantified as odds ratios (OR) using multivariable stepwise logistic regression analyses with forward addition strategy and a retention criterion of 0.05. The forward addition strategy was used since it is robust to the number of predictors for a moderate size dataset and accounts for the potential collinearity among covariates without overfitting the data. Since some patients initially not identified as having diabetes could have been misclassified, we conducted sensitivity analyses using a three-pronged approach: a. we restricted the analyses to patients on whom HbA1C data was available; b. in this subset we reclassified patients with HbA1C $\geq 6.5\%$ as diabetes; and c. We

conducted bootstrapping with 1000 replicates for robust estimation of 95% confidence intervals (CI). The differential rate of progression to death was examined using the Kaplan-Meier plot and tested for significance using the logrank test. The time trends of BG values during hospitalization were examined using generalized estimating equations (GEE). The GEE models used Gaussian family function, identity link function and equal correlation structure. BG time trends were smoothed using cubic splines with a knot every day for the first 14 days of admission. Improvement in the prediction of the primary outcome using hyperglycemia was assessed by estimating the area under a receiver-operating characteristic curve (AUROC). Statistical significance for difference between two AUROCs was tested using the DeLong and DeLong test. All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata 12.0 software package (Stata Corp., College Station, TX). The statistical significance was assessed at a type I error rate of 0.05.

RESULTS

Study participants

We included a total of 403 (out of 406 eligible, 99.3%) COVID-19 patients who were admitted to the study center and had non-missing data for diabetes and other comorbidities. Clinical characteristics of the study participants are detailed in Table 1. Majority of the patients were male (67.7%), of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity (54.84%) and Black/African American race (38%). 97 (24%) patients needed ICU admission; 56 (~14%) patients needed mechanical ventilation; and 51 (~13%) patients died.

Prevalence of hyperglycemia and diabetes

Hyperglycemia was observed in 228 (56.6%) patients (Figure 1A, yellow and red slices of the pie combined). The presence of hyperglycemia and diabetes identified four subsets of patients: those with diabetes and hyperglycemia (DM^+/HG^+ , $n = 145$, 36.0%), patients with diabetes but no hyperglycemia (DM^+/HG^- , $n = 10$, 2.5%), patients with hyperglycemia who did not have diabetes (DM^-/HG^+ , $n = 83$, 20.6%) and patients who had neither diabetes nor hyperglycemia (DM^-/HG^- , $n = 165$, 40.9%) (Figure 1A). HbA1c values within the past year were available for 279 patients (69.2%, Table 1). The median (interquartile range) HbA1c values for the four groups were as follows: DM^+/HG^+ group (available $n = 141$) – 8 % (3.3%); DM^-/HG^+ group (available $n = 51$) – 5.7% (0.8%); DM^+/HG^- group (available $n = 8$) – 6.75% (0.75%); and DM^-/HG^- group (available $n = 79$) – 5.6% (0.6%). Three (2.1%) patients belonging to the DM^-/HG^- group and 10 (19.6%) patients belonging to the DM^-/HG^+ group had one HbA1c value $\geq 6.5\%$.

As shown in Figure 1B (White funnel), for the 403 patients included in this study, we had a total of 7,263 (average 18.0 per patient) BG measurements over the entire period of hospitalization. Of these, 3,983 BG measurements were on 97 patients who were admitted to ICU during hospital stay and 70/97 (72.2%) patients had their first hyperglycemia finding before ICU admission. Of the 83 patients in the DM^-/HG^+ group (Figure 1B, yellow funnel), 36 were admitted to ICU and 25/36 (69.4%) patients had their first hyperglycemia finding before ICU hospitalization. The average time (95% CI) from first hyperglycemia finding to ICU admission was 6.83 days (5.32 – 8.36 days) in all patients ($n = 70$) and 7.32 days (4.45 – 10.2 days) in the DM^-/HG^+ group ($n = 25$).

Glycemia during hospitalization

Figure 2A shows the cubic spline smoothed, non-linear trends of glycemia in the study participants over the period of hospitalization according to the study groups. DM⁻/HG⁻ patients (blue curve) had well-maintained BG levels that stayed around 5.56 mmol/L throughout the first two-weeks of hospitalization with very little fluctuation. The DM⁺/HG⁻ patients (green curve) also mimicked the blue curve albeit with wider confidence bands and smaller number of data points. DM⁺/HG⁺ patients (red curve) demonstrated consistently high BG values with substantially larger fluctuations.

BG levels of the DM⁻/HG⁺ patients (yellow curve) showed an interesting pattern. For the first week, these patients had low average values that appeared to increase in the second week. Indeed, during the second week the DM⁺/HG⁺ and DM⁻/HG⁺ patients (red and yellow curve, respectively) showed overlapping confidence bands indicating no statistical difference in average BG levels. Consistent with these observations, the average coefficient of variation of BG values in the DM⁺/HG⁺ (red curve), DM⁺/HG⁻ (green curve), DM⁻/HG⁺ (yellow curve) and DM⁻/HG⁻ (blue curve) patients was 28.3%, 9.8%, 24.9% and 7.3%, respectively.

Association of hyperglycemia and diabetes with mortality

We investigated the association of hyperglycemia with risk of hospital mortality in three steps. First, we ran a stepwise logistic regression model with a forward addition strategy that included a total of 59 covariates (all covariates are listed in the footnote to Table 2). Higher neutrophil percentage, older age, insulin therapy (as outpatient), hematuria, high serum globulin at

admission, low platelet count and nasal congestion significantly associated covariates retained in this final model. In the second step of this analysis, we added hyperglycemia to the full model (total number of covariates 60) and found that hyperglycemia was retained in the final model with an OR of 14. In this model two new covariates (fever with chills and marijuana use) got added to the final model at the expense of the symptom of nasal congestion. The AUROC for models in step1 and step 2 was 0.8625 (95% CI 0.8105 – 0.9145) and 0.8979 (95% CI 0.8584 – 0.9374), implying a statistically significant improvement in prediction (0.0354, $p = 0.0162$). Lastly, to understand the association of hyperglycemia with and without diabetes, we replaced the covariate hyperglycemia with indicators for diabetes and hyperglycemia groups and used the DM⁻/HG⁻ patients as the reference group. The results (Table 2, step 3) showed that occurrence of hyperglycemia in patients with or without diabetes was significantly associated with hospital mortality. All other covariates retained in the final model in this step 3 were the same as those retained in step 2. This analytic strategy demonstrated that hyperglycemia with or without diabetes was an independent predictor of hospital mortality.

We assessed the robustness of this finding in several ways. First, the estimated ORs did not significantly differ between males and females (data not shown). Second, sensitivity analyses on patients with HbA1c data reaffirmed these results with a comparably high OR (13.0, Supplementary Table 1) and bootstrap CIs above unity. Third, the first detection of hyperglycemia was not influenced by the number of BG measurements ordered till that time point (adjusted OR 0.94, 95% CI 0.87 – 1.03) . Lastly, we conducted a 10-fold cross-validation of the final model (Table 2, step 2); the results of which (Supplementary Table 2) showed a

consistent prediction across folds (average 10-fold accuracy 0.7581) implying that the model did not overfit the data. Together, these results indicated that our observation of the association between hyperglycemia and mortality risk in hospitalized COVID-19 patients was robust to potential misclassification and indication biases.

Hyperglycemia as an early indicator of mortality

To examine the clinical use of hyperglycemia as a predictor of mortality, we investigated whether detection of hyperglycemia early after admission can still provide a prognostic value. Average time from hospital admission to the first detection of hyperglycemia was 0.11 days (95% CI 0 – 0.27 days) in diabetes patients and 2.15 days (95% CI 1.46 – 2.83 days) in non-diabetes patients. Of the 228 patients with hyperglycemia, 177 (77.6%) were detected by the end of 24 hours and an additional 17 (total of 194, 85.1%) by the end of 48 hours. For this, we repeated the analyses shown in Table 2, step 2 by replacing the variable hyperglycemia with either or. Hyperglycemia detected during the first 24 hours (HG_{24}) and 48 hours (HG_{48}) was a significant and independent predictor of mortality (HG_{24} - OR 2.15, 95% CI 1.00 – 4.59, HG_{48} OR - 3.31, 95% CI 1.44 – 7.62). Sensitivity analyses (Supplementary Table 1) in patients with HbA1c data suggested that while HG_{24} was marginally non-significant, HG_{48} was an independent predictor of mortality. Together, these results indicated that hyperglycemia was an early predictor of mortality in the study cohort.

Association of hyperglycemia and diabetes with time to death

The Kaplan-Meier plot (Figure 2B) (left-censored at the first detection of hyperglycemia), showed 90% survival in the DM^-/HG^- group (blue curve) while the DM^+/HG^+ patient group (red curve) rapidly progressed to death with a median survival time of 19.4 days. Interestingly, the DM^-/HG^+ group (yellow curve) overlapped the survival curve for the DM^+/HG^+ group with a median survival time of 26.2 days. Survival curves for the DM^+/HG^+ (red curve) and DM^-/HG^+ (yellow curve) patients crossed each other towards the end of follow-up indicating comparable survival. These results showed that the hyperglycemia and diabetes-based patient groups were significantly associated (logrank $p=0.005$) with survival in hospitalized COVID-19 patients.

Association of hyperglycemia and diabetes with secondary outcomes

Consistent with the results presented thus far, we observed that the patients in the DM^+/HG^+ (red bars) and DM^-/HG^+ (yellow bars) groups had significantly high rates of ICU admission, mechanical ventilation and development of ARDS (Figure 2, panels C-E). These results were replicated when restricted to patients with HbA1c data (Supplementary Table 4). HG_{24} and HG_{48} were significantly associated with all the three outcomes (Supplementary Table 5) affirming the prognostic use of early hyperglycemia. Lastly, we replicated these analyses in the subset of patients where the first detection of hyperglycemia preceded the specific outcome. The results of these analyses (Supplementary Table 6) corroborated with those shown in Figure 2 (panels C-E). Further, in the surviving patients, those belonging to the DM^-/HG^+ group (yellow box in Figure 2F) had significantly long median length of hospital stay (7.6 days) as compared to the other three groups (ranging from 2.9 to 3.8 days) (Kruskal-Wallis $p < 0.001$).

DISCUSSION

The prevalence of hyperglycemia in our study of hospitalized COVID-19 patients was 57% which is higher than the 38-40% prevalence reported in non-COVID-19 patients.¹⁸ Our analyses have uncovered a subgroup (21%) of hospitalized non diabetic COVID-19 patients with hyperglycemia that is associated with a high risk of death; have a rapid progression to death; and have a generally challenging clinical course. Diabetes patients are a high-risk group in COVID-19 disease.² While our results support this view, they also imply that it may be more informative to focus on glycemic status as an indicator of the clinical course of COVID-19 patients. Focusing on hyperglycemia, as shown by results in Table 2 and Figure 2, can potentially inform a clinician early and accurately about the anticipated disease course. Our results also point toward the possibility of using hyperglycemia within the first 48 hours of admission as an independent predictor of COVID-19 prognosis. It is noteworthy, that our definition of hyperglycemia is biased towards picking up hyperglycemia early during disease.

We and others have previously demonstrated that the degree of hyperglycemia in critically ill patients without diabetes plays a significant prognostic role in predicting hospital mortality.^{8, 19,}
²⁰ However, this prognostic role of hyperglycemia varies by the primary cause of critical care such that primary diagnoses like trauma, coma and neurological diseases are especially prone to high likelihood of adverse outcomes associated with hyperglycemia.⁸ Our results need to be viewed in the light of the emerging literature on association of hyperglycemia with COVID-19 prognosis. Studies have shown that pre-existing diabetes ², newly detected diabetes ²¹, prediabetes ²², uncontrolled hyperglycemia (≥ 2 BG values of ≥ 10 mmol/L, ³) or fasting BG ≥ 7

mmol/L²³ are significant determinants of COVID-19 prognosis. Our study shows that hyperglycemia detected early after hospitalization in patients without a history of diabetes can also independently predict the disease course in COVID-19 patients. Considering the concordance and concurrence of the COVID-19 related cytokine storm^{14, 24, 25} it is conceivable that hyperglycemia in COVID-19 patients (especially in patients without diabetes) may be partly contributed to by an intense pro-inflammatory milieu. Future studies are needed to accept or refute these mechanistic hypotheses.

Our study has some limitations. First, this is an observational study of hospitalized COVID-19 patients and is thus prone to all the limitations of observational studies. For instance, causative association cannot be inferred from our results. While our analyses attempted to ensure that hyperglycemia preceded the outcomes of interest, the possibility of a temporal bias cannot be refuted. Second, our study was not designed to implement any practice changes based on hyperglycemia detection. On the contrary, we posit that a closer clinical scrutiny of COVID-19 patients based on glycemic status may provide additional insights into their clinical course. Studies in future need to specifically address these hypotheses. Third, whether hyperglycemia in COVID-19 patients is consequential or coincidental to disease biology is currently unknown and cannot be surmised from our results. Studies are needed to specifically understand the biology of hyperglycemia in COVID-19 patients. Fourth, since the BG data were retrospectively derived from the source of blood sample, its relation to fasting status remains unknown in this study. This heterogeneity of BG sampling could have biased our OR estimates. Despite this potential measured and unmeasured confounding, our results from sensitivity analyses indicate

that our interpretations are likely to have been minimally influenced by confounding due to BG sampling. Fifth, the likelihood of undiagnosed diabetes at admission was 4% and 10% in the DM^-/HG^- and DM^-/HG^+ groups, respectively. We evaluated, through sensitivity analyses, the influence of this misclassification on our interpretations. While the sensitivity analyses demonstrated the robustness of our inferences, larger multicentric studies are needed before the findings can be generalized.

Nevertheless, we present evidence in favor of hyperglycemia as an early marker of clinical deterioration in COVID-19 patients. Hyperglycemia as defined in this study is mostly inclusive of and incremental to known diabetes status both in terms of prevalence and its association with mortality. A shift of focus from diabetes to hyperglycemia can enable early identification of patients at risk for poor outcomes and thus improve risk stratification of COVID-19 patients.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None of the authors have a conflict of interest to disclose. H.K., A.M.A. and M.M. conceptualized the study. H.K. and M.M. conducted statistical analyses and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. A.M.A., M.A., J.V., A.R.A., J.P.R., A.J.J., M.I., S.Z., R.P.M. and P.H. contributed to data collection and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript. H.K. and A.M.A are the guarantors who take full responsibility for the work as a whole, including the study design, access to data, and the decision to submit and publish the manuscript. Funding – None.

REFERENCES

1. COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU). 2020. Accessed April 25, 2020.
2. Huang I, Lim MA, Pranata R. Diabetes mellitus is associated with increased mortality and severity of disease in COVID-19 pneumonia - A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. *Diabetes & metabolic syndrome*. Apr 17 2020;14(4):395-403.
3. Bode B, Garrett V, Messler J, et al. Glycemic Characteristics and Clinical Outcomes of COVID-19 Patients Hospitalized in the United States. *Journal of diabetes science and technology*. May 9 2020:1932296820924469.
4. Jivanji CJ, Asrani VM, Windsor JA, Petrov MS. New-Onset Diabetes After Acute and Critical Illness: A Systematic Review. *Mayo Clinic proceedings*. May 2017;92(5):762-773.
5. Boonen E, Van den Berghe G. Endocrine responses to critical illness: novel insights and therapeutic implications. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism*. May 2014;99(5):1569-1582.
6. Mifsud S, Schembri EL, Gruppeta M. Stress-induced hyperglycaemia. *British journal of hospital medicine*. Nov 2 2018;79(11):634-639.
7. Olariu E, Pooley N, Danel A, Miret M, Preiser JC. A systematic scoping review on the consequences of stress-related hyperglycaemia. *PloS one*. 2018;13(4):e0194952.
8. Mamtani M, Kulkarni H, Bihari S, et al. Degree of hyperglycemia independently associates with hospital mortality and length of stay in critically ill, nondiabetic patients: Results from the ANZICS CORE binational registry. *Journal of critical care*. Feb 2020;55:149-156.
9. Pieralli F, Bazzini C, Fabbri A, et al. The classification of hospitalized patients with hyperglycemia and its implication on outcome: results from a prospective observational study in Internal Medicine. *Internal and emergency medicine*. Aug 2016;11(5):649-656.

10. Wynants L, Van Calster B, Bonten MMJ, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal. *Bmj*. Apr 7 2020;369:m1328.
11. de Lucena TMC, da Silva Santos AF, de Lima BR, de Albuquerque Borborema ME, de Azevedo Silva J. Mechanism of inflammatory response in associated comorbidities in COVID-19. *Diabetes & metabolic syndrome*. May 12 2020;14(4):597-600.
12. Azkur AK, Akdis M, Azkur D, et al. Immune response to SARS-CoV-2 and mechanisms of immunopathological changes in COVID-19. *Allergy*. May 12 2020.
13. Turina M, Fry DE, Polk HC, Jr. Acute hyperglycemia and the innate immune system: clinical, cellular, and molecular aspects. *Critical care medicine*. Jul 2005;33(7):1624-1633.
14. Sardu C, D'Onofrio N, Balestrieri ML, et al. Outcomes in Patients With Hyperglycemia Affected by COVID-19: Can We Do More on Glycemic Control? *Diabetes care*. Jul 2020;43(7):1408-1415.
15. Lansang MC, Umpierrez GE. Inpatient hyperglycemia management: A practical review for primary medical and surgical teams. *Cleveland Clinic journal of medicine*. May 2016;83(5 Suppl 1):S34-43.
16. Kodner C, Anderson L, Pohlgeers K. Glucose Management in Hospitalized Patients. *American family physician*. Nov 15 2017;96(10):648-654.
17. Freund Y, Lemachatti N, Krastinova E, et al. Prognostic Accuracy of Sepsis-3 Criteria for In-Hospital Mortality Among Patients With Suspected Infection Presenting to the Emergency Department. *Jama*. Jan 17 2017;317(3):301-308.
18. Corsino L, Dhatariya K, Umpierrez G. Management of Diabetes and Hyperglycemia in Hospitalized Patients. In: Feingold KR, Anawalt B, Boyce A, et al., eds. *Endotext*. South Dartmouth (MA)2000.

19. Yao RQ, Ren C, Wu GS, Zhu YB, Xia ZF, Yao YM. Is intensive glucose control bad for critically ill patients? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International journal of biological sciences*. 2020;16(9):1658-1675.
20. Murphy CV, Saliba L, MacDermott J, Soe K, Dungan KM. Individualizing Glycemic Control in the Critically Ill. *Critical care nursing quarterly*. Jan/Mar 2020;43(1):14-27.
21. Li H, Tian S, Chen T, et al. Newly diagnosed diabetes is associated with a higher risk of mortality than known diabetes in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *Diabetes, obesity & metabolism*. May 29 2020.
22. Smith SM, Boppana A, Traupman JA, et al. Impaired glucose metabolism in patients with diabetes, prediabetes, and obesity is associated with severe COVID-19. *Journal of medical virology*. Jun 26 2020.
23. Wang S, Ma P, Zhang S, et al. Fasting blood glucose at admission is an independent predictor for 28-day mortality in patients with COVID-19 without previous diagnosis of diabetes: a multi-centre retrospective study. *Diabetologia*. Jul 10 2020.
24. Tufan A, Avanoglu Guler A, Matucci-Cerinic M. COVID-19, immune system response, hyperinflammation and repurposing antirheumatic drugs. *Turkish journal of medical sciences*. Apr 21 2020;50(SI-1):620-632.
25. Fung SY, Yuen KS, Ye ZW, Chan CP, Jin DY. A tug-of-war between severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 and host antiviral defence: lessons from other pathogenic viruses. *Emerging microbes & infections*. 2020;9(1):558-570.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study participants (total n = 403)

Characteristic†	Mean / N*	SD / %	N available**
<i>Socio-demographic characteristics</i>			
Age (y)	54.96	13.55	403
Males	273	67.74	403
Hispanic/Latino ethnicity	221	54.84	403
Race			
Black / African American	153	37.97	403
White	137	34.00	403
Other	79	19.60	403
American Indian	25	6.20	403
Asian	7	1.74	403
Multiple	2	0.50	403
<i>Presenting symptoms</i>			
Cough	101	25.06	403
Fever	75	18.61	403
Shortness of breath	61	15.14	403
Myalgia / arthralgia	47	11.66	403
Fatigue	35	8.68	403
Fever with chills	28	6.95	403
Cough with sputum	23	5.71	403
Diarrhea	21	5.21	403
Sore throat	10	2.48	403
Nausea / vomiting	10	2.48	403
Nasal congestion	8	1.99	403
Headache	7	1.74	403
Altered mental status	7	1.74	403
Hemoptysis	2	0.50	403
<i>Comorbidities</i>			
Hypertension	196	48.64	403
Obesity (BMI ≥ 30 Kg/m ²)	185	45.91	403
Diabetes	155	38.46	403
Coronary artery disease	31	7.69	403
Chronic kidney disease	31	7.69	403
Asthma	27	6.70	403
Other lung disease	25	6.20	403
Chronic liver disease	25	6.20	403
Cancer	25	6.20	403
Chronic heart failure	21	5.21	403
COPD	17	4.22	403
ESRD	15	3.72	403

HIV/AIDS	10	2.48	403
Atrial fibrillation	9	2.23	403
Smoking status			
Non-smoker	276	68.83	401
Former smoker	51	12.72	401
Current smoker	39	9.73	401
Unknown	35	8.73	401
qSOFA score			
qSOFA 0	110	27.30	403
qSOFA 1	205	50.87	403
qSOFA 2	86	21.34	403
qSOFA 3	2	0.50	403
<i>Other early features</i>			
Highest temperature in 24 hours (°C)	38.19	0.89	402
Lowest systolic BP in 24 hours (mmHg)	108.90	15.88	403
Highest heart rate in 24 hours (bpm)	105.08	16.53	403
Highest respiratory rate in 24 hours (/min)	26.96	13.12	403
<i>Initial laboratory investigations</i>			
White cell count (x10 ⁹ cells/L)	7.56	3.97	402
Platelet count (x10 ⁹ cells/L)	224.15	112.90	402
Hemoglobin (g/L)	1.34	0.22	402
Differential white cell count			
Neutrophils (%)	74.12	11.66	374
Lymphocytes (%)	16.58	9.29	373
Eosinophils (%)	0.43	0.99	373
Basophils (%)	0.45	0.30	375
Monocytes (%)	8.42	3.68	373
Serum ferritin (µg/L)	784.88	1063.95	263
Serum sodium (mEq/L)	135.39	5.00	403
Serum potassium (mEq/L)	4.15	0.59	371
Serum bicarbonates (mEq/L)	24.10	4.17	403
First blood glucose level (mmol/L)	8.04	4.24	403
Serum creatinine (µmol/L)	145.01	221.93	403
Serum albumin (g/L)	0.35	0.05	375
Serum globulin (g/L)	0.30	0.10	403
Serum AST (U/L)	55.24	78.39	357
Serum ALT (IU/L)	44.74	55.53	375
Serum LDH (U/L)	375.84	475.00	313
Serum D-dimer (mg/L)	2.18	3.30	221
Lowest plasminogen (mg/L)	540.36	190.66	152
Serum Troponin (µg/L)	0.26	1.86	116

Serum creatine kinase (U/L)	2682.92	16006.10	53
Serum C-reactive protein (mg/L)	12.72	8.88	279
Proteinuria	8	1.99	403
Hematuria	52	12.90	403
HbA1c (%)	7.22	2.29	279
Medication history			
Insulin	69	46.00	150
ACE inhibitors	85	21.09	403
Angiotensin receptor blockers	28	6.95	403
Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist	10	2.48	403
Beta-blocker	62	15.38	403
Other antihypertensive	103	25.56	403
Statin	137	34.00	403
NSAID	28	6.95	403
Aspirin	77	19.11	403
Vitamin C supplementation	1	0.25	403
Vitamin D supplementation	6	1.49	403
Hydroxychloroquine	2	0.50	403
Azithromycin	4	0.99	403
Warfarin	10	2.48	403
Apixiban	4	0.99	403
Riveroxaban	7	1.74	403
Steroids	3	0.74	403
Chemotherapy	16	3.97	403
Calcineurin inhibitor	3	0.74	403
Mycophenolate mofetil	2	0.50	403
Azathioprine	1	0.25	403
Substance use			
Marijuana	16	3.97	403
Cocaine	19	4.71	403
Heroin	22	5.46	403
Amphetamine	2	0.50	403
Outcomes			
ICU admission	97	24.06	403
ARDS	61	15.14	403
Mechanical ventilation	56	13.90	403
Death	51	12.66	403
Length of stay (d)	7.29	7.35	403

*, Columns indicate mean and standard deviation (SD) for continuous variables and number (N) and proportion for categorical variables

**, Total number of study participants on whom data was available

†, Parentheses show units

Table 2. Association of hyperglycemia and diabetes with the risk of death using stepwise logistic regression. Results shown are from final model for each scenario.

Covariates	OR	95% CI
Step 1: using 59 covariates*		
Differential neutrophil count**	1.10	1.06 – 1.15
Age	1.05	1.02 – 1.08
On insulin	2.65	1.17 – 5.97
Hematuria	4.27	1.78 – 10.3
Initial Serum globulin	2.99	1.50 – 5.95
Initial Platelet count	0.99	0.99 – 1.00
Nasal congestion	9.06	1.33 – 61.9
Step 2: Step 1 covariates + hyperglycemia		
Differential neutrophil count**	1.09	1.04 – 1.14
Hyperglycemia	14.0	3.47 – 56.3
Age	1.05	1.02 – 1.09
Hematuria	3.28	1.78 – 10.3
Initial Serum globulin	2.99	1.50 – 5.96
Fever with chills	5.69	1.51 – 21.5
Marijuana use	20.9	2.51 – 174.8
Initial Platelet count	0.99	0.99 – 1.00
Step 3: Step 1 covariates + combination of diabetes and hyperglycemia		
Differential neutrophil count**	1.09	1.04 – 1.14
Glycemic status		
No-diabetes/no-hyperglycemia	Ref	
No-diabetes/hyperglycemia	21.94	4.04 – 119.0
Diabetes/no-hyperglycemia	5.97	0.32 – 111.8
Diabetes/hyperglycemia	17.06	3.46 – 84.1
Age	1.06	1.02 – 1.09
Hematuria	3.39	1.39 – 8.34
Initial Serum globulin	2.88	1.46 – 5.70
Fever with chills	6.10	1.62 – 23.0
Marijuana use	17.78	1.97 – 160.5
Initial Platelet count	0.99	0.99 – 1.00

*, Results are from the final model retained after stepwise forward addition strategy. We included total 59 covariates – 4 sociodemographic variables (age, gender, ethnicity and black race), 12 symptoms (cough, cough with sputum, nasal congestion, headache, fever, fever with chills, shortness of breath, nausea/vomiting, diarrhea, myalgia, altered mental status and fatigue), 14 comorbidities (hypertension, diabetes, coronary artery disease, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, other lung disease, chronic kidney disease, end-stage renal disease, chronic liver disease, cancer, ever smoker, alcohol consumption and qSOFA score), 11 laboratory investigations (total white cell count, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, platelet count, hemoglobin concentration, serum sodium, serum bicarbonates, serum creatinine, serum globulin, proteinuria, hematuria) 15 medications (insulin, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists, beta-blockers, other anti-hypertensive, statins, non-steroidal anti-

inflammatory drugs, aspirin, vitamin D, hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, rivaroxaban, chemotherapy and steroids) and 3 substance use variables (marijuana, cocaine and heroin). Variables in the final model are shown in the order of entry into the model.

**, used as a continuous variable and expressed as percentage

OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; Ref, reference category

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Distribution of study groups and blood glucose measurements in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. (A) The pie chart shows number (%) of patients in the color-coded study groups. These color-codes are consistently used throughout the rest of the paper. DM^+/HG^+ , patients with diabetes and hyperglycemia; DM^+/HG^- , patients with diabetes but no hyperglycemia; DM^-/HG^+ , patients with hyperglycemia who did not have diabetes; DM^-/HG^- , patients who had neither diabetes nor hyperglycemia **(B)** Funnel plots showing the distribution of patient subsets when considered in all study participants (funnel with white background); in the DM^-/HG^+ group (yellow background); in the DM^+/HG^+ group (red background); and in the DM^-/HG^- group (blue background). N, number of patients; M, number of blood glucose measurements; *, DM^+/HG^- group (N = 10 (2.5%)).

Figure 2. Glycemia trends and association of hyperglycemia with study outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. (A) Trends in glycemia over two-weeks following hospital admission for the diabetes- and hyperglycemia-based, color-coded study groups. N and M indicate number of patients and number of BG measurements, respectively. Shown in the plot for each study group are cubic spline-smoothed, non-linear glycemia trends obtained using generalized estimating equations. Thick lines show point estimates and light-colored areas show 95% confidence bands. **(B)** Kaplan-Meier plot for time to death in the color-coded study groups left-censored at the time of first detection of hyperglycemia. Median time to death is indicated using color-coded numbers and dashed vertical lines. Statistical significance for

difference in survival curves was tested using the logrank test (indicated at the top-right corner). **(C-E)** Bar charts showing incidence of the indicated outcome (ICU admission, mechanical ventilation and ARDS in panels C, D, and E, respectively) across color-coded study groups. Association was tested using Pearson's chi-square test which is shown on the top-right side of each panel. **(F)** Box plot showing the association of the color-coded study groups with length of stay in surviving patients. Median length of stay for each group is indicated by the white horizontal lines inside the colored boxes. Significance of association was tested using Kruskal-Wallis test (K-W P) the result of which is shown at the top-right side of panel F.



