

1 **Title:** Cardiovascular disease and severe hypoxemia associated with higher rates of non-invasive respiratory support failure in COVID-19

2

3 **Short title:** Non-invasive respiratory support in COVID-19

4

5 **Authors:** Jing Gennie Wang^{1,2}, Bian Liu³, Bethany Percha^{4,5}, Stephanie Pan³, Neha Goel¹, Kusum S. Mathews^{1,6}, Cynthia Gao^{4,5}, Pranai Tandon¹,
6 Max Tomlinson^{4,5}, Edwin Yoo⁷, Daniel Howell¹, Elliot Eisenberg¹, Leonard Naymagon⁸, Douglas Tremblay⁸, Krishna Chokshi⁹, Sakshi Dua¹, Andrew
7 Dunn⁹, Charles Powell¹, Sonali Bose¹

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care Medicine and Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York,
11 NY, USA

12 ²Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care Medicine and Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center,
13 Columbus, OH, USA

14 ³Department of Population Health Science and Policy, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

15 ⁴Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

16 ⁵Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

17 ⁶Department of Emergency Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

18 ⁷Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

19 ⁸Division of Hematology and Oncology, Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

20 ⁹Division of Hospital Medicine, Department of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

21

22 **Corresponding author:**

23 Dr. Sonali Bose

24 One Gustave L. Levy Place

25 Box 1232

26 New York, NY 10029

27 sonali.bose@mssm.edu

28

29 **Subject category:** 4.7 Mechanical Ventilation: Applications

30

31 **Keywords:** Coronavirus-2019, high-flow oxygen, non-invasive mechanical ventilation, endotracheal intubation, acute hypoxemic respiratory

32 failure

33

34 **Conflicts of interest:** None

35 JGW, BP, SP, BL and SB take responsibility for the integrity of the data and accuracy of the analyses. SB, JGW and BP conceived the original idea
36 and designed the study. JGW, CG, MT, PT, EY, DH, EE, LN, DT, KC, and SB contributed to the data collection. SP, BL and BP performed the
37 statistical analyses. JGW, BP, SP, BL, NG, KSM, SD, AD, CP, and SB contributed to data interpretation. JGW, BL, and SB drafted the manuscript. All
38 authors revised the manuscript for intellectual content and approved the final version of the manuscript.

39

40 **Funding source:** None

41

42 **Word count:** 3490/3500

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50 **ABSTRACT**

51 **Rationale**

52 Acute hypoxemic respiratory failure (AHRF) is the major complication of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), yet optimal respiratory support
53 strategies are uncertain.

54 **Objectives**

55 To describe outcomes with high-flow oxygen delivered through nasal cannula (HFNC) and non-invasive positive pressure ventilation (NIPPV) in
56 COVID-19 AHRF and identify individual factors associated with failure.

57 **Methods**

58 We performed a retrospective cohort study of hospitalized adults with COVID-19 treated with HFNC and/or NIPPV to describe rates of success
59 (live discharge without endotracheal intubation (ETI)), and identify characteristics associated with failure (ETI and/or in-hospital mortality) using
60 Fine-Gray sub-distribution hazard models.

61 **Results**

62 A total of 331 and 747 patients received HFNC and NIPPV as the highest level of non-invasive respiratory support, respectively; 154 (46.5%) in
63 the HFNC cohort and 167 (22.4%) in the NIPPV cohort were successfully discharged without requiring ETI. In adjusted models, significantly
64 increased risk of HFNC and NIPPV failure was seen among patients with cardiovascular disease (subdistribution hazard ratio (sHR) 1.82; 95%
65 confidence interval (CI), 1.17-2.83 and sHR 1.40; 95% CI 1.06-1.84), respectively, and among those with lower oxygen saturation to fraction of
66 inspired oxygen (SpO_2/FiO_2) ratio at HFNC and NIPPV initiation (sHR, 0.32; 95% CI 0.19-0.54, and sHR 0.34; 95% CI 0.21-0.55, respectively).

67 **Conclusions**

68 A significant proportion of patients receiving non-invasive respiratory modalities for COVID-19 AHRF achieved successful discharge without
69 requiring ETI, with lower success rates among those with cardiovascular disease or more severe hypoxemia. The role of non-invasive respiratory
70 modalities in COVID-19 related AHRF requires further consideration.

71

72 **Word count: 244/250**

73

74 **MeSH keywords:** Critical care, respiratory insufficiency, ventilation, coronavirus

75

76

77

78

79 **INTRODUCTION**

80 The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is responsible for the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic,
81 resulting in over 16.5 million cases and more than 655,000 deaths across 216 countries (1). The burden of cases in the United States has
82 exceeded that of any other country, with New York City as the epicenter of the pandemic at the time of this study, accounting for over 226,000
83 cases as of July 30, 2020 (2). The hallmark of COVID-19 is the development of acute respiratory illness, with a significant number of hospitalized
84 adult patients progressing to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) (3-6), and up to 18% ultimately requiring endotracheal intubation (ETI)
85 and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) (5-9). Importantly, mortality rates after ETI are substantial, ranging from 65-96% (3, 4, 7, 10).

86
87 While some experts during the pandemic have advocated for early ETI and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) (11), the optimal respiratory
88 support strategy for COVID-19 acute hypoxemic respiratory failure (AHRF) remains unclear (12). Compared to low-flow supplemental oxygen,
89 HFNC improves oxygenation and work of breathing (13) and reduces ETI rates (14-16), while NIPPV may be associated with a lower risk of both
90 ETI and mortality in certain non-COVID-19 populations with AHRF (16). Despite these benefits, some studies have shown that treatment failure
91 with HFNC and NIPPV is associated with worse outcomes, including increased mortality, possibly related to delayed ETI and initiation of IMV (17-
92 19). Reports of outcomes with HFNC and NIPPV in the COVID-19 population, however, remain limited to small case series (20, 21), with
93 significant variability in use of these modalities across centers (3, 9, 10, 22). Accordingly, individual characteristics associated with HFNC and
94 NIPPV failure in COVID-19 AHRF are unknown. Unclear benefits of HFNC and NIPPV have resulted in some experts advocating for avoidance of
95 these modalities in favor of early ETI during the pandemic (23).

96

97 To address this knowledge gap, we sought to describe patterns of HFNC and NIPPV use and outcomes for patients admitted with COVID-19 AHRF
98 within a large New York City academic health system. We subsequently identified specific demographic and clinical characteristics at the time of
99 HFNC and NIPPV initiation that were associated with HFNC and NIPPV failure, highlighting patient subgroups particularly susceptible to poor
100 outcomes with non-invasive respiratory support.

101

102 **METHODS**

103 **Study design and participants**

104 This retrospective cohort study included patients admitted to one of five hospitals within the Mount Sinai Health System, New York City,
105 including a large quaternary referral center, a tertiary care hospital, and three community hospitals, totaling 2,590 beds. The Icahn School of
106 Medicine at Mount Sinai institutional review board approved the study, and the requirement for informed consent was waived due to minimal
107 risk.

108

109 For the descriptive study aim, we included all hospitalized patients between >18 and 100 years of age admitted between March 1 and April 28, 2020
110 with a positive SARS-CoV-2 reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction of nasopharyngeal swab samples, and who required HFNC and/or
111 NIPPV prior to achieving an outcome of first ETI, live hospital discharge, or in-hospital mortality (Figure 1). Patients were followed up to May 31,
112 2020. Patients from the descriptive population without missing covariates were included in the analytic subset (Figure 1). For transferred

113 patients, defined as discharged from one of five hospital sites with readmission at another within 12 hours, both admissions were included as a
114 single hospitalization. If a patient was discharged for a period of >12 consecutive hours and subsequently readmitted, only the first admission
115 was considered.

116
117 Data were extracted from electronic databases, including Epic Clarity and Epic Caboodle (Epic Systems Corporation). ETI timings for 400 patients
118 were validated using chart review; only 3 out of 400 (0.75%) showed inconsistencies with the automatically extracted data due to charting
119 errors. Data collected included hospital disposition (either live discharge or death), patient demographics, code status of do-not-intubate (DNI),
120 comorbidities (captured using ICD-10 codes), medications (including anticoagulation therapies and corticosteroids), vital signs, laboratory tests,
121 and treatment with respiratory support devices (nasal cannula, face mask, non-rebreather mask, HFNC, NIPPV (defined as continuous or bilevel
122 positive pressure devices), and/or ETI with IMV). The last recorded vital signs and laboratory values prior to device initiation were selected; if
123 these were not available (for example, if the patient was placed on a device immediately at the time of admission) the measurements occurring
124 soonest after device initiation were selected.

125
126 **Outcomes**

127 The primary outcome was treatment success, defined as live hospital discharge without need for ETI. Treatment failure was defined as ETI
128 and/or in-hospital mortality, whichever occurred first, to account for patients who may have died before ETI documentation (e.g. during
129 cardiopulmonary resuscitation), or for whom IMV may have been indicated but who died without ETI due to DNI code status. Secondly, in

130 multivariable models including the subset of patients with non-missing data for covariates included in the main model, we explored specific
131 demographic and clinical characteristics at the time of HFNC or NIPPV initiation that were associated with treatment failure.

132

133 **Non-invasive respiratory support cohorts**

134 To simplify multiple transitions between HFNC and NIPPV that often take place during hospitalization, each patient was categorized into one of
135 two cohorts based on the highest level of non-invasive respiratory support required prior to outcome (as defined above), or if no outcome was
136 observed, the end of the study period. Accordingly, the HFNC cohort included patients who received HFNC but never NIPPV, while the NIPPV
137 cohort included patients who received NIPPV, or both HFNC and NIPPV at any point between hospital admission and outcome, irrespective of
138 sequence. In addition, timing of initiation and total duration of HFNC and/or NIPPV use from hospital admission to an outcome were calculated.

139

140 **Covariates**

141 Patient demographics included age, sex, race/ethnicity, and insurance type, as well as hospital site. Clinical factors included comorbidities,
142 smoking status, body mass index (BMI), and DNI code status (if documented prior to HFNC or NIPPV initiation), as well as vital signs, ratio of
143 peripheral blood oxygen saturation to fraction of inspired oxygen (SpO_2/FiO_2), and laboratory tests at the time of HFNC or NIPPV initiation.
144 Enrollment into investigational drug trials for COVID-19 was not included as a covariate, as only a portion of those enrolled ultimately received
145 the investigational agent and data regarding specific therapies could not be reported due to embargo.

146

147 **Statistical Analyses**

148 Baseline demographics and clinical characteristics at the time of device initiation are presented for both HFNC and NIPPV cohorts. Frequencies
149 and proportions are described for categorical variables and median and interquartile range (IQR) used for continuous measures. We determined
150 detailed follow-up time by outcome subgroups. For each cohort, Fine-Gray competing risk regression models were performed at univariable and
151 multivariable levels to estimate the sub-distribution hazard ratios (sHR) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) of treatment failure,
152 treating live hospital discharge as a competing risk. Patients were censored if they did not experience an outcome by end of the study period.
153 Covariates in the univariable models with $p \leq 0.15$ were entered into multivariable models for each cohort (Table E1). All continuous variables
154 used in models, except for age and temperature, were natural-log transformed to address observed skew in their underlying distributions (a
155 standard procedure in regression models).

156
157 We performed the following sensitivity analyses to test the robustness of the outcomes from the main model: (1) Addition of prophylactic- and
158 therapeutic-dose anticoagulation and/or corticosteroids administered prior to device initiation as individual covariates in the multivariable
159 models, as these interventions may have impacted the risk of failure and clinical characteristics may also differ by treatment status; (2) excluding
160 interleukin-6 and BMI, the two covariates with the most missing values, from the multivariable models to increase sample size and better
161 represent the initial study population; and (3) evaluating differences in demographics and clinical characteristics between patients with and
162 without any missing covariates (irrespective of whether they were included in adjusted models). P-values < 0.05 were considered statistically

163 significant. Analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC), and R (Version 3.5.0) using Rstudio (Version 1.1.453,
164 RStudio, Inc.).

165

166 **RESULTS**

167 **Population characteristics**

168 Of the 1,078 total patients receiving high-level non-invasive respiratory support at any point during their hospitalization, 331 (30.7%) and 747
169 (69.3%) required HFNC and NIPPV, respectively, as their highest level of non-invasive respiratory support with almost half of the NIPPV group
170 receiving both HFNC and NIPPV (316 patients, 42.3%) (Table 1). There was significant variability in HFNC and NIPPV use across hospital sites,
171 ranging from 3.5 to 9.5% for HFNC and 11.0 to 21.6% for NIPPV.

172

173 Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients in the HFNC and NIPPV cohorts are presented in Table 1. In both cohorts, comorbidities,
174 including chronic lung and cardiovascular diseases (Table E2), were common, and distributions of age, sex, and race/ethnicity were similar. At
175 time of HFNC and NIPPV initiation, patients had a median (IQR) SpO₂/FiO₂ of 98 (93, 125) and 97 (92, 121.4), respectively, suggesting severe
176 hypoxemia. Inflammatory markers were elevated in both groups (Table 1).

177

178 Considering dynamic respiratory support requirements including room air and low flow supplemental oxygen over time for a given patient, the
179 highest time-varying probability of receiving HFNC was 36% among those in the HFNC cohort, occurring between days 5-6 of admission (Figure

180 2). Among patients in the NIPPV cohort, the highest time-varying probability of being on NIPPV (31%) occurred within the first day of admission,
181 while HFNC use in the same group was 12% on day 5 of admission (Figure 2).

182

183 **Outcomes in the HFNC cohort**

184 Out of 331 patients in the HFNC cohort, 154 (46.5%) were successfully discharged without needing ETI during their hospital stay (Figure 3A). Of
185 the 177 (53.5%) who experienced HFNC failure, 100 (56.5%) required ETI and 77 (43.5%) died without ETI. Among the 100 patients who
186 ultimately required ETI, 35 (35.0%) were eventually discharged, 58 (58.0%) died and 7 (7.0%) were censored (Figure 3A). The median (IQR)
187 follow-up time in the overall HFNC cohort from time to device initiation to any of the defined outcomes (failure, success, or the end of study for
188 those who did not experienced failure or successful discharge) was 5.40 (1.00, 10.7) days, and specifically, was 1.36 (0.54, 3.77) days and 10.2
189 (6.72, 15.5) days among those who experienced treatment failure and successful discharge, respectively.

190

191 **Factors associated with HFNC failure**

192 In multivariable analysis, limited to the subset of patients in the HFNC cohort with complete data for all adjusted covariates (n = 232, 70%), a
193 significantly increased incidence of HFNC failure was observed among patients with cardiovascular disease (sHR 1.82; 95% CI, 1.17-2.83) (Figure
194 4). A lower SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio also increased the risk of HFNC failure (sHR 0.32; 95% CI, 0.19-0.54), as did a lower platelet count (sHR 0.61; 95% CI,
195 0.43-0.87). Admission to Community hospital C and the tertiary hospital reduced the risk of failure compared to the quaternary referral hospital
196 (sHR 0.55; 95% CI 0.31-0.99, and sHR 0.29; 95% CI, 0.16-0.55, respectively) (Figure 4).

197

198 **Outcomes in the NIPPV cohort**

199 Of 747 total patients requiring NIPPV, 167 (22.4%) were successfully discharged without requiring ETI. Of the 572 (76.6%) patients who
200 experienced NIPPV failure, 338 (59.1%) required ETI and 234 (40.9%) died without ETI. Of 338 patients who required ETI, 47 (13.9%) were
201 eventually discharged and 263 (77.8%) died (Figure 3B). The median (IQR) follow-up time for the NIPPV cohort was 4.1 (1.2, 9.1) days, and
202 specifically, was 2.6 (0.8, 6.7) days and 11.2 (6.8, 17.6) days for those with treatment failure and success, respectively.

203

204 **Factors associated with NIPPV failure**

205 In multivariable analysis limited to the subset of patients in the NIPPV cohort with complete data for all adjusted covariates (n = 408), co-morbid
206 cardiovascular disease and higher interleukin-6 were associated with increased risk of failure (sHR 1.40; 95% CI, 1.07-1.84, and sHR 1.13; 95% CI
207 1.02-1.26, respectively) (Figure 5). Increased risk of failure was also associated with a lower SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio (sHR 0.34; 95% CI, 0.21-0.55), lower
208 hemoglobin (sHR 0.41; 95% CI, 0.19-0.88), and lower peripheral lymphocyte percentage (sHR 0.74; 95% CI 0.59-0.94).

209

210 **Sensitivity analyses**

211 In sensitivity analyses where receipt of prophylactic or therapeutic anticoagulation and/or corticosteroids prior to device initiation were added
212 as covariates, co-morbid cardiovascular disease and lower SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio remained significantly associated with increased risk of failure in both
213 HFNC (Table E3) and NIPPV cohorts (Table E4). Similarly, despite differences in demographic and clinical characteristics between patients with

214 overall complete vs. incomplete covariate data (Table E5), significant associations between cardiovascular disease and SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio remained
215 in models where interleukin-6 and BMI were excluded to encompass a larger subset of patients (Tables E3 and E4).

216

217 **DISCUSSION**

218 This is the largest cohort study in patients with COVID-19 AHRF to date to describe patterns of use and outcomes with non-invasive respiratory
219 support modalities of HFNC and NIPPV. We observed that nearly half of the patients treated with HFNC and one-fifth of the patients treated with
220 NIPPV were successfully discharged without requiring ETI. As outcomes with HFNC and NIPPV were variable, we subsequently identified specific
221 clinical features, e.g. co-morbid cardiovascular disease, associated with increased risk of treatment failure (need for ETI and/or in-hospital
222 mortality). Recognition of these characteristics may help to identify vulnerable patient subgroups at higher risk of failure with non-invasive
223 modalities, thus necessitating closer monitoring. Similarly, more severe hypoxemia was associated with a higher rate of treatment failure in
224 those receiving non-invasive strategies, supporting their consideration primarily in patients with milder disease. Dedicated studies to evaluate
225 the efficacy of non-invasive modalities to reduce risks of ETI and mortality in COVID-19 AHRF are clearly warranted.

226

227 Limited studies of non-invasive respiratory support outcomes in COVID-19 patients report survival rates of 19.5% to 100% with HFNC (4, 20, 21)
228 and 7.7% to 37.7% with NIPPV (3, 4). Although our aim was not to directly compare these non-invasive modalities, we found that a lower
229 proportion of patients receiving NIPPV were successfully discharged compared to HFNC. A higher failure rate among patients receiving NIPPV
230 may be due to higher illness severity or inherent differences in physiologic mechanisms of HFNC and NIPPV for AHRF (24). Specifically, NIPPV

231 use in non-COVID-19 severe ARDS patients has been shown to result in higher ICU mortality (19), which is potentially attributable to the self-
232 inflicted lung injury phenomenon of high spontaneous respiratory drive, generation of large tidal volumes, and heterogeneity of ventilation and
233 regional distribution ventilation resulting in uncontrolled, potentially injurious transpulmonary pressures (25). Historically, treatment with NIPPV
234 for H1N1 influenza and the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome-coronavirus resulted in high failure rates leading to ETI, and clear benefits of
235 NIPPV use in SARS-CoV-1 have not been established (26). While we observed that a small subset of patients experienced good outcomes with
236 NIPPV, further studies comparing NIPPV with other forms of respiratory support are needed. Importantly, our observation that a subset of
237 patients using non-invasive respiratory support was successfully discharged from hospital without requiring ETI suggests that a uniform
238 approach of early ETI for all patients with COVID-19 AHRF deserves consideration (27-30). Avoidance of unnecessary ETI and IMV is paramount
239 to reduce IMV-associated complications, limit healthcare worker exposure associated with the ETI process (31), and preserve mechanical
240 ventilators in resource-constrained pandemic settings. Thus, the impact of non-invasive respiratory support modalities on reducing risk for ETI
241 and IMV and mortality merits further investigation.

242
243 Closer examination of non-invasive respiratory support use patterns revealed that the highest probabilities of requiring HFNC or NIPPV occurred
244 relatively early in the hospital course, consistent with other studies reporting deteriorating respiratory status and development of ARDS soon
245 after admission (4, 5, 32). Notably, we found that the median time to treatment failure was within two days after initiation of HFNC or NIPPV,
246 highlighting that the immediate period after initiation of non-invasive respiratory support represents a crucial window for clinical deterioration
247 and progression of disease. This is consistent with non-COVID-19 studies which have demonstrated that, for example, a ROX index (ratio of

248 oxygen saturation/ FiO_2 to respiratory rate) (33), of ≥ 4.88 after 12 hours of HFNC treatment for AHRE, is associated with a significantly lower
249 likelihood of requiring ETI (33). Furthermore, analysis of a subset of patients with non-COVID-19 ARDS treated with NIPPV from a large,
250 multicenter observational study showed that higher severity of illness, and worse oxygenation and ventilation over the first two days of NIPPV
251 use, were independently associated with the need for ETI (19, 34). Thus, in keeping with recommendations from the Surviving Sepsis Campaign
252 guidelines for COVID-19 (12), close monitoring and frequent reassessment of patients receiving non-invasive respiratory support, particularly
253 immediately after initiation, is essential.

254
255 Notably, we found that comorbid cardiovascular disease, including ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, and arrhythmias, was
256 independently and robustly associated with increased risk of both HFNC and NIPPV failure. This finding is consistent with and expands upon
257 other observational studies, which have demonstrated that cardiovascular disease is a common comorbidity among COVID-19 patients treated
258 with non-invasive respiratory support and is associated with poor outcomes (35). This relationship has been hypothesized to stem from viral-
259 mediated cardiac complications, including myocarditis, vascular inflammation with resultant cardiac injury and dysfunction, and new or
260 worsening cardiac arrhythmias (4, 36-39). Our work further highlights patients with cardiovascular disease as a vulnerable subgroup that is
261 susceptible to worse outcomes once initiated on non-invasive respiratory support.

262
263 We also observed other important clinical characteristics associated with HFNC and NIPPV outcomes. As expected, patients with higher severity
264 of illness--as represented by more severe hypoxemia at non-invasive respiratory support initiation--were at significantly higher risk of both HFNC

265 and NIPPV failure. Further characterization of the mechanisms and the extent to which the distribution of gas exchange and regional ventilation
266 can be corrected by non-invasive therapies are needed to better predict disease trajectory and outcomes specific to COVID-19. Additionally,
267 laboratory markers suggestive of more severe immune dysregulation, specifically elevated interleukin-6 and lymphopenia, were independently
268 associated with failure in the NIPPV cohort. Interleukin-6 is a pro-inflammatory cytokine frequently upregulated in patients with severe COVID-
269 19 as part of a dysregulated immune response, and elevated levels have been suggested to portend worse outcomes, including worsening acute
270 respiratory failure and need for IMV (40, 41). Furthermore, viral-mediated disruption of usual immune function may cause lymphocyte
271 exhaustion and lymphopenia (40), which has been associated with more severe disease and increased mortality (3, 5, 42). Lastly, hospital site
272 influenced outcomes in the HFNC cohort, which may be attributable to differences in patient severity of illness, resources, or capacity strain
273 during pandemic settings. Determination of the cause is beyond the scope of this study but deserves further exploration. Taken together,
274 specific demographic and early clinical characteristics at the time of non-invasive respiratory support initiation may inform clinicians of
275 susceptible subgroups of patients for whom close monitoring and early consideration of alternative management strategies is warranted if clear
276 clinical improvement is not evident.

277

278 Our study has notable strengths. First, this is the largest longitudinal cohort study to date to evaluate outcomes in patients treated with HFNC
279 and NIPPV on COVID-19 AHRF. Second, the granularity of our data enabled capture of accurate longitudinal data representing time-varying
280 laboratory results, vital signs and oxygenation status, and allowed us to map outcome trajectories associated with these devices. Third, the
281 diversity of our cohort, drawn from hospital sites representing distinct communities, improves the generalizability of our findings to other

282 COVID-19 populations. Fourth, we explored potential bias with several sensitivity analyses, accounting for patients with missing data and the
283 impact of anticoagulation and corticosteroids on the main analysis. Finally, we had a minimal number of censored patients, improving the
284 reliability of our outcomes.

285

286 This study also has several limitations. As an observational study, we cannot draw conclusions on the utility of HFNC and NIPPV compared to
287 low-flow supplemental oxygen. However, our study provides a strong basis for further efforts, including case-control studies and randomized
288 controlled trials to investigate the efficacy of non-invasive respiratory support in reducing risks of ETI and mortality. Additionally, we chose to
289 focus on factors at the time of HFNC or NIPPV initiation associated with treatment outcome and did not address the impact of subsequent
290 changes in clinical characteristics or treatments administered. We were also limited to using SpO₂/FiO₂ ratios to approximate degree of
291 hypoxemia (43), for which accurate interpretation of severity may be limited as arterial blood gases were unavailable for most patients.
292 Furthermore, we did not account for HFNC flow rates and NIPPV inspiratory/expiratory pressures, which may have influenced outcomes. Finally,
293 we did not assess healthcare worker infectious exposure risk, though prior studies of healthcare workers exposed to SARS-CoV 1 patients on
294 HFNC or NIPPV did not report significantly higher transmission risk (44, 45) and in a COVID-19 simulation study, the exhaled air dispersion during
295 well-fitted HFNC and CPAP use was limited (46).

296

297 **CONCLUSIONS**

298 A subset of patients treated with HFNC and/or NIPPV achieved hospital discharge without requiring ETI and IMV, suggesting that some patients
299 with COVID-19 AHRF can be managed effectively with these respiratory support modalities. Attention to specific demographic and early clinical
300 factors, such as co-morbid cardiovascular disease and severity of hypoxemia, may help inform use of non-invasive respiratory strategies,
301 allowing for a more personalized approach to the management of AHRF in pandemic settings.


302

303 **Acknowledgements**

304 We would like to thank our colleague Dr. Emilia Bagiella for her statistical input on this manuscript.

305 **FIGURES AND TABLES**

306 **Figure 1.** Selection flow diagram for study participant inclusion.



308 *Includes patients who received HFNC as the highest non-invasive respiratory support prior to outcome of first endotracheal intubation, live hospital discharge
309 or in-hospital mortality.

310 †Includes patients who received NIPPV as the highest non-invasive respiratory support prior to outcome of first endotracheal intubation, live hospital discharge
311 or in-hospital mortality.

312 SARS-CoV-2 PCR: Severe acute respiratory coronavirus-2 polymerase chain reaction; HFNC: High-flow oxygen delivered through nasal cannula; NIPPV: Non-
313 invasive positive pressure ventilation.

314

315 **Table 1.** Patient demographics, characteristics and treatments received at the time of HFNC and NIPPV initiation

	HFNC cohort (n = 331)	NIPPV cohort (n = 747)
Age (years), median (IQR)	67.7 (57.8, 78)	69.4 (60.9, 79.5)
Male sex, no. (%)	200 (60.4)	466 (62.4)
Race, no. (%)		
White	78 (23.6)	174 (23.3)
Black	84 (25.4)	185 (24.8)
Asian/Pacific Islander	19 (5.7)	40 (5.4)
Other/unknown	150 (45.3)	348 (46.6)
Ethnicity, no. (%)		
Non-Hispanic	193 (58.3)	442 (59.2)
Hispanic	101 (30.5)	216 (28.9)
Unknown	37 (11.2)	89 (11.9)
Insurance, no. (%)		
Medicare	134 (40.5)	315 (42.2)
Medicaid	48 (14.5)	89 (11.9)
Private	66 (19.9)	136 (18.2)
Self-pay	5 (1.5)	24 (3.2)
Other/unknown	78 (23.6)	183 (24.5)
Comorbidities, no. (%)		
Hypertension	167 (50.5)	406 (54.4)
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	112 (33.8)	287 (38.4)
Chronic lung disease *	192 (58)	379 (50.7)
Cardiovascular disease †	168 (50.8)	407 (54.5)
Cerebrovascular disease	38 (11.5)	73 (9.8)
Liver disease	17 (5.1)	52 (7)
Chronic kidney disease	52 (15.7)	149 (20)
Cancer	35 (10.6)	84 (11.2)

Smoking status, no. (%)		
Never	168 (50.8)	360 (48.2)
Unknown	70 (21.2)	172 (23)
Former	81 (24.5)	187 (25)
Current	12 (3.6)	28 (3.8)
Vital signs, median (IQR)		
Heart rate (beats per minute)	94 (82, 106)	95 (80, 109)
Systolic blood pressure	125 (113, 143)	128 (115, 144)
Diastolic blood pressure	73 (64, 80)	73 (64, 81)
Respiratory rate	20 (19, 25)	22 (20, 28)
SpO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio	98 (93, 125)	97 (92, 121.4)
Temperature (°Fahrenheit)	98.4 (97.5, 99.5)	98.4 (97.6, 99.3)
Body mass index, median (IQR)	28.8 (25.1, 34.0)	28.7 (25.4, 34.3)
Laboratory values, median (IQR)		
White blood cell count (x10 ³ /μL)	9.0 (6.7, 11.9)	9.8 (7.2, 13.4)
Peripheral lymphocyte (%)	9.6 (6.1, 14.3)	8.7 (5.6, 13.2)
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	12.7 (11.2, 14)	12.9 (11.2, 14.3)
Platelets (x10 ³ /μL)	249 (175, 330)	236 (171, 300)
D-Dimer (μg/mL)	1.8 (1.0, 5.1)	2.5 (1.3, 5.8)
C-reactive protein (mg/L)	170.8 (94.9, 239.4)	187.1 (102.7, 265.4)
Ferritin (ng/mL)	1090.0 (597.5, 2485.0)	1132.0 (509.0, 2276.0)
Interleukin-6 (pg/mL)	83.7 (40.6, 171.5)	93.0 (45.5, 207.0)
Pro-calcitonin (ng/mL)	0.3 (0.1, 0.8)	0.4 (0.2, 1.2)
Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.9 (0.7, 1.6)	1.2 (0.8, 1.9)
Code status[†]		
Do-not-intubate, no. (%)	59 (17.8)	96 (12.9)
Treatments received[§]		
Prophylactic anticoagulation, no. (%)	119 (36)	352 (47.1)
Therapeutic anticoagulation, no. (%)	95 (28.7)	193 (25.8)
Corticosteroids, no. (%)	5 (1.5)	12 (1.6)

Hospital admission site, no. (%)		
Quaternary referral hospital	152 (45.9)	190 (25.4)
Community hospital A	31 (9.4)	199 (26.6)
Community hospital B	28 (8.5)	95 (12.7)
Community hospital C	78 (23.6)	177 (23.7)
Tertiary hospital	42 (12.7)	86 (11.5)

324 *Chronic lung disease includes: Asthma, emphysema, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, chronic bronchitis, bronchiectasis, atelectasis, diaphragmatic
325 disease, interstitial lung diseases, sarcoidosis, and disorders of mediastinum.

326 †Cardiovascular disease includes: Atherosclerotic heart disease, ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, rheumatic heart disease, pericardial disease,
327 myocarditis, endocarditis, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, arrhythmias, history of cardiac arrest, peripheral vascular disease, aortic aneurysm, orthostatic
328 hypotension, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac arrest, post-procedural cardiac complications.

329 ‡Status at time of initiation of HFNC or NIPPV

330 §From hospital admission to initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

331 Missing sample size in the HFNC cohort included 38 for SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio, 41 for body mass index, 3 for peripheral lymphocyte percent, 16 for D-Dimer, 13 for C-
332 reactive protein, 11 for ferritin, 72 for interleukin-6, and 21 for pro-calcitonin.

333 Missing sample size in the NIPPV cohort included 52 for SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio, 132 for body mass index, 5 for peripheral lymphocyte percent, 40 for D-Dimer, 35 for
334 C-reactive protein, 37 for ferritin, 232 for interleukin-6, and 82 for pro-calcitonin.

335 HFNC: High-flow oxygen delivered through nasal cannula; NIPPV: Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation; IQR: Interquartile; SpO₂: Oxygen saturation; FiO₂:
336 Fraction of inspired oxygen.

337


338

339

340

341


342 **Figure 2.** Time-varying probabilities of HFNC and NIPPV use during hospital admission, and corresponding outcome trajectories. Among patients
343 in the HFNC cohort, highest probability of receiving HFNC over the duration of hospital stay was 36%, which occurred between days 5 and 6 of
344 admission, and probabilities of treatment success (live hospital discharge without requiring endotracheal intubation (ETI)), and failure (required
345 ETI and/or in-hospital mortality) were 47% and 54%, respectively. Among patients in the NIPPV cohort, highest probability of receiving NIPPV
346 over the duration of hospital stay was 31%, which occurred within the first day of admission, while the highest probability of receiving HFNC was
347 12% on day 5 of admission. Probabilities of treatment success and failure for patients in the NIPPV cohort were 22% and 77%, respectively.
348 HFNC: High-flow oxygen delivered through nasal cannula; NIPPV: Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation.



349

350 **Figure 3.** Trajectory of outcomes among patients who were treated with A) HFNC, and B) NIPPV as the highest non-invasive respiratory support
351 at any point during hospitalization prior to outcomes of first endotracheal intubation, live hospital discharge, or in-hospital mortality. Treatment
352 success was defined as live hospital discharge without requiring endotracheal intubation. Treatment failure was defined as requiring
353 endotracheal intubation and/or in-hospital mortality. Patients who did not experience an outcome by the end of the study period were
354 censored. HFNC: High-flow oxygen delivered through nasal cannula; NIPPV: Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation.

A




355

356

357

B



358

359

360


361

362

363

364

365 **Figure 4.** Multivariable analyses with sub-distribution hazard ratio estimates for HFNC failure among the subset of patients in the HFNC cohort
 366 with complete covariates included in the multivariable model (n = 232), with live hospital discharge as a competing risk. Statistically significant
 367 sHRs are shown with triangles.



368


369 *Cardiovascular disease includes: Atherosclerotic heart disease, ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, rheumatic heart disease, pericardial disease,
370 myocarditis, endocarditis, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, arrhythmias, history of cardiac arrest, peripheral vascular disease, aortic aneurysm, orthostatic
371 hypotension, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac arrest, post-procedural cardiac complications.

372 †At time of HFNC initiation.

373 sHR: Sub-distribution hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval; HFNC: High-flow oxygen through nasal cannula; CI: Confidence interval; SpO₂: Oxygen saturation;

374 FiO₂: Fraction of inspired oxygen. All continuous variables, except for age, were natural log-transformed.

375 **Figure 5.** Multivariable analyses with sub-distribution hazard ratio estimates for treatment failure among the subset of patients in the NIPPV
 376 cohort with complete covariates included in the multivariable model (n = 408), with live hospital discharge as a competing risk. Statistically
 377 significant sHRs are shown in triangles.



378

379 *Chronic lung disease includes: Asthma, emphysema, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, chronic bronchitis, bronchiectasis, atelectasis, diaphragmatic
380 disease, interstitial lung diseases, sarcoidosis, and disorders of mediastinum.

381 †Cardiovascular disease includes: Atherosclerotic heart disease, ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, rheumatic heart disease, pericardial disease,
382 myocarditis, endocarditis, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, arrhythmias, history of cardiac arrest, peripheral vascular disease, aortic aneurysm, orthostatic
383 hypotension, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac arrest, post-procedural cardiac complications.

384 ‡At time of NIPPV initiation.

385 sHR: Sub-distribution hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval; NIPPV: Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation; CI: Confidence interval; SpO₂: Oxygen saturation;

386 FiO₂: Fraction of inspired oxygen. All continuous variables, except for age, were natural log-transformed.

387

388 **SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX**

389

390 **Table E1.** Univariate analyses among the HFNC and NIPPV cohorts, using sub-distribution hazard ratio estimates for HFNC and NIPPV treatment

391 failure, with live hospital discharge as a competing risk. Variable with p-value ≤ 0.15 were selected to be included in the multivariable model.

Covariates	HFNC cohort (N=331)			NIPPV cohort (N=747)		
	sHR (95% CI)	p-value	missing	sHR (95% CI)	p-value	missing
Age	1.02 (1.01-1.04)	<.0001		1.01 (1.01-1.02)	0.0001	
Male sex	0.74 (0.55-1)	0.046		0.98 (0.83-1.16)	0.839	
Race						
White	reference			reference		
Black	0.83 (0.58-1.19)	0.305		0.93 (0.73-1.18)	0.550	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.56 (0.24-1.28)	0.168		0.91 (0.6-1.38)	0.650	
Other/unknown	0.9 (0.59-1.38)	0.632		1.01 (0.82-1.24)	0.920	
Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic	reference			reference		
Hispanic	1.7 (1.1-2.62)	0.018		0.93 (0.78-1.12)	0.471	
Unknown	0.96 (0.69-1.33)	0.811		1.16 (0.91-1.47)	0.245	
Insurance						
Medicare	reference			reference		
Medicaid	0.98 (0.69-1.39)	0.892		0.81 (0.61-1.08)	0.152	
Private	0.63 (0.41-0.97)	0.034		0.79 (0.62-1.01)	0.055	
Self-pay/Other/unknown	0.38 (0.22-0.67)	0.001		0.72 (0.59-0.88)	0.001	
Co-morbidities						
Hypertension	0.87 (0.65-1.17)	0.348		1.17 (0.99-1.39)	0.060	
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	1.14 (0.84-1.55)	0.410		0.89 (0.75-1.05)	0.169	

Chronic lung disease*	1.19 (0.87-1.62)	0.271		0.74 (0.63-0.88)	0.0004	
Cardiovascular disease†	2.1 (1.54-2.88)	<.0001		1.3 (1.1-1.55)	0.002	
Liver disease	0.61 (0.25-1.46)	0.268		0.94 (0.68-1.3)	0.701	
Chronic kidney disease	1.23 (0.85-1.79)	0.277		1.11 (0.92-1.35)	0.290	
Cancer	1.25 (0.85-1.85)	0.263		0.84 (0.65-1.09)	0.194	
Smoking status						
Never	reference			reference		
Unknown	0.86 (0.39-1.94)	0.722		1.09 (0.89-1.33)	0.412	
Former	1 (0.7-1.43)	0.996		1.05 (0.85-1.28)	0.665	
Current	0.92 (0.63-1.35)	0.671		0.94 (0.61-1.44)	0.771	
Vital signs						
Heart rate (beats per minute)	2.33 (1.01-5.33)	0.046		2.3 (1.46-3.62)	0.0003	
Systolic blood pressure	1.48 (0.57-3.83)	0.424		1.18 (0.72-1.92)	0.516	
Diastolic blood pressure	0.24 (0.1-0.59)	0.002		0.66 (0.41-1.07)	0.089	
Respiratory rate	1.75 (0.94-3.26)	0.079		1.36 (1.01-1.84)	0.044	
SpO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio	0.41 (0.28-0.6)	<.0001	38	0.32 (0.23-0.46)	<.0001	52
Temperature (°Fahrenheit)	1.07 (0.97-1.19)	0.163		1.03 (0.98-1.09)	0.243	
Body mass index	0.76 (0.38-1.55)	0.4521	41	0.71 (0.5-1)	0.051	132
Laboratory values						
White blood cell count (x10 ³ /μL)	1.06 (0.77-1.46)	0.716		1.34 (1.11-1.62)	0.003	
Peripheral lymphocyte (%)	0.92 (0.72-1.18)	0.513	3	0.73 (0.64-0.84)	<.0001	5
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	0.32 (0.15-0.69)	0.004		0.66 (0.44-1)	0.051	
Platelets (x10 ³ /μL)	0.61 (0.46-0.82)	0.001		0.77 (0.64-0.92)	0.004	
D-Dimer (μg/mL)	1.12 (0.98-1.28)	0.099	16	1.15 (1.07-1.25)	0.0003	40
C-reactive protein (mg/L)	1.27 (1.04-1.56)	0.021;	13	1.21 (1.09-1.35)	0.0004	35
Ferritin (ng/mL)	1.12 (0.98-1.28)	0.103	11	1.07 (0.99-1.15)	0.070	37
Interleukin-6 (pg/mL)	1.37 (1.18-1.59)	<.0001	72	1.27 (1.17-1.39)	<.0001	232

Procalcitonin (ng/mL)	1.15 (1.04-1.26)	0.005	21	1.1 (1.04-1.16)	0.0004	82	392
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.17 (0.97-1.41)	0.107		1.15 (1.03-1.29)	0.014		393
Code status[†]							394
Do-not-intubate, Yes	1.75 (1.27-2.4)	0.001		1.2 (0.98-1.48)	0.082		395
Treatments received[§]							396
Prophylactic anticoagulation, Yes	1.57 (1.12-2.21)	0.010		0.96 (0.81-1.13)	0.596		397
Therapeutic anticoagulation, Yes	0.88 (0.63-1.21)	0.424		1.01 (0.83-1.22)	0.931		398
Corticosteroids, Yes	1.29 (0.4-4.18)	0.669		1.23 (0.81-1.86)	0.330		399
Hospital admission site							400
Quaternary referral hospital	reference			reference			401
Community hospital A	0.27 (0.14-0.5)	<.0001		1.44 (1.14-1.8)	0.002		402
Community hospital B	0.63 (0.43-0.94)	0.024		1.58 (1.19-2.08)	0.001		403
Community hospital C	0.94 (0.57-1.57)	0.816		0.96 (0.76-1.22)	0.736		404
Tertiary hospital	0.82 (0.51-1.32)	0.409		0.97 (0.72-1.29)	0.821		405

410

411 *Chronic lung disease includes: Asthma, emphysema, COPD, chronic bronchitis, bronchiectasis, atelectasis, diaphragmatic disease, interstitial lung diseases,
412 sarcoidosis, and disorders of mediastinum.

413 †Cardiovascular disease includes: Atherosclerotic heart disease, ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, rheumatic heart disease, pericardial disease,
414 myocarditis, endocarditis, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, arrhythmias, history of cardiac arrest, peripheral vascular disease, aortic aneurysm, orthostatic
415 hypotension, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac arrest, post-procedural cardiac complications.

416 ‡At time of initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

417 §From hospital admission to initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

418 sHR: Sub-distribution hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval; HFNC: High-flow oxygen through nasal cannula; NIPPV: Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation;
419 SpO₂: Oxygen saturation; FiO₂: Fraction of inspired oxygen. All continuous variables, except for age and temperature, were natural log-transformed.

420

421

422 **Table E2. Breakdown of co-morbidities by ICD-10 codes**

Co-morbidity	Diagnoses by ICD-10 codes
Chronic lung disease	Asthma Emphysema/chronic obstructive pulmonary disease Chronic bronchitis Bronchiectasis Atelectasis Interstitial lung diseases Sarcoidosis Diaphragmatic disease Disorders of mediastinum
Cardiovascular disease	Atherosclerotic heart disease Ischemic heart disease Congestive heart failure Rheumatic heart disease Pericardial disease Myocarditis Endocarditis Valvular disorders Cardiomyopathy Arrhythmias History of cardiac arrest Peripheral vascular disease Aortic aneurysm Orthostatic hypotension Pulmonary hypertension Cardiac arrest Post-procedural cardiac complications

423

424

425

426 **Table E3.** Sensitivity analysis results among the HFNC cohort from three models: 1) adding receipt of prophylactic-dose and therapeutic-dose
427 anticoagulation at HFNC initiation as a covariate; 2) adding receipt of corticosteroids at HFNC initiation as a covariate; and 3) removing IL-6 and
428 BMI resulting in a larger subset of patients, using sub-distribution hazard ratio estimates for HFNC treatment failure, with live hospital discharge
429 as a competing risk. Highlighted rows are covariates, which remained significant throughout the main and all sensitivity multivariable models.

Covariates	Model 1 (n=232) sHR (95% CI)	p-value	Model 2 (n=232) sHR (95% CI)	p-value	Model 3 (n=271) sHR (95% CI)	p-value
Age (years)	1 (0.99 - 1.02)	0.841	1 (0.99 - 1.02)	0.747	1.01 (0.99 - 1.02)	0.283
Male sex (vs. Female)	0.97 (0.65 - 1.46)	0.891	0.87 (0.59 - 1.28)	0.475	0.89 (0.62 - 1.28)	0.528
Ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Hispanic	1 (0.63 - 1.58)	0.997	1.07 (0.68 - 1.69)	0.759	0.83 (0.55 - 1.24)	0.354
Unknown	1.45 (0.81 - 2.62)	0.212	1.68 (0.98 - 2.88)	0.061	1.68 (1.04 - 2.72)	0.035
Insurance						
Medicare	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Medicaid	0.53 (0.24 - 1.16)	0.114	0.46 (0.2 - 1.03)	0.060	0.54 (0.25 - 1.19)	0.126
Private	0.85 (0.47 - 1.56)	0.603	0.79 (0.43 - 1.45)	0.441	0.81 (0.46 - 1.4)	0.443
Self-pay/Other/unknown	1.04 (0.61 - 1.77)	0.884	0.91 (0.53 - 1.56)	0.722	1.01 (0.66 - 1.55)	0.966
Comorbidities						
Cardiovascular disease* (Yes vs. No)	1.96 (1.25 - 3.08)	0.003	1.87 (1.16 - 3)	0.010	1.75 (1.15 - 2.66)	0.009
Cerebrovascular disease (Yes vs. No)	1.7 (1 - 2.9)	0.050	1.34 (0.76 - 2.36)	0.309	1.66 (1.01 - 2.72)	0.045
Vital signs						
Heart rate (beats per minute)	1.85 (0.52 - 6.6)	0.343	1.97 (0.55 - 7.08)	0.301	2.58 (1 - 6.68)	0.050
Systolic blood pressure						
Diastolic blood pressure	0.28 (0.08 - 0.92)	0.036	0.32 (0.09 - 1.1)	0.071	0.3 (0.1 - 0.96)	0.042
Respiratory rate	2.1 (0.82 - 5.35)	0.121	1.93 (0.78 - 4.78)	0.156	1.35 (0.57 - 3.18)	0.493
SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio	0.35 (0.21 - 0.6)	0.0001	0.31 (0.18 - 0.54)	<.0001	0.3 (0.18 - 0.52)	<.0001
Laboratory values						
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	0.63 (0.19 - 2.11)	0.454	0.53 (0.16 - 1.73)	0.294	0.49 (0.17 - 1.46)	0.202
Platelets (x10 ³ /μL)	0.71 (0.48 - 1.04)	0.079	0.63 (0.43 - 0.91)	0.014	0.65 (0.46 - 0.92)	0.014
D-Dimer (μg/mL)	0.93 (0.76 - 1.14)	0.506	0.9 (0.75 - 1.09)	0.296	0.87 (0.73 - 1.04)	0.122
C-reactive protein (mg/L)	1.14 (0.86 - 1.52)	0.356	1.21 (0.91 - 1.61)	0.190	1.4 (1.08 - 1.81)	0.010
Ferritin (ng/mL)	0.9 (0.73 - 1.12)	0.347	0.93 (0.74 - 1.16)	0.510	0.99 (0.82 - 1.18)	0.864
Interleukin-6 (pg/mL)	1.15 (0.96 - 1.38)	0.131	1.15 (0.96 - 1.37)	0.134	-	-
Pro-calcitonin (ng/mL)	1.01 (0.86 - 1.18)	0.935	1.01 (0.86 - 1.2)	0.884	1 (0.86 - 1.16)	0.981
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1 (0.71 - 1.41)	0.983	0.93 (0.66 - 1.31)	0.679	0.93 (0.68 - 1.27)	0.649
Code status[†]						
Do-not-intubate (Yes vs. No)	0.77 (0.48 - 1.25)	0.296	0.78 (0.48 - 1.28)	0.328	0.77 (0.49 - 1.21)	0.251

Treatments received[†]						
Prophylactic anticoagulation (Yes vs. No)	2.05 (1.25 - 3.37)	0.005	-	-	-	-
Therapeutic anticoagulation (Yes vs. No)	0.78 (0.49 - 1.23)	0.283	-	-	-	-
Corticosteroids (Yes vs. No)	-	-	1.57 (0.37 - 6.63)	0.544	-	-
Hospital admission site, no. (%)						
Quaternary referral hospital	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Community hospital A	1.18 (0.52 - 2.67)	0.700	1.25 (0.57 - 2.71)	0.578	1.22 (0.66 - 2.23)	0.524
Community hospital B	1.35 (0.31 - 5.87)	0.693	1.07 (0.21 - 5.36)	0.939	1.15 (0.52 - 2.54)	0.735
Community hospital C	0.51 (0.28 - 0.92)	0.025	0.56 (0.31 - 1)	0.048	0.46 (0.26 - 0.81)	0.007
Tertiary hospital	0.23 (0.12 - 0.46)	<.0001	0.3 (0.16 - 0.56)	0.000	0.26 (0.14 - 0.48)	<.0001

* Cardiovascular disease includes: Atherosclerotic heart disease, ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, rheumatic heart disease, pericardial disease, myocarditis, endocarditis, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, arrhythmias, history of cardiac arrest, peripheral vascular disease, aortic aneurysm, orthostatic hypotension, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac arrest, post-procedural cardiac complications.

[†]At time of initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

[‡]From hospital admission to initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

sHR: Sub-distribution hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval; HFNC: High-flow oxygen through nasal cannula; SpO₂: Oxygen saturation; FiO₂: Fraction of inspired oxygen. All continuous variables, except for age, were natural log-transformed.

430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451

452 **Table E4.** Sensitivity analysis results among the NIPPV cohort from three models: 1) adding receipt of prophylactic-dose and therapeutic-dose
453 anticoagulation at NIPPV initiation as a covariate; 2) adding receipt of corticosteroids at NIPPV initiation as a covariate; and 3) removing IL-6 and
454 BMI as covariates resulting in a larger subset of patients, using sub-distribution hazard ratio estimates for treatment failure, with live hospital
455 discharge as a competing risk. Highlighted rows are covariates, which remained significant throughout the main and all sensitivity multivariable
456 models.

Covariates	Model 1 (n=408) sHR (95% CI)	p-value	Model 2 (n=408) sHR (95% CI)	p-value	Model 3 (n=605) sHR (95% CI)	p-value
Age (years)	1 (0.99 - 1.02)	0.5619	1 (0.99 - 1.01)	0.7079	1.01 (1 - 1.02)	0.0811
Insurance						
Medicare	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Medicaid	0.7 (0.43 - 1.15)	0.1632	0.71 (0.43 - 1.17)	0.1753	0.79 (0.55 - 1.15)	0.2158
Private	0.94 (0.63 - 1.41)	0.7689	0.92 (0.61 - 1.37)	0.6648	0.92 (0.68 - 1.27)	0.6239
Self-pay/Other/unknown	0.83 (0.61 - 1.13)	0.2436	0.8 (0.59 - 1.09)	0.1628	0.73 (0.57 - 0.94)	0.0134
Comorbidities						
Hypertension (Yes vs. No)	1.08 (0.82 - 1.42)	0.6059	1.07 (0.81 - 1.42)	0.6119	1.12 (0.91 - 1.39)	0.2964
Chronic lung disease* (Yes vs. No)	0.9 (0.68 - 1.19)	0.4546	0.89 (0.67 - 1.16)	0.3813	0.84 (0.68 - 1.03)	0.0866
Cardiovascular disease† (Yes vs. No)	1.41 (1.07 - 1.85)	0.0136	1.4 (1.06 - 1.84)	0.0162	1.23 (1 - 1.51)	0.0493
Vital signs						
Heart rate (beats per minute)	1.23 (0.52 - 2.92)	0.6385	1.24 (0.52 - 2.93)	0.6318	1.87 (1.03 - 3.38)	0.0393
Diastolic blood pressure	0.49 (0.23 - 1.05)	0.0663	0.5 (0.23 - 1.07)	0.0731	0.64 (0.38 - 1.09)	0.0996
Respiratory rate	1.19 (0.8 - 1.78)	0.3897	1.17 (0.79 - 1.74)	0.4386	1.25 (0.89 - 1.77)	0.202
SpO2/FiO2 ratio	0.34 (0.21 - 0.54)	<.0001	0.34 (0.21 - 0.55)	<.0001	0.33 (0.22 - 0.49)	<.0001
Body mass index	0.87 (0.53 - 1.42)	0.5746	0.83 (0.51 - 1.36)	0.4657	-	-
Laboratory values						
White blood cell count (x10 ³ /μL)	1.06 (0.76 - 1.47)	0.7411	1.07 (0.76 - 1.49)	0.7056	1.08 (0.84 - 1.39)	0.5456
Peripheral lymphocyte (%)	0.73 (0.58 - 0.92)	0.0082	0.74 (0.59 - 0.94)	0.0125	0.82 (0.68 - 0.99)	0.0358

Hemoglobin (g/dL)	0.39 (0.18 - 0.85)	0.018	0.41 (0.19 - 0.88)	0.0218	0.67 (0.39 - 1.14)	0.14
Platelets (x10 ³ /μL)	0.77 (0.58 - 1.02)	0.0652	0.77 (0.58 - 1.02)	0.0659	0.71 (0.58 - 0.88)	0.0017
D-Dimer (μg/mL)	1.01 (0.89 - 1.15)	0.8847	1.01 (0.88 - 1.15)	0.938	1.02 (0.93 - 1.13)	0.6662
C-reactive protein (mg/L)	1.1 (0.94 - 1.28)	0.2525	1.11 (0.95 - 1.29)	0.1998	1.13 (1.01 - 1.27)	0.0348
Ferritin (ng/mL)	1.08 (0.96 - 1.23)	0.2089	1.07 (0.94 - 1.21)	0.2921	1.03 (0.93 - 1.13)	0.6268
Interleukin-6 (pg/mL)	1.13 (1.02 - 1.26)	0.0252	1.13 (1.02 - 1.26)	0.0212	-	-
Pro-calcitonin (ng/mL)	0.96 (0.87 - 1.07)	0.4965	0.97 (0.87 - 1.07)	0.5062	1 (0.93 - 1.08)	0.9075
Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.9 (0.72 - 1.12)	0.3298	0.91 (0.73 - 1.13)	0.4017	0.98 (0.84 - 1.14)	0.754
Code status[‡]						
Do-not-intubate (Yes vs. No)	0.91 (0.65 - 1.27)	0.5641	0.88 (0.63 - 1.24)	0.4639	1.03 (0.8 - 1.33)	0.8016
Treatments received[§]						
Prophylactic anticoagulation (Yes vs. No)	1.1 (0.85 - 1.42)	0.4783	-	-	-	-
Therapeutic anticoagulation (Yes vs. No)	0.84 (0.62 - 1.12)	0.2264	-	-	-	-
Corticosteroids (Yes vs. No)	-	-	0.96 (0.52 - 1.76)	0.8893	-	-
Hospital admission site						
Quaternary referral hospital	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Community hospital A	1.08 (0.71 - 1.65)	0.7241	1.09 (0.72 - 1.65)	0.68	1.24 (0.94 - 1.63)	0.1279
Community hospital B	1.59 (0.89 - 2.85)	0.119	1.67 (0.95 - 2.94)	0.0775	1.45 (1 - 2.09)	0.0496
Community hospital C	0.97 (0.69 - 1.35)	0.8483	0.99 (0.71 - 1.39)	0.9687	0.91 (0.69 - 1.19)	0.4917
Tertiary hospital	0.75 (0.52 - 1.1)	0.1372	0.8 (0.56 - 1.15)	0.2294	0.82 (0.6 - 1.14)	0.2452

457 *Chronic lung disease includes: Asthma, emphysema, COPD, chronic bronchitis, bronchiectasis, atelectasis, diaphragmatic disease, interstitial lung diseases,
458 sarcoidosis, and disorders of mediastinum.

459 †Cardiovascular disease includes: Atherosclerotic heart disease, ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, rheumatic heart disease, pericardial disease,
460 myocarditis, endocarditis, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, arrhythmias, history of cardiac arrest, peripheral vascular disease, aortic aneurysm, orthostatic
461 hypotension, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac arrest, post-procedural cardiac complications.

462 ‡At time of initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

463 §From hospital admission to initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

464 sHR: Sub-distribution hazard ratio; CI: Confidence interval; NIPPV: Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation; SpO₂: Oxygen saturation; FiO₂: Fraction of
465 inspired oxygen. All continuous variables, except for age, were natural log-transformed.

466

467

468

469 **Table E5.** Comparisons of patient demographic and clinical characteristics between those with, versus without, any missing covariates.

Covariates	HFNC cohort (n=331)		p-value	NIPPV cohort (n=747)		p-value
	Missing covariates (n=117)	Complete data (n=214)		Missing covariates (n=339)	Complete data (n=408)	
Age (years), median (IQR)	73.5 (62.9, 85.1)	65.4 (55.7, 73.3)	<.0001	73.5 (63.8, 83)	67.1 (59.3, 76.7)	<.0001
Male sex, no. (%)	70 (21.1)	130 (39.3)	0.8702	207 (27.7)	259 (34.7)	0.49
Race, no. (%)			0.5619			0.00
White	30 (9.1)	48 (14.5)		96 (12.9)	78 (10.4)	
Black	33 (10)	51 (15.4)		86 (11.5)	99 (13.3)	
Asian/Pacific Islander	5 (1.5)	14 (4.2)		14 (1.9)	26 (3.5)	
Other/unknown	49 (14.8)	101 (30.5)		143 (19.1)	205 (27.4)	
Ethnicity, no. (%)			0.9476			0.00
Non-Hispanic	67 (20.2)	126 (38.1)		213 (28.5)	229 (30.7)	
Hispanic	37 (11.2)	64 (19.3)		83 (11.1)	133 (17.8)	
Unknown	13 (3.9)	24 (7.3)		43 (5.8)	46 (6.2)	
Insurance, no. (%)			0.1074			0.00
Medicare	56 (16.9)	78 (23.6)		164 (22)	151 (20.2)	
Medicaid	16 (4.8)	32 (9.7)		46 (6.2)	43 (5.8)	
Private	16 (4.8)	50 (15.1)		57 (7.6)	79 (10.6)	
Self-pay	29 (8.8)	54 (16.3)		72 (9.6)	135 (18.1)	
Other/unknown						
Comorbidities, no. (%)						
Hypertension	58 (17.5)	109 (32.9)	0.8127	181 (24.2)	225 (30.1)	0.63
Type 2 diabetes mellitus	37 (11.2)	75 (22.7)	0.5292	121 (16.2)	166 (22.2)	0.16
Chronic lung disease*	55 (16.6)	137 (41.4)	0.0027	130 (17.4)	249 (33.3)	<.0001
Cardiovascular disease†	60 (18.1)	108 (32.6)	0.8873	174 (23.3)	233 (31.2)	0.13
Cerebrovascular disease	10 (3)	28 (8.5)	0.2158	34 (4.6)	39 (5.2)	0.82
Liver disease	5 (1.5)	12 (3.6)	0.5992	22 (2.9)	30 (4)	0.62
Chronic kidney disease	18 (5.4)	34 (10.3)	0.9043	60 (8)	89 (11.9)	0.16

Cancer	15 (4.5)	20 (6)	0.3257	35 (4.7)	49 (6.6)	0.46
Smoking status, no. (%)			0.291			0.85
Never	53 (16)	115 (34.7)		169 (22.6)	191 (25.6)	
Unknown	31 (9.4)	39 (11.8)		77 (10.3)	95 (12.7)	
Former	28 (8.5)	53 (16)		81 (10.8)	106 (14.2)	
Current	5 (1.5)	7 (2.1)		12 (1.6)	16 (2.1)	
Vital signs, median (IQR)						
Heart rate (beats per minute)	96 (83, 107)	94 (82, 106)	0.6443	97 (81, 110)	93 (80, 108)	0.10
Systolic blood pressure	125 (112, 144)	125 (114, 143)	0.4213	128 (114, 145)	128 (116.5, 142)	0.85
Diastolic blood pressure	73 (63, 81)	73 (64, 80)	0.883	73 (63, 81)	73 (65, 80)	0.92
Respiratory rate	20 (19, 24)	20 (19, 25)	0.781	22 (20, 27)	22 (20, 30)	0.05
SpO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio	98 (93, 128.6); missing=38	98 (93, 125)	0.7355	97 (92, 120); missing=52	97 (92.5, 122.5)	0.42
Temperature (°Fahrenheit)	98.2 (97.5, 99.2)	98.6 (97.7, 99.6)	0.0881	98.4 (97.6, 99.2)	98.5 (97.7, 99.4)	0.15
Body mass index, median (IQR)	28.1 (24.7, 32.4); missing=41	29 (25.2, 34)	0.2103	28.7 (24.6, 32.6); missing=132	28.6 (25.7, 35.1)	0.12
Laboratory values, median (IQR)						
White blood cell count (x10 ³ /μL)	9.4 (6.3, 11.7)	8.8 (6.9, 11.9)	0.602	10.1 (7.2, 13.9)	9.8 (7.2, 13.2)	0.52
Peripheral lymphocyte (%)	8.8 (4.9, 14.3); missing=3	9.9 (6.7, 14.3)	0.3025	8.9 (5.9, 13.8); missing=5	8.4 (5.5, 12.6)	0.05
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	12.7 (10.5, 14.3)	12.7 (11.4, 13.9)	0.8693	12.9 (11.2, 14.4)	13 (11.1, 14.3)	0.82
Platelets (x10 ³ /μL)	226 (158, 290)	261.5 (188, 341)	0.0013	225 (167, 292)	243.5 (181.5, 305)	0.02
D-Dimer (μg/mL)	2.6 (1.2, 6.1); missing=16	1.6 (0.9, 3.9)	0.0089	3 (1.5, 8.2); missing=40	2.3 (1.2, 4.4)	0.00
C-reactive protein (mg/L)	161.8 (80.9, 224.2); missing=13	175.2 (106.7, 243.7)	0.0637	187.5 (104.5, 262.2); missing=35	187.1 (102.1, 268.2)	0.72
Ferritin (ng/mL)	1010 (522, 2365); missing=11	1159 (617, 2558)	0.2514	1067 (442, 2233); missing=37	1194 (565.5, 2296.5)	0.12
Interleukin-6 (pg/mL)	99.6 (54.4, 208); missing=72	80.3 (38.8, 159.2)	0.1413	112.5 (56.2, 339.3); missing=232	91 (41.6, 175.4)	0.00

Procalcitonin (ng/mL)	0.3 (0.2, 1); missing=21	0.3 (0.1, 0.8)	0.1702	0.5 (0.2, 1.7); missing=82	0.3 (0.1, 1)	0.0001
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.1 (0.8, 1.7)	0.9 (0.7, 1.4)	0.0026	1.3 (0.9, 2.1)	1 (0.8, 1.6)	<.0001
Code status[‡]			<.0001			0.75
Do-not-intubate, no. (%)	34 (10.3)	25 (7.6)		45 (6)	51 (6.8)	
Treatments received[§]						
Prophylactic anticoagulation, no. (%)	48 (14.5)	71 (21.5)	0.1549	177 (23.7)	175 (23.4)	0.0001
Therapeutic anticoagulation, no. (%)	29 (8.8)	66 (19.9)	0.2444	70 (9.4)	123 (16.5)	0.0001
Corticosteroids, no. (%)	2 (0.6)	3 (0.9)	0.8264	6 (0.8)	6 (0.8)	0.75
Hospital admission site, no. (%)			<.0001			<.0001
Quaternary referral hospital	40 (12.1)	112 (33.8)		49 (6.6)	141 (18.9)	
Community hospital A	13 (3.9)	18 (5.4)		137 (18.3)	62 (8.3)	
Community hospital B	24 (7.3)	4 (1.2)		82 (11)	13 (1.7)	
Community hospital C	32 (9.7)	46 (13.9)		50 (6.7)	127 (17)	
Tertiary hospital	8 (2.4)	34 (10.3)		21 (2.8)	65 (8.7)	

470 *Chronic lung disease includes: Asthma, emphysema, COPD, chronic bronchitis, bronchiectasis, atelectasis, diaphragmatic disease, interstitial lung diseases,
471 sarcoidosis, and disorders of mediastinum.

472 †Cardiovascular disease includes: Atherosclerotic heart disease, ischemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, rheumatic heart disease, pericardial disease,
473 myocarditis, endocarditis, valvular disorders, cardiomyopathy, arrhythmias, history of cardiac arrest, peripheral vascular disease, aortic aneurysm, orthostatic
474 hypotension, pulmonary hypertension, cardiac arrest, post-procedural cardiac complications.

475 ‡At time of initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

476 §From hospital admission to initiation of HFNC or NIPPV.

477 sHR: Sub-distribution hazard ratio CI: Confidence interval; HFNC: High-flow oxygen delivered through nasal cannula; NIPPV: Non-invasive positive pressure
478 ventilation; IQR: Interquartile; SpO₂: Oxygen saturation; FiO₂: Fraction of inspired oxygen.

479 p-value was obtained from Chi-square test for categorical variables and from Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test for continuous variables.

480 REFERENCES

- 481 1. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019)
482 [coronavirus-2019](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019). July 2, 2020].
- 483 2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC COVID Data Tracker. <https://www.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases>. July 2,
484 2020].
- 485 3. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, Xia J, Zhou X, Xu S, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in
486 Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020.
- 487 4. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in
488 Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet* 2020; 395: 1054-1062.
- 489 5. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-
490 Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020.
- 491 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,
492 China. *The Lancet* 2020; 395: 497-506.
- 493 7. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, Crawford JM, McGinn T, Davidson KW, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and
494 Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area. *JAMA* 2020.
- 495 8. Goyal P, Choi JJ, Pinheiro LC, Schenck EJ, Chen R, Jabri A, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Covid-19 in New York City. *N Engl J Med*
496 2020.
- 497 9. Cummings MJ, Baldwin MR, Abrams D, Jacobson SD, Meyer BJ, Balough EM, et al. Epidemiology, clinical course, and outcomes of
498 critically ill adults with COVID-19 in New York City: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet* 2020.
- 499 10. 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
500 Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 2020; 8: 475-481.
- 501 11. Brewster DJ, Chrimes N, Do TB, Fraser K, Groombridge CJ, Higgs A, et al. Consensus statement: Safe Airway Society principles of
502 airway management and tracheal intubation specific to the COVID-19 adult patient group. *Med J Aust* 2020.
- 503 12. Alhazzani W, Moller MH, Arabi YM, Loeb M, Gong MN, Fan E, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: Guidelines on the Management of
504 Critically Ill Adults with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Crit Care Med* 2020; 48: e440-e469.
- 505 13. Mauri T, Turrini C, Eronia N, Grasselli G, Volta CA, Bellani G, et al. Physiologic Effects of High-Flow Nasal Cannula in Acute
506 Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2017; 195: 1207-1215.
- 507 14. Rochwerg B, Granton D, Wang DX, Helviz Y, Einav S, Frat JP, et al. High flow nasal cannula compared with conventional oxygen
508 therapy for acute hypoxemic respiratory failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med* 2019; 45: 563-
509 572.

- 510 15. Frat JP, Thille AW, Mercat A, Girault C, Ragot S, Perbet S, et al. High-flow oxygen through nasal cannula in acute hypoxemic
511 respiratory failure. *N Engl J Med* 2015; 372: 2185-2196.
- 512 16. Ferreyro BL, Angriman F, Munshi L, Del Sorbo L, Ferguson ND, Rochweg B, et al. Association of Noninvasive Oxygenation
513 Strategies With All-Cause Mortality in Adults With Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure: A Systematic Review and Meta-
514 analysis. *JAMA* 2020.
- 515 17. Kang BJ, Koh Y, Lim CM, Huh JW, Baek S, Han M, et al. Failure of high-flow nasal cannula therapy may delay intubation and
516 increase mortality. *Intensive Care Med* 2015; 41: 623-632.
- 517 18. Demoule A, Girou E, Richard JC, Taille S, Brochard L. Benefits and risks of success or failure of noninvasive ventilation. *Intensive*
518 *Care Med* 2006; 32: 1756-1765.
- 519 19. Bellani G, Laffey JG, Pham T, Madotto F, Fan E, Brochard L, et al. Noninvasive Ventilation of Patients with Acute Respiratory
520 Distress Syndrome. Insights from the LUNG SAFE Study. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2017;
521 195: 67-77.
- 522 20. Wang K, Zhao W, Li J, Shu W, Duan J. The experience of high-flow nasal cannula in hospitalized patients with 2019 novel
523 coronavirus-infected pneumonia in two hospitals of Chongqing, China. *Ann Intensive Care* 2020; 10: 37.
- 524 21. Geng S, Mei Q, Zhu C, Yang T, Yang Y, Fang X, et al. High flow nasal cannula is a good treatment option for COVID-19. *Heart Lung*
525 2020.
- 526 22. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, Antonelli M, Cabrini L, Castelli A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients
527 Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. *JAMA* 2020.
- 528 23. Schünemann HJ, Khabsa J, Solo K, Khamis AM, Brignardello-Petersen R, El-Harakeh A, et al. Ventilation Techniques and Risk for
529 Transmission of Coronavirus Disease, Including COVID-19. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2020.
- 530 24. Drake MG. High-Flow Nasal Cannula Oxygen in Adults: An Evidence-based Assessment. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society*
531 2018; 15: 145-155.
- 532 25. Brochard L, Slutsky A, Pesenti A. Mechanical Ventilation to Minimize Progression of Lung Injury in Acute Respiratory Failure.
533 *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2017; 195: 438-442.
- 534 26. Esquinas AM, Egbert Pravinkumar S, Scala R, Gay P, Soroksky A, Girault C, et al. Noninvasive mechanical ventilation in high-risk
535 pulmonary infections: a clinical review. *European Respiratory Review* 2014; 23: 427-438.
- 536 27. Bos LD. COVID-19 Related Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: Not so Atypical. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical*
537 *Care Medicine* 2020; 0: null.
- 538 28. Gattinoni L, Chiumello D, Caironi P, Busana M, Romitti F, Brazzi L, et al. COVID-19 pneumonia: different respiratory treatments
539 for different phenotypes? *Intensive Care Med* 2020.

- 540 29. Gattinoni L, Coppola S, Cressoni M, Busana M, Rossi S, Chiumello D. COVID-19 Does Not Lead to a “Typical” Acute Respiratory
541 Distress Syndrome. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2020; 201: 1299-1300.
- 542 30. Camporota L, Vasques F, Sanderson B, Barrett NA, Gattinoni L. Identification of pathophysiological patterns for triage and
543 respiratory support in COVID-19. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 2020.
- 544 31. Weissman DN, de Perio MA, Radonovich LJ, Jr. COVID-19 and Risks Posed to Personnel During Endotracheal Intubation. *JAMA*
545 2020; 323: 2027-2028.
- 546 32. Wang F, Qu M, Zhou X, Zhao K, Lai C, Tang Q, et al. The timeline and risk factors of clinical progression of COVID-19 in Shenzhen,
547 China. *Journal of Translational Medicine* 2020; 18: 270.
- 548 33. Roca O, Caralt B, Messika J, Samper M, Sztrymf B, Hernández G, et al. An Index Combining Respiratory Rate and Oxygenation to
549 Predict Outcome of Nasal High-Flow Therapy. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2019; 199: 1368-
550 1376.
- 551 34. Bellani G, Laffey JG, Pham T, Fan E, Brochard L, Esteban A, et al. Epidemiology, Patterns of Care, and Mortality for Patients With
552 Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Intensive Care Units in 50 Countries. *JAMA* 2016; 315: 788-800.
- 553 35. Nishiga M, Wang DW, Han Y, Lewis DB, Wu JC. COVID-19 and cardiovascular disease: from basic mechanisms to clinical
554 perspectives. *Nature Reviews Cardiology* 2020.
- 555 36. Inciardi RM, Adamo M, Lupi L, Cani DS, Di Pasquale M, Tomasoni D, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of patients hospitalized
556 for COVID-19 and cardiac disease in Northern Italy. *European Heart Journal* 2020; 41: 1821-1829.
- 557 37. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Kuy S, Henry TD, Patel AN. Cardiovascular Disease, Drug Therapy, and Mortality in Covid-19. *New England*
558 *Journal of Medicine* 2020; 382: e102.
- 559 38. Guo T, Fan Y, Chen M, Wu X, Zhang L, He T, et al. Cardiovascular Implications of Fatal Outcomes of Patients With Coronavirus
560 Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Cardiology* 2020; 5: 811-818.
- 561 39. Madjid M, Safavi-Naeini P, Solomon SD, Vardeny O. Potential Effects of Coronaviruses on the Cardiovascular System: A Review.
562 *JAMA Cardiology* 2020; 5: 831-840.
- 563 40. Yang L, Liu S, Liu J, Zhang Z, Wan X, Huang B, et al. COVID-19: immunopathogenesis and Immunotherapeutics. *Signal*
564 *Transduction and Targeted Therapy* 2020; 5: 128.
- 565 41. Herold T, Jurinovic V, Arnreich C, Lipworth BJ, Hellmuth JC, von Bergwelt-Baildon M, et al. Elevated levels of IL-6 and CRP predict
566 the need for mechanical ventilation in COVID-19. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2020; 146: 128-136 e124.
- 567 42. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*
568 2020; 382: 1708-1720.
- 569 43. Rice TW, Wheeler AP, Bernard GR, Hayden DL, Schoenfeld DA, Ware LB, et al. Comparison of the SpO₂/FIO₂ ratio and the
570 PaO₂/FIO₂ ratio in patients with acute lung injury or ARDS. *Chest* 2007; 132: 410-417.

- 571 44. Raboud J, Shigayeva A, McGeer A, Bontovics E, Chapman M, Gravel D, et al. Risk factors for SARS transmission from patients
572 requiring intubation: a multicentre investigation in Toronto, Canada. *PLoS One* 2010; 5: e10717.
- 573 45. Fowler RA, Guest CB, Lapinsky SE, Sibbald WJ, Louie M, Tang P, et al. Transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome during
574 intubation and mechanical ventilation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2004; 169: 1198-1202.
- 575 46. Hui DS, Chow BK, Ng SS, Chu LCY, Hall SD, Gin T, et al. Exhaled air dispersion distances during noninvasive ventilation via different
576 Respronics face masks. *Chest* 2009; 136: 998-1005.
- 577