medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

COVIDTrach; a prospective cohort study of mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients undergoing tracheostomy in the UK

COVIDTrach collaborative

NJI Hamilton; AGM Schilder; T Jacob; G Ambler; M Singer; MM George; F Green; R Vasanthan; J Goulder; E Jackson; A Arora; N Kumar; C Schilling; S Laha; I Ahmad; B McGrath; MA Birchall; NS Tolley; G Sandhu; T Tatla; N Sharma; P Stimpson; P Andrews; N Mercer; P Nankivell; O Breik; P Praveen; M Idle; T Martin; S Parmar; P Pracy; C Jennings; J Higginson; K Fan; E Yeung; J Osher; R Bentley; C Huppa; P Stenhouse; K Hussain; S Hodges; F Ryba; P Surda; EK Bhargava; N Amin; J Collins; M Kelly; D Ranford; A Takhar; C Tornari; M Verkerk; C Xie; D Pennell; C Al-Yaghchi; L Ritchie; M Jaafar; M Rouhani; M Ashcroft; N Cereceda-Monteoliva; A Holroyd; J Ng; R Mistry; K Ghufoor; E Warner; H O'Mahony; S Shepherd; N Bhatti; H Drewery; J Hadley; A Mulcahy; H Wilson; R Bhandari; M Griffiths; T Magos; I Balasundaram; M Heliotis; A Loizidou; D York; R Exley; KA Solanki; P Shah; P Kirticumar; A Shah; S Shannon; A Shirazian; Y Bhatt; K Dhadwal; GM Jama; Z Abdi; T Exall; I Ekpemi; R Roplekar-Bance; C Walker; N Glibbery; K Karamali; A Li; A Rovira; D Dawson; T Munroe-Gray; P Sethukumar; J Phillips; A Williamson; R Saha; M Roberts; H Lee-Six; B Misztal; S Millington; M Musalia; S Suresh; A Cardozo; M Dunbobbin; A Tse; S Shahidi; M Chachlani; K Jolly; J Fussey; M Misurati; M Osborne; S Ashok; H Aboulgheit ; S Khwaja; R Anmolsingh; C Smyth; B Al-Dulaimy; E Omakobia; J Collier; T Browning; A Courtney; P Ward; L Lignos; C Lockie; P Twose; P Bishop; D Kathwadia; T Hwara; A Williamson; A Kumar; O Judd; W Parker; TP Davis; T Stubington; T Ali; A Schache; H Koumoullis; E Willcocks; L Skeely; K Liatsikos ; B Borgatta; J Rodrigues; A Glossop; J Sen; N Lawrence; S Bennett; L Wren; V Politidis; D Dhariwal; S Winter; A Kara; T Hunt; G Tattersall; W Udall; B Hill; S Saha; L Bates; C Smart; D Park; R O'Brien; L Linhartova; P Kirkland; J Staufenberg; K Valchanov; H Buglass; U Sheikh; E Tam; J Williamson; A McGrath; S Siddiq; NW Wahid; H Griffiths; M De; A Amlani; P Deutsch; K Markham; C Hall; S Webster; O Barker; P Sykes; A Gupta; A Easthope; S Glaze; B Morris; D Bondin; D Thorley; K Kapoor; S Sirajuddin; S Fang; F van Damme; O Mattoo; E Paramasivam; E Kershaw; S Dewhurst; S Blakeley; C Chivers; L Lindsey; DJ Lin; A Burns; A Wilson; N Macartney; F Franco; K Goodwin; B Cosway; R Glore; H Cunniffe; M Keil ; S Burrows; D Moult; D Zolger; J Bakmanidis; D Nair; S Kandiah; M Anwar; A Pericleous; C Hogan; R Temple; D Whitmore; R Sheikh; R Pinto; C Cook; J Broad; U Nagalotimath; E El-Tabal; S Ghaffar; M Dallison; E Leakey; R Harris; J Blair; E France; O Sanders; P Mukherjee; A Gomati; L Moir ; CB Groba; C Davies-Husband; N Seymour; S Mahalingam; D Williams; R Lovett; J Lunn; A Armson; A Balfour; K Steele; K Hilliard; S Ladan; P Paul; P Tsirevelou; V Ratnam; H Turner; N Jain; A Muddaiah; M Celinski; J Smith; J Westwood; J Coakes; R Borg; J McEwan; A Tsagkovits; O Mulla; N Stobbs; G Warner; D Pratap; Z Ghani; J Rocke; S Snape; S Ghosh; A Hassaan; M Cameron; A Daudia; S Menon; S Beckett; R Siau; A Howard ; C Lamont; C Blore; C Pearce; D Zakai; S Biswas; R Moorthy; J Bates; P Gill; E Riley; P Bothma; S Meghji; W Rutherford; A Lloyd; A Syndercombe; P Smith; N Keates; V Srinivasan; M Junaid; M Kumar; T Antonio ; A Vijendren; V Venkatachalam; I Gonzalez; M Lechner; D Chandrasekharan; A Arya; R Brown; H Jones; D Kumar; R Sykes; B Tehan; A Walker; J Whiteside; F Cooper; A Coombs; G Wong; D Walker; S Dennis; A Hormis; A Eldahshan; L Leach; H Paw; M Colomo-Gonzalez; D Chakravarty; S Sanyal; N Mani; B Ranganathan; H Saeed; S Linton; A Thompson; J Whittaker; N Amiruddin; A Sladkowsk; R Gohil; AK Abou-Foul; J Ahmed; S Kishwan; G Walton; P Naredla; A Al-Ajami; S Wilkinson; S Okhovat; A Menon; S Mustafa; E Carey; N Vallabh;

Corresponding author

Nick JI Hamilton PhD, MBChB, MRCS

NIHR Clinical Lecturer, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

UCL Head & Neck Academic Centre, Charles Bell House, 43-45 Foley Street, London W1W 7TY

Nick.hamilton@ucl.ac.uk +44 (0)20 7679 2000

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background: COVIDTrach is a UK multi-centre prospective cohort study project evaluating the outcomes of tracheostomy in patients with COVID-19 receiving mechanical ventilation. It also examines the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among healthcare workers involved in the procedure.

Method: An invitation to participate was sent to all UK NHS departments involved in tracheostomy in mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19. Data was entered prospectively and clinical outcomes updated over time via an online database (REDCap). Clinical variables were compared with clinical outcomes using multivariable regression analysis, with logistic regression used to develop a prediction model for mortality. Participants recorded whether any of the operators tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 within two weeks of the procedure.

Findings: The cohort comprised 1605 tracheostomy cases from 126 UK hospitals. The median time from intubation to tracheostomy was 15 days (IQR 11, 21). 285 (18%) patients died following the procedure. 1229 (93%) of the survivors had been successfully weaned from mechanical ventilation at censoring and 1049 (81%) had been discharged from hospital. Age, inspired oxygen concentration requirement on the day of tracheostomy, PEEP setting, pyrexia, number of days of ventilation before tracheostomy, C-reactive protein and the use of anticoagulation and inotropic support independently predicticted mortality. Six reports were received of operators testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 within two weeks following the procedure.

Interpretation: Tracheostomy appears to be safe in mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 and to operators performing the procedure and we identified clinical indicators that are predictive of mortality. Optimal timing of the procedure remains to be determined.

Funding: The COVIDTrach project is supported by the Wellcome Trust UCL COVID-19 Rapid Response Award and the National Institute for Health Research.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

As of 1st September 2020, there were over 33 million cases of COVID-19 globally with average daily new cases exceeding 250,000.[1] Data indicate that 5-12% develop a severe illness requiring critical care, of whom 72-81% require invasive mechanical ventilation.[2-6] The UK experienced a peak in infection during the months of March and April 2020 followed by a decline and low plateau of new cases during June and July. Of approximately 10,894 patients recorded in the UK Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre (ICNARC) database that were admitted to intensive care during this period, over 7792 required advanced respiratory support.[7]

Standard UK intensive care practice is to consider tracheostomy after 7-10 days of invasive mechanical ventilation to aid weaning, facilitate comfort and minimise complications relating to the prolonged presence of an oral endotracheal tube.[8-11] The role of tracheostomy in COVID-19 remains controversial. Guidance early in the pandemic ranged from avoiding tracheostomy completely to delaying tracheostomy until 14-21 days after intubation,[12-14] and to only proceed once the patient was COVID-19 test negative.[15-17] These recommendations aimed to prevent nosocomial infection among healthcare professionals and to avoid futile procedures. The evidence base for these recommendations was largely based on expert opinion. Subsequent evidence suggests the risk of transmission declines 3-4 days after symptom onset and that standard COVID-19 testing does not reflect the risk of infectivity later in the disease process.[18,19] Several series reporting outcomes following tracheostomy in ventilated COVID-19 patients demonstrate high rates of survival and weaning success and no SARS-COV-2 infection among those involved in the procedure.[20-22]

COVIDTrach is a UK multidisciplinary collaborative project examining the outcomes of tracheostomy in mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 in UK intensive care units and the occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among operators. An interim report documenting the first 548 patients during the first two months of the pandemic reported a hospital mortality of 12%, weaning success in 52%, and no instances of SARS-CoV-2 infection among operators at the time of writing.[23] This article presents a larger cohort of patients, their long-term outcomes and a further analysis of parameters that may predict survival.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods

Study design

COVIDTrach is a multicentre prospective cohort study of mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 who undergo tracheostomy. An invitation for clinicians to participate in the COVIDTrach project was disseminated via the UK Federation of Surgical Specialty Associations, its various member organisations and the Intensive Care Society to reach all UK departments involved in tracheostomy in COVID-19 patients. Inclusion into the study was also advertised on societal websites and social media. 137 hospital sites agreed to participate across all four nations of the United Kingdom.

Patient population

Each participating hospital included all consecutive adult patients over 18 years of age with COVID-19 who underwent elective tracheostomy while receiving invasive mechanical ventilation. Infection was identified by a positive viral RNA test on quantitative RT-PCR testing or when strongly suspected on history, laboratory and radiological findings in the absence of viral RNA test availability or a positive result. Children under the age of 18 years and those undergoing emergency tracheostomy were excluded.

Clinical indicators and outcome measures

Demographic data, clinical characteristics, SARS-CoV-2 status, ventilatory requirements before tracheostomy, details of the tracheostomy and the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) were all recorded (data dictionary in appendix). Clinical outcomes included complications, mortality, time from tracheostomy to weaning from mechanical ventilation, success and time to tracheostomy decannulation, and time from tracheostomy to hospital discharge. Successful weaning was defined as being free from pressure support for greater than 24 hours. Participants were also asked to report whether any of the operators performing the procedure tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 within two weeks of the procedure.

Procedures

Data was collected using an online survey tool (REDCap) with return codes issued to allow participants to update clinical outcomes prospectively. All participants were asked to update the clinical outcomes of their cases by July 1st 2020 and confirm the data were complete (Figure 1a). Hospital sites with missing data or data that had not been updated to within the last two weeks of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

June 2020, were followed up over the course of July and early August. Hospitals with datasets not updated by 15th August 2020 were removed from the study (n=11).

Ethics and data governance

The study was approved by the Health Research Authority (20/HRA/3766), the Scottish Public Benefit and Privacy Panel and Northern Island's Privacy Advisory Committee and was registered as a service evaluation or research study at each participating site. All data collected were anonymised and non-identifiable and did not alter the patient's clinical care. The study is registered with ClinicalTrials.Gov (NCT04572438).

Statistical analysis

Variables are ised using either mean (SD), median (IQR) or number (percentage), as appropriate. Groups of variables were compared using either t-tests or chi-squared tests, as appropriate. For multivariable regression analysis, all numerical variables, except age, were log-transformed. Logistic regression was used to develop a prediction model for mortality, after imputing missing values using multiple imputation via chained equations. Backwards elimination at the 10% significance level was used to remove unimportant variables from the model. This model was internally validated using 10-fold cross-validation. Model performance (calibration and discrimination) was quantified using the calibration slope and calibration in the large, and ROC curves.

Results

Participants

Between 6th April and 26th August 2020, data was received on 1605 tracheostomies from 126 UK hospitals (Figure 1b) led by a combination of ENT, maxillofacial and intensive care specialists. The number of tracheostomy cases entered by each hospital ranged from 1-106 (mean 12). Across all cases, over 90% of all data points were completed in all but three variables where completeness was 85% or greater (Supplementary table 1). The average patient age was 58 ± 11 years with a 70:30 male to female ratio. More detailed patient demographics and medical history are presented in Table 1 and COVID-19 test status in Table 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Timing of tracheostomy procedure

The median time from intubation to tracheostomy was 15 days (IQR 11, 21) (Figure 2a). Seventy-three (4.5%) patients had tracheostomy within 4 days of intubation and 227 (14%) after 25 days. The mean C-reactive protein on the day of tracheostomy was 119 (SD, 88) mg/l.

Tracheostomy procedure

"Anticipated prolonged wean" was the most cited indication for tracheostomy in 1473 (92%). An open method of tracheostomy was used in 797 (50%) procedures, percutaneous method in 771 (48%), and a hybrid method using a combination of open and percutaneous techniques in 31 (2%) (Figure 2b). Bronchoscopy was used as an aid in 574 (78%) percutaneous techniques. Patient factors likely to make the tracheostomy more challenging were reported in 327 (41%) open and 109 (14%) percutaneous tracheostomies. Of these, neck obesity was the most frequently reported, occurring in 242 (30%) of all open tracheostomies.

Operators used either an FFP3 mask or Powered Air Purifying Respirator (PAPR) in 1563 (99%) of cases (Figure 2c). Other PPE included double gloves in 1460 (91%), a surgical gown in 1511 (94%), and a face visor was used in 1261 (96%) of cases in addition to an FFP3 mask.

Complications

Intraoperative complications were reported in 147 (9%) procedures with oxygen desaturation below 80% being the most common (n=67), followed by intra-operative bleeding (n=29). Post-operative complications occurred in 356 (22%) cases; bleeding was reported in 119 (7%) patients, more frequently following open procedures ($p<0.001$). A leak around the tracheostomy cuff necessitating a change in tube was reported in 75 (5%) cases, 48 of these were open tracheostomies.

Outcomes

In this cohort, one patient died during the tracheostomy procedure, 276 (17%) patients died before weaning from mechanical ventilation and a further nine (1%) patients died between successful weaning and hospital discharge (Table 3). 249 (89%) deaths were COVID-19 related and nine patients died of tracheostomy-related complications.

Characteristics of survivors and non-survivors are shown in Supplementary Table 2. A multivariable logistic regression model was fitted for mortality and backward elimination applied. Age, days of mechanical ventilation pre-procedure, inspired oxygen concentration and PEEP setting at the time of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

tracheostomy, use of inotropic support (all p<0.001), upward trending CRP (P=0.003), pyrexia (p=0.003) and use of anticoagulation (p=0.002) are independently associated with mortality (Figure 3a).

A model was developed to predict mortality. Internal validation using 10-fold cross-validation produced an average ROC area of 0.76 (95% CI: 0.73 to 0.79), suggesting good discrimination (Figure 3b). The Hosmer-Lemeshow test results in each cross-validation fold suggest no problems with calibration. A comparison of observed and predicted outcomes suggests good agreement (Figure 3c) with a sensitivity of 77% and specificity of 65%. The corresponding positive predictive value and negative predictive value are 33% and 93% respectively.

Of the survivors, 1229 (93%) had been successfully weaned at the time of analysis with 1154 (88%) having undergone successful tube decannulation and 1049 (81%) discharged from hospital (Table 3). Median time from tracheostomy to discharge to hospital in survivors was 29 days (IQR 21, 42).

Characteristics of patients according to length of time to successful wean from ventilation are shown in Supplementary Table 3. A multivariable logistic regression model for time to wean success was fitted and backward elimination applied. These results suggest that advanced age, male sex, higher PEEP setting, higher inspired oxygen requirement, use of anticoagulation (all p<0.001) and non-invasive ventilation before tracheostomy (p=0.003) were all independently associated with prolonged periods of ventilation following tracheostomy (Table 4). An association was found between insertion technique and time to successful wean, although the difference was small (median 12 days for percutaneous versus 11 days for open method). No association was found between time from intubation to tracheostomy and time from tracheostomy to successful ventilatory wean (p=0.92).

SARS-CoV-2 infection in operators

The question "Did any of the operators test positive for COVID-19 within two weeks of the procedure?", was answered in 97% (1558/1605) of cases. Six instances were reported across four hospitals, four after percutaneous tracheostomy and two after open tracheostomy. Five of the cases were performed in intensive care and four within a negative pressure environment. Personal protective equipment used in these cases included an FFP3 mask in four cases, a fluid-resistant hood with face visor in one, and a PAPR device in one.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Discussion

This study involved 126 UK hospitals reporting on 1605 individual tracheostomies. Given the Intensive Care National Audit reports on 7792 patients requiring advanced respiratory support across 265 hospitals in England, Wales and Northern Island, our cohort is representative and the results are likely generalisable to the UK.

At the time of censoring, all cause mortality following tracheostomy in our cohort was 18%. This number is likely to rise as 91 patients were still mechanically ventilated and a further 171 had been weaned but were still in hospital. Prospective multicentre studies of general (non COVID-19) intensive care populations patients report mortality rates of approximately 30% in the first 30 days following tracheostomy.[24,25] Direct comparisons to this cohort of COVID-19 patients cannot however be drawn as demographics, comorbidities and underlying pathologies will differ considerably and timing of tracheostomy is usually performed earlier than the median 15 days following intubation reported in this study of COVID-19 patients. National data reported in the ICNARC registry, indicates that the ICU mortality rate in mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients was 47.8%, however median duration of critical care stay in non-survivors was 10 days (IQR 6,17).[7] Thus COVID-19 patients undergoing tracheostomy constitute a preselected population who have survived the acute phase and, in general, would have cardiorespiratory stability and are no longer requiring high-level ventilatory support and high inspired oxygen concentrations. Nonetheless, our data shows that tracheostomy in the setting of SARS-CoV-2 infection is not a futile intervention as previously claimed by some expert opinion at the start of the pandemic.[26,27]

Whether the timing of tracheostomy does influence COVID-19 patient outcomes is unclear. Early tracheostomy may benefit certain patient groups,[28,29] but meta-analyses have failed to show benefit in a general population of critically ill adults.[30,31] In randomised trials, approximately half of patients randomised to late tracheostomy eventually did not undergo the procedure, mainly due to successful extubation.[31,32] In our cohort, early tracheostomy was independently associated with higher mortality. Moreover no association was demonstrated between early tracheostomy and shortened time to successful weaning from ventilation. Clearly, cause and effect cannot be directly inferred from this data and only prospective randomised studies could address this important question.

We found no association between method of tracheostomy and likelihood of successful wean from ventilation, mortality, or discharge from hospital. As in non COVID-19 series, bleeding was more frequent using the open method, although the overall rate of reported bleeding was low. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

percutaneous method has several advantages centered around the ability to perform the procedure at the bedside. In contrast, the open method enables safe procedure in those with difficult neck anatomy and enables the surgical workforce to relieve the task from intensive care staff during periods when a critical care department is working at full capacity. The decision over which method to employ should be locally led and depends upon expertise available and close inter-disciplinary working.

The low rates of reported SARS-COV-2 infection among operators who likely continued to work in other high risk areas and performed other aerosol generating procedures is encouraging. Whilst asymptomatic cases may have been missed and recall bias may have occurred, the low rates of infection suggest that, with appropriate PPE, the procedure does not pose a high risk of infection with SARS-COV-2 to operators. Our findings are consistent with other series.[32-34]

Infectivity and viral load is believed to peak around the time of symptom onset and then decline over the following 3-4 days.[18,19] Considering the median time from symptom presentation to hospitalisation is four days and that tracheostomy is not usually considered until at least severn days after intubation, the risk of infectivity is predicted to be low even if the procedure is performed between the first and second week of ventilation.[35,36] Our results therefore do not support guidance suggesting tracheostomy should be delayed until 14-21 days after intubation to reduce the potential for infection amongst operators.[12,15] Similarly, our findings and data showing a positive COVID-19 test does not correlate with risk of infectivity later in the disease process,[37] suggest tracheostomy should not be delayed to achieve a negative COVID-19 test. Delaying in these circumastances defers the potential benefits of tracheostomy and increases the risk of complications relating to prolonged endotracheal intubation without any clear benefit to the patient or operators involved in the procedure.

Authors contributions

NH contributed to literature search, figures, study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and writing. AS contributed to study design, data analysis and interpretation and writing. GA contributed to data analysis, interpretation and writing. TJ contributed to study design, data interpretation and writing. MS contributed to data analysis & interpretation and writing. All other authors contributed equally under the principles of corporate authorship.

Funding source

COVIDTrach is supported by the Wellcome Trust UCL COVID-19 Rapid Response award and the NIHR Clinical Research Network. Nick Hamilton is an NIHR Clinical Lecturer and is supported by the Royal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

College of Surgeons (Eng) and the Academy of Medical Sciences. Anne GM Schilder is an NIHR Senior Investigator and Director of the NIHR UCLH BRC Hearing Theme; the research of her UCL Ear Institute evidENT team is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (BRC, ARC, CRN, PGfAR, RfPB), Wellcome Trust, RCSEng, and EU Horizon2020. Martin Birchall is an NIHR Senior Investigator. Data collection through BAOMS was managed by Fabien Puglia and supported by NFORC and Saving faces.

Ethics committee approval

COVIDTrach has been approved by the UK Research and Ethics Council and the Health Research Authority as a prospective cohort study.

Data collection

Study data were collected and managed using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at University College London.[32,33] REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) is a secure, web-based application designed to support data capture for research studies, providing: 1) an intuitive interface for validated data entry; 2) audit trails for tracking data manipulation and export procedures; 3) automated export procedures for seamless data downloads to common statistical packages; and 4) procedures for data integration and interoperability with external sources.

Conflicts of interests

No conflicts to declare.

References

1. Worldometer. COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic. https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/. Published 2020. Accessed 10.09.20, 2020.
2. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA.* 2020;323(13):1239-1242.
3. Grasselli G, Pesenti A, Cecconi M. Critical Care Utilization for the COVID-19 Outbreak in Lombardy, Italy: Early Experience and Forecast During an Emergency Response. *JAMA.* 2020;323(16):1545-1546.
4. Cummings MJ, Baldwin MR, Abrams D, et al. Epidemiology, clinical course, and outcomes of critically ill adults with COVID-19 in New York City: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet.* 2020;395(10239):1763-1770.
5. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. *JAMA.* 2020;323(16):1574-1581.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

6. Suleyman G, Fadel RA, Malette KM, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Morbidity Associated With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in a Series of Patients in Metropolitan Detroit. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(6):e2012270.
7. Centre ICNAR. ICNARC report on COVID-19 in critical care in Egnland, Wales and Northern Ireland 25 September 2020. https://www.icnarc.org/Our-Audit/Audits/Cmp/Reports. Published 2020. Accessed 28.09.20, 2020.
8. Durbin CG, Jr., Perkins MP, Moores LK. Should tracheostomy be performed as early as 72 hours in patients requiring prolonged mechanical ventilation? *Respir Care.* 2010;55(1):76-87.
9. Groves DS, Durbin CG, Jr. Tracheostomy in the critically ill: indications, timing and techniques. *Curr Opin Crit Care.* 2007;13(1):90-97.
10. Jaeger JM, Littlewood KA, Durbin CG, Jr. The role of tracheostomy in weaning from mechanical ventilation. *Respir Care.* 2002;47(4):469-480; discussion 481-462.
11. Pierson DJ. Tracheostomy and weaning. *Respir Care.* 2005;50(4):526-533.
12. Miles BA, Schiff B, Ganly I, et al. Tracheostomy during SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: Recommendations from the New York Head and Neck Society. *Head Neck.* 2020;42(6):1282-1290.
13. ENT.UK. COVID-19 Tracheostomy Guidance. https://www.entuk.org/covid-19-tracheostomy-guidance-t-jacob-et-al. Published 2020. Accessed 11.04.20, 2020.
14. Sommer DD, Engels PT, Weitzel EK, et al. Recommendations from the CSO-HNS taskforce on performance of tracheotomy during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2020;49(1):23.
15. British Laryngology Association. Tracheostomy Guideline COVID-19. https://www.britishlaryngological.org/news/tracheostomy-guideline-covid-19. Published 2020. Accessed 05.05.20, 2020.
16. Michetti CP, Burlew CC, Bulger EM, et al. Performing tracheostomy during the Covid-19 pandemic: guidance and recommendations from the Critical Care and Acute Care Surgery Committees of the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma. *Trauma Surg Acute Care Open.* 2020;5(1):e000482.
17. Heyd CP, Desiato VM, Nguyen SA, et al. Tracheostomy protocols during COVID-19 pandemic. *Head Neck.* 2020;42(6):1297-1302.
18. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(12):1177-1179.
19. McGrath BA BM, Warrillow SJ, Pandian V, Arora A, Cameron TS, Anon JM, Martinez GH, Truog RD, Block SD, Lui GCY, McDonald C, Rassekh CH, Atkins J, Qiang L, Vergez S, Dulguerov P, Zenk J, Antonelli M, Pelosi P, Walsh BK, Ward E, Shang Y, Gasparini S, Donati A, Singer M, Openshaw PJM, Tolley N, Markel H, Feller-Kopman DJ. Tracheostomy in the COVID-19 era: global and multidisciplinary guidance. *Lancet Resp Med.* 2020; doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30230230-7.
20. Chao TN, Harbison SP, Braslow BM, et al. Outcomes after Tracheostomy in COVID-19 Patients. *Ann Surg.* 2020.
21. Martin-Villares C, Perez Molina-Ramirez C, Bartolome-Benito M, Bernal-Sprekelsen M, Group COEC. Outcome of 1890 tracheostomies for critical COVID-19 patients: a national cohort study in Spain. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* 2020.
22. Angel L, Kon ZN, Chang SH, et al. Novel Percutaneous Tracheostomy for Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2020;110(3):1006-1011.
23. collaborative CO. COVIDTrach; the outcomes of mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients undergoing tracheostomy in the UK: Interim Report. *Br J Surg.* 2020.
24. Young D, Harrison DA, Cuthbertson BH, Rowan K, TracMan C. Effect of early vs late tracheostomy placement on survival in patients receiving mechanical ventilation: the TracMan randomized trial. *JAMA.* 2013;309(20):2121-2129.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.20.20216085; this version posted October 27, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

25. Terragni PP, Antonelli M, Fumagalli R, et al. Early vs late tracheotomy for prevention of pneumonia in mechanically ventilated adult ICU patients: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 2010;303(15):1483-1489.
26. Vukkadala N, Qian ZJ, Holsinger FC, Patel ZM, Rosenthal E. COVID-19 and the Otolaryngologist: Preliminary Evidence-Based Review. *Laryngoscope.* 2020.
27. Lavinsky J, Kosugi EM, Baptistella E, et al. An update on COVID-19 for the otorhinolaryngologist - a Brazilian Association of Otolaryngology and Cervicofacial Surgery (ABORL-CCF) Position Statement. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol.* 2020;86(3):273-280.
28. Wang R, Pan C, Wang X, Xu F, Jiang S, Li M. The impact of tracheotomy timing in critically ill patients undergoing mechanical ventilation: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled clinical trials with trial sequential analysis. *Heart Lung.* 2019;48(1):46-54.
29. Elkbuli A, Narvel RI, Spano PJ, 2nd, et al. Early versus Late Tracheostomy: Is There an Outcome Difference? *Am Surg.* 2019;85(4):370-375.
30. Huang H, Li Y, Ariani F, Chen X, Lin J. Timing of tracheostomy in critically ill patients: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(3):e92981.
31. Meng L, Wang C, Li J, Zhang J. Early vs late tracheostomy in critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Respir J.* 2016;10(6):684-692.
32. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform.* 2019;95:103208.
33. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.* 2009;42(2):377-381.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

A



B



Figure 1a. Number of daily cases in the UK from the start of the pandemic to the point of analysis. X-axis represent the month and year. **Figure 1b** Number of tracheostomies logged in the COVIDTrach database by UK region.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Demographics	COVID-19 patients undergoing tracheostomy
Age (years) [N=1605]	
Mean (SD)	58 (11)
Sex n (%) [N=1604]	
Male	1122 (70)
Female	482 (30)
Body mass index n (%), [N=1437]	
<18.5	13 (<1)
18.5-24.9	355 (25)
25-29.9	478 (33)
30-39.9	468 (33)
≥40	122 (8)
Medical History	
Time from admission to hospital to intubation, median (IQR) [N=1518]	2 (0, 4)
Use of NIV* between admission to hospital and intubation n (%) [N=1525]	651 (43)
Time from intubation to tracheostomy in days, median (IQR) [N=1565]	15 (11, 21)
Relevant comorbidities n (%)	
None	391 (24)
1	563 (35)
2	412 (26)
3	120 (7)
>3	36 (2)
Last recorded temperature >37.5°C, n (%)	
Day of tracheostomy	377 (23)
1-2 days before	403 (25)
3-4 days before	250 (16)
5 days before	451 (28)
Unknown	124 (8)
* CRP at the time of tracheostomy	
CRP downtrending	1070 (68%)
Mean CRP (SD)	119 (88)
Median CRP (IQR)	100 (50, 165)
Inotropic support at the time of tracheostomy, n (%)	606 (39)
Use of therapeutic anticoagulation at the time of tracheostomy, n (%)	698 (45)
Ventilatory requirements on the day of tracheostomy, median (IQR)	
FiO_2 (%)*	40 (30, 45)
PaO_2 (kPa)*	9.8 (9, 11)
PEEP (cmH_2O)	8 (6, 10)
PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio	195 (153, 248)

*NIV = non invasive ventilation
*CRP = C-reactive protein
*FiO_2 = Inspired oxygen concentration
*PaO_2 = Arterial oxygen tension

Table 1. Patient demographics and medical history of 1605 mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 who underwent tracheostomy.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

COVID-19 PCR Test in patients undergoing tracheostomy	
Test positive during admission to hospital n (%)	
Positive	1473 (92)
Negative	126 (8)
Total number of tests during admission to hospital	
Median (IQR)	1 (1,2)
Outcome of last test before tracheostomy n (%)	
Positive	1213 (83)
Negative	242 (17)
Outcome of second to last test before tracheostomy n (%)	
Positive	678 (75)
Negative	228 (25)
Number of cases with two negative tests before tracheostomy n (%)	115 (7)
Number of days from last test to tracheostomy	
Median (IQR)	12 (6,18)

Table 2. The outcome of COVID-19 PCR testing in 1605 mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 undergoing tracheostomy.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

A



B



C



Figure 2a. Length of time from intubation to tracheostomy (days) **Figure 2b** Number of tracheostomies divided by method and specialist performing the procedure. **Figure 2c**. Type of respirator used during the tracheostomy.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Outcomes following tracheostomy in COVID-19 patients	
All cause mortality following tracheostomy in COVID-19 patients n (%)	
Died during tracheostomy	1 (<1)
Died before successful wean from mechnical ventilation	276 (17)
Died between wean from ventilation and discharge from hospital	9 (1)
Cause of death following tracheostomy n (%)	
COVID-19 related	249 (89)
Tracheostomy related	9 (3)
Other	22 (8)
Weaning from mechanical ventilation in survivors n (%)	
Successfully weaned from mechanical ventilation	1229 (93)
Still ventilated at the time of analysis	91 (7)
Time (days) from tracheostomy to successful wean, median (IQR)	11 (7, 18)
Total length (days) of critical care in survivors, median (IQR)	33 (25, 44)
Total length (days) of critical care in non-survivors, median (IQR) [N=264]	23 (16, 32)
Successful tracheostomy decannulation at analysis n (%)	1154 (88)
Discharge from hospital n (%)	1049 (81)
Time (days) from tracheostomy to discharge from hospital in survivors, median (IQR)	29 (21, 42)

Table 3. Outcomes of mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 undergoing tracheostomy.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

A

Predictor	Category	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Age		1.038 (1.023 to 1.053)	<0.001
FiO_2 requirement (log)		7.339 (4.147 to 12.988)	<0.001
PEEP setting (log)		2.774 (1.564 to 4.921)	<0.001
Days of ventilation before tracheostomy (days)	<= 7	1	<0.001
	8-12	0.539 (0.334 to 0.872)	
	> 12	0.379 (0.245 to 0.586)	
Pyrexia (>37.5°C)	Day of tracheostomy	1	0.003
	1-2 days before	0.835 (0.540 to 1.292)	
	3-4 days before	1.388 (0.868 to 2.218)	
	5+ days before	1.683 (1.124 to 2.520)	
Downward CRP	No	1	0.003
	Yes	0.620 (0.474 to 0.846)	
Therapeutic anticoagulation	No	1	0.002
	Yes	1.603 (1.184 to 2.170)	
Inotropic support	No	1	<0.001
	Yes	1.831 (1.352 to 2.480)	

B



C



Figure 3a. Odds ratios from multivariable logistic regression model for mortality (n=1379). Eight predictive clinical variables were identified. **Figure 3b** ROC curve for multivariable prediction model. The optimal cut-point for sensitivity and specificity, found using Youden's index, is based on a predicted value of 15.8%. This provides a sensitivity of 77% and specificity of 65%. The corresponding PPV and NPV are 33% and 93% respectively. **Figure 3c** Observed and predicted risk for 10 quantile groups. The groups (1-10) were obtained by splitting patients by their predicted risk, i.e. group 1 comprise the 10% of patients with the lowest predicted risk.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Predictor	Category	Coefficient (95% CI)	P-value
Age		0.010 (0.007 to 0.014)	<0.001
Sex	Male	0	0.025
	Female	-0.101 (-0.189 to -0.012)	
PEEP setting (log)		0.288 (0.147 to 0.428)	<0.001
FiO2 requirement (log)		0.396 (0.236 to 0.556)	<0.001
Method of tracheostomy	Open	0	0.010
	Percutaneous	0.110 (0.027 to 0.193)	
Anticoagulant	No	0	<0.001
	Yes	0.157 (0.074 to 0.240)	
Use of NIV	No	0	0.003
	Yes	0.124 (0.041 to 0.207)	
Intercept		-0.246 (-0.868 to 0.376)	0.438

Table 4. Regression coefficients from multiple regression model for time to wean success (n=1039)

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Variable	% answered	Total number expected	Total number completed	Number missing
Age	100	1605	1605	0
Gender	100	1605	1604	1
COVID status	100	1605	1599	6
Method of tracheostomy	100	1605	1598	7
Mortality	100	1605	1601	4
Wean from ventilator	100	1326	1320	6
CRP before tracheostomy	99	1605	1583	22
Location of tracheostomy	99	1605	1594	11
Surgical specialty performing operation	99	1605	1588	17
Intraoperative complications	99	1605	1581	24
Discharge from hospital within 28 days	99	1326	1315	11
Intubation to tracheostomy (days)	98	1605	1565	40
Inotropic support	98	1605	1565	40
Indication for tracheostomy	98	1605	1569	36
Neck factors affecting tracheostomy	98	1605	1567	38
Use of PPE - mask use	98	1605	1578	27
Fi02 on day of tracheostomy	97	1605	1549	56
Cause of death	97	299	291	8
COVID-19 amongst operators	97	1605	1558	47
PEEP on day of tracheostomy	96	1605	1533	72
Guidance method for perc tracheostomy	96	771	736	35
Co-morbidities	95	1605	1521	84
Admission to intubation (days)	95	1605	1518	87
Use of NIV	95	1605	1525	80
Postoperative complications before wean	95	1605	1530	75
Total length of critical care in non-survivors	95	279	264	15
Type of tracheostomy tube	94	1605	1509	96
Temperature before tracheostomy	92	1605	1481	124
P02 on day of tracheostomy	92	1605	1480	125
Outcome of last test	91	1605	1455	150
BMI	90	1605	1437	168
Number of tests	90	1605	1441	164
Time from test to tracheostomy (days)	90	1605	1451	154
Tracheostomy decannulation	90	1326	1195	131
Time from tracheostomy to wean	88	1326	1164	162
Postoperative complications after wean	86	1326	1142	184
Total length of critical care in survivors	85	1326	1121	205

Supplementary Table 1. Data completeness for each variable examined with total number of missing answers.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Survived (n=1319)	Died (n=286)
Age		
<30	22 (88.0%)	3 (12.0%)
30-49	293 (89.6%)	34 (10.4%)
50-69	854 (82.9%)	176 (17.1%)
70+	150 (67.3%)	73 (32.7%)
Sex		
Male	909 (81.0%)	213 (19.0%)
Female	409 (84.9%)	73 (15.1%)
Missing	1	0
Body Mass Index		
<18.5	12 (92.3%)	1 (7.7%)
18.5-25	286 (80.6%)	69 (19.4%)
25-30	395 (82.6%)	83 (17.4%)
30-40	391 (83.5%)	77 (16.5%)
40+	109 (89.3%)	13 (10.7%)
Missing	126	43
Number of Comorbidities		
None	390 (82.3%)	84 (17.7%)
One	458 (81.3%)	105 (18.7%)
Two or more	471 (82.9%)	97 (17.1%)
CRP	112.0 (84.6)	151.4 (98.4)
Missing	19	3
Downward CRP		
No	388 (77.4%)	113 (22.6%)
Yes	904 (84.5%)	166 (15.5%)
Missing	27	7
Anticoagulant		
No	700 (84.7%)	126 (15.3%)
Yes	546 (78.2%)	152 (21.8%)
Missing	73	8
Inotropic support		
No	833 (86.9%)	126 (13.1%)
Yes	456 (75.2%)	150 (24.8%)
Missing	30	10
Use of NIV		
No	721 (82.5%)	153 (17.5%)
Yes	535 (82.2%)	116 (17.8%)
Missing	63	17
Days of ventilation before tracheostomy		
<= 7	99 (63.1%)	58 (36.9%)
8 to 12	293 (80.1%)	73 (19.9%)
> 12	895 (86.0%)	146 (14.0%)
Missing	32	9
FiO2 requirement	38.5 (11.1)	46.7 (13.7)
Missing	47	9
PO2 requirement	10.9 (7.1)	11.2 (10.6)
Missing	112	13
PEEP setting	7.9 (2.4)	8.9 (2.1)
Missing	59	13
Method of tracheostomy		
Open	681 (85.6%)	115 (14.4%)
Percutaneous	614 (79.6%)	157 (20.4%)
Missing / Hybrid	24	14

Supplementary Table 2. Baseline and demographic characteristics by mortality. Values are either N (%) or mean (SD)

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Varibale	N	Days (n=1165)	P
Age			<0.001
<30	18	8.5 (7 to 12)	
30-49	260	10 (6 to 15)	
50-69	753	12 (7 to 18)	
70+	134	13 (8 to 23)	
Sex			<0.001
Male	798	12 (7 to 19)	
Female	366	9.5 (6 to 16)	
Missing	1		
Body Mass Index			0.023
<18.5	12	11 (6 to 22)	
18.5-25	260	13 (7 to 22)	
25-30	356	11 (7 to 17.5)	
30-40	349	11 (7 to 17)	
40+	97	10 (7 to 15)	
Missing	91		
Number of Comorbidities			0.521
None	351	11 (6 to 18)	
One	394	12 (7 to 18)	
Two or more	420	11 (7 to 17)	
CRP	1152	0.11	<0.001
Missing	13		
Downward CRP			0.574
No	338	12 (7 to 19)	
Yes	807	11 (7 to 18)	
Missing	20		
Anticoagulant			<0.001
No	628	10 (6 to 16)	
Yes	492	12 (8 to 21)	
Missing	45		
Inotropic support			0.002
No	757	11 (6 to 18)	
Yes	389	12 (8 to 19)	
Missing	19		
Use of NIV			<0.001
No	644	10 (6 to 17)	
Yes	486	12 (8 to 20)	
Missing	35		
Days of ventilation before tracheostomy			0.107
<= 7	83	12 (7 to 17)	
08-Dec	265	11 (7 to 18)	
> 12	810	11 (7 to 18)	
Missing	7		
FiO2 requirement	1145	0.21	<0.001
Missing	20		
PO2 requirement	1096	-0.07	0.022
Missing	69		
PEEP setting	1136	0.17	<0.001
Missing	29		
Method of tracheostomy			0.096
Open	586	11 (6 to 18)	
Percutaneous	557	12 (7 to 18)	
Missing / Hybrid	22		

Supplementary Table 3. Days to Wean Success. Values are Spearman correlation coefficient or median (inter-quartile range). P-values are from either spearman correlation or Kruskal-Wallis test.