How closely is COVID-19 related to HCoV, SARS, and MERS? : Clinical comparison of coronavirus infections and identification of risk factors influencing the COVID-19 severity using common data model (CDM)

Yeon Hee Kim[1], Ye-Hee Ko[1], Sooyoung Kim[1], Kwangsoo Kim[2]

1. Biomedical Research Institute, Seoul National University Hospital
2. Transdisciplinary Department of Medicine & Advanced Technology, Seoul National University Hospital

Abstract

Background

South Korea was one of the epicenters for both the 2015 Middle East Respiratory Syndrome and 2019 COVID-19 outbreaks. However, there has been a lack of published literature, especially using the Electronic Medical Records (EMR), that provides a comparative summary of the prognostic factors present in the coronavirus-derived diseases. Therefore, in this study, we aimed to evaluate the distinct clinical traits between the infected patients of different coronaviruses to observe the extent of resemblance within the clinical features and to identify unique factors by disease severity that may influence the prognosis of COVID-19 patients.

Methods

We utilized the common data model (CDM), which is the database that houses the standardized EMR. We set COVID-19 as a reference group in comparative analyses. For statistical methods, we used Levene's test, one-way Anova test, Scheffe post-hoc test, Games-howell post-hoc test, and Student's t-test for continuous variables, and chi-squared test and Fisher's exact test for categorical variables. With the variables that reflected similarity in more than two comparisons between the disease groups yet significantly different between the COVID-19 severity groups, we performed univariate logistic regression to identify which common manifestations in coronaviruses are risk factors for severe COVID-19 outcomes.

Findings

We collected the records of 2840 COVID-19 patients, 67 MERS patients (several suspected cases included), 43 SARS suspected patients, and 87 HCoV patients. We found that a significantly higher number of COVID-19 patients had been diagnosed with comorbidities compared to the MERS and HCoV groups (48.5% vs. 10.4 %, $p < 0.001$ and 48.5% vs. 35.6%, $p < 0.05$) and also that the non-mild COVID-19 patients reported more comorbidities than the mild group (55.7% vs. 47.8%, $p < 0.05$). There were overall increases in the levels of fibrinogen in both sets of disease and severity groups. The univariate logistic regression showed that the male sex (OR: 1.66; CI: 1.29-2.13, $p < 0.001$), blood type A (OR: 1.80; CI: 1.40-2.31, $p < 0.001$), renal disease (OR: 3.27; CI: 2.34-4.55, $p < 0.001$), decreased creatinine level (OR: 2.05; CI: 1.45-2.88, $p < 0.001$), and elevated fibrinogen level (OR: 1.59, CI: 1.21-2.09, $p < 0.001$) are associated with the severe COVID-19 prognosis, whereas the patients reporting gastrointestinal symptoms (OR: 0.42; CI: 0.23-0.72, $p < 0.01$) and increased alkaline phosphatase (OR: 0.73; CI: 0.56-0.94, $p < 0.05$) are more less likely to experience complications and other severe outcomes from the SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Interpretation

The present study observed the highest resemblance between the COVID-19 and SARS groups as clinical manifestations that were present in SARS group were linked to the severity of COVID-19. In particular, male individuals with blood type A and previous diagnosis of kidney failure were shown to be more susceptible to developing the poorer outcomes during COVID-19 infection, with a presentation of elevated level of fibrinogen.

Background

COVID-19, a global pandemic that has caused more than 2 million deaths and over 90 million cases since its outbreak[1], is a novel respiratory viral disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus that was first discovered in Wuhan, China, in December of 2019[2-5]. Coronaviruses are the RNA viruses that are commonly present in bats and belong to the family *Coronaviridae.* The family comprises four genera, *Alphacoronavirus*, *Betacoronavirus*, *Gammacoronavirus*, and *Deltacoronavirus*, of which the two, *Alphacoronavirus* and *Betacoronavirus* are known to cause respiratory infections in humans. In addition to the COVID-19, there are six other human coronaviruses that have been previously reported since the 1960s[6], including HCoV229E, HCoV-NL63, HCoV-OC43, HCoV-HKU1, SARS-CoV-1, and MERS-CoV. While the HCoV strains cause mild upper respiratory diseases, the zoonotic strains including the SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV, and SARS-CoV-2 cause severe respiratory symptoms and complications with high mortality rates[6-15]. With the continuum of emergency outbreaks from coronavirus, a comparative assessment of the clinical traits between the infections and a stratification of common clinical variables by severity of the novel COVID-19 can be, therefore, useful in determining the specific at-risk population of each disease, risk factors of infection and severity, and degree of resemblance between the coronaviruses, in order to establish a comprehensive set of data. Thus, in this study, we aim to perform, using the real-world data of Seoul National University Hospital, a clinical characterization of the infected and suspected South Korean patients of HCoV strains, SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV, and SARS-CoV-2, and observe whether any common or distinct trait observed between the diseases may significantly influence the prognosis of the COVID-19 patients.

Methods

I. Data source

We designed a retrospective cohort observational study using Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership Common Data Model (OMOP CDM) based in Seoul National University Hospital located in Seoul, South Korea. CDM is the database that houses the Electronic Medical Records (EMR) transformed into the common format to be used by the multiple institutions for research purposes. It is the global data network shared by 19 different countries with more than half a billion patient records altogether[16]. The platform provides deidentified patient records of demographics, diagnosis, hospital admission, provider, prescription, and laboratory values, and vital statues[16]. Due to the privacy policy, there was no patient mortality information in our database. There was no patient or public involvement in this study. The study was approved by the Seoul National University Hospital Institutional Review Board (Seoul, South Korea) on April 2nd, 2020.

II. Study Cohort

The follow-up period was from October 15th of 2004 to July 31st of 2020. Without any restriction on age and gender, we collected the records of symptoms, comorbidities, and laboratory test results of patients who were diagnosed with HCoV229E, HCoV-NL63, HCoV-OC43, HCoV-HKU1 (HCoVs), SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV, and SARS-CoV-2

infections using International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10)[17]. The index date of virus infection was determined by the first visit to the hospital. It is to note that the PCR results were not available, and the study cohorts were established solely on the diagnoses from the EMR. Therefore, SARS-CoV-1 group in this study involves the suspected individuals who showed clinical symptoms of SARS at the time of their hospital visits and had been diagnosed as SARS. MERS-CoV group also includes the several suspected cases. We divided the COVID-19 patients by their disease severity based on the published criteria from the World Health Organization (WHO)[18]. Among the COVID-19 patients, those who experienced mild cold-like symptoms with no existing pneumonia were classified as mild, whereas the patients who reported any clinical presentation of pneumonia only or with oxygen saturation (SpO_2) under 90% were classified as non-mild. Laboratory test results were divided into low, normal, and high levels with a reference to published ranges by Seoul Clinical Laboratories[19] (Appendix 1).

III. Statistical analysis

There are total three statistical analyses in this study. First, we conducted a comparative clinical characterization of four disease groups with COVID-19 group as a reference. Continuous variables were expressed by the mean values with ± standard deviations (SD) with the appropriate units whereas categorical variables were represented by frequency and percentage (%). The Levene's test, one-way Anova test, Scheffe post-hoc test, Games-howell post-hoc test, and Student's t-test were used to compare continuous variables, and the χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test were used for the categorical variables[20-25]. With the same set of variables, listed analyses above were performed to compare between the mild and non-mild COVID-19 groups. To perform a univariate logistic regression[26-27] to explore the extent of influence by risk factors on severity of COVID-19, we set two criteria for a variable selection. First, we considered statistical similarity between the variables of disease groups to reflect clinical resemblance between the patients. Second, among the variables that showed such similarity, we selected the ones with p-values less than 0.05 in severity analyses. The regression model was adjusted for age and gender. We excluded any variable that had null or sparse patient records. All statistical analyses were carried using R version 3.6.2.

Results

I. Comparative analyses between the coronavirus infections

Demographic and clinical characteristics

For the study, we collected the records of 2840 COVID-19 patients, 67 MERS patients, of which some may be the suspected cases, 43 SARS suspected patients, and 87 other HCoV patients. Table 1 shows the summary of clinical characteristics of the COVID-19, MERS, SARS, and HCoV patients. Among the COVID-19 patients, the mean age was 49.5 ± 25.9 and 1457 (51.3%) were males. Among the MERS patients, the mean age was 33.0 ± 21.7 and 35 (52.2%) were males whereas among the SARS and HCoV patients, the mean age of patients was 45.6 ± 30.9 and 10.6 ± 17.9, and 31 (72.1%) and 46 (52.9%) were males, respectively. From the comparison, COVID-19 group was significantly more likely to experience cancer (29.5% vs. 3.0%, $p < 0.001$) and gastrointestinal diseases (14.4% vs. 1.5%, $p < 0.01$) compared to the MERS group, whereas a higher proportion of SARS patients

reported cerebrovascular (11.6% vs. 2.6%, $p < 0.001$), hepatic disease (11.6 % vs. 4.6 %, $p < 0.05$), renal disease (16.3% vs. 6.4%, $p < 0.01$) than the COVID-19 group. In symptom presentation, MERS and HCoV patients experienced fever (79.1% vs. 33.0%, $p < 0.001$ and 56.3% vs. 33.0%, $p < 0.001$, respectively) and upper respiratory infections (28.4% vs 0.8%, $p < 0.001$ and 34.5% vs 0.8%, $p < 0.001$) more frequently than the COVID-19 patients.

Characteristic (unit)	COVID-19 (n=2840)	MERS-CoV (n=67)	p-val	SARS-CoV-1 (n=43)	p-val	HCoV (n=87)	p-val
Age (years)							
Total	49.48 ± 25.94	33.04 ± 21.74	<.0001	45.64 ± 30.93	0.422	10.59 ± 17.89	<.0001
0-19	434 (15.28)	19 (28.35)	0.0035	13 (30.23)	0.0072	72 (82.76)	<0.0001
20-39	563 (19.82)	21 (31.34)	0.020	3 (6.98)	0.033	8 (9.20)	0.014
40-59	561 (19.75)	19 (28.35)	0.082	8 (18.60)	0.851	2 (2.30)	<0.0001
60-79	941 (33.13)	7 (10.45)	<0.001	14 (32.56)	0.937	5 (5.74)	<0.0001
80+	341 (12.00)	1 (1.49)	0.003	5 (11.63)	0.939	0 (0.00)	NA
Gender							
Male	1457 (51.30)	35 (52.23)	0.879	31 (72.09)	0.0068	46 (52.87)	0.773
Comorbidities							
Total	1376 (48.45)	7 (10.45)	<0.0001	26 (60.47)	0.118	31 (35.63)	0.018
Diabetes	124 (4.36)	1 (1.49)	0.366	3 (6.98)	0.436	1 (1.15)	0.182
Cardiovascular disease	214 (7.53)	0 (0.00)	NA	6 (13.95)	0.116	12 (13.79)	0.031
Cerebrovascular disease	73 (2.57)	0 (0.00)	NA	5 (11.63)	0.00028	2 (2.30)	1.000
Malignancy	837 (29.47)	2 (2.98)	<0.0001	8 (18.60)	0.120	9 (10.34)	0.00011
Hepatic disease	132 (4.65)	0 (0.00)	NA	5 (11.63)	0.033	1 (1.15)	0.185
Gastrointestinal disease	410 (14.44)	1 (1.49)	0.00061	9 (20.93)	0.230	6 (6.90)	0.047
Renal disease	183 (6.44)	4 (5.97)	1.000	7 (16.27)	0.099	3 (3.45)	0.259
Thyroidal disease	30 (1.06)	1(1.49)	0.516	1 (2.32)	0.374	2 (2.30)	0.246
Musculoskeletal disease	63 (2.22)	0 (0.00)	NA	1 (2.32)	0.622	8 (9.20)	<0.0001
Symptoms							
Total	1333 (46.94)	63 (94.03)	<0.0001	17 (39.53)	0.334	67 (77.01)	<0.0001
Fever	939 (33.06)	53 (79.10)	<0.0001	9 (20.9)	0.093	49 (56.32)	<0.0001
Cough	102 (3.59)	8 (11.94)	0.00040	3 (6.98)	0.205	6 (6.90)	0.107
Dyspnea	128 (4.51)	2 (2.99)	0.768	6 (13.95)	0.0035	5 (5.75)	0.584
Chest pain	63 (2.22)	0 (0.00)	NA	1 (2.32)	0.622	0 (0.00)	NA
Sore throat	51 (1.80)	3 (4.48)	0.127	0 (0.00)	NA	1 (1.15)	1.000
Gastrointestinal symptoms	193 (6.80)	1 (1.49)	0.129	2 (4.65)	1.000	6 (6.90)	0.971
Upper respiratory infection	23 (0.81)	19 (28.36)	<0.0001	2 (4.65)	0.052	30 (34.48)	<0.0001

Table 1. Summary of clinical characteristics between the HCoVs, SARS, MERS, COVID-19 groups. Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation for the continuous variables, otherwise the number of patients and percentage

Laboratory findings

Laboratory findings of each disease group are summarized in Table 2. Overall, COVID-19 patients showed increases in the level of creatinine and prothrombin time, and together with the SARS groups, experienced the elevated levels of alkaline phosphatase, total bilirubin, aminotransferases, and blood urea nitrogen. MERS group reported a high level of creatinine,

whereas the HCoV group reported an increase in the level of alkaline phosphatase. All groups experienced high levels of fibrinogen. In complete blood cell counts, the levels of hemoglobin (13.18 ± 2.12 vs. 10.87 ± 2.47, $p < 0.001$), hematocrit (39.66 ± 5.59 vs. 33.03 ± 7.24, $p < 0.001$), and red blood cell count (4.54 ± 0.73 vs. 3.58 ± 0.85, $p < 0.001$) were significantly higher in the MERS group, whereas lymphocyte count (38.90 ± 27.00 vs. 18.44 ± 17.10, $p < 0.001$), red blood cell count (3.80 ± 0.75 vs. 3.58 ± 0.85, $p < 0.05$), eosinophil count (4.38 ± 6.09 vs. 1.37 ± 2.61, $p < 0.01$) were significantly higher in the HCoV group. Within the kidney function, blood urea nitrogen level was significantly higher in COVID-19 group than the MERS group and SARS group (23.38 ± 20.07 vs. 15.78 ± 13.80, $p < 0.01$ and 23.38 ± 20.07 vs. 12.90 ± 11.77, $p < 0.001$, respectively) and a significantly higher level of creatinine than the HCoV group (1.33 ± 1.77 vs. 0.58 ± 0.64, $p < 0.01$). eGFR was significantly higher in the MERS and SARS groups compared to the COVID-19 group (105.50 ± 61.10 vs. 78.27 ± 40.62, $p < 0.001$ and 107.50 ± 48.12 vs. 78.27 ± 40.62, $p < 0.05$, respectively).

Characteristic (unit)	COVID-19 (n=2840)	MERS-CoV (n=67)	p-val	SARS-CoV-1 (n=43)	p-val	HCoV (n=87)	p-val
Complete blood count							
Hb (g/dL)	10.87 (2.47)	13.18 (2.12)	<0.0001	10.81 (2.92)	0.998	11.07 (2.19)	0.911
Hct (%)	33.03 (7.24)	39.66 (5.59)	<0.0001	31.50 (8.37)	0.650	32.45 (6.56)	0.846
Lymphocyte (%)	18.44 (17.1)	18.93 (11.75)	0.993	19.30 (15.10)	0.984	38.90 (27.00)	<0.0001
RBC (10^6/μL)	3.58 (0.85)	4.54 (0.73)	<0.0001	3.46 (0.99)	0.872	3.80 (0.75)	0.037
WBC (10^3/μL)	10.12 (15.21)	8.10 (4.11)	0.839	9.19 (6.94)	0.984	5.64 (6.02)	0.055
Eosinophil (%)	1.37 (2.61)	1.20 (1.32)	0.849	2.13 (4.71)	0.761	4.38 (6.09)	0.0020
PCT (%)	0.20 (0.11)	0.20 (0.09)	1.000	0.17 (0.09)	0.142	0.19 (0.14)	0.825
PLT (10^3/μL)	192.36 (120.45)	217.00 (100.12)	0.377	176.45 (114.49)	0.819	178.95 (152.55)	0.850
Liver function							
Albumin (g/dL)	3.53 (0.74)	4.17 (0.52)	<0.0001	2.94 (0.52)	<0.0001	3.76 (0.58)	0.063
Alkaline phosphatase (U/L)	152.34 (191.25)	89.98 (56.58)	0.201	111.64 (76.22)	0.460	132.41 (88.79)	0.921
Bilirubin, total (mg/dL)	1.39 (2.35)	0.67 (0.33)	<0.0001	2.37 (5.65)	0.742	0.66 (0.46)	<0.0001
AST (U/L)	85.58 (440.14)	33.50 (34.94)	0.896	108.21 (261.10)	0.993	38.40 (29.90)	0.889
ALT (U/L)	54.25 (163.63)	27.70 (24.84)	0.772	92.82 (169.53)	0.588	34.00 (31.26)	0.841
Kidney function							
BUN (mg/dL)	23.38 (20.07)	15.80 (13.78)	0.0044	28.50 (36.30)	0.794	12.90 (11.77)	<0.0001
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.33 (1.77)	1.07 (1.12)	0.801	1.03 (0.94)	0.999	0.58 (0.64)	0.0090
eGFR	78.27 (40.62)	105.50 (61.10)	0.0039	107.50 (48.12)	0.023	70.79 (36.94)	0.927
Coagulation function							
aPTT (sec)	31.14 (12.68)	31.85 (4.65)	0.996	33.70 (7.58)	0.883	31.18 (2.86)	1.000
Fibrinogen (mg/dL)	400.28 (134.49)	454.00 (122.64)	0.391	458.81 (152.01)	0.391	407.70 (132.59)	0.999
PT (sec)	15.16 (10.50)	13.00 (1.94)	0.837	13.10 (2.69)	0.881	12.74 (0.89)	0.885

Table 2. Summary of laboratory findings between the disease groups. Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation for the continuous variables, otherwise the number of patients and percentage. Hb: Hemoglobain, Hct: Hematocrit, RBC: Red blood cell, WBC: White blood cell, PLT: Platelet, PCT: Procalcitonin, AST: Aspartate Aminotransferase, ALT: Alanine

Aminotransferase, BUN: Blood urea nitrogen, eGFR: Estimated glomerular filtration rate, aPTT: Partial thromboplastin time, PT: Prothrombin time

We performed an additional association analysis between the ABO blood type and coronavirus infections. As shown in Table 3, there were no statistically significant differences between the COVID-19, SARS, and HCoV groups by blood types. Due to the missing number of MERS patients who performed ABO blood test, we observed low p-values of less than 0.05 between the COVID-19 and MERS group comparison.

ABO blood type comparisons

Characteristic	COVID-19 (n=2840)	MERS-CoV (n=67)	p-val	SARS-CoV-1 (n=43)	p-val	HCoV (n=87)	p-val
Blood type							
A	596 (20.99)	1 (1.49)	<0.0001	14 (32.56)	0.065	18 (20.69)	0.947
B	441 (15.53)	2 (2.99)	0.0028	10 (23.26)	0.166	17 (19.54)	0.310
AB	194 (6.83)	0 (0.00)	NA	2 (4.65)	0.766	5 (5.75)	0.692
O	470 (16.55)	4 (5.97)	0.018	7 (16.28)	0.962	11 (12.6)	0.333

Table 3. Summary of ABO blood type counts in each disease group

II. Comparative analyses of the COVID-19 severity

Demographic and clinical characteristics

After dividing the COVID-19 patients by the WHO disease severity criteria[18], as demonstrated in Figure 1, 2596 people belonged to the mild group (91.4%) and 244 (8.6%) belonged to the non-mild group.



Figure 1. Flowchart of establishing cohorts by WHO guideline[18]

In Table 4, the mean age of mild group was 47.9 ± 25.7 and 1298 (50.0%) were males, and the mean age of non-mild group was 66.7 ± 22.6 and 159 (65.2%) were males. There were total 1376 COVID-19 patients with the comorbidities, of which 1240 and 136 patients belonged to the mild and non-mild group, respectively. By comparison, non-mild COVID-19 group presented significantly more comorbidities upon their hospital visits (55.7% vs. 47.8%, $p < 0.05$), including cardiovascular disease (13.1 % vs. 7.0%, $p < 0.001$), cerebrovascular disease (4.9% vs. 2.3%, $p < 0.05$), and renal disease (16.4% vs. 5.5 %, $p < 0.01$). For symptoms, non-mild group had significantly higher proportion of individuals reporting dyspnea (19.3% vs. 3.1%, $p < 0.001$), chest pain (5.7% vs. 1.9%, $p < 0.001$), and upper respiratory infections (2.5% vs. 0.7%, $p < 0.001$).

Characteristic (unit)	**COVID-19 (n=2840)**	**Mild (n=2596)**	**Non-mild (n=244)**	**p-val**
Gender				
Male	1457 (51.30)	1298 (50.00)	159 (65.16)	<0.0001
Age (years)				
Total	49.48 ± 25.94	47.86 ± 25.65	66.75 ± 22.55	<0.0001
0-19	434 (15.28)	415 (15.99)	19 (7.79)	0.00067
20-39	563 (19.82)	555 (21.37)	8 (3.28)	<0.0001
40-59	561 (19.75)	536 (20.65)	25 (10.25)	<0.0001
60-79	941 (33.13)	828 (31.90)	113 (46.31)	<0.001
80+	341 (12.00)	262 (10.09)	79 (32.38)	<0.0001
Comorbidities				
Total	1376 (48.45)	1240 (47.77)	136 (55.74)	0.017
Diabetes	124 (4.36)	115 (4.43)	9 (3.69)	0.588
Cardiovascular disease	214 (7.53)	182 (7.01)	32 (13.11)	0.00055
Cerebrovascular disease	73 (2.57)	61 (2.35)	12 (4.92)	0.015
Malignancy	837 (29.47)	758 (29.20)	79 (32.38)	0.298
Hepatic disease	132 (4.65)	130 (5.07)	2 (0.82)	0.0012
Gastrointestinal disease	410 (14.44)	390 (15.02)	20 (8.20)	0.004
Renal disease	183 (6.44)	143 (5.51)	40 (16.39)	<0.0001
Thyroidal disease	30 (1.06)	30 (1.16)	0 (0.0)	NA
Musculoskeletal disease	63 (2.22)	55 (2.12)	8 (3.28)	0.239
Symptoms				
Total	1333 (46.94)	1234 (47.53)	99 (40.57)	0.037
Fever	939 (33.06)	895 (34.48)	44 (18.03)	<0.0001
Cough	102 (3.59)	97 (3.74)	5 (2.05)	0.176
Dyspnea	128 (4.51)	81 (3.12)	47 (19.26)	<0.0001
Chest pain	63 (2.22)	49 (1.89)	14 (5.74)	<0.0001
Sore throat	51 (1.80)	51 (1.96)	0 (0.0)	NA
Gastrointestinal symptoms	193 (6.80)	185 (7.13)	8 (3.28)	0.022
Upper respiratory infection	23 (0.81)	17 (0.65)	6 (2.46)	0.0026

Table 4. Summary of clinical characteristics between the COVID-19 severity groups. Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation for the continuous variables, otherwise the number of patients and percentage

When comparing the mild and non-mild groups of COVID-19 patients, Table 5 shows a difference between the severity by the blood type A, with a significantly higher proportion of

non-mild COVID-19 patients in type A compared to the mild group (30.7 % vs. 20.1%, $p < 0.001$).

ABO blood type comparisons

Characteristic	COVID-19 (n=2840)	Mild (n=2596)	Non-mild (n=244)	p-val
Blood type				
A	596 (20.99)	521 (20.07)	75 (30.74)	<0.0001
B	441 (15.53)	409 (15.76)	32 (13.11)	0.276
AB	194 (6.83)	172 (6.63)	22 (9.02)	0.157
O	470 (16.55)	428 (16.49)	42 (17.21)	0.770

Table 5. Summary of ABO blood type counts in each severity group

Laboratory findings

Laboratory findings of each severity group are summarized in Table 6. From the table, we observed an increase in the count of white blood cell and the levels of blood nitrogen urea and fibrinogen within the non-mild group and an increase in the level of alkaline phosphatase within the mild group. Both severity groups reported elevated levels of aminotransferases and creatinine. Compared to the mild group, non-mild group showed statistically higher levels of white blood cell count (11.13 ± 9.44 vs. 9.99 ± 0.16, $p < 0.05$), eosinophil count (1.93 ± 4.30 vs. 1.28 ± 2.25, $p < 0.01$), procalcitonin (0.21 ± 0.11 vs. 0.20 ± 0.11, $p < 0.01$), and platelet (208.26 ± 120.78 vs. 190.18 ± 120.26, $p < 0.05$). While in liver function measurements, the mild group showed higher levels of albumin (3.56 ± 0.74 vs. 3.30 ± 0.64, $p < 0.001$), alkaline phosphatase (156.52 ± 200.38 vs. 123.94 ± 106.64, $p < 0.001$), and total bilirubin (1.45 ± 2.47 vs. 0.94 ± 1.16 , $p < 0.001$), they had lower levels of blood nitrogen urea (22.50 ± 19.56 vs. 29.56 ± 22.45, $p < 0.001$), creatinine (1.28 ± 1.71 vs. 1.78 ± 2.18, $p < 0.001$), and fibrinogen (392.81 ± 135.42 vs. 449.46 ± 117.01, $p < 0.001$) compared to the non-mild group.

Characteristic (unit)	Total	Mild	Non-mild	p-val
Complete blood count				
Hb (g/dL)	10.97 (2.47)	10.91 (2.47)	10.58 (2.40)	0.013
Hct (%)	33.03 (7.24)	33.10 (7.25)	32.58 (7.19)	0.181
Lymphocyte (%)	18.44 (17.1)	18.63 (0.17)	17.16(16.44)	0.109
RBC (10^6/μL)	3.58 (0.85)	3.59 (0.85)	3.47 (0.82)	0.0061
WBC (10^3/μL)	10.12 (15.21)	9.99 (0.16)	11.13(9.44)	0.043
Eosinophil (%)	1.37 (2.61)	1.28 (2.25)	1.93 (4.30)	0.0090
PCT (%)	0.20 (0.11)	0.20 (0.11)	0.21 (0.11)	0.0027
PLT (10^3/μL)	192.36 (120.45)	190.18 (120.26)	208.26 (120.78)	0.0057
Liver function				
Albumin (g/dL)	3.53 (0.74)	3.56 (0.74)	3.30 (0.64)	<0.0001
Alkaline phosphatase (U/L)	152.34 (191.25)	156.52 (200.38)	123.94 (106.64)	<0.0001
Bilirubin, total (mg/dL)	1.39 (2.35)	1.45 (2.47)	0.94(1.16)	<0.0001
AST (U/L)	85.58 (440.14)	88.08(456.98)	67.99 (295.15)	0.274
ALT (U/L)	54.25 (163.63)	53.57(143.78)	59.05 (2644.81)	0.705
Kidney function				
BUN (mg/dL)	23.38 (20.07)	22.50 (19.56)	29.56 (22.45)	<0.0001
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.33 (1.77)	1.28(1.71)	1.78 (2.18)	<0.0001

eGFR	78.27 (40.62)	79.41(39.98)	70.66 (43.97)	0.00041
Coagulation function				
aPTT (sec)	31.14 (12.68)	31.12(12.46)	31.22 (14.06)	0.909
Fibrinogen (mg/dL)	400.28 (134.49)	392.81(135.42)	449.46 (117.01)	<0.0001
PT (sec)	15.16 (10.50)	15.15(11.11)	15.25 (4.79)	0.801

Table 6. Summary of laboratory findings between the COVID severity groups. Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation for the continuous variables, otherwise the number of patients and percentage. Hb: Hemoglobin, Hct: Hematocrit, RBC: Red blood cell, WBC: White blood cell, PLT: Platelet, PCT: Procalcitonin, AST: Aspartate Aminotransferase, ALT: Alanine Aminotransferase, BUN: Blood urea nitrogen, eGFR: Estimated glomerular filtration rate, aPTT: Partial thromboplastin time, PT: Prothrombin time

III. Logistic regression

In order to observe the extent of common clinical characteristics among disease groups that may uniquely affect the prognosis of COVID-19 patients, we conducted a nominal logistic regression with the variables that showed the p values higher than 0.05 in two thirds of the comparative groups between the diseases and less than 0.05 in the analyses between the disease severity groups. We found no collinearity between the variables. Table 7 below shows the results from regression that has been adjusted for both age and gender. The univariate logistic regression showed that the male patients (OR: 1.66; CI: 1.29-2.13, $p < 0.001$) with ABO blood type A (OR: 1.80; CI: 1.40-2.31, $p < 0.001$), renal disease (OR: 3.27; CI: 2.34-4.55, $p < 0.001$), decreased creatinine (OR: 2.05; CI: 1.45-2.88, $p < 0.001$), and increased level of fibrinogen (OR: 1.59, CI: 1.21-2.09, $p < 0.001$) are associated with the higher risks of progressing towards the more severe stage whereas the patients with gastrointestinal symptoms (OR: 0.42; CI: 0.23-0.72, $p < 0.01$) and increased alkaline phosphatase (OR: 0.73; CI: 0.56-0.94, $p < 0.05$) are less likely to experience the severe prognosis of the disease. Age was not associated with risk of high severity.

Characteristic (unit)	OR (95% CI)	p-val
Age (years)	1.04 (1.02, 1.06)	0.00087
0-19	2.74 (0.46, 16.04)	0.265
20-39	1.18 (0.30, 4.53)	0.808
40-59	0.82 (0.36, 1.85)	0.636
60-79	0.80 (0.52, 1.23)	0.311
Male, Sex	1.66 (1.29, 2.13)	<0.0001
Blood type (A)	1.80 (1.40, 2.31)	<0.0001
Dyspnea	5.36 (3.88, 7.41)	<0.0001
Renal disease	3.27 (2.34, 4.55)	<0.0001
Gastrointestinal symptoms	0.42 (0.23, 0.72)	0.0032
Hb (g/dL)		
High	2.17 (0.94, 4.70)	0.057
Low	0.98 (0.73, 1.32)	0.882
WBC (10^3/μL)		
High	1.38 (1.06, 1.80)	0.016
Low	1.72 (1.18, 2.49)	0.0044
Eosinophil (%)		
High	1.50 (0.76, 2.80)	0.217
Low	0.94 (0.74, 1.20)	0.628

PCT (%)		
High	0.88 (0.40, 1.98)	0.753
Low	0.73 (0.54, 0.99)	0.045
PLT (10^3/µL)		
High	2.25 (1.05, 4.60)	0.030
Low	0.97 (0.68, 1.37)	0.845
Alkaline Phosphatase (U/L)		
High	0.73 (0.56, 0.94)	0.015
Low	0.36 (0.06, 1.30)	0.182
Creatinine (mg/dL)		
High	0.92 (0.68, 1.23)	0.575
Low	2.05 (1.45, 2.88)	<0.0001
Fibrinogen (mg/dL)		
High	1.59 (1.21, 2.09)	0.00084
Low	0.81 (0.36, 1.63)	0.574

Table 7. Nominal logistic regression adjusted for age and gender. Hb: Hemoglobin, WBC: White blood cell, PCT: Procalcitonin, PLT: Platelet. Normal ranges served as the reference values for all measurement variables



Figure 2. Proportion of prognostic factors in non-mild COVID-19 patients



Figure 3. Proportion of prognostic factors in disease groups

Figure 2 shows the proportion of patients with risk factors in non-mild group, of which elevated fibrinogen level (72.5%) and male sex (58.2%) most commonly appeared. When comparing the identical parameters in different disease groups, Figure 3 shows that the proportions of patients in male sex (72.1%), blood type A (32.6%), dyspnea, and renal disease were the highest in SARS group whereas the number of patients with elevated WBC was the highest in MERS group. The rates of elevated fibrinogen were similar in SARS and MERS groups with 25% and 26.2%, respectively.

Discussion

The present retrospective cohort study examined the clinical resemblance between the coronavirus infected patients within South Korea and identified the common characteristics and risk factors that can potentially influence a severity of the novel COVID-19. In our findings, we discovered the most similarities in clinical features between the COVID-19 group, especially the non-mild COVID-19 patients, and SARS group, showing statistical similarities that range from 75-89.5% in their manifestations. Our observation between the SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV-1, analogous to a previous study by Petrosillo et al[28], maybe attributed to a resemblance of more than 80% in genomic sequences[29]. It is also to note that the two viruses utilize an angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor, suggesting the common cellular binding mechanism as the basis of parallel pathogeneses in COVID-19 and SARS patients[30-32].

Another important finding was that the male sex, blood type A, renal disease, and elevated level of fibrinogen were major risk factors in virus infections and severe prognosis of COVID-19. In line with our observation in the patient demographics, of which more than 50% of individuals were males, previous research on SARS data in Hong Kong showed enhanced fatality rate in men by 21.9% compared to women with 13.2%[33-34] whereas the South Korean and Saudi Arabic MERS-CoV data predominantly reflected male sex in infected population, with the respective frequencies of 65.2% and 59.1%[35]. One theory for a higher risk in males includes greater circulating ACE2 levels than in women, which creates a sex-dependent difference in virus infection[36-39], evidenced by a positive correlation of susceptibility of male mice to SARS-CoV and virus titers observed in a vitro study[39]. However, sex-dependent discrepancy is multifactorial, which would also require further investigations in relation to socioeconomic and behavioral elements.

In our study, we did not see a significant difference within a distribution of ABO blood types between the disease groups, yet the proportion of blood type A individual was significantly higher in the non-mild COVID-19 group. Such finding parallels to the meta-analysis on Spanish and Italian patient data where the odds for having severe COVID-19 were higher in A/AB groups as compared with B/O group[40-41]. While the research regarding the association between ABO blood type and coronavirus infection is relatively new, one potential mechanism of type A group's susceptibility can be attributed to a strong affinity of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein to the carbohydrates, such as galactose in the A antigen, unlike a galactose amine that is present as end group saccharide in the B and O antigens[42-43]. Another speculation pertaining to severity risk difference between the type A and non-A patients involves a protective role of neutralizing anti-A antibody blocking the interaction of ACE2 and S protein[44].

The kidney failures were evident in all disease groups and were shown to be the variable with the second-highest risk rate next to dyspnea. Firstly, ACE2, which is present in multiple organs has also been found to be highly expressed on renal cells, facilitating SARS-CoV-2 entry and consequent acute tubular injury, and occasionally collapsing focal segmental glomerulopathy in the kidney tissue[45-47]. Studies suggest a decrease in the ACE2 as a result of viral attachment to the receptor and the consequent elevation in the level of AngII and AT1R l stimulation, which induce an aggravation of respiratory distress in COVID-19 patients[48-52]. Further, CKD patients are predisposed to the poorer outcomes—their immunosuppressed state and chronic systemic inflammation can increase the risks of developing more severe complications and mortality[53-54]. Likewise, in our data, chronic kidney disease (CKD) and acute kidney injury (AKI) were the two most frequently reported diagnoses.

Of the major laboratory findings, we noticed the overall increase fibrinogen in our cohorts, especially within the non-mild COVID-19 group. Elevated fibrinogen level can be an indicator for hypercoagulability due to viral pneumonia, which is a common complication in coronavirus infections[55-57]. A literature review by Abou-Ismail et al revealed the prothrombotic traits in SARS-CoV-2 patients globally[58], which is also evidenced by our records that showed occurrences of thrombotic manifestation including pulmonary embolism, myocardial infarction, ischemic stroke, and deep vein thrombosis (DVT) in COVID-19 and SARS patients. Coagulopathy in coronavirus infected patients has been linked to a heightened inflammatory response that typically leads to thrombo-inflammation. The inflammation is suspected to begin in lungs damaging the pulmonary vasculature that leads to thrombosis in the early stage of the disease[58-66].

To conclude, our study detected the highest resemblance between the COVID-19 and SARS groups. Further, clinical manifestations that were present in SARS group were linked to the severity of COVID-19. The regression model, upon applying the common variables between the disease groups, indicated male sex, blood type A, dyspnea, renal disease, and elevated levels of white blood cell, platelet, fibrinogen and alkaline phosphatase, and decreased creatinine level as the risk factors of severe COVID-19. Our study had several limitations; first, there existed missing data, which may explain a disparity in our creatinine analyses. Considering the relative nature of logistic regression, we speculate the model to presume the contradictory correlations between the disease severity and creatinine level—only 16% of the individuals with high creatinine level belonged to the non-mild group, yet it should be noted that the number of admitted severe patients in Seoul National University Hospital was relatively low. Further, there were missing PCR data available on our database— although we utilized the diagnoses that existed on the system, there may involve the suspected cases, especially within the SARS group. Therefore, this study provides the limited clinical observations that represent the disease groups. Second, the study population was limited to the patients at a single national hospital due to the limited study period. Thus, the results in this study should not be generalized fully to other populations and ought to be considered with a caution.

Yet, we maximized the benefit of utilizing the anonymized EMR data integrated into CDM, which now is expanding in its scope globally for the vitalization of medical research[67]. Upon choosing a database, we ensured that the domains from the CDW were equally available in our CDM and that there were no gaps between the amount of data in each database with the frequent extract, transform, and load (ETL) process. Thus, through the use of CDM, we were able to reflect the real-world medical challenges in managing coronavirus infection, providing the most updated clinical dynamics. To our knowledge, this is the first study that

attempts to clinically characterize and compare four major human coronavirus infections as well as to identify the common risk factors found in previous viral infections that may influence the prognosis of novel COVID-19. With our analyses that applied the variables of both the statistical and clinical significance, we expect the results from the present study to provide clinical insights that can be used as a basis for predicting the prospective clinical representations by yet another coronavirus-derived illness in near future and to serve the guidelines for clinical treatments of current patients. However, there still left a great uncertainty around the set of symptoms and complications from coronavirus, and it is absolutely crucial to further investigate for attaining a better understanding of the disease. For future study, therefore, we recommend performing a cross-country clinical characterization and survival analysis to determine risk factors that are particular to ethnic group, which shall aid in developing more specific control and prevention schemes for each country. Moreover, it will be insightful to analyze the manifestations at a multidimensional perspective, including the patients' socioeconomic background, nutritional status, and behavioral habit that might exert an influence on the disease outcomes, with the integration of additional data from multiple institutions.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Technology Innovation Program (20003883, Technology development on CDM-based biohealth integrated data network extension) funded by the Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy (MOTIE, Korea) and a grant of the Korea Health Technology R&D Project through the Korea Health Industry Development Institute (KHIDI), funded by the Ministry of Health & Welfare, Republic of Korea (grant number: HI19C1234). The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

References

1. World Health Organization. *WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard*. Available from: https://covid19.who.int/ [Accessed on January 15th, 2020]

2. Chaw SM, Tai JH, Chen SL, Hsieh CH, Chang SY, et al. The origin and underlying driving forces of the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak. *Journal of Biomedical Science*. 2020; 27(73). Available from: doi.org/10.1186/s12929-020-00665-8 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

3. Ren LL, Wang YM, Wu ZQ, Xiang ZC, Guo L, et al. Identification of a novel coronavirus causing severe pneumonia in human: a descriptive study. *Chinese Medical Journal*. 2020; 133(9):1015-1024. Available from: doi: 10.1097/CM9.0000000000000722 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

4. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*. 2020; 579, 270–273. Available from: doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

5. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen YM, Wang W, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature*. 2020;579(7798):265–9. Available from: doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2008-3 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

6. Krishnamoorthy S, Swain B, Verma RS, and Gunthe SS. (2020) SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV, and 2019-nCoV viruses: an overview of origin, evolution, and genetic variations. *VirusDisease*. 2020; 31: 411–423. Available from: doi.org/10.1007/s13337-020-00632-9 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

7. Masters PS, and Perlman S. Coronaviridae. In: Knipe DM, Howley PM. (eds.) *Fields Virology Vol 2*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2013. p.825–858

8. Su S, Wong G, Shi W, Liu J, Lai ACK, et al. Epidemiology, Genetic Recombination, and Pathogenesis of Coronaviruses. *Trends in Microbiology.* 2016; 24, 490–502. Available from: doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2016.03.003 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

9. Forni D, Cagliani R, Clerici M, and Sironi M. Molecular Evolution of Human Coronavirus Genomes. *Trends in Microbiology.* 2017; 25, 35–48 Available from: doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2016.09.001[Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

10. Zhu Z, Lian X, Su X, Wu W, Marraro G, et al. From SARS and MERS to COVID-19: a brief summary and comparison of severe acute respiratory infections caused by three highly pathogenic human coronaviruses. *Respiratory Research*. 2020; 21, 224. Available from: doi.org/10.1186/s12931-020-01479-w [Accessed on September 18th, 2020]

11. Meo SA, Alhowikan AM, Al-Khlaiwi T, Meo IM, Halepoto DM, et al. Novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV: prevalence, biological and clinical characteristics comparison with SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV. *European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences.* 2020; 24:2012–9. Available from: doi: 10.26355/eurrev_202002_20379 [Accessed on September 18th, 2020]

12. Vos LM, Bruyndonckx R, Zuithoff NPA, Little P, Oosterheert JJ, et al. Lower respiratory tract infection in the community: associations between viral aetiology and illness course. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2020; S1198-743X(20)30168-3. Available from: doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.03.023[Accessed on September 18th, 2020]

13. Izcovich A, Ragusa MA, Tortosa FT, Marzio MAL, Agnoletti C, et al. Prognostic factors for severity and mortality in patients infected with COVID-19: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE*. 2020; 15(11): e0241955. Available from: doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0241955 [Accessed on November 20th, 2020]

14. Cui J, Li F, and Shi ZL. Origin and evolution of pathogenic coronaviruses. *Nature reviews Microbiology*. 2019; 17(3), 181-192. Available from: doi.org/10.1038/s41579-018-0118-9 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

15. Chan PKS, Chan MCW. Tracing the SARS-coronavirus. *Journal of Thoracic Disease*. 2013; 5:S118–21. Available from: doi.10.3978/j.issn.2072-1439.2013.06.19 [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

16. OHDSI (Observational Health Data Sciences and Informatics). *OMOP Common Data Model*. Available from: https://www.ohdsi.org/data-standardization/the-common-data-model/ [Accessed on October 20th, 2020]

17. World Health Organization. *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD)-10 version:2019*. Available from: https://icd.who.int/browse10/2019/en [Accessed on August 3rd, 2020]

18. World Health Organization. *Clinical Management of COVID-19.* Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/clinical-management-of-covid-19 [Accessed on August 20th, 2020]

19. Seoul Clinical Laboratories. 2020 SCL Test information (검사안내). Yongin-si, South Korea: Seoul Clinical Laboratories; 2020.

20. Brady SM, Burow M, Busch W, Carlborg Ö, Denby KJ, et al. Reassess the t Test: Interact with All Your Data via ANOVA. *Plant Cell*. 2015 27(8):2088-2094. Available from: doi:10.1105/tpc.15.00238 [Accessed on September 1st, 2020]

21. Mishra P, Singh U, Pandey CM, Mishra P, and Pandey G. Application of student's *t*-test, analysis of variance, and covariance. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia*. 2019;22(4):407-411. Available from: doi:10.4103/aca.ACA_94_19 [Accessed on September 1st, 2020]

22. Sundaram KR, Dwivedi SN, and Sreenivas V. *Medical Statistics: Principles and Methods.* 2nd ed. New Delhi: Wolters Kluwer India; 2014.

23. Mishra P, Pandey CM, Singh U, Gupta A, Sahu C, and Keshri A. Descriptive statistics and normality tests for statistical data. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia*. 2019;22:67072. Available from: doi:10.4103/aca.ACA_157_18 [Accessed on September 1st, 2020]

24. Jaykaran. How to select appropriate statistical test? *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results.* 2010;1:61–3. Available from: doi:10.4103/0976-9234.75708 [Accessed on September 1st, 2020]

25. Kim HY. Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Chi-squared test and Fisher's exact test. *Restorative Dentistry Endodontics*. 2017;42(2):152-155. Available from: doi:10.5395/rde.2017.42.2.152 [Accessed on September 2nd, 2020]

26. Sperandei S. Understanding logistic regression analysis. *Biochemia Medica (Zagreb).* 2014;24(1):12-18. Available from: doi:10.11613/BM.2014.003 [Accessed on September 2nd, 2020]

27. Xu K, Zhou M, Yang D, et al. Application of ordinal logistic regression analysis to identify the determinants of illness severity of COVID-19 in China. *Epidemiology and Infection*. 2020;148:e146. Available from: doi:10.1017/S0950268820001533 [Accessed on October 1st, 2020]

28. Petrosillo N, Viceconte G, Ergonul O, Ippolito G, Petersen E. COVID-19, SARS and MERS: are they closely related? *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2020; 26(6), 729-734. Available from: doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.03.026 [Accessed on August 1st, 2020]

29. Khan MI, Khan ZA, Baig MH, Farouk A-EAziem, Song YG, et al. Comparative genome analysis of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) from different geographical locations and the effect of mutations on major target proteins: An in silico insight. *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15 (9): e0238344. Available from: doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238344 [Accessed on September 17th, 2020]

30. Wan Y, Shang J, Graham R, Baric RS, and Li F. Receptor recognition by novel coronavirus from Wuhan: an analysis based on decade-long structural studies of SARS. *Jounal of Virology*. 2020; 94:e00127-20. Available from: doi: 10.1128/JVI.00127-20 [Accessed on September 17th, 2020]

31. Li WH, Moore MJ, Vasilieva N, Sui JH, Wong SK, et al. Angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 is a functional receptor for the SARS coronavirus. *Nature.* 2003; 426:450–454. Available from: doi:10.1038/nature02145 [Accessed on September 17th, 2020]

32. Li F. Receptor recognition mechanisms of coronaviruses: a decade of structural studies. *Journal of Virology*. 2015; 89:1954–1964. Available from: doi:10.1128/JVI.02615-14 [Accessed on September 17th, 2020]

33. Agrawal H, Das N, Nathani S, Saha S, Saini S, et al. An Assessment on Impact of COVID-19 Infection in a Gender Specific Manner. *Stem Cell Reviews and Reports*. 2020. Available from: doi.org/10.1007/s12015-020-10048-z [Accessed on October 15th, 2020]

34. Karlberg J, Chong DS, and Lai WY. Do men have a higher case fatality rate of severe acute respiratory syndrome than women do? *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 2004; *159*(3), 229–231. Available from: doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwh056 [Accessed on October 15th, 2020]

35. Chen X, Chughtai AA, Dyda A, MacIntyre CR. Comparative epidemiology of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) in Saudi Arabia and South Korea. *Emerging Microbes & Infection*. 2017;6(6):e51. Available from: doi:10.1038/emi.2017.40 [Accessed on August 27th, 2020]

36. Bwire GM. Coronavirus: Why Men are More Vulnerable to Covid-19 Than Women? *SN Comprehensive Clinical Medicine*. 2020;1-3. Available from: doi:10.1007/s42399-020-00341-w [Accessed on November 1st, 2020]

37. Gagliardi MC, Tieri P, Ortona E, and Ruggieri A. ACE2 expression and sex disparity in COVID-19. *Cell Death Discovery.* 2020; 6, 37. Available from: doi.org/10.1038/s41420-020-0276-1 [Accessed on November 2nd, 2020]

38. Bukowska, A. et al. Protective regulation of theACE2/ACE gene expression by estrogen in human atrial tissue from elderly men. *Experimental Biology and Medicine (Maywood).* 2017; 242, 1412–1423. Available from: doi: 10.1177/1535370217718808 [Accessed on November 2nd, 2020]

39. Channappanavar R, Fett C, Mack M, Eyck PPT, Meyerholz DK, Perlman S. Sex-Based Differences in Susceptibility to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Infection. *The Journal of Immunology*. 2017; 198 (10) 4046-4053. Available from: doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1601896 [Accessed on November 16th, 2020]

40. Bhattacharjee S, Banerjee M, and Pal R. ABO blood groups and severe outcomes in COVID-19: A meta-analysis. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*. 2020. Available from: doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2020-139248 [Accessed on November 15th, 2020]

41. Severe Covid-19 GWAS Group. Genomewide association study of severe Covid-19 with respiratory failure. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020; 383:1522–34. Available from: doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2020283 [Accessed on November 16th, 2020]

42. Hultström M, Persson B, Eriksson O, et al. Blood type A associates with critical COVID-19 and death in a Swedish cohort. *Critical Care*. 2020; 24, 496. Available from: doi.org/10.1186/s13054-020-03223-8 [Accessed on October 31st, 2020]

43. Chiodo F, Bruijns SCM, Rodriguez E, Li RJE, Molinaro A, et al. Novel ACE2-independent carbohydrate-binding of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein to host lectins and lung microbiota. bioRxiv. [Preprint] 2020. Available from: doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.13.092478 [Accessed on October 31st, 2020]

44. Guillon P, Clément M, Sébille V, et al. Inhibition of the interaction between the SARS-CoV spike protein and its cellular receptor by anti-histo-blood group antibodies. *Glycobiology*. 2008;18(12):1085-1093. Available from: doi:10.1093/glycob/cwn093 [Accessed on November 4th, 2020]

45. Zou, X., Chen, K., Zou, J. et al. (2020). Single-cell RNA-seq data analysis on the receptor ACE2 expression reveals the potential risk of different human organs vulnerable to 2019-nCoV infection. *Frontiers of Medicine.* 2020; 14(2), 185–192. Available from: doi.org/10.1007/s11684-020-0754-0 [Accessed on November 4th, 2020]

46. Martinez-Rojas MA, Vega-Vega O, and Bobadilla NA. Is the kidney a target of SARS-CoV-2? *American Journal of Physiology-Renal Physiology.* 2020; 318(6), F1454-F1462. Available from: doi.org/10.1152/ajprenal.00160.2020 [Accessed on November 5th, 2020]

47. Hamming I, Timens W, Bulthuis MLC, Lely AT, Navis GJ, et al. Tissue distribution of ACE2 protein, the functional receptor for SARS coronavirus. A first step in understanding SARS pathogenesis. *The Journal of Pathology.* 2004; 203(2), 631–637. Available from: doi: 10.1002/path.1570 [Accessed on November 5th, 2020]

48. Lin L, Wang X, Ren J, Sun Y, Yu R, et al. Risk factors and prognosis for COVID-19-induced acute kidney injury: a meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10:e042573. Available from: doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042573 [Accessed on November 12th, 2020]

49. Batlle D, Soler MJ, Sparks MA, Hiremath S, South AM, et al. Acute Kidney Injury in COVID-19: Emerging Evidence of a Distinct Pathophysiology. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology.* 2020; (7):1380-1383. Available from: doi: 10.1681/ASN.2020040419 [Accessed on November 1st, 2020]

50. Frimat M, Tabarin F, Dimitrov JD, Poitou C, Halbwachs-Mecarelli L, et al. Complement activation by heme as a secondary hit for atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome. *Blood*. 2013; 122: 282–292. Available from: doi: 10.1182/blood-2013-03-489245 [Accessed on November 1st, 2020]

51. Reddy R, Asante I, Liu S, Parikh P, Liebler J, et al. Circulating angiotensin peptides levels in acute respiratory distress syndrome correlate with clinical outcomes: A pilot study. *PLoS One.* 2019; 14(3): e0213096. Available from: doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0213096 [Accessed on November 1st, 2020]

52. Gheblawi M, Wang K, Viveiros A, Nguyen Q, Zhong JC, et al. Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2: SARS-CoV-2 Receptor and Regulator of the Renin-Angiotensin System: Celebrating the 20th Anniversary of the Discovery of ACE2. *Circulation research.* 2020; 126(10), 1456–1474. Available from: doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.120.317015 [Accessed on November 1st, 2020]

53. D'Marco L, Puchades MJ, Romero-Parra M, Gimenez-Civera E, Soler MJ, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 in chronic kidney disease. *Clinical Kidney Journal*. 2020;13(3):297-306. Available from: doi:10.1093/ckj/sfaa104 [Accessed on November 5th, 2020]

54. Kurts C, Panzer U, Anders H-J et al. The immune system and kidney disease: basic concepts and clinical implications. *Nature Reviews Immunology*. 2013;13(10): 738–53. Available from: doi: 10.1038/nri3523 [Accessed on November 5th, 2020]

55. Wool GD and Miller JL. The Impact of COVID-19 Disease on Platelets and Coagulation. *Pathobiology.* 2021; 88:15-27. Available from: doi.org/10.1159/000512007 [Accessed on January 3rd, 2021]

56. Spyropoulos AC, Levy JH, Ageno W, Connors JM, Hunt BJ, Iba T, et al. Subcommittee on Perioperative, Critical Care Thrombosis, Haemostasis of the Scientific, Standardization Committee of the International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis. Scientific and

Standardization Committee communication: clinical guidance on the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of venous thromboembolism in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*. 2020; 18(8):1859–65. Available from: doi: 10.1111/jth.14929 [Accessed on November 20th, 2020]

57. Giannis D, Ziogas IA, and Gianni P. Coagulation disorders in coronavirus infected patients: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV and lessons from the past. *Journal of Clinical Virology*. 2020;127:104362. Available from: doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104362 [Accessed on November 20th, 2020]

58. Abou-Ismail MY, Diamond A, Kapoor S, Arafah Y, and Nayak L. The hypercoagulable state in COVID-19: Incidence, pathophysiology, and management. *Thrombosis Research*. 2020;194:101-115. Available from: doi:10.1016/j.thromres [Accessed on November 27th, 2020]

59. Han H, Yang L, Liu R, Liu F, Wu KL, et al. Prominent changes in blood coagulation of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine.* 2020;58(7):1116–1120. Available from: doi: 10.1515/cclm-2020-0188 [Accessed on November 27th, 2020]

60. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, et al. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. New England Journal Medicine. 2020;382(18):1708–1720. Available from: doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2002032 [Accessed on November 27th, 2020]

61. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497–506. Available from: doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5 [Accessed on November 27th, 2020]

62. Campbell CM and Kahwash R. Will Complement Inhibition be the New Target in Treating COVID-19 Related Systemic Thrombosis? *Circulation*. 2020;141(22):1739–1741. Available from: doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.047419 [Accessed on November 27th, 2020]

63. Varga Z, Flammer AJ, Steiger P, Haberecker M, Andermatt R, et al. Endothelial cell infection and endotheliitis in COVID-19. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10234):1417–1418. Available from: doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30937-5 [Accessed on November 27th, 2020]

64. Ciceri F, Beretta L, Scandroglio AM, Colombo S, Landoni G, et al. Microvascular COVID-19 lung vessels obstructive thromboinflammatory syndrome (MicroCLOTS): an atypical acute respiratory distress syndrome working hypothesis. *Critical Care & Resuscitation*. 2020; 22(2):95-97. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 32294809 [Accessed on November 27th, 2020]

65. Fogarty H, Townsend L, Ni Cheallaigh C, Bergin C, Martin-Loeches I, et al. COVID19 coagulopathy in Caucasian patients. *British Journal of Haematology.* 2020; 189(6):1044-1049. Available from: doi: 10.1111/bjh.16749 [Accessed on November 28th, 2020]

66. Marongiu F, Grandone E, and Barcellona D. Pulmonary thrombosis in 2019-nCoV pneumonia? *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*. 2020;18(6):1511–1513. Available from: doi: 10.1111/jth.14818 [Accessed on November 28th, 2020]

67. Choi SA, Kim H, Kim S, Yoo S, Yi SY, Jeon YH, Hwang H, Kim KJ. Analysis of antiseizure drug-related adverse reactions from the electronic health record using the common data model. *Epilepsia*. 2020; 61(4), 610-616. Available from: doi.org/10.1111/epi.16472 [Accessed on October 15th, 2020]

Appendix 1. Normal range

	Normal range			Unit
	Pediatrics		Adults	
Albumin	3.5-5.2			g/dL
Alkaline phosphatase	M: 40-130 F: 35-105			U/L
Bilirubin, total	<1.2			mg/dL
GOT (AST)	M: <40 F: <33			U/L
GPT (ALT)	M: <41 F: <33			U/L
Hb	1-2 months	M: 10.2-12.7 F: 11.1-13.7	M: 13-17 F: 12-16	g/dL
	2-6 months	M: 10.5-13.0 F: 10.7-13.4		
	6 months – 2 yrs	M: 10.4-12.5 F: 10.8-12.6		
	2 yrs – 6 yrs	M: 11.0-12.8 F: 11.1-12.9		
	6 rs – 12 yrs	M: 11.0-13.3 F: 11.3-13.4		
	12 yrs – 18 yrs	M: 11.0-14.3 F: 11.3-13.4		
Hct	1-2 months	M: 29.1-36.6 F: 32.0-39.9	M: 39-52 F: 36-48	%
	2-6 months	M: 30.5-37.7 F: 30.5-38.6		
	6 months – 2 yrs	M: 30.5-36.4 F: 30.9-36.4		
	2 yrs – 6 yrs	M: 31.5-36.8 F: 31.8-37.0		
	6 rs – 12 yrs	M: 31.5-38.0 F: 32.3-38.3		
	12 yrs – 18 yrs	M: 31.4-41.0 F: 32.1-38.7		
Lymphocyte	1-2 months	M: 12.0-68.0 F: 16.0-68.0	17.0-46.0	%
	2-6 months	M: 16.0-68.0 F: 15.0-68.0		
	6 months – 2 yrs	M: 15.0-67.0 F: 13.0-70.0		
	2 yrs – 6 yrs	M: 11.0-54.0 F: 11.0-59.0		
	6 rs – 12 yrs	M: 8.0-45.0 F: 10.0-47.0		
	12 yrs – 18 yrs	M: 8.0-41.0 F: 8.0-39.0		
RBC	1-2 months	M: 3.24-4.08 F: 3.55-4.57	M: 4.2-6.3 F: 4.0-5.4	$*10^6/\mu L$
	2-6 months	M: 3.67-4.61 F: 3.63-4.61		
	6 months – 2 yrs	M: 3.81-4.74 F: 3.83-4.67		
	2 yrs – 6 yrs	M: 3.92-4.72 F: 3.83-4.67		

	6 rs – 12 yrs	M: 3.85-4.75 F: 3.88-4.72		
	12 yrs – 18 yrs	M: 3.74-4.93 F: 3.79-4.61		
WBC	1-2 months	M: 8.36-13.66 F: 7.34-12.31	4-10	*10^3/µL
	2-6 months	M: 7.91-13.41 F: 6.85-12.84		
	6 months – 2 yrs	M: 7.73-13.12 F: 7.05-12.98		
	2 yrs – 6 yrs	M: 5.97-10.49 F: 5.98-10.08		
	6 rs – 12 yrs	M: 5.69-9.88 F: 5.41-9.70		
	12 yrs – 18 yrs	M: 5.24-9.74 F: 35.52-9.29		
Eosinophil	1-2 months	M: 2.0-5.0 F: 2.0-6.0	1-6	%
	2-6 months	M: 2.0-6.0 F: 2.0-5.0		
	6 months – 2 yrs	M: 1.0-5.0 F: 1.0-4.0		
	2 yrs – 6 yrs	M: 1.0-4.0 F: 1.0-4.0		
	6 rs – 12 yrs	M: 2.0-4.0 F: 1.0-4.0		
	12 yrs – 18 yrs	M: 2.0-4.0 F: 1.0-3.0		
PCT	M: 0.19-0.39 F: 0.19-0.41			%
PLT	1-2 months	M: 221-471 F: 184-430	130-400	*10^3/µL
	2-6 months	M: 215-448 F: 147-423		
	6 months – 2 yrs	M: 185-399 F: 211-408		
	2 yrs – 6 yrs	M: 211-370 F: 190-365		
	6 rs – 12 yrs	M: 227-350 F: 210-339		
	12 yrs – 18 yrs	M: 180-299 F: 192-307		
BUN	< 1y r	4-19	18-60 yrs: 6-20	mg/dL
	< 18 yrs	5-18	61-90 yrs: 8-23	
Creatinine	M: 0.7-1.20 F: 0.5-0.9			mg/dL
eGFR	> 60			
CK (CPK)	M: 39-308 F: 26-192			U/L
aPTT	28.5-45.4			sec
Fibrinogen	200-400			mg/dL
PT	11.8-15.3			sec

Table 1. Normal ranges used for the continuous variables[19]



A. Patients with general symptoms inclu
cough, fatigue, dyspnea, myalgias, s
nasal congestion, headache, diarrhea
vomiting
B. Patients diagnosed with pneumonia
days since the first COVID-19 positi
C. Adults and adolescents: $SpO_2 \geq 90\%$
2 months: RR ≥ 60 breaths/min; 2-11
≥ 50 breaths/min; 1-5 years : RR ≥ 4
D. Adults and adolescents: $SpO_2 < 90\%$
breaths/min, Pediatrics: Convulsions
unconsciousness + $SpO_2 < 90\%$ or 2
60 breaths/min; 2-11 months: RR ≥ 5
breaths/min; 1-5 years : RR ≥ 40 bre


Proportion of prognostic factors in non-mild COVID-19 patients
%
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
72.5
58.2
36.1
28.7
23.4
18.9
15.2
9
3.3
High fibrinogen level
Male sex
Low procalcitonin level
Blood type A
Low creatinine level
Dyspnea
Renal disease
High platelet level
Gastrointestinal symptom


Proportion of prognostic factors in disease groups
%
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
52.9
20.7
6
3.4
15.7
7.8
31.4
72.1
32.6
14
16.3
25
25
52.2
1.5
3
6
33.3
26.2
4.5
HCoVs
SARS-CoV-1
MERS-CoV
Male sex
Blood type A
Dyspnea
Renal disease
Elevated WBC
Elevated fibrinogen
Elevated PLT