Prediction of In-hospital Mortality among Adults with COVID-19 Infection

Daniel S. Evans[1], Kyoung Min Kim[1,2], Xiaqing Jiang[1,3], Jessica Jacobson[4], Warren Browner[1], Steven R. Cummings[1,3]

Affiliations

1. San Francisco Coordinating Center, California Pacific Medical Center Research Institute, Sutter Health, San Francisco
2. Division of Endocrinology, Department of Internal Medicine, Yongin Severance Hospital, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Yongin, South Korea
3. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco,
4. New York City Health + Hospitals/Bellevue-NYU Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY

Acknowledgements

The authors have no financial conflicts of interest.

Dr. Mitch Katz, CEO of NYC H+H, enabled the collaboration and access to NYC H+H data

Abstract

IMPORTANCE: Accurate and rapid prediction of the probability of dying from COVID-19 infection might help triage patients for hospitalization, intensive care, or limited treatment.

OBJECTIVE: To develop a simple tool to estimate the probability of dying from acute COVID-19 illness.

DESIGN, SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS: This cohort study included 13,190 adult patients admitted to one of the 11 hospitals in the New York City Health + Hospitals system for COVID-19 infection between March 1 and June 30, 2020.

EXPOSURES: Demographic characteristics, vital signs, and laboratory tests readily available at the time of hospital admission.

MAIN OUTCOME: Death from any cause during hospitalization.

RESULTS: Patients had a mean age (interquartile range) of 58 (45-72) years; 5421 (41%) were women, 5258 Latinx (40%), 3805 Black (29%), 1168 White (9%), and 2959 Other (22%). During hospitalization, 2,875 (22%) died. Using separate test and validation samples, machine learning (Gradient Boosted Decision Trees) identified eight variables—oxygen saturation, respiratory rate, systolic and diastolic blood pressures, pulse rate, blood urea nitrogen level, age and creatinine—that predicted mortality, with an area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 94%. A score based on these variables classified 5,677 (46%) as low risk (a score of 0) who had 0.8% (95% confidence interval, 0.5 – 1.0%) risk of dying, and 674 (5.4%) as high-risk (score ≥ 12 points) who had a 97.6% (96.5- 98.8%) risk of dying; the remainder had intermediate risks. A risk calculator is available online at https://danielevanslab.shinyapps.io/Covid_mortality/).

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE: In a diverse population of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 infection, a clinical prediction model using a few readily available assessments may precisely estimate in-hospital mortality and can rapidly assist decisions to prioritize admissions and intensive care.

Hospitals in the US and other countries have been overwhelmed by admissions of patients with COVID-19 infection. Accurate prediction of the probability of death using rapidly available data might help prioritize patients for hospitalization, intensive care and intubation, or to receive limited treatments.

Previous studies of predictors of dying from COVID-19 infection have had a small number of deaths; [1-7] used comorbid conditions, diagnoses ,and severity indices from electronic medical records that may not be known at the time of admission;[4,8-13] or included specialized laboratory tests—such as levels of C-reactive protein, troponin, and D-dimers—that are not readily available for urgent triage of patients for hospital admission or intensive care.[14] Some studies were done in ethnically homogenous populations such as Wuhan, China[1] or Italy,[15] in specific populations such as nursing home residents,[16] or among patients already being treated in an intensive care unit (ICU)[6,9] Although some studies applied machine learning methods to develop predictive models, [1,5,17,18] none have been based on measurements available at the time of triage in a large diverse population, nor have they been translated into calculators that can be used in clinical settings.

To address these needs, we studied the large and diverse population of patients admitted to New York City Health + Hospitals (NYC H+H) public hospital system. We used machine learning to select strong predictors of mortality, developed and validated a multivariable model and score to estimate the risk of dying, and translated the model into an online calculator to estimate the risk of in-hospital mortality.

Methods

Setting and Data Sources

We used data extracted from the electronic medical records of all patients at least 18 years old who were admitted to any of the 11 hospitals of the New York City Health + Hospitals (NYC H+H) system with a diagnosis of Covid 19 infection verified with a positive polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test. NYC H+H is the largest public health system in the United States, providing health services to more than one million New Yorkers across the city’s five boroughs. These hospitals account for approximately one-fifth of all general hospital discharges and more than one-third of emergency department and hospital-based clinic visits in New York City.

Variables

We abstracted demographic characteristics (sex, age, race and ethnicity), weight, body mass index, vital signs, oxygen saturation (SpO2) from peripheral monitors, and routine clinical laboratory tests (serum chemistry panel, complete blood counts) and D-dimer levels (Table 1) from electronic medical records. When there was more than one value, we selected the first. Missing values were not imputed. Non-transformed values were used. Sex and race/ethnicity were coded as categorical variables (Table 1); all others were treated as continuous variables. (Results did not change when continuous features were centered to their mean and scaled to a standard deviation of one.) The outcome was death from any cause during hospitalization; length of hospitalization was also noted.

Statistical Analysis

Baseline characteristics are presented N (%) or mean (SD). Comparisons between continuous variables were tested using Student's t test or the Mann-Whitney U test if the distribution was skewed. Categorical variables were analyzed with the Chi-squared test.

Our overall goal was to develop a clinical prediction model to estimate the probability of dying in the hospital. We used Extreme Gradient Boosted Decision Trees (XGBoost), followed by the identification of cut-points of the selected variables using classification and regression trees (CART), then developed a score to predict mortality. Train and test data partitions were created using an 80% and 20% random split stratified by death status to ensure an even proportion of mortality in the train and test datasets. Gradient Boosted Decision Trees implemented in the XGBoost R package v 1.2.0.1 with R v 4.0.2. was used to generate an ensemble of multiple decision trees to minimize errors in the classification of mortality in patients. The XGBoost model was developed in the train partition, using four boosting rounds, a maximum depth of three for each decision tree, a learning rate of 0.3, a binary:logistic learning objective with error rate used as the evaluation metric with a minimum child weight of 75. Feature importance was evaluated using the information gain metric of a split on a variable. XGBoost model performance was evaluated in the test partition using accuracy and area under the curve (AUC) from a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. Selected features and model performance did not change with 10-fold cross-validation.

To develop a clinical prediction score, we used Classification and Regression Tree (CART) analyses in the original 80% training set to identify optimum cut-points for each variable selected by XGBoost. There was no cut-point for creatinine and it had low importance in the XGBoost model, therefore it was not included in the final calculation of clinical risk score. There were 1,501 patients missing a BUN value. To determine whether a missing value was associated with risk of mortality, we created an indicator variable for a missing BUN value. We entered the selected variables and cut-points into a logistic regression model to estimate the multivariable odds ratios. To assign risk scores, the odds ratio for each of these categorical variables were divided by 2.6 (the lowest odds ratio), rounded, and then summed for each patient to calculate a risk score. After excluding 703 patients with missing values for one or more variables, the proportions of patients who died were calculated for each 1-point interval in risk score; the highest-risk categories, which had similar scores and small numbers of patients, were combined. Because the predicted mortality by risk score categories were very similar in the training and test sets, these sets were combined to estimate the probabilities and 95% confidence intervals for the entire population. An online calculator reports the probability of in-hospital mortality based on the risk score (danielevanslab.shinyapps.io/Covid_mortality). To report the probability of dying, all variables must have non-missing values except for the blood urea nitrogen (BUN) test which includes a term for missing.

All statistical analysis was performed using R Statistical Software (version 4.0.3 and version 4.0.2; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

Results

Between March 1 and June 30, 2020, 13,190 patients were admitted to a NYC H+H hospital. The cohort included 5421 [41.1%] women, mean age 58 years [interquartile range 45-72 years]; 5258 were Latinx [39.9%], 3805 Black [28.8%], 1168 White [9%], and 2959 individuals of other races/ethnicities [22%] (Table 1). During hospitalization, 2,875 (21.8%) died a mean of 10.6 days after admission (interquartile range: 3 to 13 days) and 2279 (17.3) were treated with mechanical ventilation.

There were statistically significant differences between those who died and those who survived for almost all variables (Table 1). The XGBoost algorithm identified eight variables (Figure 1)

that, together, generated predictions of mortality with an AUC of 94% and an accuracy of 91% (Figure 2). The four boosted decision trees are provided in Supplemental Figures 1a-d.

Of the variables that the XGBoost model selected, SpO2 was the strongest predictor; respiratory rate and blood pressure were also major contributors; body temperature was not. Although race and ethnicity were associated with mortality in univariable analyses (Table 1), they were not selected in the predictive model.

CART analysis identified cut-points for each of the XGBoost-selected variables. A multivariable logistic model showed that the selected cut-points were all significant predictors of mortality (Table 2). The risk score based on the odds ratios for these variables ranged from 0 to 22 points and had an AUC of 0.934 for predicting mortality (Figure 3). There were 5,677(45.5%) patients with a score of 0, and 674 (5.4%) with a score ≥ 12 points (Table 4). In-hospital mortality increased continuously with higher risk scores, ranging from ranged from 0.8% (95% confidence interval, 0.5 - 1.0 %) for those with a score of 0 to 97.6% (96.5 - 98.8%) for patients with a score ≥ 12 points (Table 3).

The mean times between admission and death was 18 days (IOR 6-27 days) for those with a risk score of 0, compared with 9 days (IQR 3-11 days) for those with a risk score of 12 or greater.

We translated the models into an online calculator to report the probability of mortality and the corresponding 95% confidence interval: danielevanslab.shinyapps.io/COVID_mortality/.

Discussion

A few clinical observations readily available in the initial assessment of patients with COVID-19 infection can estimate the probability of dying during hospitalization. The model is available online for convenient use in acute care settings.

Not surprisingly, physiologic variables, such as SpO_2, respiratory rate, and blood pressure were important predictors, indicating that the pulmonary and systemic effects of the infection are its most important prognostic features. As expected, mortality also increased with age and with higher BUN levels. [5,19,20] Notably, after considering other variables, race and ethnicity were not

significant predictors of mortality, as has been seen in other studies. [11,21,22] While previous studies have identified other laboratory values, such as red cell distribution width and D-dimer levels, as significant predictors, they did not contribute to this algorithm.[3,14] BUN was the only laboratory value in the algorithm and a missing value did not influence the score. This suggests that clinicians do not need to order or wait for other test results to estimate a patient's probability of dying.

These data were collected before effective treatments, such as corticosteroids, were used commonly in the treatment of COVID-19.[23] Improvements in care of have reduced inpatient mortality from the infection.[24] Although our risk model and algorithm is not calibrated to the current mortality risk, it does reflect the probability of dying without current in-hospital treatments and, thus may be useful to identify patients who are most—or least--likely to benefit from hospital care.

The estimates from the model may have the most value when triage decisions need to be made about which of patients to admit to a hospital or ICU bed, especially when the number of patients exceeds capacity. The model may be most useful for prioritizing patients at the extremes of prognosis. Notably, the 41% of patients in this cohort had scores of 0 had a very low probability of dying, and likely could have been cared for in outpatient settings, especially if periodic assessments of SpO2 and vital signs could be obtained. At the other extreme, 98% of those with scores of 12 or more died, indicating a need to decide whether to implement or withhold aggressive treatment.

This analysis has several strengths. The algorithm was derived from a very diverse population of patients in New York City using data from 11 hospitals. The study population and number of deaths were large enough to produce estimates of mortality with narrow confidence intervals and high AUC values; it is unlikely that adding additional variables to the model would substantially improve its already high accuracy. The algorithm produced consistent results by 10-fold cross-validation and by testing its performance in a random 20% of the data. Multivariable regression analysis of the variables selected by machine learning confirmed that they were strong and independent predictors of mortality. An easy-to-use version of the model is also available online for use in acute care settings (danielevanslab.shinyapps.io/Covid_mortality/).

The analysis also has limitations. The model represents the natural history of COVID-19 infection before hospital care improved—and mortality rates declined—so it could not be calibrated to predict mortality with current standards of care. By design, the data did not include measurements, such as sophisticated markers of inflammation and coagulation, or indices of comorbidity and severity of illness, that predict mortality but that may not be readily available in the initial assessment of a patient.

Conclusion

Mortality from COVID-19 infection can be predicted accurately from a few clinical observations and laboratory tests that are readily available in acute care settings. When resources are scarce, estimates of the probability of dying might aid decisions about prioritizing patients to receive intensive care or other scarce resources. The prediction model is available online for use in clinical settings.

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of the Patient Population and of Those Who Survived and Died

	Total N=13,190	Survived N=10,315	Died N=2,875	p-value*
Demographics and diagnoses				
Age (years)	58.2(18.0)	54.9 (17.4)	70.3 (14.7)	<0.001
BMI (kg/m2)	29.2 (7.3)	29.1 (7.1)	29.5 (7.8)	0.032
Female (%)	5421 (41.1)	4320 (41.9)	1101 (38.3)	0.001
Hypertension (%)	6552 (49.7)	4804 (46.6)	1748 (60.8)	<0.001
Diabetes (%)	4635 (35.1)	3339 (32.4)	1296 (45.1)	<0.001
Race/Ethnicity (%)				<0.001
American Indian or Alaskan	22 (0.2)	17 (0.2)	5 (0.2)	
Asian	716 (5.4)	547 (5.3)	169 (5.9)	
Black	3805 (28.8)	2962 (28.7)	843 (29.3)	
White	1168 (8.9)	808 (7.8)	360 (12.5)	
Pacific Islander	8 (0.1)	6 (0.1)	2 (0.1)	
Hispanic	5258 (39.9)	4289 (41.6)	969 (33.7)	
Other	1601 (12.1)	1246 (12.1)	355 (12.3)	
Declined/Unknown	612 (4.6)	440 (4.3)	172 (6.0)	
Vital signs				
O2 Saturation (%)	93.7 (12.9)	96.8 (3.5)	82.6 (23.7)	<0.001
Body temperature (°F)	98.5 (3.0)	98.5 (1.6)	98.4 (5.7)	0.015
Pulse rate (/min)	83.7 (23.5)	84.9 (14.3)	79.6 (42.2)	<0.001
Respiratory rate (/min)	19.3 (6.7)	18.7 (4.4)	21.3 (11.4)	<0.001
Systolic BP (mmHg)	119.4 (26.1)	125.1 (17.6)	99.2 (38.4)	<0.001
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	70.1 (16.6)	74.4 (10.9)	54.9 (23.1)	<0.001
Laboratory parameters				
Calcium (mg/dL)	7.4 (2.5)	7.5 (2.4)	6.8 (2.6)	<0.001
Glucose (mg/dL)	163.0 (112.6)	151.5 (98.6)	199.8 (142.3)	<0.001

BUN (mg/dL)	26.0 (26.9)	21.4 (22.7)	40.3 (33.3)	<0.001
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.7 (2.2)	1.5 (2.1)	2.3 (2.4)	<0.001
Albumin (mg/dL)	3.4 (1.1)	3.5 (1.1)	3.0 (1.1)	<0.001
Magnesium (mg/dL)	2.2 (0.5)	2.1 (0.5)	2.3 (0.6)	<0.001
Sodium (mg/dL)	137.5 (6.8)	137.1 (5.7)	138.5 (9.5)	<0.001
Potassium (mg/dL)	4.3 (0.8)	4.3 (0.8)	4.5 (1.0)	<0.001
Chloride (mg/dL)	100.1 (7.3)	99.8 (6.4)	101.1 (9.6)	<0.001
CO2 (mg/dL)	22.5 (4.3)	23.1 (3.9)	20.7 (5.0)	<0.001
Anion Gap	16.1 (5.0)	15.4 (4.5)	18.6 (5.8)	<0.001
White blood cells (x 10^9/L)	8.7 (5.8)	8.3 (4.8)	10.3 (8.2)	<0.001
Red cell distribution width (%)	14.1 (2.1)	14.0 (2.0)	14.7 (2.4)	<0.001
Red blood cell count (x 10^9/L)	4.5 (0.8)	4.5 (0.7)	4.4 (0.9)	<0.001
Hemoglobin (g/L)	12.8 (2.2)	12.9 (2.1)	12.4 (2.6)	<0.001
Hematocrit (L/L)	39.4 (6.5)	39.6 (6.1)	38.8 (7.6)	<0.001
Mean corpuscular volume (fL)	88.0 (7.0)	87.6 (6.7)	89.1 (7.9)	<0.001
Mean corpuscular hemoglobin (pg)	28.5 (2.7)	28.6 (2.6)	28.5 (2.8)	0.226
MCHC (g/L)	32.4 (1.7)	32.6 (1.6)	32.0 (1.9)	<0.001
Platelets (x 109/L)	232.1 (98.6)	234.6 (96.8)	224.2 (103.6)	<0.001
Mean platelet volume (fL)	10.8 (1.1)	10.7 (1.1)	11.0 (1.1)	<0.001
Basophil (%)	0.3 (0.3)	0.3 (0.3)	0.2 (0.2)	<0.001
Immature granulocyte (%)	0.5 (1.1)	0.4 (0.8)	0.7 (1.5)	<0.001
Neutrophils (x 109/L)	6.7 (4.2)	6.2 (3.8)	8.1 (5.0)	<0.001
Lymphocytes (x 109/L)	1.3 (2.4)	1.3 (2.3)	1.2 (2.6)	0.003
Monocytes (x 109/L)	0.6 (0.6)	0.6 (0.4)	0.6 (0.9)	0.445
Eosinophils (x 109/L)	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.2)	<0.001
Nucleated red blood cell (/uL))	0.1 (0.6)	0.0 (0.5)	0.2 (0.9)	<0.001
International normalized ratio (INR)	1.3 (0.6)	1.2 (0.6)	1.3 (0.8)	<0.001
D-Dimer (ng/mL)	3015.4 (8307.2)	2103.9 (6485.1)	5167.6 (11229.3)	<0.001

Table 2. Predictors from the multivariable model and points indicating an increased risk of death

	Odds ratio (95% CI)	*Points*
Age		
Age < 70 years old	Reference	0
70 ≤ Age < 85 years old	2.6 (2.2-3.1)	1
Age ≥ 85 years old	5.4 (4.2-7.0)	2
O2 Saturation (SpO2)		
SpO2 ≥ 91%	Reference	0
SpO2 < 91%	10.7 (8.3-19.9)	4
Respiratory Rate (RR)		
14 ≤ RR<22/min	Reference	0
RR ≥ 22/min	7.8 (4.2-14.4)	3
RR < 14/min	9.2 (7.6-11.1)	4
Pulse Rate (PR)		
51 ≤ PR < 109/min	Reference	0
PR < 51/min	3.5 (2.6-4.7)	1
109 ≤ PR < 119/min	9.7 (4.8-20.0)	4
PR ≥ 119/min	12.5 (9.1-17.3)	5
Systolic BP (SBP)		
SBP ≥ 95 mmHg	Reference	0
SBP < 95 mmHg	7.9 (5.8-10.7)	3
Diastolic BP (DBP)		
DBP ≥ 54 mmHg	Reference	0
DBP < 54 mmHg	4.7 (3.6-6.1)	2
BUN		
BUN < 20 mmHg	Reference	0
20 ≤ BUN < 44 mmHg	2.6 (2.1-3.2)	1
BUN ≥ 44 mmHg	5.9 (4.8-7.4)	2
If BUN value is missing	0.2 (0.1-0.4)	0
Range of risk score		0-22

BP, blood pressure; BUN, blood urea nitrogen

Table 3. Predictors from the multivariable model and points indicating an increased risk of death

Total Score	***Risk of Death (%) (95% C.I.)***	***N (%)***
0	0.8 (0.5-1.0)	5677 (45.5)
1	4.5 (3.5-5.5)	1636 (13.1)
3	9.7 (8.0-11.4)	1137 (9.1)
4	20.7 (17.6-23.8)	936 (7.5)
5	39.4 (34.6-44.1)	404 (3.2)
6	57.8 (51.9-63.8)	268 (2.1)
7	64.3 (58.6-69.9)	277 (2.2)
8	74.4 (69.2-79.7)	266 (2.1)
9	87.6 (82.8-92.4)	185 (1.5)
10	92.3 (88.6-95.9)	207 (1.7)
11	92.4 (88.2-96.6)	157 (1.3)
≥12	97.6 (96.5-98.8)	674 (5.4)

Figure 1. Features Included in the XGBoost Model Ranked by Gain in Accuracy of Classification When Used in Decision Trees that Generated the Model



Figure 2. Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC) Curves of Mortality Predicted by the Machine Learning and Clinical Prediction Model and Point Score in the Test Set of Data

a. ROC for Mortality Predicted by the Machine Learning XGBoost Model



b. ROC Curve for the Clinical Prediction Model Point Score



References

1. Zhu JS, Ge P, Jiang C, et al. Deep-learning artificial intelligence analysis of clinical variables predicts mortality in COVID-19 patients. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open.* 2020.
2. Filardo TD, Khan MR, Krawczyk N, et al. Comorbidity and clinical factors associated with COVID-19 critical illness and mortality at a large public hospital in New York City in the early phase of the pandemic (March-April 2020). *PLOS one.* 2020;15(11):e0242760.
3. Hodges G, Pallisgaard J, Schjerning Olsen AM, et al. Association between biomarkers and COVID-19 severity and mortality: a nationwide Danish cohort study. *BMJ Open.* 2020;10(12):e041295.
4. Castro VM, McCoy TH, Perlis RH. Laboratory Findings Associated With Severe Illness and Mortality Among Hospitalized Individuals With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Eastern Massachusetts. *JAMA Network Open.* 2020;3(10):e2023934.
5. Sánchez-Montañés M, Rodríguez-Belenguer P, Serrano-López AJ, Soria-Olivas E, Alakhdar-Mohmara Y. Machine Learning for Mortality Analysis in Patients with COVID-19. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(22).
6. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2020;180(7):934-943.
7. Mendes A, Serratrice C, Herrmann FR, et al. Predictors of In-Hospital Mortality in Older Patients With COVID-19: The COVIDAge Study. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association.* 2020;21(11):1546-1554.e1543.
8. El-Solh AA, Lawson Y, Carter M, El-Solh DA, Mergenhagen KA. Comparison of in-hospital mortality risk prediction models from COVID-19. *PloS one.* 2020;15(12):e0244629.
9. Gupta S, Hayek SS, Wang W, et al. Factors Associated With Death in Critically Ill Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in the US. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2020;180(11):1-12.
10. Ioannou GN, Locke E, Green P, et al. Risk Factors for Hospitalization, Mechanical Ventilation, or Death Among 10 131 US Veterans With SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA Network Open.* 2020;3(9):e2022310.
11. Kabarriti R, Brodin NP, Maron MI, et al. Association of Race and Ethnicity With Comorbidities and Survival Among Patients With COVID-19 at an Urban Medical Center in New York. *JAMA Network Open.* 2020;3(9):e2019795.
12. Grasselli G, Greco M, Zanella A, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Mortality Among Patients With COVID-19 in Intensive Care Units in Lombardy, Italy. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2020;180(10):1345-1355.
13. Haimovich AD, Ravindra NG, Stoytchev S, et al. Development and Validation of the Quick COVID-19 Severity Index: A Prognostic Tool for Early Clinical Decompensation. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2020;76(4):442-453.

14. Katzenschlager S, Zimmer AJ, Gottschalk C, et al. Can we predict the severe course of COVID-19 - a systematic review and meta-analysis of indicators of clinical outcome? Predictors of In-Hospital Mortality in Older Patients With COVID-19: The COVIDAge Study. *medRxiv.* 2020;21(11):1546-1554.e1543.

15. Fumagalli C, Rozzini R, Vannini M, et al. Clinical risk score to predict in-hospital mortality in COVID-19 patients: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ open.* 2020;10(9):e040729.

16. Panagiotou OA, Kosar CM, White EM, et al. Risk Factors Associated With All-Cause 30-Day Mortality in Nursing Home Residents With COVID-19. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2021.

17. Yadaw AS, Li YC, Bose S, Iyengar R, Bunyavanich S, Pandey G. Clinical features of COVID-19 mortality: development and validation of a clinical prediction model. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2020;2(10):e516-e525.

18. Vaid A, Somani S, Russak AJ, et al. Machine Learning to Predict Mortality and Critical Events in a Cohort of Patients With COVID-19 in New York City: Model Development and Validation. *Journal Medical Internet Research.* 2020;22(11):e24018.

17. Davis C, Gao M, Nichols M, Henao R. Predicting Hospital Utilization and Inpatient Mortality of Patients Tested for COVID-19. *medRxiv.* 2020.

18. Wang JM, Liu W, Chen X, McRae MP, McDevitt JT, Fenyö D. Predictive modeling of morbidity and mortality in COVID-19 hospitalized patients and its clinical implications. *medRxiv.* 2020.

19. Yehia BR, Winegar A, Fogel R, et al. Association of Race With Mortality Among Patients Hospitalized With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) at 92 US Hospitals. *JAMA network open.* 2020;3(8):e2018039.

20. Ogedegbe G, Ravenell J, Adhikari S, et al. Assessment of Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Hospitalization and Mortality in Patients With COVID-19 in New York City. *JAMA network open.* 2020;3(12):e2026881.

21. Sterne JAC, Murthy S, Diaz JV, et al. Association Between Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA.* 2020;324(13):1330-1341.

22. Asch DA, Sheils NE, Islam MN, et al. Variation in US Hospital Mortality Rates for Patients Admitted With COVID-19 During the First 6 Months of the Pandemic. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2020;3(10):e2023934.

Supplemental Figures

Supplemental Figure Legends.

Supplemental Figure 1. Cover is the sum of the second order gradient of training data classified to the leaf. Gain is the information gain metric of a split. Value is the margin value that the leaf contributes to prediction.

Supplemental Figure 1a. First boosted Decision Tree from XGBoost Model



Supplemental Figure 1b. Second Boosted Decision Tree from XGBoost Model



Supplemental Figure 1c. Third Boosted Decision Tree from XGBoost Model



Supplemental Figure 1d. Fourth Boosted Decision Tree from XGBoost Model