Clinical echocardiography does not indicate cardiac dysfunction in critically ill Covid-19 patients

Henrik Isackson[1,5, β], Anders Larsson[2], Miklos Lipcsey[3,4], Robert Frithiof[3], Frank A. Flachskampf[1], Michael Hultström[3,5]

1. Department of Medical Sciences, Cardiology and Clinical Physiology, Uppsala University, Sweden.
2. Department of Medical Sciences, Clinical Chemistry, Uppsala University, Sweden
3. Department of Surgical Sciences, Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
4. Hedenstierna laboratory, CIRRUS, Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, Department of Surgical Sciences, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden.
5. Department of Medical Cell Biology, Integrative Physiology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden.

[β]Corresponding author
Email: henrik.isackson@mcb.uu.se
Tel: +46(0)727088879

ABSTRACT

Objective: We aimed to investigate the acute effects of severe SARS-CoV-2 on myocardial function.

Methods: This is an observational study generated from the first 79 patients admitted to intensive care in Uppsala due to respiratory failure with SARS-CoV-2 infection, during the first wave in 2020, included in the PRONMED study. From this group 34 underwent echocardiographic examination of which 25 were included in the study, and compared to 44 non-echo patients. Demographic analysis compared standard parameters and previous morbidities between the echo and non-echo group.

Results: Standard echocardiographic parameters were analysed indicating a reduced left ventricular function as assessed by global longitudinal strain and very discrete increases in wall thickness in the group as a whole. A group comparison between the outcomes survival and death was carried out. Right sided dimensions and functional parameters did not indicate major strain. An increased maximum tricuspid valve regurgitation velocity indicating increased pulmonary arterial pressure was significantly associated with death, but failed to maintain significance when corrected for multiple comparison. Biochemical cardiac markers and D-dimer correlated to initiation of echocardiography and mortality. Tricuspid regurgitation maximum velocity was positively correlated with maximum troponin I.

Conclusions: These results suggests that there is no clear negative effect on cardiac function in critical SARS-CoV-2 infection. There are indications that pulmonary pressure elevation carries a negative predictive outcome suggesting pulmonary disease as the major driver of mortality. Cardiac biomarkers as well as D-dimer carry a predictive outcome value.

Introduction

Since the severe acute respiratory syndrome corona virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was established as an infection transmitted amongst humans, it has been under intense scrutiny. The effects on the cardiovascular system are still not completely understood.

The respiratory tract is undisputed as the main target of SARS-CoV-2, but reports of myocarditis have been published (1), with autopsy findings showing myocardial T-cell infiltration (2, 3) and SARS-CoV-2 genome in myocardial biopsies from 104 patients with suspected myocarditis (4). Cellular internalisation through the angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE-2) receptor also generated initial concern that heart failure and hypertension patients treated with angiotensin (Ang) inhibitors would be at increased risk due to upregulation of ACE-2 (5) and that increased ACE-2 shedding lowers the AngI/AngII causing vasoconstriction, inflammation, and risk of thrombosis (6). The occurrence of venous thromboembolic disease, as well as troponin and natriuretic peptides have been shown to correlate with negative outcomes (6). Thus, patient assessment by echocardiography has attracted clinical interest.

In a study of 305 patients, 62 % had myocardial injury as defined by elevated cardiac troponin which was associated with a both left (LV) and right (RV) ventricular abnormalities, higher admission rate to the intensive care unit (ICU), and mortality (7). In 74 patients with elevated troponin, 82 % requiring mechanical ventilation, mainly RV affliction associated with elevated D-dimer but not cardiac troponins, was observed. In the same cohort LV function was described as normal to hyperdynamic (8). In another study, LV dysfunction was not associated with higher mortality nor troponin levels, and RV dysfunction only present in 3/38 patients (9). In 18 patients stratified into mild and severe coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19)

only the severely ill showed elevated measures and increased end-diastolic LV pressures without an effect on LV ejection fraction (LVEF) or RV function (10).

RV function has gained particular attention for the management of this disease. Right but not left sided affliction was associated with death in a cohort where 63 % of 94 patients were on mechanical ventilation support (11). In 120 patients RV function and pulmonary pressure, but not left sided parameters were identified as predictors of increased mortality (12). In 200 non-ICU-patients pulmonary hypertension (PH) without RV affliction was associated with a worsened outcome such as death or ICU admission (13).

We report from an exploratory study of Covid-19 patients admitted to the ICU of Uppsala University Hospital, the interrelationship between clinically initiated echocardiography, echocardiographic findings, biomarker levels, and mortality.

Method

This study is a sub study of a prospective cohort study of patients that were admitted to the ICU at Uppsala University Hospital because of Covid-19. All patients were diagnosed by polymerase chain reaction from respiratory tract swabs and had respiratory failure requiring at least high flow oxygen therapy before admission to the ICU. Patients that were investigated by echocardiography were labelled “echo” patients and those that were not investigated by echocardiography were labelled “non-echo” patients.

The study was approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority (EPM; 2020-01623). The protocol of the study was registered (Clinical trials ID: NCT04316884). The declaration of Helsinki and its subsequent revisions were followed. Informed consent was given på subject patients.

Echocardiographic examination was carried out on clinically deemed indication by hospital certified sonographers. Analysis was carried out offline, independent of clinical analysis results, on TomTec® software by the primary analyst and quality-controlled by a senior echocardiographer. Analyses of poor image quality were discarded at primary analyst's discretion. Only patients with normo-frequent sinus rhythm were included for echocardiographic analysis. Pericardial effusion was quantified in the extra RV-RA space from the subcostal longitudinal view. For patients serially investigated by echocardiography, only the first examination was included. Normal values were assessed in relation to European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging (EACVI) consensus papers by Galderisi et al (14) and Lang et al (15). For assessment of pulmonary pressure, the 2015 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines were used (16).

Concentrations of clinically initiated biochemical cardiac blood markers during the stay in ICU, highly sensitive troponin I (hs-TnI), N-terminal pro brain natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP), and D-dimer were compared between echo and non-echo investigated patients. Biomarker values were correlated to separate echocardiographic parameters to investigate the predictive value of such parameters on cardiac function and strain. Concentrations in the survivor and non-survivor subgroups were compared to assess a possible predictive importance from increasing levels in serum.

Frequency distribution testing between groups were carried out using Chi-squared test or Fischer's exact test for group sizes smaller than n=5. Groups were compared using Student's t-test for normally distributed data and Mann-Whitney's U-test for non-normally distributed data. Correlation analysis was performed using Pearson test for normally distributed data and Spearman's test for non-normally distributed data. Bonferroni multiple analysis correction was applied to reduce the risk of type 1 errors, but pre-correction values are also reported. All

confidence intervals are presented as standard error of the mean (SEM) unless otherwise stated. All statistical analyses and graphs utilised GraphPad Prism 5.0.

Results

Patient selection:

Out of 79 patients originally included in the study, 34 had been assessed by echocardiography as deemed indicated by the treating physician. Out of these 9 were subsequently excluded due to initial incorrect Covid-19 diagnosis, irregular heart rhythm, 3rd degree AV-block, or overall unacceptable image quality, leaving 25 for analysis. 45 patients were included in the non-echo arm, of which one was excluded due to lack of respiratory insufficiency and oxygen therapy, leaving 44 patients in the non-echo group. A total of 69 patients were thus included in the study (fig 1).

Demographic characterisation:

There were more male than female patients overall (54:15), this ratio was less pronounced in the echo group (19:6) vs the non-echo group (35:9). Mean age in the echo group (64.4 ± 2.6 years) was higher than in the non-echo group (56.7 ± 2.2 years) ($p<0.05$). BMI in the overall cohort was increased (28.9 ± 0.69 kg/m^2) but there was no difference between the echo (28.8 ± 1.1 kg/m^2) and non-echo group (29.0 ± 0.9 kg/m^2) ($p>0.05$). Overall mortality in the study was 26 %, this was higher in the echo group (44 %) compared to the non-echo group (16 %) ($p<0.05$). Overall percentage of invasive ventilation was 55 %, also higher in the echo (80 %) group compared to in the non-echo group (41 %) ($p<0.01$). There was a higher presence of previous morbidities in the echo group (24%) than in the non-echo group (4.5 %) regarding

ischemic heart disease ($p<0.05$) and preceding treatment with angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEi) or angiotensin receptor blockers (ARB) which was higher in the echo group (52 %) compared to non-echo (25 %) ($p<0.05$). There was no difference in regards to previous heart failure, hypertension, pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus type 2, or renal failure (table 1).

Biomarkers:

Admission level of hs-TnI was higher in the non-survivor group ($p<0.01$) and D-dimer slightly but significantly lower in the non-survivor group ($p<0.05$) (table 2 a). Maximum expression levels of hs-TnI ($p<0.0001$), NT-proBNP ($p<0.0001$) and D-dimer ($p<0.01$) were all significantly higher in the non-survivor group (table 2 b). Maximum expression levels of hs-TnI ($p<0.01$), NT-proBNP ($p<0.001$), and D-dimer ($p<0.01$) was higher in the echo group compared to non-echo group (table 2 c).

Correlation between standard echocardiographic parameters and maximum biomarker levels was investigated showing that hs-TnI was positively correlated to maximum tricuspid valve regurgitation velocity (TR V_{max}) ($p<0.01$) (fig 2). There were no significant correlations between other cardiac biomarkers or D-dimer and specific echocardiographic parameters after multiple comparison correction that stood up to multiple comparison correction (supplementary data table 1).

Echocardiography:

In the overall echocardiographic assessment, all four heart chambers were of normal size as of average values, LA/m^2 (23.8 ± 1.61 ml/m^2 (<34), of which 3/20 exceeded normal volume/m^2),

LVEDD (47.7 ± 1.3 mm (<58.4 (male), <52.2 (female) of which 2/22 exceeded normal diameter), RA/m^2 (24.2 ± 2.9 ml/m^2 (<30 (male), <28 (female) of which 7/18 exceeded normal volume/m^2), apart from RVD1 (36.1 ± 1.5 mm (<36), of which 11/22 exceeded normal values (14)). The interventricular septal diameter (IVSD) average was slightly increased (11.4 ± 0.5 mm (6-10 (male) 6-9 (female), of which 15/22 exceeded normal values) as well as posterior wall thickness (10.1 ± 0.3 mm (6-10 (male), 6-9 (female), of which 8/22 exceeded normal values (15). Average LV global longitudinal strain (GLS) was reduced (-14.1 ± 0.86 % (<-20), low in 17/18 patients, despite a normal LVEF (54.8 ± 2.2 % (>52 (male), >54 (female), which was low in 5/20 patients, of which 3 had a previous diagnosis of heart failure or coronary disease). Average RV systolic function, judging by TAPSE (22.7 ± 1.1 mm (>17), reduced in 3/22), RV fractional area change (RV FAC) (45.2 ± 2.4 % (>35), reduced in 4/20 patient) and RV free wall strain (-25.1 ± 2.5 % (<-23), below normal in 8/16 patients) was within normal range (14). Transmitral early diastolic velocity was increased (0.77 ± 0.04 m/s (<0.5), exceeding normal in 17/20 patients), but E/A ratio (1.30 ± 0.13 (0.8-2.0), abnormal in 4/20 patients), septal e' (0.079 ± 0.01 m/s (>0.07), reduced in 8/16 patients), E/e' (10.5 ± 0.81 (<14), increased in 4/16 patients) as well as transmitral deceleration time (MV dec. time) (211 ± 12 ms (160-220), abnormal in 11/20 patients) were normal (14). IVC dimension (20.0 ± 0.84 mm (<20), increased in 10/18 patients) and its respiratory variation (49.5 ± 7.3 % (>50), reduced in 10/17) failed to indicate clear signs of increased RA pressure (14). Average pulmonary artery acceleration time (PAAT) (109 ± 6.3 ms (<100 ms, highly suggestive of PH (6/16 patients), 100-130 ms, intermediate probability of PH (7/16 patients)) (17), and maximum tricuspid regurgitation velocity (TR V_{max}) (2.78 ± 0.11 m/s (<2.8 m/s), elevated in 5/10 patients, were normal (14). Non-survivors in ICU had a pre multiple comparison-correction higher TR V_{max} (3.06 ± 0.11 ms) than survivors (2.51 ± 0.01 m/s) (14), however losing significance after correction. There were no increased amounts of pericardial

effusion (0.71 ± 0.25 mm) (mild<10 mm (no patients with more than 10 mm) (18). Apart from TR V_{max} there were no other parameters that differed between the survivor and non-survivor group (table 3). None of the scanned patients had any marked valvular stenoses or regurgitations.

Discussion

The non-invasive nature and high availability of transthoracic echocardiography makes it an attractive method of assessing critically ill patients in intensive care that are often in need of serial investigations to interpret effects of treatments on the underlying condition. During spring 2020 an increasing number of patients were admitted to intensive care due to Covid-19 respiratory failure. The lungs are the main target organ of this infection, but there have been reports of myocarditis and effects on both LV and RV function which is theoretically plausible through cellular internalisation via myocardial ACE-2 receptors and indeed, SARS-CoV-2 myocarditis including myocardial virus replication has now been reported (4).

From patients admitted to the ICU at Uppsala University Hospital during the first wave of Covid-19 we attempted to investigate which parameters that are affected in this group and also to derive a predictive value from the echocardiographic examination. We also correlated standard cardiac biomarkers and D-dimer values at admission as well as the maximum values in ICU to outcome and echocardiographic parameters.

The mortality in the group investigated by echocardiography was higher than those that were not assessed which suggests that these patients exhibited a physiological and biochemical status of increased cardiopulmonary strain which explains the higher mortality. For overall assessment of the whole cohort, the LV systolic function as assessed by GLS was lower in these patients than what to expect from standard population material (14). The image quality

as well as patient cooperativity was however reduced in these patients compared to standard reference materials which confounds the interpretation of this isolated parameter as evidence of myocardial damage. The LVEF was not affected on average, and 3/5 patients with LVEF less than normal had a previous diagnosis of heart failure or coronary disease, neither were there signs of increased amounts of pericardial effusion. Overall diastolic dysfunction as assessed by combined evaluation of E/e', isolated septal diastolic movement velocity (e'), LA volume, and TR V_{max} could not be verified (19). Thus, there were no overt echocardiographic signs of myocarditis in these patients.

Systolic and diastolic function of the LV, as judged by LVEF, GLS, and e', showed no association to mortality, but there were insignificant trends towards increased LV end-diastolic diameter and LA size in the non-survival group. IVSD and left ventricle posterior wall end diastolic diameter (LVPWD) were both slightly thicker than what to expect from reference materials, this most likely reflects a high average age and presence of hypertension in the studied cohort, and trended towards thinning in the non-survival group. These findings could suggest fluid overload and passive dilation in this group, which is supported by the increased level of NT-proBNP, thus providing no evidence of myocarditis-induced oedema. Right sided parameters indicated a trend towards association with mortality. Systolic function as assessed by TAPSE, RV FAC, and RV free wall strain, showed an overall trend towards reduction in the non-survival group and the RVD1 was also increased to wider than 35 mm in 11/22 readings of all investigated patients, being insignificantly increased to 38.4 ± 2.0 mm in the non-survivor group compared to 34.2 ± 2.0 mm in the survivor group, which may indicate increased afterload of the RV. TR V_{max} was increased in the non-survivor group but failed to show significance after multiple analysis correction, which suggests an elevated pressure in the pulmonary circulation. Average PAAT was also found to be in the intermediate strata suggestive of PH. In the absence of signs of LV diastolic impairment and pulmonary

embolism diagnosed in only 4/25 echo patients, it is suggested this is due to hypoxia in the pulmonary arterial bed, pulmonary vasoconstriction, and RV strain.

Unsurprisingly, maximum levels of hs-TnI, NT-proBNP and D-dimer were associated with death. More interestingly, only increased admission level of hs-TnI was associated with mortality, with a trend for NT-proBNP. hs-TnI was also strongly associated with TR V_{max}, suggesting from biochemical and echocardiographic data this parameter to be of importance in determining the outcome of Covid-19 patients in the ICU.

The main weakness of the study in detecting cardiac affliction from SARS-CoV-2, is that not all ICU patients underwent echocardiography, but only those where the treating physician found it indicated. This leads to a selection bias but the circumstance also enabled the comparison of echo vs non-echo patients. However, this selection ought to produce a cohort with more severe cardiac dysfunction, meaning that our results may be over-estimating the degree of cardiac dysfunction rather than underestimating it. In addition, the small cohort size and large set of variables increases the risk of false positive effects, again suggesting that the study should tend to over-estimate the effect of critical Covid-19 on cardiac function, which was corrected for in the analysis.

The situation of echocardiography in the ICU-setting of reduced patient cooperativity and ventilation with positive intrathoracic pressure, will reduce availability of parameters, image quality and sensitivity of interpretation which risks failing to register significant associations. For GLS measurements 4/18 were made from 2/3 standard projections, for LVEF 2/20 were made from 1/2 standard projections and for LA volume 8/20 were made from 1/2 standard projections, since images of sufficient quality was not available.

In conclusion, there are no convincing signs of cardiac function being systematically affected in Covid-19 patients admitted to ICU, and no evidence that cardiac dysfunction is a major

driver of mortality in critically ill patients with Covid-19. Still, cardiac biomarkers and D-dimer carry a predictive value in outcome, but more likely reflect strain on the heart from a primary pulmonary affliction.

Key messages

What is already known about this subject?

Covid-19 is primarily an infection that affects the lower respiratory tract but cases have been found of SARS-CoV-2 affecting the myocardium inducing myocarditis.

What does this study add?

The presented study offers a review of intensive care admitted-patients requiring mechanical ventilation; findings from echocardiographic examination, the prognostic impact of clinically initiated echocardiography, and relevance of cardiac biomarkers and d-dimer. The material is, apart from this, unselected and therefore reflects what clinicians are likely to encounter giving care to this group of patients. It shows how from this group of patients, primary myocardial affliction is not a standard or common finding.

How might this impact on clinical practice?

The need for echocardiography is a negative prognostic factor. An increased pulmonary pressure as assessed by maximum tricuspid valve regurgitation velocity suggests a negative outcome. Troponin I is significantly correlated to maximum tricuspid valve regurgitation velocity.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Research nurses Joanna Wessbergh and Elin Söderman, and biobank research assistants Labolina Spång, Erik Danielsson and Philip Karlsson for their expertise in compiling the study.

Funding

The study was funded by the SciLifeLab/KAW national Covid-19 research program project grants to MH (KAW 2020.0182 and KAW 2020.0241), and the Swedish Research Council to RF (2014-02569 and 2014-07606). HI was supported by the Swedish Society of Medical Research (SSMF).

Authorship contributions

All authors participated in conception and design of the study. All authors had access to the data and participated in data collection and interpretation. HI and FF analyzed echocardiography. HI performed data analysis and drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to manuscript revision and gave approval of the final version.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Data availability

Data is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

1. Zeng JH, Liu YX, Yuan J, Wang FX, Wu WB, Li JX, et al. First case of COVID-19 complicated with fulminant myocarditis: a case report and insights. Infection. 2020;48(5):773-7.
2. Akhmerov A, Marban E. COVID-19 and the Heart. Circulation research. 2020;126(10):1443-55.
3. Zhou R. Does SARS-CoV-2 cause viral myocarditis in COVID-19 patients? European heart journal. 2020;41(22):2123.
4. Escher F, Pietsch H, Aleshcheva G, Bock T, Baumeier C, Elsaesser A, et al. Detection of viral SARS-CoV-2 genomes and histopathological changes in endomyocardial biopsies. ESC heart failure. 2020;7(5):2440-7.
5. Zheng YY, Ma YT, Zhang JY, Xie X. COVID-19 and the cardiovascular system. Nature reviews Cardiology. 2020;17(5):259-60.
6. Liu PP, Blet A, Smyth D, Li H. The Science Underlying COVID-19: Implications for the Cardiovascular System. Circulation. 2020;142(1):68-78.
7. Giustino G, Croft LB, Stefanini GG, Bragato R, Silbiger JJ, Vicenzi M, et al. Characterization of Myocardial Injury in Patients With COVID-19. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2020;76(18):2043-55.
8. Mahmoud-Elsayed HM, Moody WE, Bradlow WM, Khan-Kheil AM, Senior J, Hudsmith LE, et al. Echocardiographic Findings in Patients With COVID-19 Pneumonia. The Canadian journal of cardiology. 2020;36(8):1203-7.
9. Rodriguez-Santamarta M, Minguito-Carazo C, Echarte-Morales JC, Del Castillo-Garcia S, Valdivia-Ruiz J, Fernandez-Vazquez F. Echocardiographic findings in critical patients with COVID-19. Revista espanola de cardiologia. 2020;73(10):861-3.
10. Stobe S, Richter S, Seige M, Stehr S, Laufs U, Hagendorff A. Echocardiographic characteristics of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Clinical research in cardiology : official journal of the German Cardiac Society. 2020;109(12):1549-66.
11. D'Alto M, Marra AM, Severino S, Salzano A, Romeo E, De Rosa R, et al. Right ventricular-arterial uncoupling independently predicts survival in COVID-19 ARDS. Critical care. 2020;24(1):670.
12. Li Y, Li H, Zhu S, Xie Y, Wang B, He L, et al. Prognostic Value of Right Ventricular Longitudinal Strain in Patients With COVID-19. JACC Cardiovascular imaging. 2020;13(11):2287-99.
13. Pagnesi M, Baldetti L, Beneduce A, Calvo F, Gramegna M, Pazzanese V, et al. Pulmonary hypertension and right ventricular involvement in hospitalised patients with COVID-19. Heart. 2020;106(17):1324-31.
14. Galderisi M, Cosyns B, Edvardsen T, Cardim N, Delgado V, Di Salvo G, et al. Standardization of adult transthoracic echocardiography reporting in agreement with recent chamber quantification, diastolic function, and heart valve disease recommendations: an expert consensus document of the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. European heart journal cardiovascular Imaging. 2017;18(12):1301-10.
15. Lang RM, Badano LP, Mor-Avi V, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, et al. Recommendations for cardiac chamber quantification by echocardiography in adults: an update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. European heart journal cardiovascular Imaging. 2015;16(3):233-70.
16. Galie N, Humbert M, Vachiery JL, Gibbs S, Lang I, Torbicki A, et al. 2015 ESC/ERS Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of pulmonary hypertension: The Joint Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Pulmonary Hypertension of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the European Respiratory Society (ERS): Endorsed by: Association for European Paediatric and Congenital Cardiology (AEPC), International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT). The European respiratory journal. 2015;46(4):903-75.
17. Parasuraman S, Walker S, Loudon BL, Gollop ND, Wilson AM, Lowery C, et al. Assessment of pulmonary artery pressure by echocardiography-A comprehensive review. International journal of cardiology Heart & vasculature. 2016;12:45-51.

18. Perez-Casares A, Cesar S, Brunet-Garcia L, Sanchez-de-Toledo J. Echocardiographic Evaluation of Pericardial Effusion and Cardiac Tamponade. Frontiers in pediatrics. 2017;5:79.
19. Nagueh SF, Smiseth OA, Appleton CP, Byrd BF, 3rd, Dokainish H, Edvardsen T, et al. Recommendations for the Evaluation of Left Ventricular Diastolic Function by Echocardiography: An Update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography : official publication of the American Society of Echocardiography. 2016;29(4):277-314.



Figure 1: Out of 79 patients included in the study, 34 were assessed by echocardiography. Out of these 9 patients were subsequently excluded (3 did not fulfil the inclusion criteria of Covid-19 infection, 4 due to irregular heart rhythm or 3rd degree AV-block, and 2 due to overall unacceptable image quality), leaving 25 valid for echocardiographic analyses and inclusion. 45 patients were not assessed by echocardiography, of which one was excluded (admitted to the intensive care unit due to concomitant diabetic ketoacidosis and not Covid-19 respiratory insufficiency), leaving 44 patients not assessed by echocardiography and a total of 69 patients in the study.



Figure 2: Significant predictive value of maximum high sensitivity troponin I **(**hs-TnI) in relation to maximum tricuspid valve regurgitation velocity (TR V_{max}). Linear regression fit with 95% confidence intervals and best fit. For p- and r-values, see supplementary data table 1.

Table 1: Demographic characterisation. Morbidities refer to diagnoses previous to ICU admission. Confidence intervals described as standard error of the mean (SEM). Statistical analysis refers to non-echo vs echo group.

Parameter	Whole cohort	Non-echo	Echo	p-value
Gender (male:female)	54:15	35:9	19:6	ns
Age (years)	59.5 ± 1.7 (n=69)	56.7 ± 2.2 (n=44)	64.4 ± 2.6 (n=25)	<0.05
BMI (kg/m^2)	28.9 ± 0.69 (n=58)	29.0 ± 0.9 (n=35)	28.8 ± 1.1 (n=23)	ns
Mortality	18/69 (26 %)	7/44 (16 %)	11/25 (44 %)	p<0.05
Invasive ventilation	38/69 (55 %)	18/44 (41 %)	20/25 (80 %)	p<0.01
Ischemic heart disease	8/69 (12 %)	2/44 (4.5 %)	6/25 (24%)	p<0.05
Heart failure	3/69 (4.3 %)	1/44 (2.3 %)	2/25 (8 %)	ns
Pulmonary disease	14/69 (20 %)	7/44 (16 %)	7/25 (28 %)	ns
Hypertension	34/69 (49 %)	19/44 (43 %)	15/25 (60 %)	ns
Diabetes mellitus	19/69 (28 %)	10/44 (23 %)	9/25 (36 %)	ns
Renal failure	18/69 (26 %)	15/44 (34 %)	3/25 (12 %)	ns
ACEi/ARB	24/69 (35 %)	11/44 (25 %)	13/25 (52 %)	p<0.05

Table 2 a: Admission biomarker level's relation to mortality. Confidence intervals described as standard error of the mean (SEM).

Abbreviations: Highly sensitivity troponin I (hs-TnI), N-terminal brain natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP), not significant (ns).

Marker	Whole cohort	Survivors	Non-survivors	p-value
hs-TnI (ng/L)	85.4 ± 41 (n=47)	39.4 ± 15 (n=32)	180 ± 120 (n=15)	<0.01
NT-proBNP (ng/L)	1055 ± 276 (n=48)	936 ± 351 (n=33)	1318 ± 438 (n=15)	ns
D-dimer (mg/L)	2.58 ± 0.6 (n=63)	2.64 ± 0.6 (n=46)	2.42 ± 0.4 (n=17)	<0.05

Table 2 b: Maximum biomarker level's relation to mortality. Confidence intervals described as standard error of the mean (SEM).

Marker	Whole cohort	Survivors	Non-survivors	p-value
hs-TnI (ng/L)	98.8 ± 32 (n=65)	59.1 ± 21 (n=48)	211 ± 105 (n=17)	<0.0001
NT-proBNP (ng/L)	2133 ± 346 (n=67)	1310 ± 314 (n=47)	4065 ± 740 (n=20)	<0.0001
D-dimer (mg/L)	9.8 ± 1.8 (n=68)	7.2 ± 1.5 (n=50)	17.1 ± 4.8 (n=18)	<0.01

Table 2 c: Biomarker distribution in the non-echo vs. echo group. Confidence intervals described as standard error of the mean (SEM).

Marker	Non-echo	Echo	p-value
hs-TnI (ng/L)	81.3 ± 45 (n=41)	133 ± 45 (n=23)	<0.01
NT-proBNP (ng/L)	1641 ± 420 (n=42)	2959 ± 573 (n=25)	<0.001
D-dimer (mg/L)	6.1 ± 1.5 (n=43)	16.1 ± 3.7 (n=25)	<0.01

Table 3: Echocardiographic parameters in the whole group and their distribution between survivor and non-survivor group. Confidence intervals described as standard error of the mean (SEM). Statistical analyses refer to survivor vs. non-survivor group.

Parameter	**Whole group**	**Survivors**	**Non-survivors**	**p-value** (Bonferroni correction)
Static measures				
IVSD (mm)	11.4 ± 0.5 (n=22)	11.7 ± 0.58 (n=12)	10.9 ± 0.88 (n=10)	ns
LVEDD (mm)	47.7 ± 1.3 (n=22)	45.9 ± 1.8 (n=12)	49.8 ± 1.6 (n=10)	ns
LVEDD/m^2 (mm/mm^2)	23.78 ± 0.57 (n=22)	23.3 ± 0.90 (n=12)	24.4 ± 0.62 (n=10)	ns
LVPWD (mm)	10.1 ± 0.3 (n=22)	10.2 ± 0.4 (n=12)	9.8 ± 0. (n=10)	ns
LA (ml)	47.8 ± 3.3 (n=20)	44.1 ± 3.7 (n=11)	52.4 ± 5.5 (n=9)	ns
LA/m^2 (ml/m^2)	23.8 ± 1.61 (n=20)	22.3 ± 1.6 (n=11)	25.7 ± 3.0 (n=9)	ns
RVD1 (mm)	36.1 ± 1.5 (n=22)	34.2 ± 2.0 (n=12)	38.4 ± 2.0 (n=10)	ns
RVD1/m^2 (mm/m^2)	18.0 ± 0.61 (n=22)	17.43 ± 0.85 (n=12)	18.7 ± 0.86 (n=10)	ns
RA (ml)	49.0 ± 6.1 (n=18)	46.4 ± 8.2 (n=10)	52.1 ± 9.6 (n=8)	ns
RA/m^2 (ml/m^2)	24.2 ± 2.9 (n=18)	23.7 ± 3.9 (n=10)	24.9 ± 4.5 (n=8)	ns
IVC diameter (mm)	20.0 ± 0.84 (n=18)	19.0 ± 1.4 (n=7)	20.6 ± 1.1 (n=11)	ns
Pericardial effusion (mm)	0.71 ± 0.25 (n=24)	0.97 ± 0.39 (n=13)	0.41 ± 0.29 (n=11)	ns
Functional measures				
LVEF (%)	54.8 ± 2.2 (n=20)	54.1 ± 3.1 (n=11)	55.7 ± 3.4 (n=9)	ns

GLS (%)	-14.1 ± 0.86 (n=18)	-13.5 ± 1.3 (n=11)	-15.1 ± 1.0 (n=7)	ns
E (m/s)	0.77 ± 0.04 (n=20)	0.71 ± 0.05 (n=10)	0.83 ± 0.07 (n=10)	ns
A (m/s)	0.64 ± 0.05 (n=20)	0.62 ± 0.05 (n=10)	0.67 ± 0.05 (n=10)	ns
E/A	1.30 ± 0.13 (n=20)	1.27 ± 0.23 (n=10)	1.33 ± 0.13 (n=10)	ns
e’ medial (m/s)	0.079 ± 0.01 (n=16)	0.072 ± 0.01 (n=6)	0.083 ± 0.01 (n=10)	ns
E/e’	10.5 ± 0.81 (n=16)	9.72 ± 0.54 (n=6)	10.9 ± 1.3 (n=10)	ns
MV dec time (ms)	211 ± 12 (n=20)	203 ± 21 (n=10)	220 ± 11 (n=10)	ns
TAPSE (mm)	22.7 ± 1.1 (n=22)	23.4 ± 1.5 (n=12)	21.8 ± 1.6 (n=10)	ns
RV FAC (%)	45.2 ± 2.4 (n=20)	47.9 ± 2.4 (n=10)	42.4 ± 4.1 (n=10)	ns
RV free wall strain (%)	-25.1 ± 2.5 (n=16)	-26.3 ± 3.5 (n=9)	-23.6 ± 3.6 (n=7)	ns
IVC resp. variation (%)	49.5 ± 7.3 (n=17)	59.4 ± 11.2 (n=7)	42.6 ± 9.5 (n=10)	ns
PAAT (ms)	109 ± 6.3 (n=16)	115 ± 9.2 (n=9)	101 ± 8.0 (n=7)	ns
TR V_{max} (m/s)	2.78 ± 0.11 (n=10)	2.51 ± 0.01 (n=5)	3.06 ± 0.11 (n=5)	<0.05 (0.3)

Supplementary data

Table 1: Correlation of echo parameters to cardiac biomarkers and d-dimer. (p-value, r, Bonferroni-corrected p-value).

Parameter	hs-TnI (n)	NT-proBNP (n)	d-dimer (n)
IVSD (mm)	<0.05, 0.46, 1.04 (n=20)	ns	ns
LVEDD (mm)	ns	ns	ns
LVEDD/m^2 (mm/m^2)	ns	ns	ns
LVPWD (mm)	ns	ns	ns
LA (ml)	ns	ns	ns
LA/m^2 (ml/m^2)	ns	ns	ns
RVD1 (mm)	ns	ns	ns
RVD1/m^2 (mm/m^2)	ns	ns	ns
RA (ml)	ns	ns	ns
RA/m^2 (ml/mm^2)	ns	ns	ns
IVC diameter (mm)	ns	ns	ns
LVEF (%)	ns	ns	ns
GLS (%)	ns	ns	<0.01, -0.62, 0.165 (n=18)
E (m/s)	ns	<0.05, 0.50, 0.59 (n=20)	<0.05, 0.45, 1.11 (n=20)
A (m/s)	ns	ns	ns
E/A	ns	ns	ns

e’ medial (m/s)	ns	ns	ns
E/e’ medial	ns	ns	ns
MV dec. time (ms)	ns	ns	ns
TAPSE (mm)	ns	ns	ns
RV FAC (%)	ns	<0.05, -0.45, 1.1 (n=20)	ns
RV free wall strain	ns	ns	ns
IVC resp. variation (%)	ns	ns	ns
Pulm. Acc. Time (ms)	ns	ns	ns
TR V_{max} (m/s)	<0.001, 0.93, 0.0075 (n=10)	ns	ns
Pericardial effusion (mm)	ns	ns	ns

List of abbreviations

A - atrial transmitral diastolic velocity

ACE-2 - angiotensin converting enzyme 2

ACEi – angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor

ARB – angiotensin receptor blocker

Ang – angiotensin

BMI – body mass index

Covid-19 – corona virus disease 2019

E - early transmitral diastolic velocity

e’ - medial tissue diastolic velocity

EACVI - European association of cardiovascular imaging

ESC- European society of cardiology

FAC – fractional area change

GLS - global longitudinal strain

hs-TnI – high sensitivity troponin I

ICU – intensive care unit

IVC - inferior vena cava

IVC resp. variation - inferior vena cava respiratory variation

IVSD - interventricular septum diameter

LA - left atrium

LV - left ventricle

LVEDD - left ventricular end diastolic diameter

LVEF - left ventricular ejection fraction

LVPWD - left ventricular posterior wall end diastolic diameter

MV dec. time - mitral valve deceleration time

ns – not significant

NT-proBNP – N-terminal pro brain natriuretic peptide

PH – pulmonary hypertension

PAAT - pulmonary artery acceleration time

RA - right atrium

RV – right ventricle

RVD1 -right ventricular basal diameter

SARS-CoV-2 – severe acute respiratory syndrome corona virus 2

TAPSE - tricuspid annular peak systolic excursion

TR V_{max} - maximum tricuspid regurgitation velocity