TITLE PAGE

Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) associated Mucormycosis: An Anaesthesiologist's Perspective

Running Title: COVID-19 associated Mucormycosis: An Anaesthesiologist's Perspective

Author Names:

Prashant Sirohiya[1], Saurabh Vig[1], Tanmay Mathur[1], Jitendra Kumar Meena[2], Smriti Panda[3], Gitartha Goswami[1], Raghav Gupta[1], Abhilash konkimalla[3], Dheeraj Kondamudi[3], Nishkarsh Gupta[1], Brajesh Kumar Ratre[1], Ram Singh[1], Balbir Kumar[1], Anuja Pandit[1], Kapil Sikka[3], Alok Thakar[3], Sushma Bhatnagar[1]

1 Department of Onco-anaesthesia and Palliative Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi

2 Department of Preventive Oncology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi

3 Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi

#Corresponding Author

Prof Sushma Bhatnagar

Head, Department of Onco-anaesthesia and Palliative medicine

All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi

sushmabhatnagar1@gmail.com

Mobile: - +91-9811326453

Source(s) of support: Nil

Presentation at a meeting: Nil

Conflicting Interest: Nil

Contributorship statement

- Prashant Sirohiya was involved in the conceptualization of the study, study design, patient care, data collection, statistical analysis, and in writing the first draft of the manuscript

and agrees to be the guarantor of the manuscript taking responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, from inception to published article

- Saurabh Vig and Jitendra Meena were involved in the conceptualization of the study, study design, patient care, data collection, statistical analysis, and critique of the manuscript
- Tanmay Mathur, Gitartha Goswami, and Raghav Gupta were involved in the conceptualization of the study, study design, patient care, and in writing the first draft of the manuscript
- Smriti Panda, Abhilash Konkimalla, and Dheeraj Kondamudi was involved in the conceptualization of the study, study design, patient care, and in the critique of the manuscript
- Nishkarsh Gupta, Brajesh Kumar Ratre, Ram Singh, Balbir Kumar, Anuja Pandit, were involved in study design, patient care, and in the critique of the manuscript
- Kapil Sikka and Alok Thakar were involved in the conceptualization of the study and final critique and review of the manuscript
- Sushma Bhatnagar was involved in the conceptualization of the study, convening of the working group, study design, patient care, in final critique and review of the manuscript and agrees to be the guarantor of the manuscript taking responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, from inception to published article

Word count:

• Summary	:	242
• Text (Excluding References)	:	2210
Number of tables	:	4
Number of references	:	20

Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) associated Mucormycosis: An Anaesthesiologist's Perspective

Summary

In India, the second wave of coronavirus disease (COVID -19) was associated with a distinct surge in cases of invasive fungal infection with mucormycosis. This disease was seen typically in the sinonasal form in COVID-19 patients. Uncontrolled diabetes, steroid use in COVID-19 treatment, etc. were some of the postulated risk factors for the association of COVID 19 and Mucormycosis. The management plan of these cases included surgical debridement, systemic antifungal therapy, sugar control, and management of antifungal related systemic adverse effects. In this retrospective case record review, we aimed to evaluate the airway management plan, demographics, and overall outcomes in patients undergoing surgical resection for COVID-19 associated mucormycosis. Forty-one (71.9 %) patients had a diagnosis of sino-nasal mucormycosis, fourteen (24.6%) had a diagnosis of rhino-orbital mucormycosis, and 2 patients (3.5%) were diagnosed with palatal mucormycosis. Total 44 (77.19 %) patients had co-morbidities. The most common co-morbidity was Diabetes Mellitus 42 (73.6%), followed by hypertension 21 (36.84%) and Acute kidney injury 14 (28.07%). We used the intubation difficulty scale score to assess intubating conditions. Intubation was easy to slightly difficult in 53 out of 57 patients. In our study, mortality occurred in 7 (12.28 %) patients. The median mortality time was 60 (range, 27-74) days. The median time to hospital discharge was 53.5 (range,10-85) days. Managing COVID-19 on its own is challenging and additional mucormycosis can lead to increased morbidity and mortality. Despite challenges and risks, timely and meticulous interventions can reduce complications.

Introduction

Mucormycosis is an acute-onset, aggressive, and rapidly progressive angioinvasive infection caused by saprophytic fungi of the order Mucorales. The most common underlying risk factor associated with mucormycosis is uncontrolled diabetes mellitus. Hematopoietic stem cell and solid organ transplants, corticosteroid therapy, neutropenia, or drug-induced immunosuppression are other identifiable risk factors.[1,2]

There was a sudden increase in cases of mucormycosis in the second wave of Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in India. [3,4] The management plan of these cases included surgical debridement, systemic antifungal therapy, sugar control, and management of antifungal

related systemic adverse effects. Diabetes mellitus has been identified as the most common coexisting comorbidity. Attention must be given to control blood glucose.[5] Also, airway management may be difficult in these patients due to the invasive nature of the disease. The oropharyngeal region may be involved by fungus and edema in the supraglottic area may cause difficult endotracheal intubation and difficult ventilation.[6] These patients are getting injections of amphotericin B which may have significant adverse effects like nephrotoxicity, hypokalaemia, hypomagnesemia, fever, shivering, dyspnoea, and hypotension.[7] Moreover, COVID-19 itself has detrimental effects on different organs of the body. Many of these patients require surgical debridement of involved tissues and anaesthesiologists are involved in the multidisciplinary perioperative management of mucormycosis associated with COVID-19.[8]

The mortality rate of mucormycosis associated with COVID-19 is unknown but overall mortality in case of mucormycosis is 54%.[9] There is a risk of involvement of vital structures like the brain and eye, so surgical debridement should be planned on an urgent basis as delay may cause further worsening of prognosis. There may be less time for optimization of patient comorbidities, making perioperative management challenging. As all the patients in our study are positive to COVID-19, the problems encountered due to wearing personal protective equipment, limited staff and supplies are additional difficulties in the management of these patients.[10]

To our knowledge, there has been no study reporting on the anaesthetic management of patients with mucormycosis associated with COVID-19 except for few case reports. In this study, we aimed to evaluate the airway management plan, demographics, and overall outcomes in patients undergoing surgical resection for COVID-19 associated mucormycosis.

Materials And Methods

Study Protocol

After obtaining approval from the institute ethics committee (IEC-450/02.07.2021), medical records of the COVID-19 positive patients that underwent surgical resection for mucormycosis at National Cancer Institute (Jhajjar), All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi between 6th May 2021 to 15th June 2021 were retrospectively reviewed.[4]

Study Participants

The study included 57 COVID-19 positive patients that underwent surgical resection for mucormycosis under general anaesthesia. Patients with incomplete medical records were excluded from the study.

Study Design

The study was designed as a retrospective case record review that evaluated hospital records of 57 COVID-19 positive patients that underwent surgical resection for mucormycosis in the defined study period.

- Primary outcome – to describe the airway management plan in patients with sinonasal mucormycosis posted for surgery
- Secondary outcome – to describe the demographics and overall outcomes in patients undergoing surgical debridement of mucormycosis.

Preoperative Procedures

Routine monitoring including heart rate (HR), noninvasive blood pressure (NIBP), electrocardiogram (ECG), and peripheral oxygen saturation (SpO_2) was administered in the operating room

for each patient.

Anesthetic Management

All the surgeries were performed under general anaesthesia. Following the 3-min preoxygenation with 100% O_2, anaesthesia was induced with fentanyl (2 µg/kg), intravenous propofol (2 mg/kg), rocuronium (0.9 mg/kg). In 56 patients, orotracheal intubation by using C-MAC video laryngoscope was performed and in 1 patient, nasotracheal intubation was performed using the fibreoptic bronchoscope. All patients were mechanically ventilated using an Avance CS² Anesthesia Delivery System (GE Healthcare) at a frequency of 10-14 breaths per min with a tidal volume of 6-8 mL/kg. Following intubation, the $EtCO_2$ value was monitored continuously. The tidal volume and the ventilation rate were adjusted to maintain the $EtCO_2$ value within a range of 35-45 mmHg. Anaesthesia was maintained with sevoflurane or desflurane in a mixture of 50%-50% oxygen and air. A bolus injection of rocuronium was administered as needed. In patients that had no intraoperative complications, neostigmine (0.05 mg/kg) and glycopyrrolate (1/5 dose of neostigmine) were administered to reverse residual neuromuscular blockade at the end of the surgery. Patients who achieved

spontaneous respiration, adequate tidal volume (>5 mL/kg), maintaining oxygen saturation >95 % were extubated in the operation theatre and then transferred to the post-anaesthesia care unit (PACU). However, the patients who showed inadequate reversal were transferred to the Intensive care unit (ICU) for elective mechanical ventilation.

Procedural Data

Duration of anaesthesia was defined as the time between Induction of anaesthesia to transfer of the patient to the post-anaesthesia care unit PACU or ICU. Patient data regarding length of hospital stay and mortality rates were obtained from the hospital records. Length of hospital stay was defined as days between the date of admission in the hospital to the date of discharge/mortality.

Outcome Measures

The study reviewed the demographic, surgical, and clinical records of 57 patients. Patient data regarding drugs, comorbidities, and laboratory parameters were obtained from the hospital records.

Postoperative Management

Postoperative care was conducted in the PACU/ICU. Patients that achieved a Modified Aldrete score of ≥ 9 were transferred to the ward. (11). Patients who required postoperative mechanical ventilation were transferred to ICU directly from the operation theatre. Postoperative analgesia was provided according to the world health organization's stepladder approach to pain management.[11]

Statistical Analysis

Data pertaining to selected variables in the study were extracted from the records and entered into MS Excel software version 16.0 (Microsoft Inc.). for summative analysis. The data were summarized using the medians with interquartile ranges [25th – 75th] for continuous variables and numbers and =proportions (%) for categorical variables Data were statistically reviewed using IBM SPSS Version 24 (SPSS Inc, Chicago IL, USA). for distribution however it wasn’t included in the study for non-comparable groups. , Descriptive data were tabulated into contingency tables and was included in the study results.

Results

Demographic characteristics of the patients are presented in Table 1 and Table 1.1. The 57 patients comprised 35 (61.4 %) men and 22 (38.59 %) women with a median age of 49 (range, 26-78) years. The median body weight was 64 (range, 46-82) kg and the median height was 1.67 (range, 1.45-1.81) meters. Eleven patients had an American Society of Anaesthesiologists (ASA) score of I (19.29 %), 23 patients had an ASA score of II (40.35 %), while the remaining 23 patients had a score of III (40.35 %).[12] Ten (17.54%) patients were active smokers and 10 (17.54%) patients had a history of alcohol intake. Forty-one (71.9 %) patients had a diagnosis of sino-nasal mucormycosis, fourteen (24.6%) had a diagnosis of rhino-orbital mucormycosis (out of which 2 patients were diagnosed with rhino-orbital mucormycosis with cerebral extension), and 2 patients (3.5%) was diagnosed with palatal mucormycosis. Total 44 (77.19 %) patients had co-morbidities. The most common co-morbidity was Diabetes Mellitus 42 (73.6%), followed by hypertension 21 (36.84%) and Acute kidney injury 14 (28.07%).

Airway assessment, management, and procedural data parameters are presented in Table 2 and Table 2.1. Forty-nine (85.96 %) patients had mouth-opening more than three fingers. Loose Incisors are present in 5 (8.77 %) patients. Two (3.5 %) patients were edentulous. Forty-four (77.19 %) patients had a Mallampatti score of 2.[13] Fifty-six (98.25%) patients underwent oral endotracheal intubation by using a C-MAC laryngoscope. One (1.75 %) patient who had restricted mouth opening (<1 finger), we did nasotracheal intubation using a fibreoptic bronchoscope. First pass intubation success was 92.98 %. The Cormack Lehane grading was 1 in 42.1% and 2 in 49.12 %.[14] Two (3.5 %) patients required intubation stylet for their endotracheal intubation. We calculated the Intubation difficulty score to assess intubating conditions and we found a score of 0 (Easy) in 11 patients, a score of 1 to 4 (slightly difficulty) in 42 patients, and a score >5 (moderate to major difficulty) in 3 patients.[15] The median percentage of glottic opening (POGO) score was 80 (range 20-100) % and median intubation time was 15 (range, 10-180) seconds.

All patients received crystalloids while 2 patients received blood transfusions. We performed internal jugular venous cannulation in 47 (82.45 %) patients and peripherally inserted central catheterization in 7 (12.28%) patients. In 3 patients, internal jugular venous cannulation was already performed before their surgery. Nasogastric tube insertion was performed in 19 (33.33%) and Foley's catheterization was performed in 19 (33.33%) patients. Median blood loss was 150 (range 50-500) ml and median urine output was 250 (range, 200-300) ml. The preoperative investigations are listed in table 3.

The median duration of anaesthesia was 150 (range, 90–270) min. Forty-one (71.92 %) patients were extubated after surgery in the operation theatre. Sixteen (28.07 %) patients were shifted to the Intensive care unit for postoperative elective mechanical ventilation. The reason for postoperative elective mechanical ventilation was extensive surgery in 14 patients and inadequate reversal in 2 patients. Eight patients out of 16 were extubated on postoperative day 0, 6 patients were extubated on postoperative day 1, and 2 patients were extubated on day 2. One patient required a high flow nasal cannula (HFNC) after extubation for 10 days, later the patient was weaned off from the HFNC. The median time to hospital discharge was 53.5 (range,10-85) days. Mortality occurred in 7 (12.28 %) patients during the hospital stay. The median mortality time was 60 (range, 27-74) days.

Discussion

Surgical debridement of mucormycosis is an aggressive procedure and perioperative anesthetic management of the patients is challenging. Involvement of the oropharyngeal region by fungus and supraglottic edema may cause mask ventilation and endotracheal intubation.[16] In our study, mask ventilation was not difficult in any of our patients. First pass intubation success was 92.98 %. Two attempts were taken in 4 (7.01 %) patients. Two patients had required intubation stylet for their endotracheal intubation and two patients had difficulty in guiding endotracheal tube through glottis in the first attempt but the second attempt was successful.

In one patient, restricted mouth opening was present, so, fibreoptic intubation was performed. Rest all patients are intubated by C-MAC video laryngoscope as per departmental COVID-19 protocol. The intubation difficulty score was calculated with the help of the Intubation difficulty scale. Eleven patients had no intubation difficulty, 42 patients had slight intubation difficulty (score 1-4), 3 patients had moderate to major intubation difficulty (score >5).

We had a dedicated COVID-19 operation theatre with all the healthcare staff wearing level 3 personal protective equipment.[17] As an anaesthesia, we checked all equipment and drugs for anticipated or unanticipated difficult airway management. We had different sized masks, stylets, bougies, laryngeal mask airways of different sizes, video laryngoscope (C-MAC) with blades of different sizes, fibreoptic-guided intubation kit, 2 working suction apparatus, and emergency tracheostomy trolley for management of the unexpected difficult airway.

COVID-19 itself is a major contributor to morbidity and mortality due to dyspnoea, poor functional status, chest pain or tightness, hypercoagulability, endocrine abnormalities particularly impaired glycaemic control, etc. This, in addition to mucormycosis, leads to even worsening of prognosis in these patients.[18] In our study 42 (73.68 %) patients had a history of diabetes which was managed by administration of insulin perioperatively. Central venous catheters may be required peri-operatively for blood or blood product transfusion, fluid replacement, inotropic or vasopressor support, and for infusion of amphotericin B for a prolonged period.[19]We used Groshong® PICC catheter (4 and 5 Fr) in 7 patients and internal jugular venous cannulation in 47 patients.

The use of systemic amphotericin B in the management of COVID-19 associated mucormycosis has its distinct toxicities, most importantly nephrotoxicity. There are other side effects of amphotericin B such as hypokalaemia, hypomagnesemia, fever, dyspnoea, shivering, and hypotension.[20] In our study, 14 patients had pre-operative amphotericin B-induced nephrotoxicity. The primary aim of surgical management is to debride all necrotic tissues. Our patients received both antifungal treatment and surgical debridement. The overall mortality of mucormycosis is 54%.[9] The mortality rate of mucormycosis associated with COVID-19 is still unknown. In our study, mortality occurred in 7 (12.28 %) patients. The median mortality time was 60 (range, 27-74) days.

The median (interquartile range) age of patients discharged was 47.5 (41,57.5) days as compared to median (IQR) age of patients expired i.e., 64(47,70) which was statistically significant (P value=0.04]. Five (12.2%) patients out of 41 patients with sinonasal mucormycosis and 2 (14.3 %) patients out of rhino orbital mucormycosis (out of which 1 had a cerebral extension) expired. No patients with palatal mucormycosis expired. In preoperative investigations, we found D-Dimer levels statistically increased in patients who expired as compared to patients discharged [Median (IQR) →2448 (408,3301) vs 364(213,638)] [P=0.04]. Rest all investigations between discharged and expired patients were comparable.

Our study has some limitations. First, the study had a retrospective nature and was based on the analysis of anaesthesia and hospital records. Second, all the patients were from a single center. Our study has one strength as this is the first of its kind study in anesthetic perspectives of COVID-19 associated mucormycosis that can be used as a platform for further studies on this topic.

Conclusion

The anesthetic management of mucormycosis associated with COVID-19 is challenging because of its perioperative effects. Managing COVID-19 on its own is difficult and additional mucormycosis can lead to increased morbidity and mortality. Despite challenges and risks, timely and meticulous interventions can reduce complications.

References

1. Patel A, Kaur H, Xess I et al. A multicentre observational study on the epidemiology, risk factors, management and outcomes of mucormycosis in India. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 2020; **26**: 944.e9-944.e15.

2. Prakash H, Chakrabarti A. Global Epidemiology of Mucormycosis. *Journal of Fungi* 2019; **5**: 26.

3. Black fungus: India reports nearly 9,000 cases of rare infection. *BBC News*, 2021. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-57217246 (accessed July 21, 2021).

4. Elavarasi A, Sagiraju HKR, Garg RK et al. *Clinical Features, Demography and Predictors of Outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in a Tertiary Care Hospital in India-A Cohort Study*. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS), 2021.

5. Skiada A, Pavleas I, Drogari-Apiranthitou M. Epidemiology and Diagnosis of Mucormycosis: An Update. *Journal of Fungi* 2020; **6**: 265.

6. Anesthetic management of rhinoorbitocerebral mucormycosis; Focus on challenges - PubMed.https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31399350/ (accessed July 21, 2021).

7. Laniado-Laborín R, Cabrales-Vargas MN. Amphotericin B: side effects and toxicity. *Revista Iberoamericana De Micologia* 2009; **26**: 223–7.

8. Malhotra N, Bajwa SS, Joshi M, Mehdiratta L, Kurdi M. Second wave of COVID-19 pandemic and the surge of mucormycosis: Lessons learnt and future preparedness: Indian Society of Anaesthesiologists (ISA National) Advisory and Position Statement. *Indian Journal of Anaesthesia* 2021; **65**: 427.

9. Mucormycosis Statistics | Mucormycosis | Fungal Diseases | CDC. 2020. https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/mucormycosis/statistics.html (accessed July 21, 2021).

10. Fan J, Jiang Y, Hu K et al. Barriers to using personal protective equipment by healthcare staff during the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Medicine* 2020; **99**: e23310.

11. Anekar AA, Cascella M. WHO Analgesic Ladder. *StatPearls*. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing, 2021.

12. Doyle DJ, Goyal A, Bansal P, Garmon EH. American Society of Anesthesiologists Classification. *StatPearls*. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing, 2021.

13. Safavi M, Honarmand A, Amoushahi M. Prediction of difficult laryngoscopy: Extended mallampati score versus the MMT, ULBT and RHTMD. *Advanced Biomedical Research* 2014; **3**: 133.

14. Angadi SP, Frerk C. Videolaryngoscopy and Cormack and Lehane grading. *Anaesthesia* 2011; **66**: 628–9.

15. Adnet F, Borron SW, Racine SX et al. The Intubation Difficulty Scale (IDS). *Anesthesiology* 1997; **87**: 1290–7.

16. Eckmann DM, Seligman I, Cote CJ, Hussong JW. Mucormycosis Supraglottitis on Induction of Anesthesia in an Immunocompromised Host: *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 1998; **86**: 729–30.

17. 2019-02-11-aide-memoire-for-levels-of-personal-protective-equipment-ppe-for-healthcare-workers-for-patient-care.pdf.https://www.nipcm.hps.scot.nhs.uk/media/1437/2019-02-11-aide-memoire-for-levels-of-personal-protective-equipment-ppe-for-healthcare-workers-for-patient-care.pdf (accessed July 21, 2021).

18. Mehta S, Pandey A. Rhino-Orbital Mucormycosis Associated With COVID-19. *Cureus* **12**: e10726.

19. Scoppettuolo G, Biasucci DG, Pittiruti M. Vascular access in COVID-19 patients: Smart decisions for maximal safety. *The Journal of Vascular Access* 2020; **21**: 408–10.

20. Kulkarni PK, Reddy NB, Shrinivas B, Takkalki VV. Anesthetic considerations in the management of mucormycosis. 2015; doi 10.4103/2230-8598.165986.

Table 1 Demographic data and clinical characteristics		
Variable	**Variable**	**Frequency (%)**
Sex:		
	Male	35 (61.4)
	Female	22 (38.59)
Diagnosis		
	Sinonasal	41 (71.9)
	Rhinorbital	14 (24.6)
	Palatal	2 (3.5)
Clinical outcome		
	Discharge	50 (87.71)
	Expired	7 (12.28)
ASA GRADE		
	1	11 (19.29)
	2	23 (40.35)
	3	23 (40.35)
Comorbidity*		
	Diabetes	42 (73.68)
	Hypertension	21 (36.84)
	Acute Kidney Injury	14 (28.07)
	Chronic Kidney disease	2 (3.84)
	Hypothyroidism	2 (3.84)
	Coronary artery disease	2 (3.84)
	Asthma	1 (1.75)
Smoking Status*		10 (17.54)
Alcohol intake Status*		10 (17.54)

* items are mutually non-exclusive

Table 1.1 Demographic data and clinical characteristics		
Variable	**Median [IQR]**	**Range**
1. Age (Years)	49 [41.5,59.5]	(26 - 78)
2. Weight (Kilograms)	64 [58,70]	(46-82)
3. Height (meters)	1.67 [1.58,1.71]	(1.45-1.81)
4. Pre-operative Pulse Rate (per minute)	89 [79.5,100.5]	(65-115)
5. Pre-operative Systolic Blood Pressure	125[117.5,136.5]	(100-174)
6. Pre-operative Diastolic Blood Pressure	75 [66.5,84.5]	(42 - 98)
7. Pre-operative Respiratory rate (breaths per minute)	22 [20,24]	(18 - 28)

Mouth opening (adequate)		
	>3 Fingers	49 (85.96)
	2.5-3 Fingers	3 (5.26)
	2-2.5 Fingers	4 (7.01)
	<1 Fingers	1 (1.75)
Loose tooth		5 (8.77)
Artificial tooth		3 (5.26)
Edentulous		2 (3.5)
Buck tooth		2 (3.5)
Mallampatti Score	1	3 (5.26)
	2	44 (77.19)
	3	8 (14.03)
	4	2 (3.5)
Neck Movements		56 (98.24)
TMD (adequate)		46 (80.7)
Short neck		7 (12.28)
Receding chin		2 (3.5)
Post-surgical changes		0 (0)
No. of attempts		
	1	53 (92.98)
	2	4 (7.01)
No. of operators		
	1	56 (98.24)
	2	1 (1.75)
Cormack Lehane grade		
	1	24 (42.86)
	2	28 (50.00)
	3	4 (7.00)
Lifting force required		
	Normal	24 (42.86)
	Increased	32 (57.14)
Vocal cord mobility		
Abduction		57 (100)
External laryngeal maneuver		21 (36.84)
Esophageal intubation		0 (0)
Intubation Stylet used		2 (3.57)
Intubation difficulty score (n=56)		
	0	11 (19.64)
	1	13 (23.21)
	2	17 (30.36)
	3	11 (19.64)
	4	1(1.79)
	5	3 (5.36)
Blood transfusion		2 (3.5)
Extubated		41 (71.92)
Shifted to ICU (Intubated)		16 (28.07)

PICC	7 (12.28)
CVC	47 (82.45)
Ryles tube	19 (33.33)
Foleys	19 (33.33)

Table 2.1 Procedural Data		
Variable	**Median [IQR]**	**Range**
POGO Score (%)	80 [70,80]	(20 - 100)
Intubation time (sec)	15 [15,20]	(10 - 180)
Anaesthesia time (mins)	150 [125,180]	(90 - 270)
Blood loss (ml)	150 [100,225]	(50 - 500)
Urine output (ml)	250 [200,287.5]	(200 - 300)

Table 3 Pre-operative Investigations		
Variable	**Median [IQR]**	**Range**
1. Pre-Op Blood sugar (mg/dL)	146 [122.5,171]	(104 - 204)
2. Activated Partial Thromboplastin Time (sec)	31.5 [29.27,33.6]	(24.1 - 47.9)
3. D-dimer (ng/mL)	407 [227,657.75]	(65 - 3819)
4. Fibrinogen (mg/dL)	484 [415.75,556]	(226 - 769)
5. PT (sec)	11.8 [10.97,12.97]	(9.5 - 16.9)
6. INR	1 [0.93,1.14]	(0.8 - 1.52)
7. Hemoglobin (g/dL)	11.35 [10.32,12.7]	(7.1 - 14.5)
8. WBC Count (/µL)	8.84 [7,11.94]	(3.5 - 36.85)
9. Platelet Count (/µL)	235.5 [181.25,303.75]	(112 - 757)
10. Neutrophils (%)	77.3 [69.5,85.05]	(45.9 - 92.6)
11. Lymphocytes (%)	13.1 [8.4,20.2]	(3.7 - 34.8)
12. Ferritin (ng/mL)	862.85 [495.62,1381.57]	(32.7 - 3352.7)
13. Lactate dehydrogenase (units/L)	295 [225,349]	(107 - 550)
14. C-reactive protein (mg/L)	11.22 [5.02,14.99]	(1 - 20.36)
15. Procalcitonin (ng/mL)	0.09 [0.04,1.17]	(0 - 13.57)
16. Interleukin-6 (pg/mL)	17.5 [8.7,43]	(1.4 - 272)
17. Total Bilirubin(mg/dL)	0.43 [0.3,0.58]	(0.1 - 4.23)
18. Direct Bilirubin(mg/dL)	0.18 [0.1,0.26]	(0 - 0.82)
19. Alanine aminotransferase (U/L)	29 [17,45]	(6 - 142)
20. Aspartate Aminotransferase (U/L)	24 [20.5,35]	(12 - 99)
21. Total Protein(g/dL)	5.9 [5.31,6.4]	(4.2 - 7.2)
22. Albumin (g/dL)	3.2 [2.8,3.6]	(2 - 4.3)
23. Globulin(g/dL)	2.58 [2.3,3.03]	(1.7 - 3.6)
24. Albumin/Globulin Ratio	1.27 [1.07,1.43]	(0.7 - 2)

25. Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	98 [87,138.5]	(58 - 267)
26. Urea (mg/dL)	34.2 [21.2,48.15]	(4.3 - 143.4)
27. Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.87 [0.69,1.7]	(0.35 – 5.07)
28. Calcium (mg/dL)	8.11 [7.87,8.64]	(6.5 - 9.86)
29. Phosphorous (mg/dL)	3.51 [2.96,4.35]	(1.6 - 5.73)
30. Sodium (mmol/L)	136 [134,139]	(128 - 145)
31. Potassium (mmol/L)	4 [3.55,4.7]	(2.4 - 8.3)
32. Uric Acid (mg/dL)	4.3 [3.3,5.1]	(1.5 - 8.5)