Meta-analysis of COVID-19 patients to understand the key predictors of mortality in the non-vaccinated groups in remote settings

Authors

Neha L. Jain MD,[1] Karishma Parekh MD [1,3], Rishi Saigal MD[1], Amal Alyusuf MD[1]
Gabrielle Kelly MD[1], Alokkumar Jha PhD[4,5,6,7]

[1] CHI Mercy health, Roseburg, Oregon, USA
[3] Sutter Gould Medical Foundation, CA, USA
[4] Cardiovascular Institute, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford University, CA, USA
[5] Division of Pediatric Endocrinology and Diabetes, Stanford University, CA, USA
[6] Stanford Cancer Institute, Stanford University, CA, USA
[7] Centre for Neurogenetics, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, USA

Keywords: Rural Health, SARS-COV2, Vaccination, Cytokine storm

Word count: (8807 words)

Abstract: Various studies have looked into the impact of the COVID-19 vaccine on large populations. However, very few studies have looked into the remote setting of hospitals where vaccination is challenging due to social structure, myths, and misconceptions. There is a consensus that elevated inflammatory markers such as CRP, ferritin, D-dimer correlate with increased severity of COVID-19 and are associated with worse outcomes. In the present study, through retrospective meta-analysis, we have looked into ~20 months of SARS-COV2 infected patients with known mortality status and identified predictors of mortality concerning their comorbidities, various clinical parameters, inflammatory markers, superimposed infections, length of hospitalization, length of mechanical ventilation and ICU stay. Studies with larger sample sizes have covered the outcomes through epidemiological, social, and survey-based analysis—however, most studies cover larger cohorts from tertiary medical centers. In the present study, we assessed the outcome of non-vaccinated COVID 19 patients in a remote setting for 20 months from January 1, 2020, to August 30, 2021, at CHI Mercy Health in Roseburg, Oregon. We also included two vaccinated patients from September 2021 to add to the power of our cohort. The study will provide a comprehensive methodology and deep insight into multi-dimensional data in the unvaccinated group, translational biomarkers of mortality, and state-of-art to conduct such studies in various remote hospitals.

Introduction

The disease caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), known as coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), has been classified as a pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) by February 2020. As of today, over ~28.7 million cases have been reported worldwide, with more than ~5.1 million deaths[1]. The effects of the pandemic have been incredibly profound in the unvaccinated group, and a majority of them are destined to comprise the high-risk group of patients[2]. The likelihood of their increased severity is induced by but not limited to advanced age, underlying comorbidities,

54 and compromised immune status. The aforementioned comorbidities can have similar
55 gravitas of disease impact in the vaccinated group; however, the mortality rate is much
56 lower than earlier. One of the proposed mechanisms for increased severity is endothelial
57 dysfunction, most commonly seen in these chronic illnesses and is exacerbated in COVID-
58 19 infection. It is associated with increased complications such as Acute respiratory distress
59 syndrome (ARDS), coagulation imbalance, cytokine storm, and multiorgan failure[3]. It
60 remains elusive if there is a host hyperimmune reaction or host immune dysfunction when
61 infected with SARS-CoV-2, resulting in multi-organ dysfunction. Cytokine storm-related
62 to COVID-19 is associated with poor outcomes. Various cytokine levels such as
63 interleukin-1β, interleukin-6, TNF, and many more are noted to be elevated. It is unclear if
64 the cytokine storm drives COVID-19 infection or is a secondary process.[4]
65 As discussed earlier, a plethora of studies have indicated a relatively high risk of severe
66 COVID-19 in the unvaccinated group of patients[4]; however, the studies have failed to
67 capture its impact in remote locations and corresponding medical centers with low
68 vaccination rates, which favors the rapid spread of the virus, posing a health risk for all the
69 individuals within the community. Further, most studies in this area have been either
70 behavioral or observational rather than clinical and retrospective to explain the conditions
71 and microenvironment due to remote location challenges. Additionally, previous
72 publications of outcomes for the unvaccinated cohort repeatedly demonstrated relatively
73 high mortality for the subgroup of patients without vaccination.
74 Given the general paucity of information regarding factors associated with severe COVID-
75 19 in patients without vaccination, relatively high-level information regarding the
76 outcomes of patients in remote settings would be of high interest to the community of
77 remote medical centers in guiding management decisions. In this vein, we have decided to
78 conduct this unique study by performing a descriptive meta-analysis in a remote hospital
79 situated in Roseburg, Oregon. The primary purpose of the current research is to develop a
80 formal statistical model to compare the independent associations of any differences in

descriptive and clinical data with fatal COVID-19 outcomes stratified based on the vaccination status. Having such a study conducted in a remote setting hospital will be a beacon of hope for other similar studies and observations in other remote hospitals within the United States and around the world.

To achieve this, we have developed a mathematical model to identify the severity and predictors of mortality in unvaccinated COVID-19 patients trading off clinical variables such mechanical ventilation duration, severe illness requiring admission to a hospital, requirement of ICU level of care, and laboratory values. The primary focus was to build independent associations of outcome/mortality with state of disease, line of therapy received, and recent use of immunosuppressant therapy.

Background

Most studies on COVID-19 so far have focused on urban centers resulting in a paucity of data on how the current pandemic has affected the rural population and medical centers in the US and across. More diverse studies pertaining to localized information in remote hospitals are needed for COVID-19 infection related to biomarkers, treatments/management, and interventions and their outcomes. To captivate that, we have conducted a study at CHI Mercy Health, a private, not-for-profit 174-bed rural medical center located in Roseburg, Oregon. It has a population of 23,479, of which 22.3% are persons of age 65 and over. About 12.7% of the population live in poverty, with 22.9% on Medicaid and 14.1% on Medicare. The socio-economic conundrum made the COVID-19 impact worse in the area owing to various factors like lack of infrastructure, early treatment unavailability, and failure in convincing local people to get vaccinated. As of October 29th, 2021, the state epidemiological data suggested that only 49% of Douglas county's population has been vaccinated. Low rate of vaccination added a lot more to the emotional, social, and personalized health burden on the medical fraternity by in-patient

hospitalization flow due to low vaccination rate, which led the resources under severe strain[5]. Various studies also looked into the retrospective data to understand the clinical and social biomarkers to educate the community regarding better planning and management of the disease. Various published studies have helped build models based on identifying risk factors to predict severity and mortality and assist the hospitals in better preparing for the COVID-19 surge. Thus, the proposed study intended to review the medical records of deceased COVID-19 patients in our medical center to understand the disease progression during their respective hospital courses. The analysis of various variables, including demographics, medical comorbidities, clinical data, medical treatments, and their effects on each other, is expected to elucidate the COVID-19 disease, predict severity and understand the mortality trend. It is critical to conduct such a study especially in the remote setting hospital, to obtain the pattern despite complex patient heterogeneity. For example, as per **(Supplementary Table S1)**, patient #24 is an unvaccinated female in 70s with a history of hypertension, was found to be hypoxemic at 89%, requiring 15 lpm of supplemental O2. She had severe COVID-19 with imaging findings consistent with bilateral infiltrates, laboratory values confirming lymphopenia, elevated LDH, and D-dimer requiring prolonged ICU course and mechanical ventilation. She was treated with remdesivir, steroids, paralytics, and antibiotics for bacterial pneumonia. Her course was complicated with pulmonary embolism, ARDS and renal dysfunction. She underwent tracheostomy but eventually was transitioned to comfort care. Another patient #35 is a female in mid 60s with a history of a liver transplant, obesity, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, chronic kidney disease who presented with SpO2 of 82% on room air. She had a prolonged length of stay complicated with mechanical ventilation, ARDS, pulmonary embolism, shock, and fungal pneumonia, eventually transitioned to comfort care. She was appropriately treated with steroids, remdesivir, anticoagulation, antibiotics, proning, paralytics, and antifungals. Her imaging showed moderate bilateral infiltrates, and labs revealed elevated LDH and lymphopenia. The above examples of

unvaccinated and vaccinated patients (one each) show the complexity in the patient presented in terms of their comorbidities and age. It is essential to associate the vaccination status with other parameters to identify the predictors of mortality that can explain the vaccination as a multivariate model. For example, closely looking into our cohort, including the above two patients, obesity reveals as one of the critical comorbidities in COVID 19 patients. This has also been reported in many other studies, including a CDC report which suggests that approximately 40% of US adults are obese. Similarly, some demographic data have suggested that the risk of severity, intensive care admission, and mortality increases with higher BMI[9]. Seeing this pattern, we identified inflammation markers (detailed discussion in the results section) as critical predictors of mortality more precisely in the unvaccinated group. One such critical marker is D-dimer, one of the fragments produced during the degradation of blood clots and is known to be elevated in patients with moderate to severe COVID-19. The elevation of D-dimer values correlates with disease severity and is attributed to be a prognostic marker for inpatient mortality[6]. Similarly, another clinical marker that can be critical predicting poor outcomes is lymphopenia. It is associated with severe COVID-19 pneumonia and higher mortality. The mechanism of lymphopenia in COVID-19 pneumonia remains obscured. There are hypotheses such as lymphocyte sequestration in lungs, gastrointestinal tract, and lymphoid tissues versus ACE receptors on lymphocytes being a direct target of SARS-CoV-2 versus Cytokine storm further reducing the lymphocyte count [7–10].

Despite the plethora of research another critical aspect that remains warranted and requires more accumulation of clinical findings is the need for supplemental oxygenation in COVID-19 patients; higher the need for supplemental oxygen, the higher the risk for severe COVID-19 and death. This will guide the initial placement of the patient appropriately among intensive care unit, step down unit/progressive care unit, medical floors and monitor them closely for decompensation[10].

Looking through the clinical and observational parameters in deceased unvaccinated and vaccinated COVID-19 patients, it appears that point several common factors point toward the worst outcomes. These subgroups of patients presented with hypoxemia on arrival had elevated inflammatory markers, lymphopenia, bilateral lung involvement, required mechanical ventilation, and had a prolonged hospital stay. These patients often developed complications such as ARDS, multi-organ dysfunction, superimposed infections, pulmonary embolism, pneumothorax, and pneumomediastinum during their hospital stay, eventually leading to the same outcome of death.

One concluding factor that can have both logistic and clinical impact in remote settings, hospitals, and low-income areas is the length of stay (LOS). Various serological studies (including our cohort) suggested that severe COVID-19 patients develop acute respiratory distress and multi-system organ failure and are associated with poor prognosis and higher mortality. They have associated the severity with the length of ICU stay and hospitalization [11–13]. For instance, Li et al [14] suggested that based on severity defined through inflammatory markers, the length of hospitalization stay was ten days (IQR median) in all the patients, 12.5 days in severe disease (including critically ill), nine days in mild to moderate disease. This is also reciprocated in our cohort, where the length of hospitalization is 11.0 days in the vaccinated group and 13.5 days in the unvaccinated group. Thus, the correlation of LOS with other critical markers will barter as a prognostic evaluation model for critically ill patients in remote settings.

The above mentioned explains the prognostic and clinical presentation of these biomarkers. To summarize, our retrospective analysis aims to provide a bird' eye view of uniqueness and possible disparity, if any, in a rural community-based hospital. The outcomes may help the medical community in rural areas assess, stratify, and closely observe high-risk patients and prevent untimely death.

Materials and Methods:

Statistical Analysis Plan

The primary model will be a logistic regression with the outcome variable being the composite endpoint of severe COVID-19. Multiple imputations will be performed on missing variables. For the secondary analysis of mortality, logistic regression based on 30-day mortality will be served. The goodness of fit of the models will be assessed by Harrell's C-statistic with a 95% confidence interval determined by the method of DeLong. Variance inflation factors will be computed for every predictor in the model. We plan to conduct sensitivity analyses restricting the primary research to patients with primary composite endpoint, omitting one component of the severe COVID-19 composite endpoint (severe illness requiring hospitalization). The exact process for the preceding model will be conducted for the sensitivity analyses. All analyses will be performed using R v3.6.3, packages "rms", "Hmisc", "rpart", and "train."

Data Collection:

All of the variables requested for this analysis are either directly coded by the medical records group at Mercy Medical Center, Roseburg, or further investigators derived variables utilized in the course of analysis. Thus, obtaining the information necessary to complete this proposal should be feasible; however, due to hospital data guidelines, the data will only be available upon request after signing the Data Transfer Agreement (DTA).

Regarding the modeling exercise, the size of the cohort and rates of outcomes allowed us to complete the analysis as proposed. As of August 31, 2021, there were 38 patients with confirmed vaccination status, 5 of whom met the composite endpoint of severe COVID-19 in the vaccinated group. The model for our primary analysis involves a total of 36 degrees of freedom: age (1), sex (1), lab data performance status category (2, ordinal variable with 3 levels: 0, 1, 2 or greater), smoking status (1, binary variable, current/former or never), state of disease (2, a categorical variable with 3 levels: date of the first admission,....), line

212 of therapy received (2, categorical variable with 3 categories: untreated, first line, second
213 line), phase of therapy (2, categorical variable with three categories: induction,
214 consolidation, maintenance), and recent receipt of cytotoxic therapy (1, binary variable).
215 Therefore, the number of events is sufficient to power this analysis, assuming 26 events
216 per degree of freedom. Additional patient characteristics are demonstrated in **Table 1** and
217 **Table 2**.

218 **Sensitivity analyses**

219 Analyses were performed in R version 4.0.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
220 Vienna, Austria), including the Hmisc, rms, ordinalNet, UpSetR, mice, extension
221 packages.

222 **Missing data Imputation:**

223 As shown in **(Supplementary Table S1),** we had missing values for several clinical
224 variables such as D-Dimer (0-0.52 ng/l), Lymphocyte count (%), etc. Given the small
225 sample size of the study, we have an imputation algorithm to predict the missing values;
226 we have used the R package "mice" and "VIM" to visualize and predict the missing values.
227 We have used the k-NN algorithm with k=6 (Square root of the total number of patients)
228 to determine accuracy. We have identified only two patients with different predicted values
229 of D-dimer and Lymphocyte count. We have used values predicted through "mice" as final
230 values for the classification to identify the predictors of mortality. We have used m=5,
231 maxit=50, meth='pmm', seed=500 to calculate the missing value in mice function. As
232 shown in (**Figure S2(a)),** we have missing values in several variables, and (**Figure S2(b))**
233 shows post imputation; we didn't have any variables. The list of complete data is listed in
234 **(Supplementary Table S2).**

235 **Power calculation**

The sample size of 38 patients (32 Vaccinated, 5 Unvaccinated, 1 Unknown) accrued as of August 2021 yields 80% power at an alpha of 0.05 to detect a hazard ratio of 0.01 for severe COVID-19, assuming two unequally matched groups.

Classification and Predictors of mortality

Vaccinated, unvaccinated, and undetermined groups were used to build a model and identify the variables critical to the non-vaccinated group. We used "caTools'" and "randomForest" R package to classify and preprocess the data. Our model was trained using 75 % of the patients and tested using 25%. To split the data, we used the caTools split function. We have used mtry=6 and No of tress= 501 to train the model. Gini Score has been used to determine the 15 top variables.

Logistic Regression

Using the R packages "epitools" and "gtsummary," **Table 1**, **Table 2**, and **Table S1** are generated to show patient demographics and a logistic regression equation to evaluate the variables contributing to mortality assess unvaccinated patients.

Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI)

We calculated the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) with the following assumptions, firstly for age < 50 we assigned score of 0, age >= 50 (1), age < 60 ~ 1, age < 70 ~ 2, age < 80 ~ 3, age >= 80 ~ 4. Similarly, for autoimmune, obesity, CHF, HTN, ASCVD, COPD, asthma, ILD, OSA, the availability of events was scored “1” else “0”. For CKD, past cancer, transplant availability of event was score “2” else “0”. Further, for Active cancer availability of event was scored “6” else “0”, followed by DM where availability of event was scored “3” else “0”. We used the r package “comorbidity” to calculate CCI and “ggplot2” to plot CCI.

Results

In the context of remote hospitals, patients and potential outcomes were distributed in a manner that led to some of the most critical outcomes for COVID 19. The patient characteristics are outlined in **(Figure 2)**. **Table 2** depicts the distribution of patients in our medical center. **(Figure 2)** illustrates how we categorized 71 collected clinical observations and potential biomarkers across eight broad categories. As indicated by **(Figure 2)**, one of the strengths of our data is the prevalence of heterogeneity, such as marital status*, BMI, and smoking status*. Furthermore, as stated earlier, most of our patients are not vaccinated. Numerous studies have suggested that lifestyle and social factors (marital status, smoking)* impact outcomes [15] [16]. Similarly, smoking and passive smoking during the lockdown also negatively impacted children, as well as adults and family members[17]. We had 15 former and two current smokers in our cohort and 23 patients with higher BMIs (>30). In COVID-19 patients[18] both factors have been associated with the worst outcome. Additionally, chronic diseases such as cancer, autoimmune diseases, cardiovascular disorders, asthma, and hypertension contribute towards the worst outcome in COVID 19 infected patients who were unvaccinated[19]. Also, the cohort is sufficiently extensive to explain the associated complications that may be causing the worst outcome in COVID 19 unvaccinated patients. According to **Figure 2**, we have collected laboratory findings such as CRP, D-Dimer, Lymphocyte, CT-based severity, SpO2 on arrival, treatments, and complications. The selection will allow us to explain the role of biomarkers converges to predictors of mortality and aid the treating physician in opting for further treatment. In light of the factors presented in **(Figure 2)**, the following are significant conclusions we derived from the current study.

* Smoking status, Marital status, Age, Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Weight, Height is subject to IRB approval and available for peer review only. The * sign only denoted at the first occurrence of variable, however, the data availability conditions remain the same for earlier mentioned variables.

Patient Distribution:

Our cohort consisted of 38 records. There were no exclusion criteria applied, resulting in 38 records being included in the primary analysis **(Supplement Table 1)**. The median age of the included cohort was 75.5 years (interquartile range: 44 to 95 years) *, and the majority, 57.89% (n=22), were male, and 42.1 % (n=16) were female*. Non-Hispanic whites accounted for half the cohort, while non-Hispanic blacks* accounted for 2.63% (n=1). 81.57% (n=31) of the patients were without any vaccinations. These are similar proportions to the patients without vaccination, 10.52% (n=4) were treated within first three months, and 89.47% (n=34) were not treated within first three months of data collection. Over 47.36% (n=18) of the cohort had severe bilateral lung involvement based on imaging, and over 52.63% (n=20) required mechanical ventilation. 92.1% (n=35) received remdesivir; 94.73% (n=37) received steroids and 13.15% (n=5) received tocilizumab. A total of 81.57% (n=31) of the patients were unvaccinated. **Tables 1** and **2** provide additional information regarding the patient.

Patient outcomes

The data collected over the span of two weeks from a remote hospital setting led to critical observations. We calculated interquartile range (IQR) median values for the variables. Thus, all discussion further will be IQR median. As demonstrated in **(Table 1)** in 38 patients, the median age is 76. It is essential to note that our population of patients is distributed as follows: Unvaccinated: 31 (82%), Unknown and Vaccinated are 2 (5.3%) and 5 (13%), respectively. We further looked into some of the critical COVID 19 associated variables in the non-vaccinated group to compare all-cause mortality among

308 severe COVID 19 patients treated at Mercy Medical Center, Roseburg, Oregon**.** There have
309 been various criteria to define the severity of illness; however, as discussed in recently [20–
310 23] published articles following clinical parameters have higher predictive value in
311 hospitalized and unvaccinated COVID 19 patients. a) Respiratory distress, Respiratory
312 rate > 30/min b) Mean O2 saturation ≤93% in the resting state c) partial pressure of oxygen
313 in arterial blood (PaO2)/oxygen concentration (FiO2) ≤300 mmHg d) lung involvement on
314 imaging >50% within 24–48 h e) The critical value of initial D-Dimer, peak D-Dimer,
315 initial NLR (neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio) and peak NLR in prognosticating of intubation
316 was 0.73 mg/L, 12.75 mg/L,7.28 and 27.55 f) lymphocytopenia g) duration of admission
317 post-infection.

318 ***Lymphocyte count and D-Dimer in conjunction with other clinical characteristics may***
319 ***influence the outcome of unvaccinated COVID 19 patients in remote areas***

320 Earlier, we talked about how the more extensive cohort study analysis can facilitate the
321 potential biomarkers for the worst outcome in COVID 19. **Figure 1** illustrates how BMI,
322 vaccination status, and gender are distributed and suggests that age, gender, and body mass
323 index (BMI) may impact the immune response to vaccines[24]. Furthermore, the
324 epidemiological studies within the state of Oregon demonstrate that 30% of the adults in
325 Douglas County are obese, which is significantly higher than the state average of 27%,
326 despite the county having an average age of 38.7 years[25]. According to the County Vaccine
327 Tracker, as of 19th November 2021, the vaccination rate stands at 55.3%, and the risk level
328 is extremely high. To account for this, we examined our cohort's age, gender, BMI, and
329 vaccination status **(Figure 1)**. As shown in **(Figure 1)**, BMI is relatively higher in
330 unvaccinated male patients. For the sake of simplicity in the study, we avoided conclusions
331 for the unknown vaccinated group due to their singleton number. The male gender was also
332 associated with higher mortality in earlier studies[26]. Therefore, we can correlate our

333 indicators and predictors of mortality with larger-scale studies despite the small cohort size.
334 Once we established the social parameters in the earlier section and their role in the
335 outcome, we also looked into all the clinical variables to identify the predictors of mortality
336 to differentiate the vaccinated and unvaccinated patient groups. As discussed and explained
337 in the methods, we used binary classification (vaccinated, unvaccinated) using Random
338 Forest (RF) machine learning method to classify the groups. Further, we used *Gini Score* to
339 rank the clinical variables. The ranked list (Top 15) of clinical variables that differentiate
340 groups in all patients with the worst outcome is depicted in **Figure 3(a).**

341 Further, due to our small sample size, we also looked into the conservative approach of
342 identifying the correlation between different variables and extracting the significant
343 variables that may have contributed to mortality **Figure 3(c and b)**. As demonstrated
344 in **Figure 3 (a)**, SpO2 (on arrival), CRP level, lymphocyte count, BMI and associated
345 markers (age, weight), length of hospitalization, D-dimer, and paO2 (mm/hg) are expected
346 to be predictors of mortality in unvaccinated patients. For a closer look at these variables,
347 the correlation plot illustrates the correlation between them. As shown in **Figure 3 (b),** age,
348 BMI, and lymphocyte count have a negative correlation of outcome, and it has been
349 established that lymphocyte count, B cells, NK cells, cytotoxic and helper T cells are
350 reduced in severe COVID 19 patients[27].

351 The severity signifies the inverse relationship and elucidates the severity of SARS-COV2
352 in our cohort. Further, weight (kilograms), BMI, and CRP levels also negatively correlate
353 with the outcome for the number of visits prior to final admission. As shown in **Figure 3**
354 **(a)**, these markers are elucidated as critical predictors of mortality, and a higher number of
355 visits prior to admission can correlate with delay in treatment and response. Studies have
356 shown that weight (kilograms), BMI, and CRP levels are predictors of mortality in severe
357 COVID 19 cases. It has been documented that severe COVID 19 is associated with higher
358 inflammatory mediators due to cytokine storms. These markers may allow early

359 identification or even prediction of disease progression and define admission priority[28.]
360 CRP is also known as an active regulator for innate immunity and predictor for mechanical
361 ventilation. According to the positive correlation between CRP and D-dimer values, both
362 of these values are likely to be elevated during the early stages of COVID 19 infection due
363 to systemic inflammation[29,30]. Both these values have a proportional relationship with the
364 severity of the disease. As discussed earlier, similar to CRP, elevated D-dimer at the time
365 of admission could be an indicator of severe COVID 19 infection requiring ICU
366 admission[31] as shown in **Figure S3 (b).** All our patients had elevated D-dimer during
367 treatment compared to the vaccinated group (actual and predicted) displayed in **Figure**
368 **2** and **Table 1.** Further, D-dimer levels on hospital admission have been identified as being
369 associated with increased mortality, and a positive correlation of CRP and D-dimer is also
370 associated with cardiac arrest and coronary heart disease. As we can see in **Figure**
371 **2, Table 1**, **and Table 2**, we had a higher number of unvaccinated patients with a high
372 prevalence of cardiac arrest.

373 The elevation of CRP and D-dimer also increases the probability of complications such as
374 pulmonary embolism, acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), and superimposed
375 bacterial pneumonia[32]. **(Figure 2)** and **Table 2**, indicates that many unvaccinated patients
376 from our small cohort had these complications. Hence, it is established that endothelial
377 damage caused by inflammation leads to increased severity of COVID 19 in our patient
378 cohort. The systemic understanding and function are discussed below in the discussion
379 section. However, even with the remote setting, the systemic track of CRP level, D-dimer,
380 and lymphocyte count can allow the physician to plan for early hospitalization and
381 mechanical ventilation. The overall association of correlations among a few clinical
382 variables that may not be statistically significant due to the small sample size is also
383 depicted in **Figure 3 (C).** As such, **in Figure 3(B),** SpO2 (on arrival) has a strong negative
384 correlation of outcome with the number of visits prior to final admission and length of

385 hospitalization (days). Precisely, oxygen saturation (SpO2) values of less than 90% on
386 admission have been identified as the predictor of mortality in COVID 19 patients. Another
387 strong correlation was seen between PaO2/FiO2 & SpO2/FiO2. Even though not evident
388 based on the correlation plot as shown in **Figure 3(a)**, both are critical variables to
389 differentiate vaccinated and unvaccinated groups in our machine learning model. The
390 significance proves that PaO2/FiO2 is a strong predictor of mortality, as shown in **Figure**
391 **3(c)**. Even though values are not statically significant, PaO2 and SpO2 positively correlate
392 with the number of visits prior to final admission. We did not see any solid indicators for
393 the length of hospitalization, SpO2, and PaO2 despite being critical predictors of mortality
394 in COVID 19 patients[33]. However, these two factors can be one of the mediatory factors in
395 the putative connection between the length of hospitalization, number of visits prior to final
396 admission. Hence, we elucidate that despite limited resources, many such studies can be
397 conducted in remote centers to understand the location-agnostic prognostic tool of COVID
398 19 management and treatment, such as hospitalization based on vaccination status and
399 other treatment options.

400 ***Age and other metabolic features contributed highly to mortality along with***
401 ***inflammatory markers***

402 We calculated the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI)[34] to identify the pattern of mortality
403 and contributing factors that may be causing the higher levels of inflammation. According
404 to **(Figure S5)**, the distribution of CCI across all comorbidities in our cohort clearly
405 illustrates that most patients fall into the high-risk group with higher age, BMI, and obesity.
406 Additionally, hypertension and diabetes are prevalent, indicates that metabolic pathways
407 played a significant role in mortality. Numerous studies have suggested that patients with
408 COVID 19 have higher levels of cytokine storms due to cardiometabolic disease[35 36]. The
409 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) contends that Douglas county is at
410 greater risk for COVID 19 due to its average age, diabetes, and high body mass index

411 (BMI). Additionally, we examined individual CCI for each patient, as shown in **(Figure**
412 **S6)**. Keeping the CCI score zero as a baseline, it is evident that any score in the range of
413 three is prognostically indicative of death or poor outcome in COVID 19 patients. An
414 increase of one point above this will result in an increase of 16% in mortality. **(Figure s6)**
415 depicts that most of our patients had CCI > 3, which indicates that most of these patients
416 were considered high risk. M2 and M16 with higher CCI were unvaccinated, while M36
417 with the lowest CCI was vaccinated. Even the lowest CCI patient was >3, meaning that
418 this patient was in a higher-risk group with obvious signs on imaging and hypoxemia on
419 presentation (SpO2 of 80% on room air).

420 **Discussion**

421 COVID 19 poses unique risks to patients without vaccination. This study examined the
422 characteristics and clinical outcomes of a small cohort of COVID 19 unvaccinated and
423 vaccinated patients in a remote hospital in Roseburg, OR, USA. Unvaccinated Non-
424 Hispanic/ White-male patients represented the majority of all COVID 19 positive patients
425 who could not survive post-treatment or hospitalization. Patients had a higher prevalence
426 of obesity, hypertension, diabetes at baseline. A higher percentage of unvaccinated patients
427 presented with elevated inflammatory markers levels than unknown and vaccinated
428 patients. Most of the patients who received critical care or mechanical ventilation were
429 unvaccinated and obese. The white race, higher median age, a higher score on the Charlson
430 Comorbidity Index, public insurance (Medicare or Medicaid), resident in a low-income
431 area, remote location of the hospital, limited healthcare resources, higher inflammatory
432 markers, and obesity were associated with increased odds of hospital admission **(Table 2)**.
433 Whites (Male) were overrepresented among all patients who died in the hospital (78.6%).
434 The current trends in Douglas county[1] being catalogued as a high-risk zone insinuate that
435 lower vaccination rates and comorbidities prevalent in the area are expected to be the
436 prognostic predictors of mortality. The remote settings also have their challenges (see next

437 section) and other social influences indicated by CDC, such as a higher rate of vaccine
438 hesitancy and dependence on public insurance. This outcome is in line with earlier
439 published studies with similar results[37,38]. Hypoxemic respiratory failure, acute respiratory
440 distress syndrome, superimposed pneumonia, renal dysfunction, and shock were the most
441 commonly identified complications during hospitalization. Relevant laboratory
442 abnormalities included lymphopenia, elevated levels of D-dimer, and other markers of
443 inflammation.

444 As described in the results **Figure 3(b)**, CRP, D-dimer, lymphocyte count, BMI, and
445 PaO2/FiO2 ratio are the key predictors of hospitalization and mortality. In addition, our
446 results revealed that respiratory deterioration-associated biomarkers (PaO2/FiO2 and SpO2
447 on arrival) have a higher predictive capability of mortality.

448 We have conducted a single-center and remotely located hospital's retrospective cohort
449 analysis of deceased COVID 19 patients. We started teasing out the data from an
450 observational perspective, as displayed in **(Table 1).** We have used median (IQR) to
451 generate all the summaries and confidence intervals during analysis[39 40]. A higher wait time
452 for care among low-income patients may also result from the severity of their clinical
453 presentation with multiple ER/urgent care visits before hospitalization. Several factors may
454 contribute towards the occurrence of COVID 19 in our study population, including
455 remoteness, disparities in vaccination coverage, and other factors, suggesting that death in
456 our population are likely multifactorial. In addition, the lower-income level, hesitation
457 regarding vaccinations, and lack of access to upgraded medical facilities may have
458 adversely affected their admission time.

459 According to the Oregon State Public Health Department[2], Douglas county hospitals are
460 still stretched thin in providing care to COVID 19 patients; most are unvaccinated. In
461 addition, the hospital continuously faced staff and bed shortages causing the grinning

462 effect. The report also indicated that obesity, diabetes, and hypertension were more
463 prevalent in low-income and lower education counties, irrespective of race.

464 Our cohort found that elevated levels of CRP and D-dimer correlated with disease severity.
465 It is established that COVID 19 is associated with a high incidence of thrombotic
466 complications due to the unique interplay between the SARS-COV2 virus and endothelial
467 cells. The D-dimer molecule is a product of the degradation of the fibrin protein after lysis
468 by the thrombin, plasmin, and factor XIIIa enzymes. This method can also be used in
469 clinical evaluation to identify ongoing coagulation. A higher CRP level induces endothelial
470 dysfunction as well.

471 This study confirms previously described clinical presentations, laboratory findings, and
472 outcomes of COVID 19–related hospital admissions. The observed differences in the
473 clinical presentation may also reflect differences in underlying chronic conditions on
474 hospital presentation. To explain the relationship of the clinical presentation, we had a non-
475 parametric correlation analysis (**Figure S3(c)**), the positive correlation between the
476 number of days on mechanical ventilation, the number of days in ICU, and the length of
477 hospitalization are unique to our cohort. Symptoms onset prior to arrival and positive tests
478 to hospitalization also have a positive correlation. Our findings suggest that more studies
479 are warranted to assess the response of inflammatory markers in response to this novel
480 coronavirus with respect to low-income status, distance from medical centers, and
481 vaccination status. These and other unrevealed factors may influence the difference in the
482 rate of hospitalization, the timing of patients' admission, the rate of increasing hospital's
483 capacity, and the overall outcome.

484 This study mirrored the findings of similarly conducted studies that showed associations
485 between the risk of in-hospital death, demographic factors (age, BMI), clinical factors (D-
486 dimer, CRP) as well as other biomarkers (as per **Figure 1(a)**). For example, in a meta-

487 analysis of Deng et al., [41] Lodigiani et al.[30] suggested that the lowest to the highest increase
488 in D-dimer was more strongly associated with death than patients with lower D-dimer at
489 baseline. In addition, a positive correlation was found between CRP levels and the need for
490 supplemental oxygenation and invasive ventilation. This pattern was also evident in our
491 small cohort. It has been suggested in a number of studies, including Hu et al. [6], and Srikant
492 et al. [42] that CRP, D-dimer, and lymphocyte count can be used as prognostic markers of
493 disease severity for COVID 19 patients.

494 Despite the limited sample size, difficulties in obtaining data, remote infrastructure, and
495 missing data, our statistically valid methods permitted us to conclude that D-Dimer and
496 CRP are prognostic biomarkers in any setting and correlate with the need for mechanical
497 ventilation is excellent. Moreover, this information has also concluded that inflammation-
498 induced cytokine storm is associated with coagulopathy in COVID 19 infected patients.
499 Early rise in D-dimer suggests that coagulopathy acts as a prodrome of cytokine
500 Nonetheless, it was challenging to see any direct effects of treatment, we followed the
501 standard treatment protocols as described in a variety of exciting articles[43] , and our
502 observations can be seen in **(Figure S4)**. In terms of treatment, the mean hospital stay was
503 11.4 (M) and 9.8 (F) days, respectively. Most commonly prescribed medications were
504 dexamethasone (n=37), remdesivir (n=35), enoxaparin/UFH (n=35) and tocilizumab (n=5).
505 As indicated in **(Figure S4)**, 20 patients required mechanical ventilation, 27 required non-
506 invasive ventilation, and 26 required high-flow oxygen through nasal cannulas. According
507 to our data in **Table 1** and **Table 2**, most of our patients had complex comorbidities **(Figure**
508 **S5),** with medications and interventions showing minimal impacts. Many studies have
509 reported that low-risk patients with mild COVID 19 infection, stratified based on D-Dimer
510 and CRP levels, can be managed symptomatically without any specific drug intervention.
511 Consequently, these markers can also monitor progression in extremely critical care
512 patients. Thus, our biomarkers can also be utilized by the community to a) determine an

513 individual's i) develop a treatment plan, (ii) determine the need for hospitalization, and (iii)
514 eligibility for mechanical ventilation.

515 Although this study was able to identify critical biomarkers for severe COVID 19 patients,
516 it also has some limitations. This being a retrospective analysis, the findings are primarily
517 used in generating hypotheses, not necessarily in clinical practice. Furthermore, as a
518 registry analysis, there is an inherent bias in the patient selection determined by registry
519 entrant decided based on pre-defined criteria such as outcome in our case. Consequently,
520 the study population likely has a higher COVID 19 severity than the general population of
521 cancer patients with COVID 19. Additionally, as discussed above, this study included a
522 more significant proportion of unvaccinated patients than other analyses, and this may have
523 led to improved generalizability reflecting the impact of COVID 19 in remote settings.
524 However, to maximize sample size, a small number of vaccinated patients were added to
525 the cohort, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, there are significant
526 differences between the timing of COVID 19 diagnosis in this study and the epidemiology
527 of the pandemic in the general population, with an overrepresentation of diagnoses in the
528 early part of the pandemic period. In all likelihood, this study does not include patients
529 with delta-variant since it includes data up until the third trimester of 2021. In light of the
530 ordinal outcome of COVID 19 severity, including metrics such as hospitalization and ICU
531 admission, patients without vaccination may have an advantage in being admitted to higher
532 levels of care instead of their intrinsic clinical presentation.

533 It was observed in our study cohort, patients with severe hypoxemic respiratory failure
534 reported increased length of stay prior to the need for mechanical ventilation. While this
535 may not explain all the parameters linked to increased COVID 19 severity, it may
536 contribute to some findings. Furthermore, our study is the largest to date for unvaccinated
537 patients in remote settings and uses machine learning to demonstrate that inflammation
538 affects COVID 19 severity, the sample size was insufficient to determine the independent

539 effects of specific treatments. Future efforts should be aimed at performing such analyses.
540 Unfortunately, some laboratory investigations were not conducted on all patients. The role
541 of these factors in the clinical presentation of the study population may not have been
542 sufficiently considered.

543 Based on the results of this analysis, it is concluded that patients without vaccination in
544 remote settings have a relatively increased risk of developing severe COVID 19. This risk
545 is further increased in conjunction with other clinical factors. It is essential to consider the
546 individual patient scenario in the context of community infectivity, hospital resources,
547 patient's baseline characteristics, and disease response with prognosis. The health care
548 needs of this population remain high, and they require improved primary prevention with
549 therapeutic strategies.

550 Notwithstanding these limitations, this study provides comparative epidemiological
551 characteristics of unvaccinated patients in remote setting hospitals who are
552 underrepresented in the COVID 19 medical literature to date. The study is also intended to
553 shed light on differences in clinical presentation in such remote hospital settings.

554 **Limitations in remote setting hospital for health care delivery**

555 In the wake of COVID 19, healthcare workers felt the brunt of it. Often this impact is
556 multidimensional, encompassing factors like work management, mental health, and social
557 needs. Another factor contributing to the prevalence of these issues is the disparity between
558 medical centers in urban and rural areas. For example, the pandemic had twice the mortality
559 rate in remote centers than in urban centers[44]. In addition, a large number of rural centers
560 were dealing with shortages of physicians and limited access to vital lifesaving equipment,
561 including non-invasive ventilators, ventilators, dialysis machines, and medications that are
562 required in large quantities to treat moderate to severe COVID 19 infections.

563 One more Gordian knot was the scarcity of nurses, respiratory therapists, and medical
564 residents necessary to ensure adequate coverage within the already overwhelmed intensive
565 care units (ICUs) and uninterrupted overflow into the COVID units. Through this uniquely
566 positioned scenario, some of the most pressing issues during the pandemic were
567 highlighted, and respondents were asked to display resilience during overworking
568 conditions worsening their physical and mental turmoil. In part due to hospitals having an
569 uneven distribution of resources, transportation of patients needing higher levels of care,
570 such as the trial of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), was further hampered
571 and prolonged. Moreover, tertiary centers participated in the COVID 19 experimental
572 treatments in a rapidly evolving protocol environment. As a result, several new medications
573 were made available, and FDA compassionate release was granted for their patients. On
574 the other hand, the remote hospitals had limited access to resources and were more
575 vulnerable. Among such scenarios is outpatient monoclonal antibody treatment availability
576 in rural settings with limited infrastructure to potentially reduce the severity of the COVID
577 19 infection set up late in the pandemic.

578 Even with these obstacles, the hospital administration endeavors to provide up-to-date
579 health care for their community members. In addition, the advent of telemedicine has
580 enabled urban and rural areas to stay closely connected during this pandemic period.
581 However, the fact remains that many possibilities remain unexplored and yet to be
582 implemented to continue catering quality medical care throughout the country.

583 **Imputation Impact:**

584 We imputed clinical variables with a K-NN algorithm to fix the missing data issue;
585 although theoretically, it was more sensitive and specific, the actual values could be
586 different based on clinical representation, treatment, and other prognostic variables.

587

588 **Figure Legends**

589 **Figure 1:** The overall distribution of patients according to their vaccination status. Based
590 on age distribution and BMI, Pearson's correlation was calculated.

591 **Figure 2:** The flow chart indicates all the clinical variables collected and their distribution
592 based on demography, treatment, complications, laboratory findings, and end of life
593 distribution.

594 **Figure 3:** (a) Shows top 15 clinical variables based on random forest classification Gini
595 score. (b) indicated the correlation between the top 15 clinical variables. The cross shows
596 the non-significance based on p-value < 0.01. (c) defines the correlation among the top 15
597 clinical variables without indicating p-value significance. It shows that the correlation and
598 p-value can be omitted due to the non-heterogeneous small sample size.

599 **Table 1:** The clinical characteristics of the COVID-19 patients during the 20-month period,
600 based on the mean (IQR)

601 **Table 2:** The clinical characteristics of the COVID-19 patients were stratified by
602 vaccination status (vaccinated, unvaccinated, and unknown) over the 20 months, based on
603 the mean (IQR). The Kruskal-Wallis rank-sum test determined the significance of
604 distribution, Fisher's exact test.

605

606

607

608

609

610 **Supplementary File Details**

611 **Figure S1:** Distribution of patients based on age, height, weight, and BMI.

612 **Figure S2:** Missing values in clinical variables and imputation of missing values.

613 **Figure S3:** (a)Distribution of patients for vaccination status for Length of stay, patient's
614 RT PCR position day and hospitalization, and the total number of visits prior to
615 hospitalization (b)Distribution of patients for vaccination status for inflammatory markers
616 such as D-Dimer, CRP, lymphocyte and SpO2, and paO2. (c) The Pearson's correlation of
617 all the clinical variables in the study, the significance can be determined based on P-value
618 <0.05.

619 **Figure S4:** Treatment and interventions for all the patients in the cohort distributed based
620 on medications and interventions.

621 **Figure S5:** The Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) distribution for each comorbidity for
622 all the patients.

623 **Figure S6:** Each patient's Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) distribution.

624 **Table S1:** Logistic regression to classify the vaccination status.

625 **Declaration of interests**

626 Any of the authors declare no conflict of interest. The authors have no financial interests
627 related to the study.

628 **Data Sharing**

629 The data can be retrieved using the guidelines set forth by Mercy medical center.

630

Contributions

NJ designed the scientific questions, formed the IRB, implemented the clinical conceptualization, identified vital datasets, and contributed to manuscript preparation. KP conceptualized, organized, and contributed to manuscript preparation and analyses results. RS, GK, and AA helped with data collection and manuscript review. Finally, AJ wrote the manuscript and helped analyze the data.

Acknowledgments

The authors are profoundly grateful for dedicating this research to all the patients and their families unfailingly; their generosity and kindness allowed the existence of this study. In addition, the authors would like to thank Jenny Kaylor (Quality Analyst at MMC) for their help with data collection from CHI Mercy Health, Roseburg. Lastly, the authors are eternally thankful to all the healthcare and support staff involved in patient care at CHI Mercy Health, Roseburg, Oregon.

References

1. Mileham, K. F. *et al.* Changes Over Time in COVID-19 Severity and Mortality in Patients Undergoing Cancer Treatment in the United States: Initial Report From the ASCO Registry. *JCO Oncology Practice* OP.21.00394 (2021) doi:10.1200/OP.21.00394.
2. Xu, S. COVID-19 Vaccination and Non–COVID-19 Mortality Risk — Seven Integrated Health Care Organizations, United States, December 14, 2020–July 31, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **70**, (2021).

656 3. Jin, Y. *et al.* Endothelial activation and dysfunction in COVID-19: from basic
657 mechanisms to potential therapeutic approaches. *Sig Transduct Target Ther* **5**,
658 1–13 (2020).
659 4. Mallapaty, S. COVID vaccines cut the risk of transmitting Delta — but not for
660 long. *Nature* (2021) doi:10.1038/d41586-021-02689-y.
661 5. Gohil, S. K. & Huang, S. S. Community COVID-19 Incidence and Health Care
662 Personnel COVID-19 Seroprevalence. *JAMA Network Open* **4**, e211575 (2021).
663 6. Yao, Y. *et al.* D-dimer as a biomarker for disease severity and mortality in
664 COVID-19 patients: a case control study. *Journal of Intensive Care* **8**, 49 (2020).
665 7. Huang, I. & Pranata, R. Lymphopenia in severe coronavirus disease-2019
666 (COVID-19): systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Intensive Care* **8**,
667 36 (2020).
668 8. Lin, L., Lu, L., Cao, W. & Li, T. Hypothesis for potential pathogenesis of
669 SARS-CoV-2 infection-a review of immune changes in patients with viral
670 pneumonia. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **9**, 727–732 (2020).
671 9. Xu, H. *et al.* High expression of ACE2 receptor of 2019-nCoV on the epithelial
672 cells of oral mucosa. *Int J Oral Sci* **12**, 1–5 (2020).
673 10. Tan, L. *et al.* Lymphopenia predicts disease severity of COVID-19: a
674 descriptive and predictive study. *Sig Transduct Target Ther* **5**, 1–3 (2020).
675 11. Taleb, S. *et al.* Predictive Biomarkers of Intensive Care Unit and Mechanical
676 Ventilation Duration in Critically-Ill Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients. *Front*
677 *Med (Lausanne)* **8**, 733657 (2021).
678 12. Pascua, F. V. *et al.* A multi-mechanism approach reduces length of stay in
679 the ICU for severe COVID-19 patients. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0245025 (2021).
680 13. Prognostic Value of Inflammatory Biomarkers in Patients with Severe
681 COVID-19: A Single-Center Retrospective Study - Gönül Açıksarı, Mehmet
682 Koçak, Yasemin Çağ, Lütfiye Nilsun Altunal, Adem Atıcı, Fatma Betül Çelik,

683 Furkan Bölen, Kurtuluş Açıksarı, Mustafa Çalışkan, 2021. https://journals-
684 sagepub-com.stanford.idm.oclc.org/doi/full/10.1177/11772719211027022.
685 14. Xue, G. *et al.* Novel serological biomarkers for inflammation in predicting
686 disease severity in patients with COVID-19. *Int Immunopharmacol* **89**, 107065
687 (2020).
688 15. van Veenendaal, N. *et al.* Six-Month Outcomes in COVID-19 ICU Patients
689 and Their Family Members: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Healthcare (Basel)* **9**,
690 865 (2021).
691 16. Gamberini, L. *et al.* Quality of life of COVID-19 critically ill survivors after
692 ICU discharge: 90 days follow-up. *Quality of Life Research* 1
693 doi:10.1007/s11136-021-02865-7.
694 17. Polverino, F. Cigarette Smoking and COVID-19: A Complex Interaction.
695 *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **202**, 471–472 (2020).
696 18. Rodgers, G. P. & Gibbons, G. H. Obesity and Hypertension in the Time of
697 COVID-19. *JAMA* **324**, 1163–1165 (2020).
698 19. Sanyaolu, A. *et al.* Comorbidity and its Impact on Patients with COVID-19.
699 *SN Compr Clin Med* 1–8 (2020) doi:10.1007/s42399-020-00363-4.
700 20. Lu, C. *et al.* Prognostic value of lymphocyte count in severe COVID-19
701 patients with corticosteroid treatment. *Sig Transduct Target Ther* **6**, 1–3 (2021).
702 21. Thoreau, B. *et al.* D-Dimer Level and Neutrophils Count as Predictive and
703 Prognostic Factors of Pulmonary Embolism in Severe Non-ICU COVID-19
704 Patients. *Viruses* **13**, 758 (2021).
705 22. Song, X. *et al.* Post-anticoagulant D-dimer is a highly prognostic biomarker
706 of COVID-19 mortality. *ERJ Open Research* **7**, (2021).
707 23. Berger, J. S. *et al.* Prevalence and Outcomes of D-Dimer Elevation in
708 Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19. *Arteriosclerosis, Thrombosis, and*
709 *Vascular Biology* **40**, 2539–2547 (2020).

710 24. Pellini, R. *et al.* Initial observations on age, gender, BMI and hypertension in
711 antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 BNT162b2 vaccine. *EClinicalMedicine* **36**,
712 (2021).
713 25. Douglas County Health Department - Health Impact Assessments.
714 https://www.douglascountyhealth.com/staying-healthy/health-impact-
715 assessments.
716 26. Nguyen, N. T. *et al.* Male gender is a predictor of higher mortality in
717 hospitalized adults with COVID-19. *PLoS One* **16**, e0254066 (2021).
718 27. Löhr, P. *et al.* Impact of age and gender on lymphocyte subset counts in
719 patients with COVID-19. *Cytometry Part A* **n/a**,.
720 28. Luan, Y., Yin, C. & Yao, Y. Update Advances on C-Reactive Protein in
721 COVID-19 and Other Viral Infections. *Frontiers in Immunology* **12**, 3153
722 (2021).
723 29. Becher, Y., Goldman, L., Schacham, N., Gringauz, I. & Justo, D. D-dimer
724 and C-reactive Protein Blood Levels Over Time Used to Predict Pulmonary
725 Embolism in Two COVID-19 Patients. *Eur J Case Rep Intern Med* **7**, 001725
726 (2020).
727 30. Valerio, L. *et al.* Course of D-Dimer and C-Reactive Protein Levels in
728 Survivors and Nonsurvivors with COVID-19 Pneumonia: A Retrospective
729 Analysis of 577 Patients. *Thromb Haemost* **121**, 98–101 (2021).
730 31. Hashem, M. K. *et al.* Prognostic biomarkers in COVID-19 infection: value
731 of anemia, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio, and D-
732 dimer. *The Egyptian Journal of Bronchology* **15**, 29 (2021).
733 32. Fuchs-Buder, T. *et al.* Time course of procoagulant activity and D dimer in
734 bronchoalveolar fluid of patients at risk for or with acute respiratory distress
735 syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **153**, 163–167 (1996).
736 33. Tobin, M. J., Jubran, A. & Laghi, F. PaO2/FIO2 ratio: the mismeasure of

737 oxygenation in COVID-19. *European Respiratory Journal* **57**, (2021).
738 34. The impact of charlson comorbidity index on mortality from SARS-CoV-2
739 virus infection and A novel COVID-19 mortality index: CoLACD - Varol - 2021
740 - International Journal of Clinical Practice - Wiley Online Library.
741 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/ijcp.13858?casa_token=l-
742 AgR1cUQl0AAAAA%3A5huIDWcIsMovFYCbdotI-
743 TRO7ZzSZ8rdHJ_tzCxySB6B1tmluQVybvzptvbeaCwA9rLXlBMHlpJE.
744 35. Hehar, J., Todter, E. & Lahiri, S. W. Association of Patient Characteristics,
745 Diabetes, BMI, and Obesity With Severe COVID-19 in Metropolitan Detroit,
746 MI. *Clin Diabetes* cd210065 (2021) doi:10.2337/cd21-0065.
747 36. Dandona, P. & Ghanim, H. Diabetes, Obesity, COVID-19, Insulin, and
748 Other Antidiabetes Drugs. *Diabetes Care* **44**, 1929–1933 (2021).
749 37. Dyer, O. Covid-19: Unvaccinated face 11 times risk of death from delta
750 variant, CDC data show. *BMJ* **374**, n2282 (2021).
751 38. Agrawal, U. *et al.* COVID-19 hospital admissions and deaths after
752 BNT162b2 and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccinations in 2·57 million people in
753 Scotland (EAVE II): a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Respiratory*
754 *Medicine* **0**, (2021).
755 39. Leentjens, J., Haaps, T. F. van, Wessels, P. F., Schutgens, R. E. G. &
756 Middeldorp, S. COVID-19-associated coagulopathy and antithrombotic
757 agents—lessons after 1 year. *The Lancet Haematology* **8**, e524–e533 (2021).
758 40. Hein, T. W. *et al.* Human C-reactive protein induces endothelial dysfunction
759 and uncoupling of eNOS in vivo. *Atherosclerosis* **206**, 61–68 (2009).
760 41. Zeng, F. *et al.* Association of inflammatory markers with the severity of
761 COVID-19: A meta-analysis. *Int J Infect Dis* **96**, 467–474 (2020).
762 42. Creel-Bulos, C. *et al.* Trends and diagnostic value of D-dimer levels in
763 patients hospitalized with coronavirus disease 2019. *Medicine* **99**, e23186

764 (2020).
765 43. Juul, S. *et al.* Interventions for treatment of COVID-19: a protocol for a
766 living systematic review with network meta-analysis including individual patient
767 data (The LIVING Project). *Systematic Reviews* **9**, 108 (2020).
768 44. Huang, Q. *et al.* Urban-rural differences in COVID-19 exposures and
769 outcomes in the South: A preliminary analysis of South Carolina. *PLOS ONE*
770 **16**, e0246548 (2021).
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790

Figure 1


BMI
Vaccination Status
Gender
0.06
0.04
0.02
0.00
25
50
75
No
Unknown
Yes
Female
Male

793 **Figure 2**

794



795

796

797

798

799

Figure 3


(a)
SpO2 (on arrival)
CRP (0.3 mg/dL)
Lymphocyte count
Weight (Kilograms)
BMI
AGE
Height (Centimeters)
+ve test to hospitalization (days)
D-Dimer (0.52ng/l)
paO2 (mmHg)
No of visits prior to admission
Length of hospitalization (days)
Marital Status
Gender
FiO2
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
MeanDecreaseGini
(b)
AGE
Height (Centimeters)
Weight (Kilograms)
BMI
SpO2 (on arrival)
CRP (0.3 mg/dL)
D-Dimer (0.52ng/l)
Lymphocyte count
+ve test to hospitalization (days)
paO2 (mmHg)
No of visits prior to admission
Length of hospitalization (days)
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
−0.8
−1
(c)
AGE
Height (Centimeters)
Weight (Kilograms)
BMI
SpO2 (on arrival)
CRP (0.3 mg/dL)
D-Dimer (0.52ng/l)
Lymphocyte count
+ve test to hospitalization (days)
paO2 (mmHg)
No of visits prior to admission
Length of hospitalization (days)
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
−0.8
−1

Figure S1


(a)
SpO2 (on arrival)
CRP (0.3 mg/dL)
Lymphocyte count
Weight (Kilograms)
BMI
AGE
Height (Centimeters)
+ve test to hospitalization (days)
D-Dimer (0.52ng/l)
paO2 (mmHg)
No of visits prior to admission
Length of hospitalization (days)
Marital Status
Gender
FiO2
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
MeanDecreaseGini
(b)
AGE
Height (Centimeters)
Weight (Kilograms)
BMI
SpO2 (on arrival)
CRP (0.3 mg/dL)
D-Dimer (0.52ng/l)
Lymphocyte count
+ve test to hospitalization (days)
paO2 (mmHg)
No of visits prior to admission
Length of hospitalization (days)
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
−0.8
−1
(c)
AGE
Height (Centimeters)
Weight (Kilograms)
BMI
SpO2 (on arrival)
CRP (0.3 mg/dL)
D-Dimer (0.52ng/l)
Lymphocyte count
+ve test to hospitalization (days)
paO2 (mmHg)
No of visits prior to admission
Length of hospitalization (days)
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
−0.8
−1

806 **Figure S2**

a.



b.



807 All clincial variables included in Table S1

808

Figure S3


a.
Hospitalization(Post+ve detection)
No. of Visits (Prior Admission)
Length of Hospitalization (Days)
No
Unknown
Yes
Vaccination Status
b.
SpO2 (On arrival)
CRP (mg/dL)
D-Dimer (ng/l)
Lymphocyte count
PaO2 (mmHg)
Vaccination Status
c.
Number of ICU days
No of days on Ventilator
Length of hospitalization (days)
Number of visits prior to Admission
Symptoms onset prior to arrival (days)
Positive test to hospitalization (days)
Lymphocyte count
D-Dimer (ng/l)
CRP (mg/dL)
FiO2
PaO2 (mmHg)
SpO2 (on arrival)
ASCVD
BMI
Weight (Kilograms)
Height (Centimeters)
Age (Years)
[−1,−0.6]
(−0.6,−0.2]
(−0.2,0.2]
(0.2,0.6]
(0.6,1]

811 **Figure S4**



812

813

814

815

816

817