

Noninvasive ventilation strategies for patients with severe or critical COVID-19: A rapid review of clinical outcomes

Authors: Shannon E. Kelly¹, George A. Wells¹

¹ University of Ottawa, School of Epidemiology and Public Health

Abstract

Objectives: To examine whether high flow nasal oxygen (HFNO), continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), or noninvasive ventilation (NIV) strategies impact mortality, the need for invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV), or hospital and intensive care unit (ICU) length of stay compared to standard oxygen therapy (SOT) or each other in patients with severe or critical COVID-19 with acute hypoxemic respiratory failure.

Methods: A rapid review of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) identified through published systematic and rapid reviews supplemented with a search of bibliographic databases. RCTs were eligible if they compared HFNO, CPAP, or NIV to SOT or another ventilation strategy. Studies were screened, selected, and extracted by a single reviewer and checked by a second reviewer. We assessed risk of bias of included studies using the Cochrane 'Risk of bias' tool and used the grading of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation (GRADE) approach to judge the certainty of the evidence for mortality, need for IMV, and hospital and ICU length of stay. We sought RCT evidence for non-COVID-19 patients with acute hypoxemic respiratory failure and acute respiratory distress to inform additional comparisons and to supplement the available data for COVID-19.

Results: A total of 5 RCTs comparing ventilation strategies in patients with severe or critical COVID-19 were included. Patient and study characteristics were extracted and evidence and certainty of evidence assessments were completed for comparisons of HFNO and CPAP to standard oxygen therapy and NIV and CPAP to HFNO. An additional 22 RCTs of non-COVID-19 patients were also included and considered. Results from meta-analysis suggest reductions in mortality and IMV with HFNO (*RR mortality 0.87 (0.66-1.13)*, *IMV 0.89 (0.77-1.03)*; *low quality evidence*) or CPAP (*RR mortality 0.87 (0.64-1.18)* *low quality evidence*, *IMV 0.81 (0.67-0.98)* *moderate quality evidence*) compared to SOT. Helmet NIV may reduce IMV (*RR 0.69 (0.43-1.09)*) and CPAP may reduce IMV (*RR 0.69 (0.43-1.09)*) and hospital (*1.67 days fewer (5.43 fewer-2.09 more)*) or ICU length of stay (*1.02 days fewer (3.97 fewer-1.93 more)*) compared to HFNO (*low quality evidence*).

Conclusions: This rapid systematic review highlights the available evidence to support the use of noninvasive ventilation strategies including high flow nasal oxygen, noninvasive ventilation (e.g., BiPAP), or CPAP in hospitalized patients with severe or critical COVID-19 and acute hypoxemic respiratory failure who do not need emergent intubation. Findings based on moderate to very low certainty evidence suggest that noninvasive ventilation may be considered as an alternative to standard oxygen therapy to reduce hypoxemia and dyspnea. Additional high quality RCTs are warranted to reduce uncertainty and to fill in important knowledge gaps.

Introduction

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) emerged at the end of 2019 as a novel coronavirus, resulting in the current global pandemic of respiratory illness, Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Severe and critical COVID-19 involves acute hypoxemic respiratory failure requiring oxygen and ventilation therapies¹. COVID-19 patients may deteriorate quickly and require hospitalization to prevent progressive hypoxemia, leading to acute respiratory failure².

In addition to self or supported repositioning (i.e., prone positioning) and medication, support for patients with COVID-19 related hypoxemia includes oxygen therapy which often requires progressive increases in respiratory support. Clinical management of COVID-19 patients not responding well to standard oxygen may be considered for alternative ventilation support when hypoxemia is a concern. This ventilation may include high-flow nasal oxygen (HFNO), continuous positive airways pressure (CPAP), non-invasive positive pressure ventilation (NIV), invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV), or possibly a combination of more than one strategy³. Different interfaces, including oral, nasal or full face masks and helmets, may be used and are selected to minimize air leaks and adverse effects and maximize comfort and communication^{4,5}. Care for patients with COVID-19 and acute respiratory failure requires intensive monitoring and management of blood oxygen. Based on experience early in the pandemic, we know that being intubated too early can result in poor outcomes for COVID-19 patients⁶. The case fatality rate for patients with COVID-19 admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) and receiving IMV varies but is high⁷ and so avoiding progression to IMV is a common clinical goal in hospitalized patients with COVID-19.

Although there has been a redirection of attention in clinical research toward patients with COVID-19 since early 2020, there is an ongoing need to synthesize the research on non-invasive ventilation strategies for hospitalized patients with COVID-19 to inform clinical practice guidelines and care protocols. This rapid review aims to examine whether HFNO, CPAP, or NIV impact mortality, the need for IMV, or hospital and ICU length of stay (LOS) compared to standard oxygen therapy (SOT) or each other in patients with severe or critical COVID-19. In the absence of high certainty evidence for hospitalized patients with COVID-19 and acute hypoxemic respiratory failure (AHRF), we will consider the evidence for hospitalized patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and AHRF.

Methods

We conducted a rapid review of non-invasive ventilation strategies in patients with severe or critical COVID-19. Patient partners reviewed and provided feedback on the protocol registered with the National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools (NCCMT; Registration No. 428⁸).

The review team used a population, intervention, comparator, and outcomes (PICO) framework (**Table 1**). We aimed to find, assess and synthesize all randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of severe or critical COVID-19 and acute hypoxemic respiratory failure (AHRF). Eligible studies were RCTs of patients hospitalized with severe or critical COVID-19 and AHRF not needing emergent intubation who used HFNO, CPAP or NIV (e.g., Bilevel Positive Airway Pressure; BiPAP). Comparisons of interest were standard oxygen therapy (SOT) or another intervention of interest. The primary outcomes are mortality, need for invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV), and hospital length of stay, with intensive care unit (ICU) length of stay and patient-reported outcomes (e.g. patient comfort, satisfaction with care) are secondary outcomes. Patients weaned off IMV or those who require respiratory support following IMV were not eligible. Reviewers also sought evidence in a related clinical population of individuals with ARDS and AHRF to provide indirect evidence for the use of noninvasive ventilation in COVID-19 patients (Methods and results, **Online Supplement 1**).

Search

An experienced information scientist designed and executed the literature searches.

The search first targeted systematic and rapid reviews (SR/RRs) of potentially eligible RCTs in two electronic COVID-19 databases (WHO COVID-19 Global literature on coronavirus disease database⁹, the Living Overview of Evidence (L.OVE) platform)¹⁰ and the COVID-END inventory¹¹ of best evidence syntheses for clinical management to rapidly identify eligible SR/RRs [May 2 to 3, 2021] (**Online supplement 2**). Reviewers checked the included study lists of the identified English language SR/RRs for potentially eligible RCTs and checked all ongoing RCT records from the SR/RRs for results (July 15, 2021).

A second search (WHO COVID-19 study register, Cochrane COVID-19 study register, clinicaltrials.gov; May 15, 2021) sought to identify RCTs published or registered since the last identified SR/RR search (01 July 2020). The information scientist did not execute the planned search of the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP)¹² as the database was not accessible to our information scientist during this rapid review. We did not apply restrictions to publication status or language in the search strategy.

All ongoing studies identified were checked for results (June 15-21, 2021). We used monthly alerts to identify additional RCT records and performed a forward citation analysis on all included records using both SCOPUS and Google Scholar. Monitoring of search alerts and ongoing RCTs continued monthly until December 29, 2021.

Study selection

All records were uploaded into EndNoteX20¹³ and then into Covidence¹⁴ for screening and selection. One reviewer screened all title and abstract records (SR/RRs and then RCTs) and confirmed the results with a second reviewer. One reviewer located and screened all potentially relevant full-text articles identified through the SR/RR and RCT searches. A second reviewer confirmed all included SR/RRs and RCTs and resolved disagreements through discussion. Reviewers used a PRISMA flow diagram to document the selection process in detail.

Included SR/RRs and RCTs directly compared two or more interventions or comparators in the PICO and reported at least one outcome of interest. We excluded studies reporting broad clinical course as it is not possible to link clinical outcomes and isolate the effect of the noninvasive ventilation strategy.

Data extraction

For each included SR/RR, one reviewer extracted details of the citation, synthesis approach, PICO, search dates, and the number of included potentially relevant RCTs studies into structured summary tables (Microsoft Word).

For each included RCT, one reviewer retrieved all reported participant characteristics, study characteristics and outcome data from the SR/RR publication or extracted data de novo into structured outcome tables (Microsoft Excel). A second reviewer checked all extracted data.

Risk of bias assessment

One reviewer appraised each included SR/RR using AMSTAR2¹⁵ and retrieved the risk of bias (ROB) assessments for the included RCTs where reported. Otherwise, a single reviewer assessed the ROB in trials with no retrieved assessment (Cochrane ROB tool¹⁶) or when the retrieved assessment did not have sufficient detail to inform the summary of findings table. ROB ratings were not used as exclusion criteria.

Evidence tables and certainty of evidence assessment

One reviewer constructed GRADE evidence profiles of certainty for each primary and secondary outcome and each intervention comparison, separately using MAGICapp¹⁷. A second reviewer checked all tables, and they were vetted by content and methodological experts. The certainty of the evidence was determined by the risk of bias across studies, inconsistency, indirectness, and imprecision¹⁸. Reviewers did not consider incoherence, publication bias and other parameters. We used the most recent GRADE methodology to decide on the certainty of the body of evidence from RCTs, which recommends using the judgment of high certainty of evidence at baseline and downgrading due to risk of bias, imprecision, or indirectness of

RCTs¹⁸. Minimal important differences and optimal information size (OIS; 1000 participants) were determined in advance through consult with content experts and used to inform judgements about precision. Downgrading 3 levels for precision was considered when the number of study participants for an outcome was less than 30% of the OIS¹⁹.

When the certainty (or quality) of evidence is rated very low or extremely low, we are very unsure about the true effect, while a rating of low certainty/quality evidence means that the true effect could be markedly different from the estimated effect. Ratings of moderate certainty indicate that reviewers feel that the true effect is probably close to the estimated effect, and high certainty ratings signify a high level of confidence in the estimated effect²⁰. Plain language statements are determined based on the ratings for the certainty of evidence and are presented with the ratings.

Synthesis

Reviewers used Review Manager (Version 5.4; RevMan) to calculate the treatment effect for each primary and secondary outcome (risk ratios for dichotomous outcomes, mean difference for continuous outcomes). Reviewers undertook meta-analyses when 2 studies or comparisons reported the same outcome. A fixed effects model was used for all meta-analyses and the unit of analysis was individuals. Otherwise, reviewers completed a descriptive summary of evidence by comparison and outcome.

Treatment effects were calculated for the following comparisons: HFNO versus SOT, CPAP versus SOT, NIV versus SOT, CPAP versus HFNO, NIV versus HFNO, and NIV versus CPAP. The interface used for the non-invasive ventilation strategy was also compared if reported (e.g., helmet CPAP versus HFNO, facemask CPAP versus helmet CPAP).

When an RCT did not directly compare the study interventions (e.g., a 3-arm study where HFNO and NIV are each compared to SOT but not to each other), the relative effects were calculated using the pooled relative effects (risk ratio) for the interventions reported to calculate an indirect estimate for the relative effects of the comparison of interest²¹.

For RCTs reporting hospital or ICU LOS outcomes both as means (standard deviation) and medians (interquartile range; IQR) for any one outcome, meta-analysis was conducted in R using the Metamedian package^{22,23}. LOS data were also checked for consideration of competing risk²⁴.

The I^2 statistic was used to measure heterogeneity among the included trials. Publication bias was not assessed or small studies effects because fewer than 10 studies were included. Subgroup or sensitivity

analyses were not conducted, and investigators or study sponsors were not contacted to provide missing data.

Results

A total of 342 title and abstract records and 41 full-text articles were screened for relevant SR/RRs. From these, we identified three SRs (reported in five published reports)²⁵⁻²⁹ and four RRs³⁰⁻³³ reporting non-invasive ventilation strategies in hospitalized patients with severe or critical COVID-19 and acute hypoxemic respiratory failure not requiring emergent intubation. Reviewers identified and included three RCTs³⁴⁻³⁶ in three records from the included study lists of these reviews and through related forward citation tracking. An additional search for RCTs published between July 1, 2020 (the search date from the most recent included SR) and May 15, 2021 identified 1,385 title and abstract records (including records identified by alerts). Following screening, 24 full-text articles were reviewed and two more eligible RCTs were identified^{37,38}. A total of five RCTs were included.

Three additional records reporting RCTs in-progress (NCT04326075, NCT04381923 and NCT04507802) and one terminated RCT³⁹ were also located but were excluded as no posted or published results were available within our search or alert time-frame.

The screening and selection process is reported in a PRISMA 2020 flow diagram modified to capture the search for SR/RRs and RCTs (**Figure 1**)⁴⁰. The included SR/RRs and their AMSTAR2 assessments are summarized in **Online Supplement 3**.

Study and participant characteristics

A summary of the five included RCTs³⁴⁻³⁸ is provided in **Table 2**. Additional details for the study and participant characteristics are reported in **Online Supplement 4**. Four of the RCTs compared HFNO to standard oxygen therapy^{34-36,38}, one 3-arm RCT compared CPAP to standard oxygen therapy³⁵, one 2-arm RCT compared helmet NIV to HFNO³⁷ and one three-arm RCT compared CPAP and HFNO³⁵ to SOT, but not directly to each other. For the comparison of CPAP to HFNO, an indirect treatment comparison estimate was made. Not all RCTs reported all outcomes.

Li et al. (2020) is a two-arm, parallel RCT conducted in 72 patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia and acute respiratory failure in the Huanggang Hospital in China, where participants were randomized to either HFNO (n=37) or SOT (n=35)³⁴. The Li et al. was published in simplified Chinese and all eligibility, data extraction and risk of bias assessments were completed by a fluent reviewer. The study reported one outcome: mechanical ventilation outcomes at 12 hours.

Perkins et al. (2021; RECOVERY-RS) is a three-arm, open-label, adaptive RCT conducted in 75 centres in the United Kingdom. A total of 1,272 individuals were enrolled and randomized to CPAP, HFNO, or SOT. The primary comparisons in the study are CPAP to SOT and HFNO to SOT. All primary and secondary outcomes were reported. Results from the pre-print of this RCT, which was published in August 2021, were originally included³⁵ and have been checked for accuracy against the published and peer-reviewed RCT which was published in January 2022⁴¹.

Teng et al. (2021) is a two-arm, parallel RCT comparing HFNO to SOT in 22 patients diagnosed with severe COVID-19 at a single centre in China³⁶. The trial reported LOS outcomes and that all participants were cured and discharged which was inferred as a zero mortality outcome in both study arms.

The HENIVOT trial by Grieco et al. (2021) randomized ICU patients in 4 centres in Italy with COVID-19 induced moderate to severe hypoxemic respiratory failure to NIV with a helmet interface or HFNO³⁷. This open-label, multicenter, RCT assessed whether early treatment with helmet NIV decreased use of IMV in the 28 days after randomization compared to HFNO. This study reported all primary and secondary outcomes of interest and was the only RCT to report a patient-important outcome (device-related discomfort).

The two-arm parallel open label RCT by Ospina-Tascón et al. (HiFlo COVID; 2021) compared HFNO to SOT in 199 adult patients with acute respiratory failure and COVID-19³⁸. Participants were adults admitted to the emergency department, general ward, or intensive care unit of 3 centres in Columbia. This study reported all primary and secondary outcomes of interest.

Risk of Bias

There was limited information regarding the assessed ROB of the individual RCTs to carry forward from the SR/RRs, and therefore de novo ROB assessments were individually completed (**Online Supplement 5**). Mortality and IMV outcomes were considered in the assessment of blinding at the participant and personnel level, and IMV was specifically considered when blinding of outcome assessment was rated. Participants and personnel were not blinded in any of the included RCTs (and blinding would have been difficult or impossible due to the nature of the interventions). Varying criteria may have been used within or across studies to initiate IMV. Intubation outcomes in the Grieco et al. RCT were independently adjudicated by external experts, but no adjudication of the intubation outcomes was reported in the other RCTs. Crossover or progression to other interventions or study arms and cointerventions could not be fulsomely assessed in the included RCTs, and therefore the risk of bias is unclear. Intention to treat data are extracted where available, but the effects in some patients may be attributable to multiple therapies.

Evidence Tables

Evidence and certainty of evidence assessments for all comparisons and outcomes are summarized in **Table 3** (HFNO v. SOT, CPAP v. SOT, NIV v. HFNO, CPAP v. HFNO). Detailed individual outcome tables for all primary (mortality, IMV, hospital LOS) and secondary (ICU LOS) outcomes are provided in **Online Supplement 6**.

HFNO versus SOT

Four published RCTs compared HFNO to SOT (1053 participants) in patients with severe COVID-19. Based on low quality evidence from 3 RCTs, HFNO may decrease mortality (relative risk (RR) 0.87, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.66 - 1.13) and IMV (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.77 - 1.03) compared to SOT. HFNO probably decreases hospital LOS (1.08 fewer days, 95% CI 2.48 fewer – 0.35 more)^{34-36,38}. HFNO probably has little or no difference in ICU LOS (moderate quality evidence). None of the trials included children or pregnant women, and none reported any patient-important outcomes (e.g., comfort, satisfaction).

Evidence from five additional RCTs conducted in non-COVID patients with ARDS and AHRF (1425 participants) is generally consistent, although there is less certainty over potential differences in mortality⁴²⁻⁴⁷.

CPAP versus SOT

One published RCT of 742 participants compared CPAP to SOT³⁵. Based on moderate quality evidence, CPAP probably decreases IMV compared to SOT (RR 0.81, 95% CI 0.67 - 0.98). There is low quality evidence that CPAP may decrease mortality (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.64 - 1.18) and hospital LOS (0.96 fewer days; 95% CI 3.59 fewer – 1.67 more) and may have little or no difference in ICU LOS (0.08 fewer days, 95% CI 2.23 fewer – 2.07 more; low quality evidence). The study did not report any patient-important outcomes and did not include pregnant women or children.

Four RCTs of non-COVID ARDS and AHRF patients compared CPAP to SOT⁴⁸⁻⁵¹. Three RCTs compared helmet CPAP interfaces to SOT (168 participants) and one RCT compared a face mask CPAP interface to SOT (123 patients)⁴⁸⁻⁵¹. Evidence was very uncertain for all outcomes except hospital LOS where helmet CPAP may have little or no difference compared to SOT (0.5 more days, 95% CI 3.75 fewer - 4.75 more).

NIV versus SOT

No RCTs compared NIV to SOT in patients with COVID-19.

In 11 RCTs (1254 participants) of non-COVID ARDS and AHRF patients, NIV with a face mask interface probably decreases mortality (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.71 – 0.96) and IMV (RR 0.74, 95% CI 0.64 - 0.86) compared to SOT (moderate quality evidence) and may decrease hospital (2.02 days fewer, 95% CI 4.39 fewer – 0.35 more) and ICU LOS (1.61 fewer days, 95% CI 3.21 fewer – 0.03 more)(low quality evidence)^{43,45,52-61}. There was no evidence for children or pregnant women, or any non-facemask NIV interfaces.

NIV versus HFNO

One small RCT compared NIV with a helmet interface to HFNO for patients with severe COVID-19 (110 participants)³⁷. Helmet NIV may decrease the need for IMV (RR 0.54, 95% CI 0.32 – 0.89) but may increase device-related discomfort (low quality evidence). The impact of helmet NIV on mortality and hospital or ICU LOS compared to HFNO in COVID-19 patients is very uncertain.

Findings for mortality and IMV were very uncertain in three RCTs of non-COVID ARDS and AHRF patients (316 participants) comparing face mask NIV to HFNO, although there may be little or no difference in ICU LOS (1 RCT, 216 participants; low quality evidence)^{45,62,63}. No hospital LOS data were reported.

CPAP versus HFNO

One RCT^{35,41} enrolled 1273 participants into SOT, HFNO and CPAP arms but did not directly compare CPAP to HFNO in the trial analyses. As such, the meta-analysis for the comparison of CPAP vs. HFNO was informed by an indirect comparison (**Online supplement 6**). Based on these results, CPAP may decrease IMV (RR 0.69, 95% CI 0.43 – 1.09), hospital (1.67 days fewer, 95% CI 5.43 fewer – 2.09 more) and ICU LOS (1.02 days fewer, 95% CI 3.97 days fewer – 1.93 more)(low quality evidence) but results for mortality are very uncertain (RR 0.95, 95% CI 0.52 – 1.71)). The RCT did not include children or pregnant women.

Discussion

This rapid systematic review followed a transparent and robust approach to locate and appraise evidence from five RCTs comparing non-invasive ventilation strategies in hospitalized patients with severe or critical COVID-19 and acute hypoxemic respiratory failure not needing emergent intubation. Additional evidence was considered from 22 RCTs of similar patients without COVID-19 who had severe respiratory distress syndrome and acute respiratory failure. Based on the available evidence for mortality, use of IMV, and hospital or ICU LOS, it may be appropriate to consider the use of HFNO, NIV or CPAP instead of standard oxygen therapy for patients with severe and critical COVID-19 who do not require emergent intubation. None of the evidence for the outcomes of interest was assessed to be high quality using GRADE and ranged

from moderate to very low. Additional high-quality trials are required to reduce the uncertainty associated with the evidence base for the available non-invasive ventilation strategies and to eliminate knowledge gaps related to the overall generalizability of the evidence.

This data supplements two existing evidence syntheses focused only on HFNO^{28,29} and one living systematic review²⁵⁻²⁹ on ventilation techniques^{25-27,64}. Neither a Cochrane systematic review by Lewis et al. (2021)²⁸ focused on HFNO in adult ICU patients, or a rapid systematic review by Agarwal et al. (2020) include any relevant RCTs of patients with COVID-19. None of the previous reviews include the RECOVERY-RS and HiFLO-COVID RCTs, which have been recently published. The results in this review support conclusions by Ute Muti-Schünemann et al. (2022) that HFNO may reduce mortality compared with standard oxygen therapy, and the additional RCTs included contribute to reduced uncertainty around these effects⁶⁴. Conclusions are similar across reviews for helmet NIV compared to CPAP, owing to the availability of a single RCT in this patient population. In addition to the ongoing studies identified in this rapid review, Ute Muti-Schünemann et al. highlight other expected trials on NIV that should be watched for results in the near future: COVID-NIV [*Noninvasive Ventilation in Moderate-to-severe COVID-19-associated Acute Respiratory Distress-syndrome; NCT04667923*], Helmet-COVID [*Helmet Non-Invasive Ventilation for COVID-19 Patients; NCT04477668*]⁶⁵, PAP-COVID [*Early CPAP in COVID-19 Confirmed or Suspected Patients; NCT04390191*], COVID HELMET [*Helmet CPAP Versus HFNC in COVID-19, NCT04395807*], and COVID-HIGH [*HFNO vs. SOT in COVID-19; NCT04655638*]⁶⁴. Of the ongoing studies, COVID-NIV is a case-only observational study, and PAP-COVID and COVID HELMET are listed as terminated, one due to declining cases of COVID-19, and the other citing feasibility. Two RCTs (COVID-HIGH and HELMET-COVID) are still expected to produce results in 2022 or 2023. The COVID-HIGH study (NCT NCT04655638), which has completed enrollment and will provide additional outcome data for HFNO compared to standard oxygen therapy and potentially evidence to support the role of HFNO reducing the need for escalation to NIV or CPAP (n=364 participants). The HELMET-COVID trial will contribute evidence for helmet NIV compared to standard oxygen therapy, facemask NIV, HFNO. This will provide much-needed data on the use of NIV in patients aged 14 or older with COVID-19 in the ICU and potentially comparative data for the role of NIV mask or helmet interfaces. Enrollment was reported to have been completed in October of 2021.

There are several limitations in the included RCTs that should be considered alongside the findings. There was no evidence located for use of non-invasive ventilation strategies in infants or children or important subpopulations (e.g., pregnant women), very limited evidence to support the specific use of named interfaces for the ventilation strategies considered (e.g., nasal cannula, simple face mask, venturi mask, oronasal, helmet or other), and only one RCT reported patient-important outcomes. The hospital LOS data are challenging to interpret as competing risk for death may not have been appropriately accounted for in

most RCTs, or it is not possible to assess how competing risk was handled in an RCT⁶⁶. In the set of included RCTs, the LOS outcomes are generally either secondary or exploratory outcomes, and as such, the estimates presented may be confounded by death. The LOS data for survivors and non-survivors is rarely presented. Patient heterogeneity was noted by Perkins et al. in the pragmatic RECOVERY-RS RCT but not explored in-depth⁴¹.

Owing to the rapid synthesis approach, there was no formal extraction or synthesis of harm outcomes. When non-invasive ventilation supports are considered, potential benefits must be considered alongside any conceivable harms. Use of ventilation strategies could delay other clinical intervention that could lead to worsening patient prognosis, cause discomfort to the patient during use, or result in surficial wounds or pressure sores where there is skin contact.

Care for acutely ill patients with COVID-19 is complex. Although focused on ventilation strategies, the trials included likely use these interventions in conjunction with a number of other care strategies and supports (e.g., patient in prone position, medications) that should also be noted, but were not considered in detail in this rapid review. Data were insufficient to assess the impact of intervention crossover in the included RCTs which has been flagged as a concern in previous syntheses⁶⁴. No studies specified patient outcomes or source of infection associated with any particular SARS-COV-2 variants of concern. It has been suggested that use of non-invasive ventilation strategies may increase transmission of SARS-COV-2 to healthcare workers, placing them at risk during care and adding strain to the healthcare system when isolation is required^{2,26}. Although appropriate personal protective equipment may provide adequate protection for some healthcare workers when NIV strategies are used, existing studies are predominantly from early 2020 there is a lack of comparative studies available on this topic⁶⁷⁻⁷⁸.

The implementation of non-invasive ventilation strategies in the hospital environment must be supported by appropriate resources (including staff training, monitoring capacity) and infrastructure (e.g., interfaces or tubing, oxygen supply, cleaning or protective practices). This could prove to be challenging in some settings, particularly in low and middle income countries or settings that are acutely impacted by pandemic-related surges or supply shortages. Implementation of monitoring practices seen in the existing clinical trials may not be completely generalizable or feasible to clinical settings outside of the ICU where provider-patient ratios are higher².

The evidence base is expanding and additional trials and observational studies are expected to be completed later in 2022 or early 2023. It is anticipated that studies underway will provide new information for NIV use and interfaces and provide evidence for the gaps identified in the current evidence base.

Additional information related to patient important outcomes would add substantially to our knowledge and understanding of these non-invasive ventilation strategies.

Conclusions

This rapid systematic review highlights the available evidence to support the use of non-invasive ventilation strategies including high flow nasal oxygen, non-invasive ventilation (e.g., BiPAP) or CPAP in hospitalized patients with severe or critical COVID-19 and acute hypoxemic respiratory failure who do not need emergent intubation. Findings based on moderate to very low certainty evidence suggest that non-invasive ventilation may be considered as an alternative to standard oxygen therapy to reduce hypoxemia and dyspnea. Additional high quality RCTs are warranted to reduce uncertainty and to fill in important knowledge gaps.

Conflicts of Interest

Shannon E. Kelly and George A. Wells have no relevant conflicts to declare.

Funding

The Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research Evidence Alliance (SPOR EA) is supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) under the Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research (SPOR) initiative.

This project was funded in part by the World Health Organization (PO 202642154).

Project funding was augmented through existing research funds held at the University of Ottawa.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Vijay Shukla, Shuching Hsieh, and Nathan Orr for their contributions to this rapid review. We would like to acknowledge Becky Skidmore for her assistance with the search strategy design and execution. We would like to acknowledge Michael Wilson for his assistance with records from the COVID-End database.

We would also like to acknowledge our patient/citizen partners Elaine Zibrowski and Maya Sterne for their review and feedback on our protocol and their ongoing support for knowledge translation activities.

Abbreviations

AHRF	acute hypoxemic respiratory failure
ARDS	acute respiratory distress syndrome
BiPAP	bilevel positive airway pressure
CPAP	continuous positive airway pressure
HFNC	high flow nasal cannula
HFNO	high flow nasal oxygen
IMV	invasive mechanical ventilation
MA	meta-analysis
NIV	non-invasive mechanical ventilation
NMA	network meta-analysis
NPPV	negative positive pressure ventilation
ROB	risk of bias
RCT	randomized controlled trial
RR	rapid review
SOT	standard oxygen therapy
SR	systematic review
WHO	World Health Organization

References

1. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines Panel. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines. National Institutes of Health. Available at <https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/>. Accessed April 22, 2022.
2. Cosentini R, Groff P, Brambilla AM, et al. SIMEU position paper on non-invasive respiratory support in COVID-19 pneumonia. *Internal and Emergency Medicine*. 2022/02/01 2022;doi:10.1007/s11739-021-02906-6
3. Organization WH. *Living guidance for clinical management of COVID-19: living guidance, 23 November 2021*. 2021.
4. Brill A-K. How to avoid interface problems in acute noninvasive ventilation. *Breathe*. 2014;10(3):230-242. doi:10.1183/20734735.003414
5. Elliott MW. The interface: crucial for successful noninvasive ventilation. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2004;23(1):7-8. doi:10.1183/09031936.03.00115903
6. Windisch W, Weber-Carstens S, Kluge S, Rossaint R, Welte T, Karagiannidis C. Invasive and Non-Invasive Ventilation in Patients With COVID-19. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2020;117(31-32):528-533. doi:10.3238/arztebl.2020.0528
7. Lim ZJ, Subramaniam A, Ponnappa Reddy M, et al. Case Fatality Rates for Patients with COVID-19 Requiring Invasive Mechanical Ventilation. A Meta-analysis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2021;203(1):54-66. doi:10.1164/rccm.202006-2405OC
8. Registration No. 428: Clinical management of patients with severe or critical COVID-19 using high flow nasal oxygen (HFNO), continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) or non-invasive ventilation (NIV). <https://www.nccmt.ca/covid-19/covid-19-evidence-reviews/428>
9. World Health Organization. COVID-19: Global literature on coronavirus disease. Accessed December 2021. <https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/>
10. Verdugo-Paiva F, Vergara C, Ávila C, et al. COVID-19 L·OVE repository is highly comprehensive and can be used as a single source for COVID-19 studies. *medRxiv*. 2021;
11. Grimshaw JM, Tovey DI, Lavis JN. COVID-END: an international network to better co-ordinate and maximize the impact of the global evidence synthesis and guidance response to COVID-19. 2020;
12. World Health Organization. International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP). Accessed July 2021. <https://www.who.int/clinical-trials-registry-platform>
13. *EndNote*. Version x20. Clarivate; 2022.
14. *Covidence systematic review software (Available at www.covidence.org)*. Veritas Health Innovation; 2022.
15. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *bmj*. 2017;358
16. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. Oct 18 2011;343:d5928. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
17. *MAGICapp - Making GRADE the Irresistible Choice (App.magicapp.org)*. The MAGIC Foundation; 2022.
18. Schünemann H BJ, Guyatt G, Oxman A,, ed. *GRADE handbook for grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Updated October 2013*. The GRADE Working Group; 2013. Accessed June 12, 2021. guidelinedevelopment.org/handbook
19. Zeng L, Brignardello-Petersen R, Hultcrantz M, et al. GRADE guidelines 32: GRADE offers guidance on choosing targets of GRADE certainty of evidence ratings. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2021/09/01/ 2021;137:163-175. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.03.026>

20. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Feb 2013;66(2):151-7. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.01.006
21. Bucher HC, Guyatt GH, Griffith LE, Walter SD. The results of direct and indirect treatment comparisons in meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Epidemiol*. Jun 1997;50(6):683-91. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(97)00049-8
22. McGrath S, Sohn H, Steele R, Benedetti A. Meta-analysis of the difference of medians. *Biometrical Journal*. 2020;62(1):69-98. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.201900036>
23. McGrath S, Zhao X, Qin ZZ, Steele R, Benedetti A. One-sample aggregate data meta-analysis of medians. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2019;38(6):969-984. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.8013>
24. Chaou C-H, Chiu T-F, Yen AM-F, Ng C-J, Chen H-H. Analyzing factors affecting emergency department length of stay—using a competing risk-accelerated failure time model. *Medicine*. 2016;95(14)
25. Thomas R, Lotfi T, Morgano GP, Darzi A, Reinap M. Update Alert 2: Ventilation Techniques and Risk for Transmission of Coronavirus Disease, Including COVID-19. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173(11):W152-w153. doi:10.7326/l20-1211
26. Schunemann HJ, Khabsa J, Solo K, et al. Ventilation Techniques and Risk for Transmission of Coronavirus Disease, Including COVID-19: A Living Systematic Review of Multiple Streams of Evidence. *Ann Intern Med*. Aug 4 2020;173(3):204-216. doi:10.7326/M20-2306
27. Rochweg B, Solo K, Darzi A, et al. Update Alert: Ventilation Techniques and Risk for Transmission of Coronavirus Disease, Including COVID-19. *Ann Intern Med*. Sep 15 2020;173(6):W122. doi:10.7326/L20-0944
28. Lewis SR, Baker PE, Parker R, Smith AF. High-flow nasal cannulae for respiratory support in adult intensive care patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Mar 4 2021;3:CD010172. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD010172.pub3
29. Agarwal A, Basmaji J, Muttalib F, et al. High-flow nasal cannula for acute hypoxemic respiratory failure in patients with COVID-19: systematic reviews of effectiveness and its risks of aerosolization, dispersion, and infection transmission. *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia/Journal canadien d'anesthésie*. 2020/09/01 2020;67(9):1217-1248. doi:10.1007/s12630-020-01740-2
30. Radovanovic D, Coppola S, Franceschi E, et al. Mortality and clinical outcomes in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia treated with non-invasive respiratory support: A rapid review. *J Crit Care*. 2021;65:1-8. doi:10.1016/j.jcrc.2021.05.007
31. *Effectiveness of non-invasive ventilation in the treatment of acute respiratory failure due to coronavirus*. 2020. <https://www.sbu.se/en/publications/responses-from-the-sbu-enquiry-service/effectiveness-of-non-invasive-ventilation-in-the-treatment-of-acute-respiratory-failure-due-to-coronavirus/>
32. *EVIDENCE CHECK: Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP) machines - What is the current advice regarding for use of CPAP as a substitute for ventilators during the 2020*. https://www.aci.health.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/578472/20200410-Evidence-Check-CPAP.pdf
33. *COVID-19 Scientific Advisory Group Rapid Response Report - Updates on Recommended Use of Non-invasive Ventilation in AHS Acute Care Facilities During the COVID-19 Pandemic*. 2020. <https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/info/ppih/if-ppih-covid-19-sag-niv-rapid-review.pdf>
34. Li M KC, Han H, et al. Effect of transnasal high-flow humidifying oxygen therapy for the treatment of new coronavirus pneumonia with acute respiratory failure. *Chinese Journal of Coal Industry Medicine*. 2020;23:221-224.

35. Perkins GD, Ji C, Connolly BA, et al. An adaptive randomized controlled trial of non-invasive respiratory strategies in acute respiratory failure patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.08.02.21261379. doi:10.1101/2021.08.02.21261379
36. Teng Xb, Shen Y, Han Mf, Yang G, Zha L, Shi Jf. The value of high-flow nasal cannula oxygen therapy in treating novel coronavirus pneumonia. *European journal of clinical investigation*. 2021;51(3):e13435-n/a. doi:10.1111/eci.13435
37. Grieco DL, Menga LS, Cesarano M, et al. Effect of Helmet Noninvasive Ventilation vs High-Flow Nasal Oxygen on Days Free of Respiratory Support in Patients With COVID-19 and Moderate to Severe Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure: The HENIVOT Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. May 4 2021;325(17):1731-1743. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.4682
38. Ospina-Tascón GA, Calderón-Tapia LE, García AF, et al. Effect of High-Flow Oxygen Therapy vs Conventional Oxygen Therapy on Invasive Mechanical Ventilation and Clinical Recovery in Patients With Severe COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2021;326(21):2161-2171.
39. Tverring J, Akesson A, Nielsen N. Helmet continuous positive airway pressure versus high-flow nasal cannula in COVID-19: a pragmatic randomised clinical trial (COVID HELMET). *Trials*. Dec 3 2020;21(1):994. doi:10.1186/s13063-020-04863-5
40. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*. Sep 2021;74(9):790-799. Declaracion PRISMA 2020: una guia actualizada para la publicacion de revisiones sistematicas. doi:10.1016/j.rec.2021.07.010
41. Perkins GD, Ji C, Connolly BA, et al. Effect of Noninvasive Respiratory Strategies on Intubation or Mortality Among Patients With Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure and COVID-19: The RECOVERY-RS Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2022;327(6):546-558. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.0028
42. Andino R, Vega G, Pacheco SK, et al. High-flow nasal oxygen reduces endotracheal intubation: a randomized clinical trial. *Ther Adv Respir Dis*. Jan-Dec 2020;14:1753466620956459. doi:10.1177/1753466620956459
43. Frat J-P, Ragot S, Girault C, et al. Effect of non-invasive oxygenation strategies in immunocompromised patients with severe acute respiratory failure: a post-hoc analysis of a randomised trial. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2016;4(8):646-652. doi:10.1016/s2213-2600(16)30093-5
44. Jones PG, Kamona S, Doran O, Sawtell F, Wilsher M. Randomized Controlled Trial of Humidified High-Flow Nasal Oxygen for Acute Respiratory Distress in the Emergency Department: The HOT-ER Study. *Respir Care*. Mar 2016;61(3):291-9. doi:10.4187/respcare.04252
45. Frat JP, Thille AW, Mercat A, et al. High-flow oxygen through nasal cannula in acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 4 2015;372(23):2185-96. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1503326
46. Lemiale V, Mokart D, Mayaux J, et al. The effects of a 2-h trial of high-flow oxygen by nasal cannula versus Venturi mask in immunocompromised patients with hypoxemic acute respiratory failure: a multicenter randomized trial. *Crit Care*. Nov 2 2015;19:380. doi:10.1186/s13054-015-1097-0
47. Azoulay E, Lemiale V, Mokart D, et al. Effect of High-Flow Nasal Oxygen vs Standard Oxygen on 28-Day Mortality in Immunocompromised Patients With Acute Respiratory Failure: The HIGH Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. Nov 27 2018;320(20):2099-2107. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.14282
48. Brambilla AM, Aliberti S, Prina E, et al. Helmet CPAP vs. oxygen therapy in severe hypoxemic respiratory failure due to pneumonia. *Intensive Care Med*. Jul 2014;40(7):942-9. doi:10.1007/s00134-014-3325-5

49. Cosentini R, Brambilla AM, Aliberti S, et al. Helmet continuous positive airway pressure vs oxygen therapy to improve oxygenation in community-acquired pneumonia: a randomized, controlled trial. *Chest*. Jul 2010;138(1):114-20. doi:10.1378/chest.09-2290
50. Squadrone V, Massaia M, Bruno B, et al. Early CPAP prevents evolution of acute lung injury in patients with hematologic malignancy. *Intensive Care Med*. Oct 2010;36(10):1666-74. doi:10.1007/s00134-010-1934-1
51. Delclaux C, L'Her E, Alberti C, et al. Treatment of acute hypoxemic nonhypercapnic respiratory insufficiency with continuous positive airway pressure delivered by a face mask: A randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. Nov 8 2000;284(18):2352-60. doi:10.1001/jama.284.18.2352
52. Antonelli M, Conti G, Bui M, et al. Noninvasive ventilation for treatment of acute respiratory failure in patients undergoing solid organ transplantation: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. Jan 12 2000;283(2):235-41. doi:10.1001/jama.283.2.235
53. Confalonieri M, Potena A, Carbone G, Porta RD, Tolley EA, Umberto Meduri G. Acute respiratory failure in patients with severe community-acquired pneumonia. A prospective randomized evaluation of noninvasive ventilation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. Nov 1999;160(5 Pt 1):1585-91. doi:10.1164/ajrccm.160.5.9903015
54. Ferrer M, Esquinas A, Leon M, Gonzalez G, Alarcon A, Torres A. Noninvasive ventilation in severe hypoxemic respiratory failure: a randomized clinical trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. Dec 15 2003;168(12):1438-44. doi:10.1164/rccm.200301-0720C
55. He H, Sun B, Liang L, et al. A multicenter RCT of noninvasive ventilation in pneumonia-induced early mild acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Crit Care*. Sep 4 2019;23(1):300. doi:10.1186/s13054-019-2575-6
56. Hernandez G, Fernandez R, Lopez-Reina P, et al. Noninvasive ventilation reduces intubation in chest trauma-related hypoxemia: a randomized clinical trial. *Chest*. Jan 2010;137(1):74-80. doi:10.1378/chest.09-1114
57. Hilbert G, Gruson D, Vargas F, et al. Noninvasive ventilation in immunosuppressed patients with pulmonary infiltrates, fever, and acute respiratory failure. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 15 2001;344(7):481-7. doi:10.1056/NEJM200102153440703
58. Lemiale V, Mokart D, Resche-Rigon M, et al. Effect of Noninvasive Ventilation vs Oxygen Therapy on Mortality Among Immunocompromised Patients With Acute Respiratory Failure: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. Oct 27 2015;314(16):1711-9. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.12402
59. Wermke M, Schiemann S, Hoffken G, Ehninger G, Bornhauser M, Illmer T. Respiratory failure in patients undergoing allogeneic hematopoietic SCT--a randomized trial on early non-invasive ventilation based on standard care hematology wards. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. Apr 2012;47(4):574-80. doi:10.1038/bmt.2011.160
60. Wysocki M, Tric L, Wolff MA, Millet H, Herman B. Noninvasive pressure support ventilation in patients with acute respiratory failure. A randomized comparison with conventional therapy. *Chest*. Mar 1995;107(3):761-8. doi:10.1378/chest.107.3.761
61. Zhan Q, Sun B, Liang L, et al. Early use of noninvasive positive pressure ventilation for acute lung injury: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Crit Care Med*. Feb 2012;40(2):455-60. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e318232d75e
62. Azevedo JR, Montenegro WS, Leitao AL, Silva MM, Prazeres JS, Maranhao JP. High flow nasal cannula oxygen (hfnc) versus non-invasive positive pressure ventilation (nippv) in acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Intensive Care Medicine Experimental*. 2015;3(S1)doi:10.1186/2197-425x-3-s1-a166

63. Shebl E, Embarak S. High-flow nasal oxygen therapy versus noninvasive ventilation in chronic interstitial lung disease patients with acute respiratory failure. *The Egyptian Journal of Chest Diseases and Tuberculosis*. 2018;67(3)doi:10.4103/ejcdt.ejcdt_33_18
64. Ute Muti-Schüenemann GE, Szczeklik W, Solo K, et al. Update Alert 3: Ventilation Techniques and Risk for Transmission of Coronavirus Disease, Including COVID-19. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2022/01/18 2021;175(1):W6-W7. doi:10.7326/L21-0424
65. Arabi Y, Aldekhyl S, Al Qahtani S, et al. Helmet noninvasive ventilation for COVID-19 patients (Helmet-COVID): statistical analysis plan for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials*. 2022/02/02 2022;23(1):105. doi:10.1186/s13063-021-05988-x
66. Lau B, Cole SR, Gange SJ. Competing risk regression models for epidemiologic data. *American journal of epidemiology*. 2009;170(2):244-256.
67. Angel L, Kon ZN, Chang SH, et al. Novel percutaneous tracheostomy for critically ill patients with COVID-19. *The Annals of thoracic surgery*. 2020;110(3):1006-1011.
68. Bays DJ, Nguyen MH, Cohen SH, et al. Investigation of nosocomial SARS-CoV-2 transmission from two patients to healthcare workers identifies close contact but not airborne transmission events. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. Jul 3 2020:1-7. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.321
69. Beckl R. Use of Helmet-Based Noninvasive Ventilation in Air Medical Transport of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients. *Air Medical Journal*. 2021/01/01/ 2021;40(1):16-19. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amj.2020.11.009>
70. Cai SJ, Wu LL, Chen DF, et al. Analysis of bronchoscope-guided tracheal intubation in 12 cases with COVID-19 under the personal protective equipment with positive pressure protective hood. *Zhonghua jie he he hu xi za zhi= Zhonghua jiehe he huxi zazhi= Chinese journal of tuberculosis and respiratory diseases*. 2020;43:E033-E033.
71. Chatterjee P, Anand T, Singh KJ, et al. Healthcare workers & SARS-CoV-2 infection in India: A case-control investigation in the time of COVID-19. *Indian J Med Res*. May 2020;151(5):459-467. doi:10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_2234_20
72. Heinzerling A, Stuckey MJ, Scheuer T, et al. Transmission of COVID-19 to Health Care Personnel During Exposures to a Hospitalized Patient - Solano County, California, February 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Apr 17 2020;69(15):472-476. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6915e5
73. Liu M, Cheng SZ, Xu KW, et al. Use of personal protective equipment against coronavirus disease 2019 by healthcare professionals in Wuhan, China: cross sectional study. *Bmj*. Jun 10 2020;369:m2195. doi:10.1136/bmj.m2195
74. Lucar J, Navalkele B, Becker BP, Reed CD, Parham J. Health care personnel exposure to a patient with asymptomatic SARS-CoV2 infection during a prolonged surgical intervention. *Am J Infect Control*. Aug 2020;48(8):955-957. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.05.036
75. Ng K, Poon BH, Kiat Puar TH, et al. COVID-19 and the risk to health care workers: a case report. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2020;172(11):766-767.
76. Periyasamy P, Ng BH, Ali UK, Rashid ZZ, Kori N. Aerosolized SARS-CoV-2 transmission risk: Surgical or N95 masks? *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*. 2020:1-2. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.465
77. Ran L, Chen X, Wang Y, Wu W, Zhang L, Tan X. Risk Factors of Healthcare Workers With Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Retrospective Cohort Study in a Designated Hospital of Wuhan in China. *Clin Infect Dis*. Nov 19 2020;71(16):2218-2221. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa287
78. Zhong Q, Liu YY, Luo Q, et al. Spinal anaesthesia for patients with coronavirus disease 2019 and possible transmission rates in anaesthetists: retrospective, single-centre, observational cohort study. *British journal of anaesthesia*. 2020;124(6):670-675.

TABLES

Table 1. Population, intervention, comparator, outcomes (PICO) framework

Population	Hospitalized patients with severe or critical COVID-19 and acute hypoxemic respiratory failure not needing emergent intubation ^a
Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• High flow nasal oxygen• Continuous positive airway pressure (facemask or helmet)• Noninvasive ventilation via facemask (or other non-helmet interfaces including nasal, oronasal and full facial mask)• Noninvasive ventilation via helmet
Comparators	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard oxygen therapy• Any intervention
Outcomes	Primary: Mortality (within 30, 60, 90 days, or longer), need for invasive mechanical ventilation, hospital length of stay Secondary: Intensive care unit length of stay Patient-identified outcomes of interest: Patient comfort, satisfaction with care
Eligible study designs	Systematic/rapid reviews ^b to identify eligible trials, randomized controlled trials ^c

Table 2. Characteristics of included RCTs

Study/Design	Population	Country/Setting	Interventions	Outcomes reported
Li et al. 2020 ³⁴ two-arm, parallel RCT N=72	Patients with severe coronavirus pneumonia complicated with acute respiratory failure	China, isolation ward of a single centre	HFNO [n=37] Standard oxygen therapy [n=35]	Mechanical ventilation at 12 h No patient-reported outcomes
Grieco et al. 2021 ³⁷ HENIVOT two-arm, parallel RCT N=109	Patients admitted to the intensive care unit with COVID-19-induced moderate to severe hypoxemic respiratory failure	Italy, ICUs in four centres	Helmet NIV [n=55] HFNO [n=54]	Intubation, 28 d Hospital LOS ICU LOS Patient-reported: Device-related discomfort
Perkins et al. 2021 ³⁵ RECOVERY-RS three-arm, adaptive RCT N=1272	Hospitalized adults with acute respiratory failure due to COVID-19 were deemed suitable for tracheal intubation if treatment escalation was required	United Kingdom, 75 hospitals	CPAP [n=380] HFNO [n=417] Standard oxygen therapy [n=475] (primary comparisons were CPAP to standard oxygen and HFNO to standard oxygen)	Mortality, 30 d Intubation, 30 d Tracheal intubation during the study period Critical care (ICU) LOS Hospital LOS No patient-reported outcomes
Teng et al. 2021 ³⁶ two-arm, parallel RCT	Patients diagnosed with severe COVID-19.	China, single centre	HFNO [n=12] Standard oxygen therapy [n=10]	Mortality (indirect) Hospital LOS

Study/Design	Population	Country/Setting	Interventions	Outcomes reported
N= 22				ICU LOS No patient-reported outcomes
Ospina-Tascón et al. 2021³⁸ Two-arm, open-label parallel RCT N=199	Adult patients admitted to the emergency department, general ward, or intensive care unit with acute respiratory failure and COVID-19	Colombia, three centres	HFNO [n=99] Standard oxygen therapy [n=100]	Mortality, 28 d Intubation, 28 d Hospital LOS ICU LOS No patient-reported outcomes

d=days; h=hours; HFNO=high flow nasal oxygen; ICU=intensive care unit; LOS=length of stay; RCT=randomized controlled trial; QoL=quality of life.

Table 3. Evidence and certainty of evidence.

Outcome	No. of participants (studies)	Quality assessment				Effect						
		Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute Difference	Absolute effect intervention	Absolute effect intervention	Certainty (Quality) of the evidence	Importance	Plain language summary
HFNO vs. SOT, 4 RCTs, 1,053 participants^{34-36,38}								SOT	HFNO			
Mortality	1,006 (3 RCTs)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	RR 0.87 (0.66 - 1.13)	24 fewer per 1000 (64 fewer - 24 more)	188 per 1000	164 per 1000	Low	Critical	HFNO may decrease mortality
IMV	1,053 (3 RCTs)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	RR 0.89 (0.77 - 1.03)	46 fewer per 1000 (96 fewer - 13 more)	417 per 1000	371 per 1000	Low	Critical	HFNO may decrease IMV
Hospital LOS	1,003 (3 RCTs)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Serious	--	1.08 fewer days (2.48 fewer - 0.35 more)	16.85 days	16.85 days	Moderate	Critical	HFNO probably decreases hospital LOS
ICU LOS	1,003 (3 RCTs)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Serious	--	0.77 fewer days (1.45 fewer - 0.08 fewer)	5.83 days	4.65 days	Moderate	Important	HFNO probably has little or no difference in ICU LOS
CPAP vs. SOT, 1 RCT, 1,273 participants³⁵								SOT	CPAP			
Mortality	737 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	RR 0.87 (0.64 - 1.18)	25 fewer per 1000 (69 fewer - 35 more)	192 per 1000	167 per 1000	Low	Critical	CPAP may decrease mortality
IMV	733 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Serious	RR 0.81 (0.67 - 0.98)	78 fewer per 1000 (69 fewer - 8 fewer)	413 per 1000	335 per 1000	Moderate	Critical	CPAP probably decreases IMV
Hospital LOS	737 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	--	0.96 fewer (3.59 fewer - 1.67 more)	17.3 days	16.4 days	Low	Critical	CPAP may decrease hospital LOS
ICU LOS	737 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	--	0.08 fewer (2.23 fewer - 2.07 more)	9.6 days	9.5 days	Low	Important	CPAP may have little or no difference on ICU LOS

Outcome	No. of participants (studies)	Quality assessment				Effect						
		Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute Difference	Absolute effect intervention	Absolute effect intervention	Certainty (Quality) of the evidence	Importance	Plain language summary
Helmet NIV vs. HFNO, 1 RCT, 110 participants³⁷								HFNO	Helmet NIV			
Mortality	110 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Extremely serious	RR 1.1 (0.55 - 2.2)	24 more per 1000 (106 fewer - 283 more)	236 per 1000	260 per 1000	Very low	Critical	We are very uncertain of the impact of helmet NIV on mortality
IMV	110 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	RR 0.54 (0.32 - 0.89)	234 fewer per 1000 (346 fewer - 56 fewer)	509 per 1000	275 per 1000	Low	Critical	Helmet NIV may decrease IMV
Hospital LOS	110 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Extremely serious	--	1 fewer (9.2 fewer - 7.2 more)	22 days	21 days	Very low	Critical	We are very uncertain of the impact of Helmet NIV on hospital LOS
ICU LOS	110 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Extremely serious	--	1 fewer (6.2 fewer - 7.3 more)	10 days	9 days	Very low	Important	We are very uncertain of the impact of Helmet NIV on ICU LOS
Device-related discomfort	110 (1 RCT)	Serious	No concerns	No concerns	Serious	--	1.9 higher (1.4 higher - 2.5 higher)	1.8 VAS points	3.7 VAS points	Low	Patient-important	Helmet NIV may increase device-related discomfort
CPAP vs. HFNO, 1 RCT, 1,273 participants³⁵								CPAP	HFNO			
Mortality	793 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Extremely serious	RR : 0.95 (0.52 - 1.71)	9 fewer per 1000 (90 fewer - 133 more)	188 per 1000	179 per 1000	Very low	Critical	We are very uncertain of the impact of CPAP on mortality
IMV	791 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	RR 0.69 (0.43 - 1.09)	127 fewer per 1000 (234 fewer - 37 more)	411 per 1000	284 per 1000	Low	Critical	CPAP may decrease IMV
Hospital LOS	791 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	--	1.67 fewer (5.43 fewer - 2.09 more)	18.3 days	16.4 days	Low	Critical	CPAP may decrease hospital LOS

Outcome	No. of participants (studies)	Quality assessment				Effect						
		Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute Difference	Absolute effect intervention	Absolute effect intervention	Certainty (Quality) of the evidence	Importance	Plain language summary
ICU LOS	791 (1 RCT)	No concerns	No concerns	No concerns	Very serious	--	1.02 fewer (3.97 fewer - 1.93 more)	10.5 days	9.5 days	Low	Important	CPAP may decrease ICU LOS

CI = confidence interval; CPAP = continuous positive airway pressure; HFNO = high flow nasal oxygen; ICU = intensive care unit; IMV = invasive mechanical ventilation; LOS = length of stay; NIV = noninvasive ventilation; No. = number; RCT = randomized controlled trial; RR = relative risk; SOT = standard oxygen therapy; VAS = visual analogue scale

FIGURES

Figure 1. Modified PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for identification of RCTs of COVID-19 and AHRF population⁴⁰.

