

Analysing COVID treatment outcomes in dedicated wards at a large university hospital in northern Poland. A result-based observational study.

Corresponding author:

Martyna Ewa Gołębiowska

Smoluchowskiego 17, 80-214 Gdansk, Poland

margol@gumed.edu.pl

Authors:

Damian Krystian Palus

Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Gdansk, Gdańsk, Poland

Martyna Ewa Gołębiowska

Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Gdansk, Gdańsk, Poland

Olga Piątek

Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Gdansk, Gdańsk, Poland

Alan Majeranowski

Department of Hematology and Transplantology, Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Gdańsk,

Gdańsk, Poland

Radosław Owczuk

Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Therapy, Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of

Gdansk

Krzysztof Kuziemski

Department of Pulmonology and Allergology, Faculty of Medicine, Medical University of Gdansk

Tomasz Stefaniak

Department of General, Endocrine and Transplant Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Medical University

of Gdansk, Gdańsk, Poland

## **ABSTRACT**

### **Introduction**

Presenting outcomes of patients hospitalised for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) should be put in context and comparison with other facilities. Number of statistical parameters can be used to compare effectiveness of treatment, however varied methodology applied in studies can impede or hinder a reliable comparison. The aim of this study is to present outcomes of COVID-19 treatment in our facility using simplest parameters allowing for intercenter comparison - case fatality ratio (CFR), length of stay (LOS) and transparent patients' characteristics, and to discuss factors affecting mortality in COVID-19.

### **Methods**

The data were collected from patients hospitalized in COVID-19 general and ICU isolation wards in the University Clinical Centre (UCC) in Gdansk, Poland, from November 2020 to June 2021, using a computer-based patient record system. The group consisted of 642 patients – 144 (39,1 %) were women and 391 (60,9 %) were men, with a median age of 69 (IQR 59-78) years. Values of LOS and CFR were calculated and analysed.

### **Results**

Overall CFR for the analysed period was 24,8 %, varying from 19,9 % in January to May 2021 to 33,8 % in November to December 2020. CFR was 18,9 % in general ward and 70,7 % in ICU. All ICU patients required intubation and mechanical ventilation, and forty-four (75,9 %) of them developed acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). Average length of stay was 13,1 ( $\pm$  7,1) days.

### **Conclusion**

CFR in the general ward in UCC was analogous to published outcomes, but higher in our ICU ward. It resulted from more rigorous ICU admittance criteria in UCC compared to other facilities, which corresponds with patients' severe clinical condition and unfavourable prognosis. Heterogeneity of methods assessing initial clinical condition in different facilities makes a meaningful intercenter comparison challenging. In this study, we propose simple and transparent statistical and clinical parameters applicable in an intercenter analysis.

key words: COVID-19, Treatment, Hospital-based study, Health systems, Public Health

- **What is already known on this topic** - the outbreak of global pandemic caused by novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 has strained healthcare systems all over the world. Healthcare workers faced new challenges, as organisational, structural, and personal flaws were unearthed in the process. In subsequent waves the number of hospitalisations increased together with the death number in the ICUs. As we come to terms with a new disease, numerous studies reports, analyse and assess COVID-19 treatment outcomes
- **What this study adds** - COVID-19 treatment outcomes in ICU in our facility contrast with most of the published reports. We analyse the influence of some commonly omitted under-examined factors and propose simple and applicable parameters to compare results, such as CFR and LOS, enabling a meaningful intercenter comparison.
- **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy** - inclusion of CFR and LOS in studies on COVID-19 would remove significant bias and enable more robust evaluation of therapeutic interventions and outcomes. In this study we also discuss heterogeneity of admission criteria and show how their influence on treatment outcomes.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) is an acute respiratory disease caused by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). COVID-19 outbreak started in December 2019 in Wuhan, China, with its etiological factor identified in January 2020[1]. Rapid spreading of SARS-CoV-2 virus caused a global pandemic, resulting, by the end of 2021, in more than 290 million infections and over five million deaths[2]. In Poland, the number of infected reached almost six million with over 100 000 deaths by July 2022[3]. Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 infection are diverse, ranging from asymptomatic to severe pulmonary failure requiring intensive care. As pandemic continued in 2020 and 2021, an abundance of reports on COVID-19 treatment were being published and the outcomes varied significantly between and within countries, as fatality ratios were calculated using crude methods[4].

Presenting outcomes of patients with COVID-19 hospitalisation should be set in context and compared with results from other medical facilities and countries. For above-mentioned comparisons

to be meaningful and dependable, a number of statistical parameters and clinical metrics must be applied in the reports on COVID-19, such as case fatality ratio (CFR) and length of stay (LOS) [5].

### **Case Fatality Ratio**

Case fatality ratio, which estimates proportion of deaths from disease to confirmed cases of disease, is calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Case Fatality Ratio (CFR, in\%)} = \frac{\text{Number of deaths from disease}}{\text{Number of confirmed cases of disease}} \times 100$$

The equation above can lead to an underestimate when used during an ongoing pandemic, as it includes cases that are unresolved at a given time (i.e., neither died nor recovered)[4]. To present an accurate and transparent outcome of treatment, a modified equation can be applied as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Case Fatality Ratio (CFR, in\%)} \\ = \frac{\text{Number of deaths from disease}}{\text{Number of confirmed cases of disease} + \text{Number of recovered from disease}} \times 100 \end{aligned}$$

During initial stages of pandemic, the modified equation could rarely be used, as live tracking of new cases and daily reports of treatment was of high priority. With the pace of pandemic slowing down, a meaningful intercenter comparison of the effectiveness of treatment becomes possible. In case of SARS-CoV-2 pandemic CFR is difficult to measure because numerous undetected infections are excluded from statistics. Mortality is undoubtedly higher among hospitalized patients, with outcomes varying between regions and countries. The World Health Organisation (WHO) data estimates COVID-19 global mortality to be about 1,1 % [4]. In Poland CFR in hospitalized patients was estimated to be 18,4%, in other countries it varied from 0,1 to 25 % [6–8]. CFR was far from constant during each wave of pandemic. Analysis of more than 500 000 patients admitted to 209 hospitals in the United States showed that CFR varied across the year 2020, reaching 10,6% in March, peaking at 19,7% in April, before eventually dropping to 9,3% in November [9]. Similar mortality shifts were also observed in other countries, where CFR fluctuated, yet steadily increased with subsequent waves of COVID-19 [7,10,11]. Fatality ratios were affected by quality of healthcare, access to therapeutic options (as new treatments such as antiviral drugs and convalescent plasma were introduced as a standard of care at separate times), environmental, financial, and social conditions in a given time.

This is additionally supported by evidence of intra-national variations of mortality between centres with different standards of care[7,12]. Additionally, admission criteria for COVID-19 patients frequently changed during the subsequent waves of pandemic with the percentage of critically ill patients, which further affected CFR[11]. Discharge criteria affect mortality as well. Patients often required prolonged hospitalisation after having met COVID-19 discharge criteria (e.g., oxygen saturation > 94 %) due to comorbidity and complications, such as hospital-acquired infections. In some instances, as the pandemic has caused financial burden for hospitals and mental and physical exhaustion of healthcare professionals, personnel intentionally delayed discharge to avoid a new admission. Prolonged hospitalisation of stable patients was more cost-effective and less risky than new admission of unknown stability.

### **Length of Stay**

LOS helps to evaluate patient flow, bed occupancy rate and efficiency of departments. Intra-hospital CFR is affected by several complex factors. Among those increasing risk of in-hospital mortality, the most well-documented are demographics (males, higher age), obesity, comorbidity, complications, type of treatment and biochemical prognostic factors such as inflammatory biomarkers[13,14]. Furthermore, as Budweiser et al. found, patients' treatment limitations (PTL) such as "do not intubate (DNI)" / "do not resuscitate (DNR)" are important predictive factors for mortality[15]. Meta-analysis of published literature is now of limited use, as reports on patients' demographics and treatment are heterogeneous[16]. Parameters that are easy to standardize and enable comparison of group coherency in different centres are: 1) age, 2) sex, 3) initial physical condition (i.e., respiratory failure, acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), intubation, mechanical ventilation, or other invasive procedures.

To shed some light on differences in mortality outcomes, reports should include analysis of additional factors by region, country, or facility, i.e., financial, and organisational, GDP (gross domestic product) per capita, therapeutic options available, health system overload, healthcare professionals' availability, their experience, and qualifications, as well as mental burnout[17]. To this day, these crucial factors were rarely included in published research.

The aim of this study is to present outcomes of COVID-19 patients' treatment in our facility using simple and repeatable parameters enabling meaningful inter-centre comparison, and to discuss some of the under-examined factors affecting mortality.

## **METHODS**

A retrospective analysis was conducted, using observational data from the Hospital Episode Statistic (HES) data set for a large university hospital in Northern Poland - the University Clinical Centre in Gdansk. Patients hospitalized in COVID-19 isolation wards between 11/2/2020 and 5/25/2021 were included. They were hospitalized in separate isolation wards each consisting of 25 to 75 beds (COVID-S), and in an isolated intensive care unit of 4 to 12 beds (COVID-ICU). Number of beds available varied across pandemic according to the number of new cases and requisitions from administrative authorities. We used Airtable software to prepare an anonymised database consisting of patients' 1) age, 2) sex, 3) comorbidity, 4) length of stay and 5) outcome of hospitalisation. We conducted descriptive and inferential statistical analysis using STATISTICA 13.3 software directly on HES data set, calculating means, medians, standard deviations, and interquartile ranges of variables in the sample. Chi-square test was used to compare variables of the sample at distinct phases of pandemic. We estimated values of case-fatality ratios by groups, wards, and pandemic waves. This study did not involve human participants. For data gathering and processing, an approval from the Independent Bioethics Committee for Scientific Research at Medical University of Gdansk was obtained. We used the STROBE cross sectional checklist when writing our report[18].

### **Inclusion and exclusion criteria for subjects**

#### **Inclusion criteria for COVID-S**

Patients qualified to hospitalisation either in COVID-S or COVID-ICU ward were included in the analysis. At the time, S-ward admission criteria for patients with confirmed COVID-19 were: 1) oxygen peripheral saturation ( $SpO_2$ ) lower than 95% requiring supplemental oxygen, 2) symptoms requiring hospitalisation such as dyspnoea, severe cough, syncope, fatigue, diarrhoea with  $SpO_2$  equal or higher than 95%, 3) complications of COVID-19 infection requiring hospitalisation with  $SpO_2$

equal or higher than 95%, 4) maintaining continuity of medical care in patients who had tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 during hospitalisation in another ward.

Patients were considered ready for discharge from COVID-S ward 1) when there was no further need for supplemental oxygen, 2) upon the end of 10-days isolation, when oxygen therapy could be continued at home or in pulmonary ward, 3) when 10-days isolation ended and further medical care could be administered in the designated, non-isolative ward.

#### Inclusion criteria for COVID-ICU

COVID-ICU admission criteria for patients with confirmed COVID-19 requiring intubation were two out of the three, including criterion number 3: 1) aggravation of respiratory failure regardless of non-invasive ventilation methods i.e. Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP) and High Flow Nasal Oxygen (HFNO) therapy as a result of a) oxygen peripheral saturation and partial pressure remaining persistently low, leading to retention of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and respiratory acidosis or b) symptoms suggesting intolerance to the process, i.e. acute dyspnoea, increased breathing effort, anxiety with poor response to pharmacotherapy, or 2) intubation required due to surgery, injury or cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CRP), and 3) according to guidance of the Polish Society of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Therapy, the anaesthesiologist qualifying the patient for admission to the ICU had determined that the patient required intensive care and could benefit from hospitalisation in the ICU[17].

Unlike in many other facilities, early phase post-myocardial infarction patients, patients after ischemic stroke and gastrointestinal haemorrhage, as well as patients requiring dialysis or administration of pressor amines were not admitted to COVID-ICU unless they required intubation and mechanical ventilation, instead were treated in the general ward COVID-S. Advanced metastatic cancer and DNI (do not intubate)/DNR (do not resuscitate) order disqualified patients from transfer to ICU.

Patients were considered ready for discharge from COVID-ICU 1) after successful discontinuation of mechanical ventilation or 2) if further medical care could be continued in COVID-S or pulmonology ward.

## Exclusion criteria

We excluded subjects with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection: 1) whose length of stay, after having met the discharge criteria, was significantly prolonged due to non-medical issues i.e. administrative and socio-economic; or 2) did not require hospitalisation, but were admitted to COVID-19 ward in order to undergo medical procedures impossible to conduct in other wards due to public health hazard (i.e. radio-, chemotherapy).

In the analysis we also included deaths up to 8 weeks after discharge, when cause-and-effect relationship applied. Only resolved hospitalisations were taken into consideration i.e., those ending in discharge or death.

## RESULTS

Between November 2nd, 2020, and May 25th, 2021, 664 patients were hospitalized in COVID-19 wards in University Clinical Centre in Gdansk, Poland. After applying the exclusion criteria, 642 patients were included in the analysis. The median age of patients was 69 (IQR- interquartile range) 59-78) years. Subjects consisted of 391 (60,9 %) males with the median age of 68,5 (IQR 56-76) years and 251 (39,1 %) females with median age of 71 (IQR 60-82) years. Overall CFR in all COVID-19 isolation wards was calculated at 24,8 % (n=159). It was significantly higher in COVID-ICU than in COVID-S: 70,7% (n=41) vs. 18,9 % (n=118) respectively. The median age of in-hospital deaths was 75 (IQR 68-84) years and 67 (IQR 55-75) years for the discharged. Mortality was higher amongst males (58,5 %, n=93) compared with females (41,5 %, n=66). Intra-hospital general CFR decreased across second and third waves of pandemic, reaching 33,8 % in December 2020, before dropping to 19,9 % by May 2021. Similar decrease was observed within COVID-S and COVID-ICU populations [Tab.1].

Table 1. Case fatality rate (CFR) in COVID-19 patients by wards across pandemic.

Pandemic phase	All COVID CFR (deaths/cases, n)	COVID-S CFR (deaths/cases, n)	COVID-ICU CFR (deaths/cases, n)
Nov 2020 - May, 2021	24,8 % (159/642)	18,9 % (118/625)	70,7 % (41/58)



Second wave (Nov - Dec 2020)	33,8 % (76/225)	26,4 % (58/220)	78,3 % (18/23)
Third wave (Jan - May 2021)	19,9 % (83/417)	15,4 % (60/389)	65,7 % (23/35)

n = number of patients

Among those hospitalized in COVID-ICU, 75,9 % developed ARDS. All (100 %, n=58) of the subjects admitted to COVID-ICU required intubation and mechanical ventilation.

Average LOS was 12,5 ( $\pm$  7,5 SD) days, 11,5 ( $\pm$  7,3) days in COVID-S ward and 8,2 ( $\pm$  6,4) days in COVID-ICU ward. Average COVID LOS excluding intrahospital deaths was 13,1 ( $\pm$  7,1 SD) days, with 12,3 ( $\pm$  6,9 SD) and 8,3 ( $\pm$  4,6 SD) days in COVID-S and COVID-ICU wards, respectively [Tab.2].

Table 2. Average length of stay for COVID-19 patients by isolation wards across pandemic phases, excluding intrahospital deaths.

Pandemic phase	Length of stay (days)		
	All COVID Mean ( $\pm$ SD), days	COVID-S Mean ( $\pm$ SD), days	COVID-ICU Mean ( $\pm$ SD), days
Nov 2020 - May, 2021	13,1 ( $\pm$ 7,1)	12,3 ( $\pm$ 6,9)	8,3 ( $\pm$ 4,6)
Second wave (Nov - Dec 2020)	14 ( $\pm$ 9)	13,1 ( $\pm$ 8,4)	6,4 ( $\pm$ 3,7)
Third wave (Jan - May 2021)	12,6 ( $\pm$ 6,3)	11,9 ( $\pm$ 6,1)	9,1 ( $\pm$ 4,8)

SD = standard deviation

## DISCUSSION

### Mortality

Perception of the coronavirus pandemic is shaped by a fatality rate presented as the number of deaths.

In fact, this simplified measure can hardly be used to assess the severity of an epidemic, nor to compare its size and outcomes in an intercenter analysis. In this study COVID-19 case-fatality ratio in

COVID-19 dedicated wards in the University Clinical Centre in Gdansk, Poland was estimated to be 24,8 %. In-hospital mortality reported in Poland ranged from 1,38 % to 34,9 %, depending on the publishing author [Tab. 3].

Table 3. In-hospital mortality reports for the Polish population of SARS-CoV-2 positive patients. Primary data is collected from original sources - administrative databases and statistical registries. Secondary sources include institutional databases and electronic health records (EHRs)[6,19–25].

Author(s) & Year	Sample (n)	Mortality (%)	Phase of Pandemic (Waves I - III)	Data Source
Gujski, 2020[18]	1557	1,38 %	March 2020 (I)	Primary
Kanecki, 2021[23]	8252	13 %	Feb. - Sept. 2020 (I)	Primary
Gogolewski, 2022[24]	28,769	16,9 %	March - Sept. 2020 (I-II)	Primary
Gujski, 2021[5]	116,539	18,4 %	March - Dec. 2020 (I-II)	Primary
Flisiak, 2022[20]	5199	9,2 %	March 2020 – June 2021 (I-III)	Primary
Kowalska, 2021[19]	2830	11,5 %	March - June 2020 (I)	Primary
Nowak, 2020[21]	169	26,3 %	March - April 2020 (I)	Secondary
Obremska, 2021[22]	129	34,9 %	March - July 2020 (I)	Secondary
	497	29 %	Oct. - Dec. 2020 (II)	
	239	18,8 %	June - Aug. 2020 (I)	

Inconsistency between the reported outcomes arise from a range of factors, such as the phase of pandemic and standard of care at the time, sample size and demographics. Worth mentioning are,

however, differences in methods and data sources used by researchers that also affect these estimations. Published reports on in-hospital mortality based on electronic health records (EHRs), unlike statistical registries, correspond with our outcomes, with mortality ranging from 18,8 to 34,9 %[23,24].

Published reports based on large administrative registries show general CFR ranging from 15,8 % in the United States, 18,4 % in Poland and 23,3 % in the Republic of South Africa, to 26,6 % in the UK[6–9,12]. Meta-analysis evaluating thirty-three observational studies with a total sample of 13,398 patients, with 45 % of Chinese nationality, showed general mortality of 17,1 %, with 11,5 % in general COVID wards and 40,5 % in ICU[26]. Globally, CFR was changing across subsequent waves of pandemic. In March 2020, CFR in the UK was estimated to be 34 %, before declining to 12 % by September 2020, following a reduction in the number of new COVID-19 cases[27]. In the Republic of South Africa, general CFR was estimated to be 23 %, with peaks of 21,8 % and 29,3 % during the first and second wave, respectively[7].

Our outcomes show a similar declining trend across pandemic with CFR of 33,8 % in the second (Nov - Dec 2020), and 19,9 % in the third (Jan - May 2021) wave. However, unlike in many published reports, we did not observe increased mortality during the third wave of the pandemic, when the Polish healthcare system was most overwhelmed. Steady declining CFR trend throughout waves was observed among COVID-19 patients hospitalized in our facility.

In Poland, mortality in COVID-19 patient population varied significantly between general wards and ICUs. In the Polish population, 4,9 % of all SARS-CoV-2 positive patients required intensive care[6], whilst in our facility 9 % of COVID-19 patients were admitted to COVID-ICU. From March 2020 to May 2021 general CFR was estimated to be 24,8 % in COVID-S ward and over 70 % in COVID-ICU. Differentiating between the waves, in the second wave CFR was 33,8 % and 78,3 % in S and ICU wards, respectively, while in the third - 19,9 % and 65,7 %. Estimated CFR for COVID-S wards in the UCC corresponds with published reports, however, CFR for our ICU is significantly higher.

Mortality indicators for intensive care units vary locally, by region and by country. A French study on mortality during early-phase pandemic by Rimmelé et al. showed CFR of 31,3 % in the ICU[28].

Research by Taccone et al. based on the Belgian administrative registry from the first wave (March -

August 2020) estimated CFR in ICUs to be 36,1 % [29]. Similarly, researchers from Lombardy, Italy reported CFR in ICUs to be 26 %, although 58 % of the hospitalisations were of unknown outcome at the time of completion of the study [30]. A New York study on 257 ICU patients reported CFR of 39 %, although ninety-five patients were still hospitalized at the time, i.e., non-resolved cases were included. Moreover, only 79 % of patients required mechanical ventilation, indicating a less restrictive admission criteria than in Poland, or a distinct work organisation in COVID wards [31]. British cohort studies reported CFR of 31 % in COVID intensive care units [32], while broadscale analysis of French ICUs during the first wave of pandemic revealed mortality ranging from 17,6 % to 33,5 %, depending on the region. In France, at that time, only 68,1 % COVID-ICU patients required mechanical ventilation [33]. Sharma et al. reported mortality in ICU to be over 54 % in general, but 70,9 % amongst intubated and 22 % amongst those who did not require intubation [34]. Therefore, characteristics of admission criteria and the percentage of ICU patients requiring intubation is a crucial factor affecting mortality. In one study, with a total sample size of 14,513 COVID-19 patients, only 68 % required mechanical ventilation in ICU [33]. Admission criteria were far less restrictive than in our facility, where meeting them was synonymous to requiring invasive mechanical ventilation in every case. In our sample, 100 % of COVID-ICU patients required invasive mechanical ventilation.

Proportion of patients meeting admission criteria for COVID-ICU is another significant indicator affecting mortality in COVID-19 patients. In the published research we found values of 14 % in Belgium [29], 10 % in Brittany, and up to 42 % in Paris Region in France [33]. In our facility 9 % of COVID-19 patients were eligible for ICU admission - still more than in Poland on average. Outcomes presented in British papers link higher ICU admission to lower mortality [11]. With limited capacity in intensive care units in Poland, a smaller proportion of COVID-19 patients were transferred to ICU. In our hospital, limited COVID-ICU bed capacity demanded restrictive admission criteria, which could lead to higher in-hospital mortality. Patients eligible for admission to ICU were initially in critical condition and each of them required invasive mechanical ventilation.

### **Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) in COVID-19**

Diagnosis of ARDS is a significant factor predicting death in COVID-19 patients in intensive care units. Mortality associated with COVID-19-related ARDS reaches 68 %, compared to 42 % in ARDS of different aetiology. Older age is associated with higher mortality in COVID-19 patients who developed ARDS, reaching 85 % in populations over 70 years old[34]. We have established ARDS diagnosis in 75,9 % of COVID-19 patients in ICU in the UCC. High prevalence of ARDS was due to the advanced stage of disease at the moment of qualification to ICU and was also associated with higher mortality in this population. In one retrospective study analysing over 4 thousand COVID-19 patients, authors found that among 31,5 % of patients who developed ARDS, 59,3 % died. Overall mortality was 28 %, of which 42,4 % died in ICU or high-dependency units. Of those who required mechanical ventilation, 45,7 % died. Mortality in patients requiring vasopressor agents was 51,7 %, in patients requiring haemodialysis - 67,2 %, and in those requiring non-invasive ventilation - 45,8 % [34]. In the UCC, 75,9% of the intubated and ventilated patients developed COVID-19-related ARDS, leading to high mortality in ICU. As management and demography of intensive and high-dependency care units vary by country, inter-centre comparison of treatment outcomes is difficult. Methods applied by researchers, as shown in above-mentioned retrospective study that merges outcomes from ICU and high-dependency units together, can further distort the comparison[35].

### **Length of stay vs mortality in COVID-19**

In-hospital mortality measures depend on discharge criteria and length of hospitalisation. A delayed discharge of a patient deemed medically fit to leave hospital leads to bed-blocking. In estimates of in-hospital CFR, prolonged hospitalisations reduce the denominator value of the number of hospitalized cases, at the same time affecting the numerator describing death prevalence, which leads to an underestimate. Increase in the numerator value results from an intensive turnover of patients in an acute stage of COVID-19 with an unpredictable course of a disease.

From November 2020 to May 2021, LOS of over 14 days occurred in 32,2 % of COVID-19 patients in the UCC, and 12.5 % of hospitalisations lasted over 21 days (excluding deaths). It suggests high patient turnover - a desired response to an overwhelmed health care system and demand for healthcare. In Poland, average LOS during the first and second wave of COVID-19 was  $8,8 \pm 9.4$

days[6]. Another Polish analysis determined a mean LOS to be  $11,9 \pm 8.9$  days and reported a decreasing trend ( $13.0 \pm 10.5$  days in the beginning and  $11.1 \pm 7.5$  days during later stages of pandemic)[36]. In our facility the average LOS was  $13,1 \pm 7,1$  days. Heterogeneity of these values imply a necessity to use nonparametric tests to describe the phenomenon.

### **Other factors affecting death risk in COVID-19**

Reports on COVID-19 treatments in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) are scarcely presented in published studies. Despite social and economic progress over the last decades, CEE health care systems still lack innovation and funds compared to western Europe. COVID-19 treatment outcomes are proven to differ not only by phase of pandemic and by country, but also locally by region. Analysis of statistical data provided by European countries during the first wave of pandemic proved a link between high cause-specific mortality rate associated with cancer, cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, and increased CFR of COVID-19. CFR was positively associated with population size, the share of population over seventy, GDP per capita, health expenditure and, surprisingly, level of democracy. Negative association was found between CFR and number of hospital beds. Other factors found to increase CFR were prevalence of smoking and air pollution[17]. This study used primary data, and the results imply a disproportion in the quality of gathering and reporting data between developed and developing countries.

Other researchers emphasise patient treatment limitations (PTL) as a commonly ignored group of factors affecting death risk in COVID-19, i.e., medical orders to “do not intubate”/“do not resuscitate” and a patient's choice to deny life-saving interventions. PTL orders are determined in cooperation with patients and/or their loved ones, followed by an examination conducted by an internal medicine specialist or an anaesthesiologist[15].

Another aspect playing a key role in providing high quality of care is the mental condition of healthcare workers (HCWs). Prevalence of burnout among HCWs in the COVID era has been broadly discussed in recent publications[37]. In the early phase of the pandemic HCWs faced unprecedented mental and physical challenges, caused by exceptionally high mortality among patients, pathogen exposure and risk of infection, the ever-changing protocols of care and shortage of personal protective

equipment. Introduction of the national vaccination programme in Poland in December 2020 on one hand led to a slow and steady drop in number of new cases, but at the same time caused an influx of unvaccinated patients with an unpredictable course of disease, straining already exhausted HCWs. Many of HCWs were interns and resident doctors, significantly more prone to burnout than their older colleagues[38]. Lastly, socio-economic status and social support related factors affected COVID-19 patients during and after hospitalisation. In our experience families of patients discharged straight from COVID isolation wards were reluctant to cooperate from fear of infection, however their attitude changed dramatically when a patient was transferred to a non-COVID ward even for 24 hours before discharge.

### **Limitations of the study**

It should be underlined that this is purely retrospective, observational study, which aims to provide as much insight into the transparent evaluation of main outcomes of the treatment of COVID-19 at the hospital level as possible. As mentioned in the discussion the discrepancies of the definition of intensive COVID-19 treatment and, therefore, the exact presentation of the ICU group, are so significant among authors that it diminishes the generalisation of study results, unless the group selection within the material is adopted as suggested by us.

### **CONCLUSION**

Published reports worldwide rarely show the big picture and sum up the simplest outcomes of COVID-19 treatments. These basic measures are imperative in a comprehensive and thorough assessment of COVID-19 wards worldwide in both clinical and organisational context. Broad analysis of causes of public health failures is strictly related to treatment outcomes in a given facility, region or country and seems to be more than just dissimilarity between patient characteristics, organisation, and infrastructure. In our research we present transparent data on mortality and LOS among COVID-19 patients during the second and third wave of SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Poland. In our facility, we found mortality to be similar in stable COVID-19 patients and higher in ICU cases, when compared to the published reports worldwide. As a main reason for this outcome, we consider the scarcity of beds

in our facility, especially ICU, hence more demanding ICU admission criteria than in other parts of Europe.

A meaningful intercenter comparison and broad analysis of treatment is always doable, providing a rational optics, and especially important during times of pandemic. It may lead us to some hurtful conclusions relating to our - healthcare professionals - work but is the only way to initiate change and improve.

#### **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

DKP collected the data, designed methodology, performed statistical analysis, wrote the initial draft and revised the manuscript. MEG collected and analysed the data, verified, revised and translated the manuscript. OP collected and analysed the data. AM provided commentary for the paper. RO provided commentary and reviewed the paper. KK initiated, managed and supervised the project. TS initiated, planned and supervised the project, drafted and revised the paper, and monitored data collection. All authors reviewed the manuscript and accepted its final version for submission.

#### **COMPETING INTERESTS**

None declared.

#### **FUNDING**

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Hu B, Guo H, Zhou P, Shi ZL. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19 2021; 19:1.
- [2] WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard | WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard With Vaccination Data n.d. <https://covid19.who.int/> (accessed July 5, 2022).
- [3] Raport zakazeń koronawirusem (SARS-CoV-2) - Koronawirus: informacje i zalecenia - Portal Gov.pl n.d. <https://www.gov.pl/web/koronawirus/wykaz-zarazen-koronawirusem-sars-cov-2>. (accessed July 5, 2022).
- [4] Estimating mortality from COVID-19 n.d. <https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/estimating-mortality-from-covid-19> (accessed July 5, 2022).



- [5] Armstrong RA, Kane AD, Kursumovic E, Oglesby FC, Cook TM. Mortality in patients admitted to intensive care with COVID-19: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Anaesthesia*. 2021; 76:537.
- [6] Gujski M, Jankowski M, Rabczenko D, Goryński P, Juszczak G. Characteristics and Clinical Outcomes of 116,539 Patients Hospitalized with COVID-19—Poland, March–December 2020 2021; 13:1458.
- [7] Jassat W, Mudara C, Ozougwu L, Tempia S, Blumberg L, Davies MA, et al. Difference in mortality among individuals admitted to hospital with COVID-19 during the first and second waves in South Africa: a cohort study 2021; 9:e1216–25.
- [8] Roth GA, Emmons-Bell S, Alger HM, Bradley SM, Das SR, de Lemos JA, et al. Trends in Patient Characteristics and COVID-19 In-Hospital Mortality in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic 2021; 4:e218828–e218828.
- [9] Finelli L, Gupta V, Petigara T, Yu K, Bauer KA, Puzniak LA. Mortality Among US Patients Hospitalized With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in 2020 2021; 4:e216556–e216556.
- [10] Garcia-Vidal C, Cózar-Llistó A, Meira F, Dueñas G, Puerta-Alcalde P, Cilloniz C, et al. Trends in mortality of hospitalised COVID-19 patients: A single centre observational cohort study from Spain 2021; 3:100041.
- [11] Gray WK, Navaratnam A v, Day J, Wendon J, Briggs TWR. COVID-19 hospital activity and in-hospital mortality during the first and second waves of the pandemic in England: an observational study. *Thorax*. 2021:thoraxjnl-2021-218025.
- [12] Gray WK, Navaratnam A v., Day J, Babu P, Mackinnon S, Adelaja I, et al. Variability in COVID-19 in-hospital mortality rates between national health service trusts and regions in England: A national observational study for the Getting It Right First Time Programme. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021; 35:100859.
- [13] de Bruin S, Bos LD, van Roon MA, Tuip-de Boer AM, Schuurman AR, Koel-Simmelinck MJA, et al. Clinical features and prognostic factors in Covid-19: A prospective cohort study. *EBioMedicine*. 2021; 67:103378.

- [14] Hatmi ZN. A Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews on the COVID-19 Pandemic 2021; 3:419–36.
- [15] Budweiser S, Baş Ş, Jörres RA, Engelhardt S, von Delius S, Lenherr K, et al. Patients' treatment limitations as predictive factor for mortality in COVID-19: results from hospitalized patients of a hotspot region for SARS-CoV-2 infections 2021; 22:1–11.
- [16] RA A, AD K, E K, FC O, TM C. Mortality in patients admitted to intensive care with COVID-19: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Anaesthesia*. 2021; 76:537–48.
- [17] Sorci G, Faivre B, Morand S. Explaining among-country variation in COVID-19 case fatality rate 2020; 10.
- [18] Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies 2007; 335.
- [19] Gujski M, Raciborski F, Jankowski M, Nowicka PM, Rakocy K, Pinkas J. Epidemiological Analysis of the First 1389 Cases of COVID-19 in Poland: A Preliminary Report 2020; 26:e924702-1.
- [20] Kowalska M, Baranski K, Brozek G, Kaleta-Pilarska A, Zejda JE. COVID-19-related risk of in-hospital death in Silesia, Poland. *Pol Arch Intern Med*. 2021; 131:339–44.
- [21] Flisiak R, Rzymiski P, Zarębska-Michaluk D, Rogalska M, Rorat M, Czupryna P, et al. Demographic and Clinical Overview of Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients during the First 17 Months of the Pandemic in Poland 2022; 11:117.
- [22] Nowak B, Szymański P, Pańkowski I, Szarowska A, Zycińska K, Rogowski W, et al. Clinical characteristics and short-term outcomes of patients with coronavirus disease 2019: A retrospective single-center experience of a designated hospital in Poland 2020; 130:407–11.
- [23] Obremaska M, Pazgan-Simon M, Budrewicz K, Bilaszewski L, Wizowska J, Jagielski D, et al. Simple demographic characteristics and laboratory findings on admission may predict in-hospital mortality in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection: development and validation of the covid-19 score 2021; 21.

- [24] Kanecki K, Nitsch-Osuch A, Goryński P, Wojtyniak B, Juszczak G, Bogdan M, et al. Hospitalizations for COVID-19 in Poland: A study based on data from a national hospital register 2021; 131:535–40.
- [25] Gogolewski K, Miasojedow B, Sadkowska-Todys M, Stepień M, Demkow U, Lech A, et al. Data-driven case fatality rate estimation for the primary lineage of SARS-CoV-2 in Poland. *Methods*. 2022.
- [26] Macedo A, Gonçalves N, Febra C. COVID-19 fatality rates in hospitalized patients: systematic review and meta-analysis 2021; 57:14–21.
- [27] Gray WK, Navaratnam A v, Day J, Wendon J, Briggs TWR. Changes in COVID-19 in-hospital mortality in hospitalised adults in England over the first seven months of the pandemic: An observational study using administrative data 2021; 5:100104.
- [28] Rimmelé T, Pascal L, Polazzi S, Duclos A. Organizational aspects of care associated with mortality in critically ill COVID-19 patients. *Intensive Care Med*. 2021; 47:119–21.
- [29] Taccone FS, van Goethem N, de Pauw R, Wittebole X, Blot K, van Oyen H, et al. The role of organizational characteristics on the outcome of COVID-19 patients admitted to the ICU in Belgium 2021; 2:100019.
- [30] Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, Antonelli M, Cabrini L, Castelli A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. *JAMA*. 2020; 323:1574.
- [31] Cummings MJ, Baldwin MR, Abrams D, Jacobson SD, Meyer BJ, Balough EM, et al. Epidemiology, clinical course, and outcomes of critically ill adults with COVID-19 in New York City: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020; 395:1763.
- [32] Qian Z, Alaa AM, van der Schaar M, Ercole A. Between-centre differences for COVID-19 ICU mortality from early data in England 2020; 46:1.
- [33] Guillon A, Laurent E, Duclos A, Godillon L, Dequin PF, Agrinier N, et al. Case fatality inequalities of critically ill COVID-19 patients according to patient-, hospital- and region-related factors: a French nationwide study. 2021; 11:127–127.

- [34] Sharma S, Badami V, Rojas E, Mittal A, Stansbury R, Rana B, et al. ICU Mortality in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Infection: Highlighting Healthcare Disparities in Rural Appalachia 2021; 3:e547.
- [35] Berenguer J, Ryan P, Rodríguez-Baño J, Jarrín I, Carratalà J, Pachón J, et al. Characteristics and predictors of death among 4035 consecutively hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Spain 2020; 26:1525–36.
- [36] Oosterheert JJ, Flisiak R, Rzymiski P, Zar, Ebska-Michaluk D, Rogalska M, Rorat M, et al. Demographic and Clinical Overview of Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients during the First 17 Months of the Pandemic in Poland 2021; 11:117.
- [37] Leo CG, Sabina S, Tumolo MR, Bodini A, Ponzini G, Sabato E, et al. Burnout Among Healthcare Workers in the COVID 19 Era: A Review of the Existing Literature 2021; 9:1661.
- [38] Wiederhold BK, Cipresso P, Pizzioli D, Wiederhold M, Riva G. Intervention for physician burnout: A systematic review 2018; 13:253–63.