Title: Use of illness severity scores to predict mortality in interstitial lung disease patients hospitalised with acute respiratory deterioration

Rachel L Williams[1,2†], Catherine Hyams[1,3,4,5†], Joe Robertshaw[1,3], Maria Garcia Gonzalez[4,5], Zsuzsa Szasz-Benczur[4], Paul White[6], Nick A Maskell[1], Adam Finn[4] and Shaney L Barratt[1,3] on behalf on the AvonCAP Research Group

[1] Academic Respiratory Unit, University of Bristol, North Bristol NHS Trust, Southmead, Bristol, BS10 5NB

[2] Research and Innovation, North Bristol NHS Trust, Southmead, Bristol BS10 5NB

[3] Bristol Interstitial Lung Disease Service, North Bristol NHS Trust, Southmead, Bristol BS10 5NB

[4] Bristol Vaccine Centre, Schools of Population Health Sciences and Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS2 8AE

[5] Vaccine and Testing Team, UHBW NHS Trust, Bristol

[6] University of the West of England, Bristol, BS16 1QY

[†] These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence to: Dr Shaney Barratt,
Bristol Interstitial Lung Disease Service,
North Bristol NHS Trust, Southmead Hospital,
Bristol BS10 5NB, UK
shaney.barratt@nbt.nhs.uk

Short Title: Utility scores in ARD-ILD

Keywords: Interstitial lung disease, acute respiratory deterioration, severity scores, pulmonary fibrosis

Word Count: 2954 (manuscript) and 250 (abstract)

Funding: The AvonCAP study is an investigator-led University of Bristol sponsored study which was designed and implemented collaboratively with Pfizer, Inc. which also funded the study. For the current

manuscript, Pfizer staff did not play any part in data collection, analysis plan, data analysis or manuscript preparation

ABBERVIATIONS

6MWT	6-minute walk test
aLRTD	acute lower respiratory tract disease
AE	acute exacerbation
ARD	Acute respiratory deterioration
AUROC	Area Under the Receiver Operating Curve
CRP	C-reactive protein
CI	confidence interval
CCI	Charlson comorbidity index
CPFE	combined pulmonary fibrosis and emphysema (IPF with emphysema)
CT	computerized tomography (CT) scan
CTD	connective tissue disease
CXR	Chest x-ray (i.e. chest radiograph)
GAP	Gender-Age-Physiology
FVC	Forced vital capacity
HFNO	high flow nasal oxygen
HR	hazard ratio
ILD	Interstitial lung disease
IMV	invasive mechanical ventilation
IPF	Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis
IQR	interquartile range;
LFTs	lung function tests
LOS	length of stay
MDT	multidisciplinary team
NEWS-2	National Early Warning Score-2
NIV	non-invasive ventilation
NSIP	non-specific interstitial pneumonia
NP-LRTI	non-pneumonic lower respiratory tract infection
OR	odds ratio
PFTs	pulmonary function tests
PSI	pneumonia severity index
qSOFA	Sequential Organ Failure Assessment
ROC	Receiver Operating Curve
TLCO	transfer capacity of the lung, for the uptake of carbon monoxide

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Hospitalisations relating to acute respiratory deteriorations (ARD) in Interstitial Lung Disease (ILD) have poor outcomes. Factors predicting adverse outcomes are not fully understood and data addressing the use of illness severity scores in prognostication are limited.

Objective

To investigate the use of CURB-65 and NEWS-2 severity scores in the prediction of mortality following ARD-ILD hospitalisation, using prospective methodology and to validate previously determined cut-offs, derived from a retrospective study cohort.

Methods

A dual-centre prospective observational cohort study of all adults (≥18y) hospitalised with ARD-ILD in Bristol, UK (n=179). Gender-Age-Physiology (GAP), CURB-65 and NEWS-2 scores were calculated for each eligible admission.

Receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve analysis was used to quantify the strength of discrimination for NEWS-2 and CURB-65 scores. Univariable and multivariable logistic regression analyses were performed to explore the relationship between baseline severity scores and mortality.

Results

GAP showed some merit at predicting 30-day mortality (AUC=0.64, P=0.015); whereas CURB-65 showed modest predictive value for in-hospital (AUC=0.72, P<0.001) and 90-day

mortality (AUC=0.67, *P*<0.001). NEWS-2 showed higher predictive value for in-hospital (AUC=0.80, *P*<0.001) and 90-day mortality (AUC=0.75, *P*<0.001), with an optimal derived cut-off ≥6.5 found to be sensitive and specific for predicting in-hospital (83% and 63%) and 90-day (73% and 72%) mortality. In exploratory analyses, GAP score addition improved the predictive ability of NEWS-2 against 30-day mortality and CURB-65 across all time-periods.

Conclusion

NEWS-2 has good discriminatory value for predicting in-hospital mortality and moderate discriminatory value for predicting 90-day mortality. The optimal NEWS-2 cut-off value determined was the same as in a previous retrospective cohort, confirming the NEWS-2 score shows promise in predicting mortality following ARD-ILD hospitalisation.

INTRODUCTION

Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF) is considered the archetypal chronic progressive fibrotic Interstitial Lung Disease (ILD), which can have an unpredictable clinical course punctuated by sudden, severe acute respiratory deteriorations (ARD). ARD related hospitalisations in IPF patients are associated with poor patient outcomes, posing a significant burden on healthcare services.[1–4] ARD-IPF are categorised into parenchymal (e.g. pneumonia) and extra-parenchymal causes (e.g. pleural effusion) within a conceptual framework.[1] Acute exacerbation (AE), defined within this framework describes rapid respiratory deterioration associated with new widespread parenchymal ground glass opacification (with or without consolidation) on the background of established fibrosis and is not fully explained by fluid overload or cardiac failure. Mortality associated with AE-IPF is high,[1,5] although, factors predicting adverse outcomes are not fully understood. Whilst originally described in IPF, both ARD and AE are increasingly considered to be features of other fibrosing ILDs; although, ARD and AE epidemiology and triggers in non-IPF ILDs are less well understood, with no randomised controlled trials examining optimal management.[5]

The emergence of SARS-CoV-2 and resultant pandemic have severely impacted healthcare provision, with ILD patients at increased risk of severe COVID-19 disease, possibly attributable to immunosuppressive treatment in addition to their chronic lung changes.[6–8] Ensuring appropriate healthcare resource allocation and usage, especially with the significant ILD disease burden, may be aided by routinely used and validated illness scores. The CURB-65 score is a national standard and was validated against 30-day mortality in pneumonia,[9] and subsequently validated against other conditions including sepsis. The National Early Warning Score-2 (NEWS-2) is used routinely throughout UK hospitals to rapidly identify patients at risk of deterioration,[10] and also to predict in-hospital mortality. Both these scores are undertaken routinely with no requirement for invasive or additional testing and are thus

widely available to physicians. There are, however, few data on the use of admission illness severity scores to predict short to medium term outcomes following admission with ARD.[11–13]

Our previous single-centre, retrospective, observational cohort study of 172 IPF patients admitted with ARD, supported the use of CURB-65 and NEWS-2 illness severity scores to predict in-hospital and 90-day mortality.[4] This analysis identified baseline CURB-65 > 3.5 and NEWS-2 score >6.5 as the optimum cut-offs for predicting in-hospital mortality. ARD-IPF mortality was high irrespective of cause, in-line with mortality estimates from other published cohorts;[3] however, data also suggested AE-IPF mortality was higher compared to other parenchymal causes of ARD.[14]

The AvonCAP prospective observational study of acute lower respiratory tract disease (aLRTD) provided the opportunity to describe the characteristics of a prospective cohort of patients hospitalised with ARD-ILD following SARS-CoV-2 emergence. We therefore aimed to pragmatically evaluate whether admission CURB-65 and NEWS-2 scores could be used as predictors of mortality following ARD-ILD requiring hospitalisation, as these practical scores which are routinely used may aid both specialists and non-specialists in optimising treatment for patients with ILD. We then compared patients following an episode of ARD requiring hospitalisation with IPF and non-IPF ILDs and investigated factors associated with worse outcome.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

A prospective, dual-centre observational cohort study undertaken at North Bristol and University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trusts, encompassing all secondary care institutions in Bristol, UK, as part of the AvonCAP study. The study was approved by the Health Research Authority East of England Ethics Committee, including Section 251 of the 2006 NHS Act approved by the Confidentiality Advisory Group (REC:20/EE/0157, ISRCTN:17354061).

Study Subjects

All admission lists were screened by members of the clinical care team to identify patients hospitalised with worsening respiratory signs/symptoms between 1st August 2020 and 9th November 2021. Full inclusion and exclusion criteria are available on IRSCTN (Supplementary Data 1).[15] Only individuals with a multidisciplinary team (MDT)-confirmed diagnosis of ILD (either pre-existing or arising from the hospitalisation), including but not limited to IPF, were included in this analysis.

Collection of clinical data was undertaken on all eligible participants using a standardised REDCap proforma[16]. Lung Function Tests (LFTs) and 6-min walk test (6MWT) were included if conducted within 6-months of hospitalisation and were not performed specifically for this study. Gender-Age-Physiology (GAP), CURB-65 and NEWS-2 scores at the point of admission and Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI), which is a predictor of 10-year mortality, were calculated for each hospital admission (Supplementary Data 2).[9,17–19] Mortality data (30- and 90-day mortality) was collected through linked national healthcare data records using a unique identifier given to each patient.

Case Definitions

The aetiology of ARD-ILD was categorised according to Collard's conceptual framework:

(1) Extra-parenchymal causes: pleural effusion, pneumothorax or pulmonary embolism,

(2) AE-ILD: diagnosed in accordance with broadened Collard *et al*. revised criteria [1] to include all fibrosing ILDs: previous/concurrent ILD, worsening dyspnoea <1 month duration, new bilateral ground-glass opacification (with/without consolidation) on CT imaging, superimposed on background of established fibrosis and not fully explained by cardiac failure/ fluid overload. AE-ILD was further sub-categorised into triggered (clear precipitant) or idiopathic.

(3) Not AE-ILD: other parenchymal ARD-ILD causes not attributed to an AE, including: non-pneumonic lower respiratory tract infection (NP-LRTI)/presumed NP-LRTI (defined in the context of a CT not clearly identifying a radiological cause for the deterioration or unchanged CXR (presumed) but CRP>6mg/ml); pneumonia; cardiac failure/fluid overload; disease progression; and, those with non-specific trigger (no radiological cause demonstrated on CT imaging with CRP<6mg/ml; for example: anxiety, symptom control and/or palliation). Respiratory infection, regardless of pathogen, was categorised into pneumonic or NP-LRTI – thus COVID-19 was classified as a 'Not AE-ILD' cause of ARD.

(4) Not fully classified ARD-ILD: hospitalisation without CT imaging on admission but unaltered chest radiograph and CRP <6mg/ml and no clear trigger.

Outcome Measures

The primary outcome of this analysis was to validate previously determined admission (i.e. at the time of hospitalisation) CURB-65 score ≥3.5 and NEWS-2 score ≥6.5 as predictors of in-hospital mortality[4] in a broader group of patients with ILD.

Secondary outcomes were to determine the utility of the GAP score to predict in-hospital, 30- and 90-day mortality rates in patients with ARD-ILD. We also determined the overall in-hospital, 30- and 90-day mortality rates for patients with ARD-ILD, hospital length of stay (LOS), thereby highlighting any differences in mortality between IPF and non-IPF ARD cohorts.

Statistical Analysis

Categorical data were presented as numbers and proportions (n, %), continuous non-parametric data as medians and interquartile range (IQR). Either log rank test, Fisher's exact test or chi-square test was used where appropriate to analyse differences between groups.

For the primary analysis, univariable and multivariable logistic regression analyses were performed to explore the relationship between baseline severity scores and mortality. The factors used in the multivariable model were decided *a priori* and were smoking status, GAP score, CURB-65 and NEWS-2 score. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was used to quantify the strength of discrimination. Previous data suggested cut-offs of CURB-65>3.5 and NEWS-2>6.5, provided Area Under the Receiver Operating Curve (AUROC) estimates of 0.85 and 0.89 respectively, in the prediction of in-hospital mortality in hospitalised ARD-IPF.[4] Assuming an inpatient mortality rate approximating 20%.[4] a consecutive sample size of 175 patients would be sufficient to validate an AUROC≥0.8 with a lower 95% confidence interval (CI) of the AUROC exceeding a lower acceptability threshold of 0.7.[20] Power calculations were performed using the proprietary Power Analysis & Sample Size (PASS) software. The impact of prognostic factors on survival was computed using a Kaplan-Meier analysis and multivariate Cox proportional hazards model. For all tests, a $P<0.05$ was considered statistically significant. Data were analysed using IBM SPSS v28.0.

236

RESULTS

Patient Demographics

Of the total 122,097 patients ≥18 years hospitalised in the study period: 179 patients had confirmed ARD with a multidisciplinary diagnosis of ILD (Figure 1A). The median age of patients was 75 years (IQR 72-84), 64% were male and 57% were ex-smokers (Table 1). IPF was the underlying diagnosis of 39% of the cohort, but a broad range of other ILD diagnoses existed, including: unclassifiable ILD (13%), hypersensitivity pneumonitis (HP) (12%), and connective tissue disease associated-ILD (10%) (Table 1). *De novo* presentations with ILD were infrequent (3% ILD admissions). Patients had moderately restrictive disease (median FVC% predicted 75 (IQR 63-91), TLCO 44% (IQR 33-58) and a median GAP score of 4 (IQR 3-5), corresponding to GAP stage II. Approximately one third of patients had at least 2 or more (31%, n=56) concurrent medical co-morbidities. Overall, vaccination rates were high in the cohort: 75% of patients having received pneumococcal and seasonal influenza vaccination by the time of admission, and 83% of eligible patients (Supplementary Data 3) having received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccination prior to admission. The median length of stay was 7 days (IQR3-11) versus 6 days (IQR 3-11) for IPF and non-IPF ARD admissions (P=0.545), respectively.

Figure 1. Adults hospitalised with acute respiratory deterioration of interstitial lung disease (A) Flow diagram of study participants and (B) aetiology of acute respiratory deterioration of Interstitial lung disease (ARD-ILD).
ARD; acute respiratory deterioration; AE-ILD, acute exacerbation of interstitial lung disease; LRTI, lower respiratory tract infection; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; HF, heart failure.
+n=11 COVID-19 pneumonia, one aspiration pneumonia, one hospitalised pneumonia, remainder deemed to be community acquired pneumonia
*including 3 with symptomatic COVID-19 but no CXR infiltrates
^ unclassified – CT not performed and CRP <50.



IPF patients were statistically older than those with non-IPF ILD diagnoses (IPF 81 years vs non-IPF 77 years, *P*=0.0068), more likely to be male (IPF 77% vs non-IPF 55%, Fisher's exact test, *P* =0.004), with lower TLCO % predicted (IPF 38% vs non-IPF 54%, *P*=0.0002) and higher GAP scores (IPF 5 vs non-IPF 4, *P*<0.0001) on hospitalisation. IPF and non-IPF ILD patients had comparable baseline spirometry values (Table 1).

Underlying Aetiology

Most (79%) ARD-ILD admissions were due to parenchymal causes other than AE-ILD (Figure 1B). Pneumonia was the most common parenchymal cause (57%, 77/141); the vast majority were community-acquired (83% of pneumonias, n=63), with COVID-19 pneumonitis in eleven patients (14%). Other parenchymal causes included cardiac failure (n=21, 15%), NP-LRTI (n=24, 17%, including 3 patients with symptomatic COVID) and disease progression in n=5 (4%). An extra-parenchymal pathology was considered the cause of ARD in 12 patients (7%); 7 with pulmonary embolism, 3 with pleural effusion/empyema, with pneumomediastinum and anaphylaxis in the remaining patients.

Non-specific triggers of ARD were identified in approximately 10% of patients and these admissions were related to requirements for palliation and symptom control, including anxiety and breathlessness. AE-ILD was rare in this cohort (n=3, 2%) and seen in patients with fibrotic hypersensitivity pneumonitis and IPF. Due to low incidence of AE-ILD we were not able to perform analyses to determine differences between patients admitted with AE-ILD and other parenchymal causes.

Table 1: Characteristics of adults hospitalised with ARD-ILD

Characteristic	ARD-ILD n = 179	IPF n = 70	Non IPF n = 109	*P*-value
Male, n (%)	114 (64)	54 (77)	60 (55)	**0.0040**
Age (years), median (IQR)	79 (72-84)	81 (75-86)	77 (70-83)	**0.0068**
Smoking Status, n (%)				0.2537
Current	9 (5)	4 (6)	5 (5)	
Ex-smoker	102 (57)	48 (69)	54 (50)	
Never	53 (30)	14 (20)	39 (36)	
Unknown	15 (8)	4 (6)	11 (10)	
Ethnicity, n (%)				0.7566
Caucasian	148 (83)	58 (83)	90 (83)	
Other	11 (6)	6 (9)	5 (5)	
Unknown	20 (11)	6 (9)	14 (13)	
CCI, median (IQR)	5 (4-6)	5 (4-6)	5 (3-6)	0.8765
Aetiology ILD, n (%)				N/A
IPF	70 (39)	70 (100)	-	
Unclassifiable	23 (13)	-	23 (13)	
Hypersensitivity pneumonitis	22 (12)	-	22 (12)	
CTD-ILD	17 (10)	-	17 (10)	
Smoking related ILD	14 (8)	-	14 (8)	
CPFE (IPF with emphysema)	9 (5)	-	9 (5)	
NSIP	8 (5)	-	8 (5)	
Sarcoid	6 (3)	-	6 (3)	
Asbestosis	4 (2)	-	4 (2)	
Other	6 (3)	-	6 (3)	
Baseline PFTs, median (IQR)				
Lung function				
FEV1 % predicted	78 (66-93), n=168	81 (69-93), n=68	75 (63-93), n=100	0.5627
FVC % predicted	75 (63-91), n=168	75 (64-89), n=68	77 (63-96, n=100	0.5324
TLCO % predicted	44 (33-58), n=137	40 (30-46), n=58	54 (37-61), n=79	**0.0002**
6MWT distance (m)	240 (155-311), n=133	240 (130-290), n=60	245 (168-354), n=73	0.7552
6MWT minimum sats (%)	87 (84-90) n=133	87 (84-89), n=60	87 (84-90), n=73	0.8129
Total GAP score	4 (3-5), n=150	5 (4-6), n=61	4 (3-5), n=89	**<0.0001**
Admission Severity Scores				
CURB-65, median (IQR)	2 (1-4)	2 (1-4)	1 (1-3)	**0.0096**
NEWS-2, median (IQR)	6 (3-8)	6 (3-8)	5 (2-8)	0.4246
ARD-ILD cause				0.8284
Extra-Parenchymal	12 (7)	5 (7)	7 (6)	
AE-ILD	3 (2)	2 (3)	1 (1)	
Not AE-ILD	141 (79)	53 (76)	88 (81)	
Pneumonia	77 (43)	33 (47)	44 (40)	
Not fully classified ARD-ILD	23 (13)	9 (13)	14 (13)	
Respiratory Support, n (%)				
None	20 (11)	10 (14)	10 (9)	0.3346
Oxygen	159 (89)	60 (86)	99 (91)	
HFNO	20 (11)	8 (11)	12 (11)	1.0000
NIV	8 (4)	5 (7)	3 (3)	0.2123
IMV	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0.4033
Treatment, n (%) #				
Antifibrotic on admission	40 (22)	40 (57)	0 (0)	N/A
Received antibiotics (>2 days)	139 (78)	53 (74)	86 (79)	0.4391
Received corticosteroids	49 (27)	18 (26)	31 (28)	0.7702
Length of stay, median (IQR)				

Hospitalisation days	6 (3-11)	7 (3-11)	6 (3-11)	0.5451
Mortality, n (%)				
In-hospital mortality	34 (19)	17 (24)	17 (16)	0.1848
30-day mortality	42 (23)	21 (30)	21 (19)	0.0901
90-day mortality	69 (39)	33 (47)	36 (33)	0.0614
Survival days, median (IQR)	59 (10-144), n=101	23 (10-23), n=41	79 (13-144), n=60	**0.0417**

P-values represent the result of a Log-rank Test or Fisher's exact test between IPF and non-IPF groups

 Other includes lymphocytic interstitial pneumonia, Langerhan's cell histiocytosis, pleuro-parenchymal fibroelastosis, Rosai-Dorfman, organising pneumonia.

corticosteroid treatment was defined as either a three day course of 500mg IV methylprednisolone or an equivalent dose of alternative steroid. No patients in this cohort were started on immunosuppressive therapy or received antifibrotic therapy acutely.

6MWT, 6-minute walk test; ARD, acute respiratory deterioration; CCI, Charlson comorbidity index; CPFE, combined idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis & emphysema; CTD-ILD, connective tissue disease ILD; GAP, gender, age and physiology score; HFNO, high flow nasal oxygen; ILD, interstitial lung disease; IPF, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis; IMV, invasive mechanical ventilation; IQR, interquartile range; NIV, non-invasive ventilation NSIP, non-specific interstitial pneumonia; PFTs, pulmonary function tests

Primary Outcome

Over half of all patients hospitalised with an ARD-ILD had a CURB-65≥2 (n=99, 55%) and NEWS-2 ≥5 (n=114, 64%) on admission. Patients with ARD-IPF had a statistically higher baseline CURB-65 compared to those with non-IPF ARD-ILD diagnoses (median CURB-65 2 [IQR 1-4] versus 1 [IQR 1-3], *P*=0.0096), but baseline NEWS-2 scores were comparable (median NEWS-2 6 [IQR 3-8] versus 5 [IQR 2-8] respectively, *P* >0.05) (Table 1).

GAP score was found to have diminishing utility for in-hospital mortality (AUC=0.604, *P*=0.087) and some merit for 30-day mortality (AUC=0.642, *P*=0.015). CURB-65 showed modest predictive value for in-hospital (AUC=0.715, *P*<0.0001) and 90-day mortality (AUC=0.672, *P*<0.0001), with the optimal derived cut-off CURB-65≥2.5 in our previous study[4] had high specificity (75, 88% respectively) but low sensitivity (57, 46% respectively) (Table 2). The optimal derived cut-off for CURB-65 in this cohort was 3.5. The NEWS-2

showed higher predictive value for in-hospital (AUC=0.803, *P*<0.0001) and 90-day mortality (AUC=0.751, *P*<0.0001). The optimal cut-off for NEWS-2≥6.5 was found to have high sensitivity (73%) and specificity (72%) for predicting 90-day mortality, in contrast to high sensitivity (83%) and moderate specificity (63%) for predicting in-hospital mortality (Table 2).

As the CURB-65 score correlated moderately to NEWS-2 score (R=0.552, *P*<0.0001), the combined ability of these two scores to predict mortality was assessed (Table 2). NEWS-2 retained significance to predict 90-day and in-hospital mortality after allowing for the effect of CURB-65 score (OR 1.34, *P*<0.0001, and OR 1.47, *P*<0.0001, respectively); however, CURB-65 was no longer a significant predictor after controlling for NEWS-2 for 90-day (OR 1.34, *P*=0.1648) or in-hospital mortality (OR 1.423, *P*=0.1791) (Supplementary Data 5). The addition of the GAP score improved the ability of the CURB-65 score to predict mortality (Table 2), with both GAP and CURB-65 retaining significance in each other's presence. In contrast, the GAP score only improved the ability of the NEWS-2 score to predict 30-day mortality.

Table 2: Outcomes of ROC curve analysis for evaluating optimal cut-off values for CURB-65, NEWS-2 and GAP scores, correlating with ARD-ILD mortality

Evaluation of the receiver operator curve (ROC) curve analysis for CURB-65, NEWS-2 and GAP scores correlate with 30- and 90-day mortality, in addition to in-hospital mortality.

	AUC	95% CI	*P*-value	Decision Point	Sensitivity	Specificity	Youden's Index (J)
SINGLE DISEASE SEVERITY SCORES							
CURB-65							
In-hospital mortality	0.715	0.620-0.810	<0.0001	3.5	0.200	0.965	0.17
				2.5	0.571	0.746	0.32
30-day mortality	0.650	0.553-0.746	0.0021	1.5	0.476	0.737	0.21
90-day mortality	0.672	0.591-0.753	<0.0001	3.5	0.130	0.973	0.10
				2.5	0.464	0.882	0.25
NEWS-2							
In-hospital mortality	0.803	0.731-0.875	<0.0001	6.5	0.829	0.634	0.46
30-day mortality	0.750	0.669-0.831	<0.0001	6.5	0.762	0.642	0.40
90-day mortality	0.751	0.680-0.822	<0.0001	6.5	0.725	0.718	0.44
GAP							
In-hospital mortality	0.604	0.491-0.717	0.0869	4.5	0.607	0.554	0.16
30-day mortality	0.642	0.541-0.744	0.0151	3.5	0.871	0.353	0.22
90-day mortality	0.564	0.471-0.658	0.1887	4.5	0.545	0.568	0.11
COMBINATION DISEASE SEVERITY SCORES							
CURB-65 and NEWS-2							
In-hospital mortality	0.805	0.731-0.879	<0.0001	0.157	0.857	0.620	0.48
30-day mortality	0.681	0.589-0.822	<0.0001	0.225	0.624	0.681	0.40
90-day mortality	0.757	0.687-0.827	<0.0001	0.392	0.710	0.682	0.39
CURB-65 and GAP							
In-hospital mortality	0.764	0.671-0.856	<0.0001	0.207	0.679	0.739	0.41
30-day mortality	0.761	0.677-0.846	<0.0001	0.140	0.903	0.504	0.41
90-day mortality	0.727	0.646-0.809	<0.0001	0.335	0.673	0.663	0.34
NEWS-2 and GAP							
In-hospital mortality	0.802	0.745-0.895	<0.0001	0.239	0.679	0.802	0.48
30-day mortality	0.810	0.732-0.888	<0.0001	0.177	0.839	0.639	0.48
90-day mortality	0.752	0.675-0.828	<0.0001	0.342	0.782	0.642	0.43

AUC, area under curve; CI, confidence interval; GAP, Gender, Age, Physiology Score; ROC, receiver operator characteristics. ROCs are provided within Supplementary Data 5 and 6.

Secondary Outcomes

The median length of stay for patients admitted with an ARD-ILD was 6 days, but variability was observed across the cohort (IQR 3-11 days). Small numbers of patients received advanced respiratory support during their admission (n=29, 16%) although supplementary oxygen was frequently prescribed (n=159, 89%) (Table 1). ARD-ILD associated mortality was high; 20% of hospitalisations resulted in death, with 30- and 90-day mortality following admission of 24% and 38% (n=68) respectively (Table 1). Survival curve analysis indicated that patients admitted with ARD-IPF had higher in-hospital and 90-day mortality than patients with non-IPF-ARD (Figure 2). Univariate Cox regression analysis indicated that increasing NEWS-2 score was associated with higher mortality risk in-hospital and at 90-days; however, increased admission CURB-65 scores were not associated with an increased mortality risk (Table 3). Neither were higher admission CURB-65 nor NEWS-2 scores found to be associated with increased hazard of in-hospital mortality.

Figure 2: ARD-ILD survival curve analysis

Kaplan Meier survival curves for (A) in-hospital and (B) 90-day mortality, for patients admitted with ARD-IPF (green line) and non-IPF ARD-ILD (blue line).



Table 3: Association of baseline patient factors with in-hospital mortality and 90-day mortality following hospitalisation with ARD-ILD

Cox proportional hazard regression univariate analysis

Analysis	Factor	Wald	HR	*P*-value	95% CI
In hospital mortality	GAP score	0.365	1.089	0.5452	0.826-1.435
	Smoking Status	3.102	2.022	0.0778	0.924-4.428
	CURB-65 score	3.163	1.565	0.0747	0.955-2.562
	NEWS-2 score	3.841	1.188	0.0501	1.000-1.411
90-day mortality	GAP score	1.020	0.773	0.3132	0.469-1.274
	Smoking Status	2.016	1.676	0.1558	0.822-3.419
	CURB-65 score	1.089	0.753	0.2967	0.442-1.283
	NEWS-2 score	4.251	1.231	**0.0391**	1.010-1.501

CI, confidence interval; GAP, Gender, Age, Physiology Score; HR, hazard ratio.

DISCUSSION

The identification of patients with poor prognosis among those with ARD-ILD remains a significant challenge and there are limited data addressing the utility of illness severity scores to predict outcomes of these patients. This pragmatic, prospective study suggests that, as a predictor of mortality in this patient cohort, the admission NEWS-2 score has good discriminatory value for predicting in-hospital mortality and moderate discriminatory value for predicting 90-day mortality in patients following an ARD-ILD episode. As NEWS-2 is non-invasive and routinely calculated for all hospitalisations, this analysis suggests this severity score may be useful to non-specialists, enabling them to provide earlier appropriate care to ILD patients. To our knowledge, this is the first prospective evidence for utilising admission NEWS-2 as a tool to predict in-hospital and post hospitalisation morbidity following ARD-ILD. A previous retrospective cohort study conducted at one of the study hospitals found that both admission NEWS-2 and CURB-65 risk stratification tools were independent predictors of mortality in patients with IPF.[4] The current study therefore confirms the findings of this previous retrospective cohort[4] and hence admission NEWS-2 may represent a simple tool to help prognostication. Notably, the optimal derived cut-off value for admission NEWS-2 in predicting mortality across inpatient, 30- and 90-days was NEWS-2 ≥6.5, the same in both this prospective patient cohort and our previously reported retrospective cohort.[4]

The CURB-65 score at the point of admission was found to have little additional benefit for predicting mortality, either as an individual predictor or when used in exploratory analyses with NEWS-2. Furthermore, we found that admission CURB-65 was able to predict both 90-day and in-hospital mortality in ARD-ILD with high specificity but low sensitivity, in keeping with previous data from our IPF cohort[4]. Aligning with these findings, Yamazaki *et al* found that CURB-65, Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and Sequential Organ Failure

Assessment (qSOFA) were all predictive of inpatient mortality from pneumonia in a retrospective study of 79 patients with IPF.[21] In that study, the optimal CURB-65 cut-off value was ≥3.0, differing slightly from the value derived in our previous retrospective IPF cohort,[4] but contrasting with the optimal cut-off ≥2.5 derived in this current prospective ILD cohort. Notably, the admission CURB-65 score did not add value to the ability of the NEWS-2 score to predict poor outcomes. In contrast, exploratory analyses indicate there is some evidence of increased predictive ability on outcomes when NEWS-2 and GAP scores are used in tandem. Overall, these findings from different centres and patient populations suggest that the disease severity scores show promise in predicting poor outcome following hospitalisation with acute respiratory deterioration.

As reported before the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, patients hospitalised with ARD-IPF had a poor prognosis.[4,22–24] We found that ARD-ILD continues to cause a significant disease burden in secondary care following SARS-CoV-2 emergence, with a median hospital admission of 6 days (IQR3-11). Whilst we found in-hospital and 90-day mortality rates were significantly higher in the IPF group than the non-IPF group, all admissions related to an ARD were associated with significant mortality; 24% and 38% for 30- and 90-day mortality, respectively. The median survival in this cohort was 23 days, slightly shorter than the survival times in the literature ranging between 1 and 4 months after AE-IPF.[25–28] In keeping with our findings, Suzuki *et al* reported that AE IPF was associated with a 47% 90-day mortality, which was statistically poorer than non-IPF AE 90-day mortality of 38%.[29] Other studies have reported IPF patients have a significantly shorter overall and post-hospitalization survival time following an acute respiratory deterioration compared with other ILDs.[22,29] Our in-hospital mortality data supports early and frank discussions between patients/families and clinicians surrounding the high mortality associated with ARD, even in the context of potentially 'treatable' causes e.g. infection and pulmonary embolism. Furthermore, the high

short-term mortality after discharge may prompt clinicians to consider early discussions surrounding palliation and/or transplantation in suitable candidates. In practice, the treatment decisions in patients with ARD-ILD faced by both specialist and non-specialist clinicians, patients and their families are profound and often irreversible. Making these decisions optimally requires the integration of many differing and individual considerations, including accurate prognostic information, and as the predictive characteristics of the scores as determined in this study may not add value above the ability of experienced clinicians to advise patients and their families. Whilst antifibrotics reduce mortality in ILD, to our knowledge it is currently unknown what the impact of antifibrotics on severity of AE ILD once it occurs;[30] although, nintedanib may reduce severity of first exacerbation.[31] The NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) technology appraisal guideline for antifibrotics in non-IPF ILD did not exist at the time this cohort was hospitalised. We note that 57% of IPF patients in this study were receiving antifibrotic treatment at the time of admission, but this analysis would not be powered to determine if antifibrotic use in IPF reduces the severity of AE-IPF in patients hospitalised with this condition.

There were few admissions secondary to AE-ILD, which prevented further detailed analyses of any differences in the mortality between AE-ILD and other parenchymal causes of ARD. Teramachi *et al* showed 90-day mortality of AE-IPF patients was significantly higher than ARD due to other parenchymal causes (46% [16/35] vs 17% [12/71] respectively; P=0.002).[14] It is not possible to ascertain fully to what extent healthcare access and patient behaviour during the pandemic affected these outcomes. The Task Force for Lung Health suggested that over a third of people with pre-existing lung problems felt pressure to avoid or delay seeking treatment.[32] Hence, patients may have delayed presentation to hospital. Alternatively, the emergence of a novel pathogen may have affected outcomes of patients with ARD, either directly or indirectly through changes in the epidemiology of other acute

respiratory infection, treatment pathways or other aspects of patient healthcare provision. In non-ILD patients hospitalised with SARS-CoV-2 infection, admission NEWS-2 correlates moderately well with severe outcomes such as ITU admission, positive airway pressure support or death; however, there were no such significant correlations for admission CURB-65 (P>0.05).[33]

This study has many strengths. It was undertaken as a prospective two site cohort study which screened hospital admissions for signs/symptoms of acute respiratory disease. This study therefore does not rely on ICD-10 coding or solely on data-linkage. There were minimal missing data, and the study includes adults who lack capacity to consent through a consultee and by specific authorisation to use certain data without consent, thereby ensuring full ascertainment of ARD-ILD during this period. The medical records were linked with community records to obtain detailed and accurate data for each study participant.

There are also some limitations of this study. We assessed the use of admission severity scores as mortality predictors in patients hospitalised with ARD-ILD and this analysis cannot and does not assess their usefulness in ILD patients in stable state. We assessed ARD-ILD at both acute care NHS hospitals in Bristol and 83% of this cohort is Caucasian; therefore, we cannot be sure that results are generalisable to other patient populations. We are not sufficiently power to statistically test whether two correlated area under the curves differ when one element is in common (CURB-65 and GAP vs. NEWS and GAP) or whether one model nested in another (CURB-65 versus CURB-65 and GAP) differ in terms of their AUROC. This study used linked national healthcare records to determine mortality, and did not ascertain the specific cause of death. We acknowledge that the ILD exacerbation rate in this cohort appears to be low, we were therefore unable to confirm our previous findings that mortality associated with ARD-ILD was high, irrespective of the underlying cause for the

deterioration. Notably only three patients met the definition of AE-ILD. Not all patients with evidence of pneumonia had a CT performed and it is therefore possible that some of these patients had a triggered exacerbation with increased ground glass opacification not evident on CXR. We were also unable to determine the time from ILD diagnosis until hospitalisation with ARD, and therefore could not adjust for this co-variate. The impact of shielding during the COVID pandemic on exacerbation rate is a further factor to be considered. Lastly, it is difficult to determine whether healthcare access may have affected time to hospitalisation and hence outcomes, as previously discussed. Others have reported that patients with chronic respiratory disease had fewer admissions to secondary-care during the COVID-19 pandemic[32, 34] and this may have affected the results of this study, although the direction of effect is unclear.

CONCLUSION

Simple illness severity scores may permit refinement of ARD management of ILD patients and if survival to discharge is achieved, permit early discussion with patients, referral to transplantation or palliative care planning as appropriate.

REFERENCES

1. Collard HR, Ryerson CJ, Corte TJ, Jenkins G, Kondoh Y, Lederer DJ, et al. Acute Exacerbation of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis. An International Working Group Report. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2016 Aug 1;194(3):265–75.

2. Cottin V, Schmidt A, Catella L, Porte F, Fernandez-Montoya C, Le Lay K, et al. Burden of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis Progression: A 5-Year Longitudinal Follow-Up Study. PLoS One. 2017;12(1):e0166462.

3. Moua T, Westerly BD, Dulohery MM, Daniels CE, Ryu JH, Lim KG. Patients With Fibrotic Interstitial Lung Disease Hospitalized for Acute Respiratory Worsening: A Large Cohort Analysis. Chest. 2016 May;149(5):1205–14.

4. Hyams C, Hettle D, Bibby A, Adamali HA, Barratt SL. Utility of illness severity scores to predict mortality in patients hospitalised with respiratory deterioration of Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis. QJM. 2020 Jul 1;hcaa214.

5. Kolb M, Bondue B, Pesci A, Miyazaki Y, Song JW, Bhatt NY, et al. Acute exacerbations of progressive-fibrosing interstitial lung diseases. Eur Respir Rev. 2018 Dec 31;27(150):180071.

6. Southern BD. Patients with interstitial lung disease and pulmonary sarcoidosis are at high risk for severe illness related to COVID-19. Cleve Clin J Med. 2020 Jun 18;

7. Esposito AJ, Menon AA, Ghosh AJ, Putman RK, Fredenburgh LE, El-Chemaly SY, et al. Increased Odds of Death for Patients with Interstitial Lung Disease and COVID-19: A Case-Control Study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2020 Dec 15;202(12):1710–3.

8. Drake TM, Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Quint JK, Adamali H, Agnew S, et al. Outcome of Hospitalization for COVID-19 in Patients with Interstitial Lung Disease. An International Multicenter Study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2020 Dec 15;202(12):1656–65.

9. Lim WS, van der Eerden MM, Laing R, Boersma WG, Karalus N, Town GI, et al. Defining community acquired pneumonia severity on presentation to hospital: an international derivation and validation study. Thorax. 2003 May;58(5):377–82.

10. Chang CL, Sullivan GD, Karalus NC, Mills GD, McLachlan JD, Hancox RJ. Predicting early mortality in acute exacerbation of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease using the CURB65 score. Respirology. 2011 Jan;16(1):146–51.

11. Smith MEB, Chiovaro JC, O'Neil M, Kansagara D, Quiñones AR, Freeman M, et al. Early warning system scores for clinical deterioration in hospitalized patients: a systematic review. Ann Am Thorac Soc. 2014 Nov;11(9):1454–65.

12. Smith GB, Prytherch DR, Meredith P, Schmidt PE. Early warning scores: unravelling detection and escalation. Int J Health Care Qual Assur. 2015;28(8):872–5.

13. Kim I, Song H, Kim H, Park K, Kim SH, Oh S, et al. Use of the National Early Warning Score for predicting in-hospital mortality in older adults admitted to the emergency department. Clinical and Experimental Emergency Medicine. 2020 Mar 31;7:61–6.

14. Teramachi R, Kondoh Y, Kataoka K, Taniguchi H, Matsuda T, Kimura T, et al. Outcomes with newly proposed classification of acute respiratory deterioration in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Respir Med. 2018 Oct;143:147–52.

15. ISRCTN - ISRCTN17354061: A pan-pandemic respiratory infection surveillance study [Internet]. [cited 2021 Oct 6]. Available from: https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN17354061

16. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009 Apr;42(2):377–81.

17. Kolb M, Collard HR. Staging of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: past, present and future. Eur Respir Rev. 2014 Jun;23(132):220–4.

18. Ley B, Ryerson CJ, Vittinghoff E, Ryu JH, Tomassetti S, Lee JS, et al. A multidimensional index and staging system for idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Ann Intern Med. 2012 May 15;156(10):684–91.

19. Smith GB, Prytherch DR, Jarvis S, Kovacs C, Meredith P, Schmidt PE, et al. A Comparison of the Ability of the Physiologic Components of Medical Emergency Team Criteria and the U.K. National Early Warning Score to Discriminate Patients at Risk of a Range of Adverse Clinical Outcomes. Crit Care Med. 2016 Dec;44(12):2171–81.

20. Hanley JA, McNeil BJ. The meaning and use of the area under a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. Radiology. 1982 Apr 1;143(1):29–36.

21. Yamazaki R, Nishiyama O, Yoshikawa K, Saeki S, Sano H, Iwanaga T, et al. Comparison of CURB-65, PSI, and qSOFA for predicting pneumonia mortality in patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Sci Rep. 2021 Feb 16;11(1):3880.

22. Salonen J, Vähänikkilä H, Purokivi M, Kaarteenaho R. Causes of acute respiratory hospitalizations predict survival in fibrosing interstitial lung diseases. PLOS ONE. 2020 Nov 30;15(11):e0242860.

23. Collard HR, Moore BB, Flaherty KR, Brown KK, Kaner RJ, King TE, et al. Acute exacerbations of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2007 Oct 1;176(7):636–43.

24. Kondoh Y, Cottin V, Brown KK. Recent lessons learned in the management of acute exacerbation of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Eur Respir Rev. 2017 Sep 30;26(145):170050.

25. Arai T, Kagawa T, Sasaki Y, Sugawara R, Sugimoto C, Tachibana K, et al. Heterogeneity of incidence and outcome of acute exacerbation in idiopathic interstitial pneumonia. Respirology. 2016 Nov;21(8):1431–7.

26. Cao M, Sheng J, Qiu X, Wang D, Wang D, Wang Y, et al. Acute exacerbations of fibrosing interstitial lung disease associated with connective tissue diseases: a population-based study. BMC Pulmonary Medicine. 2019 Nov 14;19(1):215.

27. Collard HR, Yow E, Richeldi L, Anstrom KJ, Glazer C, for the IPFnet investigators. Suspected acute exacerbation of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis as an outcome measure in clinical trials. Respiratory Research. 2013 Jul 13;14(1):73.

28. Song JW, Hong SB, Lim CM, Koh Y, Kim DS. Acute exacerbation of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: incidence, risk factors and outcome. European Respiratory Journal. 2011 Feb 1;37(2):356–63.

29. Suzuki A, Kondoh Y, Brown KK, Johkoh T, Kataoka K, Fukuoka J, et al. Acute exacerbations of fibrotic interstitial lung diseases. Respirology. 2020;25(5):525–34.

30. Petnak T, Lertjitbanjong P, Thongprayoon C, Moua T. Impact of Antifibrotic Therapy on Mortality and Acute Exacerbation in Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Chest. 2021 Nov;160(5):1751–63.

31. Kreuter M, Koegler H, Trampisch M, Geier S, Richeldi L. Differing severities of acute exacerbations of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis (IPF): insights from the INPULSIS® trials. Respir Res. 2019 Apr 11;20(1):71.

32. Over a third of people with lung conditions felt pressure to avoid or delay seeking treatment during lockdown - British Lung Foundation [Internet]. Asthma + Lung UK. 2020 [cited 2022 Jul 6]. Available from: https://www.blf.org.uk/taskforce/press-release/over-a-third-of-people-with-lung-conditions-felt-pressure-to-avoid-or-delay-seeking-treatment

33. Arnold DT, Attwood M, Barratt S, Morley A, Elvers KT, McKernon J, et al. Predicting outcomes of COVID-19 from admission biomarkers: a prospective UK cohort study. Emerg Med J. 2021 Jul;38(7):543–8.

34. Alqahtani JS, Oyelade T, Aldhahir AM, Gonçalves Mendes R, Alghamdi SM, Miravitlles M *et al.* Reduction in hospitalised COPD exacerbations during COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE* 2021;**16**:e0255659. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0255659

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

CH, RW, PW, AF and SLB generated the research question and analysis plan. The data for this study was collected by the AvonCAP Research Team, CH, RW, JR, MGG and ZSB. CH, MGG, ZSB and RW verified the data. RW, CH, PW, AF and SLB undertook data analysis. All authors were involved in the final manuscript preparation and its revisions before publication. AF and SB provided oversight of the research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the Research Teams at North Bristol NHS and University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Trusts, including Helen Lewis-White, Diana Benton, Anna Morley, Jade King and Nicola Manning. Furthermore, we would like to acknowledge the significant contribution to the AvonCAP study made by Rachel Davies, Adam Taylor, Mai Baquedano and the IT team, including Stuart Robinson, at North Bristol NHS Trust.

DATA SHARING

The data used in this study are sensitive and cannot be made publicly available without breaching patient confidentiality regulations. Therefore, individual participant data and a data dictionary are not available to other researchers.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

CH is Principal Investigator of the AvonCAP study, which is an investigator-led University of Bristol study funded by Pfizer, Inc, and is currently a member of the BTS Pulmonary Infection Specialty Advisory Group (SAG). AF is a member of the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunization (JCVI) and chair of the World Health Organization European Technical Advisory Group of Experts (WHO ETAGE) committee. In addition to receiving

funding from Pfizer as Chief Investigator for this study, he leads another project investigating transmission of respiratory bacteria in families jointly funded by Pfizer and the Gates The other authors declare no competing interests.

The AvonCAP Research Group

AUTHOR	AFFILIATION
David Adegbite	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Rupert Antico	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Francesca Bayley	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Beth Begier	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific and Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, USA
Maddalena Bellavia	North Bristol NHS Trust
Emma Bridgeman	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Julia Brzezinska	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
James Campling	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific and Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, USA
Natalie Chang	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Julie Cloake	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Madeleine Clout	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Pip Croxford	North Bristol NHS Trust
Gillian Ellsbury	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific and Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, UK
Bradford Gessner	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific and Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, USA
Niall Grace	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Sharon Gray	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific and Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, USA
Oliver Griffiths	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Charli Grimes	North Bristol NHS Trust
Lucy Grimwood	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Zsolt Friedrich	North Bristol NHS Trust
Leah Fleming	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Kazminder Fox	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Milo Jeenes-Flanagan	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Luis Jodar	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific and Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, USA
Johanna Kellett Wright	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Jane Kinney	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Robyn Heath	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Kate Helliker	North Bristol NHS Trust
Robyn Huber	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific and Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, USA
Amelia Langdon	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Rajeka Lazarus	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Sandi Nammuni Arachchge	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Vicki Mackay	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Robin Marlow	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Zandile Maseko	North Bristol NHS Trust

Anya Mattocks	Bristol Vaccine Centre
Katie Maughan	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Nicola Manning	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Katarina Milutinovic	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Konstantina Minou	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Anna Morley	North Bristol NHS Trust
Taslima Mona	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Claire Mitchell	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Leigh Morrison	North Bristol NHS Trust
Bethany Osborne	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Fiona Perkins	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Tawassal Riaz	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Gabriella Ruffino	North Bristol NHS Trust
Peter Sequenza	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Lily Smart	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Emma Scott	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Jo Southern	Vaccines Medical Development, Scientific & Clinical Affairs, Pfizer Inc, UK
Seevakumar Suppiah	North Bristol NHS Trust
Zoe Taylor	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Grace Tilzey	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Anabella Turner	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Gabriella Valentine	Bristol Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol
Marianne Vasquez	North Bristol NHS Trust
Rhian Walters	Clinical Research and Imaging Centre, UHBW NHS Trust
Lana Ward	North Bristol NHS Trust
Louise Wright	North Bristol NHS Trust

Supplemental Data 1: AvonCAP inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria:

Patients must meet all the following inclusion criteria to be eligible for enrolment:

1. Aged ≥18 years of age
2. Patients with illness with following 2 characteristics:
    a. Acute illness (i.e., present for 28 days or less); AND
    b. Evidence of acute LRTD:
        a. Patients with current or suspected COVID-19 or previous proven COVID-19 within last 28 days OR
        b. Clinical or radiologic diagnosis of pneumonia or an acute LRTI OR
        c. New onset or worsening of ≥2 of following 8 LRTD symptoms or clinical findings:
            i. fever (>38.0°C) or hypothermia (<35.5°C) before or within 24 hours of enrolment;
            ii. pleuritic chest pain;
            iii. cough (including nocturnal only);
            iv. sputum production or purulence;
            v. dyspnea (shortness of breath) including orthopnea or on exertion only;
            vi. tachypnea (respiratory rate ≥20/min) documented by healthcare professional;
            vii. abnormal auscultatory findings suggestive of LRTD (e.g., crepitations/rales or evidence of pulmonary consolidation including dullness on percussion, bronchial breath sounds, wheezing, or egophony);
            viii. radiologic finding that is consistent with LRTD, including pneumonia, and/or acute congestive heart failure (e.g., pleural effusion, increased pulmonary density due to infection, the presence of alveolar infiltrates [multilobar, lobar or segmental] containing air bronchograms, or interstitial oedema).

Exclusion criteria:

Patients meeting any of the following criteria will not be included in the study:

1. Any patient who develops signs and symptoms of LRTD after being hospitalized for ≥48 hours (either at current hospital, another transferring hospital, or a combination of these), unless admitted with current, previous proven, or suspected COVID-19 infection

2. Previously enrolled participants readmitted ≤7 days after discharge for their study qualifying admission, unless admitted with current, previous proven, or suspected COVID-19 infection

3. At the time of enrolment, an LRTD-related diagnosis has been excluded or another diagnosis confirmed (for example, patient was found to have fever and tachypnoea due to an intraabdominal process such as cholecystitis)

Supplemental Data 2: Disease severity scores

a) NEWS-2 Score:

Physiological parameter	Score 3	2	1	0	1	2	3
Respiration rate (per minute)	≤8		9–11	12–20		21–24	≥25
SpO_2 Scale 1 (%)	≤91	92–93	94–95	≥96			
SpO_2 Scale 2 (%)	≤83	84–85	86–87	88–92 ≥93 on air	93–94 on oxygen	95–96 on oxygen	≥97 on oxygen
Air or oxygen?		Oxygen		Air			
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	≤90	91–100	101–110	111–219			≥220
Pulse (per minute)	≤40		41–50	51–90	91–110	111–130	≥131
Consciousness				Alert			CVPU
Temperature (°C)	≤35.0		35.1–36.0	36.1–38.0	38.1–39.0	≥39.1	

b) CURB-65 Score

CURB-65	Clinical Feature	Points
C	Confusion	1
U	Urea > 7 mmol/L	1
R	RR ≥ 30	1
B	SBP ≤ 90 mm Hg OR DBP ≤ 60 mm Hg	1
65	Age > 65	1

c) GAP Score

	Predictor	Points
	Gender	
G	Female	0
	Male	1
	Age years	
A	⩽60	0
	61–65	1
	>65	2
	Physiology	
	FVC % predicted	
	>75	0
	50–75	1
	<50	2
P	*D*LCO % predicted	
	>55	0
	36–55	1
	⩽35	2
	Cannot perform	3

Maximum possible points=8. FVC: forced vital capacity; *D*LCO: diffusing capacity of the lung for carbon monoxide.

Supplementary Data 3: Availability of vaccine appointments in England by date.

Start date	Group(s) which could receive vaccine	Priority group
8 December 2020	Residents in a care home for older adults and their carers; and all aged 80 and over	1 and part of 2
Procedures set out on 9 and 14 January 2021	Frontline health and social care workers	Part of 2
18 January 2021	All aged 70 and over, and clinically extremely vulnerable individuals	3 and 4
15 February 2021	All aged 65 and over; and those aged 16 to 64 with underlying health conditions which put them at higher risk of serious disease and mortality	5 and 6
1 March 2021	All aged 60 and over	7
6 March 2021	All aged 56 and over	8 (age adjusted from 55)
17 March 2021	All aged 50 and over	9

Supplementary Data 4: Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) curves

ROC curves for 30-day mortality and (A) CURB-65 score and (B) NEWS-2 score; 90-day mortality and (C) CURB-65 and (D) NEWS-2 score; and, in-hospital mortality and (E) CURB-65 and (F) NEWS-2.



Supplementary Data 5: Receiver Operator Curves (ROC) for NEWS-2 and CURB-65 combined with GAP score

ROC curves for 30-day mortality and GAP with (A) CURB-65 score and (B) NEWS-2 score; 90-day mortality and GAP with (C) CURB-65 and (D) NEWS-2 score; and, in-hospital mortality and GAP with (E) CURB-65 and (F) NEWS-2.



Supplementary Data 6: Joint predictive value of NEWS-2 and CURB-65 scores in predicting in-hospital mortality and 90-day mortality following hospitalisation with ARD-ILD

(A) Binary logistic regression analysis for joint predictive value of NEWS-2 and CURB-65 scores in predicting mortality following hospital admission with ARD-ILD.

Analysis	Factor	OR	95% CI	*P*-value
In-hospital mortality	NEWS-2 score	1.469	1.197-1.803	<0.0001
	CURB-65	1.423	0.851-2.380	0.1791
	Constant	0.008	-	<0.0001
30-day mortality	NEWS-2 score	1.341	1.152-1.566	<0.0001
	CURB-65	1.346	0.888-2.150	0.1662
	Constant	0.061	-	<0.0001
90-day mortality	NEWS-2 score	1.343	1.153-1.564	<0.0001
	CURB-65	1.344	0.885-2.040	0.1648
	Constant	0.052	-	<0.0001

ARD-ILD, acute respiratory deterioration of interstitial lung disease; CI, confidence interval; OR, Odds Ratio

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of ***cohort studies***

	Item No	Recommendation	Page/Figure Number
Title and abstract	1	(*a*) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(*b*) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(*a*) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	7-8
		(*b*) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	N/A
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Fig 1, 6-8
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8-9
Statistical methods	12	(*a*) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8-9
		(*b*) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8-9
		(*c*) Explain how missing data were addressed	8-9
		(*d*) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	NA
		(*e*) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8-9
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Figure 1, 9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Figure 1
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Figure 1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9-10
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	Table 1
Main results	16	(*a*) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted	13-14, tables

		estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	2+3
		(*b*) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	NA
		(*c*) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	13-14, Figure 2, Supp data
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	17-18
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	19
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	17-20
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	17-20
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at http://www.strobe-statement.org.