Comparison of the Clinical Implications among Two Different

Nutritional Indices in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19

Xuebei Du¹, Yuwei Liu¹, Jing Chen¹, Li Peng¹, Yalei Jin¹, Zhenshun Cheng², Harry H.X. Wang^{3,4,5}, Mingqi Luo⁶, Ling Chen^{1*}, Yan Zhao^{7*}

¹Department of General Practice, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei, China

²Department of Respiratory, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei, China

³School of Public Health, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou 510080, PR China

⁴JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

⁵General Practice and Primary Care, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Scotland, UK

⁶Department of Infectious Disease, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei, China

⁷Emergency Center, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei, China

*Corresponding authors.

E-mail addresses: chenling666@whu.edu.cn (L. Chen), doctoryanzhao@163.com (Y. Zhao)

Summary

Background: Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is an emerging infectious disease. It was first reported in Wuhan, China, and then broke out on a large scale around the world. This study aimed to assess the clinical significance of two different nutritional indices in 245 patients with COVID-19.

Methods: In this retrospective single-center study, we finally included 245 consecutive patients who confirmed COVID-19 in Wuhan University Zhongnan Hospital from January 1 to February 29. Cases were classified as either discharged or dead. Demographic, clinical and laboratory data were registered, two different nutritional indices were calculated: (i) the Controlling nutritional status (CONUT) score; (ii) prognostic nutritional index (PNI). We used univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis to explore the relationship between nutritional indices and hospital death.

Results: 212 of them were discharged and 33 of them died. In-hospital mortality was significantly higher in the severe group of PNI than in the moderate and normal groups. It was also significantly worse in the severe-CONUT group than in the moderate-, mild-, and normal-CONUT groups. Multivariate logistic regression analysis showed the CONUT score (odds ratio 3.371, 95% CI (1.124-10.106), $p = 0.030$) and PNI (odds ratio 0.721, 95% CI (0.581-0.896), $P = 0.003$) were independent predictors of all-cause death at an early stage; Multivariate logistic regression analysis also showed that the severe group of PNI was the independent risk predictor of in-hospital death (odds ratio 24.225, 95% CI (2.147-273.327), $p = 0.010$). The CONUT score cutoff value was 5.5 (56.00 and 80.81%; AUC 0.753; 95% CI (0.644-0.862); respectively). The PNI cutoff value was 40.58 (81.80 and 66.20%; AUC 0.778; 95% CI (0.686-0.809); respectively). We use PNI and the CONUT score to assess malnutrition, which

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

can have a prognosis effect of COVID-19 patients.

Conclusion: The CONUT score and PNI could be a reliable prognostic marker of all-cause death in patients with COVID-19.

Keywords: Coronavirus disease 2019; nutrition; indices; prognosis

1. Introduction

In December 2019, coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), also called severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS CoV-2) occurred in Wuhan, Hubei, China. The disease quickly and violently broke out in other provinces of China and other parts of the world. The numbers of confirmed cases have risen rapidly in the past three months. As of February 20, 2020, it has caused more than 75,000 confirmed COVID-19 cases in China[1]. The epidemiological and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 have been known through previous reports. According to Huang et al., COVID-19 patients had fever, myalgia, fatigue and dry cough[2][2][2]. But apart from the typical symptoms, there were asymptomatic patients and atypical symptoms, such as diarrhea and headache[3]. Although most patients were considered to have a good prognosis, elderly patients and patients with chronic underlying diseases or severe clinical symptoms may have a poor prognosis[4]. In addition, high SOFA scores and d-dimers greater than $1 \mu\text{g} / \text{L}$ might serve as risk factors to help clinicians identify patients with poor prognosis early[5].

Nutritional status has attracted more and more attention in various clinical fields. Generally, malnutrition is considered an indicator related to increased morbidity and mortality[6]. Therefore, the assessments of early nutritional status of different diseases are important means to identify malnutrition, nutritional risks, and possible benefit to nutritional interventions, as well as a prerequisite for guiding nutritional treatment plans. Ideal nutritional risk screening tools and nutrition assessment methods should accurately reflect the nutritional status of the body and predict the occurrence of malnutrition-related complications. Traditional measurement methods, such as height or body mass index (BMI) or laboratory indicators, such as albumin, prealbumin and total cholesterol levels, have been used to assess the nutritional status of individuals[7]. However, they are limited to reflecting a small portion of nutritional risks and cannot be comprehensive assessment. Interestingly, some studies have shown that malnutrition is linked to the inflammatory response of chronic diseases and the development of autoimmune diseases. At the same time, abnormal nutritional status is related to the prognosis of malignancies and other diseases, such as heart failure, adult spinal deformity and RA[8,9,10,11,12]. Therefore, understanding nutritional status aims to elucidate the prognostic significance of various diseases. This suggests that assessing nutritional status has clinical significance for disease prognosis[6]. However, there are currently no standard recognized tools for nutritional risk screening and assessment of nutritional status. Different methods have different effects on the accuracy of predicting the prognosis of the diseases. Therefore, sensitivity, specificity, and ease-to-use tools are often the main basis for clinical nutrition screening and evaluation. Recently, controlling nutritional status (CONUT) score, prognostic nutritional index (PNI) have also been increasingly used as markers of patients' nutritional status[13,14,15,16]. The PNI was calculated by the following formula: $10 \times \text{serum albumin (g/dL)} + 0.005 \times \text{lymphocyte count (per } \mu\text{L})$. The lower score means worse nutritional status. The CONUT score is composed of serum albumin, lymphocytes and total cholesterol[11]. Higher score means worse nutritional status.

Whether the two screening tools are suitable for assessing the prognosis of patients with COVID-19 remains unknown. Based on the information we have, there is currently no study on the effect of

nutritional status on the outcome of COVID-19 patients. Current assessments of the serious consequences and risk factors for death of COVID-19 are not numerous and limitative [19]. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to (i) investigate the relationship between two different nutritional indices and clinical characteristics of patients with COVID-19, and (ii) evaluate the prognostic effect of these indicators as predictors of adverse outcomes in COVID-19 patients

2. Methods

2.1. Patients

This retrospective cohort study finally included 245 adult patients (≥ 18 years of age) hospitalized at Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University. All patients were diagnosed with COVID-19 based on the criteria published by World Health Organization interim guidance. Zhongnan Hospital was the dedicated hospital in Wuhan to treat COVID-19 patients. Hospitalized patients with a diagnosis of COVID-19 in Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University were consecutively enrolled in the present study (n=270), from January 1, 2020 to February 20, 2020. A total of 25 patients were excluded: Life support (such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), vasopressors, mechanical ventilation, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO)) before admission died immediately after admission :N = 2 (8%); lack most baseline data: N = 1 (4%); Transfer to other designated hospitals: N = 10 (40%); Pregnant woman: N = 6 (24%); Under 18 years old: N = 6 (24%). The rest of 245 cases were included in this study. This study which complied with the Declaration of Helsinki (Approval Number 2020054) was approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University.

2.2. Clinical and Laboratory Data Collection

The demographic data collected age and gender. About baseline characteristics, gastrointestinal symptoms, comorbidities and laboratory test results are from the Electronic Medical Record System of Zhongnan Hospital. Collection of laboratory data includes Heart rate, Respiratory rate, Systolic pressure, Diastolic pressure, Sodium(Na^+), Potassium(K^+), white blood cell count (WBC), lymphocyte count, hemoglobin, Platelets, serum creatinine, Alanine aminotransferase (ALT), uric acid (UA), albumin, total cholesterol(TC), high density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, Procalcitonin(PCT), Prothrombin time(PT), D-dimer.

2.3. Nutritional Indices Selection and Calculation

The study included two different nutritional indicators: CONUT score, PNI. The CONUT score, PNI are calculated according to the following formulas: (i) The CONUT score is calculated based on 3 laboratory variables: serum albumin concentration, total cholesterol concentration, and total peripheral lymphocytes cell count; Based on their CONUT scores, patients were divided into four groups: normal-CONUT (0-1), mild-CONUT (2-4), moderate-CONUT (5-8) and severe-CONUT (≥ 9) [17]; (ii) PNI is $10 \times \text{serum albumin value (g / dL)} + 0.005 \times \text{total peripheral blood lymphocyte count (unit/L)}$; Patients were also divided into three groups based on their PNI: severe-PNI ($\text{PNI} < 35$), moderate-PNI ($35 \leq \text{PNI} < 38$), and normal-PNI ($\text{PNI} \geq 38$) [18].

2.4. Statistical Analysis

Analysis was performed using SPSS (version 22.0). Continuous variables were expressed as median (interquartile range, IQR). Spearman rank correlation analysis was used to analyze the correlation between nutritional indicators and selected baseline clinical data. We used the Mann Whitney U test, χ^2 test, or Fisher's exact test to compare the differences between categorical groups. Spearman rank correlation analysis was used to analyze the correlation between nutritional indicators and selected baseline clinical data. Calculated the sensitivity and specificity of the ROC curve to predict hospital mortality and Used Youden to determine the AUC and cutoff value. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression models explored death-related risk factors. Two-way p-values <0.05 are considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Clinical Characteristics of Patients

The baseline characteristics of 245 patients in this study was described in Table 1. Of the 245 patients who were included in the study; severe group of PNI (PNI < 35, n = 31), moderate group of PNI (35 ≤ PNI < 38, n = 30), and normal group of PNI (PNI ≥ 38, n = 182). the CONUT score: normal-CONUT (0–1, n = 18), mild-CONUT (2–4, n = 72), moderate-CONUT (5–8, n = 58), and severe-CONUT (≥9, n = 7); The severe group of PNI had significantly lower lymphocyte counts, albumin, high density lipoprotein (HDL) and total cholesterol (TC), and significantly higher white blood cells (WBC), alanine aminotransferase (ALT), prothrombin time (PT), D-dimer, Procalcitonin (PCT), than the normal and moderate groups. Some observed variables were different between the severe-CONUT group and the mild-, and normal-CONUT groups (Tables 1, 2). The in-hospital death was significantly worse in the severe PNI group (n = 12, 38.71%) than in the moderate- (n = 8, 26.67%) and normal- (n = 13, 7.14%) groups. It was also significantly worse in the severe-CONUT group (n = 6, 85.71%) than in the moderate- (n = 12, 20.69%), mild- (n = 6, 8.3%), and normal-CONUT (n = 1, 5.6%) groups (Fig. 1)

The median age was 55.0 years, of which 114 patients (46.5%) were male (Table A). 33 patients died during hospitalization and 212 were discharged (Table A). In terms of comorbidities, hypertension was the most common comorbidity (21.2%), followed by diabetes (9.4%) and coronary heart disease (7.4%) (Table A). The most common gastrointestinal symptom before admission was anorexia (22.9%), followed by diarrhea (7.4%) (Table A). In the comparison of gastrointestinal symptoms, we could find that compared with survivors, non-survivors are more prone to anorexia (57.6% vs 17.5%, p < 0.001) (Table A).

Table 1. The patient characteristics and Prognostic Nutritional Index values*					
Characteristic	total	normal-PNI	moderate-PNI	severe-PNI	P
No.of patients	243	182	30	31	-
Age	55 (39-67)	51 (36-62)	62 (54-70)	71(66-78)	<0.001
Male(%)	113(46.50)	73(40.11)	17(56.72)	23(74.19)	0.001
BMI	23.70 (20.94-25.65)	23.43 (20.82-25.30)	24.73 (23.74-28.13)	23.78 (20.45-25.36)	0.003
Gastrointestinal symptoms					
Anorexia(yes,%)	55(22.63)	28(15.38)	12(40.00)	15(48.39)	<0.001
Diarrhea(yes,%)	18(7.40)	16(8.79)	1(3.33)	1(3.23)	0.183
Vomit(yes,%)	10(4.15)	8(4.40)	1(3.33)	1(3.23)	0.718
Nausea(yes,%)	17(7.00)	13(7.14)	3(10.00)	1(3.23)	0.607
Comorbidities					
Cancer(yes,%)	9(3.70)	5(2.75)	3(10.00)	1(3.23)	0.242
COPD(yes,%)	8(3.29)	5(2.75)	1(3.33)	2(6.45)	0.313
Hypertension disease(yes,%)	52(21.40)	27(14.84)	14(46.67)	11(35.48)	<0.001
Diabetes(yes,%)	23(9.47)	10(5.49)	10(33.33)	3(9.68)	<0.001
Coronary heart disease(yes,%)	18(7.41)	9(4.95)	4(13.33)	5(16.13)	0.058
Laboratory findings					
Heart rate beats /min	84 (76-96)	84 (76-95)	89(80-103)	84(70-96)	0.133
Respiratory rate beats /min	20 (19-21)	20 (19-21)	20(20-23)	20(19-22)	0.960
Systolic pressure mmHg	12 (115-133)	122 (114-132)	125(113-134)	122(115-140)	0.673
Diastolic pressure mmHg	74 (67-82)	75 (68-82)	73(66-82)	73(64-82)	0.654
WBC ,109/l	4.38 (3.30-6.17)	4.23 (3.11-5.41)	5.36 (3.40-9.00)	7.16 (4.71-11.68)	<0.001
Lymphocyte,109/l	0.94 (0.61-1.20)	1.04 (0.73-1.32)	0.60 (0.47-0.80)	0.44 (0.34-0.73)	<0.001
Hemoglobin ,g/dl	128.0 (117.7-139.3)	130.0 (118.4-139.7)	125.5 (119.0-137.3)	119.9 (103.4-144.0)	0.680
Platelets,109/l	176 (130-222)	178 (139-221)	175.5 (119.3-220.5)	158 (106-242)	0.538
ALT, u/l	22 (15-35)	20 (14-28.25)	31(20-55.3)	38(20-55)	<0.001
Albumin, g/l	37.1 (33.9-40.7)	38.8 (36.2-41.8)	33.4 (32.2-34.6)	29.5 (27.2-31.3)	<0.001
HDL, mmol/l	1.00	1.05 (0.9-1.295)	0.86(0.76-1.15)	0.71(0.57-1.03)	<0.001

	(0.81-1.23)				
Uric acid,umol/l	263.7 (210.3-336.7)	265.8 (210.2-344.6)	251.8 (209.9-324.2)	256.3 (171.7-319.8)	0.696
Creatinine,μmol/l	67.4 (56.3-85.3)	66.0 (54.9-82.9)	71.5 (63.9-87.7)	71.9 (57.7-95.8)	0.055
Potassium(K+), mmol/l	3.97 (3.58-4.24)	3.98 (3.67-4.26)	3.86 (3.39-4.13)	3.64 (3.21-4.26)	0.121
Sodium(Na+), mmol/l	138.05 (135.3-140.4)	138.6 (136-140.6)	135.2 (133.4-138.4)	138.8 (134.0-140.4)	0.110
TC, mmol/l	3.85 (3.31-4.58)	3.97 (3.45-4.70)	3.69 (2.88-4.12)	3.73 (3.02-4.38)	0.019
PT,s	12.8 (11.9-13.5)	12.6 (11.9-13.2)	13.0 (12.0-14.2)	13.5 (12.8-14.5)	<0.001
D-dimer ng/ml	208 (127-455)	166 (109-295)	317(213-986)	658(348-3372)	<0.001
PCT,ng/ml	0 (0.00-0.10)	0 (0.00-0.00)	0.09(0.00-0.31)	0.11(0.00-0.59)	<0.001
All-cause death	33(13.58%)	13(7.14%)	8(26.67%)	12(38.71%)	<0.001

COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; WBC, white blood cells;

ALT, alanine aminotransferase;TC,Total cholesterol; HDL, high density lipoprotein

PT, prothrombin time;PCT,Procalcitonin; CONUT, Controlling nutritional status;

PNI, Prognostic nutritional index; BMI, Body mass index

*Two patients did not detect lymphocytes or albumin

Table 2.The patients' characteristics and CONUT score*						
	total	Normal	Mild	Moderate	Severe	P
No.of patients	155	18	72	58	7	-
Age	56 (40-67)	52 (34-65)	51(36-64)	63 (48-70)	76 (70-78)	<0.001
Male(%)	70(45.16)	5(27.78)	25(34.72)	36 (62.07)	4(57.14)	0.006
BMI	23.71 (20.91-25.10)	23.05 (20.47-25.07)	23.44 (20.94-25.82)	24.13 (21.66-26.31)	22.73 (20.36-25.34)	0.624
gastrointestinal symptoms						
Anorexia(yes,%)	38(24.52)	3(16.67)	6(8.33)	26(72.22)	3(42.86)	<0.001
Diarrhea(yes,%)	13(8.39)	2(11.11)	8(11.11)	2(3.44)	1(14.29)	0.324
Vomit(yes,%)	5(3.22)	-	4(5.56)	1(1.72)	-	0.650
Nausea(yes,%)	10(6.45)	-	6(8.33)	4(6.90)	-	0.821
Comorbidities						
Cancer(yes,%)	4(2.58)	-	2(2.78)	2(3.44)	-	0.680
COPD(yes,%)	5(3.22)	1(5.56)	3(4.17)	1(1.72)	-	0.287
Hypertension disease(yes,%)	34(7.74)	2(11.11)	9(12.50)	20(34.48)	3(42.86)	0.002
Diabetes(yes,%)	17(10.97)	1(5.56)	3(4.17)	13(22.41)	-	0.036
Coronary heart disease(yes,%)	12(25.80)	1(5.56)	4(5.56)	6(10.34)	1(14.29)	0.225

Laboratory findings						
Heart rate beats /min	85(78-97)	80 (76-86)	85(76-98)	90 (80-97)	80 (68-90)	0.133
Respiratory rate beats /min	20(19-21)	20 (19-21)	20(19-21)	20 (19-22)	20 (20-22)	0.635
Systolic pressure mmHg	124(113-135)	125 (108-133)	120(113-131)	127 (115-143)	110 (104-121)	0.014
Diastolic pressure mmHg	74(65-82)	80 (64-87)	75(67-81)	75 (65-85)	63 (53-66)	0.077
WBC ,109/l	4.78 (3.36-6.85)	4.84 (4.24-6.43)	4.63 (3.11-9.48)	4.94 (3.36-8.37)	8.2 (3.29-19.74)	0.084
Lymphocyte,109/l	0.94 (0.57-1.28)	1.69 (1.49-1.97)	1.06 (0.79-1.31)	0.61 (0.44-0.85)	0.36 (0.34-0.56)	<0.001
Hemoglobin ,g/dl	127.9 (117.5-140.1)	133.9 (115.4-142.7)	129.1 (118.4-138.9)	126.8 (118.5-142.3)	106 (62-140)	0.413
Platelets,109/l	182 (133-228)	205 (179-243)	188(155-242)	175 (125-221)	64 (54-125)	0.002
ALT, u/l	22 (15-37)	20 (14-29)	21(14-30)	26 (19-44)	35 (16-42)	0.025
Albumin, g/l	36.5 (33.2-40.7)	41.9 (36.8-42.8)	38.8 (36.2-41.7)	33.2 (31.2-35.6)	23.1 (21.1-27.2)	<0.001
HDL, mmol/l	1.00 (0.81-1.23)	0.91 (1.05-1.34)	1.07(0.90-1.29)	0.91 (0.72-1.11)	0.71 (0.51-1.17)	0.003
Uric acid,umol/l	264.2 (210.6-343.1)	311.3 (259.7-404.0)	256.9 (209.9-344.8)	250.4 (205.1-315.9)	273.0 (248.6-568.6)	0.066
Creatinine, μmol/l	68.2 (56.3-86.7)	66.8 (55.6-91.1)	65.6(55.0-82.5)	70.4 (61.7-87.5)	80.3 (55.2-97.1)	0.444
Potassium(K+), mmol/l	3.91 (3.54-4.23)	4.36 (4.03-4.54)	3.82(3.61-4.12)	3.92 (3.42-4.17)	3.64 (3.33-4.49)	0.008
Sodium(Na+), mmol/l	138.6 (125.3-140.5)	139.9 (138.8-142.2)	138.8 (135.8-140.8)	137 (135-140)	140.4 (134-145)	0.007
TC, mmol/l	3.85 (3.31-4.58)	4.92 (4.08-5.24)	4.09 (3.57-4.61)	3.42 (2.98-3.97)	3.02 (2.34-4.08)	<0.001
PT,s	12.75 (11.83-13.48)	12.75 (11.73-13.50)	12.45 (11.70-13.20)	13.20 (12.15-14.25)	13.1 (13.1-16.2)	0.003
D-dimer ng/ml	260 (142-615)	348 (77-889)	161 (120-332)	326 (206-1304)	2941 (933-5129)	<0.001
PCT,ng/ml	0.0 (0.00-0.11)	0 (0.00-0.07)	0 (0.00-0.03)	0.06 (0.00-0.23)	0.43 (0.1-1.16)	<0.001
All-cause death	25(16.13%)	1(5.6%)	6(8.3%)	12(20.69%)	6(85.71%)	<0.001

COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; WBC, white blood cells;

ALT, alanine aminotransferase;TC,Total cholesterol; HDL, high density lipoprotein

PT, prothrombin time;PCT,Procalcitonin; CONUT, Controlling nutritional status;

PNI, Prognostic nutritional index; BMI, Body mass index

*Between evaluation of clinical indicators and COUNT score, 90 patients lacked records of lymphocyte counts or albumin or total cholesterol

3.2. Correlation between Variables and Nutritional Indices

Table 2 shows the correlation between nutritional indices and selected characteristics or laboratory variables. The CONUT scores was significantly correlated with gender, age, anorexia, hypertension, diabetes, platelets, ALT, HDL, TC, sodium, PT, D-dimer, albumin, lymphocyte count, and PCT. the COUNT score had the highest correlation with lymphocyte, followed by albumin ($r = -0.719$, and $r = -0.695$, all $p < 0.001$). PNI was correlated with age, anorexia, hypertension, diabetes, white blood cell, lymphocyte count, hemoglobin, ALT, albumin, HDL, TC, potassium, PT, D-dimer, and PCT. the PNI had the highest correlation with albumin, followed by lymphocyte count ($r = 0.904$, and $r = 0.654$, all $p < 0.001$).

Table 3. Correlation analysis between variables and nutritional indices				
Variables	COUNT		PNI	
	rs	p value	rs	p value
Age	0.363	<0.001	-0.582	<0.001
Male	-0.297	<0.001	0.198	0.002
gastrointestinal symptoms				
Anorexia	0.353	<0.001	-0.266	<0.001
Diarrhea	-0.082	0.308	-0.044	0.497
Vomit	-0.015	0.851	-0.043	0.502
Nausea	0.049	0.548	-0.078	0.228

Comorbidities				
Cancer	0.020	0.803	-0.103	0.108
COPD	-0.068	0.401	-0.051	0.426
Hypertension	0.284	<0.001	-0.285	<0.001
Diabetes	0.208	0.010	-0.248	<0.001
Coronary heart disease	0.149	0.063	-0.126	0.050
Laboratory findings				
Heart rate	0.087	0.284	-0.070	0.274
Respiratory rate	0.083	0.307	-0.158	0.014
Systolic pressure	0.107	0.186	-0.135	0.036
Diastolic pressure	-0.144	0.074	0.050	0.439
white blood cell	0.134	0.097	-0.217	0.001
Lymphocyte	-0.719	<0.001	0.654	<0.001
Hemoglobin	-0.096	0.233	0.238	.<0.001
Platelets	-0.277	<0.001	0.093	0.148
ALT	0.235	0.003	0.281	<0.001
Albumin	-0.695	<0.001	0.904	<0.001
HDL	-0.310	<0.001	0.305	<0.001
TC	-0.557	.<0.001	0.212	0.008
Uric acid,	-0.069	0.391	0.128	0.047
Creatinine,	0.156	0.052	-0.126	0.049
K+	-0.167	0.037	0.210	0.001
Na+	-0.262	0.001	0.186	0.004

PT	0.351	<0.001	-0.224	<0.001
D-dimer	0.419	<0.001	-0.548	<0.001
PCT,	0.389	<0.001	-0.424	<0.001

3.3 Factors associated within-hospital death

This study used logistic regression analysis to clarify the factors related to death. In univariate analysis, age, gender, BMI, anorexia, hypertension, diabetes, coronary heart disease, respiratory rate, white blood cell count, ALT, creatinine, PCT, PNI and COUNT were significantly associated with death (Table 4). In the multivariate logistic regression model, we found that the CONUT score (odds ratio 3.371, 95% CI (1.124-10.106), $p = 0.030$) and PNI (odds ratio 0.721, 95% CI (0.581-0.896), $P = 0.003$) were the independent predictors of all-cause death after adjusting for age, sex, BMI, history of hypertension, history of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, history of coronary heart disease, respiratory rate, alanine transaminase, creatinine, D-dimer, white blood cell count, Lymphocyte, PCT. A multivariate logistic regression model showed that severe group (classified in PNI groups) was an independent predictor of all-cause death (odds ratio 24.225, 95% CI (2.147-273.327), $p = 0.010$), and in categorical groups of CONUT score were not the independent predictors of all-cause death (Table 5). The CONUT score, which demonstrated sensitivity and specificity for predicting in-hospital death were 56.00% and 80.81% (AUC 0.753; 95% CI (0.644 - 0.862), $p < 0.001$). The cutoff value of the COUNT score was 5.5 overall (Fig. 2A). The PNI cutoff value was 40.58 overall (81.80% and 66.20%, respectively; AUC 0.778; 95% CI (0.686-0.809), $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 2B).

Table 4 The unadjusted association between baseline variables and all-cause death during hospitalization			
Univariable Analysis			
Variables	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p value
Age	1.095	(1.060-1.131)	<0.001
Female	0.232	(0.100-0.537)	0.001
BMI	1.146	(1.011-1.299)	0.033
Anorexia	6.419	(2.954-13.948)	<0.001
COPD	4.340	(0.941-18.217)	0.060
Hypertension	3.941	(1.822-8.526)	<0.001
Coronary heart disease	6.464	(2.335-17.896)	<0.001
Respiratory rate,	1.208	(1.087-1.342)	<0.001
White blood cell	1.328	(1.186-1.488)	<0.001

Lymphocyte	1.087	(0.638-1.852)	0.758
ALT, u/l	1.014	(1.003-1.025)	0.009
HDL	0.417	(0.106-1.644)	0.211
Creatinine	1.007	(1.001-1.014)	0.018
D-dimer	1.000	(1.000-1.000)	0.112
PCT	1.938	(1.243-3.021)	0.004
PNI	0.856	(0.800-0.915)	<0.001
COUNT	1.552	(1.260-1.912)	<0.001

Table 5 The multivariate analysis of COUNT score and PNI associated with in-hospital death

	Univariate		Multivariate	
			Model 1	
	Odds ratio 95% CI	P value	Odds ratio 95% CI	P value
PNI	0.856 (0.800-0.915)	<0.001	0.721 (0.581-0.896)	0.003
Normal (high-PNI)	1		1	
Mild (middle-PNI)	4.727 (1.763-12.677)	0.020	4.632 (0.578-37.121)	0.149
Severe (low-PNI)	8.211 (3.283-20.537)	<0.001	24.225 (2.147-273.327)	0.010
	Univariate		Model 2	
CONUT score	1.552 (1.260-1.912)	<0.001	3.371 (1.124-10.106)	0.030
Normal	1		--	--
Mild	1.545 (0.174-13.714)	0.696	--	--
Moderate	4.435 (0.535-36.744)	0.167	--	--
Severe	102 (5.480-1898.580)	0.002	--	--

Model 1 :The multivariate analysis of PNI associated with in-hospital death adjusted for age, sex, BMI, history of hypertension, history of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, history of coronary heart disease, respiratory rate, alanine transaminase, creatinine, D-dimer, white blood cell count, Lymphocyte, PCT,

Model 2 :The multivariate analysis of COUNT score associated with in-hospital death adjusted for age, sex, BMI, history of hypertension, history of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, history of coronary heart disease, respiratory rate, alanine transaminase, creatinine, D-dimer, white blood cell count, Lymphocyte, PCT,

A	B
<p>Fig. 2</p> <p>A PNI: sensitivity: 81.80%,specificity : 66.20%; AUC:0.778; 95%CI(0.686–0.809);p<0.001; cutoff value: 40.58;</p> <p>B TheCONUT score: sensitivity:56.00%,specificity:80.81%;AUC:0.753; 95%CI(0.644 – 0.862), p<0.001; cutoff value: 5.5;</p>	

4. Discussion

In this study, we reported on the clinical characteristics of COVID-19 patients and the risk factors associated with death. To the author's knowledge, this study was the first to assess the importance of two different nutritional indicators in COVID-19 patients. The COUNT score and PNI had specific statistical differences between non-survivors and survivors. However, in the multivariable logistic regression analysis, the CONUT score and PNI were the independent predictors of all-cause death, individually. According to the area under the curve of ROC, PNI was a better predictor of all-cause death than the COUNT score. In addition, according to the categorical groups of PNI, severe group was an independent predictor of all-cause death. We could get this revelation that the worse nutritional status, the greater risk for death. Our research found that the CONUT score and PNI might be related to some clinical features and laboratory variables. These findings pointed out that rapid assessment tools could judge the early nutritional status of COVID-19 patients and emphasized that early intervention for malnourished people could affect the prognosis.

Nutrition plays an important role in human survival and medical development. Malnutrition is caused by low nutrient feeding or malabsorption, which is induced by hepatic insufficiency, anorexia, cytokine-induced high catabolism, intestinal edema. It is a common complication of many diseases [19]. Malnourished patients may have the following symptoms: fatigue, weakness, low daily activities, weight loss, cognitive impairment, decreased muscle volume [20]. In this condition, the disease gradually worsens [21]. It is well known that malnutrition impairs immune function, especially cell-mediated immunity [22]. Decreased nutritional status of the body leads to decreased immunity, which directly causes or induces the occurrence of nosocomial infections, and increases the morbidity and mortality associated with infections [23].

The nutritional status assessed by the CONUT score and PNI as the prognostic indicators for patients with cardiovascular disease, malignant tumors, and acute ischemic stroke have caused the attention by researchers. And their clinical value is more comprehensive, economical, simple and practical than other tools. The CONUT score and PNI were first used to estimate the correlation between malnutrition risks and postoperative complications in patients with gastrointestinal tumors, and there was increasing evidence that they were also related to the prognosis of other malnourished malignancies and diseases[24,25,26,27]. We know that the CONUT score is calculated based on 3 laboratory variables, serum albumin, lymphocytes, and total cholesterol (range 0–12, higher = worse). One study on COVID-19 confirmed that most patients had lymphopenia when they were admitted to the hospital, and that there was a decrease in albumin[28]. Studies have suggested that albumin and lymphocyte percentage might be predictors of disease severity[29]. The CONUT score weights are relatively equal between serum albumin, lymphocyte counts, and total cholesterol levels, while PNI is mainly determined by serum albumin levels and lymphocyte counts. In addition, considering that lymphocyte counts have been associated with increased disease severity. Furthermore, the lymphocytes of patients who died of COVID-19 were reported to be significantly lower than those of survivors[30]. These supported our research results, which suggested that among the nutrition indicators, CONUT score and PNI were related to death. It has been found that some parameters are related to the prognosis of COVID-19 patients. Previously, according to the research, elderly age was an important independent predictor of death in patients with SARS and MERS[31]. Currently, COVID-19 study also confirmed that patient's age was concerning with death. Increasing age was a predictor, which was consistent with age-related mortality study with an OR of 1.10[5]. Older age might be associated with more complications, which increased the mortality rate. In one study, predictors related to 30-day mortality included older, non-healthcare workers, pre-existing conditions, disease severity, and hospital-acquired infections[31]. Interestingly, BMI was originally considered only as a way to measure body composition, but now obesity is considered a chronic inflammatory state that may affect the immune system through fat-derived inflammation[32]. COVID-19 was currently considered to have potential complex immunological damage[30]. However, in this study, BMI itself significantly differed between the death and survival groups in univariate logistics analysis model. In fact, whether BMI can be used as an evaluation index to evaluate the nutritional status of COVID-19 patients requires further study. It is unclear whether individual parameters (such as serum albumin, blood lipids, vitamins) can be used to assess the nutritional status of COVID-19 patients to predict adverse outcomes. But these single parameter indicators may also be needed to support our conclusions, especially blood lipids and albumin. The advantage of this study was that, to the author's knowledge, this was the first study to assess the clinical significance of different nutritional indicators in patients with COVID-19. Our research will help clinicians to pay attention to the assessment of nutritional status of COVID-19 patients for early intervention and early treatment of COVID-19 patients with poor nutritional status.

5. Limitation

However, our study has some limitations. First, the number of patients included is relatively small. Only 155 of the 245 patients who were screened had their albumin levels, lymphocyte counts, and total cholesterol levels collected within 30 min of admission, which resulting in a relatively low sample size for CONUT scores. Second, this study was conducted at a single-center research with limited sample size. This study might have included disproportionately more patients with poor outcomes. There might also be a selection bias when identifying factors that influence the clinical outcomes.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the study has pointed out that the CONUT score and PNI were the independent risk factors for COVID-19 death. The assessment of the nutritional status of COVID-19 patients is crucial to the prognosis.

References:

1. Gostic K, Gomez AC, Mummah RO, Kucharski AJ, Lloyd-Smith JO (2020) Estimated effectiveness of symptom and risk screening to prevent the spread of COVID-19. *eLife* 9.
2. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, et al. (2020) Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* 395: 497-506.
3. Jiang F, Deng L, Zhang L, Cai Y, Cheung CW, et al. (2020) Review of the Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *J Gen Intern Med*.
4. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, Xia J, Zhou X, et al. (2020) Risk Factors Associated With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Intern Med*.
5. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, et al. (2020) Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*.
6. Vandewoude MF, Alish CJ, Sauer AC, Hegazi RA (2019) Comparison of the Clinical Implications among Five Different Nutritional Indices in Patients with Lupus Nephritis. *Nutrients*.
7. Cook Z, Kirk S, Lawrenson S, Sandford S (2005) Use of BMI in the assessment of undernutrition in older subjects: reflecting on practice. *Proc Nutr Soc* 64: 313-317.
8. Pressoir M, Desne S, Berchery D, Rossignol G, Poiree B, et al. (2010) Prevalence, risk factors and clinical implications of malnutrition in French Comprehensive Cancer Centres. *Br J Cancer* 102: 966-971.
9. Fukuda W, Yamazaki T, Akaogi T, Hayashi H, Kusakabe T, et al. (2005) Malnutrition and disease progression in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Mod Rheumatol* 15: 104-107.
10. Harrison E, Herrick AL, McLaughlin JT, Lal S (2012) Malnutrition in systemic sclerosis. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 51: 1747-1756.
11. Shirakabe A, Hata N, Kobayashi N, Okazaki H, Matsushita M, et al. (2018) The prognostic impact of malnutrition in patients with severely decompensated acute heart failure, as assessed using the Prognostic Nutritional Index (PNI) and Controlling Nutritional Status (CONUT) score. *Heart Vessels* 33: 134-144.
12. Oe S, Togawa D, Yamato Y, Hasegawa T, Yoshida G, et al. (2019) Preoperative Age and Prognostic Nutritional Index Are Useful Factors for Evaluating Postoperative Delirium Among Patients With Adult Spinal Deformity. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 44: 472-478.
13. Narumi T, Arimoto T, Funayama A, Kadowaki S, Otaki Y, et al. (2013) Prognostic importance of objective nutritional indexes in patients with chronic heart failure. *J Cardiol* 62: 307-313.
14. Kaya T, Acikgoz SB, Yildirim M, Nalbant A, Altas AE, et al. (2019) Association between neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and nutritional status in geriatric patients. *J Clin Lab Anal* 33: e22636.
15. Zhou H, Chao W, Cui L, Li M, Zou Y, et al. (2019) Controlling Nutritional Status (CONUT) score as immune-nutritional predictor of outcomes in patients undergoing peritoneal dialysis. *Clinical Nutrition*.
16. Sze S, Pellicori P, Kazmi S, Rigby A, Cleland JGF, et al. (2018) Prevalence and Prognostic

Significance of Malnutrition Using 3 Scoring Systems Among Outpatients With Heart Failure. *JACC: Heart Failure* 6: 476-486.

17. Ignacio DUJ, Gonzalez-Madrono A, de Villar NG, Gonzalez P, Gonzalez B, et al. (2005) CONUT: a tool for controlling nutritional status. First validation in a hospital population. *Nutr Hosp* 20: 38-45.
18. Onodera T, Goseki N, Kosaki G (1984) [Prognostic nutritional index in gastrointestinal surgery of malnourished cancer patients]. *Nihon Geka Gakkai Zasshi* 85: 1001-1005.
19. Krack A, Sharma R, Figulla HR, Anker SD (2005) The importance of the gastrointestinal system in the pathogenesis of heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 26: 2368-2374.
20. Lohr JM, Panic N, Vujasinovic M, Verbeke CS (2018) The ageing pancreas: a systematic review of the evidence and analysis of the consequences. *J Intern Med* 283: 446-460.
21. Matsushita M, Shirakabe A, Hata N, Shinada T, Kobayashi N, et al. (2017) Association between the body mass index and the clinical findings in patients with acute heart failure: evaluation of the obesity paradox in patients with severely decompensated acute heart failure. *Heart Vessels* 32: 600-608.
22. Scrimshaw NS, SanGiovanni JP (1997) Synergism of nutrition, infection, and immunity: an overview. *Am J Clin Nutr* 66: 464S-477S.
23. Bresnahan KA, Tanumihardjo SA (2014) Undernutrition, the acute phase response to infection, and its effects on micronutrient status indicators. *Adv Nutr* 5: 702-711.
24. Ureshino H, Kusaba K, Kidoguchi K, Sano H, Nishioka A, et al. (2019) Clinical impact of the CONUT score and mogamulizumab in adult T cell leukemia/lymphoma. *Ann Hematol* 98: 465-471.
25. Miyashita E, Konuma T, Kataoka J, Oiwa-Monna M, Mizusawa M, et al. (2019) The Prognostic Impact of Pretransplantation Inflammatory and Nutritional Status in Adult Patients after Myeloablative Single Cord Blood Transplantation. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant* 25: 981-988.
26. Agra BR, Gonzalez FR, Varela RA, Gomez OI, Kreidieh O, et al. (2017) Nutritional status is related to heart failure severity and hospital readmissions in acute heart failure. *Int J Cardiol* 230: 108-114.
27. Takaoka A, Sasaki M, Nakanishi N, Kurihara M, Ohi A, et al. (2017) Nutritional Screening and Clinical Outcome in Hospitalized Patients with Crohn's Disease. *Ann Nutr Metab* 71: 266-272.
28. Mo P, Xing Y, Xiao Y, Deng L, Zhao Q, et al. (2020) Clinical characteristics of refractory COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Clin Infect Dis*.
29. Liu Y, Yang Y, Zhang C, Huang F, Wang F, et al. (2020) Clinical and biochemical indexes from 2019-nCoV infected patients linked to viral loads and lung injury. *Sci China Life Sci* 63: 364-374.
30. Henry BM (2020) COVID-19, ECMO, and lymphopenia: a word of caution. *Lancet Respir Med*.
31. Ahmed AE (2017) The predictors of 3- and 30-day mortality in 660 MERS-CoV patients. *BMC Infect Dis* 17: 615.
32. Ahn SS, Yoo J, Jung SM, Song JJ, Park YB, et al. (2019) Comparison of the Clinical Implications among Five Different Nutritional Indices in Patients with Lupus Nephritis. *Nutrients* 11.