- 1 Association between Prolonged Intermittent Renal Replacement Therapy
- 2 and All-Cause Mortality in COVID-19 Patients Undergoing Invasive
- 3 Mechanical Ventilation: a Retrospective Cohort Study
- 4 Yi Yang*, Jia Shi*, Shuwang Ge*, Shuiming Guo, Xue Xing, Yanan Wang, Anying Cheng,
- 5 Qingquan Liu, Junhua Li, Yong Ning, Fan He# and Gang Xu#
- 7 Department of Nephrology, Tongji Hospital Affiliated to Tongji Medical College,
- 8 Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China
- 10 Short title: PIRRT in COVID-19 patients
- 12 *These authors contributed equally to this work.
- 13 #Correspondence Author:
- 14 Fan He and Gang Xu

9

11

22

- 15 Department of Nephrology
- 16 Tongji Hospital Affiliated with Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science
- 17 and Technology
- 18 1095 Jie Fang Avenue
- 19 Wuhan, Hubei 430030, China
- 20 Tel: +86-027-83662682 and +86-027-69378405
- Email: fhe@tjh.tjmu.edu.cn and xugang@tjh.tjmu.edu.cn.
- Number of Tables: 3
- Number of Figures: 1
- 25 Word count: 2497
- 26 **Keywords** prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy · COVID-19 · invasive
- 27 mechanical ventilation · mortality

Abstract

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

Background: For the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), critically ill patients had a high mortality rate. We aimed to assess the association between prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy (PIRRT) and mortality in patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation. Methods: In this retrospective cohort study, we included all patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation from February 12nd to March 2nd, 2020. All patients were followed until death or March 28th, and all survivors were followed for at least 30 days. Results: For 36 hospitalized COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical ventilation, the mean age was 69.4 (± 10.8) years, and 30 patients (83.3%) were men. Twenty-two (61.1%) patients received PIRRT (PIRRT group) and 14 cases (38.9%) were managed with conventional strategy (non-PIRRT group). There were no differences in age, sex, comorbidities, complications, treatments and most of the laboratory findings. During median follow-up period of 9.5 (interquartile range 4.3-33.5) days, 13 of 22 (59.1%) patients in the PIRRT group and 11 of 14 (78.6%) patients in the non-PIRRT group died. Kaplan-Meier analysis demonstrated prolonged survival in patients in the PIRRT group compared with that in the non-PIRRT group (P = 0.042). The association between PIRRT and a reduced risk of mortality remained significant in three different models, with adjusted hazard ratios varying from 0.332 to 0.398. Higher levels of IL-2 receptor, TNF-α, procalcitonin, prothrombin time, and NT-proBNP were significantly associated with an increased risk of mortality in patients with PIRRT. Conclusion: PIRRT may be beneficial for the treatment of COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical ventilation. Further prospective multicenter studies with larger sample sizes are required.

Introduction

An outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection, officially named Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) occurred (1). In Wuhan, the fatality rate of COVID-19 was 5.1% (2538/50006). Of note, critically ill patients with COVID-19 have a high mortality rate. In a study of 52 critically ill patients in Wuhan, 32

(61.5%) patients had died after 28 days, and the mortality rate was 81.1% (30/37) in patients requiring mechanical ventilation (2). Accumulated evidence has strongly demonstrated that systemic inflammatory response, acute kidney injury (AKI) and fluid overload (FO) were associated with high mortality in severe sepsis (3-5). In critically ill patients with COVID-19, an overwhelming inflammatory response involving C-reactive protein (CRP), interleukin (IL)-6, IL-8, IL-10, tumor necrosis factor α (TNF- α) was observed (6-9), which is similar to that observed in patients suffering from SARS-CoV (10) and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS)-CoV (11). Renal replacement therapy (RRT) is a great help in treating critically ill patients not only to control electrolyte and acid-base imbalances but also to remove inflammatory mediators and improve oxygenation during fluid overload (12-14). RRT has been applied to critically ill patients, including patients with SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV and other viral infectious diseases such as Ebola virus disease (13, 15). However, the benefits of RRT are still no consistent conclusion in critically ill patients (16). RRT significantly reduced the level of IL-6 and decreased the hospital mortality rate in pediatric severe sepsis, especially in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) (17). In addition, a meta-analysis revealed that patients who received RRT had significantly lower mortality compared to conventional therapy (18). Hoverer, RRT was associated with increased mortality in patients with MERS-CoV (15). The relationship between RRT and patient outcome varied in patients with different disease and was affected by the modalities, use of anticoagulation, vascular access management, and the timing of the initiation and intensity of RRT (16, 19, 20). Prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy (PIRRT), as a cost-effective alternative, has been used in the intensive care unit (ICU) (21, 22). To date, no specific treatment has been confirmed to be effective for COVID-19, and supportive treatment remains essential. In this retrospective cohort study, we aimed to explore the association between PIRRT and all-cause mortality in patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation.

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Participants

In this retrospective cohort study, we included all patients with COVID-19 undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation at the Optical Valley Branch of Tongji Hospital, Wuhan, from February 12^{nd} to March 2^{nd} . We divided the study participants into two groups according to the use of PIRRT treatment (PIRRT group and non-PIRRT group).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

All included patients met the criteria for the diagnosis of COVID-19 according to the New Coronavirus Pneumonia Prevention and Control Program (5th edition, in Chinese) published by the National Health Commission of China (23). Invasive mechanical ventilation was defined as mechanical ventilation through an endotracheal tube or tracheostomy. There were no exclusion criteria.

Procedures

The baseline data at the beginning of invasive mechanical ventilation for each patient were collected and recorded at the start of invasive mechanical ventilation, including age, sex, comorbidities, complications, laboratory data, and treatments. All information was obtained and managed through established data collection forms. Two researchers independently reviewed and collected the data. AKI was defined as a 50% increase in serum creatinine within 7 days or a 0.3 mg/dL increase within 48 hours according to the Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) criteria (24).

PIRRT Procedures

We performed PIRRT using commercially available pump-driven machines (PrismaFlex, Gambro, Sweden; or multiFiltrate, Fresenius, Germany) and filters (M150, Gambro; Oxiris, Baxter; or AV1000s, Fresenius). For the patients with AKI, hemofiltration plus hemodialysis was performed. The blood flow rate was set at 2.5-4

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

mL/kg/min, and the clearance rate was set at 35-70 mL/kg/hr. The filter circuit was prewashed with saline containing 5,000-6,250 IU/L heparin. Vascular access was obtained with 13.5 F central venous catheters (Covidien, MA, USA) in the femoral vein. 9.1% (2/22) of patients received continuous hemodialysis. And 90.9% (20/22) of patients received intermittent hemodialysis, 8 hours a day, once a day or every other day. PIRRT modalities were venovenous hemodiafiltration in 22.7% (5/22) of patients and venovenous hemofiltration in 77.3% (17/22) of patients. The indications for PIRRT was: 1) Nonobstructive oliguria (urine output < 200 mL/12h) or anuria, or sepsis complicated by AKI; 2) Hyperkalemia (K+ > 6.5 mmol/L); 3) Acidemia (PH < 7.1); 4) Clinically significant organ edema (especially pulmonary edema); 5) Uremic complications (pericarditis/encephalopathy/neuropathy/myopathy); 6) Azotaemia (urea > 30 mmol/L); 7) (optional) increased inflammatory cytokines (anyone of IL-1 β , IL-2 receptor, IL-6, IL-8, or TNF- $\alpha \ge 5$ times of upper limit of normal range). **Outcomes** We followed up all patients through electronic hospital medical records. The primary outcome was death. All patients were followed until death or March 28th, and all survivors were followed for at least 30 days. There was no loss to follow-up for patients. Statistical Analyses Numerical data are presented as the means and standard deviation (SD) or medians [interquartile range (IQR)] and were analyzed using Student's t-test or the Mann-Whitney U test depending on the data distribution. Categorical variables were displayed as frequencies and percentages and were analyzed using Fisher's exact test. Paired t test or Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test was used to evaluate differences of variables between before and after PIRRT. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate survival, and the log-rank test was used to evaluate differences between the two groups. Univariate and multivariate Cox proportional hazards regression analyses were performed for all-cause mortality. SPSS 23.0 (IBM Corporation, Armonk,

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

NY) statistical software was used for statistical analysis. GraphPad Prism 6 (GraphPad Software, USA) was used for statistical analysis and visualization. A P-value of 0.05 or less was considered significant. Results Description of the Cohort In total, 36 COVID-19 patients subjected to invasive mechanical ventilation were enrolled in the study. Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of the cohort patients. There were 30 men (83.3%) and 6 women (16.7%) ranging in age from 44 to 86 years. 30 patients (83.3%) have at least one comorbidity, and the common comorbidity factors in COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical ventilation were hypertension (n = 14, 38.9%) and cardiac disease (n = 12, 33.3%). We divided the study participants into two groups according to PIRRT treatment. Twenty-two patients received PIRRT (PIRRT group) while 14 patients did not (non-PIRRT group). There was no difference between the two groups in baseline characteristics including age, sex, acute physiology and chronic health evaluation (APACHE) II scores, sepsis-related organ failure assessment (SOFA) scores, comorbidities, complications, treatments or most laboratory findings, except for patients who received PIRRT with higher levels of aspartate aminotransferase (P = 0.034) and serum creatinine (P = 0.017). The indications for PIRRT (n = 22) were as follows: (1) AKI at stage 3 (serum creatinine increase ≥ 3 times baseline with 7 days) with/without hyperkalemia or pulmonary edema: n = 4; (2) hyperkalemia: n = 1; (3) acidemia: n = 1; (4) pulmonary edema: n = 1; (5) (optional) increased inflammatory cytokines (anyone of IL-1β, IL-2 receptor, IL-6, IL-8, or TNF- $\alpha \ge 5$ times of upper limit of normal range): n = 15. There was no definite indication of PIRRT for patients in non-PIRRT group. Our evaluation of dialysis indications was consistent in all patients, except for inflammatory cytokines. Furthermore, in the PIRRT group, IL-6 showed a significant difference before versus after PIRRT (before vs. after PIRRT: median 221.35, IQR 111.23-427.40, vs. median 48.53, IQR 12.93-119.23, pg/mL, P = 0.001).

Association between PIRRT and All-Cause Mortality in COVID-19 Patients Undergoing

Invasive Mechanical Ventilation

All survivors were followed for at least 30 days. During the median follow-up period of 9.5 (IQR 4.3-33.5) days, 13 of 22 (59.1%) patients in the PIRRT group and 11 of 14 (78.6%) patients in the non-PIRRT group died. Kaplan–Meier analysis indicated that the patients in the PIRRT group had prolonged survival compared to those in the non-PIRRT group (P = 0.04) (shown in Fig. 1).

In the Cox regression analysis, three different models were used to analyze the adjusted hazard ratio for PIRRT treatment. Consistently, the association between PIRRT treatment and a reduced risk of mortality remained significant and the adjusted hazard ratio (aHRs) of PIRRT treatment fluctuated between 0.332 and 0.398 (Table 2).

Risk Factors Associated with All-Cause Mortality for COVID-19 Patients Undergoing
Invasive Mechanical Ventilation with PIRRT Treatment

We further conducted univariate Cox proportional hazard regression analyses of all-cause mortality of COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation with PIRRT. We found that higher levels of IL-2 receptor, TNF- α , procalcitonin, prothrombin time, and NT-proBNP were significantly associated with an increased risk of all-cause mortality (Table 3).

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first cohort study to estimate the association between PIRRT treatment and the mortality of COVID-19 patients subjected to invasive mechanical ventilation. We included 36 COVID-19 patients subjected to invasive mechanical ventilation, of whom 22 patients received PIRRT. During the follow-up, 59.1% of patients in the PIRRT group, and 78.6% of patients in the non-PIRRT group died. PIRRT was independently associated with prolonged survival and a lower

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

8/22

risk of mortality in COVID-19 patients requiring invasive mechanical ventilation. Excessive inflammation characterized by the uncontrolled release pro-inflammatory cytokines into circulation is the main cause of death from sepsis (25, 26), and infection with influenza virus (27), Ebola virus (28), MERS-CoV (29), and SARS-CoV (30). In our study, we found that the cytokine storm might play a crucial role in critical COVID-19 patients. The mean/median levels of inflammatory markers, including IL-1β, IL-2 receptor, IL-6, IL-8, and IL-10, white blood cell count, neutrophil count, hCRP, procalcitonin, and ferritin were higher than normal. And in our study, univariate Cox proportional hazard regression analysis showed increased IL-6 [HR=1.004, 95% CI (1.001-1.007)] and TNF- α [HR=1.040, 95% CI (1.007-1.073)] were both associated with increased risk of mortality of all patients with invasive mechanical ventilation. In patients undergoing PIRRT, IL-6 showed significant difference before versus after PIRRT: before vs. after PIRRT: 221.35 (IQR 111.23-427.40) vs. 48.53 (IQR 12.93-119.23), P=0.001. Cytokine storms may be caused by the following aspects. First, SARS-CoV-2 infects patients by binding human angiotensin (Ang)-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) (31, 32), which is widely expressed in multiple organs throughout the body (33). SARS-CoV-2 might lead to multisystem inflammation through the ACE/Ang II/AT1R pathway and the ACE2/Ang (1-7)/Mas receptor pathway (34, 35). Second, it was reported that antibody-dependent enhancement (ADE) of SARS-CoV-2 due to prior exposure to other coronaviruses might also be involved in COVID-19 (36). ADE can elicit sustained inflammation, lymphopenia, and/or cytokine storm, which is a possible explanation for the geographic limitation of severe cases. Third, combined infections may lead to a more severe systemic inflammatory response. Indeed, in our study, some patients had infections in other organs (e.g., urinary tract and blood) caused by other pathogens (e.g., influenza virus and fungi). Fourth, shock, hypoxemia and coagulation pathway abnormalities in critical patients could aggravate the systemic inflammatory response, which lead to a vicious cycle that is life-threatening (37, 38). In our study, PIRRT was associated with prolonged survival in COVID-19 patients

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

with invasive mechanical ventilation. The primary goal of RRT is to compensate for the loss of renal function and associated sequelae, including uremic toxicity, electrolyte disturbances, metabolic acidosis, and volume overload (22, 39). In addition, RRT can also remove cytokines from the bloodstream. Emerging evidence has shown that RRT was associated with significantly lower mortality in patients with severe sepsis (17, 18, 40). Besides, in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome, RRT could remove inflammatory mediators, modulate immune function, and regulate oxygenation, thus improving patient prognosis (41-43). PIRRT is a widely used blood purification therapy, that achieves a high solute clearance rate through diffusion and convection (44). PIRRT has shown to encompass the benefits of both continuous RRT in terms of hemodynamic stability and intermittent hemodialysis in terms of cost-efficiency in the intensive care unit (22, 45). However, it is controversial whether PIRRT is beneficial in viral pneumonia. RRT was reported to have a positive effect on the treatment of adenovirus pneumonia (46). Other studies revealed that PIRRT was a risk factor for mortality in patients with MERS-CoV (15, 47). Yang et al also found that the proportion of nonsurvivors subjected to RRT was higher among patients with COVID-19 (48). In our study, PIRRT was associated with a reduced risk of mortality in COVID-19 patients requiring invasive mechanical ventilation after adjusting for confounding factors. COVID-19 is a novel infectious disease caused by a novel coronavirus, and the underlying pathophysiological process associated with organ involvement is still unclear. In addition, the population studied in our cohort was different from Yang et al., who focused on all critically ill patients, while we focused on patients who received invasive mechanical ventilation. Further research is needed to improve patient treatment and prognosis. There were some limitations to our study. First, it is retrospective in design, and a prospective double-blind randomized controlled study is warranted in the future. the sample size of this study was not large enough. Third it is just a single-center study, multicenter studies are needed for further confirmation. In summary, we demonstrated that PIRRT could improve COVID-19 patient survival

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

and might be an independent protective factor for COVID-19 patient survival, and might be an independent protective factor for COVID-19 patients with invasive mechanical ventilation. Further prospective multicenter studies with larger sample sizes are required. **Statements** Acknowledgements The authors greatly appreciate all the hospital staff for their efforts in recruiting and treating patients and thank all patients involved in this study. Statement of Ethics The study protocol and waiver of written informed consent were approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Tongji Hospital Affiliated to Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology (No. TJ-C20200333). **Disclosures Statement** The authors declare that they have no competing interests. **Funding Sources** This study was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC 81974089), international (regional) cooperation and exchange projects (NSFC-DFG, Grant No. 81761138041), the Major Research Plan of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 91742204), and the Science Foundation of Hubei Province (2019CFB675). **Author Contributions** F.H., G.X., S.G. and Y.Y. conceived and designed the study. Y.N., J.L., Q.L., S.G., and F.H. were in charge of management of patients. Y.Y., J.S., X.X., Y.W., A.C., and F.H. screened, reviewed and recorded the data. Y.Y., J.S. and S.G. performed statistical analyses. Y.Y., J.S.

- and S.G. drafted the manuscript. All authors provided critical revisions to the manuscript
- text. All authors read the manuscript and approved the final version.

References

291

292

- 293 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients
- with Pneumonia in China, 2019. The New England journal of medicine. 2020;382(8):727-33.
- 295 2. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill
- 296 patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective,
- 297 observational study. Lancet Respir Med. 2020, Epub ahead of print.
- 298 DOI:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5.
- 299 3. Zarbock A, Gomez H, Kellum JA. Sepsis-induced acute kidney injury revisited:
- 300 pathophysiology, prevention and future therapies. Current opinion in critical care.
- 301 2014;20(6):588-95.
- 302 4. Vincent JL. Fluid management in the critically ill. Kidney international. 2019;96(1):52-7.
- 303 5. Xie J, Wang H, Kang Y, Zhou L, Liu Z, Qin B, et al. The Epidemiology of Sepsis in
- 304 Chinese ICUs: A National Cross-Sectional Survey. Crit Care Med. 2020;48(3):e209-e18.
- 305 6. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected
- 306 with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet (London, England). 2020, Epub ahead
- 307 of print. DOI:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30183-5.
- 308 7. Qin C, Zhou L, Hu Z, Zhang S, Yang S, Tao Y, et al. Dysregulation of immune response in
- 309 patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. Clin Infect Dis. 2020, Epub ahead of print.
- 310 DOI:10.1093/cid/ciaa248.
- 311 8. Ruan Q, Yang K, Wang W, Jiang L, Song J. Clinical predictors of mortality due to

- 312 COVID-19 based on an analysis of data of 150 patients from Wuhan, China. Intensive Care
- 313 Med. 2020, Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1007/s00134-020-05991-x.
- 314 9. Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, Liang W-h, Ou C-q, He J-x, et al. Clinical Characteristics of
- 315 Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. New Engl J Med. 2020, Epub ahead of print.
- 316 DOI:10.1056/NEJMoa2002032.
- 317 10. Wong CK, Lam CW, Wu AK, Ip WK, Lee NL, Chan IH, et al. Plasma inflammatory
- 318 cytokines and chemokines in severe acute respiratory syndrome. Clin Exp Immunol.
- 319 2004; 136(1):95-103.
- 320 11. Mahallawi WH, Khabour OF, Zhang Q, Makhdoum HM, Suliman BA. MERS-CoV infection
- 321 in humans is associated with a pro-inflammatory Th1 and Th17 cytokine profile. Cytokine.
- 322 2018; 104:8-13.
- 323 12. Forni LG, Joannidis M. IDEAL timing of renal replacement therapy in critical care. Nat Rev
- 324 Nephrol. 2019;15(1):5-6.
- 325 13. Wolf T, Kann G, Becker S, Stephan C, Brodt HR, de Leuw P, et al. Severe Ebola virus
- 326 disease with vascular leakage and multiorgan failure: treatment of a patient in intensive care.
- 327 Lancet (London, England). 2015;385(9976):1428-35.
- 328 14. Rewa OG, Villeneuve PM, Lachance P, Eurich DT, Stelfox HT, Gibney RTN, et al. Quality
- 329 indicators of continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) care in critically ill patients: a
- 330 systematic review. Intensive Care Med. 2017;43(6):750-63.
- 331 15. Alfaraj SH, Al-Tawfiq JA, Assiri AY, Alzahrani NA, Alanazi AA, Memish ZA. Clinical
- 332 predictors of mortality of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV)
- infection: A cohort study. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2019;29:48-50.

- 334 16. Karkar A, Ronco C. Prescription of CRRT: a pathway to optimize therapy. Ann Intensive
- 335 Care. 2020;10(1):32.
- 336 17. Miao H, Shi J, Wang C, Lu G, Zhu X, Wang Y, et al. Continuous Renal Replacement
- 337 Therapy in Pediatric Severe Sepsis: A Propensity Score-Matched Prospective Multicenter
- 338 Cohort Study in the PICU. Crit Care Med. 2019;47(10):e806-e13.
- 339 18. Putzu A, Fang MX, Boscolo Berto M, Belletti A, Cabrini L, Cassina T, et al. Blood
- 340 purification with continuous veno-venous hemofiltration in patients with sepsis or ARDS: a
- 341 systematic review and meta-analysis. Minerva Anestesiol. 2017;83(8):867-77.
- 342 19. Fayad All, Buamscha DG, Ciapponi A. Timing of renal replacement therapy initiation for
- acute kidney injury. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018; 12: CD010612.
- 344 20. Fayad Al, Buamscha DG, Ciapponi A. Intensity of continuous renal replacement therapy
- for acute kidney injury. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016;10:CD010613.
- 346 21. Allegretti AS, Endres P, Parris T, Zhao S, May M, Sylvia-Reardon M, et al. Accelerated
- 347 Venovenous Hemofiltration as a Transitional Renal Replacement Therapy in the Intensive
- 348 Care Unit. Am J Nephrol. 2020;51(4):318-26.
- 349 22. Sethi SK, Mittal A, Nair N, Bagga A, Iyenger A, Ali U, et al. Pediatric Continuous Renal
- 350 Replacement Therapy (PCRRT) expert committee recommendation on prescribing prolonged
- 351 intermittent renal replacement therapy (PIRRT) in critically ill children. Hemodial Int. 2020,
- 352 Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1111/hdi.12821.
- 353 23. China. NHCo: the New Coronavirus Pneumonia Prevention and Control Program (5th
- 354 edition) 4 February 2020.
- 355 24. Khwaja A. KDIGO clinical practice guidelines for acute kidney injury. Nephron Clin Pract.

- 356 2012;120(4):c179-84.
- 357 25. Chousterman BG, Swirski FK, Weber GF. Cytokine storm and sepsis disease
- pathogenesis. Semin Immunopathol. 2017;39(5):517-28.
- 359 26. Giamarellos-Bourboulis EJ. Failure of treatments based on the cytokine storm theory of
- sepsis: time for a novel approach. Immunotherapy. 2013;5(3):207-9.
- 361 27. Chen S, Liu G, Chen J, Hu A, Zhang L, Sun W, et al. Ponatinib Protects Mice From Lethal
- 362 Influenza Infection by Suppressing Cytokine Storm. Front Immunol. 2019;10:1393.
- 363 28. Kennedy JR. Phosphatidylserine's role in Ebola's inflammatory cytokine storm and
- 364 hemorrhagic consumptive coagulopathy and the therapeutic potential of annexin V. Med
- 365 Hypotheses. 2020;135:109462.
- 366 29. Lau SKP, Lau CCY, Chan KH, Li CPY, Chen H, Jin DY, et al. Delayed induction of
- 367 proinflammatory cytokines and suppression of innate antiviral response by the novel Middle
- 368 East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: implications for pathogenesis and treatment. J Gen
- 369 Virol. 2013;94(Pt 12):2679-90.
- 370 30. Li Y, Chen M, Cao H, Zhu Y, Zheng J, Zhou H. Extraordinary GU-rich single-strand RNA
- 371 identified from SARS coronavirus contributes an excessive innate immune response. Microbes
- 372 and infection. 2013;15(2):88-95.
- 373 31. Kannan S, Shaik Syed Ali P, Sheeza A, Hemalatha K. COVID-19 (Novel Coronavirus
- 374 2019) recent trends. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2020;24(4):2006-11.
- 375 32. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Kruger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, et al.
- 376 SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically
- 377 Proven Protease Inhibitor. Cell. 2020, Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1016/j.cell.2020.02.052.

- 378 33. Hamming I, Timens W, Bulthuis ML, Lely AT, Navis G, van Goor H. Tissue distribution of
- 379 ACE2 protein, the functional receptor for SARS coronavirus. A first step in understanding
- 380 SARS pathogenesis. J Pathol. 2004;203(2):631-7.
- 34. Santos RAS, Sampaio WO, Alzamora AC, Motta-Santos D, Alenina N, Bader M, et al.
- 382 The ACE2/Angiotensin-(1-7)/MAS Axis of the Renin-Angiotensin System: Focus on
- 383 Angiotensin-(1-7). Physiological reviews. 2018;98(1):505-53.
- 384 35. Sun ML, Yang JM, Sun YP, Su GH. [Inhibitors of RAS Might Be a Good Choice for the
- Therapy of COVID-19 Pneumonia]. Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi. 2020;43(0):E014.
- 386 36. Tetro JA. Is COVID-19 receiving ADE from other coronaviruses? Microbes Infect. 2020,
- 387 Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1016/j.micinf.2020.02.006.
- 388 37. Bar-Or D, Carrick MM, Mains CW, Rael LT, Slone D, Brody EN. Sepsis, oxidative stress,
- and hypoxia: Are there clues to better treatment? Redox Rep. 2015;20(5):193-7.
- 390 38. Chakraborty RK, Burns B. Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome. StatPearls.
- 391 Treasure Island (FL)2020.PMID: 31613449.
- 39. Joannidis M, Forni LG. Clinical review: timing of renal replacement therapy. Crit Care.
- 393 2011;15(3):223.
- 394 40. Matsuda K, Moriguchi T, Oda S, Hirasawa H. Efficacy of continuous hemodiafiltration with
- 395 a cytokine-adsorbing hemofilter in the treatment of acute respiratory distress syndrome.
- 396 Contrib Nephrol. 2010;166:83-92.
- 397 41. Elbahlawan L, West NK, Avent Y, Cheng C, Liu W, Barfield RC, et al. Impact of
- 398 continuous renal replacement therapy on oxygenation in children with acute lung injury after
- 399 allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Pediatr Blood Cancer. 2010;55(3):540-5.

- 400 42. Han F, Sun R, Ni Y, Hu X, Chen X, Jiang L, et al. Early initiation of continuous renal
- 401 replacement therapy improves clinical outcomes in patients with acute respiratory distress
- 402 syndrome. Am J Med Sci. 2015;349(3):199-205.
- 403 43. DiCarlo JV, Alexander SR, Agarwal R, Schiffman JD. Continuous veno-venous
- 404 hemofiltration may improve survival from acute respiratory distress syndrome after bone
- 405 marrow transplantation or chemotherapy. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol. 2003;25(10):801-5.
- 406 44. Edrees F, Li T, Vijayan A. Prolonged Intermittent Renal Replacement Therapy. Adv
- 407 Chronic Kidney Dis. 2016;23(3):195-202.
- 408 45. Fathima N, Kashif T, Janapala RN, Jayaraj JS, Qaseem A. Single-best Choice Between
- 409 Intermittent Versus Continuous Renal Replacement Therapy: A Review. Cureus.
- 410 2019;11(9):e5558.
- 411 46. Ha SO, Kim HS, Park S, Jung KS, Jang SH, Han SJ, et al. Severe ARDS caused by
- 412 adenovirus: early initiation of ECMO plus continuous renal replacement therapy. Springerplus.
- 413 2016;5(1):1909
- 414 47. Cha RH, Joh JS, Jeong I, Lee JY, Shin HS, Kim G, et al. Renal Complications and Their
- 415 Prognosis in Korean Patients with Middle East Respiratory Syndrome-Coronavirus from the
- 416 Central MERS-CoV Designated Hospital. J Korean Med Sci. 2015;30(12):1807-14.
- 417 48. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia Ja, Liu H, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically
- 418 ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective,
- 419 observational study. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2020, Epub ahead of print.
- 420 DOI:10.1016/s2213-2600(20)30079-5.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1. Kaplan-Meier curve of overall patient survival according to with or without PIRRT treatment. Patient survival was significantly better for PIRRT group than for non-PIRRT group (log-rank test, P=0.042).

Table 1. Comparison of baseline demographics and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation between patients with and without PIRRT treatment in the cohort

Parameters	All patients	PIRRT group	Non-PIRRT group	Р
N	36	22	14	-
Age				0.167^{a}
Mean, years	69.4	67.5	72.6	
SD	10.8	11.4	9.1	
Range, years	44.0-86.0	44.0-86.0	58.0-86.0	
Sex				$0.658^{\rm c}$
Male, n (%)	30 (83.3)	19 (86.4)	11 (78.6)	
Female, n (%)	6 (16.7)	3 (13.6)	3 (21.4)	
APACHE-II score, mean (SD)	13.7 (4.7)	13.4 (5.4)	14.1 (3.4)	0.633^{a}
SOFA score, median (IQR)	6.0 (4.0-8.0)	6.0 (3.8-8.0)	6.0 (4.5-7.0)	0.994^{a}
Hospitalization, median (IQR), days	6.0 (4.0-9.0)	5.5 (2.8-8.0)	7.5 (4.0-10.0)	0.171^{a}
Comorbidities				
Hypertension, n (%)	14 (38.9)	8 (36.4)	6 (42.9)	0.738^{c}
Diabetes, n (%)	10 (27.8)	6 (27.3)	4 (28.6)	1.000°
Cardiac disease, n (%)	12 (33.3)	6 (27.3)	6 (42.9)	0.472^{c}
Cerebrovascular disease, n (%)	2 (5.6)	0 (0)	2 (14.3)	0.144^{c}
Chronic lung disease, n (%)	7 (19.4)	4 (18.2)	3 (21.4)	1.000°
Malignant tumor, n (%)	2 (5.6)	2 (9.1)	0 (0)	$0.511^{\rm c}$
Chronic viral hepatitis, n (%)	3 (8.3)	3 (13.6)	0 (0)	$0.267^{\rm c}$
Any of comorbidity, n (%)	30 (83.3)	18 (81.8)	12 (85.7)	0.759^{c}
Complications				
MODS, n (%)	13 (36.1)	10 (45.5)	3 (21.4)	$0.175^{\rm c}$
Heart failure, n (%)	7 (19.4)	5 (22.7)	2 (14.3)	$0.681^{\rm c}$

Acute kidney injury, n (%)	8 (22.2)	5 (22.7)	3 (21.4)	1.000c
Arrhythmia, n (%)	12 (33.3)	8 (36.4)	4 (28.6)	0.727^{c}
ARDS, n (%)	36 (100)	22 (100)	14 (100)	1.000c
Laboratory findings	, ,	, ,	, ,	
White blood cell count, mean (SD), 10 ⁹ /L	14.0 (7.1)	14.3 (8.5)	13.4 (4.4)	0.700a
Neutrophil count, mean (SD), 10 ⁹ /L	12.7 (6.7)	13.0 (8.0)	12.2 (4.2)	0.731^{a}
Lymphocyte count, mean (SD), 10 ⁹ /L	0.6 (0.3)	0.6 (0.3)	0.6 (0.3)	0.546a
Hemoglobin, mean (SD), g/L	122.4 (18.1)	126.8 (18.6)	115.5 (15.5)	0.066^{a}
Platelet, median (IQR), 10 ⁹ /L	156.0 (99.8-213.0)	159.0 (94.0-203.0)	156.0 (110.3-221.5)	$0.580^{\rm b}$
Blood glucose, mean (SD), mmol/L	9.8 (3.8)	9.0 (2.8)	11.0 (4.8)	0.131^{a}
Total cholesterol, mean (SD), mmol/L	3.3 (0.9)	3.3 (1.0)	3.2 (0.8)	0.669^{a}
hCRP, mean (SD), mg/L	121.0 (76.1)	124.7 (77.0)	105.8 (80.9)	0.667^{a}
Procalcitonin, median (IQR), ng/mL	0.32 (0.19-0.83)	0.3 (0.2-1.0)	0.3 (0.3-0.9)	$0.538^{\rm b}$
Ferritin, median (IQR), μg/L	1140.0 (799.0-1983.0)	1264.0 (795.4-2108.0)	1077.0 (806.4-1933.0)	$0.637^{\rm b}$
Prothrombin time, median (IQR), s	15.5 (14.5-16.3)	15.1 (14.1-16.3)	15.7 (14.9-16.6)	0.299^{b}
Activated partial thromboplastin time, median (IQR), s	38.7 (36.0-44.7)	38.7 (35.4-43.7)	39.0 (37.0-51.9)	$0.158^{\rm b}$
hs-cTnI, median (IQR), pg/mL	67.7 (16.0-284.9)	79.3 (16.3-587.2)	46.3 (14.6-162.0)	$0.337^{\rm b}$
NT-proBNP, median (IQR), μg/mL	1.2 (0.6-3.0)	1.1 (0.6-2.8)	1.2 (0.5-3.6)	$0.781^{\rm b}$
Alanine aminotransferase, median (IQR), U/L	34.5 (21.5-45.5)	36.0 (29.0-53.0)	30.5 (16.0-43.3)	$0.081^{\rm b}$
Aspartate aminotransferase, median (IQR), U/L	30.5 (22.5-54.0)	43.5 (24.0-63.3)	29.5 (20.0-34.0)	0.034b*
Blood urea nitrogen, median (IQR), mmol/L	10.7 (6.7-14.4)	10.8 (6.4-14.9)	10.3 (6.9-13.6)	$0.923^{\rm b}$
Serum creatinine, median (IQR), μmol/L	83.5 (66.0-126.3)	94.5 (67.0-136.0)	72.0 (51.0-82.3)	0.017b*
Serum bicarbonate, mean (SD), mmol/L	24.7 (3.4)	24.3 (2.9)	25.4 (4.1)	0.345^{a}
Potassium, median (IQR), mmol/L	4.1 (3.5-4.6)	4.1 (3.5-4.8)	4.2 (3.6-4.6)	$0.968^{\rm b}$
Lactic acid, median (IQR), mmol/L	2.3 (1.8-2.9)	2.4 (1.9-2.8)	2.3 (1.8-3.0)	0.811^{b}

Treatments

Moxifloxacin hydrochloride, n (%)	24 (66.7)	16 (72.7)	8 (57.1)	0.472c
Abidol, n (%)	28 (77.8)	17 (77.3)	11 (78.6)	1.000c
Lopinavir/ritonavir, n (%)	10 (27.8)	8 (36.4)	2 (14.3)	0.255°
Hydroxychloroquine, n (%)	3 (8.3)	2 (9.1)	1 (7.1)	1.000^{c}
Other antibiotic treatment, n (%)	34 (94.4)	21 (95.5)	13 (92.9)	1.000°
Antifungal treatment, n (%)	5 (13.9)	5 (22.7)	0 (0)	0.134^{c}
Other antiviral treatment, n (%)	4 (11.1)	1 (4.5)	3 (21.4)	0.134^{c}
Traditional Chinese medicine, n (%)	20 (55.6)	12 (54.5)	8 (57.1)	1.000c
Glucocorticoid, n (%)	29 (80.6)	17 (77.3)	12 (85.7)	0.681^{c}
Diuretics, n (%)	27 (75.0)	15 (68.2)	12 (85.7)	0.432^{c}
Human albumin, n (%)	34 (94.4)	21 (95.5)	13 (92.9)	1.000°
Gamma globulin, n (%)	29 (80.6)	18 (81.8)	11 (78.6)	1.000c
Heparin, n (%)	29 (80.6)	17 (77.3)	12 (85.7)	$0.681^{\rm c}$
IABP, n (%)	2 (5.6)	1 (4.5)	1 (7.1)	1.000^{c}
ECMO, n (%)	3 (8.3)	3 (13.6)	0 (0)	$0.267^{\rm c}$
Duration of invasive mechanical ventilation to	-	3.5 (2.0-6.3)	-	-

^{*}P<0.05. at-test, bWhitney U test, Fisher's exact test.

initiation of PIRRT, median (IQR), days

COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; APACHE II, acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II; SOFA, sepsis-related organ failureassessment; PIRRT, prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy; MODS, multiple organ dysfunction syndrome; IABP, intra aortic balloon counterpulsation; SD, standard deviation; IQR, interquartile range; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome; hCRP, hypersensitive C-reactive protein; hs-cTnI, high sensitive cardiac troponin I; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation.

Table 2. Models of multivariate Cox proportional hazard regression analysis for PIRRT treatment (reference group: non-PIRRT treatment) for all-cause mortality of all COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation in the cohort

PIRRT versus non-PIRRT	Adjusted Hazard Ratio (95%	P
	CI)	
Model A	0.350 (0.147, 0.830)	0.017
Model B	0.398 (0.171, 0.924)	0.032
Model C	0.332 (0.119, 0.925)	0.035
Model A: Adjusted for APACHE II scor	es, SOFA scores, and any of comorbidit	y;
Model B: Adjusted for Acute kidney in	ijury, APACHE II scores, Sex;	
Model C: Adjusted for IL-6, APACHE II	scores, IL-2 receptor.	

Table 3. Univariate Cox proportional hazard regression analysis for all-cause mortality of COVID-19 patients undergoing invasive mechanical ventilation with PIRRT treatment in the cohort

Parameters	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P
Age (per year)	1.048 (0.998, 1.100)	0.059
Sex (male vs. female)	0.959 (0.209, 4.397)	0.957
APACHE II score (per 1 score)	1.038 (0.942, 1.143)	0.453
SOFA score (per 1 score)	1.093 (0.948, 1.261)	0.221
Any of comorbidity (with vs. without)	1.720 (0.379, 7.816)	0.483
Acute kidney injury (with vs. without)	2.219 (0.674, 7.313)	0.190
White blood cell count (per 109/L)	0.980 (0.918, 1.047)	0.553
IL-2 receptor (per U/mL)	1.002 (1.001, 1.003)	0.004*
TNF-α (per pg/mL)	1.046 (1.002, 1.092)	0.041*
Procalcitonin (per ng/L)	2.306 (1.098, 4.842)	0.027*
Prothrombin time (per s)	1.808 (1.229, 2.659)	0.003*
D-dimer (per μg/mL [FEU])	1.034 (0.964, 1.109)	0.346
hs-cTnI (per pg/mL)	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)	0.257
NT-proBNP (per μg/mL)	1.181 (1.056, 1.320)	0.003*
Alanine aminotransferase (per U/L)	0.998 (0.992, 1.004)	0.479
Aspartate aminotransferase (per U/L)	0.998 (0.994, 1.003)	0.442
Plasma albumin (per g/L)	1.010 (0.856, 1.191)	0.910
Blood urea nitrogen (per mmol/L)	1.021 (0.950, 1.099)	0.569
Serum creatinine (per μmol/L)	1.000 (0.987, 1.012)	0.963

COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; PIRRT, prolonged intermittent renal replacement therapy; APACHE II, acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II; SOFA, sepsis-related organ failureassessment; IL, interleukin; TNF, tumor necrosis factor; FEU, fibrinogen equivalent units; hs-cTnI, high sensitive cardiac troponin I; NT-proBNP, N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide.

