

1 **Title Page**

2 **Manuscript Word Count: 2660**

3 **Abstract Word Count: 249**

4 **Clinical Outcomes With the Use of Prophylactic Versus Therapeutic Anticoagulation in**
5 **COVID-19**

6 Jishu K. Motta MD¹, Rahila O. Ogunnaike MD¹, Rutvik Shah MD¹, Stephanie Stroever PhD,
7 MPH², Harold V. Cedeño MD¹, Shyam K. Thapa MD¹, John J. Chronakos MD³, Eric J. Jimenez
8 MD³, Joann Petrini PhD², Abhijith Hegde MD³

9 ¹Department of Medicine, Danbury Hospital, Danbury, CT

10 ²Department of Research and Innovation, Danbury Hospital/ Nuvance Health Network, Danbury,
11 CT

12 ³Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care, Danbury Hospital, Danbury, CT

13 **Corresponding Author**

14 Name: Jishu Kaul Motta, MD

15 Address: 24 Hospital Avenue, Danbury, CT 06810

16 Email: jishu.motta@nuvancehealth.org

17 Telephone: 347-832-5741

18 **No conflicts exist for the specified authors**

19 **Funding information:** No external funding was received.

20 **Keywords:** Thrombosis, Pneumonia, SARS.

21 **Abstract**

22 **Background:** This study is the first of its kind to assess the impact of preemptive therapeutic
23 dose anticoagulation on mortality compared to prophylactic anticoagulation among COVID-19
24 patients. Its findings provide insight to clinicians regarding the management of COVID-19,
25 particularly with the known prothrombotic state.

26 **Research Question:** To determine the impact of anticoagulation on in-hospital mortality among
27 COVID-19 positive patients with the *a priori* hypothesis that there would be a lower risk of in-
28 hospital mortality with use of preemptive therapeutic over prophylactic dose enoxaparin or
29 heparin.

30 **Study Design and Methods:**

31 *Study Design:* Retrospective cohort study from April 1 - April 25, 2020. The date of final follow-
32 up was June 12, 2020.

33 *Setting:* Two large, acute care hospitals in Western Connecticut.

34 *Participants:* Five hundred and one inpatients were identified after discharge as 18 years or older
35 and positive for SARS-CoV-2. The final sample size included 374 patients after applying
36 exclusion criteria. Demographic variables were collected via hospital billing inquiries, while the
37 clinical variables were abstracted from patients' medical records.

38 *Exposure:* Preemptive enoxaparin or heparin at a therapeutic or prophylactic dose.

39 *Main Outcome:* In-hospital mortality.

40 **Results:** When comparing preemptive therapeutic to prophylactic anticoagulation through multi-
41 variable analysis, risk of in-hospital mortality was 2.3 times greater in patients receiving
42 preemptive therapeutic anticoagulation (95% CI = 1.0, 4.9; p = 0.04).

43 **Interpretation:** An increase in in-hospital mortality was observed with preemptive therapeutic
44 anticoagulation. Thus, in the management of COVID-19 and its complications, we recommend
45 further research and cautious use of preemptive therapeutic over prophylactic anticoagulation.

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58 **Manuscript Text**

59 **Introduction**

60 The first outbreak of SARS-CoV-1 occurred 18 years ago. Scientists identified bats as the
61 primary reservoir and additional SARS-related coronaviruses have been discovered among
62 humans since that time.^{1,2} In December 2019, a new beta-coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, infected
63 the first humans in Wuhan, China and rapidly spread throughout the world creating a global
64 pandemic.³ The disease, also known as COVID-19, has caused extensive infection and mortality
65 worldwide with over 2 million cases and over 115,000 deaths in the United States as of June 18,
66 2020.⁴ The trigger for severe disease and the extent of physiological damage in the human body
67 is currently unknown, though there are some similarities with other viruses in the *Coronaviridae*
68 family.^{1,2,5} SARS-CoV-2 uses the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) for cell entry into
69 type II pneumocytes which results in diffuse alveolar damage and acute lung injury.⁶⁻¹⁰ Patients
70 with severe illness have also been noted to have elevated d-dimer, C-reactive protein (CRP), and
71 interleukin-6 (IL-6) levels.¹¹⁻¹⁸ Additionally, there is evidence that patients develop thrombotic
72 complications such as pulmonary embolism and unexplained renal failure.¹¹⁻²² As observed with
73 SARS-CoV-1, infections that elicit a systemic inflammatory response can cause an imbalance
74 between procoagulant and anticoagulant homeostatic mechanisms.¹¹

75 Postmortem analyses of patients with SARS viruses revealed microthrombi in pulmonary
76 microvasculature, deep vein thrombosis, and pulmonary embolisms.^{11,22} There have also been
77 reports of COVID-19-induced chilblains and acute acro-ischemia in younger patients.²¹ Prior
78 studies sought to determine possible benefits in treating COVID-19 patients with anticoagulation
79 (AC) therapy. Shi et al. found that 42 patients had a significant decrease in the proportion of

80 lymphocytes, d-dimer levels, and fibrinogen degradation products among a small sample of
81 patients that received prophylactic low molecular weight heparin (LMWH), with no decrease in
82 length of hospitalization.⁶ Tang et al. found no difference in 28-day mortality among a sample of
83 449 COVID-19 patients who did or did not receive prophylactic LMWH. However, a sub-group
84 analysis among patients with markers for severe disease revealed a significantly lower rate of
85 mortality among patients who received heparin.²³ Paranjpe and Fuster et al described an
86 association between the use of therapeutic AC and decreased length of stay (LOS) but no
87 significant change in in-hospital mortality compared to patients who did not receive AC.
88 However, in patients that were mechanically ventilated and treated with therapeutic AC, they
89 described a significant decrease in mortality and LOS compared to no AC.²⁴

90 All of these findings support the hypothesis that COVID-19 can induce a prothrombotic state.
91 Despite some evidence, additional research is needed to identify possible treatments to minimize
92 the potential harm among patients who are at risk for thrombotic complications. The primary
93 objective of this study was to determine the impact of AC on the mortality among patients who
94 received a therapeutic versus prophylactic dose of enoxaparin or heparin. Based on prior studies
95 that showed a prothrombotic state induced by COVID-19 leading to increased mortality, we
96 hypothesize that preemptive treatment with therapeutic AC can lower this risk.

97 The secondary objective was to determine the difference between the two groups in in-hospital
98 mortality, among patients with a peak CRP ≥ 200 mg/L.

99 This study is the first of its kind to compare clinical outcomes of COVID-19 positive patients
100 who received preemptive therapeutic versus prophylactic AC, started upon admission as opposed
101 to for the treatment of a thrombotic condition. Previous studies assessed the impact of any AC

102 therapy compared to none. This study can provide guidance to clinicians on the appropriate
103 utilization of AC in COVID-19 patients.

104 **Methods**

105 **Study Design, Setting, and Participants**

106 We conducted a retrospective cohort study of patients from two large, acute care hospitals in
107 Western Connecticut. Both hospitals are located in Fairfield County, which had the highest
108 incidence of infection in Connecticut with more than 24,000 cases of the virus to date²⁵. The
109 protocol and subsequent work were granted exempt status by the Biomedical Research Alliance
110 of New York (BRANY) Institutional Review Board under category #4(iii), as detailed in 45 CFR
111 46.104(d) and BRANY's Standard Operating Procedure.

112 The study included adult patients admitted with a diagnosis of COVID 19 (ICD-10 code B97.29,
113 J12.89, J18.9, U07.1) between April 1 and April 25, 2020, and treated with AC during their
114 inpatient stay. AC was defined as the therapeutic or prophylactic use of enoxaparin or heparin,
115 both regimens started preemptively upon admission. Patients were excluded if they did not take
116 enoxaparin or heparin during their inpatient stay or if they were on other forms of AC prior to or
117 during their hospitalization. Demographic variables were collected via hospital billing inquiries,
118 while the clinical variables were abstracted from patients' medical records.

119 **Variables**

120 **Main Outcomes and Predictors**

121 The primary outcome measures were a dichotomous variable for death. The secondary outcome
122 measure was mortality in patients with peak ≥ 200 mg/L.

123 The primary exposure variable was dose of AC. Therapeutic dosage for enoxaparin was defined
124 as 1 mg/kg subcutaneously twice daily or 1.5 mg/kg subcutaneously daily or based on renal
125 function, or higher doses titrated to anti-Factor Xa range of 0.6 to 1 IU/mL (for twice daily
126 dosing) and 1 to 2 IU/mL (for daily dosing).²⁶ Prophylactic dosage for enoxaparin was defined as
127 30 or 40 mg subcutaneously every day. For heparin, therapeutic dosage was defined as
128 intravenous heparin titrated to an activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT) between 70 and
129 110 sec, and prophylactic dosage was defined as 5000 units given subcutaneously every 8 hours.
130 Patients were assigned to the therapeutic group if they preemptively received a therapeutic
131 dosage of either medication at any time or the prophylaxis group if they only received
132 prophylaxis for the duration of their inpatient stay. Patients who received therapeutic
133 anticoagulation specifically for a thrombotic indication were excluded from this study. We
134 recognize that the dichotomization of a time-varying variable may introduce some bias to the
135 analysis. Thus, we created an alternative exposure variable for sensitivity analyses that defined
136 AC as prophylactic or therapeutic dosage at time of admission.

137 **Covariates**

138 Numerous patient and treatment-related variables were included as possible confounders given
139 their potential association with the outcomes (Table 1). Demographic variables included age,
140 gender, race, and ethnicity. Race was defined as White, Black or African American, and others.
141 Ethnicity was defined as either Hispanic or non-Hispanic. We also included body mass index,
142 smoking status (never/ever), diabetes, current immunosuppression, prior history of heart disease,
143 pulmonary disease, kidney disease, cancer, and hyperlipidemia. History of heart disease was
144 defined as a dichotomous variable for any of the following: hypertension, congestive heart
145 failure, myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation, and other heart disease. History of any

146 pulmonary disease included asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pulmonary
147 embolism, obstructive sleep apnea, and other.

148 History of cancer and kidney disease were each a dichotomous variable reflecting either of these
149 conditions. We included immunosuppression as a dichotomous variable that reflected diseases
150 such as transplant, myelodysplasia, rheumatoid arthritis, psoriatic arthritis, and cancer. Cancer
151 and immunosuppression had some overlap in patients. However, they were maintained as
152 separate variables, because the correlation between the variables was less than 0.25.

153 Treatment-related variables included the need for ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, and
154 treatment with antibiotics, Tocilizumab, Hydroxychloroquine, or Lopinavir/Ritonavir. We also
155 included a dichotomous variable for peak CRP defined as < 200 mg/L or ≥ 200 mg/L to reflect
156 severity. Additionally, we collected data on the outcome of receiving pRBC transfusion and the
157 occurrence of an arteriovenous occlusive event.

158 **Statistical methods**

159 We performed all analyses with StateSE 16. We computed descriptive statistics as percentages of
160 the total for dichotomous and categorical variables and mean with standard deviation for
161 continuous. We also used Independent Student's t-test to assess group differences for each
162 continuous covariate and chi-square or Fisher's exact test for dichotomous/categorical
163 covariates. We accounted for missing data with list wise deletion, and set the alpha for statistical
164 hypothesis testing at 0.05.

165 We used a multi-variable logistic regression model to determine risk differences in mortality
166 given AC dosage. We developed the model according to *a priori* hypotheses on confounders that
167 were both associated with our primary exposure and outcome and not in the causal pathway. We

168 also verified model assumptions. We performed a sensitivity analysis and qualitatively assessed
169 differences in effect size and direction with the alternative exposure variable. We used similar
170 methods to assess differences in mortality among patients with $\text{CRP} \geq 200$ mg/L.

171 We performed a *post hoc* investigation of the cause of death among patients in our cohort to
172 explore the reason for the increased risk of death among patients on therapeutic dosage of
173 anticoagulant. We computed descriptive statistics on the primary cause of death and election of
174 comfort measures among all patients that expired.

175 Lastly, we assessed the difference in receiving pRBC transfusion and incidence of occlusive
176 events among all patients on therapeutic and prophylactic AC with univariate logistic regression.

177 **Results**

178 **Participants**

179 A total of 501 inpatients were initially identified as 18 years or older and positive for SARS-
180 CoV-2. A total of 374 patients were included in this study following the application of exclusion
181 criteria (Figure 1). There was limited missing data with most variables missing less than 1 to 5
182 percent (Table 1). Race had more than 20 percent missing data, because Hispanic was listed as
183 race in some medical records. Thus, the race of the patient was unknown. List wise deletion for
184 the multi-variable logistic model resulted in a final sample size of 351. The sub-group analysis to
185 determine risk of mortality among patients with $\text{CRP} \geq 200$ mg/L included 104 patients.

186 We provide descriptive statistics in Table 1. The average age was 64.7 years old, more than half
187 of the sample was male (58.6%), and the majority was White (54.0%) and non-Hispanic
188 (63.6%). Nearly all patients in our sample took enoxaparin at some time during their inpatient
189 stay (93.5%), while less than one-fifth took heparin (14.8%). Some patients took both

190 medications at different times, depending on their treatment requirements. Seventy-five (20.1%)
191 patients were on therapeutic AC, and seventy-two patients expired (19.2%).

192 **Risk differences in mortality**

193 There was a statistically significant increase in the risk of mortality in the therapeutic AC group
194 compared with the prophylactic AC group upon crude analysis (Table 2). The full logistic model
195 included AC dosage, age, ethnicity, diabetes, history of cancer or heart disease, hyperlipidemia,
196 peak CRP, intensive care, mechanical ventilation, and antibiotic use.

197 The risk of mortality was higher (aRR = 2.3, 95% CI = 1.0, 4.9, p = 0.04) for patients on
198 therapeutic AC when compared to prophylactic AC after controlling for all variables in the
199 model (Table 2).

200 **Sub-group analyses**

201 We performed a sub-group analysis of patients with a CRP \geq 200 mg/L to determine if there was
202 a risk difference in mortality. We hypothesized that patients with evidence of severe disease may
203 benefit from therapeutic AC. However, multi-variable logistic regression that included AC
204 dosage, age, ethnicity, diabetes, history of cancer, history of any heart disease, intensive care,
205 mechanical ventilation, and use of antibiotics, hydroxychloroquine, and tocilizumab
206 demonstrated no difference in the risk of mortality between patients on therapeutic and
207 prophylactic AC (aRR = 1.0, 95% CI = 0.2, 4.5, p = 0.97) (Table 2).

208 Additionally, there was no difference found in the transfusion of pRBC or incidence of
209 arteriovenous occlusive events across AC dosage on univariate analysis.

210 **Sensitivity analyses**

211 Qualitatively, we found there was little difference in the risk ratios in the sensitivity analyses for
212 risk of mortality. However, the confidence intervals in the primary exposure variable were more
213 precise than the alternative exposure variable. The conclusions remain the same regardless of the
214 definition for therapeutic AC.

215 ***Post hoc analyses***

216 The main causes of death among patients that expired are provided in Table 3. The majority of
217 patients expired due to worsening oxygenation (71.8%) and acute respiratory failure with
218 hypoxia. Patients also expired due to shock and multi-organ failure. Approximately 8% of
219 patients died from other causes, including anoxic brain injury due to hemorrhage (n = 1), kidney
220 dysfunction with inability to access hemodialysis port (n = 1), and failure to thrive with
221 encephalopathy (n = 1). Additionally, 64.4% of patients elected to receive comfort measures only
222 for end of life care.

223 **Discussion**

224 Since the onset of the COVID 19 pandemic, aggressive efforts to elucidate an effective anti-viral
225 or biologic agent against this virus, have yielded inconclusive data²⁷. Giannis et al and Mehta et
226 al have discussed the hyper inflammatory state that occurs in patients with COVID-19.^{9,11}
227 Postmortem reports of thrombo-embolic disease in COVID-19 patients indicate systemic
228 thromboses possibly leading to the clinical decline seen in these patients.^{11,22} Our study evaluated
229 whether preemptive administration of prophylactic AC versus therapeutic AC resulted in a
230 difference in in-hospital mortality, among all COVID 19 patients and among a subset with
231 significantly elevated CRP levels.

232 Among all in-patients with COVID-19, after controlling for relevant covariates, in-hospital
233 mortality was 2.3 times higher in preemptive therapeutic over prophylactic anticoagulation.
234 When we focused on patients with greater severity of disease ($CRP \geq 200$), there was still no
235 clinical improvement in outcomes of preemptive therapeutic anticoagulation. Although these
236 results were different from the study by Paranjpe and Fuster et al, this study compared
237 prophylactic with therapeutic AC, while adjusting for multiple confounders. Klok et al also did
238 not find a difference in mortality in COVID-19 patients treated with therapeutic anticoagulation
239 at baseline, despite reduction in thrombotic events²⁸. The presence of a COVID-19 induced
240 immunothrombotic state has been suggested in the literature, and disseminated intravascular
241 coagulation, which can account for thrombosis on a consumptive basis, has been reported in
242 autopsy specimens²⁹. Since the thrombotic effects of COVID 19 are not completely understood,
243 it may very well be the case that therapeutic anticoagulation is an ineffective treatment with
244 worse clinical outcomes for this syndrome. When cause of death was evaluated, it was found that
245 most patients expired due to refractory acute respiratory failure with hypoxia as well as shock
246 and multi-organ system failure. Although thrombosis could have played a role in these top
247 causes of death, they can also be attributed to other reasons unrelated to thrombosis, such as
248 direct end organ damage due to the virus or to the systemic inflammatory response syndrome
249 caused by the virus. Regardless it does not seem from our analyses that therapeutic dosing of
250 anticoagulation prevented overall disease progression. Of note the high incidence of comfort
251 measures in this study most likely reflects a transition after the disease had worsened to the point
252 where further care would not have been beneficial to the patient, and given the high risk of
253 cardiopulmonary resuscitation to healthcare workers and the poor outcomes in COVID, many

254 times patients were transitioned after other aggressive interventions were failing and death was
255 imminent in an effort to avoid it.

256 There were several limitations recognized in this study. First, this is a retrospective study that did
257 not randomize patients to treatment groups. Group assignments may be biased by prescriber
258 preferences or differences in unmeasured clinical variables that may bias the effect sizes of these
259 variables. Second, clinical outcomes, such as mortality after the patients left the hospital, were
260 not captured in this study. Therefore, there may be some misclassification bias in the outcome.
261 Additionally, we included variables in our model that we hypothesized would impact mortality
262 among patients on AC. However, it is likely there is unmeasured confounding present in the
263 model.

264 The patients in this sample were selected from two institutions in Western Connecticut and were
265 predominantly older, non-Hispanic, and White. Interpretation of the results should only be
266 generalized to similar patient populations. Future research should utilize a randomized control
267 design and include additional factors related to mortality, bleeding, and complications of AC
268 utilization.

269 **Conclusion**

270 Among hospitalized patients with COVID-19, an increase in the risk of mortality was observed
271 in patients who preemptively received therapeutic AC when compared to those who received
272 prophylactic AC. It is therefore important to consider the risks and benefits for the patient as well
273 as the healthcare system when using preemptive therapeutic AC in COVID-19. We recommend
274 further research and cautious use of therapeutic AC over standard prophylactic AC in the
275 management of COVID-19 and its complications.

276 **Acknowledgments**

277 Abhijith Hegde, MD and Jishu K. Motta, MD take responsibility for the integrity of the work as
278 a whole, from inception to published article.

279 Rutvik Shah, MD, Jishu K. Motta, MD and Rahila O. Ogunnaike, MD, were involved in
280 conception and design of the research study, data acquisition, drafting and revision of the
281 manuscript. Harold V. Cedeno, MD and Shyam K. Thapa, MD were involved in data acquisition,
282 drafting and revision of the manuscript. Stephanie Stroeve, PhD was involved in data analysis
283 and interpretation, writing of the methods and results sections, and revision of the manuscript.
284 Joann Petrini, PhD, MPH, John J. Chronakos, MD, Eric J. Jimenez, MD and Abhijith Hegde,
285 MD were involved in critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, and
286 final approval of the version to be published.

287 No external funding was received for this study.

288 The authors wish to acknowledge the following contributors to this work, who did not receive
289 any specific compensation for their contributions. From the Department of Pulmonary and
290 Critical Care, Danbury Hospital: Dr. Thomas Botta, Dr. Guillermo Ballarino, Dr. Jose Mendez,
291 Dr. Loren Inigo-Santiago and Dr. Dmitriy Golovyan. From the Department of Infectious
292 Diseases, Danbury Hospital: Dr. Paul Nee, Dr. John Stratidis, Dr. Gary Schleiter and Dr. Martha
293 DesBiens. From the Department of Research and Innovation, Nuvance Health: Jon Serino.

294

295

296

297 **References:**

- 298 1. Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new
299 coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature*. 2020;579(7798):270-273. doi:[10.1038/s41586-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7)
300 [020-2012-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7)
- 301 2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in
302 China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(8):727-733.
303 doi:[10.1056/NEJMoa2001017](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017)
- 304 3. WHO Director-General's remarks at the media briefing on 2019-nCoV on 11 February 2020.
305 Accessed April 11, 2020. [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020)
306 [remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-2019-ncov-on-11-february-2020).
- 307 4. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. Accessed May 10, 2020.
308 <https://covid19.who.int/>.
- 309 5. Thakkar N, Yadavalli T, Jaishankar D, Shukla D. Emerging Roles of Heparanase in Viral
310 Pathogenesis. *Pathogens*. 2017;6(3):43. doi:[10.3390/pathogens6030043](https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens6030043)
- 311 6. Shi C, Wang C, Wang H, et al. *The Potential of Low Molecular Weight Heparin to Mitigate*
312 *Cytokine Storm in Severe COVID-19 Patients: A Retrospective Clinical Study*. *Pharmacology*
313 *and Therapeutics*; 2020. doi:[10.1101/2020.03.28.20046144](https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.28.20046144)
- 314 7. Gralinski LE, Bankhead A, Jeng S, et al. Mechanisms of Severe Acute Respiratory
315 Syndrome Coronavirus-Induced Acute Lung Injury. Dermody TS, ed. *mBio*. 2013;4(4).
316 doi:[10.1128/mBio.00271-13](https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00271-13)
- 317 8. McGonagle D, O'Donnell JS, Sharif K, Emery P, Bridgewood C. Immune mechanisms of
318 pulmonary intravascular coagulopathy in COVID-19 pneumonia. *The Lancet Rheumatology*.
319 Published online May 2020:S2665991320301211. doi:[10.1016/S2665-9913\(20\)30121-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913(20)30121-1)

- 320 9. Mehta P, McAuley DF, Brown M, Sanchez E, Tattersall RS, Manson JJ. COVID-19:
321 consider cytokine storm syndromes and immunosuppression. *The Lancet*.
322 2020;395(10229):1033-1034. doi:[10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30628-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30628-0)
- 323 10. Yuki K, Fujiogi M, Koutsogiannaki S. COVID-19 pathophysiology: A review. *Clin*
324 *Immunol*. 2020;215:108427. doi:[10.1016/j.clim.2020.108427](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clim.2020.108427)
- 325 11. Giannis D, Ziogas IA, Gianni P. Coagulation disorders in coronavirus infected patients:
326 COVID-19, SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV and lessons from the past. *Journal of Clinical*
327 *Virology*. 2020;127:104362. doi:[10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104362](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104362)
- 328 12. Goyal P, Choi JJ, Pinheiro LC, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Covid-19 in New York City.
329 *N Engl J Med*. Published online April 17, 2020:NEJMc2010419.
330 doi:[10.1056/NEJMc2010419](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2010419)
- 331 13. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel
332 coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497-506. doi:[10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5)
333 [6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5)
- 334 14. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and
335 Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area.
336 *JAMA*. Published online April 22, 2020. doi:[10.1001/jama.2020.6775](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.6775)
- 337 15. Tang N, Li D, Wang X, Sun Z. Abnormal coagulation parameters are associated with poor
338 prognosis in patients with novel coronavirus pneumonia. *Journal of Thrombosis and*
339 *Haemostasis*. 2020;18(4):844-847. doi:[10.1111/jth.14768](https://doi.org/10.1111/jth.14768)
- 340 16. Terpos E, Ntanasis-Stathopoulos I, Elalamy I, et al. Hematological findings and
341 complications of COVID-19. *American Journal of Hematology*. Published online April 13,
342 2020. doi:[10.1002/ajh.25829](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.25829)

- 343 17. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus
344 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From
345 the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*. 2020;323(13):1239-1242.
346 doi:[10.1001/jama.2020.2648](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2648)
- 347 18. Yan Z, Wei C, Meng X, et al. Clinical and coagulation characteristics of 7 patients with
348 critical COVID-2019 pneumonia and acro-ischemia. *Chinese Journal of Hematology*.
349 2020;41(00):E006-E006. doi:[10.3760/cma.j.issn.0253-2727.2020.0006](https://doi.org/10.3760/cma.j.issn.0253-2727.2020.0006)
- 350 19. Danzi GB, Loffi M, Galeazzi G, Gherbesi E. Acute pulmonary embolism and COVID-19
351 pneumonia: a random association? *Eur Heart J*. doi:[10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa254](https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa254)
- 352 20. Porfidia A, Pola R. Venous thromboembolism in COVID-19 patients. *Journal of Thrombosis*
353 *and Haemostasis*. Published online April 15, 2020. doi:[10.1111/jth.14842](https://doi.org/10.1111/jth.14842)
- 354 21. Suarez-Valle A, Fernandez-Nieto D, Diaz-Guimaraens B, Dominguez-Santas M, Carretero I,
355 Perez-Garcia B. Acro-ischemia in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *J Eur Acad Dermatol*
356 *Venereol*. Published online May 7, 2020. doi:[10.1111/jdv.16592](https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.16592)
- 357 22. Wichmann D, Sperhake J-P, Lütgehetmann M, et al. Autopsy Findings and Venous
358 Thromboembolism in Patients With COVID-19: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Ann Intern*
359 *Med*. Published online May 6, 2020. doi:[10.7326/M20-2003](https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-2003)
- 360 23. Tang N, Bai H, Chen X, Gong J, Li D, Sun Z. Anticoagulant treatment is associated with
361 decreased mortality in severe coronavirus disease 2019 patients with coagulopathy. *Journal*
362 *of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*. 2020;18(5):1094-1099. doi:[10.1111/jth.14817](https://doi.org/10.1111/jth.14817)
- 363 24. Paranjpe I, Fuster V, Lala A, et al. Association of Treatment Dose Anticoagulation with In-
364 Hospital Survival Among Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19. *J Am Coll Cardiol*.
365 Published online May 6, 2020. doi:[10.1016/j.jacc.2020.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.05.001)

- 366 25. Coronavirus. Accessed May 20, 2020. <https://portal.ct.gov/Coronavirus>
- 367 26. Wei MY, Ward SM. The anti-factor Xa range for low molecular weight heparin
368 thromboprophylaxis. *Hematology Reports*. 2015;7(4). doi:10.4081/hr.2015.5844
- 369 27. Rameshrad M, Ghafoori M, Mohammadpour AH, Nayeri MJD, Hosseinzadeh H. A
370 comprehensive review on drug repositioning against coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID19).
371 *Naunyn-Schmiedeberg's Arch Pharmacol*. Published online May 19, 2020.
372 doi:10.1007/s00210-020-01901-6
- 373 28. F.A. Klok, M.J.H.A. Kruip, N.J.M. van der Meer, M.S. Arbous, D.A.M.P.J. Gommers, K.M.
374 Kant, F.H.J. Kaptein, J. van Paassen, M.A.M. Stals, M.V. Huisman, H. Endeman. Incidence
375 of thrombotic complications in critically ill ICU patients with COVID-19
376 *Thromb. Res.* (2020), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.thromres.2020.04.041>
- 377 29. S.E. Fox, A. Akmatbekoy, J.L. Harbert, *et al.* Pulmonary and Cardiac Pathology in Covid-19:
378 The First Autopsy Series From New Orleans
379 *MedRxiv preprint* (2020). Doi:10.1101/2020.04.06.20050575
- 380 30. Li R, Rivers C, Tan Q, Murray MB, Toner E, Lipsitch M. Estimated Demand for US
381 Hospital Inpatient and Intensive Care Unit Beds for Patients With COVID-19 Based on
382 Comparisons With Wuhan and Guangzhou, China. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(5):e208297-
383 e208297. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.8297

Table 1. Descriptive statistics among COVID-19 positive patients from two hospitals in Western Connecticut in the COV-AC study.			
	Full Sample	Prophylactic Anticoagulation	Therapeutic Anticoagulation
Number of subjects	374	299	75
	Mean (SD) ^a	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Length of stay	6.5 (5.0)	5.6 (4.0) ^b	10.8 (8.5) ^c
Age	64.7 (18.1)	64.2 (17.9)	66.9 (18.6)
BMI ^e	29.0 (7.6)	28.7 (7.0)	30.5 (9.3)
	N (%) ^d	N (%)	N (%)
Expired	72 (19.3)	43 (59.7)	29 (40.3)
Gender ^f (Female)	154 (41.2)	122 (79.2)	32 (20.8)
Race ^g			
White	202 (54.0)	159 (78.7)	43 (21.3)
African American	37 (9.9)	30 (81.1)	7 (18.9)
Other	30 (8.0)	25 (83.3)	5 (16.7)
Ethnicity (Hispanic)	125 (33.4)	104 (83.2)	21 (16.8)
Smoking status (Ever)	124 (33.2)	105 (84.7)	19 (15.3)
Diabetes ^f (Yes)	118 (31.6)	98 (83.1)	20 (17.0)
Heart disease ^e (Yes)	212 (56.7)	174 (82.1)	38 (17.9)
Pulmonary disease ^f (Yes)	94 (25.1)	75 (79.8)	19 (20.2)
Cancer ^f (Yes)	46 (12.3)	37 (80.4)	9 (19.6)
Kidney disease ^f (Yes)	40 (10.7)	32 (80.0)	8 (20.0)

Hyperlipidemia ^f (Yes)	137 (36.6)	108 (78.8)	29 (21.2)
Immunosuppressed ^e (Yes)	11 (2.9)	10 (90.9)	1 (9.1)
Intensive care (Yes)	63 (16.8)	36 (57.1)	27 (42.9)
Mechanically ventilated (Yes)	44 (11.8)	21 (47.7)	23 (52.3)
Peak CRP (≥ 200)	112 (29.9)	76 (67.9)	36 (32.1)
Antibiotic ^e (Yes)	217 (58.0)	160 (73.7)	57 (26.3)
Hydroxychloroquine ^f (Yes)	219 (58.6)	181 (82.7)	38 (17.4)
Lopinavir/ritonavir ^e (Yes)	190 (50.8)	162 (85.3)	28 (14.7)
Tocilizumab ^e (Yes)	56 (15.0)	31 (55.4)	25 (44.6)
Transfusion (Yes)	3 (0.8)	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)
Occlusive event ^f (Yes)	13 (3.5)	4 (30.8)	9 (69.2)
<p>aSD = standard deviation; bAmong survivors only (n = 256); cAmong survivors only (n = 46); dNumber, percentage; eMissing data <5%; fMissing data <1%; gMissing data = 28.1%</p>			

Table 2. Results from multi-variable logistic regression to determine the difference in risk of mortality between patients on therapeutic versus prophylactic doses of anticoagulation in the COV-AC full sample and among patients with peak C-reactive protein ≥ 200 ($\alpha = 0.05$)			
Full sample analysis			
	Prophylactic Anticoagulation ^a	Therapeutic Anticoagulation ^b	P-value

Number of subjects	299	75	
Number of deaths	43	29	
Prevalence ^c	14.4	38.7	
Crude Risk Ratio (95% CI ^d)	(Reference)	2.7 (1.8 to 4.0)	<0.001
Adjusted Risk Ratio (95% CI)	(Reference)	2.3 (1.0 to 4.9)	0.04
Sub-group analysis: CRP \geq 200			
Number of subjects	76	36	
Number of deaths	27	17	
Prevalence ^c	35.5	47.2	
Crude Risk Ratio (95% CI)	(Reference)	1.3 (0.8 to 2.1)	0.24
Adjusted Risk Ratio (95% CI)	(Reference)	1.0 (0.2 to 4.5)	0.97
aUnexposed group, bExposed group; cPer 100 persons; dConfidence Interval			

Table 3. Causes of death among COVID-19 positive patients from two hospitals in Western Connecticut in the COV-AC study^a

	Expired	Prophylactic Anticoagulation	Therapeutic Anticoagulation
Number of subjects	72	43	29
	N (%) ^b	N (%)	N (%)
Acute respiratory failure with hypoxia	51 (70.8)	31 (72.1)	20 (68.9)
Multi-organ failure and septic shock	5 (6.9)	3 (7.0)	2 (6.9)
Cardiac arrest	9 (12.5)	6 (13.9)	3 (10.3)
Anoxic brain injury due to hemorrhage	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)

Kidney injury and failure to access hemodialysis port	1 (1.4)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Failure to thrive with encephalopathy	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)
aCauses of death are not mutually exclusive. Some patients died of multiple indications; bNumber, percentage;			