Eleven Routine Clinical Features Predict COVID-19 Severity

Kai Zhou^{1#}, Yaoting Sun^{2,3#}, Lu Li^{2,3#}, Zelin Zang^{4#}, Jing Wang^{1#}, Jun Li^{1#}, Junbo Liang^{1#}, Fangfei Zhang^{2,3}, Qiushi Zhang^{2,3}, Weigang Ge^{2,3}, Hao Chen^{2,3}, Xindong Sun^{2,3}, Liang Yue^{2,3}, Xiaomai Wu¹, Bo Shen¹, Jiaqin Xu¹, Hongguo Zhu¹, Shiyong Chen¹, Hai Yang¹, Shigao Huang⁵, Minfei Peng¹, Dongqing Lv¹, Chao Zhang¹, Haihong Zhao¹, Luxiao Hong¹, Zhehan Zhou¹, Haixiao Chen¹, Xuejun Dong⁶, Chunyu Tu⁶, Minghui Li⁶, Yi Zhu^{2,3*}, Baofu Chen^{1*}, Stan Z. Li^{4*}, Tiannan Guo^{2,3*}

¹Taizhou Hospital of Zhejiang Province affiliated to Wenzhou Medical University, 150 Ximen Street, Linhai 317000, Zhejiang Province, China;

²Zhejiang Provincial Laboratory of Life Sciences and Biomedicine, Key Laboratory of Structural Biology of Zhejiang Province, School of Life Sciences, Westlake University, 18 Shilongshan Road, Hangzhou 310024, Zhejiang Province, China;

³Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, Westlake Institute for Advanced Study, 18 Shilongshan Road, Hangzhou 310024, Zhejiang Province, China;

⁴School of Engineering, Westlake University, 18 Shilongshan Road, Hangzhou 310024, Zhejiang Province, China;

⁵Institute of Translational Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Macau 999078, Macau SAR, China.

⁶Shaoxing People's Hospital, Shaoxing Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Shaoxing 312000, Zhejiang Province, China;

co-first;

* Correspondence: zhuyi@westlake.edu.cn (Y.Z.); chenbf@enzemed.com (B.C.);

stan.zq.li@westlake.edu.cn (Z.L.); guotiannan@westlake.edu.cn (T.G.).

ABSTRACT

Severity prediction of COVID-19 remains one of the major clinical challenges for the ongoing pandemic. Here, we have recruited a 144 COVID-19 patient cohort consisting of training, validation, and internal test sets, longitudinally recorded 124 routine clinical and laboratory parameters, and built a machine learning model to predict the disease progression based on measurements from the first 12 days since the disease onset when no patient became severe. A panel of 11 routine clinical factors, including oxygenation index, basophil counts, aspartate aminotransferase, gender, magnesium, gamma glutamyl transpeptidase, platelet counts, activated partial thromboplastin time, oxygen saturation, body temperature and days after symptom onset, constructed a classifier for COVID-19 severity prediction, achieving accuracy of over 94%. Validation of the model in an independent cohort containing 25 patients achieved accuracy of 80%. The overall sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV were 0.70, 0.99, 0.93 and 0.93, respectively. Our model captured predictive dynamics of LDH and CK while their levels were in the normal range. This study presents a practical model for timely severity prediction and surveillance for COVID-19, which is freely available at webserver <https://guomics.shinyapps.io/covidAI/>.

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Machine learning, Routine clinical test

INTRODUCTION

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus, poses an unprecedented public health crisis to the entire world. The basic reproductive rate (R_0) of 2.0-2.5 in COVID-19 is higher than in SARS (1.7-1.9) and MERS (<1)¹. To date, SARS-CoV-2 has spread to more than 200 countries and regions around the world, with over 16 million individuals infected. Most confirmed cases are classified as mild or moderate, while the other 14% and 5% are severe and critical cases, respectively². These patients need to be hospitalized and monitored with intensive care to prevent deterioration of the disease that may lead to fatality without timely diagnosis and treatment.

Currently, diagnosis of COVID-19 mainly depends on the virus RNA test of SARS-CoV-2³. This is a qualitative test showing whether the patient is infected or not⁴. Besides, computed tomography (CT) is a complementary strategy for COVID-19 diagnosis by showing the image of pneumonia symptoms in lungs⁵. As a physical image entity, CT can supplement with objective observations to indicate the severity of COVID-19 patients in an AI-assisted model⁶. This helps stratify the severity of COVID-19 at an early stage of disease progression. However, about 20% of COVID-19 patients show no obvious imaging changes in the lung⁷, bringing difficulties to physicians when making decisions for suitable clinical treatments. To better evaluate the disease conditions of COVID-19 patients, routine laboratory tests including but not limited to complete blood cell counts, blood laboratory metabolomics tests are taken regularly by physicians. Physicians then make clinical decisions and prescribe treatments accordingly. However, this is laborious and sometimes biased, depending on the

physician's own experience, especially when facing with such a heavy medical burden in the pandemic. Therefore, automatic integration and interpretation of routine laboratory indexes in an unbiased way will make a pivotal role in severity stratification and prognosis evaluation for COVID-19 patients.

Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 epidemic, research focusing on building severity prediction models of COVID-19 based on related features have been reported extensively to support medical decision making⁸. Several clinical features, such as age, gender, lactic dehydrogenase (LDH), C-reactive protein (CRP), and lymphocyte count, have been reported to be highly correlated with the severity of COVID-19 patients⁸. Recently, a Chinese team found that three key features (LDH, CRP and lymphocyte) can be used to predict the mortality of COVID-19 with over 90% accuracy⁹. Although all models have been reported with great predictability, they have also raised concerns of bias in prediction because of key factors including poor selection of samples, inappropriate statistical methods, *etc*⁸. In a paper published by Liang et al, a risk scoring algorithm based on some key characteristics of COVID-19 patients at the time of admission to the hospital was developed, which may assist in predicting a patient's risk of developing into critical illness¹⁰. More recently, they also built a survival model to allow early prediction of critical cases by comorbidity and several laboratory indexes¹¹. These models are mainly built on a dataset either containing static information at certain time points, for example, upon admission or discharge, mostly when the patients were in severe or critical status. However, the time from symptom onset to admission varied in a large range due to different local medical resources and personal medical treatment intention. In contrast, the time of onset of symptoms as a starting point is more objective and reasonable. During the pandemic, personal physical condition and laboratory indicators are constantly changing, however, few models make use of longitudinal measurement to predict disease severity. Therefore, it remains challenging to stratify the risk rank of a patient when she/he is in the transient stage of mild to the early severe stage, due to the lack of robust tests to detect the impalpable and subtle changes inside the patient.

In this study, we built a machine learning model based on the longitudinal measurement of 124 clinical factors in a retrospective cohort containing 144 COVID-19 patients to predict the disease severity. 11 key clinical factors were featured as a panel to be highly associated with COVID-19 severity, instead of isolated features. The model achieved an overall 93% accuracy in distinguishing severe patients among the infected cases in all dataset. The prediction model is freely accessible online as a Shiny Server App (<https://guomics.shinyapps.io/covidAI/>) to facilitate the early detection of the patients.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Clinical characteristics of the study cohort

A total of 841 patients have been screened with the SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid test from January 17 to March 10, 2020 in Taizhou Hospital, with 144 patients with positive virus RNA (COVID-19) and 697 non-COVID-19 individuals (Figure 1A). From the non-COVID-19 group, outpatients and patients lacking chest CT results were excluded. 65 patients were

recruited as the control group, with their epidemiological information collected. Meanwhile, 144 COVID-19 patients were stratified into severe ($N = 36$) and non-severe ($N = 108$) patients based on the clinical diagnosis guideline⁷ (Figure 1A). 124 types of measurements from 17 categories over 52 days were collected and manually curated for these 144 COVID-19 patients, resulting in a data matrix containing of 3,065 readings for 124 types of measurements (3065×124). The 17 categories of data included basic information, clinical symptoms and signs, chest CT results and laboratory tests, as detailed in Table S1 that were regularly recorded during their hospitalization.

This cohort has 55.6% male in the severe COVID-19 group and 52.8% male in the non-severe COVID-19 group. The median age was 55.0 years for the severe group, and 44.5 years for the non-severe group. The median BMI was 25.5 in the severe group and 23.8 in the non-severe group (Table 1). These parameters are in consistent with previous observations¹².

The most common symptom at disease onset was fever (64.8% in non-severe and 94.4% in the severe group), followed by cough and pharyngalgia (Table 1). Before admission, 40.2% of patients had underlying diseases and the ratio is substantially higher in the severe group (50.0%) than that in the non-severe group (37.0%). Hypertension (15.3%) and diabetes (9.7%) were common comorbidities.

Upon admission, 142 (98.6 %) COVID-19 patients had image changes in chest CT. Pulmonary plaque was the top 1 abnormal pattern (52.8%), with ratios of abnormality of 66.7% for severe patients and 48.2% for non-severe patients, respectively. The second abnormal pattern was ground-glass like symptoms (severe vs. non-severe was 41.7% vs. 31.5 %). Ratios of pulmonary fibrosis and consolidation did not show a statistical difference between severe patients and non-severe ones.

In severe patients, intervals from onset and admission to the diagnosis of severe cases were 9 (5-12) days and 2 (1-3) days. All 144 patients were followed up during their entire course in hospital. In this study, only one patient was admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) and underwent invasive mechanical ventilation. They were all cured and discharged eventually. The mean length of stay for the patients was 20 days for non-severe group and 23 days for severe group, respectively. In summary, this is a well-annotated and curated COVID-19 cohort with comprehensively and systematically recorded information from the disease onset till convalesce and discharge, which provided the potential for subsequent model construction.

Feature selection and machine learning

To establish a model for severity prediction, we firstly filtered the matrix including 3065×124 readings for all patients over 52 days in total (Figure 1B). For the first step, the readings with definite diagnosis for severe COVID-19 were excluded. Then the readings recorded from symptom onset to the 12th day for all patients were included for severity prediction by machine learning, in which the ratio of severe verse non-severe was close to 20% prevalence of severe cases according to previous studies². It is worthy of noting that at this time point (12th day), no patients had been clinically diagnosed as severe COVID-19 cases. After removing readings with more than 90% missing values, a much smaller data matrix containing 358×124 readings remained. The discovery dataset contained 228×124

readings collected from patients admitted before 1 February, 2020, while the test dataset containing 130*124 readings from patients admitted after 1 February, 2020. were generated. Based on the discovery dataset, a machine learning model was built up by cross training and validation (Figure 1B). To further test our model, we also collected an independent dataset from another clinical center, employing the same criteria with the previous one (Figure 1C).

The process of modeling contained three parts, including feature selection, model training and prediction (Figure 2A). In detail, firstly, the missing value for each test item in the discovery dataset was filled with a relevant median value for each gender (F or M). We randomly generated feature combinations and loaded the data with selected features. Then feature selection was performed by using genetic algorithm (GA)¹³, one of the most advanced and widely used algorithm for feature selection, assisted with 10-fold cross-validation in the discovery dataset including both training (9/10) and validation (1/10) sets. The method of GA which selected a panel of features could avoid being trapped into local optimal solution. As a result, a panel of eleven key clinical factors that are associated with COVID-19 severity was evolved from 124 characteristics, and were put into the ‘Active Feature Pool’.

Then we applied the selected features and established the classifier by using the support vector machine (SVM)¹⁴. In this step, we set up 10 random seeds and the SVM model was trained in the training set (8/10) and then validated in the validation set (2/10). The hyper-parameters of model and threshold were optimized to maximize accuracy. The threshold was set at 0.45, which was determined by maximizing the correct rate of diagnosis in the validation set. Via this way, a trained SVM model including the eleven active features and classifier was generated for predicting severe cases in the test dataset (130*124) and an independent test dataset (25*11) using the same threshold of 0.45 (Figure 2A).

To interpret the importance of each individual feature applied in the model, SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) algorithm^{15,16} was performed. The eleven features, oxygenation index, basophil counts (BASO#), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), gender, magnesium (Mg), gamma glutamyl transpeptidase (GGT), platelet counts, activated partial thromboplastin time (APTT), oxygen saturation (SaO2), body temperature and days of symptom onset, were then arranged according to their importance to the model evaluating by SHAP values (Figure 2B). The results showed that oxygenation index was the most important one with a SHAP value of 0.94 in our model. In clinical practice, oxygenation index is also a critical factor to evaluate the state of disease severity.

Furthermore, nine features with continuous records (12 days) were selected and compared in severe and non-severe groups. Their median values (discovery dataset) were calculated and showed in boxplots (Figure 2C). Six of nine features were significantly (p-value less than 0.05) dysregulated. Among them, oxygen index and SaO2 were decreased in severe cases. This was directly associated with pulmonary function. Two selected features, AST and GGT, were statistically up-regulated, indicating that COVID-19 may induce slight hepatic injury in the early stage. Although within the normal range, the count of platelets was reduced significantly in severe cases. Three characteristics, namely APTT, Mg and BASO#, showed no significant change between severe and non-severe COVID-19 patients, a comprehensive comparison was further performed. As shown in Figure S1, readings from four groups of individuals, severe COVID-19, non-severe COVID-19, non-COVID-19

patients with flu-like symptoms and healthy people with physical examination were included for systematic comparison. The data showed that APTT was substantially up-regulated in severe COVID-19 group in the entire dataset including the discovery and the test datasets, and the count of basophils was decreased in all COVID-19 patients compared with healthy group. However, Mg showed no difference across all four groups. To validate the importance of Mg in the model, we used the rest ten features except of Mg and investigated the performance of the model in ROC (Figure S2). The AUC values were the same in training and validation dataset and only decreased 0.01 in test dataset without the feature of Mg, which indicated little contribution of Mg to the model.

The remaining two indicators not shown in the box diagram were days of symptom onset and gender. There is no surprise that the earlier outstood because when the patients were evolving from non-severe to severe status, the symptoms grew worse. Gender was selected as another important feature. In our dataset, male patients were more likely to be infected SARS-CoV-2 than female patients in both non-severe and severe groups, in consistent with the literature reporting that male COVID-19 patients had a worse outcome and that 70% of patients died of COVID-19 were male in an Italy cohort¹⁷. The vulnerability of males has also been found in SARS-CoV epidemic in 2003¹⁸. It has been recently found that the plasma concentration of ACE2, a functional receptor for SARS-CoV-2 infection, is higher in men than in women as detected in two independent cohorts¹⁹. This may explain the association between gender and fatality rate of COVID-19. Meanwhile, females develop enhanced innate and adaptive immune responses than males did, thus they are less susceptible to kinds of infections of bacterial, viral, parasitic, and fungal origin and malignancies²⁰. In fact, the clinical manifestations of infectious or autoimmune diseases and malignant tumors differ between men and women.

Severity prediction by machine learning

The model assigned a score (from 0 to 1) to indicate the likelihood of disease severity, and higher score indicated greater severity. The model is described in details in Methods, while the data are shown in the scatter plot (Figure 3A). In this study, samples with a score greater than 0.45 was identified as a severe state. The receiver operating characteristics (ROC) plot achieved an area under the curve (AUC) value of 1.00 and 0.98 for training and validation datasets, respectively (Figure 3B). 224 out of 228 samples were correctly identified with an accuracy of 0.98 for the discovery dataset. The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) were 0.90, 0.99, 0.96 and 0.99, respectively (Figure 3C).

To further evaluate the performance of the 11-clinical feature classifier, we analyzed 130*124 readings in the test dataset and 25*11 readings in the independent test dataset from a different hospital. The classifier achieved AUC value of 0.89 (Figure 3B), and correctly classified 112 of 130 readings with accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of 0.86, 0.56, 0.98, 0.91 and 0.85. Sixteen of 18 incorrectly classified readings were from severe COVID-19 group, especially in early stage of COVID-19 which showed similar clinical signs with non-severe group. Most of the incorrect predictions (10 of 18 readings) were from four COVID-19 patients, indicating individual effect on the model. As to the independent test

dataset of much smaller size, the classifier achieved an AUC value of 0.75, and accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of 0.80, 0.64, 0.93, 0.69 and 0.91, respectively (Figure 3C). All incorrectly identified cases in this dataset belonged to early stage of COVID-19 with days of symptom onset less than 8 days.

We also examined the performance of the model from the longitudinal perspective. The test dataset was divided into three parts according to the length of symptom lasting period since disease onset. In general, the longer the disease progressed, the better the model predicted. As the onset time increased, the accuracy of prediction elevated from 0.79 (1-4 days), 0.82 (5-8 days) to 0.91 (9-12 days) in the test set (Figure 3D). There were two incorrectly identified readings in non-severe patients. They were both from the initial three days since onset, probably due to the low oxygen index (less than 380) which was out of the normal range (400-500). As to the part of 9-12 days, three readings of severe group were classified into non-severe group, while two of them were scored with 0.42 and 0.44, which were very close to the threshold.

Dynamic changes of key clinical features over 7 weeks

The unique curated longitudinal data permitted detailed temporal investigation of specific parameters. We investigated the temporal changes of the eight out of eleven key clinical features in both severe and non-severe COVID-19 patients during the first 40 days since disease onset. In addition, we also analyzed 18 more clinical features (Figure 4) that found to be related to the progression of COVID-19 disease^{8,21,22}.

Based on longitudinal changes of blood cell counts (such as platelet), our data showed that the severity of the disease intensified in the second week since symptom onset (Figure 4). The counts of platelets, lymphocytes, eosinophils, and basophils were reduced in the severe group, while neutrophils and WBC were dramatically elevated (Figure 4).

Decreased number of lymphocytes has been reported in association with the COVID-19 severity²³, probably due to apoptosis and necrosis of lymphocytes²⁴. Dysregulation of neutrophils was another predominant alteration in the complete blood count test. Neutrophils are recruited early to sites of infection where they kill pathogens (bacteria, fungi, and viruses) by oxidative burst and phagocytosis²⁵.

A significant rise in neutrophil counts features the severity of COVID-19. Increase of neutrophils may induce formation of neutrophil extracellular traps (NETs) which could trigger a cascade of inflammatory reactions²⁶. The latter destroys surrounding tissues, facilitates micro thrombosis, and results in permanent organ injuries to the pulmonary, cardiovascular, and renal systems²⁵, which are three commonly affected organ systems in severe COVID-19²⁷.

Eosinophils were drastically reduced after SARS-CoV-2 infection and were merely detectable in the acute stage (Figure 4). The increase of eosinophil in non-severe patients happened earlier than that in severe cases, suggesting that the increase of eosinophils can be the signs for COVID-19 recovery. The predictive value of Eosinophil count observed in our study is supported by a recent independent study²⁸. The count of Basophils is another predictive feature from our model. Basophils are the least abundant granulocytes, representing less than 1% of peripheral blood leukocytes. Recent studies have shown that the count of

basophils was reduced in COVID-19 patients²⁹, agreeing with our data. Moreover, an independent study which proposed a multivariate Cox regression model exploring risk factors for lethal COVID-19 patients also nominated progressive increase of basophils³⁰.

Coagulation dysfunction has been found in multiple epidemiologic studies of COVID-19^{27,31}. Our data showed that platelet counts in blood decreased in severe patients significantly (Figure 4), in consistent with previous meta-analysis reporting low platelet count as a risk factor for COVID-19 severity and mortality³². Furthermore, coagulation related parameters such as D-dimer elevated too, especially in death cases³¹. Thrombin time (TT) and APTT are often used to monitor the coagulation function of patients, which are mostly increased in the presence of heparin or heparin-like substances.

CRP is an acute-phase protein, expression level of which in blood is associated with the severity of inflammation³³. As an indicator of infection, in our dataset, CRP was significantly increased in both mild and severe cases, far beyond the normal range. CRP decreased as the disease progressed and recovered.

We also evaluated functions of organs since it has been reported that SARS-CoV-2 infection systematically induced multi-organ dysfunctions, such as lung, liver, kidney and heart, particularly in severe and critical cases^{34,35}. The commonly used indicators in clinic include pulmonary function indicators including SaO₂, blood-gas lactate (LAC) and oxygen index, liver function indicators (GGT, AST and ALT), renal function indicators (eGFR and creatinine) and cardiac function indicator (LDH), were monitored. Arterial blood gas (ABG) analysis is a key approach to evaluate the function of lungs by measuring acidity and the level of oxygen and carbon dioxide, which provides important indexes and direct evidence for indicating pulmonary function and the severity of COVID-19. Our data showed that oxygen-related indexes, namely SaO₂ and oxygen index, decreased in severe COVID-19 patients (Figure 4), suggesting a high degree of sensitivity for severity prediction and thus selected as pivotal features in our model. The level of blood-gas LAC reached peak in the first 10 days in severe group, agreeing with the literature²¹.

Regarding to liver functions, the dynamic change of GGT, AST and ALT showed that hepatic functions got worse around the third week (Figure 4). Moreover, levels of the three indexes were higher in severe patients than in non-severe patients from the beginning of the disease. This may be partly due to the side effect of multi-drug administration according to ALT and GGT level. AST was a predominant feature in our predictive model, which was elevated in the severe group. A multicenter retrospective study including 5771 adult patients reported that AST increased first, followed by ALT in severe cases with liver injury. This alternation was associated with dysregulation of lymphocyte and neutrophil counts³⁶, the latter were selected by our model as well.

Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) is a direct indicator of renal function and its level in severe patients was significantly lower than that in non-severe patients. On the opposite, the level of urea was elevated in severe group in the early stage (first 10 days), while remained stable in non-severe group. Electrolytes were also closely related to renal function, and most of them were within the reference interval except for sodium and magnesium in severe group (Figure 4C).

LDH is widely expressed in various organs and it has been reported as a key cardiac

marker closely associated with COVID-19 severity³⁷. In our study, LDH peaked around the 10th day in severe COVID-19 patients comparing with non-severe cases, although the peak value did not exceed the upper limit of the normal range of LDH for males. Another cardiac indicator, CK, was also in normal range, however, its dynamics differed between severe and non-severe patients.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we built a customized machine learning model for COVID-19 severity prediction based on the longitudinal measurement of the feature clinical factors over time. The model provided a classifier composed of 11 routine clinical features which are widely available during COVID-19 management. which could predict the prognosis and may guide the medical care of COVID-19 patients. Although some interesting alterations have been found, the major limitation of the present study is the limited patient cohort recruited and the relatively smaller size of it. Therefore, the model still needs to be validated in sizeable cohorts from multiple clinical centers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by grants from Tencent Foundation (2020), National Natural Science Foundation of China (81972492, 21904107, 81672086), Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation for Distinguished Young Scholars (LR19C050001), Hangzhou Agriculture and Society Advancement Program (20190101A04). This work was also financially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant NO.81672086). We thank the patients who enrolled in this study, and the physicians, nurses, and secretaries of the Taizhou Hospital for their important contributions.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

T.G., B.C., J.Liang., S.L., B.S., J.Li., H.C. and Y.Z. supervised the project. T.G. and Y.S. designed the study. K.Z., J.W., M.P., X.Z., Z.Zhou., H.Zhao., J.X., H.Zhu., J.Li., S.C., H.Y., D.L., C.Z., L.H., and X.W. collected clinical data and provided clinical supervision. S.H. organized the data, Y.S., L.L., J.W., K.Z., F.F., X.S., Q.Z., W.G., L.Y., X.S. and H.C. conducted data analysis and visualization. Z.Zang. established machine learning model. X.D., C.T., and M.L. collected the validate data. Data were interpreted and presented by all co-authors. Y.S., L.L., Y.Z., and T.G. wrote the manuscript with inputs from all co-authors.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

This study was partly supported by Tencent.

REFERENCES

1. Petrosillo, N., Viceconte, G., Ergonul, O., Ippolito, G. & Petersen, E. COVID-19, SARS and MERS: are they closely related? *Clin Microbiol Infect* **26**, 729-734 (2020).
2. Wu, Z. & McGoogan, J.M. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* (2020).
3. Huang, C., *et al.* Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* **395**, 497-506 (2020).
4. Broughton, J.P., *et al.* CRISPR-Cas12-based detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Biotechnol* (2020).
5. Ye, Z., Zhang, Y., Wang, Y., Huang, Z. & Song, B. Chest CT manifestations of new coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a pictorial review. *Eur Radiol* (2020).
6. Zhang, K., *et al.* Clinically Applicable AI System for Accurate Diagnosis, Quantitative Measurements, and Prognosis of COVID-19 Pneumonia Using Computed Tomography. *Cell* (2020).
7. Guan, W.J., *et al.* Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med* (2020).
8. Wynants, L., *et al.* Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal. *BMJ* **369**, m1328 (2020).
9. Yan, L., *et al.* An interpretable mortality prediction model for COVID-19 patients. *Nature Machine Intelligence* (2020).
10. Liang, W., *et al.* Development and Validation of a Clinical Risk Score to Predict the Occurrence of Critical Illness in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19. *JAMA Intern Med* (2020).
11. Liang, W., *et al.* Early triage of critically ill COVID-19 patients using deep learning. *Nat Commun* **11**, 3543 (2020).
12. Rolf, J.D. Clinical Characteristics of Covid-19 in China. *N Engl J Med* **382**, 1860 (2020).
13. Mitchell, M. Elements of Generic Algorithms. *An Introduction to Generic Algorithms*, 158 (1998).
14. Huang, C.-L. & Wang, C.-J. A GA-based feature selection and parameters optimization for support vector machines. *Expert Systems with Applications* **31**, 231-240 (2006).
15. Roth, A.E., ed. *The Shapley value: essays in honor of Lloyd S. Shapley*, (Cambridge University Press, 1988).
16. Shapley, L.S. Notes on the n-Person Game -- II: The Value of an n-Person Game. *Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation* (1951).
17. Onder, G., Rezza, G. & Brusaferro, S. Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy. *JAMA* (2020).
18. Karlberg, J., Chong, D.S. & Lai, W.Y. Do men have a higher case fatality rate of severe acute respiratory syndrome than women do? *Am J Epidemiol* **159**, 229-231 (2004).
19. Sama, I.E., *et al.* Circulating plasma concentrations of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 in men and women with heart failure and effects of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone inhibitors. *Eur Heart J* **41**, 1810-1817 (2020).
20. Jaillon, S., Berthenet, K. & Garlanda, C. Sexual Dimorphism in Innate Immunity. *Clin Rev*

394 *Allergy Immunol* **56**, 308-321 (2019).

395 21. Cecconi, M., *et al.* Early Predictors of Clinical Deterioration in a Cohort of 239 Patients
396 Hospitalized for Covid-19 Infection in Lombardy, Italy. *J Clin Med* **9**(2020).

397 22. The Lancet Global, H. Decolonising COVID-19. *Lancet Glob Health* **8**, e612 (2020).

398 23. Henry, B.M. COVID-19, ECMO, and lymphopenia: a word of caution. *Lancet Respir Med* **8**, e24
399 (2020).

400 24. Tan, L., *et al.* Lymphopenia predicts disease severity of COVID-19: a descriptive and predictive
401 study. *Signal Transduct Target Ther* **5**, 33 (2020).

402 25. Barnes, B.J., *et al.* Targeting potential drivers of COVID-19: Neutrophil extracellular traps. *J*
403 *Exp Med* **217**(2020).

404 26. Jorch, S.K. & Kubes, P. An emerging role for neutrophil extracellular traps in noninfectious
405 disease. *Nat Med* **23**, 279-287 (2017).

406 27. Chen, N., *et al.* Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel
407 coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* **395**, 507-513 (2020).

408 28. Liu, F., *et al.* Patients of COVID-19 may benefit from sustained lopinavir-combined regimen
409 and the increase of eosinophil may predict the outcome of COVID-19 progression. *Int J Infect*
410 *Dis* (2020).

411 29. Qin, C., *et al.* Dysregulation of immune response in patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China.
412 *Clin Infect Dis* (2020).

413 30. Chen, R., *et al.* Longitudinal hematologic and immunologic variations associated with the
414 progression of COVID-19 patients in China. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* (2020).

415 31. Wang, D., *et al.* Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel
416 Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* (2020).

417 32. Lippi, G., Plebani, M. & Henry, B.M. Thrombocytopenia is associated with severe coronavirus
418 disease 2019 (COVID-19) infections: A meta-analysis. *Clin Chim Acta* **506**, 145-148 (2020).

419 33. Sproston, N.R. & Ashworth, J.J. Role of C-Reactive Protein at Sites of Inflammation and
420 Infection. *Front Immunol* **9**, 754 (2018).

421 34. Feng, Y., *et al.* COVID-19 with Different Severities: A Multicenter Study of Clinical Features.
422 *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **201**, 1380-1388 (2020).

423 35. Liu, P.P., Blet, A., Smyth, D. & Li, H. The Science Underlying COVID-19: Implications for the
424 Cardiovascular System. *Circulation* (2020).

425 36. Lei, F., *et al.* Longitudinal association between markers of liver injury and mortality in COVID-
426 19 in China. *Hepatology* (2020).

427 37. Mo, P., *et al.* Clinical characteristics of refractory COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Clin*
428 *Infect Dis* (2020).

429 38. Altman, D.G. & Bland, J.M. Diagnostic tests 2: Predictive values. *BMJ* **309**, 102-102 (1994).

430

431

432 **Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients**

Characteristic	non-COVID-19 (N=65)	COVID-19			P value
		Non-severe (N=108)	Severe (N=36)	All (N=144)	
Gender - no. ^a (%)					
Male	41 (63.1)	57 (52.8)	20 (55.6)	77 (53.5)	0.7723
Female	24 (36.9)	51 (47.2)	16 (44.4)	67 (46.5)	
Age - yr. ^b					
Median (IQR)	36.0 (21.5-52.0)	44.5 (37.0-54.0)	55.0 (47.8-65.0)	47.0 (38.0-56.0)	0.0001
Range	(3.0-79.0)	(4.0-86.0)	(33.0-79.0)	(4.0-86.0)	
BMI, kg/m ²					
Median (IQR)	22.0 (20.5-26.2)	23.8 (21.5-26.1)	25.5 (24.1-27.2)	24.4 (22.0-26.4)	0.0050
Range	(14.0-32.9)	(16.0-31.2)	(21.6-31.3)	(16.0-31.3)	
Onset to severe, days					
Median (IQR)	NA	NA	9 (5-12)	NA	NA
Range	NA	NA	(2-26)	NA	
Admission to severe, days					
Median (IQR)	NA	NA	2 (1-3)	NA	NA
Range	NA	NA	(0-7)	NA	
Length of stay, days					
Median (IQR)	4 (3-6)	20 (13-27)	23 (19-32)	22 (13-28)	0.0154
Range	(1-31)	(6-44)	(9-40)	(6-44)	
Smoking - no. (%)	5 (7.7)	11 (10.2)	2 (5.6)	13 (9.0)	0.5182
Familial aggregation - no. (%)	7 (10.8)	43 (39.8)	11 (30.6)	54 (37.5)	0.3203
Symptoms and signs - no. (%)					
Fever	35 (53.9)	70 (64.8)	34 (94.4)	114 (79.2)	0.0006
Pharyngalgia	14 (21.5)	15 (13.9)	2 (5.7)	17 (11.8)	0.2405
Cough	38 (58.5)	47 (43.5)	18 (50.0)	65 (45.1)	0.4985
Expectoration	25 (38.5)	19 (17.6)	7 (19.4)	26 (18.1)	0.8025
Muscle soreness	1 (1.5)	4 (3.7)	2 (5.6)	6 (4.2)	0.6399
Headache	1 (1.5)	9 (8.3)	7 (19.4)	16 (11.1)	0.1208
Diarrhea	24 (36.9)	3 (2.8)	3 (8.3)	6 (4.2)	0.1652
Chest tightness	4 (6.2)	7 (6.5)	4 (11.1)	11 (7.6)	0.4676
Heart rate					
Median (IQR)	96 (86-107)	82 (75-90)	84 (75-95)	82 (75-91)	0.5106
Range	(72-126)	(57-147)	(57-106)	(57-147)	
Respiratory rate					
Median (IQR)	19 (19-20)	19 (18-20)	19 (18-20)	19 (18-20)	0.6265
Range	(18-28)	(12-26)	(12-22)	(12-26)	
Comorbidities - no. (%)					

Hypertension	7 (10.8)	14 (13.0)	8 (22.2)	22 (15.3)	0.1811
Diabetes	6 (9.2)	9 (8.3)	5 (13.9)	14 (9.7)	0.3397
Cardiovascular disease	2 (3.1)	1 (0.9)	2 (5.6)	3 (2.1)	0.1543
Cerebrovascular disease	4 (6.2)	2 (1.9)	1 (2.8)	3 (2.1)	1.000
Chronic bronchitis	3 (4.6)	4 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	4 (2.8)	0.5721
Tuberculosis	0 (0.0)	4 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	4 (2.8)	0.5721
Malignant tumor	2 (3.1)	1 (0.9)	1 (2.8)	2 (1.4)	0.4388
Thyroid disease	2 (3.1)	2 (1.9)	3 (8.3)	5 (3.5)	0.0998
Hepatitis	1 (1.5)	5 (4.6)	2 (5.6)	7 (4.9)	1.0000
Chronic kidney disease	1 (1.5)	1 (0.9)	1 (2.8)	2 (1.4)	0.4388
Digestive system disease	3 (4.6)	6 (5.6)	1 (2.8)	7 (4.9)	0.6803
Chest CT^c - no. (%)					
Involvement of chest radiographs	47 (72.3)	106 (98.1)	36 (100.0)	142 (98.6)	1.0000
Unilateral lung	14 (21.5)	28 (25.9)	3 (8.3)	31 (21.5)	0.0261
Bilateral lung	33 (50.8)	65 (60.2)	31 (86.1)	96 (66.7)	0.0043
Pulmonary plaques	13 (20.0)	52 (48.2)	24 (66.7)	76 (52.8)	0.0539
Ground-glass opacity (GGO)	2 (3.1)	34 (31.5)	15 (41.7)	49 (34.0)	0.2640
Pulmonary fibrosis	3 (4.6)	7 (6.5)	1 (2.8)	8 (5.6)	0.6796
Pulmonary consolidation	11 (16.9)	23 (21.3)	9 (25.0)	32 (22.2)	0.6434

^a no. (%): number.

^b yr.: year.

FIGURE LEGEND

Figure 1. The study design and modeling workflow. (A) The COVID-19 patient cohort. **(B)** The workflow of the modeling process. **(C)** Independent test patient cohort.

Figure 2. The machine learning model. (A) The detailed workflow contains four major steps: i) data preprocessing (green); ii) feature selection (blue); iii) building up the machine learning model (pink); iv) prediction results (yellow). **(B)** The 11 selected key clinical features displayed in two groups according the severity of the disease (blue: non-severe; orange: severe) from the discovery cohort. **(C)** The comparison of each key feature between non-severe and severe COVID-19 patients in the discovery dataset. *P*-value was calculated by the unpaired two-tailed Student's *t*-test. N, non-severe; S, severe.

Figure 3. The performance of the predictive model. (A) Severe and Non-severe cases are shown as scatter plots in different colors (red: severe; blue: non-severe). X-axis indicates the predicted scores, representing the probability of disease severity for each timepoint. The cutoff of the predicted score was 0.45. Y-axis denotes the indexes of samples. N→S indicates a non-severe case was predicted as a severe case. **(B)** ROC plots of the performance of support vector machine (SVM) for severity prediction. **(C)** Summary of the performance metrics. **(D)** The test dataset was further divided into three longitudinal parts at a four-day interval. The X-axis represents the count of the readings for four types of predicted outcomes in each part (N→N, S→S, N→S, and S→N).

Figure 4. Temporal dynamics of selected clinical indexes in COVID-19 patients. The x-axis represents the time of disease course since symptom onset, and y-axis shows the measured values for each feature over time in severe (orange line) and non-severe (blue line) patients. The solid line was fitted by locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (LOESS). Abbreviations: ALT, alanine transaminase; LAC, lactic acid; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; CK, creatine kinase; K, potassium; Na, sodium; Cl, chlorine; WBC, white blood cell; TT, thrombin time; CRP, C-reactive protein.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients

From January 17 to March 10 in 2020, we collected clinical and laboratory data for 144 patients in Taizhou Public Hygiene Taizhou Hospital of Zhejiang Province who were diagnosed as COVID-19 infected patients by reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) and chest CT according to the Pneumonia Diagnosis and Treatment Scheme for New Coronary Virus Infections (Trial Edition 5, Revision). Clinical data for these patients

were curated from the hospital information system (HIS) and included epidemiology, clinical data such as gender, age, BMI, underlying diseases, chest CT, presenting symptoms and length of stay (LOS). Laboratory data included complete blood count, blood chemistry panel, blood clotting test, cytokine panel blood test and arterial blood gas test. Twenty-five independent test readings were collected from Shaoxing People's Hospital according to the same criteria with the Taizhou test set. This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Taizhou Hospital and Westlake University, Zhejiang province of China, and informed consent was obtained from each enrolled subject. Besides, the case of minors enrolled in the study was approved by parents and/or legal guardian.

Laboratory measurements

Blood samples were collected at each time point since admission. 2 mL EDTA-K2 anticoagulant peripheral blood samples were measured for blood routine test using a Sysmex 2100D routine hematology analyzer (Kobe, Japan). Erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) was calculated using the Alifax Test 1 automatic ESR analyzer (UDINE, Italy). Cytokines and lymphocyte subsets were measured using BD FACSCanto™ II within 6 hours. Sodium citrate plasma samples were centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 15 min. Coagulation parameters were determined using a Sysmex CS 5100i automatic hemagglutination analyzer (Kobe, Japan). Arterial blood gas analysis was performed using GEM Premier 3500 (Instrumentation Laboratory, US).

Serum samples were centrifuged at 2500-3000 rpm for 5-10 min for measuring biochemical data including electrolyte, liver and kidney functional proteins, immunoglobulin serial index, blood lipid and glucose, myocardial enzymes(except myoglobin, creatine kinase MB and troponin-I), and infection index (except procalcitonin) using Beckman automatic biochemical analyzer (AU5821). Myoglobin, creatine kinase MB and troponin-I were detected by Beckman automatic immunological analyzer (UniCel DxI-800). Procalcitonin (PCT) levels were determined using the Roche Cobas e411 electrochemiluminescence analyzer (Basel, Switzerland).

Nasopharyngeal and sputum specimens collected during hospitalization were sent to the PCR laboratory (BIOSafety Laboratory II) in a biosafety transportation box. Total nucleic acid extraction from the samples was performed using Nucleic Acid Extraction Kit (Shanghai Zhijiang) and qRT-PCR was performed using a commercial kit specific for 2019-nCoV detection (triple fluorescence PCR, Shanghai Zhijiang, China, NO. P20200105) approved by the China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA).

Chest radiography

All patients had a chest CT examination at the time of admission. For each patient, the chest CT was performed once a week during the period of her/his hospitalization. A CT examination was also operated at the time of her/his discharge. The points of CT score is defined by the following rules. Based on the lesion involvement and lesion properties, each infected lobe adds one point. Presence of ground-glass opacity adds one point. Two points were added in the presence of consolidation lesions, while three points were added in case of fibrosis lesions. The score was reduced by 0.5 point if the CT is improved compared to the

previous CT scan. Otherwise, the score was increased by 0.5 point.

Machine learning

The data matrix was divided into a discovery dataset and a test dataset according to the admission date. This method defined the samples collected before February 2 as the discovery dataset and the samples collected after February 2 as the test dataset. Feature selection and model training were performed in the discovery dataset. The model was then tested in the test dataset and independent test dataset for evaluation.

The data analysis included four steps: data preprocessing, feature selection, model training and testing. In the data preprocessing step, all missing values were first filled with a median value of all patients. Then as normalization, the mean value of all features in the discovery set was converted to 0 and the standard deviation was converted to 1. The same normalization parameters were applied to the test set. In the feature selection step, the standard GA method in the Python *deap* library is used. Set the gene locus in the method as the index of the feature, and set the length of the gene chain to 20 (this indicates that the method can select up to 20 different features). Set the crossover probability to 0.3, the mutation probability to 0.5, the number of genes in the population to 500, and the number of iterations to 30. The accuracy rate of the 10-fold cross-validation on the verification set was taken as the fitness of the gene chain. Finally, we selected 11 non-repeated and effective features. In the model training step, the discovery dataset was divided into training set and the validation set. The training set was used to train the model, while the validation set was used to optimize the model parameters.

Afterwards, the test dataset was used to test the model for the prediction accuracy. The SVM model with 'rbf' kernel in Python's *sklearn* library was employed. The regularization parameter C was set to 1.2. The kernel coefficient gamma was set to 'auto'. The random state was set to 1. We have optimized the above parameters.

The detection result of patient i on a certain feature is $D_{i,f}$, then the data composed of the selected features of the patient is D_i . Then we have $D_i = \{D_{i,f_1}, D_{i,f_2}, D_{i,f_3}, \dots, D_{i,f_N}\}$ as the number of selected features. Enter D_i into the trained model $M(\cdot)$, and the model will output a predicted score S_i .

$$S_i = M(D_i)$$

We made the diagnosis based on predicted score S_i .

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S_i < T \\ 0 & \text{if } S_i \geq T \end{cases}$$

When Y_i is 1, patient i is diagnosed as severe. When Y_i is 0, patient i is diagnosed as mild. T is the threshold for diagnosis.

Due to the heterogeneity of the positive and negative samples, it is not possible to directly use $T = 0.5$ for diagnosis. The threshold T is therefore determined by maximizing the correct rate of diagnosis in the validation set, and the same T was applied to the evaluation test set.

Statistical analysis

For statistics analysis, we used R software (version 3.6.3). The comparison of continuous

variables between two groups was made using Student's t-test for normally distributed variables and the Mann-Whitney U statistics for non-normally distributed variables. *P*-value in boxplot was calculated by the unpaired two-tailed Student's t-test and in violin plot *p*-value was adjusted by Benjamini & Hochberg. The smooth plot was fitted by locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (LOESS) using the geom smooth function in ggplot. PPV and NPV were adjusted by ratio of severe cases followed by published formula ³⁸. SPSS (version 19.0) was used for baseline characteristics.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE LEGEND

Figure S1. The abundance of selected clinical features in four groups. 146 healthy people with 150 physical examination readings and 65 non-COVID-19 patients with 212 hospitalized detection readings, 108 non-severe COVID-19 patients with 292 readings, and 36 severe COVID-19 patients with 66 readings were collected. We deleted the outliers whose absolute value of Z-score was higher than 3. N refers to the count of data involved. P-value was performed by Yuen's trimmed means test and was adjusted by Benjamini & Hochberg. p-value: *, <0.05; **, <0.01; ***, <0.001.

Figure S2. Performance of the ten-feature classifier without feature Mg. ROC plots the performance of support vector machine for severe cases prediction using same ten clinical features mentioned in main text without Mg. The AUC was decreased by 0.01 compared with eleven features.

577 Figure 1

580 Figure 2

581

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure S1

Figure S2

597 **Table S1. 17 categories of indexes.**

Category	Indexes	Unit	Source	Lot number
Basic information				
	Age	years		
	Body mass index	kg/m ²		
	Days of symptom onset	days		
	Familial clustering			
	Gender			
	Smoke			
Underlying diseases				
	Cardiovascular disease			
	Cerebrovascular disease			
	Chronic bronchitis			
	Chronic kidney disease			
	Diabetes			
	Digestive system disease			
	Hepatitis			
	Hyperlipidemia			
	Hypertension			
	Malignant tumor			
	Thyroid disease			
	Tuberculosis			
Clinical signs				
	Body temperature	°C		
	Defecate frequency	times/day		
	Diastolic pressure	mmHg		
	Systolic pressure	mmHg		
	Heart rate	bpm		
	Respiratory frequency	bpm		
Chest CT				
	CT score	points		
	Ground-glass opacity			
	Improvement (compared with the previous time)			
	Number of lobes involved			
	Pulmonary consolidation			
	Pulmonary fibrosis			
Electrolyte				
	Potassium	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6952
	Sodium	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6952

	Chlorine	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6952
	Calcium	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6901
	Magnesium	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6692
	Phosphorus	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6805
Liver function				
	Albumin globulin ratio			
	Adenosine deaminase	U/L	Kuake	181127
	Albumin	g/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6708
	Alkaline phosphatase	U/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6538
	Alanine aminotransferase	U/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6709
	Aspartate aminotransferase	U/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6213
	Cholinesterase	KU/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6230
	Direct bilirubin	μmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6782
	Gamma glutamine transferase	U/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6678
	Globulin	g/L		
	Prealbumin	mg/dL	Duik	20190102
	Total bile acid	μmol/L	Kuake	190508
	Total bilirubin	μmol/L	Beckman Coulter	14603988871
	Total protein	g/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6807
Infection index				
	C-reactive protein	mg/L	Beckman Coulter	1056A
	Procalcitonin	pg/ml	Roche	43058803
	Serum amyloid A	mg/L	Puruibai	SS0226
Immunoglobulin in serial index				
	Immunoglobulin G	g/L	Beckman Coulter	2537
	Immunoglobulin A	g/L	Beckman Coulter	2536
	Immunoglobulin M	g/L	Beckman Coulter	2538
	Complement C3	g/L	Beckman Coulter	2550
	Complement C4	g/L	Beckman Coulter	2550
	Complement C1q	mg/L	Beijia	20190811
	Antistreptolysin O	KIU/L	Beckman Coulter	2586
	Rheumatoid factor	IU/mL	Beckman Coulter	2444
Kidney function				
	Creatinine	μmol/L	Beckman Coulter	2587
	Urea	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6735
	Retinol binding protein	mg/L	Beijia	20190412
	Uric acid	μmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6918
	Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)	mL/min		

Blood glucose related indexes				
	Glucose	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6734
	Glycosylated albumin	mmol/L	Meijia	190221101
Blood lipid				
	Apolipoprotein A1	g/L	Beckman Coulter	AA0183
	Apolipoprotein B	g/L	Beckman Coulter	AB0276
	High density lipoprotein	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6793
	Cholesterol			
	LDL cholesterol	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6686
	Lipoprotein (a)	mg/L	Lideman	20190108
	Total cholesterol	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6799
	Triglyceride	mmol/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6673
Cardiac biomarkers				
	Creatine kinase	U/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6919
	Creatine kinase MB	ng/ml	Beckman Coulter	832253
	Lactate dehydrogenase	U/L	Beckman Coulter	AUZ6980
	Myoglobin	ng/ml	Beckman Coulter	832331
	Troponin-I	ng/ml	Beckman Coulter	832157
Routine blood test			Sysmex	
	White blood cell count	10 ⁹ /L	FFD-200A	ZG900003(BN724 234)
	Neutrophil absolute value	10 ⁹ /L	FFS-800A	984-1721-6(114010116)
	Lymphocyte absolute value	10 ⁹ /L	SE-90L	ZG801001(83400 324)
	Monocyte absolute value	10 ⁹ /L	PK-30L	ZG801000(88408 711)
	Eosinophils absolute value	10 ⁹ /L	CL-50	834-0162-1
	Basophils absolute value	10 ⁹ /L	FBA-200A	R7057
	Red blood cell count	10 ¹² /L		
	Hemoglobin	g/L		
	Hematocrit			
	Mean corpuscular volume	fL		
	Mean hemoglobin content	pg		
	Mean hemoglobin concentration	g/L		
	Red blood cell distribution width	%		
	Platelet count	10 ⁹ /L		
	Platelet crit			
	Mean platelet volume	fL		
	Platelet distribution width	%		

	Erythrocyte sedimentation rate	mm/h	Alifax	195910
Coagulation index				
	D-dimer	mg/L	Sysmex	562567
	Prothrombin time	second	Sysmex	565642
	International standardized ratio			
	Activated partial thromboplastin time	second	Sysmex	556966
	Fibrinogen	g/L	Sysmex	565014
	Thrombin time	second	Sysmex	563501
Blood gas analysis				
			Werfen	010839A
	PH	mmol/L		
	Partial pressure of carbon dioxide	mmHg		
	Oxygen partial pressure	mmHg		
	Oxygen saturation	%		
	Base excess	mmol/L		
	Bicarbonate concentration	mmol/L		
	Lactic acid	mmol/L		
	Oxygenation index	mmHg		
Cytokine				
	Interferon gamma	pg/mL	Jiangxi nuode	20190601
	Interleukin-10	pg/mL	Jiangxi nuode	20190601
	Interleukin-2	pg/mL	Jiangxi nuode	20190601
	Interleukin-4	pg/mL	Jiangxi nuode	20190601
	Interleukin-6	pg/mL	Jiangxi nuode	20190601
	Tumor necrosis factor alpha	pg/mL	Jiangxi nuode	20190601
Lymphocyte subsets				
	CD19 absolute value	/μL	BD	40878
	CD3 absolute value	/μL	BD	33593
	CD4 absolute value	/μL	BD	33593
	CD8 absolute value	/μL	BD	33593
	CD4 / CD8 ratio			
	NK cell absolute value	/μL	BD	40878

598