Characteristics and outcomes of clinically diagnosed RT-PCR swab negative COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study

Paul Middleton,^{1*} Pablo N. Perez-Guzman (0000-0002-5277-5196),^{2*} Alexandra Cheng,¹ Naveenta Kumar,¹ Mara D. Kont,² Anna Daunt,¹ Sujit Mukherjee,¹ Graham Cooke,^{1,2} Timothy B. Hallett,² Katharina Hauck,² Peter J. White,² Mark R. Thursz,¹ Shevanthi Nayagam (0000-0002-8030-3380),^{1,2}

*These first authors contributed equally to this article

¹ Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK (P. Middleton, A. Cheng, N. Kumar, A. Daunt, S. Mukherjee, G. Cooke, M. Thursz, S. Nayagam)

² Imperial College London, London, UK (P. Perez-Guzman, M. Kont, G. Cooke, T. Hallett, K. Hauck, P. White, S. Nayagam)

Corresponding Author:

Dr Shevanthi Nayagam, MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine at St Mary's Campus, Imperial College London, W2 1PG. UK. Email: s.nayagam01@imperial.ac.uk

The opinions expressed by authors contributing to this journal do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Keywords: COVID-19, RT-PCR-negative, swab-negative, hospitalization outcomes

Conflicts of interest: None.

Word count for abstract: 254

Word count for text: 1,637

Running title

24 COVID-19 swab-negative vs swab-positive cohort UK

25 **Keywords**

26 Coronavirus infection, COVID-19, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, Retrospective
27 Studies, Cohort Studies, Hospitalization

28 **Abstract**

29 Patients with strong clinical features of COVID-19 with negative real time polymerase chain reaction
30 (RT-PCR) SARS-CoV-2 testing are not currently included in official statistics. The scale,
31 characteristics and clinical relevance of this group are thus unknown. We performed a retrospective
32 cohort study in two large London hospitals to characterize the demographic, clinical, and
33 hospitalization outcome characteristics of swab-negative clinical COVID-19 patients. We found 1 in 5
34 patients with a negative swab and clinical suspicion of COVID-19 received a clinical diagnosis of
35 COVID-19 within clinical documentation, discharge summary or death certificate. We compared this
36 group to a similar swab positive cohort and found similar demographic composition, symptomology
37 and laboratory findings. Swab-negative clinical COVID-19 patients had better outcomes, with shorter
38 length of hospital stay, reduced need for >60% supplementary oxygen and reduced
39 mortality. Patients with strong clinical features of COVID-19 that are swab-negative are a common
40 clinical challenge. Health systems must recognize and plan for the management of swab-negative
41 patients in their COVID-19 clinical management, infection control policies and epidemiological
42 assessments.

43 **Background**

44 As of 2nd August 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) has reported 17.6 million confirmed
45 cases of COVID-19 globally with 532,340 confirmed deaths.[1] WHO defines a confirmed case as a
46 person with laboratory confirmation of COVID-19 infection.[2] Cases where laboratory confirmation
47 is not done or inconclusive are recognized as probable cases however those with strong clinical
48 features, but negative testing are not recognized.[2] Epidemiological evaluations in many countries,
49 including the UK, focus on patients with positive real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)

50 testing.[3] This places a significant importance on the diagnostic accuracy of laboratory testing when
51 it has been performed.

52

53 However, the diagnostic accuracy of RT-PCR upper respiratory tract swabs is increasingly being
54 questioned. A study utilizing both chest computerized tomography imaging (CT) and RT-PCR testing
55 in patients with suspected COVID-19 found 75% of cases with a negative RT-PCR test had CT
56 findings suggestive of COVID-19.[4] Several case reports describe patients with clinical features of
57 COVID-19 but negative upper respiratory tract swabs who later have positive confirmatory testing on
58 induced sputum or bronchial lavage.[5–7] A recent analysis of published cohorts calculated the false-
59 negative rate of RT-PCR testing amongst symptomatic COVID-19 patients who eventually test
60 positive for COVID-19 is likely 20% and increases gradually with time since symptoms onset.[8]

61

62 Acknowledging this, some patients with strong features of COVID-19 receive a clinical diagnosis of
63 COVID-19 despite a negative swab result. This clinical approach is being further recognized in the
64 admission criteria of some clinical trials who permit recruitment of these patients.[9] For example in
65 the recently reported RECOVERY trial 10% of those randomized to dexamethasone had a negative
66 swab at the time of randomization.[10] However, little has been documented about the scale and
67 clinical relevance of this subgroup of patients for whom there is no consensus on optimal
68 management. Our study aims to assess the real-world prevalence and characteristics of clinically
69 diagnosed swab-negative COVID-19, including factors associated with swab-negative disease, and
70 whether their outcomes differ to swab-positive patients.

71

72 **Methods**

73 We retrospectively reviewed medical admissions from March 1 to April 12, 2020 at Imperial College
74 Healthcare Trust (ICHNT) in London, UK from two admitting sites. We defined eligible cases as
75 those who presented with clinical suspicion of COVID-19 or had symptoms compatible with COVID-
76 19, were admitted to hospital and had a SARS-CoV-2 nasopharyngeal swab performed. We collected
77 full demographic characteristics, time course of symptoms, time of presentation and testing,

78 presenting symptoms, final diagnosis and outcome as well as radiological and laboratory findings for
79 all patients with a negative swab from admission until discharge. Cases were evaluated using the
80 Public Health England (PHE) testing criteria for possible COVID cases.

81

82 We defined swab-negative clinical COVID-19 cases as follows: a) clinical COVID-19 or high level of
83 suspicion as defined by the treating medical team (as recorded in the medical notes, discharge
84 documents or death certificate); and b) RT-PCR swab-negative (on initial and any subsequent tests
85 performed).

86

87 The swab-negative clinical COVID-19 group of patients was compared to a subgroup of a previously
88 described swab-positive cohort who were similarly admitted via general medical admissions.¹¹ Chi-
89 square, Fisher's and rank sum tests were used, as appropriate, to compare the cohorts' characteristics,
90 and odds ratios (OR) calculated to assess differences in the outcomes of respiratory deterioration,
91 defined as requiring greater than 60% oxygen, and death. Lastly, we assessed the cumulative risk of
92 the competing outcomes of hospital discharge and death over time using the using the Nelson-Aalen
93 estimator.

94

95 The study was approved by the ICHNT clinical governance team. As we report on routinely collected
96 non-identifiable clinical audit data, no individual informed consent was required under the UK policy
97 framework for health and social care. All methods were conducted in accordance with relevant
98 guidelines and regulations.

99

100 **Results**

101 We identified 1,119 emergency medical admissions with initial clinical suspicion of COVID-19 who
102 had a SARS-CoV-2 swab performed (Figure 1). Initial swab was negative in 456 (41%) and positive
103 in 663 (59%) patients. 62% (281/456) of those who were swab-negative received an alternative
104 diagnosis. 47 of the swab-negative cohort later tested positive for COVID-19 on repeat PCR testing.
105 The most common alternative diagnoses included community acquired pneumonia, lower respiratory

tract infection and exacerbations of chronic lung disease such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

Overall, 20% (94/456) of swab-negative cases were identified as swab-negative clinical COVID-19. 98% (92/94) of these cases fulfilled PHE criteria for patients eligible to be swabbed for COVID-19 compared to 84% of the entire swab-negative group. 41/94 had repeat swab testing performed and remained negative.

The demographic profile and symptomatology of the swab-positive and swab-negative cohorts were similar, with high rates of influenza-like symptoms, cough and fever in both groups (Table). Typical features such as shortness of breath was higher in the swab-negative clinical COVID-19 cohort (75/92 (79.79%) vs 312/478 (66.67%) $p=0.017$). The swab-negative cohort was more likely to have chest radiographs reporting typical COVID-19 appearances than the swab-positive cohort (53/77 (68.83%) vs 195/389 (50.13%); $p=0.004$).

Overall haematological and biochemical findings that have been associated with COVID-19 including raised CRP, d-dimer and ferritin were similarly distributed between the two cohorts. A higher proportion of patients had moderate lymphopenia within the swab-negative group (65/94 (69.15%) vs 258/460 (56.09%); $p=0.026$).

Patients in the swab-negative group presented slightly later in their clinical course after symptom onset, at a median of 7 days (IQR 4.3-13) for the RT-PCR-negatives compared to 6 days (IQR 3-10) within the RT-PCR-positives cohort ($p<0.001$). Interestingly, RT-PCR-negative patients had better hospitalisation outcomes than RT-PCR-positives. The former had a 57% lower probability of requiring $\geq 60\%$ supplementary oxygen during hospitalisation (OR 0.43, 95%CI 0.26-0.70, $p<0.001$), a shorter length of hospital stay (median 5 days vs 6 days, $p<0.001$) and 60% lower probability of death (OR 0.40, 95%CI 0.22-0.72, $p<0.001$). The cumulative risk of being discharged alive was significantly higher in the swab-negative group than the positive group ($p < 0.001$). Furthermore, the

swab-negative cohort have a lower cumulative risk of in-hospital mortality than positives ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 2).

Discussion

We find one in five patients who had a negative COVID-19 swab received a clinical diagnosis of COVID-19 despite negative testing. This represents a 13% higher estimate of the number of hospitalized COVID-19 patients compared to considering swab-positive patients alone. Overall the clinical, biochemical and radiological features of the swab-negative clinical COVID-19 cohort did not differ significantly to the swab-positive cohort. Typical features of COVID-19 such as shortness of breath, typical chest x-ray findings and lymphopenia are more common in the swab-negative cohort as we would expect in a group defined by these parameters. Despite these similarities, swab-negative patients tended to have a longer delay between symptom onset and hospitalization, and had significantly better hospitalization outcomes, including mortality. Whether this potentially less aggressive phenotype is related to a lower viremia, variations in immune response or a different stage of illness presenting after period of peak viral replication is not yet known. Further research including immunological profiling would help further elucidate underlying disease mechanisms.

Our study is, to our knowledge, the first to detail a cohort of swab-negative clinical COVID-19. Our results provide evidence to validate swab-negative COVID-19 as a real clinical entity commonly encountered in hospital settings, findings which have important implications for current clinical practice and public health guidance.[12]

Firstly, it highlights that clinicians caring for COVID-19 patients should maintain a high clinical suspicion, even in the presence of a negative swab result. Our results suggest that a combination of clinical, radiological and biochemical features in keeping with COVID-19 disease, rather than swab results alone, should guide clinical management.

Secondly, managing swab-negative clinical COVID-19 within hospital poses disease control challenges. Cohorting this group with swab-positive patients presents potential risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, if the clinical diagnosis is incorrect.¹² Alternatively, isolating these patients from both swab-negative low-risk patients and swab-positive groups would place significant strain on hospital resources and may be unfeasible during an outbreak. Repeated testing may be beneficial in some cases however in our cohort 41/94 swab negative clinical COVID-19 cases had a repeat swab which remained negative. Testing on sputum or bronchial lavage may provide greater sensitivity.⁵⁻⁷ However, their use is limited by feasibility and potential risk to healthcare workers. Serological testing to confirm exposure to SARS-CoV-2 is likely the optimal second-line test as it is not operator-dependent, is low-risk to healthcare workers, and can feasibly be performed on a large number of patients. Serological proof of exposure could reduce concern regarding cohorting with swab-positive patients. However, these tests are not yet in routine clinical practice and require further evaluation.

Lastly, but importantly, from a public health perspective, swab-negative clinically diagnosed COVID-19 patients may not be captured in surveillance statistics, thereby underestimating healthcare demand. As the pandemic evolves countries with reducing incidence should consider this clinical group and how they should be addressed when planning interventions to prevent second-wave outbreaks such as contact tracing.

Our study is limited by its retrospective nature and likely under-estimates the proportion of patients with swab-negative clinical COVID-19, as it requires a high degree of clinical confidence without alternative diagnosis. The lack of positive confirmatory test means we cannot be sure of the true diagnosis in the clinically diagnosed swab negative group. However, this does not detract from the clinical problems this group presents to hospital management and epidemiological assessment. In the absence of improved testing or routine second line testing for patients who have high clinical suspicion of COVID-19 but negative swab testing, this group is likely to continue to pose a clinical challenge. During the period of data collection changes in local policy regarding repeated testing prevented re-testing for COVID-19 even in cases with high clinical suspicion therefore not all patients had repeated testing performed.

189

190 Patients with strong clinical features of COVID-19 who have negative nasopharyngeal RT-PCR test
191 results are a common but understudied clinical group. Patients with a clinical diagnosis of COVID-19
192 do not differ significantly to similar swab-positive patients but seem to have better outcomes.
193 Healthcare services should recognize and plan for the management of this group when making disease
194 control interventions and epidemiological assessments.

195

196

197 **References**

- 198 1 World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports.
199 2020.[https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)
200 reports (accessed 18 May 2020).
- 201 2 World Health Organization. Global surveillance for COVID-19 caused by human
202 infection with COVID-19 virus: interim guidance.
203 2020.[https://www.who.int/publications-detail/global-surveillance-for-covid-19-caused-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/global-surveillance-for-covid-19-caused-by-human-infection-with-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance)
204 by-human-infection-with-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance (accessed 18 May 2020).
- 205 3 UK Government. Number of coronavirus (COVID-19) cases and risk in the UK. Number
206 of coronavirus (COVID-19) cases and risk in the UK.
207 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-information-for-the-public>
208 (accessed 27 Apr 2020).
- 209 4 Ai T, Yang Z, Hou H, *et al.* Correlation of Chest CT and RT-PCR Testing in Coronavirus
210 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of 1014 Cases. *Radiology* 2020;:200642.
211 doi:10.1148/radiol.2020200642
- 212 5 Hase R, Kurita T, Muranaka E, *et al.* A case of imported COVID-19 diagnosed by PCR-
213 positive lower respiratory specimen but with PCR-negative throat swabs. *Infectious*
214 *Diseases* 2020;**52**:423–6. doi:10.1080/23744235.2020.1744711

- 215 6 Winichakoon P, Chaiwarith R, Liwsrisakun C, *et al.* Negative Nasopharyngeal and
216 Oropharyngeal Swabs Do Not Rule Out COVID-19. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;**58**:e00297-
217 20, /jcm/58/5/JCM.00297-20.atom. doi:10.1128/JCM.00297-20
- 218 7 Han H, Luo Q, Mo F, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 RNA more readily detected in induced sputum
219 than in throat swabs of convalescent COVID-19 patients. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*
220 2020;;S1473309920301742. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30174-2
- 221 8 Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, *et al.* Variation in False-Negative Rate of
222 Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time
223 Since Exposure. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2020;;M20-1495. doi:10.7326/M20-1495
- 224 9 Kulkarni S, Fisk M, Kostapanos M, *et al.* Repurposed immunomodulatory drugs for
225 Covid-19 in pre-ICu patients - mulTi-Arm Therapeutic study in pre-ICu patients admitted
226 with Covid-19 – Repurposed Drugs (TACTIC-R): A structured summary of a study
227 protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials* 2020;**21**:626. doi:10.1186/s13063-020-
228 04535-4
- 229 10 Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson J, *et al.* Effect of Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients
230 with COVID-19: Preliminary Report. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)* 2020.
231 doi:10.1101/2020.06.22.20137273
- 232 11 Perez Guzman P, Daunt A, Mukherjee S, *et al.* Report 17: Clinical characteristics and
233 predictors of outcomes of hospitalised patients with COVID-19 in a London NHS Trust:
234 a retrospective cohort study. Imperial College London 2020. doi:10.25561/78613
- 235 12 Public Health England. COVID-19: investigation and initial clinical management of
236 possible cases. 2020.[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria)
237 [coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria)
238 [management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-initial-investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria)
239 (accessed 18 May 2020).

240

241

242

243

244 **Author Contributions:**

245 SN – Conceived study, data interpretation and provided clinical expertise and critical revision of the
246 manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

247 PM – Conceived study, wrote the first manuscript and led on acquisition of data, interpreted data,
248 provided clinical expertise and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

249 PP – Conceived study, performed statistical analysis, interpreted data, provided clinical expertise and
250 critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

251 AC – Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual
252 and scientific content

253 NK - Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual
254 and scientific content

255 AD - Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual
256 and scientific content

257 SM - Supported data acquisition and curation and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual
258 and scientific content

259 MDK – Performed statistical analysis, data interpretation and critical revision of the manuscript for
260 intellectual and scientific content

261 GC – Provided clinical expertise and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific
262 content

263 MRT – Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public
264 health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

265 PJW - Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public
266 health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

TBH - Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

KH - Provided clinical expertise and scientific expertise to lead the discussion of clinical and public health implications and critical revision of the manuscript for intellectual and scientific content

Funding Statement

This work was supported by Medical Research Council Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis. Funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Competing Interests Statement

Acknowledgements: SN, TBH, KH, PJW and PP are supported by the MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis (MR/R015600/1); this award is jointly funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under the MRC/DFID Concordat agreement and is also part of the EDCTP2 program supported by the European Union (EU). The authors would also like to acknowledge the support of the Imperial BRC Centre and J-IDEA. The authors would like to thank all patients and staff at Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funding organizations had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Figure 1. Case identification.

*98% (92/94) Clinical COVID-19 cases fulfilled PHE guidance on testing eligibility

Figure 2. Cumulative risk of hospitalization outcomes by swab status.

Table. Description of clinical characteristics and clinical course

Abbreviations: CK, creatine kinase; CRP, C-reactive protein; EWS, early warning score;

FiO₂, inspiratory fraction of oxygen; IQR, interquartile range; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase.

* Pearson's Chi-squared test with Yates' continuity correction

† Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction

‡ Fisher's exact test for count data

	RT-PCR-positive (n = 468)	RT-PCR-negative (n = 94)	p value
Demography			
Male, n (%)	288 (61.5%)	57 (60.6%)	0.962 *
Median age (IQR)	68 (54 - 79)	67 (54.25 - 78)	0.638 †
Symptoms			
Influenza-like syndrome, n (%)	341 (72.9%)	74 (78.7%)	0.293 *
Cough, n (%)	353 (75.4%)	71 (75.5%)	1.000 *
Fever, n (%)	389 (83.1%)	75 (79.8%)	0.530 *
Nasal discharge, n (%)	9 (1.9%)	3 (3.2%)	0.433 ‡
Shortness of breath, n (%)	312 (66.7%)	75 (79.8%)	0.017 *
Wheezing, n (%)	1 (0.2%)	4 (4.3%)	0.003 ‡
Anosmia, n (%)	12 (2.6%)	10 (10.6%)	0.001 *
Admission Oxygen Requirements (FiO₂)			
Room air, n (%)	254 (54.3%)	50 (53.2%)	0.937 *
24 to <40%	108 (23.1%)	31 (33.0%)	0.058 *
40 to <60%	8 (1.7%)	3 (3.2%)	0.405 ‡
>60%	98 (20.9%)	10 (10.6%)	0.030 *
Chest Radiograph			
Normal CXR	65/389 (16.7%)	7/77 (9.1%)	0.129 *
Typical COVID-19 CXR	195/389 (50.2%)	53/77 (68.8%)	0.004 *
Atypical COVID-19 CXR	106/389 (27.3%)	15/77 (19.5%)	0.201 *
Non-COVID abnormal CXR	23/389 (5.9%)	2/77 (2.6%)	0.403 ‡
Laboratory Test			
Lymphocytes ≥1.1	154/460 (33.5%)	25 (26.6%)	0.238 *
Lymphocytes 0.5-1.0	258/460 (56.1%)	65 (69.2%)	0.026 *
Lymphocytes <0.5	43/460 (9.4%)	4 (4.3%)	0.152 ‡
CRP ≥100	230/448 (51.3%)	55/93 (59.1%)	0.209 *
CRP 10-99	186/448 (41.5%)	33/93 (35.5%)	0.336 *
CRP <10	32/448 (7.1%)	5/93 (5.4%)	0.698 *
D-dimer ≥3000	42/225 (18.7%)	16/66 (24.2%)	0.411 *
D-dimer 2000-2999	29/225 (12.9%)	9/66 (13.6%)	1.000 *

D-dimer 1000-1999	64/225 (28.4%)	19/66 (28.8%)	1.000 *
D-dimer 500-999	63/225 (28.0%)	18/66 (27.3%)	1.000 *
D-dimer <500	27/225 (12.0%)	4/66 (6.1%)	0.255 ‡
LDH ≥243	166/179 (92.7%)	48/51 (94.1%)	0.976 *
LDH <243	13/179 (7.3%)	3/51 (5.9%)	1.000 ‡
CK ≥320	63/210 (30.0%)	16/64 (25.0%)	0.538 *
CK <320	147/210 (70.0%)	48/64 (75.0%)	0.538 *
Ferritin ≥5000	13/259 (5.0%)	4/68 (5.9%)	0.761 ‡
Ferritin 1000-4999	94/259 (36.3%)	27/68 (39.7%)	0.706 *
Ferritin 500-999	73/259 (28.2%)	15/68 (22.1%)	0.390 *
Ferritin 300-499	38/259 (14.7%)	10/68 (14.7%)	1.000 *
Ferritin <300	41/259 (15.8%)	12/68 (17.7%)	0.860 *
Clinical Course			
Median (IQR) days prior to admission	6 (3 - 10)	7 (4.25 - 13)	0.013 †
Median (IQR) length of stay	6 (4 - 10)	5 (2.25 - 6)	<0.001 †
Received ≥60% FIO2, n (%)	215 (45.9%)	25 (26.6%)	0.001 *
Died, n (%)	151 (32.3%)	15 (16.0%)	0.002 *

299

300

301