Standard Blood Laboratory as a Clinical Support Tool to Distinguish between SARS-CoV-2 Positive and Negative Patients

Rainer Thell^{1,2,3}, M.D., Jascha Zimmermann⁴, Marton Szell^{1,2}, M.D., Sabine Tomez, M.D., Philip Eisenburger^{1,4}, M.D., Moritz Haugk¹, M.D., Anna Kreil¹, M.D., Alexander Spiel¹, M.D., Amelie Blaschke^{1,2}, M.D., Anna Klicpera^{1,2}, M.D., Oskar Janata^{1,2}, M.D., Walter Krugluger^{1,2}, M.D., Christian Sebesta^{1,2}, M.D., Harald Herkner³, M.D., and Brenda Laky^{3,5}, M.Sc., Ph.D.

¹ Wiener Gesundheitsverbund (R.T, M. S., S.T., P.E., M.H., A.K., A.S., A.B., A.K., O.J., W.K., C.S.)

² Department of Internal Medicine 2, Emergency Department, Klinik Donaustadt, Vienna, Austria

³ Medical University Vienna, Austria

⁴ Sigmund Freud University, Medical School, Vienna, Austria

⁵ Austrian Research Group for Regenerative and Orthopedic Medicine (AURROM), Vienna, Austria

Keywords. COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; standard blood laboratory

Running title Standard blood laboratory for diagnosis of COVID-19

26 Corresponding author:

27 Rainer Thell, MD

28 Department of Internal Medicine 2, Emergency Department, Klinik Donaustadt, Vienna,

29 Austria

30 Address: 122 Langobardenstrasse, 1210-Vienna, Austria

31 E-mail: rainer.thell@meduniwien.ac.at

32 Mobile: +43 676 8311 2550

33 Alternate corresponding author:

34 Brenda Laky, MSc, PhD

35 Medical University of Vienna, Austria

36 Austrian Research Group for Regenerative and Orthopedic Medicine (AURROM),

37 Vienna, Austria

38 Address: Hartmannngasse 15/10, 1050 Vienna, Austria

39 Mobile: +43 699 1068 2574

40 E-mails: brenda.laky@meduniwien.ac.at or brenda.laky@aurrom.org

41

42 **Summary**

43

44 Decreasing leucocytes and eosinophils and increasing hemoglobin and CRP were significantly
45 associated with an increased likelihood of being COVID-19 positive tested. Each single
46 parameter showed either a high sensitivity (leucocytes, eosinophils, CRP, monocytes,
47 thrombocytes) or specificity (NLR, CK, ALT, lipase), or a sensitivity and specificity around 60%
48 (Hb, LDH, AST).

49

50 ABSTRACT

51

52 **Background.** Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) caused by severe acute respiratory
53 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is current pandemic disease. Acute polymerase-chain-
54 reaction is the gold standard test for this disease, is not available everywhere. Standard blood
55 laboratory parameters may have diagnostic potential.

56 **Methods.** We evaluated standard blood laboratory parameters of 655 COVID-19 patients
57 suspected to be infected with SARS-CoV-2, who underwent PCR testing in one of five hospitals
58 in Vienna, Austria. Additionally, clinical characteristics and 28-day outcome were obtained from
59 medical records. We compared standard blood laboratory parameters, clinical characteristics, and
60 outcomes between positive and negative PCR-tested patients and evaluated the ability of those
61 parameters to distinguish between groups.

62 **Results.** Of the 590 study patients including 276 females and 314 males, aged between 20 and
63 100 years, 208 were tested positive by means of PCR. Patients with positive compared to
64 negative PCR-tests had significantly lower levels of leukocytes, basophils, eosinophils,
65 monocytes, and thrombocytes; while significantly higher levels were detected with hemoglobin,
66 C-reactive-protein (CRP), neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR), activated-partial-
67 thromboplastin-time (aPTT), creatine-kinase (CK), lactate-dehydrogenase (LDH), alanine-
68 aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate-aminotransferase (AST), and lipase. Our multivariate model
69 correctly classified 83.9% of cases with a sensitivity of 78.4%, specificity of 87.3%, positive
70 predictive value of 79.5%, and negative predictive value of 86.6%. Decreasing leucocytes and
71 eosinophils and increasing hemoglobin and CRP were significantly associated with an increased
72 likelihood of being COVID-19 positive tested.

73 **Conclusions.** Our findings suggest that especially leucocytes, eosinophils, hemoglobin, and
74 CRP are helpful to distinguish between COVID-19 positive and negative tested patients and that
75 a certain blood pattern is able to predict PCR-results.

76 INTRODUCTION

77

78 In December 2019, an uncommonly high incidence of pneumonia occurred in Wuhan province,
79 China, caused by a previously unknown pathogen and showing an unusually high mortality rate,
80 which showed to be a novel corona virus, SARS-CoV-2 (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome –
81 Corona Virus 2).[1] It causes coronavirus disease (COVID-19) which has reached pandemic
82 levels resulting in significant morbidity and mortality affecting all inhabited areas of the world
83 with large numbers of patients. Hence, the World Health Organisation (WHO) declared a
84 worldwide pandemic in March 2020.

85 Diagnostic steps for this disease currently are epidemiological contact history, clinical
86 impression, chest radiography, standard blood laboratory, and antigen detection by means of
87 real-time fluorescence PCR. PCR is the gold standard test for detection of SARS-CoV-2
88 infection.[2]

89 It soon became apparent that the available test capacities for PCR testing were far from
90 sufficient, and a feverish search for alternative and simpler detection methods began. To date,
91 point-of-care PCR testing is still not available everywhere. Testing that takes a long time can
92 make up for significant additional efforts of organisation of patient cohorts in hospitals.

93 The clinical appearance of the disease is broadly reported.[3] Signs and symptoms may include
94 fever and cough most commonly, dyspnea, rarely diarrhea, anosmia, or ageusia and others, at the
95 beginning or during the course of the disease.[4-6] Various publications indicated that COVID-
96 19 positive patients showed typical laboratory patterns,[7-9] although many of the earlier studies
97 report on relatively small numbers of COVID-19 positive patients.

98 Zhang et al. included 95 cases with COVID-19-positive pneumonia.[7] They found significantly
99 higher numbers of D-Dimer, C-reactive protein (CRP), and procalcitonin in patients to be
100 admitted to intensive care levels. In a retrospective report of 138 admitted patients, lymphopenia
101 occurred in 70%, a prolonged prothrombin time in 58%, and an elevated lactate dehydrogenase

(LDH) resulted in 40% of patients.[10] In an Iranian cohort of 70 COVID-19 positive patients, Mardani et al. found significantly higher neutrophil count, CRP, LDH, aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alanine aminotransferase (ALT), and urea levels, as well as lowered white blood count and albumin levels.[11] A further retrospective trial of 99 patients showed decreased lymphocyte counts in 35%, decreased albumin in 98%, increased LDH in 75%, an increased interleukin-6 in 52%, and raised CRP in 86% of patients were reported.[3] Li et al. performed a trial with 989 patients, detecting a combination of eosinopenia and elevated CRP yielding a sensitivity of 67% and specificity of 78% for COVID-19.[12] In an additional cohort of 458 patients from Guan et al., leukopenia, lymphopenia, eosinopenia, and an increased CRP were detected.[4] In two trials, an increased NLR was described as an independent risk factor of mortality for COVID-19 patients.[13, 14]

Standard blood laboratory data are potentially of both, diagnostic and prognostic value.[15] On one hand, they can contribute to judge the pre-test probability of a COVID-19 diagnosis and thus, support the effective and efficacious organisational management of a patient in an emergency department. On the other hand, it is of potential value, if standard blood laboratory blood results can help to distinguish a potentially life-threatening course of a disease from a less critical status.

Therefore, the overall aim of this study was to evaluate standard blood laboratory parameters and clinical characteristics in a large number of COVID-19 suspicious patients, who underwent PCR testing. The specific aim was to determine whether standard blood laboratory parameters are able to identify positive COVID-19 patients from a large COVID-19 suspected cohort.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data Source

Data were obtained from an electronical data base of the Vienna Health Care Association (Wiener Gesundheitsverbund), which stores all medical records of patients treated in its hospitals

in Vienna, Austria. Data extraction was exclusively performed by authorised employees of the emergency department at the Klinik Donaustadt, Vienna. The study protocol was approved both by the Ethics Commission of the City of Vienna (EK 20-122-VK) and the Ethics Commission of Sigmund Freud University Vienna (161/2020).

Data Collection

Data were collected from female and male adult patients with suspected COVID-19 who underwent reverse transcriptase PCR testing via a nasopharyngeal swab performed at one of the five hospitals (Klinik Donaustadt, Klinik Floridsdorf, Klinik Hietzing, Klinik Landstrasse, and Klinik Ottakring) between February 27, 2020 and April 27, 2020. Based on PCR results, patients were divided into a COVID-19 positive or negative group. Patients without reported standard blood laboratory reports, medical history, or outcome documentation at day 28 after consultation were not included.

As standard blood laboratory testing was performed according to the clinical care needs of the patients, not all parameters were available for all patients. Parameters available from less than 20 patients in the positive or negative group were not analysed. Routine blood tests generally included full blood count, blood chemistry, electrolytes, liver function parameters, renal and myocardial function parameters as well as coagulation markers and markers of inflammation.

Patients' gender (female/male), age at time of PCR testing (years), coexisting diseases and conditions (e.g. chronic diseases of the lung, liver, kidney; coronary artery disease, diabetes, and arterial hypertension); the clinical 28-day outcome including hospital admission and discharge as well as requirement of intensive care and ventilation, and death details were extracted from medical records.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used to describe the characteristics of patients. The distribution of the data was determined by visual inspection of the histograms and the Kolmogorov Smirnov tests. Normally distributed data were calculated as mean value with standard deviation (SD), otherwise as median and interquartile range (IQR).

Continuous variables were compared between COVID-19 positive and negative patients with independent t-tests (parametric) or Mann-Whitney U-tests (non-parametric). Blood parameters were categorised according to normal reference ranges used in hospitals. However, since CRP ranges higher than normal (cut off: 0.5mg/dL) were detected in almost all patients (COVID-19 positive: 99.5% and negative: 98.2%) and thus, useless to discriminate between COVID-19 positive and negative patients, coordinates of the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) and the Youden index were used to determine another, sensitivity and specificity balanced, cut off value for CRP in our cohort. Chi-square or Fisher's exact tests were applied to describe the relationship between proportions of categorical variables. Correlations between the continuous parameters were performed using Kendall's Tau. Since neutrophils significantly correlated with leucocytes (0.859; $p < 0.001$) and to reduce the number of predictive variables, we used the neutrophils-to-lymphocytes ratio (NLR) instead of neutrophils and lymphocytes. A cut-off for NLR was determined using coordinates of the ROC and the Youden index (sensitivity and specificity balanced). Hemoglobin was used instead of erythrocytes (0.761; $p < 0.001$) and hematocrit (0.874; $p < 0.001$) due to significant correlations. Procalcitonin and D-Dimer were also not included due to the small sample size. For further analysis between COVID-19 positive and negative patients, only significant different and clinical meaningful parameters were considered.

Univariate and multivariate binomial logistic regression analyses were used to construct prediction models using PCR results (COVID-19 positive/negative) as the dependent variable and significant patients' characteristics and blood parameters as predictors (independent variables). Linearity of the continuous variables regarding the logit of the dependent variable

was assessed using Box-Tidwell procedure with Bonferroni correction. None of the continuous variables violated the linearity assumption. None of the parameters showed multicollinearity.

Percentage accuracy in classification (PAC), sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) were estimated to assess models' performance. Area under the ROC curves (AUC) were determined in order to assess the overall discriminatory ability of the model and of blood parameters to distinguish between COVID-19 positive and negative patients. Statistical significance was set at a p-value of <0.05 (two-sided). All data were analysed with SPSS software (IMP Statistics Version 25; SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL).

RESULTS

Characteristics of COVID-19 Suspected Patients

A total of 655 patients from the four hospitals underwent PCR testing between February 27, 2020 and April 27, 2020. Forty-five patients were not evaluated due to missing data. Another 17 patients who were tested within this time period with complete data sets were excluded since they were hospitalized more than one month before (n=16) or more than seven days after (n=1) PCR-testing. Patients (n=3) with both eosinophilia and acute malignant disease were excluded as well.

The median age of the 276 female (46.8%) and 314 male (53.2%) patients was 71 years (range, 20-100years; 60.7% of the patients were ≥ 65 years of age at time of PCR testing). No comorbidities were recorded in 69 (33.2%) and 84 (22.0%) COVID-19 positive and negative tested patients, respectively. COVID-19 negative tested patients had significantly more comorbidities than COVID-19 positive tested patients (median (IQR): 1 (1-3) vs. 1 (0-2); p <0.001). The most common comorbidity was pre-existing arterial hypertension (58.1%), followed by diabetes (25.4%), coronary heart disease (19.5%), chronic lung disease (16.9%),

chronic kidney disease (15.8%), malignant diseases (13.6%), cerebrovascular accidents (7.5%), chronic liver disease (4.2%), and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV, 0.5%).

A comparison between demographic characteristics and comorbidities between COVID-19 positive and negative tested patients showed no significant differences between the groups (Table 1).

Similar numbers of outpatients tested positive (11.1%) or negative (8.6%; $p=0.338$). There was also no significant difference between COVID-19 positive compared to negative tested patients regarding the number of patients requiring ICU and/or ventilation (4.0% vs. 9.3%, respectively; $p=0.091$). Significantly more COVID-19 positive (25.5%) than negative (9.2%) tested patients died before day 28 ($p<0.001$). Main causes of death in COVID-19-positive patients were, in descending order, pneumonia (67.3%), followed by multi-organ failure (24.5%), acute cardiac failure (7.6%), and acute renal failure (1.9%).

Comparison of Standard Blood Laboratory Parameters between Covid-19 Positive and Negative Patients

COVID-19 positive patients had significantly lower levels of leukocytes, NLR, basophils, eosinophils, monocytes, and thrombocytes; while significantly higher levels were detected with hemoglobin, CRP, aPTT, CK, LDH, ALT, AST, and lipase compared to COVID-19 negative patients. Similar levels were detected regarding procalcitonin, albumin, glucose, potassium, total bilirubin, GGT, creatinine, and BUN between the groups (Supplement Table 1). Parameters with significant differences are presented in Table 2.

After dichotomizing blood laboratory parameters, similar significances were detected (Table 2); while binary comparisons of aPTT (normal+high (≥ 21 sec): 97.9% positive vs. 97.6% negative) and total bilirubin (normal+high (≥ 0.3 mg/dL): 93.6% positive vs. 89.6% negative) showed no

significant differences between positive and negative tested patients ($p=0.885$ and $p=0.132$, respectively).

Univariate and Multivariate Analyses of Standard Blood Laboratory Parameters

Univariate logistic regression analysis with COVID-19 positive tested patients as the dependent variable revealed that the majority of blood parameters including the dichotomized levels were associated with a positive COVID-19 diagnosis (Table 3). Comorbidities due to their low discrimination ability and parameters without significant associations were not included in further multivariate analyses (Supplement Table 2).

The multivariate logistic regression model was statistically significant (Chi-square (14) = 119.2; $p<0.001$) and explained 62.8% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in COVID-19 positive tested patients and correctly classified 83.9% of cases. Sensitivity was 78.4%, specificity was 87.3%, positive predictive value was 79.5%, and negative predictive value was 86.6%. Of the 14 predictors, four were statistically significant including leucocytes, eosinophils, hemoglobin, and CRP (Table 3). Decreasing leucocytes and eosinophils as well as increasing hemoglobin and CRP were associated with an increased likelihood of being COVID-19 positive tested. AUC, as a measure of the overall discriminatory ability of the model, and the model's best blood parameters combined are presented as ROC curves in Figure 1.

Diagnostic Performance of Single Standard Blood Laboratory Parameters

Diagnostic performance of those four dichotomized blood parameters, which were significant at the multivariate logistic regression as well as those, which were significant at the univariate analysis, were evaluated regarding their ability as single parameter to distinguish between COVID-19 positive from negative tested patients (Table 4). Each single parameter showed either a high sensitivity (leucocytes, eosinophils, CRP, monocytes, platelets), a high specificity (NLR, CK, ALT, lipase), or a sensitivity and specificity around 60% (hemoglobin, LDH, AST).

DISCUSSION

In this trial, we showed that the likelihood of a SARS-CoV-2 infection can be enforced through standard laboratory blood findings to a high degree. Several studies including meta-analyses recently focused on prediction of the severity of the disease derived from blood results.[8, 9, 16] Our consideration to find a model to predict the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection with standard blood parameters has been less studied.

To our knowledge, only three other trials comparing standard blood parameters between positive and negative cases are published to date.[11, 12, 17] Similar to those studies, our study showed that leucopenia, eosinopenia, elevated hemoglobin, and CRP were detected to be among the best standard laboratory parameters to distinguish between COVID-19 positive from negative tested patients. Accordingly, similar patterns have been detected in positive COVID-19 patients with a severe compared to a mild form of the disease.[8, 9, 16] The major differences of the three studies, which compared COVID-19 positive and negative patients, opposed to the reviews, which reported only on positive tested patients, were documented regarding leucocytes, neutrophils, and hemoglobin (Table 5).

In conformity with other publications [11, 12, 17], leucocytes were lower in COVID-19 positive than negative patients at the time of PCR testing, and so were neutrophils and lymphocytes; while severe compared to mild forms of COVID-19 tend to have higher leucocytes and neutrophils. As opposed to our findings, which showed a low ability of NLR to discriminate between positive and negative (AUC=0.561) and basically no contribution in the multivariate analysis, a raised NLR, which evolved from a raised neutrophil count as well as a lowered lymphocyte count, was already shown previously to be a prognostic value for endotracheal intubation and mortality predictor.[13, 14] A cut-off of 4.94 was used in the publication by Tatum et al. [14]; above this value, the risk of being artificially ventilated or to die was increased. Notably, 89% of those patients were African Americans. A lower cut-off (2.33) was

established in our study, which might be because only 15% of patients had a neutrophil count higher than $7.7 \times 10^9/L$. We are however unaware of any study using NLR as a pure discriminator between positive and negative COVID-19 diagnosis.

However, severity of illness appears to be less important regarding the other parameters, especially regarding eosinophils and CRP (Table 5). Like in other publications [12, 17], our data also showed that eosinopenia was one of the significant predictive biomarkers for COVID-19 with a sensitivity of 85% and a specificity of 50%.

Li et al. [12] and our study showed an increased hemoglobin in COVID-19 positive patients, which is not in accordance with a lowered hemoglobin in patients with severe COVID-19 disease reported by two meta-analyses.[8, 16] In our data, the median hemoglobin was 13.5 g/dL, which did not much differ from Li's data.[12] In several other trials assessing the severity of disease and blood patterns, hemoglobin was shown to be below normal ranges.[8, 9, 16] It can only be hypothesized why our cohort presented with a comparably high level of hemoglobin. Possibly, a degree of dehydration played a role at the time of presentation in the emergency department. Indeed, an average temperature of $38.0 \pm 0.9^\circ C$ on presentation in 99 COVID-19 positive and $37.1 \pm 1.4^\circ C$ in 103 COVID-19 negative patients, which was a significant difference, was detected in a subgroup analysis of 202 of our patients.

Not surprisingly, CRP was significantly elevated in all studies.[11, 12, 17] In our patients, we set a new cut-off using the Youden index of 22 mg/dL, since the vast majority of patients had increased CRP values.

Similar blood patterns were also detected regarding ALT, AST, and LDH.[8, 9, 12, 16, 17]

Brinati et al. included 279 patients and developed a score for SARS-Cov-2 detection with an accuracy between 82% and 86%, and sensitivity between 92% and 95%.[18] Applying our data including age, gender, leucocytes, neutrophils, lymphocytes, monocytes, eosinophils, basophils, thrombocytes, CRP, AST, ALT, GGT, and LDH to Brinati's tool, a quite high AUC (AUC=0.709, 95%CI 0.646-0.771; $p < 0.001$), sensitivity (70.4%), specificity (71.3%), and NPV

(79.9%), but less promising PPV (59.8 %) could be obtained. However, our model including 14 standard laboratory blood parameters reached better diagnostic performances in all areas (AUC=0.915, 95%CI 0.876-0.955); sensitivity (78.4%); specificity (87.3%), PPV (79.5%), and NNP (86.6%)), although, the most prominent parameters were leucocytes, eosinophils, hemoglobin, and CRP.

The following limitations of the study should be noted. The retrospective design with missing blood parameters and no validation cohort are amongst the major limiting factors and thus, our selected model may be over-fitted. Additionally, with the single time point evaluation, we were not able to retrieve information regarding progression of the disease. Furthermore, cytokines, especially interleukin-6, were not routinely measured, which may be better predictors, especially regarding the so-called ‘COVID-19 cytokine storm’, to elucidate COVID-19 positive from negative patients. Another fact to consider is the heterogeneity of underlying diseases, which may also contribute to variations in our findings. On the other hand, such a heterogeneity may reflect reality during a pandemic situation best. Eventually, all test quality crucially depends on the quality of the manual specimen acquisition.[19, 20] PCR results tend to be more positive in patients with an increased viral load and with a shorter duration of the disease.[21]

Conclusions

Generally, as laboratory equipment supply develops, more PCR point-of-care diagnostics become available. It is nonetheless doubtful that - neither in the near, nor in the far future – PCR will entirely replace standard laboratory testing. Therefore, the question of a blood laboratory pattern, as specific as possible for COVID-19, remains relevant. Our multivariate model including 14 standard blood parameters correctly classified 84% of cases with a sensitivity of 78% and a specificity of 87%, and therefore could be a useful model to facilitate rapid triage of potential COVID-19 patients.

328 **Funding**

329 There was no acquisition of any funding for this trial.

330

331 **Acknowledgment**

332 All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

333

REFERENCES

1. Wang LF, Anderson DE, Mackenzie JS, Merson MH. From Hendra to Wuhan: what has been learned in responding to emerging zoonotic viruses. *Lancet* **2020**; 395(10224): e33-e4.
2. Wang Y, Kang H, Liu X, Tong Z. Combination of RT-qPCR testing and clinical features for diagnosis of COVID-19 facilitates management of SARS-CoV-2 outbreak. *J Med Virol* **2020**; 92(6): 538-9.
3. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* **2020**; 395(10223): 507-13.
4. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382(18): 1708-20.
5. Gandhi RT, Lynch JB, Del Rio C. Mild or Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* **2020**.
6. Mattiuzzi C, Lippi G. Which lessons shall we learn from the 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak? *Ann Transl Med* **2020**; 8(3): 48.
7. Zhang G, Zhang J, Wang B, Zhu X, Wang Q, Qiu S. Analysis of clinical characteristics and laboratory findings of 95 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a retrospective analysis. *Respir Res* **2020**; 21(1): 74.
8. Henry BM, de Oliveira MHS, Benoit S, Plebani M, Lippi G. Hematologic, biochemical and immune biomarker abnormalities associated with severe illness and mortality in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a meta-analysis. *Clin Chem Lab Med* **2020**; 58(7): 1021-8.
9. Ponti G, Maccaferri M, Ruini C, Tomasi A, Ozben T. Biomarkers associated with COVID-19 disease progression. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci* **2020**: 1-11.
10. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* **2020**.

11. Mardani R, Ahmadi Vasmehjani A, Zali F, et al. Laboratory Parameters in Detection of COVID-19 Patients with Positive RT-PCR; a Diagnostic Accuracy Study. Arch Acad Emerg Med **2020**; 8(1): e43.
12. Li Q, Ding X, Xia G, et al. Eosinopenia and elevated C-reactive protein facilitate triage of COVID-19 patients in fever clinic: a retrospective case-control study. EClinicalMedicine **2020**: 100375.
13. Liu Y, Du X, Chen J, et al. Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio as an independent risk factor for mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. J Infect **2020**; 81(1): e6-e12.
14. Tatum D, Taghavi S, Houghton A, Stover J, Toraih E, Duchesne J. Neutrophil-to-Lymphocyte Ratio and Outcomes in Louisiana Covid-19 Patients. Shock **2020**.
15. Lippi G, Plebani M. Laboratory abnormalities in patients with COVID-2019 infection. Clin Chem Lab Med **2020**; 58(7): 1131-4.
16. Alnor A, Sandberg MB, Gils C, Vinholt PJ. Laboratory tests and outcome for patients with COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Appl Lab Med **2020**.
17. Ferrari D, Motta A, Strollo M, Banfi G, Locatelli M. Routine blood tests as a potential diagnostic tool for COVID-19. Clin Chem Lab Med **2020**; 58(7): 1095-9.
18. Brinati D, Campagner A, Ferrari D, Locatelli M, Banfi G, Cabitza F. Detection of COVID-19 Infection from Routine Blood Exams with Machine Learning: A Feasibility Study. J Med Syst **2020**; 44(8): 135.
19. Tu YP, Jennings R, Hart B, et al. Swabs Collected by Patients or Health Care Workers for SARS-CoV-2 Testing. N Engl J Med **2020**; 383(5): 494-6.
20. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. JAMA **2020**.
21. Gorzer I, Buchta C, Chiba P, et al. First results of a national external quality assessment scheme for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 genome sequences. J Clin Virol **2020**; 129: 104537.

TABLES

Table 1. Comparison of Demographic Characteristics and 28-day Clinical Outcome between COVID-19 Positive and Negative tested Patients.

Characteristic	COVID-19 Positive (N=208)	COVID-19 Negative (N=382)	P Value
Male – no./total no. (%)	117 (56.3)	197 (51.6)	0.276*
Age			
Median (IQR) - yr	72 (57-79.75)	70 (54-81)	0.526 [†]
Comorbidities – no./total no. (%)			
Hypertension	114 (54.8)	229 (59.9)	0.227*
Diabetes	50 (24.0)	100 (26.2)	0.569*
Coronary heart disease*	33 (15.9)	82 (21.5)	0.101*
Chronic lung disease [†]	22 (10.6)	78 (20.4)	0.002*
Chronic kidney disease [‡]	29 (13.9)	64 (16.8)	0.371*
Malignant tumor [§]	12 (5.8)	68 (17.8)	<0.001*
Cerebro vascular accident¶	13 (6.3)	31 (8.1)	0.410*
Chronic liver disease [□]	2 (1.0)	23 (6.0)	0.004*
Human immunodeficiency virus	0	3 (0.8)	0.556 [‡]
Clinical 28-day outcome – no. (%)			
Not hospitalized/outpatient	23 (11.1)	33 (8.6)	<0.001*
Discharged after ≤28 days hospitalization not requiring ICU support or ventilation	97 (46.6)	245 (64.1)	
Discharged after ≤28 days hospitalization requiring ICU support and/or ventilation	4 (1.9)	25 (6.5)	

still in hospital after day 28	31 (14.9)	44 (11.5)	
Died before day 28	53 (25.5)	35 (9.2)	

390 Abbreviation: COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit; IQR, interquartile range

391 * Chi-square test; † Mann-Whitney U-test; ‡ Fischer's exact test

392

393

Table 2. Comparison of Standard Blood Laboratory Parameters between COVID-19 Positive and Negative tested Patients.

Parameters	N*	COVID-19 Positive	N*	COVID-19 Negative	P Value
<i>Blood count</i>					
Leucocytes (10⁹/L)					
Median (IQR)	207	6.13 (4.80-8.08)	378	9.06 (6.59-12.45)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Low +normal (≤10.0)	179	86.5	221	58.5	<0.001 [‡]
High (>10.0)	28	13.5	157	41.5	
Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio					
Median (IQR)	534	5.00 (2.83-8.10)		5.44 (3.30-9.25)	0.032 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
≤2.33	36	19.8	27	7.7	<0.001 [‡]
>2.33	146	80.2	325	92.3	
Basophils (10⁹/L)					
Median (IQR)	182	0.02 (0.01-0.03)	352	0.03 (0.02-0.04)	<0.001 [†]
Eosinophils (10⁹/L)					
Median (IQR)	182	0.01 (0.00-0.05)	352	0.10 (0.04-0.20)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Low (<0.1)	155	85.2	176	50.0	<0.001 [‡]
Normal + high (≥0.1)	27	14.8	176	50.0	
Monocytes (10⁹/L)					
Median (IQR)	182	0.47 (0.30-0.64)	352	0.56 (0.40-0.77)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Low + normal (≤0.9)	169	92.9	299	84.9	0.008 [‡]
High (>0.9)	13	7.1	53	15.1	
Thrombocytes (10⁹/L)					
Median (IQR)	207	201 (161-252)	377	227 (169.5-299)	0.002 [†]
Hemoglobin (g/dL)					

Median (IQR)	207	13.50 (12.30-14.70)	378	11.75 (10.28-13.33)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Low (f: <11.8; m: <13.5)	67	32.4	234	61.9	<0.001 [‡]
Normal + high (f: ≥11.8; m: ≥13.5)	140	67.6	144	38.1	
Inflammation					
C-reactive protein (mg/dL)					
Median (IQR)	205	61.80 (25.45-129.50)	381	33.60 (7.25-93.56)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
<22 mg/dL	44	21.5	161	42.3	<0.001 [†]
≥22 mg/dL	161	78.5	220	57.7	
Coagulation					
Activated partial thromboplastin time (sec)					
Median (IQR)	141	29.90 (27.00-33.05)	298	27.00 (24.00-31.00)	<0.001 [†]
Heart function					
Creatine Kinase (U/L)					
Median (IQR)	181	127.0 (63.0-243.5)	336	102.5 (50.0-216.0)	0.023 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Normal (≤190)	113	62.4	246	73.2	0.011 [‡]
High (>190)	68	37.4	90	26.8	
Lactate dehydrogenase (U/L)					
Median (IQR)	157	285.0 (228.0-384.5)	294	225.0 (189.0-297.75)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Normal (≤250)	55	35.0	173	58.8	<0.001 [‡]
High (>250)	102	65.0	121	41.2	

Abbreviations: f, female; IQR, interquartile range; L, liter; m, male.

* Number of parameters available. [†] Mann-Whitney U-test [‡] Chi-square test [§] Fisher's exact test

Table 2 (continued). Comparison of Standard Blood Laboratory Parameters between COVID-19 Positive and Negative tested Patients.

Parameters	N*	COVID-19	N*	COVID-19	P Value
		Positive		Negative	
<i>Liver function</i>					
Alanine aminotransferase (U/L)					
Median (IQR)	171	32.00 (21.00-53.00)	346	25.00 (15.00-45.00)	0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Normal (≤45)	111	64.9	261	75.4	0.012 [‡]
High (>45)	60	35.1	85	24.6	
Aspartate aminotransferase (U/L)					
Median (IQR)	124	47.00 (29.00-70.00)	205	26.00 (20.00-52.00)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Normal (≤35)	46	37.1	130	63.4	<0.001 [‡]
High (>35)	78	62.9	75	36.6	
Lipase (U/L)					
Median (IQR)	151	39.00 (25.00-65.00)	282	23.00 (14.00-41.00)	<0.001 [†]
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Normal (≤60.0)	106	70.2	240	85.1	<0.001 [‡]
High (>60.0)	45	29.8	42	14.9	
<i>Renal function</i>					
Creatinine (mg/dL)					
Distribution – no./total no. (%)					
Low (<0.5)	0	0	12	3.2	0.009 [‡]
Normal + high (≥0.5)	208	100.0	365	96.8	

Abbreviations: f, female; IQR, interquartile range; L, liter; m, male.

* Number of parameters available. [†] Mann-Whitney U-test [‡] Chi-square test [§] Fisher's exact test

Table 3. Uni- and Multivariate Analyses of Standard Blood Laboratory Parameters with COVID-19 Positive tested Patients as the Dependent Variable.

Parameters	Univariate OR (95% CI)	P Value	Multivariate OR (95% CI)	P Value
<i>Blood count</i>				
Leukocytes (10 ⁹ /L)	0.81 (0.77-0.86)	<0.001	0.69 (0.58-0.83)	<0.001
Leukocytes (ref: >10.0)	1.00			
leukopenia+normal (≤10.0)	4.54 (2.90-7.11)	<0.001	-	-
Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio	1.00 (0.98-1.02)	0.745	-	-
Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (ref: >2.33)	1.00			
≤2.33	2.97 (1.74-5.07)	<0.001	1.72 (0.45-6.58)	0.428
Basophils (10 ⁹ /L)	9.55*10 ⁻¹⁸	<0.001	0.00	0.133
	(6.02*10 ⁻²³ -1.51*10 ⁻¹²)		(0.00-1334.76)	
Eosinophils (10 ⁹ /L)	0.00005 (0.000003-0.001)	<0.001	0.00 (0.00-0.97)	0.011
Eosinophils (ref: ≥0.1)	1.00			
eosinopenia (<0.1)	5.74 (3.63-9.09)	<0.001	-	-
Monocytes (10 ⁹ /L)	0.26 (0.13-0.51)	<0.001	0.93 (0.12-7.06)	0.942
Monocytes (ref: >0.9)	1.00			
monocytopenia+normal (≤0.9)	2.30(1.22-4.35)	0.010	-	-
Thrombocytes (10 ⁹ /L)	0.998 (0.997-1.00)	0.013	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.272
Thrombocytes (>370)	1.00			
thrombopenia+normal (≤370)	2.00 (1.10-3.66)	0.024	-	-
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	1.39 (1.27-1.52)	<0.001	1.63 (1.29-2.07)	<0.001
Hemoglobin (ref: f: <11.8; m: <13.5)	1.00			
normal+high (f: ≥11.8; m: ≥13.5)	3.40 (2.38-4.86)	<0.001	-	-
<i>Inflammation</i>				
C-reactive protein (U/L)	1.004 (1.002-1.006)	<0.001	1.01 (1.00-1.02)	0.025
C-reactive protein (ref: <22 mg/dL)	1.00			
≥22 mg/dL	2.68 (1.81-3.96)	<0.001	-	-

<i>Coagulation</i>				
Activated partial thromboplastin time (sec)	1.04 (1.01-1.08)	0.005	0.99 (0.92-1.06)	0.683
<i>Heart function</i>				
Creatine Kinase (U/L)	1.00004 (0.9999-1.0002)	0.675	-	-
Creatine kinase (ref: ≤190)	1.00			
high (>190)	1.65 (1.12-2.42)	0.011	0.84 (0.28-2.59)	0.767
Lactate dehydrogenase (U/L)	1.0005 (0.9996-1.001)	0.274	-	-
Lactate dehydrogenase (ref: ≤250)	1.00			
high (>250)	2.65 (1.77-3.96)	<0.001	2.36 (0.71-7.83)	0.159
<i>Liver function</i>				
Alanine aminotransferase (U/L)	0.999 (0.997-1.002)	0.519	-	-
Alanine aminotransferase (ref: ≤45)	1.00			
high (>45)	1.66 (1.12-2.47)	0.013	1.65 (0.55-4.96)	0.375
Aspartate aminotransferase (U/L)	1.000 (0.998-1.001)	0.653	-	-
Aspartate aminotransferase (ref: ≤35)	1.00			
high (>35)	2.94 (1.85-4.67)	<0.001	1.39 (0.44-4.38)	0.573
Lipase (U/L)	1.002 (0.999-1.005)	0.137	-	-
Lipase (ref: ≤60)	1.00			
high (>60)	2.43 (1.50-3.92)	<0.001	1.44 (0.42-4.97)	0.565
<i>Renal function</i>				
Creatinine (ref: 0.5-1.2mg/dL)	1.00		-	-
low (<0.5)	0.00	0.999		
high (>1.2)	1.26 (0.87-1.82)	0.214		

Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio.

Table 4 Diagnostic Performance of Single Standard Blood Laboratory Parameters to Distinguish Between COVID-19 Positive from Negative Tested Patients.

Parameters	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	AUC (95% CI)	P value
Leukocytes ($\leq 10.0 \times 10^9/L$)	86.5	41.5	44.8	84.9	0.640 (0.595-0.685)	<0.001
NLR (≤ 2.33)	19.8	92.3	57.1	69.0	0.561 (0.508-0.613)	0.022
Eosinophils ($< 0.10 \times 10^9/L$)	85.2	50.0	46.8	86.7	0.676 (0.630-0.722)	<0.001
Monocytes ($\leq 0.9 \times 10^9/L$)	92.9	15.1	36.1	80.3	0.540 (0.489-0.590)	0.134
Thrombocytes ($\leq 370 \times 10^9/L$)	92.8	13.5	37.1	77.3	0.209 (0.483-0.580)	0.209
Hemoglobin (f: ≥ 11.8 ; m: ≥ 13.5 g/dL)	67.6	61.9	49.3	77.7	0.648 (0.601-0.694)	<0.001
CRP (≥ 22 mg/dL)	78.5	42.3	42.3	78.5	0.604 (0.557-0.651)	<0.001
CK (> 190 U/L)	37.6	73.2	43.0	68.5	0.554 (0.501-0.606)	0.043
LDH (> 250 U/L)	65.0	58.8	45.7	75.9	0.619 (0.565-0.673)	<0.001
ALT (> 45 U/L)	35.1	75.4	41.4	70.2	0.553 (0.499-0.606)	0.051
AST (> 35 U/L)	62.9	63.4	51.0	73.9	0.632 (0.569-0.694)	<0.001
Lipase (> 60 U/L)	29.8	85.1	51.7	69.4	0.575 (0.517-0.632)	0.011

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; CK, creatine kinase; CRP, C-reactive protein; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; NLR, Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio.

Table 5. Blood parameter patterns of COVID-19 positive tested patients of various studies.

	Present study	COVID-19	positive COVID-19
	COVID-19 positive	positive	severe
Leucocytes	↓	↓ [11, 12, 17]	↑ [8, 9, 16]
Neutrophils	↓	↓ [11, 12, 17]	↑ [8, 9, 16]
Lymphocytes	↓	↓ [11, 12, 17]	↓ [8, 9, 16]
Eosinophils	↓	↓ [12, 17]	↓ [8, 9]
Thrombocytes	↓	↓ [12]; not sig. ↓ [17]	↓ [8, 9, 16]
Hemoglobin	↑	not sig. ↑ [12]	↓ [8, 16]
CRP	↑	↑ [11, 12, 17]	↑ [8, 9, 16]
ALT	↑	↑ [12, 17]	↑ [8, 9]
AST	↑	↑ [12, 17]	↑ [8, 9, 16]
LDH	↑	↑ [12, 17]	↑ [8, 9, 16]

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; CRP, C-reactive protein; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase.

FIGURE and figure legend

Figure 1. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve of (A) the model with and area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 0.915 (95% confidence intervals (CI), 0.876 to 0.955) and (B) the combined blood parameters leucocytes (dotted grey line; AUC=0.278, 95%CI, 0.232 to 0.324), eosinophils (straight black line; AUC=0.208, 95%CI, 0.165 to 0.250), hemoglobin (straight grey line; AUC=0.693, 95%CI, 0.646 to 0.739), and CRP (dotted black line; AUC=0.605, 95%CI, 0.555 to 0.655).