FULL TITLE: Detection of SARS-Cov-2 RNA in serum is associated with increased mortality risk in hospitalized COVID-19 patients.

3

SHORT TITLE: Increased mortality in COVID-19 patients with relevant CoVemia.

5

AUTHORS: Diego A. Rodríguez-Serrano^{1¶*}, Emilia Roy-Vallejo^{2¶}, Nelly D. Zurita Cruz³, Alexandra Martín Ramírez³, Sebastián C. Rodríguez-García⁴, Nuria Arevalillo-Fernández¹, José María Galván-Román², Leticia Fontán García-Rodrigo³, Lorena Vega-Piris⁵, Marta Chicot Llano¹, David Arribas Méndez⁶, Begoña González de Marcos¹, Julia Hernando Santos⁶, Ana Sánchez Azofra⁷, Elena Ávalos Pérez-Urria⁷, Pablo Rodríguez-Cortes², Laura Esparcia⁸, Ana Marcos-Jimenez⁸, Santiago Sánchez-Alonso⁸, Irene Llorente⁴, Joan Soriano^{7,9}, Carmen Suárez Fernández^{2,9}, Rosario García-Vicuña⁴, Julio Ancochea^{7,9}, Jesús Sanz², Cecilia Muñoz-Calleja^{8,9}, Rafael de la Cámara¹⁰, Alfonso Canabal Berlanga¹, Isidoro González-Álvaro^{4&}, Laura Cardeñoso^{3&}, on behalf of the REINMUN-COVID Group[^].

16

[¶] These authors have contributed equally.

[&] These authors also contributed equally to this work.

* Corresponding author: cancabrilla@hotmail.com (DA R-S)

AFFILIATIONS

¹ Intensive Care Unit. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. Madrid. Spain

² Internal Medicine Department. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. IIS-IP. Madrid.

Spain. preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 24 ³ Microbiology Department. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. IIS-IP. Madrid. Spain
- 25 ⁴ Rheumatology Department. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. IIS-IP. Madrid. Spain
- 26 ⁵ Methodology Unit. Biomedical Research Institute. Hospital Universitario La Princesa.
- 27 IIS-IP. Madrid. Spain
- 28 ⁶ Anaesthesiology Department. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. IIS-IP. Madrid. Spain
- 29 ⁷ Pneumology Department. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. IIS-IP. Madrid. Spain
- 30 ⁸ Immunology Department. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. IIS-IP. Madrid. Spain
- 31 ⁹ Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. Madrid, Spain.
- 32 ¹⁰Hematology Department. Hospital Universitario La Princesa. IIS-IP. Madrid. Spain

33 ^ Membership of REINMUN-COVID Group is provided in the Acknowledgments.

34

35

36

37 **ABBREVIATIONS:** CI, Confident interval; COPD, Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease;

38 CoVemia, SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease-2019; CRP, C-

39 reactive protein; Ct, Cycle threshold; FiO₂, , Fraction of inspired oxygen; HR, Hazard

40 ratio; ICU, Intensive Care Unit; IL, Interleukin; IMV, Invasive mechanical ventilation;

41 IQR, Interquartile range; IRR, Incidence risk ratio; LDH, Lactate dehydrogenase; NK,

42 Natural killer; NPTS, Nasopharyngeal and throat swab; OR, Odds ratio; PaO₂, Arterial

43 oxygen tension; PCR, Polymerase chain reaction; qSOFA, Quick SOFA; RNA, Ribonucleic

44 acid; ROC, Receiver operating characteristic; rRT-PCR, Real-time Reverse-Transcription

45 Polymerase Chain Reaction; SARS-CoV-2, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome

46 Coronavirus 2; SD, Standard deviation; SOFA, Sepsis related Organ Failure Assessment;

47 TFS, Thermo Fisher Scientific

48

49

ABSTRACT

Background

COVID-19 has overloaded national health services worldwide. Thus, early identification of patients at risk of poor outcomes is critical. Our objective was to analyse SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in serum as a severity biomarker in COVID-19.

Methods and Findings

Retrospective observational study including 193 patients admitted for COVID-19. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum (CoVemia) was performed with samples collected at 48-72 hours of admission by two techniques from Roche and Thermo Fischer Scientific (TFS). Main outcome variables were mortality and need for ICU admission during hospitalization for COVID-19.

CoVemia was detected in 50-60% of patients depending on technique. The correlation of Ct in serum between both techniques was good (intraclass correlation coefficient: 0.612; $p < 0.001$). Patients with CoVemia were older ($p = 0.006$), had poorer baseline oxygenation ($\text{PaO}_2/\text{FiO}_2$; $p < 0.001$), more severe lymphopenia ($p < 0.001$) and higher LDH ($p < 0.001$), IL-6 ($p = 0.021$), C-reactive protein (CRP; $p = 0.022$) and procalcitonin ($p = 0.002$) serum levels.

We defined "relevant CoVemia" when detection Ct was < 34 with Roche and < 31 for TFS. These thresholds had 95% sensitivity and 35 % specificity. Relevant CoVemia predicted death during hospitalization (OR 9.2 [3.8 - 22.6] for Roche, OR 10.3 [3.6 - 29.3] for TFS; $p < 0.001$). Cox regression models, adjusted by age, sex and Charlson index, identified increased LDH serum levels and relevant CoVemia (HR = 9.87 [4.13-23.57] for

TFS viremia and HR = 7.09 [3.3-14.82] for Roche viremia) as the best markers to predict mortality.

Conclusions

CoVemia assessment at admission is the most useful biomarker for predicting mortality in COVID-19 patients. CoVemia is highly reproducible with two different techniques (TFS and Roche), has a good consistency with other severity biomarkers for COVID-19 and better predictive accuracy.

AUTHOR SUMMARY

COVID-19 shows a very heterogeneous clinical picture. In addition, it has overloaded national health services worldwide. Therefore, early identification of patients with poor prognosis is critical to improve the use of limited health resources. In this work, we evaluated whether baseline SARS-CoV2 RNA detection in blood (CoVemia) is associated with worse outcomes. We studied almost 200 patients admitted to our hospital and about 50-60% of them showed positive CoVemia. Patients with positive CoVemia were older and had more severe disease; CoVemia was also more frequent in patients requiring admission to the ICU. Moreover, we defined “relevant CoVemia”, as the amount of viral load that better predicted mortality obtaining 95% sensitivity and 35% specificity. In addition, relevant CoVemia was a better predictor than other biomarkers such as LDH, lymphocyte count, interleukin-6, and indexes used in ICU such as qSOFA and CURB65.

In summary, detection of CoVemia is the best biomarker to predict death in COVID-19 patients. Furthermore, it is easy to be implemented and is reproducible with two techniques (Roche and Thermo Fisher Scientific) that are currently used for diagnosis in nasopharyngeal swabs samples.

INTRODUCTION

The wide spectrum of COVID-19 severity ranges from asymptomatic to critical cases, albeit less than 10% of patients develop a severe disease [1]. Even though only a minority of patients need hospitalization for COVID-19, the higher transmission rate of SARS-CoV-2 compared to other viruses, the absence of previous immunity in the population, and the high incidence of this disease in a short period of time are collapsing health care systems worldwide [2]. One remaining challenge from COVID-19 is the difficulty of predicting individual prognosis since determinants of disease severity remain unclear. Previous studies have suggested that age, male sex, obesity, hypertension, and underlying diseases like hematologic malignancies are associated with worse prognosis [3–5]. Likewise, some blood biomarkers are able to predict the emergence of the cytokine storm leading to severe acute respiratory syndrome, the most frequent cause of clinical deterioration in COVID-19 patients [6–8].

Despite the tropism of SARS-CoV-2 for the upper respiratory tissue [9], the relevance of its viral load in nasopharyngeal samples remains controversial [10]. However, several authors have reported the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum or plasma samples (henceforth CoVemia) associated with a worse prognosis, assessed as higher probability of clinical deterioration, higher levels of interleukin (IL)-6, IL-5 or CXCL10, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, critical disease and death [8,11–13]. Notwithstanding, the detection of CoVemia with more sensitive techniques was not associated with mortality, but with immune suppression status [14].

Therefore, we aimed to assess whether there is an association of CoVemia with COVID-19 severity using two different real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) techniques, and compare them with other suggested severity biomarkers.

RESULTS

Demographic and clinical characteristics of the study population

One hundred and ninety-three patients were included; their main demographic and baseline clinical characteristics and laboratory findings are shown in Table 1 and S1 Table.

Table 1. Baseline clinical characteristics of patients according to SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in blood by Roche technique

	Study Population (n = 193)	Absent (n = 100)	CoVemia Present (n = 93)	P Value
Age	63 (55 - 71)	61 (54 - 68)	67 (59 - 73)	0.001
Male sex	134 (69)	68 (68)	66 (71)	0.655
Comorbidities	137 (71)	67 (67)	70 (75)	0.206
Duration of symptoms at admission (days)	6 (4 - 8)	7 (5 - 9)	6 (4-8)	0.120
Baseline PaO₂/FiO₂	188 (100 - 282)	250 (145 - 348)	146 (90 - 214)	< 0.001
<i>Treatment during hospitalization</i>				
Hydroxychloroquine	186 (96)	97(97)	89(96)	0.629
Lopinavir/Ritonavir	168 (87)	83 (83)	85 (91)	0.083
Azithromycin	133 (69)	69 (69)	64 (69)	0.978
Interferon-β	8 (4)	2 (2)	6 (6)	0.121
Glucocorticoids	134 (69)	62 (62)	72 (77)	0.020
Methylprednisolone bolus	101 (63)	42 (53)	59 (72)	0.014
Tocilizumab	91 (47)	36 (36)	55 (59)	0.001
<i>Laboratory Findings</i>				
WBC (10 ³ /mm ³)	7.18 (4.82 - 9.61)	6.89 (4.66 - 9.35)	7.47 (5.00 - 10.36)	0.374
NR: 4.00 - 10.00				
Lymphocytes/mm³	790 (590 - 1165)	950 (720 - 1270)	660 (510 - 860)	< 0.001

NR: 1.00 -4.00				
Creatinine (mg/dl)	0.86 (0.67 – 1.09)	0.85 (0.69 – 1.03)	0.90 (0.63 – 1.16)	0.563
NR:0.70 - 1.20				
LDH (U/L)	390 (278 - 512)	314 (246 - 428)	461 (371 - 565)	< 0.001
NR: 135 - 225				
CK (U/L)	100 (49 - 270)	94 (49 - 155)	110 (56 - 336)	0.315
NR: 20 - 180				
Serum IL-6 (pg/ml)	20.7 (7.9 – 52.1)	16.4 (7.5 – 41.3)	27.0 (7.9 – 70.3)	0.031
NR: < 30 pg/ml				
Ferritin (ng/ml)	1542 (871 – 2617)	1418 (717 - 2068)	1637 (944 - 3088)	0.267
NR: 30 - 400				
CRP (mg/dL)	12.2 (5.5 - 23.0)	10.3 (5.1 – 19.2)	14.7 (7.5 – 25.7)	0.026
NR: 0.00 - 0.50				
PCT (ng/ml)	0.19 (0.11 – 0.41)	0.13 (0.08 – 0.31)	0.26 (0.14 – 0.56)	0.002
NR: 0.05 - 0.09				
D-dimer (µg/ml)	0.78 (0.52 – 1.47)	0.7 (0.45 – 1.22)	0.87 (0.67 – 1.75)	0.030
NR:0.14 - 0.50				

All categorical variables are expressed as number (%) and quantitative variables as median (p25-75).

PaO₂/FiO₂: arterial oxygen tension – fraction of inspired oxygen ratio; WBC: White Blood Count; NR:

Normal Range; LDH: Lactate Dehydrogenase; CK: Creatin Kinase; IL6: Interleukin-6; CRP: C-Reactive

Protein; PCT: Procalcitonin.

S1 Table. Baseline clinical characteristics of patients according to SARS-CoV-2 RNA

detection in blood by Thermo Fisher Systems technique.

	Study Population (n = 193)	Absent (n = 78)	CoVemia Present (n = 115)	P value
Age	63 (55 - 71)	61 (53 - 69)	65 (59 - 71)	0.012
Male sex	134 (69)	50 (64)	84 (73)	0.186
Comorbidities	137 (71)	55 (70.5)	82 (71)	0.905
Duration of symptoms at admission (days)	6 (4 - 8)	7 (4-9)	6 (5-8)	0.989
Baseline PaO₂/FiO₂	188 (100 - 282)	255 (172 – 352)	146 (87 – 232)	< 0.001
<i>Treatment during hospitalization</i>				
Hydroxychloroquine	186 (96)	76 (97)	110 (96)	0.515
Lopinavir/Ritonavir	168 (87)	64 (82)	104 (90)	0.089
Azithromycin	133 (69)	54 (69)	79 (69)	0.937
Interferon-β	8 (4)	2 (3)	6 (5)	0.364
Glucocorticoids	134 (69)	48 (62)	86 (75)	0.050
Methylprednisolone bolus	101 (63)	30 (51)	71 (70)	0.018
Tocilizumab	91 (47)	24 (31)	67 (58)	< 0.001
<i>Laboratory Findings</i>				
WBC (10 ³ /mm ³)	7.18 (4.82 – 9.61)	6.91 (4.89 – 8.56)	7.45 (4.66 – 10.89)	0.328

NR: 4.00 - 10.00				
Lymphocyte/mm³	790 (535 – 1165)	1070 (755 – 1485)	700 (535 – 930)	< 0.001
NR: 1.00 -4.00				
Creatinine (mg/dl)	0.86 (0.73 – 1.09)	0.83 (0.67 – 1.01)	0.92 (0.73 – 1.16)	0.044
NR:0.70 - 1.20				
LDH (U/L)	390 (278 - 512)	289 (223 - 390)	457 (350 – 548)	< 0.001
NR: 135 - 225				
CK (U/L)	100 (49 - 270)	93 (58-155)	117 (48 - 293)	0.412
NR: 20 - 180				
Serum IL-6 (pg/ml)	20.7 (7.9 – 52.1)	17.6 (7.5 – 30.4)	26.5 (8.2 – 75.0)	0.012
NR: < 30 pg/ml				
Ferritin (ng/ml)	1542 (871 – 2617)	1390 (634 - 2068)	1637 (944 - 3214)	0.104
NR: 30 - 400				
CRP (mg/dL)	12.2 (5.5 – 23.0)	9.1 (4.04 – 18.7)	14.1 (7.3 – 25.8)	0.002
NR: 0.00 - 0.50				
PCT (ng/ml)	0.20 (0.11 – 0.41)	0.13 (0.07 – 0.36)	0.23 (0.13 – 0.46)	0.015
NR: 0.05 - 0.09				
D-dimer (mg/ml)	0.78 (0.52 – 1.47)	0.70 (0.39 – 1.08)	0.87 (0.62 – 2.02)	0.004
NR:0.14 - 0.50				

All categorical variables are expressed as number (%) and quantitative variables as median (p25-75).

PaO₂/FiO₂: arterial oxygen tension – fraction of inspired oxygen ratio; WBC: White Blood Count; NR:

Normal Range; LDH: Lactate Dehydrogenase; CK: Creatin Kinase; IL6: Interleukin-6; CRP: C-Reactive

Protein; PCT: Procalcitonin.

Depending on the technique, CoVemia was detected in 95 (48%; Roche) and 117 (59%;

TFS) patients; the correlation between Ct (Cycle threshold) in serum obtained with both

techniques was very good ($r = 0.738$ [0.667 - 0.795], $p < 0.001$), and detection by TFS

was more sensitive than by Roche (S1A Figure). The agreement to detect CoVemia was

75.5% and the intraclass correlation coefficient was 0.612 ($p < 0.001$). Conversely, the

correlation of Ct between nasopharyngeal and throat swab (NPTS) and serum samples

was weak either with TFS or Roche techniques (S1B and 1C Figure, respectively).

S1 Figure: Correlation between quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in serum (CoVemia), either with Thermo Fisher Scientific (TFS) or Roche, and in nasopharyngeal and throat swab (NPTS). A) Correlation between CoVemia with TFS and Roche techniques; Correlation between SARS-CoV-2 detection in NPTS samples and Covemia using the TFS technique (B) or the Roche technique (C). Data are shown as dot plots of the mean Ct values of the RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 and the fitted linear prediction obtained with the option *lfit* of the command *twoway* of Stata. Correlation coefficients and significance levels were estimated with the Pearson's test.

Patients with detectable CoVemia were older ($p = 0.006$), with worse baseline arterial oxygen tension/fraction of inspired oxygen ratio ($\text{PaO}_2/\text{FiO}_2$; $p < 0.001$), lower lymphocyte count ($p < 0.001$) and higher LDH ($p < 0.001$), IL-6 ($p = 0.021$), C-reactive protein (CRP; $p = 0.022$) and procalcitonin ($p = 0.002$) serum levels compared to patients without detectable CoVemia. In addition, they were more frequently treated with glucocorticoids ($p = 0.016$), either oral or bolus ($p = 0.015$), and with tocilizumab ($p = 0.001$) (Table 1 and S1 Table).

There were no significant differences in symptom duration at the time of sample collection between patients with and without CoVemia (9 days [95%CI: 4 – 13] and 8 [6 – 11] respectively; $p = 0.223$) with both techniques. Neither we observed correlation between disease duration and viral RNA detection in serum with both techniques ($r = -0.048$ [-0.188 - 0.094], $p = 0.510$ for Roche, and $r = -0.104$ [-0.241 - 0.038], $p = 0.151$ for TFS).

Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 viremia is higher in patients requiring ICU admission

In order to evaluate the relationship between COVID-19 severity and viremia we first studied the relative frequency of CoVemia in patients who required ICU admission and those who did not. As shown in Figure 1, viremia was significantly more frequent for both techniques in patients requiring ICU ($p < 0.001$ for Roche and $p = 0.002$ for TFS). Although TFS was more sensitive to detect CoVemia, it seemed to be less specific to predict the need for ICU (OR 2.47 [95% CI: 1.37 - 4.47], $p = 0.003$ for TFS vs 3.04 [1.71 - 5.44] $p < 0.001$ for Roche).

Fig. 1. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum (CoVemia) is more frequent in patients requiring intensive care unit (ICU) admission. A) Roche technique. B) Thermo Fisher Scientific technique. Statistical significance was determined with the Chi squared test.

Additionally, we performed a multivariable logistic regression in order to determine whether CoVemia can help predicting ICU admission compared to other variables. The best model to predict the need for ICU admission included the following variables: COPD, total lymphocyte count and PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission (Table 2). When we forced CoVemia into this model, it did not reach statistical significance either when it was assessed by Roche or by TFS (Table 2).

Table 2. Variables predicting the need for Intensive Care Unit admission.

	Roche (n = 171)		Thermo Fisher Systems (n = 171)	
	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	P
COPD	4.5 (0.8 - 24.2)	0.079	4.6 (0.8 - 24.9)	0.076
Low lymphocytes	1.7 (0.9 - 3.3)	0.130	1.5 (0.8 - 3.1)	0.218
Low PaO ₂ /FiO ₂	4.0 (1.8 - 8.7)	< 0.001	4.0 (1.9 - 8.7)	< 0.001
CoVemia	1.7 (0.6 - 4.6)	0.333	1.4 (0.7 - 2.9)	0.341

COPD: Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease; CI: Confidence Interval; OR: Odds Ratio; PaO₂/FiO₂:

arterial oxygen tension – fraction of inspired oxygen ratio.

In addition, when we specifically studied the 86 patients that required ICU admission, no association was found between the presence of CoVemia and the development of multiorgan dysfunction syndrome prior to admission and during the first 24 hours at the ICU (S2 Table).

S2 Table. Multiorgan failure and dysfunction syndrome according to baseline SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in serum (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

	Negative CoVemia (n = 26)	Positive CoVemia (n = 60)	Total (n = 86)	P value
MODS (pa)	12 (46.2)	26 (43.3)	38 (44.2)	0.983
MODS (24 hrs)	19 (73.1)	40 (66.7)	59 (68.6)	0.832
MOF (pa)	1 (3.8)	3 (5.0)	4 (4.7)	> 0.99
MOF (24 hrs)	13 (50)	29 (48.3)	42 (48.8)	0.922
Cardiovascular (pa)	1 (3.8)	5 (8.3)	6 (7.0)	0.661
Liver (pa)	3 (11.5)	4 (6.7)	7 (8.1)	0.674
Renal (pa)	5 (19.2)	9 (15.0)	14 (16.3)	0.758
CNS (pa)	2 (7.7)	6 (10.0)	8 (9.3)	> 0.99
Coagulation (pa)	4 (15.4)	12 (20.0)	16 (18.6)	0.767
Cardiovascular (24 hrs)	14 (50.0)	33 (55.0)	47 (54.7)	0.719
Liver (24 hrs)	2 (7.7)	6 (10.0)	8 (9.3)	> 0.99
Renal (24 hrs)	4 (15.4)	9 (15.0)	13 (15.1)	> 0.99
CNS (24 hrs)	2 (7.7)	3 (5.0)	5 (5.8)	0.648
Coagulation (24 hrs)	6 (23.1)	9 (15.0)	15 (17.4)	0.435

MODS (pa): Multiorgan Dysfunction syndrome prior to admission; MODS (24 hrs): Multiorgan Dysfunction syndrome during the first 24 hours at the ICU; MOF (pa): Multiorgan Failure prior to admission; MOF (24 hrs): Multiorgan Failure during the first 24 hours at the ICU. Cardiovascular (pa): cardiovascular

dysfunction/failure prior to admission. Liver (pa): liver dysfunction/failure prior to admission; Renal (pa): renal dysfunction/failure prior to admission; CNS (pa): central nervous system dysfunction/failure prior to admission; Coagulation (pa): platelets dysfunction/failure prior to admission; Cardiovascular (24 hrs): cardiovascular dysfunction/failure during the first 24 hours at the ICU; Liver (24 hrs): dysfunction/failure during the first 24 hours at the ICU; Renal (24 hrs): dysfunction/failure during the first 24 hours at the ICU; CNS (24 hrs): central nervous system dysfunction/failure during the first 24 hours at the ICU; Coagulation (24 hrs): platelets dysfunction/failure during the first 24 hours at the ICU.

SARS-CoV-2 viremia predicts mortality in COVID-19 admitted patients

As it was previously suggested that CoVemia can be associated with a higher risk of mortality, we also analyzed how both techniques predicted death during admission. TFS was more sensitive than Roche's technique but less specific either in the whole population (OR 5.8 [2.6 - 13.3] for Roche and 3.3 [1.4 - 7.4] for TFS), or after stratification by requirement of ICU (S2 Figure).

S2 Figure. Mortality is higher among patients with positive CoVemia, either in the whole population (left panels), in those patients requiring ICU admission (middle panels) or those no requiring ICU (right panels). Odds ratio (OR) and significance level for mortality

according to the presence of CoVemia was estimated with the cs command of Stata. TFS:

Thermo Fisher Scientific.

Therefore, we analyzed whether a threshold of CoVemia (as Ct) could help to better predict mortality during hospitalization. As shown in Figure 2A and 2B the area under ROC curves for Roche and TFS were quite similar (0.736 [0.642 - 0.829] vs 0.702 [0.603 - 0.801] respectively; $p = 0.323$). The best cut-off to predict mortality was 34 Ct for Roche (sensitivity 91%, specificity 38%) and 31 Ct for TFS (sensitivity 93%, specificity 32%). Using these cut-off points to define “relevant CoVemia”, the capability to predict mortality improved with both techniques: OR 9.2 (3.8 - 22.6) for Roche and 10.3 (3.6 - 29.3) for TFS (Figures 2C and 2D, respectively).

In addition, Kaplan-Meier curves confirmed that those patients with “relevant CoVemia” at admission survived less than those with non-relevant detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Figures 2E and 2F), being slightly higher the incidence risk ratio for CoVemia determined by TFS compared to Roche (IRR 4.1 [2.3 - 6.9] vs 2.4 [1.5 - 3.9] respectively).

Fig. 2. Comprehensive analysis of CoVemia as a prognostic marker of mortality in patients hospitalized for severe COVID-19. ROC curve-analysis for mortality prediction with Ct values in serum of all patients, according to Roche (A) and Thermo Fisher Scientific [TFS] (B) techniques. Proportion of deceased patients according to relevant CoVemia determined by Roche (C) and TFS (D) techniques. Survival analysis with Kaplan-Meier estimator of patients hospitalized for COVID-19 who presented (dotted lines) and patients who did not present (solid lines) relevant CoVemia according to Roche (E) and TFS (F) techniques.

SARS-CoV-2 viremia correlates with severity biomarkers previously described in COVID-19 patients

In order to further validate the usefulness of CoVemia as predictor of mortality in COVID-19, we analyzed its association with clinical and laboratory parameters that have been previously associated with worse outcomes [2,7,15]. As shown in Figure 3, higher levels of CoVemia were more frequent in elderly patients ($p = 0.011$) and correlated with higher qSOFA ($p = 0.022$), CURB65 ($p = 0.014$) and Charlson comorbidity ($p = 0.078$) indexes.

Fig. 3. Association between CoVemia and main sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of patients hospitalized with severe COVID-19. Correlation between CoVemia levels (Ct value) and (A) age (years) and (B) Charlson comorbidity index (score). Distribution of CoVemia levels according to qSOFA index (C), and CURB65 scale (D) scores. All Ct data shown here were obtained by rRT-PCR in serum with Thermo Fisher Scientific (TFS) technique. In A and B panels data are shown as dot plots of the corresponding values and the fitted linear prediction (black line) obtained with the option *lfit* of the command *twoway* of Stata. Correlation coefficients and significance levels were estimated with the Pearson's test. In C and D panels data are shown as box-

plot representing the interquartile range (p75 upper edge, p25 lower edge, p50 midline in the box), p95 (line above the box), and p5 (line below the box). Significance level was determined with the Kruskal Wallis test.

Regarding laboratory parameters, CoVemia showed correlation with IL-6 serum levels and lymphocyte count (Figures 4A and 4B; $p = 0.014$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively), and a better correlation with lactate dehydrogenase serum levels (Figure 4C; $p < 0.001$). However, lower significant association was observed with ferritin and D-dimer levels (Figures 4D and 4E; $p = 0.073$ and $p = 0.023$, respectively).

Fig. 4. CoVemia correlates with the main laboratory prognosis biomarkers described in patients hospitalized with severe COVID-19. Correlation between CoVemia levels (Ct value by Thermo Fisher Scientific [TFS] technique) and IL-6 levels (pg/mL) (A), lymphocytes count (cel/mm³) (B), LDH levels (U/L) (C), ferritin levels (ng/mL) (D), D-Dimer levels (mg/mL) (E). Data are shown as dot plots of the corresponding values and

the fitted linear prediction (black line) obtained with the option *lfit* of the command *twoway* of Stata. Correlation coefficients and significance levels were estimated with the Pearson's test.

Finally, we analyzed the hazard ratio for mortality of CoVemia in comparison with all these parameters. All models were adjusted by age and Charlson index, which significantly affected survival of COVID-19 patients, as well as by sex, which did not significantly affect survival. Baseline qSOFA and CURB65 showed the worst capability to predict survival (Table 3, model 1). On the contrary, the best predictors always included baseline "relevant CoVemia" and high LDH serum levels (Table 3, all models). Interestingly, even when relevant CoVemia, and high LDH levels were included together in model 4, both were able to independently predict survival, although the hazard ratio was higher for the former (Table 3 last two columns; HR 9.87 [4.13 - 23.57] for TFS CoVemia and 7.09 [3.39 - 14.82] for Roche CoVemia; HRs for high LDH 2.48 [1.21 - 5.09] with TFS CoVemia, and 2.39 [1.17 - 4.90] with Roche CoVemia).

Table 3. Mortality predictive value of CoVemia compared to other factors

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	P
qSOFA	0.92	N.S.	N.I.	-	N.I.	-	N.I.	-
CURB65	1.06	N.S.	N.I.	-	N.I.	-	N.I.	-
Low Ly.	1.85	0.080	-	-	1.85	0.091	1.37	0.388
High IL-6	1.95	0.055	1.74	0.121	-	-	1.45	0.304
High LDH	2.74	0.005	2.74	0.008	2.57	0.011	-	-
CoVemia TFS	13.5	< 0.001	11.30	< 0.001	10.4	< 0.001	9.87	< 0.001
CoVemia Roche	8.38	< 0.001	6.84	< 0.001	6.69	< 0.001	7.09	< 0.001

CURB65: Confusion-Urea-Respiratory rate-Blood pressure-65-years-old index; HR: Hazard Ratio; p: p-value; N.S.: not significant; N.I.: not included; Low Ly.: low total lymphocyte count; IL-6: interleukin-6; LDH: lactate dehydrogenase; qSOFA: quick Sepsis related Organ Failure Assessment; TFS: Thermo Fisher Scientific. Model 1 adjusted by age, sex and Charlson index. Model 2 adjusted by age, sex, Charlson index and low total lymphocyte count. Model 3 adjusted by age, sex, Charlson index and high IL-6. Model 4 adjusted by age, sex, Charlson index and high LDH.

DISCUSSION

Many efforts have been made since the first COVID-19 outbreak in China to identify poor prognosis factors in this worldwide and evolving pandemic. Several biomarkers such as low total lymphocyte count, high LDH serum levels, increased acute phase reactants (C-reactive protein, ferritin, fibrinogen, among others) or increased IL-6 serum levels have been proposed [6,15]. Recently, detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in blood has been suggested as a potential severity biomarker [12,13,16–18]. In this regard, our results reinforce these previous data with a main contribution to the management of COVID-19: we have determined a semiquantitative threshold for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in serum early after admission that allows establishing RNA values (“relevant CoVemia”) associated with higher mortality risk. Furthermore, we have shown that, technically, this finding is reproducible and, it is the most useful biomarker in the clinical setting for predicting mortality in COVID-19 patients.

From a technical point of view, we were able to detect CoVemia with high accuracy and concordance by using two commercially available kits, from Roche and TFS, as previously described [19]. These kits had been previously approved for detecting SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal samples. Although the sensitivity of TFS technology was slightly better for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in serum, this difference disappeared when the specific

Ct cut-offs for each kit were applied to define relevant CoVemia. These results support the notion that the CoVemia detection can be highly reproducible since the Roche and TFS technologies are based on different procedures for RNA extraction and retrotranscription, as well as different genes for SARS-CoV-2 detection. Furthermore, our results validate previous reports that used the Roche kit and an “in-house” kit for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection [12,13].

From a clinical point of view, we have shown that CoVemia has a high consistence as a severity biomarker in COVID-19, since it correlates with several variables that have been proposed to be associated with poor evolution in COVID-19, namely old age, comorbidity, qSOFA and CURB-65, as well as with laboratory markers such as high IL-6 or LDH serum levels and severe lymphopenia. Furthermore, multivariable Cox regression analysis identified high LDH serum levels and relevant CoVemia as independent and solid predictors for mortality after adjusting by age, sex, and presence of comorbidity. Neither qSOFA, CURB-65, low total lymphocyte count, nor high IL-6 serum levels maintained statistically significant association with mortality. Therefore, presence of relevant CoVemia was proved to be the best mortality predictor in our population since it provides a hazard ratio three times higher than that of the other significant variable, high LDH serum level.

Certain immunological mechanisms may underlie some of these associations. First, it is tempting to suggest that a decrease in activity or number of immune cells involved in lysis of infected cells may lead to higher viral replication and viral spread in the blood. In this regard, the correlation between IL-6 levels and CoVemia levels could be related with

the recent description of lower cytotoxic potential of NK cells and senescence of CD8+ T lymphocytes associated to high IL-6 levels, which can be restored by tocilizumab treatment [20]. Second, association between lymphopenia and CoVemia could be related with lymphocyte viral infection and cellular lysis by cytotoxic cells. However, lymphopenia is more likely to be related with increased cellular migration into the lungs, as we have recently described for dendritic cells [21].

Strengths of our research include: immediacy of results during the emergency situation of the COVID-19 first wave, sufficient sample size ($n = 193$), fulfillment of STROBE standards for observational research, and a multifaceted view of patients including Immunology, Microbiology and many clinical assessments. However, this study has some limitations. Firstly, a single-center and retrospective design and, therefore, variability on the day of sample extraction. Nevertheless, the average time from beginning of symptoms to sample extraction (median of two days) was equal in patients with positive and negative CoVemia. Secondly, the moderate specificity of relevant CoVemia at admission to predict mortality. This finding could be associated to the variability over time of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in serum in COVID-19 patients [22]. Because of this variability, CoVemia detection at a specific time point may not properly reflect the state of viral infection, thereby influencing the assessment of severity outcomes. This could explain why previous descriptions of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in blood provided heterogeneous information on its value as severity biomarker [13,14,17]. Therefore, sequential assessment of CoVemia may be needed to improve its specificity to predict mortality. Last but not least, our findings are restricted to the so-called “first wave”, when an overloaded health system could not cover all the needs to

provide critical care in some severity ill patients. Although the results are solid, studies in new waves experienced elsewhere are needed to validate their utility throughout the pandemic.

In summary, the study presented here has established the usefulness of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in blood in the initial assessment of patients admitted for COVID-19 due to its capability to predict mortality. This assessment would be easily implemented since it is reproducible, regardless of the commercially available kit used for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection. Accordingly, information from tests widely used for diagnosis could be readily used for prognosis evaluation. However, the need for quantitative standardization of relevant CoVemia and evaluation of the meaning of persistent CoVemia must be addressed in further longitudinal studies.

METHODS

Study design, population and data collection

This is a retrospective observational study of patients admitted to Hospital Universitario La Princesa (HUP) during the early weeks of the first wave of COVID-19 outbreak in Spain (Flow chart in S3 Figure).

S3 Figure: Flowchart of patients included in the study.

Study inclusion criteria were: a) patients with confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in nasopharyngeal and throat swabs (NPTS), and b) availability of serum samples at the Microbiology Department for additional measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in blood. Regarding the last criterion, on average, serum samples were obtained at a median of two days from admission (interquartile range [IQR] 1 to 3) which nearly corresponded to one week after the beginning of symptoms (median: 8 days, IQR: 6 to 11).

Clinical, laboratory and therapeutic data were collected from electronic clinical records and included in an anonymized database as previously described [6]. Baseline clinical data refer to those obtained at admission day and baseline laboratory data refer to one to three days from admission date.

SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection

Nasopharyngeal and throat swab samples were obtained and real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) was performed with LightCycler® Multiplex Virus Master (Roche Diagnostics, USA) using the LightMix® Modular SARS and Wuhan CoV E-gene primers (Roche Diagnostics, USA), targeting the *e* gene as a first-line screening, followed by confirmatory testing with TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-IVD Kit RT-PCR (Applied Biosystems™, USA) which detects three specific SARS-CoV-2 genomic regions: *orf-1ab*, *s*, and *n* genes. Both procedures were performed according to manufacturers' directions on a Quant Studio-5 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems™, USA) and amplification curves were analyzed with QuantStudio™ Design and Analysis software (Applied Biosystems, USA), for their interpretation by a clinical microbiologist.

To evaluate CoVemia, we used 400 µL of surplus sera from routine HIV and hepatitis serology assessment that are usually frozen at -20 °C for internal quality controls. Serum samples were treated previously for virus inactivation and then tested with two rRT-PCR methods: cobas® SARS-COV-2 test (Roche Diagnostics, USA), a qualitative assay for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA, and TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific [TFS], USA), a multiplex RT-PCR assay for qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acids, as previously described [19]. The number of amplification cycles needed for the fluorescence signal to cross the threshold (Ct) was recorded. Briefly:

a) Roche test detects a fragment of the *orf-1ab* region, specific of SARS-COV-2; and a conserved region of *e* gene, a structural envelope gene, for pan-sarbecovirus detection.

Test was performed by cobas® 6800 System (Roche Diagnostics, USA); an automatic

platform for nucleic acid extraction and RT-PCR amplification and detection. Serum samples were processed according to manufacturer's indications, following the same protocol used for SARS-CoV-2 detection in respiratory samples. Results were analyzed and interpreted automatically by the cobas® 6800/8800 Software version 1.02.12.1002.

B) TFS test detects three specific SARS-CoV-2 genomic regions: orf-1ab, s, and n genes. This technique requires a previous nucleic acid extraction from the sample, which was performed by the automatic eMAG® Nucleic Acid Extraction System (Biomerieux, France), a validated system for the extraction of nucleic acids from serum and plasma samples. Extraction was carried out according to eMAG® manufacturer's directions, obtaining purified nucleic acids in 60 µL of elution buffer. Assay was performed using 5 µL of the eluted and according to the manufacturer's instructions, by a QuantStudio™ 5 Real Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems, USA). Amplification curves were analyzed with QuantStudio™ Design and Analysis software version 2.4.3 (Applied Biosystems, USA). Interpretation of results was carried out by a clinical microbiologist, through amplification curve analysis.

IL-6 serum level measurement

IL-6 serum levels were quantified in duplicate with the Human IL-6 Quantikine high sensitivity enzyme-immune assay from R&D Systems Europe Ltd. (Abingdon, UK), as described previously [6].

Variables

We used two different variables to evaluate CoVemia: a) dichotomic variable: CoVemia was considered positive when at least one of the genes studied was positive according to the output of the two systems used; and b) quantitative variable: when more than

one gene target was detected by one test, the mean Ct value of amplified genes was calculated. There was a high consistency among the results of the three genes analyzed with TFS and a slightly lower one for the two genes analyzed in the Roche system [19]. Since none of the two systems (Roche and TFS) provided positive results with Ct > 40, by consensus decision, we assigned Ct = 42 to those samples reported as negative (for all the genes) by the system.

Baseline IL-6 levels were considered high if > 30 pg/ml, according to their sensitivity and specificity to predict severity determined in a previous study [6]. In addition, in order to be able to compare different biomarkers, other continuous variables previously described as COVID-19 severity biomarkers were also transformed into dichotomic variables considering as cut-off point their median values in our population, namely: total lymphocyte count was considered low when < 700 cells/mm³, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) serum level was considered high when > 400 U/L, qSOFA and CURB65 were considered high if > 1. Patients were considered elderly if age > 70 years.

Multiorgan dysfunction syndrome was considered when at least two organs reached a score > 1 in SOFA scale [23]. Multiorgan failure was considered when at least two organs reached a score > 3 in SOFA scale [24].

To analyze whether CoVemia could predict disease severity, two main outcomes were considered: need for ICU admission and all-cause in-hospital mortality. Only 14 patients out of 89 admitted to ICU did not require invasive mechanical ventilation.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using Stata 14 for Windows (Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX, USA). Quantitative variables following a non-normal distribution were represented as median and IQR, and the Mann Whitney test was used to assess significant differences. Variables with a normal distribution were described by mean $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) and differences between groups were assessed with Student's t-test. Qualitative variables were described as counts and proportions and Chi square or Fisher's exact test was used for comparisons. Correlation between quantitative variables was analyzed using the Pearson correlation test. To estimate the 95% confidence interval (CI) of correlation coefficients we used the `ci2` command of Stata. To evaluate the agreement between CoVemia assessed by Roche and TFS we estimated the intraclass correlation with the `icc` command of R.

To determine the variables associated with the need for ICU admission, we performed a multivariable logistic regression analysis that was first modeled by adding all the variables with a p-value lower than 0.15 to the bivariable analysis, namely low lymphocyte count, D-dimer, high LDH, low PaO₂/FiO₂ (< 250), COPD, high qSOFA, high CURB65, hypertension, C-reactive protein, and high IL-6 level. The final model was reached through backward stepwise removal of variables with p-value higher than 0.15 and using Wald tests to demonstrate that each model was better than its previous iteration. Once the final model was obtained, the dichotomic variables CoVemia (both Roche and TFS) were forced into the model in order to determine whether they were able to predict the need for ICU admission.

515

516 Odds ratio (OR) for mortality according to the presence of CoVemia was estimated for
517 both systems with the *cs* command of Stata. Since differences between the two
518 techniques were detected in the sensitivity to detect viremia and the capability of
519 predicting mortality, receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses were performed
520 using the *roctab* command in order to estimate the best cut-off point for each system.
521 Cut-off values for relevant CoVemia were selected based on the best trade-off values
522 between sensitivity, specificity and the percentage of patients correctly classified.
523 Survival time was analyzed by Kaplan-Meier method with the *sts* command of Stata.
524 Date of admission was considered the date of entry, and for exit date we considered the
525 date of death. For those patients without this event, the last revision of the database
526 (electronic chart or telephone call) on May 21st was used to censor their follow-up.
527 Differences in time to death between different variables were analyzed by log-rank test.

528

529 To compare the predictive capability of baseline CoVemia with that of other baseline
530 parameters (qSOFA, CURB65, total lymphocyte count, LDH and IL-6 serum levels)
531 described in previous publications [12,13,25] we fitted different Cox regression models.
532 In the first model after adjustment by age, sex and Charlson comorbidity index, the
533 hazard ratio (HR) for all other variables including relevant viremia by TFS or Roche was
534 estimated. Since qSOFA and CURB65 did not reach a p-value < 0.15, they were excluded
535 from the analysis in the subsequent models. Model 2 was adjusted by the same variables
536 included in model 1 and low lymphocyte count, the hazard ratio for the remaining
537 variables was then estimated. Model 3 and 4 were developed as model 2 but
538 substituting low lymphocyte count by high IL-6 and high LDH, respectively.

539

540 **Ethics**

541 This study was approved by the local Research Ethics Committee (register number
542 4070) and it was carried out following the ethical principles established in the
543 Declaration of Helsinki. All included patients (or their representatives) were informed
544 about the study and gave an oral informed consent (registered in the electronic clinical
545 chart) as proposed by AEMPS (Agencia Española de Medicamentos y Productos
546 Sanitarios, *The Spanish Agency for Medicines and Medical Devices*) due to the COVID-
547 19 emergency [26].

548

549 This article was written following the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational
550 Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines taking into consideration the difficulties
551 to obtain all needed information in the setting of the COVID-19 pandemic (S1
552 Appendix)

553

554 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

555 Special thanks to our patients and relatives for agreeing with the use of
556 pseudonymized clinical data and surpluses of clinical samples to perform this study,
557 and PhD Manuel Gomez Gutierrez for his excellent editing assistance.

558

559 REINMUN-COVID group includes:

560 Anesthesia: David Arribas Méndez, Rosa Méndez Hernández, Julia Hernando Santos,
561 Mar Orts, Carlos Figueroa, Carlos Román, Antonio Planas.

562 Cardiology: Lourdes Domínguez Arganda, Pablo Martínez Vives, Guillermo Diego Nieto,
563 Alberto Cecconi, Amparo Benedicto, Antonio Rojas González, Jesús Jiménez
564 Borreguero.

565 Emergency Service: Carmen del Arco, Juan Mariano Aguilar, Natalia Villalba, Mónica
566 Negro, Elvira Contreras, Ana del Rey, Cristina Santiago, Manuel Junquera, Raquel
567 Caminero, Francisco Javier Val, Sonia González, Marta Caño, Isabel López, Andrés von
568 Wernitz, Iñigo Guerra, Jorge Sorando, Lydia Chao, María José Cárdenas, Verónica
569 Espiga, Alberto Pizarro.

570 Hematology Service: Rafael de la Cámara, Ángela Figuera Álvarez, Beatriz Aguado,
571 Jimena Cannata, Javier Ortiz.

572 Hospital Pharmacy: Alberto Morell, Esther Ramírez, Amparo Ibáñez Zurriaga, María
573 Pérez Abanades, Silvia Ruiz García, Tomás Gallego Aranda, María Ruiz, Concepción
574 Martínez Nieto, José María Serra.

575 Immunology: Francisco Sánchez-Madrid, Cecilia Muñoz-Calleja, Arantzazu Alfranca,
576 Ana Marcos-Jiménez, Santiago Sánchez-Alonso, Ildefonso Sánchez-Cerrillo, Laura
577 Esparcia, Pedro Martínez-Fleta, Celia López-Sanz, Ligia Gabriele, Luciana del Campo
578 Guerola, Elena Fernández, Reyes Tejedor.

579 Intensive Care Unit: Alfonso Canabal, Diego A. Rodríguez-Serrano, Nuria Arevalillo-
580 Fernández, Marta Chicot Llano, Begoña González de Marcos, Pablo A. Patiño Haro,
581 Marina Trigueros Genao, Begoña Quicios Dorado, David Jiménez Jiménez, Macarena
582 Alonso González, Pablo Villamayor.

583 Internal Medicine-Infectious Diseases: Carmen Suárez, Ignacio de los Santos, José
584 María Galván-Román, Emilia Roy Vallejo, Pablo Rodríguez-Cortes, Jesús Sanz, Eduardo
585 Sánchez, Fernando Moldenhauer, Pedro Casado, Jose Curbelo, Angela Gutiérrez,
586 Azucena Bautista, Nuria Ruiz Giménez, Angelica Fernández, Lucio García Fraile, Pedro
587 Parra, Berta Moyano, Ana Barrios, Paloma Gil, Iluminada García Polo, Diego Real de
588 Asúa, Beatriz Sánchez, Carmen Sáez, Marianela Ciudad, Marta Fernández Rico, Cristina
589 Arévalo Román, Esperanza Morillo Rodríguez.

590 Medical Biology: Desiré Navas

591 Microbiology: Laura Cardeñoso Domingo, María del Carmen Cuevas Torresano, Diego
592 Domingo García, Teresa Alarcón Caverro, Alicia García Blanco, Alexandra Martín
593 Ramírez, María Auxiliadora Semiglia Chong, Ainhoa Gutiérrez Cobos, Nelly Daniela
594 Zurita Cruz, Arturo Manuel Fraile Torres.

595 Pneumology: Julio Ancochea, Tamara Alonso, Pedro Landete, Joan Soriano, Carolina
596 Cisneros, Elena García Castillo, Claudia Valenzuela, Francisco Javier García Pérez, Rosa
597 María Girón, Javier Aspa, Celeste Marcos, Enrique Zamora, Ana Sánchez Azofra, Elena
598 Ávalos Pérez-Urria, Gorane Iturricastillo, Mar Barrio Mayo, Encarna Rubia Garrido.

599 Rheumatology: Santos Castañeda, Rosario García-Vicuña, Isidoro González-Álvaro,
600 Sebastián Rodríguez-García, Carlos Fernández-Díaz, Irene Llorente Cubas, Eva G.
601 Tomero, Noelia García Castañeda, Ana Ma Ortiz, Cristina Valero, Miren Uriarte, Nuria
602 Montes.

603 Surgery Department: Iñigo García Sanz, Francisco Eduardo Viamontes, Jesús Delgado
604 Valdueza.

REFERENCES:

1. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology, Transmission, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Review. *JAMA*. 2020;324: 782–793. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.12839
2. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, Xia J, Zhou X, Xu S, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;180: 934. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.0994
3. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, Antonelli M, Cabrini L, Castelli A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. *JAMA*. 2020;323: 1574–1581. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5394
4. Tian W, Jiang W, Yao J, Nicholson CJ, Li RH, Sigurslid HH, et al. Predictors of mortality in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2020;92(10):1875-1883. doi:10.1002/jmv.26050
5. Vijenthira A, Gong IY, Fox TA, Booth S, Cook G, Fattizzo B, et al. Outcomes of patients with hematologic malignancies and COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 3377 patients. *Blood*. [cited 16 Nov 2020]. doi:10.1182/blood.2020008824
6. Galván-Román JM, Rodríguez-García SC, Roy-Vallejo E, Marcos-Jiménez A, Sánchez-Alonso S, Fernández-Díaz C, et al. IL-6 serum levels predict severity and response to Tocilizumab in COVID-19: an observational study. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2020.09.018
7. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet*. 2020;395: 1054–1062. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3
8. Bermejo-Martin JF, González-Rivera M, Almansa R, Micheloud D, Tedim AP, Domínguez-Gil M, et al. Viral RNA load in plasma is associated with critical illness and a dysregulated host response in COVID-19. *Crit Care*. 2020;24: 691. doi:10.1186/s13054-020-03398-0
9. Meyerowitz EA, Richterman A, Gandhi RT, Sax PE. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Review of Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020. doi:10.7326/M20-5008
10. Carmo A, Pereira-Vaz J, Mota V, Mendes A, Morais C, Silva AC da, et al. Clearance and persistence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in patients with COVID-19. *J Med Virol*. 2020;92: 2227–2231. doi:10.1002/jmv.26103
11. Chen X, Zhao B, Qu Y, Chen Y, Xiong J, Feng Y, et al. Detectable Serum Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Viral Load (RNAemia) Is Closely Correlated

- 643 With Drastically Elevated Interleukin 6 Level in Critically Ill Patients With Coronavirus
644 Disease 2019. Clin Infect Dis. 2020; 71(8):1937-1942. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa449
- 645 12. Hagman K, Hedenstierna M, Gille-Johnson P, Hammas B, Grabbe M, Dillner J, et
646 al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in serum as predictor of severe outcome in COVID-19: a
647 retrospective cohort study. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2020.
648 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1285
- 649 13. Veyer D, Kernéis S, Poulet G, Wack M, Robillard N, Taly V, et al. Highly sensitive
650 quantification of plasma SARS-CoV-2 RNA sheds light on its potential clinical value.
651 Clin Infect Dis. [cited 14 Sep 2020]. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1196
- 652 14. Buetti N, Patrier J, Le Hingrat Q, Loiodice A, Bouadma L, Visseaux B, et al. Risk
653 factors for SARS-CoV-2 detection in blood of critically ill patients. Clin Infect Dis. [cited
654 14 Sep 2020]. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1315
- 655 15. Kermali M, Khalsa RK, Pillai K, Ismail Z, Harky A. The role of biomarkers in
656 diagnosis of COVID-19 – A systematic review. Life Sci. 2020;254: 117788.
657 doi:10.1016/j.lfs.2020.117788
- 658 16. Hogan CA, Stevens BA, Sahoo MK, Huang C, Garamani N, Gombar S, et al. High
659 Frequency of SARS-CoV-2 RNAemia and Association With Severe Disease. Clin Infect
660 Dis. 2020; ciaa1054. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1054
- 661 17. Prebensen C, Hre PLM, Jonassen C, Rangberg A, Blomfeldt A, Svensson M, et al.
662 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in plasma is associated with ICU admission and mortality in patients
663 hospitalized with COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2020 [cited 1
664 Nov 2020]. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1338
- 665 18. Xu D, Zhou F, Sun W, Chen L, Lan L, Li H, et al. Relationship Between serum
666 SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid(RNAemia) and Organ Damage in COVID-19 Patients: A Cohort
667 Study. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1085
- 668 19. Ramírez AM, Cruz NDZ, Gutiérrez-Cobos A, Serrano DAR, Álvaro IG, Vallejo ER,
669 et al. Evaluation of two RT-PCR techniques for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in serum for
670 microbiological diagnosis. MedRxiv [Preprint]. medRxiv 2020.11.15.20231795 [posted
671 2020 Nov 16]: [20p.]. Available from:
672 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.15.20231795v1.full-text> doi:
673 10.1101/2020.11.15.20231795
- 674 20. Mazzone A, Salvati L, Maggi L, Capone M, Vanni A, Spinicci M, et al. Impaired
675 immune cell cytotoxicity in severe COVID-19 is IL-6 dependent. J Clin Invest. 2020;130:
676 4694–4703. doi:10.1172/JCI138554
- 677 21. Sánchez-Cerrillo I, Landete P, Aldave B, Sánchez-Alonso S, Sánchez-Azofra A,
678 Marcos-Jiménez A, et al. COVID-19 severity associates with pulmonary redistribution of
679 CD1c+ DCs and inflammatory transitional and nonclassical monocytes. J Clin Invest.
680 2020;130(12):6920-6300. doi:10.1172/JCI140335

22. Kim J-M, Kim HM, Lee EJ, Jo HJ, Yoon Y, Lee N-J, et al. Detection and Isolation of SARS-CoV-2 in Serum, Urine, and Stool Specimens of COVID-19 Patients from the Republic of Korea. *Osong Public Health Res Perspect*. 2020;11: 112–117. doi:10.24171/j.phrp.2020.11.3.02
23. Vincent JL, Moreno R, Takala J, Willatts S, De Mendonça A, Bruining H, et al. The SOFA (Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment) score to describe organ dysfunction/failure. On behalf of the Working Group on Sepsis-Related Problems of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Intensive Care Med*. 1996;22: 707–710. doi:10.1007/BF01709751
24. Vincent JL, de Mendonça A, Cantraine F, Moreno R, Takala J, Suter PM, et al. Use of the SOFA score to assess the incidence of organ dysfunction/failure in intensive care units: results of a multicenter, prospective study. Working group on “sepsis-related problems” of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Crit Care Med*. 1998;26: 1793–1800. doi:10.1097/00003246-199811000-00016
25. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, Feng B, Lou B, Zou Q, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January–March 2020: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2020;369. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1443
26. The Spanish Agency for Medicine and Health Products [Agencia Española de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios (AEMPS)]. Treatments available for the management of respiratory infection by SARS-CoV-2 [Tratamientos disponibles para el manejo de la infección respiratoria por SARS-CoV-2]. 2020 [cited 10 Dec 2020]. Available: <https://www.aemps.gob.es/laAEMPS/docs/medicamentos-disponibles-SARS-CoV-2-16-4-2020.pdf>