RISK STRATIFICATION OF PATIENTS WITH COVID-19 DISEASE THROUGH THE USE OF CLINICAL SCORES IN AN EMERGENCY

DEPARTMENT. A review of the literature

SIMONE ZANELLA¹, MANCOSU ALENA², BRUGNOLLI ANNA³, CARRARA ALESSANDRO¹,
BEVILACQUA ANITA³, MARINELLI ELISA³, RICCI NICOLA⁴ and FRANCESCO BUCCELLETTI⁴

¹ Department of Surgery, S. Maria del Carmine Hospital, Corso Verona 4, 38068 Rovereto, Italy

² Nurse, 38068 Trento, Italy

³ Nursing School of Trento, University of Verona, Verona, Italy

⁴ Department of Emergency Medicine, S. Chiara Hospital, Largo Medaglie d'oro 9, 38122 Trento, Italy

Declaration: No sponsorships or competing interests have been disclosed for this article.

* *Correspondence to:* Dr. Simone Zanella, General Surgery, S. Maria del Carmine Hospital, Corso Verona 4, 38068 Rovereto, Italy. Tel: +39 0464403301, Fax: +39 0464403304, e-mail: simone.zanella@apss.tn.it

Key Words: Covid-19, SARS-Cov2, Risk Stratification, Clinical Scores and Emergency Department.

Objective To analyze various clinical scores and to understand which of these are able to predict mortality and clinical worsening in patients with Covid-19 disease admitted to an ED.

Material and methods The research question was: What are the best clinical scores used to predict hospital mortality or worsening of clinical conditions with hospitalization in intensive care in adult patients with Covid-19 who present in ED? The research of the articles and the consequent review of the literature were performed using databases such as Pubmed, Cochrane Database of Systematic Re-view and CINAHL Database (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature) until November 4, 2021. The keywords used were clinical scores, risk stratifications, Covid patients and Emergency Department. Inclusion criteria were patients > 18 years with symptoms and diagnosed Covid-19 disease admitted to the ED or directly to the hospital, prospective and retrospective cohort studies, randomized studies, meta-analyses, use or analysis of a clinical score and articles published in English between January 2020 and August 2021 without countries restrictions. Exclusion criteria were unpublished articles, articles without abstracts, articles with a population different from the selected one, articles with outcomes different from those selected and articles that did not mention or did not analyze the effectiveness of a score or a scale. The studies selected compared NEWS, NEWS2, SIRS, q-SOFA, CURB-65, PSI, REMS, MEWS, RISE UP, 4C MORTALITY SCORE, TRPNCLP and STPCAL scores for patients with confirmed Covid-19 disease admitted to Emergency Department. A meta-analysis was carried out by using fixed effects and random effects models to evaluate mortality and Intensive Care Unit (ICU) admission in patients presenting in ED.

Results A total of 39318 patients from 8 studies, 5 retrospective observational and 3 prospective, were included. Likelihood ratio was 9.1 (95% CI, 4.76-17.5) for NEWS and 3.3 (95% CI, 2.5-4.3) for NEWS2 in two different studies. The Area Under the Curve values were regarding to intensive care unit admission 0.94 (95% CI, 0.88- 0.99) and 0.8 (95% CI, 0.72- 0.8) for NEWS and NEWS2 respectively. Considering mortality AUC values were 0.87 (95% CI, 0.72-

1.00) and 0.8 (95% CI, 0.72-0.88) for NEWS and NEWS2 respectively. q-SOFA is probably the second most reliable score, analyzed and studied by most of the articles and in one study AUC value was 0.78 (95% CI, 0.60-0.96) for mortality and 0.78 (95% CI, 0.64-0.93) for ICU admission. Considering the scores created and studied specifically for Covid-19 disease the most accurate is the TRPNCLP score with a AUC value of 0.88 (95% CI, 0.85-0.91) and an LR + of 4.86 (95% CI, 4.01 - 5.88). Also RISE UP score and 4C mortality score had excellent results with a positive LR > 1 and AUC values very close to the 0.80.

Conclusions The clinical scores that are more reliable in predicting hospital mortality and admission to intensive care units are NEWS and NEWS2. At the beginning Covid-19 disease management is based on home monitoring so that the use of clinical scores NEWS and NEWS2 could be an effective to predict mortality and worsening of clinical conditions.

OBJECTIVE

The SARS-Cov2 pandemic discovered initially in Wuhan in December 2019¹ is one of the most significant health, social and economic problems worldwide in the last two years. To the date more than 270.000.000 confirmed cases worldwide and more than 5.000.000 deaths². In the past two decades other two coronaviruses were responsible for pandemic infection; SARS-Cov (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus) detected in China in 2002-2003 and MERS (Middle Est Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus) detected in Middle Est in 2012³⁻⁴. Mortality rates was approximately 10% in SARS-Cov disease and 35% in MERS disease. To the date probably bats were the initial hosts and pangolins the intermediate as reported in previous studies⁵. In most cases, the infection and the course of the disease are short and not very different from a typical seasonal flu, but in the remaining part of cases, it can lead to severe pneumonia, acute respiratory failure, multi-organ shock and death⁶. Patients at high risk of mortality are smokers, elderly or persons with other diseases such as diabetes, cancer, obesity, cardiovascular, liver or kidney disease⁷. The most common symptoms are fever (88%), cough (67%), fatigue (38%), shortness of breath (33%), gastrointestinal symptoms (5%), anosmia and dysgeusia. Most of cases were classified as mild (81%), 14% as severe and 5% as critical⁶. The US National Institutes of Health (NIH) have formulated a classification of the 5 clinical stages of COVID-19⁸:

1. Asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic infection
2. Mild illness
3. Moderate disease
4. Severe disease
5. Critical illness

Virus presents a rapid diffusion, is transmitted by direct or indirect contact with droplets, up to 6 meters away from the infected person, remains on the surfaces for a variable period ranging from a few hours (paper) to several days (steel or plastic surfaces), and it can remain in the air for up to a few hours⁹. In Italy and in Europe have been adopted stricted measures such as lockdown to limit virus diffusion¹⁰. Increased case number and clinical experiences allowed doctors to improve their knowledge about disease but many studies are required to treat these patients. No study in literature has ever evaluated all the clinical scores analyzed in our work and no meta-analysis has ever been performed. Aim of our study was to analyze various clinical scores and to understand which of these are able to predict mortality and clinical worsening in patients with Covid-19 disease admitted to an emergency department (ED).

METHODS

The research question was: What are the best clinical scores used to predict hospital mortality or worsening of clinical conditions with hospitalization in intensive care in adult patients with Covid-19 who present in ED?

PICO Question

Population: Adult population (> 18 years) with confirmed COVID-19 disease presenting in ED or directly hospitalized with symptoms

Intervention: Clinical scores and scales

Comparison: Clinical judgment

Outcomes: Hospital mortality and clinical condition worsening with admission to intensive care

Data sources, search strategy

The research of the articles and the consequent review of the literature were performed using databases such as Pubmed, Cochrane Database of Systematic Re-view and CINAHL Database (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature). The keywords used were clinical scores, risk stratifications, Covid patients and Emergency Department. At the end the definitive articles were entirely found using the PubMed database.

The NIH "Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treatment Guidelines" were examined.

Study selection

Two investigators (SZ and MA) conducted study selection and evaluated the titles and the abstracts. A third investigator (BF) resolved discrepancies. Inclusion criteria were patients > 18 years with symptoms and diagnosed Covid-19 disease admitted to the ED or directly to the hospital, prospective and retrospective cohort studies, randomized studies, meta-analyses, use or analysis of a clinical score and articles published in English between January 2020 and August 2021 without countries restrictions. Exclusion criteria were unpublished articles, articles without abstracts, articles with a population different from the selected one, articles with outcomes different from those selected and articles that did not mention or did not analyze the effectiveness of a score or a scale.

Score analyzed

The present study evaluated all these scores:

- NEWS and NEWS2¹¹⁻¹³
- SIRS¹⁴
- q-SOFA¹⁴⁻¹⁵
- CURB-65¹⁶
- PSI¹⁷
- REMS¹⁸
- MEWS¹⁸
- RISE UP19
- POINT OF MORTALITY 4C²⁰
- TRPNCLP and STPCAL²¹

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The positive and negative likelihood ratio and the confidence interval were calculated for each score of each study examined using the following online calculator: Diagnostic Test Calculator.

Sensitivity, specificity, positive (PPV) and negative predicting value (NPV), diagnostic accuracy, Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve and the Area Under the Curve (AUC) of each score was calculated. To evaluate the values of the area below the ROC curve we referred to the classification proposed by Swets¹⁹:

- 1) $AUC = 0.5$ the test is not informative;
- 2) $0.5 < AUC \leq 0.7$ the test is not very accurate;
- 3) $0.7 < AUC \leq 0.9$ the test is moderately accurate;
- 4) $0.9 < AUC < 1.0$ the test is highly accurate;
- 5) $AUC = 1$ perfect test

Funnel Plot diagram

To compare the scores analyzed and to verify the homogeneity of the studies considered a Funnel Plot diagram has been created for each score. RevMan5 was used to perform graphs creation and meta-analysis. Meta-analyses were also created using the “random effect” model. . *P*-value (*) as reported in Fig 1 was always < 0.001 for each score.

It was necessary merge SIRS and TRPNCLP scores, despite the 29% overlap, due to the only available value for TRPNCLP score.

Meta-analysis

The meta-analysis created using a Forest Plot diagram for each score (or group of scores if combined, as mentioned above) is represented below in Fig 1. Where the articles provided data for both outcomes (mortality and ICU admission) a unique LR + and AUC values were calculated.

RESULTS

Literature search

A flow chart is presented in Fig. 2. After searching Pubmed, Cochrane Database of Systematic Re-view and CINAHL Database (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature) 1449 articles were identified. After screening the title and the abstract, only 345 articles about Risk Score and COVID-19 patients were included for further consideration. We excluded 301 articles that did not meet the search question and 36 articles that did not meet the inclusion criteria. At the end 8 articles were evaluated^{13-14,16,18-21,23}. Five were retrospective observational studies and three prospective.

Likelihood ratio both positive and negative, AUC for each score analyzed and for each study considered are reported in Table 1 and Table 2. Regarding AUC values if not specified we considered both ICU admission and mortality and *p*-value (*) was always <0.001 for each score.

A first difference is that we considered scores studied and created specifically for Covid pandemic and also very common scores already used in clinical practice that have been adapted to the patient suffering from Covid-19 disease. Considering meta-analyses it is noted that the highest value, LR + 9.1 (4.76-17.5), is referred to NEWS. Maximum values such as AUC 0.83 (0.74 - 0.83) and AUC 0.80 (0.78 - 0.87) are found for Covino et. al¹⁸ respectively regarding the outcome mortality and the outcome of admission to intensive care unit. The absolute highest value is reported by Jang et. al¹⁴ with an AUC of 0.94 (0.88 - 0.99) for admission to intensive care and AUC 0.87 (0.71 - 1.00) for mortality. Random effect of q-SOFA is 3.707 (1.675 - 8.203) but his high value is mainly given by Myrstad et. al¹² with an LR + of 14 (1.64 - 113). The LR + of Holten et. al²³ is 4.92 (2.01 - 12.00) and high compared to the others. However Myrstad et. al¹² is one of the smallest studies analyzed so that the weight of this study in the meta-analysis is certainly less. Evaluating the fixed effect LR + would be 2.816, however, a largely positive value considering the research question. q-SOFA is, in fact, probably the second most reliable score, analyzed and studied by most of the articles. Jang et. al¹⁴ has an AUC value of 0.78 (0.60 - 0.96) for mortality and an AUC value of 0.78 (0.63 - 0.93) for ICU admission, both very close to the diagnostic accuracy threshold. The other studies maintain AUC values around 0.70. SIRS, CURB-65 and MEWS are less effective, both for LR + and - values and for AUC values which do not reach 0.80. REMS > 6 considering mortality has an AUC value of 0.88 (0.94-0.91) and an LR + of 3.2 (2.6 - 4). REMS was only analyzed by Covino et. al¹⁸. It would be interesting and certainly could give more information in terms of the accuracy if the score were studied and compared in several other studies. The score present some limitations because it is a single-center study, based on Italian population and the score was calculated retrospectively.

Considering the scores created and studied specifically for Covid-19 disease, the one that is certainly more accurate is the TRPNCLP score by Huang et. al²¹, with an AUC of 0.88 (0.85 - 0.91) and an LR + of 4.86 (4.01 - 5.88). This score is certainly the best and most accurate and finds agreement in the AUC and LR +/- values. It should be remembered that the score was evaluated in a recent study published on 14 April 2021 and considers 744 patients with severe disease on a total of 2430, between severe and non-severe disease. This score could therefore be interesting for its use and diffusion also in Europe and the United States because it considers the higher body temperature recorded and a series of values readily available through a blood test.

Also RISE UP score by van Dam et. al¹⁹ and 4C mortality score by Knight et. al²⁰ had excellent results. With a positive LR > 1 and AUC values very close to the 0.80 threshold, these two scores can be considered of good diagnostic accuracy. An important factor is that, especially Knight et. al²⁰, considered a very large populations of approximately 30,000 individuals. Also van Dam et. al¹⁹, compared to the other studies analyzed, consider about 650 individuals. In our opinion in this meta-analysis NEWS and NEWS2 are the most reliable scores for predicting mortality and worsening of clinical conditions for Covid-19 adult patients.

A score that is certainly effective and quick to fill out in an out-of-hospital setting is the q-SOFA. With only three parameters, q-SOFA is able to give a complete view of the patient's disease state.

The new clinical scores (Rise up score, 4C mortality and TRPNCLP score) are instead very accurate but impossible to use outside hospital. They are also long, complicated and certainly require hours from the patient's admission to the emergency room to be filled in because many values required could only be obtained through blood tests.

Limitations

Important limitations need to be reported. First of all, we evaluated 8 articles. A comparison of 30-50 articles would certainly have provided more data and therefore more significant results. Secondly, five studies were retrospective observational and three prospective so that significant "gold standard" elements for an evidence-based search are not always included such as the randomization and the presence of the control group.

Furthermore the data are constantly changing and there will be an evolution of the virus, the disease related to it and the related behavior of health professionals for the correct care of patients.

CONCLUSIONS

According to this literature review and meta-analysis, the clinical scores that are more reliable in predicting hospital mortality and admission to intensive care units are NEWS and NEWS2. Furthermore, as previously discussed, these scores are simple and quick to detect for a healthcare professional both in an intra and extra hospital setting, an educational intervention on a patient could also be effective as well as a targeted home monitoring.

REFERENCES

- 1 Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KK, Chu H, Yang J, Xing F, Liu J, Yip CC, Poon RW, Tsoi HW, Lo SK, Chan KH, Poon VK, Chan WM, Ip JD, Cai JP, Cheng VC, Chen H, Hui CK, Yuen KY. **A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster** 2020. *Lancet* 395: 514–523.
- 2 WHO. **Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Situation Report.** <https://covid19.who.int>
- 3 Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W **A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin.** *Nature.* (2020) 579:270–273.
- 4 Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J. **A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China** 2019. *N Engl J Med.* (2020) 382:727–733.
- 5 Li Y, HaiTao Z, Jorge G, Yang X, Maolin W, Yuqi G, Chuan Sun, Xiuchuan T, Liang J, Mingyang Z, Xiang H, Ying X, Haosen C, Yanyan C, Tongxin R, Fang W, Yaru X, Sufang H, Xi T, Niannian H, Bo J, Yong Z, Ailin L, Laurent M, Junyang J, Zhiguo C, Shusheng L, Hui X and Ye Y. **A machine learning-based model for survival prediction in patients with severe COVID-19 infection.** *MedRxiv.* 2020; 1–25.
- 6 Chams N, Chams S, Badran R, Shams A, Araj A, Raad M, Mukhopadhyay S, Stroberg E, Duval EJ, Barton LM, Hajj Hussein I. **COVID-19: A Multidisciplinary Review.** *Front Public Health.* 2020 Jul 29; 8:383
- 7 Alizadehsani R, Alizadeh Sani Z, Behjati M, Roshanzamir Z, Hussain S, Abedini N, Hasanzadeh F, Khosravi A, Shoeibi A, Roshanzamir M, Moradnejad P, Nahavandi S, Khozeimeh F, Zare A, Panahiazar M, Acharya UR, Islam SMS. **Risk factors prediction, clinical outcomes and mortality in COVID-19 patients.** *J Med Virol.* 2021; 93:2307-2320.
- 8 National Institutes of Health. **COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines. Management of persons with COVID-19.** Bethesda, MD NIH; 2020.

- 9 Bhardwaj R, Agrawal A. **Likelihood of survival of coronavirus in a respiratory droplet deposited on a solid surface.** *Physics of Fluids* 2020; 32: 1-6.
- 10 Ji D, Zhang D, Xu J, Chen Z, Yang T, Zhao P, Chen G, Cheng G, Wang Y, Bi J, Tan L, Lau G, Qin E. **Prediction for Progression Risk in Patients With COVID-19 Pneumonia: The CALL Score.** *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020 Sep 12;71:1393-1399.
- 11 Kostakis I, Smith GB, Prytherch D, Meredith P, Price C, Chauhan A; Portsmouth Academic Consortium For Investigating COVID-19 (PACIFIC-19). **The performance of the National Early Warning Score and National Early Warning Score 2 in hospitalised patients infected by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)** *Resuscitation.* 2021 Feb; 159: 150-157.
- 12 Myrstad M, Ihle-Hansen H, Tveita AA, Andersen EL, Nygård S, Tveit A, Berge T. **National Early Warning Score 2 (NEWS2) on admission predicts severe disease and in hospital mortality from Covid-19 - a prospective cohort study.** *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med.* 2020 Jul 13;28:66.
- 13 Gidari A, De Socio GV, Sabbatini S, Francisci D. **Predictive value of National Early Warning Score 2 (NEWS2) for intensive care unit admission in patients with SARS CoV-2 infection.** *Infect Dis* 2020 52: 698-704.
- 14 Jang JG, Hur J, Hong KS, Lee W, Ahn JH. **Prognostic Accuracy of the SIRS, qSOFA, and NEWS for Early Detection of Clinical Deterioration in SARS-CoV-2 Infected Patients.** *J Korean Med Sci.* 2020 29;35: 234.
- 15 Raith EP, Udy AA, Bailey M, McGloughlin S, MacIsaac C, Bellomo R, Pilcher DV; Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society (ANZICS) Centre for Outcomes and Resource Evaluation (CORE). **Prognostic Accuracy of the SOFA Score, SIRS Criteria, and qSOFA Score for In-Hospital Mortality Among Adults With Suspected Infection Admitted to the Intensive Care Unit.** *JAMA.* 2017 17; 317: 290-300.
- 16 Myint PK, Sankaran P, Musonda P, Subramanian DN, Ruffell H, Smith AC, Prentice P, Tariq SM, Kamath AV. **Performance of CURB-65 and CURB-age in community-acquired pneumonia.** *Int J Clin Pract.* 2009; 63:1345-50.
- 17 Patel S. **Calculated decisions: PSI/PORT score: pneumonia severity index for community-acquired pneumonia.** *Emerg Med Pract.* 2021 1; 23.
- 18 Covino M, Sandroni C, Santoro M, Sabia L, Simeoni B, Bocci MG, Ojetti V, Candelli M, Antonelli M, Gasbarrini A, Franceschi F. **Predicting intensive care unit admission and death for COVID-19 patients in the emergency department using early warning scores.** *Resuscitation.* 2020;156: 84-91.
- 19 van Dam PM, Zelis N, Stassen P, van Twist DJL, De Leeuw PW, van Kuijk S, Buijs J. **Validating the RISE UP score for predicting prognosis in patients with COVID-19 in the emergency department: a retrospective study** *BMJ* 2021 5;11
- 20 Knight SR, Ho A, Pius R, Buchan I, Carson G, Drake TM, Dunning J, Fairfield CJ, Gamble C, Green CA, Gupta R, Halpin S, Hardwick HE, Holden KA, Horby PW, Jackson C, Mclean KA, Merson L, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS, Norman L, Noursadeghi M, Oliaro PL, Pritchard MG, Russell CD, Shaw CA, Sheikh A, Solomon T, Sudlow C, Swann OV, Turtle LC, Openshaw PJ, Baillie JK, Semple MG, Docherty AB, Harrison EM; ISARIC4C investigators. **Risk stratification of patients admitted to hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: development and validation of the 4C Mortality Score.** *BMJ* 2020 13;371

- 21 Huang J, Xu Y, Wang B, Xiang Y, Wu N, Zhang W, Xia T, Yuan Z, Li C, Jia X, Shan Y, Chen M, Li Q, Bai L, Li Y. **Risk stratification scores for hospitalization duration and disease progression in moderate and severe patients with COVID-19.** *BMC Pulm Med.* 2021 14;21:120.
- 22 Swets JA, Getty DJ, Pickett RM, D'Orsi CJ, Seltzer SE, McNeil BJ. **Enhancing and evaluating diagnostic accuracy.** *Med Decis Making.* 1991;11: 9-18.
- 23 Holten AR, Nore KG, Tveiten CEVWK, Olasveengen TM, Tonby K. **Predicting severe COVID-19 in the Emergency Department.** *Resusc Plus.* 2020 ;4:

WITHDRAWN
see manuscript DOI for details

Fig 1 Forest Plot diagram (*p-value < 0.001)

Fig 2 Flow diagram of study selection process

Table 1 Likelihood ratio and AUC with 95% CI (*p-value < 0.001)

Severe disease (ICU admission or mortality), non-severe disease			
	LR +	LR -	AUC
NEWS ≥ 5 – Covino et. al – Covino et. al. – Jang et. al – Jang et. al. – Knight et. al	4.4 (3.1 - 6.1) 2.8 (2.0 - 3.9) 9.1 (4.76 - 17.5)	0.4 (0.3 - 0.6) 0.3 (0.1 - 0.9) 0.18 (0.03 - 1.10)	0.80 (ICU 0.76 – 0.84) 0.83 (mortality 0.78 – 0.87) 0.94 (ICU 0.88 – 0.99) 0.87 (mortality 0.72 – 1.00) 0.65 (mortality 0.64 – 0.66)
NEWS2 ≥ 5 – Holten et. al – Covino et. al – Covino et. al – Myrstad et. al – Gidari et. al	2.06 (1.59 - 2.66) 3.3 (2.5 – 4.3) 2.7 (1.8 – 4.0) 2.95 (1.84 – 4.71) 2.6 (1.7 – 4.1)	0.31 (0.15 - 0.60) 0.4 (0.3 – 0.6) 0.4 (0.1 – 1.0) 0.19 (0.05 – 0.69) 0.2 (0.1 – 0.5)	0.80 (0.72 – 0.88) 0.8 (ICU 0.72 – 0.88) 0.75 (mortality 0.70 – 0.80) 0.79 (0.66 – 0.91) 0.75 (ICU 0.64 – 0.86)
SIRS ≥ 2 – Holten et. al – Myrstad et. al – Jang et. al – Jang et. al	1.64 (1.29 - 2.09) 1.80 (1.02 – 3.17) 	0.41 (0.21 - 0.77) 0.60 (0.31 – 1.15) 	0.70 (0.61 – 0.80) 0.63 (0.47 – 0.80) 0.64 (mortality 0.41 – 0.86) 0.79 (ICU 0.66 – 0.93)
CURB-65 ≥ 2 – Holten et. al – Myrstad et. al – Knight et. al	2.81 (1.82 - 4.33) 2.72 (0.83 – 8.87) 	0.53 (0.36 - 0.78) 0.81 (0.59 – 1.12) 	0.75 (0.65 – 0.84) 0.58 (0.41 – 0.76) 0.76 (mortality 0.74 – 0.79)
QSOFA ≥ 2 – Holten at. al – Covino et. al – Covino et. al – Myrstad et. al – Knight et. al – Jang et. al – Jang et. al	4.92 (2.01 - 12.00) 2.36 (1.7 – 3.3) 14 (1.64 – 113)	0.78 (0.64 - 0.95) 0.80 (0.7 – 1.0) 0.75 (0.55 – 1.02)	0.70 (0.61 – 0.79) 0.56 (ICU 0.51 – 0.62) 0.81 (mortality 0.76 – 0.85) 0.62 (0.45 – 0.81) 0.62 (mortality 0.615 – 0.630) 0.78 (mortality 0.6 – 0.96) 0.78 (ICU 0.64 – 0.93)

Table 2 Likelihood ratio and AUC with 95% CI (*p-value < 0.001)

Severe disease (ICU admission or mortality), non-severe disease			
	LR +	LR -	AUC
PSI ≥3			
– Holten et. al	2.39 (1.71 - 3.33)	0.41 (0.25 - 0.69)	0.75 (0.65 – 0.84)
– Knight et. al			0.736 (mortality 0.68 – 0.79)
REMS > 6			
– Covino et. al	2.4 (1.8 – 3.2)	0.5 (0.3 – 0.7)	0.74 (ICU 0.69 – 0.79)
– Covino et al.	3.2 (2.6 – 4.0)	0.1 (0.1 – 0.8)	0.88 (mortality 0.84 – 0.91)
MEWS >5			
– Covino et. al	2.0 (1.6 – 2.5)	0.50 (0.3 – 0.7)	0.65 (ICU 0.60 – 0.70)
– Covino et al.	1.6 (1.0 – 2.6)	0.60 (0.3 – 1.0)	0.63 (mortality 0.58 – 0.68)
TRPNCLP			
– Huang et. al	4.86 (4.01– 5.88)	0.21 (0.14 – 0.31)	0.88 (0.85 – 0.91)
RISE UP SCORE			
– van Dam et. al	2.49 (2.04 – 3.02)	0.51 (0.42 – 0.62)	0.77 (mortality 0.73 – 0.81)
– van Dam et. al	2.64 (2.10 – 3.33)	0.08 (0.04 – 0.14)	0.72 (ICU 0.68 – 0.76)
4C mortality score			
– R. Knight et. al	1.51 (1.49 – 1.53)	0.19 (0.18 – 0.21)	0.76 (mortality 0.76 – 0.77)
– R. Knight et. al			0.79 (ICU 0.77 – 0.8)