

# 1 **Are health indicators able to describe the ability to cope of Health Systems with COVID-19** 2 **epidemic?**

3 Authors:

4 Silvana Castaldi<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Ester Luconi<sup>3\*</sup>, Bruno Alessandro Rivieccio<sup>4\*</sup>, Patrizia Boracchi<sup>3</sup>, Giuseppe  
5 Marano<sup>3</sup>, Elena Pariani<sup>2</sup>, Luisa Romanò<sup>2</sup>, Francesco Auxilia<sup>1</sup>, Federica Nicolussi<sup>5</sup>, Alessandra  
6 Micheletti<sup>6</sup>, Giancarlo Manzi<sup>5</sup>, Silvia Salini<sup>5</sup>, Massimo Galli<sup>7\*</sup>, Elia Biganzoli<sup>3\*</sup>

7 1- Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health University of Milan, Italy

8 2- Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore di Milano, Italy

9 3- Department of Clinical Sciences and Community Health & DSRC, University of Milan, Italy

10 4- Niguarda Hospital – AREU – Regional Emergency Service Agency – Milano, Italy

11 5- Department of Economics, Management and Quantitative Methods & DSRC, University of  
12 Milan, Italy

13 6- Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of Milan, Italy

14 7- Department of Biomedical and Clinical Sciences "L. Sacco", University of Milan, Italy

15 \* equally contributing Authors.

16

## 17 **Corresponding author**

18 Silvana Castaldi Dept Biomedical Sciences for Health, University of Milan, Italy

19 Via Pascal, 36

20 20133 Milano Italy

21 Tel 00390255038342

22 Fax 00390255033144

23 Silvana.castaldi@unimi.it

24 Keywords: **COVID-19, epidemic, health indicators, health systems, Italy**

## 25 **Abstract**

26 The Coronavirus Disease 19 epidemic is an infectious disease which was declared as a pandemic and  
27 hit all the Countries, all over the world, from the beginning of the year 2020.

28 Despite the emergency vigilance plans, in all the Countries, Health Systems experienced a different  
29 ratio of lethality, admissions to intensive care units and managing quarantine of positive patients.

30 The aim of this study is to investigate if some health indicators might have been useful to understand  
31 the capacity of Italian National Health Service to manage the COVID 19 epidemic.

32 We will compare data in two different Italian regions in the Northern part of Italy (Lombardy and  
33 Veneto) with the national data to understand if different health strategies might be significant to  
34 explain different patterns of COVID 19 epidemic in Italy.

35 The two regions have two different health policies to face CoViD-2019 epidemic.

36 To face epidemic like this one the answer should be outside hospitals but this means to have general  
37 practitioners well-trained and enough healthcare personnel working outside hospitals.

38

39

40

41

42

## 43 **Introduction**

44 Planning health services (HSs) is complex. It requires a rigorous, evidence-based approach to  
45 improving high quality services to meet the future health needs of the population (1).

46 This goal should be achieved through the provision of efficient and effective HS, considering  
47 available resources and balancing hospital and local services (2).

48 Health planning should be future oriented and able to support organizations, to be better prepared to  
49 address emerging health threats and, for this reason, it needs to develop emergency plans to assure  
50 operational readiness to respond to emergencies (2).

51 Public health is constantly threatened by a wide range of hazards. Despite measures to prevent them,  
52 emergencies of varying types, scales and consequences still occur and must find HS ready to manage  
53 them.

54 The Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID 19) epidemic is an infectious disease which was declared as a  
55 pandemic and hit all the Countries, all over the world, from the beginning of the year 2020 (3).

56 Despite the emergency vigilance plans, in all the Countries, HSs experienced a different ratio of  
57 lethality, admissions to intensive care units (ICUs), and managing quarantine of positive patients  
58 (3,4).

59 We might evaluate these differences as a proxy of distinct management decisions at both national and  
60 local level, because health data related to COVID-19 infection might change with its different  
61 healthcare management strategies, for example:

- 62 - Observed lethality ratio might change in relation of the number of the swabs performed (only  
63 with the application of the swabs we can be sure about the positive cases and the correct  
64 diagnosis).
- 65 - Some health authorities decided treating COVID-19 positive patients at home and some  
66 others in hospital. We should indeed consider that to treat COVID-19 positive patients in  
67 hospital might expose healthcare workers to the infection, moreover quarantine or home  
68 isolation of a-/pauci-symptomatic patients could leave hospital beds free for more severe  
69 cases (5).

70 The aim of this study is to investigate if the health indicators took into consideration might be useful  
71 to understand the capacity of Italian HS to manage the COVID 19 epidemic.

72 We will compare data in two different Italian regions in the Northern part of Italy (Lombardy and  
73 Veneto) with the national data to understand if different HS strategies might be significant to explain  
74 different patterns of COVID 19 epidemic in Italy.

75 The considered indicators are not good to plan preventive measures, but they are quite good measures  
76 to estimate the burden of the disease in this pandemic situation.

77

## 78 **Materials and Methods**

79 Data about the spread of the coronavirus in Italy were provided by “Dipartimento della Protezione  
80 Civile – Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri” (<http://www.protezionecivile.gov.it/it>); in particular  
81 the following information were update daily at 18:30 (after the Head of Department press  
82 conference): national situation, regional situation and provinces situation.

83 We obtained the data from the site of GitHub in which there is a repository of the data of  
84 “Dipartimento della Protezione Civile” (<https://github.com/pcm-dpc/COVID-19>).

85 For this work we took into consideration national data from 24/02/2020 to 12/04/2020 (so 49 days in  
86 total) and in particular those variables:

- 87 - deaths
- 88 - symptomatic hospitalized patients

- 89 - patients in ICUs
- 90 - currently infected patients
- 91 - total cases (currently positive patients, healed patients and deaths)
- 92 - patients in quarantine
- 93 - discharged or healed patients

94 For a particular day those variables are presented as a cumulate of the values of previous days.

95 We tried to model the dynamic evolution change of those indicators during the considered period:

- 96 - The ratio between discharged or healed patients and total cases
- 97 - Case fatality ratio (“observed lethality”)
- 98 - The ratio between currently infected patients and total cases
- 99 - The ratio between ICU patients and currently infected patients
- 100 - The ratio between quarantined patients and currently infected patients
- 101 - The ratio between symptomatic hospitalized patients and currently infected patients

102 For each day, data were available in form of aggregated daily counts and only the numerator and  
103 denominator to calculate the endpoints of interest for each analysis were used.

104 A logistic regression model was used where the response variable was the proportion of subjects with  
105 the endpoint above reported and the independent variable was the time starting from 24/02/2020  
106 (beginning of the spread of the coronavirus) and the day of 12/04/2020.

107 In the model, the denominator used to calculate the outcome of interest was added to the model as  
108 weight; for example, for the ratio between discharged/healed patients and total cases, the  
109 denominator was the number of total cases.

110 The shape of the time trend was modelled including restricted cubic spline functions.

111 Our aim was simply to obtain a smoothed shape of the trends, so we avoid to define knots positions.

112 Knots were placed according to a standard procedure, suggested by Harrell (6); in particular given  
113 the linearity constraint, the first knot is placed at 0.025 quantile and the last at 0.975 quantile of the  
114 time distribution. In fact, restricted cubic splines, depend on the number of knots but are robust to the  
115 exact knots position.

116 Separate models were performed for Italy, Lombardy and Veneto for each indicator.

117 In order to choose the final model representing the smoothed shape of the trends the following  
118 procedure was applied:

- 119 1) Models with spline from 3 to 10 knots were performed, because we decided to have a  
120 maximum of one knot every five days.
- 121 2) For each model AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) was reported and the estimated trend of  
122 the indicator over time was graphically examined in relationship to the observed data.
- 123 3) Among all the models that one with the lower value of AIC was considered.

124 The following splines were chosen for each index:

- 125 - The ratio between discharged or healed patients and total cases: for Italy, Lombardy and  
126 Veneto we chose a spline with 10 knots.
- 127 - Case fatality ratio (“observed lethality”): for Italy we chose a spline with 8 knots, for  
128 Lombardy we chose a spline with 10 knots, while for Veneto we chose a spline with 5 knots.
- 129 - The ratio between currently infected patients and total cases: for Italy, Lombardy and Veneto  
130 we chose a spline with 10 knots.
- 131 - The ratio between ICUs patients and currently infected patients: for Italy we chose a spline  
132 with 10 knots, for Lombardy we chose a spline with 7 knots and for Veneto we chose a spline  
133 with 9 knots.
- 134 - The ratio between quarantined patients and currently infected patients: for Italy and for  
135 Lombardy we chose a spline with 10 knots, while for Veneto we chose a spline with 9 knots.

136 - The ratio between symptomatic hospitalized patients and currently infected patients: for Italy  
137 and Lombardy we chose a spline with 10 knots, while for Veneto we chose a spline with 8  
138 knots.

139 As the estimated regression coefficients for the cubic splines terms are not directly interpretable,  
140 results are reported only by the graphical estimated trend.

141 In some smoothed estimates, the goodness of fit for the first days (in general for the first 10 days)  
142 seems to be not satisfactory, but this is because of the low number of events in that period.

143

## 144 **Results**

145 Fig. 1 shows the ratio between discharged or healed patients and total cases.

146 The trend of the Lombardy is over the trend of Italy and Veneto, but all the three trends show an  
147 increase during the time of our observation as it is expected in an epidemic.

148 In Veneto the trend is underlying that of Lombardy, because of the different strategies adopted by  
149 the regions: in Veneto we had less hospitalization (and so less discharged patients) because  
150 hospitalization was decided only for patients with critical condition; this strategy probably had a  
151 positive impact for the healed patients.

152

153 Fig. 2 shows the case fatality ratio (“observed lethality”)

154 The lethality was very high in Lombardy. This may be explained by the fact that epidemic started in  
155 this region for the intensive commercial traffic with China.

156 The beginning of the epidemic was misunderstood probably because it happened during the influenza  
157 season.

158 There are also other explanations for this:

159 - With a very high number of admissions in hospital it is possible that all the deaths occurred in  
160 hospital were considered caused by COVID 19 which it might have been only a comorbidity.

161 - The high admission rate might be a measure of the inadequate answer for the cure of the  
162 disease outside hospitals.

163 - The high lethality rate in Lombardy might be explained by the high number of deaths in old  
164 people guested in residential homes.

165 - It might be a bias the low lethality rate in Veneto only because people died at home with no  
166 swab performed and no identification of the positive condition for COVID 19.

167 We may distinguish between case fatality ratio (“observed lethality”) vs. infected fatality ratio (“true  
168 lethality”).

169 One can argue that in Lombardy lethality “appears” so high because of the underestimation of the  
170 number of real total cases, due to the low number of swabs performed and the consequent  
171 underestimation of the denominator. It must be considered that also the numerator of the fraction is  
172 certainly underestimated, since many people died at home (or even in hospitals, at least at the  
173 beginning of epidemic) without a certain diagnosis.

174 The red areas located in Bergamo and Brescia, which are in Lombardy, might have contributed to  
175 this high number of deaths.

176 The rapid increase of the number of deaths put the Government to decide for some restriction  
177 measures which became the national lockdown on the 9<sup>th</sup> of March (7).

178 Fig. 3 shows the ratio between currently infected patients and total cases

179 The trends, as we expected, reflect the performance of an epidemic: the number of positive falls  
180 because patients recover and thank to the lockdown measure. The numbers of Veneto are higher only  
181 because it performed much more swabs.

182 Fig. 4 shows the ratio between ICUs patients and currently infected patients  
183 The intensive use of hospital beds is evident in the figure for Lombardy while in Veneto the use of  
184 ICUs is postponed of some days and devoted only to the more severe patients. Lombardy faced the  
185 highest number of cases at the beginning of the epidemic when the way to cure these patients was not  
186 assessed and the intensive care would have been the best therapeutic option.

187 Fig. 5 shows the ratio between quarantined patients and currently infected patients  
188 The trend shows the strategy of care for this epidemic in Veneto whose government decided to bring  
189 to hospitals just the more severe patients, while treating the other ones at home.  
190 So, we have two different regional strategies: the stable trend of Veneto is the result of the territorial  
191 care and the lower proportion of the Lombardy is the result of the hospital-centered care in this  
192 region (the initial fall followed by an increase is the result of the saturation of bed in hospital,  
193 particularly in ICUs).

194 Fig. 6 shows the ratio between symptomatic hospitalized patients and the total number of cases  
195 currently infected patients

196 This figure shows how in Lombardy the only strategy played for positive patients was the admission  
197 to hospital. The Veneto strategy seems to be more stable during all the period of observation.

198 However, the excess of positive cases related to early diagnosis can only partly explain the difference  
199 in apparent lethality due to the presence of silent cases without Covid-19 disease manifestation after  
200 massive screening practice in Veneto with respect to the symptomatic confirmation approach adopted  
201 in Lombardy. It is well known that this paradoxical effect is partly compensated by the increase of  
202 the lethality ratio in time even for the best regions. However, this phenomenon was observed also to  
203 the same extent for both Lombardy and Veneto. Better indicators should be therefore the ratio  
204 between the deaths and people hospitalized. In a region with lower degree of hospitalization we could  
205 expect that more serious cases are hospitalized therefore we could expect a higher ratio between the  
206 total number of deaths and the total number of hospitalized patients. This index should be at least  
207 comparable between the regions even in situations with different numbers of silent asymptomatic  
208 cases if similar admission criteria were adopted according to the similar expression of Covid-19  
209 disease. If Veneto was expecting to admit more serious cases mostly relying for the rest on home  
210 management such an index was expected to be higher than Lombardy. However, the approximated  
211 index was 0.554 for Veneto and 0.737 for Lombardy (since the lack of analytical epidemiological  
212 data, the total number of hospitalized is only approximated by the sum of the presently hospitalized  
213 patients with the fraction of the total dismissed/healed proportional to the number of the hospitalized  
214 patients themselves). This result is supporting the fact that not only the apparent but also the true  
215 lethality could be also different between the two regions according to the different impact of Covid-  
216 19 on the local HS.

217 This evidence is also supported by the general mortality data and in particular to the relative  
218 mortality estimation looking at two reference cities of Lombardy: Milano and Brescia which were  
219 showing a huge increment in the expected mortality at 1.96 and 3.15 times with 1369 and 391 excess  
220 deaths, respectively, compared to Venezia and Verona at 1.16 and 1.33 times with 62 and 87 excess  
221 deaths, respectively attributable as directed and indirect causes to Covid-19 (8).

222

## 223 **Discussion**

224 Looking at all these data it is possible to argue that the HS in Lombardy seems less prepared to cope  
225 with this epidemic while the Veneto HS managed quite well the patients and their disease.

226 These two regions represent the Italian situation where many different health organizations coexist:  
227 in Lombardy there was a progressive removal of public services in favor of private ones and there  
228 was the gradual dismantling of “territorial-centered” services and interventions (for example GPs,

229 Local Social and Health Agencies) versus “hospital-centered” ones (for example the Emergency  
230 Departments); in Veneto we had a “territory-centered” system (9).

231 These features are reflected in the different health policies adopted by the two local governances to  
232 face CoViD-2019 epidemic.

233 In all the figures (except for a short trait in the ICUs pts. vs. currently infected pts. ratio curve), the  
234 national curve (which obviously is the result of a weighted average of all regional ones) lays between  
235 the two curves of Lombardy and Veneto, which are two “opposite poles” in the Italian landscape.  
236 Indeed, while we can consider the last one as a positive coping region. In particular, in 2009, in  
237 Lombardy, the Regional Management Board asked to limit the use of hospitals only to the more  
238 severe cases (10,11).

239 To face epidemic like this one the answer should be outside hospitals but this means to have general  
240 practitioners able to perform swabs and provided with PPEs, and in general well-trained healthcare  
241 personnel working outside hospitals (12).

242 This is not the Italian situation in fact the Global Health Security Index 2019 gave to Italy a very low  
243 score for emergency preparedness and response planning and risk communication: Italy was 31st on  
244 195 Countries: Italy must start from this point (13, 14).

245

246

247

## 248 **Author Contributions**

249 SC, EB and BAR contributed conception and design of the study. BAR and EL organized the  
250 database. PB, EL and GM performed the statistical analysis and wrote the first draft of the  
251 manuscript. EP, LR, FA, FN, AM, GM and SS wrote sections of the manuscript SC, EB and MG  
252 reviewed and editing the manuscript. All authors contributed to manuscript revision, read, and  
253 approved the submitted version.

## 254 **Conflict of Interest**

255 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial  
256 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.


257 This work did not have any grant or financing

## 258 **References**

- 259 1. RAND Europe. Framework for assessing, improving and enhancing health service planning. Santa  
260 Monica: RAND Corporation; 2010
- 261 2. Lawrence D. Strategic approaches to planning health services. In: Pencheon D, Melzer D, Gray M,  
262 Guest C, editors. Oxford handbook of public health practice. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University  
263 Press; 2006
- 264 3. WHO Situation report n.51, 2020
- 265 4. WHO. (2017). Strategic Framework for Emergency Preparedness.
- 266 5. Riviuccio, B.A., Luconi, E., Boracchi, P., Pariani, E., Romanò, L., Salini, S., Castaldi, S.,  
267 Biganzoli, E., Galli, M. (2020). Heterogeneity of COVID-19 outbreak in Italy. Acta Bio Med.  
268 2020Apr.24;91(2) in press.

- 269 6. Harrell, F.E. (2001) Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models,  
270 Logistic Regression, and Survival Analysis. Springer-Verlag, New York.  
271 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3462-1>  
272 7. Repubblica Italiana - Decreto-Legge 8 marzo 2020, n. 11. Misure straordinarie ed urgenti per  
273 contrastare l'emergenza epidemiologica da COVID-19 e contenere gli effetti negativi sullo  
274 svolgimento dell'attività giudiziaria. (Gazzetta Ufficiale n. 60 dell'8.03.2020).  
275 8. SiSMG (2020). Andamento della Mortalità Giornaliera nelle città italiane in relazione all'epidemia  
276 di Covid-19. 4° Rapporto 1 Febbraio – 11 Aprile  
277 [http://www.deplazio.net/images/stories/SISMG/SISMG\\_COVID19.pdf](http://www.deplazio.net/images/stories/SISMG/SISMG_COVID19.pdf)  
278 9. Regione Lombardia – Legge Regionale 11 agosto 2015, n. 23 Evoluzione del sistema  
279 socio-sanitario lombardo: modifiche al Titolo I e al Titolo II della legge regionale 30 dicembre 2009,  
280 n. 33 (Testo unico delle leggi regionali in materia di sanità).  
281 10. Regione Lombardia – Circolare 14.09.2009 - 19/SAN/2009 Piano Pandemico Regionale -  
282 Aggiornamento a seguito del manifestarsi della Pandemia Influenzale A/H1N1v.  
283 11. Regione Lombardia - Deliberazione IX/001046 22.12.2010 “Conclusione fase 6 pandemia  
284 influenzale da virus A/H1N1: valutazione ed indicazioni operative.  
285 12. WHO (2009). Clinical management of human infection with pandemic H1N1: revised guidance  
286 13. Global Health Security Index 2019 Building Collective Action and Accountability  
287 14. Castaldi, S., Romano, L., Pariani, E., Biganzoli, E, Garbelli, C. (2020) The end of lockdown what  
288 next? Lockdown COVID 19. Acta Bio Med. Apr.24;91(2) in press  
289  
290

291 Fig. 1. Ratio between discharged or healed patients and total cases.



292

293

294

295

296


297

298

299


300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308

Fig. 2. Case fatality ratio (“observed lethality”)



309  
310

Fig. 3. Ratio between currently infected patients and total cases



312  
313



314


315

316

317


318

319 Fig. 4. Ratio between ICUs patients and currently infected patients



320

321 Fig. 5. Ratio between quarantined patients and currently infected patients




322

323

324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333

Fig. 6. Ratio between symptomatic hospitalized patients and the total number of cases currently infected patients



334