

Temporal Changes in Clinical Practice with COVID-19 Hospitalized Patients: Potential Explanations for Better In-Hospital Outcomes

Kevin E. Kip, Ph.D.,¹ Graham Snyder, MD, SM,² Donald M. Yealy, MD,³ John W. Mellors, MD,⁴ Tami Minnier, MSN, RN,⁵ Michael P. Donahoe, MD,⁶ Jeffrey McKibben, MS,¹ Kevin Collins, BSBA,¹ Oscar C. Marroquin, MD¹

¹Clinical Analytics, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA
K.E.K. (kipke2@upmc.edu); J.M. (mckijc@upmc.edu); K.C. (collinskj@upmc.edu);
O.C.M. (marroquinoc@upmc.edu);

²Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Infection Prevention and Control, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA
G.S. (snydergm3@upmc.edu)

³Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine and University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA
D.M.Y. (yealydm@upmc.edu)

⁴Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA
J.W.M. (jwm1@pitt.edu)

⁵Wolff Center, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA
T.M. (minnierte@upmc.edu)

⁶Division of Pulmonary Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA
M.P.D. (donahoem@upmc.edu)

Keywords: COVID-19, clinical practice, dexamethasone, steroids, anticoagulants, mechanical ventilation, mortality, length of stay, temporal trends

Conflict of Interest Disclosure: None of the authors received any payments or influence from a third-party source for the work presented, and none report any potential conflicts of interest.

Corresponding Author:

Kevin E. Kip, Ph.D., FAAAS, FAHA
Vice President of Clinical Analytics | UPMC Health Services Division
3600 Forbes & Meyran | Forbes Tower, 9th Floor, Suite 10070
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
412-864-2103
kipke2@upmc.edu

ABSTRACT

Background/Aims: We reviewed demographic and clinical profiles, along with measures of hospital-based clinical practice to identify temporal changes in clinical practice that may have affected in-hospital outcomes of patients with COVID-19.

Methods: Data consisted of sociodemographic and clinical data captured in University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC) electronic medical record (EMR) systems, linked by common variables (deidentified). The analysis population included hospitalized patients (across 21 hospitals) with a primary diagnosis of COVID-19 infection during the period March 14-August 31, 2020. The primary outcome was a composite of in-hospital mechanical ventilation/mortality. We compared temporal trends in patient characteristics, clinical practice, and hospital outcomes using 4 time-defined epochs for calendar year 2020: March 14-March 31 (epoch 1); April 1-May 15, (epoch 2), May 16-June 28 (epoch 3); and June 29-August 31 (epoch 4). We report unadjusted survival estimates, followed by propensity score analyses to adjust for differences in patient characteristics, to compare in-hospital outcomes of epoch 4 patients (recently treated) to epoch 1-3 patients (earlier treated).

Results: Mean number of hospital admissions was 9.9 per day during epoch 4, which was ~2- to 3-fold higher than the earlier epochs. Presenting characteristics of the 1,076 COVID-19 hospitalized patients were similar across the 4 epochs, including mean age. The crude rate of mechanical ventilation/mortality was lower in epoch 4 patients (17%) than in epoch 1-3 patients (23% to 35%). When censoring for incomplete patient follow-up, the rate of mechanical ventilation/mortality was lower in epoch 4 patients ($p<0.0001$), as was the individual component of mechanical ventilation ($p=0.0002$) and mortality ($p=0.02$). In propensity score adjusted analyses, the in-hospital relative risk (RR) of mechanical ventilation/mortality was lower in

epoch 4 patients (RR=0.67, 95% CI: 0.48, 0.93). For the outcome being discharged alive within 3, 5, or 7 days of admission, adjusted odds ranged from 1.6- to 1.7-fold higher among epoch 4 patients compared to earlier treated patients. The better outcomes in epoch 4 patients were principally observed in patients under the age of 75 years. Patient level dexamethasone use was 55.6% in epoch 4 compared to 15% or less of patients in the earlier epochs. Most patients across epochs received anticoagulation drugs (principally heparin). Overall steroid (81.7% vs. 54.3%, $p<0.0001$) and anticoagulation use (90.4% vs. 80.7%, $p=0.0001$) was more frequent on the day or day after hospitalization in epoch 4 patients compared to earlier treated patients.

Conclusions: In our large system, recently treated hospitalized COVID-19 patients had lower rates of in-hospital mechanical ventilation/mortality and shorter length of hospital stay. Alongside of this was a change to early initiation of glucocorticoid therapy and anticoagulation. The extent to which the improvement in patient outcomes was related to changes in clinical practice remains to be established.

INTRODUCTION

Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the US and countries worldwide have seen variation in reported incidence, testing patterns, case fatality rates, investigations of novel treatments, and clinical practice approaches. A few,¹⁻³ but not all,⁴ recent non-peer reviewed reports suggested that the case fatality rate of COVID-19 infection is decreasing, and care is changing. However, there is an absence of published reports on large series of hospitalized COVID-19 patients, particularly with respect to temporal changes in clinical outcomes within the same data system.

One key intervention is mechanical ventilation, initially thought to be best started early with more severe COVID-19 respiratory finding, notably hypoxemia. Over time, informal reports note less mechanical ventilation use; potential explanations for lower rates of COVID-19 mechanical ventilation and less mortality include: (i) changing demographics of patients;⁵ (ii) more judicious use of starting and using mechanical ventilation;⁶ (iii) more frequent use of anticoagulants;^{7,8} and steroids;⁹⁻¹² (iv) changing prominent disease manifestations of patients;¹³ (v) seasonal effects of temperature and humidity variation;¹⁴ and (vi) potential changes in viral infectivity or pathogenicity.^{15,16}

There have been temporal changes in COVID-19 testing in addition to no national testing strategy. Early in the pandemic, only those with symptoms and a higher pretest probability of COVID-19 exposure or disease were the focus of testing. Soon thereafter, COVID-19 testing increased in many, notably populations with higher frequency of potential infection (e.g., nursing home patients as well as health care professionals), and more recently increased screening of asymptomatic patients such as those with return to college campus activities, along with more

intensive contacting tracing (and testing) of individuals likely to have been exposed to those carrying SARS CoV2 virus.¹⁷⁻²⁰

We sought to examine clinical outcomes of hospitalized COVID-19 patients in a large health care system accompanied by an assessment of demographic and clinical profiles, along with changes in hospital-based clinical practice, that have occurred since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in the US.

METHODS

Sources of Data. We used data routinely captured in the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC) electronic medical record (EMR) systems. In brief, UPMC is a large academic medical center and insurer, housed principally in Pennsylvania.²¹ The UPMC data system has detailed sociodemographic and medical history data, diagnostic and clinical tests conducted, surgical and other treatment procedures performed, prescriptions ordered, and billing charges on all outpatient and in-hospital encounters, with diagnoses and procedures coded based on the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth and Tenth revisions (ICD-9 and ICD-10, respectively).

We linked the primary data sources using common variables (deidentified) within the UPMC data ecosystem aggregated in its Clinical Data Warehouse (CDW) that include: (i) *Medipac*, the admit, discharge and transfer registration and hospital-based billing system; (ii) *Cerner*, the inpatient electronic medical record (EMR) for relevant clinical information for bedded patients at a UPMC inpatient hospital; (iii) *Epic*, the UPMC EMR for ambulatory office visits owned by UPMC (Community Medicine Inc. and (University of Pittsburgh Physicians); and (iv) *Aria*, the EMR utilized in most ambulatory Cancer Centers at UPMC for both radiation

oncology and medical oncology. In calendar year 2019 among discharged UPMC hospital patients, there were 306,456 visits among 201,829 unique patients, with mean (median) age of 54 (60) years, 54% female, and median length of stay of 2.6 days.

Patient Population. We studied 139,465 patients with nucleic acid amplification tests for SARS-CoV-2 (the cause of COVID-19) during the period March 14, 2020 to August 31, 2020. Of these, the study population consisted of 1,076 patients who tested positive for COVID-19 and were hospitalized at one of 21 UPMC hospitals (see **Supplemental Table S1** for listing of hospitals). Our study received formal ethics approval by the UPMC Ethics and Quality Improvement Review Committee (Project ID 2882), the ethics/oversight body for ensuring patient confidentiality and consent (including waiver of consent) for analysis and dissemination of deidentified data within the UPMC system.

Primary and Secondary Outcomes. The primary outcome for this analysis was a composite of in-hospital mechanical ventilation or mortality. We assessed in-hospital mechanical by the presence of a charge of mechanical ventilation within the Medipac billing software, specifically codes 94002 (first day of mechanical ventilation) and 94003 (each subsequent day of mechanical ventilation). Because some facilities used intensive care units for the care of COVID-19 patients regardless of illness acuity, we did not use intensive care unit admission as an outcome. We assessed in-hospital mortality by the discharge disposition of “Ceased to Breathe” sourced from the inpatient Medical Record System.

Secondary outcomes included in-hospital mechanical ventilation or mortality individually and length of hospital stay (calculated by taking the difference between a discharge date time and the admission date time) available through billing within the Medipac system. Study

investigators remained unaware of ascertainment of mechanical ventilation and mortality within the UPMC system during data collection and analysis.

Explanatory Variables. For assessment of temporal changes and prior to analyses, we categorized the study analysis period into discrete epochs based on observed empirical changes in testing patterns in the UPMC system. We chose a 4-time period classification scheme (see **Figure 1**), (*Epoch 1*: March 14-March 31, 2020; *Epoch 2*: April 1-May 15, 2020; *Epoch 3*: May 16-June 28, 2020; *Epoch 4*: June 29-August 31, 2020), and then collapsed the 4 epochs into 2 epochs to depict earlier (*Epochs 1,2,3*) versus recently admitted hospital patients (*Epoch 4*). For assessment of variation between epochs, we considered demographic variables, clinical history and medical comorbidities, laboratory values, vital signs, and medication use, with a focus on indicators of changing clinical practice such as use and timing of specific medications. As above, investigators were unaware of initial documentation of the explanatory variables in the EMRs.

Statistical Methods. We compared characteristics of patients across the 4 epochs using analysis of variance (ANOVA) for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables. We used the same methods to compare patterns of use of drugs and unadjusted in-hospital outcomes by epoch group, while using non-parametric Wilcoxon tests used for variables with skewed distributions, in particular, days from hospital admission to initiation of specific drugs or oxygen therapies. We defined 3 binary “shorter” hospital length of stay variables for patients discharged alive as ≤ 3 , ≤ 5 , and ≤ 7 days, and included only patients admitted with adequate time to meet these definitions. We used chi-square tests to compare proportions by epochs. Then, we used Kaplan-Meier survival curves to present the outcomes in-hospital mechanical ventilation/mortality and each individual component, comparing epoch 4 (recent) versus epoch 1-3 (earlier) patients by use of the log-rank test.

We used propensity score methodology to compare in-hospital outcomes between epoch 4 versus epoch 1-3, adjusting for differences in presenting characteristics.^{22,23} Logistic regression models were fit using hospital admission during epoch 4 as the dependent variable with stepwise selection (at $p < 0.2$) of measured pre-treatment explanatory variables. Resulting propensity scores (i.e. predicted probability of being in epoch 4 versus epochs 1-3) were the output and used as a continuous variable to control for confounding in Cox proportional hazards regression and logistic regression models of in-hospital outcomes. In sensitivity analyses, models were replicated with the use of inverse probability weighting (IPW), as well as 1:1 propensity score matching (PSM) with a maximum propensity score probability difference of 0.01. We set the comparison alpha error at 0.05 without correction for multiple comparisons.

In stratified analyses, we examined potential effect modification by patient age using 3 groups defined as: (i) less than 60 years of age; (ii) 60 to less than 75 years of age; and (iii) 75 years of age and older. We did not impute missing values in any of the analyses. Methods and results are reported in accordance with The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) statement²⁴ (see **Supplemental Table 2**).

RESULTS

The mean number of hospital admissions was 9.9 per day during epoch 4, which was 2- to 3-fold higher than average daily admission during the earlier epochs (see **Supplementary Figure S1**). The overall rate of COVID-19 testing performed in epoch 4 also was higher (**Figure 1**).

Presenting characteristics of patients hospitalized with COVID-19 are listed in **Table 1**. The mean patient age was similar across the 4 epochs (ranging from 63.0 to 65.2 years), as was

representation by sex and race. In the earliest epoch (1) and most current epoch (4), the proportion of patients covered by UPMC health insurance was higher. Otherwise, the majority of patient characteristics were similar across the four epochs. Exceptions included a higher prevalence of COPD in epoch 2 and 4 patients, and nominally different mean hemoglobin laboratory values. Recent outpatient medication use at the time of hospital admission was similar across the 4 epochs.

Prescribing Patterns for Inpatients. Reported timing and use of medications showed changing patterns across the 4 epochs (**Table 2**). Specifically, the use of remdesivir peaked in epoch 3 at 31.3% and then declined to 17.8% in epoch 4. There was an increase in the use of dexamethasone to 55.6% of patients in epoch 4 compared to 15% or less of patients in the earlier epochs. The majority of patients received anticoagulation drugs, principally heparin, and use was highest in epoch 2 and 4 patients. There was a striking difference in the timing of drug initiation, with much earlier use of dexamethasone, glucocorticoids as a class, and anticoagulation in epoch 4 patients. As depicted in **Figure 2**, a higher percentage of patients in epoch 4 had initiation of steroids ($p<0.0001$) or anticoagulation ($p=0.0001$) on the same day (Day 0) or following day (Day 1) after hospital admission compared to patients admitted in epochs 1-3.

Use of Oxygen Support and In-Hospital Outcomes. More than half of all patients received oxygen therapy during their hospital stay, with the highest percentage (73%) observed in epoch 2 patients (**Table 3**). Oxygen therapy started sooner in epoch 4 patients (mean of 1.9 days), and initiation of drug aerosol therapy was also sooner in epoch 4 patients (mean of 4.0 days) compared to epoch 1-3 patients (mean of 5.6 to 9.2 days). By contrast, the timing of the start of mechanical ventilation after hospital admission was longest in epoch 4 patients (mean of 3.6 days) compared to epoch 1-3 patients (mean of 1.9 to 2.3 days). Individually, the crude rate

of use of mechanical ventilation was lower in epoch 4 patients (11.7%) than in epoch 1-3 patients (17% to 22%) as was in-hospital mortality (10.2% vs. 14.5% to 23.6%), recognizing that not all epoch 4 patients had been discharged. For the primary outcome, the crude rate of mechanical ventilation/mortality was lower in epoch 4 patients (17%) than in epoch 1-3 patients (23% to 35%). When censoring for incomplete patient follow-up (i.e. patients admitted yet not yet discharged), rates of mechanical ventilation ($p=0.0002$), mortality ($p=0.02$), and mechanical ventilation/mortality ($p<0.0001$) were lower in epoch 4 patients compared to epoch 1-3 patients (**Supplemental Figures 2a, 2b, 2c**, respectively). Rates of being discharged alive within 3, 5, and 7 days of admission were significantly higher in epoch 4 patients compared to epoch 1-3 patients (**Table 3**).

Relative Risks of In-Hospital Outcomes. In propensity score adjusted Cox regression models, the estimated in-hospital relative risks (RR: expressed as hazard ratios) of the composite outcome mechanical ventilation/mortality (RR=0.67, 95% CI: 0.48, 0.93), use of mechanical ventilation (RR=0.64, 95% CI: 0.42, 0.96), and mortality, (RR=0.81, 95% CI: 0.53, 1.23) were lower in epoch 4 patients compared to epoch 1-3 patients (**Table 4**). In propensity adjusted logistic regression models, RRs (expressed as odds ratios) of being discharged alive within 3, 5, or 7 days of admission were higher in epoch 4 patients compared to epoch 1-3 patients, ranging from an estimated 1.6- to 1.7-fold higher odds of shorter length of stay in epoch 4 patients (**Table 4**).

In sensitivity analyses using 1:1 propensity matched group patients (epoch 4 vs. epochs 1-3), presenting patient characteristics were similar (see **Supplemental Table S3**), and Cox and logistic regression estimates favoring better in-hospital outcomes in epoch 4 patients were similar (see **Supplementary Table S4**). Outcome results using propensity inverse probability

weighting **Supplementary Table S4**) were similar. A comparison of outcome results across all methods of analysis is depicted in **Supplemental Figure 2**, which shows similar results across all methods.

Relative Risks of In-Hospital Outcomes by Age. As seen in **Table 5**, the in-hospital outcome changes observed in epoch 4 versus epoch 1-3 patients varied by age. Specifically, in the age groups of less than 60 years of age or 60 to 74 years of age, the adjusted risk of in-hospital mechanical ventilation/mortality was approximately 50% lower in epoch 4 patients compared to epoch 1-3 patients. In contrast, the adjusted risk of in-hospital mechanical ventilation/mortality among patients 75 years of age and older was similar between epoch 4 versus epoch 1-3 patients.

Among patients less than 60 years of age, the adjusted odds of having a hospital stay of ≤ 3 days (discharged alive) were approximately 1.8 fold higher in epoch 4 patients, and were even larger for a hospital stay of ≤ 5 days (about 2.1-fold higher) or ≤ 7 days (about 2.6-fold higher). Patients age 60 to less than 75 years also tended to have a shorter length of stay in epoch 4, whereas there were no differences by epoch in length of stay for patients aged 75 and older.

DISCUSSION

Among COVID-19 patients hospitalized starting in March of 2020, our analyses show recent (epoch 4: June 19th to August 31st, 2020) decreases in rates of mechanical ventilation, mortality, and hospital length of stay, compared with earlier time periods. These results were observed principally in hospitalized patients under the age of 75, and are consistent with some,^{1-3,39-42} but not all,⁴ recent non-peer-reviewed reports. The better hospital outcomes observed do

not appear to be attributable to differences in baseline characteristics of hospitalized COVID-19 patients, which were minimal and controlled for statistically with multiple analytic approaches.

In our large, representative health care system, we observed marked temporal changes in clinical management of patients. The most notable changes in clinical management of patients in the most recent interval was a higher use of dexamethasone (and glucocorticoids overall), higher use of anticoagulants, earlier initiation of dexamethasone, glucocorticoids as a class, and use of anticoagulants. The observed treatment strategy of earlier and significantly more frequent use of dexamethasone in patients in the UPMC system likely was triggered by the July 2020 release of the RECOVERY trial,⁹ which showed lower 28-day mortality in patients who were receiving oxygen with or without invasive mechanical ventilation, and who received dexamethasone as compared to placebo. Our observed practice pattern of more frequent use of steroids is also consistent with a recently published (September 2, 2020) meta-analysis of six trials involving random assignment of different steroids (dexamethasone, hydrocortisone, methylprednisolone) compared to placebo, and approximately 30% lower risk of 28-day mortality among patients treated with steroids.²⁵

Effect of Treatment Changes in Clinical Practice. An obvious question that arises from the present analysis is to what extent did the recent changes in clinical practice (e.g. greater use and earlier initiation of steroids and anticoagulants) lead to overall lower rates of mechanical ventilation and hospital mortality, as well shorter length of hospital stay? Unfortunately, this type of question is difficult to answer with an observational dataset. Specifically, in non-randomized settings, there is potential confounding by indication (indication bias) when comparing different treatment approaches. It is nearly impossible to determine whether a given treatment approach was initiated *a priori*, as opposed to preferentially in response to patient disease severity and/or

hospital course, thereby rendering comparisons of such treated patients to those who did not receive the treatment as potentially biased.^{26,27} As recently articulated, we believe caution is wise and causality uncertain though possible with these observational data.²⁸ Our data provide a rationale for potential conduct of new RCTs, particularly pragmatic and adaptive types²⁹ of trials that can quickly study questions, such as the timing in which steroids and anticoagulants are administered among COVID-19 hospitalized patients.

Variation in Outcomes by Age. The present analysis indicated that the better in-hospital outcomes observed in recent hospitalized COVID-19 patients (epoch 4) were principally evident in patients under the age of 75, and largely not evident among those 75 years of age and older. Multiple potential explanations exist for these apparent differential results. First may be the clinical decision for potential use of mechanical ventilation. A report of 5,700 COVID-19 patients admitted to 12 hospitals in New York showed high rates of mortality for mechanically ventilated patients over the age of 65.³⁰ These findings comport with indications that some physicians may be reluctant to initiate mechanical ventilation in elderly patients as compared to younger patients who typically present with fewer comorbidities, (e.g.³¹) potential medical ethics arguments made for rationing use of ventilators by age,^{32,33} and from the patient perspective, possibility that some elderly patients (coupled with family member input) may be particularly likely to expressly state orders against the use of mechanical ventilation. (e.g.³⁴⁻³⁶) These types of competing influences may blur assessment of the true clinical risk of mechanical ventilation in elderly COVID-19 hospitalized patients. With respect to less indication in our dataset of a mortality reduction in recently treated elderly COVID-19 patients, these findings may represent the greater challenge and complexity in treating elderly hospitalized COVID-19 patients who may be frail and have extensive comorbidities. This is consistent with reports of age being an

independent risk factor for COVID-19 mortality³⁷ as well as for higher levels of inflammatory dysfunction markers and weakened immune response³⁸.

Strengths and Limitations. Strengths of this study include analysis of a large, heterogenous patient population (e.g. enhances generalizability), standardized collection of real-world data and algorithmic coding of variables harmonized in a clinical data warehouse collected for non-research purposes (e.g. reduces potential reporting and ascertainment bias), and access to a very large battery of sociodemographic, medical history, medication use, and clinical practice and outcome variables available for analysis. A limitation is that we extracted all variables from the EHR of a multisite health care system, making fidelity concerns persist. All current data are observational and cannot determine causality. We also did not collect data to inform changes in host biology or viral pathogenesis over time, and we did not attempt to assess other external factors, such as seasonal effects of temperature and humidity variation, and possible patient-specific directives against the use of mechanical ventilation. Lastly, the present analysis includes a small percentage of hospitalized patients (<13%) enrolled in clinical trials, including potential randomization to either hydroxychloroquine, steroids, immunomodulators, convalescent plasma, or placebo. While a potential impact, we think that effect is modest if at all present.

Conclusions. Recently treated hospitalized COVID-19 patients in our large health care system have overall lower rates of mechanical ventilation/in-hospital mortality and shorter length of hospital stay compared to earlier intervals. The extent to which these improved patient outcomes are related to recent changing clinical practice (i.e. greater and earlier use of steroids and anticoagulants) is unknown but an opportunity for rigorous future controlled trials.

Figure Legends.

Figure 1.

Histogram of the average number of COVID-19 tests reported in the UPMC system during the study period. The color coding depicts the time periods in which the 4 epochs were defined for comparative analyses.

Figure 2.

Stacked bar chart of timing of use and steroids and anticoagulants comparing recently treated epoch 4 patients to earlier patients treated in epochs 1-3. Light shading: drug initiated on same day as hospital admission; Medium shading: drug administered on the day after hospital admission; Dark shading: drug administered 2 or more days after hospital admission.

Supplemental Figure 1.

Bar chart of the average number of hospital admissions during the four different study-defined Epochs: *Epoch 1*: March 14-March 31, 2020; *Epoch 2*: April 1-May 15, 2020; *Epoch 3*: May 16-June 28, 2020; *Epoch 4*: June 29-August 31, 2020.

Supplemental Figure 2.

Kaplan-Meier plots of survival free probabilities of in-hospital mechanical ventilation (**2a**), mortality (**2b**), and mechanical ventilation/mortality (**2c**) stratified by epoch 1-3 patients (blue line) versus epoch 4 patients (red line).

Supplemental Figure 3.

Plot of relative risks (RR) of in-hospital outcomes comparing epoch 4 patients to epoch 1-3 patients. The filled symbols represent the RR estimate; the lower and upper end of the vertical lines represent the lower and upper limits of the 95% confidence interval. Symbol interpretation is as follows: rectangle (unadjusted estimate); diamond (propensity score adjustment as a continuous variable); triangle (propensity score with inverse probability weighting (IPW)); circle (1:1 matched propensity score). Composite: in-hospital mechanical ventilation/mortality, LOS3: length of stay ≤ 3 days; LOS5: length of stay ≤ 5 days; LOS7: length of stay ≤ 7 days.

References

1. Harris JE. COVID-19 case mortality rates continue to decline in Florida. *MedRxiv: The Preprint Server for the Health Sciences*; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.03.20167338>. posted August 4, 2020.
2. Le Page M. Is coronavirus becoming less deadly? *New Scientist*; Volume 247, Issue 3291, 18 July 2020, Page 9. Accessed September 24, 2020 at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0262407920312276>
3. Oke J, Howdon D, Heneghan C. Declining COVID-19 case fatality rates across all ages: analysis of German data. *Oxford University Centre for Evidence Based Medicine (CEBM)*; September 9, 2020. Accessed September 24, 2020 at: <https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/declining-covid-19-case-fatality-rates-across-all-ages-analysis-of-german-data/>
4. Rothman DL, Rothman JE, Bossard G. Is Covid-19 growing less lethal? The infection fatality rate says ‘no’ *First Opinion*; August 24, 2020. Accessed September 24, 2020 at: <https://www.statnews.com/2020/08/24/infection-fatality-rate-shows-covid-19-isnt-getting-less-deadly/>
5. Centers for Disease Control. COVID-Net: A weekly summary of US COVID-19 hospitalization data. Accessed August 27, 2020 at: https://gis.cdc.gov/grasp/COVIDNet/COVID19_5.html
6. Dondorp AM, Hayat M, Aryal D, Beane A, Schultz MJ. Respiratory support in COVID-19 patients, with a focus on resource-limited settings. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 2020;102(6):1191-1197.

7. Tang N, Bai H, Chen X, Gong J, Li D, Sun Z. Anticoagulant treatment is associated with decreased mortality in severe coronavirus disease 2019 patients with coagulopathy. *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis* 2020;18(5):1094-1099.
8. Trinh M, Chang DR, Govindarajulu US, Kane E, Fuster V, Kohli-Seth R, Ahmed S, Levin MA, Chen MD. Therapeutic anticoagulation is associated with decreased mortality in mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients. *MedRxiv: The Preprint Server for the Health Sciences*; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.30.20117929>
9. RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby P, Lim WS, et al. Dexamethasone in hospitalized Patients with Covid-19 - preliminary report [published online ahead of print, 2020 July 17]. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;NEJM oa2021436. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2021436.
10. Xiang Z, Liu J, Shi D, et al. Glucocorticoids improve severe or critical COVID-19 by activating ACE2 and reducing IL-6 levels. *International Journal of Biological Sciences*. 2020;16(13):2382-2391. Published 2020 Jun 27. doi:10.7150/ijbs.47652
11. Chatterjee K, Wu CP, Bhardwaj A, Siuba M. Steroids in COVID-19: An overview. *Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine*, published online ahead of print, Aug 20, 2020. 2020;10.3949/ccjm.87a.ccc059. doi:10.3949/ccjm.87a.ccc059
12. Fadel R, Morrison AR, Vahia A, et al. Early short course corticosteroids in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. Published online ahead of print, May 19, 2020. ciaa601. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa601.
13. Firouzabadi MD, Firouzabadi DF, Goudarzi S, Jahandideh H, Roomiani M. Has the chief complaint of patients with COVID-19 disease changed over time? [published online

- ahead of print, 2020 Jun 7]. *Med Hypotheses*. 2020;144:109974.
doi:10.1016/j.mehy.2020.109974
14. Ma Y, Zhao Y, Liu J, He X, Wang B, Shihua F, Yan J, Niu J, Luo B. Effects of temperature variation and humidity on the death of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Science of the Total Environment* 724 (2020) 138226.
 15. Scientific American July 16 ,2020. Second coronavirus strain may be more infectious—but some scientists are skeptical. Accessed August 31, 2020 at:
<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/second-coronavirus-strain-may-be-more-infectious-but-some-scientists-are-skeptical/>
 16. Korber B, Fischer WM, Gnanakaran S, et al. Tracking changes in SARS-CoV-2 spike: evidence that D614G increases infectivity of the COVID-19 virus. *Cell* 2020;182(4):812-827.e19.
 17. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Testing strategy for coronavirus (COVID-19) in high-density critical infrastructure workplaces after a COVID-19 case is identified. Accessed August 31, 2020at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/worker-safety-support/hd-testing.html>
 18. Dora AV, Winnett A, Jatt LP, et al., Universal and serial laboratory testing for SARS-CoV-2 at a long-term care skilled nursing facility for veterans – Los Angeles, California, 2020. *The Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)* 2020; 69(21): 651-655.
 19. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Trump administration strengthens COVID-19 surveillance with new reporting and testing requirements for nursing homes, other providers. August 25, 2020. Accessed August 31, 2020 at:

- <https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/trump-administration-strengthens-covid-19-surveillance-new-reporting-and-testing-requirements>
20. Forbes Magazine. July brings major changes for coronavirus testing and tracing of college athletes. July 2, 2020. Accessed August 31, 2020 at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/karenweaver/2020/07/02/july-brings-major-changes-for-coronavirus-testing-and-tracing-of-college-athletes/#3696f86b3da7>
 21. University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC). (2020). "Why UPMC?". Retrieved July 13, 2020, from www.upmc.com/about/why-upmc
 22. Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* 1983; 70: 41-55.
 23. Austin PC. An introduction to propensity score methods for reducing the effects of confounding in observational studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 2011; 46(3): 399-424.
 24. Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttman A, et al. The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) statement. *PLoS Medicine* 2015; 12(10):e1001885. Published 2015 Oct 6. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001885
 25. WHO Rapid Evidence Appraisal for COVID-19 Therapies (REACT) Working Group. Association between administration of systemic corticosteroids and mortality among critically ill patients with COVID-19. A meta-analysis. *JAMA*. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.17023. Published online September 2, 2020.
 26. Walker AM. Confounding by indication. *Epidemiology* 1996; 7: 335-336.
 27. Joseph KS, Mehrabadi A, Lisonkova S. Confounding by indication and related concepts. *Current Epidemiology Reports* 2014; 1: 1-8.

28. Califf RM. Weighing the benefits and risks of proliferating observational treatment assessments. Observational cacophony, randomized harmony. *JAMA* 2020; 324(7): 625-626.
29. Angus DC. Optimizing the trade-off between learning and doing in a pandemic. *JAMA*. 2020;323(19):1895-1896. Doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4984
30. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting characteristics, comorbidities, and outcomes among 5700 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in the New York City area [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 22] [published correction appears in doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.7681]. *JAMA*. 2020;323(20):2052-2059. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6775
31. Lieberman D, Nachshon L, Miloslavsky O, et al. Elderly patients undergoing mechanical ventilation in and out of intensive care units: a comparative, prospective study of 579 ventilations. *Critical Care* 2010;14(2): R48.
32. Miller FG. Why I support age-related rationing of ventilators for COVID-19 patients. Published in: *Covid-19, Hastings Bioethics Forum, Health and Health Care*, April 9, 2020; Accessed September 16: <https://www.thehastingscenter.org/why-i-support-age-related-rationing-of-ventilators-for-covid-19-patients/>
33. LA Times, March 26, 2020. Who lives and who dies? With ventilators limited amid coronavirus, doctors might face hard choices. Accessed September 4, 2020 at: <https://www.latimes.com/science/story/2020-03-26/coronavirus-ventilator-shortage-choice-health-care-doctors>
34. Fried TR, Bradley EH, Towle VR, Allore H. Understanding the treatment preferences of seriously ill patients. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2002; 346(14):1061-1066.

35. White DB, Lo B. A Framework for rationing ventilators and critical care beds during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA*. 2020;323(18):1773–1774. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5046
36. Modern Healthcare. May 12, 2020. ‘No intubation’: seniors fearful of COVID-19 are changing their living wills; Accessed September 4, 2020 at: <https://www.modernhealthcare.com/safety-quality/no-intubation-seniors-fearful-covid-19-are-changing-their-living-wills>
37. Williamson, E.J., Walker, A.J., Bhaskaran, K. et al. Factors associated with COVID-19-related death using Open SAFELY. *Nature* 584, 430–436 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2521-4>
38. Mueller AL, McNamara MS, Sinclair DA. Why does COVID-19 disproportionately affect older people? *Aging (Albany NY)*. 2020;12(10):9959-9981. doi:10.18632/aging.103344
39. The Atlantic July 9, 2020. COVID-19 cases are rising, so why are deaths flatlining? Accessed September 3, 2020 at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/07/why-covid-death-rate-down/613945/>
40. Healthline. COVID-19 mortality is going down in ICUs - what this means for the pandemic. July 17, 2020, Accessed September 13, 2020 at: <https://www.healthline.com/health-news/covid-19-mortality-is-going-down-in-ic-us-what-this-means-for-the-pandemic>
41. LA Times, August 9, 2020. As COVID-19 cases surge, patients are dying at a lower rate. Here’s why. Accessed September 3, 2020 at: <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-08-09/covid-19-coronavirus-survival-rate-improves>

42. Bodkin H. Covid death rates dropped as doctors rejected ventilators. *The Telegraph*, September 3, 2020. Accessed on September 8, 2020 at:
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2020/09/03/covid-death-rates-dropped-doctors-rejected-ventilators/>

Table 1. Comparison of Hospitalized COVID Patient Characteristics at Admission by Epoch

Characteristic	<i>Epoch 1</i> (March 14 – March 31) (N=72)	<i>Epoch 2</i> (April 1 – May 15) (N=203)	<i>Epoch 3</i> (May 16 – June 28) (N=166)	<i>Epoch 4</i> (June 29 – August 31) (N=635)	<i>p</i>- value
Age, mean, SD	63.5, 17.4	65.0, 18.4	63.0, 20.6	65.2, 19.8	0.5640
Female gender, %	43.1	51.2	52.4	49.6	0.5864
Body mass index, mean, SD	32.2, 7.1	34.2, 9.9	32.4, 8.1	32.0, 8.3	0.3501
Race, %					
White	81.7	61.2	67.9	65.4	0.1066
Black	16.9	34.8	28.5	30.6	
Other Race	1.4	4.0	3.6	4.0	
UPMC Health Plan, %	40.3	25.6	33.7	40.5	0.0010
History of hypertension, %	55.6	62.5	53.4	62.3	0.3226
History of hyperlipidemia, %	50.0	51.9	49.5	54.5	0.7703
History of diabetes, %	22.2	38.5	29.1	38.4	0.0485
History of atrial fibrillation, %	13.0	14.4	12.6	13.0	0.9809
History of congestive heart failure, %	13.0	17.3	16.5	14.5	0.8293
History of major bleed, %	24.1	23.1	26.2	22.7	0.9024
History of cancer, %					
History of chronic kidney disease, %	9.3	24.0	18.4	17.1	0.1292
History of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, %	18.5	26.9	10.7	25.1	0.0094
History of obstructive sleep apnea, %	24.1	24.0	20.4	22.7	0.9236
Most recent lab values, mean, SD					
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	125, 14	128, 20	127, 18	131, 17.8	0.0997
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	74, 13	75, 12	73, 12	76, 12	0.2208
Total cholesterol (mg/dL)	163, 45	161, 41	165, 51	159, 46	0.8658
Aspartate aminotransferase (AST)*	35, 36	46, 51	43, 45	40, 52	0.1473

Creatinine*	1.2, 1.0	1.5, 1.8	1.4, 1.1	1.4, 1.2	0.0747
Ejection fraction	53, 13	52, 13	57, 10	53, 10	0.1954
Hemoglobin	13.0, 1.8	12.6, 2.2	12.0, 2.6	12.7, 2.0	0.0039
Lymphocytes	15.8, 11.8	17.8, 11.2	19.4, 10.6	18.6, 10.7	0.1720
Neutrophils	75, 13	73, 13	69, 12	71, 13	0.0340
Platelets*	197, 73	221, 108	212, 94	211, 91	0.3048
Partial thromboplastin time (PTT)	41.5, 22.7	32.8, 4.1	41.7, 22.6	38.3, 9.0	0.2620
Charlson Comorbidity Index score, mean, SD	1.3, 1.6	2.0, 2.1	1.6, 1.8	1.8, 1.9	0.0802
Selected medications, %					
Angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) Inhibitor	16.7	25.0	20.4	22.3	0.6557
Angiotensin II receptor blocker (ARB)	16.7	12.5	8.7	14.7	0.3860
Calcium channel blocker	24.1	28.8	27.2	25.1	0.8527
Beta Blocker	29.6	44.2	42.7	38.6	0.2889
Aspirin	46.3	42.3	39.8	42.9	0.8852
Antiplatelet	33.3	31.7	32.0	32.5	0.9971
Statin	50.0	48.1	51.5	51.4	0.9391
Warfarin	7.4	7.7	6.8	4.7	0.5699
Anti-depressant	29.6	42.3	45.6	35.3	0.1012

*Due to high skew, comparisons by epoch were made by non-parametric Kruskal Wallis tests. PCP: primary care physician

Table 2. Practice Patterns of Use of Drugs by Epoch*

Characteristic	March 14 – March 31 (N=72)	April 1 – May 15 (N=203)	May 16 – June 28 (N=166)	June 29 – August 31 (N=635)	p-value
Use of remdesivir, %	0.0	3.9	31.3	17.8	<.0001
Use of dexamethasone, %	5.6	5.4	14.5	55.6	<.0001
Use of hydrocortisone, %	2.8	11.3	6.6	3.3	<.0001
Use of prednisone, %	8.3	6.4	7.2	6.8	0.9499
Use of methylprednisolone, %	8.3	10.3	9.6	9.0	0.931
Any steroid used, %	20.8	25.6	31.3	62.2	<.0001
Use of heparin, %	68.1	73.4	71.1	79.2	0.0285
Use of anticoagulation, %	73.6	83.3	75.3	86.5	0.0007
Days from admission to remdesivir, mean, SD	., .	4.8, 2.9	2.2, 3.8	1.7, 2.4	0.3734
Days from admission to dexamethasone, mean, SD	3.8, 6.2	7.0, 8.0	4.6, 7.6	1.5, 3.1	0.0135
Days from admission to hydrocortisone, mean, SD	14.5, 10.6	5.7, 6.7	1.6, 1.4	7.5, 7.8	0.6182
Days from admission to prednisone, mean, SD	14.2, 21.8	2.9, 4.6	3.8, 3.3	4.3, 7.1	0.4186
Days from admission to methylprednisolone, mn, SD	8.5, 18.4	5.9, 7.4	3.3, 4.8	4.4, 8.9	0.1329
Days from admission to steroid use, mean, SD	5.0, 7.9	4.3, 6.5	2.6, 3.8	1.3, 2.9	<.0001
Days from admission to heparin, mean, SD	1.8, 3.0	1.5, 5.7	1.2, 2.4	1.0, 3.2	0.0003
Days from admission to anticoagulation, mean, SD	1.6, 2.9	1.0, 1.3	1.2, 2.3	0.8, 1.6	0.0005

*For all days from admission variables, comparisons by epoch were made by non-parametric Wilcoxon continuity-corrected 2-sample tests comparing epochs 1-3 to epoch 4.

Table 3. Practice Patterns of Use of Oxygen Support and Hospital Outcomes by COVID Epoch*

Characteristic	March 14 – March 31 (N=72)	April 1 – May 15 (N=203)	May 16 – June 28 (N=166)	June 29 – August 31 (N=635)	p-value
Use of oxygen, %	65.3	72.9	59.0	60.2	0.0075
Use of high flow nasal cannula, %	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.8743
Use of BIPAP and CPAP, %	5.6	16.3	15.7	16.1	0.1266
Use of ventilation, %	20.8	22.2	16.9	11.7	0.0011
Highest level hypoxemic respiratory failure treatment, %					0.0007
No use of oxygen	34.7	26.6	40.4	38.7	
Use of oxygen therapy	43.1	43.3	33.7	39.7	
Use of both BIPAP and CPAP	1.4	7.9	9.0	9.9	
Use of mechanical ventilation*	20.8	22.2	16.9	11.7	
Use of drug aerosol therapy, %	19.4	16.3	16.9	20.2	0.5633
Use of general respiratory care treatments, %	11.1	14.8	9.0	13.9	0.3233
Days admission to oxygen, mean, SD	1.9, 3.2	3.2, 7.5	4.0, 8.1	1.9, 3.3	0.0295
Days admission to both BIPAP and CPAP, mean, SD	31.3, 48.1	2.0, 3.7	4.3, 5.3	4.2, 6.7	0.2305
Days admission to ventilation, mean, SD	2.1, 2.5	1.9, 2.2	2.3, 3.4	3.6, 4.5	0.0242
Days admission to drug aerosol therapy, mean, SD	5.6, 7.3	7.5, 8.8	9.2, 10.4	4.0, 5.8	0.0039
Days admission to general resp care tx, mean, SD	6.5, 7.2	9.3, 15.2	12.4, 13.4	5.9, 7.2	0.2816
In-hospital mortality, %**	19.4	23.6	14.5	10.2	<.0001
In-hospital ventilation/mortality, %**	30.6	35.0	23.5	17.3	<.0001
LOS ≤ 3 days (discharged alive), %	26.4	21.7	23.8	31.3	0.0373
LOS ≤ 5 days (discharged alive), %	41.7	32.5	37.2	47.1	0.002
LOS ≤ 7 days (discharged alive), %	45.8	41.4	49.4	60.6	<.0001

*For all days from admission variables, comparisons by epoch were made by non-parametric Wilcoxon continuity-corrected 2-sample tests comparing epochs 1-3 to epoch 4. **Some patients in epoch 4 (June 29-August 31) have yet to be discharged, hence, crude outcomes rates should be cautiously interpreted. BIPAP: Bilevel Positive Airway Pressure. CPAP: Continuous positive airway pressure. LOS: length of stay.

Table 4. Relative Risks* of In-Hospital Outcomes Comparing Epoch 4 (Recent) to Epoch 1/2/3 (Earlier) Treated COVID-19 Patients

Outcome	Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	All Patients (N=1,076)	Patients with Covariate Data (N=683)	Propensity Score Adjustment (N=683)	
			RR	95% CI
In-hospital ventilation/mortality	0.56	0.66	0.67	0.48, 0.93
In-hospital ventilation	0.57	0.66	0.62	0.41, 0.94
In-hospital mortality	0.69	0.80	0.82	0.54, 1.25
LOS \leq 3 days (alive)**	1.50	1.65	1.60	1.10, 2.32
LOS \leq 5 days (alive)**	1.60	1.62	1.59	1.13, 2.23
LOS \leq 7 days (alive)**	1.87	1.80	1.72	1.23, 2.41

*For in-hospital ventilation and mortality, relative risk (RR) estimates are presented as hazard ratios. For length of stay (LOS), RR estimates are presented as odds ratios. **For length of stay, sample sizes ranged from 977 to 986 for the all patients in undadjusted analyses, and from 618 to 626 for the adjusted analysis among patients with covariate data. The adjusted estimates are based on use of the propensity score as a continuous variable.

Table 5. Relative Risks* of In-Hospital Outcomes Comparing Epoch 4 (Current) to Epoch 1/2/3 (Earlier) COVID-19 Patients by Age Groups

Outcome / Age Group	N	# Events	Propensity Score Adjustment	
			RR	95% CI
Mechanical ventilation/mortality				
Less than 60 years of age	233	30	0.45	0.22, 0.95
60 to less than 75 years of age	207	54	0.52	0.29, 1.93
75 years of age and older	243	71	0.99	0.58, 1.66
Mechanical ventilation				
Less than 60 years of age	233	28	0.44	0.21, 0.95
60 to less than 75 years of age	207	40	0.55	0.28, 1.07
75 years of age and older	243	34	1.14	0.51, 2.55
In-hospital mortality				
Less than 60 years of age	233	9	0.59	0.14, 2.41
60 to less than 75 years of age	207	32	0.47	0.21, 1.05
75 years of age and older	243	58	0.91	0.52, 1.62
LOS ≤ 3 days (alive)				
Less than 60 years of age	217	104	1.81	1.04, 3.15
60 to less than 75 years of age	188	43	1.80	0.85, 3.83
75 years of age and older	221	43	1.23	0.56, 2.67
LOS ≤ 5 days (alive)				
Less than 60 years of age	215	137	2.14	1.20, 3.79
60 to less than 75 years of age	188	67	1.23	0.64, 2.35
75 years of age and older	220	80	1.45	0.77, 2.73
LOS ≤ 7 days (alive)				
Less than 60 years of age	214	154	2.63	1.42, 4.88
60 to less than 75 years of age	186	94	1.90	1.01, 3.55
75 years of age and older	218	95	1.23	0.67, 2.26

*For in-hospital ventilation and mortality, relative risk (RR) estimates are presented as hazard ratios. For length of stay (LOS), RR estimates are presented as odds ratios. The adjusted estimates are based on use of the propensity score as a continuous variable.




Figure 1





Figure 2