

1 **Features of α -HBDH in COVID-19 patients with different ages,outcomes and clinical types: a cohort study**

2 Haoming Zhu¹, Gaojing Qu¹, Hui Yu¹, Guoxin Huang¹, Lei Chen¹, Meiling Zhang¹, Shanshan Wan², Bin Pei^{1,*}

3 ¹ Center of Evidence-Based Medicine, Xiangyang No.1 People's Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine, Xiangyang, 441000, China

4 ² Postgraduate Training Basement of Jinzhou Medical University, Xiangyang No.1 People's Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine, Xiangyang, 441000,
5 China

6 * Corresponding author

7 **Correspondence to:**

8 Professor Bin Pei, Department of Evidence-Based Medicine Center, Xiangyang No.1 People's Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine, Xiangyang, 441000,
9 Hubei Province, China. E-mail: binpei@hbmhmu.edu.cn; Phone: +86-18995678520.

Features of α -HBDH in COVID-19 patients with different ages, outcomes and clinical types: a cohort study

Abstract

Background: Coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) has spread all over the world and brought extremely huge losses. At present, there is no study to systematically analyse the features of hydroxybutyrate dehydrogenase (α -HBDH) in COVID-19 patients with different ages, clinical types and outcomes.

Methods: Electronic medical records including demographics, clinical manifestation, α -HBDH test results and outcomes of 131 hospitalized COVID-19 patients, with confirmed result of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) viral infection, were extracted and analyzed.

Results: The α -HBDH value in ≥ 61 years old group, severe group and critical group, death group all increased at first and then decreased, while no obvious changes were observed in other groups. And there were significant differences of the α -HBDH value among different age groups ($P < 0.001$), clinical type groups ($P < 0.001$) and outcome groups ($P < 0.001$). The optimal scale regression model showed that α -HBDH value ($P < 0.001$) and age ($P < 0.001$) were related to clinical type.

Conclusions: α -HBDH value increases in some COVID-19 patients, obviously in ≥ 61 years old, death and critical group, indicating that patients in these three groups suffer from more serious tissues and organs damage, higher α -HBDH value and risk of death. The obvious difference between death and survival group in early stage may provide a approach to judge the prognosis. The accuracy of the model to distinguish severe/critical type and other types is 85.84%, suggesting that α -HBDH could judge the clinical type of COVID-19 patients accurately. In brief, α -HBDH is an important indicator to judge the severity and prognosis of COVID-19.

Keywords: Coronavirus disease-2019, respiratory infection, clinical features, laboratory findings

26 **1 Introduction**

27 Since the outbreak of COVID-19 in December 2019, caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), it
28 has spread rapidly around the world. SARS-Cov-2 has attracted the attention of the global because of its high transmission ability,
29 morbidity and mortality^[1-4]. On January 30, the World Health Organization (WHO) identified COVID-19 as a public health emergency of
30 international concern^[5]. As of July 1, 2020, the number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 worldwide has reached 10357622, and the
31 number of deaths has reached 508055^[6].

32 Lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) is one of the important enzymes in glycolysis and gluconeogenesis. It mainly catalyzes the
33 transformation between lactic acid and pyruvate. Its enzymatic reaction is: $\text{pyruvate} + \text{NADH} + \text{H}^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{lactic acid} + \text{NAD}^+$. LDH consists of
34 five isozymes composed of different combinations of H and M subunits: LDH1 (H₄), LDH2 (H₃M), LDH3 (H₂M₂), LDH4 (HM₃) and
35 LDH5 (M₄). α -HBDH is tested by the α -ketoacid, a substrate, to determine the LDH activity. Additionally, the activity of LDH1 and
36 LDH2 with more H subunits is described by α -HBDH activity because of the high affinity for this substrate to the H subunit in LDH.
37 α -HBDH mainly distributed in the heart, brain, kidney and red blood cells, and the activity of the enzyme in the heart is more than half of
38 the total enzyme activity. α -HBDH level increased in the progression of cor pulmonale, leukemia and tumor. Moreover, the extents of the
39 increase and the tissue and organ injury were closely related, which can be used as an auxiliary diagnostic index^[7-11].

40 Compared with other pneumonia types, the α -HBDH level in COVID-19 patients was significantly higher, and the α -HBDH value of
41 severe group was higher than that of non-severe group^[12, 13]. When complicated with cardiovascular disease or gastrointestinal symptoms,
42 the increase of α -HBDH in COVID-19 patients was much more significant as well^[14, 15]. Cen Y et al. observed 1007 mild and moderate

43 COVID-19 patients for 28 days. It was found that the higher the α -HBDH value, the greater the risk of progression to severe or critical
44 type^[16]. Zhang Gemin et al. divided 95 COVID-19 patients into four groups according to their α -HBDH level on admission. They found
45 that the higher the α -HBDH value, the greater the proportion of severe cases, and the higher the risk of death or need for mechanical
46 ventilation for patients, showing that the high α -HBDH level indicates an increased risk of further aggravation of the disease^[17]. In this
47 study, we analyzed the changes of α -HBDH values of COVID-19 patients with different ages, clinical types and outcomes. The effects of
48 α -HBDH, age and gender on the clinical type of COVID-19 patients were quantified by the optimal scale regression model, so as to
49 achieve the purpose of early judging the severity of the disease.

50 **2 Methods**

51 ***2.1 Study Population***

52 Our study included individuals with complete examination data, 18 years old or above, who were hospitalized in Xiangyang No.1
53 People's Hospital with a diagnosis of COVID-19. In the end, we included a total of 131 patients.

54 ***2.2 Study Design***

55 This research project was a bidirectional observational cohort study. According to the diagnosis and treatment guidelines^[18], the patients
56 were divided into mild group, moderate group, severe group and critical group. According to their age, the patients were divided into ≤ 40 years
57 old group, 41-60 years old group and ≥ 61 years old group. According to the outcome, the patients were divided into death group and survival
58 group. The distributions of α -HBDH median value were plotted with an 5-days interval (T1, T2, T3...Tn represented the time unit successively).
59 The symptom onset data was designed as the first day of disease, the abnormal percentage, median and quartile interval of α -HBDH in different
60 ages, outcomes and clinical types were calculated.

61 The study was approved by the ethics review board of Xiangyang No.1 People's Hospital (No.2020GCP012) and registered at the Chinese
62 Clinical Trial Registry as ChiCTR2000031088. Informed consent from patients has been exempted since this study is an observational cohort
63 study that does not involve patients' personal privacy.

64 ***2.3 Data Sources***

65 Two groups (two researchers per group) extracted the data from hospital information system through a consistent data collection protocol
66 and cross-checked. Gender, age, all α -HBDH test results, disease onset date, outcome, death date, etc. were collected. Two respiratory
67 physicians classified the clinical types and then cross-checked the results. A third expert was involved when there was disagreement. The data
68 were traced back to 23 January and followed up to 28 March, 2020.

69 ***2.4 Statistical Analysis***

70 All statistical analyses were performed by SPSS 20.0. Continuous data in accordance with normality were represented by means and
71 standard deviations, otherwise median (interquartile, IQR) was applied. Categorical data were described as frequency (%). The chi-square test
72 was conducted to assess significance between groups. T-test was used to compare the quantitative data of normal distribution between the two
73 groups, and the comparison of the quantitative data of non-normal distribution between the two groups was analyzed using Mann-Whitney U test.
74 The correlation between two variables was tested by Spearman correlation test. The maximum α -HBDH value in the first 15 days, age and
75 gender were regarded as independent variables and clinical types were regarded as dependent variables to build the optimal scale regression
76 model.

77 **3 Results**

78 ***3.1 General Information***

79 Up to February 28, 542 patients with suspected and confirmed COVID-19 have been admitted to our hospital. A total of 142 cases were
80 positive for nucleic acid test, among which the data of 9 cases were incomplete, 2 cases were infants, thus 131 cases were included in this study
81 finally, including 63 males and 68 females, aged 50.13 ± 17.13 years old. Among them, there were 4 mild cases, 88 moderate cases, 18 severe
82 cases and 21 critical cases. The average time from onset to admission, from onset to discharge, from onset to death, and length of hospitalization
83 were 4.54 ± 3.10 , 26.87 ± 9.19 , 18.4 ± 9.77 and 22.38 ± 8.70 days respectively. In this study, 565 tests of α -HBDH were extracted from 37 laboratory
84 indicators (including 24560 outpatient and inpatient examination results), accounting for 2.30% of the total test results.

85 ***3.2 α -HBDH in different age groups of COVID-19 patients***

86 In ≤ 40 years old group, 41-60 years old group and ≥ 61 years old group, the α -HBDH median value was 123.17 (106.94-144.95) U/L,
87 150.49 (120.18-185.20) U/L and 221.59 (156.76-302.89) U/L, respectively, and the α -HBDH value abnormal percentage was 10.53%, 26.74%
88 and 60.70%, respectively. The changes indicated that the α -HBDH median value in ≤ 40 years old group increased during T1-T2 and decreased
89 after T2, and the normal range was T1 to T6; in 41-60 years old group, the α -HBDH median value decreased during T1-T6, and was in the
90 normal range from T1 to T6; in ≥ 61 years old group, the α -HBDH median value increased during T1-T2 and decreased after T2, and the
91 abnormal time interval was T2-T5 (Figure1, Table1).

92 There were significant differences of the α -HBDH value in the first 30 days among the three age groups. Significant differences were
93 observed in the α -HBDH value between ≤ 40 years old group and 41-60 years old group during T1-T4, between ≤ 40 years old group and ≥ 61
94 years old group during T1-T6, and between 41-60 years old group and ≥ 61 years old group during T2-T6. Differences were also significant in
95 the α -HBDH value abnormal percentage among the three age groups ($P < 0.001$). The age was correlated with α -HBDH value according to the
96 Spearman correlation test ($P < 0.001$), and the coefficient was 0.52.

97 **3.3 α -HBDH in different outcome groups of COVID-19 patients**

98 In survival group and death group, the α -HBDH median value was 147.80 (121.55-194.67) U/L and 337.18 (294.01-477.11) U/L,
99 respectively, and the α -HBDH value abnormal percentage was 29.52% and 96.08%, respectively. The changes indicated that the α -HBDH
100 median value in survival group increased during T1-T2, decreased after T2, and was in the normal range during T1-T6; while in death group, the
101 α -HBDH median value increased during T1-T4 and decreased after T4, and the abnormal time interval was T1-T6 (Figure1, Table2).

102 There were significant differences of the α -HBDH in the first 30days and every time unit during T1-T6. Differences were also significant in
103 the α -HBDH value abnormal percentage among the two outcome groups ($P<0.001$). Spearman correlation test showed that there was a
104 correlation between outcome groups and the α -HBDH value ($P<0.001$), and the correlation was 0.49.

105 **3.4 α -HBDH in different clinical type groups of COVID-19 patients**

106 In mild group, moderate group, severe group and critical group, the α -HBDH median value were 110.41 (105.67-120.25) U/L, 134.92
107 (114.40-163.23) U/L, 180.95 (144.02-231.01) U/L and 293.57 (209.53-368.64) U/L, respectively, and the abnormal percentage of α -HBDH
108 value was 0.00%, 12.45%, 49.47% and 85.59%, respectively. The changes indicated that the α -HBDH median value of the moderate group
109 increased during T1-T2 and decreased after T2, and was in the normal range during T1-T6; in the severe group, the α -HBDH median value
110 increased during T1-T3 and decreased after T3, and the abnormal time interval was T2-T4; in the critical group, the α -HBDH median value
111 increased during T1-T3 and decreased after T3, and the abnormal time interval was T1-T6 (Figure1, Table3). However, the mild group was
112 excluded in statistical analysis for the reason that it only contained 4 cases.

113 There were significant differences of the α -HBDH value in the first 30 days among the three clinical type groups. Significant differences
114 were observed in the α -HBDH value between moderate type group and severe type group during T1-T6, between moderate type group and

115 critical type group during T1-T6, and between severe type group and critical type group during T2-T6.

116 ***3.5 Optimal scale regression model based on this study***

117 After excluded 4 mild cases, we built the optimal scale regression model based on the maximum α -HBDH value in the first 15 days, age,
118 gender and clinical type. The adjusted R^2 of the model was 0.659. The clinical type was significantly correlated with age ($P<0.001$) and
119 α -HBDH value ($P<0.001$), but not with gender ($P=0.337$). The model expression was $Q_levels = 0.648*Q_alpha-HBDH + 0.036*Q_gender +$
120 $0.271*Q_age$ (Q_levels , Q_ages , $Q_alpha-HBDH$ and Q_gender represent the scale quantification scores of clinical type, age, α -HBDH value and
121 gender, respectively). The comparison between the output type and the actual type quantification score was shown in the figure 2. According to
122 the model, the output accuracy of moderate, severe and critical types was 81.45%. In order to discriminate moderate type and severe/critical type,
123 the severe type and critical type were combined to the same category, and the accuracy was 85.84%.

124 ***4 Discussion***

125 α -HBDH is one of the important enzymes in the process of glucose metabolism, which is widely distributed in various tissues and organs,
126 especially in the heart, brain, kidney and red blood cells. COVID-19 mainly induces lung injury and causes damage to the heart and other tissues
127 and organs, which results in the release of α -HBDH and the increase of α -HBDH in blood terminally^[17]. The α -HBDH value in COVID-19
128 patients changed, it increased or significantly increased in some patients (Figure1). In different age groups, outcome groups and clinical type
129 groups, there were significant differences in the distribution and abnormal percentage of α -HBDH. Age and outcome were significantly
130 correlated with α -HBDH. Moreover, α -HBDH value may be related to the severity of COVID-19.

131 In ≥ 61 years old group and death group, the α -HBDH median value increased from T1, and reached a single peak in T2 (258.66 U/L) and
132 T4 (455.11 U/L), respectively, which was significantly different from that in ≤ 40 years old group (peak value was 144.26 U/L), 41-60 years old

133 group (peak value was 174.26 U/L) and survival group (peak value was 165.02 U/L). The abnormal interval of α -HBDH median value in ≥ 61
134 years old group and death group was T1-T5, T1-T6 respectively, which was significantly different from that in ≤ 40 years old group, 41-60 years
135 old group and survival group, in which α -HBDH median value were all in the normal range. It shows that the older the age, the worse the
136 outcome, the higher the α -HBDH value, and the longer the abnormal interval. The α -HBDH value in ≥ 61 years old group and death group was
137 higher than that in other groups, indicating that the injury of heart, brain, kidney and other tissues and organs is more serious in elderly and death
138 patients, which was consistent with previous study^[19]. This may be related to the poor function of the immune system and being more sensitive
139 to virus damage in elderly and seriously ill patients. This characteristic suggests that we should pay more attention to elderly patients and
140 patients of which α -HBDH continues to increase significantly. According to the data distribution and statistical analysis, the α -HBDH value can
141 distinguish the death and the survival. For example, during T1, patients with α -HBDH ≥ 180.97 U/L have a $\geq 25\%$ chance of survival, and
142 patients with α -HBDH ≥ 218.19 U/L have a $\geq 75\%$ chance of death, which might have guiding significance for judgment of disease development
143 in early stage. Enough cases and data could help us build a mathematic model and recognize the prognosis in advance better.

144 The α -HBDH median value of the mild group was in the normal range, without obvious change, indicating that the injury of tissue and
145 organ injury in this type was slight. The same as mild group, α -HBDH median value in moderate group also distributed in the normal range. It
146 increased firstly, and reached a peak (133.20 U/L) in T2, indicating that tissue and organ injury occurred immediately after the symptom onset in
147 spite of the slight degree, and mainly occurred in the first 10 days. The changes of α -HBDH median value of severe group was similar to that of
148 critical group, which increased during T1-T3 and decreased after T3. Their peak value was 222.56 U/L and 355.23 U/L appearing in T3, and
149 recovered to normal range in T5 and T7, respectively. It shows that the more serious the illness, the higher the α -HBDH median value and peak

150 value, the longer the abnormal interval, which may be related to the serious virus-induced acute lung injury, tissues and organs damage in severe
151 and critical type groups. These characteristics are of great significance for us to judge the severity of the disease by α -HBDH.

152 The maximum α -HBDH value in the first 15 days, age and gender of all patients were selected to build the optimal scale regression model.
153 α -HBDH <250.17 U/L and aged <60 years old was associated with moderate type, α -HBDH between 259.88-311.73 U/L and aged between
154 62-70 years old was associated with severe type, α -HBDH >327.71 U/L and aged >70 years old was associated with critical type. In this model,
155 the output accuracy for clinical type was over 80%, which indicated that the model could distinguish the clinical classification based on our data
156 well. α -HBDH and age could be used to discriminate the clinical type of COVID-19 patients if further verified by other data, which could help
157 us to grasp the opportunity of treatment and reduce the risk of progression to severe and critical type in early stage.

158 However, this study has several limitations. All the patients in the study come from the single hospital, and the sample size is small. This
159 study is a retrospective cohort study, which fails to detect and analyze the daily α -HBDH in patients and may lose some information.

160 **5 Conclusion**

161 α -HBDH value increases in some COVID-19 patients, obviously in ≥ 61 years old, death and critical group, indicating that patients in these
162 three groups suffer from more serious tissues and organs damage, higher α -HBDH value and risk of death. The obvious difference between
163 death and survival group in early stage may provide a approach to judge the prognosis. The accuracy of the model to distinguish severe/critical
164 type and other types is 85.84%, suggesting that α -HBDH could judge the clinical type of COVID-19 patients accurately. In brief, α -HBDH is
165 an important indicator to judge the severity and prognosis of COVID-19.

Table1. α -HBDH in different ages of COVID-19 patients

Period	≤40 years old(Group 1)			41-60 years old(Group 2)			≥61 years old(Group 3)			P value
	Median (IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	Median (IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	Median (IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	
First 30 Days	123.17 (106.94-144.95)	133	10.53%	150.49 (120.18-185.20)	172	33.33%	221.59 (156.76-302.89)	201	60.70%	P1<0.001,P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T1	131.88 (114.41-144.56)	22	9.09%	174.2 (133.20-193.85)	21	35.00%	175.65 (157.75-199.68)	24	37.50%	P1=0.009,P2<0.001, P3=0.306
T2	144.25 (115.94-178.92)	34	23.53%	162.83 (138.83-193.96)	40	32.26%	258.66 (180.66-337.72)	40	70.00%	P1=0.044,P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T3	114.44 (104.92-136.48)	21	4.76%	167.29 (128.72-211.43)	31	17.24%	233.23 (162.08-310.66)	38	65.79%	P1<0.001,P2<0.001, P3=0.002
T4	120.07 (106.18-131.25)	28	3.57%	135.97 (118.59-156.72)	29	25.93%	232.36 (162.30-296.36)	39	69.23%	P1=0.015,P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T5	113.17 (101.75-129.70)	17	0.00%	122.83 (111.43-178.23)	27	12.50%	200.05 (154.75-317.27)	33	60.61%	P1=0.076,P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T6	111.57 (99.73-141.77)	11	18.18%	126.80 (111.96-160.15)	24	26.74%	172.36 (143.66-242.52)	27	48.15%	P1=0.303,P2=0.003, P3<0.001

P1: Group 1 vs Group 2, P2: Group 1 vs Group 3, P3: Group 2 vs Group 3, N: Total times of test in this period.

Table2. α -HBDH in different outcomes of COVID-19 patients

Period	Survival			Death			P value
	Median(IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	Median(IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	
First 30 Days	147.80 (121.55-194.67)	454	29.52	337.18 (294.01-477.11)	51	96.08	P<0.001
T1	148.48 (130.85-180.97)	61	24.59	191.11 (181.58-218.19)	6	66.67	P=0.014
T2	165.02 (135.92-215.63)	100	37.00	331.44 (258.94-479.36)	13	100.00	P<0.001
T3	157.30 (125.68-214.05)	81	33.33	440.35 (373.28-513.89)	9	100.00	P<0.001
T4	141.14 (118.86-198.90)	87	27.59	455.11 (322.65-426.79)	9	100.00	P<0.001
T5	132.02 (112.06-184.22)	69	27.54	369.98 (319.60-426.79)	8	100.00	P<0.001
T6	142.90 (113.74-165.30)	56	21.43	298.80 (279.30-315.31)	6	100.00	P<0.001

N: Total times of test in this period.

Table3. α -HBDH in different clinical types of COVID-19 patients

Period	Moderate Type(Group 1)			Severe Type(Group 2)			Critical Type(Group 3)			P value
	Median (IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	Median (IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	Median (IQR)	N	Abnormal Percentage (%)	
First 30 Days	134.92 (114.40-163.23)	273	12.45	180.95 (144.02-231.01)	95	49.47	293.57 (209.53-368.64)	118	85.59	P1<0.001,P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T1	143.40 (127.33-178.20)	41	19.51	176.28 (143.43-201.95)	12	41.67	182.88 (163.28-218.19)	10	50.00	P1=0.046,P2=0.017, P3=0.468
T2	154.24 (130.94-179.86)	64	20.31	211.30 (176.44-245.47)	21	66.67	329.90 (281.99-396.87)	23	100.00	P1<0.001, P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T3	147.36 (123.09-169.97)	49	14.29	222.56 (159.52-248.88)	17	64.71	355.23 (297.57-440.91)	18	100.00	P1<0.001, P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T4	125.84 (113.13-143.89)	54	3.70	194.13 (151.50-235.97)	20	55.00	300.20 (238.58-408.87)	20	100.00	P1<0.001,P2<0.001,P 3<0.001
T5	113.86 (108.60-129.70)	37	10.81	160.69 (120.62-174.69)	16	25.00	311.01 (211.61-340.84)	23	82.61	P1=0.008, P2<0.001, P3<0.001
T6	120.49 (106.79-143.89)	28	0.00	143.82 (126.68-156.23)	9	22.22	199.33 (158.84-268.88)	24	66.67	P1=0.306,,P2<0.001, P3=0.007

P1: Group 1 vs Group 2, P2: Group 1 vs Group 3, P3: Group 2 vs Group 3, N: Total times of test in this period.

Table4. Variable Category and quantification score in optimal scale regression model

Variable	Classification	Frequency	Score
Clinical Type	Moderate Type	85	-0.545
	Severe Type	21	0.207
	Critical Type	18	2.332
α -HBDH	96.20 - 109.35	5	-0.569
	113.28 - 182.50	64	-0.538
	187.30 - 250.17	28	-0.241
	259.88 - 311.73	8	0.118
	327.71 - 401.03	10	1.603
	441.09 - 833.00	9	2.921
	15.00 - 29.00	16	-0.627
	30.00 - 39.00	19	-0.627
Age	40.00 - 47.00	18	-0.627
	48.00 - 54.00	20	-0.627
	55.00 - 60.00	15	-0.566
	62.00 - 70.00	18	1.019
	71.00 - 90.00	18	1.997
Gender	Male	60	1.033
	Female	64	-0.968

Score: quantitative score in optimal scale regression model

Figure1. (A) the changes of α -HBDH in different age groups, (B) the changes of α -HBDH in different clinical type groups, (C) the changes of α -HBDH in different outcome groups, (D) the changes of α -HBDH in total course.





Figure2. Comparison between the output type and the actual type quantification score in the model



References:

- 1 Huang CL, Wang YM, Li XW, *et al.* Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*, 2020; 395 (10223): 497-506. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5
- 2 Chen NS, Zhou M, Dong X, *et al.* Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet*, 2020; 395 (10223): 507-13. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7
- 3 Alexandra LP, Rebecca K, Lawrence OG. The Novel Coronavirus Originating in Wuhan, China: Challenges for Global Health Governance. *JAMA*, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.1097
- 4 Li Q, Guan XH, Wu P, *et al.* Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *The New England journal of medicine*, 2020; 382 (13): 1199-1207. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001316
- 5 World Health Organization. Novel Coronavirus(2019-nCoV) Situation Report-11. Available at:https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200131-sitrep-11-ncov.pdf?sfvrsn=de7c0f7_4
- 6 World Health Organization. Novel Coronavirus(2019-nCoV) Situation Report-163. Available at:https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200701-covid-19-sitrep-163.pdf?sfvrsn=c202f05b_2
- 7 Patrick O, Laurent J, Olivier M, *et al.* Prognostic value of C-reactive protein and cardiac troponin I in primary percutaneous interventions for ST-elevation myocardial infarction. *AM HEART J*, 2006; 152 (6): 1161-1167. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2006.07.016
- 8 Dissmann R, Linderer T, Schröder R. Estimation of enzymatic infarct size: direct comparison of the marker enzymes creatine kinase and alpha-hydroxybutyrate dehydrogenase. *Am Heart J*. 1998;135(1):1-9. doi:10.1016/s0002-8703(98)70335-7
- 9 Kemp M, Donovan J, Higham H, Hooper J. Biochemical markers of myocardial injury. *Br J Anaesth*. 2004;93(1):63-73. doi:10.1093/bja/aeh148
- 10 Gungor K, Philip L, Abdul BK. Serum alpha-hydroxybutyrate dehydrogenase levels in children with sickle cell disease. *The American journal of pediatric hematology/oncology*, 1981; 3 (2): 169-171. doi:10.1097/00043426-198100320-00010
- 11 Apostolov I, Minkov N, Koycheva M, *et al.* Acute changes of serum markers for tissue damage after ESWL of kidney stones. *Int Urol Nephrol*. 1991;23 (3):215-220. doi:10.1007/BF02550414
- 12 Zhao DH, Yao FF, Wang LL, *et al.* A Comparative Study on the Clinical Features of Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) Pneumonia With Other Pneumonias. *Clinical infectious diseases*, 2020; 71 (15): 756-761. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa247
- 13 Dong YL, Zhou HF, Li MY, *et al.* A novel simple scoring model for predicting severity of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *TRANSBOUND EMERG*

DIS, 2020. doi:10.1111/tbed.13651

14 Li MY, Dong YL, Wang HJ, *et al.* Cardiovascular disease potentially contributes to the progression and poor prognosis of COVID-19. Nutrition, metabolism, and cardiovascular diseases. *NMCD* 2020; 307(7): 1061-1067. doi:10.1016/j.numecd.2020.04.013

15 Zhang H, Liao YS, Gong J, *et al.* Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patients with gastrointestinal symptoms: A report of 164 cases. *Dig Liver Dis*, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.dld.2020.04.034

16 Cen Y, Chen X, Shen Y, *et al.* Risk factors for disease progression in patients with mild to moderate coronavirus disease 2019-a multi-centre observational study. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect*, 2020; 26(9):1242-1247 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.041

17 Zhang GM, Zhang J, Wang BW, *et al.* Analysis of clinical characteristics and laboratory findings of 95 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a retrospective analysis. *RESP RES*, 2020; 21 (1): 74. doi:10.1186/s12931-020-01338-8

18 National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. Diagnosis and treatment of coronavirus disease-19 (8th trial edition). Available at:<http://www.nhc.gov.cn/yzygj/s7653p/202008/0a7bdf12bd4b46e5bd28ca7f9a7f5e5a/files/a449a3e2e2c94d9a856d5faea2ff0f94.pdf>

19 Zhang JJ, Dong X, Cao YY, *et al.* Clinical characteristics of 140 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan, China. *Allergy*. 2020;75(7):1730-1741. doi:10.1111/all.14238