Safety of 'hot' and 'cold' site admissions within a high volume urology department in the United Kingdom at the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic

Luke Stroman¹, Beth Russell² Pinky Kotecha³, Anastasia Kantartzi¹, Luis Ribeiro¹, Bethany Jackson¹, Vugar Ismaylov¹, Adeoye Oluwakanyinsola Debo-Aina¹, Findlay MacAskill¹, Francesca Kum¹, Meghana Kulkarni⁴, Raveen Sandher¹, Anna Walsh¹, Ella Doerge¹, Katherine Guest¹, Yamini Kailash¹, Nick Simson¹, Cassandra McDonald¹, Elsie Mensah¹, Li June Tay¹, Ramandeep Chalokia¹, Sharon Clovis¹, Elizabeth Eversden¹, Jane Cossins¹, Jonah Rusere¹, Grace Zisengwe¹, Louisa Fleure¹, Leslie Cooper¹, Kathryn Chatterton¹, Amelia Barber¹, Catherine Roberts¹, Thomasia Azavedo¹, Jeffrey Ritualo¹, Harold Omana¹, Liza Mills¹, Lily Studd¹, Oussama El Hage³, Rajesh Nair¹, Sachin Malde¹, Arun Sahai¹, Archana Fernando¹, Claire Taylor¹, Benjamin Challacombe¹, Ramesh Thurairaja¹, Rick Popert¹, Jonathon Olsburgh¹, Paul Cathcart¹, Christian Brown¹, Marios Hadjipavlou¹, Ella Di Benedetto¹, Matthew Bultitude¹, Jonathon Glass¹, Tet Yap¹, Rhana Zakri¹, Majed Shabbir¹, Susan Willis¹, Kay Thomas¹, Tim O'Brien¹, Muhammad Shamim Khan¹, Prokar Dasgupta³

- 1 Department of Urology, Guy's Hospital, Guys' & St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom
- 2 Department of translational Oncology and Urology Research, King's College London, College, London, United Kingdom
- 3 Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, King's College London, London, UK
- 4 Department of Cancer Imaging, School of Biomedical Engineering and Imaging Sciences, King's College London, London, UK

Corresponding Author: Mr Luke Stroman MBBCH BSc MRCH

Email: <u>Stromanl@doctors.net.uk</u>

Telephone (UK) (+44) (0) 7921 369203

Address Department of Urology

Guys' Hospital

Great Maze Pond

SE1 9RT

Word Count: Abstract 300 words

Main text 2339 words

This manuscript or any related publications have not currently been submitted elsewhere.

The Authors do not declare any conflict of interest. Funding has been provided the department of Life Sciences and Medicine, King's College London.

Safety of 'hot' and 'cold' site admissions within a high-volume surgical department in the United

Kingdom at the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic

Abstract

Background Contracting COVID-19 peri-operatively has been associated with a mortality rate as

high as 23%, making prevention vital.

Objectives: The primary objective is to determine safety of surgical admissions and procedures

during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic using 'hot' and 'cold' sites. The

secondary objective is to determine risk factors of contracting COVID-19.

Design, Setting and Participants:

A retrospective cohort study of all consecutive patients admitted from 1st March – 31st May 2020 at a high-volume tertiary urology department in London, United Kingdom. Elective surgery was carried out at a 'cold' site requiring a negative COVID-19 swab 72 hours prior to admission and to self-isolate for 14 days pre-operatively, whilst all acute admissions were admitted to the 'hot' site.

Outcome Measurements and Statistical Analysis:

Complications related to COVID-19 were presented as percentages. Risk factors for developing COVID-19 infection were determined using multivariate logistic regression analysis.

Results and Limitations:

A total of 611 patients, 451 (73.8%) male and 160 (26.2%) female, with a median age of 57 (interquartile range 44-70) were admitted under the urology team; 101 (16.5%) on the 'cold' site and 510 (83.5%) on the 'hot' site. Procedures were performed in 495 patients of which 8 (1.6%) contracted COVID-19 post-operatively with 1 (0.2%) post-operative mortality due to COVID-19. Overall, COVID-19 was detected in 20 (3.3%) patients with 2 (0.3%) deaths. Length of stay was associated with contracting COVID-19 in our cohort (OR 1.25, 95% CI 1.13-1.39). Limitations include possible under reporting due to post-operative patients presenting elsewhere.

Conclusions: Continuation of surgical procedures using 'hot' and 'cold' sites throughout the

COVID-19 pandemic was safe practice, although the risk of COVID-19 remained and

is underlined by a post-operative mortality.

Patient Summary:

Using 'hot' and 'cold' sites has allowed the safe continuation of urological practice throughout the height of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Introduction

Background

The spread of COVID-19, the respiratory disease caused by the virus Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was first reported in the United Kingdom in the week commencing 27th January 2020 and was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organisation on 11th March 2020 (1) (2). By 17th March 2020 the British Government postponed all non-urgent surgical operations to reduce spread and reallocate resources to target the disease (3). Patients having surgical operations may be at increased risk of contracting COVID-19 due to the aerosol generated during anaesthesia and the procedure itself, which may mobilise pathogens as well as the immunosuppressive response to surgery (4). Post-operative pain limiting respiration and immobility can also make patients more susceptible to respiratory infections.

Pulmonary complications related to COVID-19 reported by the COVIDSurg collaborative, an international multicentre observational study found post-operative respiratory complications occurred in half of patients that had contracted COVID-19 peri-operatively (from 7 days pre-operatively to 30 days post-operatively) and found 30-day mortality to be 23.8%. (5) Given these outcomes it is imperative to prevent peri-operative contraction of the virus and our centre has developed 'hot' sites for acute admissions and 'cold' sites for elective admissions requiring patients to self-isolate for a minimum of 14 days and produce a negative COVID-19 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) swab prior to procedure.

The department described in this study is within a high-volume tertiary referral centre. Guy's & St Thomas' NHS Trust was at the centre of the pandemic, there were over 1400 cases of COVID-19 diagnosed and over 330 ventilated in intensive care throughout the pandemic, which is the most in

the UK. Up to 2000 members of staff and 20% of the workforce took sick leave either unwell as a result of the virus or isolating. The current study helps to inform management in other centres with high incidence of COVID-19 in the community.

Objectives

The primary objective was to determine the safety of the continuation of urological admissions and procedures through the height of the COVID-19 pandemic using 'hot' and 'cold' surgical sites. The primary outcomes were post-operative COVID-19 infection and mortality related to COVID-19. The secondary objective is to determine risk factors of contracting COVID-19 within our cohort to determine which patients are more at risk and assist further preventative strategies.

Patients and Methods

Study design

An observational cohort study of all consecutive patients admitted at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic from 1st March 2020 – 31st May 2020 across both 'hot' acute sites and 'cold' elective sites was performed. Peri-operative infection, complications and mortality related to COVID-19 were reported to gauge the safety of the continuation of surgical procedures throughout the pandemic. Risk factors for developing COVID-19 infection within our cohort were determined using multivariate logistic regression analysis. Data is presented in line with the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies (STROBE) statement for cohort studies. (6)

Setting

A single surgical department of a tertiary care referral centre in London, United Kingdom. Patients managed at the 'cold' site were 'COVID-19 protected', requiring patients to self-isolate for a minimum of 14 days and produce a negative Roche COVID-19 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) antigen swab within 72 hours prior to the procedure (7). 'Hot' site admissions were 'risk managed' and included all patients admitted acutely throughout the 3 months of the study, as well as all elective admissions prior to 'cold' site opening on 30th March 2020. If patients were diagnosed with COVID-19 they were managed in isolation or in wards with only COVID-19 positive patients. All COVID-19 negative or not suspected patients were managed on wards without isolation but with personal protective equipment used. On both sites Public Health England personal protective

equipment (PPE) guidance was followed; for all inpatient care fluid repellent surgical masks, apron, gloves and eye protection and for aerosol generating procedures filtering facepiece masks (FFP3), fluid repellent gown, gloves and eye protection were worn by healthcare professionals (8). Elective admissions for extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy remained on the 'hot' site throughout with the same isolation precautions required prior to treatment.

Participants

All consecutive patients admitted under the care of the urology team. Patients were identified using a prospective consecutive dataset of admissions and surgical bookings.

Variables

Variables recorded were age, gender, ethnicity, COVID-19 positive (yes/no), complications related to COVID-19 (if positive), respiratory support required for COVID-19 (if positive), mortality (yes/no), hypertension (>140/90 mmHg), Charlson Comorbidity Index, operation performed, length of stay (in days).

Data sources

Data was retrospectively collected using a prospective consecutive dataset of admissions using trustwide electronic patient records and morbidity and mortality data. Data was gathered electronically from surrounding hospitals when reported to have presented elsewhere.

Bias

There was a risk of underreporting due patients presenting in other trusts with COVID-19 infection or subclinical COVID-19 infection in the community.

Statistical Methods

Complications related to COVID-19 were presented as percentages of the overall cohort and number of patients that underwent surgical procedures. Risk factors for developing COVID-19 infection within our cohort were determined using multivariate logistic regression analysis. Gender, ethnicity

hypertension, operation (yes/no) and COVID-19 status were analysed as binary variables, age (≤70 or >70) and Charlson Comorbidity Index as dichotomous variables and length of stay as a continuous variable.

Ethics

This service evaluation/audit was granted institutional approval by the Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital and the requirement for consent for data use that was anonymised before analysis was waived.

Results

Participants and descriptive data

A total of 611 patients, 451 (73.8%) male and 160 (26.2%) female with a median age of 57 (interquartile range 44-70) were admitted under the surgical team (table 1). Of these, 101 (16.5%) were admitted on the 'cold' site and 510 (83.5%) on the 'hot' site (table 1). Surgical procedures were performed in 495 (81%) (table 2).

Primary Objective

Overall, COVID-19 was detected in 20 (3.3%) patients with 2 (0.3%) mortalities. Of the 495 patients that underwent surgical procedures, 8 (1.6%) contracted COVID-19 post-operatively with 1 (0.2%) post-operative mortality due to COVID-19. Of the 20 COVID-19 positive patients 17 were at the 'hot' site and 3 at the 'cold' site, 2 of which were detected pre-operatively and 1 post-operatively.

Supplemental oxygen and antibiotics were required in 4 patients that developed COVID-19 while another required additional methylprednisolone and awake proning but avoided intensive care (Table 3). There were 2 mortalities in patients that contracted COVID-19; one post-operative mortality following transurethral resection of bladder tumour at the 'cold' site with negative preoperative COVID-19 swab that presented to a local hospital in respiratory failure 14 days following surgery and one patient with palliative metastatic bladder cancer and respiratory failure due to COVID-19 that did not have an operation.

Secondary Objectives

On multivariate analysis, length of stay was the associated with contracting COVID-19 in our cohort (OR 1.25, 95% CI 1.13-1.39). Patients with higher Charlson Co-morbidity Index of 3 or above also looked to be more at risk (OR 15.24, 95% CI 2.00-115.77) pointing to comorbidity as a risk factor. Patients having surgical procedures were not at higher risk of contracting COVID-19 compared to those that did not (OR 1.1, 95% CI 0.31-3.83).

Discussion

In our cohort the risk of contracting COVID-19 remained low (3.3%) throughout the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in the United Kingdom over both 'hot' and 'cold' sites. Given that the hospital was at centre of the pandemic in London in a severely affected area, this model was a relatively safe method of continuing to deliver surgical care. One challenge going forward will be dealing with increased waiting lists and delivering safe care on a larger scale. There was a significant reduction in the elective service during the time of the study; the described department typically has between 600-1000 inpatient episodes monthly, in contrast to the 200 per month described in this series. This is a worldwide phenomenon with up to 2.8 million surgeries worldwide expected to be delayed cancelled as a result of COVID-19, making it vital to find a safe method of carrying out operations following the pandemic. (9) The 'cold' site model has been safely described elsewhere, and reports from another 'cold' site in London have reported a 2% rate of post-operative COVID-19 infection, with only 0.2% of their cohort reporting Clavien-Dindo grade 3 complications related to COVID-19. (10) The current study supports the practice of 'cold' sites in areas still suffering from high rates of COVID-19.

Post-operative mortality related to COVID in our cohort was 12.5% (1/8) which is lower than the figure of 20.5% reported in China and 23.8% described by the worldwide COVIDSurg collaborative (11) (5). Interestingly, apart from the reported mortality there were no Clavien-Dindo 3 or above complications in the current series related to COVID-19 although 37.5% (3/8) of post-operative patients required supplementary oxygen and antibiotics. Over the whole cohort there were no patients from our department that required ventilatory or intensive care support apart from the two mortalities. The two patients had significant comorbidities, with Charlson Comorbidity Index scores of 7 and 8 respectively. Multivariate analysis demonstrated that those with greater comorbidity were at a higher risk of contracting COVID-19, so surgery in these patients must be taken with greater planning and caution in areas with high COVID-19 prevalence.

Benefits of 'cold' and 'hot' site work included the reduced cross-contamination of COVID-19 infection from the acute site. Global guidance for surgical care during the COVID-19 pandemic has suggested patients should be cared for by COVID-19-specific surgical teams if possible, rather than those who are also seeing uninfected patients which was followed in our site. (15) To reduce cross-contamination, members of the surgical team were not permitted to visit the 'cold' site on the same day as the 'hot' site although this did not come into effect until a few weeks into the opening of the 'cold' site as the 'cold' site evolved. Across both sites appropriate PPE guidance was followed in inpatient and outpatient areas according to Public Health England Guidance. (8) This has been a successful model in our centre where two adjacent separate sites were available, however not all centres have this facility and separation may have to occur within a single site.

One limitation of this study the possibility of under-reporting of post-operative COVID-19 infection as a result of patients presenting at other hospitals or sub-clinical infection in the community without presenting to hospital. Asymptomatic shedding of the virus can occur and may account for

Conclusions

Continuation of surgical procedures using 'hot' and 'cold' sites throughout the COVID-19 pandemic was reasonably safe and enabled patients undergo important procedures, although the risk of COVID-19 remained and is underlined by a post-operative mortality. We identified risk factors that could limit transmission, notably reducing length of stay.

outcomes here may be able to guide other centres considering 'cold' and 'hot' site models.

References

1. Lessons for managing high-consequence infections from first COVID-19 cases in the UK. Moss P, Barlow G, Easom N, Lillie P, Samson A. 10227, 2020, Lancet, Vol. 395, p. e46.

- 2. WHO. WHO announces COVID-19 outbreak a pandemic. . [Online] March 12th, 2020. http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/healthemergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/whoannounces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic (accessed April 19, 2020).
- 3. News., BBC. "Coronavirus: All non-urgent operations in England postponed". [Online] 17 March 2020.
- 4. We asked the experts: Covid-19 outbreak: is there still a place for scheduled surgery? "Reflection from pathophysiological data". Besnier E, Tuech JJ, Schwarz L. 2020, World J Surg, Vol. 44, pp. 1695-98.
- 5. Mortality and pulmonary complications in patients undergoing surgery with perioperative SARS-CoV-2 infection: an international cohort study. Collaborative, COVIDSurg. 20, May 2020, Lancet, Vols. S0140-6736.
- 6. Strobe Statement Version 4. https://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=available-checklists. [Online] 2007.
- 7. Roche COVID-19 (Coronavirus) Updates. [Online] https://diagnostics.roche.com/us/en/landing-pages/roche-covid-19-updates.html.
- 8. England, Public Health. Recommended PPE for healthcare workers inpatient clinical setting, NHS and independent sector. 2020.
- 9. Elective surgery cancellations due to the COVID-19 pandemic: global predictive modelling to inform surgical recovery plans. Collaborative, COVIDSurg. May 2020, British Journal of Surgery.
- 10. Evaluation of 30-day mortality for 500 patients undergoing non-emergency surgery in a COVID-19 cold site within a multicentre regional network during the COVID-19 pandemic. Kasivisvanathan V, Lindsay J, Rakhshani-moghadam S et al. June 2020, MedRxiv.
- 11. Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of Patients Undergoing Surgeries During the Incubation Period of COVID-19 Infection. Lei S, Jiang F, Su w. 100331, April 2020, EClinicalMedicine, Vol. 21.
- 12. Frequency and Severity of General Surgical Emergencies During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Single-Centre Experience From a Large Metropolitan Teaching Hospital. Patel R, Hainsworth AJ, Devlin K, Patel JH, Karim A. June 2020, Ann R Coll Surg Engl, Vol. 27, pp. 1-6.
- 13. COVID-19, Transmission and Risk Factors of COVID-19. Miller R, Englund K. May 2020, Cleve Clin J Med.
- 14. England, Royal College of Surgeons of. Clinical guide to surgical prioritisation during the coronavirus pandemic. [Online] [Cited:] www.rcseng.ac.uk/coronavirus/surgical-prioritisation-guidance/.
- 15. Global guidance for surgical care during the COVID-19 pandemic. Collaborative, COVIDSurg. April 2020, Br J Surg.
- 16. Hospitalization and Mortality among Black Patients and White Patients with Covid-19. Price-Haywood EG, Burton J, Fort D, Seoane L. 2020, N Engl J Med, Vol. 382, pp. 2534-2543.
- 17. The Impact of Ethnicity on Clinical Outcomes in COVID-19: A Systematic Review. Pan D, Sze S, Minhas JS. 23, 2020, EClinicalMedicine, Vol. 3, p. 100404.

Table 1. Patient Demographics

Demographic	Frequency
Total patients	611
Operative procedure (%)	496 (81%)
Age (Interquartile range)	57 (44-70)
Sex (male)	451 (74%)
Sex (female)	160 (26%)
Median Charlson Comorbidity score (range)	2 (0-9)
Hypertension >140/90 mmHg (%)	86 (14%)
Ethnicity – White (%)	265 (43%)
Ethnicity – Black or Afro-Caribbean (%)	58 (9%)
Ethnicity – Asian (%)	15 (3%)
Ethnicity – Other (%)	28 (5%)
Ethnicity – Not specified (%)	245 (40%)
'Hot' site (%)	510 (83%)
'Cold' site (%)	101 (17%)

Table 2. All procedures completed (see separate attachment)

Table 3. Management required for COVID positive patients

		Post-operative	
	All patients (%)	patients (%)	
No treatment required	13 (65%)	4 (50%)	
Supplementary oxygen and antibiotics	4 (20%)	3 (37.5%)	
Supplementary oxygen, antibiotics and steroids	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	
Ventilatory support	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Mortality	2 (10%)	1 (12.5%)	
Total	20	8	

<u>Table 4. Risk factors of contracting COVID-19 following multivariate analysis. All odds ratios (OR)</u> were adjusted for minimal variables.

Variable	No. of COVID		95% CI	P for Trend (for continuous
	events	OR		
				variables
				only)
Age				
≤70	8	1.00	Ref.	
>70	12	2.20	(0.54-8.99)	
Gender				
Female	4	1.00	Ref.	
Male	16	1.18	(0.38-3.65)	
Black or Asian Ethnicity				
No	15	1.00	Ref.	
Yes	5	1.83	(0.57-5.86)	
Cancer				
No	10	1.00	Ref.	
Yes	10	1.13	(0.44-2.91)	
Hypertension				
No	13	1.00	Ref.	
Yes	7	0.70	(0.26-1.84)	
Charlson Comorbidity Index				
0 or 1	1	1.00	Ref.	
2	3	12.15	(1.24-118.93)	
3+	16	15.24	(2.00-115.77)	
Operation/procedure				
No	4	1.00	Ref.	
Yes	16	1.10	(0.31-3.83)	
Length of stay (cont.)	N/A	1.25	(1.13-1.39)	<0.000
Site of admission				
'hot' site	17	1.00	Ref.	

'cold' site	3	0.86	(0.25-3.01)	

OR – Odds ratio; 95% CI – 95% confidence interval