

1 **A chest-CT and clinical chemistry based flowchart for rapid COVID-19 triage at**
2 **emergency departments – a multicenter study**

3

4 Steef Kurstjens^{1#}, Eva-Leonne Göttgens^{2#}, Bob Smit³, Bent Postma⁴, Carl Kluge⁵,
5 Armando van der Horst¹, Eva H.J. Lamboo⁶, Caroline M.M. Janssen – Te Slaa⁷,
6 Robert Herpers⁸, Yvette C.M. Kluiters-de Hingh⁹, Arthur du Mée¹⁰, Marjan Veuger³,
7 Rob van Marum^{11,12}, Peter de Jager¹³, Marc G. L. M. Elisen^{9,14}, Ron Kusters^{1,15*},
8 Martin Schuijt¹⁶, Marc H. M. Thelen^{2,17,18}

9

10 # Shared first author

11 * Corresponding author

12

13 ¹ Laboratory of Clinical Chemistry and Hematology, Jeroen Bosch Hospital, Den
14 Bosch, the Netherlands

15 ² Laboratory of Clinical Chemistry and Hematology, Amphia Hospital, Breda, the
16 Netherlands

17 ³ Laboratory of Clinical Chemistry and Hematology, HagaHospital, Den Haag, the
18 Netherlands

19 ⁴ Department of Medical Microbiology, Slingeland Hospital, Doetinchem, the
20 Netherlands

21 ⁵ Department of Respiratory Medicine, Slingeland Hospital, Doetinchem, the
22 Netherlands

23 ⁶ Department of Respiratory Medicine, Amphia Hospital, Breda, the Netherlands

24 ⁷ Department of Radiology, Slingeland Hospital, Doetinchem, the Netherlands

25 ⁸ Laboratory of Clinical Chemistry and Hematology, Bernhoven Hospital, Uden, the
26 Netherlands

27 ⁹ Laboratory of Clinical Chemistry & Hematology, Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital,
28 Tilburg, the Netherlands

29 ¹⁰ Department of Radiology, Amphia Hospital, Breda, the Netherlands

30 ¹¹ Department of Geriatric Medicine, Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute,
31 Amsterdam UMC, location VUmc, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

32 ¹² Department of Geriatric Medicine, Jeroen Bosch Hospital, Den Bosch, the
33 Netherlands

34 ¹³ Department of Intensive Care, Jeroen Bosch Hospital, Den Bosch, the Netherlands

35 ¹⁴ Netherlands Society of Clinical Chemistry & Laboratory Medicine (NVKC), Utrecht,
36 the Netherlands

37 ¹⁵ Department of Health Technology and Services Research, Technical Medical
38 Centre, University of Twente, the Netherlands

39 ¹⁶ Laboratory of Clinical Chemistry and Hematology, Slingeland Hospital,
40 Doetinchem, the Netherlands

41 ¹⁷ Dutch Foundation for Quality Assessment in Medical Laboratories (SKML),
42 Nijmegen, the Netherlands

43 ¹⁸ Chair in 'quality in medical laboratory care', Radboud University, Nijmegen, the
44 Netherlands

45

46 Word count: 2383

47 Number of figures: 4

48 Number of tables: 3

49 Running head: A flowchart for rapid diagnosis of COVID-19

50 **Corresponding author:**

51 Ron Kusters, PhD

52 Laboratory for Clinical Chemistry and Hematology, Jeroen Bosch Ziekenhuis, Den

53 Bosch, the Netherlands

54 P.O. Box 90153, 5223 GZ Den Bosch, the Netherlands

55 E-mail: r.kusters@jbz.nl

56 Telephone: +31621825927

57

58

59 **KEYWORDS**

60 Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, chest-CT, triage, diagnostics, clinical chemistry,

61 radiology, microbiology

62 **Summary**

63 **Background**

64 Due to the large number of patients with coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19), rapid
65 diagnosis at the emergency department (ED) is of critical importance. In this study we
66 have developed a flowchart based on two well-known diagnostic methods: the
67 'corona-score' and the 'CO-RADS'. This flowchart can be used in hospitals that use
68 chest-CT, instead of chest X-ray, for COVID-19 suspected patients at the ED.

69 **Methods**

70 ED patients (n=1904) from the Jeroen Bosch Hospital, Amphia Hospital,
71 HagaHospital, Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital, Bernhoven Hospital and Slingeland
72 Hospital were included. A laboratory-based 'corona-score', without radiology, called
73 the 'lab-corona-score' was combined with a chest-CT based radiology scoring system
74 (CO-RADS), to develop a flowchart. The performance was assessed by
75 sensitivity/specificity analyses using the RT-PCR outcome or the physician's final
76 diagnosis as golden standard.

77 **Results**

78 Out of the 1904 patients, 611 (32.1%) patients tested positive for the SARS-CoV-2
79 virus. The lab-corona-score alone had an AUC of 0.86, a sensitivity of 87% and a
80 specificity of 88% using cut-off values of 0-2 (negative) and 8-10 (positive). Of 255
81 patients, from the Amphia and Slingeland Hospitals, a CO-RADS score was
82 determined. The flowchart, which combined the 'CO-RADS' with the 'lab-corona-
83 score', was developed based on data from Slingeland Hospital (sensitivity 97%,
84 specificity 96%). Hereafter, the performance of the flowchart was validated using an
85 independent dataset from Amphia hospital, and reached a sensitivity of 98% and

86 specificity of 93%. A decision could be made in 79% of the patients, which was
87 correct in 95% of the cases.

88 **Conclusion**

89 This flowchart, based on radiology (CO-RADS) and clinical chemistry parameters
90 (lab-corona-score), results in a rapid and accurate diagnosis of COVID-19 at the ED.

91

92 **INTRODUCTION**

93 The outbreak of the novel SARS-CoV-2 virus in March has resulted in a huge
94 increase in the number of patients at the emergency department (ED). ‘Corona-virus
95 disease 2019’ (COVID-19) is diagnosed by the detection of viral genetic material by
96 real-time reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). However, it
97 takes considerable time before the result of the RT-PCR is available, in which time
98 the clinicians need to take decisions regarding treatment and isolation protocols. In
99 order to make a well-balanced decision whether a patient is infected with COVID-19,
100 the treating ED physician has to combine the clinical presentation, radiology and
101 clinical chemistry parameters, which therefore require a standardized interpretation

102

103 In March 2020 the CO-RADS (COVID-19 Reporting and Data System) was
104 introduced: a method for standardized documentation and risk stratification of a
105 chest-CT for all patients with a suspected COVID-19 infection.⁽¹⁾ The goal of the
106 classification is to improve the communication between physicians, facilitate the
107 comparison of results between institutions and to provide a basis for scientific
108 research. The CO-RADS methodology should be mainly used in a medium-to-high
109 prevalence of COVID-19.⁽¹⁾ In addition, authors of CORADS diagnostics studies have

110 suggested to add routine laboratory parameters to improve the performance of the
111 CORADS classification system.⁽²⁾

112

113 COVID-19 patients often present with a moderately elevated c-reactive protein
114 (CRP), an elevated lactate dehydrogenase (LD), elevated ferritin, lymphocytopenia and
115 a normal neutrophil count.^(3, 4)

116

117 The interpretation of clinical chemistry parameters is an excellent way to differentiate
118 between a viral and bacterial pneumonia. Based on the situation in March 2020, the
119 ‘corona-score’ was developed (www.corona-score.com). The corona-score has
120 received widespread international attention, and has been validated and
121 implemented in multiple hospitals worldwide.⁽⁵⁻⁷⁾ The corona-score is a diagnostic
122 algorithm that, based on clinical chemistry parameters, age, sex and a crude
123 interpretation of the chest X-ray, can determine with high accuracy whether a patient
124 at the ED is positive or negative for COVID-19.⁽⁸⁾ The scoring system and chosen
125 cut-off points for each variable have been optimized using artificial intelligence. In
126 order to combine the corona-score with the CO-RADS classification, the points for
127 the radiological interpretation have been removed from the corona-score, resulting in
128 the so-called ‘lab-corona-score’.

129

130 In this retrospective multicenter research we investigated whether combining the
131 ‘CO-RADS’ with the ‘lab-corona-score’ is an efficient method to distinguish COVID-19
132 positive from negative patients at the ED.

133

134 **METHODS**

135 **Patient population**

136 In this retrospective multicenter study the performance of the 'lab-corona-score'
137 separately, and in combination with the CO-RADS score, was investigated. For the
138 performance of the lab-corona-score separately all ED patients were included that
139 received a SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test. Patients were excluded if there were missing
140 clinical chemistry parameters due to a (pre-)analytical error, an invalid RT-PCR result
141 or a hemolytic blood sample (Figure 1A). In total 1904 patients were included: Jeroen
142 Bosch Hospital (n=187, 7-28 April 2020), Amphia Hospital (n=377, 1-30 April, 2020),
143 Bernhoven Hospital (n=579, 24 March - 20 April, 2020), Slingeland Hospital (n=104,
144 5-29 April), HagaHospital (n=429, 23 April - 20 July, 2020) and Elisabeth-
145 TweeSteden Hospital (n=248, 8-30 April, 2020) (Figure 1A).

146

147 **Laboratory measurements**

148 Venous blood was drawn from all patients that presented at the ED with symptoms
149 that could be related to COVID-19. A nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal swab was
150 taken for the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test. These were performed by the department of
151 medical microbiology at the institute using the following methods: Thermofisher
152 7500SDS Thermofisher and Roche cobas-6800 for E-and RdRP gene (Amphia
153 Hospital), Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 on a GeneXpert DX System
154 (Slingeland Hospital and emergency tests from HagaHospital), In-house kit on an
155 Applied Biosystems 7500 RT-PCR System (HagaHospital), PRD-06419 Aptima
156 SARS-CoV-2 on a LIAISON Panther System (Jeroen Bosch Hospital and Bernhoven
157 Hospital).

158

159 Clinical chemistry and hemocytometric tests were measured in the venous sample
160 from the initial presentation at the ED using the following analysers: Siemens Advia
161 Chemistry XPT and Advia 2120i (Jeroen Bosch Hospital), Roche cobas-8000 and
162 Sysmex XN-6000 (Amphia Hospital), Dimension Vista 1500 and CELL-DYN Sapphire
163 (Bernhoven Hospital), Roche and Sysmex (Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital), Roche
164 cobas-6000 and Sysmex XN-1000 (HagaHospital), and Roche CobasPro and
165 Sysmex XE-5000 (Slingeland Hospital). Due to the large variation in the ferritin
166 measurements between the platforms, the ferritin concentration by Roche was used
167 as a reference. Ferritin measurements were harmonized by multiplying the
168 concentrations measured by Siemens analysers by a factor of 1.2⁽⁸⁾.

169

170 **Lab-corona-score**

171 In order to combine the 'corona-score' with the CO-RADS classification we removed
172 the interpretation of the chest X-ray, resulting in the so-called 'lab-corona-score'. In
173 this score, points are attributed to each parameter as described in Table 1. The 'lab-
174 corona-score' is trimmed from a minimum score of 0 to a maximum score of 10.⁽¹⁾
175 The result of this 'lab-corona-score' can be easily implemented into the electronic
176 laboratory system, so that it is automatically reported directly into the patient file.
177 More information can be found at www.corona-score.com.

178

179 **Radiology**

180 The chest-CT images were interpreted and scored according to the CO-RADS
181 classification by the radiologists of the Amphia and Slingeland Hospitals.⁽¹⁾ The CO-
182 RADS classification is scored from 1 to 6 (Table 2). A CO-RADS score of 1 is the
183 lowest grade of suspicion, fitting a normal chest CT-image or a non-infectious image.

184 A CO-RADS score of 5 is the highest grade of suspicion, in which chest CT-findings
185 include typical signs of COVID-19, such as multifocal and bilateral ground glass
186 consolidations which extend into the pleura, with or without consolidations. ^(1, 9) Low
187 dose CT-scans were performed using a Siemens Somatom AS (Amphia Hospital)
188 and a Siemens Somatom Flash CT (Slingeland Hospital).

189

190 **Development of the flowchart**

191 For the development of the flowchart (Figure 3), based on the lab-corona-score in
192 combination with the CO-RADS score, data from hospitals were used that perform
193 routine CT-scans at the ED for each COVID-19 suspected patient. Data from
194 Slingeland Hospital (n=104) was used to design the flowchart. In designing this
195 flowchart, we evaluated for which CO-RADS scores the 'lab-corona-score' could
196 provide a contribution in making the correct diagnosis. The final decision of the
197 treating physician was used as a golden standard. In 5 patients with a negative RT-
198 PCR result, the treating physician concluded that the RT-PCR result was a false-
199 negative, and the patient was registered as COVID-19-positive. To validate the
200 flowchart an independent dataset was used from the Amphia Hospital (n=148). The
201 result of the RT-PCR was used as golden standard.

202

203 **Statistics**

204 Data were analyzed using Excel 2010 (Microsoft Corporation, VS) and SPSS (IBM,
205 Version 25.0, VS). Lab-corona-scores were compared between the two groups using
206 an unpaired t-test with a Welch correction. A p -value of < 0.05 was considered
207 statistically significant.

208

209 **Ethical statement**

210 This study was conducted according to the declaration of Helsinki and Guidelines for
211 Good Clinical Practice. The execution of this retrospective observational study of
212 patient records was approved by the regional Medical Research Ethics Committee
213 (METC Brabant), which declared that the use of anonymized patient data is not
214 subject to the regulations of the WMO (Dutch Medical Research Involving Human
215 Subjects Act). Consent was obtained by an opt-out agreement.

216

217 **RESULTS**

218 In order to combine the 'corona-score' with the CO-RADS classification, the
219 radiological interpretation has been removed from the corona-score, resulting in the
220 so-called 'lab-corona-score' (Table 1). The original corona-score can be used if chest
221 X-rays are routinely used at the ED instead of chest CT-scans (Figure 1B). The
222 performance of the 'lab-corona-score' has been retrospectively analyzed based on
223 1904 patients from 6 different hospitals. The prevalence of COVID-19 positive
224 patients at the ED ranged from 10% (HagaHospital) to 59% (Bernhoven Hospital,
225 Table 3). Using cut-off values for the 'lab-corona-score' of 0-2 (negative) and 8-10
226 (positive), the sensitivity was 87% and the specificity 88% (Table 3). In this manner, a
227 decision could be made in 61% of the patients. The area under the receiver operating
228 characteristic (AUROC) curve was 0.86 (Figure 2A). The median of the 'lab-corona-
229 score' in the COVID-19 negative patients was 2 (n=1293) and in the COVID-19
230 positive patients 8 (n=611, Figure 2B, $p<0,001$).

231

232 The flowchart was developed based on data of Slingeland Hospital (n=104). Patients
233 were classified based on their CO-RADS score (Figure 3A). Patients with a CO-

234 RADS of 1 or 2 were classified as COVID-19 negative, except if their 'lab-corona-
235 score' was 9-10. For patients with a CO-RADS score of 3, patients were considered
236 negative if their 'lab-corona-score' was 0-2. Patients with a CO-RADS score of 4
237 were classified as COVID-19 positive, except if their 'lab-corona-score' was 0-3. All
238 patients with a CO-RADS score of 5 were considered COVID-19 positive. The
239 flowchart obtained a sensitivity of 97% and a specificity of 96%. The flowchart could
240 make a decision in 85% of the patients, which was correct 97% of the times. In the 16
241 patients where no decision could be given, 4 patients were COVID-19 positive. These
242 all had a CO-RADS score of 3 with a 'lab-corona-score' between 4 and 10.

243

244 The performance of this flowchart was validated on an independent dataset of
245 Amphia Hospital (n=148, Figure 3B). In this analysis the result of the RT-PCR was
246 used as golden standard. If a patient that initially tested negative for COVID-19
247 tested positive within 7 days after their initial visit, this patient was considered
248 COVID-19 positive. Nonetheless, it is possible that this population still contains a
249 number of false-negative results due to incorrectly performed swabs. When running
250 this validation-population through the flowchart, 69 (47%) patients were considered
251 COVID-19 negative, of which 1 patient (1.4%) had a positive RT-PCR test. In the
252 flowchart 48 (32%) patients were considered COVID-19 positive, of which 90% had a
253 positive RT-PCR. In conclusion, the validation of the flowchart reached a sensitivity of
254 98% and a specificity of 93%. In 79% of the patients a decision could be made, which
255 corresponded with the RT-PCR result in 95% of the patients. In the 31 patients where
256 no conclusive decision could be reached by the flowchart, 6 patients tested positive
257 for SARS-CoV-2. Of these 6 patients, 5 patients had a CO-RADS of 3 (lab-corona-
258 score between 3 and 7) and 1 patient had a CO-RADS of 4 (lab-corona-score of 0).

259 The 'lab-corona-score' is significantly different between COVID-19 positive and
260 negative patients with a CO-RADS score of 3 or 4 ($p < 0.05$, Figure 4A-B),
261 demonstrating the additive diagnostic value of the 'lab-corona-score' in combination
262 with radiology.

263

264 **DISCUSSION**

265 The total diagnostic accuracy of the flowchart is 95-97% and is able to diagnose
266 approximately 80% of patients, using chest-CT and routine laboratory parameters.

267 The proposed flowchart allows for a fast and accurate indication whether patients at
268 the ED with COVID-19 related symptoms are infected with the SARS-CoV-2 virus or
269 not.

270 Multiple flowcharts have been proposed to support and improve triaging of COVID-19
271 suspect ED patients. For example, the Dutch Association of Medical Specialists
272 employs a flowchart based on CO-RADS classification, but the flowchart does not
273 take advantage of changes in clinical chemistry parameters in COVID-19 infected
274 patients. In addition, the use of flowcharts that rely on the outcome of SARS-CoV-2
275 RT-PCR tests are both time-consuming and complicated by the occurrence of false-
276 negative RT-PCR outcomes. Another research group has proposed the use of LD
277 and lymphocyte count as a means to assess the probability of a SARS-CoV-2
278 infection.⁽¹⁰⁾ However, the use of merely these two parameters raises the possibility
279 of misclassification. For example, LD will always be relatively high in a patient
280 suffering from hemolysis and lymphopenia has numerous pathophysiological causes
281 as well. By combining a larger set of multiple laboratory parameters, this effect will be
282 largely diluted. From our results it is clear that using the lab-corona-score and the
283 CO-RADS classification provides added value as compared to using CO-RADS

284 alone. In this instance a high lab-corona-score will confirm the diagnosis if CO-RADS
285 is 4, but will it often rightfully cast doubts in case of a low lab-corona.

286

287 Our study has several strengths. To start with, the study contained data from six
288 independent Dutch hospitals that all calculated and/or reported the corona-score or
289 lab-corona-score. The development and validation of the flowchart was performed on
290 two independent datasets from different hospitals. This strongly contributes to the
291 validity and robustness of the diagnostic performance of the flow chart. Secondly, the
292 lab-corona-score is easy to implement in the laboratory information system. It can be
293 readily reported to the hospital information system, where it will be accessible to all
294 emergency physicians. This, however, will require that a standardised set of
295 laboratory parameters will be requested by ED professionals in order to calculate the
296 (lab-)corona-score. Lastly, the use of this flowchart is significantly faster than current
297 RT-PCR tests, and can therefore reduce both triage time and time to start treatment.

298

299 This study also has a set of limitations. During the development of the flowchart, the
300 medical diagnosis of the physician was used as the golden standard. However, in the
301 validation of the flowchart, the results of the RT-PCR were used as golden standard.
302 Because false-negative RT-PCR results as a result of sampling are not uncommon, it
303 is possible that a number of COVID-19 patients have been incorrectly classified as
304 negative. This could have led to an underestimation of the diagnostic performance of
305 the flow chart. A second limitation is that the use of the flowchart requires the
306 performance of a CT-scan for all suspected patients. If a hospital is unable to perform
307 a CT-scan, they will not be able to use this flowchart. In that case, we would like to
308 recommend the use of the original corona-score, with cut-off values of 0-4 and 11-

309 14.⁽⁸⁾ A third limitation might be that the diagnostic accuracy of the flowchart might be
310 affected by geographical location and population characteristics, as this study was
311 performed in Dutch hospitals only.⁽⁷⁾ Therefore we recommend that hospitals perform
312 a small local validation of the performance of the flowchart prior to implementation.
313 Lastly, as of now we have not been able to whether the performance of the flowchart
314 would be diminished when a large portion of the patients is infected by season flue
315 (influenza). However, it is unlikely that influenza leads to such drastic changes in
316 clinical chemistry parameters, such as ferritin and LD, as seen in COVID-19
317 infections.

318

319 Based on the results of this study we conclude that a flowchart based on a
320 standardised lab-corona-score and radiological CO-RADS classification is an
321 accurate and fast diagnostic tool. Because results of CT-scans and laboratory
322 parameters are rapidly available, it is possible to expeditiously assert the risk of a
323 SARS-CoV-2 infection in EDs. Moreover, the diagnostic tool also reflects the chance
324 of a RT-PCR test result possibly being false-negative. Using this flowchart it is
325 possible to quickly triage COVID-19 suspected patients, and decide on isolation
326 measures.

327

328 **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

329 Declarations of interest: none

330

331 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

332 Data and further information are available upon reasonable request

333

334 **FUNDING**

335 None

336

337 **LEGENDS**

338 **Figure 1. Flow chart of the study setup**

339 (A) Patients from the emergency department (ED) of the Jeroen Bosch Hospital,
340 Amphia Hospital, Slingeland Hospital, HagaHospital, Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital
341 and Bernhoven Hospital that received an SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test, were included.
342 Patients with a missing or non-interpretable RT-PCR result, and patients with missing
343 clinical chemistry parameters, were excluded. In total 1904 patients were included, of
344 whom 252 (from Slingeland Hospital and Amphia Hospital) also had a CO-RADS
345 score. (B) If a hospital uses chest-CT scans for the triage at the ED, the left arm of
346 the flow chart can be used. If the ED uses chest X-ray, the corona-score can be
347 used.

348

349 **Figure 2. Diagnostic characteristics of the lab-corona-score**

350 In the 'lab-corona-score' the points for the interpretation of the radiological image
351 have been removed from the corona-score. (A) The ROC curve of the 'lab-corona-
352 score', in which the area under the curve (AUC) is 0.86. (B) Box-plots of the 'lab-
353 corona-score' in patients with a negative and positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR result.

354

355 **Figure 3. Diagnostic flow chart for COVID-19-suspected patients at the
356 emergency department**

357 (A) The flowchart was developed based on 104 patients of the Slingeland Hospital.
358 The final conclusion of the treating physician was used as golden standard to
359 determine whether a patient was considered COVID-19 negative or positive. (B)
360 Hereafter, the flowchart was validated using an independent dataset of 148 COVID-
361 19-suspected patients of the Amphia Hospital. The result of the RT-PCR was used as
362 golden standard to determine whether a patient was considered COVID-19 negative
363 or positive.

364

365 **Figure 4. The added value of the lab-corona-score in CO-RADS 3 and 4**

366 Boxplots of the 'lab-corona-score' in patients from the Slingeland Hospital and
367 Amphia Hospital who had a CO-RADS of 3 (A) or 4 (B). The 'lab-corona-score' is
368 significantly different between the COVID-19 negative and positive patients with a
369 CO-RADS of 3 or 4 ($p < 0.05$).

370

371 **REFERENCES**

372

373 1. Prokop M, van Everdingen W, van Rees Vellinga T, Quarles van Ufford H,
374 Stoger L, Beenen L, et al. CO-RADS: A Categorical CT Assessment Scheme for
375 Patients Suspected of Having COVID-19-Definition and Evaluation. *Radiology*.
376 2020;296(2):E97-E104.

377 2. Lessmann N, Sanchez CI, Beenen L, Boulogne LH, Brink M, Calli E, et al.
378 Automated Assessment of CO-RADS and Chest CT Severity Scores in Patients with
379 Suspected COVID-19 Using Artificial Intelligence. *Radiology*. 2020:202439.

380 3. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical
381 Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*.
382 2020;382(18):1708-20.

383 4. Terpos E, Ntanasias-Stathopoulos I, Elalamy I, Kastritis E, Sergentanis TN,
384 Politou M, et al. Hematological findings and complications of COVID-19. *Am J*
385 *Hematol*. 2020;95(7):834-47.

386 5. Benoit J, Benoit SW, Lippi G, Henry BM. False negative RT-PCR or false
387 positive serological testing in SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics? Navigating between Scylla
388 and Charybdis to prevent misclassification bias in COVID-19 clinical investigations.
389 *Diagnosis (Berl)*. 2020.

390 6. Assandri R, Canetta C, Vigano G, Buscarini E, Scartabellati A, Montanelli A.
391 Laboratory markers included in the Corona Score can identify false negative results
392 on COVID-19 RT-PCR in the emergency room. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*.
393 2020;30(3):030402.

394 7. Lippi G, Henry BM, Hoehn J, Benoit S, Benoit J. Validation of the Corona-
395 Score for rapid identification of SARS-CoV-2 infections in patients seeking
396 emergency department care in the United States. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2020.

397 8. Kurstjens S, van der Horst A, Herpers R, Geerits MWL, Kluiters-de Hingh
398 YCM, Gottgens EL, et al. Rapid identification of SARS-CoV-2-infected patients at the
399 emergency department using routine testing. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2020;58(9):1587-
400 93.

401 9. Shi H, Han X, Jiang N, Cao Y, Alwalid O, Gu J, et al. Radiological findings
402 from 81 patients with COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study.
403 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(4):425-34.

404 10. Dofferhoff ASM, Swinkels A, Sprong T, Berk Y, Spanbroek M, Nabuurs-
405 Franssen MH, et al. [Diagnostic algorithm for COVID-19 at the ER]. *Ned Tijdschr*
406 *Geneeskd*. 2020;164.

407

408

409 **Table 1: Point-based system for the lab-corona-score.** The total score is cut-off,
 410 with 0 as a minimum score and 10 as a maximum score.
 411

Variable	Points						
Age (years)	≤75	76-79	≥ 80				
Points	0	1	2				
Sex	Female		Male				
Points	0		1				
CRP (mg/L)	0-9	10-14	15-38	39-69	70-193	194-303	≥304
Points	0	1	2	3	2	1	0
Ferritin (µg/L)	≤15	16-179	180-301	302-538	≥539		
Points	-1	0	1	2	3		
LD* (U/L)	≤257	258-265	266-397	≥398			
Points	0	1	2	3			
Lymphocytes (10⁹/L)	≤1.2	≥1.3					
Points	1	0					
Neutrophilic granulocytes (10⁹/L)	≤5.1	5.2-7.9	8.0-9.0	9.1-10.3	≥10.4		
Points	0	-1	-2	-3	-4		

412 CRP, c-reactive protein; LD, lactate dehydrogenase, *the result was multiplied by a factor of 0.9 in
 413 case of a mildly hemolytic sample.
 414

415

416 **Table 2. Description of CO-RADS classification**

417

	Odds of having COVID-19	CT-outcomes
CO-RADS 0	Unable to assess	For example: low quality images due to artefacts
CO-RADS 1	Very low	Normal CT-images, or evidently non-infectious characteristics.
CO-RADS 2	Low	Images infectious characteristics, however not typical for COVID-19.
CO-RADS 3	Moderate/Dubious	Abnormalities fitting with a viral infection, unclear whether COVID-19 related.
CO-RADS 4	High	Abnormalities fitting with a COVID-19 viral infection, with a possibility of a different etiology.
CO-RADS 5	Very high	Highly typical infectious COVID-19 characteristics.
CO-RADS 6	RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 positive	Any image

418

419

420

421 **Table 3. Diagnostic accuracy of the lab-corona-score per hospital.**

422 In the lab-corona-score, only the laboratory parameters contributed to the scoring
423 system. The sensitivity and specificity of the lab-corona-score was determined for the
424 individual hospitals, as well the fraction of patients that could be classified. In this
425 instance, a score of 0-2 was judged as negative, while a score of 8-10 was judged as
426 positive. Other cut-offs could lead to a higher sensitivity or specificity, or could be
427 used to classify a higher number of patients.

428

Hospital	# Patients	RT-PCR positive (prevalence)	Sensitivity	Specificity	Received classification
Amphia Hospital	363	23%	87%	89%	58%
Bernhoven Hospital	579	59%	88%	84%	67%
Elisabeth-TweeSteden Hospital	248	21%	83%	93%	63%
HagaHospital	423	10%	88%	90%	58%
Jeroen Bosch Hospital	187	28%	78%	79%	50%
Slingeland Hospital	104	39%	91%	86%	62%
Total	1904	32%	87%	88%	61%

429


430

431

432

Figure 1

A



B




Figure 2






Figure 3

A



B




Figure 4

