1	Medium-term impacts of the waves of the COVID-19 epidemic on treatments for
2	non-COVID-19 patients in intensive care units: a retrospective cohort study in
3	Japan
4	Shusuke Watanabe <sup>1</sup> , Jung-ho Shin <sup>1</sup> , Takuya Okuno <sup>1</sup> , Tetsuji Morishita <sup>1</sup> , Daisuke
5	Takada <sup>1</sup> , Susumu Kunisawa <sup>1</sup> , Yuichi Imanaka <sup>1</sup>
6	1 Department of Healthcare Economics and Quality Management, Graduate School of
7	Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City, Kyoto, Japan.
8	
9	Corresponding author: Yuichi Imanaka; Professor, Department of Healthcare
10	Economics and Quality Management, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University,
11	Yoshida Konoe-cho, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan; Tel.: +81-75-753-4454; Fax:
12	+81-75-753-4455; E-mail: imanaka-y@umin.net
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

- 1 Shusuke Watanabe; Department of Healthcare Economics and Quality Management,
- 2 Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City, Kyoto, Japan. E-mail:
- 3 watanabe.shusuke.58c@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp
- 4 Jung-ho Shin; Department of Healthcare Economics and Quality Management,
- 5 Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City, Kyoto, Japan. E-mail:
- 6 shin.jungho.5h@kyoto-u.ac.jp
- 7 Takuya Okuno; Department of Healthcare Economics and Quality Management,
- 8 Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City, Kyoto, Japan. E-mail:
- 9 immbeste@gmail.com
- 10 **Tetsuji Morishita**; Department of Healthcare Economics and Quality Management,
- 11 Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City, Kyoto, Japan. E-mail:
- 12 tmori@u-fukui.ac.jp
- 13 Daisuke Takada; Department of Healthcare Economics and Quality Management,
- 14 Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City, Kyoto, Japan. E-mail:
- 15 daisuke.gaotian@gmail.com
- 16 Susumu Kunisawa; Associate Professor, Department of Healthcare Economics and
- 17 Quality Management, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City,
- 18 Kyoto, Japan. E-mail: kunisawa.susumu.2v@kyoto-u.ac.jp

1	Yuichi Imanaka; Professor, Department of Healthcare Economics and Quality
2	Management, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto City, Kyoto,
3	Japan. E-mail: <u>imanaka-y@umin.net</u>
4	
5	Word count: 3,123 words
6	Word count of abstract: 274 words
7	
8	Short title: Medium-term impacts of the COVID-19 epidemic on critical care for non-
9	COVID-19 patients in Japan
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	

**ABSTRACT** 

1

18

2 Background: Maintaining critical care for non-Coronavirus-disease-2019 (non-3 4 COVID-19) patients is a key pillar of tackling the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. 5 This study aimed to reveal the medium-term impacts of the COVID-19 epidemic on 6 case volumes and quality of intensive care for critically ill non-COVID-19 patients. 7 8 **Methods:** Administrative data were used to investigate the trends in case volumes of 9 admissions to intensive care units (ICUs) compared with the previous years. 10 Standardized mortality ratios (SMRs) of non-COVID-19 ICU patients were calculated 11 in each wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in Japan. 12 13 **Results:** The ratios of new ICU admissions of non-COVID-19 patients to those in the 14 corresponding months before the epidemic: 21% in May 2020, 8% in August 2020, 9% 15 in February 2021, and 14% in May 2021, approximately concurrent with the peaks in 16 COVID-19 infections. The decrease was greatest for new ICU admissions of non-17 COVID patients receiving mechanical ventilation (MV) on the first day of ICU

admission: 26%, 15%, 19%, and 19% in the first, second, third, and fourth waves,

1	respectively. No statistically significant change in SMR was observed in any wave of
2	the epidemic; SMRs were 0.990 (95% confidence interval (CI), 0.962-1.019), 0.979
3	(95% CI, 0.953-1.006), 0.996 (95% CI, 0.980-1.013), and 0.989 (95% CI, 0.964-1.014).
4	in the first, second, third, and fourth waves of the epidemic, respectively.
5	
6	Conclusions: Compared to the previous years, the number of non-COVID-19 ICU
7	patients continuously decreased over the medium term during the COVID-19 epidemic.
8	The decrease in case volumes was larger in non-COVID-19 ICU patients initially
9	receiving MV than those undergoing other initial treatments. The standardized in-
10	hospital mortality of non-COVID-19 ICU patients did not change in any waves of the
11	epidemic.
12	
13	EYWORDS
14	Intensive care unit, COVID-19, mechanical ventilation, in-hospital mortality
15	
16	
17	

1 TEXT

## INTRODUCTION

2

3 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has had wide-ranging impacts on 4 society globally, including many excess deaths[1]. Since most countries have 5 experienced repeated waves of COVID-19[2], it remains a global health concern after 6 first emerging more than two years ago. 7 Maintaining treatments for non-COVID-19 critically ill patients is recognized 8 as one of the key pillars of tackling the impact of the pandemic. Many countries have 9 applied resource allocation policies for emergency treatments[3] to ensure sufficient 10 capacity to deal with COVID-19 patients, and triaging admissions to intensive care units 11 (ICUs) has been recommended[4]. However, there remain non-COVID-19 patients 12 requiring critical care, and Japanese national policies against COVID-19 stress the 13 importance of concurrently maintaining health systems for non-COVID-19 patients[5]. 14 Since the start of the pandemic, there have been various impacts on critical care 15 for non-COVID-19 patients[6–14]. Reduced ICU utilization during the waves of 16 COVID-19 infections and changes in patient characteristics, such as diagnosis patterns, 17 severity, and admission process, have been reported[6–8]. Furthermore, stresses on 18 medical staff caring for COVID-19 patients have been reported[9,10], potentially

1 impacting the level of care for non-COVID-19 patients. Some studies examined the 2 impacts on quality of critical care for non-COIVID-19 patients, but conclusion is not in 3 agreement [11–14]. 4 Although the short-term and volume impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have 5 been reported, impacts on quality over the medium term remain unclear. In addition, 6 while COVID-19 originally emerged in Asia, research in Asia about its impact is scarce. 7 We analyzed a large nationwide claims database in Japan that contained data until 8 approximately one year after the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, aiming to 9 clarify the medium-term impacts – impacts during several waves of the COVID-19 – of 10 COVID-19 on critical care for non-COVID-19 patients. 11 12 13 14

## **METHODS**

1

2

3

18

The COVID-19 epidemic in Japan

4 Japan has experienced repeating waves of COVID-19[15]. Supplementary 5 Figure 1 shows the daily number of confirmed COVID-19 cases[16]. Referring to the 6 number of newly detected COVID-19 patients, the peaks of the four waves occurred in 7 April 2020, August 2020, January 2021, and May 2021. The Japanese government declared the first state of emergency on April 7th, 2020[17]. This declaration was based 8 9 on recognizing that COVID-19 could have severe impacts on public health and the 10 national economy. Consequently, public health interventions were enabled to suppress 11 infections, such as requesting the public to self-quarantine[17]. The first state of emergency was lifted on May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020[17], but another state of emergency was 12 declared from January 7th, 2021, to March 18th, 2021, and from April 23rd, 2021 to 13 14 September 28th, 2021[17]. In this study, based on COVID-19 patient trends, April 2020 15 was set as the start of the COVID-19 epidemic in Japan, and the first, second, third, and 16 fourth waves were set from April to June 2020, July to September 2020, and October 17 2020 to March 2021, and April 2021 onwards, respectively.

**Data Source** 

1

2 This study utilized data from the Diagnosis Procedure Combination / Per-Diem 3 Payment System (DPC/PDPS) obtained from the Quality Indicator/Improvement 4 Project's (QIP) database. The QIP database is administered by the Department of 5 Healthcare Economics and Quality Management, Kyoto University School of Public 6 Health. The hospitals participating in the QIP regularly provide the DPC/PDPS data. 7 The participating hospitals primarily provide acute care and represent various sizes and 8 geographical areas. The list of the hospitals participating QIP that have agreed to be 9 made public in advance is offered on the QIP website (http://med-10 econ.umin.ac.jp/QIP/sanka byouin.html). 11 Reimbursement claims in the DPC/PDPS data include the patient's clinical 12 characteristics and records of clinical services. The clinical characteristics recorded in 13 Form 1 include age, sex, admission date, discharge date, primary diagnosis, and other 14 data. Clinical services are recorded in Files E and F. Major diagnosis categories (MDCs), 15 which are the most medically resource-intensive, are recorded in File D. 16 **Study Population** 17 18 From the OIP participating hospitals, those continuously providing DPC/PDPS

1 data from April 2018 to September 2021 were included in our study. Among the patients 2 admitted to these hospitals, ICU admissions from April 2018 to July 2021, aged 18 3 years or older, were included. 4 In this study, an ICU was defined as per international standards as the wards 5 which can at least provide oxygen, noninvasive monitoring, and more intensive nursing 6 care than usual beds[18]. Within the general bed reimbursement categories, which are 7 not beds for specified diagnoses (such as stroke) in Japan, three categories meet the ICU 8 criteria as below (the summary description in each category refers to the minimum 9 requirements for reimbursement). 10 Specialized-care ICU (sICU): require the most intensive resourcing, including a 1:2 11 patient-nurse ratio and constant placement of a doctor. 12 Emergency-care ICU (eICU): require the facility to deal with emergency patients, a 13 1:4 patient-nurse ratio, and constant placement of a doctor. 14 High care units (HCU): require a 1:5 patient-nurse ratio and constant placement of a 15 doctor. 16 17 Descriptive analysis of ICU admissions for non-COVID-19 patients 18 The primary outcome of interest was case volumes of non-COVID-19 patients

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

admitted to ICUs. The case volume in each wave of COVID-19 infections was analyzed. To take seasonality into account, a trend of the ratio of the case volume in each month to the case volume in the corresponding month before the pandemic was analyzed. More specifically, monthly case volumes until March 2021 were compared with those in corresponding months one year before, and monthly case volumes from April 2021 to July 2021 were compared with those in corresponding months two years before. Additionally, the ratios of case volumes of non-COVID-19 patients initially admitted to an sICU (admitted to an sICU on the first day of ICU admissions), of non-COVID-19 ICU patients initially undergoing mechanical ventilation (MV), of non-COVID-19 ICU patients initially administered vasopressors, and of all ICU patients, the ratios of the total case numbers (patients times days) of all ICU patients, and the absolute numbers of COVID-19 ICU patients were described. The classification of COVID-19 patients was based on the diagnoses recorded in the DPC/PDPS data. For diagnoses, the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision (ICD-10) was applied, and patients with diagnoses of B34.2 and U07.1, except for suspected diagnoses, were classified as COVID-19 patients. In addition, the association between hospitals' acceptance of COVID-19 ICU

patients and impacts on non-COVID-19 ICU patient volumes was investigated.

- 1 Specifically, the included hospitals were classified into three categories described below,
- 2 which were used to stratify the ratios of case volumes of non-COVID-19 patients to
- 3 before the epidemic.
- 4 Hospitals that were continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients: more than ten
- 5 patient days of COVID-19 patients in every wave of COVID-19.
- 6 Hospitals that were accepting few COVID-19 ICU patients: less than ten patient
- 7 days of COVID-19 patients in total in the study period.
- 8 Hospitals that were intermediately accepting COVID-19 ICU patients: hospitals
- 9 meeting neither of the categories above.
- 10 Moreover, another type of hospital classification was employed as a sensitivity
- 11 analysis as below (hereinafter, referred as the month criteria).
- 12 Hospitals that were continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients: at least one
- 13 COVID-19 ICU patient in every month in the study period.
- 14 Hospitals that were accepting non COVID-19 ICU patients: non COVID-19 ICU
- patient in the study period. 15
- 16 Hospitals that were intermediately accepting COVID-19 ICU patients: hospitals
- 17 meeting neither of the categories above.
- 18 To account for regional variation in the COVID-19 epidemic, the restricted

6

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

analysis above was performed in limited areas where the impact of COVID-19 was 2 considered to be the largest. These areas included Hokkaido, Tochigi, Saitama, Chiba, 3 Tokyo, Kanagawa, Gifu, Aichi, Osaka, Kyoto, Hyogo, Okayama, Hiroshima, Fukuoka, 4 and Okinawa, where the duration of the first or second states of emergency was longer 5 than other areas of Japan[17]. 7 Changes in initial treatments for non-COVID-19 ICU patients at the start of the 8 epidemic We investigated changes in the initial treatments for non-COVID-19 ICU patients at the start of the epidemic. Specifically, the proportion of initial treatments that were distinctive for ICU patients, such as extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), MV, noninvasive positive pressure ventilation or nasal high-flow therapy (NIPPV/NHF), renal replacement therapy (RRT), and vasopressors[19,20], were 14 examined. Initial treatments were defined as treatments received on the day of admission to the ICU. The proportion of initial treatments in each wave of the COVID-16 19 epidemic in Japan were compared with those in the corresponding months in the years before the epidemic — from April 2018 to March 2020.

Standardized mortality ratios of non-COVID-19 ICU patients during the COVID-

19 epidemic

1

2

3 We investigated the change in the standardized mortality ratio of non-COVID-4 19 ICU patients from the beginning of the epidemic, based on indirect standardization. 5 First, a prediction model for the in-hospital mortality of non-COVID-19 patients was 6 developed based on observations before the epidemic. Second, based on observations 7 after the COVID-19 epidemic began, the ratio of observed in-hospital deaths to 8 expected in-hospital deaths from the prediction model was calculated as a standardized 9 mortality ratio (SMR). The SMR was calculated in each wave of COVID-19 infections, 10 stratified into the categories of hospitals based on acceptance of COVID-19 patients in 11 the ICU. 12 Although the DPC/PDPS data from the target population of this study did not 13 include risk scores for ICU patients (such as a sequential organ failure assessment 14 (SOFA) score and acute physiology and chronic health evaluation (APACHE) I 15 scores), the available data had an acceptable performance with regards to risk 16 adjustment for ICU patients[19,20]. In this study, sex, age, smoking history, body mass 17 index (BMI), major diagnosis category (MDC), ICU category of initial admission (sICU, 18 eICU, or HCU), initial ICU treatment (ECMO, MV, NIPPV/NHF, RRT, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

vasopressors), admission process (post-emergency operation, post elective operation, or medical indication), months of admissions to ICUs, e.g., January or February, were used for predictive analysis. Statistical analysis A chi-square test was performed to compare the proportion of initial treatments of non-COVID-19 ICU patients before and after the epidemic. A statistical significance level of 5% was set. A logistic regression model was employed to develop the prediction model of in-hospital mortality among non-COVID-19 ICU patients. To account for potential clustering by hospitals, a multilevel model with random intercepts for each hospital was applied[21]. For point estimates and confidence intervals, bootstrap methods were employed[21]. Resampling with replacement from the observed data was repeated 1,000 times, and percentiles (2.5% and 97.5%) from the distribution of SMRs were calculated as the lower and upper limits of the confidence intervals. The fiftieth percentile of the distribution was calculated as the point estimate of the SMRs. SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) was used for all statistical analyses; PROC GLIMMIX was used for the multilevel logistic regressions.

#### RESULTS

1

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

#### **Patient Characteristics**

3 From April 2018 to September 2021, 242 hospitals continuously provided 4 DPC/PDPS data to the QIP. In total, 529,834 patients meeting the criteria were 5 identified in the study, as shown in Supplementary Figure 2. Among these patients, 6 10,357 were diagnosed with COVID-19, with the remaining 519,477 patients classified 7 as non-COVID-19 ICU patients. Table 1 shows the characteristics of non-COVID-19 patients admitted to ICUs. Patient demographics and diagnoses were fairly persistent 8 9 over the start of the COVID-19 epidemic. Within typical treatments, MV (12.7%) and 10 vasopressors (26.4%) were relatively frequent.

#### Trends in case volumes of admissions to ICUs

Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1 show the trends in the ratios of case volumes of admissions to ICUs in each month to before the epidemic. The trends in case numbers of COVID-19 patients admitted to ICUs were similar to the national trends in confirmed COVID-19 cases in Japan, shown in Supplementary Figure 1; the first peak was in April 2020, the second peak was in August 2020, the third peak was in January 2021, and the fourth peak was in May 2021. The third and fourth peaks were larger in

size.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

The ratios of new ICU admissions of non-COVID-19 patients declined around the same time as the four peaks in the number of COVID-19 patient admissions to ICUs: a 21% decrease in May 2020, an 8% decrease in August 2020, an 9% decrease in February 2021, and a 14% decrease in May 2021. Similarly, the ratios of new ICU admissions of non-COVID-19 patients initially receiving MV decreased in the same months, but to a greater degree: a 26% decrease in May 2020, a 15% decrease in August 2020, an 19% decrease in February 2021, and 19% decrease in May 2021. Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 2 show the ratios of non-COVID-19 ICU patients, stratified by hospitals' acceptance of COVID-19 ICU patients. The decreases in case volumes of non-COVID-19 ICU patients were larger in hospitals continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients compared with other categories of hospitals. Supplementary Figure 3 and Supplementary Table 3 show the same data, limited to the areas where the impact of the COVID-19 epidemic was largest. A similar difference in case volumes of non-COVID-19 patients can be observed between hospital categories. Supplementary Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 4 show the same data based on the hospital classification of the month criteria. The same trend of the difference of the impact by the degree of acceptance of COVID-19 ICU patients was observed.

Changes in initial treatments for non-COVID-19 ICU patients at the start of the

## COVID-19 epidemic

1

2

- Figure 3 (MV and vasopressor) and Supplementary Figure 5 (NIPPV/NHF,
- 4 RRT, and ECMO) show the changes in initial treatments for non-COVID-19 ICU
- 5 patients. The proportion of patients receiving MV decreased significantly in all waves of
- 6 the epidemic: 12.7% to 12.2% (p = .0301) in the first wave, 12.0% to 10.8% (p < .0001)
- 7 in the second wave, 13.9% to 12.7% (p < .0001) in the third wave, and 12.4% to 11.8%
- 8 (p = .0006) in the fourth wave. On the other hand, the proportion of patients
- 9 administered vasopressors increased significantly in all waves of the epidemic: 25.8%
- to 27.5% (p < .0001) in the first wave, 25.1% to 26.1% (p = .0032) in the second wave,
- 11 26.6% to 27.1% (p = .0168) in the third wave, and 25.7% to 27.2% (p < .0001) in the
- 12 fourth wave.

13

15

## 14 Standardized mortality ratios of non-COVID-19 ICU patients during the COVID-

## 19 epidemic

- The c-statistic of the prediction model for in-hospital mortality of ICU patients
- was 0.8776 (95% confidence interval, 0.8756-0.87895). The odds ratios of the model's
- predictors are shown in Supplementary Table 5.

Table 2 shows the standardized mortality ratios of ICU patients admitted in each wave of the epidemic. The confidence intervals of SMRs included one in all waves of the epidemic. Supplementary Table 6 shows the SMRs stratified into the hospital categories. There was no statistically significant increase in SMRs, in any of the categories of hospitals, and in any of the waves. 

## **DISCUSSION**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Our study investigated a large claims database in Japan and revealed the medium-term impact of waves of the COVID-19 epidemic on the case volumes, initial treatments, and in-hospital mortality ratios of non-COVID-19 patients admitted to ICUs. Descriptive analysis revealed that the waves of the COVID-19 epidemic negatively impacted the volume of non-COVID-19 ICU admissions. A previous study [6] suggested that the reduced volume of ICU patients was due to patients' hesitancy to visit hospitals. In fact, a reduction in case volumes has been observed in many areas, including acute coronary syndrome[22], pneumonia[23], and surgeries[24]. However, the reasons behind the reduction in admissions have not been clarified. In addition to patient hesitancy, another potential mechanism of reduced case volumes is the postponement of non-emergency treatments or tests to reserve capacity for critically ill COVID-19 patients. Postponing non-essential procedures was implemented in various countries around the world[3,4], and the Japanese government also requested health care providers to postpone non-emergency medical procedures during waves of COVID-19 infections[25]. We observed that the decrease in non-COVID-19 ICU patient admissions was greater for hospitals continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients, results that are consistent with the latter mechanism of postponement of nonemergency procedures.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

This study observed that the impact on case volumes was largest in the first wave compared to subsequent waves. In other countries, decreased patient volumes during subsequent waves of COVID-19 have been reported, but comparisons with the impact of the first wave are not in agreement with the present study [26,27]. One potential explanation for the smaller impact in subsequent waves is the more organized management of ICU beds. For instance, during subsequent waves, health professionals might take advantage of lessons learned during the first wave. Another possible explanation is less hesitancy to visit hospitals during subsequent waves. Residents may have gradually become accustomed to the COVID-19 epidemic. In fact, reduced mobility in public spaces in Japan was reported to be smaller in subsequent waves than in the first wave [28]. The impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on volumes of non-COVID-19 ICU patients receiving MV was larger than for other treatments. In addition, the proportion of patients receiving MV decreased in all waves of the epidemic. Since the treatment of COVID-19 patients is considered to exhaust the capacity to undertake MV[4], MVs are supposed to have been suppressed more than other treatments. However, changes in patient volumes have been reported in various areas, including acute coronary

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

syndrome[22], pneumonia[23], and surgeries[24]; the influence of these changes cannot be denied. In addition, volumes themselves of respiratory infection diseases were suggested to decrease due to infection prevention measures employed by residents during the epidemic of the COVID-19[23,29]. Our finding that the confidence intervals of SMRs included one in all waves of the epidemic implies that treatment quality for non-COVID-19 ICU patients was maintained in Japan. Global evidence has been inconsistent about the quality of intensive care during the COVID-19 pandemic[7,8,12–14]. Many factors influence the epidemic's impact on the quality of intensive care. Confirmed COVID-19 patient numbers were smaller in Japan than in other high-income countries[30], which might explain our findings. This study has several limitations. First, although the characteristics of the data-providing hospitals were varied, the data collection relied on the voluntary participation of the hospitals. This may introduce selection bias and limit the generalizability of our findings. Second, the DPC/PDPS data of the study population did not include risk scores of ICU patient severity, such as SOFA or APACHE II scores. Although the prediction performance was good in our study, the risk was adjusted in different ways compared to other studies[7,8]. Third, data about the demand for

1	treatments is not available. As mentioned in the previous section, it is difficult to
2	distinguish between the suppression of required treatments and a decline in the demand
3	for treatments. Further research is warranted, including an investigation of the trend in
4	disease volumes in the general population.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	

# CONCLUSION

We revealed that the number of non-COVID-19 ICU patients continuously decreased over the medium term during the COVID-19 epidemic, compared to the previous year. The decrease in case volumes was larger among non-COVID-19 ICU patients initially receiving MV than those undergoing other initial treatments. The standardized in-hospital mortality of non-COVID-19 ICU patients did not change in any waves of the epidemic. 

## REFERENCES

- 2 1 Islam N, Shkolnikov VM, Acosta RJ, et al. Excess deaths associated with
- 3 covid-19 pandemic in 2020: age and sex disaggregated time series analysis in 29 high
- 4 income countries. BMJ. 2021;373:n1137.
- 5 2 Bontempi E. The europe second wave of COVID-19 infection and the Italy
- 6 "strange" situation. Environ Res. 2021;193(October 2020):110476.
- Haldane V, De Foo C, Abdalla SM, et al. Health systems resilience in managing
- 8 the COVID-19 pandemic: lessons from 28 countries. Nat Med. 2021;27:964–80.
- 9 4 Aziz S, Arabi YM, Alhazzani W, et al. Managing ICU surge during the
- 10 COVID-19 crisis: rapid guidelines. Intensive Care Med. 2020;46(7):1303–25.
- Novel Coronavirus Response Headquarters (Ver. 2021/7/30). Basic
- management policy for COVID-19 [Internet]. Tokyo; 2021 [cited 2021 Aug 2].
- 13 Available from:
- 14 https://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/singi/novel coronavirus/th sirvou/kihon r 030730.pdf
- Fadel FA, Al-Jaghbeer M, Kumar S, et al. The impact of the state of Ohio stay-
- at-home order on non-COVID-19 intensive care unit admissions and outcomes.
- 17 Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther. 2020;52(3):249–52.
- 7 Zee-Cheng JE, McCluskey CK, Klein MJ, et al. Changes in Pediatric ICU

- 1 Utilization and Clinical Trends During the Coronavirus Pandemic. Chest.
- 2 2021;160(2):529–37.
- Bagshaw SM, Zuege DJ, Stelfox HT, et al. Association Between Pandemic
- 4 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Public Health Measures and Reduction in Critical Care
- 5 Utilization Across ICUs in Alberta, Canada. Crit Care Med. 2022 Mar 1;50(3):353-362.
- 6 9 Hoogendoorn ME, Brinkman S, Bosman RJ, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on
- 7 nursing workload and planning of nursing staff on the Intensive Care: A prospective
- 8 descriptive multicenter study. Int J Nurs Stud. 2021 Sep;121:104005.
- 9 10 Manzano García G, Ayala Calvo JC. The threat of COVID-19 and its influence
- 10 on nursing staff burnout. J Adv Nurs. 2021;77(2):832–44.
- Huespe IA, Marco A, Prado E, et al. Changes in the management and clinical
- outcomes of critically ill patients without COVID-19 during the pandemic. Rev Bras Ter
- 13 Intensiva. 2021;33(1):68–74.
- 14 12 Bologheanu R, Maleczek M, Laxar D, et al. Outcomes of non-COVID-19
- critically ill patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: A retrospective propensity score-
- matched analysis. Wien Klin Wochenschr. 2021;133:942–50.
- 17 13 Wilcox ME, Rowan KM, Harrison DA, et al. Does Unprecedented ICU
- 18 Capacity Strain, As Experienced During the COVID-19 Pandemic, Impact Patient

- 1 Outcome? 2022; Publish Ahead of Print: 1–9.
- 2 14 Gonzenbach TP, McGuinness SP, Parke RL, et al. Impact of
- 3 Nonpharmaceutical Interventions on ICU Admissions during Lockdown for
- 4 Coronavirus Disease 2019 in New Zealand A Retrospective Cohort Study. Crit Care
- 5 Med. 2021 Oct 1;49(10):1749-1756.
- 6 15 Karako K, Song P, Chen Y, et al. Overview of the characteristics of and
- 7 responses to the three waves of COVID-19 in Japan during 2020-2021. Biosci Trends.
- 8 2021;15(1):1–8.
- 9 16 Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare. Domestic situation of COVID-19
- 10 [Internet]. Tokyo; 2021 [cited 2022 Jan 18]. Available from:
- 11 https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/covid-19/open-data.html
- 12 17 Cabinet Secretariat. Emergency Declaration [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jan 18].
- 13 Available from: https://corona.go.jp/emergency/
- 14 18 Marshall JC, Bosco L, Adhikari NK, et al. What is an intensive care unit? A
- 15 report of the task force of the World Federation of Societies of Intensive and Critical
- 16 Care Medicine. J Crit Care. 2017;37:270–6.
- 17 19 Iwashita Y, Yamashita K, Ikai H, et al. Epidemiology of mechanically
- ventilated patients treated in ICU and non-ICU settings in Japan: a retrospective

- 1 database study. Crit Care. 2018;22(1):329.
- 2 20 Yamashita K, Ikai H, Nishimura M, et al. Effect of certified training facilities
- 3 for intensive care specialists on mortality in Japan. Crit Care Resusc. 2013;15(1):28–32.
- 4 21 Mohammed MA, Manktelow BN, Hofer TP. Comparison of four methods for
- 5 deriving hospital standardised mortality ratios from a single hierarchical logistic
- 6 regression model. Stat Methods Med Res. 2016;25(2):706–15.
- 7 22 Morishita T, Takada D, Shin J, et al. Trends, Treatment Approaches, and In-
- 8 Hospital Mortality for Acute Coronary Syndrome in Japan During the Coronavirus
- 9 Disease 2019 Pandemic. J Atheroscler Thromb. 2021;28:1–11.
- 10 Nagano H, Takada D, Shin J, et al. Hospitalization of mild cases of community-23
- 11 acquired pneumonia decreased more than severe cases during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 12 Int J Infect Dis. 2021;106(January):323–328.
- 13 24 Okuno T, Takada D, Shin J ho, et al. Surgical volume reduction and the
- 14 announcement of triage during the 1st wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Japan: a
- 15 cohort study using an interrupted time series analysis. Surg Today 2021;21:1–8.
- 16 25 Headquarter against COVID-19, Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare.
- 17 Management of the in-hosptail health care systems to deal with the expansion of
- 18 patients infected with the novel Corona virus. (ver.2, March 26. 2021) [Internet]. 2021

- 1 [cited 2021 Sep 16]. Available from: https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000614595.pdf
- 2 26 Solomon MD, Nguyen-Huynh M, Leong TK, et al. Changes in Patterns of
- 3 Hospital Visits for Acute Myocardial Infarction or Ischemic Stroke During COVID-19
- 4 Surges. JAMA. 2021 Jul 6;326(1):82-84.
- 27 5 Katsouras C, Tsivgoulis G, Papafaklis M, et al. Persistent decline of
- 6 hospitalizations for acute stroke and acute coronary syndrome during the second wave
- 7 of the COVID-19 pandemic in Greece: collateral damage unaffected. Ther Adv Neurol
- 8 Disord Orig. 2021;14:1–9.
- 9 28 Nomura S, Tanoue Y, Yoneoka D, et al. Mobility Patterns in Different Age
- 10 Groups in Japan during the COVID-19 Pandemic: a Small Area Time Series Analysis
- 11 through March 2021. J Urban Heal. 2021;98(5):635-41.
- 12 29 Feng L, Zhang T, Wang Q, et al. Impact of COVID-19 outbreaks and
- 13 interventions on influenza in China and the United States. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):
- 14 3249.

- 15 30 OECD. The health impact of COVID-19 in regions [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021]
- 16 Aug 31]. Available from: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/5442b5fc-
- 17 en/index.html?itemId=/content/component/5442b5fc-en

**DECRALATION** 

2	
3	ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE
4	This study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration
5	of Helsinki and the study was approved by the Ethics Committee, Kyoto University
6	Graduate School and Faculty of Medicine (approval number: R0135) with a waiver of
7	informed consent prior to data collection.
8	
9	CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION
10	Not applicable
11	
12	AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS
13	Data cannot be shared for ethical/privacy reasons.
14	
15	Competing interests
16	The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
17	
18	

FUNDING

1

8

9

16

- This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI [Grant Number JP19H01075 to
- 3 YI and 21K21136 to JS] from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, by the
- 4 GAP Fund Program of Kyoto University type B to YI and by Health Labour Sciences
- 5 Research Grant from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan [20HA2003] to
- 6 YI. The funders played no role in the study design, data collection and analysis,
- 7 decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

## **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

- S.W., J.S., T.O., T.M., D.T., S.K., and Y.I. were involved in the
- 11 conceptualization of the study and the design of the methodology. J.S. and S.K. were in
- charge of the data curation. S.W. and J.S. undertook the formal analysis. S.W. wrote the
- original draft of the manuscript with input from all authors. All authors critically revised
- the report, commented on drafts of the manuscript, and approved the final report. Y.I.
- was in charge of the administration and supervision of the project administration.
- 17 Acknowledgements
- We thank all the staff members and all the participating acute care hospitals.

1	FIGURE LEGENDS
2	
3	Figure 1. The trends in the ratios of case volumes of admissions to ICUs in each
4	month to the same month before the epidemic
5	ICU, intensive care unit; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; sIUC, specialized-care
6	ICU; MV, mechanical ventilation
7	* Indicates new admissions to ICU
8	
9	Figure 2. The trends in the ratios of case volumes of admissions of non-COVID-19
10	ICU patients in each month to the same month before the epidemic, stratified by
11	hospitals
12	ICU, intensive care unit; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019;
13	* Indicates new admissions to ICU
14	
15	Figure 3. Changes in the proportion of initial treatments received by non-COVID-
16	19 ICU patients (MV and vasopressors)
17	COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit; MV, mechanical

ventilation

1	* Indicates a statistically significant difference
2	
3	Supplementary Figure 1. The trend in daily COVID-19 case numbers in Japan
4	COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019
5	
6	Supplementary Figure 2. Flowchart of case classifications in this study
7	ICU, intensive care unit; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019
8	
9	Supplementary Figure 3. The trend in the ratios of case volumes of admissions of
10	non-COVID-19 ICU patients in each month to the same month before the epidemic,
11	stratified by hospitals, in the prefectures with proactive COVID-19 policies
10	
12	ICU, intensive care unit; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019;
13	ICU, intensive care unit; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019;  * Indicates new admissions to ICU
13	
13 14	* Indicates new admissions to ICU
13 14 15	* Indicates new admissions to ICU  Supplementary Figure 4. The trend in the ratios of case volumes of admissions of

1	* Indicates new admissions to ICU
2	
3	Supplementary Figure 5. Changes in the proportion of initial treatments for non
4	COVID-19 ICU patients (NIPPV/NHF, RRT, and ECMO)
5	NIPPV, noninvasive positive pressure ventilation; NHF, nasal high flow; RRT, renal
6	replacement therapy; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation
7	* Indicates statistical difference
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	

Figure 1. The trends in the ratios of case volumes of admissions to ICUs in each month to the same month before the epidemic




Figure 2. The trends in the ratios of case volumes of admissions of non-COVID-19 ICU patients in each month to the same month before the epidemic, stratified by hospitals








Figure 3. Changes in the proportion of initial treatments received by non-COVID-19 ICU patients (MV and vasopressors)









Supplementary Figure 2. Flowchart of case classifications in this study



Supplementary Figure 3. The trend in the ratios of case volumes of admissions of non-COVID-19 ICU patients in each month to the same month before the epidemic, stratified by hospitals, in the prefectures with proactive COVID-19 policies



Supplementary Figure 4. The trend in the ratios of case volumes of admissions of non-COVID-19 ICU patients in each month to the same month before the epidemic, stratified by hospitals (classified by the month criteria)



Supplementary Figure 5. Changes in the proportion of initial treatments for non-COVID-19 ICU patients (NIPPV/NHF, RRT, and ECMO)




Table 1. Patient Characteristics

	All (n=519,477)	Before April 2020 (24	After April 2020 (12
	All (II-319,477)	months) (n=320,111)	months) (n=199,366)
Demographics			
Age, years*	74.00 [64.00, 83.00]	74.00 [64.00, 83.00]	75.00 [65.00, 83.00]
Sex (female), n (%)	217400 ( 41.8)	134320 ( 42.0)	83080 ( 41.7)
Major Diagnosis Category			
Nervous system, n (%)	80099 ( 15.4)	49978 ( 15.6)	30121 ( 15.1)
Eye, n (%)	82 ( 0.0)	49 ( 0.0)	33 ( 0.0)
Ear, nose, mouth, and throat, n (%)	2847 ( 0.5)	1711 ( 0.5)	1136 ( 0.6)
Respiratory system, n (%)	57959 ( 11.2)	36391 ( 11.4)	21568 ( 10.8)
Circulatory system, n (%)	132489 ( 25.5)	81855 ( 25.6)	50634 ( 25.4)
Digestive system, n (%)	98061 ( 18.9)	59544 ( 18.6)	38517 ( 19.3)

Musculoskeletal system, n (%)	13082 ( 2.5)	8038 ( 2.5)	5044 ( 2.5)
Skin and subcutaneous tissue, n (%)	1573 ( 0.3)	893 ( 0.3)	680 ( 0.3)
Breast, n (%)	1153 ( 0.2)	661 ( 0.2)	492 ( 0.2)
Endocrine and metabolic system, n (%)	11317 ( 2.2)	6649 ( 2.1)	4668 ( 2.3)
Kidney and urinary system, n (%)	22557 ( 4.3)	13655 ( 4.3)	8902 ( 4.5)
Female reproductive system, n (%)	7064 ( 1.4)	4531 ( 1.4)	2533 ( 1.3)
Blood and immunological disorders, n (%)	6763 ( 1.3)	4136 ( 1.3)	2627 ( 1.3)
Congenital disease, n (%)	692 ( 0.1)	409 ( 0.1)	283 ( 0.1)
Pediatric disease, n (%)	13 ( 0.0)	7 ( 0.0)	6 ( 0.0)
Injuries, burns, and poisoning, n (%)	42330 ( 8.1)	26475 ( 8.3)	15855 ( 8.0)
Psychiatry, n (%)	1223 ( 0.2)	802 ( 0.3)	421 ( 0.2)
Others, n (%)	15290 ( 2.9)	9364 ( 2.9)	5926 ( 3.0)
Treatment process			
Duration of admission to ICU, days, mean (SD)	3.38 (3.86)	3.45 (3.94)	3.27 (3.73)

#### Initial treatment

Admitted to sICU, n (%)	177855 ( 34.2)	110143 ( 34.4)	67712 ( 34.0)
Admitted ito eICU, n (%)	162323 ( 31.2)	103788 ( 32.4)	58535 ( 29.4)
Admitted to HCU, n (%)	179299 ( 34.5)	106180 ( 33.2)	73119 ( 36.7)
MV, n (%)	66016 ( 12.7)	42052 ( 13.1)	23964 ( 12.0)
NIPPV or NHF, n (%)	6558 ( 1.3)	4287 ( 1.3)	2271 ( 1.1)
RRT, n(%)	11781 ( 2.3)	7320 ( 2.3)	4461 ( 2.2)
Vasopressors, n (%)	137356 ( 26.4)	83433 ( 26.1)	53923 ( 27.0)
ECMO, n (%)	2273 ( 0.4)	1366 ( 0.4)	907 ( 0.5)
Admission process			
Post emergency operations, n (%)	96978 ( 18.7)	59099 ( 18.5)	37879 ( 19.0)
Post elective operations, n(%)	165723 ( 31.9)	101329 ( 31.7)	64394 ( 32.3)
Medical indication, n (%)	256776 ( 49.4)	159683 ( 49.9)	97093 ( 48.7)

\* Indicates that values that are medians [1st quartile, 3rd quartile]

ICU, intensive care unit; sICU, specialized-care ICU; eICU, emergency-care ICU; HCU, high care unit; MV, mechanical ventilation; NIPPV, noninvasive positive pressure ventilation; NHF, nasal high flow; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; RRT, renal replacement therapy.

Table 2. Standardized mortality ratios of non-COVID-19 ICU patients in each wave of the epidemic

## SMR of non-COVID-19 ICU patients (95% CI)

First wave (Apr - Jun 2020)	0.990(0.962-1.019)
Second wave (Jul - Sep 2020)	0.979(0.953-1.006)
Third wave (Oct 2020 - Mar 2021)	0.996(0.980-1.013)
Fourth wave (Apr 2021 - Jul 2021)	0.989(0.964-1.014)

SMR, standardized mortality ratio; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit.

Supplementary Table 1. Trends in the ratios of case volumes of admissions to ICUs in each month to the corresponding month before the epidemic

	New admitted				Non-COVID-19	Non-COVID-19	Non-COVID-19
	COVID-19 ICU	All patients	All patients**	Non-COVID-19	patients initially		patients initially
		(patient-days)	An patients.	patients**	admitted to	patients initially	administering
	patients				sICU**	undergoing MV**	vasopressor**
Feb-20	4	46273 (102.8%)	13057 (101.4%)	13053 (101.4%)	4452 (101.1%)	1892 (103.7%)	3503 (101.4%)
Mar-20	29	45216 (94.8%)	13232 (97.5%)	13203 (97.3%)	4667 (100.2%)	1806 (101.9%)	3613 (99.4%)
Apr-20	315	39733 (86.9%)	11212 (83.1%)	10897 (80.8%)	3934 (86.1%)	1427 (78.0%)	3140 (90.0%)
May-20	76	38405 (82.3%)	10572 (79.6%)	10496 (79.0%)	3623 (81.1%)	1280 (73.6%)	2808 (82.8%)
Jun-20	17	40019 (89.4%)	12128 (92.4%)	12111 (92.3%)	4375 (99.8%)	1376 (88.7%)	3263 (97.6%)
Jul-20	247	44401 (97.0%)	13337 (97.2%)	13090 (95.4%)	4599 (96.2%)	1408 (91.0%)	3451 (96.8%)
Aug-20	552	46632 (99.6%)	13078 (95.7%)	12526 (91.7%)	4165 (90.9%)	1400 (85.5%)	3267 (97.0%)
Sep-20	217	43549 (97.2%)	12687 (97.9%)	12470 (96.2%)	4266 (94.7%)	1310 (85.1%)	3223 (103.1%)

Oct-20	247	46554 (98.2%)	13778 (98.4%)	13531 (96.6%)	4561 (94.9%)	1506 (89.4%)	3511 (98.9%)
Nov-20	674	48895 (103.1%)	13603 (99.1%)	12929 (94.2%)	4325 (93.7%)	1635 (89.4%)	3469 (97.6%)
Dec-20	900	53144 (107.3%)	14721 (102.1%)	13821 (95.8%)	4481 (92.2%)	1812 (87.9%)	3758 (94.6%)
Jan-21	1190	57811 (112.3%)	14640 (100.7%)	13450 (92.5%)	4335 (89.6%)	1880 (83.8%)	3674 (95.2%)
Feb-21	516	47593 (102.9%)	12449 (95.3%)	11933 (91.4%)	3980 (89.4%)	1541 (81.4%)	3360 (95.9%)
Mar-21	508	49696 (109.9%)	14081 (106.4%)	13573 (102.8%)	4580 (98.1%)	1680 (93.0%)	3702 (102.5%)
Apr-21	1252	52616 (115.1%)	14049 (104.2%)	12797 (94.9%)	4273 (93.5%)	1562 (85.4%)	3535 (101.3%)
May-21	1712	56331 (120.8%)	13133 (98.8%)	11421 (86.0%)	3880 (86.8%)	1408 (81.0%)	3072 (90.5%)
Jun-21	932	48110 (107.5%)	12943 (98.6%)	12011 (91.5%)	4189 (95.6%)	1373 (88.5%)	3383 (101.2%)
Jul-21	969	46418 (101.4%)	13279 (96.8%)	12310 (89.7%)	4146 (86.7%)	1366 (88.2%)	3307 (92.8%)

COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit; sICU, specialized-care ICU; MV, mechanical ventilation

<sup>\*</sup> From Feb-20 to Mar-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 1-year before (Feb-19 to Mar-20) are shown and from Apr-21 to Jul-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 2-years before (Apr-19 to Jul-19) are shown.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Indicates new admissions to ICU

Supplementary Table 2. Trends in the ratios of case volumes of non-COVID-19 patient admissions to ICUs in each month to the same month in the previous year, stratified by hospitals

	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19
	acceptance, few)**	acceptance, intermediate)**	acceptance, continuous)**
Feb-20	1816 (104.5%)	5494 (100.8%)	5743 (101.0%)
Mar-20	1773 (94.0%)	5642 (98.7%)	5788 (97.1%)
Apr-20	1700 (87.9%)	4998 (89.3%)	4199 (70.5%)
May-20	1601 (85.6%)	4772 (86.0%)	4123 (70.3%)
Jun-20	1798 (96.5%)	5280 (94.6%)	5033 (88.7%)
Jul-20	1905 (100.2%)	5623 (98.0%)	5562 (91.5%)
Aug-20	1773 (94.8%)	5439 (93.6%)	5314 (88.8%)
Sep-20	1794 (99.1%)	5441 (100.1%)	5235 (91.7%)
Oct-20	2023 (105.4%)	5794 (97.4%)	5714 (93.1%)

Nov-20	1948 (106.0%)	5580 (95.7%)	5401 (89.2%)
Dec-20	2108 (105.7%)	6116 (101.0%)	5597 (87.8%)
Jan-21	2158 (106.0%)	5749 (93.8%)	5543 (87.0%)
Feb-21	1903 (104.8%)	5092 (92.7%)	4938 (86.0%)
Mar-21	2061 (116.2%)	5799 (102.8%)	5713 (98.7%)
Apr-21	2081 (107.6%)	5470 (97.7%)	5246 (88.1%)
May-21	1892 (101.2%)	4996 (90.0%)	4533 (77.3%)
Jun-21	1873 (100.5%)	5234 (93.7%)	4904 (86.4%)
Jul-21	1865 (98.1%)	5376 (93.7%)	5069 (83.4%)

COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit

<sup>\*</sup> From Feb-20 to Mar-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 1-year before (Feb-19 to Mar-20) are shown and from Apr-21 to Jul-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 2-years before (Apr-19 to Jul-19) are shown.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Indicates new admissions to ICU

Supplementary Table 3. Trends in the ratios of case volumes of non-COVID-19 patient admissions to ICUs in each month to the same month in the previous year, stratified by hospitals, in the prefectures with proactive COVID-19 policies

	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19
	acceptance, few)**	acceptance, intermediate)**	acceptance, continuous)**
Feb-20	708 (106.9%)	3025 (95.3%)	4594 (100.6%)
Mar-20	723 (103.3%)	3109 (93.9%)	4706 (99.0%)
Apr-20	601 (83.9%)	2627 (82.4%)	3299 (68.8%)
May-20	621 (85.3%)	2566 (81.1%)	3252 (68.7%)
Jun-20	653 (89.8%)	2936 (92.5%)	4001 (86.6%)
Jul-20	691 (93.0%)	3196 (96.2%)	4412 (89.3%)
Aug-20	704 (92.4%)	3071 (90.0%)	4185 (86.4%)
Sep-20	675 (95.7%)	3103 (99.6%)	4151 (90.5%)
Oct-20	768 (105.1%)	3203 (96.4%)	4480 (90.1%)

Nov-20	761 (111.7%)	3031 (93.5%)	4210 (85.9%)
Dec-20	756 (100.5%)	3486 (105.6%)	4359 (84.8%)
Jan-21	817 (104.3%)	3150 (92.6%)	4336 (84.6%)
Feb-21	686 (96.9%)	2768 (91.5%)	3880 (84.5%)
Mar-21	718 (99.3%)	3170 (102.0%)	4494 (95.5%)
Apr-21	759 (106.0%)	3035 (95.2%)	4186 (87.3%)
May-21	647 (88.9%)	2754 (87.0%)	3565 (75.4%)
Jun-21	659 (90.6%)	2895 (91.2%)	3855 (83.4%)
Jul-21	629 (84.7%)	3044 (91.6%)	4061 (82.2%)

COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit

<sup>\*</sup> From Feb-20 to Mar-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 1-year before (Feb-19 to Mar-20) are shown and from Apr-21 to Jul-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 2-years before (Apr-19 to Jul-19) are shown.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Indicates new admissions to ICU

Supplementary Table 4. Trends in the ratios of case volumes of non-COVID-19 patient admissions to ICUs in each month to the same month in the previous year, stratified by hospitals (classified by the month criteria)

	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19	Non-COVID-19 patients (COVID-19
	acceptance, non)**	acceptance, intermediate)**	acceptance, continuous)**
Feb-20	968 (99.6%)	10366 (101.4%)	1719 (102.3%)
Mar-20	1000 (100.5%)	10500 (96.7%)	1703 (99.4%)
Apr-20	874 (84.6%)	9010 (84.3%)	1013 (57.5%)
May-20	823 (81.3%)	8698 (82.6%)	975 (55.9%)
Jun-20	930 (92.2%)	9773 (94.8%)	1408 (78.1%)
Jul-20	980 (97.3%)	10484 (97.1%)	1626 (85.1%)
Aug-20	883 (87.7%)	10151 (93.1%)	1492 (84.7%)
Sep-20	858 (89.6%)	10150 (98.4%)	1462 (86.6%)
Oct-20	992 (96.5%)	10860 (97.3%)	1679 (92.5%)

Nov-20	1001 (103.2%)	10450 (95.5%)	1478 (81.7%)
Dec-20	1072 (101.6%)	11385 (99.4%)	1364 (71.2%)
Jan-21	1123 (107.4%)	10858 (93.6%)	1469 (77.8%)
Feb-21	1023 (105.7%)	9516 (91.8%)	1394 (81.1%)
Mar-21	1063 (106.3%)	10873 (103.6%)	1637 (96.1%)
Apr-21	1080 (104.5%)	10321 (96.5%)	1396 (79.3%)
May-21	957 (94.6%)	9311 (88.4%)	1153 (66.1%)
Jun-21	1003 (99.4%)	9659 (93.7%)	1349 (74.8%)
Jul-21	1011 (100.4%)	9809 (90.8%)	1490 (78.0%)

COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit

<sup>\*</sup> From Feb-20 to Mar-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 1-year before (Feb-19 to Mar-20) are shown and from Apr-21 to Jul-21, ratios of case numbers to those of the same months 2-years before (Apr-19 to Jul-19) are shown.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Indicates new admissions to ICU

#### Supplementary Table 5. Odds ratios of predictors in the prediction model

	OR (95% CI)	p-value
sex (male)	1.317 (1.278-1.358)	<.0001
age		
under 45 (reference)	-	-
45-55	1.596 (1.438-1.772)	<.0001
55-65	1.980 (1.800-2.179)	<.0001
65-75	2.511 (2.298-2.743)	<.0001
75-85	3.502 (3.211-3.819)	<.0001
85-	5.010 (4.590-5.469)	<.0001
Body mass index		
18.5-25 (reference)	-	-
under 18.5	1.593 (1.537-1.652)	<.0001
25-30	0.825 (0.790-0.862)	<.0001
30-	0.954 (0.882-1.033)	0.2496
unmeasured	2.586 (2.478-2.700)	<.0001
smoking history	0.853 (0.825-0.882)	<.0001
ICU categories of initial admission		
sICU (reference)	-	-
eICU	0.960 (0.915-1.008)	0.0998

It is made	available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International	license.
HCU	0.861 (0.819-0.906)	<.0001
Initial treatment in ICU		
MV	2.946 (2.845-3.051)	<.0001
NIPPV/NHF	2.104 (1.933-2.291)	<.0001
RRT	1.748 (1.634-1.870)	<.0001
ECMO	14.144 (12.333-16.223)	<.0001
vasopressor	2.705 (2.616-2.797)	<.0001
Admission process		
post emergency operations		
(reference)	<del>-</del>	-
post elective operations	0.303 (0.285-0.321)	<.0001
medical indication	2.194 (2.105-2.288)	<.0001
Major Diagnosis Category		
Nervous system (reference)	-	-
Eye	0.027 (0.000-36.115)	0.3252
Ear, nose, mouth and throat	0.480 (0.353-0.653)	<.0001
Respiratory system	1.269 (1.209-1.332)	<.0001
Circulatory system	0.630 (0.602-0.660)	<.0001
Digestive system	0.878 (0.831-0.928)	<.0001
Musculoskeletal system	1.059 (0.937-1.198)	0.3576
Skin and subcutaneous tissue	0.401 (0.289-0.554)	<.0001

Breast	1.518 (1.004-2.296)	0.0479
Endocrine and metabolic system	0.372 (0.323-0.429)	<.0001
Kidney and urinary system	0.723 (0.667-0.784)	<.0001
Female reproductive system	1.242 (0.975-1.581)	0.0788
Blood and immunological	2.011 (2.674.2.160)	. 0001
disorders	2.911 (2.674-3.168)	<.0001
Congenital disease	0.406 (0.156-1.055)	0.0643
	0.023	0.7025
Pediatric disease	(0.000-5777606.185)	0.7025
Injuries, burns and poisoning	0.462 (0.431-0.496)	<.0001
Psychiatry	0.101 (0.046-0.224)	<.0001
Others	1.639 (1.536-1.749)	<.0001
Unmeasured	28.858 (26.967-30.883)	<.0001
Month of admission		
January	1.058 (0.995-1.126)	0.0701
February	1.041 (0.976-1.110)	0.226
March	1.011 (0.948-1.079)	0.7366
April	0.942 (0.882-1.006)	0.0769
May	0.990 (0.927-1.057)	0.759
June	0.930 (0.869-0.995)	0.0342
July	0.944 (0.883-1.008)	0.086

August	0.959 (0.898-1.024)	0.2117	
September	0.978 (0.915-1.045)	0.5059	
October	1.000 (0.937-1.067)	0.9953	
November	1.048 (0.983-1.117)	0.152	
December (reference)	-	-	

OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; ICU, intensive care unit; sICU, specialized-care ICU; eICU, emergency-care ICU; HCU, high care unit; MV, Mechanical Ventilation; NIPPV, Noninvasive positive pressure ventilation; NHF, Nasal high flow; ECMO, Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; RRT, Renal replacement therapy

Supplementary Table 6. Standardized mortality in each wave of the epidemic, stratified by hospital categories

Time period	Hospital category of acceptance of COVID-19 ICU patients	SMR (95% CI)
First wave (Apr - Jun 2020)	All hospital	0.990(0.962-1.019)
	Hospitals, continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	0.961(0.924-0.999)*
	Hospitals, intermediately accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	1.018(0.981-1.061)
	Hospitals, accepting few COVID-19 ICU patients	0.987(0.916-1.059)
Second wave (Jul - Sep 2020)	All hospital	0.979(0.953-1.006)
	Hospitals, continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	0.975(0.942-1.013)
	Hospitals, intermediately accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	0.956(0.919-0.996)*
	Hospitals, accepting few COVID-19 ICU patients	1.057(0.992-1.129)
Third wave (Oct 2020 - Mar 2021)	All hospital	0.996(0.980-1.013)
	Hospitals, continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	1.001(0.977-1.023)
	Hospitals, intermediately accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	0.984(0.958-1.009)

	Hospitals, accepting few COVID-19 ICU patients	1.017(0.977-1.061)
fourth wave (Apr 2021 - Jul 2021)	All hospital	0.989(0.964-1.014)
	Hospitals, continuously accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	0.963(0.933-0.996)*
	Hospitals, intermediately accepting COVID-19 ICU patients	1.007(0.972-1.044)
	Hospitals, accepting few COVID-19 ICU patients	1.011(0.948-1.071)

SMR, standardized mortality ratio; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ICU, intensive care unit

<sup>\*</sup> indicates statistically significantly different from 1.