

# 1 **Optimization of Ventilation Therapy Prioritization Strategies** 2 **among Patients with COVID-19: Lessons Learned from Real-** 3 **World Data of nearly 600,000 Hospitalized Patients**

4 **Running Title:** Optimizing Ventilation Therapy Prioritization for COVID-19 Patients

5 Mohsen Abbasi-Kangevari<sup>1,†</sup>, Ali Ghanbari<sup>1,†</sup>, Mohammad-Reza Malekpour<sup>1,†</sup>, Seyyed-Hadi  
6 Ghamari<sup>1</sup>, Sina Azadnajafabad<sup>1</sup>, Sahar Saeedi Moghaddam<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad Keykhaei<sup>2</sup>, Rosa  
7 Haghshenas<sup>1</sup>, Ali Golestani<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad-Mahdi Rashidi<sup>1</sup>, Nazila Rezaei<sup>1</sup>, Erfan Ghasemi<sup>1</sup>, Negar  
8 Rezaei<sup>1,3,\*</sup>, Hamid Reza Jamshidi<sup>4</sup>, Bagher Larijani<sup>3</sup>

9 <sup>1</sup>Non-Communicable Diseases Research Center, Endocrinology and Metabolism Population  
10 Sciences Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

11 <sup>2</sup>Feinberg Cardiovascular Research Institute, Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern  
12 University, Chicago, IL 60611

13 <sup>3</sup>Endocrinology and Metabolism Research Center, Endocrinology and Metabolism Clinical Sciences  
14 Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

15 <sup>4</sup>Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical  
16 Sciences, Tehran, Iran

17 <sup>†</sup>These authors share first-authorship

18 <sup>\*</sup>Address correspondence to Negar Rezaei, MD PhD

19 Non-Communicable Diseases Research Center, Endocrinology and Metabolism Population Sciences  
20 Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

21 Address: No. 10, Al-e-Ahmad and Chamran Highway intersection, Tehran, Iran.

22 Postal code: 1411713136. Tel/Fax: +982188631293

23 E-mail: [n.rezaei81@yahoo.com](mailto:n.rezaei81@yahoo.com)

## 24 **Summary**

### 25 **Objective**

26 To investigate the benefit of ventilation therapy among various patient groups with COVID-19  
27 admitted to hospitals, based on the real-world data of hospitalized adult patients.

### 28 **Methods**

29 Data used in the longitudinal study included 599,340 records of hospitalized patients. All  
30 participants were categorized based on demographics and their date of hospitalization. Two models  
31 were used in this study: firstly, participants were assessed by their probability of receiving  
32 ventilation therapy during hospitalization using mixed-effects logistic regression. Secondly, the  
33 clinical benefit of receiving ventilation therapy among various patient groups was quantified while  
34 considering the probability of receiving ventilation therapy during hospital admission, as estimated  
35 in the first model.

### 36 **Findings**

37 Among participants, 60,113 (10.0%) received ventilation therapy, 85,158 (14.2%) passed away due  
38 to COVID-19, and 514,182 (85.8%) recovered. Among all groups with sufficient data for analysis,  
39 patients aged 40-64 years who had chronic respiratory diseases (CRD) and malignancy benefitted  
40 the most from ventilation therapy; followed by patients aged 65+ years who had malignancy,  
41 cardiovascular diseases, and diabetes; and patients aged 18-39 years who had malignancy. Patients  
42 aged 65+ who had CRD and cardiovascular disease gained the least benefit from ventilation  
43 therapy.

### 44 **Conclusion**

45 This study promotes a new aspect of treating patients for ventilators: it could be suggested that  
46 rather than focusing on the scarcity of ventilators, guidelines focus on decision-making algorithms  
47 to also take the usefulness of the intervention into account, whose beneficial effect is dependent on  
48 the selection of the right time in the right patient.

### 49 **Keywords**

50 COVID-19; Health Care Rationing; Mechanical Ventilators; Medical Ethics; Resource Allocation;  
51 Triage.

## 52 **Funding**

53 This work was supported by the World Health Organization (WHO) Eastern Mediterranean  
54 Regional Office (EMRO) (Grant No. 202693061). The funders had no role in study design, data  
55 collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

56

## 57 **Research in context**

### 58 **What was already known**

59 Research has been ongoing to investigate the main principles for allocating scarce medical  
60 resources during pandemics. Medical experts working at the COVID-19 care units interact with  
61 patients of different socioeconomic, clinical, paraclinical, and overall health statuses. While  
62 physicians should not be faced with situations where they would be obliged to decide which patient  
63 to treat due to the risk of human error as well as the double-burden of life-long emotional toll, the  
64 pandemic has increased the likelihood of such dilemmas, especially in settings with limited  
65 resources. Serious discussions on the ethical considerations of ventilator allocation were also raised  
66 during the pandemic. Utility (maximizing benefits) and equity (distributive justice) were two  
67 concerns raised in decision making in such dilemma which has also been considered to be "the  
68 toughest triage".

### 69 **What new knowledge the manuscript contributes**

70 This longitudinal study provides new insights on optimizing the strategies for ventilation therapy  
71 prioritization among patients with COVID-19, based on the real-world data of nearly 600,000  
72 hospitalized patients with COVID-19. So far, there has been focus on how to prioritize patients with  
73 COVID-19 for ventilation therapy. Nevertheless, there has not been much evidence on how much  
74 patients of different age groups with various underlying conditions actually benefitted from  
75 ventilation therapy based on real-world data. The results of this study could have a significant  
76 message: should the prioritization guidelines for ventilators allocation take no notice of the real-  
77 world data, patients might be deprived of ventilation therapy, who could benefit the most from it.  
78 This would pave the way to capture clearer picture in the possible future pandemics.

## 79 **Background**

80 The coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has far officially claimed more than 5.22  
81 million lives worldwide (1). Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), a common complication  
82 of COVID-19 among critically ill patients, requires medical management involving ventilation  
83 therapy. Of all patients diagnosed with COVID-19, 17% to 35% would be hospitalized at intensive  
84 care units (ICUs) (2,3), and 9% to 19% would require invasive mechanical ventilation (2,4). The  
85 availability of ICU beds varies widely between countries, even among the wealthiest countries (5).

86 While COVID-19 continues to place extraordinary demands on healthcare systems, resulting in  
87 severe shortages of essential resources and services (6), the scarcity of ventilators could be the most  
88 challenging, as there is typically limited time if mechanical ventilation is vital (7). The estimated  
89 number of available invasive mechanical ventilators in various countries would not be adequate to  
90 serve all clinically eligible patients during the pandemic (8).

91 Research has been ongoing to investigate the main principles for allocating scarce medical  
92 resources during pandemics (9–11). Medical experts working at the COVID-19 care units interact  
93 with patients of different socioeconomic, clinical, paraclinical, and overall health statuses. While  
94 physicians should not be faced with situations where they would be obliged to decide which patient  
95 to treat due to the risk of human error as well as the double-burden of life-long emotional toll, the  
96 pandemic has increased the likelihood of such dilemmas, especially in settings with limited  
97 resources (12). Thus, prioritization recommendations and guidelines are under development in the  
98 hope of helping physicians, especially those less experienced, with the real-time decision-making  
99 process based on the resources and contexts (6,13). Serious discussions on the ethical  
100 considerations of ventilator allocation were also raised during the pandemic. Utility (maximizing  
101 benefits) and equity (distributive justice) were two concerns raised in decision making (14,15) in  
102 such dilemma which has also been considered to be "the toughest triage" (7). From a utilitarian  
103 perspective, saving the most lives or saving the most life-years by allocation of ventilation to those  
104 with higher survival could guide rationing (7,14,15).

105 Nevertheless, there is not much information about ventilation therapy for patients with COVID-19.

106 Drawing from previous World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines, there are recommendations

107 to indicate which patients with hypoxemic respiratory failure should be considered for non-invasive

108 ventilation and prioritize in settings with limited resources (16). It remains challenging yet

109 imperative to prioritize therapy to patients who will benefit the most from it considering availability

110 and risk, considering the increased risk of infection transmission when the patient undergoes

111 endotracheal intubation and non-invasive ventilation (17). Determining which patients with

112 COVID-19 would benefit the most from ventilation therapy could help optimize the current

113 ventilator allocation guidelines. Thus, the objective of this study was to investigate the benefit of

114 ventilation therapy among various patient groups with COVID-19 admitted to hospitals, based on

115 the real-world data of hospitalized adult patients.

## 116 **Material and methods**

### 117 **Ethics**

118 This work was supported by the WHO EMRO Office (EMRO) (Grant No. 202693061). The ethics  
119 committee of Endocrinology and Metabolism Research Center, Endocrinology and Metabolism  
120 Clinical Sciences Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, approved this  
121 study under the reference number IR.TUMS.EMRI.REC.1400.034. The confidentiality of the data  
122 and the results are preserved.

### 123 **Overview**

124 Data used included 599,340 records of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Iran who were  
125 admitted from February 2020 to June 2021. Patients were categorized based on sex, age, city of  
126 residence, the hospitals' affiliated university, date of hospitalization, and comorbidities. First, the  
127 probability of patients' ventilation therapy during hospitalization was calculated. Then, patients'  
128 survival was assessed and the clinical benefit of ventilation therapy among various patient groups  
129 was quantified while considering the probability of receiving ventilation therapy during hospital  
130 admission, as estimated in the first model.

### 131 **Data source and variables**

132 Data of this longitudinal study were retrieved from the Iranian COVID-19 Registry provided by the  
133 Ministry of Health and Medical Education, which was gathered from hospitals and included patients  
134 with COVID-19 in Iran from the early days of the pandemic. Data used in the current study  
135 included 599,340 records of hospitalized patients who were admitted from February 2020 to June  
136 2021. The study variables included the patients' age; sex; underlying conditions, including diabetes  
137 mellitus (DM), cardiovascular diseases (CVD), chronic respiratory disease (CRD), malignancy;  
138 receiving ventilation therapy; and COVID-19 outcomes, including recovery or death.

### 139 **Case definitions**

140 DM, CVD, CRD, and malignancy were obtained from patients' self-reported medical history. The  
141 diagnosis of COVID-19 was made by physicians based on a positive Real-Time Reverse  
142 Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) result for SARS-CoV-2, or clinical suspicion

143 defined as (1) at least two of the following symptoms lasting for at least 48 hours: fever (axillary  
144 temperature  $\geq 37.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), chills, sore throat, stuffy nose, myalgia, fatigue, headache, nausea or  
145 vomiting, or diarrhea or (2) at least one respiratory sign or symptom (including cough, shortness of  
146 breath), new olfactory or taste disorder, or radiographic evidence of COVID-19–like pneumonia.

## 147 **Data analysis**

### 148 **Variables**

149 All participants were categorized based on sex, age, city of residence, the hospitals' affiliated  
150 university, and their date of hospitalization. Age groups were defined as 18-39, 40-64, and more  
151 than 65-year-old participants. The affiliated university were assessed due to the possibility of using  
152 disparate approaches and guidelines regarding ventilator allocation policies. The date of  
153 hospitalization was also included due to the paramount importance of considering the scarcity of  
154 vital equipment at the peak of the COVID-19 epidemic surge. The intervals included in the analysis  
155 were as follows: February-March 2020, April-May 2020, June-July 2020, August-September 2020,  
156 November-December 2020, January-February 2021, March-April 2021, and May-June 2021. In  
157 addition to demographic annotations, patients' data were further assessed for comorbidities and  
158 underlying/clinical conditions, which included CRD, CVD, DM, and malignancies.

### 159 **Statistical methods**

160 Two models were used in this study: in the first model, participants were assessed by their  
161 probability of receiving ventilation therapy during hospitalization based on demographic and  
162 clinical factors using mixed-effects logistic regression. In the second model, the clinical benefit of  
163 receiving ventilation therapy among various patient groups was quantified while considering the  
164 probability of receiving ventilation therapy during hospital admission, as estimated in the first  
165 model.

#### 166 *Estimating the probability of ventilation therapy*

167 First, we used a mixed-effects logistic regression model (18) to estimate the probability of receiving  
168 ventilation therapy among patients. The response variable was binary, with "one" representing  
169 receiving ventilation therapy. The effects of time intervals, age groups and affiliated university were



170 considered as random intercept effects. Sex, ICU admission, CRD, malignancy, CVD, and diabetes  
 171 were random intercept effects that varied among different age groups, as presented in the following:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = \text{intercept} + u_{\text{affiliated university}} + u_{\text{admission time}} + u_{\text{intercept}_l} + u_{\text{sex}_l}$$

$$+ u_{\text{ICU admission}_l} + u_{\text{CRD}_l} + u_{\text{malignancy}_l} + u_{\text{CVD}_l} + u_{\text{diabetes}_l} + \epsilon$$

$\pi = \text{probability of receiving ventilation therapy}$

$l = 1, \dots, n_l$ ; indicate age group

$$u_{\text{affiliated university}} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_{\text{affiliated university}})$$

$$u_{\text{time}} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_{\text{time}})$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{\text{sex}_l} \\ u_{\text{ICU}_l} \\ u_{\text{CRD}_l} \\ u_{\text{malignancy}_l} \\ u_{\text{CVD}_l} \\ u_{\text{diabetes}_l} \\ u_{\text{intercept}_l} \end{pmatrix} \sim \text{MultivariateNormal}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$$

$\Sigma$  is a variance – covariance matrix

$$\epsilon \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma)$$

172 *Estimating the probability of recovery*

173 To investigate the extent of benefit among patients with various underlying conditions, the uneven  
 174 chance of receiving ventilation therapy due to the time of admission, hospital equipment, or  
 175 resource allocation guidelines used needed to be addressed. First, we divided the patients into 48  
 176 groups based on their age groups and underlying conditions, including CRD, malignancy, CVD,  
 177 DM. Then, considering the high sample size and to simplify the modeling process, a logistic  
 178 generalized linear model was fitted separately for each group. The response variable was binary  
 179 with "one" representing recovery. Also, the admission province, admission time, patient sex, and  
 180 ICU admission were the independent variables. The last term of the model was the interaction  
 181 between a binary variable, with "one" representing receiving ventilation therapy, and a continuous  
 182 variable indicating the probability of receiving ventilation therapy obtained from the first model.  
 183 This interaction gives away two main effects and one interaction coefficient, as presented in the  
 184 following:

185  $\text{outcome} \sim 1 + \text{icu} + \text{affiliated university} + \text{time} + \text{sex} + \text{ventilation therapy} * \text{probability of receiving}$   
 186  $\text{ventilation therapy}$

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = \text{intercept} + \text{icu} + \text{affiliated university} + \text{time.period} + \text{sex} \\ + \text{ventilator.therapy} * \text{probability of receiving ventilation therapy} + \epsilon \\ \pi = \text{probability of recovery} \\ \epsilon \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma)$$

187 Main effects

188 The first main effect indicated the ratio of the odds for recovery among patients who received  
189 ventilation therapy to the odds for those who did not, while considering other factors constant. The  
190 second main effect indicated the ratio of the odds for recovery for a one-unit increase (“zero”  
191 probability represents not receiving ventilation therapy, while “one” represents receiving ventilation  
192 therapy) in the probability of receiving ventilation therapy, while considering other factors constant.

193 Interaction coefficient

194 The interaction coefficient indicated the difference in the slope of the logit probability of recovery  
195 for a one-unit increase in the probability of receiving ventilation therapy between the patients who  
196 received ventilation compared to those who did not while considering other factors constant. We  
197 considered the positive and significant coefficient values to represent the benefit of receiving  
198 ventilation for patients who receive ventilation compared to those who did not. Also, a higher value  
199 of this coefficient indicated more benefit. The interaction coefficient could be used as an indicator  
200 to quantify the benefit of ventilation reception and possibly be used as a criterion for comparison  
201 among various patient groups.

202

## 203 **Results**

204 Data of 599,340 participants were analyzed, which encompassed 60,113 (10.0%) cases with  
205 ventilation therapy, 85,158 (14.2%) cases who died, and 514,182 (85.8%) cases who recovered. The  
206 mean (SD) age was 58.5 (18.3) [range= 18-114, being 58.3 (18.2) among women, and 58.6 (18.4)  
207 among men]. Characteristics of participants are presented in Table 1. The COVID-19 outcome  
208 based on sex, age-groups and underlying diseases are presented in Figure 1.

209 Among all combinations, analysis of eight groups was not available due to paucity of data (Table  
210 2). Among all groups with sufficient data for analysis, patients aged 40-64 years who had CRD and  
211 malignancy benefitted the most from ventilation therapy; followed by patients aged 65+ years who  
212 had malignancy, cardiovascular diseases, and diabetes; and patients aged 18-39 years who had  
213 malignancy. Patients aged 65+ who had CRD, and cardiovascular disease gained the least benefit  
214 from ventilation therapy. Among patients with diabetes, patients aged 65+ years benefited from  
215 ventilation therapy, followed by 40-64 years. Among patients with cardiovascular diseases, patients  
216 aged 18-39 years benefited the most from ventilation therapy, followed by patients aged 40-64  
217 years and 65+ years. Among patients with diabetes and cardiovascular diseases, patients aged 40-64  
218 years benefited from ventilation therapy, followed by 65+ years. Among patients with no history of  
219 CRD, malignancy, cardiovascular disease, or diabetes, patients aged 18-39 years benefited the most  
220 from ventilation therapy, followed by patients aged 40-64 years and 65+ years (Figure 2).

## 221 **Discussion**

222 This longitudinal study provides new insights on optimizing the strategies for ventilation therapy  
223 prioritization among patients with COVID-19, based on the real-world data of nearly 600,000  
224 hospitalized patients with COVID-19. So far, there has been focus on how to prioritize patients with  
225 COVID-19 for ventilation therapy (19). Nevertheless, there has not been much evidence on how  
226 much patients of different age groups with various underlying conditions actually benefitted from  
227 ventilation therapy based on real-world data. Some studies made endeavours to predict COVID-19  
228 severity (20) or the need for mechanical ventilation (21); however, their approaches have not been  
229 investigated in the real-world to determine their outcomes.

230 In this study, patients aged 40-64 years who had CRD and malignancy benefitted the most from  
231 ventilation therapy, followed by patients aged 65+ years who had malignancy, CVD, and DM; and  
232 patients aged 18-39 years who had malignancy. Considering that these patient groups are  
233 considered to be at moderate or high risk of severe COVID-19 and possibly require ventilation  
234 therapy (22), it was propitious that ventilation therapy could increase their chance of recovery.

235 Patients with COVID-19 who have DM are more likely to require mechanical ventilation (23).  
236 Among patients with DM, older age is associated with worse COVID-19 outcomes (24,25). In this  
237 study, patients with DM aged 65+ years benefitted from ventilation therapy more than those aged  
238 40-64. It is worth mentioning that all patients aged 40+ who only had DM benefitted from  
239 ventilation therapy.

240 Pre-existing CVD is independently associated with COVID-19 adverse outcomes (26). Among  
241 patients who only had a CVD in this study, the younger the patients, the more they benefitted from  
242 ventilation therapy, unlike what was witnessed for DM. The same age pattern was also seen among  
243 patients who had DM and CVD. Some guidelines include age group as an additional consideration  
244 (19).

245 Individuals also usually prioritize younger patients in situations of absolute scarcity of life  
246 sustaining resources; however, simply excluding patients from prioritization solely based on their  
247 age could be ethically unjustified and biased against older adults (27). Although age-based

248 discrimination includes moral conflicts and socio-cultural issues, ageism has become more apparent  
249 since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. The media has played a significant role in this  
250 sense, while broadcasting discussions on the age limits for intensive care and ventilation allocation,  
251 unintentionally implying that an older person's life is worth less than a young person's (28). In this  
252 study, among otherwise healthy patients, patients aged 18-39 years benefited the most from  
253 ventilation therapy, followed by patients aged 40-64 years, and patients aged 65+ years.

254 While COVID-19 has resulted in severe shortage of ventilators (6) worldwide, countries with  
255 limited resources face the most challenges to serve all clinically eligible patients during the  
256 pandemic (8). In this sense, factoring the level of benefit each patient would receive from  
257 ventilation therapy could help optimizing current guidelines.

258 In a study, the public opinion on priorities towards the fair allocation of ventilators during the  
259 COVID-19 pandemic was investigated, where people assigned a high priority score to patients with  
260 underlying diseases (29). This could imply that people assumed that ventilation therapy would  
261 generally improve the outcome for patients with underlying conditions. Nevertheless, the real-world  
262 data suggested that patients' age group and underlying diseases could play a significant role in the  
263 outcome of ventilation therapy. This calls for knowledge translation by public health authorities and  
264 the media to regularly convey the prognostic factors of COVID-19 based on emerging evidence to  
265 justify people's expectations from the healthcare systems

266 In a Delphi study, a panel of experts were asked to prioritise the allocation of ventilators based on  
267 various medical or non-medical factors. While the panel considered patients with active-malignancy  
268 to have low priority in receiving ventilation therapy, the real-world data made it crystal clear that  
269 patients with malignancy could also benefit from ventilation therapy. Moreover, the panel did not  
270 reach a consensus regarding underlying diseases (30). The deviation of real-world data from the  
271 experts' perspectives highlights the potential bias the physicians could have when making a death-  
272 life decision, which needs to be taken into account by future guidelines on the fair allocation of  
273 ventilators.

274 Some guidelines assess patients based on their clinical condition at admission, which could include  
275 assessment of irreversible shock, and mortality risk using the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment  
276 (SOFA) score (31). They also recommend continuous evaluation for withdrawing patients whose  
277 clinical condition is not improving despite ventilation therapy (7). Nevertheless, few studies have  
278 assessed the application of the current triage criteria to actual patients. In the early days of the  
279 pandemic, a retrospective cohort study highlighted how divergent even supposedly similar triage  
280 approaches could be, suggesting that different triage approaches identified substantially other  
281 patients for initial consideration for withholding or early withdrawal of mechanical ventilation (32).  
282 We did not find any studies that investigated the role of ventilation therapy in improving the course  
283 of COVID-19 in a setting where patients have been triaged based on SOFA scores.

## 284 **Strengths and limitations**

285 This is the first nationwide study to quantify the benefit of ventilation therapy based on the real-  
286 world data around 600,000 hospitalized patients of various age groups with COVID-19 who had  
287 DM, CVD, malignancy, or CRD. The strength of this study lies in a large sample and data gathering  
288 since the early days of the outbreak in Iran. Findings could empower public health authorities to  
289 optimize the ventilation therapy prioritization strategies among patients with COVID-19 admitted to  
290 hospitals, especially considering that there are currently no national guidelines for allocation of  
291 ventilators at the time of resources scarcity in Iran and the decision to prioritize patients for  
292 ventilator allocation is performed based on hospital regulations. We realize the limitations of the  
293 study. Due to the lack of a national integrated electronic health records system in Iran, many  
294 underlying conditions or baseline data of patients, such as their body mass index or behavioral risk  
295 factors, were not properly recorded in the COVID-19 registry. Despite the large study population,  
296 data points for some patient groups were insufficient for analysis, which need to be addressed in  
297 future studies.

## 298 **New insights and conclusion**

299 The results of this study could have a significant message: should the prioritization guidelines for  
300 ventilators allocation take no notice of the real-world data, patients might be deprived of ventilation  
301 therapy, who could benefit the most from it. The comparison of real-world evidence with the  
302 general population's attitudes and medical experts showed an unexpected bias against older age  
303 groups and underlying conditions. This study promotes a new aspect of treating patients for  
304 ventilators as a scarce medical resource, considering whether ventilation therapy would improve the  
305 patient's clinical outcome. This gains significance considering the divergent outcomes of existing  
306 guidelines, especially for patients meeting the lowest priority criteria for mechanical ventilation  
307 (32). As a rapidly evolving crisis, numerous therapeutic or preventive approaches are being  
308 investigated to lessen the burden of the COVID-19 pandemic (33,34). It could be suggested that  
309 rather than focusing on the scarcity of ventilators, guidelines focus on evidence-based decision-  
310 making algorithms to also take the usefulness of the intervention into account, similar to some other  
311 medications, whose beneficial effect is dependent on the selection of the right time in the right  
312 patient (35).

## 313 **Acknowledgement**

314 We thank all of our colleagues at the Non-Communicable Diseases Research Center (NCDRC),  
315 Endocrinology and Metabolism Population Sciences Institute, Tehran University of Medical  
316 Sciences, and the supporting roles in Ministry of Health and Medical Education (MOHME) of Iran  
317 and WHO Eastern Mediterranean Regional Office (EMRO) who made the conduction of this study  
318 possible. The authors would like to appreciate the invaluable contribution of Professor Farshad  
319 Farzadfar to this project. They would also like to express their most sincere gratitude to all frontline  
320 healthcare workers across the globe during this pandemic.

## 321 **Ethical issues**

322 The ethics committee of Endocrinology and Metabolism Research Center, Endocrinology and  
323 Metabolism Clinical Sciences Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran,

324 approved this study under the reference number IR.TUMS.EMRI.REC.1400.034. The  
325 confidentiality of the data and the results are preserved.

### 326 **Competing interests**

327 None

### 328 **Funding**

329 This work was supported by the WHO EMRO Office (EMRO) (Grant No. 202693061). The  
330 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation  
331 of the manuscript.

### 332 **Data sharing statement**

333 De-identified, individual participant data will be made available upon requests directed to the  
334 corresponding author; after the approval of a proposal, data can be shared through a secure online  
335 platform.



## 336 **References**

- 337 1. Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Beltekian D, Mathieu E, Hasell J, Macdonald B, et al.  
338 Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). Our World Data [Internet]. 2020 Mar 5 [cited 2021 Aug  
339 6]; Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus>
- 340 2. Potere N, Valeriani E, Candeloro M, Tana M, Porreca E, Abbate A, et al. Acute  
341 complications and mortality in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019: A  
342 systematic review and meta-analysis. Vol. 24, Critical Care. BioMed Central; 2020.
- 343 3. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, Hardwick HE, Pius R, Norman L, et al. Features of  
344 20 133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical  
345 Characterisation Protocol: Prospective observational cohort study. BMJ. 2020 May;369.
- 346 4. Grant MC, Geoghegan L, Arbyn M, Mohammed Z, McGuinness L, Clarke EL, et al. The  
347 prevalence of symptoms in 24,410 adults infected by the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2;  
348 COVID-19): A systematic review and meta-analysis of 148 studies from 9 countries. PLoS  
349 One. 2020 Jun;15(6 June).
- 350 5. Verdonk F, Zacharowski K, Ahmed A, Orliaguet G, Pottecher J. A multifaceted approach to  
351 intensive care unit capacity. Lancet Public Heal [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1 [cited 2021 Nov  
352 17];6(7):e448. Available from:  
353 <http://www.thelancet.com/article/S2468266721001316/fulltext>
- 354 6. Emanuel EJ, Persad G, Upshur R, Thome B, Parker M, Glickman A, et al. Fair Allocation of  
355 Scarce Medical Resources in the Time of Covid-19. N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2020 May 21  
356 [cited 2020 Sep 3];382(21):2049–55. Available from:  
357 <http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMs2005114>
- 358 7. Truog RD, Mitchell C, Daley GQ. The toughest triage — Allocating ventilators in a  
359 pandemic [Internet]. Vol. 382, New England Journal of Medicine. Massachusetts Medical  
360 Society; 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 3]. p. 1973–5. Available from:  
361 <http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMp2005689>
- 362 8. Dos Santos MJ, Martins MS, Santana FLP, Furtado MCSPC, Miname FCBR, Pimentel

- 363 RRDS, et al. COVID-19: Instruments for the allocation of mechanical ventilators- A  
364 narrative review [Internet]. Vol. 24, Critical Care. BioMed Central Ltd; 2020 [cited 2021 Feb  
365 26]. p. 582. Available from: [https://ccforum.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13054-](https://ccforum.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13054-020-03298-3)  
366 [020-03298-3](https://ccforum.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13054-020-03298-3)
- 367 9. Adeniji KA, Cusack R. The Simple Triage Scoring System (STSS) successfully predicts  
368 mortality and critical care resource utilization in H1N1 pandemic flu: A retrospective  
369 analysis. Crit Care [Internet]. 2011 Jan 26 [cited 2020 Dec 25];15(1). Available from:  
370 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21269458/>
- 371 10. Christian MD, Hawryluck L, Wax RS, Cook T, Lazar NM, Herridge MS, et al. Development  
372 of a triage protocol for critical care during an influenza pandemic. CMAJ [Internet]. 2006  
373 Nov 21 [cited 2020 Dec 25];175(11):1377–81. Available from:  
374 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17116904/>
- 375 11. Challen K, Bentley A, Bright J, Walter D. Clinical review: Mass casualty triage - Pandemic  
376 influenza and critical care [Internet]. Vol. 11, Critical Care. Crit Care; 2007 [cited 2020 Dec  
377 25]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17490495/>
- 378 12. The Lancet. COVID-19: protecting health-care workers [Internet]. Vol. 395, The Lancet.  
379 Lancet Publishing Group; 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 4]. p. 922. Available from:  
380 <https://doi.org/10.1016/>
- 381 13. Swiss Academy Of Medical Sciences. COVID-19 pandemic: triage for intensive-care  
382 treatment under resource scarcity. Swiss Med Wkly [Internet]. 2020 Mar 23 [cited 2021 Feb  
383 25];150:w20229. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32208495/>
- 384 14. Basu S. Approaches to critical care resource allocation and triage during the COVID-19  
385 pandemic: an examination from a developing world perspective. J Med Ethics Hist Med  
386 [Internet]. 2021 Feb 28 [cited 2022 Feb 7];14:1–10. Available from:  
387 <https://jmehm.tums.ac.ir/index.php/jmehm/article/view/941>
- 388 15. Asghari F, Tehrani SS. Ethical Issues in Responding to the COVID-19 Pandemic; A  
389 Narrative Review. Front Emerg Med [Internet]. 2020 Apr 28;4(2s SE-Review article).

- 390 Available from: <https://fem.tums.ac.ir/index.php/fem/article/view/390>
- 391 16. Africa WHORO for. Management of severe / critical cases of COVID-19 with non-invasive  
392 or mechanical ventilation: based on information as at 1st June 2020 [Internet]. Brazzaville PP  
393 - Brazzaville: World Health Organization. Regional Office for Africa; 2020. (WHO Regional  
394 Office for Africa COVID-19 Rapid Policy Brief Series; 003-01). Available from:  
395 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/332340>
- 396 17. Izadi N, Eshrati B, Mehrabi Y, Etemad K, Hashemi-Nazari SS. The national rate of intensive  
397 care units-acquired infections, one-year retrospective study in Iran. BMC Public Health  
398 [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Nov 17];21(1):1–8. Available from:  
399 <https://bmcpublihealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-021-10639-6>
- 400 18. Twisk JWR. Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis for Epidemiology: A Practical Guide. Appl  
401 Longitud Data Anal Epidemiol A Pract Guid [Internet]. 2013 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Nov 20];1–  
402 321. Available from: [https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/applied-longitudinal-data-  
403 analysis-for-epidemiology/2D3284A1794498DB74039E5E58C11114](https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/applied-longitudinal-data-analysis-for-epidemiology/2D3284A1794498DB74039E5E58C11114)
- 404 19. White DB, Lo B. A Framework for Rationing Ventilators and Critical Care Beds During the  
405 COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA [Internet]. 2020 May 12 [cited 2021 Oct 26];323(18):1773–4.  
406 Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2763953>
- 407 20. Mahdavi M, Choubdar H, Zabeih E, Rieder M, Safavi-Naeini S, Jobbagy Z, et al. A machine  
408 learning based exploration of COVID-19 mortality risk. PLoS One [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1  
409 [cited 2021 Oct 26];16(7):e0252384. Available from:  
410 <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0252384>
- 411 21. Hiremath A, Bera K, Yuan L, Vaidya P, Alilou M, Furin J, et al. Integrated Clinical and CT  
412 Based Artificial Intelligence Nomogram for Predicting Severity and Need for Ventilator  
413 Support in COVID-19 Patients: A Multi-Site Study. IEEE J Biomed Heal Informatics.  
414 2021;25(11):4110–8.
- 415 22. Bialek S, Boundy E, Bowen V, Chow N, Cohn A, Dowling N, et al. Severe Outcomes  
416 Among Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) — United States, February 12–

- 417 March 16, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020 Mar 27;69(12):343–6.
- 418 23. Yan Y, Yang Y, Wang F, Ren H, Zhang S, Shi X, et al. Clinical characteristics and outcomes  
419 of patients with severe covid-19 with diabetes. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* [Internet]. 2020  
420 Apr 27 [cited 2021 Nov 6];8(1):1343. Available from: </pmc/articles/PMC7222577/>
- 421 24. Rezaei N, Montazeri F, Malekpour M-R, Ghanbari A, Azadnajafabad S, Mohammadi E, et  
422 al. COVID-19 in patients with diabetes: factors associated with worse outcomes. *J Diabetes*  
423 *Metab Disord* 2021 [Internet]. 2021 Oct 28 [cited 2021 Nov 6];1–10. Available from:  
424 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40200-021-00910-3>
- 425 25. Apicella M, Campopiano MC, Mantuano M, Mazoni L, Coppelli A, Del Prato S. COVID-19  
426 in people with diabetes: understanding the reasons for worse outcomes. *Lancet Diabetes*  
427 *Endocrinol.* 2020 Sep 1;8(9):782–92.
- 428 26. Xu J, Xiao W, Liang X, Shi L, Zhang P, Wang Y, et al. A meta-analysis on the risk factors  
429 adjusted association between cardiovascular disease and COVID-19 severity. *BMC Public*  
430 *Heal* 2021 211 [Internet]. 2021 Aug 11 [cited 2021 Nov 6];21(1):1–49. Available from:  
431 <https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-021-11051-w>
- 432 27. White DB, Katz MH, Luce JM, Lo B. Who should receive life support during a public health  
433 emergency? Using ethical principles to improve allocation decisions. *Ann Intern Med*  
434 [Internet]. 2009 Jan 20 [cited 2021 Apr 23];150(2):132–8. Available from:  
435 </pmc/articles/PMC2629638/>
- 436 28. Silva MF, da Silva DSM, de Macedo Bacurau AG, Francisco PMSB, de Assumpção D, Neri  
437 AL, et al. Ageismo contra idosos no contexto da pandemia da covid-19: uma revisão  
438 integrativa. *Rev Saude Publica* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 14 [cited 2022 Feb 7];55:1–13. Available  
439 from: <http://www.scielo.br/j/rsp/a/YrY9rX7jNPq6LjpsKsYQXNr/?lang=pt>
- 440 29. Abbasi-Kangevari M, Arshi S, Hassanian-Moghaddam H, Kolahi A-A. Public Opinion on  
441 Priorities towards Fair Allocation of Ventilators during COVID-19 Pandemic: A nationwide  
442 survey. *Front Public Heal.* 1AD;0:2074.
- 443 30. Ghamari S-H, Abbasi-Kangevari M, Zamani N, Hassanian-Moghaddam H, Kolahi A-A.

- 444 Priorities Towards Fair Allocation of Ventilators During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Delphi  
445 Study. *Front Med*. 2022 Jan 24;0:3143.
- 446 31. Han S, Health VK-DM and P, 2020 undefined. Clinical and ethical considerations in  
447 allocation of ventilators in an influenza pandemic or other public health disaster: a  
448 comparison of the 2007 and 2015 New York. *cambridge.org* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct  
449 26]; Available from: [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/disaster-medicine-and-public-  
450 health-preparedness/article/clinical-and-ethical-considerations-in-allocation-of-ventilators-in-  
451 an-influenza-pandemic-or-other-public-health-disaster-a-comparison-of-the-2007-and-2015-  
452 new-york-state-ventilator-allocation-guidelines/277BB3C5CC9EC9567E528516FBD2A5CD](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/disaster-medicine-and-public-health-preparedness/article/clinical-and-ethical-considerations-in-allocation-of-ventilators-in-an-influenza-pandemic-or-other-public-health-disaster-a-comparison-of-the-2007-and-2015-new-york-state-ventilator-allocation-guidelines/277BB3C5CC9EC9567E528516FBD2A5CD)
- 453 32. Wunsch H, Hill AD, Bosch N, Adhikari NKJ, Rubenfeld G, Walkey A, et al. Comparison of  
454 2 Triage Scoring Guidelines for Allocation of Mechanical Ventilators. *JAMA Netw open*  
455 [Internet]. 2020 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Apr 23];3(12):e2029250. Available from:  
456 [/pmc/articles/PMC7737087/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34591941/)
- 457 33. Malekpour MR, Abbasi-Kangevari M, Azadnajafabad S, Ghamari SH, Rezaei N, Rezazadeh-  
458 Khadem S, et al. How the scientific community responded to the COVID-19 pandemic: A  
459 subject-level time-trend bibliometric analysis. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2021 Sep 1 [cited 2021  
460 Nov 8];16(9). Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34591941/>
- 461 34. Khanali J, Malekpour MR, Kolahi AA. Improved dynamics of sharing research findings in  
462 the COVID-19 epidemic compared with the SARS and Ebola epidemics. *BMC Public Health*  
463 [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Nov 8];21(1). Available from:  
464 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33422049/>
- 465 35. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* [Internet]. 2021 Feb  
466 25 [cited 2021 Nov 8];384(8):693–704. Available from:  
467 <https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa2021436>
- 468

469 **Figure legends**

470 **Figure 1.** COVID-19 outcome based on (A) sex, (B) cardiovascular disease, (C) chronic respiratory  
471 disease, (D) malignancy, (E) diabetes mellitus, and (F) age groups.

472 **Figure 2.** Patient groups who significantly benefited from ventilation therapy: estimated benefit  
473 (95% Confidence Interval)

474

475 **Tables**

**Table 1.** Characteristics of participants

Variable	N (%)
<b><i>Demographics</i></b>	
Sex	
Female	291,267 (48.6)
Male	308,073 (51.4)
Age	
18-39 years	113,211 (18.9)
40-64 years	240,298 (40.1)
More than 65 years	245,831 (41.0)
<b><i>Underlying conditions</i></b>	
CVD	
Yes	110,593 (18.5)
No	488,747 (81.5)
DM	
Yes	84,973 (14.2)
No	514,367 (85.8)
COPD	
Yes	26,153 (4.4)
No	573,187 (95.6)
Malignancy	
Yes	10610 (2.0)
No	588730 (98.0)
<b><i>Outcomes</i></b>	
Ventilation therapy	60,113 (10.0)
Death	85,158 (14.2)
Recovery	514,182 (85.8)

476

477

**Table 2.** The estimated benefit of ventilation therapy among patients of different age groups with various underlying conditions

id	COPD	Malignancy	CVD	DM	Age	Benefit*	p-value	Observation (Total**)	Observation (Ventilation***)	Observation (Recovery****)
1	No	No	No	No	18-39	1.983	<0.001	103991	8574	100269
2	No	No	No	No	40-64	1.728	<0.001	171041	14566	155469
3	No	No	No	No	65+	1.369	<0.001	139453	14014	108579
4	No	No	No	Yes	18-39	1.267	N/S	2827	288	2654
5	No	No	No	Yes	40-64	1.455	<0.001	22096	2214	19465
6	No	No	No	Yes	65+	1.72	<0.001	23258	2705	17752
7	No	No	Yes	No	18-39	1.836	0.008	2895	336	2667
8	No	No	Yes	No	40-64	1.31	<0.001	22712	2539	20251
9	No	No	Yes	No	65+	1.266	<0.001	43934	5722	34249
10	No	No	Yes	Yes	18-39	-2.412	N/S	401	46	361
11	No	No	Yes	Yes	40-64	1.877	<0.001	10660	1276	9088
12	No	No	Yes	Yes	65+	1.427	<0.001	19903	2598	15205
13	No	Yes	No	No	18-39	3.639	<0.001	1136	136	858
14	No	Yes	No	No	40-64	1.255	0.004	3788	528	2816
15	No	Yes	No	No	65+	0.691	N/S	3085	501	2098
16	No	Yes	No	Yes	18-39	N/A	N/A	16	2	15
17	No	Yes	No	Yes	40-64	-0.324	N/S	313	44	242
18	No	Yes	No	Yes	65+	2.592	N/S	388	72	258
19	No	Yes	Yes	No	18-39	N/A	N/A	21	6	16
20	No	Yes	Yes	No	40-64	-0.808	N/S	234	44	181
21	No	Yes	Yes	No	65+	1.867	N/S	617	111	440
22	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	18-39	N/A	N/A	7	1	6
23	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	40-64	4.885	N/S	132	16	99
24	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	65+	3.79	0.049	279	45	206
25	Yes	No	No	No	18-39	0.499	N/S	1685	238	1582
26	Yes	No	No	No	40-64	0.873	0.041	5958	721	5204
27	Yes	No	No	No	65+	0.466	N/S	7095	1015	5391
28	Yes	No	No	Yes	18-39	241.684	N/S	44	8	40
29	Yes	No	No	Yes	40-64	3.137	0.005	834	123	696
30	Yes	No	No	Yes	65+	0.605	N/S	1295	172	977
31	Yes	No	Yes	No	18-39	445.595	N/S	131	14	118
32	Yes	No	Yes	No	40-64	0.651	N/S	1599	221	1348
33	Yes	No	Yes	No	65+	0.76	0.032	4488	730	3329
34	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	18-39	N/A	N/A	21	3	18
35	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	40-64	0.934	N/S	698	105	572
36	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	65+	2.473	<0.001	1711	277	1274
37	Yes	Yes	No	No	18-39	-383.91	N/S	34	6	25
38	Yes	Yes	No	No	40-64	6.504	0.017	183	31	120
39	Yes	Yes	No	No	65+	-0.061	0.982	182	29	120
40	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	40-64	N/A	N/A	14	1	11
41	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	65+	-338.243	1.00	31	4	22
42	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	18-39	N/A	N/A	1	0	1
43	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	40-64	-6.389	1.00	24	5	15
44	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	65+	-3.169	0.494	80	16	49
45	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	18-39	N/A	N/A	1	1	1
46	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	40-64	N/A	N/A	12	2	9



---

47	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	65+	1466.119	0.999	32	7	16
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----------	-------	----	---	----

---

\*The interaction coefficient of the second model

\*\*The total number of patients with COVID-19 who were admitted to the hospital in each group

\*\*\*The total number of patients with COVID-19 who received ventilation therapy in each group


\*\*\*\*The total number of patients with COVID-19 who recovered after hospital admission in each group

---


478

479


A




B




C




D



E



F



Ventilation Therapy  
 No Yes

