

Evaluation of S/F_{94} as a proxy for COVID-19 severity

Maaïke C Swets^{*1,2}, Steven Kerr^{*1,3}, James Scott-Brown⁴, Adam B Brown¹,
Rishi Gupta⁵, Jonathan E Millar¹, Enti Spata⁶, Fiona McCurrach⁷,
Andrew D Bretherick⁸, Annemarie Docherty³, David Harrison⁹,
Kathy Rowan⁹, Neil Young¹⁰, ISARIC4C Investigators, Geert H Groeneveld²,
Jake Dunning¹¹, Jonathan S Nguyen-Van-Tam¹², Peter Openshaw¹³,
Peter W. Horby¹¹, Ewen Harrison³, Natalie Staplin⁶, Malcolm G Semple^{14,15},
Nazir Lone^{3, 16}, J Kenneth Baillie^{1, 16, 17, 18}

* These authors contributed equally

Address for correspondence: j.k.baillie@ed.ac.uk

Affiliations:

1. Roslin Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
2. Department of Infectious Diseases, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands
3. Centre for Medical Informatics, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
4. School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
5. Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK
6. Medical Research Council Population Health Research Unit at the University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Population Health (NDPH), Oxford, UK
7. EMERGE, NHS Lothian, Royal Infirmary Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
8. MRC Human Genetics Unit, Institute of Genetics and Cancer, University of Edinburgh, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, UK
9. Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre, London, UK
10. Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
11. Pandemic Sciences Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
12. Population and Lifespan Health, University of Nottingham School of Medicine, Nottingham, UK
13. National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, London, UK
14. Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
15. Department of Respiratory Medicine, Alder Hey Children's Hospital, Liverpool, UK
16. Intensive Care Unit, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, UK
17. Baillie Gifford Pandemic Science Hub, Centre for Inflammation Research, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
18. MRC Human Genetics Unit, Institute for Genetics and Molecular Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Optimising statistical power in early-stage trials and observational studies accelerates discovery and improves the reliability of results. Ideally, intermediate outcomes should be continuously distributed and lie on the causal pathway between an intervention and a definitive outcome such as mortality. In order to optimise power for an intermediate outcome in the RECOVERY trial, we devised and evaluated a modification to a simple, pragmatic measure of oxygenation function - the $S_aO_2/F_I O_2$ (S/F) ratio.

We demonstrate that, because of the ceiling effect in oxyhaemoglobin saturation, S/F ceases to reflect pulmonary oxygenation function at high values of S_aO_2 . Using synthetic and real data, we found that the correlation of S/F with a gold standard ($P_aO_2/F_I O_2$, P/F ratio) improved substantially when measurements with $S_aO_2 \geq 0.94$ are excluded (Spearman r , synthetic data: S/F : 0.31; S/F_{94} : 0.85). We refer to this measure as S/F_{94} .

In order to test the underlying assumptions and validity of S/F_{94} as a predictor of a definitive outcome (mortality), we collected an observational dataset including over 39,000 hospitalised patients with COVID-19 in the ISARIC4C study. We first demonstrated that S/F_{94} is predictive of mortality in COVID-19. We then compared the sample sizes required for trials using different outcome measures (S/F_{94} , the WHO ordinal scale, sustained improvement at day 28 and mortality at day 28) ensuring comparable effect sizes. The smallest sample size was needed when S/F_{94} on day 5 was used as an outcome measure.

To facilitate future study design, we provide an online user interface to quantify real-world power for a range of outcomes and inclusion criteria, using a synthetic dataset retaining the population-level clinical associations in real data accrued in ISARIC4C <https://isaric4c.net/endpoints>.

We demonstrated that S/F_{94} is superior to S/F as a measure of pulmonary oxygenation function and is an effective intermediate outcome measure in COVID-19. It is a simple and non-invasive measurement, representative of disease severity and provides greater statistical power to detect treatment differences than other intermediate endpoints.

Introduction

Therapeutic research in COVID-19 depends on efficient, accurate assessment of therapeutic candidates in early-stage clinical studies. Efficacy measures should be “clinically meaningful”¹ endpoints such as the WHO ordinal scale.² Intermediate endpoints for early phase trials, or severity measures for observational studies, must be closely related to the causal pathway from intervention to a key outcome such as mortality, must be modifiable by therapy, and ideally should have a continuous numerical distribution to improve statistical power.³

In COVID-19, intermediate endpoints such as the WHO ordinal scale, duration of hospitalisation, and viral load have been used widely.^{4,5} Both the WHO ordinal scale and various alternative ordinal scales,^{6,7} rely on a complex clinical measure - the level of respiratory support received by a patient - as an indicator of illness severity. Viral load is a valid outcome for antiviral therapy, but it has not been shown to correlate with mortality benefit, and is not directly relevant to the effect of anti-inflammatory treatments.⁸⁻¹⁰ In the RECOVERY trial, we identified a need for more powerful intermediate endpoints for early phase clinical trials.[citation to follow: MEDRXIV/2022/280285]

Impairment of lung oxygenation function indicates disease progression in COVID-19,¹¹ and is strongly predictive of mortality.¹² Importantly, in COVID-19, failure of lung oxygenation is likely to be mechanistically linked to death: patients at extreme risk of mortality¹² have high survival rates if oxygenation is provided by extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO).¹³ Pulmonary oxygenation function, together with clinical decision-making and resource availability, determines movement between most of the stages of the WHO Ordinal Scale (WHO scale points 4-9).² Oxygenation function is a key determinant of efficacy for immunosuppression with corticosteroids in COVID-19.⁹ It is likely that lung oxygenation function lies on the causal pathway between the SARS-CoV-2 infection and death for many hospitalised patients.

Peripheral oxygen saturation can be measured easily and non-invasively using a pulse oximeter (formally, arterial oxygen saturation measured by pulse oximetry, rather than direct measurement in blood, is S_pO_2). The ratio of S_aO_2 or S_pO_2 to inspired fraction of oxygen ($F_I O_2$), known as the S/F ratio, provides a continuous index of lung oxygenation function which can be calculated without an arterial blood sample. S/F correlates well with the most widely-used arterial blood-derived measure of oxygenation - P/F ratio ($P_aO_2/F_I O_2$).¹⁴ S/F under steady state conditions in humans can range from around 0.5 (severe oxygenation defect) to 4.8 (perfect oxygenation function). A major limitation of S/F is the ceiling effect: at high S_aO_2 values, S_aO_2 ceases to be dependent on lung oxygenation function, because the blood is close to maximally oxygenated.^{15,16} A healthy patient with perfect lungs breathing 21% oxygen with $S_aO_2 = 0.99$ would have $S/F = 4.7$, but the same patient breathing 100% oxygen would have $S/F = 0.99$.

In order to improve the accuracy of measurement of lung oxygenation, we limited the ceiling effect in prospective data by protocolising measurement of S_aO_2 to control high values, or in retrospective analyses by excluding values recorded with S_aO_2 above a given value. We first evaluated an optimal threshold using both synthetic and real data from arterial blood gas samples, concluding that $S_aO_2 < 0.94$ provides an optimal balance between safety and predictive validity. We defined the S/F_{94} measurement as: S/F measured when S_aO_2 is 0.94 or less, achieved by reducing $F_I O_2$ to a minimum of $= 0.21$ (the fraction of oxygen in ambient air). Since many patients receive oxygen through devices for which $F_I O_2$ is not accurately quantified (e.g. Hudson mask, nasal cannulae), prospective studies measuring S/F_{94} will require a protocolised modification of oxygen delivery devices which, in itself, is expected to improve accuracy of measurement (Appendix: Protocol). Here, we assess the predictive validity of this outcome measure and compare it to a range of alternative outcome measures.

Results

Relationship with gold standard oxygenation measure (P/F)

There is a consistent pattern in both synthetic (Figure 1) and real (Supplementary Figure 1) data: if no maximum cut-off value for S_aO_2 is used, spuriously low S/F values are seen in patients with good lung function, reflected in high P/F values (Figure 1a, Supplementary Figure 1a). This is due to the ceiling effect - S_aO_2 cannot rise above 100%. These misleading values are removed by excluding values with S_aO_2 above 94% (Figure 1b, Supplementary Figure 1b), which improves the correlation with the gold standard for both synthetic (Spearman rS/F : 0.40; S/F_{94} : 0.85; Figure 1a) and real data (Spearman rS/F : 0.82; S/F_{94} : 0.97, Supplementary Figure 1a).

Predictive validity

In parallel, we assessed the predictive validity of S/F and S/F_{94} . As in our previous work,¹⁷ we assert that if S/F_{94} is measuring true oxygenation function well, then it should be able to more accurately predict a future event: the P_aO_2 value in a future arterial blood gas measurement taken from the same patient. We used an existing opportunistic dataset of unselected ABG result pairs from hospitalised patients, described in detail previously.¹⁷ We quantified the median absolute error above baseline (MAE) in P_aO_2 to quantify predictive validity, with lower error values indicating better performance (Figure 1c, Supplementary Figure 2). Across a range of maximum cut-off values for S_aO_2 , the lowest MAE value was obtained at 94% (Figure 1a; S/F MAE = 4.41 kPa (IQR: 2.74-6.63 kPa); S/F_{94} MAE = 3.32 kPa (IQR: 1.87-5.26 kPa), $p(\text{MWU}) = 3.7 \times 10^{-18}$).

Evaluation in ISARIC4C data

39,765 cases in the ISARIC4C study had S_aO_2 , $F_I O_2$ and clinical data available for analysis and met inclusion criteria (See Methods). Mortality in this population was 20.8% (Table 1). Since measurement of S/F_{94} was not protocolised in ISARIC4C, measurements were obtained for patients for whom S_aO_2 happened to be < 0.94 or who were breathing room air ($F_I O_2 = 0.21$), therefore meeting the S/F_{94} definition. The conceptual advantage of S/F_{94} over S/F is that it offers a closer relationship to the pathophysiological process of interest. This is not expected to be apparent in the distribution of values observed, but rather in the sensitive detection of a real therapeutic effect. For this reason, and because of the risk of selection bias (see Methods), we did not undertake a direct comparison of patients meeting the criteria for S/F_{94} measurement, against patients who do not. Instead, we evaluated S/F_{94} against other commonly used outcome measures.

Within the ISARIC4C dataset, S/F values were available for the largest numbers of patients on days 0, 2, 5 and 8 from study enrolment. Among patients who remained in hospital, the distribution of S/F_{94} values moves over the first 5 days from study enrolment towards a bimodal pattern with high values in survivors, and low values in non-survivors (Figure 2a). We therefore chose day 5 as the primary timepoint for comparison.

An intermediate clinical outcome should have a strong association with a definitive outcome. Using 28-day mortality as the definitive outcome, and including S/F_{94} values on both day 0 and day 5 as covariates in a linear regression model, we found a strong inverse association between S/F_{94} on day 5 and mortality: an increased risk of mortality at day 28 is associated with a lower value of S/F_{94} on day 5 (Figure 2d). The OR for 28-day mortality is 0.25 (95%




Figure 1: Comparison of P/F and S/F or S/F_{94} in synthetic data. (a,b) Scatterplots of P/F vs S/F individual measurements across a range of hypothetical physiological characteristics. Points are coloured according to the S_aO_2 as shown in the colour scale. (a) including all values, showing linear regression of S/F against P/F in using different cut-off values for S_aO_2 . Patients breathing air ($F_I O_2=21\%$) were included in all bins. (b) including only values with $S_aO_2 < 94\%$ or $F_I O_2 = 21\%$ (c,d) Optimisation of cut-off value for S_aO_2 using predictive validity: the error in the prediction of a future P_aO_2 , based on a previous one. (c) (d) change in correlation coefficient (Pearson's ρ) as the threshold for inclusion is lowered from $S_aO_2 < 100\%$ to $S_aO_2 < 80\%$.

confidence interval 0.23-0.28), meaning that for a 1 unit increase in S/F_{94} on day 5, the odds of 28-day mortality decrease by 75%.

We also compared S/F_{94} with a widely-used intermediate outcome, the WHO scale. Since this scale records clinical decisions about therapy that are, in part, determined by the severity of hypoxic lung disease, a close relationship was expected with S/F_{94} (Figure 2c). The distributions were consistent between patients meeting the inclusion criteria (Figure 2c) and unselected patients (Supplementary Figure 5a).

Sample size estimation

Using the observed relationships in ISARIC4C data for eligible patients (see Methods), we quantified effect sizes associated with a 15% relative risk reduction in mortality for each of the following measures: S/F_{94} at 5 and 8 days after study enrolment, the WHO ordinal scale at 5 and 8 days after study enrolment, the proportion of patients who reached a sustained 1 or 2-level improvement on the WHO ordinal scale, and a gold standard, 28-day mortality. We chose a 15% relative risk reduction in mortality based on previous power calculations for the RECOVERY trial. We then estimated the sample sizes required to detect these effects with 80% power at $2p = 0.05$.

Some examples of sample size calculations using different inclusion criteria can be found in the supplemental information. We created an online tool, using synthetic data with similar characteristics to the ISARIC4C data (See methods), to enable users to test any combination of inclusion criteria (age, frailty score and type of respiratory support) and outcome assessment timepoint: <https://isaric4c.net/endpoints>.

For a 15% relative reduction in mortality, the required sample size was smallest for S/F_{94} on day 5, needing 731 patients in each arm (1,462 in total, Table 1). The number of subjects required for S/F_{94} on day 8 was higher, with 1,322 subjects in each arm. For the WHO ordinal scale, 1,486 participants would be required in each arm on day 5, or 1,161 on day 8 to detect this mortality reduction. Sample size was larger when 1-level sustained improvement was used as the outcome variable, with 3,378 patients in each arm, and 1,904 subjects in each arm when using 2-level sustained improvement.

Estimated improvement with protocolised measurement of S/F_{94}

We have developed a protocol for measurement of S/F_{94} (Appendix: Protocol). Opportunistic measurements of S/F_{94} are likely to be less precise than protocolised measurements of S/F_{94} , and hence to underestimate the relationship with the outcome variable, mortality.¹⁸ As a consequence, we expect a smaller number of participants will be required to detect a treatment effect at a given power when using protocolised S/F_{94} measurements as an outcome. We sought to estimate the magnitude of this improvement. Protocolising measurements is likely to substantially improve the accuracy of measurements of oxygenation function, firstly by ensuring that an oxygen delivery mode is used for which $F_I O_2$ can be accurately quantified (e.g. Venturi systems), and secondly by ensuring that measurements are taken at steady state. Protocolised measurement also permits inclusion of all patients, since $F_I O_2$ is decreased until $S_a O_2 < 0.94$, to a minimum of $F_I O_2 = 0.21$. A description of the estimation of effect size for the protocolised S/F_{94} measurement can be found in the supplemental methods. Based on this effect size estimate, sample size for a protocolised measurement of day 5 S/F_{94} would be around 630 subjects in total (Figure 3).




Figure 2: Evaluation of S/F_{94} in observational data. (a) Smoothed distributions of S/F_{94} values in survivors and non-survivors during the first 12 days of the study (restricted to 39,765 patients aged 20 – 75, oxygen therapy within 3 days). (b) Histogram showing distribution of S/F_{94} values on day 5 as used for subsequent analyses (in blue) Patients discharged home before day 5 are assigned the maximum value (4.78), and patients who died before day 5 are assigned to an arbitrary minimum of 0.5 (in red). (c) Distribution of S/F_{94} values day 5 compared with WHO ordinal scale² value at the same time point, in patients who met our inclusion criteria (aged 20 – 75, oxygen therapy within 3 days). For some patients who died on day 5, S/F_{94} values were available. For those with missing S/F_{94} values who died, an S/F_{94} of 0.5 was used to reflect poor pulmonary oxygenation function. Hosp = hospitalised, no oxygen support; Ox = Hospitalised, oxygen by mask or nasal prongs; CPAP/HFNO = Hospitalised, oxygen by continuous positive airway pressure; high-flow nasal oxygen or non-invasive ventilation; IMV = Intubation and mechanical ventilation; IMV $S/F < 2$ = Mechanical ventilation; $S/F < 2$ or vasopressors; MOF = Multi-organ failure & mechanical ventilation & $S/F < 2$ & ECMO or renal replacement therapy. (d) Logistic regression analysis with 95% confidence interval, using both S/F_{94} on day 0 and S/F_{94} on day 5 as covariates, showing a clear association between mortality at 28 days and S/F_{94} value on day 5.

Measure	Distribution/ Event rate	Estimated treatment effect	Total n ($\beta = 80\%$ $2p = 0.05$)
Opportunistic S/F_{94} day 5	Mean = 2.40 SD = 1.29 ρ vs Day 0: 0.32	$\Delta S/F_{94}$: 0.18	1,462
Protocolised S/F_{94} day 5	Mean = 2.40 SD = 1.03 ρ vs Day 0: 0.70	$\Delta S/F_{94}$: 0.18	630
WHO day 5	(See Supplementary Table 4)	OR: 0.83	2,971
1-level sustained improvement	13,437/30,060 (44.7%)	RR: 1.03	6,756
2-level sustained improvement	5,411/30,060 (18.0%)	RR: 1.04	3,808
28-day mortality	8,262/39,765 (20.8%)	RR: 0.85	5,143

Table 1: Comparison of outcome measures among 39,765 hospitalised patients aged 20-75, who required supplemental oxygen in the first 3 days in hospital. The estimated treatment effect is for a 15% relative reduction in mortality. Sample size shows the total number of subjects needed in both arms using a 1:1 allocation. Protocolised S/F_{94} - hypothetical improvement in power using a protocolised measurement of S/F_{94} . $\Delta S/F_{94}$ - change in S/F_{94} associated with a 15% reduction in mortality. RR - risk ratio. OR - proportional odds ratio.




Figure 3: Comparison of the number of patients needed for the different outcome measures, using treatment effects between 0.85 and 0.70. The bottom line shows predicted sample size required when using a protocolised S/F_{94} measurement, rather than an opportunistic measurement.

Discussion

We found that S/F_{94} performs well as a noninvasive measure of lung oxygenation function. $S_aO_2 < 0.94$ is a pragmatic cut-off value in a safe range, excluding the majority of obviously misleading values caused by the ceiling effect, and optimising predictive validity (Figure 1). S/F_{94} fulfils the criteria of an intermediate outcome: a continuous outcome measure that is closely related to mortality and can be modified by therapy.³ In a clinical trial setting, where both S_aO_2 and $F_I O_2$ measurement can be better protocolised, both the variance of S/F_{94} , and the strength of the relationship to mortality are expected to improve. Comparing both the WHO ordinal scale and S/F_{94} to the definitive outcome of mortality at day 28, we found that the same predicted treatment effect can be detected with fewer patients using S/F_{94} , even when measurement is not protocolised.

Our analyses may underestimate the statistical power of mortality, since time-to-event analyses would be used in most circumstances to maximise statistical power. Due to the large proportion of missing data after day 10, it was not possible to carry out survival modelling in our data. Ideally, we would have performed a mediation analysis with treatment effect, to determine the extent to which the treatment effect on mortality is explained by the intermediate endpoint S/F_{94} . However, since there is no S/F_{94} data available from clinical studies showing treatment effect, it is not possible to perform this analysis.

S_aO_2 and $F_I O_2$ are both subject to measurement error, particularly in opportunistic data. Estimating $F_I O_2$ for patients receiving supplemental oxygen via nasal cannula or simple (Hudson) masks is inaccurate, because the $F_I O_2$ is profoundly affected by respiratory rate, tidal volume and inspiratory flow rate. The position of a patient on the ordinal WHO scale is influenced by both availability of resources and the decision by the patient and the clinician to not to escalate the level of care or provide organ support. This may explain the wide range of S/F_{94} values for patients at the same position on the WHO scale (Figure 2c).

There are multiple advantages of using S/F_{94} as an intermediate outcome measure in a phase II clinical trial in hospitalised patients. It is an easy, non-invasive measurement, using near-ubiquitous monitoring equipment. In contrast, daily $P_a O_2$ measurements (from an arterial blood sample) are time-consuming, require highly-skilled staff, and are burdensome for patients unless an indwelling arterial catheter is present (unusual outside of critical care areas).

Of the pragmatic endpoints available from routinely collected data, the WHO ordinal scale is the best-performing endpoint. In studies where clinical observations can be obtained, S/F_{94} is a robust measure of lung oxygenation function, and is the best measure to optimise statistical power for comparisons. S/F_{94} is comparable to the P/F ratio as a measure of lung oxygenation, and superior to $S_aO_2/F_I O_2$ ratio. Where protocolised measurements can be obtained, further improvements in statistical power are expected. S/F_{94} is a powerful and robust intermediate endpoint for clinical studies of COVID-19 and other causes of acute lung injury.

Methods

Relationship to gold standard (P/F ratio)

We evaluated the relationship between S/F and P/F in two datasets: a synthetic dataset of 1,529,176 predictions covering a wide range of possible physiological variation, generated by a mathematical model of oxygen delivery written in Python (available at https://github.com/baillielab/oxygen_delivery) and reported previously,¹⁷ and 72,457 unselected arterial blood gas results from a critically ill population.¹⁷ Taking P/F to be the gold standard, we evaluated S/F at different thresholds in both synthetic and real data.

Predictive validity

We considered the predictive validity of S/F and S/F_{94} compared to P/F and two other measures of oxygenation function: the Alveolar-arterial difference (A-a), and effective shunt fraction (ES).¹⁷

Predictive validity quantifies the extent to which a clinical measurement predicts an unseen event. The aim is not to optimise prediction, but to test the extent to which a measurement is describing a real feature of the patient's illness.¹⁹ In this case, we contend that a measure that accurately describes lung oxygenation function will accurately predict P_aO_2 after a change is made to $F_I O_2$. Using the same opportunistic dataset as in our previous study,¹⁷ we used this approach to assess the validity of S/F and S/F_{94} .

Briefly, in pairs of arterial blood gas (ABG) results taken from the same patient <3h apart, in which $F_I O_2$ was decreased in the later sample (indicating weaning, and hence clinical stability), we used various measures of oxygenation (A-a, P/F , ES, S/F) in the first ABG to predict the P_aO_2 in the second sample. Predictive validity is quantified by the median absolute error (difference from the real value). A baseline value, showing the difference between ABG results for matched pairs in which $F_I O_2$ did not change, is provided to contextualise the MAE results by providing a reasonable minimum error value as a baseline. Results are presented as difference in MAE from this baseline (MAE). Mann-Whitney U-test (MWU) was used for comparison of MAE difference from baseline.

Evaluation in ISARIC4C data

Inclusion criteria

All subjects were part of the ISARIC Coronavirus Clinical Characterisation Consortium (IS-ARIC4C) WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol UK (CCP- UK), a study in England, Wales, and Scotland prospectively collecting data from patients hospitalised with SARS-CoV-2 infection since the start of the pandemic.

In order to focus our assessment on the subset of patients with hypoxaemic respiratory failure that is potentially modifiable by anti-inflammatory treatment, we repeated all analyses in subjects aged 20-75 who required supplementary oxygen therapy within 3 days of hospital admission, subjects aged 20-75 that were oxygen dependent on the day of admission, and subjects aged 20-75 without criteria for oxygen dependency. All included patients had S_aO_2 and $F_I O_2$ data available.

Estimation of S/F_{94} in observational data

The S/F ratio was calculated by dividing S_aO_2 by $F_I O_2$ (with both as fractions taking values between 0 and 1). For this evaluation, S/F_{94} was defined as an opportunistic measurement in

which $S_aO_2 \leq 0.94$, or the patient was receiving no supplementary oxygen ($F_I O_2 = 0.21$).

Importantly, the retrospectively-defined subgroup of patients meeting the S/F_{94} criteria is not representative of all patients since there was an excess of patients who were not receiving respiratory support, with slight excess mortality, in the S/F_{94} group (Supplementary Table 1). This indicates at least two mechanisms of selection bias, acting in opposite directions, and precluding a direct comparison. Firstly, patients who have high blood oxygen levels on relatively little supplementary oxygen are excluded from the S/F_{94} group; by definition these patients have relatively mild disease. Secondly, the group in whom S/F_{94} could be measured includes patients who receive supplemental oxygen, and fail to reach adequate S_aO_2 values, but are not escalated to a higher level of respiratory support; this is a frail and multimorbid population with very severe disease.

S/F_{94} was calculated at baseline (day 0) and on day 5 and day 8 from study enrolment. There is expected to be differential missingness between S/F_{94} and mortality: S_aO_2 and $F_I O_2$ data are only available for a proportion of cases, whereas outcome data is well-recorded. Patients who died or were discharged on given day and had a missing value for S/F_{94} were assigned values 0.5 (severe oxygenation defect) and 4.76 (perfect oxygenation), respectively. However, death/discharge was more likely to be recorded than S/F_{94} , and this could introduce bias into our analysis. We addressed this by estimating the proportion of patients for whom S/F_{94} measurements were available and who would be expected to die/be discharged at a given point in time. We then resampled those who died/discharged according to these proportions. For example, if on day 5 5% of patients had died, and 15% went home, the other 80 % was still hospitalised. We resampled from those who died/ were discharged alive, so that the non-missing values reflected the same proportion (5% dead with S/F_{94} set to 0.5, 15% discharged alive with S/F_{94} set to 4.76 and the other 80 % still hospitalised with available S/F_{94} values.

Association between S/F_{94} and 28-day mortality

Two key assumptions underlie the use of S/F_{94} as an intermediate endpoint. Firstly, that pulmonary oxygenation function lies on the causal pathway to death in COVID-19, and secondly, that S/F_{94} accurately reflects pulmonary oxygenation function. If either of these assumptions are violated, then a strong relationship between S/F_{94} and subsequent mortality would not be expected.

To evaluate this association, a logistic regression model was developed with 28-day mortality as the dependent variable and S/F_{94} measured on day 0 and day 5 as two separate covariates. Given the strong relationship between S/F_{94} on day 0 and S/F_{94} on days further in the disease trajectory, we included both S/F_{94} on day 0 and day 5 as covariates. Linear dependence of log-odds on S/F_{94} measured on day 0 and day 5 was assessed both by visual inspection and with model selection criteria including the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). Nonlinearities were evaluated using a restricted splines model. Finally, predicted models were made to assess the absolute change in risk of mortality with a change in S/F_{94} .

Sample size calculations

We compared the sample sizes required for a range of different outcomes measures (S/F_{94} , WHO ordinal scale, sustained improvement at day 28 and 28-day mortality). For the intermediate endpoints, we estimated the treatment effect associated with a 15% relative reduction in mortality. Below we give brief descriptions of the effect size calculations for the different outcome measures. All calculations assumed a 1:1 allocation of participants between treatment and control groups and are based on having 80% power at $p=0.05$ (two-sided) to detect the stated treatment effect. Details on effect size estimation can be found in the supplementary material.

Quantifying uncertainty

Errors around the point estimates shown in Table 1 are shown in Figure 3 for a range of effect sizes. The upper and lower limits of the 95% confidence interval calculated for the effect size were used to bootstrap 95% confidence intervals for sample size. This 95% confidence interval does not capture uncertainty around validity of the modelled relationship between outcome and effect. The sample size and 95% confidence interval when the outcome measure is 1- or 2-level sustained improvement on the WHO scale are noticeably larger than for the other outcome measures, in particular S/F_{94} . There are several reasons for this. The first is that the magnitude of effect size compared to variance of outcome measure is much smaller when 1- or 2-level sustained improvement on the WHO scale is the outcome measure compared to when S/F_{94} is the outcome measure. The second reason is that S/F_{94} is a continuous variable, whereas 1- or 2-level sustained improvement on the WHO scale is a Bernoulli variable whose mean is the proportion of people who had a 1 or 2-level sustained improvement on the WHO scale, respectively. The sample size calculation with S/F_{94} as outcome measure relies on a two-sample t-test for testing the hypothesis that the means of two normal distributions with the same variance are equal. In the case of 1- or 2-level sustained improvement on the WHO scale, the procedure is similar except the variances of the two distributions are not equal. The mean of a large number of independent Bernoulli variables with mean μ is approximately normally distributed with mean μ and variance $\mu(1 - \mu)$. Therefore, two sets of Bernoulli distributed variables with different means also have different variances. If we use μ_1 to denote the mean for the control group, and μ_2 to denote the mean for the treatment group, then while $\mu_1 < \mu_2 \leq 0.5$, the variance of the sample mean of the outcome measure increases as the effect size $\mu_2 - \mu_1$ increases. Thus while these conditions hold, and with all else equal, this has the consequence that an outcome measure that is Bernoulli distributed will require larger sample sizes than an outcome measure that has a continuous distribution.

Continuous variables vs (S/F_{94})

We fit a logistic regression with mortality at day 28 as the independent variable, and S/F_{94} on day 0 (baseline) and day 5 (or day 8) as predictors. Age and sex were also included in the model as they are strong predictors of mortality. We used this to calculate the predicted probability of mortality, and the change in S/F_{94} associated with a relative reduction in predicted mortality of 15%, for each subject. Finally, we took the mean to find the average change in day 5 S/F_{94} that is associated with a 15% reduction in mortality across the sample. This is the target treatment effect in the clinical trial. We calculated the sample size required to see this treatment effect with a given level of power using a two sample t-test with ANCOVA correction for the correlation between S/F_{94} on day 0 and day 5.²⁰

Ordinal variables (WHO scale)

Values for the WHO ordinal scale were derived using information about oxygen support and mortality. Possible values in hospitalised patients range between 4 and 10.²

WHO scale - absolute value

Sample size calculations for this outcome are based on the proportional odds model. In order to estimate the odds ratio equivalent to a 15% relative reduction in mortality, a proportional odds model was used.²¹ The dependent variable was WHO ordinal scale on day 5 or 8, with age and sex as predictor variables.

WHO scale - sustained improvement

We calculated the number of patients who had a sustained 1- or 2-level improvement in the WHO scale. To be considered sustained, an improvement had to be maintained until discharge or until day 28. We calculated sample size for this outcome using a two-sample test for proportions with a continuity correction.²² Only patients who had WHO ordinal scale values on at least two separate days were included in this analysis.

We used a logistic regression model to analyse the relationship between mortality and the predictors sustained improvement, age and sex. We then used this model to estimate the difference in proportion of people who had a sustained improvement on the WHO ordinal scale that is associated with a 15% reduction in risk of mortality.

Mortality

In order to compare these alternative outcome measures with a gold standard (mortality), we calculated the number of participants needed if 28-day mortality was the outcome measure, using a two-sample test for proportions with continuity correction.

Declaration

Ethics approval

Ethical approval was given by the South Central-Oxford C Research Ethics Committee in England (13/SC/0149), the Scotland A Research Ethics Committee (20/SS/0028), and the WHO Ethics Review Committee (RPC571 and RPC572, April 2013).

Availability of data and materials

The dataset used and analysed in this study is not available, but a synthetically generated dataset, containing the same key properties as the original dataset is available for sample size calculations on <https://isaric4c.net/endpoints>

Competing interests

JKB and ABD report grants from the UK Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), during the conduct of the study, and grants from Wellcome Trust,. PJMO reports personal fees from consultancies (GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen, Bavarian Nordic, Pfizer, and Cepheid) and from the European Respiratory Society, grants from MRC, MRC Global Challenge Research Fund, the EU, NIHR BRC, MRC–GlaxoSmithKline, Wellcome Trust, NIHR (HPRU in Respiratory Infection), and is an NIHR senior investigator outside the submitted work. PJMO's role as President of the British Society for Immunology was unpaid but travel and accommodation at some meetings was provided by the Society. JKB reports grants from MRC. MGS reports grants from DHSC, NIHR UK, MRC, HPRU in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, and University of Liverpool, during the conduct of the study, and is chair of the scientific advisory board and a minority shareholder at Integrum Scientific, outside the submitted work. JSN-V-T was seconded to the Department of Health and Social Care, England (DHSC), October 2017-March 2022. The views expressed in this manuscript are those of its authors and not necessarily those of DHSC. JSN-V-T reports personal fees and travel and accommodation from AstraZeneca. NS reports grants from Boehringer Ingelheim and Novo Nordisk outside the submitted work.

Funding

JKB gratefully acknowledges funding support from a Wellcome Trust Senior Research Fellowship (223164/Z/21/Z), UKRI grants MC_PC_20004, MC_PC_19025, MC_PC_1905, MRNO2995X/1, and MC_PC_20029, Sepsis Research (Fiona Elizabeth Agnew Trust), a BB-SRC Institute Strategic Programme Grant to the Roslin Institute (BB/P013732/1, BB/P013759/1), and the UK Intensive Care Society. ISARIC4C work was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), the Medical Research Council [MC_PC_19059] and by the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections at University of Liverpool in partnership with Public Health England (PHE), in collaboration with Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine and the University of Oxford [200907], NIHR HPRU in Respiratory Infections at Imperial College London with PHE [200927], Wellcome Trust and Department for International Development [215091/Z/18/Z], and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation [OPP1209135], and Liverpool Experimental Cancer Medicine Centre (C18616/A25153), NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Imperial College London [IS-BRC-1215-20013], EU Platform for European Preparedness Against (Re-) emerging Epidemics (PREPARE) [FP7 project 602525] and NIHR Clinical Research Network for providing infrastructure support for this research.

Authors' contributions

JKB and PH conceived the study. JKB, MGS and PJMO acquired funding. JKB, PWH, FM, NY, JD, ADB, JM, JSN-V-T, PWH, and MGS designed the analysis. EMH, RG, ES, ABD, DH, NS and NL provided guidance on methodology and interpretation. MCS, SK, ABB, NS and JKB did the formal analysis. JSB and SK created the website. EH, ABD, GHG, NL, NS and JKB supervised the work. MCS, SK and JKB wrote the original draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and gave feedback on the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

This work uses data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as part of their care and support. We are extremely grateful for the front-line NHS clinical and research staff and volunteer medical students who collected this data in challenging circumstances, and the generosity of the participants and their families for their individual contributions in these difficult times. We also acknowledge the support of Jeremy J Farrar (Wellcome Trust) and Nahoko Shindo (WHO). For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

References

1. Drugs, F. C.-. D. & for Treatment or Prevention Guidance for Industry, B. P. **18** (2020).
2. Working, W. Group on the clinical characterisation and management of covid-19 infection. *A minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-* **20**, 8 (2020).
3. Dodd, L. E. *et al.* Endpoints for randomized controlled clinical trials for covid-19 treatments. *Clinical trials (London, England)* **17**, 472–482 (2020). [2006.10533](#).
4. Horby, P. *et al.* Effect of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with covid-19. *The New England journal of medicine* **383**, 2030–2040 (2020).

5. Beigel, J. H. *et al.* Remdesivir for the treatment of covid-19 - final report. *The New England journal of medicine* **383**, 1813–1826 (2020).
6. Cao, B. *et al.* A trial of lopinavir-ritonavir in adults hospitalized with severe covid-19. *The New England journal of medicine* **382**, 1787–1799 (2020).
7. Davoudi-Monfared, E. *et al.* A randomized clinical trial of the efficacy and safety of interferon beta-1a in treatment of severe covid-19. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy* **64** (2020).
8. Abani, O. *et al.* Tocilizumab in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): A randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *The Lancet* **397**, 1637–1645 (2021).
9. Horby, P. *et al.* Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19 — Preliminary Report. *New England Journal of Medicine* (2020).
10. Abani, O. *et al.* Baricitinib in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): A randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial and updated meta-analysis. *The Lancet* **400**, 359–368 (2022).
11. Docherty, A. B. *et al.* Features of 20 133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: Prospective observational cohort study. *BMJ* **369** (2020).
12. Knight, S. R. *et al.* Risk stratification of patients admitted to hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: Development and validation of the 4C Mortality Score. *BMJ* **370**, m3339 (2020).
13. Barbaro, R. P. *et al.* Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation support in COVID-19: An international cohort study of the Extracorporeal Life Support Organization registry. *The Lancet* **396**, 1071–1078 (2020).
14. Kwack, W. G. *et al.* Evaluation of the spo₂/fio₂ ratio as a predictor of intensive care unit transfers in respiratory ward patients for whom the rapid response system has been activated. *PloS one* **13**, e0201632 (2018).
15. Brown, S. M. *et al.* Nonlinear Imputation of PaO₂/FIO₂ From SpO₂/FIO₂ Among Mechanically Ventilated Patients in the ICU: A Prospective, Observational Study. *Critical Care Medicine* **45**, 1317–1324 (2017).
16. Brown, S. M. *et al.* Nonlinear Imputation of Pao₂/Fio₂ From Spo₂/Fio₂ Among Patients With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Chest* **150**, 307–313 (2016).
17. Chang, E. M., Bretherick, A., Drummond, G. B. & Baillie, J. K. Predictive validity of a novel non-invasive estimation of effective shunt fraction in critically ill patients. *Intensive Care Medicine Experimental* **7** (2019).
18. Hutcheon, J. A., Chioloro, A. & Hanley, J. A. Random measurement error and regression dilution bias. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)* **340**, c2289 (2010).
19. Ferguson, N. D. *et al.* The berlin definition of ards: an expanded rationale, justification, and supplementary material. *Intensive care medicine* **38**, 1573–82 (2012).

20. Borm, G. F., Fransen, J. & Lemmens, W. A. J. G. A simple sample size formula for analysis of covariance in randomized clinical trials. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* **60**, 1234–8 (2007).
21. Jr, F. E. H. a. *& others, with contributions from C* (Harrell Miscellaneous, D. and many Hmisc, 2021).
22. Wittes, J. Sample size calculations for randomized controlled trials. *Epidemiologic reviews* **24**, 39–53 (2002).