

Association of polypharmacy and burden of comorbidities on COVID-19 adverse outcomes in people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes

JK Gupta¹, R Ravindrarajah¹, George Tilston¹, W Ollier², DM Ashcroft^{3,4}, AH Heald^{5,6}

¹ Division of Informatics, Imaging and Data Science, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

² Faculty of Science and Engineering, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK

³ Division of Pharmacy & Optometry, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

⁴ NIHR Greater Manchester Patient Safety Research Collaboration (PSRC), University of Manchester, UK

⁵ Department of Diabetes and Endocrinology, Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust, Salford, UK

⁶ Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Manchester, UK

RUNNING TITLE: Polypharmacy and comorbidity impact on COVID-19 health outcome in diabetes

Abstract

Aim: To investigate whether polypharmacy and comorbidities conveyed more risk of adverse health outcomes following COVID-19 infection in people with type 1 diabetes (T1DM) or type 2 diabetes (T2DM).

Materials and methods: The Greater Manchester Care Record (GMCR) is an integrated database of electronic health records containing data collected from 433 general practices in Greater Manchester. Baseline demographic information (age, BMI, gender, ethnicity, smoking status, deprivation index), hospital admission or death within 28 days of infection were extracted for adults (18+) diagnosed with either T1DM or T2DM.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Results: For T2DM, 16 to 20 medications ($p=0.01$; OR [95% CI]=2.37 [1.31 to 4.32]) and > 20 medications ($p=0$; OR [95% CI]=3.14 [1.75 to 5.62]) were associated with increased risk of death following COVID-19 infection. Increased risk of hospital admissions in T2DM individuals was determined for 11 to 15 medications ($p=0.01$; OR [95% CI]=1.34 [1.06 to 1.69]) and above. This was independent of comorbidities, metabolic and demographic factors. For T1DM there was no association of polypharmacy with hospital admission. Respiratory, cardiovascular/cerebrovascular and gastrointestinal conditions were associated with increased risk of hospital admissions and deaths in T2DM ($p>0.001$).

Conclusion: We have shown in T2DM an independent association of number of medications taken from 11 upwards with adverse health consequences following COVID-19 infection. We also found that individuals with diabetes develop comorbidities that were common across both T1DM and T2DM. This study has laid the foundation for future investigations into the way that complex pharmacological interactions may influence clinical outcomes in people with T2DM.

Keywords: polypharmacy; comorbidity; electronic health records; COVID-19

Introduction

Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) or COVID-19 is the pathogenic coronavirus that led to the 2020 pandemic. COVID-19 infections can lead to adverse outcomes, such as hospital admission or death, the risk of which are increased further for individuals diagnosed with either type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) or type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) ^{1,2}. Increased risk of adverse health outcomes following COVID-19 infection have also been linked to other underlying medical conditions, which has raised concerns for chronic disease care ³⁻⁷. It has been showed that socially marginalised and psychiatrically vulnerable individuals are at higher risk of severe health outcomes following COVID-19 infection ⁸. McQueenie et al. (2020) investigated the UK Biobank data to determine the association between multi-morbidity (including polypharmacy as a proxy) and COVID-19 infection risk

⁹. McQueenie et al. (2020) reported that individuals diagnosed with ≥ 2 cardiometabolic conditions and increasing polypharmacy were associated with increased the risk of COVID-19 infection ⁹. Previous studies of COVID-19 in individuals with T1DM and T2DM (in the Greater Manchester (GM) area) have shown that the prescribing of certain medications influenced the likelihood of hospitalisation or death following COVID-19 infection ^{10,11}. Many individuals in this population are often prescribed, and are taking, multiple medications as they live with other long-term conditions. The definition of 'polypharmacy' has been shown to widely vary in the published literature ¹². In addition to this term, Masnoon et al. (2017) summarised that the terms minor, moderate and major polypharmacy were used in literature to describe when between 2 to 11 or more medications are consumed. The most commonly reported number of medications across these 'polypharmacy' terms was greater than or equal to 5, as identified in the review ¹². It is widely accepted that the higher the number of medications prescribed and taken by an individual, the higher the risk of poor health outcomes. Recent reviews have reported a high prevalence of polypharmacy in older people diagnosed with diabetes and an association with several health-related outcomes, including falls, syncope, hospitalization, and death, as well as highlighting the need to reduce inappropriate prescribing ¹³⁻¹⁵. Several studies have also investigated the relationship between polypharmacy and severe COVID-19 health outcomes ^{16,17}. However, there is little understanding of how polypharmacy in people with diabetes might affect their risk of severe health outcome post COVID-19 infection, other than the public health burden and impact of adverse drug-drug interactions in individuals ¹⁸. Electronic health records (EHR) emerged as a useful tool for public health and COVID-19 research, as described by Madhavan et al. (2021) and Casey et al. (2016) ^{19,20}. It is also useful for improving health service for example by identifying and understanding health inequalities ^{21,22}. To date, there are no studies that explore the associations between both polypharmacy and comorbidity with adverse health outcomes, such as hospital admission or death, post first infection of COVID-19 specifically in individuals with diabetes. This study aimed to investigate whether

polypharmacy and comorbidities conveys more risk of adverse outcomes in people with diabetes when testing positive for COVID-19 infection in UK EHR data.

Materials and methods

Cohort data source

The Greater Manchester Care Record (GMCR) is an integrated database of primary care, secondary care and mental health trusts from across GM (<https://gmwearebettertogether.com/research-and-planning/>) for retrospective analyses covering a population of approximately 3 million people. Health and care data were collected from 433 of 435 (99.5%) general practices in GM. Data were de-identified at source and were extracted from the GMCR database. The inclusion criteria for this study were defined as individuals that are registered with a GM GP practice and with a diagnosis of T1DM or T2DM and age 18 or above. Individuals with a positive test for COVID-19 close to January 2020 were included in this study. **Variables and data cleaning**

Baseline demographic information (age, BMI, gender, ethnicity, smoking status, deprivation index), hospital admission or death within 28 days of infection were extracted for adults (18+) diagnosed with either T1DM or T2DM (the codes applied are summarised in Appendix 1). Other rare forms of diabetes were not included.

Hospital admissions were recorded within 4 weeks after, or 2 weeks before a positive COVID-19 test (between Jan 2020 to May 2022). The exposure was defined as prescribed medications, which were recorded in the EHRs and mapped to the corresponding BNF (British National Formulary) chapters. For this study, medications were considered at a single point in time, the month closest to first COVID-19 infection date (January 2020 onwards). The BNF groups were not mutually exclusive, therefore medications that are grouped under more than one chapter were counted. History of comorbidity was collected before March 2020.

Individuals who were not assigned a gender were excluded. A total of 410 individuals having a code for both T1DM and T2DM were excluded. Data were checked for extreme outliers or inconsistent values and removed as appropriate.

Ethics

This project was reviewed, and ethical approval for COVID-19 research was overseen by Health Innovation Manchester and granted by the Greater Manchester Care Record (GMCR) review board (ref: IDCR-RQ-046). This research was performed with anonymised data, in line with the Health Research Authority's Governance arrangements for research ethics committees.

Statistical methods

Multivariable logistic regression analyses were performed on the T1DM and T2DM individuals, measuring exposure to number of medications and comorbidities, with either hospital admission or death after COVID-19 infection (within 28 days of COVID-19 diagnosis) as the outcome. The models were adjusted for age, BMI, ethnicity, smoking status, IMD, eGFR < 60, cholesterol, HBA1C and blood pressure. Analyses were performed in STATA v17.

This manuscript follows the reporting recommendation of RECORD-PE ²³.

Results

The study cohort included patients diagnosed as T1DM and T2DM separately. Across the Greater Manchester Region a total of 145,907 individuals were diagnosed with T2DM and 9,705 were diagnosed with T1DM (Table 1; Table 2). The number of deaths in T1DM were too low (n=30) for further statistical analyses to explore the association with mortality.

Table 1. Baseline demographics of individual diagnosed with Type 1 diabetes (T1DM) or Type 2 diabetes (T2DM).

	Type 1 Diabetes	Type 2 Diabetes
	<i>N=9,705</i>	<i>N=145,907</i>
Age (years)	47.3±16.8	65.8±13.8
BMI (kg/m ²)	27.7±7.0	31.0±7.7

Gender:		
Female	4143 (42.7)	65922 (45.2)
Male	5562 (57.3)	79985 (54.8)
Smoking status:		
Non-smoker	3967 (40.9)	51823 (35.5)
Current smoker	1804 (18.6)	20906 (14.3)
Ex-smoker	3765 (38.8)	71519 (49.0)
Unknown/missing	169 (1.7)	1659 (1.1)
Ethnicity:		
White	8020 (82.6)	102051 (69.9)
Asian	565 (5.8)	25359 (17.4)
Black	221 (2.3)	5176 (3.6)
Mixed	107 (1.1)	1528 (1.1)
Other	379 (3.9)	6184 (4.2)
Missing/refused	413 (4.3)	5609 (3.8)
Deprivation index/Townsend quintile (IMD)		
1 (least deprived)	1182 (12.2)	13471 (9.2)
2	1451 (15.0)	19080 (13.1)
3	1395 (14.4)	18017 (12.4)
4	1984 (20.4)	28863 (19.8)
5 (most deprived)	3680 (37.9)	66426 (45.5)
Missing	13 (0.1)	50 (0.03)
Total number of medications prescribed*		
0	543 (5.60)	13359 (9.16)
1 to 5	5822 (59.99)	51999 (35.64)
6 to 10	1879 (19.36)	38533 (26.41)
11 to 15	744 (7.67)	21433 (14.69)
16 to 20	348 (3.59)	9880 (6.77)
> 20	369 (3.80)	10703 (7.34)
Systolic blood pressure (mm Hg) †	127.1±15.2	131.1±14.5
Diastolic blood pressure (mm Hg) †	74.8±9.8	75.9±9.6
HBA1C (mmol/mol) †	69.3±20.3	56.8±17.0
eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m²) < 60 ‡	907 (9.4)	25851 (17.7)
eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m ²) †	81.0±15.5	75.4±17.2
Cholesterol (mmol/mol) †	4.5±1.1	4.3±1.1
LDL (mmol/L) †	2.4±0.9	2.2±0.9
HDL (mmol/L) †	1.5±0.5	1.2±0.4
Diabetes duration (years)	20.6±14.3	10.4±7.45
Vaccination status: (define prior to/around the time of first infection)		
Yes	8816 (90.8)	135141 (92.6)
No	889 (9.2)	10766 (7.4)
Prescribed medications: *		
Metformin	1015 (10.5)	72084 (49.4)
SGLT2 *	163 (1.7)	16134 (11.1)
Insulin	6854 (70.6)	12149 (8.3)
Arb/ACE inhibitors	1759 (18.1)	44127 (30.2)
Antiplatelet (clopidogrel/aspirin)	1177 (12.1)	31403 (21.5)
Angiotensin receptor blockers	710 (7.3)	20168 (13.8)
Sulphonylureas	98 (1.0)	22011 (15.1)

GLP1 receptor agonists	79 (0.8)	4475 (3.1)
Alogliptin	36 (0.4)	10196 (7.0)
Linagliptin	37 (0.4)	5388 (3.7)
Saxagliptin	< 10 (0)	944 (0.7)
Sitagliptin	29 (0.3)	6570 (4.5)
Vildagliptin	< 10 (0)	396 (0.27)
Admission to hospital (within 28 days of infection)	146(1.5)	2107 (1.4)
Length of stay in hospital (days)	4.5±8.3	7.1±11.9
Deaths (within 28 days of confirmed infection)	30 (0.3)	885 (0.6)

Categorical variables presented as N (%) and continuous variables as mean (±SD)

Townsend index: 1 denotes the least deprived and 5 the most deprived.

* Medications prescribed close to January 2020.

† Closest point before first COVID-19 +ve test

‡ Estimated glomerular filtration rate

* Sodium glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitor (SGLT2i) or a glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) agonist.

A varying number of multiple medications were prescribed to individuals with T1DM or T2DM (Table 1). A large proportion of individuals were prescribed between 1 to 5 medications; the distribution of number of medications prescribed and BNF chapters can be seen in Figure S1 and Figure S2. In T2DM, after endocrine and cardiovascular medications, the largest number of multiple prescriptions were from the gastrointestinal (GI) BNF chapter.

Common comorbidities were grouped into broader categories (see Supplementary Information Table S1) and counts were collated for T1DM and T2DM. The top six modal comorbidity groups identified in T2DM were mental health conditions, hypertension, gastrointestinal or liver disease, pain, respiratory conditions (or sinus-related) and cardiovascular/cerebrovascular conditions (Table 2). Of the individuals diagnosed with T2DM, 69.9% were diagnosed with hypertension and 44.9% with mental health conditions (Table 2). The same six comorbidity groups were also identified in the individuals with T1DM (Table S2).

Table 2. Prevalence of co-morbidity groups in individuals diagnosed with T2DM. The top 6 groups are shown in italics.

Morbidity group	N	%
<i>Hypertension</i>	101995	69.9
<i>GI/liver disease</i>	82193	56.3
<i>Mental health disorder</i>	65487	44.9
<i>Pain</i>	60237	41.3
<i>Cardiovascular/cerebrovascular</i>	48213	33.0

<i>Respiratory/sinus</i>	41653	28.6
Sensory	34541	23.7
Skin/connective tissue disorder	28459	19.5
Chronic kidney disease	27931	19.1
Neurological disorders	22795	15.6
Thyroid disorders	14476	9.9
Prostate diseases	9276	6.4
Alcohol substance abuse	9108	6.2
Cancer	7892	5.4
Dementia	6498	4.5
Glaucoma	6262	4.3
Learning disability	1016	0.7

147

148 **Logistic Regression Analysis**

149 Odds ratios (95% confidence intervals) of the univariate regression are reported in the individuals with
150 T1DM and T2DM respectively.

151 **T1DM**

152 An increased risk of adverse outcomes post-infection was observed for individuals with T1DM and
153 GI/liver disorders ($p=0$; 3.45 [2.12 to 5.62]) and pain associated conditions ($p=0.04$; OR [95% CI] = 1.56
154 [1.02 to 2.37]) (Table 3). Age was significant. Other significant variables included eGFR < 60 ($p=0$; OR
155 [95% CI] = 2.79 [1.75 to 4.47]). There was no association with polypharmacy.

156

157 **Table 3. Logistic regression analyses of hospital admission resulting from COVID-19 infection in**
158 **individuals with T1DM.**

Variable	OR (95% CI)	p value
Age	0.96 (0.95 to 0.98)	> 0.001
Gender		
Females		
Males	0.79 (0.54 to 1.17)	0.24
BMI	0.99 (0.96 to 1.02)	0.49
Ethnicity		
White		
Asian	0.92 (0.43 to 1.96)	0.83
Black	0.39 (0.05 to 2.88)	0.36
Mixed	1.89 (0.44 to 8.04)	0.39
Other	0.45 (0.11 to 1.85)	0.27
Unknown	0.25 (0.03 to 1.81)	0.17
Smoking status		
Non-smoker		
Current smoker	0.86 (0.49 to 1.51)	0.59
Ex-smoker	1.02 (0.66 to 1.57)	0.92
Unknown/missing	1.24 (0.29 to 5.36)	0.78

IMD		
1 (least deprived)		
2	0.86 (0.4 to 1.85)	0.71
3	0.65 (0.29 to 1.45)	0.29
4	1 (0.5 to 1.99)	1
5 (most deprived)	0.84 (0.44 to 1.61)	0.60
Missing		
eGFR<60	2.79 (1.75 to 4.47)	> 0.001
Cholesterol	0.92 (0.78 to 1.1)	0.37
HBA1C	1 (0.99 to 1.01)	0.68
Systolic BP	1 (0.98 to 1.01)	0.79
Diastolic BP	1.02 (1 to 1.04)	0.11
Mental health disorder	0.69 (0.46 to 1.03)	0.07
Hypertension	1.18 (0.75 to 1.86)	0.48
GI/liver disorder	3.45 (2.12 to 5.62)	> 0.001
Pain	1.56 (1.02 to 2.37)	0.04
Respiratory/sinus conditions	0.99 (0.65 to 1.5)	0.95
Cardiovascular/cerebrovascular	1.33 (0.81 to 2.16)	0.26
Total number of medications:		
0		
1 to 5	1 (0.23 to 4.27)	1
6 to 10	2.14 (0.49 to 9.38)	0.31
11 to 15	2.5 (0.54 to 11.55)	0.24
16 to 20	3.58 (0.74 to 17.33)	0.11
> 20	2.16 (0.42 to 10.99)	0.36

159

160 T2DM

161 In individuals with T2DM, an increased number of medications, from 11 upwards was associated with
162 increased risk of hospital admission following COVID-19 infection (Table 4). Individuals diagnosed with
163 co-morbidities in the following morbidity groups had an increased likelihood of hospital admission:
164 mental health disorders (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.17 (1.05 to 1.29)); Gastro-intestinal/liver disorders (p=0;
165 OR [95% CI] = 1.98 (1.74 to 2.25)); pain (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.41 (1.27 to 1.56)); respiratory/sinus
166 conditions (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.24 (1.11 to 1.37)) and cardiovascular/cerebrovascular conditions
167 p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.44 (1.29 to 1.61)). People with T2DM and eGFR level <60 (p= 0; OR [95% CI] =
168 1.43 [1.27 to 1.61]) also had an increased risk of hospital admission, similarly HBA1C levels (p= 0.01;
169 OR [95% CI] = 1 [1 to 1.01]) were also at increased risk (Table 4).

170 Males were more likely to be admitted to hospital after infection with COVID-19 (p=0; OR [95% CI] =
171 1.31 [1.18 to 1.46]). Extremes of BMI (too high or too low) was associated with a higher likelihood of
172 adverse outcomes (hospitalisation & mortality) from COVID-19 (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.01 [1 to 1.02]).
173 Age was protective of hospital admission; however the odds ratio was only slightly less than 1 (p=0.01;

OR [95% CI] = 0.99 [0.99 to 1]). Individuals of Asian (p=0.01; OR [95% CI] = 1.21 [1.06 to 1.39]) or Black (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.44 [1.13 to 1.84]) ethnicities were also more likely to be admitted to hospital following infection (Table 4).

Individuals who identified as 'current smokers' were not identified as being at increased risk (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 0.51 [0.42 to 0.61]). However, individuals who lived in more deprived regions were statistically significant IMD 4 and 5 (p=0.02; OR [95% CI] = 1.28 [1.04 to 1.57]; p=0.03; OR [95% CI] = 1.24 [1.02 to 1.5]) (Table 4).

Table 4. Logistic regression analyses of hospital admission resulting from COVID-19 infection in individuals with T2DM.

Variable	OR (95% CI)	p value
Age	0.99 (0.99 to 1)	0.01
Gender		
Females		
Males	1.31 (1.18 to 1.46)	> 0.001
BMI	1.01 (1 to 1.02)	> 0.001
Ethnicity		
White		
Asian	1.21 (1.06 to 1.39)	0.01
Black	1.44 (1.13 to 1.84)	> 0.001
Mixed	1.06 (0.63 to 1.77)	0.83
Other	0.96 (0.74 to 1.24)	0.75
Unknown	0.95 (0.7 to 1.28)	0.73
Smoking status		
Non-smoker		
Current smoker	0.51 (0.42 to 0.61)	> 0.001
Ex- smoker	1 (0.89 to 1.12)	0.98
Unknown/missing	0.86 (0.53 to 1.4)	0.53
IMD		
1 (least deprived)		
2	1.07 (0.85 to 1.34)	0.56
3	1.09 (0.87 to 1.37)	0.45
4	1.28 (1.04 to 1.57)	0.02
5 (most deprived)	1.24 (1.02 to 1.5)	0.03
Missing		
eGFR<60	1.43 (1.27 to 1.61)	> 0.001
Cholesterol	1.02 (0.98 to 1.07)	0.37
HBA1C	1 (1 to 1.01)	0.01
Systolic BP	1 (1 to 1)	0.71
Diastolic BP	1 (1 to 1.01)	0.47
Mental health disorder	1.17 (1.05 to 1.29)	> 0.001
Hypertension	1.07 (0.95 to 1.22)	0.27
GI/liver disorder	1.98 (1.74 to 2.25)	> 0.001
Pain	1.41 (1.27 to 1.56)	> 0.001
Respiratory/sinus conditions	1.24 (1.11 to 1.37)	> 0.001

Cardiovascular/cerebrovascular	1.44 (1.29 to 1.61)	> 0.001
Total number of medications:		
0		
1 to 5	1.12 (0.9 to 1.4)	0.3
6 to 10	1.11 (0.89 to 1.39)	0.37
11 to 15	1.34 (1.06 to 1.69)	0.01
16 to 20	1.45 (1.12 to 1.87)	> 0.001
> 20	1.53 (1.19 to 1.97)	> 0.001

184

185 In individuals with T2DM, the number of deaths was 885 (0.6% of the total number of individuals
186 diagnosed with T2DM) (Table 1). An increased number of medications, from 16 to 20 to > 20 was
187 associated with increased risk of death following COVID-19 infection (p=0.01; OR [95% CI] = 2.37 [1.31
188 to 4.32] and p=0; OR [95% CI] = 3.14 [1.75 to 5.62] respectively) (Table 5).

189 People diagnosed with the following long-term conditions were at higher risk of death post-infection:
190 mental health disorders (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.54 (1.22 to 1.95)); respiratory/sinus conditions (p=0; OR
191 [95% CI] = 1.57 [1.24 to 1.99]) or cardiovascular/cerebrovascular conditions (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.69
192 [1.3 to 2.2]). A protective effect was observed for individuals living with GI/liver disorder (p=0; OR
193 [95% CI] = 0.52 (0.4 to 0.67)) or pain (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 0.51 [0.4 to 0.66]) (Table 5).

194 As with hospital admission, the risk of death in males and with increased BMI was high (p=0.02; OR
195 [95% CI] = 1.35 [1.05 to 1.73] and p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.02 [1.01 to 1.04] respectively). Age was
196 associated with an increased risk of mortality post COVID-19 infection (p=0; OR [95% CI] = 1.09 [1.08
197 to 1.11]) (Table 5).

198 Individuals with T2DM and living in the most deprived regions (IMD 5) were at higher risk of death
199 following COVID-19 infection (p=0.02; OR [95% CI] = 1.68 [1.08 to 2.62]) or if their eGFR level measure
200 was <60 (p=0.01; OR [95% CI] = 1.38 [1.08 to 1.77]) (Table 5).

201

202 **Table 5. Logistic regression analyses of deaths resulting from COVID-19 infection in individuals**
203 **with T2DM.**

Variable	OR (95% CI)	p value
Age	1.09 (1.08 to 1.11)	> 0.001
Gender		
Females		
Males	1.35 (1.05 to 1.73)	0.02
BMI	1.02 (1.01 to 1.04)	> 0.001

Ethnicity		
White		
Asian	0.72 (0.46 to 1.12)	0.15
Black	0.67 (0.27 to 1.63)	0.37
Mixed	1.42 (0.45 to 4.5)	0.55
Other	0.7 (0.36 to 1.36)	0.29
Unknown	1.26 (0.72 to 2.21)	0.42
Smoking status		
Non-smoker		
Current smoker	1.02 (0.67 to 1.55)	0.95
Ex- smoker	0.94 (0.72 to 1.23)	0.68
Unknown/missing		
IMD		
1 (least deprived)		
2	1.44 (0.88 to 2.37)	0.15
3	1.18 (0.7 to 1.99)	0.53
4	1.48 (0.92 to 2.38)	0.11
5 (most deprived)	1.68 (1.08 to 2.62)	0.02
Missing		
eGFR<60	1.38 (1.08 to 1.77)	0.01
Cholesterol	1.08 (0.97 to 1.21)	0.15
HBA1C	1 (0.99 to 1.01)	0.97
Systolic BP	0.99 (0.98 to 1)	0.12
Diastolic BP	1 (0.99 to 1.01)	0.91
Mental health disorder	1.54 (1.22 to 1.95)	> 0.001
Hypertension	0.79 (0.57 to 1.1)	0.16
GI/liver disorder	0.52 (0.4 to 0.67)	> 0.001
Pain	0.51 (0.4 to 0.66)	> 0.001
Respiratory/sinus conditions	1.57 (1.24 to 1.99)	> 0.001
Cardiovascular/cerebrovascular	1.69 (1.3 to 2.2)	> 0.001
Total number of medications:		
0		
1 to 5	0.58 (0.32 to 1.06)	0.08
6 to 10	0.94 (0.54 to 1.67)	0.84
11 to 15	1.43 (0.8 to 2.55)	0.23
16 to 20	2.37 (1.31 to 4.32)	0.01
> 20	3.14 (1.75 to 5.62)	> 0.001

Discussion

We found that the number of medications prescribed to an individual was associated with an increased risk of severe outcome from COVID-19 infection, particularly in people living with T2DM (Table 4; Table 5). Given the large proportion of individuals diagnosed with comorbidities, it was not unexpected that many of these individuals were prescribed multiple medications (Figure S1; Figure S2). However, the effect of multiple medications was independent of the presence of the most common comorbidities. This study uniquely explored the relationship between number of medications and adverse outcome from COVID-19 infection in individuals diagnosed with diabetes in

the Greater Manchester population and is therefore distinct from our previous published studies in this area ^{10,11}. We saw that polypharmacy, independent of other factors including major multimorbidity, was associated with an increased likelihood of hospital admission in people with T1DM and of hospitalisation and death in T2DM following COVID-19 infection. This has not been specifically reported previously, although it was described in older individuals ²⁴. This is of relevance to the consequences following any serious viral infection in people with diabetes, while also highlighting the importance of regular medicine reviews in everyone with diabetes, where there may be an opportunity to reduce the prescribed medications ²⁵.

The mean ages of individuals diagnosed with T1DM or T2DM are similar to the mean ages of a Swedish cohort investigated by ¹. In our study we also identified several co-morbidities that increased the risk of adverse health outcome post COVID-19 infection. Similar co-morbidities were identified for both individuals with T1DM and T2DM. The increase in medications could be related to the co-morbidities that these individuals are diagnosed with and receiving medications for. The impact of this on an individual's risk of suffering from severe health outcome post COVID-19 infection warrants further investigation. Notably, we also identified that there were a large proportion of diagnoses of mental health conditions in people with T2DM (Table 2), though the highest number of diagnoses was observed in people with T1DM (Table S2). The relationship between physical health conditions and poor mental health is an area that is not fully understood, in addition to this, the impact of polypharmacy is unknown.

Over-prescribing is an issue in the current healthcare system. Medication is routinely recorded, therefore in clinical practice there is the potential to flag the number of medications prescribed to clinicians to monitor. Thereby the number of prescriptions given to vulnerable individuals could be limited as appropriate and effective for the individual, though this does require both routine monitoring and structured reviews of the medications that people are taking. The UK healthcare system looks to improve the management of prescriptions, and the removal of unnecessary medications is key to reducing the burden of polypharmacy ^{26,27}.

One of the limitations of this study is that a measure of ‘frailty’ was not included²⁸. However, a count of comorbidities is included which could possibly be used as a proxy for frailty. As the data from this study originated from electronic health records, it is also subject to the limitations of how information is coded when originally entered into the systems, such as missing data. Only 70% of individuals with T1DM were recorded with a prescription of insulin (Table 1), this could be due to lack of recording or unclear diagnosis, which highlights another issue with routinely collected data. Another issue is that medications are recorded in the health care records are not true reflections of medications that are concordant with the choices of the individual²⁹. A study in America demonstrated that EHR-related medication errors can occur at different stages including at ordering, preparation, dispensing, administering or monitoring stage, these can ultimately affect the data in EHRs³⁰. Inaccuracies of coding are inherent in any project that relies on primary coded data. Nevertheless, the large number of people included in the study means that such inaccuracies are unlikely materially to influence the results. Furthermore, medications can also be counted in more than one BNF chapter, making it difficult to determine unique counts. As this data was from one region in the UK, it is difficult to generalise to the rest of the population.

Future work would include investigating the modal medications prescribed in this cohort and explore possible drug-drug interactions between medications that could contribute to increasing the risk of adverse outcome post COVID-19 infection. The burden of mental health conditions on people with diabetes and how to effectively manage multiple long-term conditions, could also be explored. The knowledge gained would be useful for future pandemics and better prepare our healthcare system.

In conclusion, we have identified that multiple medications were prescribed to many people living with diabetes and that this was associated with a higher risk of adverse health outcome following COVID-19 infection. We also found that individuals with diabetes also developed comorbidities that were common across both Type 1 and 2 diabetes. Our analysis confirmed the impact of higher levels of deprivation on increasing a person’s a risk of adverse outcome post COVID-19 infection. This study

has laid the foundation for future investigations into the increased and complex treatments people living with diabetes who develop other clinical complications.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Turing-Manchester Feasibility Project Funding. The authors recognise the Greater Manchester Care Record (a partnership of Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership, Health Innovation Manchester and Graphnet Health, on behalf of Greater Manchester localities) in the provision of data required to undertake this work. This work uses data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as part of their care and support. GT was funded by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203308) for this work. DMA is supported by the NIHR Greater Manchester Patient Safety Research Collaboration (PSRC). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Author contributions

RR performed the data cleaning and data analyses. JG, WO and AHH conceived the study. JG prepared the figures and the manuscript. GT extracted the original dataset. DM WO and AHH contributed to all sections of the paper and DM provided expert input from a pharmacological perspective. All authors were involved in designing the study, interpreting results and the reviewing and editing of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

The datasets generated during and analysed during the current study are not publicly available as all data access is subject to review by Health Innovation Manchester.

References

1. Rawshani A, Kjölhede EA, Rawshani A, et al. Severe COVID-19 in people with type 1 and type 2 diabetes in Sweden: A nationwide retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*. 2021;4:100105. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100105
2. Izzi-Engbeaya C, Distaso W, Amin A, et al. Adverse outcomes in COVID-19 and diabetes: a retrospective cohort study from three London teaching hospitals. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*. 2021;9(1):e001858. doi:10.1136/bmjdr-2020-001858
3. Kone AP, Martin L, Scharf D, et al. The impact of multimorbidity on severe COVID-19 outcomes in community and congregate settings. *Dialogues in Health*. 2023;2:100128. doi:10.1016/j.dialog.2023.100128
4. Li Y, Ashcroft T, Chung A, et al. Risk factors for poor outcomes in hospitalised COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Glob Health*. 11:10001. doi:10.7189/jogh.11.10001
5. Fekadu G, Bekele F, Tolossa T, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on chronic diseases care follow-up and current perspectives in low resource settings: a narrative review. *Int J Physiol Pathophysiol Pharmacol*. 2021;13(3):86-93.
6. Danhieux K, Buffel V, Pairon A, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on chronic care according to providers: a qualitative study among primary care practices in Belgium. *BMC Family Practice*. 2020;21(1):255. doi:10.1186/s12875-020-01326-3
7. Zheng Z, Peng F, Xu B, et al. Risk factors of critical & mortal COVID-19 cases: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Infection*. 2020;81(2):e16-e25. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.021
8. Nilsson SF, Laursen TM, Osler M, et al. Adverse SARS-CoV-2-associated outcomes among people experiencing social marginalisation and psychiatric vulnerability: A population-based cohort study among 4.4 million people. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*. 2022;20:100421. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100421
9. McQueenie R, Foster HME, Jani BD, et al. Multimorbidity, polypharmacy, and COVID-19 infection within the UK Biobank cohort. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(8):e0238091. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0238091
10. Heald AH, Jenkins DA, Williams R, et al. The Risk Factors Potentially Influencing Hospital Admission in People with Diabetes, Following SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Population-Level Analysis. *Diabetes Ther*. 2022;13(5):1007-1021. doi:10.1007/s13300-022-01230-2
11. Heald AH, Jenkins DA, Williams R, et al. Mortality in People with Type 2 Diabetes Following SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Population Level Analysis of Potential Risk Factors. *Diabetes Ther*. 2022;13(5):1037-1051. doi:10.1007/s13300-022-01259-3

- 321 12. Masnoon N, Shakib S, Kalisch-Ellett L, Caughey GE. What is polypharmacy? A systematic review
322 of definitions. *BMC Geriatr.* 2017;17(1):230. doi:10.1186/s12877-017-0621-2
- 323 13. Remelli F, Ceresini MG, Trevisan C, Noale M, Volpato S. Prevalence and impact of polypharmacy
324 in older patients with type 2 diabetes. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2022;34(9):1969-1983.
325 doi:10.1007/s40520-022-02165-1
- 326 14. Rochon PA, Petrovic M, Cherubini A, et al. Polypharmacy, inappropriate prescribing, and
327 deprescribing in older people: through a sex and gender lens. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity.*
328 2021;2(5):e290-e300. doi:10.1016/S2666-7568(21)00054-4
- 329 15. Bhagavathula AS, Vidyasagar K, Chhabra M, et al. Prevalence of Polypharmacy,
330 Hyperpolypharmacy and Potentially Inappropriate Medication Use in Older Adults in India: A
331 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Pharmacology.* 2021;12. Accessed August 11,
332 2023. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2021.685518>
- 333 16. McKeigue PM, Kennedy S, Weir A, et al. Relation of severe COVID-19 to polypharmacy and
334 prescribing of psychotropic drugs: the REACT-SCOT case-control study. *BMC Medicine.*
335 2021;19(1):51. doi:10.1186/s12916-021-01907-8
- 336 17. Iloanusi S, Mgbere O, Essien EJ. Polypharmacy among COVID-19 patients: A systematic review. *J*
337 *Am Pharm Assoc (2003).* 2021;61(5):e14-e25. doi:10.1016/j.japh.2021.05.006
- 338 18. Rahman S, Singh K, Dhingra S, et al. The Double Burden of the COVID-19 Pandemic and
339 Polypharmacy on Geriatric Population – Public Health Implications. *Ther Clin Risk Manag.*
340 2020;16:1007-1022. doi:10.2147/TCRM.S272908
- 341 19. Madhavan S, Bastarache L, Brown JS, et al. Use of electronic health records to support a public
342 health response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States: a perspective from 15
343 academic medical centers. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2021;28(2):393-401.
344 doi:10.1093/jamia/ocaa287
- 345 20. Casey JA, Schwartz BS, Stewart WF, Adler NE. Using Electronic Health Records for Population
346 Health Research: A Review of Methods and Applications. *Annual Review of Public Health.*
347 2016;37(1):61-81. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032315-021353
- 348 21. Kruse CS, Stein A, Thomas H, Kaur H. The use of Electronic Health Records to Support Population
349 Health: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Med Syst.* 2018;42(11):214.
350 doi:10.1007/s10916-018-1075-6
- 351 22. Cowie MR, Blomster JI, Curtis LH, et al. Electronic health records to facilitate clinical research.
352 *Clin Res Cardiol.* 2017;106(1):1-9. doi:10.1007/s00392-016-1025-6
- 353 23. Langan SM, Schmidt SA, Wing K, et al. The reporting of studies conducted using observational
354 routinely collected health data statement for pharmacoepidemiology (RECORD-PE). *BMJ.*
355 Published online November 14, 2018;k3532. doi:10.1136/bmj.k3532
- 356 24. Rahman S, Singh K, Dhingra S, et al. The Double Burden of the COVID-19 Pandemic and
357 Polypharmacy on Geriatric Population – Public Health Implications. *Ther Clin Risk Manag.*
358 2020;16:1007-1022. doi:10.2147/TCRM.S272908
- 359 25. Kerr L. Polypharmacy in diabetes and solutions for greater adherence. *Practical Diabetes*
360 *International.* 2009;26(7):289-290. doi:10.1002/pdi.1402

- 361 26. The AHSN Network. Polypharmacy. The AHSN Network. Published 2022. Accessed April 7, 2023.
362 <https://www.ahsnnetwork.com/programmes/medicines/polypharmacy/>
- 363 27. Department of Health and Social Care. National overprescribing review report. GOV.UK.
364 Published 2023. Accessed April 7, 2023. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-overprescribing-review-report)
365 [overprescribing-review-report](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-overprescribing-review-report)
- 366 28. Hanlon P, Nicholl BI, Jani BD, Lee D, McQueenie R, Mair FS. Frailty and pre-frailty in middle-aged
367 and older adults and its association with multimorbidity and mortality: a prospective analysis of
368 493 737 UK Biobank participants. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2018;3(7):e323-e332.
369 doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(18)30091-4
- 370 29. Marzec LN, Maddox TM. Medication Adherence in Patients with Diabetes and Dyslipidemia:
371 Associated Factors and Strategies for Improvement. *Curr Cardiol Rep*. 2013;15(11):418.
372 doi:10.1007/s11886-013-0418-7
- 373 30. Carayon P, Du S, Brown R, Cartmill R, Johnson M, Wetterneck TB. EHR-related medication errors
374 in two ICUs. *J Healthc Risk Manag*. 2017;36(3):6-15. doi:10.1002/jhrm.21259
- 375