

1 **A risk stratification model for high-flow nasal cannula use in patients with coronavirus disease**  
2 **2019 in Japan: a single-center retrospective observational cohort study**

3

4 Short title: A risk stratification model for severe COVID-19

5

6 Ibuki Kurihara<sup>1\*</sup> and Hitoshi Sugawara<sup>1</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup> Division of General Medicine, Department of Comprehensive Medicine 1, Saitama Medical Center,  
9 Jichi Medical University, Saitama City, Saitama, Japan

10

11 **\* Corresponding author:**

12 Ibuki Kurihara

13 Department of General Medicine, Saitama Medical Center, Jichi Medical University

14 1-847 Amanuma-cho, Omiya-ku, Saitama-shi, Saitama, 330-8503, Japan

15 Tel: +81-48-647-2111; Fax: +81-48-644-8617; E-mail address: [hsmdfacp@jichi.ac.jp](mailto:hsmdfacp@jichi.ac.jp)

16

17 **Abstract**

18 **Background:** The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has put a strain on the  
19 healthcare system, and sudden changes in disease status during home treatment have become a  
20 serious issue. Therefore, prediction of disease severity and allocation of sufficient medical resources,  
21 including high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC), to patients in need are important. We aimed to determine  
22 risk factors for the need of HFNC use in COVID-19.

23 **Methods:** This was a single-center retrospective observational cohort study including all eligible  
24 hospitalized adult patients aged  $\geq 18$  years diagnosed with COVID-19 between April 14, 2020 and  
25 August 5, 2021 who were treated in the study hospital. The primary outcome was critical respiratory  
26 illness meeting one of the following criteria: oxygenation flow rate  $\geq 10$  L/min, high-flow  
27 oxygenation, noninvasive ventilation, invasive ventilation, and death. Nineteen potential predictive  
28 variables, including patient characteristics at hospital admission, were screened using least absolute  
29 shrinkage and selection operator and logistic regression to construct a predictive risk score. Accuracy  
30 of the risk score was determined using area under the receiver operating characteristic curve.

31 **Results:** The study cohort included 148 patients. The rate of critical respiratory illness was 22.9%  
32 (all patients needed high-flow device support). Among the 19 potential variables, percutaneous  
33 oxygen saturation ( $\text{SpO}_2$ )  $< 92\%$  (odds ratio [OR] 7.50, 95% confidence interval [CI] 2.806–20.82)  
34 and IL-6 (OR 1.021, 95% CI 1.010–1.033) were included in developing the risk score, which was  
35 termed interleukin (IL)-6-based COVID-19 severity (IBC-S) score.

36 **Conclusions:** The IBC-S score, an easy-to-use risk score based on parameters available at the time  
37 of hospital admission, predicted critical respiratory failure in patients with COVID-19. In primary  
38 care settings, the IBC-S score based on interleukin-6 and  $\text{SpO}_2$  might aid in determining patients  
39 who should be transported to a tertiary medical institution or an isolation facility.

40

## 41 **Introduction**

42 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has claimed approximately 15 million lives as  
43 of September 2022 [1]. While approximately 80% of patients with COVID-19 experience a mild  
44 disease course and recover, the remaining 20% of the infected patients rapidly progress to severe  
45 COVID-19 [2] High-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) can deliver high concentrations of humidified  
46 oxygen with low positive end-expiratory pressure and facilitate the elimination of carbon dioxide,  
47 thereby rapidly relieving the symptoms of acute hypoxemic respiratory failure [3] . In the COVID-19  
48 pandemic, HFNC use significantly reduced the need for mechanical ventilation support and  
49 shortened the time to clinical recovery compared with conventional low-flow oxygen therapy [4];  
50 therefore, HFNC has been played an important role in the management of patients with severe or  
51 critical COVID-19 [5]. However, HFNC uses hyperbaric oxygen, which limits the medical facilities  
52 that can utilize it.

53 In Japan, the COVID-19 pandemic has put a strain on the healthcare system and the sudden change  
54 in disease status during home treatment has become a serious problem [6]. Therefore, predicting the  
55 severity of COVID-19 and allocating sufficient medical resources, including HFNC, to patients in  
56 need are important. Therefore, we aimed to determine the risk factors for HFNC use in patients with  
57 COVID-19 by examining the medical records of patients treated in our medical center during the  
58 COVID-19 Alpha, Beta, and Delta surges in Japan.

59

## 60 **Materials and Methods**

### 61 **Study design, participants, and setting**

62 This was a single-center retrospective observational cohort study including all adult patients aged  
63  $\geq 18$  years that were diagnosed with COVID-19 and hospitalized in the Division of General Medicine,  
64 Saitama Medical Center, Jichi Medical University between April 14, 2020 and August 5, 2021. The  
65 study period covered the COVID-19 Alpha, Beta, and Delta surges in Japan.

## 66 **Primary outcome, data collection, and processing**

67 The primary outcome was critical respiratory illness meeting one of the following criteria any time  
68 after the day of admission: oxygenation flow rate  $\geq 10$  L/min, high-flow oxygenation, noninvasive  
69 ventilation, invasive ventilation, and death [7]. In all patients, the COVID-19 diagnosis was  
70 confirmed based on a positive nucleic acid amplification test using oropharyngeal, nasopharyngeal,  
71 or oropharyngeal/nasopharyngeal swab samples. The study data were collected from electronic  
72 medical records between September 15, 2021 and March 31, 2023.

## 73 **Sample size estimation**

74 G\*Power version 3.1.9.2 (Heinrich Heine University Duesseldorf, Duesseldorf, Germany) was used  
75 to determine the required sample size using the following parameters: test family, z test; statistical  
76 test, logistic regression; type of power analysis, a priori: compute required sample size—given  $\alpha$ ,  
77 power, and effect size; tails, two; odds ratio, 8.142 (alternative hypothesis was assumed to be  
78 moderately correlated at 0.3, and null hypothesis was assumed to be 0.05);  $\alpha$  error probability, 0.05;  
79 power ( $1 - \beta$  error probability), 0.8;  $R^2$  other X, 0.26 (i.e., the regression equation is accurate.); X  
80 distribution, exponential; X parm  $\lambda$ , 0.3. The calculated sample size was 44.

## 81 **Potential predictive variables**

82 We referred to the previous studies and extracted potential predictive variables [2,8,9]. Potential  
83 predictive variables were patient characteristics at the time of hospital admission and included  
84 demographic variables (age, sex, and smoking status), medical history (diabetes mellitus,  
85 hypertension, coronary artery disease, chronic kidney disease, chronic heart failure, and cancer),  
86 physical parameters (body mass index and percutaneous oxygen saturation [ $SpO_2$ ]), laboratory  
87 parameters (lymphocyte count, C-reactive protein, albumin, direct bilirubin, lactate dehydrogenase,  
88 ferritin, D-dimer, and interleukin 6 [IL-6]), and prehospital treatments (steroid, remdesivir,  
89 tocilizumab, and baricitinib).

## 90 **Ethics approval**

91 The current study was approved by the Institutional Clinical Review Board of Saitama Medical  
92 Center, Jichi Medical University (approval no: Clinical # S21-024). In accordance with the ethical  
93 guidelines for medical and health research involving human subjects in Japan, written informed  
94 consent was not required due to the retrospective study design. The study was conducted with the  
95 online opt-out method accessed through the hospital website.

## 96 **Statistical analysis**

97 The 19 potential predictive variables were entered into analysis to construct a predictive risk score  
98 for HFNC use. The Mann–Whitney  $U$  and Pearson’s chi-square tests were used to compare  
99 continuous and categorical baseline characteristics, respectively. The least absolute shrinkage and  
100 selection operator method was used to minimize the potential collinearity of variables from the same  
101 patient and the over-fitting of variables. Imputation for missing variables was considered if missing  
102 values were lower than 20%. The selected variables and treatment before admission which was a  
103 confounder, were included in the multiple logistic regression analysis. The predictive value of risk  
104 stratification models was assessed using area under the receiver operating characteristic curve. For  
105 continuous variables included in the model, parameter values with the equal sensitivity and  
106 specificity and the highest positive predictive value were chosen as cut-off values [10]. After the  
107 creation of the risk scoring model using the selected variables, bootstrapped logistic regression was  
108 used to verify internal validity. All statistical tests were two-tailed with significance set at a P value  
109 of <0.05.

110 The Stata/SE 16.2 software (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) was used for all  
111 statistical analyses.

112

## 113 **Results**

### 114 **Baseline information of the participants**

115 The study flow chart is shown in Fig 1. During the study period, a total of 152 patients were admitted  
116 with COVID-19 in the study institution. The actual study cohort size was markedly above the  
117 estimated sample size (152 versus 44), which increased the power of the study. Of these 152 patients,  
118 4 patients who met the primary study endpoint of critical respiratory illness on the day of admission  
119 were excluded; therefore, the final analysis included 148 patients.

120

121 Fig 1 Study flow diagram

122 PCO; primary composite outcome; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019

123

124 Table 1 shows the demographic and clinical characteristics of the cohort. Briefly, the  
125 median age (interquartile range) was 58.5 (23–84) years, 43 patients (30%) of the patients were  
126 female, and 18.4% of the patients had at least one comorbidity. Of the 148 patients, 34 patients  
127 (22.9%) required oxygen with a flow rate of  $\geq 10$  L/min, 34 patients (22.9%) required high-flow  
128 device support, 9 (6.1%) patients required invasive ventilation, and 13 patients (8.8%) died.  
129 Additionally, 12 patients (8.1%) were admitted to the intensive care unit after the day of admission.

Table 1. Baseline patient characteristics

	Total patients (n = 148)	Outcome (n = 34)	Non-outcome (n = 114)	P value
Age	58.5 (23–84)	60 (44–89)	57.5 (22–83)	0.037
Male, n (%)	105 (70%)	25 (73.5%)	80 (70.1%)	0.705
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	24.69 (17.9–33.5)	25.1 (16.8–33.3)	24.6 (17.9–33.8)	0.521
Diabetes, n (%)	51 (34.4%)	18 (52.9%)	33 (28.9%)	0.01

Hypertension, n (%)	77 (52.0%)	25 (73%)	52 (45.6%)	0.004
Ever smoker, n (%)	71 (48.3%)	14 (41.1%)	57 (50.4%)	0.343
Coronary artery disease, n (%)	11 (7.4%)	4 (11.7%)	7 (6.1%)	0.272
Chronic heart failure, n (%)	6 (4.0%)	3 (8.8%)	3 (2.6%)	0.108
Chronic kidney disease, n (%)	16 (10.8%)	4 (11.76%)	12 (10.5%)	0.838
SpO <sub>2</sub> on room air <92%, n (%)	70 (47.3%)	28 (82.3%)	42 (36.8%)	0
Malignancy, n (%)	28 (18.9%)	6 (17.6%)	22 (19.3%)	0.829
<hr/>				
Laboratory tests				
<hr/>				
Albumin (g/dL)	3.6 (2.5–4.5)	3.4 (1.9–4)	3.7 (2.6–4.5)	0.001
D-bil (mg/dL)	0.2 (0.1–0.64)	0.24 (0.12–0.87)	0.19 (0.1–0.55)	0.029
LDH (U/L)	296 (146–541)	358 (214–591)	264 (143–541)	0
CRP (mg/dL)	3.95 (0.09–20.14)	7.65 (0.76–29.2)	2.94 (0.06–14.2)	0
Lymphocyte(/μL)	804 (294–1938)	516 (172–1286)	891 (392–2172)	0
Ferritin (ng/mL)	359 (60–1486)	467 (139–1769)	310 (51–1486)	0.014
D-dimer (μg/mL)	1.15 (1–4.8)	1.4 (1–5.1)	1.1 (1–4.8)	0.038
IL-6 (pg/mL)	15 (2.2–139)	31.7 (5.6–186)	13.05 (1.3–65.5)	0
<hr/>				
Therapy before-admission				
<hr/>				
Steroids, n (%)	25 (16.8%)	10 (29.41%)	15 (13.16%)	0.026

Remdesivir, n (%)	6 (4.0%)	4 (3.5%)	2 (5.88%)	0.538
Tocilizumab, n (%)	0	0	0	
Baricitinib, n (%)	1 (0.68%)	1 (0.88%)	0 (0.0%)	0.534

Continuous data are shown as medians with interquartile ranges.

The Mann–Whitney and Pearson’s chi-square tests were used.

BMI, body mass index; SpO<sub>2</sub>, oxygen saturation; D-bil, direct bilirubin; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; CRP,

C-reactive protein; IL-6, interleukin-6

130

131 **Selection of predictors**

132 A total of 19 variables that were measured at the time of admission were included in the least  
 133 absolute shrinkage and selection operator regression, which identified SpO<sub>2</sub> and IL-6 as significant  
 134 predictors of critical respiratory illness. In the logistic regression model including these two  
 135 parameters, both an SpO<sub>2</sub> <92% (odds ratio [OR] 7.50, 95% confidence interval [CI] 2.806–20.82; P  
 136 < 0.001) and IL-6 (per 10 pg/ml increase, OR 1.23, 95% CI 1.010–1.038; P < 0.001) were  
 137 independent and significant predictors of critical respiratory illness and were included in the risk  
 138 score (Table 2).

Table 2 Association of SpO<sub>2</sub> <92% and IL-6 with the risk of critical respiratory illness

Crude		Multivariable-adjusted	
OR (95% CI)	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value



SpO <sub>2</sub> <92%	8.00 (3.06–20.9)	<0.001	7.50 (2.80–20.0)	<0.001
IL-6 (per 10 pg/mL increase)	1.19 (1.07–1.32)	0.001	1.23 (1.10–1.38)	<0.001

Logistic regression models were used to estimate odds ratios, 95% confidence intervals, and P values.

The multivariable logistic regression model included two likely confounders: before-admission therapy with steroids and remdesivir.

SpO<sub>2</sub>, oxygen saturation; IL-6, interleukin-6; CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio

139

#### 140 **Construction of the risk score**

141 The cut-off IL-6 value of 19.5 pg/mL exhibited equal sensitivity and specificity with the highest

142 positive predictive value of 63.2 pg/mL; therefore, this value was used to create the IL-6-based

143 COVID-19 severity [IBC-S] score to determine the risk of critical respiratory failure (Table 3). The

144 IBC-S risk score ranged from 0 to 3.

Table 3 IL-6 based COVID-19 severity score to predict the critical respiratory illness

Variable	IBC-S score
SpO <sub>2</sub> on room air (%)	
≥92	0
<92	1
IL-6 (pg/mL)	
<19.5	0

19.5–63.2

1

63.2

2

---

IBC-S, interleukin-6-based COVID-19 severity; SpO<sub>2</sub>, oxygen saturation; IL-6, interleukin-6.

145

146 **Performance of the risk score**

147 The bootstrap analysis for internal validation indicated that the mean area under the receiver  
148 operating characteristic curve based on the cohort data was 0.834 (OR 4.762, 95% CI 2.198–10.31; P  
149 < 0.001). An IBC-S score of <1 had a sensitivity of 93.94% and a negative likelihood ratio of 0.13.  
150 An IBC-S score of >3 had a specificity of 98.15% and a positive likelihood ratio of 19.63 (Table 4).

Table 4 Performance of the IBC-S score

---

Cut-off value	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Positive likelihood ratio	Negative likelihood ratio
≤1	93.9	43.5	1.66	0.13
≥3	36.3	98.1	19.6	0.64

---

151

152 **Discussion**

153 Early identification of patients with COVID-19 at increased risk for HFNC use is beneficial for the  
154 proper use of medical resources. In the present study, we found that the combination of SpO<sub>2</sub> and  
155 IL-6 at admission may predict critical respiratory illness in patients hospitalized with COVID-19.

156 Simple risk scoring strategies are important in primary care settings. The IBC-S score  
157 provides a simple assessment approach based on a small number of predictor variables determined at  
158 the time of admission. The IBC-S score has only two predictor variables; in comparison, the 4C

159 mortality score has eight predictor variables and the COVID-GRAM score has ten predictor  
160 variables [2,11]. Moreover, the IBC-S score requires only physical examination findings and the  
161 measurement of IL-6 and does not require medical history, blood gas tests, or imaging studies. In the  
162 COVID-19 era, simple risk scores are important since imaging studies and more sophisticated tests  
163 may not be available in many situations.

164  $SpO_2$  is one of the two variables of the IBC-S score. The main pathologic feature of  
165 COVID-19 is viral pneumonia with alveolar edema and blockage of small bronchi, leading to the  
166 compromise of pulmonary gas exchange and reduced oxygen saturation, which is a major indicator  
167 of disease severity [12]. Since arterial blood gas analysis is an invasive and complex test,  $SpO_2$   
168 measurement is more frequently used to estimate the arterial oxygen partial pressure in primary care  
169 settings [13]. A study previously reported  $SpO_2$  as one of the predictors of inpatient mortality in  
170 patients with COVID-19 [12].  $SpO_2$  is one of the preeminent predictors of severe COVID-19.

171 High IL-6 levels are a predictor of severe COVID-19. IL-6 is a cytokine in cell signaling  
172 and the regulation of immune cells. IL-6 has a strong proinflammatory effect with multiple biologic  
173 functions and plays an important role in inflammation [14]. In patients with COVID-19 complicated  
174 by acute respiratory distress syndrome, hyperactivation of the immune system with prominent IL-6  
175 response can lead to organ dysfunction [9]. Several systematic reviews and meta-analyses revealed  
176 that IL-6 inhibitors such as tocilizumab were associated with reduced mortality in patients with  
177 COVID-19 [9,15]. In one systematic review and meta-analysis [9,15], IL-6 was one of the predictors  
178 of ventilator management and death [9,15][NO\_PRINTED\_FORM]. In primary care settings, the  
179 evaluation of IL-6 and  $SpO_2$  may aid in identifying patients who should be transported to an  
180 appropriate medical institution or an isolation facility.

181 The present study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the external  
182 validity of the IBC-S score was not tested and future studies using other cohorts are warranted to  
183 confirm its validity. Second, the study population did not include patients infected with the Omicron

184 variants, which have been increasing in prevalence worldwide [16]. Several Omicron subvariants  
185 exhibit replication advantage over prior variants [17] and can evade human immunity to a greater  
186 extent than the prior variants [18]. Additionally, the Omicron subvariants might be associated with  
187 less severe disease than the other variants [19]. Zhang et al. reported that an SpO<sub>2</sub> of <90% was  
188 associated with critical illness in [20] patients infected with the Omicron variant, although the  
189 association of IL-6 with disease severity was not investigated [20]. It is possible that the IBC-S score  
190 might show different results in the evaluation of patients infected with the Omicron variant. Finally,  
191 the current study cohort did not include patients who were vaccinated. Future studies should consider  
192 evaluating the utility of the IBC-S score in other cohorts including those infected with other variants  
193 and those who are vaccinated. .

194

## 195 **Conclusions**

196 The IBC-S score, an easy-to-use risk score based on parameters that can be obtained at the time of  
197 hospital admission, predicted critical respiratory failure. In primary care settings, the evaluation of  
198 IL-6 and SpO<sub>2</sub> might aid in determining patients who should be transported to a tertiary medical  
199 institution or an isolation facility.

200

## 201 **List of abbreviations**

202 COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019

203 HFNC, high-flow nasal cannula

204 SpO<sub>2</sub>, percutaneous oxygen saturation

205

## 206 **Acknowledgments**

207 We would like to thank Drs. Takahiko Fukuchi, Hiroshi Hori, and Hanako Yoshihara for their  
208 medical care of the study participants. We also thank Enago for providing English proofreading  
209 services.

210

## 211 **References**

- 212 1. Barouch DH. Covid-19 vaccines — immunity, variants, boosters. *N Engl J Med*.  
213 2022;387: 1011-1020. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra2206573.
- 214 2. Knight SR, Ho A, Pius R, Buchan I, Carson G, Drake TM, et al. Risk stratification of  
215 patients admitted to hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO clinical  
216 characterisation protocol: Development and validation of the 4C mortality score. *BMJ*.  
217 2020;370: m3339. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m3339.
- 218 3. Frat JP, Thille AW, Mercat A, Girault C, Ragot S, Perbet S, et al. High-flow oxygen  
219 through nasal cannula in acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372:  
220 2185-2196. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1503326.
- 221 4. Ospina-Tascón GA, Calderón-Tapia LE, García AF, Zarama V, Gómez-Álvarez F,  
222 Álvarez-Saa T, et al. Effect of high-flow oxygen therapy vs conventional oxygen  
223 therapy on invasive mechanical ventilation and clinical recovery in patients with severe  
224 COVID-19: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2021;326: 2161-2171. doi:  
225 10.1001/jama.2021.20714.

- 226 5. Feng S, Shen C, Xia N, Song W, Fan M, Cowling BJ. Rational use of face masks in the  
227 COVID-19 pandemic. Vol. 8, In: The lancet respiratory medicine. London: Lancet  
228 Publishing Group; 2020. pp. 434-436. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30134-X.
- 229 6. Terada M, Ohtsu H, Saito S, Hayakawa K, Tsuzuki S, Asai Y, et al. Risk factors for  
230 severity on admission and the disease progression during hospitalisation in a large  
231 cohort of patients with COVID-19 in Japan. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11: e047007. doi:  
232 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047007.
- 233 7. Haimovich AD, Ravindra NG, Stoytchev S, Young HP, Wilson FP, van Dijk D, et al.  
234 Development and validation of the quick COVID-19 severity index: A prognostic tool  
235 for early clinical decompensation. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2020;76: 442-453. doi:  
236 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2020.07.022.
- 237 8. Liang W, Liang H, Ou L, Chen B, Chen A, Li C, et al. Development and validation of a  
238 clinical risk score to predict the occurrence of critical illness in hospitalized patients  
239 with COVID-19. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;180: 1081-1089. doi:  
240 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2033.
- 241 9. Coomes EA, Haghbayan H. Interleukin-6 in Covid-19: A systematic review and  
242 meta-analysis. Vol. 30, In: *Reviews in medical virology*. New York: John Wiley and  
243 Sons Ltd; 2020. pp. 1-9. doi: 10.1002/rmv.2141.

- 244 10. Saito K, Sugawara H, Ichihara K, Watanabe T, Ishii A, Fukuchi T. Prediction of  
245 72-hour mortality in patients with extremely high serum C-reactive protein levels using  
246 a novel weighted average of risk scores. PLoS One. 2021;16: e0246259. doi:  
247 10.1371/journal.pone.0246259.
- 248 11. Liang W, Liang H, Ou L, Chen B, Chen A, Li C, et al. Development and validation of a  
249 clinical risk score to predict the occurrence of critical illness in hospitalized patients  
250 with COVID-19. JAMA Intern Med. 2020;180: 1081-1089. doi:  
251 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2033.
- 252 12. Xie J, Hungerford D, Chen H, Abrams ST, Li S, Wang G, et al. Development and  
253 external validation of a prognostic multivariable model on admission for hospitalized  
254 patients with COVID-19. SSRN J. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3562456.
- 255 13. Seifi S, Khatony A, Moradi G, Abdi A, Najafi F. Accuracy of pulse oximetry in  
256 detection of oxygen saturation in patients admitted to the intensive care unit of heart  
257 surgery: Comparison of finger, toe, forehead and earlobe probes. BMC Nurs. 2018;17:  
258 15. doi: 10.1186/s12912-018-0283-1.
- 259 14. Taniguchi K, Karin M. IL-6 and related cytokines as the critical lynchpins between  
260 inflammation and cancer. Vol. 26, In: Seminars in immunology. USA: Academic Press:  
261 2014. pp. 54-74. doi: 10.1016/j.smim.2014.01.001.

- 262 15. Ghosn L, Chaimani A, Evrenoglou T, Davidson M, Graña C, Schmucker C, et al.  
263 Interleukin-6 blocking agents for treating COVID-19: a living systematic review.  
264 Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2021;3: CD013881.
- 265 16. Tegally H, Moir M, Everatt J, Giovanetti M, Scheepers C, Wilkinson E, et al.  
266 Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron lineages BA.4 and BA.5 in South Africa. Nat  
267 Med. 2022;28: 1785-1790. doi: 10.1038/s41591-022-01911-2.
- 268 17. Baker JM, Nakayama JY, O'hegarty M, McGowan A, Teran RA, Bart SM, et al.  
269 Morbidity and mortality weekly report SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) variant  
270 transmission within households-four U.S. Jurisdictions, 2022 [cited 2021 Nov].  
271 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr>
- 272 18. Pulliam JRC, van Schalkwyk C, Govender N, von Gottberg A, Cohen C, Groome MJ,  
273 et al. Increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection associated with emergence of omicron  
274 in South Africa. Science. 2022;376: eabn4947. doi: 10.1126/science.abn4947.
- 275 19. Nyberg T, Ferguson NM, Nash SG, Webster HH, Flaxman S, Andrews N, et al.  
276 Comparative analysis of the risks of hospitalisation and death associated with  
277 SARS-CoV-2 omicron (B.1.1.529) and delta (B.1.617.2) variants in England: A cohort  
278 study. Lancet. 2022;399: 1303-1312. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00462-7.



- 279           20.   Ebell MH, Hamadani R, Kieber-Emmons A. Development and validation of simple risk  
280                    scores to predict hospitalization in outpatients with COVID-19 including the omicron  
281                    variant. J Am Board Fam Med. 2022;35: 1058-1064. doi:  
282                    10.3122/jabfm.2022.220056R1.  
283

**Patients with mild/moderate COVID-19  
(n = 152)**

**Patients meeting critical  
respiratory illness on  
admission day (n = 4)  
were excluded**

**Study cohort  
(n = 148)**

**PCO  
(n = 34)**

**Non-PCO  
(n = 114)**

Figure