medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on rates of congenital heart disease procedures among children: Prospective cohort analyses of 26,270 procedures in 17,860 children using CVD-COVID-UK consortium record linkage data.

Arun Karthikeyan Suseeladevi,[1,2,3] Rachel Denholm,[1,2,4] Sonya Babu-Narayan,[5] Shubhra Sinha[6], Serban Stoica[6], Tim Dong[6], Gianni Angelini[6], Cathie Sudlow[7], Venexia Walker[2,3,8], Katherine Brown[9], Massimo Caputo[6], and Deborah A Lawlor,[1,2,3] on behalf of the CVD-COVID-UK/COVID-IMPACT Consortium

1. NIHR University of Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, Bristol, UK
2. Population Health Science, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK
3. Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, UK
4. Health Data Research UK South-West, Bristol, UK
5. National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, UK
6. Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK
7. British Heart Foundation Data Science Centre, Health Data Research UK, London, UK
8. Department of Surgery, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA
9. Institute of Cardiovascular Science University College London

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Background

The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated major re-allocation of health care services. Our aim was to assess the impact on pediatric procedures for congenital heart disease during different periods of the COVID-19 pandemic compared to the pre-pandemic period to inform appropriate responses to future major disruptions of health services.

Methods and Results

We used data on 26,270 procedures from 17,860 children between 01st January 2018 and 31st March 2022 in England and linked them to the primary/secondary care data to obtain the basic demographic information. We compared characteristics of procedures and outcomes between different periods of population restrictions, and relaxation of those, with the pre-pandemic period. There was a reduction in all procedures across all pandemic periods. These varied in magnitude with the largest magnitudes seen in the first, and most severe period of restrictions, and the period of relaxation following the second restrictions, which coincided with winter pressures. For example, there was a reduction of 51 median procedures per week, during the first period of restrictions (3rd March 2020 to 23rd June 2020) compared with the pre-pandemic period (1st January 2018 to 22nd March 2020): 80/week vs 131/week, $p = 4.98 \times 10^{-08}$). The reductions in procedures were driven by reductions in elective procedures. In the first period of restrictions these fell from median 96/week to 44/week, ($p = 1.89 \times 10^{-06}$), with urgent (28/week vs 27/week, p = 0.649) and life-saving / emergency procedures (7/week vs 6/week, p = 0.198) not changing. Cardiac surgery rates increased, and catheter-based procedure rates decreased during pandemic periods compared to the pre-pandemic period and there was evidence that procedures in those younger than 1-year were prioritized, particularly during the first four pandemic periods. We did not find evidence of differences in post procedure complications (age adjusted odds ratio 1.1 (95%CI: 0.9, 1.4) or post procedure mortality (age and case mix adjusted odds ratio 0.9 (0.6, 1.3)).

Conclusions

Reductions in elective procedures and prioritization of urgent, emergency and life-saving procedures during the pandemic did not impact pediatric CHD post procedure complications or mortality. This is informative for future major disruptions of health services, though longer-term follow-up of the effects of delaying elective surgery is needed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

The pandemic caused by the novel coronavirus, severe acute respiratory coronavirus type 2 (SARS-CoV-2), necessitated major re-allocation of health care service resources globally to respond to the urgent need for hospitalization of patients with severe COVID-19.[1,2] This included the active cancellation of elective surgery across different countries, particularly at the start of the pandemic.[3] Children born with congenital heart diseases (CHD) commonly require repeat cardiac catheterization and surgical procedures (hereafter collectively referred to as procedures) across childhood to ensure they maintain healthy cardiac structure and function as they grow.[4-6] Several studies from different countries including China,[7] India,[8] Mexico,[9] Turkey,[10] Italy,[11] and the UK,[12] have explored the impact of the pandemic on procedures for children with CHD. These have compared the initial period, commonly the first 4 to 6 months, of the pandemic, with an equivalent pre-pandemic period, and report marked reductions in the rate of procedures during the early phase of the pandemic that were driven by a reduction in elective procedures. These have all been from selected regions or cities in each country, with number of procedures ranging from 29 to ~8000.[8,10] None of the studies explored effects over the period of continued different levels of population restrictions followed by relaxations of those restrictions, and few explored post procedure complications and mortality. An international survey using an online questionnaire targeting practitioners in pediatric cardiac surgery units, found that the majority (88%, n=152 centers) who responded reported an active cessation of elective procedures in the initial months of the pandemic but this clinician survey did not quantify differences.[13]

Learning from the COVID pandemic experiences is crucial for preparing for future disruptions to healthcare services, including those resulting from other pandemics or epidemics, as well as those from other sources, such as seasonal (e.g. winter) pressures, increasing extremes of the weather, wars, and social disruptions, such as industrial action by health care providers. Prioritizing services for vulnerable populations during such disruptions is important. At the same time understanding the consequences of these actions, particularly over a prolonged period is necessary. Large scale population data covering different periods of the COVID-19 pandemic and its management provide a unique opportunity to inform responses to future major threats to health service provision.

The aim of this study was to assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on pediatric procedures for CHD in England. Specifically, we aimed to describe differences in total, elective, urgent, emergency and life-saving procedures, and in post procedure complications and post procedure mortality during different periods of pandemic restrictions and relaxations of these compared to the pre-pandemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

period. We also explored whether the results differed by the child's age, residential area deprivation (measured at the neighborhood level) and ethnicity. **Table 1** shows the different phases of the pandemic population restrictions and relaxations in England. The restrictions were at a population level and varied across different periods.

Methods

We have followed the Reporting of studies conducted using observational routinely collected health data (RECORD) recommendations in this paper.[14]

Study design and data sources

We used the National Congenital Heart Disease Audit database (NCHDA) as the central dataset to which other datasets were linked in order to create the cohort used in this study. Established in 2000 as the Central Cardiac Audit Database (congenital), the NCHDA evaluates outcomes of pediatric and congenital cardiovascular procedures, including surgery, transcatheter and electrophysiological interventions, in the UK. Data submission is mandatory for all centers performing such procedures. The dataset contains information on the diagnoses, procedure, procedure urgency, discharge status, and outcomes (complications and mortality) up to 30-days after the procedure.[15] The NCHDA data undergoes a series of validation tests, including annual site visits by an independent clinical data auditor and volunteer clinician to ensure full case ascertainment and to validate the accuracy of the data submitted.[16-18] In addition, a random selection of patients records at each site undergo detailed analysis of all submitted data fields, comparing the dataset and the hospital records, for missing or incorrect data.

We linked the patients in the NCHDA dataset to their routine electronic health records available in General Practice Extraction Service (GPES) Data for Pandemic Planning and research (GDPPR), Hospital Episode Statistics (HES), or Office of National Statistics (ONS) death registry. These datasets provided information on date of birth, date of death, and socio-demographic data, such as neighborhood deprivation and ethnicity. We limited our analysis to procedures performed between 01st January 2018 to 31st March 2022 among children below 16 years of age residing in England. **Figure 1** summarizes the linkage and numbers of children/procedures included in this study.

The de-identified data were accessed within National Health Service (NHS) England's privacy-protecting Secure Data Environment service for England[19], made available via the British Heart Foundation (BHF) Data Science Centre's CVD-COVID-UK/COVID-IMPACT Consortium. The CVD-COVID-UK/COVID-IMPACT Approvals and Oversight Board provided ethical approval and oversight of ethics

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and governance for all analyses in the consortia. NHS England's disclosure control rules were in place to prevent disclosure of personal, sensitive, and confidential data. This includes suppressing counts based on fewer than 10 participants and rounding counts to the nearest multiple of five where there are more than 10 participants.[20]

Exposure

Our exposure was defined using seven time periods between 1st January 2018 and 31st March 2022 that were chosen based on the varying COVID-19 guidance and legal restrictions of the UK Government (**Table 1**).[21] The seven periods of exposure in our study were:

- Pre-pandemic period (01st January 2018 to 22nd March 2020); reference period to which all other periods are compared.
- First restriction period (23rd March 2020 to 23rd June 2020)
- First relaxation period (24th June 2020 to 04th November 2020)
- Second restriction period (05th November 2020 to 02nd December 2020)
- Second relaxation period (03rd December 2020 to 05th January 2021)
- Third restriction period (06th January 2021 to 21st June 2021)
- Third relaxation period marking the end of the pandemic (22nd June 2021 to 31st March 2022).

Outcomes

The three key outcomes of the study - the procedure urgency status, post procedure complications, and post procedure mortality, were derived from the NCHDA audit dataset. The procedure urgency status variable identifies patients at high risk whose condition cannot be optimized before the procedure. It classifies them into elective, urgent, emergency and life-saving procedures. Elective patients are those who are admitted based on a waiting list. Urgent patients are those who require intervention or surgery but are not scheduled for routine admission. They cannot be discharged without undergoing the procedure. Emergency patients require intervention within 24 hours. Life-saving procedures are those performed on patients who are at imminent risk of death.

Post procedure complications were defined according to international practice, as any operative or procedure complication, regardless of cause, occurring within 30 days after surgery or intervention in or outside of the hospital, or after 30 days during the same hospitalization after the operation or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

intervention.[15,16] This include extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), unplanned reoperation, necrotizing enterocolitis, surgical site infection and pleural effusion (full list **Supplementary Table S1)**. Procedure related mortality was similarly defined as all deaths occurring within 30-days of the procedure. Date of death was obtained from the ONS death registry.[15,16]

Covariates:

We calculated the age of the child on the procedure date and categorized them into four age categories: <1 year, 1 to < 5 years, 5 to < 10 years, and 10 to 16 years for adjustment and exploratory subgroup analyses. These groups reflect clinical practice. For instance, most children with CHD diagnosed early in life need at least one procedure before 1-year, and numbers of procedures differ by age.

CHD case mix

Each record in the NCHDA dataset corresponds to a unique procedure (i.e., there will be multiple records for anyone who has had more than one procedure). The NCHDA database uses the Association for European Pediatric and Congenital Cardiology (EPCC) derived version of the International Pediatric and Congenital Cardiac Code (IPCCC).[22] A combination of up to eight individual procedure codes describe each operation.[22,23] We used the activity analysis algorithm (version 6.14), which employs a hierarchical method to aggregate individual EPCC codes from patient procedure records into distinct activity groups: cardiac surgery, interventional catheter, diagnostic catheter, electrophysiological, mechanical support, and chest closure and exploration. [16] Procedures belonging to the chest closure and exploration group were excluded from this analysis as these were deemed as part of the main operation. (**Figure 1**)

We used the specific procedure algorithm, developed by NCHDA steering committee, to consolidate individual EPCC codes from patient procedure records and to establish standardized procedure categories ('specific procedures'). It also incorporates a hierarchical structure that prioritizes recognizable procedures, with the most complex procedures at the top and the least complex at the bottom. For our analysis, we employed specific procedure algorithm version 6.05, which defines 86 specific procedure categories.[22-24] Similarly, an existing hierarchical scheme was used to assign a primary diagnosis for each record based on the first six (NCHDA approved) diagnostic codes submitted. If the diagnosis or procedure code suggested single-ventricle physiology, the record was coded as a functionally univentricular heart.[16,24,25] **Supplementary Tables S2 and S3** provide the full list of diagnoses and specific procedures that could be allocated.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Among cardiac surgical procedures, the variables like specific procedure group, diagnosis group, activity type of procedure, functionally univentricular heart, indicators of acquired comorbidities, additional cardiac risk factor, congenital comorbidity, indicator of severity of illness, along with age and weight of the child at the time of the procedures were used to calculate Partial Risk Adjustment in Surgery 2 (PRAIS2) score. [26] (refer to **Supplementary material section 1** for details) PRAIS2 is used in England to account for case mix when mortality following pediatric 'cardiac surgery' is being compared between hospitals.[26]

The mortality models were adjusted for case mix (see *statistical methods section* below). For this, we used the individual risk factors for mortality that contribute to the PRAIS2 score - indicators of acquired comorbidity, additional cardiac risk factor, congenital comorbidity, and severity of illness. We used the individual risk factors, rather than the derived score, as PRAIS2 has been developed to assess case mix for 'cardiac surgery' alone, and our main analyses included all procedures (not solely surgery). **Supplementary Table S4** lists all the risk factors from PRAIS2 that we adjusted for.

Subgroup variables

We hypothesized that associations between the different pandemic management periods and outcomes might vary by child age, ethnicity, and family socioeconomic position, and explore this in subgroup analyses (see *statistical methods section* below).

Information about ethnicity was obtained primarily from NCHDA, with the latest documented ethnicity in primary care data used if there was no entry or 'unknown ethnicity' documented in the former source. We generated four ethnicity groups for the exploratory subgroup analyses: White European, South Asian, African/Caribbean, and other ethnicities, with the latter including mixed White and Black Caribbean, mixed White and Black African, mixed White and Asian, any other mixed background, Chinese and any other ethnic groups, each of which had too few participants for robust analyses. As an indicator of family socioeconomic position, we used a small area-level measure of deprivation, the 2011 English Index of multiple deprivation (IMD) score. IMD is derived by the English government to assess relative deprivation across low-level geographical areas of an average of 1700 people. Each area is assessed across seven domains (income, employment, health deprivation and disability, education skills and training, and living environment) using information on 39 variables. [27] We undertook subgroup analyses within quintiles of the IMD score, with the lowest quintile reflecting those from the most deprived residential areas.

Statistical methods

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Our unit of analysis was each unique procedure, with children who received more than one procedure contributing multiple times. This was accounted for in our analysis by using robust standard errors. We described the distribution of the procedures and the sociodemographic characteristics of the children who contributed to the data, using counts (%), median (interquartile range (IQR)), and mean (standard deviation (SD)), as appropriate.

Differences in all procedures, urgency status of procedures and types of procedures, post procedure complications and post procedure mortality during pandemic periods compared with pre-pandemic period

As each of the seven exposure time periods are a different length of time, we present results (e.g. median number) per week. We dealt with weeks that crossed a period by multiplying them with the ratio of days in a full week to the actual number of days in the week (e.g., the number of procedures in a week with just two days corrected by a factor of 7/2). We present the median (IQR) number per week of overall, elective, urgent, and emergency/life-saving procedures for the pre-pandemic and all pandemic periods and used the Wilcoxon rank sum test to determine statistical evidence for a difference between each pandemic period compared to the pre-pandemic period. We combined emergency and life-saving procedure in this analysis due to low numbers.

We estimated the difference in mean percentage (95% confidence interval (95% CI)) of procedures that were elective, urgent, or emergency/life-saving and in the type of procedure between each pandemic period compared with the pre-pandemic period. For the type of procedure, we used three categories – cardiac surgery, intervention catheter, and other procedure. The latter category combined diagnostic catheter, electrophysiological, and mechanical support procedures as the numbers were too few for robust analysis. We used the Z test to estimate 95% CI for these mean differences in percentage.

To explore whether younger children were prioritized for procedures, we estimated the difference in mean percentage (95%CI) of procedure among children in each age group (<1 year, 1 to < 5 years, 5 to < 10 years, and 10 to 16 years) during each pandemic period compared to the pre-pandemic period, using the same approach as above.

We used age-adjusted logistic regression to estimate the odds ratios of (1) having an urgent, emergency, or life-saving procedure vs elective procedure, (2) post procedure complications (yes vs no), and (3) post procedure mortality within 30-days of the procedure (yes vs no) comparing each pandemic period to the pre-pandemic period. We additionally adjusted for case mix in the analyses of mortality within 30-days using the PRAIS2 risk factors (ref **Supplementary Table S4**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Sensitivity analyses

We explored whether using individual PRAIS2 case mix risk factors, rather than the weighted score, was likely to have influenced our main analysis results by comparing the logistic regression results for mortality with age only adjustment, age plus individual risk factors and age plus PRAIS2 derived score, specifically among the cardiac surgeries.

Exploratory subgroup analyses

We repeated the logistic regression analyses in subgroups of age groups, ethnicity, and deprivation quintiles and tested for statistical difference by including an interaction term between each of age group, ethnicity, and deprivation quintiles, and the pandemic periods, using indicator variables for both the potential modifying variable categories and pandemic period categories. We considered these exploratory analyses, recognizing that power would be limited, particularly for rare outcomes such as mortality, despite having a large sample size.

Dealing with missing data

For the main analyses, there was no missing data on the variables included in the model by design. For the exploratory subgroup analyses data on ethnicity was missing for 1,385 procedures (5.3%) and for area deprivation was missing for 1,405 procedures (5.3%). We only included those with complete data in the subgroup analyses.

This analysis was performed according to a pre-specified analysis plan published on GitHub, along with the phenotyping and analysis code (https://github.com/BHFDSC/CCU007_01).

Results

The NCHDA dataset used for linkage consisted of around 44,540 records of CHD procedures, of which we were able to successfully link 43,495 (98%) records with the routine health care data from primary care, secondary care, or ONS death registry data (91 % linked to primary care, 99% to secondary care, and 90% linked to both sources). After excluding the last three months of the data, due to low reporting (95 records from April to June 2022), and the chest closure and exploration procedures (1370 records), the final analysis included 26,270 procedures performed on 17,860 children below 16 years of age, between 01st January 2018 to 31st March 2022 **(Figure 1** & **Table 2).** The distributions of the sociodemographic and clinical characteristics for all procedures across the whole analysis period (i.e., from pre-pandemic to the last pandemic period analyzed) are presented in **Table 2**. Male children represented around 53% (n=9475) of the participants, White European was the predominant ethnic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

group (n=12,370, 70%), and the London region contributed the highest proportion of cases (n=2470, 14%). Across the whole study period, including the pre-pandemic years, pulmonary atresia and stenosis (n= 2715, 10%), left ventricular outflow obstruction (n=2625, 10%), and patent ductus arteriosus (PDA, n=2255, 9%) were the most common specific primary diagnosis, while total anomalous pulmonary venous connection (TAPVC, n=235; 1%) was the least common. Of all the procedures, 72% (n=18,920) were elective, and most were cardiac surgery (n=12,955, 49%) or intervention catheters (n=7250, 28%). Fewer than 10% had complications after the procedure. During the 5-year period, 385 (2.1%) children died within 30 days of an initial procedure. CHD was the underlying cause of death for 45%, with circulatory diseases and perinatal causes responsible for 12% of them.

Figure 2 shows the median (IQR) number of procedures per week for overall procedures and separately by elective, urgent, and emergency or life-saving procedures during the pre-pandemic and all six restriction/relaxation periods. There was a reduction in number of procedures per week across all pandemic periods in comparison to the pre-pandemic period. These varied in magnitude with the largest magnitudes seen in the first, and most severe period of pandemic restrictions, and the period of relaxation following the second restriction, which coincided with winter pressures. There was a reduction of 51 procedures per week, during the first restriction period compared with the pre-pandemic period ([01st January 2018 to 22nd March 2020] median 80/week vs 131/week $p = 4.98 \times 10^{-08}$), and of 47 (median 84/week vs 131/week p =0.0002) during the relaxation following the second restriction period. The smallest differences were seen during the relaxation following the first restriction (-9/week) and the second restriction period (-7/week). The reductions in procedures were driven by reductions in elective procedures. For example, in the first restriction period these declined to a median of 44/week compared to the 96/week during the per-pandemic period ($p = 1.89 \times 10^{-06}$), with no change in urgent (27/week vs 28/week, p = 0.649) or life-saving/emergency procedures (6/week vs 7/week, p = 0.198). Differences in the mean percentage of urgent and emergency/life-saving procedures between each pandemic period and the pre-pandemic period showed the same patterns **(Supplementary Figure S1).**

Figure 3 shows the difference in mean percentage of different types of procedures performed during pandemic periods compared to the pre-pandemic period. There was a 6.1% [95%CI: 3.1, 9.1] increase in cardiac surgery, mirrored by decreases in catheter (-2.8 % [-5.4, -0.2]) and other (-3.3% [-5.7, 0.9]) procedures during the first restriction period compared to pre-pandemic period. This was followed by an attenuation in all three towards pre-pandemic levels until the final pandemic periods (i.e., the period of relaxation of all restrictions) during which cardiac surgical procedures were lower (-4.1 [-5.8, -2.4]) and catheter (2.3 [0.7, 3.8]) and other procedures (1.8 [0.4, 3.3]) higher than the pre-pandemic

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

period. **Supplementary table S7** shows differences in mean percentages for each specific procedure. Among the 86 specific procedures, 36 were less likely, 46 were more likely and 6 did not differ between the first period of restrictions and the pre-pandemic periods. Among those that were less likely, the difference in mean percentage ranged from -0.1% to -3%. These included lower proportions of electrophysiological ablation (-3.0% [-2.05, -3.96]), atrial septal defect (-1.76% [-1.34, -2.18]), atrial septal defect transluminal (-1.60% [-0.94, -2.26]), total cavo-pulmonary connection (known as Fontan's procedure) (-1.54% [-1.17, -1.92]), and patent ductus arteriosus transluminal (-1.37% [-0.02, -2.72]). Among those that were more likely during the first restriction period, the difference in mean percentage ranged from 0.01% to 2.48%. These included Fallot's (2.48% [1.13, 3.84]), balloon atrial septostomy (1.31% [0.31, 2.31]), coarctation hypoplasia (1.2% [0.02, 2.38]), superior vena cava to pulmonary artery anastomosis (known as Glenn's anastomosis) (1.12% [0.09, 2.15]), and endocardial pacemaker (0.8% [-0.03, 1.64]). There was no strong evidence of differences in specific procedures during other pandemic periods, though we had limited power at this granular level.

Figure 4 shows the difference in mean percentage of procedure age groups across each pandemic period compared to the pre-pandemic period. Across all pandemic periods, except the third restriction and post-pandemic period, procedures in children younger than 1 year were higher than during the pre-pandemic. During the third period of restrictions procedures in those younger than 1 year were lower than during the pre-pandemic period. For other age groups patterns differed across the pandemic periods. By the post-pandemic period procedures in those aged 1 to younger than 5 were lower than in the pre-pandemic period, with the other three age groups being the same as the pre-pandemic period.

Figure 5 shows the: (1) age adjusted odds ratio of having an urgent, emergency, or life-saving procedure (vs elective) procedure (2) age adjusted odds ratio of having a post procedure complication (yes vs no), and (3) age, and age plus case mix, adjusted odds ratios of post procedure mortality (yes vs no), comparing each pandemic period to the pre-pandemic period. There was a marked increase in odds of urgent, emergency, or life-saving procedures in the first period of restrictions (age adjusted odds ratio 1.6 [95%CI: 1.4, 1.8]), followed by a decrease in the subsequent relaxation period (age adjusted odds ratio 0.8 [95%CI: 0.7, 1.9]). We did not find evidence of differences in post procedure complications or post procedure mortality within 30-days during any pandemic period, compared with pre-pandemic.

In sensitivity analysis, we found no difference in the odds of mortality within 30 days following cardiac surgery in the pandemic periods, compared to pre-pandemic, in age adjusted, age plus individual case mix risk factor adjusted, and age plus PRAIS2 risk score adjusted models (**Supplementary Figure S2)**.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In exploratory subgroup analyses, there was statistical evidence of differences in the association of each pandemic period with the urgency of the procedure, compared with the pre-pandemic period, across the four age groups (interaction p-value = 2.96 x10^{-09}; **Supplementary Figure S3**). During the first period of restriction, compared with the pre-pandemic period there was increased odds in all four age groups of the procedure being urgent, emergency, or life-saving, with the associations being stronger in the two older age groups, covering those aged 5 to <16 years. These associations attenuated in the following relaxation, such that odds were reduced in the two younger age groups and null in the two older groups. Over the other pandemic periods, patterns continued to suggest some difference between the two older age groups (mostly having null or increased odds) and the two younger age groups (mostly null or reduced odds), though most estimates were imprecise with wide confidence intervals.

There was no strong statistical evidence of differences by age group for the odds of post procedure complications during each pandemic period (interaction p-value 0.09; **Supplementary Figure S4**). While there was some evidence of differences in the odds of post procedure mortality across age groups (interaction p-value 0.007; **Supplementary Figure S5**), imprecise estimates with wide confidence intervals made it difficult to draw conclusions for both complications and mortality.

There was statistical evidence of differences in the associations of each pandemic period with whether the procedure was urgent, emergency, or life-saving between distinct ethnic groups (interaction p-value 0.003, **Supplementary Figure S6**). In the first period of restrictions there was increased odds of an urgent emergency or life-saving procedure in all groups except South Asian children, in whom there was no association. These attenuated so that during the second period of restriction and the relaxation after the third restriction period there were reduced odds in all ethnic groups, though several estimates had wide confidence intervals including the null. By the post-pandemic (final removal of all restrictions) period odds of an urgent, emergency or life-saving procedure were consistent with the pre-pandemic period for Afro-Caribbean and South Asian and 'other' ethnicity group, with increased odds among White European children. There was no strong statistical evidence that the association of pandemic periods with post procedure complications differed by ethnicity (interaction p-value 0.580; **Supplementary Figure S7**) and whilst there was statistical evidence of differences in post-procedure mortality between ethnic groups (interaction p-value = 4.7 x 10^{-05}, **Supplementary Figure S8**), estimates for both post procedure complications and post procedure mortality were too imprecise for meaningful conclusions.

We did not find robust statistical evidence that associations of pandemic periods (compared to pre-pandemic) with urgent, emergency, or life-saving procedures (interaction p-value 0.744;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Figure S9) or post procedure complications (interaction p-value 0.6367; **Supplementary Figure S10**) differed by residential area deprivation. Although there was some evidence of differences in odds of post procedure mortality between area deprivation groups (interaction p-value = 1.03×10^{-05}; **Supplementary Figure S11**), the estimates were too imprecise for robust conclusions.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the largest study, using whole population data to explore the impact of the response to the COVID-19 pandemic on CHD procedures in children. We found that the median number of CHD procedures per week was lower during all pandemic periods compared with the pre-pandemic period. The reduction in procedures was most notable in the first, and most severe period of pandemic restrictions, and the period of relaxation following the second restrictions, which coincided with winter pressures. The periods of reduced rates of procedures were driven by marked reductions in rates of elective procedures and with urgent and emergency and life-saving procedures remaining similar to those pre-pandemic. There was also evidence of cardiac surgery being prioritized over catheterization or other procedures during periods with reductions in overall procedures, and prioritization of procedures in infants across the first four pandemic periods. Reassuringly, there was limited evidence for an increased risk of post procedure complications or post procedure mortality during the different pandemic periods compared to the pre-pandemic period.

Children with the most complex CHD such as truncus arteriosus, isolated coarctation, etc., the initial operative management is palliative rather than reparative. For such patients, it is likely that they will require operations or percutaneous/hybrid interventions throughout their lifetimes.[5,6] On the other hand, certain types of heart condition, such as transposition of the great arteries , hypoplastic left heart syndrome or obstructed total anomalous pulmonary venous drainage, etc., are time sensitive and require immediate perinatal attention, while some conditions may remain stable despite longer delays. The prioritization of urgent, emergency and life-saving CHD procedures over elective procedures, as observed in our and other studies.[2,3,13], may explain why we did not see differences in post procedure complications or post procedure mortality within 30-days. However, the impact of delays in elective surgery and the wider impact of major disruptions to specialized surgery care in response to the pandemic, such as reallocation of resources, staff fatigue and illness and family anxiety is currently unknown. The ability we have to continue to update information from primary and secondary care on the children included in this study using the same linked data but over a longer time period, will enable us to explore the impact of the pandemic and its management on children's cardiovascular and other health. New linkages, including to educational administrative data sets and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

family members health care records would enable exploration of the effects on the children's educational outcomes and the mental health of the children, parents and other family members .

We explored whether any of the associations we observed differed by the child's age, ethnicity and residential area deprivation and found statistical evidence for some of these. The increased odds of urgent, emergency, or life-saving procedures in older children, during the first restriction period and some other pandemic periods likely reflects the prioritization of procedures in younger children (meaning that those younger than one were more likely to have elective procedures, as well as, urgent, emergency or life-saving procedures, compared with older ages). However, we acknowledge that our subgroup analyses were under-powered and like all subgroup analyses need replication.

Strengths and limitations

A key strength of this study is the use of country-wide data for all the CHD procedures performed in all the centers in England. This is enabled by the compulsory requirement of all institutions undertaken pediatric cardiac procedures to provide complete data to NCHDA and our ability to link these data to primary and secondary care data to complete the analyses presented in this study. The NCHDA ensures highly accurate data through rigorous validation, including complication and mortality verification. A DQI score >90% is considered good, with all pediatric centers meeting this standard in the recent audit report.[18,28] Furthermore, for our main analyses, there were no missing data. To our knowledge, this is the largest study to-date and enables us to explore how health care provision for pediatric CHD procedures changed over a prolonged period of varying levels of restrictions and relaxation of those restrictions. These large numbers also allowed us to undertake some exploratory subgroup analyses, though we acknowledge that even with the large numbers included here, estimates are imprecise and larger studies would be required to explore these robustly. There were small amounts of missing data for two of the variables used in these exploratory subgroup analyses (5.3% were missing for each of ethnicity and residential area deprivation). We acknowledge that this might have biased results if most or all of these missing data were in one of the subgroups. For example, if most missing data on ethnicity were in just one or two of the subgroups. This is not something that we can explore. However, given data on both are obtained from electronic health records (rather than self-report for this study) and the proportion with missing data is small, we suspect any bias would be small.

The between-hospital variation in timing of uploading the compulsory data can result in incomplete data or artificial trends towards the most recent months of analyses. We minimized this by initially extracting data up to the end of June 2022 and then removing the data from final three months and only including data up to 31st March 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Our analysis is at a population level and as yet we are not able to map individual patient experiences and follow them to quantify differences between children in the length of their delay or determine the impact of delays in elective surgery on individual children. We *a priori* classified the pandemic months into six periods of restrictions and relaxation. However, the same restrictions did not apply in all of the restriction periods (**Table 1**). For example, the first period of restrictions was the most stringent and identical across the whole country, during the second restriction period there were some regional differences in legal restrictions and across the period of the third restrictions there were six steps of reducing restrictions, until the time that the pandemic was declared over. We *a priori* decided to analyze each period of any legal restrictions in the same way to increase sufficient power to detect differences, including for the rarer outcomes of post procedure complications and post procedure mortality. Thus, our results cannot be interpreted as potential effects of specific restrictions, rather they demonstrate the population impact of pressures on health services that necessitate delaying elective procedures and prioritizing those that are more urgent.

Implications and conclusions

Our results suggest that when pressures on health services result in prioritization of urgent, emergency and life-saving procedures in children with CHD and delaying elective procedures, this does not result in increased post procedure complications or post procedure mortality, at least over a period of two years (March 2020 to March 2022). These findings have implications for other factors that impact health service provision, including future infectious disease epidemics or global pandemics and pressures due to weather and climate extremes, which are common across Europe.[29-31] It is notable that during the period of relaxation after the second restriction the median rate of overall and elective procedures was reduced to a similar extent as that seen in the first restriction period and to a greater extent than the second restriction that preceded this relaxation. This second relaxation occurred during the winter (3rd December 2020 to 5th January 2021) and may have reflected winter pressures. As climate change increases the occurrence of weather extremes globally, particularly heat waves, such pressures are likely to increase. Methods to mitigate climate change and the development of plans to manage pressures on health services from any source are essential.

In conclusion, our results suggest that in situations where there are pressures on health service provision, delaying elective procedures in children with CHD in order to prioritize urgent, emergency and life-saving procedures does not lead to an increase in procedure-related complications or mortality within 30-days, and may therefore be an appropriate response when needed. However, further research is important to determine the effects of such delays on cardiovascular health among

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

children whose procedure is delayed, as well as the impact on theirs, and their parents and other family members, mental health, and wellbeing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science*. Jun 26 2020;368(6498):1481-1486. doi:10.1126/science.abb8001
2. Stephens EH, Dearani JA, Guleserian KJ, et al. COVID-19: Crisis management in congenital heart surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. Aug 2020;160(2):522-528. doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.04.006
3. Collaborative CO. Elective surgery cancellations due to the COVID-19 pandemic: global predictive modelling to inform surgical recovery plans. *Br J Surg*. Oct 2020;107(11):1440-1449. doi:10.1002/bjs.11746
4. Checchia PA, Brown KL, Wernovsky G, Penny DJ, Bronicki RA. The Evolution of Pediatric Cardiac Critical Care. *Crit Care Med*. Apr 1 2021;49(4):545-557. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000004832
5. Garne E, Loane M, Tan J, et al. European study showed that children with congenital anomalies often underwent multiple surgical procedures at different ages across Europe. *Acta Paediatrica*. 2023;
6. Holst KA, Said SM, Nelson TJ, Cannon BC, Dearani JA. Current Interventional and Surgical Management of Congenital Heart Disease: Specific Focus on Valvular Disease and Cardiac Arrhythmias. *Circ Res*. Mar 17 2017;120(6):1027-1044. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.309186
7. Shi G, Huang J, Pi M, et al. Impact of early Coronavirus Disease 2019 pandemic on pediatric cardiac surgery in China. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. May 2021;161(5):1605-1614 e4. doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.11.074
8. Choubey M, Ramakrishnan S, Sachdeva S, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on pediatric cardiac services in India. *Ann Pediatr Cardiol*. Jul-Sep 2021;14(3):260-268. doi:10.4103/apc.apc_133_21
9. Ortega-Zhindon DB, Calderon-Colmenero J, Garcia-Montes JA, Rivera-Buendia F, Cervantes-Salazar JL. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Congenital Cardiac Surgeries at a National Referral Center in Mexico. *World J Pediatr Congenit Heart Surg*. Nov 2021;12(6):799-801. doi:10.1177/21501351211040739
10. Atalay A, Soran Turkcan B, Tasoglu II, et al. Management of congenital cardiac surgery during COVID-19 pandemic. *Cardiol Young*. Dec 2020;30(12):1797-1805. doi:10.1017/S1047951120002760
11. Giamberti A, Varrica A, Agati S, et al. Impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic on the Italian congenital cardiac surgery system: a national survey. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. Dec 1 2020;58(6):1254-1260. doi:10.1093/ejcts/ezaa352
12. Mohamed MO, Banerjee A, Clarke S, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on cardiac procedure activity in England and associated 30-day mortality. *Eur Heart J Qual Care Clin Outcomes*. May 3 2021;7(3):247-256. doi:10.1093/ehjqcco/qcaa079
13. Protopapas EM, Rito ML, Vida VL, et al. Early Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Congenital Heart Surgery Programs Across the World: Assessment by a Global Multi-Societal Consortium. *World J Pediatr Congenit Heart Surg*. Nov 2020;11(6):689-696. doi:10.1177/2150135120949462
14. Nicholls SG, Quach P, von Elm E, et al. The REporting of Studies Conducted Using Observational Routinely-Collected Health Data (RECORD) Statement: Methods for Arriving at Consensus and Developing Reporting Guidelines. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(5):e0125620. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0125620
15. Research NIfCO. Congenital Heart Disease in Children and Adults (Congenital audit). NICOR. https://www.nicor.org.uk/congenital-heart-disease-in-children-and-adults-congenital-audit/
16. Research NIfCO. CCAD. Congenital Analysis - Technical Information. NICOR. Accessed 15 August 2022, https://nicor4.nicor.org.uk/CHD/an_paeds.nsf/vwContent/Technical%20Information?Opendocument

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

17. Espuny Pujol F, Pagel C, Brown KL, et al. Linkage of National Congenital Heart Disease Audit data to hospital, critical care and mortality national data sets to enable research focused on quality improvement. *BMJ Open*. May 19 2022;12(5):e057343. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-057343
18. Franklin R. National Congential Heart Disease Audit (NCHDA). Bristish Congential Cardiac Association. Updated 21 Nov 2016. Accessed 31 Mar 2024, 2024. https://www.bcca-uk.org/pages/page_box_contents.asp?pageid=932&navcatid=244
19. Digital N. Trusted Research Environment service for England. NHS Digital. Accessed 15 August 2022, https://digital.nhs.uk/coronavirus/coronavirus-data-services-updates/trusted-research-environment-service-for-england
20. Wood A, Denholm R, Hollings S, et al. Linked electronic health records for research on a nationwide cohort of more than 54 million people in England: data resource. *BMJ*. Apr 7 2021;373:n826. doi:10.1136/bmj.n826
21. Brown J, Kirk-Wade E, Baker C, Barber S. Coronavirus: A history of English lockdown laws. House of Commons Library. Updated 22 December 2021. Accessed 15 August 2022, https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9068/
22. Rogers L, Brown KL, Franklin RC, et al. Improving Risk Adjustment for Mortality After Pediatric Cardiac Surgery: The UK PRAiS2 Model. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Jul 2017;104(1):211-219. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2016.12.014
23. Crowe S, Brown KL, Pagel C, et al. Development of a diagnosis- and procedure-based risk model for 30-day outcome after pediatric cardiac surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. May 2013;145(5):1270-8. doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2012.06.023
24. Brown KL, Rogers L, Barron DJ, et al. Incorporating Comorbidity Within Risk Adjustment for UK Pediatric Cardiac Surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg*. Jul 2017;104(1):220-226. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2016.12.013
25. Brown KL, Crowe S, Pagel C, et al. Use of diagnostic information submitted to the United Kingdom Central Cardiac Audit Database: development of categorisation and allocation algorithms. *Cardiol Young*. Aug 2013;23(4):491-8. doi:10.1017/S1047951112001369
26. Pagel C, Rogers L, Brown K, et al. Improving risk adjustment in the PRAiS (Partial Risk Adjustment in Surgery) model for mortality after paediatric cardiac surgery and improving public understanding of its use in monitoring outcomes. *Health Services and Delivery Research*. 2017;5(23):1-164.
27. Government MoHCaL. *The English Indices of Deprivation 2019, Statistical Release*. 2019. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/833951/IoD2019_Technical_Report.pdf
28. NCHDA. *National Congenital Heart Disease Audit (NCHDA) 2023 summary report*. 2023. 2023. https://www.nicor.org.uk/publications/ncap/congenitial/10633-nicor-annual-summary-reports-nchda-domain-report-v7/?layout=default
29. Atkin C, Knight T, Subbe C, Holland M, Cooksley T, Lasserson D. Response to winter pressures in acute services: analysis from the Winter Society for Acute Medicine Benchmarking Audit. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2022;22(1):1-8.
30. Charlton-Perez AJ, Aldridge RW, Grams CM, Lee R. Winter pressures on the UK health system dominated by the Greenland Blocking weather regime. *Weather and Climate Extremes*. 2019;25:100218.
31. Appleby J. Is it just the UK finding winter pressures hard? *Nuffield Trust* blog. 2018. Accessed 2023/12/20/15:58:21. https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/news-item/is-it-just-the-uk-finding-winter-pressures-hard
32. Digital N. Safe Output services. https://digital.nhs.uk/services/data-access-environment-dae/user-guides/using-rstudio-in-the-data-access-environment#safe-output-service

Table 1: Key restrictions during the different phases of pandemic in England.

Period	Dates	Policy on action	Description
Pre-pandemic	01 Jan 2018 to 22 Mar 2020	None	
First Restriction period	23 Mar 2020 to 23 Jun 2020	Hospitality closure	Pubs, bars, and restaurants must close but can operate a takeaway/delivery service
		Movement: stay at home	People are prohibited from leaving home without a reasonable excuse
		Gatherings: Social gatherings ban	Gatherings of more than two people is prohibited unless for a limited number of exempted purposes
		Movement: Staying away restriction	People are prohibited from staying away from home overnight without a reasonable excuse
		Movement: Outdoor recreation from 13 May	
		Gatherings: Rule of six (outdoors only) from 01 June	
		Hospitality : Non-essential retail opened on 15 June	
		Gathering: Support bubbles introduced on 15 June	
First relaxation	24 Jun 2020 to 04 Nov 2020	Movement: Staying away restriction	People are prohibited from staying away from home overnight without a reasonable excuse
		Gatherings: Rule of six(outdoors) only	Gatherings of more than six people are prohibited unless they are for an exempted purpose. Exemptions include organised sports, small weddings and support groups
		Gatherings: Large gatherings banned from 01 July	Gatherings of more than thirty people are prohibited
		Hospitality: Opening times	Pubs, bars and restaurants must close at a specific time
		Gatherings: restored rule of six	Gatherings of more than six people are prohibited unless they are for an exempted purpose. Exemptions include organised sports, small weddings and support groups
		Tier: introduced Tier System (1,2,3)	
Second restrictions	05 Nov 2020 to 02 Dec 2020	Hospitality: Business closure	Pubs, bars, and restaurants must close but can operate a takeaway/delivery service
		Gatherings: Social gathering ban	Gatherings of more than two people are prohibited unless for a limited number of exempted purposes

		Movement: Staying at home-outdoor recreation allowed throughout	People are prohibited from leaving home without a reasonable excuse
Second relaxation	03 Dec 2020 to 05 Jan 2021	Tier: reintroduced tier system, Tier4 introduced on 20 Dec	
Third restriction	06 Jan 2021 to 21 Jun 2021	Hospitality: Business closure	Pubs, bars and restaurants must close but can operate a takeaway/delivery service
		Gatherings: Social gathering ban	Gatherings of more than two people are prohibited unless for a limited number of exempted purposes
		Movement: stay at home	People are prohibited from leaving home without a reasonable excuse
		Movement: Outdoor recreation allowed on 08 Mar	
		Step 1 unlock	
		Step 1 unlock: children return to schools	
		Step1 unlock: Gatherings: Rule of six in outdoor reinstated	
		Movement: International travel ban	People are prohibited from leaving the United Kingdom without a reasonable excuse
		Hospitality: Opening times	Pubs, bars and restaurants must close at a specific time
		Step 2 unlock: Gatherings: reopening of outdoor attractions and settings	
		Step 3 unlock: not early than 17 May	
		Step 4 unlock: not early than 22 June	
Post third restrictions	22 Jun 2021 to 31 Mar 2022	19 July: Most legal limits on social contact removed in England and final closed sectors of economy reopened (e.g. nightclubs etc)	
		14 Sept: PM unveils England's winter plan for Covid-'Plan B' to be used if the NHS is coming under "unsustainable pressure", and includes measures such as face masks	
		08 Dec: PM announces a move to 'Plan B' measures in England following the spread of the Omicron variant	
		10 Dec: Face masks become compulsory in most public indoor venues under Plan B	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2: Characteristics of children (< 16-years) who underwent congenital heart disease surgical procedures in England between 01 January 2018 and 31 March 2022

Characteristics		N (%) of procedures (N=26,270)	N (%) of children (N=17,860)
Age group, years	<1 year	8520 (32.4%)	5885 (33.0%)
	1 to <5 years	9235 (35.2%)	5730 (32.1%)
	5 to <10 years	4150 (15.8%)	2880 (16.1%)
	10 & above	4365 (16.6%)	3365 (18.8%)
Gender	Male	14,290 (54.4%)	9475 (53.1%)
	Female	11,980 (45.6%)	8385 (46.9%)
Ethnicity (new)	White European	18,155 (69.1%)	12,370 (69.3%)
	South Asian	2555 (9.7%)	1680 (9.4%)
	African / Caribbean	1205 (4.6%)	860 (4.8%)
	Other	2975 (11.3%)	2020 11.3%)
	Missing	1385 (5.3%)	930 (5.2%)
Region	East Midlands	1770 (6.7%)	1165 (6.5%)
	East of England	1935 (7.4%)	1430 (8.0%)
	London	3400 (12.9%)	2470 (13.8%)
	North East	1125 (4.3%)	745 (4.2%)
	North West	3060 (11.6%)	1980 (11.1%)
	South East	3140 (12.0%)	2230 (12.5%)
	South West	1805 (6.9%)	1155 (6.5%)
	West Midlands	2910 (11.1%)	1885 (10.6%)
	Yorkshire and the Humber	2750 (10.5%)	1790 (10.0%)
	Missing	4380 (16.7%)	3010 (16.9%)
Index of Multiple Deprivation Quintiles	1 (most deprived)	7100 (27.0%)	4630 (25.9%)
	2	5520 (21.0%)	3695 (20.7%)
	3	4580 (17.4%)	3140 (17.6%)
	4	3955 (15.1%)	2750 (15.4%)
	5 (least deprived)	3715 (14.1%)	2720 (15.2%)
	Missing	1405 (5.3%)	930 (5.2%)
Primary diagnosis	Pulmonary atresia and stenosis †	2715 (10.3%)	
	Left ventricular outflow obstruction †	2625 (10.0%)	
	Patent Ductus Arteriosus	2255 (8.6%)	
	Arrhythmia	1845 (7.0%)	
	Ventricular Septal Defect	1845 (7.0%)	
	Misc. congenital primary diagnoses †	1825 (6.9%)	
	Transposition of great arteries †	1660 (6.3%)	
	Hypoplastic left heart syndrome	1640 (6.2%)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Fallot/DORV-Fallot type	1620 (6.2%)
	Interatrial communication ('ASD')	1555 (5.9%)
	Functionally univentricular heart	1500 (5.7%)
	Atrioventricular septal defect	1400 (5.3%)
	Primary atrioventricular valvar disease †	1240 (4.7%)
	Acquired heart diseases	1115 (4.2%)
	Misc. congenital terms	410 (1.6%)
	Common arterial trunk (truncus arteriosus)	400 (1.5%)
	Total Anomalous Pulmonary Venous Connection	235 (0.9%)
	Missing‡	385 (1.5%)
Urgency of procedure	Elective	18,920 (72.0%)
	Urgent	5815 (22.1%)
	Emergency	1185 (4.5%)
	Life-saving	300 (1.1%)
	Missing	55 (0.2%)
Procedure activity group	Cardiac surgery	12,955 (49.3%)
	Interventional catheter	7250 (27.6%)
	Diagnostic catheter	3045 (11.6%)
	Electrophysiology	2295 (8.7%)
	Mechanical support	720 (2.7%)
	Missing	0 (0%)
Complication*	**Yes (Any)**	**2405 (9.2 %)**
	ECMO	310 (1.2%)
	Unplanned surgeries	380 (1.4%)
	Necrotising enterocolitis	185 (0.7%)
	Surgical site infection	75 (0.3%)
	Pleural effusion	405 (1.5%)
	Any other complication	1,600 (6.1%)
Discharge destination	Home	22,725 (86.5%)
	Other hospital	2260 (8.6%)
	Convalescence	20 (0.1%)
	Death	550 (2.1%)
	Death with referral to coroner	260 (1.0%)
	Hospice/palliative care	35 (0.1%)
	Other specialty in same hospital	340 (1.3%)
	Missing	80 (0.3%)
Discharge status	Alive	25395 (96.7%)
	Died in hospital	815 (3.1%)
	Missing	55 (0.2%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Hospital stay	Duration of hospitalization (median (IQR) days	5 (1-11)

[1]Smaller groups were combined to form larger groups (Full information in Supplementary Table 1)

**No information on missing data as the field is completed only in relevant cases.*

All counts below 10 are suppressed and others are rounded to the nearest multiple of 5 as per the safe output services guidelines of NHS England's Secure Data Environment service for England[32]

‡ Records with diagnostic codes other than NCHDA approved diagnostic codes were assigned as missing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1: Flow chart of study participants from record linkage to the final analysis sample



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2: Difference in weekly median numbers of all, elective, urgent and emergency/life-saving pediatric congenital heart disease procedures comparing pandemic periods to the pre-pandemic period.



Results show the median (IQR) number of all , elective, urgent, and emergency or life-saving pediatric procedures per week during the pre-pandemic and all pandemic periods p-values for the difference between each pandemic period and the pre-pandemic period were calculated using the Willcoxin rank test. We combined emergency and life-saving procedures into a single category because of low numbers

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 3: Difference in the mean percentage of each procedure during pandemic periods compared to the pre-pandemic.



Results show the difference in mean percentage (95% CI) of the type of procedure compared to all procedures between each period of the pandemic compared to the pre-pandemic period. We combined diagnostic catheter, electrophysiology, and mechanical support procedures into a 'other procedures'

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 4: Difference in the mean percentage of the age group of procedure during pandemic periods compared to the pre-pandemic.



Difference in mean percentage for each restriction period estimated from the pre-pandemic period (01 Jan 2012 to 22 Mar 2020)

Results show the difference in mean percentage (95% CI) of procedure among different age groups between each period of the pandemic compared to the pre-pandemic period.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307597; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 5: Odds ratios of urgency, post-procedure complications, and mortality within 30-days of a procedure comparing pandemic periods to the pre-pandemic period



Results show the age adjusted odd ratios of urgent/emergency/life-saving procedure vs elective, post-procedure complications (yes vs no), and age, and age plus case mix adjusted odds of mortality within 30-days of a procedure (yes vs no) during different periods of the pandemic compared with the pre-pandemic period. We combined urgent, emergency, and life-saving procedures into a single category.