1	Competing Risk Survival analysis of time to in-hospital mortality or Recovery among
2	Covid-19 Patients in South-East Ethiopia: a hospital-based multisite study
3	Addis Wordofa <sup>1</sup> , Ayalneh Demissie <sup>1</sup> *, Abdurehman Kalu <sup>1</sup> , Abdurehman Tune <sup>2</sup> , Mohammed
4	Suleiman <sup>2</sup> , Abay Kibret <sup>3</sup> , Zerihun Abera <sup>4</sup> , Yonas Mulugeta <sup>4</sup>
5	Details
6	<sup>1</sup> Department of Public Health, College of Health Science, Arsi University, Ethiopia
7	<sup>2</sup> Department of Anesthesia, College of Health Science, Arsi University, Ethiopia
8	<sup>3</sup> Department of Nursing, College of Health Science, Arsi University, Ethiopia
9	<sup>4</sup> Department of Biomedical, College of Health Science, Arsi University, Ethiopia
10 11	<b>Corresponding Author</b> : Ayalneh Demissie: * <u>ayalnehdemissis@gmail.com</u>
12	AW: Addis Wordofa: addisdemese@gmail.com
13	AD: Ayalneh Demissie: ayalnehdemissis@gmail.comt
14	AKa: Abdurehman Kalu : <u>abdurehmankelu@gmail.com</u>
15	AT: Abdurahman Tune: abdurahmantune@gmail.com
16	MS: Mohammed Suleiman: msuleiman43@gmail.com
17	AKi: Abay Kibret: zbluenile2121@gmail.com
18	ZA: Zerihun Abera: zeriabe21@gmail.com
19	YM: Yonas Mulugeta: yonasm.balcha@gmail.com
20	

## 21 Abstract

22

Background: To date, survival data on risk factors for COVID-19 mortality in southEthiopia is limited, and none of the published survival studies have used a competing risk
approach. This study aims to identify risk factors for in-hospital mortality in COVID-19
patients hospitalized at one of the six hospitals in southeast -Ethiopia, considering
recovery as a competing risk.

Methods: This observational multisite study included a medical record of 827 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases hospitalized at one of the six hospitals in southeast-Ethiopia from October 1, 2022 to May 31, 2023. We compiled data on the patients' socio-demographic characteristics, clinical manifestation, comorbidity, treatment status, treatment outcomes, and length of stay. We performed a Cox regression analysis for competing risks, presenting cause-specific hazard ratios (HRcs) for the effect of preselected factors on the absolute risk of death and recovery.

**Results:** 827 patients were included (51.9% male; median age 50 years, IQR: 38—65). Patients were hospitalized for a median duration of 5 days (IQR: 1—7); 139 (17%) of them died, while 516 (62%) were recovered and discharged alive, the rest 172 (21%) were censored. Patients with higher age (HR<sub>cs</sub> 2.62, 95% CI 1.29—5.29), immunecompromised state (HR<sub>cs</sub> 1.46, 95% CI 1.08—1.98) had increased risk of death, whereas male sex paradoxically (HR<sub>cs</sub> 0.45, 95% CI 0.22—0.91) associated with decreased risk of death. We found no increased mortality risk in diabetes patients.

42 **Conclusion:** This competing risk survival analysis allows us to corroborate specific pattern of 43 risk factors about COVID-19 mortality and its progression among different groups of 44 individuals (differentiated by age and immune-compromised state). 62% presenting cases 45 recovered within a median duration of 5 days; where as 17% die within the first 72 hours, 46 most with immune-compromised conditions. This should be considered while planning and 47 allocating the distribution of care services for effective health service delivery 48 Kenworder Time to death. Recovery Consering, COVID, 10 Competing risks, Survival

48 Keywords: Time to death, Recovery, Censoring, COVID- 19, Competing risks, Survival

49 analysis, Ethiopia

# 50 Introduction

Despite limited access to healthcare [1,2] and relatively milder social distancing restrictions compared to those imposed in most high-income countries [3,4], corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) mortality rates have been relatively low throughout Africa [5]. As of June 23, 2021, the World Health Organization (WHO) reports 3,852,707diagnosed cases and 92,719 deaths in the continent [5]. However, severe acute respiratory syndrome corona virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) transmission and survival dynamics have been highly heterogeneous across different African countries in terms of timing and implemented interventions [6].

In sub-Saharan Africa, Ethiopia is second only to South Africa in terms of the number of 58 59 recorded cases and deaths, with an overall case fatality ratio (CFR) of about 1.5% compared 60 to about 2.2% in the rest of the world [5]. The first COVID-19 case was confirmed on March 13, 2020, meanwhile, the Ethiopian government declared a state of emergency on April 8, 61 2020 in the country [7]. Since then, rigorous contact tracing, isolation, and compulsory 62 quarantine have been established [8,9]. Schools and borders closed, public institutions and 63 firms operated at minimum capacity or closed completely, and people informed to stay at 64 home [8]. Nevertheless, in November 2020, schools reopened in the entire country, and social 65 gatherings up to 50 individuals were allowed again. As of June 23, 2021, 275,391 Covid-19 66 cases and 4290 deaths [5] were recorded nationally, with thousands of cases reported in all 67 the 12 regions of Ethiopia [9]. In Ethiopia, a syndromic surveillance is carried out to identify 68 Covid-19 infected individuals. 69

Samples from suspected cases and case contacts are collected at different health facilities
 displaced in the country (including health centers serving the most rural areas) and cases are
 confirmed via real-time reverse transcription–polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) test.

Collected samples are analyzed by 38 national, regional, hospital, and private laboratories
[10]. Both suspected and confirmed cases are admitted to isolation centers and discharged

after a negative laboratory test [9]. Although swab testing was initially applied to both 75 76 symptomatic patients and all close contacts of cases, it is possible that, due to limited 77 resources and the increased number of cases in the country, only symptomatic case contacts 78 are currently tested. Active monitoring of cases conducted by the Ethiopian Public Health 79 Institute suggested that 52% of the identified positive cases were asymptomatic [11]. As of 80 January 10, 2021, the overall rate for positive laboratory test results since the first detection 81 of the epidemic in the country was 6.9%, likewise 1,054 and 524 Intensive Care Unit(ICU) 82 beds and mechanical ventilators in the COVID-19 treatment centers for an estimated 83 population of 117million [11].

The possible spread of COVID-19 in rural areas of the country is especially dangerous because of the sparse presence of well-resourced health facilities implying long travel distances for remote populations, which is an important barrier to universal access to primary care[2].

Moreover, the healthcare workforce in Ethiopia is 5 times lower than the minimum threshold defined by the WHO for Sustainable Development Goals health targets [12] and far below the African average [13].

91 Unfortunately, new facts come with a lag compared to the virus spread and governments are
92 forced to make prompt decisions based on limited evidence which changes at a staggering
93 pace.

94 The fight against a practically unknown enemy has been and still is the major obstacle. Aside 95 from studying the virus's biology, infecting mechanisms, probable treatments and of course 96 vaccine development, epidemic modeling has stepped forward.

In a trade-off between recovery and death, competing risk modeling strategies provide a
sharp suit that allows exploring a variety of scenarios and provides an intuitive understanding
of the most critical factors governing disease dynamics.

Recent modeling studies have made a difference for public health care decision making by providing, for example, estimations of the impact of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPI) in a number of sub-Saharan African countries, highlighting the difficulties in defining effective, feasible, and sustainable strategies for suppression or mitigation of COVID-19 epidemics [14-17].

The main challenge is to create a model that predicts plausible scenarios for a disease we have known for only a few months. One of the most important barriers for the provision of solid epidemiological parameters has been the different management strategies that each country has taken in response to this outbreak.

109 Variation in survival cannot be explained only by the different population age structure,110 symptom data, specific clinical parameters or available critical care beds.

Because of the increase in mortality due to COVID-19 and the increase in the speed of its 111 spread, many methods have been developed to reliably predict patient survival based on 112 113 symptom data and specific clinical parameters. Studies describing the clinical features of COVID-19 and risk factors associated with incidence and timing of poor outcome have been 114 extensively published [18], but survival data regarding risk factors for COVID-19 mortality 115 116 in south-east Ethiopia is limited. Further- more, to our knowledge, none of the published survival studies have considered recovery as competing risk for mortality. Not taking 117 competing risks into account leads to biased mortality estimates and to overestimation of 118 119 survival curves [19,20]. Analyzing mortality data with a more accurate competing risk analysis adds to the growing body of evidence on disease course and risk factors of a poor 120 121 COVID-19 outcome. More robust knowledge about these risk factors is crucial to inform local prediction research [18]. Calculating the probability to survive and the effect of each 122 feature like symptoms (competing risks) in our case on survival probability was done using 123 survival analysis. Survival analysis is a model for time until a certain "event". Time-to-event 124

data encounters several research challenges such as censoring, symptoms correlations, highdimensionality, temporal dependencies, and difficulty in acquiring sufficient event data in a reasonable period of time [21]. Most importantly not taking, competing risks into account leads to biased mortality estimates and to overestimation of survival curves. Therefore, evidence showing the duration of recovery and pace of death from COVID-19 in different contexts and settings is necessary for tailoring appropriate treatment and prevention measures.

There are many current literature techniques for conducting this sort of survival study. Among them, the Fine and Gray model have been deployed for computing infection risks, performing survival analysis and classification [22]. Therefore, the above model should be able to take these variables into account.

The present study aimed to analyze the socio-demographic and clinical profile of COVID-19 patients that were hospitalized to one of the six hospitals in the southeast-Ethiopia, characterized by different levels of access to healthcare while accounting for the effect of gender, location, clinical presentation, and co-morbid conditions on mortality and recovery.

140 Methods

### 141 Study setting

The study was conducted at six hospitals in southeast Ethiopia: Bishoftu, Modjo, Adama, Negele Arsi, Bekoji and Shashamane hospitals, also COVID-19 isolation and treatment Centers located in southeast Ethiopia, 35, 75,85,229,232 and 270kms from Addis Ababa (the capital), respectively. The isolation and treatment centers were the place where all Ethiopian and none-Ethiopian citizens with COVID-19 were admitted for isolation, care and support. There are 82 functional public hospitals in the region of which 44 are primary hospitals and 34 are general hospitals and 4 are comprehensive specialized hospitals [23].

149 Study design

We performed an observational multisite study using a medical record of 827 confirmed 150 151 SARS-CoV-2 cases hospitalized at one of the six sites: Bishoftu, Modjo, Adama, Negele 152 Arsi, Bekoji and Shashamane, also called COVID-19 treatment centers from October 1, 2022 to May 31, 2023. The sample size for duration of recovery was calculated taking the 153 154 following assumptions into account: 95% Confidence Interval (CI), 46% survival 155 probability, 5% margin of error and 10% withdrawal, and equal proportion of individuals in 156 each group [24]. The minimum sample size required to conduct this study was 419 with a design effect 2 due to differences in the size of the hospitals, the final sample size become 157 158 838.

Sampling procedures: To select the records studied, we consecutively included confirmed adult patients record with COVIC-19, and who were admitted to one of the six hospitals in Oromia region from Bishoftu to Shashemene for at least 24 hours between October1, 2022 and May 31, 2023. In the current analysis, we excluded patients if data regarding duration of hospital admission were missing for those who died or recovered. A sample of 827 patients allocated proportional to their catchment population size (PPs) to each center =  $n_x * n/N$ 

165	1. Bishoftu (KTC)	n <sub>1</sub> =750	final n <sub>1f</sub>	171
166	$\frac{750}{3631}$ * 827 = 171			
167	2. Modjo PH	n <sub>2</sub> =605	final n <sub>2f</sub>	138
168	$\frac{605}{3631} * 827 = 138$			
169	3. Adama (AHMC)	n <sub>3</sub> =931	final n <sub>3f</sub>	212
170	$\frac{931}{3631} * 827 = 212$			
171	4. Bekoji PH	n <sub>4</sub> =650	final n <sub>4f</sub>	148
172	$\frac{650}{3631} * 827 = 148$			
173	5. Shashamane RH	n <sub>5</sub> =396	final n <sub>5f</sub>	90
174	$\frac{396}{3631}$ * 827 = 90			
175	6. Negele Arsi PH	n <sub>6</sub> =299	final n <sub>6f</sub>	68
176	$\frac{299}{3631}$ * 827 = 68			
177	Total	<u>N=3631</u>		<u>n= 827</u>

178

# 179 Variables collected and definitions

180 Outcome variables (dependent variables)

The possible outcomes categorized as a recovered case or death. The primary outcome was COVID-19 death that reported as a death occurring in a confirmed COVID-19 case. Recovery/ survival were analyzed as competing event/ secondary endpoint. COVID-19 patients who were discharged due to clinical improvement, for medical rehabilitation, or transfer to a nursing home were considered 'recovered'. COVID-19 patients who were transferred to a non-study hospital, who were lost to follow-up because of other reasons, or whose reason of discharge is unknown or missing were considered 'censored '.

188 Covariates (independent variables)

The socio-demographic factors, health-related factors, co-morbidities, clinical manifestation,
laboratory -result and treatment-related factors were considered independent variables.

Outcome variables: The possible outcomes categorized as a recovered case or death. The primary outcome was in-hospital mortality. Recovery/ survival were analyzed as competing event/ secondary endpoint. COVID-19 patients who were discharged due to clinical improvement, for medical rehabilitation, or transfer to a nursing home were considered 'recovered'. COVID-19 patients who were transferred to a non-study hospital, who were lost to follow-up because of other reasons, or whose reason of discharge is unknown or missing were considered 'censored '.

# 198 Data collection

We extracted routine data of all confirmed COVID-19 patients that were followed from admission to one of the six treatment sites till discharge using a structured datasheet. It includes socio-demographic characteristics, status during admission, information on clinical

202 presentation, diagnostic procedure, comorbidity, type of co-morbidity, disease course, 203 treatments, type of drug used, treatment outcomes and length of stay. Five public health 204 officers collected the data after we provided them two-days training on the data collection 205 instruments. Patient data were entered anonymously into electronic case form (using Epidata 206 Entry client), only using a study identifier. The middle six authors (AD, AKa, AT, MS, AKi 207 and ZA) supervised the data collection and entry for completeness in real-time.

# 208 Statistical analysis

Collected data were coded, entered, cleaned and analyzed using STATA software Version 209 16.1. Descriptive summary statistics such as: mean, standard deviations (SD) and inter 210 quartile range (IQR) were calculated for continuous variables, while frequencies, and 211 212 percentages for categorical variables. Moreover, we used a competing risks regression model 213 to evaluate the effect of risk factors for time-to-event analyses or on the time from admission to death and on the time from admission to recovery [25,26]. A study evidenced the 214 occurrence of competing risk if subjects experience one or more events or outcomes which 215 compete with the outcome of interest [26]. In our study, recovery is considered a competing 216 risk for mortality and is taken into account as an extra outcome, whereas in standard survival 217 analyses, patients who recover are censored. However, the latter violates the assumption of 218 219 non informative censoring, i.e. the recovered patients are not representative of those who are still admitted to the hospital in terms of their risk of dying. Censoring recovered patients 220 induces bias and overestimation of survival curves, i.e. Kaplan Meier estimate incidence of 221 death with upwards biases [25,26]. For the competing risk analysis, we estimated 222 univariable and multivariable cause-specific hazard ratios (HRcs) for death and recovery for 223 selected risk factors [20,25]. These risk factors were pre-selected based on literature and 224 expert opinion to be clinically relevant and routinely available at time of presentation, rather 225

than based on statistical significance [27]. Variables with a P-value of less than or equal to 226 227 0.25 were considered as candidates for multivariate analysis. Variables in the final model 228 with a p-value < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. The results were expressed as adjusted hazard ratios (HR) and their 95% confidence intervals (CI). Furthermore, cumulative 229 incidence probabilities were estimated using the Fine and Gray approach [20,25]. Gray's 230 test was used to compare equality of cumulative incidence curves (CIFs) across subgroups 231 [28,29]. The proportional hazards assumption was checked by an evaluation of the 232 Schoenfeld residuals. 233

Multivariable HRcs were also estimated for a subpopulation of patients with a 'non ICU admission '. The cause-specific hazard (CSH) model was fitted again for this subpopulation, to assess the influence of risk factors on the outcome in these patients. Variables with a Pvalue of less than or equal to 0.25 were considered as candidates for multivariate analysis. Variables with a P-value of less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

# 239 Missing data

Missing data in the variables 'age, gender, religion, smoking status, clinical manifestation, type of co morbidity, status at admission, dexamethasone use and length of stay were assumed to be missing at random (MAR) and the missed count were dropped from the analysis in these nine datasets.

# 244 **Results**

A total of 827 confirmed COVID-19 patient records were included for analysis, the rest 11 245 patient records that had fragmentary data were excluded. Among them, 516 (62%) patients 246 were recovered, 172 (21%) were censored and the remaining 139 (17%) patients were dead 247 of COVID-19 in the hospital. 248 The median follow-up time were 17.7 (95% CI: 14.5–21.4) days. The cumulative incidence 249 250 of both death and recovery increased over time. The median duration of hospital admission until death and recovery was 5 days (IQR: 1–7) and 11 days (IQR: 5–16), respectively. The 251 median age of patients were 50years (IQR: 58-77), most 429 (51.9%), 601(72.7%) and 637 252 253 (77%) were male, from urban and presented with clinical manifestations, respectively. Nearly 254 half patients 384(46.4%) had one or more co morbidities as shown in Table 1.

256

# 257 Table 1 Characteristics of the study population in hospitals, south eastern Ethiopia 2024

		Total		Status last recoded					
		number	Missing n (%)	Death		Recovery		Censored	
		(n = 827)		n	%	n	%	n	%
Age (Years 0ld)		50(38-65)	138(16.7%)	40	29%	294	57%	15	44%
Gender, male		429(51.9%)	140(16.9%)	96 t	o 70%	308	60%	25	74%
Location, urban		601(72.7%)	27(3.3%)	93	68%	402	81%	106	63%
Smoking status, no		412(49.8%)	377(45.6%)	69	82%	316	94%	27	93%
Clinical manifestation, yes		637(77%)	147(17.8%)	136	99%	472	92%	29	97%
Co morbidity, y	es	384(46.4%)	38(4.6%)	81	61%	210	43%	93	56%
	Hypertension	113 (31%)		26	31%	78	31%	9	38%
	Chronic cardiac disease	15(4%)		5	6%	10	4%	0	0%
	Pulmonary disease	16(4%)		8	9%	8	3%	0	0%
Most frequent	Asthma	33(9%)	468(56.6%)	4	5%	26	10%	3	12%
co morbidities	Chronic kidney disease	6 (2%)		1	1%	5	2%	0	0%
	Diabetic mellitus	103(29%)		23	27%	73	29%	7	29%
	Other	73(20%)		18	21%	50	20%	5	21%
Status at admissi	on, symptomatic	695(84%)	21 (2.5%)	136	99%	452	91%	107	63%
Antibiotics use, yes		732(92.1%)	0(0%)	135	97%	456	88%	171	99%
Dexamethasone	use, yes	494(59.7%)	142(17.2%)	129	93%	338	66%	27	82%
Ventilatory supp	ort, yes	522(63%)	20(2.4%)	123	90%	304	60%	93	55%
Length of stay, <15 days		502(60.7%)	156(18.9%)	116	87%	356	71%	30	91%
Duration of hos	pital admission (days)	5(1-7)	0(0%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)
	Death	139(17%)	0(0%)	139	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Reason for	Recovery	516(62%)		0	0%	516	62%	0	0%
discharge	Censored	172(21%)		0	0%	0	0%	172	21%
	ARDS	82(9.9%)	713(86.2%)	3	3%	0	0%	1	50%
	Pneumonia	8(1%)		8	7%	0	0%	0	0%
	Cardiopulmonary edema	6(.7%)		4	4%	0	0%	0	0%
	Shock	4(.5%)		81	73%	0	0%	1	50%
Cause of death	Stroke	4(.5%)		1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
	Chronic liver disease	2(.2%)		2	2%	0	0%	0	0%
	Uremic encephalopathy	2(.2%)		5	5%	1	100%	0	0%
	Traumatic brain injurv	1(.1%)		2	2%	0	0%	0	0%
	Other	5(.6%)		5	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Median Age at c	liagnosis, age < 50 years	349 (42.2%)	138 (16.7%)	40	29%	294	57%	15	44%

258 NB: Other represents, Immunocompromised status which was defined as having a malignancy, auto-immune

259 disease, HIV/AIDS and/or use of immunosuppressive medication.

260

261

# 262 Cumulative incidence curves

The Cumulative Incidence function (CIF) curves of the total patients showed that the 263 probability of death after one, two and three weeks of hospital admission was 22.3% (95% 264 15.2—32.0), 35.1% (95% CI 23.7—49.9), and 51.3% (95% CI 32.1—73.9), respectively (Fig 1). 265 The probabilities of recovery were 7.6% (95% 5.6—10.3), 17.9% (95% CI 14.3—22.2), and 44.7% 266 (95% CI 36.2—54.1), respectively. Patients aged  $\geq$  50 years had a higher chance of death 267 (p<0.01) and a lower chance of recovery (p<0.05) than patients aged <50 years (Fig 2). Males 268 had a lower probability of recovery and a higher probability of death (p = 0.004 and p =269 0.003) than females (Fig 3). 270

271

*Figure 1 Cumulative incidence plot of death and recovery in south eastern Ethiopia hospitals, 2024*As shown in figure 1 cumulative incidence plot of death and recovery in the total patients, the
probability of death conditional on not having recovered after one, two and three weeks of
hospital admission was 22.3% (95% 15.2—32.0), 35.1% (95% CI 23.7—49.9), and 51.3% (95% CI
32.1—73.9), respectively. The probability of recovery conditional on not having died after one,
two and three weeks of hospital admission was 7.6% (95% 5.6—10.3), 17.9% (95% CI 14.3—
22.2).

# Figure 2 Cumulative incidence plots of death and recovery in south eastern Ethiopia hospitals, separated by age group 2024

As shown in <u>figure</u> 2, the cumulative incidence plot of death and recovery in the total population, separated by age group. Gray's test indicated a significant difference between two groups for both death (p<0.01) and recovery (p<0.001). The probability of death for patients aged <50 years after one, two and three weeks of hospital admission was 4.6% (95% CI 1.5—13.8), 10.1% (95% CI 4.7—21.3), 12.6% (95% CI 6.1—24.9), respectively, whereas for patients aged >50 years and above, the probability of death was 30.9% (95% CI 19.9-46.0), 46.8% (95% CI 31.5—65.2), and 52.7% (95% CI 35.6-72.1), respectively.

290

#### Figure 3 Cumulative incidence plots of death and recovery in south eastern Ethiopia 291 292 hospitals, separated by gender 2024

293

294 Cumulative incidence plot of death and recovery in the total patients separated, by gender. Grav's test indicated a statistically significant difference between both groups for death (p = 0.03), but 295 not for recovery (p = 0.050). The probability of death for females after one, two and three weeks 296 297 of hospital admission was 17.2% (95% CI 8.0-34.6), 21.1% (95% CI 10.5-39.8), and 47.4% (95% CI 16.4—90.0), respectively, whereas for males the probability of death was 18.7% (95% CI 11.4—29.8), 298 299 43.3% (95% CI 26.7-64.6), and 54.6% (95% CI 32.4-79.8), respectively. Figure 4Cumulative incidence plots of death and recovery in south eastern Ethiopia 300 301 hospitals, separated by type of Co morbidities 2024 302 As shown in figure 4, the cumulative incidence plot of death in the total patients separated, by 303 type of co morbidities. Gray's test indicated a statistically significant difference amongst the three 304 groups for death (p = 0.03), but not for recovery (p = 0.16). The probability of death for 305

hypertensive patients after one, two and three weeks of hospital admission was 26.2% (95% CI 306

307 10.7-64.4), and the same 46.2% (95% CI 17.2-1.24) after the rest two weeks, respectively, and for Immunocompromised patients the probability of death was 32.6% (95% CI 12.1-87.8), 52.6%

(95% CI 20.0-1.38), and no death after the last week, respectively, whereas for diabetes mellitus 309 310 patients the probability of death was the same 9.1% (95% CI 2.3-36.5) after all of the three

consecutive weeks. 311

# 312 Univariable and multivariable SH model

HRcs from univariable and multivariable SH models are reported in Table 2. Univariable 313 analysis showed that older age increased the risk of death: with every year increase in age, 314 the risk of death increased with 1% (HRcs 1.01, 95% CI 1.00-1.02), and also the chances of 315 recovery insignificantly increased by 0.1% (HRcs 1.00, 95% CI 0.99-1.01). In terms of 316 location, being in urban the risk of death increased with 90% (HRcs 1.90, 95% CI 1.16-317 3.11), and also the chances of recovery increased by 29% (HRcs 1.29, 95% CI 1.04-1.59), 318 regarding religion, being an Orthodox the risk of death increased with 196% (HRcs 2.96, 319 95% CI 1.50-5.82), and also the chances of recovery increased by 111% (HRcs 2.11, 95% 320 CI 1.44—3.10), whereas, being a smoker the risk of death increased with 96% (HRcs 1.96, 321 95% CI 1.11–3.47), but the chance of recovery non significantly increased by 119% (HRcs 322 2.19, 95% CI 0.98–4.88). In terms of presenting symptom, symptomatic patients had an 323 97.4% increase in the risk of death (HRcs 1.974, 95% CI 1.29-3.01), but the chance of 324 recovery decreased by 28% (HRcs 0.72, 95% CI 0.52—1.01) 325

Generally presence of co-morbidity increases the risk of death: Patients with two or more co morbidities had an 11.7% increase in the risk of death (HR<sub>cs</sub> 1.117, 95% CI 1.01—1.24), and also the chances of recovery increased by 3.6% (HR<sub>cs</sub> 1.036, 95% CI 0.98—1.08) but it was not statistical significant.

330

Of the co morbidities: Pulmonary disease, hypertension, HIV/AIDS and diabetes mellitus increases risk of death. Patients with pulmonary disease had a 155% increase in the risk of death (HR<sub>cs</sub> 2.55, 95% CI 1.45—4.84), and a 48% increase in chances of recovery (HR<sub>cs</sub> 1.48, 95% CI 1.03—2.13). Patients with hypertension had a 140.6% increase in the risk of death (HR<sub>cs</sub> 2.406, 95% CI 1.39—4.15), and a 341.6% increase in chances of recovery

(HR<sub>cs</sub> 4.416, 95% CI 1.563—12.48). Whereas, HIV/AIDs Patients had a 100% increase in 336 the risk of death (HRcs 2.002, 95% CI 1.03-3.91), and an 80.7% non significant increase in 337 chances of recovery (HRcs 1.807, 95% CI 0.64-5.10). Furthermore, patients with diabetes 338 mellitus had a 69% increase in the risk of death (HRcs 1.691, 95% CI 1.01–2.84), and a 39% 339 non significant decrease in chances of recovery (HRcs 0.388, 95% CI 0.09-1.67). 340 In terms of medication, both use of antibiotics or dexamethason medication were associated 341 with an increased risk of death (HRcs 1.85, 95% CI 1.22-2.79, and HRcs 1.88, 95% CI 1.20-342 2.94, respectively). Regarding length of hospital stay and intranasal oxygen use or ventilatory 343 support, both extended hospital stay and use of intranasal oxygen increased risk of death. 344 Patients admitted  $\geq$  15 days had a 147% increase in risk of death (HR<sub>cs</sub> 2.47, 95% CI 1.55— 345 3.93) and patients with intranasal oxygen a 67% increase in risk of death (HRcs 1.67, 95% CI 346

347 1.05-2.65).

In multivariable analyses, the following factors were associated with risk of death: age in 348 349 general, older age, gender, immunocompromised state, symptomatic state at time of admission, and extended length of stay after admission. Firstly, with every year increase in 350 age, the risk of death increased with 2.3% (HRcs 1.023, 95% CI 1.00-1.05), and the 351 chances of recovery increased with 0.3% (HRcs 1.003, 95% CI 0.993-1.014). In other 352 words, if in two patients all variables except for age are the same, the patient who is one 353 354 year older has a 2.3% higher risk of dying. Furthermore, patients with immunocompromised state had a 46% increased risk of death (HRcs 1.46, 95% CI 1.08-1.98), and 24% 355 decrease in chances of recovery (HRcs 0.76, 95% CI 0.62-0.93). Whereas, patients that 356 were symptomatic at the time of admission had a 75% decrease in risk of death (HRcs 0.25, 357 95% CI 0.09-0.68), and a 49 % decrease in chances of recovery (HRcs 0.51, 95% CI 0.26-358 0.98). Furthermore, aged patients  $\geq$  50 years at the time of diagnosis had a 162% increase in 359

- 360 risk of death (HRcs 2.62, 95% CI 1.29-5.29). Finally, patients that stayed 15 or
- 361 more days following admission had an 80% decrease in the risk of death (HRcs 0.20,
- 362 95% CI 0.07-0.56), and an 89% decrease in chances of recovery (HRcs 0.11, 95% CI
- 363 0.06-0.19).

# 364 **Discussion**

365 366	Summary of findings					
367	In south eastern Ethiopia hospitals, approximately 17% of all COVID-19 patients died after					
368	a median hospital admission of five days during the hit of the epidemic. Using a competing					
369	risk approach, we identified age, gender, residence, status at admission, length of stay, co					
370	morbidities, such as pulmonary disease, hypertension, smoking, and use of medication as the					
371	most important risk factors in univariate analyses. After adjusting for all relevant factors at					
372	baseline, we found that higher age and immunocompromised state were associated with					
373	increased risk of death.					
374	On the other hand, extended period of admission beyond 15 days was associated with lower					
375	mortality. Male sex was a significant protective factor about mortality.					
376	Interpretation of results and comparison to literature					
377	Conventional survival analyses do not take competing risks into account, which leads to					
378	biased mortality estimates and to overestimation of survival curves. Using the competing risk					
379	approach, we took into account that patients who recovered were no longer at the same risk					
380	of dying than those who remained hospitalized, resulting in less biased mortality estimates.					
381	Even though death or recovery are the two possible final outcomes of the disease, the time to					
382	death and time to recovery may not the same (i.e. time to death was generally shorter than					
383	time to recovery). In addition, 21% of our patients were censored. As a result, the risk factors					
384	influencing death may differ from risk factors for recovery [30]. For example, we identified					

385 strong risk factors that both increased the risk of dying and reduced the recovery risk, namely 386 higher age and immunosuppression. Male sex has reduced death risk in the final model, and 387 symptomatic patients at admission and length of stay more than 15 days showed equivocal 388 results, reducing the risk of death as well as the risk of recovery.

# 389

# 390

# Table 2. Univariable and multivariable cause-specific hazard ratios (HRcs) including 95% confidence intervals for death and recovery in south eastern Ethiopia hospitals, 2024

393

	Univariable		Multivariable		
	Death	Recovery	Death	Recovery	
$\overline{\text{Age} \ge 50(\text{years})}$	2.53(1.57-4.08)***	0.76 (0.64-0.90) **	2.62 (1.29-5.29)**	0.69 (0.50-0.96)*	
Sex, male	1.96(1.21-3.18)**	1.88 (1.43-2.46)***	0.451 (0.22—.91)*	0.88 (0.64—1.21)	
Location, urban	1.90 (1.16-3.11)*	1.29 (1.04-1.59)*	0.75 (0.34—1.61)	1.32 (0.95-1.86)	
Religion, Orthodox	2.96(1.50-5.82)**	2.11(1.44-3.10)***	0.98 (0.65—1.48)	0.97 (0.78-1.20)	
Smoking, yes	1.96 (1.11-3.47)*	2.19 (0.98-4.88)	0.87 (0.35-2.18)	0.62 (0.37-1.03)	
Clinical manifestation, yes	1.93 (1.27-2.91)**	0.84 (0.59—1.18)	1.73(0.22-13.89)	0.59 (0.29—1.19)	
Co morbidity, yes	2.505 (1.41-4.46)**	1.11 (0.93—1.33)	3.37(0.76—15.04)	0.98 (0.54-1.77)	
Types of co morbidities, generally	1.12 (1.01-1.24)*	1.04 (0.99—1.09)	1.14 (0.99–1.31)	0.98 (0.91-1.05)	
Hypertension	4.42(1.56-12.48)**	2.41 (1.39-4.15)**	0.78 (0.56-1.10)	1.15 (0.90-1.48)	
Cardiovascular disease	1.58 (1.02-2.42)*	0.65 (0.50-0.85)*	0.97 (0.59–1.60)	1.01 (0.74–1.38)	
Pulmonary disease	2.55 (1.45-4.48)*	1.48(1.03-2.13)*	1.33 (0.98-1.80)	0.88 (0.73-1.07)	
Diabetes Mellitus	1.69 (1.01-2.84)*	0.39 (0.09—1.67)	1.17 (0.86—1.59)	0.85 (0.69-1.04)	
Immunocompromised	2.00 (1.03-3.91)*	1.81 (0.64-5.10)	1.46 (1.08-1.98)*	0.76 (0.62-0.93)	
Admission status, symptomatic	1.974 (1.29-3.01)**	0.72 (0.52—1.01)	0.25 (0.09-0.68)**	0.51 (0.26-0.98)*	
use of antibiotic medication	1.851 (1.22-2.79)**	1.03 (0.77-1.37)	1.30#	2.42 (0.32—18.37)	
Chronic use of Dexamethasone	1.881 (1.20-2.94)**	1.32 (1.09-1.60)**	1.36 (0.51-3.59)	1.22 (0.69-2.15)	
Intranasal oxygen use, yes	1.667 (1.05-2.65)*	1.06 (0.88-1.28)	1.23 (0.43-3.51)	1.01 (0.59—1.75)	
Length of stay, $\geq 15$ days	2.469(1.55-3.93)***	0.78 (0.43—1.41)	0.20 (0.07-0.56)**	0.11(0.06-0.19)***	

394 \* Statistically significant, i.e. p<0.05.

395 <sup>#</sup> Collinearity omitted cells

396 Immunocompromised was defined as having a malignancy, auto-immune disease, HIV/AIDS

- and/or use of immunosuppressive medication.
- 398 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249231.t002
- 399

In our study population, approximately 17% of all patients died, which is consistent with 400 other studies [31,32]. Our study showed that age and low immune status at time of admission 401 were risk factors for in-hospital mortality, which is in line with results of many other studies 402 [18,33-35]. We included both cardiovascular disease and Asthma in our model, which may 403 be subject to collinearity. However, a sensitivity analyses excluding cardiovascular disease 404 from the model did not change our estimates and standard errors, showing that our reported 405 estimates are valid. We found immunosuppression as a risk factor for mortality. This has 406 been reported previously, although the exact role of the immune system in COVID-19 is 407 408 complex [36-38].

Poor outcome could be determined by a declining immune system less able to clear the virus, 409 410 but lung tissue damage in severe cases could also be caused by an exaggerated immune 411 response, rather than damage inflicted by the virus itself [39-43]. Consequently, immunocompromised patients may be protected from this type of hyper inflammation 412 413 [37,44,45]. We found that chronic use of antibiotics or dexamethason medication was 414 associated with increased risk of death. Although this may be partially explained by the fact 415 that these medications are used by patients with cardiovascular disease, which has been 416 reported as an individual risk factor for in-hospital mortality [18], anticoagulant medication 417 remained an independent risk factor for death in our multivariable analyses. Thromboembolic events are frequently reported in association with severe COVID-19 disease and mortality 418 [46,47], and current guidelines suggest prophylactic anticoagulants in all hospitalized 419 COVID-19 patients if not contraindicated. However, studies have reported conflicting 420 results regarding the effect of anticoagulants medication on COVID-19 mortality [48], 421 ranging from a protective effect [49] to a harmful effect [50,51], or no association [49,52]. 422 Prospective studies and RCTs are needed to explore the true effects of these medications in 423 hospitalized COVID-19 patients. 424

425 Findings of a living systematic review of 23 prognostic studies about COVID-19 mortality indicated that age, immunocompromising comorbidities, and composite scores of vital 426 parameters are frequently reported predictors of in-hospital mortality, similar to our findings 427 [18]. Blood ferritin levels and anticoagulants medication were scarcely reported [18]. On the 428 other hand, male sex and comorbidities, such as cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases, that 429 430 were significantly associated with in-hospital mortality in our univariable but not multivariable analyses, were frequently reported in other prognostic studies. This is an 431 important finding and shows that many of these risk factors are interacting with each other. 432 Last, we found no increased risk of dying in patients with male sex, diabetes, which are also 433

risk factors that have been reported previously. Larger studies may be needed to revealadditional risk factors of clinical importance.

### 436 Strengths and limitations

The strength of this study is the large, multisite population in an area in which infections 437 were clustered. We analyzed mortality in COVID-19 patients using a competing risk 438 approach, leading to more accurate risk estimates for mortality than when using conventional 439 survival analysis. As previously explained, conventional survival analyses may have resulted 440 in biased estimates and Kaplan-Meier curves presenting overestimated incidence of death. 441 There were some limitations to this study. First, approximately 21% of patients in our study 442 were censored, mainly due to frequent transfer of patients. However, this was considered 443 444 within acceptable limits [53-55]. Second, our data consisted of routinely collected data, 445 resulting in missing values in several variables. We used multiple imputations to minimize associated bias and analyzing dropping missed values. The advantage of routinely collected 446 data is that the study's predictors are readily available and be used in clinical practice without 447 extra effort. All reported predictors are variables measured at time of hospital admission, 448 which means that these factors can be used to identify patients in need of more intensive care 449 and monitoring in an early stage of hospitalization. Finally, data were collected in multiple 450 451 centers with differences in manner of reporting in medical records and differences in clinical management. The advantage of this multisite approach is that it increased the 452 generalizability of our findings. 453

454

# 455 Conclusion

Using a robust, competing risk survival analysis, our study confirmed specific risk factors for in hospital COVID-19 mortality, adding rigor to the current knowledge of risk factors. We confirmed that age and immunocompromised state are important risk factors for death in

hospitalized COVID- 19 patients. This allows us to corroborate specific pattern of risk factors 459 about COVID-19 mortality and its progression among different groups of individuals 460 461 (differentiated by age and immune-compromised state). Clinicians and administrators need to make arrangements to segregate and manage these individuals. Nearly 1 in 5 patients who 462 463 succumb to illness in the hospitals are likely to do so within the first 72 hours. Further, those who die are likely to be older, with each advancing decade, conferring additional significant 464 465 mortality risk. This should be considered while planning distribution of services. Nearly 1 of 2 patients who succumb to illness has associated immune-compromised state. Our findings 466 reaffirm the need for prompt diagnosis, testing and multidisciplinary case mix management. 467 Within health facilities these thoughts shall allow informed decision making for sound, 468 effective, and sustained health-care services to ease mortality. 469

# 470 Abbreviations

AHMC: Adama Hospital Medical College; AIDS: Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome;
ARDS: Acute Respiratory Distress syndrome; AOR: Adjusted Odd Ratio; CI: Confidence
Interval; COR: Crude Odd Ratio; HRcs: cause-specific hazard ratios; HIV: Human Immune
Virus; ICU: Intensive Care Unit; IQR: Inter Quartile Range; KTC: Kurkura Treatment
Center; PH: Primary Hospital; PPs: Proportional population size; OR: Odd Ratio; RH:
Regional Hospital; RNA: Ribose Nucleotide Acid; SARS-COV-2: Severe Acute Respiratory
Syndrome; SD: Standard Deviation; WHO: World Health Organization

478 **Declarations** 

# 479 Ethical approval

This study was approved by Arsi University's Health Research Ethical Review Committee, accreditation number ERC No A/CHS/RC/75/2023 and permission was obtained from the treatment sites for the data collection. There was no direct human contact with the respondents in this study. Participant reports/information was already anonymized and de-

484 identified prior to data collection. Data security and confidentiality were maintained at all
485 levels of data management.

486

496

# 487 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable

488 Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the manuscript and the raw
489 datasets used during the analysis were available from the corresponding author on reasonable
490 request.

491 Funding: This research work was financed by Arsi University. It supported the work by 492 allocating budget for data collection and perdiem for the authors during the data collection 493 period. The funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to 494 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

495 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist

#### 497 Authors' contributions

498 AW, AD, AKa, AT, MS, Aki, ZA and YM designed and worked on the study protocols. AD,

AW and AT prepared a data collection tool and provided training to data collectors. AD and

AT were conducted data entry to Epidata Entry client. AW, AD, AKa, AT, MS, Aki, ZA, and YM analyzed the data, interpreted the result, and wrote the manuscript's draft and final version. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

# 503 Acknowledgments

504 Our heartfelt thanks go to Bishoftu, Modjo, Adama, Negele Arsi, Bekoji and Shashamane 505 hospital administrations and staffs for their permission and cooperation during the data 506 collection process.

# 508 **References**

- 509
- 510
- Gilbert M, Pullano G, Pinotti F, Valdano E, Poletto C, et al. (2020) Preparedness and vulnerability
   of African countries against importations of COVID-19: a modelling study. The Lancet 395: 871-877.
- 2. Poletti P, Parlamento S, Fayyisaa T, Feyyiss R, Lusiani M, et al. (2018) The hidden burden of
  measles in Ethiopia: how distance to hospital shapes the disease mortality rate. BMC
  Medicine 16: 177.
- 517 3. IMF (2020) International Monetary Fund. Policy responses to COVID-19. Policy Tracker: IMF.
- 4. Massinga Loembé M, Tshangela A, Salyer SJ, Varma JK, Ouma AEO, et al. (2020) COVID-19 in
   Africa: the spread and response. Nature Medicine 26: 999-1003.
- 520 5. WHO (2020) WHO COVID-19 dashboard. WHO.
- 6. Makoni M (2020) COVID-19 in Africa: half a year later. The Lancet Infectious Diseases 20: 1127.
- 522 7. WHO (2020) COVID-19 Response Bulletin Ethiopia June 28, 2020.
- 8. Mohammed H, Oljira L, Roba KT, Yimer G, Fekadu A, et al. (2020) Containment of COVID-19 in
   Ethiopia and implications for tuberculosis care and research. Infectious Diseases of Poverty 9:
   131.
- 526 9. EIPH (2021) Ethiopian Institute of Public Health. COVID-19 pandemic preparedness and response
   527 in Ethiopia weekly bulletin.
- 528 10. UNICEF (2020) COVID-19 Response Humanitarian Situation Report #3.
- 529 11. EIPH (2021) Ethiopian Institute of Public Health. COVID-19 PANDEMIC PREPAREDNESS
   530 AND RESPONSE IN ETHIOPIA. 19 p.
- World Health O (2016) Health workforce requirements for universal health coverage and the
   Sustainable Development Goals. (Human Resources for Health Observer, 17). Geneva: World
   Health Organization.
- 13. Haileamlak A (2018) How Can Ethiopia Mitigate the Health Workforce Gap to Meet Universal
   Health Coverage? Ethiop J Health Sci 28: 249-250.
- 536 14. Brand SPC, Aziza R, Kombe IK, Agoti CN, Hilton J, et al. (2020) Forecasting the scale of the
   537 COVID-19 epidemic in Kenya. medRxiv: 2020.2004.2009.20059865.
- 538 15. Quaife M, van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Shah K, McCreesh N, et al. (2020) The impact of
   539 COVID-19 control measures on social contacts and transmission in Kenyan informal
   540 settlements. BMC Medicine 18: 316.
- 541 16. van Zandvoort K, Jarvis CI, Pearson CAB, Davies NG, Nightingale ES, et al. (2020) Response
   542 strategies for COVID-19 epidemics in African settings: a mathematical modelling study.
   543 BMC Medicine 18: 324.
- 544 17. Walker PGT, Whittaker C (2020) The impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation and 545 suppression in low- and middle-income countries. 369: 413-422.
- 546 18. Wynants L, Van Calster B, Collins GS, Riley RD, Heinze G, et al. (2020) Prediction models for
   547 diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19: systematic review and critical appraisal. BMJ 369:
   548 m1328.
- 549 19. Oulhaj A, Ahmed LA, Prattes J, Suliman A, Alsuwaidi AR, et al. (2020) The competing risk
  550 between in-hospital mortality and recovery: A pitfall in COVID-19 survival analysis research.
  551 medRxiv: 2020.2007.2011.20151472.
- Schuster NA, Hoogendijk EO, Kok AA, Twisk JW, Heymans MW (2020) Ignoring competing
  events in the analysis of survival data may lead to biased results: a nonmathematical
  illustration of competing risk analysis. Journal of clinical epidemiology 122: 42-48.
- 555 21. R.A.Fadnavis (2019) Application of Machine Learning For Survival Analysis- A
- 556 Review. IOSR Journal of Engineering (IOSRJEN) 9: 5.
- 557 22. Fine JP, Gray RJ (1999) A Proportional Hazards Model for the Subdistribution of a Competing
   558 Risk. Journal of the American Statistical Association 94: 496-509.
- Edae CK, Wabalo EK, Heyi CD (2020) Assessment of preparedness and response of health
   professionals towards COVID-19 pandemic during early period in public hospitals in Oromia

regional state, Ethiopia. Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research 32: 15.

- Andersen MP, Mills EHA, Meddis A, Sørensen KK, Butt JH, et al. (2023) All-cause mortality
  among Danish nursing home residents before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a
  nationwide cohort study. Eur J Epidemiol 38: 523-531.
- 565 25. Austin PC, Lee DS, Fine JP (2016) Introduction to the Analysis of Survival Data in the Presence
   566 of Competing Risks. Circulation 133: 601-609.
- 567 26. Noordzij M, Leffondré K, van Stralen KJ, Zoccali C, Dekker FW, et al. (2013) When do we need
   568 competing risks methods for survival analysis in nephrology? Nephrology Dialysis
   569 Transplantation 28: 2670-2677.
- 570 27. Steyerberg EW (2019) Clinical Prediction Models: A Practical Approach to Development,
   571 Validation, and Updating: Springer International Publishing.
- 572 28. Gray RJ (1988) A Class of K-Sample Tests for Comparing the Cumulative Incidence of a
   573 Competing Risk. The Annals of Statistics 16: 1141-1154.
- Scrucca L, Santucci A, Aversa F (2007) Competing risk analysis using R: an easy guide for
   clinicians. Bone Marrow Transplant 40: 381-387.
- 576 30. Dignam JJ, Zhang Q, Kocherginsky M (2012) The use and interpretation of competing risks
   577 regression models. Clin Cancer Res 18: 2301-2308.
- 578 31. Goel S, Jain T, Hooda A, Malhotra R, Johal G, et al. (2020) Clinical Characteristics and In 579 Hospital Mortality for COVID-19 Across The Globe. Cardiol Ther 9: 553-559.
- 32. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC (2020) Pathophysiology,
  Transmission, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A
  Review. Jama 324: 782-793.
- 583 33. Hu H, Yao N, Qiu Y (2020) Comparing Rapid Scoring Systems in Mortality Prediction of
   584 Critically III Patients With Novel Coronavirus Disease. Acad Emerg Med 27: 461-468.
- 585 34. Lu L, Zhong W, Bian Z, Li Z, Zhang K, et al. (2020) A comparison of mortality-related risk
   586 factors of COVID-19, SARS, and MERS: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Infect 81:
   587 e18-e25.
- 588 35. Parohan M, Yaghoubi S, Seraji A, Javanbakht MH, Sarraf P, et al. (2020) Risk factors for
   589 mortality in patients with Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection: a systematic
   590 review and meta-analysis of observational studies. Aging Male 23: 1416-1424.
- 591 36. Evans RA, Dube S, Lu Y, Yates M, Arnetorp S, et al. (2023) Impact of COVID-19 on
   592 immunocompromised populations during the Omicron era: insights from the observational
   593 population-based INFORM study. Lancet Reg Health Eur 35: 100747.
- 594 37. Fung M, Babik JM (2021) COVID-19 in Immunocompromised Hosts: What We Know So Far.
   595 Clin Infect Dis 72: 340-350.
- 596 38. Gao Y, Chen Y, Liu M, Shi S, Tian J (2020) Impacts of immunosuppression and immunodeficiency on COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Infect 81: e93e95.
- 39. Abdulamir AS, Hafidh RR (2020) The Possible Immunological Pathways for the Variable
   Immunopathogenesis of COVID—19 Infections among Healthy Adults, Elderly and
   Children. ELECTRON J GEN MED 17: 4.
- 40. Coperchini F, Chiovato L, Croce L, Magri F, Rotondi M (2020) The cytokine storm in COVID19: An overview of the involvement of the chemokine/chemokine-receptor system. Cytokine
  Growth Factor Rev 53: 25-32.
- 41. Liu Y, Chen D, Hou J, Li H, Cao D, et al. (2021) An inter-correlated cytokine network identified
   at the center of cytokine storm predicted COVID-19 prognosis. Cytokine 138: 155365.
- 42. Mehta P, McAuley DF, Brown M, Sanchez E, Tattersall RS, et al. (2020) COVID-19: consider
   cytokine storm syndromes and immunosuppression. Lancet 395: 1033-1034.
- 43. Prompetchara E, Ketloy C, Palaga T (2020) Immune responses in COVID-19 and potential
  vaccines: Lessons learned from SARS and MERS epidemic. Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol
  38: 1-9.
- 44. Abdulla ZA, Al-Bashir SM, Alzoubi H (2023) The Role of Immunity in the Pathogenesis of
   SARS-CoV-2 Infection and in the Protection Generated by COVID-19 Vaccines in Different
   Age Groups. 12.

- 45. Minotti C, Tirelli F, Barbieri E, Giaquinto C, Donà D (2020) How is immunosuppressive status
  affecting children and adults in SARS-CoV-2 infection? A systematic review. J Infect 81:
  e61-e66.
- 46. Bavaro DF, Poliseno M, Scardapane A, Belati A, De Gennaro N, et al. (2020) Occurrence of
  Acute Pulmonary Embolism in COVID-19-A case series. Int J Infect Dis 98: 225-226.
- 47. Malas MB, Naazie IN, Elsayed N, Mathlouthi A, Marmor R, et al. (2020) Thromboembolism risk
   of COVID-19 is high and associated with a higher risk of mortality: A systematic review and
   meta-analysis. EClinicalMedicine 29: 100639.
- 48. Salah HM, Naser JA, Calcaterra G, Bassareo PP, Mehta JL (2020) The Effect of Anticoagulation
  Use on Mortality in COVID-19 Infection. Am J Cardiol 134: 155-157.
- 49. Wijaya I, Andhika R, Huang I (2020) The Use of Therapeutic-Dose Anticoagulation and Its Effect
   on Mortality in Patients With COVID-19: A Systematic Review. 26: 1076029620960797.
- 50. Chen F, Sun W, Sun S, Li Z, Wang Z (2020) Clinical characteristics and risk factors for mortality
   among inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. 10: e40.
- 51. Giacomelli A, Ridolfo AL, Milazzo L, Oreni L, Bernacchia D, et al. (2020) 30-day mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 during the first wave of the Italian epidemic: A prospective cohort study. Pharmacol Res 158: 104931.
- 52. Klok FA, Kruip M, van der Meer NJM, Arbous MS, Gommers D, et al. (2020) Confirmation of
  the high cumulative incidence of thrombotic complications in critically ill ICU patients with
  COVID-19: An updated analysis. Thromb Res 191: 148-150.
- 53. Zhu X, Zhou X, Zhang Y, Sun X, Liu H, et al. (2017) Reporting and methodological quality of
  survival analysis in articles published in Chinese oncology journals. Medicine (Baltimore) 96:
  e9204.
- 54. Demler OV, Paynter NP, Cook NR (2018) Reclassification calibration test for censored survival
   data: performance and comparison to goodness-of-fit criteria. Diagnostic and Prognostic
   Research 2: 16.
- 641 55. Qin J, Shen Y (2010) Statistical methods for analyzing right-censored length-biased data under
   642 cox model. Biometrics 66: 382-392.
- 643



Figure 1Cumulative incidence plot of death and recovery in hospitals, south eastern Ethiopia 2024



Duration of hospital admission (days)

Figure 2 Cumulative incidence plots of death and recovery in south eastern Ethiopia hospitals separated, by age group 2024





Duration of hospital admission (days)

Figure 3 Cumulative incidence plots of death and recovery in south eastern Ethiopia hospitals separated, by gender 2024



