

The impact of Intensive Care Strain on Patients' Outcomes during COVID-19 - a UNITE COVID study

Katharina Kohler^{1,2}, Thomas De Corte^{3,4}, Massimiliano Greco^{5,6}, Pedro Pova^{7,8,9}, Maurizio Cecconi^{5,6},
Marlies Ostermann¹⁰, Jan De Waele^{3,11}, Andrew Conway Morris^{1,12} for the UNITE-COVID investigators.

¹ Perioperative, Acute, Critical Care and Emergency Medicine section, Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, UK

² Department of Anaesthesia, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK

³ Dept of Internal Medicine and Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

⁴ Department of Hematology, Ghent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium

⁵ Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Via Rita Levi Montalcini 4, Pieve Emanuele, 20072, Milan, Italy

⁶ IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, Via Manzoni 56, Rozzano, 20089, Milan, Italy

⁷ NOVA Medical School, CHRC, NOVA University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

⁸ Department of Intensive care, Hospital de São Francisco Xavier, CHLO, Lisbon, Portugal

⁹ Research Unit of Clinical Epidemiology, Department of Clinical Research, OUH Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

¹⁰ Department of Intensive Care, Guy's & St Thomas' Hospital, London, UK

¹¹ Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Ghent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium

¹² JVF Intensive Care Unit, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK

Address for correspondence:

A Conway Morris

Perioperative, Acute, Critical Care and Emergency Medicine section

Department of Medicine

University of Cambridge

Level 4 Addenbrooke's Hospital

Hills Road

Cambridge

United Kingdom

Ac926@cam.ac.uk

Take home message: We examined the effects of various aspects of ICU strain on patient outcomes during the periods of maximal unit occupancy during the COVID-19 pandemic. We identified adverse relationships between preventable complications and increases in patient:nursing ratios and use of non-ICU trained staff, whilst procedural support teams and staff well-being interventions were associated with better patient outcomes.

140 character summary: COVID strained ICUs. Increased patient:staff ratios & non-ICU staff increased complications, staff well-being initiatives improved outcomes.

Funding: ACM is supported by a Clinician Scientist Fellowship from the Medical Research Council (MR/V006118/1). JDW is supported by a Sr Clinical Research Grant from the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO, Ref. 1881020N).

Competing interests: ACM reports speaking fees from Biomerieux, Thermo-Fisher, Fischer and Paykel and Boston Scientific (paid to institution), he sits on the scientific advisory board of Cambridge Infection Diagnostics. MO has received research funding from Biomerieux and Baxter (paid to institution). JdW has consulted for Biomerieux, Menarini, MSD, Pfizer, Roche Diagnostics, ThermoFisher and Viatrix (fees and honoraria paid to institution). PP reports speaking fees from Gilead, Mundipharma and advisory board fees from MSD, Biocodex.

Word count 3197

Abstract: 248 words

Tables:3

Figures:3

Additional methods and results are available in the online supplemental section

Abstract

Purpose: Intensive care unit (ICU) strain is associated with increased mortality. Most strain metrics focus on 'simple' measures such as bed occupancy or admission rates. There is limited data on mitigation strategies, such as procedure teams or staff well-being services on strain, or the impact of increased patient-to-nurse ratios and non-ICU trained nurses working in ICU.

Methods: Using the multi-national UNITE-COVID study, collecting data from ICUs on their busiest day in two periods (2020 and 2021) of the COVID-19 pandemic, we evaluated metrics of strain (Bed occupancy, patient: nurse ratio, use of non-ICU staff and shortages of consumables) and potential mitigators (procedural support teams and staff well-being interventions). We examined how these related to outcomes (mortality, complications and length of stay).

Results: In both epochs, ICUs experienced significant strain, with ICU bed expansion to 133% and 163% respectively, whilst patient-to-nurse ratios increased by 0.4 and 0.3. Consumable shortages were widespread in 2020. Mortality was inversely correlated with staff well-being interventions in both epochs. Complications were inversely correlated with procedure support teams, and positively correlated with staffing ratios. In regression models, pressure sores were reduced in presence of support teams ($p=0.004$) and increased with the increase in patients per nurse ($p=0.05$) whilst unplanned extubations were related to non-ICU trained staff working in ICU ($p = 0.02$).

Conclusions: COVID-19 induced ICU strain had effects beyond mortality, including increases in complications. Staff pressure and lack of ICU training were related to specific complications, whilst support teams and well-being interventions were associated with improved outcomes.

Keywords: Intensive care, health services, system strain, healthcare providers, COVID-19

1 Background:

2 Strained health systems are those that cannot meet the World Health Organisation (WHO)
3 requirements for healthcare to be high-quality and person centered, timely, equitable, integrated,
4 and efficient¹. Previous studies investigating the links between health system strain, in particular
5 intensive care unit (ICU) strain, and patient outcomes have found that increased strain is associated
6 with worse patient outcomes, prolonged admissions and increased risk of complications²⁻⁵. Most
7 commonly used strain metrics focus on readily measurable elements such as an increase in ICU
8 occupancy or an increase in the proportion of new admissions⁶⁻⁹. The “activity index” integrates a
9 number of these measures, but remains a fundamentally “process” focused measure^{10,11}.

10 The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in exceptional health system-wide stress on resources, particularly
11 with respect to respiratory support and intensive care. In contrast to more ‘routine’ service strain in
12 the ICU, it forced ICUs to increase patient:staff ratios, use non-ICU trained staff and work in
13 improvised ‘surge’ units. These demands were particularly acute throughout the “first wave” in
14 winter and spring of 2020 and then again during the “second wave” in winter of 2021 resulting in
15 ICUs around the world reaching and breaching baseline capacity. Studies investigating the specific
16 effects of COVID strain on ICU care and outcomes have found some correlation between strain and
17 adverse outcomes¹². While these studies provide relevant information on this important topic, these
18 again focused on ‘simple’ strain metrics such as bed census and admission rates. Additionally, study
19 outcomes were frequently limited to length of stay and mortality^{13,14} and restricted to either a single
20 center or single country¹⁵.

21 The UNITE-COVID study was a multi-centre, international point prevalence study examining the
22 burden of COVID-19 in ICUs around the world during 2020 and 2021. By combining centre-level data
23 with the granular patient data, the UNITE-COVID project presents a unique opportunity to
24 comprehensively evaluate strain during the aforementioned COVID-19 periods on ICUs worldwide
25 and to relate this strain to patient outcomes and delivery of care.

26

27 **Methods:**

28 **Data collection**

29 The UNITE-COVID data collection and data from 2020 and 2021 editions have been described
30 previously¹⁶. Briefly, sites collected data regarding patients in ICU with COVID-19 on their day of peak
31 occupancy in 2020 and again in 2021 via an electronic patient case report form (CRF), which can be
32 found in the Online Supplement (Figure S1). Data included patient-level data covering demographic
33 features, comorbidities, severity of illness and complications. Center level data covered hospital and
34 ICU type, changes in ICU capacity and staffing, availability and shortages of resources, visiting policies
35 and modes of communication with family members, availability of task-specific teams and provision
36 of well-being services.

37 **Severity scores and outcome metrics**

38 As described in previous papers, scores were developed to understand the severity of COVID-19^{17,18}
39 and the burden of comorbidities in the UNITE-COVID cohorts. Briefly, for comorbidity scoring, each
40 condition was given a weight of 1, within the patient population to enable comparison between
41 different settings. Severity of COVID-19 was determined by ‘ventilation severity score’ calculated
42 based on the level of respiratory intervention needed for each patient: non-invasive ventilation (1),
43 invasive ventilation (2), need for neuro-muscular blockade and/or extracorporeal membrane
44 oxygenation (ECMO) support(3).

45 To evaluate the effect of shortages (sedative and analgesia medications, ventilation equipment,
46 invasive line insertion provisions, renal replacement therapy, antimicrobials, tracheostomy
47 equipment and “other” shortages), an overall shortage score was calculated by adding each category
48 with equal weight, with shortages resulting in change in practice reported separately from those that
49 did not have this impact.

50 The outcome measures for this analysis were unit average length of stay in ICU, mortality rate and
51 the frequency of potentially avoidable complications, the latter used as a metric of quality of care.
52 The preventable complications were: accidental extubations, thrombotic events, pneumothorax,
53 endotracheal/tracheostomy tube obstructions and pressure sores. These were aggregated with equal
54 weight into the ‘complication score’.

55 Strain parameter development

56 In the absence of a well-established metric of ICU strain we utilized the parameters collected at ICU
57 and individual patient level to develop individual and composite measures across several domains to
58 estimate comparative ICU strain across the cohort and time periods examined. The details of these
59 are set out in the supplemental methods.

60 Statistical analysis

61 All statistical analyses were performed using R studio (v 4.2.1)¹⁹. Continuous variables are presented
62 as mean and standard deviation for normally distributed data and as median and interquartile range
63 for non-normally distributed data. Categorical variables are presented as percentages and number of
64 evaluable instances (between brackets) unless explicitly stated otherwise. Pearson’s Chi-squared test
65 and Wilcoxon rank sum test were used where appropriate. A p-value < 0.05 was deemed statistically
66 significant. In case of multiple testing, a Benjamini-Hochberg correction was performed.

67 Ethical approvals

68 The study received approval from Ghent University Hospital Ethics committee, registration BC-07826
69 and appropriate approvals at each participating site in line with local regulations (ClinicalTrials.gov
70 registration: NCT04836065, retrospectively registered April 8th 2021).

71

72 **Results:**

73 **Patient level data:**

74 Overall, in 2020, we had data from 4976 patients across 280 ICUs, spanning 45 countries and 5
 75 continents in 2020. In 2021, participation was lower, but remained substantial and broad-based with
 76 2503 patients from 37 countries across 5 continents. 69 ICUs participated in both years, providing a
 77 comparison for “matched units” (see supplemental Figure S3)

78 Patient-level data is presented in Table 1. Despite the changes in provision of evidence-based
 79 therapeutics¹⁸, overall mortality was higher in 2021. There was considerable variation in ICU
 80 mortality between units with median 26.3% [18.2 – 46.2] in 2020 vs 28.1% [21.2 – 44.4] in 2021
 81 (supplemental Figure S4A), as well as in length of stay with median 19.5 [15.5 – 24.1] days in 2020 vs
 82 17.8 [13.6 – 23.3] days in 2021 (Figure S4B).

83 *Table 1 Patient level data 2020 and 2021*

	2020	2021	p-value*	q – value[§]
	N = 4,976	N = 2,503		
DEMOGRAPHICS				
Sex	71% Male - 29% Female (4,957)	67% Male – 33% Female (2,473)	<0.001	<0.001
Pregnancy	0.7% (4735)	1.3% (2415)	<0.001	<0.001
Median [IQR] age (years)	62 [53 – 70] (4,891)	62 [53 – 71] (2,473)	0.055	0.079
Median [IQR] BMI	28.0 [25.3 – 32.3] (4,516)	28.1 [25.4 – 32.3] (2,342)	0.7	0.7
Health care worker	5.6% (4,554)	2.6% (2,131)	<0.001	<0.001
Admission to surge capacity bed	43% (4,589)	59% (2,476)	<0.001	<0.001
COMORBIDITIES				
Chronic cardiac disease	16% (4,751)	17% (2,417)	0.11	0.15
History of hypertension	50% (4,766)	52% (2,423)	0.030	0.048
Chronic liver disease	2.6% (4,739)	3.9% (2,423)	0.004	0.008
Chronic neurological disease	5.9% (4,737)	7.1% (2,421)	0.063	0.087
Chronic pulmonary disease	9.0% (4,752)	12% (2,413)	<0.001	<0.001
Diabetes			0.4	0.5
<i>No diabetes</i>	68.4% (4,746)	68.8% (2,408)		
<i>Type I diabetes</i>	2.1% (4,746)	1.6% (2,408)		

<i>Type II diabetes</i>	29.5% (4,746)	29.6% (2,408)		
Asthma	8.8% (4,761)	8.7% (2,425)	0.9	0.9
Malignant neoplasm	5.5% (4,700)	7.0% (2,410)	0.016	0.027
Chronic kidney disease	7.1% (4,756)	8.8% (2,423)	0.012	0.022
Immunosuppression	5.1% (4,704)	6.6% (2,412)	0.008	0.015
HIV			0.083	0.11
<i>HIV – not on ART</i>	0.3% (4,409)	0.7% (2,289)		
<i>HIV – on ART</i>	0.4% (4,409)	0.3% (2,289)		
<i>No HIV</i>	99.3% (4,409)	99% (2,289)		
Comorbidity score [§]				
0	33%	30%		
1	29%	30%		
2	20%	19%		
3	8.4%	10%		
4	6.2%	6.8%		
5	2.6%	2.8%		
6	0.7%	1%		
7	< 0.1%	0.1%		
CHRONIC MEDICATION				
ACE-inhibitor	19% (4,538)	19% (2,281)	0.6	0.7
Angiotensin II receptor antagonist	15% (4,529)	17% (2,276)	0.045	0.069
Anticoagulation	6.9% (4,580)	11% (2,299)	<0.001	<0.001
Antiplatelet therapy	17% (4,567)	17% (2,301)	0.5	0.6
CLINICAL STATUS AT ICU ADMISSION				
Reason for admission			<0.001	0.002
<i>Referral from another ICU</i>	7.7% (4,807)	6.2% (2,468)		
<i>ICU admission due to respiratory failure</i>	88% (4,807)	87.8% (2,468)		
<i>ICU admission due to other complications of COVID-19</i>	2.2% (4,807)	3.3% (2,468)		
<i>ICU admission due to other diagnosis</i>	2.1% (4,807)	2.7% (2,468)		
Median [IQR] days between symptoms and hospital admission	7.0 [4.0 – 9.0] (4,234)	6.0 [4.0 – 9.0] (2,065)	<0.001	<0.001
Median [IQR] LoS in hospital before ICU admission	1.0 [0.0 – 4.0] (4,676)	2.0 [0.0 – 4.0] (2,302)	0.003	0.007
Respiratory support before ICU admission (any)	73% (4,807)	76% (2,438)	<0.001	0.002
Type of pre-ICU respiratory support				
<i>CPAP</i>	11% (3,220)	15% (1,707)		
<i>HFNO</i>	7.8% (3,220)	21% (1,707)		
<i>NIV</i>	5.2% (3,220)	11% (1,707)		
<i>Standard oxygen</i>	76% (3,220)	53% (1,707)		

Median [IQR] days of respiratory support before ICU admission	1.00 [1.00 - 3.00] (709)	2.00 [1.00 - 3.00] (773)	<0.001	0.002
Deep vein thrombosis at admission	0.8%	1.0% (2,502)	0.4	0.5
Pulmonary embolism at admission	1.9%	4.9% (2,502)	<0.001	<0.001
Other thrombosis at admission	1.4%	2.7% (2,502)	<0.001	<0.001

* Pearson's Chi-squared test or Wilcoxon rank sum test was used where appropriate

[§] q-value was determined using the false discovery rate (Benjamini-Hochberg) procedure for multiple testing

[&] Comorbidity score achieved by summing the number of co-morbidities recorded (chronic cardiac disease, arterial hypertension, chronic pulmonary disease (excluding asthma), asthma, chronic liver disease, chronic kidney disease, diabetes mellitus, malignancy, immunosuppression).

84 In 2020, 217 centres had sufficient data for analysis, whilst 2021 it was 107 (Supplemental figure S2
85 shows inclusion flowchart). In 2020, centers included between 1 and 121 patients into the study with
86 a median of 13 [7-23], and in 2021, there were a median of 18 patients [10.5 – 25]. Aggregating
87 overall patients constitutes a weighting towards the larger centers, however when aggregated at
88 centre level (therefore weighting each centre equally) there were few major differences.
89 The severity of illness was summarized by the ventilation severity score^{17,18}. When aggregated by
90 centre, in 2020 the mean ventilation severity score was 2.2 +/- 0.6, reflecting the severity of illness of
91 the population and the significant contribution of ECMO centres to the study. The mean comorbidity
92 score was 1.0 +/- 0.6 showing the level of background comorbidities to be relatively low in the
93 patient population. In 2021, similarly the mean ventilation score was 2.3 +/- 0.6 and the comorbidity
94 score was 1.0 +/- 0.5.

95 Centre data:

96 Supplemental Table S1 shows the number of centres, number of patients and the bed state
97 characteristics during the 2020 and 2021 surge periods.

98 Whilst hospitals and ICUs expanded bed capacity in both years, the surge in ICU beds in 2020 was
99 smaller than overall hospital capacity increase (33% vs 56% increase over baseline respectively). In
100 2021 this was inverted as the ICU bed capacity surged by 63% while the overall hospital beds
101 increased by 53%, with similar findings when only comparing matched units (Table S1), potentially

102 showing that centres were better equipped and prepared for the needed ICU capacity. Additional
 103 features describing the composition of units in terms of provider type and open vs closed were
 104 broadly similar between 2020 and 2021 (see supplemental Figure S3).

105 There was an increase patient-to-nurse ratio (rising from baseline median 1.9:1 to surge 2.3:1 in
 106 2020 ($p < 0.001$) with similar values in 2021 ($p = 0.03$) (Table 2) and an increase in intensivist:bed
 107 ratio that was significant in 2021. Additionally, a significant number of centres deployed non-ICU
 108 trained nursing staff into ICUs. The matched centres data is shown for validation, of note is the
 109 slightly changed baseline of the patient:nurse ratio standard between 2020 and 2021, however the
 110 IQRs overlap and the data was collected as a snapshot with potential variations depending on
 111 day/week.

112 *Table 2 staffing related factors 2020 and 2021*


	2020 – all centres (204)	2021 – all centres (94)	2020 – matched centres only	2021 – matched centres only
Patient : nurse ratio standard	1.9 [1 – 2]	1.8 [1 - 2]	2.4 [2 – 3]*	1.8 [1.5 – 2]*
Patient : nurse ratio surge	2.3 [2 - 3]	2.1 [2 – 2.5]	2.9 [2 - 4]	2.0 [2 - 2]
Patient: intensivist ratio standard	3.6 [3 – 9]	3.6 [2.8 - 9]	4.9 [4 - 10]	3.2 [3 – 9.25]
Patient : intensivist ratio surge	4.2 [3.9 – 10]	5.2 [4 – 12]	5.9 [5 – 9]	5.2 [4 – 12]
Percentage of centres with non-ICU trained nurses working in ICU	74%	71%	59%	67%

113 * baseline staffing changed between 2020 and 2021.

114 Information on resource shortages showed widespread shortages of medications and equipment in
 115 2020, although the majority did not impact on practice (Figure 1, Table S2). The surge in 2021 again
 116 saw shortages, although to a lesser degree than in 2020. The main shortages with an impact on
 117 practice occurred with ventilators and sedation and analgesic medications.

118 Analysis of the overall average shortage score with a change in practice showed a median of 0 [0 – 4]

119 for 2020 and 0 [0 -1] for 2021. The higher shortages leading to a change in practice in 2020
120 represented a significant difference to the lower ones in 2021 ($p=0.02$).



121

122 *Figure 1 Shortages stacked bar chart: Showing the shortages across both surge periods in all recorded categories. RRT =*
123 *renal replacement therapy. Change = shortages that caused a change in practice, No change = shortages that existed but*
124 *did not cause a change in practice. Notable is that shortages with change decreased in 2021 compared to 2020.*
125 *Sedation/analgesia medications and the ventilation/renal replacement treatments were most affected by shortages.*

126

127 2020 saw extensive use of specialist support teams, most notably intubation, vascular access and
128 proning teams (Table 3). 2021 saw a reduction in such team provision. Table S3 compares the
129 matched units, showing similar trends.

130

131

132


133 *Table 3 Additional teams to support ICU - 2020 and 2021*

ICU support teams	2020 – all centres			2021 – all centres		
	24/7	Day	never	24/7	day	Never
Intubation team	72.4%	6.9%	20.7%	68.9%	2.3%	28.7%
Tracheostomy insertion team	23.5%	48.4%	29.9%	34.5%	35.6%	29.9%
Vascular access team	72.4%	6.9%	20.7%	68.9%	2.3%	28.7%
Proning team	59.4%	16.6%	23.9 %	58.6%	11.5%	29.9%
Communications team	31.8%	31.3%	36.9%	37.9%	21.8%	40.2%
Mouth care team	46.5 %	8.8%	44.7%	44.8%	6.9 %	48.3%
Drains team	47.0 %	13.6%	39.1%	44.8%	12.6%	42.5%
Pressure ulcer team	35.5 %	27.6%	36.9%	44.7%	22.9%	33.3%
Overall support team score	5.5 [2 – 7]			5 [1.25 – 7.5]		

134 We examined staff welfare provisions (Table S4) that aimed to mitigate strain. 2020 saw high levels of
 135 support including provision of free food in 82% and free accommodation in 52% of centres, and
 136 psychological support in 68%. In 2021 only the psychological support was maintained at similar levels
 137 to 2020, indeed showing a significant increase in matched centers, whilst other forms of welfare
 138 support were less frequently offered.

139 Communication methods and visiting policies also changed substantially during the surges of 2020
 140 and 2021 (Figure 2). The overall trend was towards more restrictive visiting during COVID peaks,
 141 although this was less marked in 2021. Communication was similarly altered with reduction in face-
 142 to-face communications, again this was less marked in 2021.

143



144

145

146 *Figure 2 Changes in visiting policies (top) and relative communication policies (bottom): Pre COVID – prior to surge 2020,*
147 *Intra 2020 – during surge 2020, Pre 2021 – prior to surge 2021, Intra 2021 – during surge 2021.*

148 *Visiting: EOL: end of life.*

149 *Relative communications: FTF – face to face, telephone – via voice (phone or other), video – via video tool.*


150

151 Correlation of strain parameters with outcomes

152 To understand the relationships between the strain metrics, and how these relate to our outcomes
153 we show a correlation matrix (Figure 3) across variables and outcome metrics for both surge periods.
154 Figure 3 shows that the outcome measures are correlated with a range of aggregated strain scores
155 and staffing metrics, notably non-ICU trained staff working in ICU and the staffing ratio change.
156 Statistically significant correlations also include the negative correlation of well-being support with
157 mortality ($p < 0.01$), indicating a higher mortality in ICUs with lower well-being support.

158 The complication score was negatively correlated with the presence of support teams, indicating
 159 fewer complications were associated with the presence of procedural teams. Complications had a
 160 positive correlation with the change in nursing ratio indicating that more complications were
 161 reported in ICUs that had a higher increase in patients per nursing staff.
 162 Additionally, the complication score was positively correlated with communication changes - mainly
 163 so in 2020 – and the presence of non-ICU trained staff working in ICUs. The most significant
 164 correlation was with the shortage score²⁰, indicating that shortages that resulted in a change in
 165 practice were associated with higher rate of complications of care.

166



167

168 *Figure 3 Correlation of outcomes with main strain categories. Correlation matrices show the relation between parameters,*
 169 *with the variables displayed across the top and sides of the diagram. The diagonal shows the distribution of the variable in*
 170 *question (2020 in red, 2021 in teal), the upper triangle shows the correlation coefficient by Pearson coefficient, *p<0.05,*
 171 ***p<0.01, ***p<0.001 by Pearson coefficient, significant positive correlations highlighted in green, significant negative*
 172 *correlations highlighted in orange. The lower triangle shows the scatter plot of the two variables to allow visual inspection.*
 173 *NonICU – non-ICU nursing staff recruited into the ICU, Ratio – nursing ratio change in surge times (increased ratio indicating*

174 more patients per staff), Comms – communication change score, LOS – length of stay, Complics – complication score across
175 domains. Outcome measures (mortality, complications and length of stay) highlighted in purple.

176 Regression modelling of strain parameters on outcomes

177 We sought to further understand the extent to which ICU strain explained the variation in outcomes
178 by constructing linear regression models for the outcome variables using the strain variables (Figure
179 3) as parameters. To account for differences in patient cohort characteristics we also included the
180 centre mean ventilation severity and comorbidity score. The variables entered the final model by
181 backward stepwise selection, maintaining only those significantly contributing to the model (see
182 Table S5).

183 Complications modelling:

184 For 2020, the linear regression model for the aggregate mean complication score contained the
185 mean ventilation severity score ($p < 0.001$), the shortage score ($p = 0.02$) and the change in
186 communication policies ($p = 0.04$) with a model R^2 of 0.21. All coefficients were positive indicating
187 that higher severity and higher strain parameters are related to a higher complication score.

188 For the 2021 surge period the best fit model only contained the mean ventilation severity score
189 ($p < 0.001$), none of the other parameters were significant.

190 Investigating the sub-categories of complications (Table S5) found that different complications had
191 slightly different best fit models. In 2020 the additional findings were that the model for unplanned
192 extubation complications contained the presence of non-ICU trained staff in the ICU as a significant
193 variable ($p = 0.02$) and the pressure sore complication model included the presence of support teams
194 ($p = 0.004$) and the change in patient to nurse ratio ($p = 0.05$). The presence of support teams reduced
195 the pressure sore score, whereas an increase in patients per nursing staff increased it.

196 In 2021 the main additional findings were that the mean centre comorbidity score was significant
197 ($p = 0.007$) in the pneumothorax subcategory of complications indicating a higher risk with the
198 presence of increased comorbidities.

199 Mortality modelling:

200 The 2020 surge mean centre mortality model included the mean comorbidity score ($p=0.03$) and the
201 change in visiting policies ($p=0.02$) with an $R^2=0.20$ (Table S5)

202 The 2021 surge mean centre mortality model included the mean comorbidity score ($p=0.04$) and the
203 change in communication policies ($p=0.02$) with an $R^2=0.21$, again with positive coefficients
204 indicating an increase in mortality with an increase in comorbidities and changes in communication
205 process.

206 Length of stay modelling:

207 For the 2020 surge period the regression model (Table S5) included the mean ventilation severity
208 score ($p<0.001$) with none of the strain parameters significant for inclusion. For the 2021 surge
209 period the only significant variable in the parsimonious model was the well-being support ($p=0.04$)
210 with a negative coefficient indicating that length of stay decreased with increased staff well-being
211 support.

212 Discussion:

213 This secondary analysis of data from the large, multi-continental UNITE-COVID study brings deeper
214 and wider understanding of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on ICU working. ICU strain is
215 usually considered within the context of existing bed and staffing envelopes, and in high-income
216 nations, shortages across wide ranges of healthcare consumables are extremely rare. There has also
217 been almost no prior work evaluating mitigation strategies for ICU strain²¹.

218 Our analysis finds that there were significant changes to service provision throughout the two peak
219 periods examined with a more significant impact of shortages and capacity issues during the first
220 peak (2020). Important changes to working practices occurred during both peaks, some driven by
221 clinical need, such as the widespread practice of adding procedure support teams²². Others were
222 driven by shortages of usual medications or equipment²³, whilst infection control concerns motivated

223 the changes in visiting and communication policies²⁴. These changes were present in most ICUs,
224 reflecting rapid changes in working practices in an environment where practice change is commonly
225 slow and measured. The ability to deliver such significant changes at pace reflects a level of resilience
226 within the system and workforce. However, there was also an association with increased
227 complications when practice had changed due to shortages or with respect to communication
228 policies. Although we did not measure staff mental health in this study, previous studies have found
229 significant levels of psychological distress and moral injury amongst healthcare workers with the
230 most junior staff most strongly affected²⁵.

231 The regression modelling found significant relationships between severity of illness and comorbidity
232 scores with mortality, giving reassurance that these detect known and plausible relationships. We
233 also used a composite score of complication rates as an outcome metric, allowing a more nuanced
234 analysis than mortality alone. Complications were independently associated with shortages and
235 changes in communication strategy, whilst correlation analysis suggested a protective association
236 with procedure teams. Whilst we cannot infer causation from these relationships, the divergent
237 relationships do at least suggest that complications were not simply a reflection of strain, and have
238 the potential to be mitigated. Procedure teams have both the benefit of allowing specialized skill
239 development through concentrated practice, as well as reducing the procedural burden on the
240 primary care team²². This suggests that preventable complications such as those we examined could
241 be a useful metric for units to consider in the future.

242 We found that filling staff shortages with non-ICU trained health care was associated with an
243 increased risk of certain complications. This was most prominent in 2020, and it is possible that
244 interventions to improve staff training, such as the ESICM's C19Space initiative and similar
245 programmes had a positive impact preparing staff better for the subsequent wave in 2021²⁶. The
246 pressure sore complication rate findings are an example of both risk factors (increase in patients per
247 nursing staff) and mitigation by presence of additional help (support by special teams) indicating

248 potential mitigations to the risks of increased workload and reduced skill mix. The impact of the
249 COVID-19 pandemic on communication and visiting has been reported previously²⁴ , and clinicians
250 reported dissatisfaction with the approaches taken and the potential for detrimental effects on staff,
251 patients and families²⁴. Our identification of an association between changed communication and
252 outcomes suggests these concerns were valid.

253 The role of staff well-being support remains notably under-explored in both the COVID and wider ICU
254 literature. Well-being support across several domains was positively associated with patient length of
255 stay, and in correlation analysis with mortality. Whilst we cannot infer causality from our data, a
256 recent systematic review of 85 studies found a relationship between nursing burnout and care
257 quality²⁷. Attention to staff well-being may help improve patient outcomes both at times of
258 exceptional strain and also during more routine times.

259 This study has a number of strengths. First it reports results from every continent and from a large
260 number of ICUs. It also identified ICUs at point of maximal bed capacity strain, and therefore is able
261 to identify factors beyond simple bed number and admission rates that impacted on outcomes.
262 Second, due to the unprecedented changes in practice forced on ICUs by COVID-19 we were able to
263 assess the impacts of strain across domains that are seldom examined, namely shortages of
264 medicines and other consumables, radical changes in communication and visiting and widespread
265 recruitment of non-ICU staff to ICU roles. We were reliant on ICUs self-reporting and could not
266 externally validate the numbers and changes reported. For some questions, most notably bed
267 number and surge bed number, the question was interpreted in different ways in different ICUs
268 requiring post-hoc adjudication by the investigators as to actual bed number at baseline and
269 expansion. We also must caution against drawing causal inferences from our data, as an
270 observational study, this must be seen as hypothesis generating rather than definitive. We did not
271 differentiate in our analysis between specific ICU types as the analysis was conducted at site level not
272 unit level. It is therefore not possible to distinguish between “surge ICUs” (set up purely during the

273 surge periods) and standard ICUs. We have not analysed results by national income level, which may
274 have impacts on shortages and capacity to mitigate strain.

275 Whilst previous studies have shown relationships between ICU strain and outcomes, this work
276 extends this to both less commonly assessed outcomes (complications), demonstrating that these
277 relationships persist across types of ICU, institutions and national boundaries and can be detected
278 even at times of world-wide maximal strain.

279 Conclusions

280 The UNITE-COVID study allowed a multi-centre analysis of the work pressures on ICUs worldwide.
281 The natural experiment of exceptional ICU demand in 2020 and 2021 found that increased strain, in
282 particular via shortage-incurred changes in practice, were related to worse outcomes. We also found
283 that increasing nurse:patient ratios and deployment of non-ICU nurses to ICUs were associated with
284 increased complications. Improving working conditions for staff via well-being initiatives and
285 procedural support teams provided some mitigation. Whilst the causal relationships between these
286 factors need to be further explored, we believe that these findings may have wide applicability
287 outside of pandemic conditions and point to areas for investigation to improve patient outcomes in
288 critical care. Additionally we suggest that the findings could be of help in crisis preparedness
289 programs anticipating future high demand on ICUs.

290

291

292

293

294 References:

295 1. https://www.who.int/health-topics/quality-of-care#tab=tab_1 Accessed 20/12/2024

- 296 2. Wilcox ME, Harrison DA, Patel A, Rowan KM. Higher ICU Capacity Strain Is Associated With Increased Acute
297 Mortality in Closed ICUs. *Crit Care Med*. 2020 May;48(5):709-716.
- 298 3. Bihari, S. et al, "Intensive care unit strain and mortality risk in patients admitted from the ward in Australia and
299 New Zealand." 2022, *Journal of Critical Care* 68: 136-140
- 300 4. Kohn, R., et al. A Data-Driven Analysis of Ward Capacity Strain Metrics That Predict Clinical Outcomes Among
301 Survivors of Acute Respiratory Failure. *J Med Syst* 2023 47(1): 83.
- 302 5. Gibbons, P. W., et al. Influence of ICU Surge and Capacity on COVID Mortality Across U.S. States and Regions
303 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Intensive Care Med* 2023 38(6): 562-565.
- 304 6. Gabler, N et al. Mortality among Patients Admitted to Strained Intensive Care Units. *AJCCM* 2013, 188 (7): 800-
305 806.
- 306 7. Bagshaw, S. M., et al. Association between strained capacity and mortality among patients admitted to intensive
307 care: A path-analysis modeling strategy. *J Crit Care* 2018 43: 81-87.
- 308 8. Anesi, G. L., et al. Associations of Intensive Care Unit Capacity Strain with Disposition and Outcomes of Patients
309 with Sepsis Presenting to the Emergency Department." *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2018 15(11): 1328-1335.
- 310 9. Kashiouris MG, Sessler CN, Qayyum R, Velagapudi V, Stefanou C, Kashyap R, Crowley N, Daniels C, Kashani K. Near-
311 simultaneous intensive care unit (ICU) admissions and all-cause mortality: a cohort study. *Intensive Care Med*. 2019
312 Nov;45(11):1559-1569.
- 313 10. Pilcher, D. V. et al. "Measuring the Impact of ICU Strain on Mortality, After-Hours Discharge, Discharge Delay,
314 Interhospital Transfer, and Readmission in Australia With the Activity Index.", 2023, *Critical Care Medicine* 24: 24
- 315 11. Kohn R, Harhay MO, Bayes B, Mikkelsen ME, Ratcliffe SJ, Halpern SD, Kerlin MP. Ward Capacity Strain: A Novel
316 Predictor of 30-Day Hospital Readmissions. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2018 Nov;33(11):1851-1853.
- 317 12. Wilcox ME, Rowan KM, Harrison DA, Doidge JC. Does Unprecedented ICU Capacity Strain, As Experienced During
318 the COVID-19 Pandemic, Impact Patient Outcome? *Crit Care Med*. 2022 Jun 1;50(6):e548-e556.
- 319 13. Stattin K, Frithiof R, Hultström M, Lipcsey M, Kawati R. Strain on the ICU resources and patient outcomes in the
320 COVID-19 pandemic: A Swedish national registry cohort study. *Eur J Anaesthesiol*. 2023 Jan 1;40(1):13-20.
- 321 14. Mojoli F, Cutti S, Mongodi S, Bruno R, Di Sabatino A, Corsico AG, Marena C. The potential role of ICU capacity strain
322 in COVID-19 mortality: comparison between first and second waves in Pavia, Italy. *J Anesth Analg Crit Care*. 2021
323 Oct 22;1(1):8. doi: 10.1186/s44158-021-00007-6.
- 324 15. Demoule A, Fartoukh M, Louis G, Azoulay E, Nemlaghi S, Jullien E, Desnos C, Clerc S, Yvin E, Mellati N, Charron C,
325 Voiriot G, Picard Y, Vieillard-Baron A, Darmon M. ICU strain and outcome in COVID-19 patients-A multicenter
326 retrospective observational study. *PLoS One*. 2022 Jul 19;17(7):e0271358.
- 327 16. Greco M, De Corte T, Ercole A, Antonelli M, Azoulay E, Citerio G, Morris AC, De Pascale G, Duska F, Elbers P, Einav S,
328 Forni L, Galarza L, Girbes ARJ, Grasselli G, Gusarov V, Jubb A, Kesecioglu J, Lavinio A, Delgado MCM, Mellinghoff J,
329 Myatra SN, Ostermann M, Pellegrini M, Povoja P, Schaller SJ, Teboul JL, Wong A, De Waele JJ, Cecconi M; ESICM
330 UNITE-COVID investigators. Clinical and organizational factors associated with mortality during the peak of first

- 331 COVID-19 wave: the global UNITE-COVID study. *Intensive Care Med.* 2022 Jun;48(6):690-705. doi:
332 10.1007/s00134-022-06705-1. Epub 2022 May 21
- 333 17. Conway Morris A, Kohler K, De Corte T, Ercole A, De Grooth HJ, Eibers PWG, Povoia P, Morais R, Koulioti D, Jog S,
334 Nielsen N, Jubb A, Cecconi M, De Waele J; ESICM UNITE COVID investigators. Co-infection and ICU-acquired
335 infection in COVID-19 ICU patients: a secondary analysis of the UNITE-COVID data set. *Crit Care.* 2022 Aug
336 3;26(1):236.
- 337 18. De Corte T, Kohler K, Cecconi M, De Waele JJ, Conway Morris A; UNITE-COVID investigators. Characteristics of co-
338 infection and secondary infection amongst critically ill COVID-19 patients in the first two waves of the pandemic.
339 *Intensive Care Med.* 2024 Jun;50(6):989-993.
- 340 19. RStudio Team (2020). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA URL
341 <http://www.rstudio.com/>
- 342 20. Kohler K, DeCorte T, Conway Morris A, Resource shortages in the ICU - a metric of strain associated with patient
343 outcomes (UNITE-COVID study), *Intensive Care Medicine Experimental* 2024, 12(Suppl 1):87 p 320
- 344 21. Douglas IS, Mehta A, Mansoori J Policy Proposals for Mitigating Intensive Care Unit Strain: Insights from the COVID-
345 19 Pandemic. *Ann Am Thorac Soc.* 2024 Dec;21(12):1633-1642. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202404-356FR.
- 346 22. Sinha MD, Saha P, Melhem N et al. Vascular access support teams: A multi-disciplinary response to optimise patient
347 care during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Crit Care.* 2021 Oct;65:184-185.
- 348 23. Lumlertgul N, Tunstell P, Watts C et al. In-House Production of Dialysis Solutions to Overcome Challenges During
349 the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic. *Kidney Int Rep.* 2021 Jan;6(1):200-206.
- 350 24. Boulton AJ, Jordan H, Adams CE, Polgarova P; TRIC Network (Corporate Author), WMTRAIN (Corporate Author);
351 Morris AC, Arora N. Intensive care unit visiting and family communication during the COVID-19 pandemic: A UK
352 survey. *J Intensive Care Soc.* 2022 Aug;23(3):293-296.
- 353 25. Hall CE, Milward J, Spoiala C, Bhogal JK, Weston D, Potts HWW, Caulfield T, Toolan M, Kanga K, El-Sheikha S, Fong
354 K, Greenberg N. The mental health of staff working on intensive care units over the COVID-19 winter surge of 2020
355 in England: a cross sectional survey. *Br J Anaesth.* 2022 Jun;128(6):971-979.
- 356 26. Cecconi M, Barth A, Szóllósi GJ, Istrate GM, Alexandre J, Duska F, Schaller SJ, Boulanger C, Mellinshoff J, Waldauf P,
357 Girbes ARJ, Derde L, De Waele JJ, Azoulay E, Kesecioglu J. The impact of the massive open online course
358 C19_SPACE during the COVID-19 pandemic on clinical knowledge enhancement: a study among medical doctors
359 and nurses. *Intensive Care Med.* 2024 Nov;50(11):1841-1849.
- 360 27. Li LZ, Yang P, Singer SJ, Pfeffer J, Mathur MB, Shanafelt T. Nurse Burnout and Patient Safety, Satisfaction, and
361 Quality of Care: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2024 Nov 4;7(11):e2443059.