

A simple laboratory parameter facilitates early identification of COVID-19 patients

Qilin Li, PhD^{1, #}, Xiuli Ding, MS^{1, #}, Geqing Xia, MD^{2, #}, Zhi Geng, MS¹, Fenghua Chen¹, PhD, MD, Lin Wang, PhD^{1, *}, Zheng Wang, PhD, MD^{3, *}

¹ Department of Clinical Laboratory, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430022, China.

² Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430022, China.

³ Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430022, China.

Corresponding Authors:

Prof Zheng Wang, zhengwang@hust.edu.cn; Prof Lin Wang, lin_wang@hust.edu.cn

Author Contributions

Dr Q. Li, X. Ding, and Prof. G. Xia contributed equally to this work. All corresponding authors had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: Z. Wang, L. Wang, G. Xia

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Z. Wang, L. Wang, Q. Li, X. Ding

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Z. Geng, F. Chen. G. Xia

Supervision: Z. Wang, L. Wang.

Funding/Support: This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) and the Major Scientific and Technological Innovation Projects of Hubei Province (MSTIP).

Role of the Funder: NSFC and MSTIP had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: None reported

Introduction: As of Feb 11, 2020, the total number of patients with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection across China has reached over 40000 and are still growing.¹ This outbreak has now spread over 24 countries. The WHO has declared international public health emergency. Referring to previous experience combatting SARS-CoV in 2003 in China, Wuhan and other cities have established fever clinic to triage suspected COVID-19 patients from other patients with similar symptoms. Soon after the outbreak, an overwhelmingly large number of mixed patients with fever or other respiratory symptoms flooded in, resulting in considerably long waiting time for CT examination and etiological PCR tests. Consequently, physicians were often unable to make timely diagnosis for quarantine or therapeutic decisions. A way of accelerating triage process and prioritizing CT examination and PCR tests for suspected SARS-CoV-2 patients would be to identify a useful practical marker. The official guidelines (the Guidelines of the National Health Commission of China for COVID-19, 5th edition;² and the WHO interim guideline³) currently recommend two laboratory parameters, “normal/ decreased number of leukocytes” or “decreased number of lymphocytes”, as one of the criteria for diagnosis of COVID-19 infection. Here, our analysis suggests eosinopenia (decreased number of eosinophils) as a potentially more reliable laboratory predictor of SARS-CoV-2 infection than recommended “leukocyte counts” and “lymphopenia”.

Methods: Data of this retrospective case-negative control study were collected from 105 patients first visiting the Fever Clinic of Wuhan Union Hospital from Feb 3 to Feb 7, 2020. Nasopharyngeal swab specimens of all patients were subject to real time RT-PCR tests through amplifying ORF1ab gene and N gene of SARS-CoV-2 (BioGerm, Shanghai, China). Clinical and laboratory findings were recorded and carefully checked. All statistical analyses were carried out by SPSS 20.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA). This study was approved by Wuhan Union Hospital Ethics Committee.

Results: Two cohorts contained SARS-CoV-2-negative (SN) patients (n=53) and SARS-CoV-2-positive (SP) patients (n=52), respectively. The differences in clinical and laboratory findings between the two cohorts were univariately and multivariately analyzed (Table 1). No significant differences were found in gender. SP patients (average age 57) was older than SN patients (average age 51, $p=0.015$). SN patients had a higher rate of other respiratory pathogens infection (34% vs 9.6%, $p=0.005$). All the patients had pneumonia-like clinical symptoms including fever and respiratory symptoms, whose distribution was similar in the two cohorts. In laboratory findings, the rates of “normal or decreased number of leukocytes” and “lymphopenia” that were used for defining suspected patients by the current guidelines, were not different between these two cohorts. Intriguingly, eosinopenia ($<0.02 \times 10^9/ L$) was observed in the majority of SP patients (78.8 %), in stark contrast to 35.8 % in SN patients ($p < 0.001$). Consistently, the average eosinophil counts across SP patients ($0.02 \times 10^9/ L$) was significantly lower than that of SN patients ($0.05 \times 10^9/ L$, $p=0.004$).

The performance of eosinopenia as a predictor for SARS-CoV-2 infection was then determined in the presence of symptoms (Table 2). The inclusion of leukocyte counts (normal or decreased number) had no significant diagnostic value. Notably, the inclusion of eosinopenia remarkably improved the sensitivity and specificity to 78.8% and 64.2%, respectively, much higher than the inclusion of lymphopenia (48.1% and 52.8%). Further, the combination of other blood parameters (leukocytes and/ or lymphopenia) with eosinopenia increased selectivity but reduced sensitivity.

Discussion: Eosinopenia can be observed in typhoid fever or as a response to glucocorticoid. In previous clinical reports on SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV and current SARS-CoV-2,⁴⁻⁶ changes in eosinophils in peripheral blood were usually omitted. Our study showed that eosinopenia appeared in the majority of SP patients. The mechanisms underlying such eosinopenia were currently unclear and warrant further study.

Since the data was collected at patients' first medical visit, eosinopenia was presumed to be an early event in patients' clinical course, possibly prior to emergence of characteristic radiological findings. Combined with fever and respiratory symptoms, eosinopenia as a parameter in routine blood tests might be capable of facilitating rapid identification of highly-suspected cases from mixed patients at triage in fever clinics. These quickly-identified suspected patients would be recommended to (1) receive the priority for radio-diagnosis and laboratory-definitive diagnosis, (2) be isolated in designated wards without any delay to avoid potential virus spreading, (3) and receive empirical antiviral treatment (as of now no consensus

over usage of antiviral agents) to prevent aggravation. The additional inclusion of eosinopenia may further refine the laboratory diagnostic criteria recommended by the current guidelines.

References

1. National Health Commission of China. The latest situation of the COVID-19 epidemic (up to February 11th).
<http://www.nhc.gov.cn/xcs/yqtb/202002/395f075a5f3a411f80335766c65b0487.shtml>.
Accessed February 12, 2020.
2. National Health Commission of China. Clinical Diagnosis and treatment Guidance of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) caused pneumonia (5th edition).
<http://www.nhc.gov.cn/xcs/zhengcwj/202002/3b09b894ac9b4204a79db5b8912d4440.shtml>. Accessed February 5, 2020.
3. WHO. Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection when novel coronavirus (ncov) infection is suspected. <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel->
4. Peiris JS, Chu CM, Cheng VC, et al. Clinical progression and viral load in a community outbreak of coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a prospective study. *Lancet*. 2003;361(9371):1767-1772.
5. Zumla A, Hui DS, Perlman S. Middle East respiratory syndrome. *Lancet*. 2015;386(9997):995-1007.
6. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020.

Table 1. Comparison of clinical data and laboratory findings between SARS-CoV-2- negative (SN) and SARS-CoV-2-positive (SP) patients

	SN (n=53)	SP (n=52)	Univariate analysis	Multivariate analysis	
Clinical features			p-value	OR	p-value
Gender, male/ female	30/ 23	26/ 26	0.50		n.s.
Age, years	51 (41-61)	57 (49-69)	0.015*		n.s.
Symptoms of chief complaint			0.428		
Fever	28 (52.8%)	31 (59.6%)			
Respiratory symptom	25 (47.2%)	20 (38.5%)			
Weakness	0 (0)	1(1.9%)			
Laboratory findings					
Other respiratory pathogens infections	18 (34%)	5 (9.6%)	0.005*	0.05 (0.01 - 0.28)	0.002*
Blood routine examination					
Leukocyte (x10 ⁹ / L; Ref. 3.5 - 9.5)	5.84 (3.75 - 7.93)	5.47 (3.74 - 7.2)	0.32		
Normal or decreased	49 (92.4%)	50 (96.2%)	0.33		
Neutrophil (x10 ⁹ / L; Ref. 1.8 - 6.3)	3.98 (2.39 - 5.57)	3.74 (2.18 -5.3)	0.49		
Increased	5 (9.4%)	3 (5.7%)	0.65		
Lymphocyte (x10 ⁹ / L; Ref. 1.1 - 3.2)	1.38 (0.66 - 2.09)	1.23 (0.68 - 1.78)	0.11		
Decreased	25 (47.2%)	25 (48.1%)	0.93		
Monocytes (x10 ⁹ / L; Ref. 0.1 - 0.6)	0.43 (0.21 - 0.64)	0.45 (0.28 -0.68)	0.68		
Increased	8 (15.1%)	12 (23.1%)	0.30		
Eosinophil (x10 ⁹ / L; Ref. 0.02 - 0.52)	0.05 (-0.04 - 0.14)	0.02 (-0.01 - 0.05)	0.004*		
Decreased	19 (35.8%)	41 (78.8%)	<0.001*	0.10 (0.03 - 0.32)	< 0.001*
Red blood cell count (x10 ¹² / L; Ref. 3.8 - 5.1)	4.72 (4.21 - 5.23)	4.71 (4.25 - 5.12)	0.93		
Hemoglobin (g/ L; Ref. 115 -150)	140.8 (125.1 - 156.5)	140.8 (127.3 -154.3)	0.99		n.s.
Platelet (x10 ⁹ / L; Ref. 125 - 350)	237.5 (135.2 - 335.9)	198.4 (125.8-270.9)	0.022*		n.s.
hCRP (mg/ L; Ref. < 4)	23.6 (-6.9 - 54.1)	36.5 (-2.8 - 75.8)	0.32		n.s.
Increased	36 (67.9%)	42 (80.8%)	0.14		

Data are presented as n/ n, n (%), media (IQR) and mean (95% CI). Other respiratory pathogen infections include mycoplasma, chlamydia, syncytial virus, adenovirus and coxsackie virus B, and influenza. Ref., normal reference range; OR, odds ratio; hCRP, hypersensitive C-reactive protein; *, p - value < 0.05, significantly different.

Table 2. Diagnostic performance of single and combined laboratory parameters in conjunction with symptoms on differentiating SARS-CoV-2-positive patients from SARS-CoV-2-negative patients

	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)
Symptoms + Leukocytes (≤ 3.5)	96.2	5.7	50.0	60.0
Symptoms + lymphopenia (< 1.1)	48.1	52.8	50.0	50.9
Symptoms + lymphopenia + Leukocytes (≤ 3.5)	46.2	52.8	49.0	50.0
Symptoms + eosinopenia (< 0.02)	78.8	64.2	68.3	75.6
Symptoms + eosinopenia (< 0.02) + leukocytes (≤ 3.5)	75.0	66.0	68.4	72.9
Symptoms + eosinopenia (< 0.02) + lymphopenia (< 1.1)	38.5	75.5	60.6	55.6
Symptoms + eosinopenia (< 0.02) + lymphopenia (< 1.1) + leukocyte (≤ 3.5)	36.5	75.5	59.4	54.8

Numbers are absolute cell counts ($10^9/L$). PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value.