

COVID-19 ICU and Mechanical Ventilation Patient Characteristics and Outcomes - A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Raymond Chang (✉ chang@meridianmedical.org)

Institute of East-West Medicine, New York, NY 10016, USA <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9115-7799>

Khaled Mossad Elhusseiny

Al-Azhar University

Yu-Chang Yeh

National Taiwan Sport University

Wei-Zen Sun

National Taiwan University Hospital

Research

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, ICU, mechanical ventilation, mortality, outcomes, meta-analysis

Posted Date: September 2nd, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-66766/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at PLOS ONE on February 11th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246318>.

Abstract

Background To characterize COVID-19 ICU admissions, their outcome and associated features, as well as identify their regional discrepancies.

Methods Scopus, Embase, preprint servers bioRxiv and medRxiv and the Intensive Care National Audit and Research Center (ICNARC) website was searched for reports through May 1st 2020 on COVID-19 ICU admissions and outcomes using pre-defined search terms and eligibility criteria.

Relevant data was extracted and pooled using fixed or random effects meta-analysis depending on heterogeneity. Study quality was assessed by the NIH tool and heterogeneity was assessed by I^2 and Q tests. Baseline patient characteristics, ICU and IMV outcomes were pooled and meta-analyzed. Pooled odds ratios (pOR) were calculated for clinical features against ICU, MV mortality. Subgroup analysis was carried out based on patient regions.

Results Twenty-eight studies comprising 12,437 COVID-19 ICU admissions from seven countries were meta-analyzed. Pooled ICU admission rate was 21%[95% CI 0.12 to 0.34] and 69% of cases needed IMV[95% CI 0.61-0.75]. ICU and IMV mortality were 28.3%[95% CI 0.25 to 0.32], 43%[95% CI 0.29 to 0.58] and ICU, IMV duration was 7.78[95% CI 6.99 to 8.63] and 10.12[95% CI 7.08 to 13.16] days respectively. Besides confirming the significance of comorbidities and clinical findings of COVID-19, major correlates with ICU mortality were found to be IMV [pOR 16.46, 95% CI 4.37 to 61.96], acute kidney injury (AKI) [pOR 12.47, 95% CI 1.52 to 102.7], and acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) [pOR 6.52, 95% CI 2.66 to 16.01]. Subgroup analyses confirm significant regional discrepancies in outcomes.

Conclusions This is the most comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of COVID-19 ICU and IMV cases and associated outcomes to date and the only analysis to analyze and associate IMV with COVID-19 ICU mortality. The significant association of AKI, ARDS and IMV with mortality has implications for ICU resource planning for AKI and ARDS as well as research into optimal ventilation strategies for patients. Regional differences in outcome implies a need to develop region specific protocols for ventilatory support as well as overall treatment.

Study Registration PROSPERO registration number CRD42020182482.

Background

Since its inception, the Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has placed unprecedented strain on healthcare globally with intensive care unit (ICU) care and ventilator availability being focal points of health resource allocation and planning. Understanding COVID-19 ICU and associated invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) patient characteristics and outcomes as well as appreciating their regional variations is thus critically important for patient management as well as resource planning. Despite an increasing number of studies relating to various aspects of severe COVID-19 and its ICU management; discrepancies in size, methodologies and research focus as well as regional differences in these studies calls for a comprehensive systematic review and analysis of reports to date.

Methods

Search strategy

Our review was conducted according to PRISMA guidelines [1] (S1 Table). We searched Pubmed, Scopus, Embase, preprint servers bioRxiv and medRxiv and the Intensive Care National Audit and Research Center (ICNARC) website for publications through May 1st 2020. A hand search through referenced published studies was additionally performed.

Search terms used were ("COVID-19" OR "SARS-Cov-2") AND ("ICU" or "ventilator" OR "mechanical ventilation" OR "critical care" OR "intensive care" OR "hospitalized" OR "outcomes"). The study protocol was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO CRD42020182482).

Selection criteria

Studies reporting COVID-19 cases and their ICU admissions and IMV outcomes were included. Case reports, abstracts, or studies without outcomes were excluded. Two authors (RC and KME) independently screened titles and abstracts of retrieved studies and reviewed full-texts for further inclusion. Studies with larger outcome samples from same hospitals were analyzed to avoid patient overlaps; however, studies with overlapped patients but distinct outcome measures were meta-analyzed for those outcomes.

Data extraction

Data extracted independently by two authors (RC and KME) into Excel (Microsoft) included study characteristics and patient clinical characteristics, and outcomes.

Quality assessment

Two authors (RC and KME) independently assessed the risk of bias of included studies utilizing the NIH quality assessment tool for observational cohorts [2]. The overall assessment was good, fair, or poor. Disagreements were resolved by discussion between all authors.

Data analysis

Meta-analysis was conducted when there were two or more studies for the same outcome using Comprehensive Meta-analysis (CMA) software version 3. The pooled event rate (pER) was used to meta-analyze the prevalences of patient characteristics, rates of ICU admissions and IMV, and ICU and IMV mortalities. Pooled odds ratio (pOR) was used to assess the association between clinical features and outcomes. Pooled mean or weighted mean differences with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were used in meta-analysis of continuous outcomes. We used the fixed-effect model unless there was evidence of heterogeneity, in which case the random-effects model was used. Heterogeneity was determined using I^2 and Q test [3,4] and was considered significant if the P-value of the Q test is <0.1 and/or $I^2 >50\%$. The corresponding 95% CI of the pooled effect size was calculated. Subgroup analysis were done on patient region, overall quality, and publication type (pre-print vs. peer-reviewed) to investigate the heterogeneity amongst studies. Publication bias was assessed using Egger's regression test and funnel plots for outcomes with five or more studies, and was considered significant if Egger's regression P-value is <0.1 [5,6]. When a mean value of a continuous outcome was missing, methods by Wan [7] were utilized to impute the needed value for the meta-analysis. Since some studies [8,9,10-17,18-23] included patients still hospitalized at endpoint ($n=4,697$, 37.8%), we considered two mortality scenarios methodologically: (1) best case scenario by pooling patients with known outcome and (2) worst case scenario by pooling those still hospitalized with non-survivors.

Results

Search results

We retrieved 7846 studies and removed 5134 duplicates and remaining articles were screened to yield 49 studies for full-text review (Figure 1). Twenty-eight studies were finally included and 16 were peer-reviewed, 11 were preprints, while one was an online report [24].

Characteristics of studies and patients (Table 1)

All included studies were observational and comprised 12,437 ICU patients admitted between December 2019 to May 1 2020. Of these, 6,875 patients were on IMV. Nine studies were from the USA [8-11,17,18,23,25,26], 13 from China [12,14,16,20-22,27-33], two from the UK [24,32], and one each from Italy [15], Spain [13], France [19], and Mexico [35].

Risk of bias assessment (Table 1)

Fifteen studies were good and 13 were fair as assessed by the NIH tool. Follow-up duration was insufficient or unreported in seven [8,10,12,14,26,29,35] among which three had fair assessments. Of note, 14 studies [8,9,12-15,17-19,21,22,24,25,34] had over 20% of patients with unknown outcome at endpoint of which 8 had fair assessment.

Table 1. COVID-19 ICU study regions, ICU admitted and IMV patient number and demographics , and study quality assesement. Studies based on reporting region and identified by first author and 2020 publication month, the number of ICU admitted and IMV patients in ICU and their age and sex as reported per study; and overall quality assesement of the studies by the NIH quality assessment tool [2]. Abbreviations: NM= Not mentioned, a = Data range, b =Data are reported as median (IQR).

Reference ID (First author, publication month 2020)	Number of patients		Mean age ± SD	Gender (male) [n (%)]	Overall quality assessment
	ICU admitted	IMV patients in ICU			
China					
Bi/April [12]	19	18	(30-70) ^a	14/19 (74)	Good
Cao/May [28]	18	14	NM	NM	Good
Du/April [27]	51	33	68.4±9.7	34/51 (71)	Good
Feng/April [14]	29	22	64±13.4	71/114 (62)	Good
Guan/February [29]	55	25	63 (53-71) ^b	NM	Good
Huang/January [32]	13	4	49(41–61) ^b	11/13 (85)	Good
Lapidus/April [16]	59	40	62(52–70) ^b	38/59 (64)	Fair
Lei/April [30]	15	—	55(44-74) ^b	5/15 (33)	Fair
Wang/April [33]	344	100	64 (52–72) ^b	179/344 (52)	Good
Xu/March [21]	45	20	56.7 + 15.4	29/45 (64)	Good
Yang/February [31]	52	22	59.7±13.3	35/52 (67)	Good
Zheng/April [22]	34	15	66(58-76) ^b	23/34 (68)	Fair
Zhou/March [20]	50	32	NM	NM	Good
USA					
Arentz/March [8]	21	15	70 (43-92) ^a	11/21 (52)	Fair
Argenziano/April [9]	231	215	62.2±14.7	156/231 (68)	Good
Auld/April [10]	217	165	64(54-73) ^b	119/217 (55)	Fair
Bhatraju/March [11]	24	—	64±18	15/24 (63)	Good
Goyal/May [26]	—	130	64.5 (51.7–73.6) ^b	92/130 (71)	Fair
Myers/April [17]	113	103	63 (53-	74/113 (66)	Good

			73) ^b		
Paranjpe/April [25]	385	—	NM	NM	Good
Richardson/April [18]	1281	1151	63 (52-75) ^b	3437/5700(60)	Good
Ziehr/April [23]	66	66	58 (23-87) ^b	43/65 (65)	Good
UK					
ICNARC/May [24]	7542	4522/6880	59.3±12.5	5389/ 7538 (72)	Good
Docherty/April [34]	1914/11185	497	72(57-82)	NM	Fair
Mexico					
Valente-Acosta/May [35]	33	12	60.6±12.68	23/33 (70)	Good
Italy					
Grasselli/April [15]	1591	1150	63 (56-70) ^b	1304/1591 (82)	Good
Spain					
Borobia/May [13]	237	—	64(54-71) ^b	57/75 (76)	Good
France					
Simonnet/April [19]	124	—	60 (51-70) ^b	90/124 (73)	Good

Quantitative analysis

ICU admissions, duration and outcome. Pooled ICU admission rate among 17,639 hospitalized COVID-19 patients meta-analyzed from eight studies [9,12,14,18,25,27,29,34] was 21% (95% CI 0.12 to 0.34) (Fig 2a) and pooled ICU mortality rate of 12,437 patients from 20 studies [8-19,21-25,31,33,35] was 28.3% (95% CI 0.27 to 0.36) (Fig 2b), while the worst case scenario mortality is 60% (95% CI 0.49 to 0.69) considering 4,697 patients with unknown outcomes. ICU length of stay (LoS) from five studies [8,10,11,15,24] had a pooled mean duration of 7.78 (7.05 to 8.51) days. Substantial heterogeneity was observed with ICU outcomes (p -value <0.1, I^2 > 60%) and not explained by subgroup analysis. Eggers' test revealed no publication bias (Figure 3).

Prevalence of comorbidities and clinical features. The prevalence of comorbidities as well as presenting clinical features are listed in Table 2 with hypertension (HTN) 51%, obesity (BMI>30kg/m²) 35%, diabetes (DM) 30% and fever 81%, cough 76%, dyspnea 75% the 3 most prevalent comorbidities and symptoms respectively. The pER's of select reported test findings were: bilateral infiltrates on chest radiography 83%, lymphopenia 78%, elevated alanine (ALT), aspartate aminotransferases (AST) 71%, 66.3% respectively, elevated troponin 22%. The pER for concurrent acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and acute kidney injury (AKI) were 84% and 32% respectively.

Table 2. Pooled prevalence of comorbidities and clinical features among ICU-admitted COVID-19 patients. Pooled prevalence of COVID-19 ICU admitted patients' clinical characteristics including comorbidities, symptoms, signs,

laboratory and radiographic findings, as well as complications of ARDS and AKI. Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; AKI, acute kidney injury; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease.

Clinical characteristics	Number of studies pooled	Heterogeneity		Prevalence (95%CI)
		P value	I ²	
Comorbidities				
Hypertension	15	<0.01	78.81	0.51 (0.46 - 0.56)
Obesity	5	<0.01	94.85	0.35 (0.23 - 0.49)
Diabetes mellitus	17	<0.01	89.74	0.29 (0.23 - 0.37)
Respiratory viral co-infection	3	<0.01	94.46	0.21 (0.004 - 0.94)
CHF	5	<0.01	88.36	0.16 (0.10 - 0.25)
Smoking	6	<0.01	90.14	0.15 (0.07 - 0.31)
CVD	3	0.4	00.00	0.13 (0.104 - 0.17)
Obstructive sleep apnea	3	<0.01	90.43	0.13 (0.03 - 43)
Asthma	5	0.4	00.00	0.103 (0.08 - 0.13)
Chronic Kidney disease	15	<0.01	96.97	0.09 (0.04 - 0.18)
COPD	12	<0.01	78.08	0.09 (0.06 - 0.13)
Malignancy	13	<0.01	93.33	0.07 (0.04 - 0.12)
Immuno-suppressive therapy	5	0.04	73.87	0.06 (0.03 - 0.12)
History of organ transplantation	2	0.4	00.00	0.05 (0.03 - 0.09)
Liver disease	11	<0.01	90.99	0.03 (0.01 - 0.07)
HIV	3	0.7	00.00	0.03 (0.01 - 0.05)
Complications				
ARDS	6	<0.01	96.13	0.84 (0.59 – 0.95)
AKI	6	<0.01	96.49	0.32 (0.13 – 0.58)
Symptoms and signs				
Fever	11	<0.01	92.95	0.81 (0.67 – 0.89)
Cough	12	<0.01	89.08	0.76 (0.56 – 0.77)
Shortness of breath	10	<0.01	82.21	0.75 (0.66 – 0.81)
Malaise	3	<0.01	89.39	0.53 (0.25 – 0.79)
Fatigue	5	<0.01	82.76	0.46 (0.32 – 0.61)
Myalgia	8	<0.01	83.26	0.23 (0.14 – 0.36)
Diarrhea	9	0.03	52.71	0.23 (0.17 – 0.29)
Sore throat	2	0.1	62.68	0.12 (0.05 – 0.27)
Nausea and vomiting	5	0.06	54.94	0.11 (0.07 – 0.19)
Headache	9	<0.01	79.45	0.11 (0.05 – 0.22)

Rhinorrhea	4	0.5	0	0.09 (0.06 – 0.13)
Investigational findings				
Bilateral infiltrates on chest radiography	6	<0.01	96.73	0.83 (0.53 - 0.96)
Lymphocytes, <1000/μL	6	0.09	47.49	0.78(0.72 - 0.84)
AST, >40/L	4	0.03	65.55	0.58 (0.35 – 0.75)
ALT, >40/L	3	<0.01	87.26	0.47 (0.14 – 0.83)
Troponin, >99th percentile	2	0.3	22.04	0.22 (0.11 – 0.39)

Association of patient characteristics with ICU and IMV mortality. We analyzed associated COVID-19 ICU patient characteristics and initial laboratory findings for potential association with ICU (Table 3 and Table 4) and IMV survival. Demographically, age>60 years (pOR 3.7, 95% CI 2.87 to 4.78) and male gender (pOR 1.37, 95% CI 1.23 to 1.54) was associated with ICU mortality and male gender (pOR 1.8, 95% CI 1.25 to 2.59) with IMV mortality. Of symptoms and signs, only dyspnea was associated with ICU mortality (pOR 2.56, 95% CI 1.65 to 3.99). Of comorbidities, HTN was associated with both ICU and IMV mortality (pOR 2.02, 95% CI 1.37 to 2.98; pOR 1.5, 95% CI 1.06 - 2.12, respectively), whereas COPD (pOR 3.22, 95% CI 1.03 to 10.09), cardiovascular disease (CVD) (pOR 2.77, 95% CI 1.76 to 4.37), and DM (pOR 1.78, 95% CI 1.19 to 2.65) were associated with ICU mortality. Of clinical findings, we found obesity, white blood cell count (WBC), ALT, AST, creatinine, total bilirubin, D-dimer, prothrombin time (PT), C-reactive protein (CRP), creatine kinase, lactate, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH); and reduced PaO₂/FiO₂, albumin or lymphocyte count to be correlated with ICU mortality. Among complications, AKI (pOR 12.47, 95% CI 1.52 to 102.7) and ARDS (pOR 6.52, 95% CI 2.66 to 16.01) were associated with ICU mortality. Thrombocytopenia and lymphocytopenia were correlated with ICU mortality; and there were no reports with laboratory findings to allow IMV outcome analysis. Finally, IMV significantly correlated ICU mortality (pOR 16.46, 95% CI 4.37 to 61.96) based on 6 studies [10,11,18,20,31,33] with substantial heterogeneity (p-value <0.1, I² > 60%) not explained by subgroup analysis. Eggers' testing revealed no publication bias.

Table 3. Meta-analysis of associations between COVID-19 ICU patient characteristics and ICU mortality. COVID-19 ICU patient characteristics including analysed demographics, presenting symptoms, comorbidities, complications and IMV and the corresponding number of non-surviving and discharged patients. Abbreviations: ARDS, adult respiratory distress syndrome; AKI, acute kidney injury; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; CVSD, cerebrovascular disease; DM, diabetes mellitus; HTN, hypertension, IMV, invasive mechanical ventilation.

Patient characteristics	OR (95%CI)	Heterogeneity		Number of studies	Number of non-surviving patients	Number of discharged patients	Non-surviving patients with the comorbidity	Discharged patients with the comorbidity
		P-value	I ²					
Symptoms and signs								
Dyspnea	2.56 (1.65-3.99)	0.2	39.61	2	165	231	121	120
Cough	1.38 (0.88-2.15)	0.8	0	2	165	231	121	152
Fever	0.84 (0.55-1.28)	0.9	0	3	283	495	167	260
Patient demographics								
Age > 60 years	3.7 (2.87-4.78)	0.1	49.08	5	3119	3258	2207	1375
Gender (male)	1.37 (1.23-1.54)	0.5	0	8	2839	3190	2072	2092
Comorbidities								
HTN	2.02 (1.37-2.98)	0.07	51.68	6	610	717	359	284
DM	1.78 (1.19-2.65)	0.1	41.9	5	281	396	72	64
CVD	2.77 (1.76-4.37)	0.1	44.87	6	333	525	65	40
COPD	3.22 (1.03-10.09)	0.06	55.03	5	301	505	34	20
Smoking	1.19 (0.48-2.92)	0.2	42.06	3	141	177	12	11
CVSD	3.84 (0.48-30.89)	0.3	16.95	2	39	28	8	1
Complications and IMV								
ARDS	6.52 (2.66-16.01)	0.5	0	3	172	49	161	28
AKI	12.47	0.005	81.15	3	172	239	94	9

	(1.52- 102.7)							
IMV	16.46 (4.37- 61.96)	<0.001	91.2	3	217	360	163	92

Table 4. Meta-analysis findings of the association between laboratory findings and COVID-19 ICU mortality.

Abbreviation: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase ; CRP, C-reactive protein; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; WMD, weighted mean difference.

Laboratory Finding	Number of studies	WMD (95% CI)	Meta-analysis P-value	Heterogeneity		Non-survived patients with data of the factor	Survived patients with data of the factor
				P-value	I ²		
Oxygenation							
Pao ₂ /FiO ₂ , mm/Hg	2	-33.763 (-46.936 - -20.591)	<0.001	0.8	0	84	149
Cell Blood Count							
Hemoglobin, g/dL	2	-0.380 (-1.348 - 0.587)	0.44	0.02	71.60	143	278
White blood cell count, x10 ⁹ /L	2	4.280 (3.675 - 4.885)	<0.001	0.5	0	244	469
Lymphocyte count, x10 ⁹ /L	3	-0.272 (-0.536 - -0.007)	0.044	<0.001	92.61	524	256
Platelet count/μl	3	-16.073 (-57.853 - 25.707)	0.45	<0.001	90.69	276	489
Coagulation index							
D-dimer, ug/mL	3	6.685 (1.328 - 12.042)	0.014	<0.001	95.49	242	467
Prothrombin time, secs	3	1.646 (1.362 - 1.930)	<0.001	0.2	33.326	228	328
Inflammatory marker							
CRP, mg/L	3	86.217 (47.912 - 124.523)	<0.001	<0.001	88.21	265	522
Biochemistry							
Albumin, g/dL	2	-0.512 (-0.590 - -0.434)	<0.001	0.7	0	240	447
ALT, U/L	2	3.846 (-2.474 - 10.165)	0.233	0.12	59.17	189	426
AST, U/L	2	22.996 (11.696 - 34.296)	<0.001	0.01	84.59	239	447
Creatinine, mg/dL	3	0.325 (-0.044 - 0.695)	0.084	<0.001	96.44	279	492
Creatine kinase, U/L	2	378.166 (-127.086 - 883.418)	0.142	<0.001	95.73	175	284
Lactate,	2	0.289 (0.027	0.03	0.2	42.45	66	69

mmol/L			- 0.551)				
LDH, U/L	2	235.354 (174.931 - 295.778)	<0.001	0.01	84.63	200	399
Total bilirubin, mmol/L	2	5.317 (4.200 - 6.434)	<0.001	0.6	0	165	231

Regional differences in ICU and IMV outcomes. Subgroup analysis revealed the following regional ICU admissions: USA (35%), UK (17%) and China (14%); IMV rates: USA (85%), Italy (72%), France (69%), UK (66%), China (56%), Mexico (36%); ICU mortality rates: UK (33%), USA (29%), Italy (26%), China (24%), Spain (23%), France (15%), and Mexico (2%) and IMV mortality rates: China (59%) followed by UK (53%), USA (24%) and Mexico (4%).

IMV prevalence, duration and outcome. Pooled IMV prevalence and mortality was respectively 69% (95% CI 0.61-0.75) from 18 studies [8,9-12,15-19,21,22,24,27,31,33,35] with 10,240 cases (Figs 2c) and 43% (95% CI 0.29-0.58) from 12 studies [10,11,14,18,22,23,26,28,31,33-35] with 2,212 cases based on a best case scenario, with worst case scenario mortality of 74% (95% CI 0.54 to 0.87) (Fig. 2d). IMV duration was pooled from four studies [9,15-17] with a mean duration of 10.12 days (95% CI 7.08 to 13.16). There was significant heterogeneity among IMV mortalities (p-value < 0.001, $I^2 > 90%$), which was not explained by subgroup analysis, and Egger's test revealed no publication bias (Fig 4).

Discussion

This is the most comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of COVID-19 ICU cases and

outcomes to date to our knowledge. Many reviews explored COVID-19 prognosis, with some reporting generally on all [36] or hospitalized cases [37], or from a certain region [38], or focused on specific aspects such as mortality [39] or outcomes [40], with only one systematic review specifically addressing IMV mortality [41]. Here we attempt to provide a comprehensive assessment of ICU-admitted COVID-19 patient characteristics, regional discrepancies, as well as overall ICU and IMV specific outcomes and their associated factors.

Our pooled ICU best case mortality rate of 28.3% (95% CI 0.27 to 0.32) amongst COVID-19 patients is lower than earlier reports from Wuhan's 78% [20] and Seattle's 85% [8], but in line with the more recent report of 31% from Atlanta [10], as well as 25.7% and 41.6% reported in reviews by Quah et al. [39] and Armstrong et al. [40] respectively.

Our 43% (95% CI 0.29 to 0.58) pooled IMV mortality rate is also significantly lower than earlier reports of 86–97% from Wuhan [20,31] or 71-75% from Seattle [8,11]. The more recent Atlanta study revealed improved IMV mortality of 35.7% [10], which is more consistent with the 35% to 46% mortality respectively reported for patients intubated with H1N1 influenza pneumonia [42] and other causes of ARDS [43].

We found a pooled mean ICU LoS of 7.8 (7 to 8.5) days comparable to results from a review reporting a median LoS of 8 (5 to 13) days for patients from China and 7 (4 to 11) days from outside China [44]. As for IMV duration, we found a pooled mean duration of 10 days (95% CI 7 to 13), which is shorter than earlier reports from Wuhan and Seattle of 10 to 17 days [41].

Taken together, our results are consistent with the recent finding by Armstrong et al of improved COVID-19 ICU outcome over time, which was attributed to increased ICU experience, and evolving admission criteria, treatments, and demographics [40]. We additionally hypothesize that improvements in reported mortalities over time and regions may arise as healthcare systems become less overwhelmed, and as more recent studies account for more complete

patient outcomes. Significant differences between reporting geographic regions could additionally be due to different ICU admission criteria and treatment protocols, diversity of ethnic genetic factors as well as mutational evolution of the virus itself [45], but more studies are necessary to explore these aspects.

Systematic reviews and analyses of select patient demographics, comorbidities, selective laboratory findings and complications of the disease have been published [46,47], although there is no systematic review addressing all these aspects in COVID-19 ICU or IMV to date. We found that elderly COVID-19 patients with comorbidities have higher ICU and IMV fatalities; but this is not unique to COVID-19 as many studies have noted that ICU patients generally consists of elderly patients who have greater mortality [48].

Interestingly, despite higher absolute prevalences of certain comorbidities and presenting features in COVID-19 ICU patients, the relative prevalence is the same as reported in less severe symptomatic or hospitalized cases. For example, a review of mostly Chinese studies similarly found hypertension to be the most common comorbidity in COVID-19 [49]; and another review identified fever (88.7%), cough (57.6%) and dyspnea (45.6%) to be similarly most common manifestations [50]. Our results also corroborated findings from meta-analyses where DM [51], CVD [52], abnormal liver function [53] have been found prevalent, associated and potentially prognostic in COVID-19.

For comorbidities, we found CVD, HTN and DM to be significantly associated with ICU mortality, which is consistent with findings by a review that identified these same comorbidities to be correlated with disease severity and ICU admissions [49]. Separately, Wang et al. also found HTM, DM, and CVD to correlate with COVID-19 severity and mortality [54].

Of clinical findings: obesity, WBC, AST, D-dimer PT, CRP, lactate, LDH, and total bilirubin as well as lower PaO₂/FiO₂, lymphocyte count and albumin to be significantly associated with ICU outcome (Table 4), which is again consistent with previous reports on associations of obesity, liver dysfunction, lymphocytopenia, coagulopathy, malnutrition, renal dysfunction, and cardiac injury with COVID-19 severity or mortality.

While most clinical correlates we found above are consistent and noted by other reports to date, three correlates with ICU mortality deserve discussion. One is AKI (pOR 12.47, 95% CI 1.52 to 102.7), for which there are divergent reports on prevalence and significance. Thus, while some large COVID-19 systematic reviews excluded AKI [27,37] and it is absent from some COVID-19 critical care management guidelines [55,56], its incidence in hospitalized COVID-19 has been reported to be as low as 0.5% [29] and some researchers even concluded that COVID-19 does not cause AKI [57]. However, we found a pooled AKI prevalence of 32% and a New York report cited 46% of hospitalized and 68% of ICU COVID-19 cases with AKI with 34% of those in ICU requiring replacement renal therapy (RRT), and with an OR of 20.9 (95% CI 11.7 to 37.3) for AKI vs non-AKI associated ICU mortality [58]. Along with our analysis, this raises the concern that AKI maybe seriously under appreciated in critically ill COVID-19 patients.

ARDS is another significantly associated complication (pOR 6.52, 95% CI 2.66 to 16.01) we found. Problematically, ARDS itself is a heterogeneous syndrome, with the six studies [8,9,22,31-33] we analyzed variously applying the Berlin criteria [59], WHO guidance [60], or no criteria at all for its diagnosis. Then there is a notion that COVID-19 ARDS may be a separate entity and that current criteria are inadequate in guiding treatment [61]. Indeed, ARDS per the Berlin criteria defines a one week onset limit whereas COVID-19 related ARDS has a median onset of 8 to 12 days [20]. Pathophysiologically, there are also differences between COVID or non-COVID ARDS and Gattinoni et al. have highlighted the non-uniformity of ARDS in COVID-19 based on elastance, ventilation/perfusion ratio, lung weight and recruitability [62]. Thus, further efforts are urgently needed in clarifying the pathophysiology and developing new stratifications of severity for COVID-19 specific ARDS to guide optimal ventilatory support for ICU COVID-19 patients.

Finally, the issue of defining ARDS in COVID-19 leads to applicability of IMV as its treatment. Early studies have reported ICU mortality rates as high as 86 to 97% for IMV in COVID-19 patients [18,20,31], but no study to date specifically reported on the relative odds for IMV v. non-IMV in terms of outcome. Our finding that IMV itself is significantly associated with ICU mortality (pOR 16.46, 95% CI 4.37 to 61.96) coupled with subgroup analyses showing regions with higher ICU mortalities coincide with regions with higher IMV rates (USA, UK, Italy) are notable because it questions the benefits of IMV as well as the wisdom of public policies emphasizing ventilator availability in coping with the pandemic. The concern for potentially harmful overuse of IMV has been raised by past research, since IMV itself carries risks that may adversely affect survival [63]. Additionally, inappropriate timing of intubation too early or too late, inadequately trained or overwhelmed staff, as well as improper ventilation settings and IMV associated pneumonia can all potentially enhance mortality; and this should all be investigated more fully in COVID-19 cases.

From prior studies on ARDS, we know that other ventilation strategies such as non-invasive ventilation (NIV) may improve mortality over IMV [64], and there are suggestions that non-rebreathing masks and prone positioning may improve outcome in hypoxemic COVID-19 patients [65]. The comparison of different ventilation strategies is beyond the scope of our review and there is yet no published study comparing ventilation strategies in COVID-19. However, our data supports a more conservative approach to initiating IMV, as well as the need for well designed trials to clarify the role of various ventilation strategies in COVID-19 associated ARDS.

Finally, our results highlight significant regional discrepancies in COVID-19 ICU and IMV rates and outcomes. As the pandemic evolves, regional differences of local health systems and their resources as well as genetic differences amongst populations and possible viral evolution over time can all account for such differences and deserves study. Regional differences also imply the need for flexible region-specific treatment protocols especially in resource-limited settings [65] instead of the aim to set uniform international protocols for treatment.

Limitations

There are multiple limitations with our study. We have issues with incompleteness of data where not all outcomes are accounted for in many studies, as well as underlying heterogeneity of data with small number of studies and studies with small numbers of patients. Moreover, all our retrieved reports were retrospective cohorts, which limits our ability to infer causality; and some of these were not peer-reviewed. Furthermore, we could not adjust for confounders of potentially related variables in an analysis of survival vs. non-survival based on these studies. Finally, regional differences in health systems and their different treatment protocols may also confound results.

Conclusions

This is the largest and most comprehensive review and meta-analysis of ICU and IMV outcomes in COVID-19 ICU patients. Our findings parallel earlier reports on prevalences of associated comorbidities and clinical findings in COVID-19 patients implying largely the same set of factors is associated with severity and outcome regardless of stage of disease. However, we highlight the significant association of AKI and ARDS associated IMV in ICU outcomes, which deserve further research to refine diagnostic criteria and enable the development of optimally tailored treatment strategies, as well as better planning and allocation of critical care resources. Finally significant regional discrepancies in outcomes implies a need for further studies to allow a broader perspective of factors associated with ICU and IMV risks and outcomes under different healthcare systems in different populations.

Abbreviations

AKI, acute kidney injury; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome; CI, confidence interval; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; COVID-19, coronavirus disease of 2019 ;CVD, cardiovascular disease; CRP, C-reactive protein; DM, diabetes mellitus; HTN, hypertension; ICNARC, Intensive Care National Audit and Research Center; ICU, intensive care unit; IMV, invasive mechanical ventilation; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; LoS, length of stay; pER, pooled event rate; pOR, pooled odds ratio; PT, prothrombin time; RRT, renal replacement therapy; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; WBC, white blood cell count; WHO, World Health Organization.

Declarations

Patient and public involvement No patients were involved.

Ethics approval and consent for participation: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding: We declare no external funding.

Availability of data: All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files, and further available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Authors contributions: RC is the first author. RC and WS were involved in designing the study. RC and KME were involved in searching the database and screened citations for inclusion. RC, KMW, YY, WS were involved in risk of bias analysis. RC, KME and WS were involved in extracting data and interpretation. KME analysed the data. RC, KME, WZ and YY drafted the manuscript. RC is study guarantor. All authors reviewed the final manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work and approved the final manuscript for submission. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the [BMJ policy on declaration of interests](#) have been omitted.

References

1. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 339:b2535. <https://doi:10.1136/bmj.b2535>
2. National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI). Study quality assessment tools. <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>.
3. DerSimonian R, Laird N (1986) Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trial* 7:177-188. [https://doi:10.1016/0197-2456\(86\)90046-2](https://doi:10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2)
4. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *Br Med J*. <https://doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557>
5. Begg CB, Mazumdar M (1994) Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics* 50:1088. <https://doi:10.2307/2533446>

6. Sterne JAC, Egger M (2001) Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 54:1046-1055. [https://doi:10.1016/S0895-4356\(01\)00377-8](https://doi:10.1016/S0895-4356(01)00377-8)
7. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T (2014) Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. <https://doi:10.1186/1471-2288-14-135>
8. Arentz M, Yim E, Klaff L, et al (2020) Characteristics and outcomes of 21 critically ill patients with COVID-19 in Washington state. *JAMA* 363:1612. <https://doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4326>
9. Argenziano MG, Bruce SL, Slater CL, et al (2020) Characterization and clinical course of 1000 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York: retrospective case series. *BMJ*. <https://doi:10.1136/bmj.m1996>
10. Auld SC, Caridi-Scheible M, Blum JM, et al (2020) ICU and ventilator mortality among critically ill adults with coronavirus disease 2019. *Crit Care Med*. <https://doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000004457>
11. Bhatraju PK, Ghassemieh BJ, Nichols M, et al (2020) Covid-19 in critically ill patients in the Seattle region – Case series. *N Engl J Med* 382:2012-2022. <https://doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2004500>
12. Bi Q, Hong C, Meng J, et al (2020) Characterization of clinical progression of COVID-19 patients in Shenzhen, China. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.22.20076190>
13. Borobia A, Carcas A, Arnalich F, et al (2020) A cohort of patients with COVID-19 in a major teaching hospital in Europe. *J Clin Med* 9:1733. <https://doi:10.3390/jcm9061733>
14. Feng X, Li P, Ma L, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics and short-term outcomes of severe patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.24.20078063>
15. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, et al (2020) Baseline characteristics and outcomes of 1591 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy region, Italy. *JAMA* 323:1574. <https://doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5394>
16. Lapidus N, Zhou X, Carrat F, Riou B, Zhao Y, Hejblum G (2020) Biased and unbiased estimation of the average lengths of stay in intensive care units in the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.21.20073916>
17. Myers LC, Parodi SM, Escobar GJ, Liu VX (2020) Characteristics of hospitalized adults with COVID-19 in an integrated health care system in California. *JAMA* 323 :2195. <https://doi:10.1001/jama.2020.7202>
18. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al (2020) Presenting characteristics, comorbidities, and outcomes among 5700 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in the New York City area. *JAMA* 323:2052. <https://doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6775>
19. Simonnet A, Chetboun M, Poissy J, et al (2020). High prevalence of obesity in severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) requiring invasive mechanical ventilation. *Obesity* 28 :1195-1199. <https://doi:10.1002/oby.22831>
20. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al (2020) Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 395:1054-1062. [https://doi:10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30566-3](https://doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3)
21. Xu Y, Xu Z, Liu X, et al (2020). Clinical findings in critical ill patients infected with SARS-Cov-2 in Guangdong province, China: A multi-center, retrospective, observational study. *medRxiv*. doi:10.1101/2020.03.03.20030668
22. Zheng Y, Sun L, Xu M, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics of 34 COVID-19 patients admitted to intensive care unit in Hangzhou, China. *J Zhejiang Univ B* 21:378-387. <https://doi:10.1631/jzus.B2000174>
23. Ziehr DR, Alladina J, Petri CR, et al (2020) Respiratory pathophysiology of mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19: A cohort study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 201:1560-1564. <https://doi:10.1164/rccm.202004-1163LE>
24. Intensive Care National Audit and Research Centre. ICNARC report on COVID-19 in critical care. 30th April 2020. <https://icnarc.org/Our-Audit/Audits/Cmp/Reports>. Accessed 1 May 2020

25. Paranjpe I, Russak A, Freitas JK, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics of hospitalized covid-19 patients in New York City. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.19.20062117>
26. Goyal P, Choi JJ, Pinheiro LC, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics of covid-19 in New York City. *N Engl J Med* 382:2372-2374. <https://doi:10.1056/NEJMc2010419>
27. Du R-H, Liu L-M, Yin W, et al (2020) Hospitalization and Critical Care of 109 Decedents with COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 17:839-846. <https://doi:10.1513/AnnalsATS.202003-225OC>
28. Cao J, Tu W-J, Cheng W, et al (2020). Clinical features and short-term outcomes of 102 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *Clin Infect Dis*. <https://doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa243>
29. Guan W, Ni Z, Hu Y, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med* 382:1708-1720. <https://doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2002032>
30. Lei S, Jiang F, Su W, et al (2020) Clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients undergoing surgeries during the incubation period of COVID-19 infection. *EClinicalMedicine* 21:100331. <https://doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100331>
31. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, et al (2020) Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir Med* 8:475-481. [https://doi:10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30079-5](https://doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5)
32. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al (2020) Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 395:497-506. [https://doi:10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5)
33. Wang Y, Lu X, Li Y, et al (2020) Clinical course and outcomes of 344 intensive care patients with COVID-19. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 201:1430-1434. <https://doi:10.1164/rccm.202003-0736LE>
34. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, et al (2020). Features of 16,749 hospitalised UK patients with COVID-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.23.20076042>
35. Valente-Acosta B, Hoyo-Ulloa I, Espinosa-Aguilar L, et al (2020) *COVID-19* Severe pneumonia in Mexico City - First experience in a Mexican hospital. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.26.2008079>
36. Zhao X, Zhang B, Li P, et al (2020) Incidence, clinical characteristics and prognostic factor of patients with COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.03.17.20037572>
37. Abate, SM, Checkol YA, Manfredafro B BB (3030) Prevalence and risk factors of mortality among hospitalized patients with COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bull World Health Org*. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.20.260737>
38. Jain V, Yuan JM (2020) Predictive symptoms and comorbidities for severe COVID-19 and intensive care unit admission: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Public Health* 65:533-546. <https://doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01390-7>
39. Quah P, Li A, Phua J (2020). Mortality rates of patients with COVID-19 in the intensive care unit: a systematic review of the emerging literature. *Crit Care*. 24:285. <https://doi:10.1186/s13054-020-03006-1>
40. Armstrong RA, Kane AD, Cook TM (2020) Outcomes from intensive care in patients with COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Anaesthesia*. <https://doi:10.1111/anae.15201>
41. Almeshari MA, Alobaidi NY, Al Asmri M, et al (2020) Mechanical ventilation utilization in COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.06.04.20122069>
42. Domínguez-Cherit G (2009) Critically ill patients with 2009 influenza A(H1N1) in Mexico. *JAMA*302:1880. <https://doi:10.1001/jama.2009.1536>
43. Bellani G, Laffey JG, Pham T, et al (2016) Epidemiology, patterns of care, and mortality for patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome in intensive care units in 50 Countries. *JAMA* 315:788. <https://doi:10.1001/jama.2016.0291>

44. Rees EM, Nightingale ES, Jafari Y, et al (2020) COVID-19 length of hospital stay: a systematic review and data synthesis. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.30.20084780>
45. Phan T (2020) Genetic diversity and evolution of SARS-CoV-2. *Infect Genet Evol* 81:104260. <https://doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2020.104260>
46. Tian W, Jiang W, Yao J, et al (2020) Predictors of mortality in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. <https://doi:10.1002/jmv.26050>
47. Cao Y, Liu X, Xiong L, Cai K (2020) Imaging and clinical features of patients with 2019 novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. <https://doi:10.1002/jmv.25822>
48. Santa Cruz R, Villarejo F, Figueroa A, Cortés-Jofré M, Gagliardi J, Navarrete M (2019) Mortality in critically ill elderly individuals receiving mechanical ventilation. *Respir Care* 64:473-483. <https://doi:10.4187/respcare.06586>
49. Liu H, Chen S, Liu M, Nie H, Lu H (2020) Comorbid chronic diseases are strongly correlated with disease severity among COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aging Dis* 11:668. <https://doi:10.14336/AD.2020.0502>
50. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Cardona-Ospina JA, Gutiérrez-Ocampo E, et al (2020) Clinical, laboratory and imaging features of COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis* 34:101623. <https://doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101623>
51. Huang I, Lim MA, Pranata R (2020) Diabetes mellitus is associated with increased mortality and severity of disease in COVID-19 pneumonia – A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Clin Res Rev* 14:395-403. <https://doi:10.1016/j.dsx.2020.04.018>
52. Shamshirian A, Heydari K, Alizadeh-Navaei R, Moosazadeh M, Abrotan S, Hessami A (2020) Cardiovascular diseases and COVID-19 mortality and intensive care unit admission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.04.12.20062869>
53. Youssef M, Hussein M, Attia AS, et al (2020) COVID-19 and liver dysfunction: a systematic review and meta-analysis of retrospective studies. *J Med Virol*. <https://doi:10.1002/jmv.26055>
54. Wang X, Fang X, Cai Z, et al (2020) Comorbid chronic diseases and acute organ injuries are strongly correlated with disease severity and mortality among COVID-19 patients: A systemic review and meta-Analysis. *Research* 2020:1-17. <https://doi:10.34133/2020/2402961>
55. Phua J, Weng L, Ling L, et al (2020) Intensive care management of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): challenges and recommendations. *Lancet Respir Med* 8:506-517. [https://doi:10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30161-2](https://doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30161-2)
56. Alhazzani W, Møller MH, Arabi YM, et al (2020) Surviving sepsis campaign: guidelines on the management of critically ill adults with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Intensive Care Med* 46:854-887. <https://doi:10.1007/s00134-020-06022-5>
57. Wang L, Li X, Chen H, et al (2020) Coronavirus disease 19 infection does not result in acute kidney injury: An analysis of 116 hospitalized patients from Wuhan, China. *Am J Nephrol* 51:343-348. <https://doi:10.1159/000507471>
58. Chan L, Chaudhary K, Saha A, et al (2020) Acute kidney injury in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*. <https://doi:10.1101/2020.05.04.20090944>
59. Ferguson ND, Fan E, Camporota L, et al (2012) The Berlin definition of ARDS: an expanded rationale, justification, and supplementary material. *Intensive Care Med* 38:1573-1582. <https://doi:10.1007/s00134-012-2682-1>
60. World Health Organization (2020) Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection when novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infection is suspected: interim guidance, 28 January 2020. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/330893>

61. Tsolaki V, Zakynthinos GE, Makris D (2020) The ARBSnet protocol may be detrimental in COVID-19. Crit Care 24:351. <https://doi:10.1186/s13054-020-03081-4>
62. Gattinoni L, Chiumello D, Caironi P, et al (2020). COVID-19 pneumonia: different respiratory treatments for different phenotypes? Intensive Care Med 46:1099-1102. <https://doi:10.1007/s00134-020-06033-2>
63. Slutsky AS, Ranieri VM (2013) Ventilator-induced lung injury. N Engl J Med. 369:2126-2136. <https://doi:10.1056/NEJMra1208707>
64. Lindenauer PK, Stefan MS, Shieh M-S, Pekow PS, Rothberg MB, Hill NS (2014). Outcomes associated with invasive and noninvasive ventilation among patients hospitalized with exacerbations of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. JAMA Intern Med 174:1982. <https://doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.5430>
65. Dondorp AM, Hayat M, Aryal D, Beane A, Schultz MJ (2020). Respiratory support in COVID-19 patients, with a focus on resource-Limited Settings. Am J Trop Med Hyg 102:1191-1197. <https://doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-0283>

Figures




Figure 1

PRISMA flow diagram. PRISMA diagram depicting study selection process




Figure 2

Forest plots of relevant included studies showing pooled event rates of ICU and IMV outcomes. Forest plots of studies for 2a) ICU admission rates, 2b) ICU mortality rates, 2c) IMV rates, 2d) IMV mortality rates.




Figure 3

Funnel plot of ICU mortality rate




Figure 4

Funnel plot of IMV mortality rate

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [supp1.docx](#)
- [PRISMA.docx](#)