



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/165084/>

Version: Submitted Version

Article:

Goodacre, S., Thomas, B., Lee, E. et al. (Submitted: 2020) Characterisation of 22446 patients attending UK emergency departments with suspected COVID-19 infection : observational cohort study. medRxiv. (Submitted)

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.10.20171496>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Characterisation of 22446 patients attending UK emergency departments with suspected COVID-19 infection: Observational cohort study

The PRIEST Research Group (details in Appendix 1)

Steve Goodacre, Professor of Emergency Medicine, University of Sheffield,

s.goodacre@sheffield.ac.uk

Ben Thomas, Study Manager, University of Sheffield, b.d.thomas@sheffield.ac.uk

Ellen Lee, Statistician, University of Sheffield, e.lee@sheffield.ac.uk

Laura Sutton, Statistician/Research Associate, University of Sheffield, l.j.sutton@sheffield.ac.uk

Amanda Loban, Head of Data Management, University of Sheffield, a.loban@sheffield.ac.uk

Simon Waterhouse, Lead Data Specialist, University of Sheffield, s.waterhouse@sheffield.ac.uk

Richard Simmonds, Data Management/Information Systems Officer, University of Sheffield,

r.p.simmonds@sheffield.ac.uk

Katie Biggs, Assistant Director, University of Sheffield, c.e.biggs@sheffield.ac.uk

Carl Marincowitz, Clinical Lecturer in Emergency Medicine , University of Sheffield,

c.marincowitz@sheffield.ac.uk

Jose Schutter, Research Assistant, University of Sheffield, j.schutter@sheffield.ac.uk

Sarah Connelly, Research Assistant, University of Sheffield, s.l.connelly@sheffield.ac.uk

Elena Sheldon, Research Assistant, University of Sheffield, e.m.sheldon@sheffield.ac.uk

Jamie Hall, Research Assistant, University of Sheffield, jamie.hall@sheffield.ac.uk

Emma Young, Research Assistant, University of Sheffield, e.l.young@sheffield.ac.uk

Andrew Bentley, Consultant in ICM & Respiratory Medicine, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Wythenshawe Hospital, andrew.bentley@manchester.ac.uk

Kirsty Challen, Consultant in Emergency Medicine, Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, kirsty.challen@lthtr.nhs.uk

Chris Fitzsimmons, Consultant in Paediatric Emergency Medicine, Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust, c.fitzsimmons@nhs.net

Tim Harris, Professor of Emergency Medicine, Barts Health NHS Trust,

Tim.Harris@bartshealth.nhs.uk

Fiona Lecky, Clinical Professor in Emergency Medicine, University of Sheffield,

f.e.lecky@sheffield.ac.uk

Andrew Lee, Reader of Global Public Health, University of Sheffield, andrew.lee@sheffield.ac.uk

Ian Maconochie, Consultant in Paediatric Emergency Medicine, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, i.maconochie@ic.ac.uk

Darren Walter, Consultant in Emergency Medicine, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, darren.walter@manchester.ac.uk

Corresponding author:

Steve Goodacre, School of Health and Related Research (SchARR), University of Sheffield, Regent Court, Regent Street, Sheffield, S10 1UL
s.goodacre@sheffield.ac.uk

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0803-8444

Word count: 2334

ABSTRACT

Background

Hospital emergency departments play a crucial role in the initial management of suspected COVID-19 infection. We aimed to characterise patients attending emergency departments with suspected COVID-19, including subgroups based on sex, ethnicity and COVID-19 test results.

Methods

We undertook a mixed prospective and retrospective observational cohort study in 70 emergency departments across the United Kingdom (UK). We collected presenting data from 22446 people attending with suspected COVID-19 between 26 March 2020 and 28 May 2020. Outcomes were admission to hospital, COVID-19 result, organ support (respiratory, cardiovascular or renal), and death, by record review at 30 days.

Results

Adults were acutely unwell (median NEWS2 score 4) and had high rates of admission (67.1%), COVID-19 positivity (31.2%), organ support (9.8%) and death (15.9%). Children had much lower rates of admission (27.4%), COVID-19 positivity (1.2%), organ support (1.4%) and death (0.3%). Adult men and women presented in similar numbers (10210 versus 10506), but men were more likely to be admitted (72.9% v 61.4%), require organ support (12.2% v 7.7%) and die (18.7% v 13.3%). Black or Asian adults tended to be younger than White adults (median age 54, 50 and 67 years), were less likely to be admitted (60.8%, 57.3%, 69.6%) or die (11.9%, 11.2%, 16.8%), but were more likely to require organ support (15.9%, 14.3%, 8.9%) or have a positive COVID-19 test (40.8%, 42.1%, 30.0%). Adults admitted with confirmed COVID-19 had similar age and comorbidities (except chronic lung disease) to those who did not have COVID-19 confirmed, but were much more likely to need organ support (22.2% v 8.9%) or die (32.7% v 15.9%).

Conclusions

Important differences exist between patient groups presenting to the emergency department with suspected COVID-19. People with confirmed COVID-19 have a poor prognosis, compared with similar emergency admissions without confirmed COVID-19.

Registration

ISRCTN registry, ISRCTN56149622, <http://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN28342533>

INTRODUCTION

Hospital emergency departments (ED) have played a crucial role during the COVID-19 pandemic in receiving acutely ill patients, determining the need for admission and critical care, and providing emergency treatment. International [1,2] and national [3-6] guidelines have been developed for the emergency management of suspected COVID-19.

Studies of hospitalised cases with COVID-19 [7-10] inform the emergency management of suspected COVID-19 but have important limitations. First, patients typically present with suspected rather than proven COVID-19. This presentation includes many patients with characteristics of COVID-19, who need urgent care, but do not ultimately have the virus. Second, emergency management involves differentiating those with severe illness who require hospital admission from those with mild or moderate illness who can be managed at home. Appropriate management of this heterogeneous population is an important challenge that needs to be informed by relevant data.

The Pandemic Respiratory Infection Emergency System Triage (PRIEST) study collected data from consecutive patients attending EDs across the UK with suspected COVID-19. We aimed to characterise patients attending EDs with suspected COVID-19, including subgroups based on sex, ethnicity and COVID-19 results.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The PRIEST study was originally set up and piloted as the Pandemic Influenza Triage in the Emergency Department (PAINTED) study as part of the UK National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) pandemic portfolio of studies to be activated in the event of an influenza pandemic [11,12]. It was developed into the PRIEST study and expanded to include other respiratory infections in response to the emerging COVID-19 pandemic.

We undertook an observational cohort study of adults and children attending the ED with suspected COVID-19 infection. Patients were included if the assessing clinician recorded that the patient had suspected COVID-19 in the ED records or completed a standardised assessment form for suspected COVID-19 patients. The clinical diagnostic criteria for COVID-19 during the study were of fever ($\geq 37.8^{\circ}\text{C}$) and at least one of the following respiratory symptoms, which must be of acute onset: persistent cough (with or without sputum), hoarseness, nasal discharge or congestion, shortness of breath, sore throat, wheezing, sneezing. We did not seek consent to collect data but information about the study was provided in the ED and patients could withdraw their data at their request.

Patients with multiple presentations to hospital were only included once, using data from the first presentation identified by research staff.

Baseline characteristics at presentation to the ED were recorded prospectively, using a standardised assessment form developed and piloted for the PAINTED study [12] that doubled as a clinical record (Appendix 2), or retrospectively, through research staff extracting data onto the standardised form using the clinical records. Research staff collected follow-up data onto a standardised follow-up form (Appendix 3) using clinical records up to 30 days after presentation. They then entered data onto a secure online database managed by the Sheffield Clinical Trials Research Unit (CTRU).

Patients who died or required respiratory, cardiovascular or renal support were classified as having an adverse outcome. Patients who survived to 30 days without requiring respiratory, cardiovascular or renal support were classified as having no adverse outcome. Respiratory support was defined as any intervention to protect the patient's airway or assist their ventilation, including non-invasive ventilation or acute administration of continuous positive airway pressure. It did not include supplemental oxygen alone or nebulised bronchodilators. Cardiovascular support was defined as any intervention to maintain organ perfusion, such as inotropic drugs, or invasively monitor cardiovascular status, such as central venous pressure or pulmonary artery pressure monitoring, or arterial blood pressure monitoring. It did not include peripheral intravenous cannulation or fluid administration. Renal support was defined as any intervention to assist renal function, such as haemofiltration, haemodialysis or peritoneal dialysis. It did not include intravenous fluid administration.

The sample size was determined by the size and severity of the pandemic, but was originally planned to involve recruiting 20,000 patients across 40 sites. This was expected to include 200 with an adverse outcome, based on a 1% prevalence of adverse outcome in a previous study undertaken during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic.

This paper presents a descriptive analysis of the cohort. We calculated a National Early Warning Score (2nd version, NEWS2) for adults, to provide an overall assessment of acute illness severity on a scale from zero to 20, based on respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, systolic blood pressure, heart rate, level of consciousness and temperature [13]. We calculated a modified Paediatric Observation Priority Score (POPS) for children for the same purpose, with a scale from zero to 14, based on respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, heart rate, level of consciousness, temperature, breathing and

past medical history (excluding the gut feeling parameter) [14]. We undertook descriptive analysis of subgroups based on age, sex and ethnicity. We also compared the characteristics and outcomes of admitted patients with positive COVID-19 testing to those with negative or no testing.

Patient and public involvement

The Sheffield Emergency Care Forum (SECF) is a public representative group interested in emergency care research. [15] Members of SECF advised on the development of the PRIEST study and two members joined the Study Steering Committee. Patients were not involved in the recruitment to and conduct of the study. We are unable to disseminate the findings to study participants directly.

RESULTS

The PRIEST study recruited 22485 patients from 70 EDs across 53 sites between 26 March 2020 and 28 May 2020. We included 22446 in the analysis after excluding 39 who requested withdrawal of their data. The mean age was 58.4 years, 11200 (50.4%) were female, 11035 (49.6%) male (211 missing), and ethnicity was 15198 (84.7%) UK/Irish/other white, 1150 (6.4%) Asian, 692 (3.9%) Black/African/Caribbean, 328 (1.8%) mixed/multiple ethnic groups, 570 (3.2%) other ethnic groups and 4508 unknown (missing data or preferring not to say). After ED assessment COVID-19 was considered the most likely diagnosis for 14401 (67.2% of those with non-missing data). Figure 1 shows that hourly presentations between 11:00 and 18:00 were around four times the night-time rate.

Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics, presenting features and physiology of adults and children in the cohort, and Table 2 shows the admission decisions and adverse outcomes for adults and children. Figure 2 shows the NEWS2 score for adults and Figure 3 shows the POPS score for children. The median (inter-quartile range [IQR]) NEWS2 score was 4 (2, 7) for adults and the median POPS score was 1 (1, 3) for children.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics, presenting features and physiology of adults (N=20909) and children (N=1530)†

Characteristic	Statistic/level	Adults	Children
Age (years)	N	20909	1530
	Mean (SD)	62.4 (19.7)	3.6 (4.2)
	Median (IQR)	64 (48,79)	2 (0,6)
Sex	Missing	193	18
	Male	10210 (49.3%)	821 (54.3%)

	Female	10506 (50.7%)	691 (45.7%)
Ethnicity	Missing/prefer not to say	4216	290
	UK/Irish/other white	14243 (85.3%)	950 (76.6%)
	Asian	1044 (6.3%)	106 (8.5%)
	Black/African/Caribbean	640 (3.8%)	52 (4.2%)
	Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	247 (1.5%)	81 (6.5%)
	Other	519 (3.1%)	51 (4.1%)
Presenting features	Cough	12995 (62.2%)	580 (37.9%)
	Shortness of breath	15586 (74.5%)	314 (20.5%)
	Fever	10282 (49.2%)	1222 (79.9%)
Symptom duration (days)	N	18890	1442
	Mean (SD)	7.9 (8.9)	4.3 (5.9)
	Median (IQR)	5 (2,10)	2 (1,5)
Heart rate (beats/min)	N	20478	1482
	Mean (SD)	94.9 (21.6)	137.2 (28.4)
	Median (IQR)	93 (80,108)	138 (118,157)
Respiratory rate (breaths/min)	N	20364	1473
	Mean (SD)	23.3 (7)	33.1 (10.3)
	Median (IQR)	22 (18,26)	32 (26,40)
Systolic BP (mmHg)	N	20316	376
	Mean (SD)	134.6 (24.9)	107.9 (15.2)
	Median (IQR)	133 (118,149)	109 (98,117)
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	N	20229	366
	Mean (SD)	78.2 (16.1)	65.3 (12.4)
	Median (IQR)	78 (68,88)	64 (58,73)
Temperature (°C)	N	20249	1485
	Mean (SD)	37.1 (1.1)	37.5 (1.1)
	Median (IQR)	37 (36.4,37.8)	37.4 (36.7,38.3)
Oxygen saturation (%)	N	20650	1498
	Mean (SD)	94.7 (6.8)	97.7 (3.1)
	Median (IQR)	96 (94,98)	98 (97,99)
Glasgow Coma Scale	N	15435	506
	Mean (SD)	14.6 (1.4)	14.9 (0.9)
	Median (IQR)	15 (15,15)	15 (15,15)
AVPU	Missing	2391	120
	Alert	17581 (94.9%)	1394 (98.9%)
	Verbal	640 (3.5%)	11 (0.8%)
	Pain	183 (1%)	3 (0.2%)
	Unresponsive	114 (0.6%)	2 (0.1%)

†N=7 omitted due to missing age

Table 2: Outcomes of adults (N=20909) and children (N=1530)

Outcome	Level	Adult N (%)	Child N (%)
---------	-------	-------------	-------------

Admitted at initial assessment	Missing	45	3
	No	6867 (32.9%)	1109 (72.6%)
	Yes	13997 (67.1%)	418 (27.4%)
Respiratory pathogen	COVID-19	6521 (31.2%)	19 (1.2%)
	Influenza	27 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)
	Other	1721 (8.2%)	237 (15.5%)
	None identified	12640 (60.5%)	1272 (83.1%)
Mortality status	Missing	20	3
	Alive	17569 (84.1%)	1523 (99.7%)
	Dead	3320 (15.9%)	4 (0.3%)
	Death with organ support *	706 (21.3%)	0 (0%)
	Death with no organ support *	2614 (78.7%)	4 (100%)
Organ support	Respiratory	1944 (9.3%)	18 (1.2%)
	Cardiovascular	517 (2.5%)	8 (0.5%)
	Renal	218 (1%)	2 (0.1%)
	Any	2058 (9.8%)	22 (1.4%)

*Denominator=total deaths in category

Adults with suspected COVID-19 were acutely unwell, with a lower IQR oxygen saturation of 94% and an upper IQR respiratory rate of 26/minute, and had high rates of admission (67.1%), organ support (9.8%) and death (15.9%). Children with suspected COVID-19 also presented with abnormal physiology, but had low rates of admission, organ support and mortality. Adults tended to present with cough and breathlessness, while children tended to present with fever. Very few children had a positive test for COVID-19, compared with almost a third of adults.

Table 3 shows that adults with suspected COVID-19 had substantial co-morbidities (30.8% with hypertension and 19.7% with diabetes) and almost half were recorded as having some limitation of normal activities. A substantial proportion (19.3%) had a Do Not Attempt Resuscitation decision recorded on or before the day of presentation.

Table 3: Co-morbidities, performance status and Do Not Attempt Resuscitation decisions for adults (N=20909)

Characteristic	Level	N (%)
Comorbidities	Hypertension	6438 (30.8%)
	Heart Disease	4702 (22.5%)
	Diabetes	4129 (19.7%)
	Other chronic lung disease	3767 (18%)
	Asthma	3410 (16.3%)
	Renal impairment	1934 (9.2%)

	Active malignancy	1120 (5.4%)
	Immunosuppression	631 (3%)
	Steroid therapy	557 (2.7%)
	No Chronic disease	5798 (27.7%)
Performance status	Missing	1081
	Unrestricted normal activity	10541 (53.2%)
	Limited strenuous activity, can do light	2373 (12%)
	Limited activity, can self care	2781 (14%)
	Limited self care	2649 (13.4%)
	Bed/chair bound, no self care	1484 (7.5%)
DNAR in place after ED assessment		4029 (19.3%)

Table 4 shows that men tended to be older than women, have slightly more severe illness, and were more likely to have hypertension, heart disease, diabetes or chronic lung disease, while women were more likely to have asthma. Men and women attended the ED in similar numbers, but men were more likely to be admitted, have positive COVID-19 testing, require organ support and die.

Table 4: Characteristics and outcomes of male (N=10210) and female (N=10506) adults†

Characteristic	Statistic/level	Adult men	Adult women
Age (years)	N	10210	10506
	Mean (SD)	64 (18.3)	60.8 (20.9)
	Median (IQR)	66 (51,79)	61 (45,79)
Presenting features	Cough	6407 (62.8%)	6473 (61.6%)
	Shortness of breath	7646 (74.9%)	7811 (74.3%)
	Fever	5224 (51.2%)	4969 (47.3%)
Symptom duration (days)	N	9216	9501
	Mean (SD)	7.6 (8.5)	8.3 (9.2)
	Median (IQR)	5 (2,10)	5 (2,10)
Respiratory rate (breaths/min)	N	9952	10228
	Mean (SD)	23.7 (7.3)	22.8 (6.7)
	Median (IQR)	22 (18,27)	21 (18,26)
Oxygen saturation (%)	N	10095	10367
	Mean (SD)	94.2 (7)	95.1 (6.6)
	Median (IQR)	96 (93,98)	97 (94,98)
NEWS2 score	N	10119	10304
	Mean (SD)	4.7 (3.4)	4.1 (3.2)
	Median (IQR)	4 (2,7)	4 (1,6)
Comorbidities	Hypertension	3357 (32.9%)	3013 (28.7%)
	Heart Disease	2718 (26.6%)	1945 (18.5%)
	Diabetes	2343 (22.9%)	1747 (16.6%)

	Other chronic lung disease	1981 (19.4%)	1760 (16.8%)
	Asthma	1261 (12.4%)	2117 (20.2%)
	Renal impairment	1029 (10.1%)	888 (8.5%)
	Active malignancy	659 (6.5%)	453 (4.3%)
	Immunosuppression	294 (2.9%)	333 (3.2%)
	Steroid therapy	248 (2.4%)	305 (2.9%)
	No Chronic disease	2659 (26%)	3080 (29.3%)
Performance status	Missing	531	539
	Unrestricted normal activity	5005 (51.7%)	5437 (54.6%)
	Limited strenuous activity, can do light	1216 (12.6%)	1134 (11.4%)
	Limited activity, can self care	1420 (14.7%)	1339 (13.4%)
	Limited self care	1315 (13.6%)	1308 (13.1%)
	Bed/chair bound, no self care	723 (7.5%)	749 (7.5%)
Admitted at initial assessment	Missing	22	23
	No	2766 (27.1%)	4043 (38.6%)
	Yes	7422 (72.9%)	6440 (61.4%)
Respiratory pathogen	COVID-19	3612 (35.4%)	2851 (27.1%)
	Influenza (pandemic or seasonal)	10 (0.1%)	17 (0.2%)
	Other	809 (7.9%)	902 (8.6%)
	None identified	5779 (56.6%)	6736 (64.1%)
Mortality status	Missing	9	11
	Alive	8298 (81.3%)	9103 (86.7%)
	Dead	1903 (18.7%)	1392 (13.3%)
	Death with organ support*	448 (23.5%)	254 (18.2%)
	Death with no organ support*	1455 (76.5%)	1138 (81.8%)
Organ support	Respiratory	1165 (11.4%)	769 (7.3%)
	Cardiovascular	360 (3.5%)	151 (1.4%)
	Renal	155 (1.5%)	61 (0.6%)
	Any	1241 (12.2%)	805 (7.7%)

†N=193 omitted due to missing sex

*Denominator=total deaths in category

Table 5 reports the characteristics and outcomes of adults in different ethnic groups. Black or Asian adults tended to be younger than White adults, were less likely to have impaired performance status, be admitted to hospital or die, but were more likely to require organ support or have a positive COVID-19 test. Comorbidities also varied between ethnic groups.

Table 6 shows the characteristics and outcomes of admitted adults with subsequent positive COVID-19 testing and admitted patients with negative or no testing. Age and comorbidities (except chronic lung disease) did not differ markedly between the two groups, but adults with confirmed COVID-19 were more likely to die or require organ support.

Table 5: Characteristics and outcomes of different ethnic groups among adults

Characteristic	Statistic/level	UK/Irish/ other white	Asian	Black/ African/ Caribbean	Mixed/ Multiple groups	Other	Unknown
Age (years)	N	14243	1044	640	247	519	4216
	Mean (SD)	64.5 (19.5)	52.8 (17.8)	55 (17.7)	52.8 (19.3)	51.2 (18.5)	60.6 (19.7)
	Median (IQR)	67 (51,81)	50 (40,66)	54 (41.5,67)	52 (36,69)	48 (38,64)	61 (46,77)
Sex	Missing	129	11	6	4	5	38
	Male	6858 (48.6%)	531 (51.4%)	309 (48.7%)	104 (42.8%)	269 (52.3%)	2139 (51.4%)
	Female	7256 (51.4%)	502 (48.6%)	325 (51.3%)	139 (57.2%)	245 (47.7%)	2039 (48.6%)
Presenting features	Cough	8749 (61.4%)	717 (68.7%)	386 (60.3%)	155 (62.8%)	342 (65.9%)	2646 (62.8%)
	Shortness of breath	10662 (74.9%)	765 (73.3%)	442 (69.1%)	178 (72.1%)	388 (74.8%)	3151 (74.9%)
	Fever	6756 (47.4%)	650 (62.3%)	329 (51.4%)	127 (51.4%)	288 (55.5%)	2132 (50.5%)
Symptom duration (days)	N	12891	988	601	232	494	3684
	Mean (SD)	7.6 (8.7)	9.3 (8.9)	9.1 (9.5)	8.8 (8.8)	8.7 (7.7)	8.3 (9.5)
	Median (IQR)	5 (2,10)	7 (3,13)	7 (3,14)	7 (3,10.5)	7 (3,12)	6 (2,10)
Respiratory rate (breaths/min)	N	13898	1013	617	239	502	4095
	Mean (SD)	23.2 (6.8)	24.2 (8.2)	23.7 (7.8)	22.5 (7.2)	22.4 (6.6)	23.3 (7.8)
	Median (IQR)	22 (18,26)	22 (18,28)	21 (18,28)	20 (18,25)	20 (18,24)	21 (18,26)
Oxygen saturation (%)	N	14079	1031	634	245	513	4148
	Mean (SD)	94.5 (6.9)	95 (7.6)	95.3 (7)	95.6 (5.9)	95.5 (6.4)	94.8 (6.9)
	Median (IQR)	96 (94,98)	97 (95,98)	97 (95,99)	97 (95,99)	97 (95,98)	96 (94,98)
NEWS2 score	N	14062	1021	632	241	509	4147
	Mean (SD)	4.5 (3.3)	4.2 (3.3)	4.1 (3.3)	3.8 (3.3)	3.7 (3.2)	4.4 (3.3)
	Median (IQR)	4 (2,7)	4 (1,6)	4 (1,6)	3 (1,6)	3 (1,6)	4 (2,7)
Comorbidities	Hypertension	4576 (32.1%)	338 (32.4%)	253 (39.5%)	61 (24.7%)	105 (20.2%)	1105 (26.2%)
	Heart Disease	3563 (25%)	158 (15.1%)	66 (10.3%)	28 (11.3%)	56 (10.8%)	831 (19.7%)
	Diabetes	2743 (19.3%)	334 (32%)	175 (27.3%)	59 (23.9%)	67 (12.9%)	751 (17.8%)
	Other chronic lung disease	2938 (20.6%)	70 (6.7%)	45 (7%)	29 (11.7%)	47 (9.1%)	638 (15.1%)

	Asthma	2400 (16.9%)	160 (15.3%)	99 (15.5%)	36 (14.6%)	63 (12.1%)	652 (15.5%)
	Renal impairment	1415 (9.9%)	86 (8.2%)	63 (9.8%)	17 (6.9%)	23 (4.4%)	330 (7.8%)
	Active malignancy	865 (6.1%)	26 (2.5%)	22 (3.4%)	7 (2.8%)	12 (2.3%)	188 (4.5%)
	Immunosuppression	445 (3.1%)	33 (3.2%)	29 (4.5%)	7 (2.8%)	13 (2.5%)	104 (2.5%)
	Steroid therapy	414 (2.9%)	19 (1.8%)	14 (2.2%)	4 (1.6%)	15 (2.9%)	91 (2.2%)
	No Chronic disease	3452 (24.2%)	380 (36.4%)	189 (29.5%)	97 (39.3%)	257 (49.5%)	1423 (33.8%)
Performance status	Missing	706	28	13	6	21	307
	Unrestricted normal activity	6549 (48.4%)	744 (73.2%)	356 (56.8%)	180 (74.7%)	367 (73.7%)	2345 (60.7%)
	Limited strenuous activity, can do light	1755 (13%)	84 (8.3%)	81 (12.9%)	22 (9.1%)	40 (8%)	391 (10.0%)
	Limited activity, can self care	2095 (15.5%)	79 (7.8%)	70 (11.2%)	23 (9.5%)	36 (7.2%)	478 (12.3%)
	Limited self care	2058 (15.2%)	50 (4.9%)	54 (8.6%)	9 (3.7%)	32 (6.4%)	446 (11.4%)
	Bed/chair bound, no self care	1080 (8%)	59 (5.8%)	66 (10.5%)	7 (2.9%)	23 (4.6%)	249 (6.4%)
Admitted at initial assessment	Missing	22	1	0	0	0	22
	No	4329 (30.4%)	445 (42.7%)	251 (39.2%)	108 (43.7%)	262 (50.5%)	1472 (35.5%)
	Yes	9892 (69.6%)	598 (57.3%)	389 (60.8%)	139 (56.3%)	257 (49.5%)	2722 (64.5%)
Respiratory pathogen	COVID-19	4278 (30%)	440 (42.1%)	261 (40.8%)	68 (27.5%)	170 (32.8%)	1304 (30.0%)
	Influenza (pandemic or seasonal)	23 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.1%)
	Other	1361 (9.6%)	65 (6.2%)	29 (4.5%)	16 (6.5%)	19 (3.7%)	231 (5.5%)
	None identified	8581 (60.2%)	538 (51.5%)	350 (54.7%)	163 (66%)	330 (63.6%)	2678 (63.4%)
Mortality status	Missing	3	0	0	0	0	17
	Alive	11847 (83.2%)	927 (88.8%)	564 (88.1%)	220 (89.1%)	473 (91.1%)	3538 (84.7%)
	Dead	2393 (16.8%)	117 (11.2%)	76 (11.9%)	27 (10.9%)	46 (8.9%)	661 (15.3%)
	Death with organ support*	450 (18.8%)	40 (34.2%)	32 (42.1%)	13 (48.1%)	17 (37%)	154 (23.3%)
	Death with no organ support*	1943 (81.2%)	77 (65.8%)	44 (57.9%)	14 (51.9%)	29 (63%)	507 (76.7%)
Organ support	Respiratory	1189 (8.3%)	139 (13.3%)	93 (14.5%)	31 (12.6%)	53 (10.2%)	439 (10.4%)
	Cardiovascular	278 (2%)	58 (5.6%)	45 (7%)	5 (2%)	14 (2.7%)	117 (2.8%)
	Renal	115 (0.8%)	22 (2.1%)	31 (4.8%)	3 (1.2%)	5 (1%)	42 (1%)
	Any	1264 (8.9%)	149 (14.3%)	102 (15.9%)	34 (13.8%)	53 (10.2%)	456 (10.8%)

*Denominator=total deaths in category

Table 6: Characteristics and outcomes of admitted adult patients with (N=5768) and without (N=8229) positive COVID-19 test

Characteristic	Statistic/level	COVID-19 positive	COVID-19 negative or not tested
Age (years)	N	5768	8229
	Mean (SD)	69.8 (16.6)	68.4 (17.8)
	Median (IQR)	73 (58,83)	72 (57,82)
Sex	Missing	53	82
	Male	3282 (57.4%)	4140 (50.8%)
	Female	2433 (42.6%)	4007 (49.2%)
Presenting features	Cough	3722 (64.5%)	4633 (56.3%)
	Shortness of breath	4390 (76.1%)	6158 (74.8%)
	Fever	3425 (59.4%)	3629 (44.1%)
Symptom duration (days)	N	5199	7278
	Mean (SD)	6.9 (6.3)	7 (8.9)
	Median (IQR)	6 (2,10)	3 (2,8)
Respiratory rate (breaths/min)	N	5634	8060
	Mean (SD)	25.6 (7.8)	23.9 (6.9)
	Median (IQR)	24 (20,29)	22 (19,28)
Oxygen saturation (%)	N	5710	8152
	Mean (SD)	92.7 (7.8)	94.1 (7)
	Median (IQR)	95 (91,97)	96 (93,98)
NEWS2 score	N	5711	8146
	Mean (SD)	6.1 (3.2)	5.2 (3.2)
	Median (IQR)	6 (4,8)	5 (3,7)
Comorbidities	Hypertension	2251 (39%)	3000 (36.5%)
	Heart Disease	1605 (27.8%)	2457 (29.9%)
	Diabetes	1591 (27.6%)	1885 (22.9%)
	Other chronic lung disease	978 (17%)	2189 (26.6%)
	Asthma	770 (13.3%)	1276 (15.5%)
	Renal impairment	769 (13.3%)	959 (11.7%)
	Active malignancy	282 (4.9%)	693 (8.4%)
	Immunosuppression	181 (3.1%)	309 (3.8%)
	Steroid therapy	160 (2.8%)	288 (3.5%)
	No Chronic disease	1158 (20.1%)	1406 (17.1%)
Performance status	Missing	232	504
	Unrestricted normal activity	2224 (40.2%)	2989 (38.7%)
	Limited strenuous activity, can do light	605 (10.9%)	1160 (15%)
	Limited activity, can self care	856 (15.5%)	1625 (21%)
	Limited self care	1128 (20.4%)	1286 (16.6%)
	Bed/chair bound, no self care	723 (13.1%)	665 (8.6%)
Mortality status	Missing	0	1

	Alive	3881 (67.3%)	6916 (84.1%)
	Dead	1887 (32.7%)	1312 (15.9%)
	Death with organ support*	478 (25.3%)	214 (16.3%)
	Death with no organ support*	1409 (74.7%)	1098 (83.7%)
Organ support	Respiratory	1235 (21.4%)	661 (8%)
	Cardiovascular	379 (6.6%)	128 (1.6%)
	Renal	151 (2.6%)	65 (0.8%)
	Any	1278 (22.2%)	729 (8.9%)

*Denominator=total deaths in category

DISCUSSION

Our study describes the presentation of suspected COVID-19 to EDs across the United Kingdom over the first wave of the pandemic. This large, generalizable cohort allows us to characterise the challenge faced by EDs, identify important differences between demographic groups and guide planning for future emergency care.

Adults presenting to the ED with suspected COVID-19 tended to have severe illness, with relatively high NEWS2 scores and abnormal respiratory physiology, and a correspondingly high rate of admission and adverse outcome. Children had a much lower rate of admission and a very low rate of adverse outcome. Adults were also much more likely to have confirmed COVID-19 than children. Suspected COVID-19 in adults and children could therefore be considered as different entities, requiring different approaches to triage, diagnosis and management.

A number of policies were implemented during the pandemic to reduce unnecessary ED attendances with suspected COVID-19. The UK National Health Service advised people with suspected COVID-19 to use the online or telephone NHS111 service rather than attend the ED directly. Some ambulance services avoided transferring people to the ED if they did not have features of severe disease. Our findings suggest that these approaches resulted in an adult ED population with severe illness and high rate of admission. Further research is underway as part of the PRIEST study to determine whether this was achieved at the expense of delayed hospital admission for some cases.

Adults admitted with suspected COVID-19 that was subsequently confirmed were more than twice as likely to die or receive organ support as those who did not have COVID-19 confirmed, despite having similar age and comorbidities (except chronic lung disease). Admission with COVID-19 therefore confers a markedly worse prognosis compared to similar presentations. We are only

aware of one other study comparing ED presentations in this way – a small single centre study from San Francisco showing no difference in mortality. [16]

Adult men and women presented to the ED with suspected COVID-19 in almost equal numbers, but men were more likely to be admitted, have positive COVID-19 testing, receive organ support and die. This may be explained by age and comorbidities. Previous studies have shown a male majority of around 60% among admitted patients. [7-10, 17-19] Petrilli *et al* included patients managed as outpatients or discharged from the ED in their cohort and report similar findings to us, with an equal ratio presenting but men more likely to be admitted. [20]

Black or Asian adults tended to be younger than White adults, had less impairment of performance status, and were less likely to be admitted to hospital or die, but were more likely to require organ support or have a positive COVID-19 test. A recent systematic review [21] suggested Black or Asian people are at an increased risk of acquiring COVID-19 and a greater risk of worse clinical outcomes compared to White people. Harrison *et al* studied admitted patients with a high likelihood of COVID-19 infection across UK hospitals over the same time period as our study and showed that higher mortality among the White population was explained by age on multivariable analysis. [Harrison] In contrast, Price-Heywood *et al* found that high mortality associated with Black ethnicity in Louisiana was explained by sociodemographic and clinical characteristics [22], while Petrelli *et al* showed that Hispanic ethnicity in New York was associated with an increased risk of hospital admission but not of critical illness. [20] These findings suggest a complex interaction between underlying demographics and comorbidities, susceptibility to COVID-19 and use of health services may explain differences between ethnic groups.

Our study is based on a large and generalizable cohort covering the first wave of the pandemic, but has some limitations. A combination of prospective and retrospective data collection was used, and infection control measures limited our ability to collect data directly from patients. Reliance on clinical records may have underestimated the prevalence of some presenting features and comorbidities, and resulted in missing data for some variables. Selection of cases was based on subjective clinical judgement that COVID-19 was a suspected diagnosis, which may have been applied in a variable manner between clinicians and between sites. Our analysis was limited to describing the cohort rather than using multivariable analysis to explain the observed differences between groups. We felt that the latter analysis would need to be based on a clear theoretical rationale and inclusion of appropriate covariates, which would be beyond the scope of this study.

In summary, we have shown important differences between patient groups presenting to the ED with suspected COVID-19. Adults and children differ markedly and require different approaches to emergency triage. Admission and adverse outcome rates among adults suggest that policies to avoid unnecessary ED attendance achieved their aim. Subsequent COVID-19 confirmation confers a worse prognosis and greater need for organ support.

Ethical approval

The North West - Haydock Research Ethics Committee gave a favourable opinion on the PAINTED study on 25 June 2012 (reference 12/NW/0303) and on the updated PRIEST study on 23rd March 2020. The Confidentiality Advisory Group of the Health Research Authority granted approval to collect data without patient consent in line with Section 251 of the National Health Service Act 2006.

Contributor and guarantor information

SG, AB, KC, CF, TH, FL, ALe, IM and DW conceived and designed the study. BT, KB, ALo, SW, RS, JS, SC, ES, JH and EY acquired the data. EL, LS, MBr, MBu, SG, BT, KB and CM analysed the data. SG, AB, KC, CF, TH, FL, ALe, IM, DW, EL, LS, MBr, MBu, SG, BT, KB and CM interpreted the data. All authors contributed to drafting the manuscript. Steve Goodacre is the guarantor of the paper. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Competing interests

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: grant funding to their employing institutions from the National Institute for Health Research; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Acknowledgements

We thank Katie Ridsdale for clerical assistance with the study, Erica Wallis (Sponsor representative, all members of the Study Steering Committee (Appendix 4) and the site research teams who delivered the data for the study (Appendix 5), and the research team at the University of Sheffield past and present (Appendix 6).

Data sharing

Anonymised data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request (contact details on first page). The Confidentiality Advisory Group of the Health Research Authority will need to consider any requests for data to be used for purposes other than those specified in our application, so a data request should be accompanied by explanation of the purpose of the request and justification of the public benefit. We also recommend inclusion of a pre-specified plan of analysis.

Role of the funding source

The PRIEST study was funded by the United Kingdom National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment (HTA) programme (project reference 11/46/07). The funder played no role in the study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the article for publication. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

References

1. World Health Organisation. Clinical care of severe acute respiratory infections – Tool kit. <https://www.who.int/publications-detail/clinical-care-of-severe-acute-respiratory-infections-tool-kit> (accessed 28/04/2020)
2. International Federation for Emergency Medicine. Global Response to COVID-19 for Emergency Healthcare Systems and Providers: From the IFEM Task Force on ED Crowding and Access Block. <https://www.ifem.cc/coronavirus-2019-information/> (accessed 15/06/2020)
3. NHS. Clinical guide for the management of emergency department patients during the coronavirus pandemic. 17 March 2020 Version 1 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/secondary-care/other-resources/specialty-guides/#ae> (accessed 15/06/2020)
4. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing suspected or confirmed pneumonia in adults in the community. Published: 3 April 2020. www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng165 (accessed 28/04/2020)
5. American College of Emergency Physicians. Guide to Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) <https://www.acep.org/corona/covid-19-field-guide/cover-page/>
6. Public Health England. COVID-19: investigation and initial clinical management of possible cases. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/wuhan-novel-coronavirus-initial->

[investigation-of-possible-cases/investigation-and-initial-clinical-management-of-possible-cases-of-wuhan-novel-coronavirus-wn-cov-infection#criteria](#) (accessed 27/04/2020)

7. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2020;395(10229):1054-1062.
8. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, Crawford JM, McGinn T, Davidson KW, Barnaby DP, Becker LB, Chelico JD, Cohen SL, Cookingham J, Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area. *JAMA*.
9. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, Hardwick HE, Pius R, Norman L et al. Features of 202133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: prospective observational cohort study *BMJ* 2020; 369 :m1985
10. Cummings MJ, Baldwin MR, Abrams D, et al. Epidemiology, clinical course, and outcomes of critically ill adults with COVID-19 in New York City: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2020;395(10239):1763-1770.
11. Simpson CR, Thomas BD, Challen K, De Angelis D, Fragaszy E, Goodacre S, Hayward A, Lim WS, Rubin GJ, Semple MG, Knight M. The UK hibernated pandemic influenza research portfolio: triggered for COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; May 15 doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30398-4 [Epub ahead of print]
12. Goodacre S, Irving A, Wilson R, Beever D, Challen K. The PAndemic INfluenza Triage in the Emergency Department (PAINTED) pilot cohort study. *Health Technol Assess* 2015;19(3):1-70.
13. Royal College of Physicians. National Early Warning Score (NEWS) 2: Standardising the assessment of acute-illness severity in the NHS. Updated report of a working party. London: RCP, 2017.
14. Roland D, Arshad F, Coats T, Davies F. Baseline Characteristics of the Paediatric Observation Priority Score in Emergency Departments outside Its Centre of Derivation. *BioMed Research International* 2017; 9060852,
15. Hirst E, Irving A, Goodacre S. Patient and public involvement in emergency care research. *Emerg Med J* 2016;33:665–670.
16. Shah SJ, Barish PN, Prasad PA, et al. Clinical features, diagnostics, and outcomes of patients presenting with acute respiratory illness: a comparison of patients with and without COVID-19. Preprint. medRxiv. 2020;2020.05.02.20082461. Published 2020 May 6.

17. Argenziano MG, Bruce SL, Slater CL, Tiao JR, Baldwin MR, Barr RG et al. Characterization and clinical course of 1000 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York: retrospective case series BMJ 2020; 369 :m1996
18. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, Liu L, Shan H, Lei CL, Hui DS, Du B. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med 2020;382:1708-1720.
19. Liang W, Liang H, Ou L, et al. Development and Validation of a Clinical Risk Score to Predict the Occurrence of Critical Illness in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19. JAMA Intern Med. Published online May 12, 2020. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2033
20. Petrilli CM, Jones SA, Yang J, Rajagopalan H, O'Donnell L, Chernyak Y et al. Factors associated with hospital admission and critical illness among 5279 people with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York City: prospective cohort study BMJ 2020; 369 :m1966
21. Pan D, Sze S, Minhas JS, et al. The impact of ethnicity on clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review. EClinicalMedicine 2020;23:100404.
22. Price-Haywood EG, Burton J, Fort D, Seoane L. Hospitalization and Mortality among Black Patients and White Patients with Covid-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 27]. N Engl J Med. 2020;10.1056/NEJMsa2011686. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa2011686

Figure 1: Time of presentation to the ED




Figure 2: Adult patients NEWS2 scores




Figure 3: Child patient POPS scores

