



Hospitalized Healthcare workers and adverse outcomes from Covid-19

TOM BECKER

NORTHWEST PORTLAND AREA INDIAN HEALTH BOARD

Game plan



- ▶ Review an article on healthcare workers and their risk of adverse outcomes during hospitalization for Covid-19, from a large population-based study in Spain
- 

Objectives

- ▶ Be able to recite key findings from this study
- ▶ Recognize that both survey analytic methods and cohort study analytic methods were both used in this study, and the main design considerations in so doing
- ▶ Suggest studies that should be done moving forward to better understand factors associated with poor outcomes among HCW with Covid-19

Take home messages

- ▶ Hospitalized HCW had less severe courses of infection/disease than non HCW in Spain
- ▶ Occurrence of sepsis was lower in hospitalized HCW compared to non HCW patients
- ▶ Mortality in hospital was lower in HCW vs. non HCW (0.7% vs 4.8%)
- ▶ For all patients combined: non HCW status, advanced age, male sex, and higher number of co-morbidities were associated with higher mortality in hospital
- ▶ 30-day survival (unadjusted) was higher among HCW than non HCW (97% vs 85%)

Introduction

- ▶ A single case reported from China in February sparked interest in this question: how much more likely are healthcare workers hospitalized with Covid-19, to experience adverse outcomes from infection/disease?
- ▶ Risk of death from Covid-19 reported to be high among HCW in Mexico, but low in Germany and Malaysia
- ▶ The high proportion of HCW in New York, Sweden, and other locations (compared to community members) with antibodies to SARS-CoV-2, makes this topic one of clear concern
- ▶ Few comprehensive, population-based approaches to address the question of adverse outcomes among HCW have been published

Healthcare workers study, Diez-Manglano et al, Methods

- ▶ Nationwide observational cohort, all patients hospitalized in Spain from Jan to end of May (10,600 cases)
- ▶ Electronic chart review (300 variables collected)
- ▶ Foci: socio-demographics, lab, clinical, treatment
- ▶ Included patients aged 20-65 years, all with RT-PCR testing +
- ▶ Logistic regression used to identify key factors associated with in-hospital mortality and other secondary outcomes (different models were considered)
- ▶ Survival analysis to examine differences in 30-day survival post diagnosis

Healthcare workers study, results



- ▶ 4393 total hospitalized Covid-19 patients were included in the analysis (a large proportion were very old and thus excluded)
- ▶ 419 (9.5%) were HCW
- ▶ Median age 52 years, 62% female
- ▶ 1/3 physicians, 1/4 nurses, 1/4 nurses aides, rest were 'other'

	Total	NHCW	HCW	p
Complications				
Bacterial pneumonia (<i>n</i> =4356)	330 (7.6)	305 (7.7)	25 (6.0)	0.209
ARDS (<i>n</i> =4355)	1001 (23.0)	919 (23.3)	82 (19.8)	0.101
Acute kidney failure (<i>n</i> =4353)	243 (5.6)	228 (5.8)	15 (3.6)	0.068
Sepsis (<i>n</i> =4351)	160 (3.7)	153 (3.9)	7 (1.7)	0.024
Shock (<i>n</i> =4349)	132 (3.0)	125 (3.2)	7 (1.7)	0.094
Thromboembolic disease (<i>n</i> =4350)	71 (1.6)	64 (1.6)	7 (1.7)	0.921
Respiratory support				
High flow nasal cannula (<i>n</i> =4334)	327 (7.5)	293 (7.5)	34 (8.2)	0.578
Noninvasive mechanical ventilation (<i>n</i> =4357)	174 (4.0)	156 (4.0)	18 (4.3)	0.707
Invasive mechanical ventilation (<i>n</i> =4357)	314 (7.2)	291 (7.4)	23 (5.5)	0.168
Intensive care unit (ICU)				
Admission to ICU (<i>n</i> =4385)	415 (9.5)	371 (9.4)	44 (10.5)	0.435
Days in the ICU	11 (10)	11 (11)	8.5 (10)	0.099
Death and readmission				
Hospital length-of-stay, days (<i>n</i> =4392)	8 (7)	8 (8)	7 (7)	0.067
In-hospital death (<i>n</i> =4393)	194 (4.4)	191 (4.8)	3 (0.7)	<0.001
Readmission (<i>n</i> =4194)	121 (2.9)	112 (2.9)	9 (2.3)	0.449
ARDS: acute respiratory distress syndrome; ICU: intensive care unit Data are expressed as n (%) and median [interquartile range]				

- 
- 
- ▶ The next slide shows univariate and multivariate associations of a variety of risk factors, with in-hospital mortality as the outcome.

Model 2				
Age	1.073 (1.053-1.095)	<0.001	1.055 (1.031-1.081)	<0.001
Male sex	1.884 (1.366-2.599)	<0.001	1.712 (1.159-2.530)	0.007
BAME	0.743 (0.505-1.094)	0.132		
HCW	0.143 (0.045-0.449)	0.001	0.285 (0.089-0.908)	0.034
Alcohol	2.642 (1.604-4.351)	<0.001	1.266 (0.674-2.379)	0.463
Smoking	2.491 (1.625-3.820)	<0.001	2.436 (1.473-4.030)	0.001
Hypertension	2.362 (1.762-3.166)	<0.001	1.360 (0.923-2.004)	0.120
Dyslipidemia	1.886 (1.393-2.552)	<0.001	0.819 (0.543-1.236)	0.342
Obesity	2.029 (1.471-2.798)	<0.001	1.679 (1.136-2.481)	0.009
Diabetes	2.870 (2.030-4.059)	<0.001	1.464 (0.926-2.316)	0.103
Acute myocardial infarction	2.609 (1.236-5.508)	0.012	1.278 (0.518-3.156)	0.595
Heart failure	3.660 (1.782-7.519)	<0.001	1.158 (0.426-3.147)	0.773
Atrial fibrillation	2.279 (1.085-4.788)	0.03	0.939 (0.376-2.344)	0.893
Stroke/TIA	3.913 (2.178-7.033)	<0.001	0.952 (0.417-2.171)	0.907
Dementia	8.773 (4.551-16.910)	<0.001	8.884 (3.800-20.772)	<0.001
COPD	6.017 (3.600-10.057)	<0.001	2.330 (1.233-4.403)	0.009
OSAHS	3.165 (2.058-4.867)	<0.001	1.659 (0.955-2.884)	0.072
Moderate-severe CKD	5.351 (3.138-9.126)	<0.001	3.649 (1.889-7.051)	<0.001
Moderate-severe CLD	5.375 (2.324-12.429)	<0.001	1.845 (0.657-5.180)	0.245
Malignancy	3.710 (2.490-5.527)	<0.001	3.058 (1.891-4.943)	<0.001
BAME: black, Asian and minority ethnic; CCI: Charlson Comorbidity Index score; CI: confidence interval; CKD: chronic kidney disease; CLD; chronic liver disease; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; HCW: healthcare workers; OR: odds ratio; OSAHS: obstructive sleep apnoea/hypopnoea syndrome; TIA: transient ischemic attack				

Strengths and weaknesses of this study

- ▶ Large and complete series of eligible cases/patients; all RT-PCR positive, population-based
- ▶ Over 300 variables include in data collection
- ▶ Efficient use of electronic records
- ▶ Use of different regression models to evaluate strength of associations with multiple outcomes
- ▶ Appropriate use of survival analysis but multiple co-factors were NOT considered
- ▶ Concern re: healthy worker effect (what is that?)
- ▶ No QC on hospital admission criteria....up to each admitting dr....perhaps HCW were admitted quickly and received different care

Strengths and weaknesses, cntd

- ▶ Reasonable request to see the authors report on cumulative incidence and cumulative incidence ratios, as a measure of relative risk (in addition to survival curves)
- ▶ To calculate cumulative incidence, we need a closed cohort and complete follow-up to specific endpoints (like death) with a definite endpoint in time (like a month)
- ▶ Numerator is number of Covid admissions that died, divided by all admitted and followed forward to the endpoint in time.
- ▶ We can compare cumulative incidence of death among HCW to that of non HCW, and do so within strata
- ▶ We rarely have this type of information

CI/CIR example (made up)

- ▶ 100 HCW admitted with Covid-19 and followed til one month post admission.
- ▶ 10 of them die within that one month period, or $10/100$ HCW=10% or .10
- ▶ 100 non HCW admitted and followed for same time period
- ▶ 20 of them die within that same period, or $20/100$ non-HCW =20% or .20
- ▶ Cumulative incidence ratio: $.10/.20$, or .5 The risk of death from Covid-19 during one month post admission was .5 for HCW compared to non-HCW. (The term does not have units, but the time period of follow-up needs to be stated).

Take home test

- ▶ List three factors associated with in- hospital mortality from Covid-19 in the Spanish study
- ▶ How might this study be expanded or improved upon?
- ▶ What is healthy worker effect and how could this factor influence study results?
- ▶ Is it reasonable to generalize findings from Spanish clinicians and providers to our own situation in Indian country with those providers?

References

- ▶ **doi:** <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.23.20236810> Diez-Manglano et al, Healthcare workers hospitalized due to Covid-19, MedRxiv 2020
- ▶ [Thanks to Grazia Ori](#)