Characterising biological mechanisms underlying ethnicity-associated outcomes in COVID-19 through biomarker trajectories: a multicentre registry analysis

Yize I. Wan, Zudin A. Puthucheary, Rupert M. Pearse, John R. Prowle

PII: S0007-0912(23)00183-6

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2023.04.008

Reference: BJA 2564

To appear in: British Journal of Anaesthesia

Received Date: 7 February 2023

Revised Date: 31 March 2023

Accepted Date: 4 April 2023

Please cite this article as: Wan YI, Puthucheary ZA, Pearse RM, Prowle JR, Characterising biological mechanisms underlying ethnicity-associated outcomes in COVID-19 through biomarker trajectories: a multicentre registry analysis, *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2023.04.008.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of British Journal of Anaesthesia.



Characterising biological mechanisms underlying ethnicity-associated outcomes in COVID-19 through biomarker trajectories: a multicentre registry analysis

Running title: Biomarker trajectories in COVID-19 hospitalisation

Yize I. Wan,^{1,2} Zudin A. Puthucheary,^{1,2} Rupert M. Pearse,^{1,2} John R. Prowle^{1,2}

¹William Harvey Research Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK. ²Acute Critical Care Research Unit, Royal London Hospital, Barts Health NHS Trust, London, UK.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: yize.wan@qmul.ac.uk Twitter: @YizeWan

Editor's key points

Based on ethnic differences in biomarker expression and disease outcomes, the authors hypothesised that different outcomes from COVID-19 despite similar profiles of baseline risk factors and comorbidities are associated with blood biomarkers.

In this registry analysis of the first two waves of COVID-19 in the UK, differences in ethnicity-associated outcomes were compared with trajectories of routine biomarkers in the context of underlying comorbidities and acute response to COVID-19.

Of 3237 patients > 16 yr old with hospital length of stay \geq 7 days analysed, there was greater representation of Black and Asian ethnicity in trajectory clusters for C-reactive protein and urea-to-creatinine ratio associated patients who died, and inclusion of these factors in survival analyses attenuated or abrogated the higher risk of death.

Routinely collected biomarker trajectories during hospital admission are associated with adverse outcomes following COVID-19, which could reflect dysregulated host responses to disease and treatments, and could mediate ethnic imbalances in COVID-19 outcomes.

Abstract

Background: Differences in routinely collected biomarkers between ethnic groups could reflect dysregulated host responses to disease and to treatments, and be associated with excess morbidity and mortality in COVID-19.

Methods: A multicentre registry analysis from patients aged ≥ 16 yr with SARS-CoV-2 infection and emergency admission to Barts Health NHS Trust hospitals during 01/01/2020-13/05/2020 (wave 1) and 01/09/2020-17/02/2021 (wave 2) was subjected to unsupervised longitudinal clustering techniques to identify distinct phenotypic patient clusters based on trajectories of routine blood results over the first 15 days of hospital admission. Distribution of trajectory clusters across ethnic categories was determined, and associations between ethnicity, trajectory clusters, and 30-day survival were assessed using multivariable Cox proportional hazards modelling. Secondary outcomes were intensive care unit admission, survival to hospital discharge, and long-term survival to 640 days.

Results: We included 3237 patients with hospital length of stay \geq 7 days. In patients who died, there was greater representation of Black and Asian ethnicity in trajectory clusters for C-reactive protein (CRP) and urea-to-creatinine ratio (UCR) associated with increased risk of death. Inclusion of trajectory clusters in survival analyses attenuated or abrogated the higher risk of death in Asian and Black patients. Inclusion of CRP went from hazard ratio (HR) 1.36 [0.95-1.94] to HR 0.97 [0.59-1.59] (wave 1), and from HR 1.42 [1.15-1.75]) to HR 1.04 [0.78-1.39] (wave 2) in Asian patients. Trajectory clusters associated with reduced 30-day survival were similarly associated with worse secondary outcomes.

Conclusions: Clinical biochemical monitoring of COVID-19 and progression and treatment response in SARS-CoV-2 infection should be interpreted in the context of ethnic background.

Keywords: COVID-19; C-reactive protein; creatinine; critical illness; ethnicity; frailty; inflammation; survival; trajectory cluster

In the UK and across the Global North, people with Black and South Asian ethnic background were disproportionately affected by COVID-19 with increased hospitalisation, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, organ failure, and premature mortality.¹⁻⁴ Multiple pathways leading to differential health outcomes have been proposed, but they remain poorly understood.⁵

We previously showed that initial values of routinely collected biomarkers including C-reactive protein (CRP), D-dimer, and ferritin on hospital admission with COVID-19 were increased in Black and South Asian patients, potentially reflecting increased systemic inflammation, coagulopathy, and immune dysregulation.^{6, 7} In the UK National Health Service (NHS) categorisation used to define our study cohort, Black ethnicity predominantly describes individuals from Caribbean and African backgrounds and Asian ethnicity is predominantly South Asian (including Indian, Bangladeshi, Pakistani), while people of a Chinese background are placed in the 'Other Ethnic Groups' category. This differs to the USA where definitions are based on continent of origin.^{8, 9} Similarly other investigators have shown high CRP and D-dimer, as important inflammatory markers, and thrombocytopenia to strongly correlate with COVID-19 disease severity and prognosis.¹⁰⁻¹³ These findings suggest that potential biological differences in host response to COVID-19 occur between ethnic groups, identifiable in routinely collected biochemical data. Such differences are likely to reflect a summation of population imbalances in baseline health, comorbidity, and deprivation.^{14, 15}

Current studies often use regression-based methodologies adjusting for static measures of baseline health status and single timepoint clinical features such as disease severity scores on hospital admission.⁵ These can fail to capture and account for variations in disease response and development of critical illness in patients within similar profiles of baseline risk factors. Use of longitudinal data such as blood results throughout hospitalisation could help to characterise these differences.¹⁶

As studies begin to map long-term COVID-19 outcomes, characterising differences in disease response will help define underlying biological mechanisms and determine population specific interventions. Based on prior evidence for ethnic differences in biomarkers, we hypothesise that different phenotypes within similar profiles of baseline risk factors and comorbid disease exist in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19. In this study, we aimed to identify phenotypes with different underlying biological features driving ethnicity-associated outcomes using trajectories of routine biomarkers, and assess these within the context of underlying comorbidities and acute response to COVID-19.

Methods

We included all adults (age ≥ 16 yr) with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection admitted as emergencies to the four acute care hospitals within Barts Health NHS Trust. We considered admissions between 1st January 2020 and 13th May 2020 as the first study period (wave 1), and those between 1st September 2020 and 17th February 2021 as the second (wave 2). For patients with more than one hospital admission, we included the first as the index admission. Full methods of cohort collation, data collection, and baseline demographics have been described.^{6, 7} For this analysis, we excluded patients with unknown or undisclosed ethnicity status. In order to allow sufficient data to explore temporal trends in blood results and outcomes, we also excluded patients with hospital length of stay <7 days.

Data sources

Clinical and demographic data including ethnicity, blood results, and coding data from the clinical encounter defined as date of hospital admission (start) to date of discharge or death (end), whichever occurred sooner, were collated from the Barts Health Cerner Millennium Electronic Medical Record data warehouse by members of the direct clinical care team. Mortality data updated to the data warehouse routinely against the NHS spine which captures death registration in primary care and NHS institutions was available to 24th November 2022, enabling a minimum follow-up of 640 days and a maximum of 1058 days.

Definition of key variables

Ethnicity information captured in electronic health records are a combination of self-reporting on hospital admission and clinician assigned based on primary care records or clinical judgement in the case of emergency hospital admissions. Ethnicity was defined using NHS ethnic category codes and based on five high-level groups: White, Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British, Mixed, and Other. In the NHS categorisation, the Asian group is predominantly South Asian (Indian, Bangladeshi, Pakistani). Due to small numbers, the Mixed and Other categories were merged in multivariable modelling to preserve statistical power. We examined results from all haematological and clinical biochemistry tests measured as part of routine daily panels. We included the last result if multiple were taken on the same day. The urea-to-creatinine ratio (UCR) was calculated from blood samples with the same date and time and expressed as urea (mM):creatinine (mM).

Outcomes

Primary outcome was 30-day survival from time of index COVID-19 hospital admission. Secondary outcomes were ICU admission, survival to hospital discharge, and 640-day survival. ICU admission was defined by admission to a designated critical care area capable of providing mechanical ventilation and multi-organ support.

Statistical analyses

Full statistical methods are detailed in the supplementary information (supplementary data file [link]). Trajectories of blood results during hospital admission in combination with baseline clinical data were assessed by ethnic group from admission to discharge or death. The two pandemic waves were assessed separately due to potential differences in viral variants and specific COVID-19 therapies. Distinct phenotypes were derived using unsupervised longitudinal k-means clustering techniques assessing trajectories of blood results during hospital admission. Clustering tendency was assessed using multiple quality criteria (Calinsky & Harabatz, Ray & Turi, Davies & Bouldin).¹⁷⁻¹⁹ We determined distribution of identified trajectory clusters within patients categorised by ethnic group. Predefined clinical outcome measures were compared between clusters and survival plots constructed. We considered the eight examined trajectory clusters as multiple tests for the primary outcome giving a Bonferroni corrected p-value threshold of 0.00625. Multivariable Cox proportional hazards modelling accounting for predefined baseline risk factors (age, sex, index of multiple deprivation (IMD), smoking, obesity, hypertension (HTN), and chronic kidney disease (CKD)) was used to assess association between ethnicity, trajectory clusters, and survival outcomes. Multivariable logistic regression was used to assess ICU admission using the same covariates. Results are presented as n (%) and adjusted hazard ratios (HR) or odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). All analyses were performed using R software v. 4.02 and the kml package for clustering.²⁰

Ethics approval and regulations

This is a secondary analysis of the EthICAL study, which was approved by NHS England Health Research Authority and Yorkshire & The Humber Bradford Leeds Research Ethics Committee as anonymised analysis of routinely collected patient data without need for direct consent (Ethics reference 20/YH/0159). All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations.

Results

A total of 3237 patients with hospital length of stay \geq 7 days was included: 917 in wave 1 and 2320 in wave 2 (Table 1). Overall mortality at day 30 was 28.2% (n=259) in wave 1 and 22.8% (n=528) in wave 2. There were differences in measures across routine blood tests between ethnic groups at hospital admission and on days 7 and 15 in both waves (Table S1). In wave 2, there was a generalised attenuation in biochemical abnormalities. Numbers of patients excluded at each stage, median follow-up time and numbers of measures contributing to each examined biomarker are detailed in the supplementary information (Table S2). There were no significant differences between ethnic groups.

Phenotypic patient clusters

We considered trajectories of markers of inflammation (WCC, CRP), coagulation (platelet count), muscle wasting (UCR) as well as haemoglobin, red cell distribution width (RCDW), sodium, and albumin, and identified trajectory-based phenotypic patient clusters (Figs. 1, 2, S1, and S2). Other potential markers of interest such as lymphocyte count, D-dimer, and lactate dehydrogenase were excluded due to fewer overall patients with any results and less frequent measurements suggesting high risk of indication bias. For all patients in each wave, we identified three distinct clusters for each examined trajectory over time.

Cluster membership and baseline characteristics

We confirmed differences in age, baseline comorbidity, and frailty across ethnic groups (Fig. S3). In patients who died, those with White ethnicity were older (age ≥ 60 yr: 94.7% vs. 79.7% Asian and 75.6% Black in wave 1, 93.0% vs. 85.3% Asian and 84.6% black in wave 2), frailer (Hospital Frailty Risk Score ≥ 15 : 60.8% vs. 25.0% Asian and 40.5% Black in wave 1, 21.1% vs. 18.5% Asian and 17.7% Black in wave 2) and less likely to be admitted to ICU (18.8% vs. 54.7% Asian and 36.6% Black in wave 1, 20.4% vs. 40.7% Asian and 23.1% Black in wave 2). Overall levels of comorbidity were higher in Asian and Black patients (diabetes: 53.6% and 59.5% respectively vs. 25.8% White in wave 1, 63.0% and 52.6% vs. 35.5% White in wave 2; HTN: 73.2% and 89.2% vs. 74.2% White in wave 1, 82% and 85.5% vs 74.6% White in wave 2; CKD: 25.0% and 48.6% vs. 27.5% White in wave 1, 46.5% and 46.8% vs 39.0% White in wave 2). Similarly social deprivation was greater in Asian and Black patients (most deprived two national quintiles: 39.1% and 57.5% respectively vs. 31.1% White in wave 1, 32.6% and 44.6% vs 34.1% White in wave 2). We examined if differences in ethnicity distribution across trajectory clusters were related to differences in age, baseline comorbidity, or frailty (Tables

S4-S11). Patients in the highest risk platelet cluster were older, and more comorbid and frailer compared to those in the medium and lower risk clusters (Table S6). Conversely, patients in the highest risk WCC, CRP and UCR clusters were younger, less comorbid and less frail compared to the respective medium and lower risk clusters for each marker (Tables S7, S8 and S10).

Trajectory clusters and 30-day survival

We classified trajectory clusters according to high-, medium-, and lower-risk defined by survival from day 7 to day 30. Across both waves, reduced 30-day survival was associated with lower platelet count, elevated WCC, elevated CRP, elevated UCR, lower haemoglobin, increased RCDW, higher sodium, and lower albumin. In the high-risk clusters, peak levels of CRP occurred during the first week of hospital admission in wave 1 compared to a secondary rise during the second week in wave 2 (Figs. 1, 2, S1, and S2). Allowing for multiple comparisons, association with differential risk of death at 30-days remained significant for all clusters across both waves except haemoglobin and RCDW in the first wave (Tables S4-S11).

Ethnicity distribution across trajectory clusters

In patients who died by day 30, proportions of high-risk trajectory clusters varied between ethnic groups (Figs. 3 and 4). Significantly higher proportions of Black ethnicity patients carried the high-risk trajectory cluster for CRP (60.0% wave 1, 50.5% wave 2) compared to Asian (22.2% wave 1, 29.2% wave 2) and White patients (38.5% wave 1, 38.7% wave 2). In both waves, representation of the high-risk UCR trajectory cluster was greater in both Asian (25.4% wave 1, 25.2% wave 2) and Black patients (33.3% wave 1, 23.6% wave 2) compared to White (14.3% wave 1, 9.5% wave 2).

Adjusted 30-day survival analyses

After adjustment for predefined baseline risk factors, higher risk clusters were consistently associated with increased risk of death (Figs. S5 and S6). In wave 1, compared to the lowest risk cluster for each biomarker, patients within the highest risk clusters had 2.2 to 8.2 times higher risk of death: lower platelet count (HR 8.17 [2.50-26.68]), elevated WCC (HR 4.09 [2.28-7.35]), higher CRP (HR 4.13 [2.51-6.80]), elevated UCR (HR 2.43 [1.49-3.97]), lower haemoglobin (HR 2.18 [1.23-3.83]), increased RCDW (HR 1.72 [0.98-3.02]), higher sodium (HR 2.43 [1.53-3.85]), and lower albumin (HR 4.09 [2.06-8.13]). Similar associations were seen in wave 2 but attenuated with the highest compared to lowest risk clusters having 1.5 to 4.7 times higher risk of death: lower platelet count (HR 3.57 [2.29-5.56]), elevated WCC (HR 3.61 [2.64-4.93]), higher CRP (HR 4.74 [3.66-6.14]), elevated UCR (HR 2.75 [2.03-3.73]), lower haemoglobin (HR 1.50 [1.11-2.02]), increased RCDW (HR 1.62 [1.13-2.35]), higher sodium (HR 3.53 [2.66-4.69]), and lower albumin (HR 3.90 [2.60-5.86]). Total numbers of observations included in multivariable models are listed in Table S3.

Ethnicity-associated risk adjusted for trajectory clusters

We confirmed increased risk of death in Asian compared to White patients in this smaller subset of the EthICAL cohort even after adjustment for predefined baseline risk factors (wave 1: HR 1.36 [0.95-1.94], wave 2: HR 1.42 [1.15-1.75]) (Fig. S4). In this analysis, no association with increased risk of death was observed for Black or Mixed and Other ethnicity patients consistent with multivariable analyses in the larger datasets.^{6, 7} Importantly, deaths in Black ethnicity patients occurred early during hospitalisation with median days to death being 5 days, meaning a larger proportion of Black patients who died will have been excluded from this analysis.⁶ Inclusion of CRP trajectories abrogated the higher risk of death associated with Asian ethnicity in both waves (wave 1: HR 0.97 [0.59-1.59], wave 2: HR 1.04 [0.78-1.39]). Additionally in wave 2, the risk of death associated with Asian ethnicity was also lost after adjustment for WCC (1.29 [1.00-1.65]) and UCR (HR 1.18 [0.91-1.52]) (Fig. S5 and S6).

Secondary outcomes

We assessed association between clusters and predefined secondary outcomes adjusted for baseline risk factors above (Figs. S7-8: ICU admission, S9-10: survival to hospital discharge, S11-12: 640-day survival). Consistent directions of effect were seen for higher risk clusters associated with 30-day survival. Survival curves to 640 days are shown in Figs. S13-14. Higher WCC and CRP clusters had more influence in early mortality whereas lower platelet count, higher UCR, lower albumin, lower haemoglobin, and higher RCDW clusters appeared to have more sustained and/or later impact on survival.

Discussion

In this multicentre study, we found that phenotypes based on routine biomarker trajectories during hospital admission are associated with adverse outcomes following COVID-19, and that ethnicity affects the interpretation of these associations. We showed that longitudinal trajectories revealed much greater differences than single timepoint values. In particular, there was strong evidence for reduced survival associated with a lower platelet

count, elevated WCC, higher CRP, and elevated UCR. Increased representation of high-risk trajectory clusters associated with inflammation and catabolism in Black and Asian patients who died and attenuation of ethnicity-associated risk of death when accounting for biomarker trajectory clusters suggest ethnic differences in phenotypes of COVID-19. In contrast White patients who died were older, frailer and less often admitted to ICU.

Comparison with other studies

Several observational studies have described associations between different biomarkers with severe outcomes in COVID-19 including a meta-analysis of 32 studies reporting similar magnitudes of effect ranging from pooled OR 2.36 (thrombocytopenia) to 4.27 (elevated CRP).²¹ A small number of studies assessing longitudinal changes in biomarkers have been limited by small sample sizes,²²⁻²⁴ lack of generalisability,²⁵ use of selected laboratory, immune and proteomic panels,^{22, 25, 26} restricted time points such as differences between admission to discharge,^{23, 27} cut-offs or aggregate measures such as means,^{24, 28} and retrospective assessment based on survival or disease severity.^{24, 26, 27} The majority of these studies were also conducted using primarily first wave data.^{23, 24, 27} From these analyses, markers of inflammation, particularly CRP, have been most frequently associated with increased disease severity and death. Only one UK-based study assessed and did not find evidence for ethnicity-related variation in measured biomarkers.²⁵

Phenotypes defined by biomarker trajectories

Multiple mechanisms behind COVID-19-associated thrombocytopenia have been proposed.²⁹ In our analysis, although large proportions of patients have a degree of thrombocytopenia, a failure to recover was most associated with poor outcomes, while a protective repose to COVID-19 appears to involve a degree of thrombocytosis. This might reflect bone marrow and megakaryocyte suppression from an ongoing inflammatory response, inability to reduce viral load, liver and kidney failure.³⁰ Increased release of inflammatory cells and acute phase proteins resulting in elevated WCC and raised CRP are associated with increased disease severity.^{31, 32} Compared to prior studies reporting high static measures, we found changes throughout hospitalisation. Trajectories in CRP differed between waves. Overall levels of CRP were lower in the second wave and patients with a higher level early during hospitalisation had increased hospital length of stay, whereas patients with a secondary rise had increased risk of ICU admission and death. This may reflect routine early use of corticosteroids during the second wave reducing initial inflammation, but perhaps predisposing to later nosocomial infection.³³ These differences could also relate to treatment changes both in and before hospitalisation or a change in disease profile over time.^{34, 35} UCR is a well-established measure of catabolism correlated with both muscle loss and development of persistent critical illness.³⁶⁻³⁸ In COVID-19, elevated levels associated with increased mortality and requirement for prolonged organ support are likely to be driven by multiple pathways including multisystem inflammation, organ dysfunction ³⁹, and prolonged critical illness.⁴⁰

Ethnicity-associated biological mechanisms

Studies examining drivers of ethnic inequalities in COVID-19 remain sparse. In particular, little is known about biological mechanisms underlying greater disease severity, differential rates of organ failure, and variations in treatment response. Proposed hypotheses include impaired glucocorticoid sensitivity due to factors such as chronic social stress leading to an increased inflammatory response.⁴¹ This might help explain potential differential responses to dexamethasone with trends in greater improvement in outcomes in non-White patients ³³. Similarly, acute inflammation arising from COVID-19 might augment existing chronic inflammation secondary to increased medical comorbidity in Black and Asian patients.¹⁴ There is considerable evidence that incidence of clinically important disease is higher in many minority ethnic groups.⁴² These findings could be explained by attenuation in the higher risk of death associated with Black and Asian ethnicity in our study when adjusting for biomarker trajectory clusters.

Overall, these data suggest that ethnic imbalances in severity of COVID-19 disease could be driven by differences in baseline health status, reflecting longstanding health inequalities, and leading to adverse responses to disease in terms of inflammation and catabolism. This highlights the importance and urgency in addressing disparities in general health and wellbeing and across acute and routine care throughout the life course. Patients of different backgrounds can respond differently to disease, and better integration of these findings in routine clinical data could identify differing healthcare needs. COVID-19 has allowed examination of underlying biochemical features in a less heterogenous disease presentation, however future work should assess whether these differences are also seen in non-COVID disease states. This is a research priority but the greater heterogeneity will require significantly larger data sources.

Strengths and limitations

Strengths of our study include the granularity of our dataset, a > 50% ethnically diverse patient cohort, the longitudinal analysis, and relatively large sample size in both pandemic waves that had significant impact on

hospitalisation in the UK. Limitations are as follows. To ensure inclusion of sufficient numbers of data points and adequate representation of blood tests across the total duration of hospital admission and ethnic groups, we were not able to fully explore correlations between different biomarker trajectory clusters and examine certain results such as D-dimer. We were unable to compare the effect of differing viral strains between waves and examine and adjust for potential differences in treatments and pathways as well as vaccination status. Based on clinical experience, all patient groups across hospital sites received management according to centralised treatment protocols. As a result, any observed treatment differences are more likely to reflect changes between waves rather than differences across ethnic groups. There could be systematic biases in data collection with more unwell patients receiving more frequent laboratory testing. However, data collected alongside routine clinical management allows for more directly translatable findings. In addition, current ethnic categorisations used in healthcare do not reflect the vast heterogeneity within each aggregated ethnic category. Furthermore, misclassification of patients into both unknown or other ethnic groups might occur more frequently in emergency admissions and therefore lead to over-representation of these ethnic categories and exclusion in our analysis compared to census data. Given the above limitations, our data remain exploratory in nature, and findings need to be interpreted with caution. Importantly, we make no assumptions regarding the underlying mechanisms behind phenotypes that represent complex interactions between biological, social, economic, and behavioural factors.

Conclusions

Phenotypes based on routinely collected biomarker trajectories during hospital admission are associated with adverse outcomes following COVID-19. These potentially reflect dysregulated host responses to disease and to treatments, and could be a mechanism mediating ethnic imbalances in outcomes for COVID-19. Increased representation of high-risk phenotypes associated with inflammation and catabolism in Black and Asian patients could be driven by baseline differences in health status, reflecting longstanding health inequalities.

Authors' contributions

YIW and JRP carried out study concept, design and manuscript writing, ethics application and approvals, and wrote the study protocol and analysis plan. JRP is responsible for data extraction. YIW carried out data analysis. All authors were involved in critical review of findings and review of the final submission.

Declarations of interest

All authors declare no competing interests related to the submitted work.

Data sharing

The corresponding author had full access to all the data and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. The authors will be happy to consider additional analyses of the anonymised dataset on request. The need for stringent measures to prevent re-identification of individuals within a discrete geographical location and limited time-period however preclude sharing of patient level dataset in a GDPR compliant form.

Funding

Data preparation and analysis was supported by a Clinical Research Award to YIW from the Intensive Care Society of the United Kingdom.

References

1 Sze S, Pan D, Nevill CR, et al. Ethnicity and clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review and metaanalysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020; **29**: 100630

2 Magesh S, John D, Li WT, et al. Disparities in COVID-19 Outcomes by Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status: A Systematic-Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**: e2134147

3 Office of National Statistics. Updating ethnic contrasts in deaths involving the coronavirus (COVID-19), England: 24 January 2020 to 31 March 2021. 2021. Available from https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/articles/updatingethni ccontrastsindeathsinvolvingthecoronaviruscovid19englandandwales/24january2020to31march2021 (accessed 11 Nov 2022

4 I ntensive Care National Audit & Research Centre. ICNARC report on COVID-19 in critical care: England, Wales and Northern Ireland 26 March 2021 2021. Available from https://www.icnarc.org/Our-Audit/Audits/Cmp/Reports (accessed 12 April 2021

5 Katikireddi SV, Lal S, Carrol ED, et al. Unequal impact of the COVID-19 crisis on minority ethnic groups: a framework for understanding and addressing inequalities. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2021; **75**: 970-4

6 Apea VJ, Wan YI, Dhairyawan R, et al. Ethnicity and outcomes in patients hospitalised with COVID-19 infection in East London: an observational cohort study. *BMJ Open* 2021; **11**: e042140

7 Wan YI, Apea VJ, Dhairyawan R, et al. Ethnic disparities in hospitalisation and hospital-outcomes during the second wave of COVID-19 infection in east London. *Sci Rep* 2022; **12**: 3721

8 UK gov.uk. List of ethnic groups (2021 Census of England and Wales). 2021. Available from https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/style-guide/ethnic-groups (accessed 20 March 2023)

9 US census.gov. About the topic of race (US census bureau). 2022. Available from https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html (accessed 20 March 2023)

10 Ali N. Elevated level of C-reactive protein may be an early marker to predict risk for severity of COVID-19. *J Med Virol* 2020; **92**: 2409-11

11 Yao Y, Cao J, Wang Q, et al. D-dimer as a biomarker for disease severity and mortality in COVID-19 patients: a case control study. *J Intensive Care* 2020; **8**: 49

12 Pranata R, Lim MA, Yonas E, et al. Thrombocytopenia as a prognostic marker in COVID-19 patients: diagnostic test accuracy meta-analysis. *Epidemiol Infect* 2021; **149**: e40

13 Lucijanic M, Krecak I, Soric E, et al. Thrombocytosis in COVID-19 patients without myeloproliferative neoplasms is associated with better prognosis but higher rate of venous thromboembolism. *Blood Cancer J* 2021; **11**: 189

14 Vepa A, Bae JP, Ahmed F, Pareek M, Khunti K. COVID-19 and ethnicity: A novel pathophysiological role for inflammation. *Diabetes Metab Syndr* 2020; **14**: 1043-51

15 Forde AT, Crookes DM, Suglia SF, Demmer RT. The weathering hypothesis as an explanation for racial disparities in health: a systematic review. *Ann Epidemiol* 2019; **33**: 1-18.e3

16 Wan YI, Brayne AB, Haines RW, Puthucheary ZA, Prowle JR. Prognostic association of routinely measured biomarkers in patients admitted to critical care: a systematic review. *Biomarkers* 2021; **26**: 1-12

17 Ray Siddheswar, Turi RH. Determination of Number of Clusters in K-Means Clustering and Application in Colour Image Segmentation. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Advances in Pattern Recognition and Digital Techniques (ICAPRDT'99)* 2000

18 T. Caliński, Harabasz J. A dendrite method for cluster analysis. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods* 1974; **3**: 1-27

19 Davies DL, Bouldin DW. A cluster separation measure. *IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell* 1979; 1: 224-7 20 Genolini C, Falissard B. KmL: a package to cluster longitudinal data. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed* 2011; **104**: e112-21

21 Malik P, Patel U, Mehta D, et al. Biomarkers and outcomes of COVID-19 hospitalisations: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Evid Based Med* 2021; 26: 107-8

22 Lasso G, Khan S, Allen SA, et al. Longitudinally monitored immune biomarkers predict the timing of COVID-19 outcomes. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2022; **18**: e1009778

23 Burke H, Freeman A, O'Regan P, et al. Biomarker identification using dynamic time warping analysis: a longitudinal cohort study of patients with COVID-19 in a UK tertiary hospital. *BMJ Open* 2022; **12**: e050331

24 Zeng HL, Lu QB, Yang Q, et al. Longitudinal Profile of Laboratory Parameters and Their Application in the Prediction for Fatal Outcome Among Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; **72**: 626-33

25 Gisby J, Clarke CL, Medjeral-Thomas N, et al. Longitudinal proteomic profiling of dialysis patients with COVID-19 reveals markers of severity and predictors of death. *eLife* 2021; **10**

26 Bowring MG, Wang Z, Xu Y, et al. Outcome-Stratified Analysis of Biomarker Trajectories for Patients Infected With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Am J Epidemiol* 2021; **190**: 2094-106

27 Zeng Z, Yu H, Chen H, et al. Longitudinal changes of inflammatory parameters and their correlation with disease severity and outcomes in patients with COVID-19 from Wuhan, China. *Crit Care* 2020; **24**: 525

28 Chen A, Zhao Z, Hou W, Singer AJ, Li H, Duong TQ. Time-to-Death Longitudinal Characterization of Clinical Variables and Longitudinal Prediction of Mortality in COVID-19 Patients: A Two-Center Study. *Front Med* (*Lausanne*) 2021; **8**: 661940

29 Wool GD, Miller JL. The Impact of COVID-19 Disease on Platelets and Coagulation. *Pathobiology* 2021; 88: 15-27

30 Zhang Y, Zeng X, Jiao Y, et al. Mechanisms involved in the development of thrombocytopenia in patients with COVID-19. *Thromb Res* 2020; **193**: 110-5

31 Karimi Shahri M, Niazkar HR, Rad F. COVID-19 and hematology findings based on the current evidences: A puzzle with many missing pieces. *Int J Lab Hematol* 2021; **43**: 160-8

32 Yamada T, Wakabayashi M, Yamaji T, et al. Value of leukocytosis and elevated C-reactive protein in predicting severe coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19): A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Chim Acta* 2020; **509**: 235-43

33 Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, et al. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **384**: 693-704

34 Talic S, Shah S, Wild H, et al. Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of covid-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and covid-19 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2021; **375**: e068302

35 Association of Anaesthetists, FICM, ICS, Royal College of Anaesthetists. Clinical guide for the management of critical care for adults with COVID-19 during the Coronavirus pandemic (version 6 updated 16 August 2021). 2021

36 Gunst J, Kashani KB, Hermans G. The urea-creatinine ratio as a novel biomarker of critical illness-associated catabolism. *Intensive Care Med* 2019; **45**: 1813-5

37 Haines RW, Zolfaghari P, Wan Y, Pearse RM, Puthucheary Z, Prowle JR. Elevated urea-to-creatinine ratio provides a biochemical signature of muscle catabolism and persistent critical illness after major trauma. *Intensive Care Med* 2019; **45**: 1718-31

38 Haines RW, Fowler AJ, Wan YI, et al. Catabolism in Critical Illness: A Reanalysis of the REducing Deaths due to OXidative Stress (REDOXS) Trial. *Crit Care Med* 2022; **50**: 1072-82

39 Ok F, Erdogan O, Durmus E, Carkci S, Canik A. Predictive values of blood urea nitrogen/creatinine ratio and other routine blood parameters on disease severity and survival of COVID-19 patients. *J Med Virol* 2021; **93**: 786-93

40 Blayney MC, Stewart NI, Kaye CT, et al. Prevalence, characteristics, and longer-term outcomes of patients with persistent critical illness attributable to COVID-19 in Scotland: a national cohort study. *Br J Anaesth* 2022; **128**: 980-9

41 Karan A, Ali K, Rambaran K, Del Corral P, Sakhamuri S, Teelucksingh S. COVID-19 and ethnicity: Does reduced responsiveness to glucocorticoids explain the more aggressive nature of disease among minorities? *Med Hypotheses* 2020; **144**: 110220

42 Wan YI, Robbins AJ, Apea VJ, et al. Ethnicity and acute hospital admissions: Multi-center analysis of routine hospital data. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021

Table 1: Study population baseline characteristics and outcomes for patients with hospital length of stay \geq 7 days. Stratified by ethnic group excluding unknown, n (%) unless otherwise stated. Total n=3210 consisting of 917 patients in wave 1 and 2320 patients in wave 2 unless otherwise stated. P values based on Chi-square (for categorical) or Kruskal-Wallis test (for continuous). SD: standard deviation, IQR: interquartile range, IMD: index of multiple deprivation, CKD: chronic kidney disease, ICU: intensive care unit.

	Wave 1 (n=917)					Wave 2 (n=2320)				
	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed and Other	White	p value	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Mixed and Other	White	p value
n	236	178	68	435		824	318	215	963	
Age (yr) Median (IQR)	62.0 (49.5-71.0)	65.5 (55.0-79.0)	66.5 (56.0-74.3)	76.0 (62.5-85.0)	< 0.001	63.5 (51.0-75.0)	65.5 (55.0-77.0)	62.0 (52.0-72.0)	74.0 (62.0-83.0)	< 0.001
Male	150 (63.6)	108 (60.7)	46 (67.6)	251 (57.7)	0.28	489 (59.3)	174 (54.7)	131 (60.9)	500 (51.9)	0.01
IMD quintile [n=912, 2315]					<0.001					< 0.001
1 (most deprived)	42 (17.9)	51 (28.8)	14 (20.9)	81 (18.7)		161 (19.7)	84 (26.6)	54 (25.4)	164 (17.2)	
2	48 (20.5)	42 (23.7)	13 (19.4)	75 (17.3)	2	168 (20.5)	54 (17.1)	43 (20.2)	175 (18.3)	
3	69 (29.5)	34 (19.2)	18 (26.9)	48 (11.1)		200 (24.4)	62 (19.6)	41 (19.2)	144 (15.1)	
4	36 (15.4)	31 (17.5)	9 (13.4)	84 (19.4)		177 (21.6)	72 (22.8)	39 (18.3)	166 (17.4)	
5 (least deprived)	39 (16.7)	19 (10.7)	13 (19.4)	146 (33.6)		113 (13.8)	44 (13.9)	36 (16.9)	305 (32.0)	
Smoking [n=1815, 2218]	17 (8.1)	9 (5.7)	4 (7.4)	61 (15.5)	0.002	77 (9.3)	40 (12.6)	20 (9.3)	172 (17.9)	< 0.001
Co-morbidity [n=1815, 2218]			~	7						
Obesity	50 (23.8)	45 (28.7)	6 (11.1)	107 (27.2)	0.06	202 (25.0)	104 (33.3)	70 (33.5)	272 (28.6)	0.01
Diabetes mellitus	92 (43.8)	77 (49.0)	25 (46.3)	108 (27.4)	< 0.001	421 (53.8)	154 (51.3)	67 (35.4)	288 (31.4)	< 0.001
Hypertension	128 (61.0)	115 (73.2)	32 (59.3)	251 (63.7)	0.07	512 (65.5)	227 (75.7)	101 (53.4)	579 (63.2)	< 0.001
Moderate to severe CKD	46 (21.9)	51 (32.5)	9 (16.7)	95 (24.1)	0.05	222 (28.4)	100 (33.3)	27 (14.3)	251 (27.4)	< 0.001
Charlson comorbidity index					0.04					<0.001
0	56 (26.7)	33 (21.0)	18 (33.3)	78 (19.8)		146 (18.7)	46 (15.3)	59 (31.2)	158 (17.2)	
1-2	81 (38.6)	54 (34.4)	20 (37.0)	134 (34.0)		296 (37.9)	103 (34.3)	76 (40.2)	310 (33.8)	
3-4	34 (16.2)	26 (16.6)	8 (14.8)	93 (23.6)		144 (18.4)	70 (23.3)	26 (13.8)	208 (22.7)	
≥5	39 (18.6)	44 (28.0)	8 (14.8)	89 (22.6)		196 (25.1)	81 (27.0)	28 (14.8)	240 (26.2)	
Rockwood frailty Score [n=465,1868]					0.001					<0.001
1-2 (very fit, well)	16 (17.4)	3 (3.8)	4 (14.8)	15 (5.6)		42 (10.6)	19 (11.3)	19 (17.4)	57 (8.7)	
3-4 (managing well, vulnerable)	41 (44.6)	29 (36.7)	10 (37.0)	90 (33.7)		205 (51.5)	84 (50.0)	55 (50.5)	250 (38.0)	
5-6 (mildly to severely frail)	30 (32.6)	45 (57.0)	11 (40.7)	137 (51.3)		148 (37.2)	58 (34.5)	31 (28.4)	319 (48.5)	
8-9 (very severely frail, terminally ill)	5 (5.4)	2 (2.5)	2 (7.4)	25 (9.4)		3 (0.8)	7 (4.2)	4 (3.7)	32 (4.9)	

Hospital frailty risk score [n=815, 2218]					<0.001					< 0.001
<5 (low risk)	90 (42.9)	49 (31.2)	21 (38.9)	91 (23.1)		434 (55.5)	145 (48.3)	127 (67.2)	408 (44.5)	
5-15 (intermediate risk)	77 (36.7)	53 (33.8)	22 (40.7)	105 (26.6)		276 (35.3)	114 (38.0)	49 (25.9)	376 (41.0)	
≥15 (high risk)	43 (20.5)	55 (35.0)	11 (20.4)	198 (50.3)		72 (9.2)	41 (13.7)	13 (6.9)	132 (14.4)	
Outcomes										
ICU admission	89 (37.7)	51 (28.7)	19 (27.9)	67 (15.4)	< 0.001	240 (29.1)	63 (19.8)	57 (26.5)	148 (15.4)	< 0.001
Hospital length of stay Median (IQR)	11.0 (8.0-19.0)	12.0 (9.0-19.0)	11.0 (9.0-15.0)	13.0 (9.0-20.0)	0.14	12.0 (8.0-18.0)	13.0 (9.0-23.0)	12.0 (9.0-22.0)	14.0 (9.0-21.0)	0.001
Died within 30 days	64 (27.1)	41 (23.0)	21 (30.9)	133 (30.6)	0.27	204 (24.8)	65 (20.4)	29 (13.5)	230 (23.9)	0.003
Died within 90 days	74 (31.4)	48 (27.0)	23 (33.8)	164 (37.7)	0.06	261 (31.7)	89 (28.0)	45 (20.9)	299 (31.0)	0.01
Died within 640 days	83 (35.2)	63 (35.4)	26 (38.2)	193 (44.4)	0.06	295 (35.8)	109 (34.3)	51 (23.7)	386 (40.1)	< 0.001
Alive at discharge	172 (72.9)	136 (76.4)	47 (69.1)	301 (69.2)	0.30	599 (72.7)	244 (76.7)	180 (83.7)	735 (76.3)	0.007
Discharge destination					0.003					< 0.001
Care home or equivalent	5 (2.8)	5 (3.5)	0 (0.0)	35 (11.3)		6 (1.0)	11 (4.6)	7 (4.2)	59 (8.2)	
Health-related institution	9 (5.1)	15 (10.6)	6 (12.5)	18 (5.8)		26 (4.5)	21 (8.8)	8 (4.8)	46 (6.4)	
Usual place of residence	156 (87.6)	119 (84.4)	40 (83.3)	243 (78.6)		533 (91.3)	197 (82.1)	150 (89.3)	591 (82.2)	
Hospice or equivalent	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)		3 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.7)	
Temporary place of residence	7 (3.9)	2 (1.4)	2 (4.2)	12 (3.9)		16 (2.7)	11 (4.6)	3 (1.8)	18 (2.5)	

Figure legends

Fig. 1: Clusters of patients in wave 1 with differing trajectories for platelet count, white cell count (WCC), C-reactive protein (CRP) concentration, and urea-to-creatinine ratio (UCR). Levels and counts for each result for each cluster from day 0 to day 15 of hospital admission shown in the top row. Survival curves with 95% confidence intervals for each cluster to day 30 of hospital admission shown in the bottom row.

Fig. 2: Clusters of patients in wave 2 with differing trajectories for platelet count, white cell count (WCC), C-reactive protein (CRP) concentration, and urea-to-creatinine ratio (UCR). Levels and counts for each result for each cluster from day 0 to day 15 of hospital admission shown in the top row. Survival curves with 95% confidence intervals for each cluster to day 30 of hospital admission shown in the bottom row.

Fig. 3: Proportions of patients in wave 1 that died by day 30 with each highest risk phenotype comparing ethnic groups (Mixed and Other group omitted for clarity). Each variable shown by a different colour. Proportions shown as % values within each bubble, with differing area size and colour density relative to the proportion size.

Fig. 4: Proportions of patients in wave 2 that died by day 30 with each highest risk phenotype comparing ethnic groups (Mixed and Other group omitted for clarity). Each variable shown by a different colour. Proportions shown as % values within each bubble, with differing area size and colour density relative to the proportion size.

ounalprerk







