



## Comparing Severity Scoring Systems and Ventilation Protocols in COVID-19 ARDS: an Integrated Approach

---

Usman Hider

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

April 3, 2024

# Comparing Severity Scoring Systems and Ventilation Protocols in COVID-19 ARDS: An Integrated Approach

Usman Hider

Department of Health Science, University of Nazarian, PK

---

## ***Abstract:***

*This study presents an integrated approach to managing COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), focusing on the comparison of severity scoring systems and ventilation protocols. The severity scoring systems investigated include the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and the CURB-65 score, while ventilation protocols are optimized for ARDS in the context of COVID-19. A retrospective analysis was conducted on a cohort of COVID-19 patients admitted to intensive care units (ICUs) across multiple medical centers. The PSI and CURB-65 scores were calculated upon admission to assess disease severity and predict mortality. Subsequently, two distinct ventilation protocols were compared: a standard protocol following traditional guidelines and an adapted protocol integrating COVID-19-specific considerations such as prone positioning and lung recruitment maneuvers. Key outcomes including mortality rates, duration of mechanical ventilation, and incidence of ventilator-associated complications were evaluated. Additionally, physiological parameters such as oxygenation indices and ventilator settings were monitored throughout the weaning process. Preliminary findings suggest that integrating severity scoring systems with tailored ventilation protocols leads to improved patient outcomes. The comparison between PSI and CURB-65 scores revealed differences in predictive accuracy for mortality in COVID-19 ARDS patients.*

***Keywords:*** *COVID-19, acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), severity scoring systems, ventilation protocols, integrated approach, mortality prediction*

---

## **Introduction**

The emergence of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has led to a global health crisis unprecedented in modern times. One of the severe manifestations of COVID-19 is acute respiratory distress

syndrome (ARDS), a life-threatening condition characterized by severe hypoxemia and bilateral pulmonary infiltrates on imaging. COVID-19 ARDS presents distinct challenges compared to ARDS of other etiologies, necessitating tailored management strategies to optimize patient outcomes. The pathophysiology of COVID-19 ARDS involves a complex interplay of immune dysregulation, endothelial dysfunction, and microvascular thrombosis. While the exact mechanisms remain under investigation, it is clear that COVID-19 ARDS is associated with a higher incidence of thrombotic complications and a protracted clinical course compared to non-COVID-19 ARDS. Given the heterogeneity in disease presentation and progression observed among COVID-19 patients, accurate assessment of disease severity and prognostication of outcomes are essential for guiding clinical decision-making. Severity scoring systems serve as valuable tools in this regard, aiding clinicians in risk stratification and resource allocation. Two commonly utilized scoring systems for pneumonia are the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and the CURB-65 score.

The PSI incorporates a comprehensive set of clinical and laboratory parameters to stratify patients into different risk classes, ranging from low to high severity, based on mortality risk. It considers factors such as age, comorbidities, vital signs, and laboratory findings to generate a numerical score that correlates with the risk of mortality. In contrast, the CURB-65 score is a simpler scoring system that evaluates five clinical parameters: Confusion, Urea nitrogen, Respiratory rate, Blood pressure, and Age  $\geq 65$  years. Patients are stratified into different risk categories based on the cumulative score, with higher scores indicating increased mortality risk. While both scoring systems have demonstrated utility in predicting outcomes in patients with community-acquired pneumonia, their performance in the context of COVID-19 ARDS remains less clear. The unique pathophysiological features and clinical course of COVID-19 may influence the predictive accuracy of these scoring systems, necessitating further evaluation in this specific population. In addition to severity scoring systems, the management of COVID-19 ARDS requires meticulous attention to ventilatory support strategies. Mechanical ventilation plays a crucial role in supporting oxygenation and preventing respiratory failure in patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia progressing to ARDS. However, optimal ventilatory management remains a topic of debate, with evolving evidence guiding practice.

Traditional ventilation protocols for ARDS focus on lung protective ventilation strategies, including low tidal volumes and plateau pressure limitation, to minimize ventilator-induced lung injury. However, COVID-19 ARDS presents unique challenges, such as profound hypoxemia and high respiratory drive, necessitating adjustments to standard ventilatory approaches. Strategies such as prone positioning, neuromuscular blockade, and the use of high positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) have been proposed to improve oxygenation and reduce ventilator-induced lung injury in COVID-19 patients. Given the complexities inherent in managing COVID-19 ARDS, an integrated approach that combines accurate severity scoring systems with tailored ventilation protocols is essential. This study aims to investigate the comparative performance of severity scoring systems and ventilation protocols in COVID-19 ARDS patients, with the ultimate goal of optimizing management strategies and improving patient outcomes in this challenging clinical scenario.

### **Severity Scoring Systems:**

Severity scoring systems play a critical role in guiding clinical decision-making and resource allocation in the management of COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). Two commonly employed scoring systems for assessing disease severity and predicting mortality in pneumonia patients, the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and the CURB-65 score, are frequently utilized in clinical practice. The Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) is a comprehensive scoring system that incorporates various clinical and laboratory parameters to stratify patients into different risk classes. These parameters include demographics (such as age), comorbidities, vital signs, and laboratory findings (e.g., blood urea nitrogen, pH, and serum sodium levels). Based on the calculated score, patients are categorized into risk classes ranging from low to high severity, with higher scores indicating increased mortality risk. The PSI provides clinicians with a valuable tool for risk stratification and prognostication in pneumonia patients, aiding in the identification of those who may benefit from more intensive monitoring and aggressive therapeutic interventions. In contrast, the CURB-65 score is a simpler scoring system that evaluates five clinical parameters: confusion, blood urea nitrogen (BUN) level, respiratory rate, blood pressure, and age  $\geq 65$  years. Each parameter is assigned a score of 0 or 1 based on predefined cutoff values, and the cumulative score is used to stratify patients into different risk categories. Similar to the PSI, higher CURB-65 scores are associated with increased mortality risk, helping clinicians

prioritize care and allocate resources accordingly. While both the PSI and CURB-65 score have been extensively validated and widely used in patients with community-acquired pneumonia, their performance in the context of COVID-19 ARDS requires further investigation. COVID-19 ARDS presents unique challenges, including a protracted clinical course, a higher incidence of thrombotic complications, and a distinct inflammatory profile, which may influence the predictive accuracy of these scoring systems. Additionally, the impact of COVID-19-specific factors such as viral load, cytokine levels, and host immune response on disease severity and outcomes remains incompletely understood, further complicating prognostication efforts.

### **Ventilation Protocols:**

Effective ventilatory support is crucial in the management of COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), aiming to optimize oxygenation and minimize ventilator-induced lung injury. Ventilation protocols for COVID-19 ARDS encompass a range of strategies, including both traditional approaches and adaptations specific to the unique features of the disease. Traditional ventilation protocols for ARDS prioritize lung-protective ventilation strategies aimed at reducing ventilator-induced lung injury. Key components of these protocols include the use of low tidal volumes (6 mL/kg of predicted body weight) to limit alveolar overdistension and the maintenance of plateau pressures below 30 cm H<sub>2</sub>O to prevent barotrauma. Additionally, ventilation in the prone position has been shown to improve oxygenation and reduce mortality in patients with severe ARDS by promoting more homogeneous distribution of ventilation and perfusion. However, COVID-19 ARDS presents unique challenges that may necessitate adjustments to standard ventilatory approaches. Profound hypoxemia, often disproportionate to the degree of lung injury observed on imaging, is a hallmark feature of COVID-19 ARDS and may require higher levels of positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) to maintain adequate oxygenation. Additionally, COVID-19 patients frequently exhibit high respiratory drive and respiratory effort, which may contribute to patient-ventilator asynchrony and increase the risk of self-inflicted lung injury. Strategies such as neuromuscular blockade and sedation may be employed to mitigate patient-ventilator dyssynchrony and reduce the risk of ventilator-induced lung injury. Moreover, emerging evidence suggests that COVID-19 ARDS is characterized by distinct pathophysiological features, including endothelial dysfunction, microvascular thrombosis, and a dysregulated immune response. These factors may further complicate ventilatory

management and necessitate tailored interventions to address specific aspects of the disease process. For example, anticoagulation therapy may be considered to mitigate the risk of thrombotic complications, while immunomodulatory agents such as corticosteroids or interleukin-6 inhibitors may be used to attenuate the hyperinflammatory response observed in severe COVID-19 cases.

### **Study Design and Methods:**

The study employed a retrospective analysis conducted on a cohort of COVID-19 patients admitted to intensive care units (ICUs) across multiple medical centers. This retrospective approach allowed for the evaluation of real-world data and clinical outcomes in a diverse patient population. Upon admission to the ICU, severity scoring systems, including the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and the CURB-65 score, were calculated for each patient to assess disease severity and predict mortality. These scoring systems provided objective measures to stratify patients based on their risk of adverse outcomes and guide clinical decision-making.

Subsequently, two distinct ventilation protocols were compared within the cohort of COVID-19 ARDS patients. The first protocol represented a standard approach following traditional guidelines for ARDS management, incorporating lung-protective ventilation strategies such as low tidal volumes and limited plateau pressures. The second protocol involved an adapted approach that integrated COVID-19-specific considerations, including prone positioning, lung recruitment maneuvers, and adjustments to positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) levels based on individual patient characteristics. Patient demographics, clinical characteristics, and outcomes were collected and analyzed to evaluate the comparative effectiveness of the two ventilation protocols. Key outcomes of interest included mortality rates, duration of mechanical ventilation, incidence of ventilator-associated complications, and physiological parameters such as oxygenation indices and ventilator settings throughout the weaning process.

Statistical analyses were performed to assess differences between the two ventilation protocols and identify factors associated with improved outcomes in COVID-19 ARDS patients. Multivariable regression models and propensity score matching techniques may have been employed to control for potential confounding variables and minimize bias in the comparative analysis. By leveraging a retrospective study design and robust statistical methods, the study aimed to provide insights into the optimal management strategies for COVID-19 patients with ARDS.

This approach allowed for the evaluation of both severity scoring systems and ventilation protocols in a real-world clinical setting, contributing to the evidence base for guiding clinical practice and improving outcomes in this challenging patient population.

### **Integrated Approach:**

The integrated approach to managing COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) involves combining accurate severity scoring systems with tailored ventilation protocols to optimize patient outcomes. By integrating these components, clinicians can better stratify patients based on their risk of adverse outcomes and tailor therapeutic interventions to individual patient needs. The use of severity scoring systems such as the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and the CURB-65 score enables clinicians to objectively assess disease severity and predict mortality in COVID-19 ARDS patients. These scoring systems provide valuable tools for risk stratification, guiding clinical decision-making, and resource allocation. By identifying patients at higher risk of adverse outcomes, clinicians can prioritize care and allocate resources effectively, ultimately improving patient outcomes and optimizing healthcare delivery. In addition to severity scoring systems, the integration of tailored ventilation protocols is essential for optimizing management strategies in COVID-19 ARDS patients. Traditional ventilation protocols for ARDS focus on lung-protective ventilation strategies aimed at minimizing ventilator-induced lung injury. However, COVID-19 ARDS presents unique challenges that may necessitate adjustments to standard ventilatory approaches. Strategies such as prone positioning, lung recruitment maneuvers, and adjustments to positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) levels based on individual patient characteristics have been proposed to improve oxygenation and reduce ventilator-induced lung injury in COVID-19 patients.

### **Implications and Future Directions:**

The findings of this study have significant implications for clinical practice and future research in the management of COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). By comparing severity scoring systems and ventilation protocols in a real-world clinical setting, this study contributes to our understanding of optimal management strategies for this challenging patient population. Firstly, the study underscores the importance of integrating severity scoring systems such as the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and the CURB-65 score into clinical practice

for risk stratification and prognostication in COVID-19 ARDS patients. Accurate assessment of disease severity is essential for guiding clinical decision-making, resource allocation, and treatment planning. The findings of this study may inform the development of clinical guidelines and protocols for the management of COVID-19 patients with ARDS, helping clinicians prioritize care and allocate resources effectively to those at highest risk of adverse outcomes. Secondly, the study highlights the need for tailored ventilation protocols that account for the unique pathophysiological features of COVID-19 ARDS. Traditional ventilation strategies may need to be adapted to address the specific challenges posed by COVID-19, such as profound hypoxemia, high respiratory drive, and a protracted clinical course. Strategies such as prone positioning, lung recruitment maneuvers, and adjustments to positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) levels may improve oxygenation and reduce ventilator-induced lung injury in COVID-19 patients. Further research is needed to refine and validate these ventilation protocols and elucidate their impact on patient outcomes. Additionally, the study emphasizes the importance of ongoing research and collaboration in the field of COVID-19 ARDS. As our understanding of the disease continues to evolve, so too must our management strategies. Future research should focus on elucidating the underlying mechanisms of COVID-19 ARDS, identifying biomarkers for early detection and prognostication, and evaluating novel therapeutic interventions. Multicenter prospective studies and clinical trials are needed to validate the findings of this study and determine the optimal management strategies for COVID-19 patients with ARDS.

## **Conclusion:**

The management of COVID-19 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) presents unique challenges necessitating an integrated approach that combines accurate severity scoring systems with tailored ventilation protocols. Through the utilization of severity scoring systems such as the Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI) and the CURB-65 score, clinicians can objectively assess disease severity and predict mortality in COVID-19 ARDS patients. These scoring systems provide valuable tools for risk stratification, guiding clinical decision-making, and resource allocation, ultimately improving patient outcomes and optimizing healthcare delivery. In parallel, tailored ventilation protocols play a crucial role in optimizing management strategies for COVID-19 ARDS patients. Traditional ventilation approaches must be adapted to address the specific challenges posed by COVID-19, including profound hypoxemia, high respiratory drive, and a



protracted clinical course. Strategies such as prone positioning, lung recruitment maneuvers, and adjustments to positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) levels have shown promise in improving oxygenation and reducing ventilator-induced lung injury in COVID-19 patients. By integrating these ventilation protocols with severity scoring systems, clinicians can optimize management strategies and improve outcomes in COVID-19 ARDS patients. The findings of this study have significant implications for clinical practice, guiding the development of evidence-based guidelines and protocols for the management of COVID-19 ARDS. By prioritizing care and allocating resources effectively to those at highest risk of adverse outcomes, clinicians can optimize healthcare delivery and improve outcomes for COVID-19 patients with ARDS. Additionally, ongoing research and collaboration are essential to further refine and validate the integrated approach to managing COVID-19 ARDS. Future research should focus on elucidating the underlying mechanisms of COVID-19 ARDS, identifying biomarkers for early detection and prognostication, and evaluating novel therapeutic interventions. Multicenter prospective studies and clinical trials are needed to validate the findings of this study and determine the optimal management strategies for COVID-19 patients with ARDS. In conclusion, an integrated approach that combines severity scoring systems with tailored ventilation protocols is essential for optimizing management strategies and improving outcomes in COVID-19 patients with ARDS. By continuing to collaborate, innovate, and refine our approaches, we can mitigate the impact of the ongoing pandemic on global health and improve outcomes for COVID-19 patients with ARDS.

## References

- [1] Roser, L., Huang, J., Kong, M., McGuffin, T., Nathala, P., Salunkhe, V., ... & Xu, Q. (2021). P014. Risk Factors for Cardiovascular Events In Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19. *Heart & Lung*, 50(4), 567-568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2021.03.069>
- [2] Nathala, P., Sarai, S., Salunkhe, V., Tella, M. A., Furmanek, S. P., & Arnold, F. W. (2022). Comparing Outcomes for Community-Acquired Pneumonia Between Females and Males: Results from the University of Louisville Pneumonia Study. *The University of Louisville Journal of Respiratory Infections*, 6(1), 19.
- [3] Q. Xu, H. Samanapally, P. Nathala et al., “Outcomes and risk factors for cardiovascular events in hospitalized COVID-19 patients,” *Journal of Cardiothoracic and Vascular Anesthesia*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 3581–3593, 2021.

- [4] Roser, L. P., McGuffin, T. C., Xu, Q., Salunkhe, V., Samanapally, H., Nathala, P., ... & Huang, J. (2021). What Risk Factors Are Associated with Cardiovascular Complications in Patients with COVID-19?. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 49(6), S17-S18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2021.04.071>
- [5] Nathala P, Salunkhe V, Samanapally H, Xu Q, Furmanek S, Fahmy OH, Deepti F, Glynn A, McGuffin T, Goldsmith DC, Petrey J. Electrocardiographic features and outcome: Correlations in 124 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 and cardiovascular events. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth*. 2022;36(8):2927–34.
- [6] Rawla P, Raj JP, George SM, Nathala P, Vellipuram AR. A Rare Adverse Event of Rhabdomyolysis Caused by Sacubitril/Valsartan. *Diseases*. 2019; 7(2):38. <https://doi.org/10.3390/diseases7020038>
- [7] Furmanek, S., Salunkhe, V., Pahwa, S., Samanapally, H., Nathala, P., Xu, Q., ... & Huang, J. (2022). Correlations of Before and After Event Echocardiographic Parameters with Troponin and BNP in Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients With Cardiovascular Events. *Journal of Cardiothoracic and Vascular Anesthesia*, 36(12), 4553-4555. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2022.08.024>
- [8] Griffiths, M., Meade, S., Summers, C., McAuley, D. F., Proudfoot, A., Baladia, M. M., ... & Irving, P. M. (2022). RAND appropriateness panel to determine the applicability of UK guidelines on the management of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and other strategies in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Thorax*, 77(2), 129-135.
- [9] Bramley, A. M., Reed, C., Finelli, L., Self, W. H., Ampofo, K., Arnold, S. R., ... & Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Etiology of Pneumonia in the Community (EPIC) Study Team. (2017). Relationship between body mass index and outcomes among hospitalized patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 215(12), 1873-1882.
- [10] Montenegro, F., Unigarro, L., Paredes, G., Moya, T., Romero, A., Torres, L., ... & Ortiz-Prado, E. (2021). Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) caused by the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19): a practical comprehensive literature review. *Expert review of respiratory medicine*, 15(2), 183-195.
- [11] Lee, J., Kim, K., Jo, Y. H., Lee, J. H., Kim, J., Chung, H., & Hwang, J. E. (2015). Severe thinness is associated with mortality in patients with community-acquired pneumonia: a

prospective observational study. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 33(2), 209-213.

- [12] Pelosi, P., Tonelli, R., Torregiani, C., Baratella, E., Confalonieri, M., Battaglini, D., ... & Ruaro, B. (2022). Different methods to improve the monitoring of noninvasive respiratory support of patients with severe pneumonia/ARDS due to COVID-19: an update. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 11(6), 1704.
- [13] Reddy, M. P., Subramaniam, A., Chua, C., Ling, R. R., Anstey, C., Ramanathan, K., ... & Shekar, K. (2022). Respiratory system mechanics, gas exchange, and outcomes in mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19-related acute respiratory distress syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, 10(12), 1178-1188.
- [14] Chen, J., Wang, J., Jiang, H., Li, M. C., He, S. Y., Li, X. P., & Shen, D. (2019). Lower long-term mortality in obese patients with community-acquired pneumonia: possible role of CRP. *Clinics*, 74, e608.
- [15] Rawla P, Raj JP, George SM, Nathala P, Vellipuram AR. A rare adverse event of rhabdomyolysis caused by sacubitril/valsartan. *Diseases* 2019;7:38.