scientific reports



OPEN Prophylactic heparin and risk of orotracheal intubation or death in patients with mild or moderate **COVID-19** pneumonia

Alessandra Vergori¹², Patrizia Lorenzini¹, Alessandro Cozzi-Lepri², Davide Roberto Donno³, Gina Gualano⁴, Emanuele Nicastri⁵, Fabio Iacomi⁶, Luisa Marchioni⁷, Paolo Campioni⁰⁸, Vincenzo Schininà¹⁰⁸, Stefania Cicalini¹, Chiara Agrati¹⁰⁹, Maria Rosaria Capobianchi¹⁰, Enrico Girardi¹¹, Giuseppe Ippolito¹², Francesco Vaia¹³, Nicola Petrosillo³, Andrea Antinori^{1,15}, Fabrizio Taglietti^{2,3,15} & The ReCOVeRI Study Group*

Prophylactic low molecular weight heparin (pLMWH) is currently recommended in COVID-19 to reduce the risk of coagulopathy. The aim of this study was to evaluate whether the antinflammatory effects of pLMWH could translate in lower rate of clinical progression in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. Patients admitted to a COVID-hospital in Rome with SARS-CoV-2 infection and mild/ moderate pneumonia were retrospectively evaluated. The primary endpoint was the time from hospital admission to orotracheal intubation/death (OTI/death). A total of 449 patients were included: 39% female, median age 63 (IQR, 50-77) years. The estimated probability of OTI/death for patients receiving pLMWH was: 9.5% (95% CI 3.2-26.4) by day 20 in those not receiving pLMWH vs. 10.4% (6.7–15.9) in those exposed to pLMWH; p-value = 0.144. This risk associated with the use of pLMWH appeared to vary by PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio: aHR 1.40 (95% CI 0.51–3.79) for patients with an admission $PaO_{2}/FiO_{2} \leq 300 \text{ mmHg}$ and 0.27 (0.03–2.18) for those with $PaO_{2}/FiO_{2} > 300 \text{ mmHg}$; p-value at interaction test 0.16. pLMWH does not seem to reduce the risk of OTI/death mild/moderate COVID-19 pneumonia, especially when respiratory function had already significantly deteriorated. Data from clinical trials comparing the effect of prophylactic vs. therapeutic dosage of LMWH at various stages of COVID-19 disease are needed.

On January 9 2020, the "World Health Organization" (WHO) declared the identification, by Chinese Health authorities, of a novel coronavirus, further classified as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)¹. The outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 was considered to have originally started via a zoonotic transmission associated with the seafood market in Wuhan, China leading to a sharply spreading outbreak of human respiratory disease (COVID-19) in several other countries worldwide. On March 11 2020, WHO declared COVID-19

¹HIV/AIDS Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Via Portuense, 292, 00149 Rome, Italy. ²Centre for Clinical Research, Epidemiology, Modelling and Evaluation (CREME), Institute for Global Health, UCL, London, UK. ³Severe and Immune-Depression Associated Infectious Diseases Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ⁴Respiratory Infectious Diseases Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ⁵Emerging Infectious Diseases Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ⁶Hepatology Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ⁷Intensive Care Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ⁸Radiology Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. 9Cellular Immunology and Pharmacology Laboratory, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ¹⁰Laboratory of Virology, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ¹¹Clinical Epidemiology Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ¹²Scientific Direction, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ¹³Health Direction, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ¹⁵These authors contributed equally: Andrea Antinori and Fabrizio Taglietti. *A list of authors and their affiliations appears at the end of the paper. Zemail: alessandra.vergori@inmi.it

a pandemic². To date, over 50.7 million COVID-19 cases and 1.2 million deaths have been reported to WHO. Currently, there are more than 3.6 million new cases and over 54 000 new deaths reported³.

COVID-19 might be commonly complicated with some hemostatic changes including mild thrombocytopenia⁴ and increased D-dimer levels^{5,6}, indicating some forms of coagulopathy⁷⁻¹⁰ that may predispose to thrombotic events, associated with a higher risk of requiring mechanical ventilation, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, or death^{6,9,10}. These hemostatic changes are a specific effect of SARS-CoV-2 and a consequence of a cytokine storm that alters the onset of the systemic inflammatory response syndrome as observed in other viral disease⁸. Generally, a correlation between inflammation and coagulation exists: several inflammatory cytokines lead to an impairment of the coagulation pattern, with a consequent imbalance between the procoagulant and anticoagulant states¹¹. In the severe acute respiratory syndrome induced by coronavirus, vascular endothelial damage in small and medium sized pulmonary vessels, disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC), deep venous thrombosis, and pulmonary thromboembolism have been described^{12,13}. Hospitalized patients with acute medical illness, including infections such as pneumonia, are at increased risk of thrombotic events¹⁰ and it is well known that prophylactic anticoagulation reduces that risk^{14,15}. Interestingly, heparin and its related derivatives have shown antiviral and anti-inflammatory activities and seem to be beneficial for patients with other diseases^{16,17}. As inflammation, atherogenesis, thrombogenesis, and cell proliferation are joint with each other, the pleiotropic effects of heparin and derivatives may have a therapeutic effect and might be relevant in this setting^{6,16,18}. Nowadays, physicians treating patients with COVID-19 are facing challenges and one of these is related with the therapeutic utility of heparin¹⁷. The use of prophylactic-doses of low molecular weight heparin (pLMWH) is now recommended by the WHO¹⁹ and others guidelines²⁰⁻²⁴ for all hospitalized COVID-19 patients, unless of clinical contraindications. However, there are conflicting opinions regarding the optimal dose of prophylactic anticoagulation to prevent thrombotic events in COVID-19 patients and to induce a potential anti-inflammatory activity because of the lack of solid evidences.

The aim of this analysis was to assess the effectiveness of prophylactic dose of LMWH vs. no heparin in reducing the risk of orotracheal intubation and death in a real-life setting of patients hospitalized for COVID-19.

Results

Patients' characteristics. A total of 449 patients with COVID-19 mild/moderate pneumonia was included in this analysis. Over 48 h from the date of admission, 210 (46.8%) patients started pLMWH and 239 (53.2%) did not. Overall, 39% were female, with a median (Inter-Quartile Range, IQR) age of 63 (50–77) years and a median of 8 days from onset of symptoms to hospital admission (IQR 4–12).

The main characteristics of the study population at admission, overall and according to pLMWH treatment at admission, are shown in Table 1.

The two groups were considerably different. Patients receiving pLMWH at admission were older, more frequently female and had a higher number of co-morbidities than those who did not receive pLMWH. In the overall study population, we observed 303 (67.5%) patients with more than one comorbidity, a significantly higher proportion of patients with diabetes (23.8% vs 10.5%; p < 0.001), cardiovascular diseases (37.1% vs 18.8%; p < 0.001), hypertension (51.9% vs 29.3%; p < 0.001), COPD/Asthma (25.7% vs 14.2%; p = 0.002), kidney diseases (8.6% vs 2.1%; p = 0.002) and liver disease (8.6% vs 3.4%, p = 0.020) was found among those who received pLMWH at admission versus those who did not. Patients receiving pLMWH had a median PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio at admission significantly lower than those not receiving pLMWH [333 mmHg (IQR, 248–400) vs 352 (295–410) respectively; p = 0.05], more frequently met the definition of hyperinflammation condition (64% vs 53%; p = 0.018) and, as expected, showed a higher median d-dimer level [841 ng/mL vs 568, p < 0.001]. The Padua score at admission was higher in the pLMWH group vs. no pLMWH and the volume of normal ventilated lung appeared lower in patients receiving pLMWH than in those who did not [3.0 L (2.2–4.2) vs 4.0 (2.9–5.1); p = 0.008].

Weak positive correlation was observed for d-dimer level at admission with Padua score (Spearman correlation coefficient = +0.28, p < 0.001 and with PaO₂/FiO₂ level at admission (Spearman correlation coefficient = +0.25, p < 0.001) as showed in Fig. 1.

53% of patients did not receive pLMWH and they were more frequently hospitalized in the first pandemic period (196/239 in March, 33/239 in April and 10 between June and July 2020; p < 0.001).

Overall, only 16 (3.5%) pulmonary thrombosis occurred, of whom 12 were in participants who started pLMWH close to admission and 4 in those who did not. We observed 5 major bleeding events which occurred 4 in people who were treated with heparin and 1 in untreated (p at Fisher exact test 0.076), more in detail: two intramuscular hematomas, 1 cerebral haemorrhage, 1 cerebellar bleeding and a vascular bleeding from the ascending aorta.

As to other treatments, patients on pLMWH received immunomodulant therapy, steroids and remdesivir over follow-up more frequently than patients not treated with pLMWH.

Primary endpoint OTI/death. Over 214 person-months of follow-up, 36 patients experienced OTI or death (6 OTI and 30 death). As expected, the estimated probability of OTI/death was very different according to level of PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission (21.3% (95% CI 14.8–30.2) by day 15 in those with PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio < 300 mmHg vs. 2.9% (95% CI 1.3–6.3) in those with PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio > 300 mmHg; log-rank p-value < 0.001) Fig. 2a. In patients who were hospitalized with $PaO_2/FiO_2 \le 300$ mmHg, the probability of OTI/death seemed not different between treatment groups (Fig. 2c), while in patients with $PaO_2/FiO_2 > 300$ at admission, those who did not receive pLMWH showed higher probability of the outcome respect to those who received pLMWH (Fig. 2b).

At multivariable analysis, a first model was adjusted only for time-fixed confounders (model 1) and a second one which included also time-varying confounders concerning concomitant treatment (model 2).

| | n. 449 | n. 239 | n. 210 | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| | Overall | No pLMWH | pLMWH | p-value |
| Gender, n (%) | | | | |
| Male | 275 (61.3) | 161 (67.4) | 114 (54.3) | 0.005 |
| Female | 174 (38.8) | 78 (32.6) | 96 (45.7) | |
| Age, years, median (IQR) | 63 (50–77) | 59 (49–71) | 72 (55–82) | < 0.001 |
| Number of co-morbidities, n (%) | | | | |
| 0 | 146 (32.5) | 107 (44.8) | 39 (18.6) | < 0.001 |
| 1 | 109 (24.3) | 66 (27.6) | 43 (20.5) | |
| 2 | 73 (16.3) | 32 (13.4) | 41 (19.5) | |
| 3+ | 121 (27.0) | 34 (14.2) | 87 (41.4) | |
| PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission $\leq 200 \text{ mmHg}$, n (%) | 48 (10.7) | 18 (7.5) | 30 (14.3) | 0.013 |
| PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission \leq 300 mmHg, n (%) | 133 (29.6) | 58 (24.3) | 75 (35.7) | 0.008 |
| Hyperinflammation at admission ^a , n (%) | 260 (57.9) | 126 (52.7) | 134 (63.8) | 0.018 |
| Ferritin, pg/ml, median (IQR) | 357 (179–733) | 257 (195–767) | 357 (163-706) | 0.694 |
| C Reactive Protein, mg/dl, median (IQR) | 2.7 (1.2–7.0) | 2.6 (1.2-6.1) | 3.2 (1.3-8.2) | 0.205 |
| Lactic dehydrogenase, UI, median (IQR) | 233 (185–295) | 237 (194–290) | 223 (181-300) | 0.169 |
| D-dimer, median (IQR) | 671 (419–1415) | 568 (396-1045) | 841 (436–1676) | < 0.001 |
| Lymphocytes, median (IQR) | 1220 (860–1720) | 1250 (910-1690) | 1190 (755–1720) | 0.207 |
| D-dimer, ng/ml, n (%) | | | | |
| < 500 | 141 (31.4) | 80 (33.5) | 61 (29.1) | < 0.001 |
| 501-1000 | 110 (24.5) | 56 (23.4) | 54 (25.7) | |
| 1000-2500 | 92 (20.5) | 35 (14.6) | 57 (27.1) | |
| >2500 | 42 (9.4) | 12 (5) | 30 (14.3) | |
| Missing | 64 (14.2) | 56 (23.4) | 8 (3.8) | |
| Antiviral therapy started in follow-up, n (%) | 364 (81.1) | 201 (84.1) | 163 (77.6) | 0.080 |
| LPV/r | 99 (22.1) | 71 (29.7) | 28 (13.3) | < 0.001 |
| HCQ | 91 (20.3) | 30 (12.6) | 61 (29.1) | |
| LPV/r+HCQ | 169 (37.6) | 100 (41.8) | 69 (32.9) | |
| Neither LPV/r nor HCQ | 90 (20.0) | 38 (15.9) | 52 (24.8) | |
| Remdesivir | 16 (3.6) | 1 (0.4) | 15 (7.1) | < 0.001 |
| Immunomodulant therapy started in follow-up, n (%) | 58 (12.9) | 22 (9.2) | 36 (17.1) | 0.012 |
| Steroids, n (%) | 157 (35.0) | 62 (25.9) | 95 (45.2) | < 0.001 |
| Padua score, median (IQR) | 1 (0-2) | 0 (0-1) | 1 (0-2) | < 0.001 |
| Residual normal ventilated lung, volume, L median (IQR) ^b | 3.4 (2.4–4.5) | 4.0 (2.9–5.1) | 3 (2.2-4.2) | 0.008 |

Table 1. General characteristics of study population. *pLMWH* prophylactic dose of low molecular weight heparin, *IQR* inter quartile range, *COPD* chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases, *LPV/r* lopinavir/ritonavir, *HCQ* hydroxychloroquine. ^aDefined by the presence of at least two of the following criteria: (a) blood lymphocytes < 1000/mmc; (b) ferritin > 500 ng/mL; (c) LDH > 300 U/L; (d) D-dimers > 1000 ng/mL; (e) C-reactive protein > 3 mg/dL. ^bAvailable for 130 patients.

.....

Overall, crude and adjusted marginal hazard ratio for OTI/death showed a reduced risk for patient who received pLMWH but data were highly compatible with the null hypothesis of no difference (model 1: aHR=0.89, 95% CI 0.34–2.29, p=0.806; model 2: aHR=0.66, 95% CI 0.28–1.57, p=0.352).

After stratifying by baseline PaO₂/FiO₂ (> or \leq 300 mmHg) there was some evidence for a difference in risk by treatment group according to strata. In particular, pLMWH use appeared to be associated with a higher risk of OTI/death among patients admitted with PaO₂/FiO₂ \leq 300 mmHg [model 1 aHR 1.67 (95% CI 0.60–4.67), model 2 aHR 1.40 (95% CI 0.51–3.79)]. In contrast, in the stratum with PaO₂/FiO₂ \geq 300 mmHg, patients receiving pLMWH was consistent with a markedly reduced risk of OTI/death, although with wide confidence intervals [model 1 aHR 0.17 (95% CI 0.01–3.18); model 2 aHR 0.27 (95% CI 0.03–2.18)]. This is indicative of a qualitative interaction although the p-value at interaction test was 0.16 (Table 2).

The ITT analysis showed similar risk for treated and not treated in the group with $PaO_2/FiO_2 > 300$ and higher risk for treated if the baseline PaO_2/FiO_2 was ≤ 300 mmHg (supplementary table 1).

Similar results were obtained after the exclusion of 16 patients with pulmonary thromboembolic events from the study population patients treated with pLMWH showed higher risk of OTI/death versus those not treated if their PaO₂/FiO₂ at admission was \leq 300 mmHg (HR 1.26; 95% CI 0.45–3.53), and they showed a lower risk if they were admitted at hospital with PaO₂/FiO₂ > 300 mmHg (HR 0.29; 95% CI 0.04–2.17) (Supplementary table 2).



Padua score

Figure 1. Scatterplot and regression line representing the correlation between (a) D-dimer and Padua score and between (b) D-dimer and PaO₂/FiO₂.

| (a) Overall population | (b) Patients with | (c) Patients with |
|---|---|---|
| | PaO2/FiO2>300 mmHg at | PaO2/FiO2 <u><</u> 300 mmHg at |
| | admission | admission |
| Number at risk pLMWH 210 204 199 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 10 15 20 Number at risk pLMWH 210 204 199 166 117 75 No pLMWH 204 199 106 117 75 | 8 - | Number at risk NopLMWH 58 53 35 17 5 pLMWH 75 69 57 42 30 No pLMWH |
| Log-rank p-value =0.144 | Log-rank p=0.557 | Log-rank p=0.092 |
| 20-days probability of OTI/death | 20-days probability of OTI/death | 20-days probability of OTI/death |
| <u>No pLMWH: 9.5%;95% CI 3.2-26.4</u> | No pLMWH: 9.6%; <u>95% CI 2.1-38.8</u> | No pLMWH: 10.2%; <u>95% CI 4.3-23.1</u> |
| pLMWH: 10.4%;95% CI 6.7-15.9 | pLMWH: 3.5%; <u>95% CI 1.3-9.0</u> | pLMWH: 22.0%; <u>95% CI 13.8-34.0</u> |

Figure 2. (a) Estimated probability of mechanical invasive oro-tracheal intubation/death (OTI/death) according to pLMWH exposure in the study population and stratified by PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio at admission (b) > 300 mmHg and (c) \leq 300 mmHg. *pLMWH* prophylactic low molecular weight heparin, *OTI/death* orotracheal intubation/death.

Secondary endpoint: death. Over 216 person-months of follow-up, 31 deaths were observed. At the multivariable analysis on the overall population, we found a signal for a reduced risk of death according

to LMWH use [model 1: aHR 0.75 (0.28 to 1.97); p=0.558; model 2: 0.53 (0.21-1.31); p=0.168]. Prophylactic LMWH use was associated with a higher, even though not significant, risk of death among patients admitted with a $PaO_2/FiO_2 \le 300 \text{ mmHg}$ [model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95% CI 0.37-3.79); p = 0.782; model 1: aHR 1.18 (95\% CI 0.37

2: 1.14 (0.37–3.48); p = 0.823], whereas there was some evidence that was a protective factor in the stratum of admission $PaO_2/FiO_2 > 300 \text{ mmHg}$ [model 1: aHR 0.25 (95% CI 0.02–3.59); p = 0.31; model 2: 0.28 (0.03–2.19); p=0.223] (Table 3).

Discussion

This cohort of patients hospitalized for COVID-19 pneumonia at the National Institute for Infectious Diseases L. Spallanzani in Rome, Italy, was mainly enrolled during the first pandemic time-window of the hospitalizations for COVID-19 in Rome. The fact that the evidence was insufficient to determine the risks and benefits of

| | Unadjusted and adjusted marginal relative hazards of IOT/death ^a | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------|--|--|
| | Unadjusted HR (95% CI) | p-value | Adjusted* HR (95% CI) | p-value | Adjusted** HR (95% CI) | p-value | | |
| All patients | | | | | | | | |
| No pLMWH | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | | |
| pLMWH | 0.85 (0.35, 2.07) | 0.727 | 0.89 (0.34, 2.29) | 0.806 | 0.66 (0.28, 1.57) | 0.352 | | |
| Baseline PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ≤300 mmHg | | | | | | | | |
| No pLMWH | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | | |
| pLMWH | 1.68 (0.65, 4.39) | 0.287 | 1.49 (0.52, 4.23) | 0.458 | 1.40 (0.51, 3.79) | | | |
| Baseline PaO2/FiO2>300 mmHg | | | | Interaction p-value 0.164 | | | | |
| No pLMWH | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | | |
| pLMWH | 0.33 (0.07, 1.48) | 0.146 | 0.25 (0.02, 3.61) | 0.310 | 0.27 (0.03, 2.18) | | | |

Table 2. Hazard Ratio of oro-tracheal intubation/death (OTI/death) in all population and according to PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission. *pLMWH* prophylactic dose of low molecular weight heparin. *Adjusted for time-fixed factors: age, gender, time from symptoms onset, comorbidities (cardiovascular diseases, hypertension, COPD/Asthma, diabetes), PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission. **Adjusted for time-fixed and time varying factors: age, gender, time from symptoms onset, cardiovascular diseases, hypertension, COPD/Asthma, diabetes), PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission. **Adjusted for time-fixed and time varying factors: age, gender, time from symptoms onset, comorbidities (cardiovascular diseases, hypertension, COPD/Asthma, diabetes), PaO_2/FiO_2 at admission, time-varying use of immune-therapy, antiviral and steroids and censoring using IPW. ^aInitiation of invasive mechanical ventilation or death.

Unadjusted and adjusted marginal relative hazards of death Adjusted** HR (95% CI) Adjusted* HR (95% Unadjusted HR (95% p-value CD p-value CI) p-value All patients No pLMWH 1.00 1.00 1.00 **pLMWH** 0.75 (0.28, 1.97) 0.53 (0.21, 1.31) 0.71 (0.28, 1.80) 0.471 0.558 0.168 Baseline $PaO_2/FiO_2 \le 300 \text{ mmHg}$ No pLMWH 1.00 1.00 1.00 pLMWH 1.41 (0.49, 4.01) 0.525 1.18 (0.37, 3.79) 0.782 1.14 (0.37, 3.48) Interaction p-value Baseline PaO2/FiO2 > 300 mmHg 0.216 No pLMWH 1.00 1.00 1.00 pLMWH 0.25 (0.02, 3.59) 0.28 (0.03, 2.19) 0.31 (0.07, 1.38) 0.123 0.310

Table 3. Hazard Ratio of death in all population and according to PaO₂/FiO₂ at admission. *Adjusted for time-fixed factors: age, gender, time from symptoms onset, comorbidities (cardiovascular diseases, hypertension, COPD/Asthma, diabetes), PaO₂/FiO₂ at admission. *Adjusted for time-fixed and time varying factors: age, gender, time from symptoms onset, comorbidities (cardiovascular diseases, hypertension, COPD/Asthma, diabetes), PaO₂/FiO₂ at admission, time-varying use of immune-therapy, antiviral and steroids and censoring using IPW. *pLMWH* prophylactic dose of low molecular weight heparin.

prophylactic anticoagulants for people hospitalized with COVID-19 because of the lack of randomized comparisons on pLMWH versus no treatment and of the availability of few observational studies with no converging

results²⁵ were the main triggers to perform this analysis. Patients receiving LMWH prophylaxis (39%) appeared to be older than those who did not receive LMWH prophylaxis, with at least 1 comorbidity; specifically, cardiovascular diseases, hypertension, kidney diseases,

COPD/Asthma were the more prevalent. In our study population, there was a non-negligible proportion of patients, mainly those hospitalized in March/April 2020 (53%) in whom prophylactic LMWH was not prescribed. This finding reflects the fact that in the early stages of the epidemic the risk of thromboembolic events in people with COVID-19 disease had not been clearly recognized. As soon as recommendations were made on prophylactic anticoagulation in COVID-19, since May 2020¹⁹⁻²⁶, all hospitalized patients with pneumonia at our COVID-hospital were administered prophylactic dose of LMWH in order to prevent SARS-CoV-2-related thrombotic events. Therefore, this type of analysis will be no longer possible for people enrolled during the second wave of the pandemic.

This analysis reveals that a significant higher proportion of patients receiving LMWH prophylaxis had an impaired respiratory function and a hyperinflammation pattern, which have a known potential prognostic value⁵. These findings highlight that clinicians might have been more prone to use anticoagulant prophylaxis in

patients admitted in severe clinical conditions and that respiratory function was the main driver in prescribing LMWH prophylaxis.

Our findings are only partially consistent with those of a meta-analysis showing that adjunctive LMWH use appeared to reduce 7-day and 28-day mortality [RR 0.52 (0.31-0.87 and 0.63 (0.41-0.96), respectively)] as well as improved the PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio [by weighted mean difference 74.8 mmHg (52.18-96.78)] in individuals with acute lung injury/acute respiratory distress syndrome (ALI/ARDS) not caused by SARS-Cov-2²⁷. The results of this meta-analysis were similar after excluding two studies including more severe patients. Furthermore, our results are also in conflict with those of another observational study in which a better in-hospital survival was shown even in a population with saturation of oxygen < 90% and fever²⁸.

More recently, other studies have emerged regarding the risk of mortality in patients treated with heparin such as the experience of the Multicenter Italian CORIST observational study which showed a 40% lower risk of death in patients receiving LMWH or unfractionated heparin [UFH] vs. no heparin (hazard ratio = 0.60; 95% confidence interval: 0.49-0.74; E-value = 2.04) association particularly evident in patients with a higher severity of disease or strong coagulation activation²⁹.

The results of a randomized trials, also only recently published^{30,31}, add evidence against dose-escalated thromboprophylaxis in critically ill patients with COVID-19. A large observational cohort study of 2,809 critically ill patients with COVID-19 from 67 centers in the US found no benefit of therapeutic dose anticoagulation initiated within 2 days of intensive care unit (ICU) admission compared with standard-dose thromboprophylaxis³². Similarly, another Italian study found that the use of a prophylactic dosage of enoxaparin appears to be associated with similar in-hospital overall mortality compared to higher doses in patients hospitalized for COVID-19³³.

Unfortunately our data do not provide elements to contribute to this debate as we only compared prophylactic dosage with no heparin at all.

Interestingly, in our study the risk of a clinical worsening in patients receiving prophylactic LMWH seemed to vary by the PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio at admission. In particular, there appeared to be a qualitative interaction with some evidence that treatment with pLMWH was beneficial in reducing the risk of OTI/death in participants who started the drug with a $PaO_2/FiO_2 > 300$ mmHg but even potentially harmful in those who started with $PaO_2/FiO_2 \leq 300$ mmHg.

The results for the outcome death alone, were similar to those of the main analysis although with a reduced power to detect the potential interaction with levels of PaO_2/FiO_2 and again only partially consistent with those of other observational studies³³⁻³⁵.

Regarding the risk of bleeding events, although it was expected, the frequency was very low and there was no difference between pLMWH and no pLMWH.

Our study has some limitations. Firstly, the analysis is retrospective and conducted in the observational setting, therefore residual confounding bias is likely to be an issue. Secondly, this observation includes mainly patients hospitalized in the early stages of the epidemic only in one COVID-hospital in central Italy and may have disproportionately included more patients with better outcomes. Thirdly, only the prophylactic dose of LMWH was evaluated so our data do not contribute to the current debate regarding the identification of the optimal dosage. Last, although an interesting signal was detected regarding a possible role of PaO₂/FiO₂ as an effect modifier, the analysis was not powered to detect this interaction.

In conclusion, our results carry little evidence that prophylactic doses of pLMWH can lead to a reduction in risk of OTI/death in patients with mild/moderate COVID-19 pneumonia.

Therefore, overall it seems that prophylactic doses are not sufficient to contrast the hypercoagulable state established in many severe COVID-19 patient, as an obvious consequence of the hyperinflammation and the cytokine storm syndrome and that higher dosage might be needed in people showing generally hyper-inflamed status, impaired respiratory function or suspected high risk of a thrombotic event.

Nevertheless, we have also shown a signal for some clinical benefit of using pLMWH in participants who initiated the drug with a $PaO_2/FiO_2 > 300$ and these data are important to guide future research and the design of randomized studies evaluating the impact of prophylactic heparin vs. higher doses in COVID-19 disease. Our data are compatible with the null hypothesis of no interaction although the effect sizes in the strata are so different that lack of power is a likely explanation for the large p-value. Indeed, the role of prophylactic vs. therapeutic doses LMWH for reducing the risk of thrombosis in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 is currently under evaluation in randomized studies.

Methods

Study population. This retrospective analysis included data on patients, \geq 18 years old, admitted to the National Institute for Infectious Diseases L. Spallanzani in Rome, Italy, with SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosed by means of RT-PCR positive on naso-pharyngeal swabs (at least once) and/or serology and with a radiologically confirmed mild/moderate pneumonia from 1st March up to 31st July 2020. Data have been collected for the ReCOVeRI Study, a registry on COVID-19 for clinical Research of the National Institute for Infectious Diseases L. Spallanzani, approved by the Ethical Commettee of the National Institute for Infectious Diseases L. Spallanzani IRCCS (number 164, 26 June 2020).

Demographic, epidemiological, clinical data, comorbidities, blood exams, therapeutic data including antibiotic, antiviral and immunomodulating agents (dose, duration and administration mode), oxygen supplementation, were collected and recorded using an electronic database. The management of the registry is adapted according the standards of *EUnetHTA* reported in the Registry Evaluation and Quality Standards Tool (*EUnetHTA*, 2019). All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations.

All patients gave informed consent for collecting personal data for research purposes.

CT scans were performed on a multi-detector CT scanner (Bright Speed, GE Medical Systems, Milwaukee, WI). The non-contrast scans were reconstructed with sub-millimetric thicknesses and spacing, high-contrast-resolution algorithm and evaluated to assess the residual pulmonary volume with automatic segmentation of lung areas on dedicated workstation (expressed in Liters).

Patients were included if they were followed-up for at least 2 days after admission. Patients who started a standard prophylactic dose of heparin within 48 h from admission, non-randomly, according to local protocol (intermediate dosage of 100 UI/Kg/day)²⁵ were included in the intervention group and compared to the remaining patients who did not receive the drugs.

Patients who started a prophylactic dose of heparin more than 48 h after admission or started a therapeutical dose were excluded from the analysis dataset.

Definitions. Hyperinflammation condition was defined by the presence of at least two of the following criteria at any time from admission: (a) blood lymphocytes < 1000/mmc; (b) ferritin > 500 ng/mL; (c) LDH > 300 U/L; (d) D-dimers > 1000 ng/mL; (e) C-reactive protein > 3 mg/dL⁵. The Padua score is a tool used to stratify patients and to guide management of the risk of pulmonary embolism³⁶.

Endpoints. The primary endpoint of this analysis was the time to the first event between orotracheal intubation and death (OTI/death). Time to death was analyzed as secondary endpoint.

Statistical analysis. Patients' characteristics were described at baseline, non-parametric Mann–Whitney test was used to compare continuous variables and Chi-Square test to compare categorical variables between treatment groups (pLMWH vs. not). Shapiro–Wilk test was used to check for the normality of distribution and the Spearman correlation coefficient was calculated and tested for the correlation analysis. Baseline for the survival analysis was the admission for patients not treated and heparin initiation for treated group. Standard survival analysis by means of weighted Kaplan–Meier (KM) curves were performed to estimate the cumulative proportion of people experiencing the primary endpoint from baseline.

The main analysis was performed using a Cox marginal structural model. The causal HR and corresponding 95% CI of the primary outcome for heparin treated vs not treated participants were estimated by Cox regression model weighted by (i) inverse probability of treatment weights and (ii) censoring weights.

Participants' follow-up accrued from baseline until the occurrence of the outcome or last in-hospital observation. The follow-up was censored if participants changed the heparin dose from prophylactic to therapeutic. Confounders included for the construction of the weights were: gender, age, duration of symptoms, type of comorbidities, PaO₂/FiO₂ measured at admission as time-fixed factors, and the initiation of any antiviral therapy, any immunomodulating agents, any steroids as time-varying factors.

To test the hypothesis of a beneficial effect pLMWH solely via reduction of inflammation, a sensitivity analysis was performed after exclusion of participants who experienced pulmonary thromboembolic events.

The analysis was stratified according to the severity of disease at admission defined as a) PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio \leq or > 300 mmHg. The interaction between PaO_2/FiO_2 ratio level and heparin use was formally tested.

The analysis was conducted following both OT and ITT principle, the latter ignored any change in dosage of heparin during observation.

Data availability

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Received: 24 November 2020; Accepted: 17 May 2021 Published online: 31 May 2021

References

- 1. WHO Statement Regarding Cluster of Pneumonia Cases in Wuhan, China. https://www.who.int.. Archived from the original on 14 January 2020. Accessed 9 Jan 2020.
- WHO Coronavirus Diseases 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report 51, 11 March 2020. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/ coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200311-sitrep-51-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=1ba62e57_10 (Lippi, G., Plebani, M., Michael Henry, B. Thrombocytopenia is associated with severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infections: A meta-analysis. Clin. Chim. Acta 2020).
- Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19): Global Epidemiological Situation. Data as Received by WHO from National Authorities, as of 10 November 2020. https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update---10-november-2020.
- Lippi, G. & Favaloro, E. D-dimer is associated with severity of coronavirus disease 2019: A pooled analysis. *Thromb. Haemost.* 120(5), 876–878 (2020).
- 5. Zhou, F. *et al.* Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: A retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* **395**, 1054–1062
- 6. Thachil, J. The versatile heparin in COVID-19. J. Thromb. Haemost. 18(5), 1020-1022 (2020).
- 7. Bikdeli, B. *et al.* COVID-19 and thrombotic or thromboembolic disease: Implications for prevention, antithrombotic therapy, and follow-up [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 15]. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* **S0735–1097**(20), 35008–7 (2020).
- Tang, N., Li, D., Wang, X., Sun, Z. Abnormal Coagulation parameters are associated with poor prognosis in patients with novel coronavirus pneumonia. J. Thromb. Haemost. 18, 844–847 (2020)
- 9. Fan, B.E. et al. Hematologic parameters in patients with COVID-19 infection. Am. J. Hematol. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.25774
- 10. Rogers, M. A. *et al.* Triggers of hospitalization for venous thromboembolism. *Circulation* **125**, 2092–2099 (2012).
- 11. Goeijenbier, M. et al. Viral infections and mechanisms of thrombosis and bleeding. J. Med. Virol. 84, 1680-1696 (2012).
 - 12. Lee, N. et al. A major outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. N. Engl. J. Med. 348, 1986–1994 (2004).
- 13. Hwang, D. M. et al. Pulmonary pathology of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Toronto. Mod. Pathol. 18, 1-10 (2005).

- Samama, M.M. et al. A comparison of enoxaparin with placebo for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. Prophylaxis in medical patients with enoxaparin study group. N. Engl. J. Med. 341, 793–800 (1999).
- Leizorovicz, A. et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of dalteparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. Circulation 110, 874–879 (2004).
- Mousavi, S., Moradi, M., Khorshidahmad, T., Motamedi, M. Anti-inflammatory effects of heparin and its derivatives: A systematic review. Adv. Pharmacol. Sci. 2015, 507151 (2015).
- Hippensteel, J.A. *et al.* Heparin as a therapy for COVID-19: Current evidence and future possibilities. *Am. J. Physiol. Lung Cell. Mol. Physiol.* **319**(2), L211–L217. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajplung.00199.2020 (2020).
- Costanzo, L., et al; Italian Society for Vascular Investigation and the Italian Society of Vascular Medicine. Coagulopathy, thromboembolic complications, and the use of heparin in COVID-19 pneumonia. J. Vasc. Surg. Venous Lymphat. Disord. 8(5), 711–716 (2020).
- World Health Organization. Clinical Management of Severe Acute Respiratory Infection When Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Infection is Suspected. Interim Guidance 28 January 2020. https://www.who.int/docs/defaultsource/coronaviruse/clinical-management-of-novel-cov.pdf.
- 20. National Institute of Health. COVID-19 Treatment Guidelines. https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov.
- 21. Thachil, J. et al. ISTH interim guidance on recognition and management of coagulopathy in COVID-19. J. Thromb. Hemost. https://doi.org/10.1111/jth.14810.
- 22. Spyropoulos, A.C. *et al.*; Subcommittee on Perioperative, Critical Care Thrombosis, Haemostasis of the Scientific, Standardization Committee of the International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis. Scientific and Standardization Committee communication: Clinical guidance on the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of venous thromboembolism in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *J. Thromb. Haemost.* 18(8), 1859–1865 (2020)
- 23. Baumann Kreuziger, L. et al. COVID-19 and VTE/Anticoagulation: Frequently Asked Questions. www.hematology.org/covid-19/ covid-19-and-vte-anticoagulation.
- Marietta, M. et al. COVID-19 and haemostasis: A position paper from Italian Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis (SISET). Blood Transfus. 18(3), 167–169 (2020).
- 25. Flumignan, R.L. *et al.* Prophylactic anticoagulants for people hospitalised with COVID-19. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **10**, CD013739 (2020).
- 26. Raccomandazioni per la gestione clinica e terapeutica della COVID-19. https://www.simit.org/images/documenti/Linee%20guida% 20SIMIT%20LAZIO%20SARS%20CoV%202%20maggio%202020.pdf.
- Li, J., Li, Y., Yang, B., Wang, H. & Li, L. Low-molecular-weight heparin treatment for acute lung injury/acute respiratory distress syndrome: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int. J. Clin. Exp. Med.* 11(2), 414–422 (2018).
- Ayerbe, L., Risco, C. & Ayis, S. The association between treatment with heparin and survival in patients with Covid-19. J. Thromb. Thrombolysis 50(2), 298–301 (2020).
- Di Castelnuovo, A. et al. Heparin in COVID-19 patients is associated with reduced in-hospital mortality: The Multicenter Italian CORIST Study. Thromb. Haemost. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1347-6070 (2021) (online ahead of print).
- 30. INSPIRATION Investigators, Sadeghipour, P. *et al.* Effect of intermediate-dose vs standard-dose prophylactic anticoagulation on thrombotic events, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation treatment, or mortality among patients with COVID-19 admitted to the intensive care unit: The INSPIRATION Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* **27**, **325**(16), 1620–1630 (2021).
- The REMAP-CAP, ACTIV-4a, ATTACC Investigators, Zarychanski, R. Therapeutic anticoagulation in critically ill patients with Covid-19—Preliminary report. medRxiv 2021.03.10.21252749. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.10.21252749.
- Al-Samkari, H., *et al.*; STOP-COVID Investigators. Thrombosis, bleeding, and the observational effect of early therapeutic anticoagulation on survival in critically ill patients with COVID-19. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 26, M20-6739. https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-6739 (2021) (epub ahead of print).
- Mennuni, M.G., Renda, G., Grisafi, L., *et al.*; COVID-UPO Clinical Team. Clinical outcome with different doses of low-molecularweight heparin in patients hospitalized for COVID-19. *J. Thromb. Thrombolysis* 1, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11239-021-02401-x (2021) (epub ahead of print).
- Tang, N. et al. Anticoagulant treatment is associated with decreased mortality in severe coronavirus disease 2019 patients with coagulopathy. J. Thromb. Haemost. 18(5), 1094–1099 (2020).
- Paranjpe, I. *et al.* Association of treatment dose anticoagulation with in-hospital survival among hospitalized patients with COVID-19. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 76(1), 122–124 (2020).
- Kandagatla, P. et al. PADUA score 526 as a predictor for pulmonary embolism: A potential strategy for reducing unnecessary imaging. J. Thromb. Thrombolysis 47(4), 566–571 (2019).

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge nurse staff, all the patients and all the members of the ReCOVeRI Study Group.

Author contributions

A.V., F.T. and A.A. conceived and designed the study, wrote the first draft of the manuscript and referred to appropriate literature. A.A., F.T. and N.P. conceived, supervised the study and contributed to data interpretation. P.L. and A.C.L. were the main responsible persons for data analysis and also contributed to the article drafting. P.C. was the main responsible person in estimating the normal ventilated lung volume. G.G. revised the intellectual concept of the study and reviewed the manuscript. E.N., D.R.D., S.C., F.I., C.A., M.R.C. revised the manuscript content. V.S., L.M., E.G., G.I., F.V. reviewed the final version of the manuscript. All authors agreed with and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by Line one—Ricerca Corrente 'Infezioni Emergenti e Riemergenti' and by Progetto COVID-2020-12371675 both funded by Italian Ministry of Health.

Competing interests

The corresponding author is responsible for submitting a competing interests statement on behalf of all authors of the paper. Alessandra Vergori, Patrizia Lorenzini, Alessandro Cozzi lepri, Davide Roberto Donno, Emanuele Nicastri, Gina Gualano, Fabio Iacomi, Luisa Marchioni, Paolo Campioni, Vincenzo Schininà, Stefania Cicalini, Chiara Agrati, Maria Rosaria Capobianchi, Enrico Girardi, Giuseppe Ippolito, Francesco Vaia, Nicola Petrosillo, Andrea Antinori and Fabrizio Taglietti have no competing interests that might be perceived to influence the

results and/or discussion reported in this paper. Outside of this submitted work: Alessandra Vergori received institutional grant from Gilead Sciences, personal fees and travel grant from Janssen, personal fee from MSD; Andrea Antinori has served as a paid consultant to Gilead Sciences, Janssen-Cilag, Merck and ViiV Healthcare and received research institutional grants from Gilead Sciences, Janssen-Cilag and ViiV Healthcare; Enrico Girardi received institutional grants for Gilead Sciences and Mylan, personal fees from Gilead Sciences and ViiV; Nicola Petrosillo received personal fees from Shionogi Ltd, MSD, Becton &Dickinson, Pfizer and Cepheid. The other co-authors declare no conflicts of interests outside the submitted work.

Additional information

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/ 10.1038/s41598-021-90713-6.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to A.V.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2021

The ReCOVeRI Study Group

Maria Alessandra Abbonizio¹⁴, Amina Abdeddaim¹⁴, Elisabetta Agostini¹⁴, Fabrizio Albarello¹⁴, Gioia Amadei¹⁴, Alessandra Amendola¹⁴, Maria Assunta Antonica¹⁴, Mario Antonini¹⁴, Tommaso Ascoli Bartoli¹⁴, Francesco Baldini¹⁴, Raffaella Barbaro¹⁴, Barbara Bartolini¹⁴, Rita Bellagamba¹⁴, Martina Benigni¹⁴, Nazario Bevilacqua¹⁴, Gianluigi Biava¹⁴, Michele Bibas¹⁴, Licia Bordi¹⁴, Veronica Bordoni¹⁴, Evangelo Boumis¹⁴, Marta Branca¹⁴, Rosanna Buonomo¹⁴, Donatella Busso¹⁴, Marta Camici¹⁴, Flaminia Canichella¹⁴, Maria Rosaria Capobianchi¹⁴, Alessandro Capone¹⁴, Cinzia Caporale¹⁴, Emanuela Caraffa¹⁴, Ilaria Caravella¹⁴, Fabrizio Carletti¹⁴, Concetta Castilletti¹⁴, Adriana Cataldo¹⁴, Stefano Cerilli¹⁴, Carlotta Cerva¹⁴, Roberta Chiappini¹⁴, Pierangelo Chinello¹⁴, Maria Assunta Cianfarani¹⁴, Carmine Ciaralli¹⁴, Claudia Cimaglia¹⁴, Nicola Cinicola¹⁴, Veronica Ciotti¹⁴, Francesca Colavita¹⁴, Angela Corpolongo¹⁴, Massimo Cristofaro¹⁴, Salvatore Curiale¹⁴ Alessandra D'Abramo¹⁴, Cristina Dantimi¹⁴, Alessia De Angelis¹⁴, Giada De Angelis¹⁴, Maria Grazia De Palo¹⁴, Federico De Zottis¹⁴, Virginia Di Bari¹⁴, Rachele Di Lorenzo¹⁴, Federica Di Stefano¹⁴, Gianpiero D'Offizi¹⁴, Francesca Evangelista¹⁴, Francesca Faraglia¹⁴, Anna Farina¹⁴, Federica Ferraro¹⁴, Lorena Fiorentini¹⁴, Andrea Frustaci¹⁴, Matteo Fusetti¹⁴, Marisa Fusto¹⁴, Vincenzo Galati¹⁴, Roberta Gagliardini¹⁴, Paola Gallì¹⁴, Gabriele Garotto¹⁴, Ilaria Gaviano¹⁴, Saba Gebremeskel Tekle¹⁴, Maria Letizia Giancola¹⁴, Filippo Giansante¹⁴, Emanuela Giombini¹⁴, Guido Granata¹⁴, Maria Cristina Greci¹⁴, Elisabetta Grilli¹⁴, Susanna Grisetti¹⁴, Marta Iaconi¹⁴, Giuseppina Iannicelli¹⁴, Carlo Inversi¹⁴, Eleonora Lalle¹⁴, Maria Elena Lamanna¹⁴, Simone Lanini¹⁴, Daniele Lapa¹⁴, Luciana Lepore¹⁴, Raffaella Libertone¹⁴, Raffaella Lionetti¹⁴, Giuseppina Liuzzi¹⁴, Laura Loiacono¹⁴, Andrea Lucia¹⁴, Franco Lufrani¹⁴, Manuela Macchione¹⁴, Gaetano Maffongelli¹⁴, Alessandra Marani¹⁴, Andrea Mariano¹⁴, Maria Cristina Marini¹⁴, Micaela Maritti¹⁴, Annelisa Mastrobattista¹⁴, Ilaria Mastrorosa¹⁴, Giulia Matusali¹⁴, Valentina Mazzotta¹⁴, Paola Mencarini¹⁴, Silvia Meschi¹⁴, Francesco Messina¹⁴, Sibiana Micarelli¹⁴, Giulia Mogavero¹⁴, Annalisa Mondi¹⁴, Marzia Montalbano¹⁴, Chiara Montaldo¹⁴, Silvia Mosti¹⁴, Silvia Murachelli¹⁴, Maria Musso¹⁴, Michela Nardi¹⁴, Assunta Navarra¹⁴, Martina Nocioni¹⁴, Pasquale Noto¹⁴, Roberto Noto¹⁴, Alessandra Oliva¹⁴, Ilaria Onnis¹⁴, Sandrine Ottou¹⁴, Claudia Palazzolo¹⁴, Emanuele Pallini¹⁴, Fabrizio Palmieri¹⁴, Giulio Palombi¹⁴, Carlo Pareo¹⁴, Virgilio Passeri¹⁴, Federico Pelliccioni¹⁴, Giovanna Penna¹⁴, Antonella Petrecchia¹⁴, Ada Petrone¹⁴, Elisa Pianura¹⁴, Carmela Pinnetti¹⁴, Maria Pisciotta¹⁴,

Pierluca Piselli¹⁴, Silvia Pittalis¹⁴, Agostina Pontarelli¹⁴, Costanza Proietti¹⁴, Vincenzo Puro¹⁴, Paolo Migliorisi Ramazzini¹⁴, Alessia Rianda¹⁴, Gabriele Rinonapoli¹⁴, Silvia Rosati¹⁴, Dorotea Rubino¹⁴, Martina Rueca¹⁴, Alberto Ruggeri¹⁴, Alessandra Sacchi¹⁴, Alessandro Sampaolesi¹⁴, Francesco Sanasi¹⁴, Carmen Santagata¹⁴, Alessandra Scarabello¹⁴, Silvana Scarcia¹⁴, Paola Scognamiglio¹⁴, Laura Scorzolini¹⁴, Giulia Stazi¹⁴, Giacomo Strano¹⁴, Chiara Taibi¹⁴, Giorgia Taloni¹⁴, Tetaj Nardi¹⁴, Roberto Tonnarini¹⁴, Simone Topino¹⁴, Martina Tozzi¹⁴, Francesco Vairo¹⁴, Maria Beatrice Valli¹⁴, Laura Vincenzi¹⁴, Ubaldo Visco-Comandini¹⁴, Serena Vita¹⁴, Pietro Vittozzi¹⁴, Mauro Zaccarelli¹⁴, Antonella Zanetti¹⁴ & Sara Zito¹⁴

¹⁴National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy.