



**HAL**  
open science

## **Outpatient management or hospitalization of patients with proven or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection: the HOME-CoV rule**

Delphine Douillet, Rafael Mahieu, Violette Boiveau, Yves-Marie Vandamme, Aurore Armand, François Morin, Dominique Savary, Vincent Dubée, Cédric Annweiler, Pierre-Marie Roy

### ► To cite this version:

Delphine Douillet, Rafael Mahieu, Violette Boiveau, Yves-Marie Vandamme, Aurore Armand, et al.. Outpatient management or hospitalization of patients with proven or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection: the HOME-CoV rule. *Internal and Emergency Medicine*, 2020, 15 (8), pp.1525-1531. <10.1007/s11739-020-02483-0>. <hal-02964159>

**HAL Id: hal-02964159**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02964159v1>**

Submitted on 9 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

**Title:** Outpatient management or hospitalization of patients with proven or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection: The HOME-CoV rule.

**Authors' affiliations:**

Douillet D<sup>a,b</sup>, Mahieu R<sup>c,d</sup>, Boiveau V.<sup>a</sup>, Vandamme Y.-M.<sup>c</sup>, Armand A.<sup>a</sup>, Morin F.<sup>a</sup>, Savary D.<sup>a,e</sup>, Dubée V.<sup>c,d</sup>, Annweiler C.<sup>f,g</sup>, P.-M. Roy<sup>a,b</sup> on behalf of HOME-CoV expert group.

<sup>a</sup> Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.

<sup>b</sup> UMR (CNRS 6015 - INSERM 1083) et Institut MitoVasc, Université d'Angers, Angers, France.

<sup>c</sup> Department of infectious disease, CHU Angers, Université d'Angers, Angers, France.

<sup>d</sup> CRCINA, Inserm, Université de Nantes, Nantes, France

<sup>e</sup> EHESP, Irset, Inserm, UMR S1085, CAPTV CDC, Université Rennes, Rennes, France.

<sup>f</sup> Geriatric Department, CHU Angers, France.

<sup>g</sup> Robarts Research Institute, Department of Medical Biophysics, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, the University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada.

**Keywords:** covid-19; hospitalization; outpatient; Delphi method; expert consensus, rule-based decision-making.

**Corresponding Author :** Delphine Douillet, Département de Médecine d'Urgences. Centre Hospitalier Universitaire d'Angers, 4 rue Larrey 49100 ANGERS, France. Tel + 33 2 41 35 36 37 - E-mail address: [Delphine.Douillet@chu-angers.fr](mailto:Delphine.Douillet@chu-angers.fr)

**Authors' contribution statement:**

DD and PMR have designed the study. DD, RM, and PMR elaborated the initial list but did not take part in the Delphi consensus. CA, VB, YMV, and AA were part of the first expert group that compiled the first list of criteria. DD, RM and PMR were moderators of the Delphi method and collected the data. All the authors (except DD, RM, and PMR) were part of the group of experts and contributed greatly to the quality of this work through their valuable comments. DD, RM, and PMR drafted the manuscript and all authors contributed substantially to its revision. DD, RM, and PMR take responsibility for the paper as a whole.

## ABSTRACT

1  
2  
3 In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and overloaded hospitals, a central issue is the need to define reliable  
4 and consensual criteria for hospitalization or outpatient management in mild cases of COVID-19. Our aim was to  
5 define an easy-to-use clinical rule aiming to help emergency physicians in hospitalization or outpatient  
6 management decision-making for patients with suspected or confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (the HOME-CoV  
7 Rule). The Delphi method was used to reach a consensus of a large panel of 51 experts: emergency physicians,  
8 geriatricians, infectious disease specialists, and ethical consultants. A preliminary list of eligible criteria was  
9 compiled based on a literature review. Four rounds of anonymized expert consultations were performed. The  
10 experts were asked to score each item as relevant, possibly relevant and non-relevant, as major or minor, and to  
11 choose the cut-off. They were also able make suggestions and remarks. Eight criteria constituting the HOME-CoV  
12 were selected: six correspond to the severity of clinical signs, one to the clinical course (clinically significant  
13 worsening within the last 24 hours), and the last corresponds to the association of a severe comorbidity and an  
14 inadequate living context. Hospitalization is deemed necessary if a patient meets one or more of the criteria. In the  
15 end, 94.4% of the experts agreed with the defined rule. Thanks to the Delphi method, an absolute consensus was  
16 obtained of a large panel of experts on the HOME-CoV rule, a decision-making support mechanism for clinicians  
17 to target patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 requiring hospitalization.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 **Trial registration:** NCT04338841  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Introduction

1  
2 The novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) has spread worldwide and the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)  
3  
4 is responsible of more than 2,5 million cases globally (04/23/2020) [1]. The classification of COVID-  
5  
6 19 as a pandemic by the World Health Organization on 11 March 2020 alerted every country-specific  
7  
8 health care system to the need for an urgent response to the requirements and challenges of this  
9  
10 unprecedented situation. Because the spectrum of forms of the disease varies from asymptomatic to  
11  
12 severe, public health systems have been mobilized at all levels [2]. Most cases during the outbreak of  
13  
14 COVID-19 in China were reported by the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)  
15  
16 team in a large cohort of 72,314 patients and 81% were classified as mild (non-pneumonia and mild  
17  
18 pneumonia) and 14% were severe [3]. There is growing concern that the healthcare system, and intensive  
19  
20 care units (ICU) and emergency departments (ED) in particular, will not be able to cope with the scale  
21  
22 of the outbreak. Many models have predicted demand would rapidly exceed hospital capacities in most  
23  
24 countries [4–6]. The excessive hospitalization of patients with only mild symptoms may lead to  
25  
26 overloaded hospitals. In this context, the decision between hospitalization or outpatient management in  
27  
28 cases of mild COVID-19 in ED is crucial.  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 In pneumonia patients or in patients with sepsis, many risk assessment score matrices and decision-  
34  
35 making tools, such as the Pulmonary Severity Index (PSI), CRB 65, CURB65, sequential organ failure  
36  
37 assessment (SOFA) and quick sequential organ failure assessment (qSOFA), exist to identify low-risk  
38  
39 patients [7–10]. However, most of them cannot be used to quickly identify low-risk patients in ED  
40  
41 because they incorporate biological or imaging parameters (PSI, CURB-65, SOFA). In addition, they  
42  
43 do not integrate all pragmatic elements that are taken into account in an orientation decision such as  
44  
45 decompensated comorbidity or inability to take medication or inadequate follow-up care once the patient  
46  
47 has been discharged.  
48  
49

50  
51 Our aim was to define an easy-to-use clinical rule aiming to help emergency physicians decide between  
52  
53 hospitalization or outpatient management for patients with suspected or confirmed SARS-CoV-2  
54  
55 infection (the HOME-CoV Rule: **H**ospitalization or **O**utpatient **M**anag**E**ment of patients with SARS-  
56  
57 **CoV**-2 infection).  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Methods

A Delphi method was used to develop a list of items that will constitute the HOME-CoV rule. In short, the Delphi method consists of a multiple-round questionnaire sent to a panel of experts who, through participating in a series of rounds, collectively identify relevant candidate items [11]. After each round, the experts are given results of the group trends and are asked to reconsider their initial opinion for items with low agreements (<75%) in the light of these trends. A consensus for decision making is usually obtained by four rounds. We used an electronic survey through the built-in tools GoogleForms® website with the aim to finish the process in less than two weeks.

### Preliminary phase

The main investigators (DD, RM and PMR) began by reviewing the literature on the characteristics of COVID-19 patients at high risk of progression to a severe illness. Because of the limited published data, pre-print studies were also considered. A preliminary list of pre-existing conditions and clinical characteristics associated with a greater risk of disease progression to a severe illness was defined by the study's scientific committee composed of 7 experts in emergency medicine, infectious diseases, geriatrics, and ethics. The preliminary list included 10 clinical and disease course criteria, 22 comorbidities and treatments, and 3 living conditions (table 1).

### Delphi Panel

An invitation to participate to the Delphi method was sent to 64 French and Belgian physicians working in ED, infectious diseases departments, ICU and geriatric medicine and two experts in ethics. They were selected according to their clinical experience in rule-based decision-making and their interest in the field of COVID-19. The main investigators were not included in the panel of experts for the subsequent Delphi method questionnaire. The experts were asked to respond to each item in regard to the purpose of the HOME-CoV rule.

### Data collection

1 The four-round Delphi method took place between April 4 and April 16, 2020. Experts were asked to  
2 rate each criterion for its relevance (relevant, possibly relevant, non-relevant), for the best cut-off value  
3  
4 (1 to 4 proposed cut-off value if applicable) and for its level of significance (major or minor criteria)  
5  
6 (table 1). One major criterion or two combined minor criteria will require hospitalization.  
7

8 For the first round, a questionnaire was sent through an electronic survey with the preliminary list of  
9  
10 criteria selected by the scientific committee. The experts were asked to score each item into 3 categories  
11  
12 of relevance (relevant, possibly relevant, and non-relevant) and 2 categories of significance (major or  
13  
14 minor). For non-binary items (ordinal or continuous variables), the experts had to select a “cut-off value”  
15  
16 among 1 to 4 proposals sourced from research literature. They could also propose additional criteria or  
17  
18 other cut-off values and make anonymous comments. The duration of each round was 72 hours with an  
19  
20 electronic reminder every 24 hours. The results were analyzed by the main investigators, with details of  
21  
22 the experts who made suggestions or comments anonymized. At the end of the first and the second  
23  
24 rounds, items considered as relevant with a strong agreement between experts ( $\geq 75\%$ ) were selected and  
25  
26 incorporated in the rule. Items considered as non-relevant or facultative by 75% of the experts were  
27  
28 excluded. The same rule was applied to consider each item as major or minor and to define the cut-off.  
29  
30 Values that achieved an agreement  $\geq 75\%$  were selected. Criteria that did not fulfill these conditions  
31  
32 were subjected to the next round. On the basis of the comments of the experts, the main investigators  
33  
34 proposed some groupings and/or clarifications and submitted them to the experts again.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In the second round, the experts were asked to reconsider their opinions and to score the new proposals  
41  
42 taking into account the results of the last step, the group trends, and the anonymized comments of the  
43  
44 others.  
45

46 In the third round, the option “possibly relevant” was removed as well as the cut-off value with the  
47  
48 lowest agreement for those items concerned. The experts were so asked to make a choice between only  
49  
50 two options for the remaining criteria: relevant or non-relevant; major or minor; cut-off 1 or cut-off 2.  
51  
52

53 Finally, in the last round, the experts were asked to validate or reject the overall criteria constituting the  
54  
55 HOME-CoV rule.  
56

## 57 **Ethics**

58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2 This research project is part of an important trial that obtained approval from the *Comité de Protection*  
3 *des Personnes Ouest IV – Nantes* on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020 (36/20\_2). The sponsor of the study is CHU  
4 d'Angers (Angers University Hospital), Delegation for Clinical Research and Innovation. Approval for  
5 this study was obtained from all participants who gave their written informed consent.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **Results**

12  
13 Among the 64 who were approached to participate, 51 experts agreed (80%). Among them, 47 experts  
14 participated in the first and the second rounds (92%), 42 (82%) in the third, and 37 (72.5%) in the fourth  
15 round of the Delphi method.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 In the first round, among the 35 items of the preliminary list, seven items were classified as relevant (i.e.  
21 respiratory rate, peripheral capillary oxygen saturation, ability to speak, blood pressure, consciousness  
22 or confusion, home follow-up impossible, and clinically significant worsening within 24 hours). Twelve  
23 items were rejected. Details, and particularly those pertaining to the classification as major or minor and  
24 the cut-off values, are mentioned (Supplementary Table 1).  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 In the second round, 18 unclassified items were proposed to the experts and 3 more items were classified  
30 as relevant (i.e. chronic severe respiratory disease, inappropriate dwelling in which containment is  
31 complicated, and lack of support person), and 3 items were rejected (Supplementary Table 2).  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 In the third round all remaining items were classified: 3 as relevant (i.e. severe cognitive disorder,  
37 chronic heart failure, and immunodepression); and 1 was rejected. Grouping severe comorbidity and  
38 inadequate living conditions together in one criterion was proposed. Severe comorbidity includes severe  
39 chronic respiratory disease (unstable asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) stage III  
40 or IV, and respiratory failure with continuous oxygen therapy), chronic heart failure (NYHA $\geq$ III), severe  
41 cognitive disorder, or immunodepression (primary immunodeficiency, uncontrolled HIV,  
42 immunosuppressive drug, or chemotherapy). Inadequate living conditions include inappropriate  
43 dwelling (homeless, frail relative at home, long term care institution), lack of support person (family  
44 member or friend), or home follow-up impossible (Supplementary Table 3).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

59 The final rule includes 8 criteria: 6 items correspond to clinical signs of severity, 1 to the disease course  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

and the last 1 to the association of a severe comorbidity and an inappropriate living condition. (table 2).

The presence of one or more criteria should lead the physician to consider hospitalization.

In the last round, the final HOME-CoV rule was submitted to the experts and achieved an agreement of 94.4% of the experts (n=34/36).

## Discussion

Using a Delphi method, the panel of 51 experts designed the HOME-CoV rule based on 8 clinical criteria to help physicians decide between hospitalizing patients with mild COVID-19 symptoms or treating them as outpatients. Hospitalization is deemed necessary if a patient with COVID-19 meets one or more criteria consisting of 6 major clinical signs, has experienced clinically significant worsening within the last 24 hours, or has a severe comorbidity and inadequate living conditions. Conversely, when no criteria of the rule are met, outpatient management should be considered. For example, a 54-year-old man presenting to the ED with symptoms consistent with COVID-19 (ageusia, myalgia, and fever) and unable to speak or to count without taking a breath more than 6 seconds should need hospitalization. A 78-year-old woman with chronic heart failure (NYHA III) presenting mild dyspnea but no desaturation or other clinical signs of severity and who lives with her husband in a reassuring environment can be treated on an outpatient basis with instructions on warning signs to watch.

Due to the rapid spread of the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, no high-grade recommendation is yet available for management of COVID-19 patients. Most guidelines are based on expert opinion with a very low certainty of evidence. Almost all suggest that the decision to manage a patient as an inpatient or an outpatient should be made on a case-by-case basis or recommend applying a triage tool all the while without specifying which one to use [12–14]. SOFA score on admission, age, gender, d-dimer, serum lactate dehydrogenase, C-reactive protein level, the coefficient of variation of red blood cell distribution width, lymphocyte count, blood urea nitrogen, direct bilirubin, albumin, and quantitative evaluation on CT scan have all been associated with severe forms of COVID-19 and mortality [3, 15–19]. However, these risk factors were identified in cohorts of patients with COVID-19 who had been hospitalized and none of them has been evaluated to guide the management of suspected COVID-19 patients on admission in the ED. Moreover, like most previous risk assessment scores for sepsis or

1 pneumonia incorporating biological or imaging parameters, they cannot be used to quickly identify low-  
2 risk patients in ED [7–9].  
3

4 The best methodology for developing a decision rule is to perform multivariate logistic regression on a  
5 derivation important cohort of patients and to validate the rule in another important cohort. This was not  
6 possible for our purpose in lack of large data basis of COVID-19 patients including patients hospitalized  
7 as well as patients managed at home. The Delphi method is widely used to provide an expert consensus  
8 based on available data and expert experiences through a multiple-round questionnaire [20]. This  
9 method is recommended when scientific data are limited. For example, it has been previously used for  
10 building SEPSIS-3 consensus, for the definition of appropriate management of outpatient parenteral  
11 antimicrobial therapy, and for elaborating a consensual definition of de-escalation of beta-lactams [21–  
12 23]. The use of an Internet-based version of the Delphi process allowed us to complete the fourth round  
13 in less than two weeks. This “electronic Delphi” method was motivated by the sanitary context of  
14 containment and the urgent need for COVID-19 management guidelines while allowing for the  
15 recruitment of a large panel of experts. Despite the exceptional sanitary situation, the high level of  
16 participation and the almost absolute expert consensus on the final rule (94.4%) are a pledge of quality  
17 and may assure a high level of acceptance of this guideline by physicians.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The HOME-CoV rule incorporates 6 major clinical signs, 3 concerning respiratory status, 2  
36 hemodynamic status, and one neurological status. Most of them were taken into account in previous  
37 severity rules for sepsis and/or pneumonia (respiratory rate, pulse oxygen saturation, systolic blood  
38 pressure, heart rate, confusion, or impaired consciousness). Nevertheless, the cut-offs were debated  
39 between experts. Most of the time, the consensus was reached on an attitude that should be adopted with  
40 care with the aim to apply the rule as a guide for the majority of patients but not as an absolute decision-  
41 making rule. For example, SpO<sub>2</sub> at 94% in ambient air is a severity criterion for a young person without  
42 comorbidity but may be a usual feature for an old person or a patient with chronic respiratory disease.  
43 The cut-off for the respiratory rate decided upon ( $\geq 25$ /min) may appear as a mid-mid choice in  
44 comparison to other rules [7,9,21]. However, it corresponds to the value found in the epidemiological  
45 study of COVID-19 patients in China [17]. The ability to talk or to count without breathing is a less  
46 common criterion but currently used in the unformal assessment of dyspneic patients [24,25]. By  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

defining 8 seconds as the time cut-off, the HOME-CoV rule proposes a standardization of this criterion.

From the outset, the experts considered a clinically significant worsening within the last 24 hours to be a major criterion. This criterion may appear, at least partly, subjective. However, the clinical course of COVID-19 may be a good indicator of the short-term risk of complication, as rapid progressions to severe hypoxemia have been observed [26].

The HOME-CoV rule may be an important help decision making for physicians. Faced with a lack of reliable criteria and recommendations, physicians use their individual gestalt perception to decide whom to hospitalize or to manage as an outpatient. However, gestalt evaluation is associated with a great variability among physicians and an overestimation of patients' short-term risk of adverse outcome [27, 28]. In the specific field of the COVID-19 pandemic, gestalt accuracy may be even lower than expected in other circumstances and hospitalizing patients when there is "any concern for rapid deterioration or an inability to return promptly to hospital" may underestimate the number of patients who can be managed at home and lead to hospitals becoming overcrowded. Indeed, among 1,099 patients hospitalized in China for COVID-19, 6.1% required mechanical ventilation and 41.3% needed oxygen therapy, indicating that a significant proportion would not have required specific in-hospital care [2]. In cases of pneumonia, the use of a clinical prediction rule has been proven to improve the identification of low-risk patients, to increase the rate of patients managed at home, and to reduce costs of medical care [27, 28]. At least the same benefit could be expected as a result of deploying the HOME-CoV rule in ED. This rule could be also useful for general practitioners and physicians in older nursing home.

Nevertheless, our study has some limitations. Most of the experts consulted were French and their personal experiences in COVID-19 management were recent and varied. The rule does not apply to patients with rare and/or very specific comorbidity or in specific clinical situations. It does not take into account some criteria that appear, in recent data, to be death risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection, such as obesity, diabetes, and hypertension [29–30]. Indeed, the real direct impact of these factors is still unknown, as there has still been no large-scale international epidemiological study providing multivariate analysis of all possible risk factors. The decision of the expert panel may facilitate the deployment of the rule in many countries and for other viral pneumonia. Finally, in the absence of systematic screening, the rule may only apply to symptomatic patients for whom the search for infection

1 has been carried out in the ED or prior to admission, and not to all asymptomatic patients or those  
2 without suggestive symptoms.  
3  
4  
5

6 The HOME-CoV rule achieved by a Delphi method provides an easy-to-use clinical tool for physicians  
7  
8 in deciding between hospitalization or outpatient management for patients with suspected or confirmed  
9  
10 SARS-CoV-2 infection.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 **Declaration of interests**

17 We declare no conflicts of interest.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **HOME-CoV scientific committee and expert group**

- 24 - Andrianjafy H., Emergency Department, GH Nord-Essonne, Longjumeau, France.
- 25 - Annweiler C., Geriatric Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- 26 - Armand A., Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- 27 - Baudin L., Emergency Department, CH Cholet, Cholet, France.
- 28 - Bekhir L., Emergency Department, Cliniques universitaires saint Luc, Bruxelles, Belgium.
- 29 - Benezit F., Department of infectious disease, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France.
- 30 - Benhammouda K., Emergency Department, CH Colmar, Colmar, France.
- 31 - Bissolokele P., Emergency Department, CH Libourne, Libourne, France.
- 32 - Blanchi S., Department of infectious disease, CH Le Mans, Le Mans, France.
- 33 - Boiveau V., Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- 34 - Bouillier K., Department of infectious disease, CHU Besançon, Besançon, France.
- 35 - Bouillon J.-B., Emergency Department, CHU Clermont Ferrand, Clermont Ferrand, France.
- 36 - Brice C., Emergency Department, CH Saint Briec, Saint Briec, France.
- 37 - Brunel A.-S., Department of infectious disease, CHU Besançon, Besançon, France.
- 38 - Cayeux C., Emergency Department, CH Remiremont, Remiremont, France.
- 39 - Cazenave B., Department of infectious disease, GHT Yvelines-Nord, Saint Germain en Laye, France.
- 40 - Chauvin A., Emergency Department, APHP – Hôpital Lariboisière, Paris, France.
- 41 - Claessens YE., Emergency Department, Princess Grace Hospital, Monte Carlo, Monaco.
- 42 - Cormier H., Department of infectious disease, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- 43 - Coustilleres F., Department of infectious disease, CHU Tours, Tours, France.
- 44 - Crochette N., Department of infectious disease, CH Le Mans, Le Mans, France.
- 45 - Dall Acqua D., Emergency Department, CH Vichy, Vichy, France.
- 46 - Douillet D., Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- 47 - Dupriez F., Emergency Department, Cliniques universitaires saint Luc, Bruxelles, Belgium.
- 48 - Friou E., Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- 49 - Gangloff C., Emergency Department, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France.
- 50 - Gennai S., Emergency Department, CHU Reims, Reims, France.
- 51 - Joly L.-M., Emergency Department, CHU Rouen, Rouen, France.
- 52 - Karam H.-H., Emergency Department, CHU Limoges, Limoges, France.
- 53 - Le Bot A., Department of infectious disease, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France.
- 54 - Lemaignan A., Department of infectious disease, CHU Tours, Tours, France.
- 55 - Leroy A., Emergency Department, CH Troyes, Troyes, France.
- 56 - Mahieu R., Department of infectious disease, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- 57 - Marchant N., Emergency Department, CH Alpes Lemant, Contamine sur Avre, France.
- 58 - Marjanovic N., Emergency Department, CHU Poitiers, Poitiers, France.
- 59 - Montassier E., Emergency Department, CHU Nantes, Nantes, France.
- 60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- Morin F., Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- Pasquier J., Department of infectious disease, CHU Martinique, Martinique, France.
- Patrat Delon S., Department of infectious disease, CHU Rennes, Rennes, France.
- Penalozza Baeza A., Emergency Department, Cliniques universitaires saint Luc, Bruxelles, Belgium.
- Plantefevre G., Emergency Department, CH Argenteuil, Argenteuil, France.
- Roy P.-M., Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- Sanderink D., Department of infectious disease, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- Savary D., Emergency Department, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- Schmidt J., Emergency Department, CHU Clermont Ferrand, Clermont Ferrand, France.
- Schotte T., Emergency Department, CH Le Mans, Le Mans, France.
- Soulie C., Emergency Department, CH Cholet, Cholet, France.
- Tchangai-Kao S., Department of infectious disease, CH Saint Nazaire, Saint Nazaire, France.
- Thiebaud P.-C., Emergency Department, APHP-Hôpital Saint Antoine, Paris, France.
- Timsit E., Emergency Department, CHU Dijon, Dijon, France.
- Trabattoni E., Emergency Department, APHP – Hôpital saint Joseph, Paris, France.
- Turmel J.-M., Department of infectious disease, CHU Martinique, Martinique, France.
- Vandamme Y.-M., Department of infectious disease, CHU Angers, Angers, France.
- Violeau M., Emergency Department, CH Niort, Niort, France.
- Yombi J.-C., Department of infectious disease, Cliniques universitaires saint Luc, Bruxelles, Belgium.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Table 1. Preliminary list of criteria				
Criteria	Threshold value			
<b>Clinical characteristics and disease course</b>				
Respiratory rate	≥ 22/min	≥ 25/min	≥ 30/min	
Peripheral oxygen saturation	≤ 90%	≤ 92%	≤ 94%	
Ability to talk without stopping for a breath	< 5 sec	< 8 sec	< 10 sec	
Blood pressure	Systolic BP ≤ 100mmHg	Systolic BP ≤ 90mmHg	Systolic BP<90mmHg & diastolic BP ≤ 60mmHg	
Heart rate	≥ 110 bpm	≥ 120 bpm	≥ 125 bpm	
Confusion or impaired consciousness	NA			
Hypothermia	≤ 35°C	≤ 36°C		
Hyperthermia	≥ 39°C	≥ 40°C	≥ 41°C	
Clinically significant worsening within the last 24 hours.	NA			
Days from the onset of initial symptoms and admission between 7 days to 10 days	-	-	-	-
<b>Comorbidities</b>				
Age	≥ 65 y*	≥ 70 y*	≥ 75 y*	≥ 80 y*
Body Mass Index	≥ 30kg/m <sup>2</sup>	≥ 35kg/m <sup>2</sup>	≥ 40kg/m <sup>2</sup>	
Cognitive disorder	mild	moderate	severe	-
COPD	Any stage	Stage III/IV	-	-
Respiratory failure with continuous oxygen therapy	-	-	-	-
Asthma	Any stage	Controlled with systemic glucocorticoid therapy	unstable	-
Chronic renal failure	Moderate (GFR<60 mL/min)	Severe (DFG< 30ml/min)	Terminal	dialysis
Cirrhosis	Any stage	Stage Child B or C	Stage Child C	-
Chronic heart failure	Any stage	NYHA ≥ III	-	-
Arterial hypertension	-	-	-	-
Diabetes	-	-	-	-
Neuro-vascular disease	-	-	-	-
Coronary artery disease	-	-	-	-
Personal history of VTE†	-	-	-	-
Neoplasia	History of cancer	Active cancer	Cancer receiving chemotherapy	-
Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)	History of HIV	Uncontrolled HIV	-	-
Primary immunodeficiency	-	-	-	-
Pregnancy	Any term	3rd trimester	-	-
ACE inhibitor or ARB	-	-	-	-
Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug	-	-	-	-
Systemic glucocorticoid therapy	Any dosage	Dosage > 10 mg/d		
Immunosuppressive drug	-	-	-	-
<b>Living conditions</b>				
Inappropriate dwelling (homeless, frail relative at home, long-term care institution)	-	-	-	-
Lack of support person (family member or friend)	-	-	-	-
Home follow-up impossible (no general practitioner, telephone contact not possible, etc.)	-	-	-	-

\*y : years

†VTE: Venous Thrombo-Embolism

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

Table 2. HOME-CoV rule

Respiratory rate $\geq 25$ /min
Pulse oxygen saturation $\leq 94\%$ in ambient air
Ability to talk without breathing $< 8$ sec
Systolic blood pressure $\leq 90$ mmHg
Heart rate $\geq 120$ beats/min
Confusion or impaired consciousness
Clinically significant worsening within the last 24 hours
Severe comorbidity* AND inadequate living conditions†

\* Severe chronic respiratory disease (unstable asthma, COPD stage III or IV, respiratory failure with continuous oxygen therapy), chronic heart failure (NYHA  $\geq$  III), severe cognitive disorder, or immunodepression (primary immunodeficiency, uncontrolled HIV, immunosuppressive drug, chemotherapy)

† Inappropriate dwelling (homeless, frail relative at home, long term care institution), lack of support person (family member or friend), or home follow-up impossible.

## REFERENCES

1. WHO situation reports. Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) situation reports. Available at: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports>. Accessed 17 April 2020.
2. Guan W-J, Ni Z-Y, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2002032
3. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* **2020**; doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2648
4. Massonnaud C, Roux J, Crépey P. COVID-19: Forecasting short term hospital needs in France. *medRxiv* **2020**; :2020.03.16.20036939. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.16.20036939>
5. Remuzzi A, Remuzzi G. COVID-19 and Italy: what next? *Lancet* **2020**; [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30627-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30627-9)
6. Gilbert M, Pullano G, Pinotti F, et al. Preparedness and vulnerability of African countries against importations of COVID-19: a modelling study. *Lancet* **2020**; 395:871–877. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30411-6
7. Fine MJ, Auble TE, Yealy DM, et al. A prediction rule to identify low-risk patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* **1997**; 336:243–250. DOI:10.1056/NEJM199701233360402
8. Marti C, Garin N, Groscurin O, et al. Prediction of severe community-acquired pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care* **2012**; 16:R141. doi:10.1186/cc11447
9. Aujesky D, Auble TE, Yealy DM, et al. Prospective comparison of three validated prediction rules for prognosis in community-acquired pneumonia. *Am J Med* **2005**; 118:384–392. DOI: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.01.006
10. Vincent JL, Moreno R, Takala J, et al. The SOFA (Sepsis-related Organ Failure Assessment) score to describe organ dysfunction/failure. On behalf of the Working Group on Sepsis-Related Problems of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Intensive Care Med* **1996**; 22:707–710. doi: 10.1007/BF01709751
11. Kötter T, Blozik E, Scherer M. Methods for the guideline-based development of quality indicators--a systematic review. *Implement Sci* **2012**; 7:21. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-21.
12. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Treatment and Management of Patients with COVID-19. Available at: <https://www.idsociety.org/practice-guideline/covid-19-guideline-treatment-and-management/>. Accessed 17 April 2020.
13. Canada PHA of. Clinical Management of Patients with Moderate to Severe COVID-19 - Interim Guidance. 2020. Available at: <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/clinical-management-covid-19.html>. Accessed 17 April 2020.
14. CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). 2020. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html>. Accessed 21 April 2020.
15. Ji D, Zhang D, Xu J, et al. Prediction for Progression Risk in Patients with COVID-19 Pneumonia: the CALL Score. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa414
16. Gong J, Ou J, Qiu X, et al. A Tool to Early Predict Severe Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) : A Multicenter Study using the Risk Nomogram in Wuhan and Guangdong, China. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa443.
17. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* **2020**; [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30566-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3)
18. Mo P, Xing Y, Xiao Y, et al. Clinical characteristics of refractory COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa270
19. Li K, Fang Y, Li W, et al. CT image visual quantitative evaluation and clinical classification of coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *Eur Radiol* **2020**; <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-020-06817-6>
20. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, et al. Defining consensus: a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* **2014**; 67:401–409. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.12.002.
21. Singer M, Deutschman CS, Seymour CW, et al. The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3). *JAMA* **2016**; 315:801–810. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.0287
22. Berrevoets MAH, Ten Oever J, Oerlemans AJM, Kullberg BJ, Hulscher ME, Schouten JA. Quality Indicators for Appropriate Outpatient Parenteral Antimicrobial Therapy in Adults: A Systematic Review and RAND-modified Delphi Procedure. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; 70:1075–1082. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz362.
23. Weiss E, Zahar J-R, Lesprit P, et al. Elaboration of a consensual definition of de-escalation allowing a ranking of  $\beta$ -lactams. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **2015**; 21:649.e1–10. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2015.03.013
24. Reddel HK, FitzGerald JM, Bateman ED, et al. GINA 2019: a fundamental change in asthma

management: Treatment of asthma with short-acting bronchodilators alone is no longer recommended for adults and adolescents. *Eur Respir J* **2019**; 53. doi: 10.1183/13993003.01046-2019

25. Chorin E, Padegimas A, Havakuk O, et al. Assessment of Respiratory Distress by the Roth Score. *Clin Cardiol* **2016**; 39:636–639. doi: 10.1002/clc.22586

26. Lescure F-X, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, et al. Clinical and virological data of the first cases of COVID-19 in Europe: a case series. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2020**; [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30200-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30200-0)

27. Poses RM, McClish DK, Bekes C, Scott WE, Morley JN. Ego bias, reverse ego bias, and physicians' prognostic. *Crit Care Med* **1991**; 19:1533–1539. doi: 10.1097/00003246-199112000-00016

28. Fine MJ, Hough LJ, Medsger AR, et al. The hospital admission decision for patients with community-acquired pneumonia. Results from the pneumonia Patient Outcomes Research Team cohort study. *Arch Intern Med* **1997**; 157:36–44.

29. Simonnet A, Chetboun M, Poissy J, et al. High prevalence of obesity in severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) requiring invasive mechanical ventilation. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* **2020**; doi: 10.1002/oby.22831

30. Guo W, Li M, Dong Y, et al. Diabetes is a risk factor for the progression and prognosis of COVID-19. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* **2020**; :e3319. doi: 10.1002/dmrr.3319.