

Prevalence and characteristics of pulmonary embolism in 1042 COVID-19 patients with respiratory symptoms: A nested case-control study

Benjamin Planquette, Alice Le Berre, Lina Khider, Alexandra Yannoutsos, Nicolas Gendron, Marie de Torcy, Nassim Mohamedi, Stéphane Jouveshomme, David M. Smadja, Isabelle Lazareth, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Benjamin Planquette, Alice Le Berre, Lina Khider, Alexandra Yannoutsos, Nicolas Gendron, et al.. Prevalence and characteristics of pulmonary embolism in 1042 COVID-19 patients with respiratory symptoms: A nested case-control study. Thrombosis Research, 2021, 197, pp.94 - 99. 10.1016/j.thromres.2020.11.001. hal-03493066

HAL Id: hal-03493066 https://hal.science/hal-03493066v1

Submitted on 21 Nov 2022

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049384820305958 Manuscript_217def0c170e03992a5ac02b29fb72ab

1 Prevalence and characteristics of pulmonary embolism in 1042 COVID-19 patients with

2 respiratory symptoms: a nested case-control study.

- 3 Benjamin Planquette^{1,2,3,4,5}, Alice Le Berre^{6,7}, Lina Khider^{1,3,5,8,9}, Alexandra Yannoutsos,^{7,9,10},
- 4 Nicolas Gendron^{1,2,3,5,11}, Marie de Torcy^{4,7}, Nassim Mohamedi^{5,9}, Stéphane Jouveshomme^{4,7},
- 5 David M. Smadja^{1,2,3,5,11,12}, Isabelle Lazareth^{7,9}, Guillaume Goudot^{1,3,5,8,9}, Laure
- 6 Fournier^{1,5,6,13}, Cédric Bruel^{7,14}, Jean Luc Diehl^{1,2,3,5,14}, Jean-Jacques Mourad^{1,7,15}, Guy
- 7 Meyer^{1,4,5,12,13,16}, Pascal Priollet^{7,9}, Emmanuel Messas^{1,5,8,9,13}, Olivier Sanchez^{1,2,3,4,5,12}, Hélène
- 8 Beaussier^{7,17}, Tristan Mirault^{1,5,9,13}, Marc Zins^{6,7}, Gilles Chatelier^{1,5,16,18}, and Joseph
- 9 Emmerich^{1,7,9,10}
- 10 1. Université de Paris
- 11 2. Innovative Therapies in Haemostasis, INSERM, F-75006 Paris, France
- 12 3. Biosurgical research lab (Carpentier Foundation), F-75015 Paris, France
- 13 4. Department of Respiratory Medicine
- Assistance publique hôpitaux de Paris AH-HP, Hôpital européen Georges-Pompidou, F 75015 Paris, France
- 16 6. Department of Radiology
- 17 7. Groupe Hospitalier Paris Saint-Joseph, F-75014 Paris, France
- 18 8. Physics for Medicine Paris, INSERM U1273, ESPCI Paris, CNRS FRE 2031, F-75011
- 19 Paris, France
- 20 9. Department of Vascular Medicine
- 21 10. INSERM CRESS UMR 1153, F-75005 Paris, France
- 22 11. Department of Haematology
- 23 12. F-CRIN INNOVTE, Saint-Étienne, France
- 24 13. Paris research cardiovascular center PARCC INSERM UMR-S 970, F-75015 Paris, France
- 25 14. Intensive Care Unit
- 26 15. Department of Internal Medicine
- 27 16. INSERM CIC 14-18, F-75015 Paris, France
- 28 17. Department of Clinical Investigation
- 29 18. Department of statistics, bioinformatics and public health
- 30
- 31 Benjamin Planquette M.D., Ph.D, Alice Le Berre M.D., Lina Khider M.D, MSc, Alexandra
- 32 Yannoutsos M.D., Ph.D., Nicolas Gendron, Pharm D., Ph.D, Marie de Torcy M.D., Nassim
- 33 Mohamedi, M.D., Stéphane Jouveshomme, M.D., David Smadja Pharm D., Ph.D., Isabelle
- 34 Lazareth M.D., Guillaume Goudot, M.D., Laure Fournier, M.D., Ph.D., Cedric Bruel M.D.,
- 35 Ph.D., Jean Luc Diehl, M.D., Ph.D Jean-Jacques Mourad M.D, Ph.D; Guy Meyer, M.D.,
- 36 Ph.D., Pascal Priollet, M.D., Emmanuel Messas, M.D., Ph.D, Olivier Sanchez, M.D., Ph.D,

- 37 Hélène Beaussier Pharm D., Ph.D., Tristan Mirault M.D., Ph.D, Marc Zins M.D., Gilles
- 38 Chatellier, M.D., Ph.D., Joseph Emmerich M.D., Ph.D.

39 Corresponding author:

- 40 Dr Benjamin Planquette
- 41 Department of respiratory medicine Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, AH-HP, Hôpital
- 42 européen Georges-Pompidou, 20 rue Leblanc 75015 Paris, France
- 43 Tel: +33 156093460
- 44 Fax: +33 156093255
- 45 E-mail: benjamin.planquette@aphp.fr

46 Abstract

47 Introduction. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has been associated with 48 cardiovascular complications and coagulation disorders. Previous studies reported pulmonary 49 embolism (PE) in severe COVID-19 patients. Aim of the study was to estimate the prevalence 50 of symptomatic PE in COVID-19 patients and to identify the clinical, radiological or 51 biological characteristics associated with PE

52 Patients/Methods. We conducted a retrospective nested case-control study in 2 French 53 hospitals. Controls were matched in a 1:2 ratio on the basis of age, sex and center. PE patients 54 with COVID-19 were compared to patients in whom PE was ruled out (CTPA controls) and 55 in whom PE has not been investigated (CT controls).

56 **Results.** PE was suspected in 269 patients among 1042 COVID-19 patients, and confirmed in 57 59 patients (5.6%). Half of PE was diagnosed at COVID-19 diagnosis. PE patients did not 58 differ from CT and CTPA controls for thrombosis risk factors. PE patients more often 59 required invasive ventilation compared to CTPA controls (odds ratio (OR) 2.79; 95% 60 confidence interval (CI) 1.33–5.84) and to CT controls (OR 8.07; 95% CI 2.70–23.82). PE 61 patients exhibited more extensive parenchymal lesions (>50%) than CT controls (OR 3.90; 62 95% CI 1.54–9.94). D-dimer levels were 5.1 (95% CI 1.90–13.76) times higher in PE patients than CTPA controls. 63

64 **Conclusions**. Our results suggest a PE prevalence in COVID-19 patients close to 5% in the 65 whole population and to 20% of the clinically suspected population. PE seems to be 66 associated with more extensive lung damage and to require more frequently invasive 67 ventilation.

68 Key words

69 Pulmonary embolism, COVID-19, CTPA, D-dimer

- 70 Word count: 2901
- 71 Tables: 3

72 Introduction

73 In December 2019, China reported the first cluster of severe acute respiratory syndrome due to a new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2).¹ The disease rapidly spread into a global pandemic of 74 75 public health worldwide leading to more than 617 000 deaths (data from July 22, 2020). The 76 main failure in COVID-19 was atypical acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) because 77 of the dissociation between well-conserved lung compliance and severe hypoxemia, attributed to pulmonary vasoregulation disruption and local thrombogenesis.^{2,3} Furthermore, COVID-19 78 79 outbreak coagulopathy has been described with unusual high levels of D-dimer in a large majority of patients^{1,4-6}. High D-dimer levels, caused by both inflammation storm and 80 coagulation activation have been associated with increased mortality.^{4,5,7–9} Taking together, 81 82 these reports have led to several therapeutic proposals in terms of anticoagulant therapy from scientific societies.^{10–12} Publications recently reported thrombotic complications in series of 83 84 severe COVID-19 patients admitted in intensive care unit (ICU), but the frequency of pulmonary embolism (PE) remains uncertain.¹³⁻²⁰ 85

Earlier during the European COVID-19 outbreak, the European Society of Radiology and the European Society of Thoracic Imaging suggested to performed CT-scan in COVID-19 patients with respiratory symptoms such as dyspnea and desaturation²¹. Additional pulmonary CT angiogram (CTPA) could be performed if COVID-19 patient has symptoms susceptible to be associated with PE such as worsening of oxygen requirement and occurrence of ARDS. Hence, a nested-case control seems an appropriate methodology to compare PE patients to all COVID-19 in-patients with CT-scan requiring or not CTPA.

In the present analysis, we aimed to 1) evaluate the prevalence of PE among a large
population of all consecutive patients admitted for COVID-19 pneumonia in two centers and
identify the characteristics associated with PE in those patients by using a nested case-

- 96 control design with patients who underwent either unenhanced computed tomography (CT) or
- 97 computed tomography pulmonary angiogram (CTPA).

98

99 Methods

100 **Patients and study design**

We conducted a retrospective study that included, from March 1 to April 20, 2020, all consecutive patients with COVID-19 pneumonia who had a CT scan for diagnosis and/or evaluation of the severity of lung lesions. All patients were recorded in a database in two large university hospitals in Paris, France: Groupe Hospitalier Paris Saint-Joseph (GHPSJ) and Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou (HEGP).

Patients were included according to the following inclusion criteria: patients over 18 years of age, admitted for acute COVID-19 pneumonia and who underwent a chest CT at baseline for rapid triage assessment at the emergency room and/or in wards during their hospitalization. Diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed by a positive result of a reversetranscriptase–polymerase-chain-reaction (RT-PCR) assay and/or typical CT findings of COVID-19 pneumonia. Exclusion criteria were patient's refusal to participate and respiratory distress syndrome explained by another cause.

Patients were hospitalized in medical wards or ICU, if required, to receive usual supportive care including oxygen therapy, antibiotics, as well as prophylactic anticoagulation by lowmolecular weight heparin (enoxaparin 4000 IU) or unfractionated heparin in case of glomerular filtration rate <30 mL/min.

From this COVID-19 cohort, we selected case patients with CTPA proven PE, and we compared them to two subgroups of controls matched for age, sex and center, in whom PE had been either excluded or not suspected: 1) COVID-19 patients with a negative CTPA (CTPA controls) and 2) COVID-19 patients with unenhanced CT only (CT controls). For more detailed methods for imaging protocol, see supplementary data. The study sponsor is GHPSJ. The cohort protocol has been approved by the institutional ethics committee (IRB number IRB00012157 and registered on national institute of health data platform INDS n° MR 4516150520). The patients' non-opposition to the use of their data for research was also collected in accordance with European regulations (General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR). We followed requirement of the STROBE statement, on observational studies in epidemiology (https://www.strobe-statement.org).

128 Clinical and laboratory data

129 All data were extracted from our computed medical record (Dx-Care® MEDASYS, France) 130 by distinct investigators independently. All data were confidentially collected and coded 131 according to the local cohort IRB-approved statements. The database was frozen for statistical 132 analysis on May 20, 2020. The computed file used for this research was implemented in 133 accordance with French regulations and European regulations (GDPR). Demographic and 134 medical characteristics, including age, sex, body mass index (BMI), history of venous or 135 arterial thrombosis, tobacco use, and anticoagulant treatment at admission and before the 136 diagnosis of PE were available in medical records. During follow-up, maximal oxygen flow 137 required or the need of invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) were recorded. Time from 138 COVID-19 illness onset to hospital admission and to PE diagnosis have been recorded. 139 Patients status at the end of the inclusion period was recorded as discharged from hospital, 140 still hospitalized or deceased.

Biological parameters at admission including complete blood count, aspartate and alanine
aminotransferase (ASAT, ALAT), plasma creatinine were recorded. We report D-dimer
values in PE patients and CTPA controls, using the STA®-Liatest® D-Di (Diagnostica Stago,
Asnières, France) (GHPSJ) or the Vidas D-Dimer® assay (Biomérieux, Marcy-Etoile, France)
(HEGP). During follow-up, highest values of C-reactive protein (CRP) and fibrinogen were

also noted. Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected in universal transport medium (Xpert®
nasopharyngeal sample collection kit) at hospital admission. SARS CoV-2 was detected using
AllplexTM 2019-nCoV Assay (Seegene), a multiplex Real-time PCR assay that detects three
target genes (E gene, RdRP gene and N gene) in a single tube, as previously described.²² Only
qualitative data were available.

151 Study outcomes

The main purpose of our study was to estimate the prevalence of symptomatic PE in a large population of consecutive COVID-19 patients presenting with respiratory symptoms. Secondary objectives were to identify the clinical, radiological or biological characteristics associated with PE. We also analyzed whether or not PE was associated with a worse outcome in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. Finally, we evaluated the diagnostic performance of D-dimer for the diagnosis of PE in COVID-19 patients.

158 Statistical analysis

Cases and controls were matched in a 1:2 ratio on the basis of age, sex and center. For each patient of the PE group, a greedy-matching algorithm was used to select the control patients who most closely matched that patient in terms of the three matching factors.²³ This resulted in 2 different case-control studies. The first one compares the PE group to a control group sampled in the whole database of COVID-19 patients who had a CTPA and did not have PE (CTPA controls). The second one compares the PE group to a control group sampled in the whole database of COVID-19 patients who had an unenhanced CT-scan (CT controls).

166 Categorical variables are presented as number of patients (percentages) and quantitative 167 variables as median (interquartile range [IQR]). All percentages were calculated for available 168 data for each variable. Unadjusted conditional logistic regression analysis, which accounted 169 for the matched study design, was performed to evaluate the association of various clinical or

170 biological characteristics with the risk of having PE. Odds ratios (OR) are displayed with their 171 95% confidence intervals (CI). To evaluate the diagnostic performance of D-dimer in 172 predicting PE, receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis of D-dimer 173 concentration prior to CTPA evaluation was performed. Youden's index (calculated as 174 sensitivity + specificity -1) was chosen to obtain the optimal D-dimer threshold. Sensitivity 175 and specificity are calculated with standard formulas. The positive and negative predictive 176 values (PPV and NPV) were calculated with the Bayes' theorem with the PE prevalence 177 obtained in the whole cohort (5.6%) and in the cohort with CTPA (21.2%). Statistical 178 analyses were performed using the NCSS 2020 statistical software.

179 **Results**

180 **Population**

181 This study included a total of 1042 COVID-19 patients assessed by at least one chest CT scan 182 for respiratory symptoms (454 in GHPSJ and 588 in HEGP). During the same period 115 and 183 102 COVID-19 patients were hospitalized in GHPSJ and HEGP without CT or CTPA, 184 respectively. Among the whole 1259 COVID-19 patients, 312 (24.7%) required ICU. The 185 median age of the population was 63 years (53–79) and 59.8% were male. Among the 1042 186 COVID-19 patients, CTPA was performed in 269 (25.8%) patients for PE suspicion; 59 187 patients were diagnosed with PE (27 in GHPSJ and 32 in HEGP). The prevalence of PE in 188 this entire COVID-19 population was 5.6%. By considering only the group of 269 patients 189 who underwent CTPA, the prevalence of PE was 21.2%.

190 Median time from onset of reported COVID-19 symptoms and PE diagnosis was 15 days. 191 Twenty-eight (47.5%) PE were diagnosed on the day of admission. In 36 patients (61.0%) PE 192 was suspected because of increasing oxygen requirements, in 16 (27.1%) patients because of 193 PE symptoms such as chest pain, tachycardia or right cardiac failure and in 6 (10.2%) patients 194 because initial symptoms could not be explained by the lung parenchymal findings alone. One 195 PE was an incidental finding. History of venous thrombosis was present in 5 (8.6%) patients. 196 Active smoking was found in only 2 (3.4%) patients. Locations of the emboli were proximal 197 (pulmonary trunk or lobar artery) in 27 (45.7%) patients, segmental in 24 (40.6%) patients 198 and sub-segmental in 8 (13.6%) patients. At PE diagnosis, 32 (54.2%) patients had received 199 anticoagulant at prophylactic dose (at least one dose) and 4 (6.9%) patients at therapeutic 200 dose. Among these 59 PE patients, 25 (42.4%) were treated by IMV in ICU corresponding to 201 a PE prevalence in ICU of 8.0%

202

203 Clinical characteristics

The main clinical characteristics of PE patients and matched CTPA and CT controls are summarized in Table 1. BMI, history of venous or arterial thrombosis, were not associated with the occurrence of PE in this population. Interestingly, active smoking was uncommon in this COVID-19 population and was not associated with the occurrence of PE. Therapeutic anticoagulation and hydroxychloroquine treatment were not associated with a decreased risk of PE.

IMV was associated with an increased risk of PE with an OR of 2.79 (95% CI 1.33–5.84) compared to CTPA controls and with an OR of 8.07 (95% CI 2.70–23.82) compared to CT controls. Twelve deaths (20.3%) occurred in PE patients, as compared to 19 (16.1%) in CTPA controls (OR 1.36; 95% CI 0.53–3.14) and 14 (11.9%) in CT controls (OR 2.09; 95% CI 0.83–5.31). Only one death out of 12 was directly linked to a high risk PE in a 41 year-old woman. Excluding deceased patients, median length of hospital stay was not significantly higher in PE patients as compared to either control groups.

217

218 Radiological and biological characteristics

219 The main radiological and biological characteristics of the cases and controls are summarized 220 in Table 2. There was no difference between PE patients and the two control groups in terms 221 of CT findings suggestibility for COVID-19 on the first CT scan, with highly suggestive 222 features found in a majority of patients in all groups. PE patients exhibited more extensive 223 lesions than the CT controls (OR 3.9; 95% CI 1.54-9.94, for a parenchymal involvement 224 >50%). At admission, there was no difference among PE patients and the two control groups 225 regarding hemoglobin level, platelet count, lymphocyte count, creatinine, ASAT and ALAT 226 levels. Regarding inflammation during the hospitalization, assessed by both CRP and fibrinogen, PE diagnosis tends to be associated with increased levels of these biomarkers. The
risk of PE was significantly associated with CRP elevation (OR 3.36; 95% CI 1.58–7.14)
compared to CT controls.

230

231 **D-dimer level**

232 Among COVID-19 patients with suspected PE, the risk of being diagnosed with PE was 5.11 233 times higher in patients with D-dimer level above 2605 ng/mL (95% CI 1.90-13.76). The 234 ROC curve for D-dimer as a predictive marker for PE is shown in Supplemental figure 1. 235 According to the Youden index, the optimal D-dimer level cut-off was 1500 ng/mL (Table 3). 236 The sensitivity of the test is 76.1% and the specificity is 65.0%. With this test, in our 237 population, the NPV was 97.8% and 91.1% according to a PE prevalence of 5.6% (whole 238 population) or 21.2% (population with CTPA). On the other hand, we also assessed if a higher 239 threshold of D-dimer would have a good PPV for the diagnosis of PE. In our population of 240 1042 COVID-19 patients, thresholds of 2500 ng/mL and 3500 ng/mL, were associated with a 241 PPV of 15.9% and 20.3% respectively. In the suspected PE group (CTPA group), PPV were 242 of 45.4% and 53.3% respectively.

243 **Discussion**

244 Our study evaluates the prevalence of PE in 1042 COVID-19 patients consecutively admitted 245 in 2 large French hospitals for acute respiratory symptoms, during the main period of the 246 pandemic in France. We found a prevalence of PE of 5.6% in this large population. This rate 247 could be considered as a high prevalence of PE in such unselected population. Considering 248 that 24.7% of patients required ICU, our study highlight that PE prevalence is 3 times higher 249 than the 1.7% prevalence observed in the ICU population of the PROTECT study (dalteparin 250 versus unfractionated heparin prophylaxis of thromboembolism in critical care) that included 60% of patients for respiratory or sepsis conditions.²⁴ In a study of 198 consecutive Dutch 251 patients a similar prevalence of PE was observed $(6.6\%)^{17}$ and a prevalence of 2.8% in 388 252 Italian patients.¹⁸ Recently a French multicentric study found a prevalence of 8.3% in large 253 population of COVID-19 patients hospitalized in medical wards²⁰. 254

255 Furthermore, compared to recent prevention studies in acutely ill medical patients, the 256 prevalence of PE in our population is 10 times higher than the prevalence observed in these randomized trials, demonstrating the high thrombotic risk associated with COVID-19.25-28 257 258 Nevertheless, it remains difficult to draw definite conclusions by comparing incidence measured in randomized studies in ICU to prevalence observed in our retrospective series. In 259 260 COVID-19 patients who had CTPA performed, we found a PE prevalence of 21.2%. 261 Recently, 4 studies of less than 200 COVID-19 patients, mainly hospitalized in ICU, found a similar prevalence of PE between 13.5% and 30%.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Interestingly, almost half of the PE 262 263 episodes were diagnosed at hospital admission as previously described¹⁸, suggesting that PE 264 should be suspected at COVID-19 diagnosis in patients with respiratory symptoms. Furthermore, for hospitalized patients PE occurred despite the fact that patients received 265 266 prophylactic anticoagulation, either with regular or higher doses, as physicians were aware of the higher thrombotic risk in this population. The protective effect of hydroxychloroquine on 267

thrombotic events in systemic lupus erythematosus was not observed in our COVID-19
 population.²⁹

We did not find a higher prevalence for VTE risk factors in PE patients compared to both control groups. IMV was strongly associated with the occurrence of PE, compared to both control groups. The association remains true considering high flow oxygen therapy (≥ 6 L/min) compared to lower flow oxygen therapy. Therefore, PE patients seemed more severe than controls.

Interestingly and in accordance with another report³⁰, the mortality did not differs between
groups suggesting that PE does not impact patient's survival in this COVID-19 population.

277 Patients with PE tended to have a higher CRP than patients in the 2 control groups and to 278 present more extensive COVID-19 lung damages. Those findings have been related to a more severe COVID-19 associated coagulopathy.¹⁰ Two other French studies showed that PE was 279 more frequent in ICU COVID-19 patients when compared to ARDS non-COVID-19 280 patients¹⁶ or patients with influenza infection.¹⁴ Finally, our data are concordant with the 281 hypothesis of a specific effect of the SARS-CoV-2 infection in thrombosis and inflammation. 282 283 A recent autopsy study demonstrated a high incidence of thromboembolic events associated 284 with COVID-19 coagulopathy (58%), but histology also demonstrated microvascular thrombosis.³¹ Clinical and pathology studies demonstrated endothelial injury³² associated with 285 286 intracellular SARS-CoV-2 infection, widespread microangiopathy of alveolar capillaries and 287 angiogenesis, features that appeared different from influenza A (H1N1) infection.³³ 288 Furthermore, recently, our team showed that therapeutic anticoagulation at admission could prevent COVID-19-associated endothelial injury.⁶ 289

290 Previous reports^{1,4,8,7,5,6} have shown that D-dimer levels are increased during COVID-19291 associated coagulopathy and higher D-dimer levels at admission are associated with VTE

during follow-up.¹⁷ The use of high D-dimer thresholds, such as 3500 ng/mL, is not effective enough to diagnose PE or initiate therapeutic anticoagulation, as we showed that the D-dimer positive predictive value in patients with suspected PE was only 50%. As previously published D-dimer are increased in pneumonia and associated with radiologic pneumonia extension³⁴ Furthermore, in patients diagnosed with community-acquired pneumonia, Ddimers where more elevated in patients with high probability PE³⁵.

298 Our study results suggest that D-dimer measurement has a poor performance for PE diagnosis 299 that should be only driven by CTPA or V/Q lung scan use as suggested by the recent ISTH guidance³⁶. The main limitation of this strategy is the prevalence of renal impairment³⁷ and 300 the risk of contrast-induced nephropathy in COVID-19 patients especially in ICU. 301 302 Considering that PE could be frequently suspected at COVID-19 diagnosis or when 303 respiratory condition gets worse, majority of patients would require CTPA. A specific clinical 304 probability score, a specific D-dimer threshold or an adjusted strategy pending damage lung 305 extent could help in reducing CTPA use in COVID-19 patients

306 Our study has a few limitations. First this is a retrospective series due to the emergency of the 307 health crisis. Second outcomes analysis may be biased because some patients were still 308 hospitalized at the time of data collection and other patients were transferred to other 309 hospitals. Thus, it may lead to immortal time bias, potentially affecting the PE prevalence. 310 Finally, screening for PE is mainly dependent on the decision to perform CTPA i.e. for 311 clinical suspicion of PE and in patients with worsening of oxygen dependence or acute 312 degradation of hemodynamic status. But, as the practice of CTPA investigations was not pre-313 defined according to specific criteria but left to the appreciations of the different clinicians in 314 charge of the patients; obviously more severe patients received CTPA. To circumvent this 315 potential limitation, we performed a nested case-control study in our large population of 1042

- 316 patients with COVID-19 acute respiratory syndrome. On the contrary, the fact that only one
- 317 quarter of the studied population had a CTPA probably underestimates the rate of PE.

318 **Conclusion**

Our study results suggest a PE prevalence in COVID-19 patients close to 5% in the whole population and to 20% of the clinically suspected population. D-dimer could be an interesting tool in the diagnostic strategy of PE as long as the threshold is adjusted to the COVID-19 associated coagulopathy. Further prospective studies are necessary to confirm the thresholds of D-dimer analyzed here, and to alert physicians on the high risk of PE in this setting.

324 Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge all nurses, technicians and physicians involved in the Vascular medicine, Radiology, Internal medicine, Respiratory medicine, Intensive care and Hematology departments of GHPSJ and HEGP for their help in taking care of patients and including them in the study. We thank Andréanne Durivage for the English editing.

329 References.

- Guan W, Ni Z, Hu Y, *et al.* Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in
 China. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**: 1708–20.
- Marini JJ, Gattinoni L. Management of COVID-19 Respiratory Distress. *JAMA* 2020;
 published online April 24. DOI:10.1001/jama.2020.6825.
- 334 3 Diehl J-L, Peron N, Chocron R, *et al.* Respiratory mechanics and gas exchanges in the
 a hypothesis-generating study. *Ann Intensive Care* 2020; 10: 95.
- 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;
 395: 1054–62.
- 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* 2020;
 18: 844–7.
- Khider L, Gendron N, Goudot G, *et al.* Curative anticoagulation prevents endothelial
 lesion in COVID-19 patients. *J Thromb Haemost JTH* 2020; published online June 18.
 DOI:10.1111/jth.14968.
- Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, *et al.* Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With
 2019 Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 2020; **323**: 1061.
- 348 8 Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, *et al.* Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with
 349 coronavirus disease 2019: retrospective study. *BMJ* 2020; **368**: m1091.
- Han H, Yang L, Liu R, *et al.* Prominent changes in blood coagulation of patients with
 SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2020; 58: 1116–20.
- 10 Thachil J, Tang N, Gando S, *et al.* ISTH interim guidance on recognition and management of coagulopathy in COVID-19. *J Thromb Haemost* 2020; **18**: 1023–6.
- Bikdeli B, Madhavan MV, Jimenez D, *et al.* COVID-19 and Thrombotic or
 Thromboembolic Disease: Implications for Prevention, Antithrombotic Therapy, and
 Follow-Up: JACC State-of-the-Art Review. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2020; **75**: 2950–73.
- Khider L, Soudet S, Laneelle D, *et al.* Proposal of the French Society of Vascular
 Medicine for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of venous thromboembolic disease
 in outpatients with COVID-19. *J Med Vasc* 2020; 45: 210–3.
- Leonard-Lorant I, Delabranche X, Severac F, *et al.* Acute Pulmonary Embolism in
 COVID-19 Patients on CT Angiography and Relationship to D-Dimer Levels. *Radiology* 2020; : 201561; Apr 23, 2020 (Epub ahead of print).

14 Poissy J, Goutay J, Caplan M, *et al.* Pulmonary Embolism in COVID-19 Patients:
364 Awareness of an Increased Prevalence. *Circulation* 2020; : Apr 24, 2020 (Epub ahead of
365 print).

- Klok FA, Kruip MJHA, van der Meer NJM, *et al.* Confirmation of the high cumulative
 incidence of thrombotic complications in critically ill ICU patients with COVID-19: An
 updated analysis. *Thromb Res* 2020; : Apr 30, 2020 (Epub ahead of print).
- Helms J, Tacquard C, Severac F, *et al.* High risk of thrombosis in patients with severe
 SARS-CoV-2 infection: a multicenter prospective cohort study. *Intensive Care Med* 2020; : 1–10; May 4, 2020 (Epub ahead of print).
- Middeldorp S, Coppens M, van Haaps TF, *et al.* Incidence of venous thromboembolism
 in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *J Thromb Haemost JTH* 2020; : May 05, 2020
 (Epub ahead of print).
- Lodigiani C, Iapichino G, Carenzo L, *et al.* Venous and arterial thromboembolic
 complications in COVID-19 patients admitted to an academic hospital in Milan, Italy.
 Thromb Res 2020; **191**: 9–14.
- Llitjos J-F, Leclerc M, Chochois C, *et al.* High incidence of venous thromboembolic
 events in anticoagulated severe COVID-19 patients. *J Thromb Haemost JTH* 2020; : Apr
 22, 2020 (Epub ahead of print).
- Fauvel C, Weizman O, Trimaille A, *et al.* Pulmonary embolism in COVID-19 patients: a
 French multicentre cohort study. *Eur Heart J* 2020; published online July 13.
 DOI:10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa500.
- Revel M-P, Parkar AP, Prosch H, *et al.* COVID-19 patients and the radiology
 department advice from the European Society of Radiology (ESR) and the European
 Society of Thoracic Imaging (ESTI). *Eur Radiol* 2020; published online April 20.
 DOI:10.1007/s00330-020-06865-y.
- 22 Péré H, Podglajen I, Wack M, *et al.* Nasal Swab Sampling for SARS-CoV-2: a
 289 Convenient Alternative in Times of Nasopharyngeal Swab Shortage. *J Clin Microbiol*2020; 58: May 26, 2020 (Epub ahead of print).
- 391 23 Gu XS, Rosenbaum PR. Comparison of Multivariate Matching Methods: Structures,
 392 Distances, and Algorithms. *J Comput Graph Stat* 1993; 2: 405–20.
- PROTECT Investigators for the Canadian Critical Care Trials Group and the Australian
 and New Zealand Intensive Care Society Clinical Trials Group, Cook D, Meade M, *et al.*Dalteparin versus unfractionated heparin in critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2011;
 364: 1305–14.
- Hull RD, Schellong SM, Tapson VF, *et al.* Extended-duration venous thromboembolism
 prophylaxis in acutely ill medical patients with recently reduced mobility: a randomized
 trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2010; **153**: 8–18.
- 400 26 Goldhaber SZ, Leizorovicz A, Kakkar AK, *et al.* Apixaban versus Enoxaparin for
 401 Thromboprophylaxis in Medically III Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2011; **365**: 2167–77.
- 402 27 Cohen AT, Spiro TE, Büller HR, *et al.* Rivaroxaban for Thromboprophylaxis in Acutely
 403 Ill Medical Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2013; **368**: 513–23.

- 28 Cohen AT, Harrington RA, Goldhaber SZ, *et al.* Extended Thromboprophylaxis with
 Betrixaban in Acutely III Medical Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2016; **375**: 534–44.
- 406 29 Petri M. Use of Hydroxychloroquine to Prevent Thrombosis in Systemic Lupus
 407 Erythematosus and in Antiphospholipid Antibody–Positive Patients. *Curr Rheumatol*408 *Rep* 2011; 13: 77–80.
- 409 30 Poyiadji N, Cormier P, Patel PY, *et al.* Acute Pulmonary Embolism and COVID-19.
 410 *Radiology* 2020; : 201955.
- 411 31 Wichmann D, Sperhake J-P, Lütgehetmann M, *et al.* Autopsy Findings and Venous
 412 Thromboembolism in Patients With COVID-19. *Ann Intern Med* 2020; : May 06, 2020
 413 (Epub ahead of print).
- Smadja DM, Guerin CL, Chocron R, *et al.* Angiopoietin-2 as a marker of endothelial
 activation is a good predictor factor for intensive care unit admission of COVID-19
 patients. *Angiogenesis* 2020; published online May 27. DOI:10.1007/s10456-020-097300.
- 418 33 Ackermann M, Verleden SE, Kuehnel M, *et al.* Pulmonary Vascular Endothelialitis,
 419 Thrombosis, and Angiogenesis in Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020; : May 21, 2020 (Epub
 420 ahead of print).
- 421 34 Querol-Ribelles JM, Tenias JM, Grau E, *et al.* Plasma d-dimer levels correlate with 422 outcomes in patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *Chest* 2004; **126**: 1087–92.
- 423 35 Castro DJ, Pérez-Rodríguez E, Montaner L, Flores J, Nuevo GD. Diagnostic value of D
 424 dimer in pulmonary embolism and pneumonia. *Respir Int Rev Thorac Dis* 2001; 68:
 425 371–5.
- 36 Spyropoulos AC, Levy JH, Ageno W, *et al.* Scientific and Standardization Committee
 427 Communication: Clinical Guidance on the Diagnosis, Prevention and Treatment of
 428 Venous Thromboembolism in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19. *J Thromb Haemost*429 *JTH* 2020; published online May 27. DOI:10.1111/jth.14929.
- 430 37 Cheng Y, Luo R, Wang K, *et al.* Kidney disease is associated with in-hospital death of 431 patients with COVID-19. *Kidney Int* 2020; **97**: 829–38.
- 432

433

Tables and figure

435Table 1. Clinical characteristics of the COVID-19 study patients

| Characteristic | PE patients CTPA controls | | CT controls | OD (05%, CI)a | OR (05% CI)b | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Characteristic | (n = 59) | (n = 118) | (n = 118) | UK (95 % CI)* | UN (95% UI)" | |
| Age (years) | 63 (53–79) | 65 (54–78) | 63 (53–78) | _ | _ | |
| Male | 33 (55.9) | 68 (58.1) | 66 (55.9) | _ | _ | |
| BMI (kg/m²) | 27.8 (24.4– 31.9) | 26.6 (23.8–29.6) | 25.1 (22.1–29.1) | 1.39 (0.60– 3.21) | 1.66 (0.60–4.59) | |
| BMI ≥30 kg/m² | 16 (34.4) | 20 (24.4) | 12 (10.2) | 2.02 (0.84– 4.90) | 1.61 (0.64-4.05) | |
| History of venous thrombosis (PE/DVT) | 5 (8.6) | 13 (11.2) | 7 (6.1) | 0.72 (0.23– 2.26) | 1.48 (0.44-4.95) | |
| Cancer | 3 (5.1) | 16 (13.6) | 14 (12.0) | 0.34 (0.01– 1.23) | 0.37 (0.10–1.40) | |
| History of arterial thrombosis | 6 (10.5) | 22 (19.1) | 25 (22.3) | 0.38 (0.12– 1.17) | 0.36 (0.13–1.02) | |
| Hypertension | 22 (37.2) | 54 (45.8) | 55 (46.6) | 0.7 (0.35–1.39) | 0.61 (0.28–1.31) | |
| Atrial fibrillation | 2 (3.4) | 8 (6.8) | 9 (7.9) | 0.50 (0.11– 2.35) | 0.41 (0.09–2.02) | |
| Active smoking | 2 (3.5) | 7 (6.6) | 11 (10.2) | 0.52 (0.11– 2.53) | 0.32 (0.07–1.60) | |
| Time from illness onset to PE diagnosis (days) | 15 (11–20) | - | - | — | — | |
| Time from admission to PE diagnosis (days) | 1 (0-8) | _ | — | — | — | |
| Oxygen–support category ^c | | | | | | |
| Invasive mechanical ventilation | 25 (42.4) | 25 (24.0) | 12 (12.5) | - | - | |
| High–flow oxygen (≥6 L/min) | 16 (27.1) | 33 (31.7) | 18 (18.8) | - | - | |
| Low–flow oxygen (<6 L/min) or room air | 18 (30.5) | 46 (44.3) | 66 (68.7) | — | — | |
| Invasive mechanical ventilation versus none | _ | _ | _ | 2.79 (1.33– 5.84) | 8.07 (2.73– 23.82) | |
| High-flow oxygen versus Low-flow oxygen or room air | _ | _ | _ | 1.46 (0.55– 3.91) | 2.91 (1.09–7.73) | |
| Treatment | | | | | | |

| Hydroxychloroquine ^d | 16 (28.1) | 33 (28.7) | 30 (26.8) | 0.97 (0.46– 2.08) | 1.11 (0.46–2.66) |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------------|
| Prophylactic anticoagulation | 32 (55.2) | 39 (33.6) | 44 (39.6) | 0.38 (0.12- 1.22) | 1.31 (0.31–5.57) |
| Therapeutic anticoagulation ^d | 4 (6.9) | 18 (15.5) | 6 (5.4) | 0.39 (0.12– 1.20) | 1.32 (0.31–5.57) |
| Outcome | | | | | |
| Hospital length of stay before discharge alive (days) | 12 (3–18) | 8 (2–15) | 5 (2–10) | 1.06 (0.32– 3.44) | 2.00 (0.72-5.59) |
| Death | 12 (20.3) | 19 (16.1) | 14 (11.9) | 1.36 (0.59– 3.14) | 2.09 (0.83-5.31) |

436 Continuous parameters are reported as median (IQR) and data expressed as *n* (%). All percentages were calculated for available data for each

437 variable. ^aPE patients versus CTPA controls; ^bPE patients versus CT controls; ^cHigher oxygen-support category during hospital stay. ^dbefore PE

438 diagnosis in PE patients. BMI = body mass index; PE = pulmonary embolism; DVT deep vein thrombosis; CTPA = computed tomography

439 pulmonary angiogram; CT = unenhanced computed tomography; OR = odds ratio.

Table 2. Radiologic and biological characteristics of the COVID-19 study patients

| | PE patients | CTPA controls | CT controls | OR (95% CI) ^a | OR (95% CD ^b | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | (n = 59) | (n = 118) | (n = 118) | | | |
| Radiologic characteristic | | | | | | |
| Findings of COVID-19 on the first chest CT | | | | | | |
| performed | | | | | | |
| Non suggestive | 4 (6.8) | 11 (9.3) | 7 (5.9) | ref | ref | |
| Indeterminate | 10 (16.9) | 40 (33.9) | 47 (39.8) | 0.79 (0.21–2.95) | 0.30 (0.07–1.33) | |
| Highly suggestive | 45 (76.3) | 67 (56.8) | 64 (54.3) | 3.33 (0.83– 13.34) | 1.41 (0.30–6.54) | |
| Extent of lung damage on the first chest CT | | | | | | |
| performed | | | | | | |
| <10% (limited) | 9 (15.2) | 19 (16.1) | 29 (24.6) | ref | ref | |
| 10–50% (mild or moderate) | 23 (39.0) | 66 (55.9) | 70 (59.3) | 0.78 (0.29–2.14) | 1.07 (0.44–2.58) | |
| >50% (severe or diffuse) | 27 (45.8) | 27 (45.8) 33 (28.0) 19 (16.1) | | 1.82 (0.63-5.23) | 3.90 (1.54–9.94) | |
| Location of PE | | | | | | |
| Pulmonary trunk | 12 (20.0) | - | _ | _ | - | |
| Lobar artery | 15 (25.5) | _ | — | _ | - | |
| Segmental artery | 24 (41.0) | _ | — | — | - | |
| Sub–segmental artery | 8 (13.5) | _ | — | — | - | |
| Biological characteristic | | | | | | |
| D-dimers ^c (ng/mL) | 2605 (1436–7333) | 1237 (885–2075) | _ | 5.11 (1.90- | - | |
| | | | | 13.76) | | |
| Fibrinogen ^d (g/L) | 6.6 (4.6–7.7) | 5.6 (4.9–7.0) | 5.45 (4.7-6.58) | 1.59 (0.71–3.55) | 2.20 (0.87–5.57) | |
| CRP^{d} (mg/L) | 136 (56–244) | 100 (30–158) | 88 (25–131) | 1.66 (0.84–3.27) | 3.36 (1.58–7.14) | |
| Hemoglobin ^e (g/dL) | 13.2 (11.9–14.2) | 13.3 (11.8–14.4) | 13.3 (12.3–14.5) | 0.70 (0.35–1.39) | 0.76 (0.40–1.43) | |
| Platelet count ^e (G/L) | 227 (175–310) | 213 (148–288) | 201 (160-257) | 1.27 (0.65–2.48) | 1.36 (0.69–2.68) | |
| Lymphocyte count ^e (M/L) | 895 (697–1342) | 860 (597–1242) | 865 (662–1220) | 1.55 (0.80-2.99) | 1.46 (0.67–3.16) | |
| Creatinine ^e (µmol/L) | 75 (60–90) | 77 (61–99) | 76 (61–94) | 0.77 (0.40–1.48) | 0.86 (0.42–1.75) | |
| ASAT ^e (IU/L) | 49 (33–79) | 48 (33–71) | 40 (28–57) | 1.15 (0.58-2.28) | 1.71 (0.86–3.41) | |
| ALAT ^e (IU/L) | 31 (22–59) | 30 (18–60) | 27 (17–49) | 1.20 (0.58–2.46) | 1.42 (0.68–2.99) | |

- 441 Continuous parameters are reported as median (IQR) and data expressed as n (%). All percentages were calculated for available data for each
- 442 variable. ^aPE patients versus CTPA controls; ^bPE patients versus CT controls; ^cbefore CTPA assessment. ^dhigher level during hospitalisation.
- ⁴⁴³ ^elevel at admission PE = pulmonary embolism; CTPA = computed tomography pulmonary angiogram ; CT = unenhanced computed tomography;
- 444 OR = odds ratio.

445 Table 3. Sensitivity and specificity of several D-dimer thresholds in PE-diagnosis in

| | | | | | | PE prevalence in COVID-19 patients ^a | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------------------------------------------------|------|-------|------|--|
| | PE | | | | | 5.6% | | 21.2% | | |
| | D-dimer ≥500 ng/mL | | | | | | | | | |
| | Confirmed | Excluded | Total | Se | Sp | NPV | PPV | NPV | PPV | |
| ≥500 | 46 | 91 | 137 | 100.0 | | | | | | |
| <500 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 100.0 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 22.8 | |
| Total | 46 | 100 | 146 | | | | | | | |
| D-dimer ≥1500 ng/mL ^b | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Confirmed | Excluded | Total | Se | Sp | NPV | PPV | NPV | PPV | |
| ≥1500 | 35 | 35 | 70 | | | | | | | |
| <1500 | 11 | 65 | 76 | 76.1 | 65.0 | 97.8 | 11.6 | 91.1 | 36.6 | |
| Total | 46 | 100 | 146 | | | | | | | |
| | D-dimer ≥2500 ng/mL | | | | | | | | | |
| | Confirmed | Excluded | Total | Se | Sp | NPV | PPV | NPV | PPV | |
| ≥2500 | 23 | 16 | 39 | | | | | | | |
| <2500 | 23 | 84 | 107 | 50.0 | 84.0 | 96.5 | 15.9 | 86.3 | 45.4 | |
| Total | 46 | 100 | 146 | | | | | | | |
| | D-dimer ≥3500 ng/mL | | | | | | | | | |
| | Confirmed | Excluded | Total | Se | Sp | NPV | PPV | NPV | PPV | |
| ≥3500 | 20 | 10 | 30 | | | | | | | |
| <3500 | 26 | 90 | 116 | 43.5 | 90.0 | 96.4 | 20.3 | 85.6 | 53.3 | |
| Total | 46 | 100 | 146 | | <u> </u> | | | | | |

446 **COVID-19 patients with respiratory symptoms.**

⁴⁴⁷ ^aTwo prevalences were tested considering prevalence of PE in our cohort (5.6%) and
⁴⁴⁸ prevalence of PE in patients for whom it has been suspected (21.2%); ^bOptimal D-dimer
⁴⁴⁹ according to the ROC curve. PE = pulmonary embolism; Se = sensitivity; Sp = specificity;
⁴⁵⁰ NPV = negative predictive value; PPV = positive predictive value.