



HAL
open science

Phenotypic Heterogeneity of Fulminant COVID-19–Related Myocarditis in Adults

Petra Barhoum, Marc Pineton de Chambrun, Karim Dorgham, Mathieu Kerneis, Sonia Burrel, Paul Quentric, Christophe Parizot, Juliette Chommeloux, Nicolas Bréchet, Quentin Moyon, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Petra Barhoum, Marc Pineton de Chambrun, Karim Dorgham, Mathieu Kerneis, Sonia Burrel, et al.. Phenotypic Heterogeneity of Fulminant COVID-19–Related Myocarditis in Adults. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 2022, 80 (4), pp.299-312. 10.1016/j.jacc.2022.04.056 . hal-03783443

HAL Id: hal-03783443

<https://hal.science/hal-03783443>

Submitted on 22 Sep 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.

1 **TITLE:** Phenotypic Heterogeneity of Fulminant COVID-19-Related Myocarditis in Adults

2

3 **BRIEF TITLE:** Types of Myocarditis Related to COVID-19

4

5 **AUTHORS:** Petra Barhoum^{a§}, MD; Marc Pineton de Chambrun^{a,b,c,d§}, MD, MSc; Karim

6 Dorgham^d, PhD; Mathieu Kerneis^{b,e}, MD, PhD; Sonia Burrel^f, PharmD, PhD; Paul

7 Quentric^{c,d}, MD, MSc; Christophe Parizot^d, PhD; Juliette Chommeloux^a, MD; Nicolas

8 Bréchet^a, MD, PhD; Quentin Moyon^{a,c}, MD; Guillaume Lebreton^g, MD, PhD; Samia

9 Boussouar^h, MD; Matthieu Schmidt^{a,b}, MD, PhD; Hans Yssel^d, PhD; Lucie Lefevre^a, MD;

10 Makoto Miyara^d, MD, PhD; Jean-Luc Charuel^d, PharmD; Stéphane Marot^f, MD; Anne-

11 Geneviève Marcelin^f, MD, PhD; Charles-Edouard Luyt^{a,b}, MD, PhD ; Pascal Leprince^g, MD,

12 PhD; Zahir Amoura^c, MD, MSc; Gilles Montalescot^{b,e}, MD, PhD; Alban Redheuil^h, MD,

13 PhD; Alain Combes^{a,b}, MD, PhD; Guy Gorochov^{d‡}, MD, PhD; Guillaume Hékimian^{a‡}, MD.

14

15 ^aSorbonne Université, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Hôpital La Pitié-

16 Salpêtrière, Service de Médecine Intensive Réanimation, Paris, France

17 ^bSorbonne Université, Inserm, UMRS_1166-ICAN, Institut de Cardiométabolisme et

18 Nutrition (ICAN), Paris, France

19 ^cSorbonne Université, AP-HP, Hôpital La Pitié-Salpêtrière, Institut E3M, Service de

20 Médecine Interne 2; Centre de Référence National Lupus Systémique, Syndrome des

21 Anticorps Anti-phospholipides et Autres Maladies Auto-Immunes Systémiques Rares, Paris,

22 France

23 ^dSorbonne Université, Inserm, Centre d'Immunologie et des Maladies Infectieuses (CIMI-

24 Paris), and AP-HP, Hôpital La Pitié-Salpêtrière, Département d'Immunologie, 47-83,

25 boulevard de l'Hôpital, Paris, France

1 ^eSorbonne Université, AP-HP, Hôpital La Pitié-Salpêtrière, ACTION Study Group,

2 Département de Cardiologie, Paris, France

3 ^fSorbonne Université, Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP),

4 INSERM U1136 and AP-HP, Hôpital La Pitié-Salpêtrière, Service de Virologie, Paris, France

5 ^gSorbonne Université, AP-HP, Hôpital La Pitié-Salpêtrière, Service de Chirurgie Cardio-

6 Thoracique, Paris, France

7 ^hSorbonne Université, APHP, Hôpital La Pitié-Salpêtrière, Unité d'Imagerie Cardiovasculaire

8 et Thoracique (ICT), Paris, France

9

10 §These authors contributed equally: PB and MPdC

11 ‡These authors jointly coordinated the study: GH and GG

12

13 **Correspondance to:**

14 - Pr Guy Gorochov, Inserm, Centre d'Immunologie et des Maladies Infectieuses (CIMI-

15 Paris), and AP-HP, Hôpital La Pitié-Salpêtrière, Département d'Immunologie, 47-83,

16 boulevard de l'Hôpital, Paris, FranceE-mail: guy.gorochov@sorbonne-universite.fr

17 - or to Dr. Guillaume Hékimian, Service de Médecine Intensive Réanimation, Institute

18 of Cardiology, Groupe Hospitalier La Pitié-Salpêtrière, 47-83 bd de l'Hôpital, 75651

19 Paris Cedex 13, France. Tel: + 33 1 42 16 38 28. guillaume.hekimian@aphp.fr

20

21

22 **WORD COUNT: 2993/5000; ABSTRACT WORD COUNT: 247/250; CONDENSED**

23 **ABSTRACT WORD COUNT: 98/100**

24 **TABLES: 4+1; FIGURES: 2; REFERENCES: 41**

25

1 **FUNDING:** This study was supported by the Fondation de France, “Tous unis contre le
2 virus” framework Alliance (Fondation de France, AP-HP, Institut Pasteur) in collaboration
3 with Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR Flash COVID19 program), by the SARS-CoV-
4 2 Program of the Faculty of Medicine from Sorbonne University ICOViD programs, by the
5 Programme Hospitalier de Recherche Clinique PHRC-20-0375 COVID-19 (PI: G.G.).
6 MPdC was supported for this study by a grant from: la Société Française Nationale de
7 Médecine Interne (SNFMI-2021).

8

9 **DISCLOSURES:**

- 10 - MPdC received a research grant from Octopharma and received lecture fee from Sanofi
11 - AC received grants and personal fees from Maquet, Xenios and Baxter outside the
12 submitted work.
13 - GM reported research grants from Abbott, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer
14 Ingelheim, Boston Scientific, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Cell Prothera, CSL Behring, Europa,
15 Idorsia, IRIS-Servier, Medtronic, MSD, Novartis, Pfizer, Quantum Genomics, Sanofi-
16 Aventis
17 - MK received research grants from Fédération Française de Cardiologie, French Ministry
18 of Health, and consulting fees from Bayer, Sanofi and Kiniksa
19 - The remaining authors have nothing to disclose.

20

21 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:**

22 This study was supported by the Fondation de France, “Tous unis contre le virus” framework
23 Alliance (Fondation de France, AP-HP, Institut Pasteur) in collaboration with Agence
24 Nationale de la Recherche (ANR Flash COVID19 program), by the SARS-CoV-2 Program of

1 the Faculty of Medicine from Sorbonne University ICOViD programs, by the Programme
2 Hospitalier de Recherche Clinique PHRC-20-0375 COVID-19 (PI: G.G.).
3 MPdC was supported for this study by a grant from: la Société Française Nationale de
4 Médecine Interne (SNFMI-2021).

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **BACKGROUND:** Adults who have been infected with SARS-CoV-2 can develop a
3 multisystem inflammatory syndrome (MIS-A), including fulminant myocarditis. Yet, several
4 patients fail to meet MIS-A criteria, suggesting the existence of distinct phenotypes in
5 fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis.

6 **OBJECTIVE:** To compare the characteristics and clinical outcome between patients with
7 fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis fulfilling MIS-A criteria (MIS-A⁺) or not (MIS-A⁻).

8 **METHODS:** A monocentric retrospective analysis of consecutive fulminant COVID-19-
9 related myocarditis in a 26-bed ICU.

10 **RESULTS:** Between March 2020 and June 2021, 38 patients required ICU admission (male:
11 66%; mean age: 32±15 years) for suspected fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis. In-ICU
12 treatment for organ failures included dobutamine 79%, norepinephrine 60%, mechanical
13 ventilation 50%, VA-ECMO 42% and renal replacement therapy 29%. In-hospital mortality
14 was 13%. Twenty-five (66%) patients met the MIS-A criteria. MIS-A⁻ compared to MIS-A⁺
15 patients were characterized by a shorter delay between COVID-19 symptoms onset and
16 myocarditis, a lower left ventricle ejection fraction, a higher rate of in-ICU organ failure, and
17 were more likely to require mechanical circulatory support with VA-ECMO (92% versus
18 16%, $p < 0.0001$). In-hospital mortality was higher in MIS-A⁻ patients (31% vs. 4%). MIS-A⁺
19 had higher circulating levels of IL-22, IL-17 and TNF- α whereas MIS-A⁻ had higher IFN- $\alpha 2$
20 and IL-8 levels. RNA-polymerase-III autoantibodies were present in 7/13 (54%) of MIS-A⁻
21 but in none MIS-A⁺ patients.

22 **CONCLUSION:** MIS-A⁺ and MIS-A⁻ fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis patients
23 have 2 distinct phenotypes with different clinical presentations, prognosis and immunological
24 profiles. Differentiating these 2 phenotypes is relevant for patients' management and further
25 understanding of their pathophysiology.

1 **CONDENSED ABSTRACT:**

2 The multisystem inflammatory syndrome accounts for a large proportion of COVID-19-
3 related myocarditis in adults (MIS-A). We compared the characteristics of fulminant COVID-
4 19-related myocarditis (n=38) between patients fulfilling MIS-A criteria (MIS-A⁺) or not
5 (MIS-A⁻). As compared to MIS-A⁺ (n=25), MIS-A⁻ patients (n=13) had a shorter delay
6 between first COVID-19 symptoms and myocarditis, a lower LVEF, higher in-ICU organ
7 failure, need for mechanical circulatory support and in-hospital mortality. Immunological
8 profiles were different in the 2 groups: MIS-A⁺ had high levels of IL-22, IL-17 and TNF- α ,
9 while MIS-A⁻ high IFN- α 2 and IL-8 levels and a high frequency of RNA-polymerase-III
10 autoantibodies (54%).

11

12 **KEY WORDS:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; Fulminant Myocarditis; VA-ECMO;
13 Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome; RNA polymerase III autoantibodies; Cytokines

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **ABBREVIATIONS:**

2 COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease 2019

3 Ig: immunoglobulin

4 IFN: Interferon

5 IL: Interleukin

6 MIS: multisystem inflammatory syndrome

7 N: SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein

8 S: SARS-CoV-2 spike protein

9 RBD: Receptor Binding Domain

10 SARS-CoV-2: Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2

11 TNF- α : Tumor Necrosis Factor- α

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

INTRODUCTION

COVID-19-related myocarditis has been reported since the beginning of SARS-CoV-2 outbreak(1–6). Fulminant myocarditis is a rare but life-threatening form of myocarditis leading to significant morbidity and mortality especially in young patients(7). Firstly described in children(8) and subsequently in adults(9), the multisystem inflammatory syndrome (MIS-C or MIS-A, respectively) accounts for a large proportion of COVID-19-related myocarditis. The United States (US) Center for Disease Control and Prevention has developed case definition criteria to standardize its diagnosis(10). Yet, some patients do not meet these criteria suggesting the existence of distinct phenotypes in COVID-19-related myocarditis. We conducted a study to compare the clinical, biological and immunological characteristics of patients with fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis meeting or not meeting MIS-A criteria.

METHODS

Patients and controls

We retrospectively reviewed the database of our 26-bed ICU between March 2020 and June 2021, and included all patients admitted for clinically suspected myocarditis with proven SARS-CoV-2 infection. Clinically suspected myocarditis was then adjudicated as definite or probable myocarditis according to the definition by Bonaca *et al.*(11) (see **Supplementary Materials**) following clinical investigations. Proven SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed by positive RT-PCR in either nasopharyngeal aspirate, lower airway respiratory samples or serum and/or positive serology showing the presence of circulating anti-N or anti-S-RBD antibodies, in patients not vaccinated against COVID-19. All laboratory analyses are performed as the standard of care in the myocarditis work-up of our institution. In addition,

1 healthy SARS-CoV-2-negative individuals (n=10) were included as controls for cytokine
2 measurements.

3

4

5 **Data collection**

6 The following information was collected on standardized forms: epidemiologic
7 parameters; severity of underlying condition according to the McCabe & Jackson criteria;
8 medical history; COVID-19 infection history, manifestations and complications; MIS-A
9 criteria (**see Supplementary Materials**); day-0 Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA)
10 score and Simplified Acute Physiology Score (SAPS) II; day-0 and in-ICU clinical and
11 biological parameters; day-0 and in-ICU organ-failure support treatment; day-0, in-ICU and
12 last-follow-up echocardiography parameters; in-ICU cytokine profiling; in-ICU SARS-CoV-2
13 and myocarditis-specific treatment; in-ICU and follow-up CT-scan and cardiac magnetic
14 resonance imaging (CMR); complications; vital status at ICU and hospital discharge, as well
15 as at last follow-up.

16

17 **SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and serological analyses**

18 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 was carried out by RT-PCR in clinical specimens, using
19 Cobas®6800 SARS-CoV-2 Test-Roche Diagnostics (Roche Diagnostic, Meylan, France) and
20 serological detection of IgG anti-N and IgG anti-S SARS-CoV-2 was performed by ELISA on
21 the Abbott platform (Abbott Diagnostics, Rungis, France) in accordance with the
22 manufacturer's specifications.

23

24 **Cytokine measurement**

1 Whole blood was collected in anticoagulant-free tubes, serum was separated by
2 centrifugation and stored at -80°C . Serum concentrations of IL-1 β , IL-4, IL-5, IL-6, IL-8, IL-
3 10, IL-12p70, IL-22, IFN- γ , and TNF- α were measured on a Quanterix® SP-X™ imaging and
4 analysis platform using the Human CorPlex Cytokine Panel Array kit (Quanterix, Lexington,
5 MA, USA). Single-plex bead-based ultrasensitive immunodetection of IL-17A and IFN- α was
6 performed by digital ELISA using the Simoa™ (single molecule array) HD-1 analyzer
7 (Quanterix), according to the manufacturer's instructions. Serum IFN- β levels were quantified
8 using a highly sensitive ELISA kit (PBL Assay Science, Piscataway, NJ, USA), according to
9 the manufacturer's instructions. Serum cytokine concentrations were interpolated from the
10 correspondent calibration curve taking into account the dilution factor. All cytokine
11 concentrations were expressed in pg/mL. Samples with non-detectable values or those above
12 the detection range were replaced by the limit of detection value (LOD) and the upper limit of
13 quantification (ULOQ), respectively.

14

15 **Anti-IFN- α and RNA-polymerase-III autoantibodies**

16 Auto-antibodies against IFN- α were quantified using the anti-IFN- α Antibody Human
17 ELISA Kit (Thermo Fisher, Invitrogen), according to the manufacturer's instructions.
18 Calibrators were run in duplicate and fit with a 4-parameter logistic (4PL) regression. The
19 concentration of anti-IFN- α antibodies in samples was interpolated from the calibration curve
20 by multiplying the obtained values with the dilution factor. The positivity threshold was 15
21 ng/mL. For RNA-polymerase-III autoantibodies screening, an indirect immunofluorescence
22 assay was run on HEp-2000 cells (Immuno Concepts, Sacramento, CA, USA). When positive
23 ($\geq 1/80$) and when the immunofluorescence labeling pattern was evocative of RNA-
24 polymerase III autoantibodies (fine-speckled nuclear-labeling pattern with small dots), a
25 confirmatory immunodot assay (Euroline Systemic Sclerosis Test, Bio Advance, Bussy Saint-

1 Martin, France) was carried out.

2

3 **Statistical analyses**

4 Continuous variables are expressed as median [interquartile range] and compared with
5 Wilcoxon's signed-rank tests. Categorical variables are expressed as number (percent) and
6 compared with χ^2 tests or Fisher's exact tests. Cumulative probabilities of survival were
7 calculated using Kaplan-Meier method and compared with Log-Rank tests. A two-tailed p-
8 value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analyses were computed with StatView
9 v5.0 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) and IBM SPSS Statistics v22.0 software (IBM Corp, Armonk,
10 NY). Unsupervised principal component analysis (PCA) was performed using R v3.6.2 with
11 the FactoExtra and FactoMineR functions, on z-scaled log₁₀-transformed cytokine
12 concentrations. Samples with missing data were excluded from the PCA analysis for one
13 MIS-A⁺ and two MIS-A⁻ patients).

14

15 **Ethical considerations**

16 This study was conducted in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki using the
17 database registered at the Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés (CNIL,
18 registration no. 1950673). In agreement with the ethical standards of our hospital's
19 institutional review board, the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects and French
20 law, written informed consent was not needed for demographic, physiological and hospital-
21 outcome data analysis, because this observational study does not modify existing diagnostic
22 or therapeutic strategies; however, patients and/or their relatives were informed of their
23 anonymous inclusion in the study.

24

25 **RESULTS**

1 **General Patients characteristics**

2 Between March 2020 and June 2021, 38 patients requiring ICU admission for
3 clinically suspected fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis were included in this study.
4 They were mostly men (66%) of young age (median [IQR25-75] age, 27.5 [19-37] years) with
5 few comorbidities. Their baseline characteristics are reported in **Table 1** and **Supplemental**
6 **Table 1**. All had positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR (37%) or serology (68%) with a median
7 delay of five days between COVID-19 symptoms onset and the first manifestation of
8 myocarditis. None had previously received any COVID-19 vaccine. Most frequent symptoms
9 were fever (95%), abdominal pain or nausea (60%), chest pain (47%) and dyspnea (42%).

10 At admission, patients had severely impaired left ventricle function (LVEF 20% [14-
11 37], LVOT-VTI 11 cm [6-15]), an increased high-sensitivity T-troponin (median 1,300 [IQR
12 = 486-4,750] ng/mL) and 79% presented with cardiogenic shock. When performed (n=10),
13 coronary angiography was normal. COVID-19 pneumonia was noted on CT scan examination
14 in 29% of cases. In the 26 patients who had CMR evaluation, myocardial edema and late
15 gadolinium enhancement were reported in 73% and 54% respectively.

16 Three patients without recovery of cardiac function underwent myocardial biopsy.
17 None were MRI-guided, as all were taken under mechanical circulatory support. Two surgical
18 biopsies were taken in patients during venoarterial-extracorporeal membrane oxygenation
19 (VA-ECMO) centralization. The first one was an apical surgical biopsy in a patient
20 cannulated under cardiopulmonary resuscitation which was nonconclusive. The second
21 surgical biopsy highlighted myocarditis with an inflammatory infiltrate associated with
22 myocyte dystrophy and oedema. SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR was negative and electron
23 microscopy analysis failed to identify viral particles in cardiomyocytes despite active
24 myocarditis lesions on the evaluated sample. Last biopsy was endomyocardial and disclosed a
25 mild lympho-histiocytic myocarditis with no oedema but severe necrosis. SARS-CoV-2 RT-

1 PCR was negative. Twenty-nine (76%) patients met the Bonaca classification criteria for
2 definite myocarditis while the others had probable myocarditis (**Table 2**).

3

4 **In-ICU evolution and Outcomes**

5 Median length of stay in ICU was 6 days. Seventy nine percent of the patients received
6 dobutamine, 60% norepinephrine, 50% mechanical ventilation and 29% renal replacement
7 therapy (**Table 3**). Four patients had a large pericardial effusion requiring drainage. Sixteen
8 (42%) patients required mechanical circulatory support with VA-ECMO 1 [0-1] day
9 following ICU admission, for a median duration of 7 days. Twenty-eight (74%) were treated
10 with corticosteroids and 27 (74%) with intravenous immunoglobulins. In-hospital mortality
11 was 13%. None of the survivors required cardiac transplantation or long-term ventricular
12 assist device. Among the five deceased patients, all had multiorgan failure before VA-ECMO
13 implantation, including three cannulations during cardiopulmonary resuscitation. None could
14 be weaned from VA-ECMO because of severe cardiac dysfunction. Median LVEF at ICU and
15 hospital discharge was 42% [30-54] and 60% [50-64], respectively. Twenty one survivors
16 (64%) received betablockers at discharge and 25 (76%) were treated with angiotensin-
17 converting-enzyme inhibitors, until distant evaluation with a cardiologist. At the last follow-
18 up (median [IQR] 235 [155–359] days), 32 patients were alive, all but one had normal LVEF.
19 One patient was lost of follow-up.

20

21 **Comparison between MIS-A⁺ and MIS-A⁻ patients**

22 Twenty-five (66%) patients met the MIS-A criteria (**Table 1**). By definition, MIS-A⁺
23 patients had more frequent fever, skin rash, enanthema, pharyngitis and conjunctivitis, as
24 compared to MIS-A⁻ patients (**Table 1**). In addition, they had, as expected by the MIS-A

1 definition, higher levels of systemic inflammation markers, including circulating leucocytes,
2 procalcitonin, C-reactive protein and fibrinogen (**Table 4**).

3 The median delay between COVID-19 symptoms onset and occurrence of myocarditis
4 was shorter in MIS-A⁻ patients: 3 vs. 8 days. Noteworthy, the delay between first COVID-19
5 symptoms and myocarditis was 32 [25-44] days among the 12 MIS-A⁺ patients with prior
6 proven symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. The rate of positive serology was lower in MIS-
7 A⁻ patients (15% vs. 96%) and their titer was also much lower than in MIS-A⁺ patients (p
8 <0.0001). Conversely, positive nasopharyngeal RT-PCR at the time of myocarditis was
9 infrequent in MIS-A⁺ (16%), as compared to MIS-A⁻ (85%) patients.

10 MIS-A⁻ patients had swifter ICU admission after myocarditis onset (1 vs. 4 days) with
11 a more severe presentation (day-0 SOFA score of 11 versus 6 in MIS-A⁺ patients). They had a
12 lower left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF 10 vs. 30% and LVOT-VTI 5 vs. 13 cm)
13 (**Table 2**) and were more likely to receive norepinephrine, mechanical ventilation and renal
14 replacement therapy. Large pericardial effusions were also more frequently observed in MIS-
15 A⁻ patients. The median lactate level was 5.5 versus 2.1 mmol/L in MIS-A⁻ and MIS-A⁺
16 patients, respectively. Finally, MIS-A⁻ patients were more likely to require VA-ECMO than
17 MIS-A⁺ patients (92% vs. 16%), and had a higher in-ICU mortality (31% vs. 4%, p=0.04,
18 **Table 3**). The 3-month cumulative probabilities of survival ± standard errors for MIS-A⁻ and
19 MIS-A⁺ patients were respectively: 68±13% and 96±4%, Log-Rank test p=0.01.

20 Cytokine profiling highlighted the presence of two distinct cytokine production
21 profiles (**Figure 1 and Table 4**): MIS-A⁺ had higher IL-22 (9.93 vs. 1.5 pg/mL, p<0.0001),
22 IL-17 (3.2 vs. 0.15 pg/mL, p<0.0001) and TNF-α (21.1 vs. 8.0 pg/mL, p=0.05) levels, as
23 compared to MIS-A⁻ patients, while the latter had higher IFN-α2 (2.4 vs. 0.013 pg/mL,
24 p=0.001) and IL-8 (158.7 vs. 65.7 pg/mL, p=0.02), respectively. Moreover, RNA-polymerase
25 III autoantibodies were found in seven (54%) MIS-A⁻ patients, five of them being female

1 **(Table 4).**

2 Finally, to elucidate the relative importance of the various bio-clinical parameters
3 listed above with the clinical profile of MIS-A⁺ or MIS-A⁻ patients, we performed non-
4 supervised PCA using study parameters contributing, in a statistically significant manner, to
5 inter-patient variation (**Tables 1-3**). The results from PCA underlined important overall
6 differences between MIS-A⁺ and MIS-A⁻ patients, (**Figure 2**). The data also further highlight
7 parameters most contributing to either clinical status *i.e.*: fibrinogen (p<0.0001), CRP
8 (p<0.0001), IL-17 (p<0.0001), IL-22 (p<0.0001), IFN- α 2 (p=0.001) levels, SARS-CoV-2
9 serology (p<0.0001) and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR (p<0.0001), LVEF (p=0.01) values on
10 admission and the presence of RNA polymerase III autoantibodies (p=0.001).

11

12 **DISCUSSION**

13 In this retrospective monocenter cohort of fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis,
14 we applied the MIS-A criteria case definition and we identified two subsets of patients with
15 very different clinical/biological presentations, outcomes, and immunological profiles. This
16 phenotypic heterogeneity being likely explained by important differences in
17 pathophysiological mechanisms.

18 The patients in this cohort were mostly young men with severely impaired cardiac
19 function, frequently requiring VA-ECMO, with infrequent concomitant COVID-19-associated
20 pneumonia. All survivors recovered a near normal cardiac function at distant follow-up. To
21 our knowledge, this study is the largest cohort of COVID-19-related fulminant myocarditis
22 and extends prior reports of COVID-19-related myocarditis(9, 12–15) and fulminant non-
23 COVID-19 myocarditis(7, 16–19).

24 This analysis underscores the major clinical and immunological differences between
25 patients with fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis fulfilling or not MIS-A criteria. The

1 original description of MIS-C was reported in May 2020(8) and MIS-A a few months
2 afterwards(9, 20, 21). This somewhat delayed description, together with the rarity of the
3 disease may have participated to an under-recognition of MIS in the adult population.
4 Furthermore, whereas MIS-C is now well defined with classification criteria established by
5 the World Health Organization and the Center for Disease Control and Prevention(22, 23),
6 only the latter has adapted its criteria to the adult population(10).

7 The main differences between the phenotypes of MIS-A⁺ and MIS-A⁻ patients are
8 summarized in the **Central Illustration**. MIS-A⁺ COVID-19 related myocarditis appears to
9 be a post-infectious complication of SARS-CoV-2 infection, as suggested by the higher delay
10 between COVID-19 symptoms and myocarditis, as well as by frequently positive serology
11 and negative (or slightly positive) RT-PCR. Mucocutaneous manifestations are frequent in
12 addition to laboratory evidence of severe systemic inflammation. Heart failure is more
13 progressive, leading to fewer accounts of refractory cardiogenic shock, and is associated with
14 a lower mortality rate. Conversely, MIS-A⁻ fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis
15 occurred at the early phase of SARS-CoV-2 infection (negative or slightly positive serology
16 and positive RT-PCR) with an explosive and refractory cardiogenic shock in nearly all
17 patients leading to high morbidity and mortality.

18 Interestingly, these different clinical phenotypes are supported by immunological
19 findings. The frequency of RNA-polymerase III autoantibodies is high in MIS-A⁻, while
20 absent in MIS-A⁺ patients. The presence of these rare autoantibodies, usually associated with
21 severe systemic sclerosis, has been previously reported by Pineton de Chambrun M *et al.* in
22 patients with severe recurrent myocarditis and/or pericarditis, especially related to influenza
23 virus(24). Their role in the susceptibility to viral myocarditis is not yet elucidated. They might
24 reflect altered immune defenses toward viral infections or alternatively exaggerated antiviral
25 responses leading to organ damage. Another patient with recurrent viral myocarditis,

1 including COVID-19-related myocarditis, has been recently reported(25).

2 The cytokine profiles of these patients were also found definitely different in the two
3 clinical phenotypes (**Figure 2**). In MIS-A⁻ patients, high levels of systemic circulating anti-
4 viral IFN- α 2 likely arise from the ongoing viral infection, in relation to detectable viral
5 replication and yet undetectable anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG humoral responses. Levels of IL-8, a
6 proinflammatory cytokine, were also more elevated in MIS-A⁻, as compared to MIS-A⁺
7 patients, further underlining the dominance of an innate type of immune response in the
8 former group. Conversely, elevated IL-17 and IL-22 levels were found particularly associated
9 with the MIS-A⁺ phenotype, in agreement with the mucocutaneous manifestations observed in
10 these patients. IL-17 and IL-22 shape innate defenses at mucosal and epithelial surfaces, IL-
11 17 being pro-inflammatory and involved in the pathogenesis of several autoimmune diseases,
12 while the latter cytokine is playing an important role in tissue regeneration(26). Of note, the
13 extremely high serum IL-10 levels observed both in MIS-A⁻ and MIS-A⁺ patients have been
14 previously associated with severe myocardial injury(27), and increased risk of death in severe
15 COVID-19 patients(28).

16 MIS pathogenesis is not fully understood, but the delay between SARS-CoV-2
17 infection and disease onset, and over-expression of mucosal T cell cytokines (IL-22 and IL-
18 17) suggest a role for the adaptive immune response in MIS-A⁺ patients. Conversely, in MIS-
19 A⁻ cases, innate anti-viral immunity and/or direct toxicity of the virus are more likely involved
20 in heart tissue injury. In our series, SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR on 2 MIS-A⁻ endomyocardial
21 biopsies (EMBs) were negative. This is in line with previous cases reports(2, 29), even if
22 positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR in myocardial samples have also been sporadically
23 reported(30, 31). To the best of our knowledge, only one study demonstrated the presence of
24 viral particles in cardiomyocytes by electronical microscopy(32), with only mild interstitial
25 inflammatory infiltrate and no necrosis or microthrombosis, thereby suggesting that the

1 underlying mechanism of myocarditis development was mainly related to a virus-mediated
2 immune response. The EMBs published results from fulminant COVID-19 related
3 myocarditis often reported important myocardial edema with no or mild inflammatory
4 infiltrate or necrosis(2, 33), a finding which is also consistent with cardiac MRI
5 observations(2, 5).

6 The phenotypic clustering of patients with fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis
7 seems relevant for their management. Indeed, MIS-A⁻ cases, owing to the high risk of
8 evolution towards refractory cardiogenic shock should be urgently referred to a center with
9 VA-ECMO capability and closely monitored to avoid a too late cannulation, especially under
10 cardiopulmonary resuscitation, known to be associated with poor outcome(34). The five
11 patients who died in our series had late VA-ECMO implantation, while having multiple organ
12 failure or under resuscitation. Conversely, the risk of evolution towards refractory cardiogenic
13 shock is lower in MIS-A⁺ cases. Our results are consistent with those of a large series of 186
14 MIS-C from the United States, where only eight patients required VA-ECMO and four
15 died(35). MIS-A⁺ patient identification is all the more important given that numerous data
16 support the efficacy of corticosteroids and/or intravenous immunoglobulins in MIS-C(36).
17 The best treatment regimen is yet to be determined because conflicting results have been
18 reported with standalone or combination treatment(37, 38). However, one should take with
19 caution the results of non-randomized/non-blinded therapeutical intervention in a disease
20 where spontaneous recovery occurs in most patients in a few days.

21 This study has some limitations that deserve mentioning. First, the external validity is
22 limited by its monocentric and retrospective nature. Notably, as an ECMO center, there might
23 be a selection bias towards the inclusion of the most severe patients. Thus, MIS-A⁻ patients
24 could have been better identified and transferred earlier in our center. Second, while being the
25 largest series of fulminant COVID-19 related myocarditis, the sample size remains small,

1 limiting the power of the study. Lastly, EMBs were performed in only 3 patients, while expert
2 consensus and guidelines recommend to consider EMB in fulminant presentation, for its
3 diagnostic and therapeutic implications(39–41). However, coagulation disorders are frequent
4 in COVID-19-related myocarditis and VA-ECMO patients. The benefit/risk ratio was
5 evaluated against EMB in all but three cases, especially given the known diagnosis of SARS-
6 CoV-2 infection. It is nevertheless unfortunate that we cannot provide a more extensive
7 characterization of COVID-19-related myocarditis histopathological findings in MIS-A⁺ and
8 MIS-A⁻ patients.

9

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 We identified two phenotypes of fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis harboring
12 distinct clinical and laboratory manifestations, evolutions and outcomes. Differentiating these
13 patients seems relevant for their management and for further pathophysiological studies. The
14 role of RNA-polymerase-III autoantibodies in fulminant myocarditis requires further
15 investigation.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **PERSPECTIVE**

2 **Competency in Patient Care and Procedural Skills:** Multisystem inflammatory syndrome

3 A (MIS-A) criteria distinguish phenotypes of patients who develop fulminant myocarditis

4 related to COVID-19, with different clinical presentations, immunological profiles and

5 outcomes. Those with MIS-A criteria more often have elevated serum levels of the

6 interleukins IL-17 and IL-22, and RNA polymerase III autoantibodies, and more often require

7 extracorporeal membrane oxygenator (ECMO) support.

8

9 **Translational Outlook:** Further investigation is needed to characterize the role of RNA-

10 polymerase-III antibodies in the pathophysiology of MIS-A COVID-19-related fulminant

11 myocarditis.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Hu H, Ma F, Wei X, Fang Y. Coronavirus fulminant myocarditis saved with glucocorticoid
3 and human immunoglobulin. *Eur. Heart J.* 2020.
- 4 2. Sala S, Peretto G, Gramegna M, et al. Acute myocarditis presenting as a reverse Tako-
5 Tsubo syndrome in a patient with SARS-CoV-2 respiratory infection. *Eur. Heart J.*
6 2020;41:1861–1862.
- 7 3. Tavazzi G, Pellegrini C, Maurelli M, et al. Myocardial localization of coronavirus in
8 COVID-19 cardiogenic shock. *Eur. J. Heart Fail.* 2020;22:911–915.
- 9 4. Zeng J-H, Liu Y-X, Yuan J, et al. First case of COVID-19 complicated with fulminant
10 myocarditis: a case report and insights. *Infection* 2020.
- 11 5. Garot J, Amour J, Pezel T, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Fulminant Myocarditis. *JACC Case Rep.*
12 2020;2:1342–1346.
- 13 6. Kesici S, Aykan HH, Orhan D, Bayrakci B. Fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis in
14 an infant. *Eur. Heart J.* 2020;41:3021–3021.
- 15 7. Mirabel M, Luyt C-E, Leprince P, et al. Outcomes, long-term quality of life, and
16 psychologic assessment of fulminant myocarditis patients rescued by mechanical circulatory
17 support. *Crit. Care Med.* 2011;39:1029–1035.
- 18 8. Riphagen S, Gomez X, Gonzalez-Martinez C, Wilkinson N, Theocharis P.
19 Hyperinflammatory shock in children during COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* 2020.
- 20 9. Hékimian G, Kerneis M, Zeitouni M, et al. COVID-19 acute myocarditis and Multisystem
21 Inflammatory Syndrome in adult intensive and cardiac care units. *Chest* 2020.
- 22 10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in
23 Adults (MIS-A) Case Definition Information for Healthcare Providers. Available at:
24 <https://www.cdc.gov/mis/mis-a/hcp.html>.

- 1 11. Bonaca MP, Olenchock BA, Salem J-E, et al. Myocarditis in the Setting of Cancer
2 Therapeutics: Proposed Case Definitions for Emerging Clinical Syndromes in Cardio-
3 Oncology. *Circulation* 2019;140:80–91.
- 4 12. Gneccchi M, Moretti F, Bassi EM, et al. Myocarditis in a 16-year-old boy positive for
5 SARS-CoV-2. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* 2020;395:e116.
- 6 13. Doyen D, Mocerri P, Ducreux D, Dellamonica J. Myocarditis in a patient with COVID-19:
7 a cause of raised troponin and ECG changes. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* 2020;395:1516.
- 8 14. Castiello T, Georgiopoulos G, Finocchiaro G, et al. COVID-19 and myocarditis: a
9 systematic review and overview of current challenges. *Heart Fail. Rev.* 2021.
- 10 15. Ho JS, Sia C-H, Chan MY, Lin W, Wong RC. Coronavirus-induced myocarditis: A meta-
11 summary of cases. *Heart Lung J. Crit. Care* 2020;49:681–685.
- 12 16. Ammirati E, Veronese G, Brambatti M, et al. Fulminant Versus Acute Nonfulminant
13 Myocarditis in Patients With Left Ventricular Systolic Dysfunction. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.*
14 2019;74:299–311.
- 15 17. Lorusso R, Centofanti P, Gelsomino S, et al. Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane
16 Oxygenation for Acute Fulminant Myocarditis in Adult Patients: A 5-Year Multi-Institutional
17 Experience. *Ann. Thorac. Surg.* 2016;101:919–926.
- 18 18. Hékimian G, Jovanovic T, Bréchet N, et al. When the heart gets the flu: Fulminant
19 influenza B myocarditis: A case-series report and review of the literature. *J. Crit. Care*
20 2018;47:61–64.
- 21 19. Ammirati E, Cipriani M, Lilliu M, et al. Survival and Left Ventricular Function Changes
22 in Fulminant Versus Nonfulminant Acute Myocarditis. *Circulation* 2017;136:529–545.
- 23 20. Shaigany S, Gnirke M, Guttman A, et al. An adult with Kawasaki-like multisystem
24 inflammatory syndrome associated with COVID-19. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* 2020;396:e8–e10.

- 1 21. Morris SB, Schwartz NG, Patel P, et al. Case Series of Multisystem Inflammatory
2 Syndrome in Adults Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection - United Kingdom and United
3 States, March-August 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* 2020;69:1450–1456.
- 4 22. World Health Organization. Multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children and
5 adolescents temporally related to COVID-19. Available at: [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/multisystem-inflammatory-syndrome-in-children-and-adolescents-with-covid-19)
6 [room/commentaries/detail/multisystem-inflammatory-syndrome-in-children-and-adolescents-](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/multisystem-inflammatory-syndrome-in-children-and-adolescents-with-covid-19)
7 [with-covid-19](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/multisystem-inflammatory-syndrome-in-children-and-adolescents-with-covid-19).
- 8 23. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Case Definition for MIS-C. Available at:
9 [https://www.cdc.gov/mis/mis-](https://www.cdc.gov/mis/mis-c/hcp/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fmis%2Fhcp%2Findex.html)
10 [c/hcp/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fmis%2Fhcp%2Fin-](https://www.cdc.gov/mis/mis-c/hcp/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fmis%2Fhcp%2Findex.html)
11 [dex.html](https://www.cdc.gov/mis/mis-c/hcp/index.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fmis%2Fhcp%2Findex.html).
- 12 24. Pineton de Chambrun M, Charuel J-L, Hékimian G, et al. Severe Viral Myopericarditis
13 With Autoantibodies Directed Against RNA Polymerase III. *Ann. Intern. Med.*
14 2020;172:502–504.
- 15 25. Caraffa R, Marcolongo R, Bottio T, et al. Recurrent autoimmune myocarditis in a young
16 woman during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *ESC Heart Fail.* 2021;8:756–760.
- 17 26. Eyerich S, Eyerich K, Cavani A, Schmidt-Weber C. IL-17 and IL-22: siblings, not twins.
18 *Trends Immunol.* 2010;31:354–361.
- 19 27. Nishii M, Inomata T, Takehana H, et al. Serum levels of interleukin-10 on admission as a
20 prognostic predictor of human fulminant myocarditis. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 2004;44:1292–
21 1297.
- 22 28. Dorgham K, Quentric P, Gökkaya M, et al. Distinct cytokine profiles associated with
23 COVID-19 severity and mortality. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 2021;147:2098–2107.
- 24 29. Weckbach LT, Curta A, Bieber S, et al. Myocardial Inflammation and Dysfunction in
25 COVID-19-Associated Myocardial Injury. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Imaging* 2021;14:e012220.

- 1 30. Tavazzi G, Pellegrini C, Maurelli M, et al. Myocardial localization of coronavirus in
2 COVID-19 cardiogenic shock. *Eur. J. Heart Fail.* 2020;22:911–915.
- 3 31. Escher F, Pietsch H, Aleshcheva G, et al. Detection of viral SARS-CoV-2 genomes and
4 histopathological changes in endomyocardial biopsies. *ESC Heart Fail.* 2020.
- 5 32. Albert CL, Carmona-Rubio AE, Weiss AJ, Procop GG, Starling RC, Rodriguez ER. The
6 Enemy Within: Sudden-Onset Reversible Cardiogenic Shock With Biopsy-Proven Cardiac
7 Myocyte Infection by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Circulation*
8 2020;142:1865–1870.
- 9 33. Salamanca J, Díez-Villanueva P, Martínez P, et al. COVID-19 “Fulminant Myocarditis”
10 Successfully Treated With Temporary Mechanical Circulatory Support. *JACC Cardiovasc.*
11 *Imaging* 2020;13:2457–2459.
- 12 34. Combes A, Leprince P, Luyt C-E, et al. Outcomes and long-term quality-of-life of patients
13 supported by extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory cardiogenic shock. *Crit.*
14 *Care Med.* 2008;36:1404–1411.
- 15 35. Dufort EM, Koumans EH, Chow EJ, et al. Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in
16 Children in New York State. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2020;383:347–358.
- 17 36. Feldstein LR, Rose EB, Horwitz SM, et al. Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in U.S.
18 Children and Adolescents. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2020;383:334–346.
- 19 37. McArdle AJ, Vito O, Patel H, et al. Treatment of Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in
20 Children. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2021;385:11–22.
- 21 38. Son MBF, Murray N, Friedman K, et al. Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children
22 - Initial Therapy and Outcomes. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2021;385:23–34.
- 23 39. Caforio ALP, Pankuweit S, Arbustini E, et al. Current state of knowledge on aetiology,
24 diagnosis, management, and therapy of myocarditis: a position statement of the European

1 Society of Cardiology Working Group on Myocardial and Pericardial Diseases. *Eur. Heart J.*
2 2013;34:2636–2648, 2648a–2648d.

3 40. Kociol RD, Cooper LT, Fang JC, et al. Recognition and Initial Management of Fulminant
4 Myocarditis: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*
5 2020;141:e69–e92.

6 41. Ammirati E, Frigerio M, Adler ED, et al. Management of Acute Myocarditis and Chronic
7 Inflammatory Cardiomyopathy: An Expert Consensus Document. *Circ. Heart Fail.*
8 2020;13:e007405.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **FIGURE LEGENDS:**

2 **Central Illustration.** Main phenotypic differences between MIS-A⁺ and MIS-A⁻ fulminant
3 COVID-19-related myocarditis.

4 **Caption:** MIS-A⁺ and MIS-A⁻ fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis patients have 2
5 distinct phenotypes with different clinical presentations, prognosis and immunological
6 profiles.

7 For box and whisker plots: the centrer line denotes the median value (50th percentile), while
8 the box contains the 25th to 75th percentiles of dataset. The whiskers mark the 5th and 95th
9 percentiles.

10 Abbreviations: COVID-19, Coronavirus Disease 2019; ICU, Intensive Care Unit; US-CDC,
11 United States Center for Disease Control; MIS-A, Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in
12 Adults; RT-PCR, Reverse Transcription-Polymerase Chain Reaction.

13

14

15 **Figure 1.**

16 **Title:** Circulating cytokines levels in fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis.

17 **Caption:** Comparison of 6 circulating serum cytokines levels (IL-8,10,17,20, IFN- α 2 and
18 TNF- α) in patients with MIS-A⁺/MIS-A⁻ and healthy controls. MIS-A⁺ had higher IL-22, IL-
19 17 and TNF- α , while MIS-A⁻ had higher IFN- α 2 and IL-8. Methods: serum concentrations of
20 IL-8, IL-10, IL-22 and TNF- α were measured on a Quanterix® SP-X™ imaging and analysis
21 platform using the Human CorPlex Cytokine Panel Array kit (Quanterix, Lexington, MA,
22 USA). Single-plex bead-based ultrasensitive immunodetection of IL-17A and IFN- α was
23 performed by digital ELISA using the Simoa™ (single molecule array) HD-1 analyzer
24 (Quanterix), according to the manufacturer's instructions.

1 For box and whisker plots: the center line denotes the median value (50th percentile), while
2 the box contains the 25th to 75th percentiles of dataset. The whiskers mark the 5th and 95th
3 percentiles.

4 Abbreviations: COVID-19, Coronavirus Disease 2019; IFN, Interferon; IL, Interleukin; TNF,
5 Tumor Necrosis Factor; MIS-A, Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Adults; RT-PCR,
6 Reverse Transcription-Polymerase Chain Reaction.

7

8 **Figure 2.**

9 **Title:** Principal component analyses (PCA): of cytokines measured in fulminant COVID-19-
10 related myocarditis and combining clinical and biological features in fulminant COVID-19-
11 related myocarditis.

12 **Methods:** unsupervised PCA was performed using R v3.6.2 with the FactoExtra and
13 FactoMineR functions, on z-scaled log₁₀-transformed cytokine concentrations. Samples with
14 missing data were excluded from the PCA analysis for one MIS-A⁺ and two MIS-A⁻ patients).
15 Ellipses with 66 % confidence interval are drawn for each group.

16 **Panel A: Caption:** the principal component analysis of 10 circulating serum cytokines.

17 **Panel B: Caption:** the principal component analysis including clinical findings, laboratory
18 findings and immunological profiles highlights the main features of MIS-A⁻ and MIS-A⁺
19 fulminant COVID-19 related myocarditis phenotypes.

20 Abbreviations: SOFA, Sequential Organ-Failure Assessment; CRP, C-reactive protein;
21 LVEF, Left Ventricle Ejection Fraction; IFN, Interferon; IL, Interleukin; MIS-A, Multisystem
22 Inflammatory Syndrome in Adults; TNF, Tumor Necrosis Factor; RT-PCR, Reverse
23 Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction.

24

25

Table 1. COVID-19-related MIS-A Criteria and SARS-CoV-2 Tests Results

Variables	All patients n=38	MIS-A⁻ n=13	MIS-A⁺ n=25	p-value
Age, years	27.5 [19.0-37.0]	33.0 [21.5-38.5]	25.0 [18.5-35.5]	0.3
Women	13 (34)	6 (46)	7 (28)	0.3
BMI, kg/m ²	24.8 [22.4-28.6]	25.9 [23.3-28.9]	24.7 [21.7-28.2]	0.7
Time from first COVID-19 symptoms to myocarditis, days	5 [0-26]	3 [0-5]	8 [2-38]	0.04
Time from myocarditis symptoms onset to ICU, days	3 [0-5]	1 [0-3]	4 [1-6]	0.009
ICU admission SOFA score	8 [5-11]	11 [8-13]	6 [4-10]	0.002
ICU admission SAPS-II score	30 [20-40]	33 [25-49]	25 [15-35]	0.04
MIS-A criteria¹				
Fever	36 (95)	9 (69)	25 (100)	0.01
Primary clinical criteria				
Myocardial involvement	38 (100)	13 (100)	25 (100)	na
Skin involvement	14 (37)	1 (8)	13 (52)	0.01
Secondary clinical criteria				
Neurological involvement	14 (37)	4 (31)	10 (40)	0.5
Shock or hypotension	36 (95)	13 (100)	23 (92)	0.1
Abdominal involvement	22 (58)	7 (54)	15 (60)	0.7
Platelets <150 G/L	10 (26)	5 (38)	5 (20)	0.09
Laboratory evidence				
Inflammation ²	29 (76)	2 (15)	25 (100)	<0.0001
Positive SARS-CoV-2 test ³	38 (100)	13 (100)	25 (100)	na
SARS-CoV-2 tests				
Positive nasopharyngeal RT-PCR	14 (37)	11 (85)	4 (16)	<0.0001
CT value	26 [18-32]	24.0 [18.0-28.0]	32.5 [21.5-34.5]	0.2
Positive serology	26 (68)	2 (15)	24 (96)	<0.0001
IgG anti-S	25 (67)	2 (15)	23/24 (96)	<0.0001

Titer, UA/mL	660 [156-1,440]	2.3 [0.1-59]	854 [528-2,575]	<0.0001
IgG anti-N	26 (68)	2 (15)	24 (96)	<0.0001
Index, value	2.2 [0.1-5.3]	0.4 [0.03-0.8]	4.8 [2.2-5.5]	<0.0001

Abbreviations: COVID-19, the coronavirus disease 2019; MIS-A, Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Adults; SARS-CoV-2, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2; BMI, body-mass index; ICU, Intensive Care Unit; SOFA, Sequential Organ-Failure Assessment; SAPS-II, Simplified Acute Physiology Score-II; RT-PCR, Reverse transcription Polymerase-Chain Reaction; CT, Cycle Threshold; S, spike protein; N, nucleocapsid protein.

Continuous variables are expressed as median [interquartile range] and compared with Wilcoxon’s rank test; categorical variables are expressed as n (%) and compared with Fischer’s exact test.

¹According the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (<https://www.cdc.gov/mis/mis-a/hcp.html>)

²Elevated levels of at least two of the following biomarkers including: C-reactive protein >10mg/L, procalcitonin >1ng/mL, fibrinogen >5g/L.

³Positive RT-PCR, serology or antigen for SARS-CoV-2

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15

Table 2. Fulminant COVID-19-related myocarditis findings

Variables	n[†]	All patients n=38	MIS-A⁻ n=13	MIS-A⁺ n=25	p-value
Clinical symptoms					
Chest pain		18 (47)	9 (69)	9 (36)	0.09
Faintness		4 (10)	4 (31)	0 (0)	0.01
Syncope		2 (5)	1 (8)	1 (4)	1.0
Sudden death		1 (3)	1 (8)	0 (0)	0.3
Laboratory findings					
Troponin, ng/mL		526 [224-1,227]	441 [177-1,089]	712 [217-2,025]	0.2
Highest value in ICU		1,300 [486-4,750]	2,836 [450-9,634]	1,000 [471-3,036]	0.2
NT-pro-BNP, ng/L	1	9,931 [2,367-23,934]	2,755 [1,044-8,271]	12,525 [7,000-32,500]	0.007
Creatin Phosphokinase, UI/L		312 [131-1,150]	586 [388-1,802]	190 [115-435]	0.003
Electrocardiogram findings					
Normal electrocardiogram		14 (37)	5 (38)	9 (36)	1.0
Sinus rhythm		36 (95)	12 (92)	24 (96)	1.0
Atrial fibrillation		2 (5)	1 (8)	1 (4)	1.0
ST segment elevation		10 (26)	6 (46)	4 (16)	0.06
ST segment depression		6 (16)	2 (15)	4 (16)	1.0
Negative T wave		10 (26)	1 (8)	9 (36)	0.1
Complete heart block		1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (4)	1.0
Bundle branch block		5 (13)	1 (8)	4 (16)	0.6
Ventricular rhythm disorders		3 (8)	3 (23)	0 (0)	0.03
Echocardiography findings					
LVEF, %					
First evaluation		30 [20-45]	30 [15-45]	30 [25-42]	0.5
On ICU admission		20 [14-37]	10 [5-30]	30 [15-45]	0.01
Lowest value in ICU		20 [10-30]	10 [5-25]	20 [15-30]	0.02
ICU discharge		42 [30-54]	35 [17-57]	45 [35-52]	0.1
Last follow-up	10	60 [50-64]	59 [44-60]	60 [50-65]	0.5

LVOT VTI, cm					
First evaluation		12 [8-16]	8 [7-17]	12 [9-15]	0.2
On ICU admission		11 [6-15]	5 [2-9]	13 [10-17]	<0.0001
ICU discharge		17 [12-18]	12 [7-18]	17 [15-19]	0.08
Ventricular hypertrophy		16 (42)	8 (62)	8 (32)	0.1
Ventricular dilation		5 (13)	2 (15)	3 (12)	1.0
LVEDD, mm		50 [47-56]	48 [46-55]	50 [47-56]	0.7
Right ventricle involvement		15 (39)	7 (54)	8 (32)	0.3
TAPSE, mm	20	14 [12-17]	12 [8-16]	14 [12-17]	0.2
S wave, cm/sec	21	9 [7-11]	6 [1-11]	10 [8-11]	0.1
Mitral valve regurgitation		9 (24)	3 (23)	6 (24)	1.0
Aortic valve regurgitation		3 (8)	0 (0)	1 (4)	1.0
Tricuspid valve regurgitation		3 (8)	0 (0)	3 (12)	0.5
Pericardial effusion		15 (39)	8 (62)	7 (28)	0.08
Pericardiocentesis		4 (10)	4 (31)	0 (0)	0.01
CMR findings					
In-ICU/hospital		26 (68)	5 (38)	21 (84)	
Time from symptoms to CMR, days		7 [4-18]	16 [9-33]	5 [4-10]	
Myocardial edema		19/26 (73)	3/5 (60)	16/21 (76)	0.6
Late gadolinium enhancement		14/26 (54)	4/5 (80)	10/21 (48)	0.3
Myocarditis classification²					
Definite myocarditis		29 (76)	9 (69)	20 (80)	
Probable myocarditis		9 (24)	4 (31)	5 (20)	
Pathology		2 (5)	2 (15)	1 (4)	
Imaging					
Cardiac magnetic resonance		22 (58)	4 (31)	18 (72)	
Echocardiography WMA		32 (84)	13 (100)	24 (96)	
Coronary angiography performed and normal		10 (26)	6 (46)	4 (16)	

Electrocardiogram	23 (60)	8 (61)	15 (60)
Syndrome	38 (100)	13 (100)	25 (100)
Biomarkers	38 (100)	13 (100)	25 (100)

Abbreviations: MIS-A, Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Adults; ICU, Intensive Care Unit; LVEF, Left Ventricle Ejection Fraction; LVOT VTI, Left Ventricular Outflow Tract Velocity-Time Integral; LVEDD, Left Ventricle End Diastolic Diameter; TAPSE, Tricuspid Annular Plane Systolic Excursion; CMR, Cardiac Magnetic Resonance; RVEF, Right Ventricle Ejection Fraction; WMA, Wall Motion Abnormality.

Continuous variables are expressed as median [interquartile range] and compared with Wilcoxon’s rank test; categorical variables are expressed as n (%) and compared with Fischer’s exact test.

¹Number of missing values.

²According the myocarditis classification proposed by Bonaca et al.(11)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16

Table 3. Organ failure support, myocarditis treatment, complications and outcome in ICU

Variables	All patients	MIS-A ⁻	MIS-A ⁺	p-value
	n=38	n=13	n=25	
Time in ICU, days	6 [4-16]	12 [7-30]	5 [2-6]	<0.0001
Cardiac arrest before ICU	1 (3)	1 (8)	0 (0)	0.3
Organ failure support in ICU				
Dobutamine	30 (79)	12 (92)	18 (72)	0.2
Norepinephrine	23 (60)	12 (92)	11 (44)	0.005
Mechanical ventilation	19 (50)	11 (85)	8 (32)	0.005
Time on mechanical ventilation, days	15 [6-28]	15 [8-35]	11 [4.25-25.5]	0.3
Renal replacement therapy	11 (29)	8 (61)	3 (12)	0.003
VA-ECMO	16 (42)	12 (92)	4 (16)	<0.0001
VA-ECMO under CPR	4 (11)	4 (31)	0 (0)	0.02
Time on VA-ECMO, days	7 [5-12]	8 [6-12]	5 [4-12]	0.1
Time from admission to VA-ECMO, days	1 [0-1]	0 [0-1]	1 [0-5]	0.4
VV-ECMO	4 (10)	2 (15)	2 (8)	0.6
Time on VV-ECMO, days	18 [14-29]	24 [16-24]	17 [14-17]	0.4
Myocarditis treatment in ICU				
Corticosteroids	28 (74)	7 (54)	21 (84)	0.06
Intravenous immunoglobulins	27 (71)	8 (61)	19 (76)	0.5
Tocilizumab	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	Na
Outcome				
In-ICU mortality	5 (13)	4 (31)	1 (4)	0.04
In-hospital mortality	5 (13)	4 (31)	1 (4)	0.04
3-month probability of survival*	86±6%	68±13%	96±4%	0.01

Abbreviations: MIS-A, Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Adults; ICU, Intensive Care Unit; VA-ECMO, Veno-Arterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation; CPR, CardioPulmonary Resuscitation; VV-ECMO, Veno-Venous Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation.

Continuous variables are expressed as median [interquartile range] and compared with Wilcoxon's rank test; categorical variables are expressed as n (%) and compared with Fischer's exact test.

*Probability of survival were calculated using Kaplan-Meier method and compared with Log-Rank tests.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

Table 4. Laboratory findings and cytokine profiling in ICU

Variables	n [†]	All patients n=38	MIS-A ⁻ n=13	MIS-A ⁺ n=25	p-value
Day-0 laboratory findings					
Hemogram and haemostasis					
Leukocytes G/L		12.6 [9.2-19.7]	8.7 [5.7-11.4]	18.5 [11.7-21.0]	<0.001
Lymphocytes, G/L		0.8 [0.5-1.5]	1.2 [0.6-2.3]	0.8 [0.5-1.2]	0.08
Polymorphonuclear cells, G/L		10.7 [5.8-18.0]	5.8 [3.4-8.1]	15.6 [10.3-19.0]	<0.001
Haemoglobin, g/dL		12,1 [11,1-13,5]	12.5 [10.4-16.0]	12 [11.6-13.3]	0.8
Platelets G/L		192 [152-247]	192 [92-258]	206 [160-243]	0.7
Prothrombin time, %		72 [64-81]	65 [56-90]	72 [69-77]	0.4
D-dimers, µg/L	3	3,860 [1,290-6,700]	2,500 [396-20,000]	4,217 [1,602-6,035]	0.6
Inflammatory parameters					
C-reactive protein, mg/L	5	257 [110-329]	5 [4-72]	277 [226-376]	<0.0001
Procalcitonin, ng/mL		7.4 [0.5-46]	0.2 [0.1-1.1]	12.8 [3.7-65]	<0.0001
Fibrinogen, g/L		6.8 [4.2-8.5]	3.2 [2.2-4.3]	7.9 [6.8-9.2]	<0.0001
Biochemical findings					
Serum creatinine, µmol/L		105 [69-156]	85 [60-105]	134 [71-265]	0.038
LDH, IU/L	2	419 [315-634]	619 [320-973]	385 [307-526]	0.2
AST, IU/L		83 [46-139]	70 [42-168]	94 [46-129]	0.9
ALT, IU/L		50 [32-101]	39 [26-110]	60 [37-101]	0.4
Serum total bilirubin, µmol/L		11 [8-19]	6 [4-14]	12 [10-21]	0.006
pH	1	7.43 [7.30-7.46]	7.31 [7.15-7.42]	7.44 [7.41-7.47]	0.004
pO ₂ , mmHg	1	90 [70-120]	106 [80-235]	81 [69-99]	0.06
pCO ₂ , mmHg	1	30 [24-36]	29 [20-46]	30 [27-36]	0.7
Serum bicarbonates, mmol/L	2	19 [15-23]	16 [10.4-19.4]	21 [17-24]	0.005
Arterial lactate, mmol/L	2	2.5 [1.7-3.9]	5.5 [1.8-8.2]	2.1 [1.5-2.7]	0.009
Highest value in ICU	2	3.1 [2.4-7.1]	7.5 [5.2-15.5]	2.7 [1.7-3.4]	<0.0001
Serum protein, g/L		61 [52-68]	51 [40-57]	65 [58-70]	<0.0001
Serum albumin, g/L		25 [22-28]	27 [23-33]	25 [20-27]	0.1

Triglycerides, mmol/L	15	2 [1.7-3]	2.0 [1.1-3.0]	2.3 [1.8-3.2]	0.4
Immunological findings					
RNA polymerase 3 autoantibodies	7 (18)		7 (54)	0 (0)	0.001
Serum cytokine levels in ICU					
IL-12p70, pg/mL	3	0.03 [0.01-0.4]	0.03 [0.01-0.1]	0.03 [0.01-0.4]	0.3
IL-1 β , pg/mL	3	0.2 [0.02-0.4]	0.3 [0.01-0.9]	0.2 [0.02-0.3]	0.5
IL-4, pg/mL	3	0.4 [0.2-1.1]	0.3 [0.3-0.5]	0.6 [0.2-2.1]	0.3
IL-5, pg/mL	3	0.1 [0.01-0.5]	0.04 [0.01-0.6]	0.3 [0.06-0.6]	0.1
IFN- γ , pg/mL	3	0.4 [0.2-2.2]	0.4 [0.09-2.0]	1.2 [0.2-2.6]	0.2
IL-6, pg/mL	3	55.2 [25.1-207.6]	39.6 [16.6-225.4]	57.8 [26.9-198.9]	0.7
IL-8, pg/mL	3	82.7 [58.2-166.4]	158.7 [74.9-784.2]	65.7 [55.7-118.3]	0.02
IL-22, pg/mL	3	6.4 [2.3-15.7]	1.5 [0.7-2.9]	9.93 [5.28-28.99]	<0.0001
TNF- α , pg/mL	3	14.2 [8.9-38.1]	8.0 [4.9-34.0]	21.1 [9.9-41.9]	0.05
IL-10, pg/mL	3	50.3 [15.9-76.6]	67.8 [20.1-143.1]	44.2 [12.8-68.4]	0.3
IL-17A, pg/mL	3	1.6 [0.2-5.2]	0.15 [0.08-0.3]	3.2 [0.8-6.2]	<0.0001
IFN- α 2, pg/mL	3	0.02 [0.005-1.3]	2.4 [0.2-15.0]	0.013 [0.002-0.04]	0.001
IFN- β , pg/mL	4	0.6 [0.6-0.6]	0.6 [0.6-1.8]	0.6 [0.6-0.6]	0.2
Anti-IFN α autoantibodies	4	5 (15%)	1 (10%)	4 (17%)	1

Abbreviations: MIS-A, Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Adults; ICU, Intensive Care Unit;

APTT, Activated Partial Thromboplastin Time; LDH, Lactate Dehydrogenase; AST, Aspartate Aminotransferase;

ALT, Alanine Aminotransferase; ALP, Alkaline Phosphatase; GGT, γ -Glutamyl Transpeptidase; IL, interleukin;

TNF, tumor necrosis factor; IFN, interferon.

Continuous variables are expressed as median [interquartile range] and compared with Wilcoxon's rank test;

categorical variables are expressed as n (%) and compared with Fischer's exact test.

¹Number of missing values.