Management of ARDS: including review of novel virus

台中榮總 呼吸治療科 詹明澄

The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

REVIEW ARTICLE

CRITICAL CARE MEDICINE

Simon R. Finfer, M.D., and Jean-Louis Vincent, M.D., Ph.D., Editors

Ventilator-Induced Lung Injury

Arthur S. Slutsky, M.D., and V. Marco Ranieri, M.D.

HE PURPOSE OF MECHANICAL VENTILATION IS TO REST THE RESPIRATORY muscles while providing adequate gas exchange. Ventilatory support proved

mortality among patients with paralytic polio from more than 80% to approximately 40%.1 Despite the clear benefits of this therapy, many patients eventually die after the initiation of mechanical ventilation, even though their arterial blood gases may have normalized.

of ventilation such as barotrauma (i.e., gross air leaks), oxygen toxicity, and hemodynamic compromise.2,3 During the polio epidemic, investigators noted that mechanical ventilation could cause structural damage to the lung.4 In 1967, the term "respirator lung" was coined to describe the diffuse alveolar infiltrates and hyaline membranes that were found on postmortem examination of patients who had undergone mechanical ventilation.5 More recently, there has been a renewed focus on the worsening injury that mechanical ventilation can cause in previously damaged lungs and the damage it can initiate in normal lungs. This damage is characterized pathologically by inflammatory-cell infiltrates, hyaline membranes, increased vascular permeability, and pulmonary edema. The constellation of pulmonary consequences of mechanical ventilation has been termed ventilator-induced lung injury.

The concept of ventilator-induced lung injury is not new. In 1744, John Fothergill discussed a case of a patient who was "dead in appearance" after exposure to coal fumes and who was successfully treated by mouth-to-mouth resuscitation.6 Fothergill noted that mouth-to-mouth resuscitation was preferable to using bellows because

thout injury, as great a force as those of anellows cannot always be determin'd." Fotherat mechanical forces generated by bellows (i.e.,

this century that the clinical importance of Its was confirmed by a study showing that a mize such injury decreased mortality among istress syndrome (ARDS).7 Given the clinical g injury, this article will review mechanisms and physiological consequences, and clinical its effects.

LOGICAL FEATURES

approximately 500 million breaths. For each late the lungs comprises the pressure to overa measure of the pressure gradient required

NOVEMBER 28, 2013

ledicine

uil 16, 2019. For personal use only. No other uses without permission iety. All rights reserved.

From the Division of Pulmonary and Crit-IFTY YEARS AGO, ASHBAUGI ical Care, Department of Medicine, Mastachypnea, refractory hypox sachusetts General Hospital, and Harvard Medical School - both in Boston (B.T.T.); Centre for Inflammation and Tissue Repair, the Division of Medicine, University College London, London (R.C.C.) and the Divisions of Nephrology and Critical Care Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco

(K.D.L.). Address reprint requests to Dr. Thompson at the Division of Pulmonan and Critical Care, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Bulfinch Bldg., Suite 148, 55 Fruit St., Boston, MA 02114, or at thompson .taylor@mgh.harvard.edu.

This article was last updated on August 11, 2017, at NEJM.org.

N Engl J Med 2017;377:562-72. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra1608077 Copyright @ 2017 Massachusett's Medical Society



ter infection or trauma.1 Pro veolar spaces of the lungs in 6 of to be specific for the respiratory adult (later changed to acute) res Since ARDS was last reviewed has been made in the care of af with reductions in both inciden tively common and lethal or dis involving 29,144 patients,3 10%

LTBA

_ 805

based on the degree of hypoxem tory pressure (PEEP) (Table 1). T

endothelial injuty (VEGE Are 2: GAGs vWF, sICAM3

ation leading to plate

tts Medic

Critical Care Medicine, University of Toronto - both in Toronto (A.S.S.); and Dipartimento di Anestesia e Medicina 2014, at NEJM.org.

degli Stati Critici, Ospedale S. Giovanni Battista Molinette, Università di Torino, Turin, Italy (V.M.R.). Address reprint requests to Dr. Slutsky at St. Michael's Hospital, 30 Bond St., Toronto, ON M5B IW8, Canada, or at slutskya@smh.ca. This article was updated on April 24,

From the Keenan Research Center, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, and the Department of Medito be indispensable during the 1952 polio epidemic in Copenhagen, decreasing cine and Interdepartmental Division of



Ppl - 25 cm H.O

Ptp = 10 - (-15) = +25 cm H_O

(ICU) and 23% of mechanically subgroup of patients with severe der are at high risk for cognitive and persistent skeletal-muscle w

The NEW ENG

Acute Respira

B. Taylor Thompson, M.D., Rache

DEFINITION AN

Four major definitions of ARDS the central features of the initial lung permeability, edema, and in care and no validated diagnostic on clinical features and chest in posed in 2012.6 breaks with tr



The New England Journal

Review Artic

based

the ra the fr pliand

chest

sessm

prese

tion

tem

lung

als, i

the f

respir

clinica

four

score

plicat

chani

In

Amer

mitte

advan

clinic

hypo

sure

ygen

injury

defin

have

ognit

cilitat

ical t

in the

Th

Medical Progress

THE ACUTE RESPIRATORY DISTRESS SYNDROME

LORBAINE B. WARE, M.D. AND MICHAEL A. MATTHAY, M.D.

■HE acute respiratory distress syndrome is a common, devastating clinical syndrome of acute lung injury that affects both medical and surgical patients. Since the last review of this syndrome appeared in the Journal,1 more uniform definitions have been devised and important advances have occurred in the understanding of the epidemiology, natural history, and pathogenesis of the disease, leading to the design and testing of new treatment strategies. This article provides an overview of the definitions, clinical features, and epidemiology of the acute respiratory distress syndrome and discusses advances in the areas of pathogenesis, resolution, and treatment.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE AND DEFINITIONS

The first description of acute respiratory distress syndrome appeared in 1967, when Ashbaugh and colleagues described 12 patients with acute respiratory distress, cyanosis refractory to oxygen therapy,





Ptp = 150 - 140 = +10 cm H O









EDITORIAL

Happy 50th birthday ARDS!

Arthur S. Slutsky^{1,2*}, Jesús Villar^{1,3,4} and Antonio Pesenti^{5,6}

Intensive Care Medicine 2016 March



Fig. 1 Major advances related to the acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI): from the bench to the bedside. *GWAS* genome-wide association studies, *ICU* intensive care unit, *NMB* neuromuscular blocking agents, *PIP* peak inspiratory pressure, *PMN* polymorphonuclear cells, *V* volume, *vent*. ventilation. (Modified from [21])



Berlin Definition

Table 3. The Berlin Definition of Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome

Timing	Within 1 week of a known symptoms	clinical insult or new or worsening respiratory					
Chest imaging ^a	Bilateral opacities—not full nodules	ly explained by effusions, lobar/lung collapse, or					
Origin of edema	Respiratory failure not fully Need objective assessmer edema if no risk factor	Respiratory failure not fully explained by cardiac failure or fluid overload Need objective assessment (eg, echocardiography) to exclude hydrostatic edema if no risk factor present					
Oxygenation ^b Mild	200 mm Hg PaO ₂ /FiO ₂	300 mm Hg with PEEP or CPAP 5 cm H_2O^c					
Moderate	100 mm Hg PaO ₂ /FIO ₂	200 mm Hg with PEEP 5 cm H ₂ O					
Severe	PaO ₂ /FIO ₂ 100 mm Hg v	vith PEEP 5 cm H ₂ O					



NEJM 2000

Common Causes of ARDS

Direct Lung Injury

- Pneumonia
- Aspiration of gastric content
- Pulmonary contussion
- Fat embolism
- Near-drowning
- Inhalation injury
- Reperfusion injury after transplantation, pulmonary lobectomy

Indirect Lung Injury

- Sepsis
- Severe trauma with shock and multiple transfusion
- Cardiopulmonary bypass
- Drug overdose
- Acute pancreatitis
- Transfusion of blood prodcuts

Barotrauma, not Just Air Leak

Normal

5 MIN

20 MIN



Peak Airway Pressure 45cm H₂O

VILI in Light Microscope

Perivascular cuffing PC 45cmH₂O, 5ming

Alveolar edema PC 45cm H₂O, 20min





AJRCCM 1998

Ultrastructural Change of Barotrauma



EP type I epithelium IE Interstitial edema EN Endothelium

M. J. Tobin, Principles and Practice of Mechanical Ventilation, McGraw-Hill, New York. 793-811

B Bleb

Volutrauma



Atelectrauma



- Opening collapsed airway requires relatively high forces and thus causes epithelium disruption.
- Ventilation at low lung volumes can inhibit production of surfactant and/or lead to surfactant being squeezed out of alveoli.
- Reexpansion of atelectatic regions can be associated with marked increase in regional stress.



Figure 9. Alterations caused by ventilator-induced lung injury (VIL). Biologic, physiologic, and systemic effects caused by injurious ventilatory strategies. Further injury can be caused by mediators released into the lung. These mediators can recruit neutrophils into the lung or cause changes that can promote pulmonary fibrosis. VILI can also lead to increased alveolar–capillary permeability that in turn can facilitate translocation of mediators, bacteria, or lipopolysaccharides into the systemic circulation. These can then potentially lead to multiorgan dysfunction syndrome and death. PMN = polymorphonuclear leukocytes. Reprinted by permission from Reference 29.

Injurious Ventilation Strategy Leads to Increased Epithelial Apoptosis



JAMA 2003;289(16):2104-2112

The ARDS Lung

Gattinoni JAMA 1993, Pelosi AJRCCM 1994, Gattinoni AJRCCM 2002, Gattinoni ICM 2005



Rouby Intensive Care Med 2000



Protective Ventilation



NEJM 2007

6 vs 12 ml/kg

N Engl J Med 2000;342:1301-8

Table 4. Main Outcome Variables.*					pg/ml	Plasma	IL-6	
VARIARI F	GROUP RECEIVING LOWER TIDAL VOLUMES	GROUP Receiving Traditional Tidal Volumes	Ρ. ναι με	3 2.5				<mark>■</mark> 6ml/kg ■ 12ml/kg
Death before discharge home and breathing without assistance (%)	31.0	39.8	0.007	2				
Breathing without assistance by day 28 (%)	65.7	55.0	< 0.001	1.5				
No. of ventilator-free days, days 1 to 28	12±11	10 ± 11	0.007					
Barotrauma, days 1 to 28 (%)	10	11	0.43	1 -	Do:: 1		Do:: 2	
No. of days without failure of nonpulmonary organs or systems, days 1 to 28	15±11	12±11	0.006	•	The decre with lowe	ase was great r tidal volume	ter in the gro	oup treated

The day 3 plasma interleukin-6 concentrations were also lower in this group (P=0.002).



Driving pressure vs mortality



N Engl J Med 2015;372:747-55.

Higher vs Lower PEEP

The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute ARDS Clinical Trials Network



N Engl J Med 2004;351:327-36.

Higher vs Lower PEEP metaanalysis



JAMA. 2010;303(9):865-873

Corticosteroid for persistent ARDS

- Double-blind, randomized controlled, NHLBI ARDSNet
- 180 patients with ADRS for more than 7 days, methylprednisolone vs placebo
- No differences of mortality at 60 and 180 days.
- Methylprednisolone is associated with higher ventilator and shock free days at 28 days
- Higher mortality in methylprednisolone group at least 14 days of ARDS



Figure 2. Probability of Survival and the Proportion of Patients with Persistent ARDS Who Became Able to Breathe without Assistance during the First 180 Days after Randomization.

At 180 days, 29 patients in the placebo group had died, 58 had been discharged home, and 4 had not been discharged home; the respective values in the methylprednisolone group were 28, 57, and 4. The status was known for all 180 patients at 180 days.

N Engl J Med 2006;354:1671-84.

Corticosteroid is associated with increased mortality in ARDS due to influenza pneumonia

Taiwan Severe Influenza Research Consortium



Table 2 Univariate and multivariable analyses of factors associated with hospital mortality in patients with influenzaassociated ARDS

Variables	Univariate analysis ^a		Multivariable analysis [†]			
	OR (95% CI)	p value	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> value		
APACHE II score	1.11 (1.07–1.16)	< 0.001	1.12 (1.07–1.17)	< 0.001		
PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio	0.99 (0.99-1.00)	0.007				
WBC	1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.015				
Albumin, g/dL	0.55 (0.31-0.97)	0.039				
Malignancy	2.80 (1.27-6.18)	0.011	2.71 (1.06-6.90)	0.037		
Influenza type A	0.50 (0.27-0.93)	0.028	0.38 (0.18-0.82)	0.013		
ECMO	4.53 (2.25-9.14)	< 0.001	8.51 (3.52-20.55)	< 0.001		
Vasopressor infusion	2.89 (1.59-5.25)	0.001				
Hemodialysis	2.54 (1.26-5.12)	0.009				
Early CS treatment	3.24 (1.80–5.81)	< 0.001	5.02 (2.39–10.54)	< 0.001		

APACHE II Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II, ARDS acute respiratory distress syndrome, BMI body mass index, CI confidence interval, CS corticosteroid, ECMO extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, FIO₂ fraction of inspired oxygen, PaO₂ partial pressure of arterial oxygen, OR odds ratio, WBC white blood cell

^a The variable representing early CS treatment, basic demographic variables, and all clinical variables possibly associated with hospital mortality were analyzed in univariate logistic regression models

[†] We replaced missing values (APACHE II score in 4 patients, WBC count in 2 patients, and albumin in 40 patients) by the corresponding overall median values for the multivariable regression analysis. Variables associated with hospital mortality with a p value < 0.05 in univariate models were selected into the multivariable logistic regression model, using a stepwise algorithm with criteria of p > 0.05 for eliminating variables



PEEP Guided by Esophageal Balloon

- 1. Optimal level of PEEP has been difficult to determine
- Adjusting PEEP in according to lung and chest wall mechanics is achievable
- Pao = flow x resistance + Vt/compliance
- 4. Ptp = Paw Ppleura (Pes)

Fluid management of ARDS



N Engl J Med 2006;354:2564-75.

Nasal High Flow for Acute Hypoxemia



N Engl J Med 2015;372:2185-96.

Neuromuscular Blockade in Early ARDS

ACURASYS study



- Multi-center, double-blind, randomized controlled trial
- 340 patients with ARDS admitted to ICU within 48 hours
- Cisatracurium besylate v.s. placebl
- Hazard ratio of 90 days death in the cisatracurium v.s. placebo is 0.68 (95% Cl, 0.48 to 0.98; P = 0.04),

N Engl J Med 2010;363:1107-16.

Early Neuromuscular Blockade in ARDS

ROSE trial, PETAL network



NEJM May 19, 2019

Mortality Benefits in Low P/F patients



Intensive Care Med (2010) 36:585–599

Prone positioning in severe ARDS

- Multicenter, prospective, randomized, controlled trial
- 446 patients
 - 237 prone, 229 supine
- Severe ARDS
 - P/F ratio < 150</p>
 - $FiO_2 \ge 0.6$
 - PEEP \geq 5 cm H₂O
- \geq 16 hours/day



N Engl J Med 2013;368:2159-68.



Research

CMAJ 2014. DOI:10.1503/cmaj.140081

Effect of prone positioning during mechanical ventilation on mortality among patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis

	No. of	Deaths, n/N			l ² value	Eavours - Eavours	
Variable	trials	Prone	Supine	RR (95% CI)	%	← prone supine →	
Protective lung ventilation	n						
Mandated	6	154/510	209/506	0.74 (Cl 0.59–0.95)	29	- J n = 0.05	
Not mandated	4	229/458	205/395	0.98 (CI 0.86–1.12)	0	\downarrow \downarrow $p = 0.05$	
Duration of prone position	oning						
≥ 16 h/d	6	191/565	243/547	0.77(Cl 0.64–0.92)	21		
< 16 h/d	4	192/403	171/354	1.02 (CI 0.88–1.17)	0	p = 0.02	
Level of hypoxemia*							
Severe	6	75/210	102/209	0.76 (Cl 0.61–0.94)	0	→]	
Moderate	6	75/274	102/268	0.74 (CI 0.48–1.16)	42	p >	0.9
Mild	4	3/22	3/23	0.98 (CI 0.18–5.24)	0	↓ J	
						0.1 1 10	

RR (95% CI)

Table 3. Patient Outcomes^a

	2009 Influenza A(H1N1)							
Outcome Measure	Confirmed Infection (n = 53)	Suspected Infection (n = 15)	All Infections (N = 68)					
Length of stay, median (IQR), d ICU	26 (16-35)	31 (15-38)	27 (16-37)					
Hospital	35 (24-45)	40 (27-54)	39 (23-47)					
Duration, median (IQR), d Mechanical ventilation	24 (13-31)	28 (13-34)	25 (13-34)					
ECMO support	10 (7-14)	11 (10-16)	10 (7-15)					
Survival at ICU discharge	38 (72)	10 (67)	48 (71)					
Still in ICU	4 (8)	2 (13)	6 (9)					
Survival at hospital discharge	22 (42)	10 (67)	32 (47)					
Still in hospital ^b	14 (26)	2 (13)	16 (24)					
Ambulant at hospital discharge ^c	21 (95)	10 (100)	31 (97)					
Sao ₂ on room air at hospital discharge, median (IQR), % ^c	97 (95-98)	97 (95-98)	97 (95-98)					
Discharge destination Died	11 (21)	3 (20)	14 (21)					
Home	18 (34)	4 (27)	22 (32)					
Other hospital	0	1 (7)	1 (1)					
Rehabilitation facility	4 (8)	5 (33)	9 (13)					
Cause of death ^d Hemorrhage	3 (27)	1 (33)	4 (29)					
Intracranial hemorrhage	4 (36)	2 (66)	6 (43)					
Infection	1 (9)	0	1 (7)					
Intractable respiratory failure	3 (27)	1 (33)	4 (29)					

ECMO for 2009 Influenza H1N1 Severe ARDS

Australia and New Zealand

JAMA. 2009;302(17):1888-1895

Efficacy and economic assessment of conventional ventilatory support versus extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for severe adult respiratory failure (CESAR): a multicentre randomised controlled trial



Giles J Peek, Miranda Mugford, Ravindranath Tiruvoipati, Andrew Wilson, Elizabeth Allen, Mariamma M Thalanany, Clare L Hibbert, Ann Truesdale, Felicity Clemens, Nicola Cooper, Richard K Firmin, Diana Elbourne, for the CESAR trial collaboration

- UK-based multi-center trial
- 180 patients,1:1 ratio, conventional vs ECMO
 - aged 18–65 years, severe (Murray score >3.0 or pH <7.20)
 - high pressure (>30 cm H_2O of PIP) or high FiO₂ (>0.8) ventilation for more than 7 days; intracranial bleeding; any other contraindication to limited heparinisation; or any contraindication to continuation of active treatment
- Survive to 6 months without disability
 - ECMO 63% (57/90) vs conventional 47% (41/87) (RR 0.69; 95% CI 0.05–0.97, p=0.03)

Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation for Severe Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome



A. Combes, D. Hajage, G. Capellier, A. Demoule, S. Lavoué, C. Guervilly, D. Da Silva, L. Zafrani, P. Tirot, B. Veber,
E. Maury, B. Levy, Y. Cohen, C. Richard, P. Kalfon, L. Bouadma, H. Mehdaoui, G. Beduneau, G. Lebreton, L. Brochard,
N.D. Ferguson, E. Fan, A.S. Slutsky, D. Brodie, and A. Mercat, for the EOLIA Trial Group, REVA, and ECMONet*



1. Very sick patients

- P/F ratio < 80 mmHg
- $C_{RS} < 30 \text{ cmH}_2\text{O}$
- Driving pressure > 16 cmH₂O
- SOFA > 10
- 2. Strict study design
 - 100% ECMO in study group
 - Optimal care in control group
 - Low tidal volume, 90% prone, 100% NM blockade

The routine use of ECMO in patients with severe ARDS is not superior to the use of ECMO as a rescue maneuver in patients whose condition has deteriorated further.

Survival Without Treatment Failure

Crossover to ECMO or Death for the Control Group and Death for the ECMO Group



- 1. Ethical consideration
- 2. 35(28%) in the control group crossover to ECMO
- 3. Crossover patients are sicker
 - Higher P_{plat}, ΔP, Lower compliance, more CXR infiltrates
- 4. High mortality (57%), without crossover (41%)



"Prediction is very difficult, especially about the future"

Niels Bohr 1885-1962

Physics Nobel Price - 1922

Predictors for Prone Position Ventilation in Influenza-related ARDS

Table 3 Cox regression analysis of clinical variables associated with 60-day mortality in influenza pneumonia-related ARDS with prone positioning

Clinical variables	Univariate		Multivariate			
	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	p value	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	<i>p</i> value		
APACHE II score	1.089 (1.035–1.147)	0.001*	1.042 (0.982–1.106)	0.178		
PSI	1.015 (1.005–1.026)	0.003*	1.020 (1.009–1.032)	< 0.001*		
Renal replacement therapy	5.355 (2.159–13.281)	0.000*	6.248 (2.245–17.389)	< 0.001*		
Δ Peak airway pressure (cm H ₂ O)	1.143 (1.019–1.282)	0.022*	0.996 (0.822–1.208)	0.969		
Δ Dynamic driving pressure (cm H ₂ O)	1.147 (1.008–1.305)	0.037*	1.372 (1.095–1.718)	0.006*		
Δ Dynamic compliance (ml/cm H ₂ O)	0.925 (0.871–0.983)	0.011*	0.941 (0.872–1.015)	0.117		

ARDS acute respiratory distress syndrome, CI confidence interval, APACHE II Acute Physical and Chronic Health Evaluation, PSI pneumonia severity index, Δ difference between before and after prone positioning 1 day

*p<0.05

Dynamic Driving Pressure for ARDS with ECMO

ble 2 Cox proportional haz	zards re	gression model v	with ICU morta	lity as outco	ne				
ctors				Hazard ra	tio (95% C	I)		<i>p</i> value	
ltivariate analysis nmunocompromised PACHE II score RDS duration before ECMO				1.957 (1.21 1.039 (1.00 1.002 (1.00	6–3.147) 5–1.073) 0–1.003)			0.006 0.023	
ean dynamic driving pressure fror	m day 1 t	o 3 on ECMO		1.070 (1.02	6–1.116)			0.002	
Cumulative probability of survival	1.0 - 0.8 - 0.6 - 0.4 - 0.2 - 0.0 -	P = 0.001	Driv	ving pressu ving pressu 50 60	re (ΔP) re (ΔP) 70	≤ 21 c > 21 c	mH₂O + mH₂O 90		
			Da	ays				Chiu et al. Ann. Inte	ensive Care (2017) 7

Lung Safe Study

Global Epidemiology of ARDS

- International, multicenter, prospective cohort study in winter 2014
 - 459 ICUs from 50 countries
- 10.4% (3022/29144) of ICU admission and 23% of patients requiring MV fulfilled ARDS criteria.
- Underrecognized
 - Clinician recognition of ARDS only 60%
 - Clinician recognition of ARDS at the time of fulfillment of ARDS criteria was 34.0%
- Undertreated
 - Less than 2/3 Vt < 8 of mL/kg.
 - P_{plat} measured in 40.1%, whereas 82.6% PEEP < 12 cm H₂O.
 - Prone positioning was used in 16.3% of severe ARDS.
- High mortality
 - Hospital mortality, mild 34.9%, moderate 40.3%, severe 46.1%.

Univariate	Multivariate		
HR (95% C.I.)	P value	HR (95% C.I.)	P value
1.009 (0.991-1.027)	0.33	1.016 (0.992-1.041)	0.19
, ,		· · · ·	
1 [Reference]		1 [Reference]	
1.072 (0.663-1.819)	0.80	0.845 (0.452-1.581)	0.60
0.940 (0.889-0.994)	0.03	0.960 (0.892-1.034)	0.28
1 [Reference]		1 [Reference]	
2.165 (1.028-4.557)	0.04	0.899 (0.307-2.635)	0.85
0.995 (0.990-1.000)	0.03	0.998 (0.992-1.004)	0.54
1.087 (1.054-1.121)	<0.01	1.058 (1.014-1.105)	0.01
1.014 (1.009-1.019)	<0.01	1.011 (1.004-1.018)	<0.01
1 [Reference]		1 [Reference]	
2.068 (1.211-3.529)	<0.01	1.096 (0.526-2.286)	0.81
, ,		· · ·	
1 [Reference]		1 [Reference]	
2.125 (1.225-3.683)	<0.01	1.896 (0.877-4.099)	0.10
1.250 (1.091-1.431)	<0.01	1.261 (1.072-1.484)	<0.01
	Univariate HR (95% C.I.) 1.009 (0.991–1.027) 1 [Reference] 1.072 (0.663–1.819) 0.940 (0.889–0.994) 1 [Reference] 2.165 (1.028–4.557) 0.995 (0.990–1.000) 1.087 (1.054–1.121) 1.014 (1.009–1.019) 1 [Reference] 2.068 (1.211–3.529) 1 [Reference] 2.125 (1.225–3.683) 1.250 (1.091–1.431)	UnivariateHR (95% C.I.)P value $1.009 (0.991-1.027)$ 0.33 $1 [Reference]$ $0.03 = 0.991 - 0.03$ $1 [Reference]$ $0.03 = 0.994$ $0.940 (0.889-0.994)$ $0.03 = 0.03$ $1 [Reference]$ $0.04 = 0.001 = 0.001$ $2.165 (1.028-4.557)$ $0.04 = 0.001 = 0.001$ $0.995 (0.990-1.000)$ $0.03 = 0.001 = 0.001$ $1.087 (1.054-1.121)$ $<0.011 = 0.001$ $1.014 (1.009-1.019)$ $<0.011 = 0.001$ $1 [Reference]$ $2.068 (1.211-3.529)$ $<0.011 = 0.001$ $1 [Reference]$ $2.125 (1.225-3.683)$ $<0.011 = 0.001$ $1.250 (1.091-1.431)$ $<0.011 = 0.001$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline Univariate & Multivariate \\ \hline HR (95\% C.I.) & P value & HR (95\% C.I.) \\ \hline 1.009 (0.991-1.027) & 0.33 & 1.016 (0.992-1.041) \\ \hline 1 [Reference] & 1 [Reference] \\ \hline 1.072 (0.663-1.819) & 0.80 & 0.845 (0.452-1.581) \\ \hline 0.940 (0.889-0.994) & 0.03 & 0.960 (0.892-1.034) \\ \hline 1 [Reference] & 1 [Reference] \\ \hline 2.165 (1.028-4.557) & 0.04 & 0.899 (0.307-2.635) \\ \hline 0.995 (0.990-1.000) & 0.03 & 0.998 (0.992-1.004) \\ \hline 1.087 (1.054-1.121) & <0.01 & 1.058 (1.014-1.105) \\ \hline 1.014 (1.009-1.019) & <0.01 & 1.011 (1.004-1.018) \\ \hline 1 [Reference] & 1 [Reference] \\ \hline 2.068 (1.211-3.529) & <0.01 & 1.096 (0.526-2.286) \\ \hline 1 [Reference] & 1 [Reference] \\ \hline 2.125 (1.225-3.683) & <0.01 & 1.261 (1.072-1.484) \\ \hline \end{tabular}$

Table 3Cox proportional hazard regression for 30-day mortality.

Taiwan Severe Influenza Research Consortium.

Journal of the Formosan Medical Association (2018) xx, 1e8

