Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Emergency Department Referrals with Urologic Complaints; a Retrospective Cross-Sectional Study
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Abstract: Introduction: Medical and surgical priorities were dramatically changed during the COVID-19 pandemic. This study aimed to evaluate the impact of this pandemic on presentation to emergency department (ED) with urologic complaint. Methods: This cross-sectional study was conducted at a tertiary urology referral center in Tehran, Iran. The data of all ED admissions were collected and the frequency of admissions with urologic complaint and their outcomes were compared between two 90-day periods (before and during COVID-19 era). Results: 480 ED admissions were studied. The number of patients visiting the ED with urologic complaint during COVID-19 era was significantly lower than the same period in the pre-COVID-19 period (125 vs. 355 admissions; p = 0.01). The mean hospitalization days for patients in the pre-COVID-19 period were significantly higher (5.6 ± 4.4 vs. 3.2 ± 4.2 days; p <0.001). The most common patient complaints before and during COVID-19 period were flank pain (32.7%) and gross hematuria (32.8%), respectively. The number of patients discharged against medical advice in the COVID-19 period was significantly higher than before (22 (17.6%) vs. 10(2.8%); p < 0.001). The number of patients who developed severe complications was significantly higher in the COVID-19 period than in the pre-COVID-19 period (p = 0.001). Conclusion: During the COVID-19 pandemic we were faced with decreasing frequency of admission with urologic complaint, change in the pattern of referrals, decrease in the duration of hospitalization, increase in the number of patients discharged against medical advice, and increase in the number of cases with irreversible urologic complications or complications requiring surgery due to deferred treatment.
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1. Introduction

Pneumonia of unknown etiology was reported in China at the end of December 2019, probably related to a seafood market (1). The authorities closed the market by the 1st of January 2020 and applied strict epidemiological investigations. As a result, scientists were able to isolate and perform genome sequencing of the 2019 novel Coronavirus (2019-nCOV) on the 7th of January and gave it to the World Health Organization.
The first confirmed Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) infections in Iran were announced on 19 February 2020 (3). The World Health Organization declared the outbreak a Public Health Emergency of International Concern on 30 January 2020 and recognized it as a pandemic on 11 March 2020 (4, 5).

The COVID-19 virus is arguably the most significant challenge world healthcare systems have faced in the modern era. Medical and surgical priorities were dramatically changed at the time of this pandemic. To save facilities and resources for urgent cases and COVID-19 patients, all outpatient and elective activities were postponed by most of the world’s hospitals (6). Stricter healthcare measures were also adopted, like suspending all non-urgent elective surgeries (7, 8) and limiting inpatient and outpatient services to critically ill patients, while increasing the critical care capacity (8-10).

Many studies were conducted to evaluate the effect of COVID-19 outbreak on the field of urology. Some of them assessed the impact of COVID-19 on the education of urology students and residents (11, 12), and others revealed the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on patients with non-COVID-19 health problems, including urologic emergencies (13). All reported the negative effects of the COVID-19 outbreak.

We experienced an interesting situation in our hospital (a tertiary referral center for urology and one of the leading centers for admission of COVID-19-positive patients during the COVID-19 outbreak). In addition to a reduction in the number of emergency urology patients, we also encountered an increase in ill patients’ request for discharge against medical advice, even after they were told that this could endanger their lives.

In this study, we attempt to evaluate the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on urology emergency patients and follow the outcomes of patients who were discharged against medical advice.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design and setting

This retrospective cross-sectional study was conducted in Shohada-e-Tajrish Hospital, a tertiary urology referral center in Tehran, Iran. We reviewed the data of all patients admitted to the emergency department with urologic problems in two 90-day time periods, first, from February 20th to May 20th, 2019 (pre-COVID-19 epidemic period), and the second, from February 20th to May 20th, 2020 (COVID-19 epidemic period). Then the frequency of ED admissions with urologic complaint and their outcomes were compared between the two studied periods and possible causes were discussed. The protocol of the study was approved by Ethics committee of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences (code: IR.SBMU.RETECH.REC.1400.211). Researchers adhered to confidentiality of patients’ information and principles of Helsinki declaration regarding the ethical considerations in biomedical researches.

2.2. Participants

All patients who were admitted to ED with urologic complaints in those specific periods of time were included and patients who were admitted due to trauma and surgical complications were excluded. Also, patients who were managed by other specialists were excluded.

2.3. Data gathering

Using a pre-designed checklist, the patients’ demographic characteristics, chief complaints, final diagnosis, and outcomes were recorded. In addition, patients who were discharged against medical advice during these two time periods were listed, and a telephone follow-up was conducted to determine their final outcomes. The outcomes were categorized into three groups: group one, those who died due to postponing their treatment. Group two included those who developed severe complications (irreversible complications or complications requiring surgery) due to deferred treatment, including renal failure, erectile dysfunction, orchietomy, and penile chordee. Group three included patients for whom a delay in treatment had no effect on their outcome or who were treated at another center.

2.4. Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed using SPSS (version 23). Continuous variables are presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD). Categorical variables are presented as numbers (%). Statistical analyses such as chi-square and independent t-test were used. The significance level was set at 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Baseline characteristics

480 ED admissions were studied. The number of patients visiting the ED with urologic complaint in the studied 90-day period after the beginning of the COVID-19 epidemic was significantly lower than the same period in the previous year (125 vs. 355 admissions; p = 0.01), despite the increase in total admission rate during COVID-19 pandemic. The male/female ratio was similar in the pre-COVID-19 period and during the COVID-19 (289/66 vs. 107/18, respectively; p = 0.33). Total hospitalization time for patients in the pre-COVID-19 period was significantly higher (5.6 ± 4.4 vs. 3.2 ± 4.2 days; p <0.001).
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Table 1: Comparing the frequency of patients’ chief complaints before and during the COVID-19 period

| Chief complaint                  | Pre-COVID-19 | During COVID-19 | P value |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|
| Flank pain                       | 116 (32.7)   | 22 (17.6)       | 0.001   |
| Gross hematuria                  | 81 (22.8)    | 41 (32.8)       | 0.032   |
| Testis pain                      | 40 (11.3)    | 27 (21.6)       | 0.006   |
| Urinary retention                | 37 (10.4)    | 4 (3.2)         | 0.014   |
| Lower urinary tract symptoms     | 30 (8.4)     | 0 (0)           | <0.0001 |
| LUTS and fever                   | 21 (5.9)     | 11 (8.8)        | 0.297   |
| Abdominal pain                   | 17 (4.8)     | 6 (4.8)         | 0.401   |
| Nausea and vomiting              | 7 (2)        | 4 (3.2)         | 0.488   |
| Penile pain                      | 6 (1.7)      | 10 (8)          | 0.002   |
| Total patients                   | 355 (100)    | 125 (100)       | <0.001  |

Data are presented as frequency (%). LUTS: Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms.

Table 2: Characteristics of patients discharged against medical advice in the pre-COVID-19 period and their three-month follow-up

| N     | Age | Sex | CC                          | Underlying   | Diagnosis             | Treatment*                         | Follow-up                                      |
|-------|-----|-----|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1     | 14  | Male| Testis pain                 | Non          | Testicular torsion    | Surgery                           | Orchietomy in another center                 |
| 2     | 12  | Male| Testis pain                 | Non          | Testicular torsion    | Surgery                           | Spontaneous Pain resolution                  |
| 3     | 67  | Male| Scrotal pain                | DM,HTN       | Fournier gangrene     | Surgery                           | Expired                                       |
| 4     | 30  | Female| Flank pain and fever       | Non          | Pyelonephritis        | Admission and medical treatment   | Revisit to emergency and admission           |
| 5     | 39  | Male | Flank pain and N&V          | Non          | Urethral stone        | Surgery                           | Spontaneous stone passage                    |
| 6     | 55  | Female| Flank pain and fever       | DM,IHD       | Emphysematous pyelonephritis| Surgery                           | Nephrectomy in another center                 |
| 7     | 60  | Male | Gross hematuria             | HTN          | Bladder mass          | Surgery                           | Revisit 2 weeks later                         |
| 8     | 70  | Male | LUTS                        | CVA          | Neurogenic bladder    | Catheter insertion and evaluation| Revisit to another center                    |
| 9     | 76  | Male | Testis pain and fever       | DM           | Testicular abscess    | Surgery                           | Orchiectomy                                   |
| 10    | 80  | Male | Gross hematuria             | Prostate cancer| Hemorrhagic cystitis  | Admission and evaluation          | Relative spontaneous recovery                 |

Ages are presented in years; N: number; *: recommended treatment; CC: chief complaint; DM: Diabetes mellitus; HTN: Hypertension; IHD: Ischemic heart disease; N&V: Nausea and vomiting; LUTS: Lower urinary tract symptoms.

3.2. Chief complaints

Table 1 compares the frequency of patients’ chief complaints before and during the pre-COVID-19 periods. In pre-COVID-19 period, flank pain (32.7%) was the most common patient complaint, followed by gross hematuria (22.8%) and testis pain (11.3%). But in the COVID-19 period, gross hematuria (32.8%) was the most common complaint, followed by testis pain (21.6%) and flank pain (17.6%). The number of patients discharged against medical advice in the COVID-19 period was significantly higher compared to the pre-COVID-19 period (22 (17.6%) vs. 10 (2.8%); p < 0.001).

3.3. Discharge against medical advice and its outcomes

Tables 2 and 3 show the characteristics of patients discharged against medical advice in the pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 periods with their three-month follow-ups, respectively. The most common reason for discharge against medical advice in the pre-COVID-19 period was their willingness to seek treatment at other centers (70%), treatment being unaffordable (20%), and uncertainty about treatment staff (10%); however, during the COVID-19 period, fear of getting COVID-19 in the hospital (80%) was the most common reason for self-discharge. The outcomes of patients discharged against medical advice in pre and during COVID-19 era are compared in table 4. The number of patients in group two (patients who developed severe complications) was significantly higher in the COVID-19 period compared to the pre-COVID-19 period (p < 0.001).

4. Discussion

Based on the findings, during the COVID-19 pandemic period we were faced with decreasing frequency of admissions due to urologic complaint, change in the pattern of referrals, decrease in the duration of hospitalization, and increase in the number of patients discharged against medical advice. The numbers of cases who developed irreversible urologic...
Table 3: Characteristics of patients discharged against medical advice in the COVID-19 period and their three-month follow-up

| N  | Age | Sex | CC                  | Underlying                  | Diagnosis            | Treatment*                  | Follow-up                  |
|----|-----|-----|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1  | 54  | Male| N&V, fatigue        | HTN,BPH,DM                  | Uremia               | Catheterization and work up | Renal failure & H/D        |
| 2  | 63  | Male| Gross hematuria     | Bladder cancer              | Bladder cancer       | Admission & cystoscopy      | Relative recovery          |
| 3  | 31  | Male| Flank pain &        | HTN,BPH,DM                  | Ureteral stone       | TUL                         | Stone passage              |
| 4  | 64  | Male| Gross hematuria     | Bladder cancer              | Bladder mass         | TURP                        | Relative recovery          |
| 5  | 86  | Male| Gross hematuria     | Bladder cancer              | Prostate cancer      | Admission and work up       | Expired                    |
| 6  | 56  | Male| Flank pain after    | Bladder cancer              | Renal stone          | Ureteral catheterization    | Treatment 2 months later   |
| 7  | 72  | Male| Scrotal pain and    | Bladder cancer              | DM                   | Fournier gangrene           | Surgery                    |
| 8  | 56  | Female| Flank pain          | Bladder cancer              | Renal stone          | Surgery                     | Decreased renal function   |
| 9  | 46  | Male| Flank pain          | Bladder cancer              | TURP                 | Surgery                     | Penile chordee             |
| 10 | 70  | Male| Gross hematuria     | Bladder cancer              | Testis torsion       | Orchietomy                  | Orchietomy 24 hours later  |
| 11 | 28  | Male| Penile pain/        | Bladder cancer              | Pyelonephritis       | Nephrostomy insertion       | Revisit to another center  |
| 12 | 12  | Male| Scrotal pain        | Bladder cancer              | Peyronie's disease   | CCB injection               | Penile chordee             |
| 13 | 30  | Female| Flank pain and      | Bladder cancer              | Tumor progression    | Admission and cystoscopy    | Revisit one month later    |
| 14 | 52  | Male| Gross hematuria     | Bladder cancer              | Urethral wart        | Wart excision               | Revisit to another center  |
| 15 | 78  | Male| Prostate cancer     | Bladder cancer              | DM                   | Surgery                     | Expired 48 hours later     |
| 16 | 32  | Male| Gross hematuria     | Bladder cancer              | Colon cancer, DM     | Fournier gangrene           | Surgery                    |
| 17 | 80  | Male| Scrotal pain and    | Bladder cancer              | Ureteral stone       | Surgery                     | Expirid one month later    |
| 18 | 69  | Female| Flank pain          | Bladder cancer              | Renal stone          | TURP                        | Died due to COVID-19       |
| 19 | 70  | Male| Gross hematuria     | Bladder cancer              | TURP                 | Revisit one months later    |                            |
| 20 | 69  | Male| Urinary incontinency| Bladder cancer              | BPH                  | Catheterization             | Renal failure              |
| 21 | 15  | Male| Scrotal pain        | Bladder cancer              | Testis torsion       | Orchietomy                  |                            |
| 22 | 30  | Male| Penile ecchymosis   | Bladder cancer              | Penile fracture      | Surgery                     | Erectile dysfunction        |

Ages are presented in years; N: number; *: recommended treatment; CC: chief complaint; DM: Diabetes mellitus; HTN: Hypertension; CVA: Cerebrovascular accident; N&V: Nausea and vomiting; BPH: Benign prostatic hyperplasia; H/D: Hemodialysis; TUL: Transurethral lithotripsy; TURT: Transurethral resection of tumor; ESWL: Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy; CCB: Calcium channel blocker.

Table 4: Comparing the outcomes of patients discharged against medical advice between pre-COVID-19 and COVID-19 eras

| Period           | Total | Outcome | P value |
|------------------|-------|---------|---------|
|                  | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 |       |
| Pre-COVID-19     | 10(100) | 1(10)   | 2(20)   | 7(70) | 0.001 |
| COVID-19         | 22(100) | 2(9)    | 12(55)  | 8(36) |       |
| P value          | <0.001 | 0.16    | 0.001   | 0.03  |       |

Data are presented as frequency (%). Group one: Those who died due to postponing their treatment; Group two: Those who developed severe complications due to deferred treatment; Group three: Patients for whom a delay in treatment had no effect on their outcome or who were treated at another center.

complications or complications requiring surgery due to deferred treatment were also increased in the COVID-19 era. The COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 caused a sudden and double burden on the health care systems of all countries, and different countries dealt with this situation in different ways. For example, in the field of urology, the first step was to suspend all non-urgent elective surgeries. The second step was to discharge inpatients at the first opportunity permitted by...
the patient's clinical condition (7). These steps freed up more facilities and hospital beds for COVID-19 patients and decreased the length of hospital stay for patients with urological complaints.

Our research revealed significant reductions in emergency urologic visits to our hospital at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. This result was confirmed by other studies in different countries (8, 13), with Motterle showing that seeking care in the year 2020 (vs. 2019) was a significant predictor of admission (OR:2.71). The results strongly suggest that COVID-19 significantly influenced people’s urologic care-seeking behavior (14). We can conclude that the fear of being infected by COVID-19 made people avoid attending health care centers unless they had no other choice, instead preferring to tolerate or treat their problems conservatively. A reduction in elective urology surgeries and visits during the COVID-19 period is reasonable. However, a decrease in urology emergency visits is potentially dangerous because a delay in treatment for some patients could be life threatening or may cause severe complications.

While our hospital is a urology tertiary referral center, during the COVID-19 pandemic, it became a referral center for COVID-19 patients. Therefore, patients tended to stay in the hospital as little as possible due to fear of COVID-19 infection. As a result, the mean hospital stays were reduced significantly (5.6±4.4 vs. 3.2±4.2 days, p-value <0.001), and the rate of discharge against medical advice increased significantly (17.6% vs. 2.8%, p-value: 0.001).

For the first time, we followed up and compared the outcomes of patients discharged against medical advice and found that these patients had more than twice as many complications in the COVID-19 period than in the pre-COVID-19 period, when many complications were prevented with timely procedures.

Since we may face similar situations in the future, we need to be prepared. Many of the solutions introduced in this crisis were mainly based on prioritizing patients and surgeries (14); we would like to provide another solution. We suggest it would be better to determine a certain number of medical centers that would be able to provide the necessary emergency services to patients. The patients could then go to these “clean centers” confidently and without fear of contamination. In this plan, patients would not postpone their treatment due to fear of contamination, and performing some elective surgeries is possible. We suggest the idea of establishing “clean centers” for managing emergency patients as a viable solution for similar future situations.

5. Limitations

Some of the limitations of our study were the short period studied in this research and the limited amount of data collected due to COVID-19’s relatively short history. Future studies should cover the influence of COVID-19 pandemic on long-term urologic services and will be able to utilize a more extensive data set as more time passes.

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings, during the COVID-19 pandemic period we were faced with decrease in frequency of admissions due to urologic complaints, change in the pattern of referrals, decrease in the duration of hospitalization, and increase in the number of patients discharged against medical advice. The number of cases who developed irreversible urologic complications or complications requiring surgery due to deferred treatment were also increased in the COVID-19 era.

7. Declarations

7.1. Acknowledgments

We are thankful to all medical staff for their cooperating in the fight against COVID-19. Also, we appreciate all the efforts of personnel in charge of the hospital’s archive of medical records for helping us gather the required data.

7.2. Data availability

Authors guarantee that data of the study are available and will be provided if anyone needs them.

7.3. Authors’ contributions

AAD: Conception and design, protocol development, gaining ethical approval, BJ: researched literature and conceived the study, NB: patient recruitment and data analysis, SAH and SMH: collected the data; Contributed data or analysis tools, HK: Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, Supervision, ARR: wrote the first draft of the manuscript, AR: wrote the first draft of the manuscript, data analysis, Supervision

7.4. Funding and supports

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

7.5. Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this article.

References

1. Bogoch II, Watts A, Thomas-Bachli A, Huber C, Kraemer MU, Khan K. Pneumonia of unknown aetiology in...
Wuhan, China: potential for international spread via commercial air travel. J Travel Med. 2020;27(2):taaa008.
2. Hui DS, Azhar EI, Madani TA, Ntoumi F, Kock R, Dar O, et al. The continuing 2019-nCoV epidemic threat of novel coronaviruses to global health—The latest 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak in Wuhan, China. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;91:264-6.
3. Novin K, Hassanlouei B, Motamed M, Faraji S, Najafi M, Fadavi P, et al. Psychological Status during COVID-19 Pandemic on the Patients with Cancer. Middle East J Cancer. 2021.
4. Team EE. Note from the editors: World Health Organization declares novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) sixth public health emergency of international concern. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(5):200131e.
5. García-Basteiro AL, Chaccour C, Guinovart C, Llupiá A, Brew J, Trilla A, et al. Monitoring the COVID-19 epidemic in the context of widespread local transmission. Lancet Respir Med. 2020;8(5):440-2.
6. Puliatti S, Eissa A, Eissa R, Amato M, Mazzone E, Dell’Oglio P, et al. COVID-19 and urology: a comprehensive review of the literature. BJU Int. 2020;125(6):E7-E14.
7. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: all non-urgent elective surgery is suspended for at least three months in England. BMJ: Br Med J (Online). 2020;368.
8. Naspro R, Da Pozzo LF. Urology in the time of corona. Nat Rev Urol. 2020;17(5):251-3.
9. Ficarra V, Novara G, Giannarini G, De Nunzio C, Abate A, Bartoletti R, et al. Urology practice during the COVID-19 vaccination campaign. Urologia. 2021;88(4):298-305.
10. Chan M-C, Yeo SE, Chong Y-L, Lee Y-M. Stepping forward: urologists’ efforts during the COVID-19 outbreak in Singapore. Eur Urol. 2020;78(1):e38.
11. Amparore D, Claps F, Cacciamani GE, Esperto F, Fiori C, Liguori G, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on urology residency training in Italy. Minerva Urol Nefrol. 2020;72(4):505-9.
12. Porpiglia F, Checcucci E, Amparore D, Verri P, Campi R, Claps F, et al. Slowdown of urology residents’ learning curve during the COVID-19 emergency. BJU Int. 2020;125(6):E15.
13. Motterle G, Morlacco A, Iafrate M, Bianco M, Federa G, Xhafka O, et al. The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on urological emergencies: a single-center experience. World J Urol. 2021;39(6):1985-9.
14. Heldwein FL, Loeb S, Wroclawski ML, Sridhar AN, Carneiro A, Lima FS, et al. A systematic review on guidelines and recommendations for urology standard of care during the COVID-19 pandemic. Eur Urol Focus. 2020;6(5):1070-85.