



## Research Article

JMR 2022; 8(3):99-102

May- June

ISSN:2395-7565

© 2022, All rights reserved

www.medicinarticle.com

Received:29-03-2022

Accepted:14-06-2022

# Evaluation of Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup> and P levels in the 2019 novel coronavirus patients with mucormycosis

Mahdie Hamidfar <sup>1</sup>, Seyed Hossein Shahcheraghi <sup>1, 2</sup>, Faezehsadat Heidari <sup>1</sup>, Sajjad Shahmohammadi <sup>3</sup>, Jamshid Ayatollahi <sup>1, 4</sup>, Tahere Fallah <sup>5</sup>, Yeganeh Aliakbarzade Yazdani <sup>5</sup>, Mansoureh Mirhosaini <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Infectious Diseases Research Center, Shahid Sadoughi Hospital, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of Medical Genetics, School of Medicine, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Medical Nanotechnology and Tissue Engineering Research Center, Yazd Reproductive Sciences Institute, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran

<sup>4</sup> Hematology and Oncology Research Center, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran

<sup>5</sup> Shahid Sadoughi Hospital, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran

<sup>6</sup> Assistant Expert, vice chancellor for Research and Technology, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran

## Abstract

The new coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) caused by SARS-CoV-2 is a risk factor for universal public health difficulties. Some COVID-19 patients have an increased risk of fungal infections particularly mucormycosis diseases. Current laboratory examinations especially mineral elements are very important tests in terms of both detection and severity of COVID-19. The aim of the present study was to evaluate Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup> and P levels in the COVID-19 patients with mucormycosis. This study was done during 2021- 2022. All hospitalized COVID-19 (PCR positive test) patients with mucormycosis participated in the present study. Data included gender, age, hospitalization and recovery. The tested laboratory parameters included Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup> and P rate. Finally, SPSS software analyzed the data. The results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups admitted to the ward and ICU in terms of K<sup>+</sup>. There was also a significant difference between recovery and K<sup>+</sup> level. There was no significant difference in Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup> and P in terms of gender, age, hospitalization and recovery. According to the findings, K<sup>+</sup> level should be checked as a key element in the COVID-19 patients with mucormycosis.

**Keywords:** COVID-19, Mucormycosis, Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, P.

## INTRODUCTION

At the finish of 2019 a novel type of coronavirus called Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) -CoV-2 emerged in China. This has spread rapidly around the world and poses major challenges to the individuals' health <sup>[1]</sup>. Typical cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) can differ in harshness from asymptomatic to dangerous pneumonia with fungal or bacterial co-infection <sup>[2,3]</sup>.

Patients with COVID-19 experiencing ARDS, the individuals who need an extended stay in an emergency unit and ventilation, taking very high dosages of corticosteroids, are at enhanced risk of fungal infections particularly mucormycosis <sup>[3-6]</sup>.

SARS-Cov-2 may adversely impact the equilibrium of mineral condition in the COVID-19 patients' blood, through a yet to be revealed way. It isn't realized whether mineral unevenness of the blood is a reason or a result of extreme COVID-19 disease. Since the ions assume a key part in both SARS-Cov-2 combination with the host cells, and they are cofactors of a few compounds especially enzymes, further examinations and clinical considerations should be done to explore the impact of the ions level on clinical state of COVID-19 patients with or without co-infection <sup>[7]</sup>.

The aim of the current study was to investigate Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup> and P levels in the COVID-19 patients with mucormycosis.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This cross-sectional study was done during January 2021 to February 2022. It was approved in the ethics committee of Yazd Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Iran with the ethics code of

\*Corresponding author:

Dr. Seyed Hossein  
Shahcheraghi

Department of Medical  
Genetics, School of Medicine,  
Shahid Sadoughi University of  
medical sciences, Yazd, Iran

Email:  
shahcheraghih@gmail.com

IR.SSU.REC.1400.196. All hospitalized COVID-19 patients (PCR positive test) with mucormycosis were entered in this study. Also, exclusion criteria included patients with inadequate information.

The recorded data included gender, age, hospitalization and recovery. The tested laboratory parameters included Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup> and P levels.

After collecting the data were entered into SPSS software (v. 22) and Chi-Square test was also used to analyze the data. In all cases, p<0.05 was considered as a significant level.

## RESULTS

In this study, 33 patients with definitive diagnosis of COVID-19 were evaluated.

**Table 1:** Relationship between Ca<sup>++</sup> level based on gender, age, hospitalization and recovery

| Ca <sup>++</sup> Recorded Data |          | Normal N (%) | Above normal N (%) | Total N (%) | p-value |
|--------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|
| Gender                         | Female   | 5 (29.4)     | 7 (43.8)           | 12 (36.4)   | 0.866   |
|                                | Male     | 12 (70.6)    | 9 (56.3)           | 21 (63.6)   |         |
|                                | Total    | 17 (100)     | 16 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Age (year)                     | Below 55 | 8 (47.1)     | 8 (47.1)           | 16 (48.5)   | 0.392   |
|                                | Above 55 | 9 (52.9)     | 8 (50)             | 17 (51.5)   |         |
|                                | Total    | 17 (100)     | 16 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Hospitalization                | Ward     | 12 (70.6)    | 9 (56.3)           | 21 (63.6)   | 0.392   |
|                                | ICU      | 5 (29.4)     | 7 (43.8)           | 12 (36.4)   |         |
|                                | Total    | 17 (100)     | 16 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Recovery                       | Complete | 5 (29.4)     | 4 (25)             | 9 (27.3)    | 0.879   |
|                                | Relative | 8 (47.1)     | 7 (43.8)           | 15 (45.5)   |         |
|                                | Death    | 4 (23.5)     | 5 (31.3)           | 9 (27.3)    |         |
|                                | Total    | 17 (100)     | 16 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |

**Table 2:** Relationship between Na<sup>+</sup> level based on gender, age, hospitalization and recovery

| Na <sup>+</sup> Recorded Data |          | Normal N (%) | Above normal N (%) | Total N (%) | p-value |
|-------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|
| Gender                        | Female   | 7 (31.8)     | 5 (45.5)           | 12 (36.4)   | 0.622   |
|                               | Male     | 15 (68.2)    | 6 (54.5)           | 21 (63.6)   |         |
|                               | Total    | 22 (100)     | 11 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Age (year)                    | Below 55 | 10 (45.5)    | 6 (54.5)           | 16 (48.5)   | 0.443   |
|                               | Above 55 | 12 (54.5)    | 5 (45.5)           | 17 (51.5)   |         |
|                               | Total    | 22 (100)     | 11 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Hospitalization               | Ward     | 16 (72.7)    | 5 (45.5)           | 21 (63.6)   | 0.125   |
|                               | ICU      | 6 (27.3)     | 6 (54.5)           | 12 (36.4)   |         |
|                               | Total    | 22 (100)     | 11 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Recovery                      | Complete | 8 (36.4)     | 1 (9.1)            | 9 (27.3)    | 0.135   |
|                               | Relative | 10 (45.5)    | 5 (45.5)           | 15 (45.5)   |         |
|                               | Death    | 4 (18.2)     | 5 (45.5)           | 9 (27.3)    |         |
|                               | Total    | 22 (100)     | 11 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |

There was no significant difference in calcium (Ca<sup>++</sup>) in terms of gender, age, hospitalization and recovery (Table 1).

The results showed that no significant difference was observed for Na<sup>+</sup> (Table 2).

There was a statistically significant difference between the two groups admitted to the ward and ICU in terms of K<sup>+</sup> (p=0.001). Also, there was a significant difference between recovery and K<sup>+</sup> level (p=0.041) (Table 3).

The results showed that no significant difference was observed about Mg<sup>2+</sup> between groups (Table 4).

There was also no significant difference based on P level (Table 5).

**Table 3:** Relationship between k<sup>+</sup> level based on gender, age, hospitalization and recovery

| K <sup>+</sup> Recorded Data |          | Normal N (%) | Above normal N (%) | Total N (%) | p-value |
|------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|
| Gender                       | Female   | 9 (33.3)     | 3 (50)             | 12 (36.4)   | 0.656   |
|                              | Male     | 18 (66.7)    | 3 (50)             | 21 (63.6)   |         |
|                              | Total    | 27 (100)     | 6 (100)            | 33 (100)    |         |
| Age (year)                   | Below 55 | 14 (51.9)    | 2 (33.3)           | 16 (48.5)   | 0.643   |
|                              | Above 55 | 13 (48.1)    | 4 (66.7)           | 17 (51.5)   |         |
|                              | Total    | 27 (100)     | 6 (100)            | 33 (100)    |         |
| Hospitalization              | Ward     | 21 (77.8)    | 0 (0)              | 21 (63.6)   | 0.001   |
|                              | ICU      | 6 (22.2)     | 6 (100)            | 12 (36.4)   |         |
|                              | Total    | 27 (100)     | 6 (100)            | 33 (100)    |         |
| Recovery                     | Complete | 9 (33.3)     | 0 (0)              | 9 (27.3)    | 0.041   |
|                              | Relative | 13 (48.1)    | 2 (33.3)           | 15 (45.5)   |         |
|                              | Death    | 5 (18.5)     | 4 (66.7)           | 9 (27.3)    |         |
|                              | Total    | 27 (100)     | 6 (100)            | 33 (100)    |         |

**Table 4:** Relationship between Mg<sup>2+</sup> level based on gender, age, hospitalization and recovery

| Mg <sup>2+</sup> Recorded Data |          | Normal N (%) | Above normal N (%) | Total N (%) | p-value |
|--------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|
| Gender                         | Female   | 5 (35.7)     | 7 (36.8)           | 12 (36.4)   | 0.208   |
|                                | Male     | 9 (64.3)     | 12 (63.2)          | 21 (63.6)   |         |
|                                | Total    | 14 (100)     | 19 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Age (year)                     | Below 55 | 5 (35.7)     | 11 (57.9)          | 16 (48.5)   | 0.947   |
|                                | Above 55 | 9 (64.3)     | 8 (42.1)           | 17 (51.5)   |         |
|                                | Total    | 14 (100)     | 19 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Hospitalization                | Ward     | 7 (50)       | 14 (73.7)          | 21 (63.6)   | 0.162   |
|                                | ICU      | 7 (50)       | 5 (26.3)           | 12 (36.4)   |         |
|                                | Total    | 14 (100)     | 19 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Recovery                       | Complete | 4 (28.6)     | 5 (26.3)           | 9 (27.3)    | 0.560   |
|                                | Relative | 5 (35.7)     | 10 (52.6)          | 15 (45.5)   |         |
|                                | Death    | 5 (35.7)     | 4 (21.1)           | 9 (27.3)    |         |
|                                | Total    | 14 (100)     | 19 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |

**Table 5:** Relationship between p level based on gender, age, hospitalization and recovery

| P Recorded Data |          | Normal N (%) | Above normal N (%) | Total N (%) | p-value |
|-----------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|
| Gender          | Female   | 1 (14.3)     | 11 (42.3)          | 12 (36.4)   | 0.225   |
|                 | Male     | 6 (85.7)     | 15 (57.7)          | 21 (63.6)   |         |
|                 | Total    | 7 (100)      | 26 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Age (year)      | Below 55 | 5 (71.4)     | 11 (42.3)          | 16 (48.5)   | 0.223   |
|                 | Above 55 | 2 (28.6)     | 15 (57.7)          | 17 (51.5)   |         |
|                 | Total    | 7 (100)      | 26 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |
| Hospitalization | Ward     | 6 (85.7)     | 15 (57.7)          | 21 (63.3)   | 0.223   |
|                 | ICU      | 1 (14.3)     | 11 (42.3)          | 12 (36.4)   |         |
|                 | Total    | 7 (100)      | 26 (100)           | 33 (100)    |         |

|          |          |          |           |           |       |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Recovery | Complete | 3 (42.9) | 6 (23.1)  | 9 (27.3)  | 0.508 |
|          | Relative | 3 (42.9) | 12 (46.2) | 15 (45.5) |       |
|          | Death    | 1 (14.3) | 8 (30.8)  | 9 (27.3)  |       |
|          | Total    | 7 (100)  | 26 (100)  | 33 (100)  |       |

## DISCUSSION

In the current study, there was no significant difference in Ca<sup>++</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup> and P in terms of gender, age, hospitalization and recovery. There was a statistically significant difference between the two groups admitted to the ward and ICU in terms of K<sup>+</sup>. There was also a significant difference between recovery and K<sup>+</sup> level.

In a study in 2020 in Kermanshah in COVID-19 patients, a significant difference was observed between ICU and outpatients in terms of Mg<sup>2+</sup> and Na<sup>+</sup>, but in terms of K<sup>+</sup> level no difference was found between the two groups [8].

Another study in India in 2020 on COVID-19 patients showed that serum Ca<sup>++</sup> and P levels were significantly different between the patient and control groups and also patients had lower serum levels than controls [9].

In another 2020 study in China, COVID-19 patients with low Ca<sup>++</sup> and P levels had more severe disease than those with normal serum levels of the two elements [10].

In 2020, hypokalemia and high serum Na<sup>+</sup> levels were the predominant findings in Thailand. Most patients had mild hypokalemia [11].

A study in China in 2020 showed that 93% of COVID-19 patients with severe disease had hypokalemia. Loss of K<sup>+</sup> in the urine was the cause of hypokalemia [12].

## CONCLUSION

According to the findings, difference between the two groups (ward and ICU) in terms of K<sup>+</sup> and also between recovery and K<sup>+</sup> level shows that this factor should be considered as a key element in the COVID-19 patients with mucormycosis. Also, increasing the statistical population is essential in the next studies.

## Acknowledgement

The authors want to acknowledge infectious diseases research center of Yazd, Iran for their help.

## Conflicts of interest

None declared.

## Financial support

None declared.

## REFERENCES

1. Dzieciatkowski T, Szarpak L, Filipiak KJ, Jaguszewski M, Ladny JR, Smereka J, *et al.* COVID-19 challenge for modern medicine. *Cardiol J*. 2020; 27:175-83.
2. Szarpak L, Wisco J, Boyer R. How healthcare must respond to ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) in invasively mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2021;48:61.
3. Salehi M, Ahmadikia K, Badali H, Khodavaisy S. Opportunistic fungal infections in the epidemic area of COVID-19: a clinical and diagnostic perspective from Iran. *Mycopathologia*. 2020;185:607-11.
4. Salehi M, Ahmadikia K, Mahmoudi S, Kalantari S, Jamalimoghaddamsiahkali S, Izadi A, *et al.* Oropharyngeal candidiasis

in hospitalised COVID-19 patients from Iran: Species identification and antifungal susceptibility pattern. *Mycoses*. 2020;63:771-78.

5. Ahmadikia K, Hashemi SJ, Khodavaisy S, Getso MI, Alijani N, Badali H, *et al.* The double-edged sword of systemic corticosteroid therapy in viral pneumonia: A case report and comparative review of influenza-associated mucormycosis versus COVID-19 associated mucormycosis. *Mycoses*. 2021;64:798-808.
6. Bengoechea JA, Bamford CG. SARS-CoV-2, bacterial co-infections, and AMR: the deadly trio in COVID-19? *EMBO Mol Med*. 2020; 12:e12560.
7. Errasfa M. Magnesium therapeutic potential against Covid-19: Could it be an "All-in-one" therapy? *Magnes Res*. 2021:1.
8. Sarvazad H, Cahngaripour S, Roozbahani NE, Izadi B. Evaluation of electrolyte status of sodium, potassium and magnesium, and fasting blood sugar at the initial admission of individuals with COVID-19 without underlying disease in Golestan Hospital, Kermanshah. *New Microbes and New Infections*. 2020;38:100807.
9. Pal R, Ram S, Zohmangaihi D, Biswas I, Suri V, Yaddanapudi LN, *et al.* High prevalence of hypocalcemia in non-severe COVID-19 patients: a retrospective case-control study. *Frontiers in medicine* 2021:1057.
10. Yang C, Ma X, Wu J, Han J, Zheng Z, Duan H, *et al.* Low serum calcium and phosphorus and their clinical performance in detecting COVID-19 patients. *J Med Virol*. 2021;93:1639-51.
11. Nasomsong W, Ungthammakun C, Phiboonbanakit D, Prapaso S, Luvira V, Changpradub D, *et al.* Low serum potassium among patients with COVID-19 in Bangkok, Thailand: Coincidence or clinically relevant? *Trop Doct*. 2021;51:212-15.
12. Chen D, Li X, Song Q, Hu C, Su F, Dai J, *et al.* Hypokalemia and clinical implications in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *MedRxiv* 2020.