

1 **Secondary pneumonia in critically ill ventilated patients with COVID-19**

2

3 Mailis Maes^{1*}, Ellen Higginson^{1*}, Joana Pereira-Dias^{1*}, Martin Curran², Surendra Parmar²,
4 Fahad Khokhar¹, Delphine Cuchet-Lourenço³, Janine Lux³, Sapna Sharma-Hajela⁴, Benjamin Ravenhill⁴,
5 Razeen Mahroof⁴, Amelia Solderholm¹, Sally Forrest¹, Sushmita Sridhar^{1,5}, Nicholas Brown², Stephen Baker¹,
6 Vilas Navapurkar⁴, Gordon Dougan¹, Josefin Bartholdson Scott¹, Andrew Conway Morris^{3,4#}

7

81 ¹ Cambridge Institute of Therapeutic Immunology & Infectious Disease (CITIID), Department of Medicine,
9 University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

10 ²Public Health England, Clinical Microbiology and Public Health Laboratory, Addenbrookes Hospital,
11 Cambridge, United Kingdom

122 ³Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

133 ⁴John Farman ICU, Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge, United Kingdom

144 ⁵ Wellcome Sanger Institute, Hinxton, United Kingdom

15

16 *Contributed equally to the paper

17 # Corresponding author

18 Andrew Conway Morris

19 Division of Anaesthesia

20 Department of Medicine

21 Level 4, Addenbrooke's Hospital

22 Hills Road

23 Cambridge

24 CB2 0QQ

25 Email: ac926@cam.ac.uk

26 Phone: +44 (0)1223 217889

27

28

29 Running title: Secondary pneumonia in COVID-19 patients.

30 Word count: 2630

31

32 Author statement

33 We studied the microbial composition and diagnostic microbiology results of bronchoalveolar lavage
34 (BAL) samples taken from adult COVID-19 patients and COVID-19 negative patients receiving
35 mechanical ventilation in 3 hospital ICUs. We observed that although COVID-19 patients had a
36 greater incidence of VAP, the associated causative pathogens were similar in both groups.

37

38 Keywords:

39 COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, coinfections, microarray, VAP, ICU.

40

41 **Abstract**

42 **Background** Pandemic COVID-19 caused by the coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 has a high incidence of
43 patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS). Many of these patients require admission to
44 an intensive care unit (ICU) for invasive artificial ventilation and are at significant risk of developing
45 a secondary, ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP).

46 **Objectives** To study the incidence of VAP, as well as differences in secondary infections, and
47 bacterial lung microbiome composition of ventilated COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 patients.

48 **Methods** In this prospective observational study, we compared the incidence of VAP and secondary
49 infections using a combination of a TaqMan multi-pathogen array and microbial culture. In addition,
50 we determined the lung microbiome composition using 16S RNA analysis. The study involved
51 eighteen COVID-19 and seven non-COVID-19 patients receiving invasive ventilation in three ICUs
52 located in a single University teaching hospital between April 13th 2020 and May 7th 2020.

53 **Results** We observed a higher percentage of confirmed VAP in COVID-19 patients. However, there
54 was no statistical difference in the detected organisms or pulmonary microbiome when compared to
55 non-COVID-19 patients.

56 **Conclusion** COVID-19 makes people more susceptible to developing VAP, partly but not entirely
57 due to the increased duration of ventilation. The pulmonary dysbiosis caused by COVID-19, and the

58 array of secondary infections observed are similar to that seen in critically ill patients ventilated for

59 other reasons.

60

61 Abstract word count: 209

62

63

64 **Background**

65 Pandemic COVID-19 is associated with a high number of patients suffering from severe acute
66 respiratory syndrome (SARS). Such patients can spend significant periods of time in intensive care
67 units (ICU), with >80% of patients admitted to ICU requiring invasive mechanical ventilation [1,2].
68 Critically ill patients are at high risk of nosocomial pneumonia, especially when ventilated [3]. The
69 reasons for this includes breach of natural defences by invasive devices [4], sedation and impairment
70 of coughing and mucociliary clearance, and the immunoparetic effects of critical illness [5,6]. Early
71 reports indicated that critically ill patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 had a high prevalence of
72 nosocomial pneumonia, especially ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) [7]. This is likely
73 influenced by the widespread use of corticosteroids and empiric immunosuppressive medication
74 together with increased prevalence of co-morbid conditions [7] and the prolonged duration of
75 artificial ventilation [2].

76
77 The management of critically ill patients with COVID-19 requires the identification, or exclusion, of
78 bacterial, viral or fungal pathogens which may be present as co-infections on presentation or arise
79 later in the course of the disease. Ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) can be challenging to
80 diagnose as a range of non-infectious diseases may mimic the clinical picture of radiographic
81 infiltrates, systemic inflammation and impaired oxygenation that typifies VAP [8]. To limit
82 overdiagnosis and facilitate appropriate antimicrobial therapy in VAP, most centres use culture- based
83 approaches [9,10]. However, molecular tests to detect multiple pathogens (viruses and bacteria) are
84 becoming more accessible and may further reduce unnecessary antimicrobial therapy [11].
85 Additionally, the choice of diagnostic sample is critical and directed bronchoscopy can limit
86 contamination from the proximal airway [12]. An observation that the rate of VAP amongst patients
87 with COVID-19 appeared to be higher than our background rate led to the institution of a minimally-
88 aerosol generating bronchoscopic sampling procedure to seek to minimise over-diagnosis inherent in
89 endo-tracheal aspirate-based sampling [12].

90

91 In this study, we aimed to identify and compare the distribution of secondary infections and VAP in
92 critically ill ventilated COVID-19 patients against ventilated non-SARS-CoV-2 infected patients. We
93 performed conventional microbiology, multi-pathogen molecular testing using a TaqMan array card
94 developed and validated previously [13], and assessed the composition of the bacterial lung
95 microbiome in bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) samples of COVID-19 positive and COVID-19
96 negative patients in the same hospital over a certain time period.

97

98 **Materials and methods**

99

100 *Setting and study design*

101 This study was performed in three adult ICUs in Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK,
102 consisting of a liver/general unit, neurotrauma unit and a surge capacity COVID unit. Units had
103 routinely audited ventilator bundles in place, which included sub-glottic suction tubes, mandated
104 twice daily oral hygiene with fluoride toothpaste, daily sedation holds and head of bed elevation.
105 Patients from April 13th to May 7th were included in the study if the treating clinician was
106 undertaking BAL for the diagnosis of respiratory infection in a ventilated patient. All patients had X-
107 ray infiltrates and features of systemic inflammation (raised white cell count, temperature >38°C,
108 raised C-reactive protein and/or raised serum pro-calcitonin levels).

109

110 BALs were conducted in accordance with a modified unit protocol designed to minimise aerosol
111 generation. Briefly, staff members wearing appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) inserted
112 a pre-loaded bronchoscope through an endotracheal tube catheter mount. The bronchoscope was
113 wedged in a sub-segmental bronchus corresponding to the region of maximal infiltrate on plain
114 radiography. Up to 200ml of saline was instilled and aspirated.

115

116 *Diagnostics*

117 Samples for routine microbiology were processed according to the UK Standards for Microbiology
118 Investigations [14]. Any significant growth with a CFU of $>10^4$ /mL was identified by MALDI-ToF
119 mass spectrometry.

120

121 *RNA/DNA extraction and SARS-CoV-2 qPCR*

122 500µl of BAL was subjected to RNA/DNA extraction following an existing method (14). Viscous
123 samples were first treated with 10% v/v mucolysin, before 500µl lysis buffer (25mM Tris-HCL+ 4M
124 Guanidine thiocyanate with 0.5% b-mercaptoethanol) and glass beads were added to each sample.
125 Tubes were vortexed, and 100% analytical grade ethanol was added to a final concentration of 50%.
126 After a 10 min incubation, 860µl of lysis buffer (containing MS2 as an internal extraction and
127 amplification control) was added. This was then run over an RNA spin column as previously
128 described [15]. SARS-CoV-2 specific real-time RT-PCR was performed and interpreted as
129 previously described [15].

130

131 *TaqMan multi-pathogen array*

132 Custom designed TaqMan Array Cards (TAC; Thermo Fisher Scientific) targeting 52 different
133 common respiratory pathogens, were used to test for secondary infections as previously described
134 [13]. Fifty microlitres of extracted nucleic acid was used in a 200 µl final reaction volume with
135 TaqMan™ Fast Virus 1-step Master Mix (Thermo Fisher Scientific), and cards were run on the
136 QuantStudio 7 Flex platform (Thermo Fisher Scientific) as per the manufacturer's instructions.
137 Detection of a clear exponential amplification curve with a Cycles to Threshold (CT) value ≤ 32 for
138 any single gene target was reported as a positive result for the relevant pathogen. In those patients
139 who had BALs obtained more than once, new pathogens identified in later samples were added to the
140 results of the initial array.

141

142 *VAP diagnosis*

143 The definition of VAP was adapted from the European Centre for Disease Control criteria [16]. VAP
144 was determined to be present in those patients with clinical evidence of pulmonary inflammation,
145 radiographic evidence of lung infiltrates and detection of significant amounts of pathogenic bacterial
146 or fungal species. Clinically significant amounts of pathogen were defined as those detected at a CT
147 value ≤ 32 and/ or microbial growth on culture of $\geq 10^4$ CFU/ml. Low lung pathogenicity organisms
148 (*Enterococcus spp.*, *Candida albicans*, non-pneumococcal *Streptococci* and coagulase negative
149 *Staphylococci*) were reported but not considered a component of VAP [17]. *Herpesviridae* (Herpes
150 simplex, cytomegalovirus and Epstein-Barr virus) were reported but were considered to be
151 reactivations and not considered a component of VAP [18].

152

153 *16S Nanopore sequencing*

154 Extracted nucleic acids were concentrated using AMPure XP beads (Beckman Coulter) and 16S DNA
155 libraries prepared using the 16S Barcoding Kit SQK-16S024 (Oxford Nanopore Technologies) as per
156 the manufacturer's instructions. Final DNA libraries were loaded onto FLO-MIN106D R9.4.1 flow
157 cells and sequencing was performed on a GridION Mk1 for ~36 hours with high accuracy basecalling
158 enabled. The resulting fastq files were de-multiplexed with guppy_barcode v3.6.0 using the --
159 require_barcodes_both_ends and --trim_barcodes flags. Porechop v0.2.4
160 (<https://github.com/rrwick/Porechop>) was used to trim adapter and barcode sequences and Nanofilt
161 v2.6.0 (De Coster, et. al., 2018) was used to filter the reads by length, 1,400 – 1,600 bps and a quality
162 score of 10. Reads were classified against the Silva 132 99% OTUs 16S database using Kraken2 [19].
163 Microbial diversity analyses were carried out in R using packages vegan [20] and metacoder [21].

164

165 **Results**

166 During the COVID-19 outbreak we have used a combination of TaqMan multi-pathogen array
167 and conventional microbial culture to investigate secondary infections associated with patients
168 undergoing ventilation. In our ICU, VAP was suspected in 82% of ventilated patients with COVID-19
169 and confirmed by culture or TAC in 49% of these patients, giving an incident density of 26 per 1000
170 ventilator days for confirmed VAP and 52 per 1000 ventilator days for suspected VAP. We report in

171 more detail the diagnoses made from protected lower respiratory samples analysed by these combined
172 culture-based and molecular techniques.

173

174 34 BAL samples were taken from 25 patients, of which the clinical and demographic data are
175 summarized in Table 1; five patients were sampled on two occasions and two patients sampled on
176 three occasions over the study period. Nineteen of these samples were SARS-CoV-2 positive by RT-
177 PCR, with a mean CT of 28.3. Fifteen samples tested negative for SARS-CoV-2; however, six of
178 these samples came from patients previously diagnosed with COVID-19 by RT-PCR (Table 2).

179

180 Amongst the 14 patients with a SARS-CoV-2 positive RT-PCR at time of sampling, nine were
181 confirmed to have VAP on the basis of clinical features and detection of a lung pathogen at a CT \leq 32
182 or by microbial culture $>10^4$ CFU/ml. Of these, one patient incurred two episodes of VAP, first with
183 *S. aureus* and later with *S. maltophilia* . Of the seven patients without COVID-19, four developed
184 confirmed VAP. Three of the four patients previously diagnosed with COVID-19 but with negative
185 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR at the time of sampling also were confirmed as VAP. (The co-infecting
186 organisms are shown in Table 2).

187

188 Notably, there was no significant difference in the concentration (CT) or distribution of organisms
189 between the COVID-19 positive and negative patients. Although not classed as VAP here, a number
190 of organisms (*Enterococcus spp.*, *Candida albicans*, non-pneumococcal *Streptococci*) and reactivated
191 viruses (Herpes simplex), normally regarded as being of low pathogenic potential, were detected in
192 patients (Table 2). In some cases, these were detected alongside classical lung pathogens, whereas in
193 other patients they were the sole organisms detected. There was no clear difference in the prevalence
194 of low-pathogenicity organisms between patients positive or negative for SARS-CoV-2 The mean
195 number of organisms detected by TAC in the COVID positive patients was 1.8 organisms/patient
196 (range 0 - 5), whereas the equivalent number in the COVID negative group was 1.1 organisms/patient
197 (range 0 - 3).

198

199 To investigate changes in the lung microbiota in the COVID-19 positive and negative patients we
200 performed 16S rRNA sequencing on a subset of BAL samples. In general, bacteria detected by TAC
201 or conventional microbiology were abundantly identified in samples by 16S sequencing (Figure 1).
202 When comparing COVID-19 positive to COVID-19 negative patients, there was no specific taxon that
203 was more prevalent in either group. Additionally, the microbiomes of COVID-19 positive patients
204 were not significantly different in either the species richness (alpha diversity) or the microbial
205 composition (beta diversity) to those of COVID-19 negative patients.

206

207 To investigate changes in the microbiota over the course of infection, we next looked at the microbial
208 composition of BAL samples in individual patients over time. Two patients diagnosed with VAP
209 (patients 1 and 24) showed decreasing species richness over time, as the bacterial pathogen implicated
210 in the illness became the predominant microbe present. For patient 6, the microbial composition
211 shifted significantly over time, as *Enterococcus* took over from *Staphylococcus* as the most
212 predominant pathogen. The microbiome composition of patient 24, who was both VAP and COVID-
213 19 negative, was largely stable over time. In general, the lung microbiomes of patients who did not
214 have VAP at the time of sampling (sample 1 from patient 14 and both samples from patient 24) were
215 more diverse than samples from patients who had been diagnosed with VAP.

216

217 **Discussion**

218 COVID-19 is a very new disease in the human population and this has led to an increase in the
219 number of patients in need of active sustained ventilation, which in turn introduces an increased risk
220 of VAP. COVID-19 can present in many different severe manifestations and reports of co-infections
221 vary [22,7]. However, often these reports suffer from a lack of clarity around the severity of illness,
222 location of patients (critical care vs non-critical care), timing of sampling relative to onset of disease
223 and, where applicable, the use of mechanical ventilation [22]. Here, we report on the most severely
224 affected COVID-19 patients who required clinical management on an ICU with mechanical
225 ventilation. We found a high incident density of confirmed (26/1000 ventilator days) and suspected

226 (52/1000 ventilator days) VAP in COVID-19 patients. This is greater than the previously reported
227 rates from units with similar admission profiles and use of ventilator bundles, where incident densities
228 were 6-14/1000 ventilator days for confirmed and 12-32/1000 ventilator days for suspected VAP [23].
229 Although incident density can correct for duration of ventilation to some extent, it is imperfect and
230 long-staying patients may display different features from shorter staying patients [24]. However, even
231 when compared to reports of patients staying for >14 days [23], incident density for COVID-19
232 patients remains high.

233

234 At the lung microbiome level, we observed no difference in the composition of organisms between
235 COVID-19 positive and COVID-19 patients who developed VAP. Similarly, the causative pathogens
236 identified using molecular and culture methods, were comparable in both the COVID-19 positive and
237 negative patients. Reassuringly, antibiotic susceptibility of the causative pathogens was similar in the
238 two groups (data not shown) and this meant that conventional antimicrobial regimens could be used.
239 We did detect by TAC assay *Aspergillus fumigatus* in one patients, with supportive clinical and
240 radiographic features, suggesting genuine fungal infection. This is notable as there is increasing
241 recognition of fungal infections amongst patients with viral pneumonitides [25]. Our data support the
242 concept that COVID-19, in common with other critical illness syndromes requiring mechanical
243 ventilation, induces a pulmonary dysbiosis, leading to overgrowth of enteric and respiratory
244 organisms, many of which are of low pathogenic potential[26,27]. These observations likely reflect
245 intercurrent antimicrobial therapy and a degree of immunoparesis which is also observed in other
246 critical illness states. Systemic inflammation, including activation of complement and release of C5a
247 is a hallmark of severe COVID-19 [7, 28], with excessive C5a release being a key driver of innate
248 immune dysfunction in critically ill patients and predictor of subsequent infections [23,5].

249

250 Studies reporting on VAP in COVID-19 patients are limited and have not reported the
251 microbiological or diagnostic details of the case [7]; however, it has been suggested that bacterial
252 pneumonia may be facilitated by the use of corticosteroids and empiric immunosuppressive
253 medication. In our setting these medications are not commonly used, yet there remains a high

254 prevalence of bacterial VAP in COVID-19 patients. Although VAP in COVID-19 may present
255 problems of quantity, we did not find evidence in this report of a qualitative difference. Indeed, the
256 microbial profiles of ventilated patients with active SARS-CoV-2, those who had cleared SARS-CoV-
257 2 and those who never had the viral infection were similar on both targeted TAC and 16S rRNA
258 sequencing. Our patients demonstrated similar profiles to those reported by other groups investigating
259 the pulmonary microbiome of ventilated patients [26,29]. The factors which lead to pulmonary
260 dysbiosis in critical illness remain incompletely understood, but may include intercurrent antibiotic
261 use, enteric translocation, pulmonary immune dysfunction and altered clearance [30, 27]. We
262 acknowledge the sample size limitations with our observations and suggest larger studies from
263 distinct geographic locations may help fully understand the risk of developing secondary bacterial
264 infections in patients with severe COVID-19.

265

266 **Conclusion**

267 COVID-19 makes people more susceptible to developing VAP, partly but not entirely due to the
268 increased duration of ventilation. The change in lung microbiome and causes of secondary infection
269 are similar to those seen in critically ill patients ventilated for other reasons. Careful sampling of the
270 respiratory tract whilst minimising contamination from the proximal tract, in combination with
271 sensitive diagnostic testing to reduce the risk of false negative cultures will aid antimicrobial
272 optimisation in patients with COVID-19.

273

274 **Ethical approval and consent to participate**

275 The *TaqMan multi-pathogen array* has been adopted as a routine clinical service in our institution
276 following a previous evaluation study [13]. The use of discard samples surplus to that required for
277 clinical testing, and anonymised data review were conducted under the consent waiver granted by
278 Leeds West NHS Research Ethics Committee (ref: 20/YH/0152).

279

280 **Acknowledgments**

281 Our thanks go out to all the ICU clinicians, nurses and physiotherapists who have ensured proper
282 patient care and sample management even in these hard times, as well as to PHE microbiologists for
283 running standard microbiology tests. Furthermore, the authors wish to thank Mark Wills for his help
284 as Biological Safety Officer to ensure we work in a safe environment. We also thank Estée Török and
285 Ian Goodfellow for access to consumables and the GridION for Nanopore sequencing, and Satpal
286 Ubhi for help with clinical data collection. Finally, we wish to acknowledge our funders the NIHR
287 BRC. In addition we would like to acknowledge the grant awarded by Addenbrooke's Charitable
288 Trust for the initial study of the clinical utility of the TaqMan microarray [13].

289

290 **Authors contributions**

291 MM- sample processing, data analysis and manuscript writing; EEH- sample processing, data analysis
292 and manuscript writing; JPD-sample processing and manuscript editing; DCL,JL,AS, SF,SS -sample
293 processing; FK- sample processing and data analysis; SSH, BR, RM- clinical data collection MC,SP,
294 NB- diagnostic data analysis; SB manuscript editing; VN conceived study and sample acquisition:
295 GD- conceived study and manuscript editing; JBS conceived study, sample processing and
296 manuscript editing ; ACM- conceived study, manuscript writing, sample acquisition, data analysis and
297 clinical data collection.

298

299 **Consent for publication**

300 All authors read and approved the final version for publication.

301

302 **Availability of supporting data**

303 Raw sequencing data is available upon request.

304

305 **Funding**

306 This study was funded by the National Institute for Health Research [Cambridge Biomedical
307 Research Centre at the Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust]. The views expressed
308 are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health

309 and Social Care. Dr Conway Morris is supported by a Clinical Research Career Development

310 Fellowship from the Wellcome Trust (WT 2055214/Z/16/Z).

311

312 **Competing interest**

313 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

314

315

316

317

318 References

- 319 1) Goyal P, Choi JJ, Pinheiro LC, et al. Clinical Characteristics of COVID-19 in New York City.
320 *N Engl J Med*. April 2020:NEJMc2010419.
- 321 2) Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591
322 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy.
323 *JAMA*. 2020;323(16):1574-1578.
- 324 3) Vincent J-L, Sakr Y, Singer M, et al. Prevalence and Outcomes of Infection Among Patients
325 in Intensive Care Units in 2017. *JAMA*. 2020;323(15):1478–10.
- 326 4) Álvarez-Lerma F, Palomar-Martínez M, Sánchez-García M, et al. Prevention of Ventilator-
327 Associated Pneumonia. *Critical Care Medicine*. 2018;46(2):181-188.
- 328 5) Morris AC, Datta D, Shankar-Hari M, et al. Cell-surface signatures of immune dysfunction
329 risk-stratify critically ill patients: INFECT study. *Intensive Care Med*. 2018;44(5):627-635.
- 330 6) Hotchkiss RS, Monneret G, Payen D. Sepsis-induced immunosuppression: from cellular
331 dysfunctions to immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2013;13(12):862-874.
332 doi:10.1038/nri3552.
- 333 7) Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients
334 with COVID-19-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet*. March
335 2020:1-9. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3.
- 336 8) Meduri GU, Maul din GL, Wunderink RG, et al. Causes of fever and pulmonary densities in
337 patients with clinical manifestations of ventilator-associated pneumonia. 1994;106(1):221-
338 235.
- 339 9) Torres A, Niederman MS, Chastre J, et al. International ERS/ESICM/ESCMID/ALAT
340 guidelines for the management of hospital-acquired pneumonia and ventilator-associated
341 pneumonia: *European Respiratory Journal*. 2017;50(3):1700582.
- 342 10) Kalil AC, Metersky ML, Klompas M, et al. Management of Adults With Hospital-acquired
343 and Ventilator-associated Pneumonia: 2016 Clinical Practice Guidelines by the Infectious
344 Diseases Society of America and the American Thoracic Society. *Clinical Infectious
345 Diseases*. 2016;63(5):e61-e111. doi:10.1093/cid/ciw353.

- 346 11) Arulkumaran N, Routledge M, Schlebusch S, Lipman J, Morris AC. Antimicrobial-associated
347 harm in critical care: a narrative review. *Intensive Care Med.* January 2020:1-11.
- 348 12) Morris AC, Kefala K, Simpson AJ, et al. Evaluation of the effect of diagnostic methodology
349 on the reported incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Thorax.* 2009;64(6):516-522.
350 doi:10.1136/thx.2008.110239.
- 351 13) Navapurkar V, Bartholdson Scott J, Maes M et al. Development and implementation of a
352 customised rapid syndromic diagnostic test for severe pneumonia. *MedRxiv*
353 medRxiv 2020.06.02.20118489; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.02.20118489>
- 354 14) SMI B 57: investigation of bronchoalveolar lavage, sputum and associated specimens
355 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/smi-b-57-investigation-of-bronchoalveolar-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/smi-b-57-investigation-of-bronchoalveolar-lavage-sputum-and-associated-specimens)
356 [lavage-sputum-and-associated-specimens](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/smi-b-57-investigation-of-bronchoalveolar-lavage-sputum-and-associated-specimens)
- 357 15) Sushmita Sridhar, Sally Forrest, Iain Kean, et al. A blueprint for the implementation of a
358 validated approach for the detection of SARS-Cov2 in clinical samples in academic facilities,
359 bioRxiv 2020.04.14.041319; doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.14.041319>
- 360 16) Plachouras D, Lepape A, Suetens C. ECDC definitions and methods for the surveillance of
361 healthcare-associated infections in intensive care units. *Intensive Care Med.* October 2018:1-
362 3.
- 363 17) Chastre J, Fagon J-Y. Ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.*
364 2002;165(7):867-903.
- 365 18) Bruynseels P, Jorens PG, Demey HE, et al. Herpes simplex virus in the respiratory tract of
366 critical care patients: a prospective study. *The Lancet.* 2014;362(9395):1-6.
- 367 19) Wood DE, Lu J, Langmead B. Improved metagenomic analysis with Kraken 2. *Genome Biol.*
368 2019;20(1):257. Published 2019 Nov 28. doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1891-0
- 369 20) Oksanen, J. (2013). Vegan: ecological diversity. *R Project.*
- 370 21) Foster, Z. S., Sharpton, T. J., & Grünwald, N. J. (2017). Metacoder: an R package for
371 visualization and manipulation of community taxonomic diversity data. *PLoS computational*
372 *biology*, 13(2), e1005404.
- 373

- 374 22) Rawson TM, Moore LSP, Zhu N, et al. Bacterial and fungal co-infection in individuals with
375 coronavirus: A rapid review to support COVID-19 antimicrobial prescribing. *Clin Infect Dis*.
376 May 2020.
- 377 23) Morris AC, Hay AW, Swann DG, et al. Reducing ventilator-associated pneumonia in
378 intensive care: Impact of implementing a care bundle. 2011;39(10):2218-2224.
- 379 24) Nelson JE, Cox CE, Hope AA, Carson SS. Chronic critical illness. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
380 *Med*. 2010;182(4):446-454.
- 381 25) Schauwvlieghe A.F.A.D, Rijnders B.J.A, Philips N. et al. Invasive aspergillosis in patients
382 admitted to the intensive care unit with severe influenza: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*
383 *Respiratory Medicine* July 2018 DOI:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(18\)30274-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(18)30274-1).
- 384 26) Zakharkina T, Martin-Loeches I, Matamoros S, et al. The dynamics of the pulmonary
385 microbiome during mechanical ventilation in the intensive care unit and the association with
386 occurrence of pneumonia. *Thorax*. 2017;72(9):803-810.
- 387 27) Roquilly A, Torres A, Villadangos JA, et al. Pathophysiological role of respiratory dysbiosis
388 in hospital-acquired pneumonia. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2019;7(8):710-720.
389 doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(19)30140-7.
- 390 28) Gao T, Hu M, Zhang X, et al. Highly pathogenic coronavirus N protein aggravates lung
391 injury by MASP-2-mediated complement over-activation. *medrxiv.org*
392 doi:10.1101/2020.03.29.20041962.
- 393 29) Dickson RP, Singer BH, Newstead MW, et al. Enrichment of the lung microbiome with gut
394 bacteria in sepsis and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Nat Microbiol*.
395 2016;1(10):16113.
- 396 30) Dickson RP, Huffnagle GB. The Lung Microbiome: New Principles for Respiratory
397 Bacteriology in Health and Disease. Goldman WE, ed. *PLoS Pathogens*.
398 2015;11(7):e1004923-e1004925.
- 399 31) Jacobs F, Denis O et al. Clinical evaluation of a multi-parameter customized respiratory
400 TaqMan® array card compared to conventional methods in immunocompromised patients.
401 *Journal of Clinical Virology*. 2015;72:36-41.

402 32) Browne E, Hellyer TP, Baudouin SV, et al. A national survey of the diagnosis and
403 management of suspected ventilator-associated pneumonia. *BMJ Open Resp Res.*
404 2014;1(1):e000066.
405
406

407 Figure Legends

408

409 Figure 1 Microbial composition of BAL samples from SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative patients.

410 Bacterial 16S genes were sequenced and classified to the genus level using Kraken2. The percent of

411 reads mapping to each genus is shown for individual samples from each patient (A), and longitudinal

412 samples (1, 2 or 3) from individual patients (B, C, D, E). Individuals were classified as either COVID-

413 19 negative, COVID-19 positive, or recovering (previously diagnosed with COVID-19 but SARS-

414 CoV-2 negative at time of sample).

415

416 Tables

417 Table 1. Clinical and demographic features of reported population.

Characteristic	
Median age (range)	57 (31-73)
Female n(%)	9 (36%)
Antibiotics at time of bronchoscopy n(%)	24 (96%)
Median FiO2 prior to bronchoscopy (range)	0.5 (0.25-0.9)
Alive at end of study (remain in ICU)	17 (68%) 11
Median Duration of ventilation: days (range)	17 (2-42)
Median duration of ICU admission: days (range)	19 (2-44)
Immunocompromised* n(%)	6 (24%)

418

419 *Immunocompromised patients were defined as having active haematological malignancy,
420 neutropaenic malignancy, solid organ or bone marrow transplant and receipt of immunosuppressive
421 medication including corticosteroids for >1 week prior to hospital admission.

422

Patient	Sample	SARS-CoV-2	COVID-19	Organism with CT<32	Cultured Organism	VAP
Patient 1	1	POS	YES	<i>S. aureus</i>	No significant growth	YES
	2	POS	YES	<i>S. maltophilia</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 2	1	POS	YES	<i>H. influenzae</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 3	1	POS	YES	<i>K. pneumoniae, S. marcescens, E. coli S. epidermidis</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 4	1	POS	YES		No significant growth	NO
	2	POS	YES	<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	YES
Patient 5	1	POS	YES	<i>HSV, S. epidermidis, C. albicans</i>	<i>C. albicans</i>	NO
	1	POS	YES	<i>S. aureus, S. epidermidis, Streptococcus spp</i>	<i>S. aureus</i>	YES
Patient 6	2	POS	YES	<i>S. aureus, E. faecium, S. marcescens</i>	<i>S. aureus</i>	YES
	3	POS	YES	<i>S. aureus, E. faecium, HSV</i>	<i>S. aureus, S. maltophilia</i>	YES
Patient 7	1	POS	YES	<i>E. faecium, S. epidermidis</i>	Mixed upper resp. tract flora	NO
Patient 8	1	POS	YES	<i>E. faecium, C. albicans</i>	<i>C. albicans</i>	NO
Patient 9	1	POS	YES	<i>HSV, S. marcescens,</i>	<i>S. marcescens</i>	YES
	2	POS	YES	<i>E. faecium, S. marcescens</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 10	1	POS	YES	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 11	1	POS	YES		No significant growth	NO
Patient 12	1	POS	YES	<i>A. fumigatus, S maltophilia</i>	<i>S. maltophilia</i>	YES
Patient 13	1	POS	YES		No significant growth	NO
Patient 14	1	POS	YES		No significant growth	NO
	2	NEG	YES	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	YES
Patient 15	3	NEG	YES	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	YES
	1	NEG	NO	<i>C. albicans</i>	<i>C. albicans</i>	NO
Patient 16	1	NEG	NO		<i>E. coli</i>	YES
Patient 17	1	NEG	NO	<i>S. marcescens</i>	<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	YES
Patient 18	1	NEG	YES	<i>Streptococcus spp, E. Proteus , K. pneumoniae</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 19	1	NEG	YES	<i>E. faecium, E. coli</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	YES
Patient 20	1	NEG	YES	<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 21	1	NEG	NO	<i>Streptococcus spp, H. influenzae</i>	No significant growth	YES
Patient 22	1	NEG	NO	<i>H. influenzae, Streptococcus spp, S. aureus</i>	No significant growth	YES
	1	NEG	NO		No significant growth	NO
Patient 23	2	NEG	NO		No significant growth	NO
	1	NEG	NO	<i>HSV</i>	<i>HSV</i>	NO
Patient 24	2	NEG	NO	<i>HSV</i>	No significant growth	NO
	1	NEG	YES		No significant growth	NO

2:

21

423 Table

Figure 1

