

1 **Prevalence and Characterization of Bacteria Present in the Nasopharynx of**
2 **Outpatients with and without SARS-CoV-2**

3

4 James F. Shurko^{#1}, Chris A. Mares^{#2}, Robert B. Page², Kristina Lopez¹, Vivian Nguyen¹, Niti Vanee¹,
5 Pramod K. Mishra^{1*}

6

7 ¹iGenomeDx, San Antonio, Texas, USA

8 ²Department of Life Sciences, Texas A&M University-San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas, USA

9

10 [#]James F. Shurko and Chris A. Mares contributed equally to the preparation of this manuscript.

11 ^{*}Correspondence:

12 Pramod K. Mishra, iGenomeDx, 2040 Babcock Road, Suite 200, San Antonio, Texas, 78229,

13 pmishra@igenomedx.com.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **Abstract**

28 COVID-19 has emerged as a highly contagious and debilitating disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus
29 and has claimed the lives of over 6.8 million people worldwide. Bacterial co-infections are one of many
30 co-morbidities that have been suggested to impact the outcome of COVID-19 in patients. The primary
31 goal of this study was to assess the prevalence of bacterial co-infections and to describe any trends
32 observed during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. To do this, we investigated SARS-CoV-2 and
33 bacterial co-infections from outpatient RT-PCR testing in Texas. The results indicate *Staphylococcus*
34 *aureus*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Moraxella catarrhalis*, and *Haemophilus*
35 *influenzae* were the most frequently detected bacterial pathogens in both SARS-CoV-2 positive and
36 SARS-CoV-2 negative patients and that these bacterial pathogens were present in these two patient
37 populations at similar proportions. We also detected *Staphylococcus aureus* in a significantly larger
38 proportion of males relative to females and people under 65 years of age relative to those 65 and over.
39 Finally, we found that Hispanics were 75% more likely to be SARS-CoV-2 positive than non-Hispanics.
40 The results suggest that COVID-19 patients may benefit from rapid diagnostic tests for bacterial
41 pathogens and that this information could help delineate targeted antimicrobial therapy.

42 43 **Introduction**

44 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is caused by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
45 (SARS-CoV-2) and represents an important global health challenge. Approximately 6.8 million deaths
46 have been reported as due to COVID-19 globally with over one million occurring in the United States^{1,2}.
47 In the state of Texas alone, the CDC has reported a total of over 6.8 million cases and over 86 thousand
48 deaths since March of 2020. As of May 26th, 2022, the CDC reports an incidence of over 4.5 thousand
49 cases per day contributing to an average of 5 daily deaths³. While vaccines are available to the general
50 public in the United States, nearly 33.4% of the general population is not fully vaccinated (defined as

51 receiving two doses of either the Pfizer or Moderna vaccine or a single Dose of the Johnson and Johnson
52 vaccine) and in the State of Texas, approximately 34.4% of the population is not fully vaccinated^{4,5}.
53 These data, combined with the discovery of newly emerging strains, demonstrate that COVID-19 is a
54 continuing health concern⁶.

55 SARS-CoV-2 infections display a wide range of prognoses ranging from asymptomatic infection
56 to severe respiratory failure and death. More specifically, patients may experience fever, cough, fatigue,
57 dyspnea, diarrhea, loss of taste or smell, aches, conjunctivitis, pneumonia, acute respiratory distress
58 syndrome (ARDS) and multi-organ failure^{7,8}. Currently, treatments for COVID-19 are limited and
59 controversial, with clinicians focusing largely on supportive care⁹⁻¹¹. In addition to comorbidities such as
60 hypertension and diabetes, bacterial co-infections have been shown to have a profound impact on the
61 outcomes of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2¹²⁻¹⁵. Subsequently, empiric antimicrobial therapy has
62 been commonly administered to affected patients. Widespread antibiotic use remains controversial
63 however, due to increased healthcare costs, increased adverse drug reactions, and the evolution of
64 antimicrobial resistance. This study therefore aims to determine the effect of patient demographics
65 (age, sex, race and ethnicity) on the frequency of SARS-CoV-2 and bacterial infection, and to compare
66 the prevalence of common respiratory pathogens present within the nasopharynx of SARS-CoV-2
67 negative and SARS-CoV-2 positive patients. By elucidating the types of bacteria, frequency of bacterial
68 co-infection, and populations most likely to be infected, these data may aid in guiding the selection of
69 appropriate antimicrobials during infection as well as identify populations that are most likely to benefit
70 from concurrent respiratory pathogen testing or antibiotic use.

71

72 **Results**

73 Of the 4905 patients included in this data set 985 tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. Table 1 shows point
74 estimates and 95% confidence intervals for the proportion of patients from various demographics (i.e.,

75 sex, age, ethnicity, and race) that were positive for SARS-CoV-2, *S. aureus*, and bacterial pathogens other
76 than *S. aureus*. Of the 12 tests conducted to compare positivity across these demographics, three were
77 statistically significant after correcting for multiple testing (Supplemental File 1). Despite fewer than half
78 (46.20%) of all patients self-reporting ethnicity, the positivity rate for SARS-CoV-2 was 75% higher in
79 Hispanics compared to non-Hispanics (Table 1). Further, the positivity rate for *S. aureus* was 23% higher
80 in males than females and 24% higher in patients under 65 years of age when compared to individuals
81 65 years of age or older (Table 1). Finally, there were no statistically significant differences in the
82 positivity rates of non-*S. aureus* bacteria detected across any of the demographic variables examined.

83 A total of eight bacterial pathogens were detected in this study including *S. aureus* ($n = 1247$), *S.*
84 *pneumoniae* ($n = 184$), *M. catarrhalis* ($n = 157$), *K. pneumoniae* ($n = 129$), *H. influenzae* ($n = 91$), *M.*
85 *pneumoniae* ($n = 3$), *C. pneumoniae* ($n = 4$) and *Bordetella sp* ($n = 4$). The estimated proportions and 95%
86 confidence intervals of SARS-CoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative patients who tested positive for
87 each of these eight bacterial pathogens are shown in Figure 1. Three of these eight bacterial pathogens
88 (*Bordetella sp.*, *C. pneumoniae*, and *M. pneumoniae*) were detected in fewer than five patients;
89 therefore, tests of equal proportions were not performed. Of the remaining five pathogens, tests
90 comparing positivity rates in SARS-CoV-2 negative and SARS-CoV-2 positive patients were not
91 statistically significant after correcting for multiple testing (Supplemental File 1).

92 Of the 4905 patients included in this study 1566 (31.9%) tested positive for at least one bacterial
93 pathogen and 471 (9.6%) patients tested positive for a pathogen other than *S. aureus*. Additionally, 213
94 (4.3%) patients tested positive for multiple bacterial pathogens and 85 (1.7%) patients tested positive
95 for multiple pathogens not counting *S. aureus* (Table 2). Contingency tables, odds ratios, 95% confidence
96 intervals, and *P*-values from Fisher's Exact Tests assessing the association between SARS-CoV-2 and
97 bacterial infection of any kind, bacterial infections other than *S. aureus*, polymicrobial infection including
98 *S. aureus*, and polymicrobial infection not including *S. aureus* are shown in Table 2. Upon correcting for

99 multiple testing, no significant associations were detected. However, the percentage of patients in
100 which multiple non-*S.aureus* bacteria were detected was more than twice as high in SARS-CoV-2
101 negative patients (1.9%) when compared to SARS-CoV-2 positive (0.91%) patients (Table 2).

102

103 **Discussion**

104 Among patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 globally, meta-analyses report a wide range (1-100%) of
105 antimicrobial prescribing rates. In the United States these rates generally range from 50% to 95% and
106 are typically near 70%¹⁶⁻¹⁹. While some of these patients do suffer from bacterial co-infection or develop
107 secondary infections after admission, a disparity may exist between the rate of prescribing antibiotics
108 and the number of patients concurrently infected with SARS-CoV-2 and bacterial pathogens. As
109 antibiotics are prescribed, adverse drug reactions and antimicrobial resistance become concerns. With
110 studies identifying drug resistant organisms in SARS-CoV-2 patients treated with antibiotics, it has
111 become imperative to determine the necessity of utilizing these agents^{20,21}. With studies identifying drug
112 resistant organisms in SARS-CoV-2 patients treated with antibiotics, it has become imperative to weigh
113 the risks and benefits of utilizing these agents. To address the necessity of prescribing antibiotics during
114 the current pandemic, we explored the propensity of SARS-CoV-2 infected patients to also experience
115 bacterial co-infection in the state of Texas. Further, we investigated whether patient demographics were
116 associated with the rate of SARS-CoV-2 or bacterial infection, as well as the types of bacteria and
117 number of polymicrobial infections present.

118 The rate of co-infection varies widely in the literature ranging from approximately 1 to 50
119 percent^{17,20,22-28}. Many factors may contribute to this variation including differences in geography,
120 setting (inpatient vs outpatient), time of collection (upon admission vs during hospital stay), site of
121 collection/sample type (sputum vs bronchiolar lavage vs nasopharyngeal swab etc.), and targeted
122 organisms (bacteria vs viruses or both). This study detected bacteria in 31.9 percent of patients including

123 32 percent among SARS-CoV-2 positive patients and 31 percent among SARS-CoV-2 negative patients.
124 While this bacterial co-infection rate may be higher than those estimated from many studies, it is typical
125 within the literature for studies utilizing nasopharyngeal swabs to observe higher rates of bacteria
126 compared to those drawing from other sources such as sputum. For example, a study conducted by
127 Calcagno et al., in which 75.9% of samples were collected via nasopharyngeal swabs, reported a similar
128 rate (32.7 percent of patients overall in comparison to 31.9 percent in our study)²⁵. Additionally,
129 Calcagno et al.²⁵ identified *S. aureus* in 15.4 percent of patients while *S. aureus* was identified in 25.4%
130 percent of patients in our study. When combined with the notion that *S. aureus* colonizes the nares of a
131 large portion of the general population, it's likely that the rate of infection, especially that by *S. aureus*
132 was inflated due to commensal bacteria. In addition to *S. aureus* our study identified *H. influenza* (1.8%),
133 *K. pneumoniae* (2.6%), *S. pneumoniae* (3.8%) and *M. catarrhalis* (3.2%) as the most common pathogens.
134 Similarly, in a meta-analysis by Musuuza et al., the most common respiratory pathogens detected in
135 patients co-infected with SARS-CoV-2 were *K. pneumoniae* (9.9%), *S. pneumoniae* (8.2%), *S. aureus*
136 (7.7%), *H. influenzae* (6.6%), and *M. pneumoniae* (4.3%), and *M. catarrhalis* (1.7%)²⁹. Unlike in our
137 study however, Musuuza et al.²⁹ found that *M. pneumoniae* comprised 4.3% of the bacterial pathogens
138 identified, whereas our study only detected three instances of *M. pneumoniae*, all of which were SARS-
139 CoV-2 negative patients.

140 While many factors potentially contribute to the similarities and differences between our results
141 and those of others, it is important to note that the types of bacterial infections observed may change
142 over time and/or differ considerably between outpatient and hospital settings. For example,
143 *Acinetobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, and *Enterococcus* were more commonly identified after prolonged
144 hospital stays and multi-drug resistant organisms (MDROs) have been detected in hospitalized
145 patients^{20,29}. An additional limitation of comparing our results to the results of others is that the panels
146 of bacterial pathogens tested for often differs among studies. Thus, while it is expected for pathogens

147 associated with prolonged hospital stays to be less frequent in our outpatient population, use of the Fast
148 Tracking Diagnostics (FTD) panel limited our ability to fully assess their impact because it does not target
149 many of these organisms. Nevertheless, while the FTD panel may have limited the number of bacterial
150 species detected and therefore the overall infection rate, this limitation was partially addressed by
151 noting the presence of individual species. Additionally, separate analyses were conducted with and
152 without *S. aureus*. In doing so, infection rates of specific pathogens could be compared across groups or
153 between studies. Despite these limitations, this study is unique in that few studies have specifically
154 reviewed outpatient data and while several studies described the rate of co-infection in COVID-19
155 patients, few studied the difference in rate among SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative patients. However,
156 due to a lack of clinical follow up, culture, or genomic information, we were not able to describe the
157 effect of antimicrobial treatment on these patients. Overall, this study, and comparisons of our data
158 with data from other studies, show no evidence of an increased rate of bacterial infection among SARS-
159 CoV-2 positive patients.

160 In addition to comparing the rate and types of bacterial infections in SARS-CoV-2 positive and
161 negative patients we sought to identify populations that may be at increased risk of either SARS-CoV-2
162 or bacterial infections. The data from this study confirm an increased rate of SARS-CoV-2 present in
163 Hispanics. This study was limited by its retrospective nature and self-reported demographics, of which
164 many patients declined to answer. Despite this limitation the proportion of Hispanics testing positive
165 for SARS-CoV-2 is in line with data reported by the CDC³⁰. Notably 2639 patients did not disclose their
166 ethnicity and only 283 patients identified as non-Hispanic compared to 1983 patient who identified as
167 Hispanic. Consequently, the ethnicity of 53.8% of the patients is unknown and therefore volunteer bias
168 should be considered when interpreting these results. Despite this limitation, this study did uncover
169 that Hispanics were significantly more likely to be infected with SARS-CoV-2 when compared to non-
170 Hispanics or when compared to those that did not self-report their ethnicity. Others have reported

171 similar observations, suggesting minorities have higher incidence and mortality rates due to COVID-19³¹⁻
172 ³³. This study also found that *S. aureus* was more likely to be observed in men and adults below the age
173 of 65, while other patient demographics did not appear to influence the presence of bacteria.

174 RT-PCR is currently the gold standard for detecting SARS-CoV-2, and in this study, this
175 technology was used concurrently with RT-PCR-based bacterial pathogen testing to ensure that no
176 systemic discrepancies existed in the sample collection and testing procedures. Using this approach, we
177 found a higher rate of detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Hispanics; however, no significant differences were
178 detected in the rate of bacterial infection between SARS-CoV-2 positive and SARS-CoV-2 negative
179 patients. Therefore, these data alone do not support an increase in the prescription of antimicrobials
180 due to the presence of SARS-CoV-2. We also detected *S. aureus* at higher rates in men and people under
181 65. However, *S. aureus* (the most commonly detected bacterium in our study) is observed in the nares of
182 approximately 20%-30% of the population^{34,35}, suggesting that the presence of *S. aureus* in and of itself
183 is not necessarily indicative on infection—an issue we addressed by conducting separate analyses that
184 included and excluded *S. aureus*. Because this study was derived from outpatient settings at multiple
185 sites within the state of Texas, these data may not generalize to populations from other parts of the US.
186 However, by surveying outpatients, this study may be more applicable to the portion of the general
187 public that does not require hospitalization. Moreover, this study may provide utility in selecting
188 appropriate empiric therapies for patients who develop serious infections that require hospitalization.

189

190 **Methods**

191 **Study design, sample collection & patient population**

192 This study was a retrospective, multicenter analysis of outpatients concurrently tested for the presence
193 of SARS-CoV-2 as well as respiratory pathogens from April 2020 to April 2021. The patient population

194 was derived from within the state of Texas and patients were indicated for testing due to experiencing
195 symptoms such as cough, fever, etc.

196 Sample kits composed of requisition forms, nasopharyngeal swabs (Huachenyang iClean,
197 Shenzhen, China) and conical tubes (Stellar Scientific, Baltimore Maryland) containing storage buffer
198 were sent to outpatient facilities. Storage buffer was prepared according to CDC guidelines³⁶. Patient
199 demographics including sex, date of birth, ethnicity and race were included on the requisition forms and
200 self-reported by patients. Broad consent was provided by the patients at the time of testing. Prior to
201 analysis patient information was de-identified using the Safe Harbor Method³⁷. Specifically, date of
202 birth, provider, facility, insurance provider, and detailed geographic information such as zip codes etc.
203 were removed from the data set. This study was exempted from institutional review by the Institutional
204 Review Board at Texas A&M University-San Antonio (TAMUSA IRB #2022-016).

205

206 **RNA isolation and Pathogen Identification**

207 Bacteria were characterized by species, using RT-PCR. After nasal swab samples were obtained, RNA was
208 extracted using the Applied Biosystems MagMax Viral/Pathogen II kit (ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA) per
209 the manufacturer's instructions. After isolation, RNA was amplified and detected via RT-PCR using the
210 Applied Biosystems QuantStudio 7 flex and 12K flex systems (ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA). Primers,
211 probes and enzymes used to detect SARS-CoV-2 and bacteria were purchased from Integrated DNA
212 Technologies (Coralville, Iowa) and Fast Track Diagnostics (Sliema, Malta) respectively. Positive SARS-
213 CoV-2 tests were defined as a cycle threshold (Ct) value of 40 or less for RNase P, N1 and N2 collectively.
214 The Fast Track Diagnostics (FTD) respiratory kit contained probes for *Bordetella spp*, *Chlamydia*
215 *pneumoniae*, *Haemophilus influenzae*, *Haemophilus influenzae type B*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Legionella*
216 *pneumophila*, *Moraxella catarrhalis*, *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, *Salmonella spp*, *Staphylococcus aureus*,

217 *and Streptococcus pneumoniae*. Bacterial infection was defined as a positive RT-PCR test in which the Ct
218 value was less than 35 for any of the respective probes.

219

220 **Statistical analysis**

221 This study is based on a subset of a larger data set generated from over 20 states and containing more
222 than 28,000 SARS-CoV-2 tests. These tests were conducted between the months of April 2020 and April
223 2021. All patients included in this study were administered SARS-CoV-2 and respiratory pathogen tests
224 concurrently. To ensure that analyses were based on a common suite of tests, only patients tested for
225 SARS-CoV-2 and all 11 respiratory pathogens described above were included. Additionally, to ensure
226 that all observations were independent, patients that were continually monitored or otherwise received
227 multiple tests were excluded. Given the differences in mitigation policy between states, and the fact
228 that Texas was the most heavily represented state in this data set, we focused on patients residing in
229 Texas for this study. After imposing these filters, the analyses we conducted were based on 4905
230 patients in total. These data are composed of patients from throughout the state of Texas; however,
231 1522 (31%) samples (i.e., patients) were collected in the McAllen-Edinburgh-Mission metropolitan
232 statistical area (MSA) and 2357 (48%) samples were collected from the San Antonio-New Braunfels MSA.
233 Thus, 79% of the samples that our analyses are based on come from these two MSAs. In addition, these
234 data include 1026 patients who did not disclose their city of residence, were from MSAs (e.g., Dallas-Fort
235 Worth) other than McAllen-Edinburgh-Mission and San Antonio-New Braunfels, or rural areas
236 throughout the state.

237 We used the 'binom.test' function in R to calculate point estimates and 95% confidence intervals
238 for the proportion of patients positive for SARS-CoV2, *S. aureus*, and bacterial pathogens other than *S.*
239 *aureus*. This approach was applied across several demographic categories and was complemented by
240 using R to test for equal proportions ('prop.test' function) among: (1) races, (2) ethnicities, (3) women

241 vs. men, and (4) patients ≥ 65 vs. patients < 65 . We then adjusted the 12 resulting P -values (three
242 pathogen categories x four demographic factors) for multiple testing using the False Discovery Rate (FDR
243 = 0.05) correction described by Benjamini and Hochberg³⁸.

244 In addition to examining positivity rates across demographic factors, we also used ‘binom.test’
245 to compute point estimates and 95% confidence intervals of the proportion of SARS-CoV-2 positive and
246 SARS-CoV-2 negative patients who tested positive for each of the eight bacterial pathogens detected in
247 our survey. We then used ‘prop.test’ to make comparisons between the bacterial positivity rates of
248 SARS-CoV-2-positive and SARS-CoV-2-negative patients for bacterial pathogens that had sufficient data
249 to ensure that all expected cell counts were five or larger. The resulting five P -values were adjusted for
250 multiple testing by controlling the FDR at the 0.05 level³⁸.

251 Finally, we used the odds ratio (OR) to estimate the magnitude and direction of association
252 between: (1) SARS-CoV-2 and detection of bacterial pathogens of any kind, (2) SARS-CoV-2 and
253 detection of bacteria other than *S. aureus*, (3) SARS-CoV-2 and detection of more than one bacterium of
254 any kind, and (4) SARS-CoV-2 and detection of more than one kind of bacteria, not including *S. aureus*.
255 The null hypothesis that $OR = 1.00$ was assessed via Fisher’s Exact Test and 95% confidence interval of
256 OR were computed using the ‘fisher.test’ function in R. The four resulting p -values were corrected for
257 multiple testing by controlling the FDR at the 0.05 level³⁸.

258

259 References

- 260 1 IHME. *COVID-19 Projections United States of America*, <[https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-](https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-america?view=cumulative-deaths&tab=trend)
261 [states-of-america?view=cumulative-deaths&tab=trend](https://covid19.healthdata.org/united-states-of-america?view=cumulative-deaths&tab=trend)> (
262 2 CDC. *COVID-19 Integrated County View.*, <[https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view)
263 [view](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-view)> (2022).
- 264 3 CDC. *Compare Trends in COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the US*, <[https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#compare-trends_comptrends-deaths-daily-raw-lin)
265 [data-tracker/#compare-trends_comptrends-deaths-daily-raw-lin](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#compare-trends_comptrends-deaths-daily-raw-lin)> (2022).
- 266 4 CDC. *COVID-19 Vaccinations in the United States-Total Doses Administered*,
267 <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#vaccinations_vacc-total-admin-rate-total> (2022).

- 268 5 CDC. *COVID-19 Vaccinations in the United States Percent of People Receiving at Least One Dose*,
269 <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#vaccinations_vacc-people-onedose-percent-total.>
270 (2022).
- 271 6 Dholariya, S. *et al.* Notable and Emerging Variants of SARS-CoV-2 Virus: A Quick Glance. *Indian J*
272 *Clin Biochem* **36**, 451-458, doi:10.1007/s12291-021-00991-0 (2021).
- 273 7 Pascarella, G. *et al.* COVID-19 diagnosis and management: a comprehensive review. *J Intern Med*
274 **288**, 192-206, doi:10.1111/joim.13091 (2020).
- 275 8 CDC. *Symptoms of COVID-19*, <[https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html)
276 [testing/symptoms.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html)> (2022).
- 277 9 Ohl, M. E. *et al.* Association of Remdesivir Treatment With Survival and Length of Hospital Stay
278 Among US Veterans Hospitalized With COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open* **4**, e2114741,
279 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.14741 (2021).
- 280 10 Aleissa, M. M. *et al.* New Perspectives on Antimicrobial Agents: Remdesivir Treatment for
281 COVID-19. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **65**, doi:10.1128/AAC.01814-20 (2020).
- 282 11 NIH. *Clinical Management*,
283 <<https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/management/clinical-management/>> (
284 12 Minh, L. H. N. *et al.* Clinical and laboratory factors associated with coronavirus disease 2019
285 (Covid-19): A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Rev Med Virol* **31**, e2288,
286 doi:10.1002/rmv.2288 (2021).
- 287 13 Mania, A. *et al.* Pneumonia, gastrointestinal symptoms, comorbidities, and coinfections as
288 factors related to a lengthier hospital stay in children with COVID-19-analysis of a paediatric part
289 of Polish register SARSTER. *Infect Dis (Lond)* **54**, 196-204, doi:10.1080/23744235.2021.1995628
290 (2022).
- 291 14 Shafran, N. *et al.* Secondary bacterial infection in COVID-19 patients is a stronger predictor for
292 death compared to influenza patients. *Sci Rep* **11**, 12703, doi:10.1038/s41598-021-92220-0
293 (2021).
- 294 15 De Santis, V. *et al.* Bacterial infections in critically ill patients with SARS-2-COVID-19 infection:
295 results of a prospective observational multicenter study. *Infection* **50**, 139-148,
296 doi:10.1007/s15010-021-01661-2 (2022).
- 297 16 Langford, B. J. *et al.* Antibiotic prescribing in patients with COVID-19: rapid review and meta-
298 analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **27**, 520-531, doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.12.018 (2021).
- 299 17 Rawson, T. M. *et al.* Bacterial and Fungal Coinfection in Individuals With Coronavirus: A Rapid
300 Review To Support COVID-19 Antimicrobial Prescribing. *Clin Infect Dis* **71**, 2459-2468,
301 doi:10.1093/cid/cia530 (2020).
- 302 18 Al-Hadidi, S. H. *et al.* The Spectrum of Antibiotic Prescribing During COVID-19 Pandemic: A
303 Systematic Literature Review. *Microb Drug Resist* **27**, 1705-1725, doi:10.1089/mdr.2020.0619
304 (2021).
- 305 19 Calderon-Parra, J. *et al.* Inappropriate antibiotic use in the COVID-19 era: Factors associated with
306 inappropriate prescribing and secondary complications. Analysis of the registry SEMI-COVID.
307 *PLoS One* **16**, e0251340, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251340 (2021).
- 308 20 Khurana, S. *et al.* Profile of co-infections & secondary infections in COVID-19 patients at a
309 dedicated COVID-19 facility of a tertiary care Indian hospital: Implication on antimicrobial
310 resistance. *Indian J Med Microbiol* **39**, 147-153, doi:10.1016/j.ijmmb.2020.10.014 (2021).
- 311 21 Lai, C. C., Chen, S. Y., Ko, W. C. & Hsueh, P. R. Increased antimicrobial resistance during the
312 COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* **57**, 106324, doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2021.106324
313 (2021).

- 314 22 Son, H. J. *et al.* Risk factors for isolation of multi-drug resistant organisms in coronavirus disease
315 2019 pneumonia: A multicenter study. *Am J Infect Control* **49**, 1256-1261,
316 doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2021.06.005 (2021).
- 317 23 Cimolai, N. The Complexity of Co-Infections in the Era of COVID-19. *SN Compr Clin Med* **3**, 1502-
318 1514, doi:10.1007/s42399-021-00913-4 (2021).
- 319 24 Alosaimi, B. *et al.* Influenza co-infection associated with severity and mortality in COVID-19
320 patients. *Virol J* **18**, 127, doi:10.1186/s12985-021-01594-0 (2021).
- 321 25 Calcagno, A. *et al.* Co-infection with other respiratory pathogens in COVID-19 patients. *Clin*
322 *Microbiol Infect* **27**, 297-298, doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.08.012 (2021).
- 323 26 Karaba, S. M. *et al.* Prevalence of Co-infection at the Time of Hospital Admission in COVID-19
324 Patients, A Multicenter Study. *Open Forum Infect Dis* **8**, ofaa578, doi:10.1093/ofid/ofaa578
325 (2021).
- 326 27 Lansbury, L., Lim, B., Baskaran, V. & Lim, W. S. Co-infections in people with COVID-19: a
327 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect* **81**, 266-275, doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.046 (2020).
- 328 28 Sreenath, K. *et al.* Coinfections with Other Respiratory Pathogens among Patients with COVID-
329 19. *Microbiol Spectr* **9**, e0016321, doi:10.1128/Spectrum.00163-21 (2021).
- 330 29 Musuuz, J. S. *et al.* Prevalence and outcomes of co-infection and superinfection with SARS-CoV-
331 2 and other pathogens: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **16**, e0251170,
332 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0251170 (2021).
- 333 30 CDC. *COVID-19 Weekly Cases and Deaths per 100,000 Population by Age, Race/Ethnicity, and*
334 *Sex*, <<https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#demographicsovertime>> (2022).
- 335 31 Karmakar, M., Lantz, P. M. & Tipirneni, R. Association of Social and Demographic Factors With
336 COVID-19 Incidence and Death Rates in the US. *JAMA Netw Open* **4**, e2036462,
337 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.36462 (2021).
- 338 32 Zelner, J. *et al.* Racial Disparities in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Mortality Are Driven by
339 Unequal Infection Risks. *Clin Infect Dis* **72**, e88-e95, doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1723 (2021).
- 340 33 Khubchandani, J. & Macias, Y. COVID-19 vaccination hesitancy in Hispanics and African-
341 Americans: A review and recommendations for practice. *Brain Behav Immun Health* **15**, 100277,
342 doi:10.1016/j.bbih.2021.100277 (2021).
- 343 34 Davis, K. A., Stewart, J. J., Crouch, H. K., Florez, C. E. & Hospenthal, D. R. Methicillin-resistant
344 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) nares colonization at hospital admission and its effect on
345 subsequent MRSA infection. *Clin Infect Dis* **39**, 776-782, doi:10.1086/422997 (2004).
- 346 35 Kuehnert, M. J. *et al.* Prevalence of *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal colonization in the United
347 States, 2001-2002. *J Infect Dis* **193**, 172-179, doi:10.1086/499632 (2006).
- 348 36 CDC. *Preparation of Viral Transport Medium*, <<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/Viral-Transport-Medium.pdf>> (2021).
- 349
350 37 Kayaalp, M. Modes of De-identification. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* **2017**, 1044-1050 (2017).
- 351 38 Benjamini, Y. a. H., Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to
352 multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistics Society: Series B* **57**, 289-300 (1995).

353

354

355 Author Contributions

356 Conceptualization, JFS, CAM, PKM, NV, and RBP. Methodology, JFS, RBP, PKM, KL, and VN. Analysis, JFS,
357 RBP, CAM, VN, KL, PKM. Writing, revising and editing, JFS, CAM, RBP, NV, and PKM.

358 **Data Availability Statement**

359 The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, Dr. Pramod
360 K. Mishra, upon reasonable request.

361

362

363

364 **Figure 1:** Grouped bar plot comparing the proportions of SARS-CoV-2 positive patients (n = 985) and
365 SARS-CoV-2 negative patients (n = 3920) that tested positive for the various respiratory bacterial
366 pathogens detected during the study period. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals for the
367 estimated proportions. Bs = *Bordetella sp.*, Cp = *C. pneumoniae*, Hi = *H. influenzae*, Kp = *K. pneumoniae*,
368 Mc = *M. catarrhalis*, Mp = *M. pneumoniae*, Sa = *S. aureus*, Sp = *S. pneumoniae*. Note that *H. influenzae B*,
369 *L. pneumophila*, and *Salmonella sp.* were not detected in any patients and were therefore omitted.

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387 **Table 1. Proportion of patients who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 or respiratory pathogens stratified**
 388 **by demographic**

Demographic	Number of Patients n	Proportion (95% Confidence interval)		
		SARS-CoV-2	<i>S. aureus</i>	Other ^a
Sex				
Female	2837	0.1939 (0.1795-0.2089)	0.2330 (0.2175-0.2490)	0.0917 (0.08128-0.1029)
Male	2014	0.2105 (0.1929-0.2290)	0.2855 (0.2659-0.3058)	0.1033 (0.0903-0.1174)
Undisclosed sex	54	0.2037 (0.1063-0.3353)	0.2037 (0.1063-0.3353)	0.0556 (0.0116-0.1539)
Age				
≥ 65 years of age	846	0.2163 (0.1890-0.2456)	0.2116 (0.1845-0.2407)	0.0780 (0.0609-0.0982)
< 65 years of age	4037	0.1982 (0.1860-0.2108)	0.2631 (0.2495-0.2769)	0.0991 (0.0900-0.1087)
Undisclosed age	22	0.0909 (0.0112-0.2916)	0.2727 (0.1073-0.5022)	0.2273 (0.0782-0.4537)
Race				
African American	65	0.1846 (0.0992-0.3003)	0.2769 (0.1731-0.4019)	0.1077 (0.0444-0.2094)
Asian	36	0.1389 (0.0467-0.2950)	0.3056 (0.1635-0.4811)	0.0556 (0.0068-0.1866)
Native American	7	0.1429 (0.0036-0.5787)	0.2857 (0.0367-0.7096)	0.2857 (0.0367-0.7096)
Pacific Islander	1	0.0000 (0.0000-0.9750)	0.0000 (0.0000-0.9750)	0.0000 (0.0000-0.9750)
White	1892	0.2378 (0.2188-0.2577)	0.2775 (0.2574-0.2983)	0.0946 (0.0818-0.1087)
Undisclosed race	2904	0.1780 (0.1643-0.1924)	0.2379 (0.2226-0.2539)	0.0968 (0.0863-0.1081)
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	1983	0.2532 (0.2341-0.2729)	0.2552 (0.2361-0.2750)	0.0872 (0.07519-0.1005)
Non-Hispanic	283	0.1449 (0.1060-0.1914)	0.3145 (0.2608-0.3721)	0.1060 (0.0727-0.1479)
Undisclosed ethnicity	2639	0.1675 (0.1534-0.1823)	0.2471 (0.2307-0.2640)	0.1016 (0.0903-0.1137)
Total	4905			

389

390 Proportions and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) of patients with SARS-CoV-2, *S. aureus* and

391 (a) other bacteria contained in the respiratory testing panel regardless of *S. aureus* presence.

392 Statistically significant findings are bolded.

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403 **Table 2. Association between SARS-CoV-2 status and number of patients that tested positive for the**
 404 **various bacterial respiratory pathogens detected during the study period.**

	COVID Status		OR (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted p-value
	Positive	Negative			
One or more Bacteria of any kind					
Yes	309	1257			
No	676	2663			
Percentage	31	32	0.9684 (0.8302-1.1281)	0.7023	0.9306
One or more bacteria excluding <i>S. aureus</i>					
Yes	87	384			
No	898	3536			
Percentage	8.8	9.8	0.8921 (0.6907-1.1426)	0.3970	0.7940
Multiple bacteria of any kind					
Yes	42	171			
No	943	3749			
Percentage	4.3	4.4	0.9765 (0.6743-1.3871)	0.9306	0.9306
Multiple bacteria excluding <i>S. aureus</i>					
Yes	9	76			
No	976	3844			
Percentage	0.91	1.9	0.4665 (0.2047-0.9374)	0.02806	0.11224

405

406 Raw counts, odds ratios (OR), 95% confidence intervals (95% CI), and p-values based on Fisher's Exact

407 Test of the null hypothesis that the true odds ratio is equal to one. Odds ratios describe how many times

408 more likely bacterial infection is given the presence of SARS-CoV-2.

409

410

411

Proportion of Patients Positive

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.17.22278915>; this version posted August 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

