

Fungal infections in mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 during the first wave: the French multicentre MYCOVID study

Jean-Pierre Gangneux, Eric Dannaoui, Arnaud Fekkar, Charles-Edouard Luyt, Françoise Botterel, Nicolas de Prost, Jean-Marc Tadié, Florian Reizine, Sandrine Houzé, Jean-François Timsit, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Jean-Pierre Gangneux, Eric Dannaoui, Arnaud Fekkar, Charles-Edouard Luyt, Françoise Botterel, et al.. Fungal infections in mechanically ventilated patients with COVID-19 during the first wave: the French multicentre MYCOVID study. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine, 2022, 10 (2), pp.180-190. 10.1016/s2213-2600(21)00442-2. inserm-03587204

HAL Id: inserm-03587204 https://inserm.hal.science/inserm-03587204v1

Submitted on 3 Jun 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 High prevalence of fungal infections in mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients in

the ICU: The French multicenter MYCOVID study

3

2

- 5 Jean-Pierre Gangneux, Eric Dannaoui, Arnaud Fekkar, Charles-Edouard Luyt, Françoise
- 6 Botterel, Nicolas De Prost, Jean-Marc Tadié, Florian Reizine, Sandrine Houze, Jean-François
- 7 Timsit, Xavier Iriart, Béatrice Riu-Poulenc, Boualem Sendid, Saad Nseir, Florence Perlat,
- 8 Florent Wallet, Patrice Le Pape, Emmanuel Canet, Ana Novara, Melek Manai, Estelle
- 9 Perraud, Arnaud Thille, Sophie Brun, Yves Cohen, Alexandre Alanio, Bruno Mégarbane,
- 10 Muriel Cornet, Nicolas Terzi, Lionel Lamhaut, Estelle Sabourin, Guillaume Desoubeaux,
- 11 Stephan Ehrmann, Christophe Hennequin, Muriel Fartoukh, Gilles Nevez, Cécile Aubron,
- 12 Valérie Letcher-Bru, Ferhat Meziani, Julien Mayaux, Antoine Monsel, Marion Blaize,
- 13 Frédérique Boquel, Florence Robert-Gangneux, Yves Le Tulzo, Philippe Seguin, Hélène
- 14 Guegan, Brice Autier, Matthieu Lesouhaitier, Romain Pelletier, Sorya Belaz, Christine
- 15 Bonnal, Antoine Berry, Jordan Leroy, Nadine François, Chantal Fradin, Jean-Christophe
- 16 Richard, Sylvie Paulus, Laurent Argaud, Damien Dupont, Jean Menotti, Florent Morio,
- 17 Stéphane Gaudry, Carole Schwebel, Cécile Garnaud, Juliette Guitard, Solène Le Gal,
- 18 Dorothée Quinio, Jeff Morcet, Bruno Laviolle, Jean-Raph Zahar, Marie-Elisabeth Bougnoux

19 20

- 21 CHU de Rennes, Rennes (JP Gangneux, JM Tadié, F Reizine, F Robert-Gangneux, Y Le
- Tulzo, P Seguin, H Guegan, B Autier, M Lesouhaitier, R Pelletier, S Belaz, J Morcet, B
- 23 Laviolle); CHU Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou APHP, Paris (E Dannaoui, A
- Novara, M Manai); CHU La Pitié-Salpêtrière APHP, Paris (A Fekkar, CE Luyt, J Mayaux,
- 25 A Monsel, M Blaize); CHU Henri Mondor APHP, Créteil (F Botterel, N De Prost, F
- 26 Boquel); CHU Bichat APHP, Paris (S Houze, JF Timsit, C Bonnal); CHU de Toulouse,
- Toulouse (X Iriart, B Riu-Poulenc, A Berry, J Leroy, N François); CHU de Lille, Lille (B
- Sendid, S Nseir, C Fradin); Hospices civils de Lyon, Lyon (F Persat, F Wallet, JC Richard, S
- 29 Paulus, L Argaud, D Dupont, J Menotti); CHU de Nantes, Nantes (P Le Pape, E Cannet, F
- 30 Morio); CHU de Poitiers, Poitiers (E Perraud, A Thille, S Gaudry); CHU Avicenne APHP,
- 31 Bobigny (S Brun, Y Cohen, C Garnaud, JR Zahar); CHU Lariboisière/Saint-Louis APHP,
- 32 Paris (B Megarbane, A Alanio); CHU de Grenoble, Grenoble (M Cornet, N Terzi, L
- 33 Lamhaut, C Schwebel, C Garnaud); CHU Necker Enfants malades APHP, Paris (L
- Lamhaut, E Sabourin, ME Bougnoux); CHU de Tours, Tours (G Desoubeaux, S Ehrmann, J
- 35 Guitard); CHU Saint-Antoine/Tenon APHP, Paris (C Hennequin, M Fartoukh); CHU de
- 36 Brest, Brest (G Nevez, C Aubron, S Le Gal, D Quinio); CHU de Strasbourg, Strasbourg (V
- 37 Letcher-Bru, F Meziani); Institut Pasteur, Paris (ME Bougnoux).

- 39 1 Covering letter
- 40 2 Manuscript including tables and panels
- 41 3 Figures
- 42 4 Authors statement form (see next section)
- 43 5 Declaration of interests and source of funding statements (see next section)
- 44 6 In-press papers—one copy of each with acceptance letters
- 45 7 Protocols and CONSORT details for randomised controlled trials (see Articles)
- 46 *Texte: 3500 mots*
- 47 *30 réf*

Summary (300 mots)

48 49 50

Background

- Patients with severe COVID-19 have clearly emerged as a population with a high risk of
- 52 invasive fungal infections (IFI). However, the prevalence of IFI has not yet been
- 53 prospectively assessed in large populations of mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients.
- We aimed to determine the prevalence of IFI, the risk factors, and the mortality associated
- 55 with COVID-19-associated pulmonary aspergillosis (CAPA) in mechanically ventilated
- 56 patients in the ICU.

Methods

- 58 We performed a national multicenter observational cohort study among 18 French ICUs and
- 59 enrolled 576 mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients. Patients were systematically
- screened for fungal microorganisms once/twice a week during the period of mechanical
- ventilation up to ICU discharge, and CAPA was defined according to recent definitions. The
- trial is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT04368221.

63 64

57

Findings

- In total, 509 patients with \ge 3 screening samples were analyzed (mean age of 59.4 years and
- 78.6% were male). The prevalence of proven/probable CAPA was $17 \cdot 1\%$ (87/509) and $4 \cdot 7\%$
- 67 (24/509) for possible CAPA. Thirty-eight (7.5%) patients experienced other IFIs: 32
- candidemia (6.3%), six mucormycosis (1.2%), and one fusariosis. Four patients had a positive
- PCR for *Pneumocystis jirovecii*. Multivariate analysis of factors associated with death in the entire study population showed three significant factors: age >62 (HR: 1.83 [95% CI 1.35-
- 71 2.48]), solid organ transplantation (2.33 [1.43-3.79], and proven/probable CAPA (1.77
- 72 [1.25-2.48]). Severity scores were significantly higher for CAPA and mortality was
- real field of the field of the
- 74 45.8%, and 30.9%, respectively (p < 0.0001). Anti-IL6-treated patients were characterized by
- 75 a significantly younger age, dexamethasone treatment (6.64 [2.89-15.23]), positive
- galactomannan antigenemia (5·01 [1·47-17·09]), and proven/probable/possible CAPA (2·60
- 77 [1.11-6.06]).

Interpretation

- This study shows the dramatic prevalence of CAPA and candidiasis associated with a high mortality rate in mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients. These findings highlight the
- 81 need of active surveillance for fungal pathogens in severe COVID-19 patients.

82 83

84

78

Funding

Pfizer Inc., NY, USA

858687

Key words: Covid-19 associated pulmonary aspergillosis (CAPA), invasive pulmonary aspergillosis (IPA) Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), mechanical ventilation, ICU, Candidemia, anti-IL6

89 90 91

92

88

Research in context a faire

93 Autres Recos:

- We use a comma before the final "and" or "or" in a list of items Type decimal points midline (ie, 23·4, not
- 95 23.4). To create a midline decimal on a PC: hold down ALT key a
- 96 Figures: no less than 300 dpi when set at its final printed size. Ideal file formats are TIF or JPG

97 Flowchart en .ppt

Introduction

Fungal infections are known to be among the infectious complications related to the damage caused by viral pulmonary infections, particularly in intensive care unit (ICU) patients with severe acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). Indeed, invasive pulmonary aspergillosis (IPA) is now a well-known complication of the clinical course of critically ill patients with influenza.^{1, 2} Patients with severe COVID-19 have also emerged as a population with a high risk of fungal infections.^{3, 4} COVID-19 is associated with epithelial lung damage, lymphopenia, dysfunction of the cell response, and the use of broad spectrum antibiotics, dexamethasone, and immunosuppressive therapies.⁵ Thus, adherence of *Aspergillus* conidia may be promoted by prior damage of the lungs due to SARS- CoV-2 infection and multiple risk factors may lead to tissue invasion after conidia germination.^{6, 7}

During the COVID-19 pandemic, several case series have been published that suggest an increased risk of IPA in patients with severe COVID-19 (COVID-19-associated pulmonary aspergillosis - CAPA), with an estimated prevalence of <5% to >30%, whereas the prevalence of candidemia and other fungal infections is still poorly known.⁵ However, the heterogeneity of monitoring protocols, diagnostic tools, and severity of COVID-19 patients included in various studies (all hospitalized COVID-19 patients, only patients in the ICU, or only patients in the ICU with ARDS) make it difficult to interpret the data published in the literature.

It is only recently that specific criteria for the case definition and diagnosis of CAPA were published in The Lancet Infectious Diseases journal.⁸ Consensual recommendations are essential because patients who have been infected during the pandemic do not met the usual EORTC/MSG criteria for invasive aspergillosis, as there are no host-related risk factors nor specific clinical features.⁹ In addition, the more focused AspICU algorithm to diagnose invasive pulmonary aspergillosis (IPA) in critically ill patients does not include new diagnostic developments and appears to be ill adapted to COVID-19 patients.^{10, 11} Furthermore, the typical radiological features of aspergillosis may be difficult to assess in ARDS-associated COVID-19.¹² Finally, the sensitivity and specificity of current mycological tests have still not been completely evaluated in this specific population.

Here, we sought to characterize the prevalence, risk factors, and outcome of invasive fungal infections (IFI), including CAPA and candidemia, in COVID-19 infected and mechanically ventilated patients in the ICU using the new definitions of CAPA and a standardized and rigorous protocol registered at ClinicalTrials.gov ID: NCT04368221.

Methods

132 Study design and participants

- We performed a national multicenter observational cohort study among ICU COVID-19 patients to determine the burden of IFI. Adult patients (≥18 years) were eligible for enrolment if they had an RT-PCR-confirmed diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection and required mechanical ventilation for ARDS. Patients were consecutively included between February and July 2020 in 18 participating university hospital ICUs across France (figure S1). The patients' clinical and biological data were collected as part of their follow-up from admission to discharge from the ICU. Data were collected anonymously and managed using eCRF available at ClinicalTrials.gov ID: NCT04368221.
- The MYCOVID study was conducted in full concordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and the laws, and regulations of France. This study was approved by the French authorities (Comité Consultatif sur le Traitement de l'information en matière de Recherche dans le domaine de la Santé, and Commission Nationale de L'Informatique et des Libertés) and registered as No. 910346. According to French policy, a non-opposition statement was obtained for all included patients or, where applicable, a relative or their legal representative, signifying that all received written detailed information about the objectives of the study and were free to request withdrawal of their data at any time. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the ethics committee of Rennes University Hospital, Rennes, France (Approval no. 20.56). The study was registered at clinicaltrial.gov under the number NCT04368221.

Procedures

In each participating ICU, patients with ARDS-associated COVID-19 who were mechanically ventilated were systematically screened for fungal respiratory microorganisms once or twice a week during the period of mechanical ventilation up to ICU discharge, resulting in a minimum of three samples if discharge occurred after 15 days (figure 1A). Respiratory samples included tracheal aspiration (TA), and/or bronchial aspiration (BA), and/or bronchioloalveolar lavage (BAL). The local microbiological laboratory in each participating center processed the fungal cultures of the samples. Real-time quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR) for *Aspergillus*, *Pneumocystis jirovecii*, and Mucorales were also performed on the same samples either locally or following referral to a specialized laboratory. The other

microbiology samples and tests were performed according to the local ICU hospital standard of care. Specific blood biomarkers (qPCR for either Aspergillus or Mucorales and galactomannan antigenemia) were sought if respiratory samples were positive either for filamentous fungi or *P. jirovecii*. Demographic and clinical data (underlying diseases, gravity scores (Simplified Acute Physiology Score II [SAPS II], Sequential Organ Failure Assessment [SOFA], anti-COVID-19 treatments), laboratory data (lymphopenia, viral detection of HSV and CMV, bacterial and fungal ventilated-associated pneumonia [VAP], and candidemia), and antifungal treatments received were recorded in the eCRF.

170

The local investigators were requested to classify patients as being colonized or infected with proven or putative pulmonary aspergillosis according to the AspICU classification currently being used at the time of the study. During the analysis of data, the CAPA consensual definitions were published by Koehler et al. and were thus also used for the statistical analysis.

176 177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

171

172

173

174

175

Outcomes

The outcomes of interest were the prevalence of IFIs and fungal respiratory colonization and their impact on ICU mortality. CAPA was defined and classified according to the most recent definitions.⁸ The characteristics of CAPA patients were compared to those of non-CAPA patients and to proven/putative IPA according to the AspICU algorithm. Candidemia was defined as one or more positive blood cultures for *Candida* spp. For patients with a positive qPCR for P. jirovecii, the Ct was recorded but it was not possible to discriminate between infection and colonization. Invasive mucormycosis were defined by the local investigators according to the clinical signs associated to a positive specific qPCR or culture from respiratory samples and/or a positive blood qPCR for the same genus. The diagnosis of other invasive fungal infections was performed on a case-by-case basis for respiratory samples with positive cultures for other filamentous fungi.

189 190

191

192

193

194

195

196

Statistical analysis

An independent data monitoring committee provided an external medical and statistical review of the efficacy and safety data. Continuous variables are presented as means, with standard deviations, and medians (interquartile range) and categorical variables as numbers (percentage), with the corresponding 95% confidence interval. Subgroups (for example, positive and negative patients) were compared using standard statistical approaches: chi² tests for categorical variables and Student t or Wilcoxon rank sum tests for continuous variables.

Multivariate analysis using a Cox model or logistic regression was performed to determine the parameters most highly associated with invasive fungal infections and mortality. Survival curves were constructed using the Kaplan-Meier method and were compared using the log rank test. Two-sided tests were performed and considered statistically significant for p-values <0.05. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 software (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). The full population for prevalence calculations was defined as patients who did not oppose participation in the study, met the eligibility criteria, and were systematically screened for fungal respiratory microorganisms once or twice a week from entry to discharge from the ICU.

Role of the funding source

The study sponsor (Pfizer Inc., NY, USA) was not involved in the study design, collection, analysis, or interpretation of the data, writing of the report, or the decision to submit the paper for publication. The corresponding author had full access to all the data and the final responsibility to submit the manuscript for publication. All authors vouch for the accuracy and completeness of the data, data analyses, and interpretation and fidelity to the protocol and approved the final manuscript for submission.

Results

Between February 29 and July 9, 2020, 576 mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients, from 18 French ICUs, were enrolled in the MYCOVID study. The final analysis was carried out on 509 patients, as 11 were withdrawn/excluded and 56 did not undergo complete mycological screening or follow-up (<3 screening samples) (figure 1B). The mean number of samples (respiratory and serum) was 6.6 ± 3.8 (median 6.0 [95% CI 6.3-7.0]) for the whole population. The number of included patients and the period of inclusion according to the center are presented in figure S1.

Baseline characteristics

The mean duration of ICU stay was 32.7 ± 24.1 days (median 26.0, minimum 1, maximum 204). The baseline characteristics of the 509 patients included in the statistical analysis are shown in table 1. The mean age was 59.4 ± 12.5 years (median 60.7) and 79% were male. The mean body mass index was 29.3 ± 5.6 (median 28.4 [95% CI 28.7-29.8]). The baseline characteristics and comorbidities were typical of COVID-19, with 32.9% (28.8-37.1) of patients presenting with diabetes mellitus, 50.1% (45.7-54.5) with high blood pressure, and 64.2% (59.9-68.4) with initial lymphopenia. Anti-COVID-19 treatments are listed in table 1. The mean duration of mechanical ventilation was 27.1 ± 19.8 days (25.5-28.9). Severity scores (SAPS II and SOFA) are presented in table 1 and 186/509 patients died in the ICU (36.5% [32.3-40.9]).

Table 1. Demographic and baseline characteristics and clinical course data for 509 mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients in the intensive care unit (ICU).

Demographic characteristics

	Mean \pm SD, and 95% CI
Sex at birth (509)	
- Female	109 (21.4% [17.9 - 25.2])
- Male	400 (78.6% [74.8 - 82.1])
Age, years (509)	59.4 ± 12.5
	(50.4.50.4)

Willie	100 (70 070 [71 0 02 1])
Age, years (509)	59.4 ± 12.5
	(58·1 - 60·4)
Weight, kg (490)	86.9 ± 17.6
	(85.3 - 88.5)
Height, cm (490)	$172 \cdot 4 \pm 9 \cdot 1$
	(171.6 - 173.2)

	(171.6 - 173.2)
BMI, kg/m^2 (490)	29.3 ± 5.6
	$(28\cdot8 - 29\cdot8)$

	Baseline characteristics
	n (%, [95% CI])
Obesity	62 (12·2% [9·5 - 15·3])
Dyslipidemia	21 (4·1% [2·6 - 6·2])
Diabetes mellitus	167 (32.9% [28.8 - 37.1])
High blood pressure	254 (50·1% [45·7 - 54·5])
COPD	34 (6.7% [4.7 - 9.2])
Asthma	14 (2.8% [1.5 - 4.6])
Initial lymphopenia	323 (64·2% [59·9 - 68·4])
Transplantation	35 (6.9% [4.8 - 9.4])
Hematological malignancy	6 (1·2% [0·4 - 2·6])
All immunosuppression	55 (10.8% [8.2 - 13.8])
Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra)	111 (21.8% [20.7 - 33.9])
Remdisivir	20 (3.9% [2.4 - 6.0])
Oseltamivir	40 (7.9% [5.7 - 10.6])

Cefotaxime	25 (4.9% [3.2 - 7.2])
Rovamycin	15 (2.9% [1.7 - 4.8])
Azithromycin	10 (2.0% [0.9 - 3.6])
Hydroxychloroquine	167 (32.9% [28.8 - 37.1])
Dexamethasone	202 (40·1% [35·8 - 44·5])
Anti-IL6	38 (7.5% [5.4 - 10.2])
Anti-IL1	16 (3·1% [1·8 - 5·1])
Prone position	394 (77.6% [73.7 -81.1]
	Clinical course data
	Mean \pm SD, and 95% CI
Duration of mechanical ventilation, days (508)	$27 \cdot 1 \pm 19 \cdot 8$
	(25.4 - 28.9]
SAPS II – admission (485)	44.1 ± 16.2
	$(42 \cdot 6 - 45 \cdot 5]$
SOFA – admission (398)	7.4 ± 3.9
	(7.0 - 7.8)
SOFA – day 7 (367)	8.7 ± 4.2
	(8.3 - 9.1)
SOFA – day 15 (261)	8.5 ± 4.6
	(7.9 - 9.0)
SOFA - discharge (285)	$6 \cdot 1 \pm 6 \cdot 0$
	(5·4 - 6·8)
Death in ICU (509)	186 (36·5% [32·3 - 40·9])

BMI: body-mass index, COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, SAPS II: Simplified Acute Physiology Score II; SOFA: Sequential Organ Failure Assessment.

Prevalence of secondary infections

The prevalence of secondary infections is presented in table 2. We compared the observed prevalence of invasive aspergillosis using either the definition according to Koehler et al. (i.e. proven/probable/possible CAPA) or that according to Blot et al. (i.e. proven/putative IPA). In total, 111/509 (21·8%) patients were classified as having CAPA according to Koehler et al.; 887/509 (17·1%) fulfilled the criteria for proven/probable CAPA and 24/509 (4·7%) for possible CAPA. Use the AspICU classification published by Blot et al. 11 resulted in 57/509 (11·2%) patients being classified by the local investigators as proven/putative IPA and 50/509 (9·8%) as colonized. Concerning other IFIs, 38 patients (7·5%) experienced another invasive fungal infection, sometimes with co-infections with one or two different fungi, consisting of 32 cases of candidemia (6·3%), six of invasive mucormycosis (1·2%), and one of invasive fusariosis. Of note, four patients had a positive PCR for *Pneumocystis jirovecii* that could be classified either as infection or colonization. Aside from fungal infections, 374 (73·5%) patients were diagnosed with bacterial ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP), 76 (15·5%) with a HSV1 viral infection, and 49 (10·0%) with a CMV infection (table 2). Overall, 162 (31.8%) patients received antifungal treatment during the

mechanical ventilation period, among them 58/162 received more than one antifungal). Voriconazole and caspofungin were the two most frequently administered antifungal drugs (table 2).

Table 2. Prevalence of infections in 509 mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients in the intensive care unit (ICU) and antifungal treatments.

	Prevalence of infections n (%, [95% CI])	267 268
CAPA status*		
- pr/pb invasive aspergillosis	87 (17·1% [13·9 - 20·6])	
 pos invasive aspergillosis 	24 (4·7% [3·0 - 6·9])	
AspICU status#		273
 pr/pu invasive aspergillosis 	57 (11·2% [8·6 - 14·3])	274
- Aspergillus colonization	50 (9.8% [7.4 - 12.7])	275 276
Other invasive fungal infections (one or more)	38 (7.5% [5.3 - 10.1])	, , ,
- Candidemia	32 (6.3% [4.3 - 8.8])	
- Invasive mucormycosis	6 (1.2% [0.4 - 2.5])	
- Invasive fusariosis	1 (0.2% [0.0 - 1.1])	
Bacterial VAP	374 (73·5% [69·4 - 77·3])	
CMV infection	49 (10.0% [7.5 - 13.0])	283
HSV1 infection	76 (15.5% [12.4 - 19.0])	
	Duration of antifungal treatment (da	nys)
	Mean \pm SD (min, median, max)	
Fluconazole (n=30)	$19.2 \pm 20.4 (2, 14, 84)$	
Caspofungin (n=70)	$7.9 \pm 9.1 (1, 5, 60)$	
Liposomal amphotericin B (n=34)	$11.8 \pm 27.5 (1, 4, 156)$	
Voriconazole (n=73)	$15.2 \pm 16.1 (1, 10, 88)$	
Isavuconazole (n=15)	$12 \cdot 3 \pm 6 \cdot 1 \ (3, 12, 26)$	
		294

proven/putative

Invasive aspergillosis

We used the case definition of CAPA according to Koehler et al.⁸ in all subsequent analyses. Invasive aspergillosis was the most prevalent IFI in this cohort. We analyzed the risk factors and impact of CAPA on mortality. The main significant differences between the proven/probable/possible CAPA group and the non-CAPA group were the mean age of the patients $(62 \cdot 2\pm 13 \cdot 3 \text{ versus } 58 \cdot 6\pm 12 \cdot 2 \text{, respectively, } p=0.007)$ and an immunosuppressed status $(16 \cdot 2\% \text{ versus } 9 \cdot 3\% \text{, respectively, } p=0.038)$, particularly transplantation $(11 \cdot 7\% \text{ versus } 5 \cdot 5\% \text{, respectively, } p=0.023)$ (table 3). Comparison of the proven/probable CAPA group with others (including possible CAPA and non-CAPA) showed significant differences for exactly the same variables: higher mean age (p=0.025), total immunosuppression (p=0.034), and transplantation (p=0.05). Thirty-eight patients received anti-IL6 treatment for COVID-19,

showing a statistical difference between the CAPA group (15·3%) and non-CAPA group (5·3%, p=0.0016).

The mean duration of mechanical ventilation was $31 \cdot 3 \pm 24 \cdot 5$ days for patients with CAPA $(32 \cdot 1 \pm 25 \cdot 3)$ days for proven/probable CAPA and $28 \cdot 1 \pm 21 \cdot 7$ for possible CAPA) versus $26 \cdot 0 \pm 18 \cdot 1$ for patients without CAPA $(p=0 \cdot 013)$. The severity scores were significantly higher for the CAPA patients (table 3). Survival curves show that mortality was significantly different between the three groups: $30 \cdot 9\%$, $45 \cdot 8\%$, and $59 \cdot 8\%$ for the non-CAPA, possible CAPA, and proven/probable CAPA groups, respectively $(p < 0 \cdot 0001)$ (figure 2). Seventy-seven percent (67/87) of proven/probable CAPA patients received at least one antifungal agent (33/67) received more than one antifungal). Among them, $67 \cdot 2\%$ (45/67) received voriconazole, $31 \cdot 3\%$ (21/67) liposomal amphotericin B, $29 \cdot 9\%$ (20/67) caspofungin, $16 \cdot 4\%$ (11/67) isavuconazole, and $16 \cdot 4\%$ (11/67) other antifungal drugs, alone or in combination.

Table 3. Demographic and baseline characteristics, immunosuppressive and antimicrobial agents, and severity scores between CAPA and non-CAPA patients under mechanical ventilation.

	pr/pb/pos CAPA*	Non-CAPA*	
	(n=111)	(n=398)	
Onset factors of CAPA* (n, %)	n, value or % (95% CI)	n, value or % (95% CI)	p
Sex at birth			0.84
Female (109, 21%)	23, 20.7% (13.6-29.5)	86, 21.6% (17.7-26.0)	
Male (400, 79%)	88, 79·3% (70·5-86·4)	312, 78.4% (74.0-82.3)	
Age, years	111	398	0.005
Mean <u>+</u> SD, (95% CI)	$62 \cdot 2 \pm 13 \cdot 3 \ (59 \cdot 7 - 64 \cdot 7)$	$58.6 \pm 12.2 (57.4-59.8)$	
Weight, kg	104	387	0.07
Mean <u>+</u> SD, (95% CI)	$84 \cdot 1 \pm 18 \cdot 5 \ (80 \cdot 5 - 87 \cdot 7)$	$87 \cdot 3 \pm 17 \cdot 3 \ (85 \cdot 9 - 89 \cdot 4)$	
BMI, kg/m^2	102	384	0.11
Mean <u>+</u> SD, (95% CI)	$28.5 \pm 5.4 \ (27.4-29.6)$	29·5±5·7 (28·9-30·1)	
Obesity	9	53	0.14
$(62, 12 \cdot 2\%)$	8.1% (3.8-14.8)	13.3% (10.1-17.1)	
Diabetes mellitus	41	126	0.31
(167, 32.9%)	36.9% (28.0-46.6)	31.7% (27.2-36.6)	
High blood pressure	57	197	0.68
(254, 50·1%)	51.8% (42.1-61.4)	49.6% (44.6-54.7)	
COPD	11	23	0.12
(34, 6.7%)	9.9% (5.1-17.0)	5.8% (3.7-8.5)	
Asthma	5	9	0.20
(14, 2.8%)	4.5% (1.5-10.2)	2.3% (1.0-4.2)	
Transplantation	13	22	0.023
(35, 6.9%)	11.7% (6.4-19.2)	5.5% (3.5-8.2)	
Hematological malignancy	0	6	0.35

(6, 1.2%)	0.0% (0.0-3.3)	1.5% (0.6-3.3)	
All immunosuppression	18	37	0.038
(55, 10·8%)	16.2% (9.9-24.4)	9.3% (6.6-12.6)	0.038
Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra)	21	9.3% (0.0-12.0)	0.40
•	18.9% (12.1-27.5)		0.40
(111, 21·8%)	` '	22.6% (18.6-27.0)	1.0
Remdisivir	4	16	1.0
(20, 3.9%)	3.6% (1.0-9.0)	4.0% (2.3-6.4)	0.42
Oseltamivir	11	29	0.42
(40, 7.9%)	9.9% (5.1-17.0)	7.3% (4.9-10.3)	0.02
Cefotaxime	5	20	0.82
(25, 4.9%)	4.5% (1.5-10.2)	5.0% (3.1-7.7)	
Rovamycin	6	9	0.11
(15, 2.9%)	5.4% (2.0-11.4)	2.3% (1.0-4.2)	
Azithromycin	4	6	0.24
$(10, 2 \cdot 0\%)$	3.6% (1.0-9.0)	1.5% (0.6-3.3)	
Hydroxychloroquine	30	137	0.17
(167, 32.9%)	27.0% (19.0-36.3)	34.5% (29.8-39.4)	
Dexamethasone	48	154	0.34
$(202, 40 \cdot 1\%)$	44.0% (34.5-53.9)	39.0% (34.1-44.0)	
Anti-IL6	17	21	0.0016
(38, 7.5%)	15.3% (9.2-23.4)	5.3% (3.3-8.0)	
Anti-IL1	3	13	1.0
$(16, 3 \cdot 1\%)$	2.7% (0.6-7.7)	3.3% (1.8-5.5)	
Duration of mechanical	111	397	0.013
ventilation (508)	$31 \cdot 3 \pm 24 \cdot 5 \ (26 \cdot 6 - 35 \cdot 9)$	$26.0 \pm 18.1 \ (24.2-27.8)$	
Prone position	89	305	0.52
(394, 77.6%)	80.2% (71.5-87.1)	76.8 (72.4%-80.9)	
SAPS II – admission	107	378	0.021
$(485, 44 \cdot 1 \pm 16 \cdot 2)$	$47 \cdot 3 \pm 17 \cdot 5 \ (43 \cdot 9 - 50 \cdot 6)$	$43 \cdot 2 \pm 15 \cdot 7 \ (41 \cdot 6 - 44 \cdot 8)$	
SOFA – admission	100	298	0.22
$(398, 7.4 \pm 3.9)$	$7.8 \pm 3.7 \ (7.1-8.6)$	$7.3 \pm 4.0 \ (6.8-7.7)$	
SOFA – day 7	93	273	0.010
$(367, 8.7 \pm 4.2)$	$9.6 \pm 3.7 \ (8.8-10.4)$	$8.4 \pm 4.4 (7.9 - 8.9)$	
SOFA – day 15	78	183	0.075
$(261, 8.5 \pm 4.6)$	$9.2 \pm 4.2 \ (8.3-10.2)$	$8.1 \pm 4.8 (7.4-8.8)$	
SOFA - discharge	81	204	< 0.0001
$(285, 6.1 \pm 6.0)$	$8.3 \pm 6.1 (7.0-9.7)$	$5.3 \pm 5.8 (4.5-6.1)$	

*According to Koehler et al.⁸. SAPS II: Simplified Acute Physiology II, SOFA: Sequential Organ Failure Assessment, BMI: body-mass index, COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

332333 *Mortality*

- 334 The severity of the SAPS II and SOFA scores was significantly associated with death in the
- 335 ICU: 186/509 patients (36.5% [95% CI 32.3-40.9], table 4).
- 336 Three host factors were significantly associated with overall mortality in the ICU: older age
- 337 (p=0.0001), immunosuppression (p=0.019), and, in particular, transplantation (p=0.0008)
- 338 table 4). Among the treatments and management measures administered in the ICU to the
- patient population, the combination of lopinavir+ritonavir (Kaletra)(p=0.035) and anti-IL1
- 340 (p=0.036) were associated with death in the ICU, whereas cefotaxime was associated with
- survival (p=0.0005, table 4). The duration of mechanical ventilation was longer for survivors
- $(28.9\pm21.2 [95\% CI 26.5-31.2])$ than for the patients who died $(24.1\pm16.6 [21.7-26.5],$ table
- 343 4). Other treatment or management measures showed no significant statistical differences in
- terms of mortality in the ICU (table 4).
- 345 Among secondary infections, only fungal co-infections were significantly associated with
- death. In addition to the survival curves showing mortality to be significantly higher for
- CAPA patients (figure 2), invasive aspergillosis was associated with death in the univariate
- analysis (table 4), regardless of the case definition used: proven/probable/possible CAPA
- 349 (p<0.0001), proven/probable CAPA (p<0.0001), possible CAPA (p=0.01), and
- proven/putative IPA (p=0.011). The detection of Aspergillus in respiratory samples by culture
- or PCR was also associated with death (p=0.005 and p=0.05, respectively, data not shown),
- 352 regardless of the aspergillosis status. The introduction of anti-Aspergillus triazole
- 353 (voriconazole and/or isavuconazole) did not modify mortality (figure 3, p=0.86), nor did other
- antifungal drugs increase survival.
- 355 Aside from invasive Aspergillus infections, among the other infections, only candidemia was
- associated with mortality (p=0.017, table 4). There was no significance for bacterial VAP, nor
- 357 HSV1 or CMV infections. We then performed a multivariate analysis of factors associated
- with death, which identified three significant factors: age >62 (HR 1.83 [95% CI 1.35-2.48]),
- solid organ transplantation (HR 2.33 [1.43-3.79], and proven/probable CAPA (HR 1.77
- 360 [1.25-2.48], figure 4). Of note, possible CAPA and candidemia, although not significantly
- associated with death, showed, however, a trend toward higher mortality (HR 1.37 [0.74-
- 362 2.55] and 1.19 [0.71-2.01], respectively).

Sex at birth Fermale (109, 21%)		Death in the ICU (n=186)	Survival (n=323)	
Female (109, 21%) 34, 18.3% (13.0-24-6) 75, 23.2% (18.7-28-2) Male (400, 79%) 152, 81.7% (75.4-87-0) 248, 76-8% (71-8-81-3) Age, years 62.3 ± 10-9 57-6 ± 13-1 0-0001 (60-7-63-9) (56-2-59-1) Weight, & 86-8 ± 17-8 86-8 ± 17-5 0-93 Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (84-2-89-5) (85-0-88-9) BMI, kg/m² 29.2 ± 5-6 29.3 ± 5-7 0.77 Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (28.3-30-0) (28.7-30-0) Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (28.3-30-0) Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (19.3-8-2) Mean	Factors (n, %)	n, %, (95% CI)	n, %, (95% CI)	p
Male (400, 79%)	Sex at birth			
Age, years 62.3 ± 10.9 57.6 ± 13.1 0.0001 Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (607-63-9) (56-2-59-1) 0.93 Weight, kg 86.8 ± 17.8 86.8 ± 17.5 0.93 Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (84-289.5) (85-088.9) 0.77 Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (28.3-30-0) (28.7-30-0) 7.7 Baseline characteristics in (%, [95% CI]) Dobesity 17 45 0.11 (62, 12-2%) 9-1% (54-14-2) 13-9% (10-3-18-2) 0.11 Obssity 17 45 0.11 (62, 12-2%) 9-1% (54-14-2) 13-9% (10-3-18-2) 0.11 Obssity 17 45 0.11 (62, 12-2%) 9-1% (54-14-2) 13-9% (10-3-18-2) 0.11 Obssity 1.0 1.0 1.0 (167, 32-9%) 3-3-0.8 1.0 0.0 2.2 High blood pressure 101 153 0-12 0.12 (254, 50-1%) 54-6% (47-16-19) 47-5% (42-0-53-1) 0.0 0.0 <t< td=""><td>Female (109, 21%)</td><td>34, 18.3% (13.0-24.6)</td><td>75, 23.2% (18.7-28.2)</td><td></td></t<>	Female (109, 21%)	34, 18.3% (13.0-24.6)	75, 23.2% (18.7-28.2)	
Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (607-63-9) (56-2-59·1) Weight, kg 86-8 ± 17·8 86-8 ± 17·5 0-93 Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (84-2-89·5) (85-0-88·9) BMI, kg/m² 29-2 ± 5·6 29-3 ± 5·7 0.77 Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Image: Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Image: Baseline characterist	Male (400, 79%)	152, 81.7% (75.4-87.0)	248, 76.8% (71.8-81.3)	
Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (607-63-9) (56-2-59·1) Weight, kg 86-8 ± 17·8 86-8 ± 17·5 0-93 Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (84-2-89·5) (85-0-88·9) BMI, kg/m² 29-2 ± 5·6 29-3 ± 5·7 0.77 Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Image: Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Image: Baseline characterist	Age, years	62.3 ± 10.9	57.6 ± 13.1	0.0001
Weight, kg 86.8 ± 17.8 (84.2-89.5) 86.8 ± 17.5 (85.0-88.9) 0.93 BMII, kg/m² 29.2 ± 5.6 (29.3 ± 5.7 (28.3-30.0) 22.8 ± 5.7 (28.3-30.0) 0.77 Baseline characteristics n (% [95% CII) O.77 Baseline characteristics n (% [95% CII) O.11 (62.12.2%) 9.1% (5.4-14.2) 13.9% (10.3-18.2) 0.11 Obesity 17 45 0.11 (62.12.2%) 9.1% (5.4-14.2) 13.9% (10.3-18.2) 0.11 Dyslipidemia 8 13 0.88 (21,4-1%) 4.3% (19.8-3) 4.0% (2.2-6-8) 0.08 Diabetes mellitus 61 106 1.0 (254,50-1%) 33.0% (26-340-3) 32.8% (27-7-38-2) High blood pressure 101 153 0.12 C254,50-1%) 54-6% (47-1-61-9) 47-5% (42-0-53-1) 0.12 0.2 C254,50-1%) 9.1% (54-14-2) 5.3% (31-8-3) 0.12 0.0 C254,50-1%) 9.1% (44-12-8) 1.2% (6-0-6-6-				
Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (84-2-89-5) (85-0-88-9) Mean ± gD, (95% CI) (29-2 ± 5-6) 29-3 ± 5-7 0-77 Mean ± gD, (95% CI) (28-3-30-0) (28-7-30-0) Description Baseline characteristics n (%), [95% CI]) Obesity 17 45 0-11 (62, 12-2%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 13-9% (10-3-18-2) Description Dyslipidemia 8 13 0-88 2(1, 4-1%) 4-3% (19-8-3) 32-8% (27-7-38-2) 11 High blood pressure 101 153 0-12 (25-4, 50-1%) 54-6% (47-1-61-9) 47-5% (42-0-53-1) 0-09 COPD 17 17 0-09 3(4, 6-7%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 5-3% (31-8-3) 0-10 Asthma 8 6 0-10 (14, 2-8%) 4-3% (19-8-3) 1-9% (0-7-4-0) 11 Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0-11 (32, 3-6-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75-3) 61-6% (56-0-67-0) 7 Transplantation 22 13(86.8 ± 17.8		0.93
BMI, kg/m² 29.2 ± 5.6 29.3 ± 5.7 0.77		-		
Mean ± SD, (95% CI) (28·3-30·0) (28·7-30·0) Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Baseline characteristics n (%, [95% CI]) Obesity 17 45 0·11 (62, 12·2%) 9·1% (5·4-14·2) 13·9% (10·3·18·2) Dyslipidemia 8 13 0·88 (21, 4·1%) 4·3% (1·9·8·3) 4·0% (2·2·6·8) Diabetes mellitus 61 106 1·0 (167, 32·9%) 33·0% (26·3·40·3) 32·8% (27·7·38·2) ————————————————————————————————————				0.77
Colorative		——————————————————————————————————————	——————————————————————————————————————	
Desity	,	,		
Obesity 17 45 0-11 (62, 12-2%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 13-9% (10-3-18-2) 0-88 Dyslipidemia 8 13 0-88 (21, 4-1%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 4-0% (2-2-6-8) 1-0 Diabetes mellitus 61 106 1-0 (167, 32-9%) 33-0% (26-3-40-3) 32-8% (27-7-38-2) 1-12 High blood pressure 101 153 0-12 (254, 50-1%) 54-6% (47-1-61-9) 47-5% (42-0-53-1) 0-09 (34, 6-7%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 5-3% (3-1-8-3) 0-09 (34, 6-7%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 5-3% (3-1-8-3) 0-10 (14, 2-8%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 1-9% (0-7-4-0) 0-10 (14, 2-8%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 1-9% (0-7-4-0) 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75-3) 61-6% (56-0-67-0) 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75-3) 61-6% (56-0-67-0) 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75-3) 61-6% (56-0-67-0) 0-0008 (35, 6-9%) 11-8% (7-6-17-4) <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>				
(62, 12-2%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 13-9% (10-3-18-2) Dyslipidemia 8 13 0-88 (21, 4-1%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 4-0% (2-2-6-8) Diabetes mellitus 61 106 1-0 (167, 32-9%) 33-0% (26-3-40-3) 32-8% (27-7-38-2) High blood pressure 101 153 0-12 (254, 50-1%) 54-6% (47-1-61-9) 47-5% (42-0-53-1) COPD 17 17 0-09 (34, 6-7%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 5-3% (3-1-8-3) Asthma 8 6 6 0-10 (14, 2-8%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 1-9% (0-7-4-0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75-3) 61-6% (56-0-67-0) Transplantation 22 13(4-0% (2-2-6-8) 0-0008 (35, 6-9%) 11-8% (7-6-17-4) Hematological malignancy 3 3 0-67 (6, 1-2%) 1-6% (0-3-4-7) 0-9% (0-2-2-7) All immunosuppression 28 27 0-019 (55, 10-8%) 15-1% (10-2-21-0) 8-4% (5-6-11-9) Lopinavir-Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0 0-035 (111, 21-8%) 3-8% (1-5-7-6) 4-0% (2-2-6-8) 0-09 (40, 7-9%) 10-8% (6-7-16-1) 6-2% (3-8-9-4) Cefotaxime 1 24 0-0005 (25, 4-9%) 0-5% (0-0-3-0) 7-4% (4-8-10-9) Rovamycin 5 10 0-79 (15, 2-9%) 2-7% (0-9-6-2) 3-1% (1-5-5-6) Azithromycin 3 7 16 0-0502 (167, 32-9%) 2-7% (0-9-6-2) 3-1% (1-5-5-6) Azithromycin 3 7 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 1-6% (0-3-4-6) 2-2% (0-9-4-4) Hydroxychloroquine 11 0 18 (201, 3-9%) 2-7% (0-9-6-2) 3-1% (1-5-5-6) Azithromycin 3 7 0-75 (102-2-0%) 4-0% (3-6-2-4) Hydroxychloroquine 11 0 0-0502 (202, 40-1%) 45-7% (38-3-53-1) 36-9% (31-6-42-4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0-28 (38, 7-5%) 9-2% (5-4-14-3) 6-5% (4-1-9-8)	Obesity	17		0.11
Dyslipidemia 8 13 0-88 (21, 4+1%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 4-0% (2-2-6-8) Diabetes mellitus 61 106 1-0 (167, 32-9%) 33-0% (26-3-40-3) 32-8% (27-7-38-2) 1-0 High blood pressure 101 153 0-12 (254, 50-1%) 54-6% (47-161-9) 47-5% (42-0-53-1) 0-09 (34, 6-7%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 5-3% (31-8-3) 0-10 Asthma 8 6 0-10 (14, 2-8%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 1-9% (0-7-4-0) 1-1 Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-475-3) 61-6% (56-0-67-0) 1-1 Transplantation 22 13(4-0% (2-2-6-8) 0-0008 (35, 6-9%) 11-8% (7-6-17-4) 1-0 0-07 Hematological malignancy 3 3 0-67 (6, 1-2%) 1-6% (0-3-4-7) 0-9% (0-2-2-7) 0-019 (55, 10-8%) 15-1% (10-2-21-0) 8-4% (5-6-11-9) 0-05 Lopinavir-Ri				0 11
(21, 4-1%) 4-3% (1-9-8·3) 4-0% (2-2-6·8) Diabetes mellitus 61 106 1-0 (167, 32-9%) 33-0% (26·3-40·3) 32·8% (27·7-38·2) 1 High blood pressure 101 153 0-12 (254, 50·1%) 54·6% (47·1-61·9) 47·5% (42·0-53·1) 0-09 (34, 6·7%) 9-1% (5·4-14·2) 5·3% (3·1-8·3) -09 (34, 6·7%) 9-1% (5·4-14·2) 5·3% (3·1-8·3) -09 34xthma 8 6 0·10 (14, 2·8%) 4·3% (1·9-8·3) 1·9% (0·7-4·0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0·11 (323, 64·2%) 68·6% (61·4-75·3) 61·6% (56·0-67·0) 1 Transplantation 22 13(4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0·0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6-17·4) 1 0·9% (0·2-2·7) 4 Hematological malignancy 3 3 0·67 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				0.88
Diabetes mellitus (167, 32.9%) 33.0% (26.3-40·3) 32.8% (277-38·2) High blood pressure 101 153 0-12 (254, 50·1%) 54-6% (47·1-61·9) 47·5% (42·0-53·1) COPD 17 17 17 0-09 (34, 6.7%) 9.1% (5·4-14·2) 5.3% (31-8·3) Asthma 8 6 0-10 (14, 2·8%) 4·3% (1·9-8·3) 1·9% (0.7·4·0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0-11 (323, 64·2%) 68·6% (61·4-75·3) 61·6% (56·0-67·0) Transplantation 22 13(4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0-0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6-17·4) Hematological malignancy 3 3 3 0-67 (6, 1·2%) 15·1% (10·2-21·0) 8·4% (5·6-11·9) Lopinayir-Ritionayir (Kaletra) 50 61 0 0.035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) Remdisivir 7 7 13 0·88 (20.3·9%) 3.8% (1·5-7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0-009 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) Cefotaxime 1 20 20 0 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) Cefotaxime 1 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5-5·6) Arzithonycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·9%) 1·6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 1 51 116 0·0502 (167, 3·2-9%) 1·6% (0·3-4-6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 1 51 116 0·0502 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)				0 00
(167, 32-9%) High blood pressure 101 101 153 0-12 (254, 50-1%) 54-6% (47-1-61-9) 17 17 0-09 (34, 6-7%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 5-3% (3-1-8-3) Asthma 8 6 0-10 (14, 2-8%) 1-27 196 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75-3) 1-18% (7-6-17-4) Hematological malignancy (6, 1-2%) 1-16% (0-3-4-7) 1-19% (0-2-2-7) All immunosuppression 28 27 (55, 10-8%) 15-1% (10-2-21-0) 18-9% (14-8-23-6) Remdisivir 20, 3-9%) 3-8% (15-7-6) 3-8% (6-1-6-1) 0-88 (20, 3-9%) 3-8% (15-7-6) 0-88 (20, 3-9%) 3-8% (6-1-6-1) 0-88 (20, 3-9%) 0-88 (20, 3-9%) 0-88 (20, 3-9%) 0-9% (0-2-6-8) 0-009 (40, 7-9%) 10-8% (6-7-16-1) 0-79 (15, 2-9%) 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 1-6% (0-3-4-6) 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 1-6% (0-3-4-6) 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 0-75 (10, 2-0%) 0-84 11-8 0-052 (202, 40-1%) 0-92% (5-4-14-3) 0-55% (4-19-8)		, ,		1.0
High blood pressure (254, 50·1%) 54-6% (47·1-61·9) 17 17 0.09 (34, 6·7%) 9-1% (5·4-14·2) 5-3% (3·1-8·3) Asthma 8 6 0.10 (14, 2·8%) 4-3% (1-9·8·3) 1-9% (0·7-4·0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 (323, 64·2%) 68-6% (61·4·75·3) 61-6% (56·0-67·0) Transplantation 22 13(4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0-0008 (35, 6·9%) 11-8% (7·6-17·4) Hematological malignancy (6, 1·2%) 1-6% (0·3-4·7) 1-6% (0·3-4·7) 0-9% (0·2-2·7) All immunosuppression 28 27 0-019 (55, 10·8%) 15-1% (10·2-21·0) 18-9% (14·8-23·6) Remdisivir 7 13 0-88 (20, 3·9%) 3-8% (1·5-7·6) 4-0% (2·2-6·8) 0-099 (40, 7·9%) 10-8% (6·7-16·1) 10-2% 0-9% (15, 2·9%) 10-8% (6·7-16·1) 10-2% 0-79 (15, 2·9%) 10-6% (0·3-4·6) 10-079 (15, 2·9%) 10-6% (0·3-4·6) 2-2% (0·9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 11 24 0-052 (20, 40·1%) 45-7% (38·3-53·1) 36-9% (31·6-42·4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0-28 (38, 7·5%) 9-2% (5·4-14·3) 6-5% (4·1-9·8)				1.0
(254, 50-1%) 54-6% (47-1-61-9) 47-5% (42-0-53-1) COPD 17 17 0-09 (34, 6-7%) 9-1% (5-4-14-2) 5-3% (3-1-8-3) Asthma 8 6 0-10 (14, 2-8%) 4-3% (1-9-8-3) 1-9% (0-7-4-0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75-3) 61-6% (56-0-67-0) Transplantation 22 13(4-0% (2-2-6-8) 0-0008 (35, 6-9%) 11-8% (7-6-17-4) 0-9% (0-2-2-7) 0-019 Hematological malignancy 3 3 0-67 (6, 1-2%) 1-6% (0-3-4-7) 0-9% (0-2-2-7) 0-019 All immunosuppression 28 27 0-019 (55, 10-8%) 15-1% (10-2-21-0) 8-4% (5-6-11-9) 0-035 Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0-035 (111, 21-8%) 26-9% (207-33-9) 18-9% (14-8-23-6) 8 Remdisivir 7 13 0-88 (20, 3-9%) 3-8% (1-5-7-6) 4-0% (2-2-6-8)		` ` `		0.12
COPD (34, 6.7%) 17 17 0.09 (34, 6.7%) 9·1% (5·4·14·2) 5·3% (3·1·8·3) Ashtma 8 6 0·10 (14, 2·8%) 4·3% (1·9·8·3) 1·9% (0·7·4·0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0·11 (323, 64·2%) 68·6% (61·4·75·3) 61·6% (56·0·67·0) 0·0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6·17·4) 0·0008 0·0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6·17·4) 0·9% (0·2·2·7) 0·0008 (6, 1·2%) 1·6% (0·3·4·7) 0·9% (0·2·2·7) 0·019 (6, 1·2%) 1·6% (0·3·4·7) 0·9% (0·2·2·7) 0·019 (55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2·21·0) 8·4% (5·6·11·9) 0·019 Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7·33·9) 18·9% (14·8·23·6) 0 Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5·7·6) 4·0% (2·2·6·8) 0 Oseltamivir 20 20 0·09 0·09 (40, 7·9%) </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.17</td>				0.17
(34, 6·7%) 9·1% (5·4-14·2) 5·3% (3·1-8·3) Asthma 8 6 0·10 (14, 2·8%) 4·3% (1·9-8·3) 1·9% (0·7-4·0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0·11 (323, 64·2%) 68·6% (61·4·75·3) 61·6% (56·0-67·0) 0·0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6·17·4) 3 0·67 (6, 1·2%) 1·6% (0·3·4·7) 0·9% (0·2-2·7) 0·019 (55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2-21·0) 8·4% (5·6-11·9) 0·019 (55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2-21·0) 8·4% (5·6-11·9) 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5·7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5·7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7·16·1) 6·2% (3·8·9·4) 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0·3·0) 7·4% (4·8·10·9) 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5·5·6) 0·75 (10, 2·9%) 1·6% (0·3·4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) 0·0502 (167, 32·9%) 2·7.4% (21·1·3·4·4) 36·0% (30·8·41·5) 0·052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) 0·052 Anti-IL6 17 21 </td <td>,</td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td>	,	,		0.00
Asthma (14, 2-8%)				0.09
(14, 2.8%) 4.3% (1.9-8·3) 1.9% (0.7-4·0) Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0·11 (323, 64·2%) 68·6% (61·4·75·3) 61·6% (56·0-67·0) 0·0008 Transplantation 22 13(4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0·0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6-17·4) 0·9% (0·2-2·7) Hematological malignancy 3 3 0·67 (6, 1·2%) 1·6% (0·3-4·7) 0·9% (0·2-2·7) All immunosuppression 28 27 0·019 (55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2-21·0) 8·4% (5·6-11·9) Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) 0 Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5-7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0 Oseltamivir 20 20 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) 0 Cefotaxime 1 24 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0-3·0) 7·4% (4·8-10·9) Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>· · · · ·</td><td>0.10</td></t<>			· · · · ·	0.10
Initial lymphopenia 127 196 0-11 (323, 64-2%) 68-6% (61-4-75·3) 61-6% (56-0-67·0) Transplantation 22 13(4-0% (2·2-6·8) 0-0008 (35, 6-9%) 11-8% (7·6-17·4) Hematological malignancy 3 3 0-67 (6, 1·2%) 1-6% (0·3-4·7) 0-9% (0·2-2·7) All immunosuppression 28 27 0-019 (55, 10-8%) 15-1% (10·2-21·0) 8-4% (5·6-11·9) Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0-035 (111, 21·8%) 26-9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) Remdisivir 7 13 0-88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5·7·6) 4-0% (2·2-6·8) Oseltamivir 20 20 0-09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7·16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) Cefotaxime 1 24 0-0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0-3·0) 7·4% (4·8-10·9) Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5·5·6) Azithromycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·0%) 1-6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0·0502 (167, 32·9%) 27·4% (21·1-34·4) 36·0% (30·8-41·5) Dexamethasone 84 118 0·052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)				0.10
(323, 64·2%) 68·6% (61·4·75·3) 61·6% (56·0·67·0) Transplantation 22 13(4·0% (2·2·6·8) 0·0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6·17·4)			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.11
Transplantation 22 13(4·0% (2·2·6·8)) 0·0008 (35, 6·9%) 11·8% (7·6·17·4) 0·00% Hematological malignancy 3 3 0·67 (6, 1·2%) 1·6% (0·3·4·7) 0·9% (0·2·2·7) 0·019 All immunosuppression 28 27 0·019 (55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2·2·1·0) 8·4% (5·6·11·9) 0·019 Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7·33·9) 18·9% (14·8·23·6) 0·88 Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5·7·6) 4·0% (2·2·6·8) 0·88 Oseltamivir 20 20 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7·16·1) 6·2% (3·8·9·4) 0·0005 Cefotaxime 1 24 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0·3·0) 7·4% (4·8·10·9) 0·79 Revampcin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5·5·6) 0·28 Azithromycin	* * *			0.11
(35, 6.9%)			`	0.0000
Hematological malignancy 3 3 0-67 (6, 1·2%) 1·6% (0·3-4·7) 0·9% (0·2-2·7) All immunosuppression 28 27 0·019 (55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2-21·0) 8·4% (5·6-11·9) 0·035 Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) 0 Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5-7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0 Oseltamivir 20 20 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) 0 Cefotaxime 1 24 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0-3·0) 7·4% (4·8-10·9) 0 Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5-5·6) 0 Azithromycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·0%) 1·6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) 0 Hydroxychloroquine 51 116	•		13(4.0% (2.2-6.8)	0.0008
(6, 1·2%) 1·6% (0·3-4·7) 0·9% (0·2-2·7) All immunosuppression 28 27 0·019 (55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2-21·0) 8·4% (5·6·11·9) 0·035 Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) 0·88 Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5-7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) 0·0005 Cefotaxime 1 24 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0-3·0) 7·4% (4·8-10·9) Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5-5·6) Azithromycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·0%) 1·6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0·0502 (167, 32·9%) 27·4% (21·1-34·4) 36·0% (30·8-41·5) 0·052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0·			2	0.67
All immunosuppression 28 27 0.019 (55, 10.8%) 15.1% (10.2-21.0) 8.4% (5.6-11.9) Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0.035 (111, 21.8%) 26.9% (20.7-33.9) 18.9% (14.8-23.6) Remdisivir 7 13 0.88 (20, 3.9%) 3.8% (1.5-7.6) 4.0% (2.2-6.8) Oseltamivir 20 20 0.09 (40, 7.9%) 10.8% (6.7-16.1) 6.2% (3.8-9.4) Cefotaxime 1 24 0.0005 (25, 4.9%) 0.5% (0.0-3.0) 7.4% (4.8-10.9) Rovamycin 5 10 0.79 (15, 2.9%) 2.7% (0.9-6.2) 3.1% (1.5-5.6) Azithromycin 3 7 0.75 (10, 2.0%) 1.6% (0.3-4.6) 2.2% (0.9-4.4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0.0502 (167, 32.9%) 27.4% (21.1-34.4) 36.0% (30.8-41.5) Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40.1%) 45.7% (38.3-53.1) 36.9% (31.6-42.4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0.28 (38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)				0.67
(55, 10·8%) 15·1% (10·2-21·0) 8·4% (5·6-11·9) Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5·7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) Oseltamivir 20 20 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) Cefotaxime 1 24 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0-3·0) 7·4% (4·8-10·9) Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5-5·6) Azithromycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·0%) 1·6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0·0502 (167, 32·9%) 27·4% (21·1-34·4) 36·0% (30·8-41·5) 0·052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0·052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)				0.010
Lopinavir+Ritonavir (Kaletra) 50 61 0·035 (111, 21·8%) 26·9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5-7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) 0 Oseltamivir 20 20 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7-16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) 0·09 Cefotaxime 1 24 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0-3·0) 7·4% (4·8-10·9) 0·79 Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5-5·6) 0·75 Azithromycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·0%) 1·6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) 0·0502 Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0·0502 (167, 32·9%) 27·4% (21·1-34·4) 36·0% (30·8-41·5) 0·052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0·052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.019</td>				0.019
(111, 21-8%) 26-9% (20·7-33·9) 18·9% (14·8-23·6) Remdisivir 7 13 0·88 (20, 3·9%) 3·8% (1·5-7·6) 4·0% (2·2-6·8) Oseltamivir 20 20 0·09 (40, 7·9%) 10·8% (6·7·16·1) 6·2% (3·8-9·4) Cefotaxime 1 24 0·0005 (25, 4·9%) 0·5% (0·0-3·0) 7·4% (4·8-10·9) 0·79 Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5-5·6) 0·75 Azithromycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·0%) 1·6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) 0·0502 Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0·0502 (167, 32·9%) 27·4% (21·1-34·4) 36·0% (30·8-41·5) 0·0502 Dexamethasone 84 118 0·052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) 0·28 Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)				
Remdisivir 7 13 0.88 (20, 3.9%) 3.8% (1.5-7.6) 4.0% (2.2-6.8) Oseltamivir 20 20 0.09 (40, 7.9%) 10.8% (6.7-16.1) 6.2% (3.8-9.4) 0.0005 Cefotaxime 1 24 0.0005 (25, 4.9%) 0.5% (0.0-3.0) 7.4% (4.8-10.9) 0.79 Rovamycin 5 10 0.79 (15, 2.9%) 2.7% (0.9-6.2) 3.1% (1.5-5.6) 0.75 Azithromycin 3 7 0.75 (10, 2.0%) 1.6% (0.3-4.6) 2.2% (0.9-4.4) 0.0502 Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0.0502 (167, 32.9%) 27.4% (21.1-34.4) 36.0% (30.8-41.5) 0.0502 Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40.1%) 45.7% (38.3-53.1) 36.9% (31.6-42.4) 0.28 (38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)				0.035
(20, 3.9%) 3.8% (1.5-7.6) 4.0% (2.2-6.8) Oseltamivir 20 20 0.09 (40, 7.9%) 10.8% (6.7-16.1) 6.2% (3.8-9.4) 0.0005 Cefotaxime 1 24 0.0005 (25, 4.9%) 0.5% (0.0-3.0) 7.4% (4.8-10.9) Rovamycin 5 10 0.79 (15, 2.9%) 2.7% (0.9-6.2) 3.1% (1.5-5.6) Azithromycin 3 7 0.75 (10, 2.0%) 1.6% (0.3-4.6) 2.2% (0.9-4.4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0.0502 (167, 32.9%) 27.4% (21.1-34.4) 36.0% (30.8-41.5) 0.052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40.1%) 45.7% (38.3-53.1) 36.9% (31.6-42.4) 0.28 (38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)	(111, 21.8%)	26.9% (20.7-33.9)	18.9% (14.8-23.6)	
Oseltamivir 20 20 0.09 (40, 7.9%) 10.8% (6.7-16.1) 6.2% (3.8-9.4) Cefotaxime 1 24 0.0005 (25, 4.9%) 0.5% (0.0-3.0) 7.4% (4.8-10.9) Rovamycin 5 10 0.79 (15, 2.9%) 2.7% (0.9-6.2) 3.1% (1.5-5.6) Azithromycin 3 7 0.75 (10, 2.0%) 1.6% (0.3-4.6) 2.2% (0.9-4.4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0.0502 (167, 32.9%) 27.4% (21.1-34.4) 36.0% (30.8-41.5) 0.052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40.1%) 45.7% (38.3-53.1) 36.9% (31.6-42.4) 0.28 (38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)	Remdisivir	7	13	0.88
(40, 7.9%) 10.8% (6.7-16·1) 6.2% (3.8-9·4) Cefotaxime 1 24 0.0005 (25, 4.9%) 0.5% (0.0-3·0) 7.4% (4.8-10·9) Rovamycin 5 10 0.79 (15, 2.9%) 2.7% (0.9-6·2) 3.1% (1.5-5·6) Azithromycin 3 7 0.75 (10, 2.0%) 1.6% (0.3-4·6) 2.2% (0.9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0.0502 (167, 32·9%) 27·4% (21·1-34·4) 36·0% (30·8-41·5) 0.052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) 0.28 Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)	(20, 3.9%)	3.8% (1.5-7.6)	4.0% (2.2-6.8)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Oseltamivir	20	20	0.09
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(40, 7.9%)	10.8% (6.7-16.1)	6.2% (3.8-9.4)	
Rovamycin 5 10 0·79 (15, 2·9%) 2·7% (0·9-6·2) 3·1% (1·5-5·6) Azithromycin 3 7 0·75 (10, 2·0%) 1·6% (0·3-4·6) 2·2% (0·9-4·4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0·0502 (167, 32·9%) 27·4% (21·1-34·4) 36·0% (30·8-41·5) 0·052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0·052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) 0·28 Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8) 0·28	Cefotaxime	1	24	0.0005
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(25, 4.9%)	0.5% (0.0-3.0)	7.4% (4.8-10.9)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Rovamycin	, ,		0.79
Azithromycin 3 7 0.75 (10, 2.0%) 1.6% (0.3-4.6) 2.2% (0.9-4.4) Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0.0502 (167, 32.9%) 27.4% (21.1-34.4) 36.0% (30.8-41.5) 0.052 Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40.1%) 45.7% (38.3-53.1) 36.9% (31.6-42.4) 0.28 Anti-IL6 17 21 0.28 (38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)	(15, 2.9%)			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		3	7	0.75
Hydroxychloroquine 51 116 0.0502 (167, 32.9%) 27.4% (21·1-34·4) 36.0% (30·8-41·5) Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)	$(10, 2 \cdot 0\%)$	1.6% (0.3-4.6)	2.2% (0.9-4.4)	
(167, 32.9%) 27.4% (21.1-34.4) 36.0% (30.8-41.5) Dexamethasone (202, 40.1%) 84 118 0.052 45.7% (38.3-53.1) 36.9% (31.6-42.4) 36.9% (31.6-42.4) Anti-IL6 (38, 7.5%) 17 21 0.28 (38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)	Hydroxychloroquine			0.0502
Dexamethasone 84 118 0.052 (202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0.28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)	(167, 32.9%)	27.4% (21.1-34.4)		
(202, 40·1%) 45·7% (38·3-53·1) 36·9% (31·6-42·4) Anti-IL6 17 21 0·28 (38, 7·5%) 9·2% (5·4-14·3) 6·5% (4·1-9·8)	, ,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.052
Anti-IL6 17 21 0.28 (38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)				0.032
(38, 7.5%) 9.2% (5.4-14.3) 6.5% (4.1-9.8)		, ,		
				0.28
Anti-IL1 10 6 0.036				
	Anti-IL1	10	6	0.036

$(16, 3 \cdot 1\%)$	5.4% (2.6-9.7)	1.9% (0.7-4.0)	
Time in the ICU before mechanical ventilation (508)	$ 186 \\ 0.1 \pm 2.3 (-0.2-0.5) $	$322 \\ -0.6 \pm 5.6 \ (-1.2-0.00)$	0.11
Duration of mechanical ventilation (508)	$186 \\ 24 \cdot 1 \pm 16 \cdot 6 \ (21 \cdot 7 - 26 \cdot 5)$	$322 \\ 28.9 \pm 21.2 \ (26.5-31.2)$	0.01
Prone position (394, 77.6%)	147 79·0% (72·5-84·6)	247 76·7% (71·7-81·2)	0.58
		Clinical course data Mean \pm SD, median, and (95% C	CI)
SAPS II – admission $(485, 44 \cdot 1 \pm 16 \cdot 2)$	$180 \\ 46.8 \pm 16.1 (44.4-49.2)$	$ 305 42.5 \pm 16.1 (40.6-44.3) $	0.004
SOFA – admission $(398, 7.4 \pm 3.9)$	$142 \\ 7.9 \pm 3.9 (7.2-8.5)$	$ 256 7.2 \pm 3.9 (6.7-7.6) $	0.08
SOFA – day 7 $(366 \ 8.7 \pm 4.2)$	$128 \\ 10.2 \pm 4.1 (9.410.9)$	239 7·9 ± 41 (7·4-8·4)	0.0001
SOFA – day 15 (261, 8.5 ± 4.6)	96 10·7 ± 4·1 (9·9-11·6)	$165 \\ 7 \cdot 1 \pm 4 \cdot 4 \ (6 \cdot 5 - 7 \cdot 8)$	0.0001
SOFA - discharge $(285, 6.1 \pm 6.0)$	$109 \\ 12.6 \pm 4.5 \ (11.7-13.4)$	$ 176 2 \cdot 1 \pm 2 \cdot 1 \ (1 \cdot 8 \cdot 2 \cdot 4) $	0.0001
CAPA pr/pb/pos* (111, 21·8%)	63 33·9% (24·6-45·3)	48 14·8% (9·9-21·5)	<0.0001
CAPA pr/pb* (87, 17·1%)	52 28·0% (21·6-35·0)	35 10·8% (7·7-14·7)	<0.0001
CAPA pos* (24, 4·7%)	11 5·9% (3·0-10·3)	13 4·0% (2·2-6·8)	0.33
AI AspICU pr/pu# (57, 11·2%)	31 16·7% (11·6-22·8)	26 8·0% (5·3-11·6)	0.003
Other IFI (38, 7.5%)	21 11·3% (7·1-16·7)	17 5·3% (3·1-8·3)	0.013
Candidemia (32, 6·3%)	18 9·7% (5·8-14·9)	14 4·3% (2·4-7·2)	0.017
Bacterial VAP (374, 73·5%)	137 73·7% (66·7-79·8)	237 73·4% (68·2-78·1)	0.94
CMV infection (49, 10·0%)	22 12·2% (7·8-17·8)	27 8·7% (5·8-12·4)	0.22
HSV1 infection (76, 15.5%)	30 16·6% (11·5-22·8)	46 14·8% (11·1-19·3)	0.61

Anti-IL6 treatment

Among the 38 patients who received anti-IL6 for COVID-19, 15.3% were in the proven/probable/possible CAPA group versus 5.3% in the non-CAPA group (p=0.0016, table 3). Comparison between only the proven/probable CAPA patients and the others showed a similar statistically significant difference (p=0.006). Although there was no significant link between anti-IL6 treatment and overall mortality (table 4), we investigated whether anti-IL6 could be a significant onset factor for CAPA. The significant factors associated with anti-IL-6 treatment by univariate analysis are summarized in table 5. Among them, four factors were identified by multivariate analysis. Dexamethasone treatment (6.64 [95% CI 2.89-15.23]), positive galactomannan antigenemia (5.01 [1.47-17.09]), and proven/probable/possible CAPA (2.60 [1.11-6.06]) were highly significantly associated with anti-IL6 treatment and an age ≥ 62 was significantly associated with the absence of anti-IL6 treatment (0.25 [0.11-0.58]).

Table 5. Uni- and multivariate analysis of factors associated with anti-IL6 treatment in 509 intubated and mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients.

	Anti-IL6 treatment	No anti-IL6	Univariate	Multivariate
Factors	n (% [95% CI])	n (% [95% CI])	P	OR
				(95% CL)
Age, years	38	468	0.001	0.25
Mean \pm SD (95% CI)	$53{\cdot}1\pm12{\cdot}8$	59.9 ± 12.3		(0·11-0·58) fo
	(48.9 - 57.3)	(58.8 - 61.0)		$age \geq 62$
Solid organ				
transplantation	38	468	0.0383	-
Yes	6 (15.8% [6.0 - 31.3])	29 (6.2 [4.2% - 8.8])		
No	32 (84·2% [68·7 - 94·0])	439 (93.8% [91.2 - 95.8])		
Total immunodepression	38	468	0.0145	-
Yes	29 (76·3% [59·8 - 88·6])	46 (9.8% [7.3 - 12.9])		
No	9 (23.7% [11.4 - 40.2])	422 (90·2% [87·1 - 92·7])		
Dexamethasone	38	464	< 0.0001	6.64
Yes	29 (76·3% [59·8 - 88·6])	173 (37·3% [32·9 - 41·9])		(2.89-15.23)
No	9 (23.7% [11.4 - 40.2])	291 (62·7% [58·1 - 67·1])		
Aspergillus culture in			0.040	-
respiratory samples	38	468		
Negative	29 (76·3% [59·8 - 88·6])	414 (88.5% [85.2 - 91.2])		
Positive	9 (23.7% [11.4 - 40.2])	54 (11·5% [8·8 - 14·8])		
Galactomannan			0.002	5.01
antigenemia	38 (0)	468 (0)		(1.47-17.09)
Negative	31 (81-6% [65-7 - 92-3])	448 (95.7% [93.5 - 97.4])		
Positive	7 (18-4% [7-7 - 34-3])	20 (4.3% [2.6 - 6.5])		

Proven/Probable CAPA	38 (0)	468 (0)	0.004	-
No	25 (65.8% [48.6 - 80.4])	394 (84·2% [80·6 - 87·4])		
Yes	13 (34·2% [19·6 - 51·4])	74 (15.8% [12.6 - 19.4])		
Proven/probable/possible			0.002	2.60
CAPA	38 (0)	468 (0)		$(1 \cdot 11 - 6 \cdot 06)$
No	21 (55·3% [38·3 - 71·4])	374 (79.9% [76.0 - 83.5])		
Yes	13 (34·2% [19·6 - 51·4])	74 (15.8% [12.6 - 19.4])		
Among yes, possible	4 (10·5% [2·9 - 24·8])	20 (4.3 [2.6-6.5])		

DISCUSSION

393394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

To our knowledge, this is the largest cohort study to date to investigate the prevalence of IFI among mechanically ventilated ICU patients infected with SARS-CoV-2, along with the associated mortality and the risk factors for such secondary infections. Among this homogeneous population, we were surprised to record 106/509 (20.8%) patients (representing 150 episodes) with proven or probable IFI, which increased to 130/509 (25.5%) when including possible IFI. The high prevalence observed in the MYCOVID study may be related to several factors, such as the homogeneous severe COVID-19 population with ARDS under study, the rigorous monitoring dedicated to fungal diagnosis, the role of previous comorbidities, and the role of the treatment received. Covid-19 associated aspergillosis are the most prevalent fungal infections in this cohort. The vast majority of the already published data included heterogeneous COVID-19 populations and mainly used the AspICU case definitions. By contrast, we also used the recent CAPA definitions and included only the most severe mechanically ventilated patients, which represents a higher-risk subgroup of patients than all those infected with SARS-CoV-2. Using the most recent and consensual definitions in the literature, we identified a high prevalence of CAPA. Indeed, we observed 17.1% proven/probable CAPA and 4.7% possible CAPA cases, allowing us to refine the prevalence of CAPA among mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients. Highly variable IPA prevalence estimates, ranging from 2% to 27.7%, have been reported in 10 studies that included more than 80 patients. 13-22 Such varying prevalence may be related to variable definitions of IPA, the monocentric nature of most of the studies, and the relatively low number (<150) of patients included in 8 of the 10 studies. Furthermore, the higher prevalence of IPA observed in the MYCOVID study may be the result of under-diagnosis in previous studies, as several authors did not provide their diagnostic criteria or rhythm of monitoring and used the AspICU case definition.

We identified several factors associated with CAPA. Patients with CAPA were significantly older, their disease was more severe based on the SOFA score on day 7, and they were more frequently under immunosuppressive therapy, particularly for organ transplantation. They also more frequently received anti-IL6 treatment, which was, furthermore, independently associated with CAPA by multivariate analysis. The benefit/risk ratio of anti-IL6 treatment needs to be carefully evaluated due to the conflicting results concerning its use and clinical interest for COVID-19 patients. ^{23, 24} Other risk factors, not investigated in this study, could be

linked to environmental exposure. Indeed, several teams have modified their existing air treatment to protect healthcare workers from aerosolization by creating negative pressure zones, which could potentially increase the risk of *Aspergillus* exposure.

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

Certain other respiratory viruses, such as influenza, also predispose patients to IPA. In such patients, infection by respiratory viruses results in epithelial damage and disruption of normal ciliary clearance, aiding the invasion of pulmonary tissues by conidia. The prevalence of IPA in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 appears to be similar than the known prevalence during severe seasonal influenza, despite the accumulation of numerous facilitating factors, including leucopenia/lymphopenia, T-cell perturbations, and treatment with corticosteroids, anti-IL1, and anti-IL6.

One main result of this study is the significantly higher mortality of CAPA patients, both by uni- and multivariate analysis, reaching 59.8% for proven/probable and 45.8% for possible CAPA versus 30.9 in the absence of CAPA. One limit to this work is that it was not designed to evaluate the efficacy of antifungal treatment. Such elevated mortality warrants consideration of early antifungal strategies, such as antifungal prophylaxis for high-risk patients, as well as the implementation of air-treatment measures. Of note, we observed a pejorative outcome using the AspICU classification for proven/putative AI (31/57, 54.4%) similar to that for proven/probable CAPA (52/87, 59.8%), even for patients categorized as colonized (18/50, 36%), compared to non-CAPA patients. A search for discrepancies in the classification between CAPA and AspICU case definitions showed that 36 patients classified as CAPA were classified as "only" colonized using the AspICU case definition. Mortality was, however, as high as 61.1% (22/36). Although many authors have suggested that the presence of Aspergillus in respiratory specimens from COVID-19-infected patients is a manifestation of colonization, we advocate using the more robust CAPA definitions and considering any marker indicating the presence of Aspergillus as an indication to perform a BAL, as also suggested by van Grootveld.²⁵ In the MYCOVID study, all positive diagnostic procedures on respiratory and/or blood samples were statistically linked to increased mortality and should be considered.

Aside from aspergillosis, the MYCOVID study highlights the occurrence of other fungal infections, with a high prevalence of 7.5%, of which the most frequent was candidemia in 6.3% of patients. Several authors have noted a global increase in the incidence of candidemia in COVID-19 patients, even candidemia due to *Candida auris*. Among them, a recent

review reported an overall incidence varying from 0.7% to 23.5%, of which most occurred in the ICU.²⁶ The reasons for such an increased incidence in this specific population is as yet unknown. COVID-19 patients are exposed to multiple risk factors for candidemia, such as antibiotic therapy, corticosteroids, immunosuppressive therapy, and long ICU stays. Several studies have suggested that direct disruption of the intestinal barrier caused by COVID-19 may be an additional risk factor for candidemia.^{21, 28} Indeed, it is known that enterocytes are infected by SARS-CoV-2, suggesting a possible link with *Candida* gut translocation.²⁹ Recently, a pilot study found enrichment of the fecal mycobiome with *Candida* and *Aspergillus* during the hospitalization of 30 patients with COVID-19 relative to controls.³⁰ However, more studies are needed to determine whether such alterations can explain the observed increased incidence of candidemia. The high mortality of patients with candidemia in the MYCOVID study (56·3%) warrants the analysis of risk factors and the establishment of optimal management and prevention of candidemia in this context.

This study highlights the high prevalence and mortality of invasive aspergillosis and candidiasis in ARDS-associated COVID-19 patients relative to that due to bacterial and viral secondary infections.

Antifungal drugs with high efficacy and low toxicity are available, along with non-invasive diagnostic tools, to allow the efficient management of IFI. The high mortality currently associated with CAPA demonstrates the importance of improving the management of this infectious complication. Overall, these findings highlight the need for a high index of suspicion and the implementation of active surveillance.

Further studies should determine if an early antifungal treatment or prophylaxis is needed if risk factors, such as those determined in this study, are present.

Contributors

JPG, ED, JRZ, and MEB conceived and designed the trial and wrote the manuscript. BL and JM contributed to the protocol and design of the study. All other authors contributed to the implementation of the study, inclusion of patients, and data collection. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final version.

Declaration of interests

491	Acknowledgments
492	We thank
493	Relecture, stats, We also thank the volunteers who participated in this study.
494	
495	Figure legends
496	Figure 1. Study design (A) and study flowchart (B)
497	Figure 2. Survival probability according to CAPA status
498	Figure 3. Probability of survival of proven/probable/possible CAPA patients receiving, or
499	not, anti-Aspergillus treatment with voriconazole and/or isavuconazole
500 501	Figure 4. Multivariate analysis of factors associated with death
502	
503	
504	

References

- 508 1 Schauwvlieghe A, Rijnders BJA, Philips N, et al. Invasive aspergillosis in patients admitted to the intensive care unit with severe influenza: a retrospective cohort study.

 510 Lancet Respir Med 2018; 6: 782-92.
- Verweij PE, Rijnders BJA, Bruggemann RJM, et al. Review of influenza-associated pulmonary aspergillosis in ICU patients and proposal for a case definition: an expert opinion. *Intensive Care Med* 2020; **46**: 1524-35.
- Bassetti M, Kollef MH, Timsit JF. Bacterial and fungal superinfections in critically ill patients with COVID-19. *Intensive Care Med* 2020; **46**: 2071-4.
- Lai CC, Yu WL. COVID-19 associated with pulmonary aspergillosis: a literature review. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect* 2021; **54**: 46-53.
- 518 5 Apostolopoulou A, Esquer Garrigos Z, Vijayvargiya P, Lerner AH, Farmakiotis D.
 519 Invasive pulmonary aspergillosis in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection: a systematic review of the literature. *Diagnostics (Basel)* 2020; **10**: 807.
- Arastehfar A, Carvalho A, van de Veerdonk FL, et al. COVID-19 associated pulmonary aspergillosis (CAPA)-from immunology to treatment. *J Fungi (Basel)* 2020; **6**: 91.
- Marr KA, Platt A, Tornheim JA, et al. Aspergillosis complicating severe coronavirus disease. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021; **27**: 18-25.
- Koehler P, Bassetti M, Chakrabarti A, et al. Defining and managing COVID-19-associated pulmonary aspergillosis: the 2020 ECMM/ISHAM consensus criteria for research and clinical guidance. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; published online Dec 14. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30847-1.
- 529 9 Donnelly JP, Chen SC, Kauffman CA, et al. Revision and update of the consensus 530 definitions of invasive fungal disease from the European Organization for Research and 531 Treatment of Cancer and the Mycoses Study Group Education and Research 532 Consortium. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; **71**: 1367-76.
- 533 10 Bassetti M, Giacobbe DR, Grecchi C, et al. Performance of existing definitions and tests 534 for the diagnosis of invasive aspergillosis in critically ill, adult patients: a systematic 535 review with qualitative evidence synthesis. *J Infect* 2020; **81**: 131-46.
- 536 11 Blot SI, Taccone FS, Van den Abeele AM, et al. A clinical algorithm to diagnose invasive pulmonary aspergillosis in critically ill patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2012; **186**: 56-64.
- Machado M, Valerio M, Alvarez-Uria A, et al. Invasive pulmonary aspergillosis in the COVID-19 era: an expected new entity. *Mycoses* 2021; **64**: 132-43.
- Bartoletti M, Pascale R, Cricca M, et al. Epidemiology of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis among COVID-19 intubated patients: a prospective study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; published online Jul 28. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1065.
- Dellière S, Dudoignon E, Fodil S, et al. Risk factors associated with COVID-19associated pulmonary aspergillosis in ICU patients: a French multicentric retrospective cohort. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020; published online Dec 13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.12.005.
- 548 15 Dupont D, Menotti J, Turc J, et al. Pulmonary aspergillosis in critically ill patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Med Mycol* 2021; **59**: 110-4.
- Fekkar A, Lampros A, Mayaux J, et al. Occurrence of invasive pulmonary fungal infections in patients with severe COVID-19 admitted to the ICU. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2021; **203**: 307-17.

- Lamoth F, Glampedakis E, Boillat-Blanco N, Oddo M, Pagani JL. Incidence of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis among critically ill COVID-19 patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020; **26**: 1706-8.
- Maes M, Higginson E, Pereira-Dias J, et al. Ventilator-associated pneumonia in critically ill patients with COVID-19. *Crit Care* 2021; **25**: 25.
- Razazi K, Arrestier R, Haudebourg AF, et al. Risks of ventilator-associated pneumonia and invasive pulmonary aspergillosis in patients with viral acute respiratory distress syndrome related or not to Coronavirus 19 disease. *Crit Care* 2020; **24**: 699.
- Ripa M, Galli L, Poli A, et al. Secondary infections in patients hospitalized with COVID-19: incidence and predictive factors. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2021; **27**: 451-7.
- White PL, Dhillon R, Cordey A, et al. A national strategy to diagnose COVID-19 associated invasive fungal disease in the ICU. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; published online Aug 29. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1298.
- Permpalung N, Chiang TP, Massie AB, et al. COVID-19 associated pulmonary aspergillosis in mechanically ventilated patients. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; published online Mar 9. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab223.
- Stone JH, Frigault MJ, Serling-Boyd NJ, et al. Efficacy of tocilizumab in patients hospitalized with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **383**: 2333-44.
- Horby PW, Pessoa-Amorim G, Peto L, et al. Tocilizumab in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): preliminary results of a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *medRxiv* 2021: 2021.02.11.21249258.
- van Grootveld R, van Paassen J, de Boer MGJ, et al. Systematic screening for COVID-19 associated invasive aspergillosis in ICU patients by culture and PCR on tracheal aspirate. *Mycoses* 2021; published online Feb 19. https://doi.org/10.1111/myc.13259.
- 577 26 Nucci M, Barreiros G, Guimarães LF, Deriquehem VAS, Castiñeiras AC, Nouér SA. 578 Increased incidence of candidemia in a tertiary care hospital with the COVID-19 579 pandemic. *Mycoses* 2021; **64**: 152-6.
- Prestel C, Anderson E, Forsberg K, et al. *Candida auris* outbreak in a COVID-19 specialty care unit Florida, July-August 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021; **70**: 56-7.
- Mastrangelo A, Germinario BN, Ferrante M, et al. Candidemia in COVID-19 patients: incidence and characteristics in a prospective cohort compared to historical non-COVID-19 controls. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; published online Oct 30. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1594.
- 587 29 Xiao F, Tang M, Zheng X, Liu Y, Li X, Shan H. Evidence for gastrointestinal infection of SARS-CoV-2. *Gastroenterology* 2020; **158**: 1831-3 e3.
- Zuo T, Zhan H, Zhang F, et al. Alterations in fecal fungal microbiome of patients with COVID-19 during time of hospitalization until discharge. *Gastroenterology* 2020; **159**: 1302-10.e5.

592593

600 Koehler Philip

- 601 MARR Kierien, University of Seattle
- 602 Benoit Misset

603	Frédéric Lamoth
604	Stijn Blot, University of Gant
605	Vanderdonk
606	D Dennning, University of Manchester
607	TORRES Antonio, University of Barcelona
608	Rodriguez-Bano Jesus, University of Sevilla
609	MUNOZ P, University of Madrid
610	WELTE Tobias, University School of Hanver
611	SHORR Andrew, Washington Dc,
612	KANJ Souha, American University of Beiruth
613	
614	