To the Editor—We read with great interest the article by Rawson et al recently published in this journal [1]. In this article, the authors described low rates of pulmonary bacterial coinfection in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). They also warn about the extensive use of broad-spectrum empirical antibiotics in critically ill COVID-19 patients, in the context of reduced routine microbiological investigation making antibiotic stewardship difficult. However, the low rate of coinfection described seems to us to be underestimated. We experienced in our center a much more important incidence of bacterial pneumonia, possibly related to the sampling method and the rate of sampling. Here we report bacterial pneumonia in critically ill patients with COVID-19 diagnosed by bacterial cultures of blind bronchoalveolar lavage (BBAL) [2].

We conducted a prospective single-center study including every patient admitted to the Saint-Louis surgical intensive care unit (ICU) (Assistance Publique–Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France) for respiratory failure related to COVID-19. Exclusion criteria were age <18 years, pregnancy, or moribundity patient at admission. Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) was defined according to the Berlin definition [3]. COVID-19–associated ARDS was managed as recommended [4]. Early-onset and late-onset ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) were defined as pneumonia diagnosed before and after 5 days of mechanical ventilation, respectively [5].

All patients or their surrogate had an information about the data collection and gave their nonopposition to the study (ethical committee of the Société Française d’Anesthésie Réanimation, institutional review board 00010254-2019–203). Continuous variables were described as median while categorical variables were expressed as frequencies (%), and group comparisons of continuous variables were performed using Student t test. Categorical data were compared using χ² test for count data.

Of 54 COVID-19 patients admitted in our ICU from 20 March 2020 to 15 April 2020, 49 have been mechanically ventilated. Characteristics of patients are summarized in Table 1. In univariate analysis, patients with VAP had more ARDS, had more acute kidney injury, were mechanically ventilated longer, and had a longer ICU length of stay (Table 1).

BBAL was performed in 45 patients during ICU stay; all were mechanically ventilated and suspected of bacterial pneumonia. Bacterial cultures of BBAL grew with significant amount of bacteria (ie, ≥10⁴ colony-forming units/mL) in 37% (n = 20) of patients. Bacterial pathogens causing pneumonia are summarized in Supplementary Table 1. Among the 20 bacterial pneumonias, 4 (20%) were classified as community-acquired, 1 (5%) hospital-acquired, and 15 (75%) VAP including 3 early-onset and 12 late-onset. In early-onset VAP, bacterial pathogens were mostly gram-positive bacteria (2/3), and 67% (2/3) were susceptible to piperacillin-tazobactam, cefotaxime, cefepime, and meropenem. Conversely, in late-onset VAP, most bacterial pathogens were gram-negative bacteria (12/14) including 8 nonfermenting bacilli and 4 Enterobacterales. Among gram-negative bacteria causing late-onset VAP, 8% (1/12), 43% (5/12), 58% (7/12), and 83% (10/12) were susceptible to cefotaxime, piperacillin-tazobactam, cefepime, and meropenem, respectively.

We reported significant rate of bacterial pneumonia, mostly late-onset VAP, in critically ill patients with COVID-19 in our unit. We would emphasize the importance of performing respiratory samples to diagnose bacterial pneumonia and therefore base antimicrobial therapy on bacterial cultures. BBAL does not require bronchoscopy, decreasing the risk of contamination, and is suitable for bacterial culture. Recently, a new molecular test named FilmArray Pneumonia plus panel (BioFire, Salt Lake City, Utah) showed excellent performance compared to bacterial culture in bacterial pneumonia with rapid turnaround time [6]. This new tool for detection of pathogens could lead to a reduction of spectrum and duration of antibiotic therapy.
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Reply to Dudoignon et al

To the Editor—We read with interest Dudoignon and colleagues’ correspondence reporting evidence of bacterial coinfection in 20 of 54 (37%) critically unwell adults with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) [1]. The majority of diagnosed coinfections were late-onset ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP). The authors highlight the need for robust methods for microbiological

Table 1. Characteristics of Patients

| Characteristic                        | All Patients (N = 54) | Pneumonia (n = 20) | No Pneumonia (n = 34) | PValue |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|
| Age, y                                | 63 (57–68)            | 64 (59–72)         | 62 (56–67)             | .291   |
| Weight, kg                            | 83 (75–94)            | 82 (72–89)         | 83 (77–95)             | .407   |
| Height, cm                            | 175 (166–178)         | 176 (168–180)      | 174 (165–178)          | .341   |
| BMI, kg/m²                            | 27 (26–30)            | 27 (23–29)         | 27 (26–32)             | .288   |
| Male sex                              | 42 (77.8)             | 16 (80.0)          | 26 (76.5)              | .763   |
| Comorbidities                         |                       |                    |                        |        |
| Tobacco use                           | 5 (9.3)               | 1 (5.0)            | 4 (11.8)               | .408   |
| Hypertension                          | 35 (64.8)             | 12 (60.0)          | 23 (67.6)              | .570   |
| ACEI or ARB                           | 19 (35.2)             | 6 (30.0)           | 13 (38.2)              | .541   |
| Diabetes mellitus                     | 21 (38.9)             | 8 (40.0)           | 13 (38.2)              | .898   |
| Dyslipidemia                          | 18 (33.3)             | 7 (35.0)           | 11 (32.4)              | .541   |
| Coronary disease                      | 5 (9.3)               | 1 (5.0)            | 4 (11.8)               | .408   |
| Chronic pulmonary disease             | 7 (13.0)              | 2 (10.0)           | 5 (14.7)               | .619   |
| Treatments before admission           |                       |                    |                        |        |
| Antibiotics                           | 35 (64.8)             | 12 (60.0)          | 23 (67.6)              | .570   |
| Cephalosporin third generation        | 26 (48.1)             | 9 (45.0)           | 17 (50.0)              | .723   |
| Rovamycin                             | 17 (31.5)             | 6 (30.0)           | 11 (32.4)              | .857   |
| Amoxicillin-clavulanate               | 3 (5.6)               | 1 (5.0)            | 2 (5.9)                | .891   |
| Hydroxychloroquine                    | 4 (7.4)               | 1 (5.0)            | 3 (8.8)                | .604   |
| Azithromycin                          | 10 (18.5)             | 2 (10.0)           | 8 (23.5)               | .216   |
| Severity of illness, median (IQR)    |                       |                    |                        |        |
| Delay between onset of symptoms and intubation, d | 8 (3–11) | 10 (5–12) | 8 (11–11) | .299 |
| SAPS II                               | 37 (27–46)            | 40 (29–56)         | 34 (27–43)             | .209   |
| SOFA score                            | 5 (4–7)               | 5 (4–7)            | 4 (3–6)                | .279   |
| Organ failure                         |                       |                    |                        |        |
| ARDS                                  | 46 (85.2)             | 20 (100.0)         | 26 (76.5)              | .019   |
| Admission PaO2/FiO2                    | 126 (80–174)          | 115 (80–155)       | 141 (81–194)           | .500   |
| Worst PaO2/FiO2                        | 79 (70–114)           | 76 (70–101)        | 82 (68–136)            | .476   |
| AKI                                   | 28 (51.9)             | 14 (70.0)          | 14 (41.2)              | .041   |
| RRT                                   | 11 (20.4)             | 5 (25.0)           | 6 (17.6)               | .517   |
| Outcome                               |                       |                    |                        |        |
| ICU mortality                         | 15 (27.8)             | 6 (30.0)           | 9 (26.5)               | .780   |
| Length of mechanical ventilation, d   | 12 (7–21)             | 15 (11–32)         | 7 (8–20)               | .046   |
| Length of stay in ICU, d              | 12 (6–17)             | 17 (14–34)         | 9 (3–12)               | .001   |

Continuous variables are described as median (interquartile range) and categorical variables as frequency (%). Abbreviations: ACEI, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; AKI, acute kidney injury; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome; BMI, body mass index; ICU, intensive care unit; PaO2/FiO2, arterial partial pressure of oxygen/fraction of inspired oxygen; RRT, renal replacement therapy; SAPS II, Simplified Acute Physiology Score II; SOFA, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment.