Prevalence of Bacterial Coinfection and Patterns of Antibiotics Prescribing in Patients with COVID-19: A Systematic review and Meta-Analysis

Faisal Salman ALSHAIKH^{a,b}, Oula Nawaf SINDI^a, Brian GODMAN^{a,c,d}, R Andrew SEATON^{d,e}, Amanj KURDI^{g,h,a,d}

^a Strathclyde Institute of Pharmacy and Biomedical Science (SIPBS), University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK; ph.faisalalshaikh@gmail.com; oula.nawaf@gmail.com

^b Pharmaceutical Services, Bahrain Defence Force Military Hospital, Kingdom of Bahrain

^c Centre of Medical and Bio-allied Health Sciences Research, Ajman University, United Arab Emirates

^d Division of Public Health Pharmacy and Management, School of Pharmacy, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University, Pretoria, South Africa

^e Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, Glasgow, UK

^f Scottish Antimicrobial Prescribing Group, Healthcare Improvement Scotland, Glasgow, UK

^g Center of Research and strategic studies, Lebanese French University, Erbil, Kurdistan Region Government, Iraq

^h Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, College of Pharmacy, Hawler Medical University, Erbil, Kurdistan Region Government, Iraq

Corresponding Author:

Faisal Alshaikh

Strathclyde Institute of Pharmacy and Biomedical Science, University of Strathclyde, 161 Cathedral Street, Glasgow, G4 0RE, Scotland, UK

Email: ph.faisalalshaikh@gmail.com

Telephone: (00973)36805888

Co-corresponding Author:

Brian Godman

Email: briangodman@outlook.com

Word Count: 3583

Number of Tables: 1

Number of Figures: 7

Abstract

Background: Evidence around prevalence of bacterial coinfection and pattern of antibiotic use in COVID-19 is controversial although high prevalence rates of bacterial coinfection have been reported in previous similar global viral respiratory pandemics. Early data on the prevalence of antibiotic prescribing in COVID-19 indicates conflicting low and high prevalence of antibiotic prescribing which challenges antimicrobial stewardship programmes and increases risk of antimicrobial resistance (AMR).

Aim: To determine current prevalence of bacterial coinfection and antibiotic prescribing in COVID-19 patients

Data Source: OVID MEDLINE, OVID EMBASE, Cochrane and MedRxiv between January 2020 and June 2021.

Study Eligibility: English language studies of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 patients which reported (a) prevalence of bacterial coinfection and/or (b) prevalence of antibiotic prescribing with no restrictions to study designs or healthcare setting

Participants: Adults (aged ≥ 18 years) with RT-PCR confirmed diagnosis of COVID-19, regardless of study setting.

Methods: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Proportion (prevalence) data was pooled using random effects meta-analysis approach; and stratified based on region and study design.

Results: A total of 1058 studies were screened, of which 22, hospital-based studies were eligible, comprising 76,176 of COVID-19 patients. Pooled estimates for the prevalence of bacterial co-infection and antibiotic use were 5.62% (95% CI 2.26 – 10.31) and 61.77% (CI 50.95 – 70.90), respectively. Sub-group analysis by region demonstrated that bacterial co-infection was more prevalent in North American studies (7.89%, 95% CI 3.30-14.18).

Conclusion: Prevalence of bacterial coinfection in COVID-19 is low, yet prevalence of antibiotic prescribing is high, indicating the need for targeted COVID-19 antimicrobial stewardship initiatives to reduce the global threat of AMR.

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Bacterial Coinfection, Antibiotic Prescribing, Antibiotics

1- Introduction

The first case of COVID-19 was reported in December 2019^[1, 2]. Since its emergence, the novel severe acute respiratory coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has resulted in a global pandemic. As of January 14th 2022, a total of 318 million confirmed cases have been reported, with 5.5 million confirmed deaths^[3]. The pandemic has overwhelmed healthcare systems globally and proved to be a challenge to healthcare professionals in providing optimum healthcare with limited evidence of effective treatment approaches certainly initially with potential treatments including hydroxychloroquine, lopinavir/ritonavir and remdesivir subsequently found to have limited impact in reducing morbidity and mortality in hospitalised patients in large clinical trials^[4, 5]. In fact in the initial studies only dexamethasone was shown to reduce mortality among patients with COVID-19 who were receiving either invasive mechanical ventilation or oxygen alone^[6].

Alongside concerns with misinformation concerning potential treatments for patients with COVID-19 including hydroxychloroquine and the subsequent impact on morbidity, mortality and costs^[7, 8], the presence of bacterial co-infection in COVID-19 has been a widespread concern amongst healthcare professionals due to overlapping clinical features with bacterial pneumonia^[9], and the increased risk of morbidity and mortality associated with bacterial co-infections^[10]. The presence of bacterial co-infection had been observed during previous viral pandemics including the 1918 influenza pandemic and the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic^[11, 12], with *S. pneumoniae*, *β-hemolytic streptococci*, *H. influenzae*, and *S. aureus*, being the most common causative pathogens of respiratory tract infections^[13]. During winter months influenza-associated bacterial infections may account for up to 30% of community acquired pneumonia cases (CAP)^[14]. Nevertheless, other respiratory viruses such as Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) and SARS-CoV-1 have reported a very low prevalence of bacterial co-infection amongst infected patients^[15, 16] potentially attributable to the comparatively small number of cases reported^[17].

Concerns regarding bacterial co-infection in COVID-19 patients has led to widespread use of antibiotics empirically in both hospital and community settings^[18-22]. The significant increase in antibiotic prescribing during the pandemic challenges antimicrobial stewardship programmes and risks emergence of multi-drug resistant bacteria^[23-25], with their associated impact on morbidity, mortality and costs^[26-29].

Prior meta-analyses suggest a bacterial coinfection prevalence of <4% - 8% in patients with COVID-19, nonetheless, these studies included a small number of patients^[9, 30-32]. The prevalence of antibiotic prescribing in patients with COVID-19 was 74.6%, reported in a prior meta-analysis, which included literature mostly from Asia^[33]. Consequently, this review aims at building on these publications through identifying the prevalence of bacterial co-infection, and the prevalence of antibiotic use in patients with COVID-19 across multiple countries and regions to guide future prescribing. This includes reducing the inappropriate use of antimicrobials during the COVID-19 pandemic where inappropriate use is a potential driver of antimicrobial resistance (AMR)^[24, 25, 34]

2- Method

Search Strategy

Electronic databases were systematically searched for published literature reporting bacterial coinfection and/or antibiotic use in patients with COVID-19. The databases searched included OVID MEDLINE, OVID EMBASE, Cochrane library and MedRxiv, with articles published between December 2019 and 29th June 2021. The search terms and keywords used included terms related to “COVID-19”, “Coinfections” and “Antibiotics” (*Appendix 1*). The results of the search conducted were imported into Covidence online software for systematic reviews, in which duplicate publications were removed. Reporting was based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines for systematic reviews. The study protocol was registered in the international register of systematic reviews, PROSPERO, under the following ID: CRD42021261734

Study Selection

Two reviewers (FA and ON) independently screened titles and abstracts and read full texts to assess if they met the pre-set inclusion criteria, disputes were settled by third a reviewer (AK). All English language articles, irrespective of their primary outcomes, reporting bacterial coinfection rate and/or antibiotics use in, laboratory-confirmed (via Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)), COVID-19 human adult patients (≥ 18 years) in all healthcare settings were included (Outpatients and Inpatients). Studies in which patients with suspected COVID-19, based on clinical symptoms and not laboratory confirmed RT-PCR, were excluded. No restrictions to study design were applied. Case reports, case notes, editorials, letters, systematic review, meta-analysis and qualitative studies were excluded. Abstract only publications with no full text were also excluded.

Non-peer reviewed/ Pre-prints publications on MedRxiv were also included if the papers contained relevant information regarding the topic of interest.

Data Extraction and quality assessment

Data was extracted into a standardised collection form that was created using Microsoft Excel 2016, by reviewers FA and ON. Data collected for information regarding the demographics of the studies included the following variables: first author; publication year; country of publication; study design (Retrospective, prospective, RCTs etc...); is the study multicentre; study setting (Community, hospital, mixed etc...); if the study was peer-reviewed; number of positive COVID-19 patients; proportion of male population; and the average age. Data was collected for the following variables: prevalence of bacterial coinfection (defined as a bacterial coinfection within 48 hours of positive COVID-19 diagnosis and hospital admission), studies looking into super-infection and/or secondary-infection (occurring at 48 hours of hospital admission), were not included; and prevalence of antibiotic use among COVID-19 patients. The following information, if reported, was also collected: bacterial species isolated; the prevalence of most common bacteria; most common site of infection of

bacterial infection; clinical outcomes of co-infected patients; antibiotic class prescribed; timing of antibiotic initiation in relation to COVID-19 onset and clinical outcomes of patients prescribed antibiotics. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used to assess the quality of the observational studies included in the review^[35].

Data Synthesis, sensitivity analysis and publication bias

The two primary outcomes were the prevalence of bacterial coinfection in COVID-19 patients and the prevalence of antibiotics use in COVID-19 patients. Further sub-group analysis was conducted based on studies' region/continent and design. Proportion (prevalence) outcome data across all studies were pooled using a random effect meta-analysis with Freeman and Tukey method^[36]. Results were presented using forest plots, to demonstrate the studies' effect size, and 95% confidence intervals (CI). Heterogeneity was assessed using I^2 statistic. A value below 40% was considered to be low heterogeneity, 30 – 60% was considered to be moderate heterogeneity, 50-90% was substantial, and 75-100% is considerable heterogeneity^[37]. Publication bias was assessed through Funnel plots followed by Egger's asymmetry test^[38]. All analyses were carried out using STATA/BE 17.0 for Windows (64-bit x 86-64) using the *Metaprop* command package.

3- Results

A total of 1183 studies were identified and 125 duplicates were removed. A total of 1058 studies were screened for title and abstract, 81 were screened by full-text screening and 22 studies were eligible for inclusion in the final analysis²⁴⁻⁴⁵ (*figure 1*). Prevalence of bacterial coinfections was reported in 20 of the 22 studies included, whilst prevalence of antibiotics use was reported in 18 studies only (*table 1*).

Figure 1. Study flow diagram based on PRISMA guidelines

Author, Year	Country	Study Design	Multicentre? (Y/N)	Study Setting	Peer-reviewed? (Y/N)	Quality Rating	COVID-19 Patients, n	Male, n (%)	Age (SD/IQR)	Bacterial Coinfection, n (%)	Most common Bacteria, N (%)	Antibiotic Use, N (%)	Antibiotic Class (most common)
1. Puzniak L, 2021 ^[39]	USA	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	17003	9026 (53)	61.7 (18)	2889 (16.99)	<i>Enterobacteriales</i> , 1594 (55.17)	11562 (68)	Cephalosporins
2. Wang L, 2020 ^[40]	UK	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	1396	903 (65)	67.4 (16.2)	37(2.65)	<i>E. Coli</i> , 6 (16.22)	36 (2.58)	
3. Michael S, 2020 ^[41]	USA	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	73	35 (48)				27 (36.99)	NR
4. S. Hughes, 2020 ^[42]	UK	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	836	519 (62)	69 (55-81)	27 (3.23)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 4 (14.81)		
5. Contou D, 2020 ^[43]	France	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Good	92	73 (79)	61 (55-70)	26 (28.26)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 10 (38.46)	39 (42.39)	Cephalosporins
6. Cheng, L, 2020 ^[44]	China	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	147	85 (58)	36 (24-54)	4 (2.72)		52 (35.37)	Cephalosporins
7. Neto A G M, 2020 ^[45]	USA	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Good	242	123 (51)	66 (14.75)	46 (19.01)	<i>E. Coli</i> , 12 (26.09)	162 (66.94)	Cephalosporins
8. Lardaro T, 2020 ^[46]	USA	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	542	269 (50)	62.8 (16.5)	20 (3.69)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 7 (35)		
9. Chen S, 2020 ^[47]	China	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Good	408	196 (48)	48 (34-60)	25 (6.13)	<i>mycoplasma pneumonia</i> , 13 (52)	60 (14.71)	NR
10. Baskar V, 2021 ^[48]	UK	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	254	164 (65)	59 (49-69)	14 (5.51)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 4 (28.57)		
11. Russell C D, 2021 ^[49]	UK	Prospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	48902	28116 (58)	74 (59-84)	318 (0.65)	<i>E. Coli</i> , 64 (20.13)	39528 (80.83)	Penicillin/B-lactams
12. Lehmann C J, 2021 ^[50]	USA	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Poor	321	155 (48)	60 (17)	7 (2.18)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 2 (28.57)	222 (69.16)	NR
13. Vaughn V, 2021 ^[51]	USA	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	1705	885 (52)	64.7 (53-77)	59 (3.46)		965 (56.6)	Cephalosporins
14. Miao Q, 2021 ^[52]	China	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Good	323			17 (5.26)	<i>Klebsiella pneumonia</i> , 11 (64.71)		
15. Karami Z, 2020 ^[53]	Netherlands	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	925	591 (64)	70 (59-77)	7 (0.76)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 4 (57.14)	556 (60.11)	Cephalosporins
16. Garcia-Vidal C, 2021 ^[54]	Spain	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Good	989	552 (56)	62 (48-74)	31 (3.13)	<i>Streptococcus pneumonia</i> , 12 (38.71)	917 (92.72)	Macrolide
17. Crotty M P, 2020 ^[55]	USA	Prospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	N	Good	289		58.6 (14.4)	25 (8.65)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 5 (20)	271 (93.77)	NR
18. Wei W, 2020 ^[56]	USA	Prospective Cohort	N	Hospital	N	Good	147	87 (59)	52			87 (59.18)	Cephalosporins
19. Karaba S, 2020 ^[57]	USA	Prospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	Y	Good	1016	543 (53)	62 (48-74)	53 (5.22)		717 (70.57)	NR
20. Martin A, 2020 ^[58]	USA	Retrospective Cohort	Y	Hospital	N	Good	208	105 (51)	69 (60-80)	24 (11.54)	<i>S. aureus</i> , 5 (20.83)	172 (82.69)	Cephalosporins
21. Rothe K, 2021 ^[59]	Germany	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Good	140	90 (64)	63.5 (17-99)	3 (2.14)		116 (82.86)	Penicillin/B-lactams
22. Asmarawati T P, 2020 ^[60]	Indonesia	Retrospective Cohort	N	Hospital	Y	Good	218	120 (55)	52.45 (14.44)	13 (5.96)	NR	164 (75.23)	Quinolones

Table 1. Summary of study and patients' characteristics

Study characteristics

Retrospective cohort studies accounted for the majority of the studies involved (n = 18, 81%), whilst prospective cohort studies accounted for the remaining (n=4, 18%). Of the 22 studies included, 3 (13%) studies were pre-prints^[55, 56, 58], whilst the remaining (n=19, 86%) were peer-reviewed. A total of 13 (59%) studies were conducted in multicentre settings, whilst the remainder (n=9, 40%) were conducted in single centre settings. All of the studies included were conducted in hospital settings, whether it be in a normal, isolation or an intensive care ward. Twenty one out of the 22 studies have been classified as a “Good” rating during the quality assessment process.

Geographical distribution

The majority of the studies included in the review took place in the United States of America (USA) (n=10, 45%), followed by the United Kingdom (UK) (n=4, 18%), China (n=3, 14%) and 1 study each in France, Germany, Indonesia, The Netherlands and Spain. Continent-wise, 10 (45%) studies were from North America, 8 (36%) from Europe and 4 (18%) were from Asia.

Patients Characteristics

A total of 76,176 adult patients with RT-PCR confirmed COVID-19 were included from 22 studies, with studies by Russell *et al*^[49] (UK, 48,902 patients) and Puzniak *et al*^[39] (US, 17,003 patients) comprising 86.5% of the overall study population. The mean age of patients, was 61 years (IQR 59-67, range 36-74) and mean proportion of male subjects was 54% (IQR 50-63).

The most commonly used class of antibiotics were the cephalosporins (8 out of 18 studies), with 7 out of 18 of the studies reporting that antimicrobial use was initiated on admission.

Meta-analysis of prevalence of bacterial coinfection in COVID-19 patients

A total of 20 studies of the 22 studies included in this review, comprising of 75,956 (99.7%) of the overall study population, investigated bacterial co-infection. Of which, only 3,645 (4.7%) patients were reported to have a confirmed diagnosis of bacterial co-infection. The random effects meta-analysis of all combined studies estimated that the prevalence of bacterial coinfection in COVID-19 patients was 5.62% (95% CI 2.26 – 10.31), with an I^2 value of 99.69%, indicating considerable heterogeneity (**Figure 2**).

Of all the 20 studies (90%) reporting on bacterial coinfection, the most commonly reported bacterial organism was *S. aureus* (n=8, 40%), followed by *E.coli* (n=3, 15%). The most common source of bacterial coinfection was respiratory (n=10, 50%), followed by blood (n=2, 10%) and urine (n=2, 10%).

252

253

254

Figure 2. Prevalence of Bacterial coinfection

255

Bacterial coinfection by Region

257

The prevalence of bacterial coinfection was highest in North America (7.89%, 95% CI 3.30-14.18), followed by Asia (5.3%, 95% CI 4.03 – 6.73), with Europe having the lowest prevalence (3.57%, 95% CI 1.72 -6) (**Figure 3**). Heterogeneity was considerable in both North America and Europe, $I^2 = 98.89\%$ and 96.75% respectively. Studies in Asia had low heterogeneity with an I^2 value of 0% .

263

Figure 3. Prevalence of Bacterial coinfection by region

Bacterial coinfection by study design

Retrospective cohort studies had the highest prevalence of bacterial coinfection (5.92%, 95% CI 2.79 – 10.07), whilst prospective cohort studies had a prevalence of 3.97% (95% CI 0.38, 10.92) (**Figure 4**). Heterogeneity was considerable in both retrospective and prospective, $I^2 = 98.88\%$ and 98.62% (**Appendix Fig. A**) respectively.

275

276

Figure 4. Prevalence of Bacterial coinfection by study design

277

278

Meta-analysis of antibiotic use in COVID-19 patients

279

280

Antibiotic use was reported in 55,653 of the total 76,176 patients included in this review, with 18 studies (81%) reporting antibiotic use in COVID-19 patients. The random effects meta-analysis of all combined studies have estimated a prevalence of 61.16% (CI 50.95 – 70.90) of antibiotic prescribing in COVID-19, with an I^2 value of 99.77%, indicating considerable heterogeneity (**Figure 5**).

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

Figure 5. Antibiotic use

Antibiotic use by region

North America had the highest antibiotic use in COVID-19 patients per region (68.84%, 95% CI 62.27 – 75.05), followed by Europe (60.01%, 95% CI 25.50- 89.67), with Asia having the lowest prevalence of antibiotic use (40.81%, 95% CI 7.75 – 79.65) (**Figure 6**). Heterogeneity was considerable across all with studies in Europe being the most heterogeneous ($I^2 = 99.91\%$), followed by Asia ($I^2 = 99.18\%$) (**Appendix Fig. B**), followed by North America ($I^2 = 97.28\%$).

304

305

306

307

Figure 6. Antibiotic use by region

308

Antibiotic use by study design

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

Prospective cohort studies had the highest estimate of antibiotic prescribing prevalence (77.83%, 95% CI 68.09 – 86.23), followed by retrospective cohort studies (56.02%, 95% CI 39.40 – 71.97) (**Figure 7**). Heterogeneity was considerable in both Retrospective and Prospective cohort studies, with I^2 value of 99.72% and 97.82%, respectively.

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

Figure 7. Antibiotic use by study design

Bias assessment

As detected by the funnel plots generated (**Figure 8**), there was no evidence of publication bias. This is further supported by the objective results (p-values) obtained through Egger's asymmetry test for studies in both prevalence of bacterial coinfection and antibiotic use, p-values were 0.43 and 0.59.

330 ??
331

332
333 **Figure 8.** Funnel plots illustrating the assessment of publication bias for each primary
334 outcome
335

336 4- Discussion

337
338 This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed at determining the prevalence of bacterial
339 coinfection and antibiotic use in COVID-19 patients. The prevalence of bacterial coinfection
340 amongst COVID-19 patients was 5.62% (95% CI 2.26 – 10.31) whilst, the use of antibiotic
341 agents amongst COVID-19 patients was 61.77% (CI 50.95 – 70.90). To the best of the
342 authors' knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis to investigate both outcomes at once as
343 well as break the findings down by Region to provide future guidance.
344

345 With regards to bacterial coinfection in COVID-19 patients, the findings in this review is
346 consistent with those of previously published studies and smaller systematic reviews
347 addressing this issue (Range <4% - 8%)^[9, 30-32]. Bacterial coinfection prevalence were low
348 across all included studies, with the exception to Contou *et al*, Neto *et al* and Puzniak *et al*
349 in which the reported prevalence rates were 28%, 19% and 16% respectively^[39, 43, 45].
350 High prevalence rates reported by Contou *et al* can be attributed to the study setting, which
351 was the ICU. Symptomatic patients admitted to the ICU were tested for COVID-19 and for
352 bacteriological pathogens afterwards; consequently, potentially reporting higher prevalence
353 of bacterial coinfection. Nonetheless, Contou D *et al* clearly differentiated in their study
354 design between coinfections and nosocomial infections. Positive microbiological samples
355 conducted within the first 48 hours of admission were labelled as coinfection, whilst positive
356 microbiological samples after 48 hours were considered to be nosocomial ICU-acquired
357 infections^[43].
358

359 Urinary tract infections (UTIs) were the most prevalent source of bacterial coinfection (57%)
360 as reported by Neto *et al*^[45]. The authors attributed the high UTI rate to the lack of a fixed

defining clinical characteristics of bacterial coinfection and to high risk factors for UTIs amongst the study population, e.g. elderly hospitalised female patients and diabetic patients. High bacterial coinfection prevalence rates (16%) were reported by Puznik *et al*^[39], the second largest study included in this review, when compared to the low prevalence rates reported by Russell *et al*^[49] (0.65%), the largest study in the review. This may be due to a number of factors. These include the frequency of microbiological investigations, in which, investigation rates were higher in the study of Puznik *et al*. Interpretation of microbiological results in which gram-negative bacteria in sputum samples of non-ventilated patients were taken which may have over-estimated significance of bacterial coinfection^[39].

The analyses conducted around bacterial coinfection in COVID-19 patients suggests that bacterial coinfection prevalence rates are lower than seen in previous viral pandemics. During the 2009 swine flu pandemic, up to 55% of mortalities were as a result of bacterial pneumonia⁴⁶. Previous pandemics have also reported that *S. pneumoniae*, *β-hemolytic streptococci*, *H. influenzae*, and *S. aureus* were the most commonly identified bacterial co-pathogens^[13]. In this review, *S. aureus* has been the most identified bacterial co-pathogen.

This review also identified very high antibiotic use in COVID-19 patients, which is consistent with previous reviews including those of Langford *et al* (2021)^[33], which reported a prevalence of 74.6% (95% CI 68.3-80.0%). Differences between the results seen in this review and the review of Langford *et al* may be attributed to the fact that the latter review also included case series with ≥10 patients. This can potentially be attributed to the time period of the pandemic in which the studies were conducted. There was scarceness of cohort studies in the review of Langford *et al* (2021)^[33], which is different to our study. This review also included a wider selection of nations in addition to a larger number of patients.

The increase in antibiotic use observed during this pandemic might have impacted and setback antimicrobial stewardship (AMS) efforts globally, especially in regions where AMS programmes are just starting as seen in Africa with previous knowledge and resource issues^[61-63]. This is starting to change in Africa with a growing number of AMS activities to address identified concerns^[64-66]. However, remarkably, in certain regions globally, specifically in Europe, there was a decline in antibiotic use overall in 2020, despite high antibiotic use in COVID-19 positive patients. This can potentially be attributed to a number of factors including social distancing measures and reduction in medical activities^[67-69]. Nonetheless, inappropriate use of antibiotics during COVID-19 is a potential driver of the silent AMR pandemic^[24, 70]. However, with current changes observed in global human behaviour, relating to personal hygiene, and increased interest in infection control since the emergence of this pandemic, we should see a rise in AMS activities globally^[71].

Sub-group analysis based on the key regions demonstrated that the prevalence of reported bacterial coinfection was higher in North America followed by Asia and Europe at 7.89%, 5.30% and 3.57%, respectively. Antibiotic use was also higher in North America (68.84%), followed by Europe (60%) and Asia (40.81%). Our hypothesis suggests that the reason for higher prevalence of bacterial coinfection and antibiotic use in North America is due to the presence of larger number of studies and patients from the region in this review, in addition to possibly higher rates of microbiology investigation and over interpretation of microbiology

results. Nevertheless, studies from Asia are reporting high use of antibiotics including the study of Hassan *et al*, which reported extremely high use of antibiotics (92%) in COVID-19 patients^[72], however, this study was not included in our meta-analysis as it has not met our inclusion criteria. We are also aware of more recent studies in Asia reporting high rates since our analysis^[22, 73].

In this review, investigating regional distribution of co-infection and antibiotic use was key. Its significance is directly correlated to the fact that antimicrobial use varies considerably across regions, albeit some convergence^[74]. It is quite apparent that high antibiotic consumption is common in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) in contrast to high-income countries (HICs)^[74]. In addition, AMR rates vary considerably across countries and regions, with high AMR rates quite evident in regions such as South Asia and Sub-Sahara Africa, therefore, it was practical, in this review, to breakdown antibiotic usage rates by region^[75, 76].

In terms of study design, sub-group analysis has demonstrated that retrospective studies had higher prevalence of bacterial coinfection than prospective ones at 5.92% vs 3.97% respectively. Whilst, on the other hand, antibiotic use was higher in prospective than retrospective studies, 77.83% vs 56.02%, respectively. The main hypothesis that might explain these variations in prevalence from the main meta-analyses is the study design itself. Prospective studies had well-defined processes to determine bacterial coinfection in COVID-19 patients, such as pre-defined clinical characteristics that prompt microbiological sampling^[49]; hence likely lower bacterial coinfection rates but higher justifiable antibiotic use.

Despite having 10 out of 22 studies included in this review published in 2021, all the studies included have been conducted mainly in the first few months of the pandemic (February and April 2020) with the exception of one study conducted in June 2020^[60]. The results from this review demonstrates that there is insufficient evidence supporting considerable empiric antibiotic prescribing in COVID-19 patients due to a low prevalence of bacterial coinfection. Nonetheless, antibiotics use was high mirroring the findings in other reviews. As the pandemic evolves, and new COVID-19 specific therapeutics come into clinical practice, it will be important to assess their impact on antibiotic use. The early phase of the pandemic from which most of the published studies to date relate has been characterised by a lack of specific COVID-19 therapies and it may be as treatment options become available, and the understanding of the low prevalence of bacterial co-infection becomes more established, that there will be less reliance or defaulting to antibiotic prescribing. We will be following this up in future studies.

Strengths and Limitations

We believe the key strengths of this review included a comprehensive search strategy spanning several databases, including both pre-prints and peer-reviewed studies, resulting in 22 studies being included, representing over 76,000 patients.

However, we are aware that this review was not without limitations. During the screening process, a significant number of studies have been excluded as they did not meet the inclusion criteria. The majority of the excluded studies included non-lab confirmed COVID-19 patients, therefore, bacterial coinfection and antibiotic use may be under- or over-reported. Disproportionate representation from North America and failure to include studies from regions other than Europe and Asia can also limit the generalizability of the results to other regions impacted by COVID-19. Additionally, the majority of studies included were conducted within the first 6 month of pandemic. Consequently, data included might not be up to date, which again, can compromise the generalizability of the results. Notably, the emergence of new variants, updated treatment regimens and variations in measures for SARS-CoV-2 testing, might impact the prevalence of bacterial coinfection and antibiotic use^[77]. In addition, the majority of studies included in the meta-analyses were retrospective studies with their inherently associated bias and limitations.

Alongside this, determining the appropriateness and justifiable need of antibiotic therapy, which is likely to be higher in prospective studies in comparison to retrospective studies, was not possible, as studies have mainly reported the number of patients prescribed antibiotics. Information such as indications, initiation timing and duration of antibiotic could assist in determining future appropriateness. Diagnostic tests and measures used to determine bacteriological infections were also under-reported. This is crucial to determine whether the infection is a true infection or bacterial colonisation.

In addition 3 (13%) of the 22 studies included in this review were non-peer reviewed, which might raise concerns regarding their quality^[55, 56, 58]. However, one of these studies is now published, so it is unlikely to be of low quality^[58]. The remaining two, despite not being published, have still attained a “good” quality rating using the NOS, in addition, both studies weighted in the forest plot were small, and therefore unlikely to affect the overall results

Future reviews and studies should aim at diversifying study regions, and to include or conduct studies that are more up to date. Studies should also include data on the appropriateness of antibiotic therapy, diagnostic tests and measures used to determine the infection. However, despite these limitations, we believe the findings give good guidance regarding the need to improve the rationality of antibiotic prescribing in patients with COVID-19 to reduce the occurrence of AMR within facilities.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the prevalence of bacterial coinfection amongst COVID-19 patients was low, 5.62%, nevertheless, antibiotics use amongst COVID-19 patients was high (61.77%). The findings of this study encourage a more rational approach to antibiotics prescribing in COVID-19 patients, an approach based on laboratory-confirmed diagnosis of coinfection, rather than clinical, advocating for more antimicrobial stewardship (AMS). We know that antimicrobial stewardship programmes have been successfully instigated across countries including LMICs, and we will be looking to build on this.

497 **Statements and Declarations**

498 **Funding**

499 *The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the*
500 *preparation of this manuscript*

501

502 **Competing Interests**

503 *The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose*

504

505 **Author Contributions**

506 *Data collection and analysis were performed by Faisal Alshaikh, Oula Sindi and Amanj*
507 *Kurdi. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Faisal Alshaikh and all authors*
508 *commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final*
509 *manuscript*

510

511 **Data Availability**

512 *All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article*

513

514 **Ethics approval**

515 *Not applicable*

516

517 **Consent to participate**

518 *Not applicable*

519

520 **Consent to publish**

521 *Not applicable*

References

1. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, Wang X, Zhou L, Tong Y, et al. Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. *New England journal of medicine*. 2020.
2. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *Jama*. 2020;323(13):1239-42.
3. WHO. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard 2022, January 02 [Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/>].
4. Harris M, Bagozzi D. WHO discontinues hydroxychloroquine and lopinavir/ritonavir treatment arms for COVID-19. *World Heal Organ News Release*. 2020.
5. Horby P, Mafham M, Linsell L, Bell JL, Staplin N, Emberson JR, et al. Effect of hydroxychloroquine in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: preliminary results from a multi-centre, randomized, controlled trial. *MedRxiv*. 2020.
6. Group RC. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2021;384(8):693-704.
7. Abena PM, Decloedt EH, Bottieau E, Suleman F, Adejumo P, Sam-Agudu NA, et al. Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine for the prevention or treatment of COVID-19 in Africa: caution for inappropriate off-label use in healthcare settings. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*. 2020;102(6):1184-8.
8. Sefah IA, Ogunleye OO, Essah DO, Opanga SA, Butt N, Wamaitha A, et al. Rapid assessment of the potential paucity and price increases for suggested medicines and protection equipment for COVID-19 across developing countries with a particular focus on Africa and the implications. *Frontiers in pharmacology*. 2021;11:2055.
9. Lansbury L, Lim B, Baskaran V, Lim WS. Co-infections in people with COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Infection*. 2020;81(2):266-75.
10. Morris DE, Cleary DW, Clarke SC. Secondary bacterial infections associated with influenza pandemics. *Frontiers in microbiology*. 2017;8:1041.
11. Gupta RK, George R, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Bacterial pneumonia and pandemic influenza planning. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2008;14(8):1187.
12. Martín-Loeches I, Sanchez-Corral A, Diaz E, Granada RM, Zaragoza R, Villavicencio C, et al. Community-acquired respiratory coinfection in critically ill patients with pandemic 2009 influenza A (H1N1) virus. *Chest*. 2011;139(3):555-62.
13. Morens DM, Taubenberger JK, Fauci AS. Predominant role of bacterial pneumonia as a cause of death in pandemic influenza: implications for pandemic influenza preparedness. *The Journal of infectious diseases*. 2008;198(7):962-70.
14. Joseph C, Togawa Y, Shindo N. Bacterial and viral infections associated with influenza. *Influenza and other respiratory viruses*. 2013;7:105-13.
15. Assiri A, Al-Tawfiq JA, Al-Rabeeah AA, Al-Rabiah FA, Al-Hajjar S, Al-Barrak A, et al. Epidemiological, demographic, and clinical characteristics of 47 cases of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus disease from Saudi Arabia: a descriptive study. *The Lancet infectious diseases*. 2013;13(9):752-61.
16. Zahariadis G, Gooley TA, Ryall P, Hutchinson C, Latchford MI, Fearon MA, et al. Risk of ruling out severe acute respiratory syndrome by ruling in another diagnosis: variable incidence of atypical bacteria coinfection based on diagnostic assays. *Canadian respiratory journal*. 2006;13(1):17-22.
17. Arabi YM, Al-Omari A, Mandourah Y, Al-Hameed F, Sindi AA, Alraddadi B, et al. Critically ill patients with the Middle East respiratory syndrome: a multicenter retrospective cohort study. *Critical care medicine*. 2017;45(10):1683-95.

18. Grau S, Hernández S, Echeverría-Esnal D, Almendral A, Ferrer R, Limón E, et al. Antimicrobial consumption among 66 acute care hospitals in Catalonia: impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Antibiotics*. 2021;10(8):943.
19. Mustafa ZU, Salman M, Aldeyab M, Kow CS, Hasan SS. Antimicrobial consumption among hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Pakistan. *SN comprehensive clinical medicine*. 2021:1-5.
20. Molla MMA, Yeasmin M, Islam MK, Sharif MM, Amin MR, Nafisa T, et al. Antibiotic Prescribing Patterns at COVID-19 Dedicated Wards in Bangladesh: Findings from a Single Center Study. *Infection Prevention in Practice*. 2021;3(2):100134.
21. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The lancet*. 2020;395(10229):1054-62.
22. Chowdhury K, Haque M, Nusrat N, Adnan N, Islam S, Lutfur AB, et al. Management of children admitted to hospitals across Bangladesh with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 and the implications for the future: a nationwide cross-sectional study. *Antibiotics*. 2022;11(1):105.
23. Caselli E. Hygiene: microbial strategies to reduce pathogens and drug resistance in clinical settings. *Microbial Biotechnology*. 2017;10(5):1079-83.
24. Founou RC, Blocker AJ, Noubom M, Tsayem C, Choukem SP, Dongen MV, et al. The COVID-19 pandemic: a threat to antimicrobial resistance containment. *Future Science OA*. 2021(0):FSO736.
25. Hsu J. How covid-19 is accelerating the threat of antimicrobial resistance. *Bmj*. 2020;369.
26. Cassini A, Högberg LD, Plachouras D, Quattrocchi A, Hoxha A, Simonsen GS, et al. Attributable deaths and disability-adjusted life-years caused by infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the EU and the European Economic Area in 2015: a population-level modelling analysis. *The Lancet infectious diseases*. 2019;19(1):56-66.
27. Hofer U. The cost of antimicrobial resistance. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. 2019;17(1):3-.
28. Godman B, Egwuenu A, Haque M, Malande OO, Schellack N, Kumar S, et al. Strategies to improve antimicrobial utilization with a special focus on developing countries. *Life*. 2021;11(6):528.
29. Founou RC, Founou LL, Essack SY. Clinical and economic impact of antibiotic resistance in developing countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*. 2017;12(12):e0189621.
30. Westblade LF, Simon MS, Satlin MJ. Bacterial Co-Infections in Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Trends in microbiology*. 2021.
31. Langford BJ, So M, Raybardhan S, Leung V, Westwood D, MacFadden DR, et al. Bacterial co-infection and secondary infection in patients with COVID-19: a living rapid review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2020.
32. Musuuza JS, Watson L, Parmasad V, Putman-Buehler N, Christensen L, Safdar N. Prevalence and outcomes of co-infection and superinfection with SARS-CoV-2 and other pathogens: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*. 2021;16(5):e0251170.
33. Langford BJ, So M, Raybardhan S, Leung V, Soucy J-PR, Westwood D, et al. Antibiotic prescribing in patients with COVID-19: rapid review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2021.
34. Iwu CJ, Jordan P, Jaja IF, Iwu CD, Wiysonge CS. Treatment of COVID-19: implications for antimicrobial resistance in Africa. *The Pan African Medical Journal*. 2020;35(Suppl 2).

35. Institute OHR. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses 2021 [Available from: The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses.
36. Freeman MF, Tukey JW. Transformations related to the angular and the square root. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*. 1950;607-11.
37. DerSimonian R, Kacker R. Random-effects model for meta-analysis of clinical trials: an update. *Contemporary clinical trials*. 2007;28(2):105-14.
38. Deeks JJ, Macaskill P, Irwig L. The performance of tests of publication bias and other sample size effects in systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy was assessed. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2005;58(9):882-93.
39. Puzniak L, Finelli L, Kalvin CY, Bauer KA, Moise P, De Anda C, et al. A multicenter analysis of the clinical microbiology and antimicrobial usage in hospitalized patients in the US with or without COVID-19. *BMC infectious diseases*. 2021;21(1):1-9.
40. Wang L, Amin AK, Khanna P, Aali A, McGregor A, Bassett P, et al. An observational cohort study of bacterial co-infection and implications for empirical antibiotic therapy in patients presenting with COVID-19 to hospitals in North West London. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*. 2021;76(3):796-803.
41. Pulia MS, Wolf I, Schwei RJ, Chen D, Lepak AJ, Schulz LT, et al. Antibiotic prescribing patterns for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in two emergency departments with rapid procalcitonin. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*. 2021;42(3):359-61.
42. Hughes S, Troise O, Donaldson H, Mughal N, Moore LS. Bacterial and fungal coinfection among hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study in a UK secondary-care setting. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2020;26(10):1395-9.
43. Contou D, Claudinon A, Pajot O, Micaëlo M, Flandre PL, Dubert M, et al. Bacterial and viral co-infections in patients with severe SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia admitted to a French ICU. *Annals of intensive care*. 2020;10(1):1-9.
44. Cheng LS-k, Chau SK-y, Tso EY-k, Tsang SW-c, Li IY-f, Wong BK-c, et al. Bacterial co-infections and antibiotic prescribing practice in adults with COVID-19: experience from a single hospital cluster. *Therapeutic Advances in Infectious Disease*. 2020;7:2049936120978095.
45. Goncalves Mendes Neto A, Lo KB, Wattoo A, Salacup G, Pelayo J, DeJoy III R, et al. Bacterial infections and patterns of antibiotic use in patients with COVID-19. *Journal of medical virology*. 2021;93(3):1489-95.
46. Lardaro T, Wang AZ, Bucca A, Croft A, Globler N, Holt DB, et al. Characteristics of COVID-19 patients with bacterial coinfection admitted to the hospital from the emergency department in a large regional healthcare system. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2021;93(5):2883-9.
47. Chen S, Zhu Q, Xiao Y, Wu C, Jiang Z, Liu L, et al. Clinical and etiological analysis of co-infections and secondary infections in COVID-19 patients: An observational study. *The Clinical Respiratory Journal*. 2021.
48. Baskaran V, Lawrence H, Lansbury LE, Webb K, Safavi S, Zainuddin NI, et al. Co-infection in critically ill patients with COVID-19: an observational cohort study from England. *Journal of medical microbiology*. 2021;70(4).
49. Russell CD, Fairfield CJ, Drake TM, Turtle L, Seaton RA, Wootton DG, et al. Co-infections, secondary infections, and antimicrobial usage in hospitalised patients with COVID-19 from the ISARIC WHO CCP-UK study: a prospective, multicentre cohort study. 2021.

50. Lehmann CJ, Pho MT, Pitrak D, Ridgway JP, Pettit NN. Community-acquired coinfection in coronavirus disease 2019: A retrospective observational experience. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021;72(8):1450-2.
51. Vaughn VM, Gandhi TN, Petty LA, Patel PK, Prescott HC, Malani AN, et al. Empiric antibacterial therapy and community-onset bacterial coinfection in patients hospitalized with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a multi-hospital cohort study. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021;72(10):e533-e41.
52. Miao Q, Ma Y, Ling Y, Jin W, Su Y, Wang Q, et al. Evaluation of superinfection, antimicrobial usage, and airway microbiome with metagenomic sequencing in COVID-19 patients: A cohort study in Shanghai. *Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection*. 2021.
53. Karami Z, Knoop BT, Dofferhoff AS, Blaauw MJ, Janssen NA, van Apeldoorn M, et al. Few bacterial co-infections but frequent empiric antibiotic use in the early phase of hospitalized patients with COVID-19: results from a multicentre retrospective cohort study in The Netherlands. *Infectious Diseases*. 2021;53(2):102-10.
54. Garcia-Vidal C, Sanjuan G, Moreno-García E, Puerta-Alcalde P, Garcia-Pouton N, Chumbita M, et al. Incidence of co-infections and superinfections in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2021;27(1):83-8.
55. Crotty MP, Dominguez EA, Akins R, Nguyen AT, Slika R, Rahmanzadeh K, et al. Investigation of subsequent and co-infections associated with SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) in hospitalized patients. *medRxiv*. 2020.
56. Wei W, Ortwine JK, Mang NS, Joseph C, Hall BC, Prokesch BC. Limited role for antibiotics in COVID-19: scarce evidence of bacterial coinfection. Available at SSRN 3622388. 2020.
57. Karaba SM, Jones G, Helsel T, Smith LL, Avery R, Dzintars K, et al., editors. Prevalence of co-infection at the time of hospital admission in COVID-19 patients, a multicenter study. *Open forum infectious diseases*; 2021: Oxford University Press US.
58. Martin AJ, Shulder S, Dobrzynski D, Quartuccio K, Pillinger KE. Rate of Antibiotic Use and Associated Risk Factors in COVID-19 Hospitalized Patients. *medRxiv*. 2020.
59. Rothe K, Feihl S, Schneider J, Wallnöfer F, Wurst M, Lukas M, et al. Rates of bacterial co-infections and antimicrobial use in COVID-19 patients: a retrospective cohort study in light of antibiotic stewardship. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases*. 2021;40(4):859-69.
60. Asmarawati TP, Rosyid AN, Suryantoro SD, Mahdi BA, Windradi C, Wulaningrum PA, et al. The clinical impact of bacterial co-infection among moderate, severe and critically ill COVID-19 patients in the second referral hospital in Surabaya. *F1000Research*. 2021;10.
61. Fadare JO, Ogunleye O, Iliyasu G, Adeoti A, Schellack N, Engler D, et al. Status of antimicrobial stewardship programmes in Nigerian tertiary healthcare facilities: findings and implications. *Journal of global antimicrobial resistance*. 2019;17:132-6.
62. Kalungia AC, Mwambula H, Munkombwe D, Marshall S, Schellack N, May C, et al. Antimicrobial stewardship knowledge and perception among physicians and pharmacists at leading tertiary teaching hospitals in Zambia: implications for future policy and practice. *Journal of chemotherapy*. 2019;31(7-8):378-87.
63. Cox JA, Vlieghe E, Mendelson M, Wertheim H, Ndegwa L, Villegas MV, et al. Antibiotic stewardship in low-and middle-income countries: the same but different? *Clinical microbiology and infection*. 2017;23(11):812-8.
64. Sneddon J, Cooper L, Afriyie DK, Sefah IA, Cockburn A, Kerr F, et al. Supporting antimicrobial stewardship in Ghana: Evaluation of the impact of training on knowledge and

attitudes of healthcare professionals in two hospitals. JAC-antimicrobial resistance. 2020;2(4):dlaa092.

65. D'Arcy N, Ashiru-Oredope D, Olaoye O, Afriyie D, Akello Z, Ankrah D, et al. Antibiotic Prescribing Patterns in Ghana, Uganda, Zambia and Tanzania Hospitals: Results from the Global Point Prevalence Survey (G-PPS) on Antimicrobial Use and Stewardship Interventions Implemented. *Antibiotics*. 2021;10(9):1122.

66. Akpan MR, Isemin NU, Udoh AE, Ashiru-Oredope D. Implementation of antimicrobial stewardship programmes in African countries: a systematic literature review. *Journal of global antimicrobial resistance*. 2020;22:317-24.

67. Scotland HP. SONAAR report for 2020. NHS Scotland 2021 16 November 2021.

68. Agency UHS. English surveillance programme for antimicrobial utilisation and resistance (ESPAUR) Report for 2020 to 2021. England; 2021. Contract No.: GOV-9892.

69. (ECDC) ECfDPaC. Surveillance of antimicrobial resistance in Europe, 2020 data. 2021.

70. Nusrat N, Haque M, Chowdhury K, Adnan N, Lutfor AB, Karim E, et al. Pilot study on the current management of children with COVID-19 in hospitals in Bangladesh; findings and implications. *Bangladesh Journal of Medical Science*. 2021:188-98.

71. Huttner B, Catho G, Pano-Pardo J, Pulcini C, Schouten J. COVID-19: don't neglect antimicrobial stewardship principles! *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2020;26(7):808.

72. Hassan M, Biswas M, Al Jubayer A, Rahman F, Akhtar Z, Das P, et al. Use of Antimicrobials among Suspected COVID-19 Patients at Selected Hospitals, Bangladesh: Findings from the First Wave of COVID-19 Pandemic. *Antibiotics*. 2021;10(6):738.

73. Kumar S, Haque M, Shetty A, Acharya J, Kumar M, Sinha VK, et al. Current management of children with COVID-19 in hospitals in India; pilot study and findings. *Advances in Human Biology*. 2021.

74. Klein EY, Van Boeckel TP, Martinez EM, Pant S, Gandra S, Levin SA, et al. Global increase and geographic convergence in antibiotic consumption between 2000 and 2015. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2018;115(15):E3463-E70.

75. Murray CJ, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, Swetschinski L, Aguilar GR, Gray A, et al. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. *The Lancet*. 2022.

76. Sriram A KE KG, Craig J, Balasubramanian R, Brar S et al. A global analysis of antimicrobial resistance and its drivers. Center for Disease Dynamics, Economics & Policy. Washington, DC; 2021 2021.

77. Raman R, Patel KJ, Ranjan K. COVID-19: Unmasking Emerging SARS-CoV-2 Variants, Vaccines and Therapeutic Strategies. 2021.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Key search strategy

Embase (OVID)

	Searches	Results
1	coronavirus disease 2019.ti,ab,kw.	25682
2	covid-19.ti,ab,kw.	130651
3	severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.ti,ab,kw.	14082
4	1 or 2 or 3	134431
5	mixed infection.ti,ab,kw.	4870
6	co-infection.ti,ab,kw.	18590
7	5 or 6	23284
8	antibiotic agent.ti,ab,kw.	766
9	antimicrobial therapy.ti,ab,kw.	18563
10	antimicrobial activity.ti,ab,kw.	46766
11	antibacterial activity.ti,ab,kw.	46261
12	antiinfective agent.ti,ab,kw.	31
13	8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	103731
14	7 or 13	126880
15	4 and 14	463
16	prevalence/	793668
17	Observational Studies/ or observational.ti,ab.	384858
18	prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/ or prospective.ti,ab. or retrospective.ti,ab.	2326072
19	randomized controlled trial/	665355
20	16 or 17 or 18 or 19	3703038
21	15 and 20	151
22	limit 21 to (human and yr="2019 -Current")	149
23	limit 22 to english language	147

764 **MedLine (OVID)**

765

	Searches	Results
1	COVID-19/	88096
2	Coronavirus Infections/	44949
3	SARS-CoV-2/	68317
4	covid*.ti,ab,kw.	134027
5	coronavirus*.ti,ab,kw.	68550
6	ncov*.ti,ab,kw.	1606
7	sars*.ti,ab,kw.	60031
8	severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavir*.ti,ab,kw.	16722
9	"2019 ncov*" .ti,ab,kw.	1682
10	nCOV19*.ti,ab,kw.	9
11	SARSCoV2*.ti,ab,kw.	45
12	"sars cov2*" .ti,ab,kw.	2059
13	"coronavirus 19*" .ti,ab,kw.	290
14	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13	170734
15	Coinfection/	12379
16	coinfect*.ti,ab,kw.	15898
17	co-infect*.ti,ab,kw.	18471
18	"mixed infecti*" .ti,ab,kw.	7718
19	"bacterial coinfect*" .ti,ab,kw.	311
20	"bacterial co-infect*" .ti,ab,kw.	365
21	15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20	44285
22	Anti-Bacterial Agents/	354528
23	Anti-Infective Agents/	56119
24	antimicrob*.ti,ab,kw.	184372
25	anti-microb*.ti,ab,kw.	4930
26	antiinfect*.ti,ab,kw.	798
27	anti-infect*.ti,ab,kw.	7984
28	antibact*.ti,ab,kw.	84949
29	anti-bact*.ti,ab,kw.	4701
30	antibiot*.ti,ab,kw.	372008
31	22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29 or 30	710470
32	21 or 31	751355
33	14 and 32	4117
34	prevalence/	311186
35	Observational Studies/ or Observational.ti,ab,kw.	203842
36	prospective studies/ or retrospective studies/ or prospective.ti,ab,kw. or retrospective.ti,ab,kw.	1880121
37	randomized controlled trial/	535869
38	34 or 35 or 36 or 37	2654657
39	33 and 38	836
40	limit 39 to (english language and humans and yr="2019 - 2022")	461

766 **Cochrane**

767

ID	Search	Hits
#1	MeSH descriptor: [COVID-19] this term only	398
#2	MeSH descriptor: [Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome] this term only	358
#3	MeSH descriptor: [SARS-CoV-2] this term only	294
#4	(covid*):ti,ab,kw	5941
#5	(corona*):ti,ab,kw	65223
#6	(coronavirus*):ti,ab,kw	3372
#7	(coronavirus infect*):ti,ab,kw	2051
#8	("SARS-Co-V*"):ti,ab,kw	2144
#9	("severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus*"):ti,ab,kw	489
#10	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9	68000
#11	MeSH descriptor: [Coinfection] this term only	210
#12	MeSH descriptor: [Bacterial Infections] this term only	3191
#13	MeSH descriptor: [Respiratory Tract Infections] this term only	2323
#14	(coinfect*):ti,ab,kw	1606
#15	(co-infect*):ti,ab,kw	965
#16	("co infect*"):ti,ab,kw	1
#17	("mixed infection*"):ti,ab,kw	579
#18	("respiratory infection*"):ti,ab,kw	1323
#19	#11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18	8180
#20	MeSH descriptor: [Anti-Bacterial Agents] this term only	11188
#21	MeSH descriptor: [Antibiotic Prophylaxis] this term only	1301
#22	MeSH descriptor: [Anti-Infective Agents] this term only	2715
#23	(antibiotic*):ti,ab,kw	32360
#24	(antimicrobial*):ti,ab,kw	7832
#25	("antimicrobial drug*"):ti,ab,kw	82
#26	("antibiotic drug*"):ti,ab,kw	55
#27	("antibiotic agent*"):ti,ab,kw	2527
#28	("empirical antibiotic*"):ti,ab,kw	166
#29	("prophylactic antibiotic*"):ti,ab,kw	635
#30	#20 OR #21 OR #22 OR #23 OR #24 OR #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29	42620
#31	#19 OR #30	47991
#32	#10 AND #31	822
#33	#32 with Cochrane Library publication date Between Nov 2019 and Jun 2021	392
#34	#33 in Cochrane Reviews, Trials	392

768

769 **MedRXiv**

770

771 Full text or abstract or title "covid-19 AND (Antibiotic OR Coinfection)" (match whole all)

772 and posted between "01 Dec, 2019 and 14 Jun, 2021" Reuslts: **182**

773

774

Fig a. Prevalence of Bacterial coinfection in Prospective Cohort Studies

Figure b. Prevalence of antibiotic use in Asia