

Procalcitonin for Antimicrobial Stewardship Among Cancer Patients Admitted with COVID-19

Hiba Dagher¹, Anne-Marie Chaftari¹, Patricia Mulanovich¹, Ying Jiang¹, Ray Hachem¹, Alexandre E. Malek¹, Jovan Borjan², George M. Viola¹, Issam Raad¹

¹Department of Infectious Diseases, Infection Control and Employee Health, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA

²Pharmacy Clinical Programs, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA

Corresponding author: Anne-Marie Chaftari, Department of Infectious Diseases, Infection Control and Employee Health, Unit 1460, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe Blvd., Houston, TX 77030, USA. Tel: 713-792-3491, Email: achaftari@mdanderson.org

Keywords: Cancer patients, procalcitonin, immunocompromised, COVID-19

Abstract

Background:

Procalcitonin (PCT) has been used to guide antibiotic therapy in bacterial infections. We aimed to determine the role of PCT in decreasing the duration of empiric antibiotic therapy among cancer patients admitted with COVID-19.

Methods:

This retrospective study included cancer patients admitted to our institution for COVID-19 between March 1, 2020, and June 28, 2021, with a PCT test done within 72 hours after admission. Patients were divided into 2 groups: PCT <0.25 ng/ml and PCT ≥0.25 ng/ml. We assessed pertinent cultures, antibacterial use, and duration of empiric antibacterial therapy.

Results:

The study included 530 patients (median age, 62 years [range, 13-91]). All the patients had ≥1 culture test within 7 days following admission. Patients with PCT <0.25 ng/ml were less likely to have a positive culture than were those with PCT ≥0.25 ng/ml (6% [20/358] vs 17% [30/172]; p<0.0001). PCT <0.25 ng/ml had a high negative predictive value for bacteremia and 30-day mortality. Patients with PCT <0.25 ng/ml were less likely to receive intravenous (IV) antibiotics for >72 hours than were patients with PCT ≥0.25 ng/ml (45% [162/358] vs 69% [119/172]; p<0.0001). Among patients with PCT <0.25 ng/ml and negative cultures, 30-day mortality was similar between those who received IV antibiotics for ≥72 hours and those who received IV antibiotics for shorter durations (2% [2/111] vs 3% [5/176], p=0.71).

Conclusions:

Among cancer patients with COVID-19, PCT level <0.25 ng/ml is associated with lower likelihood of bacterial co-infection and greater likelihood of a shorter antibiotic course. In patients with PCT level <0.25 ng/ml and negative cultures, an antibiotic course of > 72 hours is unnecessary. PCT could be useful in enhancing antimicrobial stewardship in cancer patients with COVID-19.

Introduction

Many factors predicting the outcome and prognosis of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) have been identified. These factors have proved valuable for determining prognosis and have guided the treatment of patients at risk for severe COVID-19. Procalcitonin (PCT) is a biomarker that has served as an indicator for bloodstream infections and has been used as a guide to antimicrobial management in sepsis and bacterial infections in the general population¹⁻⁴ and in cancer patients with and without neutropenia⁵⁻⁸. Randomized trials have shown PCT to be useful in guiding decisions regarding antimicrobial therapy for lower respiratory tract infections⁹⁻¹¹. Several PCT cut-off values have been evaluated and used in different treatment algorithms. PCT cut-off values of 0.25 ng/ml and 0.5 ng/ml have been adopted for critically ill patients in the intensive care unit (ICU)¹², neutropenic patients^{2,3,8}, and patients with lower respiratory tract infections¹³.

In patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), elevated PCT levels and elevated levels of other inflammatory markers have been associated with more severe COVID-19 both in the general population^{5,14-17} and in cancer patients^{1,18}.

Bacterial co-infections may not be prevalent in patients with COVID-19¹⁹. However, because of the similarity in signs and symptoms between bacterial co-infections and COVID-19 and the difficulty of ruling out a bacterial infection in patients presenting with COVID-19 pneumonia, empirical treatment with antimicrobials is often initiated in patients with COVID-19 without a confirmed bacterial co-infection¹⁹. This practice may lead to an emergence of antimicrobial resistance, undesirable adverse events, and increase costs^{2,3}. One study showed that the use of antibiotics in patients with COVID-19 with a PCT level >0.25 ng/ml and with a low suspicion of bacterial infection did not improve clinical outcome²⁰. Little to no data have been published regarding PCT for antimicrobial stewardship among cancer patients with COVID-19.

Given the widespread use of empiric antibiotics in cancer patients admitted for COVID-19, we evaluated the role of PCT in decreasing the duration of empiric antimicrobial therapy in this patient population.

Methods

We conducted a retrospective study of cancer patients who were admitted to The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center between March 1, 2020, and June 28, 2021, for COVID-19 and had a serum PCT level measured within 72 hours after admission. Patients were divided into 2 groups: PCT level < 0.25 ng/ml and PCT level \geq 0.25 ng/ml. This cut-off is conventionally suggested and has been used in different algorithms¹¹⁻¹³.

We reviewed the patients' electronic medical records and collected data pertinent to demographics (age, sex, and race and ethnicity), type of cancer (hematological malignancy vs solid tumor), cancer status (active vs in remission), active cancer therapy, co-morbidities, tobacco use, and presence of pneumonia. We assessed laboratory test results, including absolute neutrophil count, PCT level, documented bacterial infections, and sources of cultures. We also extracted data on oxygen saturation, requirement for oxygen supplementation, need for and duration of intravenous (IV) antibiotic therapy, ICU admission, and 30-day mortality after COVID-19 diagnosis.

Our study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of MD Anderson Cancer Center, and a waiver of informed consent was obtained.

We compared the clinical characteristics and outcomes of the patients in the PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and PCT \geq 0.25 ng/ml groups. We used the χ^2 or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate, to compare categorical variables. We used Wilcoxon rank-sum tests to compare continuous variables because of the deviation of the data from the normal distribution. We assessed negative predictive values of PCT levels for the prediction of the various outcomes. We also estimated the relative risks of various outcomes for

a patient with PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml. All tests were 2-sided at a significance level of .05. The statistical analyses were performed using SAS version 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC).

Results

We identified 530 patients, of whom 358 (68%) had a PCT level < 0.25 ng/ml and 172 (32%) had a PCT level ≥ 0.25 ng/ml. Patients in the 2 PCT groups were similar in terms of age, sex, race and ethnicity, type and status of cancer, and active cancer therapy (Table 1). The rate of an absolute neutrophil count $< 1000/\mu\text{l}$ was 9% in both groups; however, the rate of an absolute lymphocyte count $< 1000/\mu\text{l}$ was lower in patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml (63% vs 75%; $p=0.009$).

Patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml were less likely to require oxygen supplementation within 72 hours of admission (54% vs 69%, $p=0.001$); were less likely to have a positive bacterial culture (6% vs 17%; $p<0.0001$) from any source, including blood, lower respiratory tract, and urine; and had a lower rate of pneumonia, although the difference was not significant (76% vs 82%; $p=0.10$). Patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml were less likely to receive IV antibiotic therapy than were patients with PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml (76% vs 90%; $p<0.001$). Furthermore, patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml had a shorter median duration of IV antibiotic therapy (4 days vs 6 days; $p<0.0001$) and were less likely to receive antibiotics for ≥ 72 hours compared to patients with PCT ≥ 0.25 (45% vs 69%; $p<0.0001$) (Table 1). Similar results were found among patients with negative culture results: those with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml were less likely to receive IV antibiotics for ≥ 72 hours than those with PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml (44% vs 67%; $p<0.0001$). In addition, among patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and negative culture results, those who received a long course of IV antibiotics (≥ 72 hours) and those who received a shorter course had similar 30-day mortality rates (2% vs 3%, $p=0.71$) (Table 2).

Compared to patients with PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml, patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml had shorter median duration of hospital stay (6 days vs 10 days; $p < 0.0001$), lower rate of ICU admission (14% vs 29%; $p < 0.0001$), and lower rate of mortality within 30 days of COVID diagnosis (6% vs 19%; $p < 0.0001$).

PCT < 0.25 ng/ml had a high negative predictive value for bacteremia, 30-day mortality, ICU admission, and IV antibiotic use ≥ 7 days (Table 3).

PCT level ≥ 0.25 ng/ml was associated with elevated relative risk for 30-day mortality, positive bacterial culture, IV antibiotic use ≥ 7 days, and ICU admission (Table 3).

Discussion

In this study of cancer patients admitted for COVID-19, we found that PCT level < 0.25 ng/ml was associated with a lower rate of bacterial co-infection, shorter hospital stay, shorter duration of IV antibiotics, and lower 30-day mortality. We also found that among the patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and negative bacterial cultures, 30-day mortality was similar for patients treated with IV antibiotics for ≥ 72 hours and those treated with IV antibiotics for shorter periods.

Our finding that the rate of microbiologically documented bacterial co-infections from any source, including blood, lower respiratory tract, and urine, was lower in patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml is consistent with well-established findings that pure viral infections are unlikely to increase PCT levels²¹. Furthermore, both in the general population^{1,2,4,9-11} and in immunocompromised patients⁵⁻⁸, patients with low PCT levels are unlikely to have bacterial infections. PCT levels increase in patients with many types of bacterial infections, including bacterial infections of the lower respiratory tract²², bacterial meningitis²³, acute pyelonephritis²⁴, spontaneous bacterial peritonitis²⁵, and bloodstream bacterial infections²⁶. Our findings regarding PCT levels and the risk of bacterial infection is also consistent with published data on patients with COVID-19^{20,27}. In a recent study of patients hospitalized with COVID-19, PCT levels were higher in patients with proven bacterial co-infections: PCT level ≥ 0.25 ng/ml was seen in

69% of patients with proven co-infection, compared to 35% of those with low suspicion of bacterial co-infection ($p < 0.001$)²⁰. The low rate of bacterial co-infection in our cancer patients with COVID-19 (about 9%) is also consistent with rates reported in the literature^{19,28}.

Another recent study showed that PCT could be abnormally elevated in patients with COVID-19 with no evidence of pneumonia and may result in unnecessary antibiotic administration in such patients²⁹. In our current study, IV antibiotics were administered to 90% of patients with PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml and 76% of patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml ($p < 0.001$). These high rates are similar to rates reported earlier in the pandemic, which ranged from 70% to 90%^{30,31}. This high rate of use of IV antibiotics in our cancer patient population could be due to the vulnerability of our immunocompromised patients. The initial PCT level may not have influenced the decision of the treating physician to initiate IV antibiotics in our frail and immunocompromised cancer patient population.

In hospitalized patients with COVID-19, PCT level ≥ 0.25 ng/ml was previously found to be a good predictor of oxygen supplementation, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, and antibiotic use²⁰. Similarly, in our study, cancer patients with higher PCT levels were more likely to require oxygen supplementation within 72 hours of admission, had a higher rate of ICU admission, had a higher 30-day mortality rate, had a longer median duration of hospital stay, and were more likely to receive IV antibiotics.

Our data demonstrate that administering IV antibiotics beyond 72 hours in patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and negative bacterial cultures does not improve outcome and is unnecessary. Thus, just as PCT has been used to de-escalate antibiotic use in the general population^{9,10}, it can be used to de-escalate antibiotic use in cancer patients with COVID-19. We found that patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and negative blood cultures were more likely to receive a short course of antibiotics (< 72 hours) than were patients with PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml and negative blood cultures. In addition, we found that among patients with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and negative blood cultures, patients who received IV antibiotics for < 72

hours had similar 30-day mortality and a significantly shorter hospital stay compared to patients who received IV antibiotics for ≥ 72 hours.

Our findings that PCT < 0.25 ng/ml had a negative predictive value for bacteremia, 30-day mortality, ICU admission, and IV antibiotic use > 7 days are consistent with previously published data from patients with COVID-19^{20,32}.

The use of PCT levels to guide antimicrobial therapy decisions has been important in antimicrobial stewardship outside of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, our data suggest that in cancer patients with COVID-19, if the PCT level is < 0.25 ng/ml, there is low suspicion for infection, and if bacterial cultures are negative, PCT could be used as an adjunct to clinical judgment to guide de-escalation of antimicrobials after 72 hours. Incorporating PCT into future algorithms for treatment of patients with COVID-19 could be cost-effective and may decrease antibiotic overuse, which is associated with undesirable adverse events (such as *Clostridium difficile* infection, acute kidney injury, potential allergic reactions, and loss of microbiome diversity) and contributes to the emergence of antibiotic resistance^{2,33,34}.

Our study has limitations. First, the retrospective nature of this study may have masked confounding variables. Second, bacterial co-infections may have been overlooked given the limited face-to-face interactions with patients admitted with COVID-19 during the pandemic. Third, antimicrobials were administered empirically at the discretion of the team treating the patient. Finally, this is a single-center study, which limits the generalizability of our results.

Conclusions

Cancer patients with COVID-19 often receive IV antibiotics despite a low rate of bacterial co-infections. Patients with low PCT levels (< 0.25 ng/ml) are unlikely to have a documented bacterial infection, and

they are more likely than patients with higher PCT levels to have a shorter hospital stay, shorter course of IV antibiotics, and a better overall outcome.

In cancer patients with COVID-19 and PCT < 0.25 ng/ml, continuing antibiotics beyond 72 hours (or beyond when the PCT result becomes available, if antibiotic therapy has already been administered for ≥72 hours at that time) does not reduce mortality and is unnecessary. Hence, PCT could be used along with clinical judgment to promote antibiotic stewardship in cancer patients with COVID-19 by reducing the duration of antimicrobial therapy beyond the initial empiric use of systemic antibiotics until PCT results become available.

Table 1. Comparison of hospitalized cancer patients with COVID-19 with different PCT levels.^a

Characteristic	PCT < 0.25 ng/ml (n=358)	PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml (n=172)	<i>p</i> -value
Age, median (range), years	61 (13-91)	64 (14-86)	0.11
Sex, male	178 (50)	95 (55)	0.23
Race and ethnicity			0.36
Asian	14/355 (4)	5/171 (3)	
Black	42/355 (12)	30/171 (18)	
Hispanic	102/355 (29)	47/171 (27)	
White	194/355 (55)	86/171 (50)	
Other race or ethnicity	3/355 (1)	3/171 (2)	
Declined to answer or unknown	3	1	
Type of cancer			0.79
Hematological malignancy only	142 (40)	63 (37)	
Solid tumor only	195 (54)	99 (58)	
Both of above	21 (6)	10 (6)	
Status of cancer			0.90
Active	315 (88)	152 (88)	
No evidence of disease	43 (12)	20 (12)	
Active cancer therapy within 30 days	118 (33)	58 (34)	0.86
Chemotherapy received	272 (76)	121 (70)	0.16
Smoking status			0.29
Never smoker	223/354 (63)	96/165 (58)	
Current or former smoker	131/354 (37)	69/165 (42)	
Unknown	4	7	
Chronic kidney disease	114/327 (35)	89/168 (53)	< 0.001
Asthma	44/327 (13)	23/168 (14)	0.94
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	59/327 (18)	34/168 (20)	0.55
Congestive heart failure	46/327 (14)	33/168 (20)	0.11
Diabetes mellitus	164/327 (50)	83/168 (49)	0.87

Coronary artery disease	12/327 (4)	3/168 (2)	0.25
Hypertension	251/327 (77)	137/168 (82)	0.22
Venous thromboembolic event	42/327 (13)	19/168 (11)	0.62
Obesity	37/327 (11)	20/168 (12)	0.85
Obstructive sleep apnea	55/327 (17)	18/168 (11)	0.07
ANC < 1000/ μ l at admission	33/352 (9)	16 (9)	0.98
ALC < 1000/ μ l at admission	219/348 (63)	126/169 (75)	0.009
Pneumonia	270/357 (76)	141 (82)	0.10
Oxygen supplementation within 72 hours	191/356 (54)	118 (69)	0.001
Culture test performed	358 (100)	172 (100)	
Positive bacterial culture	20 (6)	30 (17)	< 0.0001
Site of positive culture			
Blood	2/20 (10)	10/30 (33)	0.09
Lower respiratory tract	5/20 (25)	10/30 (33)	0.53
Wound	6/20 (30)	5/30 (17)	0.31
Urine	10/20 (50)	8/30 (27)	0.09
Transfusion reaction culture	0/20 (0)	1/30 (3)	> 0.99
Cerebrospinal fluid	0/20 (0)	1/30 (3)	> 0.99
Positive fungal culture	3 (1)	8 (5)	0.007
Viral co-infection	2 (1)	0 (0)	> 0.99
Duration of hospital stay, median (IQR), days	6 (4-10)	10 (6-18)	< 0.0001
IV antibiotic treatment	271 (76)	154 (90)	< 0.001
Duration of IV antibiotic treatment, median (IQR), days	4 (2-6)	6 (3-7)	< 0.0001
Duration of IV antibiotic therapy \geq 72 hours	162 (45)	119 (69)	< 0.0001
Duration of IV antibiotic therapy \geq 7 days	54 (15)	54 (31)	< 0.0001
Number of different IV antibiotic treatment, median (IQR)	2 (1-3)	2 (2-3)	< 0.001
ICU admission	51 (14)	50 (29)	< 0.0001
Duration of ICU stay, median (IQR), days	1 (1-4)	3 (1-3)	0.13
Mortality within 30 days of COVID-19 diagnosis	20 (6)	33 (19)	< 0.0001

190 ALC, absolute lymphocyte count; ANC, absolute neutrophil count; IQR, interquartile range.

191 ^aValues in table are number of patients (percentage) unless otherwise indicated.

192

Table 2. Treatment and outcomes of hospitalized cancer patients with COVID-19 with PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and negative bacterial cultures.

Outcome	Duration of IV antibiotic treatment		<i>p</i> -value
	< 72 hours (n=176)	≥ 72 hours (n=111)	
Duration of hospital stay, median (IQR), days	5 (3-7)	7 (5-11)	< 0.0001
Mortality within 30 days of COVID-19 diagnosis, n (%)	5 (3)	2 (2)	0.71

Note: Patients with ICU admission during hospitalization and patients who died within 3 days after hospital admission were excluded from analysis.

Table 3. Negative predictive value (NPV) of PCT < 0.25 ng/ml and relative risk associated with PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml for selected outcomes in hospitalized cancer patients with COVID-19 .

Outcome	NPV of PCT < 0.25 ng/ml	95% Confidence interval	Relative risk of PCT ≥ 0.25 ng/ml	95% Confidence interval
Positive bacterial culture	0.94	0.92 to 0.97	3.12	1.83 to 5.34
Use of IV antibiotics	0.24	0.20 to 0.29	1.18	1.09 to 1.28
Use of IV antibiotics ≥ 72 hours	0.55	0.49 to 0.60	1.53	1.31 to 1.78
Use of IV antibiotics ≥ 7 days	0.85	0.81 to 0.88	2.08	1.50 to 2.90
ICU admission	0.86	0.82 to 0.89	2.04	1.45 to 2.88
Death within 30 days after COVID-19 diagnosis	0.94	0.92 to 0.97	3.43	2.03 to 5.80

195 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

196 We thank Ms. Salli Saxton, Department of Infectious Diseases, Infection Control and Employee Health, MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, for
197 helping with the submission of the manuscript.

198 We thank Stephanie Deming, Research Medical Library, MD Anderson Cancer Center, for editing the manuscript.

199 This research was supported by the National Institutes of Health/National Cancer Institute under award number P30CA016672, which supports
200 MD Anderson Cancer Center's Clinical Trials Office.

201

202 **References**

- 203 1. ElGohary GM, Hashmi S, Styczynski J, et al. The risk and prognosis of COVID-19 infection in cancer patients: A systematic review and
204 meta-analysis. *Hematol Oncol Stem Cell Ther.* 2020.
- 205 2. Azzini AM, Dorizzi RM, Sette P, et al. A 2020 review on the role of procalcitonin in different clinical settings: an update conducted with
206 the tools of the Evidence Based Laboratory Medicine. *Ann Transl Med.* 2020;8(9):610.
- 207 3. Kalil AC, Metersky ML, Klompas M, et al. Management of Adults With Hospital-acquired and Ventilator-associated Pneumonia: 2016
208 Clinical Practice Guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America and the American Thoracic Society. *Clin Infect Dis.*
209 2016;63(5):e61-e111.
- 210 4. Schuetz P, Raad I, Amin DN. Using procalcitonin-guided algorithms to improve antimicrobial therapy in ICU patients with respiratory
211 infections and sepsis. *Curr Opin Crit Care.* 2013;19(5):453-460.
- 212 5. Haddad HE, Chaftari AM, Hachem R, et al. Procalcitonin Guiding Antimicrobial Therapy Duration in Febrile Cancer Patients with
213 Documented Infection or Neutropenia. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8(1):1099.
- 214 6. El Haddad H, Chaftari AM, Hachem R, Chaftari P, Raad, II. Biomarkers of Sepsis and Bloodstream Infections: The Role of Procalcitonin and
215 Proadrenomedullin With Emphasis in Patients With Cancer. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2018;67(6):971-977.
- 216 7. Chaftari P, Qdaisat A, Chaftari AM, et al. Prognostic Value of Procalcitonin, C-Reactive Protein, and Lactate Levels in Emergency
217 Evaluation of Cancer Patients with Suspected Infection. *Cancers (Basel).* 2021;13(16).
- 218 8. Chaftari P, Chaftari AM, Hachem R, et al. The role of procalcitonin in identifying high-risk cancer patients with febrile neutropenia: A
219 useful alternative to the multinational association for supportive care in cancer score. *Cancer Med.* 2021;10(23):8475-8482.
- 220 9. Schuetz P, Wirz Y, Sager R, et al. Procalcitonin to initiate or discontinue antibiotics in acute respiratory tract infections. *Cochrane*
221 *Database Syst Rev.* 2017;10:CD007498.
- 222 10. Schuetz P, Christ-Crain M, Thomann R, et al. Effect of procalcitonin-based guidelines vs standard guidelines on antibiotic use in lower
223 respiratory tract infections: the ProHOSP randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 2009;302(10):1059-1066.
- 224 11. Christ-Crain M, Stolz D, Bingisser R, et al. Procalcitonin guidance of antibiotic therapy in community-acquired pneumonia: a randomized
225 trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2006;174(1):84-93.
- 226 12. Bouadma L, Luyt CE, Tubach F, et al. Use of procalcitonin to reduce patients' exposure to antibiotics in intensive care units (PRORATA
227 trial): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2010;375(9713):463-474.
- 228 13. Christ-Crain M, Jaccard-Stolz D, Bingisser R, et al. Effect of procalcitonin-guided treatment on antibiotic use and outcome in lower
229 respiratory tract infections: cluster-randomised, single-blinded intervention trial. *Lancet.* 2004;363(9409):600-607.
- 230 14. Frater JL, Zini G, d'Onofrio G, Rogers HJ. COVID-19 and the clinical hematology laboratory. *Int J Lab Hematol.* 2020;42 Suppl 1:11-18.
- 231 15. Pink I, Raupach D, Fuge J, et al. C-reactive protein and procalcitonin for antimicrobial stewardship in COVID-19. *Infection.*
232 2021;49(5):935-943.
- 233 16. Ponti G, Maccaferri M, Ruini C, Tomasi A, Ozben T. Biomarkers associated with COVID-19 disease progression. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci.*
234 2020;57(6):389-399.

- 235 17. Lippi G, Plebani M. Procalcitonin in patients with severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): A meta-analysis. *Clin Chim Acta*.
236 2020;505:190-191.
- 237 18. Cai G, Gao Y, Zeng S, et al. Immunological alternation in COVID-19 patients with cancer and its implications on mortality.
238 *Oncoimmunology*. 2021;10(1):1854424.
- 239 19. Rawson TM, Moore LSP, Zhu N, et al. Bacterial and Fungal Coinfection in Individuals With Coronavirus: A Rapid Review To Support
240 COVID-19 Antimicrobial Prescribing. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;71(9):2459-2468.
- 241 20. So W, Simon MS, Choi JJ, et al. Characteristics of procalcitonin in hospitalized COVID-19 patients and clinical outcomes of antibiotic use
242 stratified by procalcitonin levels. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2022.
- 243 21. Gilbert DN. Use of plasma procalcitonin levels as an adjunct to clinical microbiology. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2010;48(7):2325-2329.
- 244 22. Self WH, Balk RA, Grijalva CG, et al. Procalcitonin as a Marker of Etiology in Adults Hospitalized With Community-Acquired Pneumonia.
245 *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;65(2):183-190.
- 246 23. Wei TT, Hu ZD, Qin BD, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Procalcitonin in Bacterial Meningitis Versus Nonbacterial Meningitis: A Systematic
247 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016;95(11):e3079.
- 248 24. Zhang H, Yang J, Lin L, Huo B, Dai H, He Y. Diagnostic value of serum procalcitonin for acute pyelonephritis in infants and children with
249 urinary tract infections: an updated meta-analysis. *World J Urol*. 2016;34(3):431-441.
- 250 25. Yang Y, Li L, Qu C, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Serum Procalcitonin for Spontaneous Bacterial Peritonitis Due to End-stage Liver Disease:
251 A Meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2015;94(49):e2077.
- 252 26. Shomali W, Hachem R, Chaftari AM, et al. Can procalcitonin distinguish infectious fever from tumor-related fever in non-neutropenic
253 cancer patients? *Cancer*. 2012;118(23):5823-5829.
- 254 27. Fabre V, Karaba S, Amoah J, et al. The role of procalcitonin results in antibiotic decision-making in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).
255 *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2022;43(5):570-575.
- 256 28. Garcia-Vidal C, Sanjuan G, Moreno-Garcia E, et al. Incidence of co-infections and superinfections in hospitalized patients with COVID-19:
257 a retrospective cohort study. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021;27(1):83-88.
- 258 29. Fabre V, Karaba S, Amoah J, et al. The role of procalcitonin results in antibiotic decision-making in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).
259 *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2021:1-6.
- 260 30. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in
261 Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020;323(11):1061-1069.
- 262 31. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan,
263 China: a descriptive study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):507-513.
- 264 32. Heesom L, Rehnberg L, Nasim-Mohi M, et al. Procalcitonin as an antibiotic stewardship tool in COVID-19 patients in the intensive care
265 unit. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist*. 2020;22:782-784.
- 266 33. Kip MM, Kusters R, MJ IJ, Steuten LM. A PCT algorithm for discontinuation of antibiotic therapy is a cost-effective way to reduce
267 antibiotic exposure in adult intensive care patients with sepsis. *J Med Econ*. 2015;18(11):944-953.

268 34. Kip MMA, van Oers JA, Shajiei A, et al. Cost-effectiveness of procalcitonin testing to guide antibiotic treatment duration in critically ill
269 patients: results from a randomised controlled multicentre trial in the Netherlands. *Crit Care*. 2018;22(1):293.

270