

1
2 **Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on prevalence of *Clostridioides***
3 ***difficile* infection in a UK tertiary centre**

4
5 **Sanjana Voona¹, Heather Abdic², Ros Montgomery³, Annette Clarkson⁴,**
6 **Hannah Twitchell⁴, Tim Hills⁴, Steve Briggs⁵, Colin Crooks^{6,7}, Tanya M**
7 **Monaghan^{6,7*}**

8 ¹ School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, England, UK

9 ² Department of Gastroenterology, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust,
10 England, UK

11 ³ Infection Prevention & Control, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust,
12 England, UK

13 ⁴ Pharmacy Department, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust

14 ⁵ Quality and Nursing, Information & Insight Services, Finance & Procurement,
15 Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust

16 ⁶ NIHR Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, University of Nottingham, England,
17 UK

18 ⁷ Nottingham Digestive Diseases Centre, School of Medicine, University of
19 Nottingham, England, UK

20

21 Corresponding author: tanya.monaghan@nottingham.ac.uk

22

23

24

25

26

27 **Abstract**

28

29 Serious concerns have been raised about a possible increase in cases of
30 *Clostridioides difficile* infection (CDI) during the COVID-19 pandemic. We conducted
31 a retrospective observational single centre study which revealed that total combined
32 community and hospital-based quarterly rates of CDI decreased during the
33 pandemic compared to the pre-pandemic period.

34

35 **Keywords**

36 *Clostridioides difficile* infection, coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic, SARS-CoV-2

37

38

39 **Introduction**

40 Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory
41 Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), emerged in Wuhan (China) in early
42 December 2019 and has spread rapidly worldwide, causing a global pandemic. The
43 elderly population is disproportionately affected by COVID-19, with initial reports
44 showing that ~80% of the deaths due to COVID-19 occur in those over the age of 65
45 [1]. Due to the enhanced usage of broad-spectrum antibiotics during the current
46 pandemic, overcrowding in hospitals, and the fact that *Clostridioides difficile* infection
47 (CDI) largely affects the elderly, serious concerns have been raised about a
48 consequent possible increase in transmission of hospital-acquired infections such as
49 CDI, particularly in frail, elderly patients [2]. There are very few clinical surveillance
50 studies reporting CDI with COVID-19. Sandhu et al described 9 patients at a medical

51 centre in Detroit, Michigan, with SARS-CoV-2 and CDI during March 11 - April 22,
52 2020, the majority of whom were elderly females with high ATLAS scores
53 (<https://www.mdcalc.com/atlas-score-clostridium-difficile-infection>) and multiple co-
54 morbidities [3]. The onset of diarrhoea was found to occur after COVID-19 diagnosis
55 in 7 of these cases, with a median of 6 days from CDI diagnosis to COVID-19
56 diagnosis. In another high-volume US tertiary-care centre, Mount Sinai, New York,
57 Luo et al did not find a difference in hospital onset CDI (HO-CDI) rate during the
58 pandemic despite a trend toward increased high-risk antibiotic exposures [4] and is
59 further corroborated by similar findings of a retrospective study by Allegretti et al
60 across 9 hospitals in Massachusetts [5]. More recently, Sehgal et al identified 21
61 patients (20 hospitalised) with median age 70.9 years who had CDI and COVID-19
62 within 4 weeks of each other [6].

63 From a European perspective, Granata et al identified 32 COVID-19 patients who
64 developed HO-CDI across 8 participant hospitals in Italy during the study period from
65 February through July 2020, corresponding to a HO-CDI prevalence of 0.38%. The
66 presence of previous hospitalization, steroid administration, and consumption of
67 antibiotics during hospitalization were the main risk factors associated with CDI [7].
68 Bentivegna et al assessed differences in hospital-acquired CDI (HA-CDI) in the
69 medical wards of a hospital in Rome before and during the COVID-19 pandemic,
70 finding that HA-CDI was significantly lower during the pandemic with respect to
71 previous years. However, COVID-19 departments showed higher HA-CDI incidence
72 respect to COVID-19 free wards during 2020, suggesting that SARS-CoV-2 infection
73 may be a possible risk factor for CDI [8]. In a Spanish tertiary centre study, Ponce-
74 Alonso et al observed a 70% reduction in the incidence density of nosocomial CDI
75 during the period with the maximal incidence of COVID-19 compared with the same

76 period in the preceding year, which they attributed to the reinforcement of infection
77 control measures [9]. In contrast, Lewandowski et al found a significant increase in
78 the incidence of CDI during the COVID-19 pandemic compared with the pre-
79 pandemic period in their single centre study in Warsaw, Poland (10.9% vs 2.6%; $P <$
80 0.001) [10].

81 The main aim of this study was to assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on
82 total hospital and community-associated quarterly rates of CDI and in-hospital
83 antimicrobial consumption patterns before and during the pandemic. We
84 hypothesized that the reinforcement of infection control measures implemented to
85 prevent COVID-19 transmission would lead to a decrease in total CDI case burden in
86 our tertiary care centre.

87

88 **Methods**

89 We conducted a single centre retrospective analysis in Nottingham University
90 Hospitals NHS Trust (NUHT), UK, from Jan 2019 through to June 2021. NUHT is a
91 large acute teaching hospital in England with 1700 beds, 90 wards and
92 approximately 16,000 staff, providing specialist medical and surgical services to 2.5
93 million residents of Nottingham and its surrounding communities, and tertiary
94 services to a total of 3-4 million people from neighbouring counties. During the
95 pandemic, NUHT continued to admit both COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 patients
96 and was therefore not complicitly dedicated to coronavirus disease. Throughout the
97 pandemic infection control measures (including PPE, mask wearing, heightened
98 cleaning, adherence to social distancing and the limiting of visitors) were
99 implemented and adapted in line with national guidance. Prudent antibiotic

100 prescribing practices remained in place throughout the pandemic and the Pharmacy
101 department launched an antibiotic prescribing guideline for COVID-19 to help
102 reinforce appropriate use of antibiotics during the pandemic. All antibiotic audits
103 remained in place throughout the pandemic.

104 Using the database of the participant Trust, we identified total CDI case burden
105 (community and hospital-combined in all subjects ≥ 2 years of age) and hospitalized
106 adult (≥ 18 years old) COVID-19 patients with CDI reported from January 2019 (one
107 year before the first UK lockdown in March 2020), through to end of June 2021. We
108 compared total quarterly CDI cases per 10,000 occupied bed days (OBD) during the
109 pandemic with the preceding control years 2019/2020. We also documented OBD
110 (%), total COVID-19 admissions, and consumption of antimicrobials by quarter. A
111 diagnosis of CDI was made in patients with new onset diarrhoea and confirmed by
112 means of toxin immunoassays. Some PCR positive, toxin negative cases were
113 treated. However, this was based on clinical suspicion or susceptibility of the patient
114 and thus not definitive clinical cases, thus these were not included in the analysis.
115 Basic demographic and laboratory data were collected using Excel Office and
116 analysed by means of descriptive statistics. Rates of CDI per 10,000 OBD were
117 compared between quarters by means of binomial test of proportions. A corrected *P*-
118 value of ≤ 0.008 was considered significant to account for multiple comparisons. The
119 research was reviewed by the clinical governance team at the Nottingham University
120 Hospitals NHS Trust and informed consent was not required since this was a service
121 evaluation and minimal risk retrospective study.

122

123 **Results**

124 A total of 491 cases of CDI were observed over the study period in over 1.4 million
125 bed days. The CDI infection rates per 10,000 OBD for each yearly quarter for 2019,
126 2020 and 2021 are shown in Figure 1. The CDI rate per 10,000 OBD was
127 significantly lower in the first and second quarters of 2021 compared to that seen
128 during the same period in 2020 ($p < 0.0001$). The quarterly defined daily doses (DDD)
129 of antimicrobials per 10,000 OBD were also lower in the first quarter of 2021
130 compared to the preceding 2 years (Supplementary Figure 1). However, the total
131 CDI rates in 2020 were significantly higher for the quarterly period from July-Sept
132 compared to the same time in 2019, $p = 0.005$. Data pertaining to the number of CDI
133 cases, number of OBD and DDD of antimicrobials per 10,000 OBD in the time
134 periods before, during and after the emergence of the pandemic are detailed in
135 Supplementary table 1. Details of OBD (%) and total COVID-19 admissions per
136 quarter are presented in Figure 2.

137

138 We identified 8 cases (median age 74.5 years, range 65-84 years with male:female
139 ratio 5:3) with SARS-CoV-2 and CDI. The mean duration from SARS-CoV-2
140 diagnosis to CDI diagnosis was 21 days, and in all cases, CDI was diagnosed after
141 SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis.

142

143 **Discussion**

144 In this study, we observed a significant reduction in the total CDI infection rate per
145 10,000 OBD during the current pandemic compared with the pre-pandemic period.
146 There are several potential reasons for this observation. Firstly, it is likely that a
147 reduction in patient mobility, including a general reluctance to present to primary or
148 secondary practice, as well as a reduction in overall testing, may have under-

149 estimated the true burden of CDI in the community. Despite the widespread use of
150 antibiotics, the total CDI burden may have been suppressed due to aggressive
151 reinforcement of infection control measures such as frequent handwashing,
152 augmented environmental cleaning regimes, universal PPE, social distancing, in
153 addition to limited patient visits and movement, all of which may have indirectly
154 limited the nosocomial spread of *C. difficile*. Furthermore, a forced reduction in
155 hospital consultations and surgical procedures may have contributed to fewer
156 opportunities of introducing *C. difficile* into the hospital from the community.

157 The higher CDI case burden seen in July-Sept in 2020 may be partially explained by
158 Annual Epidemiological Commentary data on seasonal trends from Public Health
159 England which showed that the greatest proportion of CDI cases was reported in the
160 July-September quarter of financial year from 2016/17 onwards (between 26% and
161 29% of cases each year) [11]. An explanation for this shift in seasonality is currently
162 lacking. Interestingly, studies have demonstrated seasonal variability in rates of CDI
163 [12-13]. Rodriguez-Palacios et al [12] observed that *C. difficile* was more commonly
164 isolated from retail meat in Canada in winter, suggesting a seasonal component may
165 exist. Clements et al [13] analysed 20 studies in their systematic review, which
166 reported a peak in CDI cases in the spring and contrastingly lower frequencies of
167 CDI in summer/autumn across Northern and Southern hemispheres and continents.
168 It remains possible that environmental or food contamination with *C. difficile* spores
169 may explain variation in seasonal patterns of CDI. Indeed, hypervirulent strains of *C.*
170 *difficile* have been detected in various environmental sources, including farms,
171 livestock animals, water (sewage and rivers) and agricultural produce [14-16] as well
172 as public lawn spaces [17]. However, there have been no reported cases of
173 foodborne transmission of CDI reported to date.

174 Our study is limited by its retrospective design and single centre analysis. We did not
175 distinguish between community-acquired and hospital-acquired CDI. Nevertheless,
176 our findings support the importance of maintaining a heightened level of attention
177 regarding infection control measures during the pandemic, which may help
178 significantly decrease overall *C. difficile* transmission and related health economic
179 costs.

180

181

182

183 **Transparency declaration**

184 T.M. is a consultant advisor for Takeda. All other authors declare that they have no
185 conflicts of interest.

186

187 **Author contributions**

188

189 T.M and C.C planned and drafted the study. S.V. collated the data with the
190 assistance of R.M. A.C. H.T, S.B. T.H. and H.A. S.V., T.M., and C.C. analysed and
191 evaluated the results. All authors contributed to writing the manuscript and approved
192 of the final submitted version of the manuscript.

193

194 **Acknowledgements**

195 We would like to thank Dr Jeremy Lewis in his role as Caldicott Guardian at
196 Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust for reviewing and approving our
197 manuscript.

198

199

200 **References**

- 201 1. CDC. *COVID-19 Provisional Counts - Weekly Updates by Select*
202 *Demographic and Geographic Characteristics*. National Center for Health
203 Statistics (2020). Available online
204 at: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/covid_weekly/index.htm (accessed
205 October 4, 2020).
- 206 2. P. Spigaglia. *Clostridioides difficile* infection in the COVID-19 era: old and new
207 problems. *Polish Archives of Internal Medicine* 2021; 131 (2).
- 208 3. A. Sandhu, G. Tilotson, J. Polistico, H. Salimnia, M. Cranis, J. Moshos et al.
209 *Clostridioides difficile* in COVID-19 Patients, Detroit, Michigan, USA, March-
210 April 2020. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2020; 26 (9): 2272-2274.
- 211 4. Y. Luo, L.T. Grinspan, Y. Fu, V. Adams-Sommer, D.K. Wiley, G. Patel, A.M.
212 Grinspan. Hospital-onset *Clostridioides difficile* infections during the COVID-
213 19 pandemic. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* 2020: 1-2;
214 doi:10.1017/ice.2020.1223.
- 215 5. J.R. Allegretti, C. Nije, E. McClure, W.D. Redd, D. Wong, J.C. Zhou, et al.
216 *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2021; 5: 622-625.

- 217 6. K. Sehgal, H.J. Fadel, A.J. Tande, D.S. Pardi, S. Khanna. Outcomes in
218 Patients with SARS-CoV-2 and *Clostridioides difficile* Coinfection. Infection
219 and Drug Resistance 2021; 14: 1645-1648.
- 220 7. G. Granata, A. Bartoloni, M. Codeluppi, I. Contadini, F. Cristini, M. Fantoni, et
221 al. and on behalf of the CloVid Study Group. The Burden of Clostridioides
222 Difficile Infection during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Retrospective CASE-
223 Control Study in Italian Hospitals (CloVid). J. Clin. Med. 2020: 9, 3855.
- 224 8. E. Bentivegna, G. Alessio, V. Spuntarelli, M. Luciani, I. Santino, M. Simmaco,
225 P. Martelletti. Impact of COVID-19 prevention measures on risk of health care-
226 associated *Clostridium difficile* infection. American Journal of Infection Control
227 2020; 000: 1-3.
- 228 9. M. Ponce-Alonso, J. Saez de la Fuente, A. Rincon-Carlavilla, P. Moreno-
229 Nunez, L. Martinez-Garcia, R. Escudero-Sanchaez, et al. Impact of the
230 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic on nosocomial Clostridioides
231 difficile infection. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology 2020; 1-5. Doi:
232 100.1017/ice.2020.454.
- 233 10. K. Lewandowski, M. Rosolowski, M. Kaniewska, P. Kucha, A. Meler, W.
234 Wierzba, G. Rydzewska. Clostridioides difficile infection in coronavirus
235 disease 2019 (COVID-19): an underestimated problem? Pol Arch Intern Med.
236 2021: 131 (2): 121-127.
- 237 11. Annual epidemiological commentary: Gram-negative bacteraemia, MRSA
238 bacteraemia, MSSA bacteraemia and C. difficile infections, up to and
239 including financial year April 2019 to March 2020. Public Health England 3rd
240 December 2020.

- 241 12. A. Rodriguez-Palacios, R.J. Reid-Smith, H.R. Staempfli, D. Daignault, N.
242 Janecko, B.P. Avery, et al. Possible seasonality of Clostridium difficile in retail
243 meat, Canada. Emerg Infect Dis. 2009;15(5): 802-5.
- 244 13. L. Furuya-Kanamori, S.J. McKenzie, L. Yakob, J. Clark, D.L. Paterson, T.V.
245 Riley, et al. Clostridium difficile infection seasonality: patterns across
246 hemispheres and continents – systematic review. PLoS One 2015; 10(3):
247 e0120730.
- 248 14. M.J. Alam, A. Anu, S.T. Walk, K.W. Garey. Investigation of potentially
249 pathogenic Clostridium difficile contamination in household environs.
250 Anaerobe 2014; 27: 31-33.
- 251 15. S.M. Kotila, T. Pitkanen, J. Brazier, E. Eeroloa, J. Jalava, M. Kuusi, et al.
252 Clostridium difficile contamination of public tap water distribution system
253 during a waterborne outbreak in Finland. Scand J Public Health 2013; 41 (5):
254 541-545.
- 255 16. C. Rodriguez, B. Taminiau, J. Van Broeck, M. Delmee, G. Daube. Clostridium
256 difficile in food and animals: a comprehensive review. Adv Exp Med Biol 2016;
257 932: 65-92.
- 258 17. P. Moono, S.C. Lim, T.V. Riley. High prevalence of toxigenic Clostridium
259 difficile in public space lawns in Western Australia. Scientific Reports 2017; 7:
260 41196.

261

262

263 **Figure Legends**

264

265 **Figure 1:** Total community and hospital- acquired *C. difficile* infection (CDI) rate per 10,000
266 occupied bed days between January 1st 2019 to June 30th 2021.

267

268 **Figure 2:** Occupied bed days (%) and total COVID-19 admissions by quarter. Data between
269 January 1st 2019 and June 30th 2021.

270

271 **Supplementary Figure 1:** Defined daily doses of antimicrobials per 10,000 occupied bed
272 days (OBD) by quarter. Data between January 1st 2019 and June 30th 2021.

273

274

275 **Supplementary Table Legend**

276

277 *C. difficile* infection (CDI) case numbers, total occupied bed days (OBD), CDI per 10,000
278 OBD, COVID-19 admissions and in-hospital defined daily doses of antimicrobials per
279 quarter.