



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Strategies to optimise the treatment of community-acquired pneumonia

Wittermans, E.

### Citation

Wittermans, E. (2023, September 28). *Strategies to optimise the treatment of community-acquired pneumonia*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3642455>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3642455>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).







# CHAPTER 1

General introduction, aim  
and outline of the thesis

---



## COMMUNITY-ACQUIRED PNEUMONIA

Pneumonia is an infection of the alveoli of the lungs, which is clinically characterised by a pulmonary infiltrate on chest radiograph accompanied by symptoms such as cough, fever, sputum production and dyspnoea.<sup>1</sup> Pneumonia can be divided into three types based on place of acquirement: hospital-acquired pneumonia, ventilator-acquired pneumonia and community-acquired pneumonia (CAP).<sup>2</sup> This thesis will only focus on CAP, pneumonia acquired outside the hospital. In the Netherlands, CAP is most frequently caused by *Streptococcus pneumoniae* followed by *Haemophilus influenzae* and atypical bacteria. Viruses such as Influenza virus, are responsible for 3-5% of hospitalised CAP cases and approximately one third of viral pneumonia is also accompanied by bacterial pneumonia.<sup>3-5</sup> In the period in which the studies presented in this thesis were performed, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-COV-2) emerged as a new pathogen for CAP and led to the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, this thesis will distinguish between two types of CAP: non-COVID-19 pneumonia (from here on referred to as CAP) and hospitalised COVID-19 (from here on referred to as COVID-19). Both will be discussed, though CAP is the main focus of this thesis.

Globally pneumonia is among the leading causes of death due to infectious diseases.<sup>6</sup> The incidence of CAP is highest in young children and the elderly. In the Netherlands, there were 156.000 new cases of CAP in 2020. In that same year 24.205 patients were hospitalised with CAP and 2.726 patients died due to CAP. The annual health care costs for CAP are substantial, in the Netherlands the healthcare cost for CAP was estimated at 584 million euros in 2019 of which 61,3% was allocated to hospital care.<sup>7</sup> Identifying strategies to optimise the management of CAP might aid in lightening the burden of CAP.

The cornerstones of CAP treatment are early diagnosis and swift initiation of appropriate empiric antimicrobial treatment, preferably within 4 hours of hospital presentation.<sup>8</sup> Empiric antimicrobial treatment is based on the most likely causative organism and disease severity.<sup>9</sup> Empiric antimicrobial treatment should be switched to targeted treatment once the causative pathogen is identified. Appropriate antimicrobial therapy is essential in the treatment of CAP as it improves clinical outcomes and reduces the selective pressure for antimicrobial resistance.<sup>10-12</sup> Yet, in some patients appropriate antibiotic therapy is not enough to prevent unfavourable clinical outcomes. An excessive or dysregulated host immune response can lead to severe disease accompanied by lung injury, sepsis and eventually multi-organ damage and death.<sup>13,14</sup> This has led to an interest in immunomodulation in CAP. In COVID-19 a similar mechanism is thought to play a role: dysregulation of the host immune response triggered by SARS-COV-2 is thought to cause inflammatory organ injury resulting in unfavourable clinical outcomes.<sup>15</sup>

## ADJUNCTIVE CORTICOSTEROID TREATMENT IN CAP

The host inflammatory response in CAP is a complex interaction between the numerous cells and soluble mediators of the immune system. The response is regulated by cytokines and chemokines, the messengers of the immune system. Cytokines are produced by multiple cell types (e.g., neutrophils, macrophages, epithelial cells). They recruit, regulate and activate immune cells such as neutrophils and initiate local repair processes. The interaction between pro-inflammatory cytokines and anti-inflammatory cytokines determines the nature, duration and intensity of the host immune response.<sup>16</sup> Corticosteroids are potent non-specific inhibitors of the immune system. Corticosteroids have multiple anti-inflammatory mechanisms. The most important being the deactivation of genes that encode for pro-inflammatory cytokines (e.g., IL-6 and IL-8) and the activation genes that encode for anti-inflammatory cytokines (e.g., IL-10).<sup>17,18</sup> In CAP, corticosteroids have shown to downregulate the cytokine response.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, corticosteroids inhibit the migration of neutrophils to the site of infection.<sup>20</sup> It is hypothesised that downregulation of the host immune response by corticosteroids can reduce pulmonary damage and inhibit the development of sepsis ultimately reducing unfavourable clinical outcomes.<sup>21</sup>

The first well-designed randomised clinical trial investigating adjunctive corticosteroid treatment in CAP was published in 2005 by Confalonieri et al.<sup>22</sup> The study was terminated after the first interim analysis (n = 46) due to far better improvement of the PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio and a lower mortality rate (0% vs 30%) in the intervention group. Several large trials have followed most with positive albeit less spectacular results.<sup>23-27</sup> An individual patient data meta-analysis (IPDMA) including 6 trials showed that corticosteroids reduced length of hospital stay (LOS) by 1 day and improved time to clinical stability (TTCS). Yet, corticosteroids did not reduce mortality in CAP.<sup>28</sup> This begs the question if a 1-day LOS reduction outweighs the possible adverse event of corticosteroid use. This dilemma is further complicated by the fact that, in the IPDMA, CAP-related rehospitalisation was more frequent in patients treated with corticosteroids compared to placebo (5.0% vs 2.7%).<sup>28</sup> Currently treatment guidelines for CAP do not advise the routine use of adjunctive corticosteroid treatment.<sup>9</sup>

Nonetheless, it has been hypothesised that corticosteroids could be more effective in patients with severe disease as patients with severe disease show a more exuberant immune response.<sup>29,30</sup> Hence, a subgroup of CAP patients may exist for whom the benefits of corticosteroid treatment outweigh the risks. The IPDMA suggested a possible greater effect of corticosteroids on LOS in patients with severe disease based on pneumonia severity index (PSI) score.<sup>28,31</sup> No RCT has prospectively tested this hypothesis. Therefore **Chapter 2** aims to prospectively investigate whether the effect of adjunctive corticosteroid treatment depends on disease severity. In this randomised placebo-controlled trial (the Santeon-CAP study) randomisation is stratified by disease

severity based on PSI risk class. The Santeon-CAP study is the sequel to the Ovidius trial by Meijvis et al.<sup>24</sup> in which 6 mg dexamethasone reduced LOS by 1 day. In the Ovidius trial dexamethasone was administered intravenously. It was hypothesised that this may have hampered iv-to-oral switch of antibiotics thereby delaying discharge. Therefore, in the Santeon-CAP study, oral dexamethasone is investigated.

## INFLAMMATORY SUBGROUPS FOR GUIDING CORTICOSTEROID TREATMENT IN CAP

As mentioned above, it is thought that corticosteroids are most effective in patients with more severe disease based on the rationale that severe disease is caused by higher levels of inflammation. In **Chapter 2**, PSI score is used to define subgroups. However, the PSI score is a mortality risk score and is greatly influenced by age.<sup>31</sup> Consequently, the PSI score does not necessarily correspond to level of inflammation. Parameters more indicative of inflammation may be more appropriate to identify patients in whom corticosteroid treatment is more effective. Yet identification of such a parameter has proven a challenge; Analysis of parameters such as C-reactive protein, ICU admission, or systemic inflammatory response criteria, have not resulted in the identification of a well-defined CAP subgroup benefitting more from corticosteroid treatment.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, besides PSI score, this thesis explores two additional methods for identifying CAP subgroups which might benefit more from corticosteroid treatment.

The first method is based on white blood cell (WBC) count differential parameters. WBCs are important effectors in the local and systemic inflammatory response in CAP.<sup>32</sup> Neutrophilia is widely used as a marker of inflammation in CAP. More recently, lymphocytopenia has been associated with disease severity and higher concentrations of inflammatory cytokines in CAP.<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, the neutrophil-lymphocyte count ratio (NLR) has been acknowledged as a marker of systemic inflammation.<sup>34-36</sup> In CAP, NLR has been associated with disease severity and has shown to predict mortality.<sup>37,38</sup> **Chapter 3** examines whether these parameters could also be used to guide corticosteroid treatment. In **Chapter 3** a post-hoc analysis of the Santeon-CAP study is performed to test whether the effect of adjunctive oral dexamethasone on clinical outcomes is modified by a high neutrophil count, low lymphocyte count and/or high NLR.

The second method used in this thesis to identify CAP subgroups is latent class analysis (LCA) of inflammatory and clinical parameters. LCA is a statistical modelling method used to identify "hidden" subgroups in a population by identifying individuals that share similar characteristics. Unlike other outcome modelling approaches LCA recognises the fact that some clinical factors can share variance as a constellation of observed variables for a common unobserved (latent) variable.<sup>39</sup> LCA uses this relationship between observed variables to group individuals together into mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive subgroups. The subgroups identified by LCA are

called 'latent classes'. In general, LCA subgroups are solely based on baseline data or patient characteristics and thus are not dependent on an outcome variable. LCA is useful in defining the unobservable heterogeneity in a population.<sup>39,40</sup>

In acute respiratory distress syndrome LCA has successfully identified subgroups with different inflammatory profiles. These clinically distinct subgroups were shown to respond differently to ventilator and fluid management.<sup>41,42</sup> In COVID-19 related ARDS LCA also identified two clinically distinct subgroups. Both subgroups responded differently to corticosteroid treatment. Corticosteroids improved mortality in the hyperinflammatory subgroup but worsened mortality in the hypoinflammatory subgroup.<sup>43</sup> **Chapter 4** and **Chapter 5** examine whether LCA can also identify clinically distinct subgroups in CAP and if so, whether these subgroups respond differently to adjunctive corticosteroids. Therefore, in **Chapter 4** and **Chapter 5**, LCAs of baseline clinical and biomarker data collected at time of hospital admission are performed in three independent CAP cohorts.

## DEXAMETHASONE FOR COVID-19

As discussed above adjunctive corticosteroids for CAP have been a subject of research for many years and no definitive conclusions have been made regarding its place in the treatment of CAP. In COVID-19 this is quite different. Dexamethasone has been studied as a stand-alone treatment for COVID-19. Trials studying corticosteroids for COVID-19 were commenced promptly after the Sars-CoV-2 virus emerged. The rationale for corticosteroids being that severe COVID-19 (defined as an oxygen saturation <94%), is caused by a dysregulated host immune response in reaction to the SARS-CoV-2 virus.<sup>15</sup> Just several months after COVID-19 was declared a pandemic the preliminary results from RECOVERY Trial and the results of the WHO react meta-analysis were published. The results showed that 6 mg dexamethasone reduced risk for mortality and mechanical ventilation.<sup>44,45</sup> The choice to investigate a 6 mg dose was partially based on the dose used in the Ovidius trial.<sup>24</sup> After publication of these studies, dexamethasone 6 mg for 10 days became standard treatment for hospitalised COVID-19 patients requiring oxygen therapy.<sup>46,47</sup>

Trials investigating corticosteroids for COVID-19 did not perform subgroup analyses based on BMI despite the fact that obesity had been associated with ICU admission and mortality.<sup>48,49</sup> Because dexamethasone is a lipophilic drug with a relatively large volume of distribution, one may hypothesise that serum dexamethasone levels are lower in patients with obesity compared to those with normal weight which might translate in the fixed 6 mg dexamethasone dose being less effective in patients with overweight or obesity.<sup>50-52</sup> To test this hypothesis, **Chapter 6** examines whether overweight and obesity are associated with worse clinical outcomes in a cohort of non-ICU COVID-19 patients treated with fixed-dose dexamethasone.

## MICROBIOLOGICAL TESTING AND ANTIBIOTIC ALTERATIONS IN CAP

Though immunomodulation might improve outcomes for CAP patients, as mentioned earlier, appropriate antibiotic treatment is still the basis of CAP treatment. A quality indicator of appropriate antimicrobial treatment is the adjustment of the empirical antibiotic regimen guided by microbiological test results.<sup>53</sup> Yet to do so, the availability of actionable microbiological test results is necessary. In >60% of CAP cases a causative micro-organism is not identified.<sup>9</sup> Microbiological diagnostics consist of traditional cultures of blood and respiratory samples, newer techniques such as PCR assays on throat and nose swabs for identifying atypical bacteria and respiratory viruses, and urinary antigen tests for legionella and pneumococcus. In a research setting, the combination of traditional and newer tests had the potential to increase the percentage of identified pathogens up to 67%.<sup>54–56</sup> However, there is little evidence if the same is true in day-to-day clinical practice and more importantly, whether extensive testing leads to more alterations of the empirical antimicrobial regimen in individual patients. Therefore, **Chapter 7** examines whether extensive microbiological testing is associated with an increase in diagnostic yield and antibiotic treatment alterations in day-to-day clinical practice.

## AIMS OF THE THESIS

The aim of this thesis was to identify strategies to improve the management of community-acquired pneumonia outside the intensive care unit with a focus on corticosteroid treatment. This thesis specifically focuses on the following three topics:

1. The effect of oral adjunctive dexamethasone on clinical outcomes in CAP and whether CAP subgroups exist in which the benefits of adjunctive corticosteroids outweigh the disadvantages of corticosteroid use.
2. The association between obesity and overweight and clinical outcomes in COVID-19 patients treated with dexamethasone.
3. The relationship between the extent of microbiological testing and early alterations of antibiotic therapy in CAP.



## REFERENCES

1. Mandell LA, Wunderink RG, Anzueto A, et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America/American Thoracic Society Consensus Guidelines on the management of community-acquired pneumonia in adults. *Clin Inf Dis*. 2007;44(suppl 2):S27-S72. doi:10.1086/511159
2. Anand N, Kollef MH. The alphabet soup of pneumonia: CAP, HAP, HCAP, NHAP, and VAP. *Semin Respir Crit Care Med*. 2009;30(1):3-9. doi:10.1055/S-0028-1119803
3. Postma DF, van Werkhoven CH, van Elden LJR, et al. Antibiotic Treatment Strategies for Community-Acquired Pneumonia in Adults. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(14):1312-1323. doi:10.1056/nejmoa1406330
4. Musher DM, Abers MS, Bartlett JG. Evolving Understanding of the Causes of Pneumonia in Adults, With Special Attention to the Role of Pneumococcus. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;65(10):1736-1744. doi:10.1093/cid/cix549
5. Bonten MJM, Huijts SM, Bolkenbaas M, et al. Polysaccharide Conjugate Vaccine against Pneumococcal Pneumonia in Adults. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(12):1114-1125. doi:10.1056/nejmoa1408544
6. Estimates of the global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of lower respiratory infections in 195 countries, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2018;18(11):1191-1210. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(18)30310-4
7. Infecties van de onderste luchtwegen. VZinfo. Published September 1, 2022. Accessed October 27, 2022. <https://www.vzinfo.nl/infecties-van-de-onderste-luchtwegen>
8. Lim WS, Woodhead M. British Thoracic Society adult community acquired pneumonia audit 2009/10. *Thorax*. 2011;66(6):548-549. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2011-200081
9. Wiersinga W, Bonten MJM, Boersma W, et al. Management of community-acquired pneumonia in adults: 2016 guideline update from the Dutch Working Party on Antibiotic Policy (SWAB) and Dutch Association of Chest Physicians (NVALT). *Neth J Med*. 2018;76(1):4-13.
10. Schuts EC, Hulscher MEJL, Mouton JW, et al. Current evidence on hospital antimicrobial stewardship objectives: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2016;16(7):847-856. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(16)00065-7
11. Kothe H, Bauer T, Marre R, Suttorp N, Welte T, Dalhoff K. Outcome of community-acquired pneumonia: influence of age, residence status and antimicrobial treatment. *Eur Respir J*. 2008;32(1):139- 146.
12. Garcia-Vidal C, Fernández-Sabé N, Carratalà J, et al. Early mortality in patients with community-acquired pneumonia: causes and risk factors. *Eur Respir J*. 2008;32(3):733 - 739.
13. Fernandez-Botran R, Uriarte SM, Arnold FW, et al. Contrasting Inflammatory Responses in Severe and Non-severe Community-acquired Pneumonia. *Inflammation*. 2014;37(4):1158-1166. doi:10.1007/s10753-014-9840-2
14. Deng JC, Standiford TJ. The Systemic Response to Lung Infection. *Clin Chest Med*. 2005;26(1):1-9. doi:10.1016/j.ccm.2004.10.009
15. Hsu RJ, Yu WC, Peng GR, et al. The Role of Cytokines and Chemokines in Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infections. *Front Immunol*. 2022;13. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2022.832394
16. Moldoveanu B, Otmishi P, Jani P, et al. Inflammatory mechanisms in the lung. *J Inflamm Res*. 2009;2:1-11.
17. Barnes PJ. Anti-inflammatory Actions of Glucocorticoids: Molecular Mechanisms. *Clin Sci*. 1998;94(6):557-572. doi:10.1042/cs0940557

18. Rendon A, Rendon-Ramirez EJ, Rosas-Taraco AG. Relevant Cytokines in the Management of Community-Acquired Pneumonia. *Curr Infect Dis Rep.* 2016;18(3):10. doi:10.1007/s11908-016-0516-y
19. Remmelts HHF, Meijvis SCA, Biesma DH, et al. Dexamethasone downregulates the systemic cytokine response in patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Vaccine Immunol.* 2012;19(9):1532-1538. doi:10.1128/cvi.00423-12
20. Rhen T, Cidlowski JA. Antiinflammatory Action of Glucocorticoids – New Mechanisms for Old Drugs. *N Engl J Med.* 2005;353(16):1711-1723. doi:10.1056/nejmra050541
21. Martin-Loeches I, Torres A. Corticosteroids for CAP, influenza and COVID-19: when, how and benefits or harm? *European Respiratory Review.* 2021;30(159):1-9. doi:10.1183/16000617.0346-2020
22. Confalonieri M, Urbino R, Potena A, et al. Hydrocortisone Infusion for Severe Community-acquired Pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2005;171(3):242-248. doi:10.1164/rccm.200406-808oc
23. Snijders D, Daniels JMA, de Graaff CS, van der Werf TS, Boersma WG. Efficacy of Corticosteroids in Community-acquired Pneumonia. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2010;181(9):975-982. doi:10.1164/rccm.200905-0808oc
24. Meijvis SC, Hardeman H, Remmelts HH, et al. Dexamethasone and length of hospital stay in patients with community-acquired pneumonia: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet.* 2011;377(9782):2023-2030. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60607-7
25. Torres A, Sibila O, Ferrer M, et al. Effect of Corticosteroids on Treatment Failure Among Hospitalized Patients With Severe Community-Acquired Pneumonia and High Inflammatory Response: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2015;313(7):677-686. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.88
26. Fernández-Serrano S, Dorca J, Garcia-Vidal C, et al. Effect of corticosteroids on the clinical course of community-acquired pneumonia: a randomized controlled trial. *Crit Care.* 2011;15(2):R96-R96. doi:10.1186/cc10103
27. Blum CA, Nigro N, Briel M, et al. Adjunct prednisone therapy for patients with community-acquired pneumonia: A multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet.* 2015;385(9977):1511-1518. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62447-8
28. Briel M, Spoorenberg SMC, Snijders D, et al. Corticosteroids in Patients Hospitalized With Community-Acquired Pneumonia: Systematic Review and Individual Patient Data Metaanalysis. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2017;66(3):346-354. doi:10.1093/cid/cix801
29. Fernández-Serrano S, Dorca J, Coromines M, Carratalà J, Gudiol F, Manresa F. Molecular inflammatory responses measured in blood of patients with severe community-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Diagn Lab Immunol.* 2003;10(5):813-820. doi:10.1128/cdli.10.5.813-820.2003
30. Paats MS, Bergen IM, Hanselaar WEJJ, et al. Local and systemic cytokine profiles in nonsevere and severe community-acquired pneumonia. *Eur Respir J.* 2013;41(6):1378-1385. doi:10.1183/09031936.00060112
31. Fine MJ, Auble TE, Yealy DM, et al. A Prediction Rule to Identify Low-Risk Patients with Community-Acquired Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med.* 1997;336(4):243-250. doi:10.1056/nejm199701233360402
32. Pechous RD. With friends like these: The complex role of neutrophils in the progression of severe pneumonia. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol.* 2017;7:160. doi:10.3389/fcimb.2017.00160
33. Méndez R, Menéndez R, Amara-Elori I, et al. Lymphopenic community-acquired pneumonia is associated with a dysregulated immune response and increased severity and mortality. *J Infect.* 2019;78(6):423-431. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2019.04.006
34. Huang Z, Fu Z, Huang W, Huang K. Prognostic value of neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio in sepsis: A meta-analysis. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2020;38(3):641-647. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2019.10.023

35. Guthrie GJK, Charles KA, Roxburgh CSD, Horgan PG, McMillan DC, Clarke SJ. The systemic inflammation-based neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio: Experience in patients with cancer. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. 2013;88(1):218-230. doi:10.1016/j.critrevonc.2013.03.010
36. Angkananard T, Anothaisintawee T, McEvoy M, Attia J, Thakkinstian A. Neutrophil Lymphocyte Ratio and Cardiovascular Disease Risk: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Biomed Res Int*. 2018;2018: 2703518. doi:10.1155/2018/2703518
37. de Jager CPC, Wever PC, Gemen EFA, et al. The Neutrophil-Lymphocyte Count Ratio in Patients with Community-Acquired Pneumonia. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(10):4-11. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0046561
38. Cataudella E, Giraffa CM, di Marca S, et al. Neutrophil-To-Lymphocyte Ratio: An Emerging Marker Predicting Prognosis in Elderly Adults with Community-Acquired Pneumonia. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2017;65(8):1796-1801. doi:10.1111/jgs.14894
39. Law E, Harrington R. A Primer on Latent Class Analysis. *Value & Outcome Spotlight*. 2016;2(6):18-19.
40. Sinha P, Calfee CS, Delucchi KL. Practitioner's Guide to Latent Class Analysis: Methodological Considerations and Common Pitfalls. *Crit Care Med*. 2021;49(1):e63-e79. doi:10.1097/ccm.0000000000004710
41. Famous KR, Delucchi K, Ware LB, et al. Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Subphenotypes Respond Differently to Randomized Fluid Management Strategy. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2017;195(3):331-338. doi:10.1164/rccm.201603-06450C
42. Calfee CS, Delucchi K, Parsons PE, Thompson BT, Ware LB, Matthay MA. Subphenotypes in acute respiratory distress syndrome: latent class analysis of data from two randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2014;2(8):611-620. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(14)70097-9
43. Sinha P, Furfaro D, Cummings MJ, et al. Latent Class Analysis Reveals COVID-19-related ARDS Subgroups with Differential Responses to Corticosteroids. 2021;204(11):1274-1285. doi:10.1164/rccm.202105-13020C
44. RECOVERY Collaborative Group, Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, et al. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(8):693-704. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2021436
45. Sterne JAC, Murthy S, Diaz J v., et al. Association between Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality among Critically Ill Patients with COVID-19: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2020;324(13):1330-1341. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.17023
46. Medicamenteuze behandeling voor patiënten met COVID-19 (infectie met SARS-CoV-2) | SWAB. Accessed December 16, 2021. <https://swab.nl/nl/covid-19>
47. Corticosteroids for COVID-19. Accessed December 16, 2021. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Corticosteroids-2020.1>
48. Dessie ZG, Zewotir T. Mortality-related risk factors of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 42 studies and 423,117 patients. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2021;21(1):855. doi:10.1186/S12879-021-06536-3
49. Poly TN, Islam MM, Yang HC, et al. Obesity and Mortality Among Patients Diagnosed With COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Med*. 2021;8:620044. doi:10.3389/FMED.2021.620044
50. Loew D, Schuster O, Graul EH. Dose-dependent pharmacokinetics of dexamethasone. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 1986;30(2):225-230. doi:10.1007/bf00614309
51. Tsuei SE, Moore RG, Ashley JJ, McBride WG. Disposition of synthetic glucocorticoids. I. Pharmacokinetics of dexamethasone in healthy adults. *J Pharmacokinet Biopharm*. 1979;7(3):249-264. doi:10.1007/BF01060016
52. Spooenberg SMC, Deneer VHM, Grutters JC, et al. Pharmacokinetics of oral vs. intravenous dexamethasone in patients hospitalized with community-acquired pneumonia. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2014;78(1):78-83. doi:10.1111/BCP.12295

## CHAPTER 1

---

53. van den Bosch CMA, Geerlings SE, Natsch S, Prins JM, Hulscher MEJL. Quality Indicators to Measure Appropriate Antibiotic Use in Hospitalized Adults. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(2):281-291. doi:10.1093/cid/ciu747
54. van der Eerden MM, Vlaspolder F, de Graaff CS, Groot T, Jansen HM, Boersma WG. Value of intensive diagnostic microbiological investigation in low- and high-risk patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2005;24(4):241-249. doi:10.1007/s10096-005-1316-8
55. Johansson N, Kalin M, Tiveljung-Lindell A, Giske CG, Hedlund J. Etiology of Community-Acquired Pneumonia: Increased Microbiological Yield with New Diagnostic Methods. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;50(2):202-209. doi: 10.1086/648678
56. Andreo F, Dominguez J, Ruiz J, et al. Impact of rapid urine antigen tests to determine the etiology of community-acquired pneumonia in adults. *Respir Med*. 2006;100(5):884-891. doi:10.1016/j.rmed.2005.08.020

