iScience, Volume 26

Supplemental information

Noninvasive diagnosis of secondary infections

in COVID-19 by sequencing of plasma

microbial cell-free DNA

Grace Lisius, Radha Duttagupta, Asim A. Ahmed, Matthew Hensley, Nameer Al-Yousif, Michael Lu, William Bain, Faraaz Shah, Timothy A. Blauwkamp, Sivan Bercovici, Caitlin Schaefer, Shulin Qin, Xiaohong Wang, Yingze Zhang, Kevin J. Mitchell, Ellen K. Hughes, Jana L. Jacobs, Asma Naqvi, Ghady Haidar, John W. Mellors, Barbara Methé, Bryan J. McVerry, Alison Morris, and Georgios D. Kitsios

SUPPLEMENT: Table S1: Baseline characteristics by sequencing run success, related to Table 1.

P-values significant below threshold of 0.05 are shown in bold. Abbreviations: Microbiologically-Diagnosed Secondary Infection (Micro-SI); Clinically-Diagnosed secondary infections (Clinical-SI); No Clinical Suspicion for SI (No-Suspected-SI); chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD); extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO); Radiographic Assessment of Lung Edema score (RALE score); receptor for advanced glycation end products (RAGE); suppression of tumorigenicity (ST-2); tumour necrosis factor receptor (TNFR-1); Surfactant Protein D (SPD); molecules per microliter (MPMs).

Figure S2: Comparisons of host response plasma biomarkers by WHO ordinal scale of severity at the time of admission (levels 4-9), related to Table 1.

Figure S3: Comparisons of host response plasma biomarkers by the level of respiratory support required at the time of sampling (ECMO vs. Invasive Mechanical Ventilation [IMV] or non-invasive support), related to Table 1.

Figure S4: Successful plasma metagenomic sequencing runs had significantly lower levels of human cell-free DNA compared to unsuccessful runs, related to Table 1 and Figure 2. We classified the derived metagenomic sequences as human (hcfDNA) vs. microbial (mcfDNA), expressed as molecules per microliter (MPMs). Based on meeting minimum sequencing coverage metric required for quality control, we classified sequencing runs as successful ("Pass"), "Qualitatively Pass" or "Failed". Baseline "Pass" samples had significantly lower hcfDNA compared to "Qualitatively Pass" or "Failed" samples (Wilcoxon test pairs p<0.001, panel A). We also found that among subjects with both Day 1 and Day 5 samples, those samples that failed on both time points per subject (i.e. "0" sequencing success in panel B) had significantly higher hcfDNA levels compared to "Pass" samples on both days (Wilcoxon p-value <0.001). Data in boxplots are represented as individual values with median values and interquartile range depicted by the boxplots.

Figure S5: hcfDNA levels by sequencing run success, stratified by ECMO status, related to Table 1 and Figure 2. Data in boxplots are represented as individual values with median values and interquartile range depicted by the boxplots.

Figure S6: Subjects with COVID-19 have much higher levels of human cell-free DNA compared to non-COVID subjects with and without pneumonia, related to Table 1 and Figure 2. To contextualize the circulating cfDNA load in our COVID-19 cohort, we compared hcfDNA, total mcfDNA and pathogen mcfDNA MPMs between the COVID-19 SI categories against available published data from our group for mechanically ventilated patients with microbiologically-confirmed pneumonia (n=26, MCP), clinically-diagnosed pneumonia (n=41, CDP) and uninfected controls (n=16, intubated for airway protection or due to cardiogenic pulmonary edema). We found markedly higher levels of hcfDNA in subjects with COVID-19 compared to all non-COVID patient groups (pvalues shown for the No-Suspected-SI only for parsimony). Non-COVID patients with microbiologicallyconfirmed pneumonia had higher mcfDNA levels compared to patients with COVID-19 with No-Suspected-SI, who in turn had markedly higher mcfDNA levels compared to uninfected controls. Data in boxplots are represented as individual values with median values and interquartile range depicted by the boxplots.

Figure S7: Longitudinal evaluation of SI classifications with corresponding changes in mcfDNA and hcfDNA levels, related to Figure 4. The Sankey plot shows the subjects who transitioned between SI categories throughout the study from days 1, to 5, and 10 (A). Height of bars represents number of subjects. Attrition occurred throughout the study leading to decreased height of day 5 and 10 nodes. HcfDNA was not significantly different among SI groups across the study period (B). Total mcfDNA was not significantly different among SI categories on enrollment (C). Micro-SI subjects had significantly higher total and pathogen mcfDNA versus No-Suspected-SI subjects at Day 5 (C, D).

Figure S8: Human and total mcfDNA trajectories among survivors and non-survivors, related to Figure 6. Trajectories of human cfDNA and total mcfDNA were not significantly different across the study period in survivors and non-survivors (A, B).

Table S2: Detailed results of mcfDNA positive/negative findings by SI category, among all sequenced samples and among "Pass" samples only, related to Figure 2.

Table S4: Linear regression models for the adjusted effects of cfDNA (human and microbial) on host biomarkers when controlling for the plasma viral load variable, related to Figure 5. Significant results are highlighted in bold.

Table S5: Microbial species classifications, related to STAR methods.

Table S6: References for pathogenic microbe classifications, related to STAR Methods.

References:

- S1. Hall, V. (2008). Actinomyces—gathering evidence of human colonization and infection. Anaerobe *14*, 1- 7.
- S2. Tavares, M., Kozak, M., Balola, A., and Sá-Correia, I. (2020). Burkholderia cepacia complex bacteria: a feared contamination risk in water-based pharmaceutical products. Clinical microbiology reviews *33*, e00139-00119.
- S3. Reuben, R.C., Roy, P.C., Sarkar, S.L., Alam, R.U., and Jahid, I.K. (2019). Isolation, characterization, and assessment of lactic acid bacteria toward their selection as poultry probiotics. BMC Microbiol *19*, 253. 10.1186/s12866-019-1626-0.
- S4. Könönen, E., and Gursoy, U.K. (2021). Oral Prevotella species and their connection to events of clinical relevance in gastrointestinal and respiratory tracts. Frontiers in Microbiology *12*.
- S5. Hajjar, R., Ambaraghassi, G., Sebajang, H., Schwenter, F., and Su, S.-H. (2020). Raoultella ornithinolytica: emergence and resistance. Infection and Drug Resistance *13*, 1091.
- S6. Kameda, M., Abiko, Y., Washio, J., Tanner, A.C.R., Kressirer, C.A., Mizoguchi, I., and Takahashi, N. (2020). Sugar Metabolism of Scardovia wiggsiae, a Novel Caries-Associated Bacterium. Front Microbiol *11*, 479. 10.3389/fmicb.2020.00479.
- S7. Otto, M. (2009). Staphylococcus epidermidis--the 'accidental' pathogen. Nat Rev Microbiol *7*, 555-567. 10.1038/nrmicro2182.
- S8. Park, O.J., Kwon, Y., Park, C., So, Y.J., Park, T.H., Jeong, S., Im, J., Yun, C.H., and Han, S.H. (2020). Streptococcus gordonii: Pathogenesis and Host Response to Its Cell Wall Components. Microorganisms *8*. 10.3390/microorganisms8121852.
- S9. Dos Santos, K.M.O., de Matos, C.R., Salles, H.O., de Melo Franco, B.D.G., Arellano, K., Holzapfel, W.H., and Todorov, S.D. (2020). Exploring Beneficial/Virulence Properties of Two Dairy-Related Strains of Streptococcus infantarius subsp. infantarius. Probiotics Antimicrob Proteins *12*, 1524-1541. 10.1007/s12602-020-09637-8.
- S10. Zhu, B., Macleod, L.C., Kitten, T., and Xu, P. (2018). Streptococcus sanguinis biofilm formation & interaction with oral pathogens. Future Microbiol *13*, 915-932. 10.2217/fmb-2018-0043.