



HAL
open science

Clinical recurrences of COVID-19 symptoms after recovery: Viral relapse, reinfection or inflammatory rebound?

Marie Gousseff, Pauline Penot, Laure Gallay, Dominique Batisse, Nicolas Benech, Kevin Bouiller, Rocco Collarino, Anne Conrad, Dorsaf Slama, Cédric Joseph, et al.

► To cite this version:

Marie Gousseff, Pauline Penot, Laure Gallay, Dominique Batisse, Nicolas Benech, et al.. Clinical recurrences of COVID-19 symptoms after recovery: Viral relapse, reinfection or inflammatory rebound?. *Journal of Infection*, 2020, 81 (5), pp.816-846. 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.073 . hal-03080302

HAL Id: hal-03080302

<https://hal.science/hal-03080302v1>

Submitted on 11 Sep 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Fabrice Dami
Emergency department, Lausanne University Hospital, Switzerland

Thierry Calandra
Infectious Diseases Service, Department of Medicine, Lausanne
University Hospital and University of Lausanne, Lausanne,
Switzerland

*Corresponding author
E-mail address: sylvain.meylan@chuv.ch (S. Meylan)

Accepted 23 May 2020
Available online 28 May 2020

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.047>

© 2020 The British Infection Association. Published by Elsevier
Ltd. All rights reserved.

Clinical recurrences of COVID-19 symptoms after recovery: Viral relapse, reinfection or inflammatory rebound?



Dear Editor,

The rapidly spreading COVID-19 pandemic resulted in more than 8.5 million cases diagnosed and 450,000 deaths on June 20th, 2020. As described with other coronaviruses, SARS-CoV-2 was first expected to induce a monophasic disease with at least transient immunity.^{1,2} Nevertheless, rare cases of suspected COVID-19 “recurrence” or “reactivation” have been reported, including the description by Ye & Colleagues in this journal of 5 patients with suspected SARS-CoV-2 reactivation after home discharge.^{3–6}

Similarly, the COCOREC (Collaborative study COvid REcurrences) study aimed at summarizing clinical and virological data of patients presenting a second confirmed COVID-19 episode, at least 21 days after the first onset, and after a symptom-free interval [oxygen-free and discharge from acute-care unit (ACU), or return to usual clinical state]. Cases were collected retrospectively at a multicenter observational level through the COCLICO (Collaborative CLInician COVID-19) French study group meeting. A COVID-19 episode was defined by (i) at least one recent major clinical sign of COVID-19 including fever or chills, febrile flu-like-syndrome, dyspnoea, anosmia, or dysgeusia; and (ii) a positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test. Patients were not included if a differential diagnosis (amongst which bacterial, fungal or other viral superinfection, thrombo-embolic complication, secondary organizing pneumonia or interstitial lung disease) could explain the symptom recurrence. After information, all patients agreed with the use of their anonymous medical data. The study has been approved by the Ethic Committee of French Speaking Society of Infectious Disease (CERMIT), number 2020-0503 COVID.

Between April 6th and May 14th, 2020, 11 patients were identified (sex ratio M/F 1.2, median age 55, range [19–91] years). The median duration of symptoms was 18 [13–41] days for the first episode and 10 [7–29] days for the second one for the 7 patients who eventually recovered. Epidemiological and clinical data are summarized in [Table 1](#).

Four healthcare workers (patients 1–4, median age 32.5 [19–43] years) without significant comorbidity had a first mild COVID-19 episode with a complete recovery: three returned to work in COVID units, one had possible COVID re-exposure at home (patient 2). All of them experienced a clinical relapse requiring sick-leave

but no hospitalization after a median symptom-free interval of 9 [7–14] days.

In contrast, 7 older comorbid patients (patients 5–11, median age 73 [54–91] years) required ACU hospitalization for both episodes, with a clinical recovery of 11 [4–27] days in the interval. During the first episode, one patient received lopinavir, and three corticosteroids. Six of them required oxygen therapy again during the second episode. Two patients died of ARDS recurrence and another of chronic right heart failure worsening.

All patients had a positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test in respiratory samples for both episodes ([Table 2](#)). They all showed CT scan signs of acute COVID-19 during the second episode, worsening for 4 in 7 when comparison available, including a case of pulmonary embolism without sign of superinfection and no differential diagnosis (supplementary Table). A SARS-CoV-2 serology was available after D21 for nine patients: five were positive, one slightly positive and three negative. A viral culture was performed on Vero E6 cells from naso-pharyngeal swabs of two patients during the second episode; one was positive with a typical cytopathic effect of SARS-CoV-2 and confirmed by RT-PCR; after sequencing, the strain was shown to belong to the B2 European lineage (Rambaut et al., bioRxiv preprint, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.17.046086>).

Immunity to SARS-CoV-2 involves both cell-mediated and humoral responses, but its protective role from re-infection along with definitive viral clearance is uncertain.⁷ Our case series of 11 patients having experienced two separate symptomatic COVID-19 episodes, associated with viral detection and no evidence for a differential diagnosis, raises two pathophysiological hypotheses underlying these recurrences: viral reinfection or viral reactivation from sanctuaries. In the case of healthy healthcare workers with mild symptoms at both episodes, a re-infection due to the prolonged exposition can be supposed, given the fact that the immune response may faint in this young population with no invasive infection.⁸ The second group included vulnerable persons less likely to have met the virus again and having presented two repeated episodes of hypoxemic pneumonia, fatal in three cases. Recurrence might have occurred due to a suboptimal control of the SARS-CoV-2 infection, allowing a second episode of viral replication.

COVID-19 recurrences should be differentiated from secondary complications such as pulmonary embolism or super infection⁵ or persistence of traces of viral RNA that can be detected in respiratory samples up to 6 weeks after onset of symptoms in clinically-cured patients.⁹

Immunosuppressive factors such as drugs or pathological conditions could contribute to impair viral clearance and favour SARS-CoV-2 reactivation.¹⁰ Three of the 7 severe patients of our series, and 3 of 4 patients reported by Ye³ received corticosteroids during the first episode. Furthermore, from our 3 patients who developed no SARS-CoV-2 antibodies more than 21 days after severe symptoms, two received recent chemotherapy and/or rituximab.

An inflammatory rebound triggered by an inappropriate immune response could constitute an alternative explanation to the recurrence of clinical symptoms. Yet, the facts that viral RNA was detected in all patients –some of them with low cycle threshold– and that a viral strain could be cultured during the second episode for one of them rather support re-infection or virus replication's rebound.

This work has some limitations. In addition to the limited number of observations, the cure between episodes was only clinically-defined (except for patient 6) because iterative RT-PCR controls were not recommended by French guidelines. Finally, viral culture could be performed only for two patients, with no phylogenetic sequence comparison at this time.

In conclusion, the fact that patients could experience reactivation of a long-lasting virus carriage or might be re-infected, as well as potential long-term effects of drugs or diseases that

Table 1

Clinical characteristics of COVID 19 first and 2nd episodes, from onset of first episode (D1) to last follow-up (home-care patients: patients 1–4; hospitalized patients: patients 5–11).

Case	Patients characteristics			First episode Clinical characteristics	Treatments	1st Clinical cure	2nd episode		Treatments	Duration of 2nd episode (days)	Outcome
	Age	Sex	Past medical history				Clinical characteristics	2nd ep onset			
1	19	F	None (HCW)	FLS with no fever- cough-dyspnoea-AO-DG -headache-diarrhoea- otalgia-	None	D18	D26	FLS-cough-dyspnoea -chest pain	None	on-going	home care
2	32	F	None (HCW)	Cough-AO-myalgia- headache	None	D29	D36	FLS	None	10	cured
3	33	F	First trimester pregnancy (HCW)	Myalgia-headache- fatigue-nasal congestion-sore throat	None	D13	D27	Fatigue-nasal congestion-sore throat-chills	None	8	cured
4	43	M	None (HCW)	FLS-AO- headache	None	D14	D24	Cough-AO-myalgia headache-diarrhoea- fatigue	None	29	cured
5	85	M	Bronchiectasis - CHD - pace maker - arrhythmia	Fever-cough-dyspnoea- fatigue-confusion-falls	O2, ATB	D17	D44	Cough-dyspnoea- fatigue-chest pain-confusion-acute heart failure	O2	6	cured
6	54	M	HT	Fever-cough-dyspnoea -severe ARDS-fatigue	ICU, OTI, ATB, LPV/rtv, CTS	D41	D45	Cough-dyspnoea- diarrhoea-ARDS-fatigue	ICU, OTI, ECMO, ATB	34	death
7	91	F	CHD - HT-CVD- atherosclerosis- arrhythmia- DM	Fever-dyspnoea-fatigue- pleural & pericardial effusion	O2, ATB, CTS	D13	D25	Dyspnoea-fatigue	none	9	cured
8	55	M	CLD, cirrhosis Child C	Fever-headache-fatigue	ATB	D21	D27	Dyspnoea-headache- diarrhoea -fatigue	ICU-HFNIV-OTI ATB	20	cured
9	72	M	Anti MAG neuropathy (rituximab, bendamustine)	Fever- cough- dyspnoea-worsening neuropathy	O2, ATB	D21	D27	Fever- cough- dyspnoea -fatigue - worsening neuropathy	ICU-HFNIV-OTI, ATB remdesivir	29	death
10	73	M	DLBCL (chemotherapy d-22)	Fever-fatigue- abdominal cutaneous rash	ATB	D13	D24	Fever-dyspnoea-fatigue	O2, ATB, CTS *	17	cured
11	84	F	CLD / O2T - mild CRD - CHD arrhythmia/ATC - valvulopathy - atherosclerosis - DM	Fever-cough-dyspnoea- AO-fatigue	O2, curative ATC, ATB + CTS	D23	D49	Fever-cough-dyspnoea- fatigue	O2, HFNIV, ATB,tocilizumab, CTS curative ATC	30	death

Abbreviations : ATB : antibiotics - AO : anosmia - ATC : anticoagulation - CHD : Chronic Heart Disease- CLD : Chronic Lung Disease- CRD : Chronic Renal Disease - CVD : CerebroVascular Disease - CTS : corticosteroids
DM : Diabetes Mellitus - DG : dysgeusia - DLBCL : Diffuse Large B Cell Lymphoma - ECMO : extra-corporeal membrane oxygenation - FLS : Flu Like Syndrome (= fever + myalgia + fatigue +/- sore throat, nasal congestion) - HT : hypertension - HCW : Health Care Worker - HFNIV: High Flow Non Invasive Ventilation - ICU : Intensive Care Unit -LPV/rtv : lopinavir/ritonavir - NA : Non Available - OTI : Oro-Tracheal Intubation
- O2 : oxygen therapy.

* No improvement after 7 days of piperacillin-tazobactam ; apyrexia 4 days after pip-taz stop and before linezolid.

Table 2

Laboratory findings of COVID 19 first and 2nd episodes, from onset of first episode (D1) to last follow-up. (home-care patients: patients 1–4; hospitalized patients: patients 5–11).

Case	First episode (onset = D1)			No symptom Minimal CRP Maximal L PCR if available	2nd episode				
	Blood tests	SARS CoV2 PCR			Blood tests	SARS CoV2 PCR		Serology	
		Days from onset	CT if available *			Days from 1st onset	CT if available *	Days from 1st onset	Results
1	NA	D2	E 18 - N22 - RdRP 19	NA	NA	D29	E 35 - IP2 37 - IP4 42	D58	POSITIVE total Ig
2	NA	D18	E 23,9- N NA - RdRP 23,6	NA	NA	D36 D55	E 31,5- N NA - RdRP 30,3 NEGATIVE	NA	NA
3	NA	D3	30,5	NA	L 1800	D28	32,7	D27	POSITIVE IgG IgM
4	NA	D3	POSITIVE, CT NA	NA	L 1300 Eo 90CRP 1	D38	21.5	D31, 45	slightly POSITIVE IgG, NEGATIVE IgM
5	L 290 Eo 0 CRP 33	D1	E8 - N11- RdRP 12	L 870 CRP 17 PCR D36 : + E35	L700 Eo 30 CRP 15	D46	E 33 - N 33 - RdRP 32 Viral culture NEGATIVE	NA	NA
6	L 690 CRP 365	D16 D 38, 44	IP2 29,4 - IP4 29.9 NEGATIVE	L 2750 CRP 28	L 690 Eo 50 CRP 247	D45	IP2 38.3 - IP4 36.2	D31	POSITIVE IgG IgM
7	L 720 Eo 10 CRP 143	D3	ORF1 18.7 - N 18.1	L 1500 CRP 34	L 1000 Eo 160 CRP 188	D26	ORF1 29,7	D27	POSITIVE IgG IgM
8	L 629 Eo 0 CRP 74	D6	16	L 1400 CRP 33	L 800 Eo 10 CRP 73	D31	POSITIVE, CT NA	D27 D47	Ambiguous POSITIVE IgG NEGATIVE
9	L 630 Eo 260 CRP 39	D7	POSITIVE, CT NA	L 750 Eo 90 CRP 8	L 360 Eo 0 CRP 85	D 23, 32, 36	POSITIVE, CT NA	D41	
10	L 60 Eo 0 CRP 112.8	D6	17 Cutaneous PCR neg	L 80 CRP 18	L 60 Eo 30 CRP 160	D35	18	D25	NEGATIVE
11	L 770 CRP 88	D11	IP4 31	L 1180 CRP 4.2	L 480 CRP 346	D50	IP4 16,7 Viral culture POSITIVE	D53	NEGATIVE

L : lymphocytes (per mm³) – Eo = Eosinophils polymorphonuclear leukocytes (per mm³). CRP : C Reactive Protein (mg/l) NA: Non Available.

* SARS CoV2 Polymerase Chain Reaction: cycle threshold (CT), envelope gene (E), nucleocapsid gene (N), ARN polymerase gene (RdRP, IP2, IP4), specific Open Reading Frame (ORF)1.

hamper the immune response, constitutes a substantial point of vigilance for the management of the pandemic at the individual and collective levels. Studies including genomic comparisons of viral strains involved in both episodes, determination of RNA infectivity by viral culture, as well as assessment of innate and adaptive immunity and monitoring inflammatory targets, would be of great value for further understanding the underlying pathophysiology of these COVID-19 recurrences.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None of the authors has any conflict of interest to declare regarding this subject. This work had no financial support.

Acknowledgements

We thank Mr. Nicolas Dumesges and Mrs Alison Mac Lean for the proofreading.

Supplementary materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:[10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.073](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.073).

References

1. Kiyuka P.K., Agoti C.N., Munywoki P.K., Njeru R., Bett A., Otieno J.R., et al. Human Coronavirus NL63 Molecular Epidemiology and Evolutionary Patterns in Rural Coastal Kenya. *J Infect Dis* 2018;**217**(11):1728–39 05.
2. Tang F., Quan Y., Xin Z.-T., Wrammert J., Ma M.-J., Lv H., et al. Lack of peripheral memory B cell responses in recovered patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome: a six-year follow-up study. *J Immunol Baltim Md 1950* 2011;**186**(12):7264–8 Jun 15.
3. Ye G., Pan Z., Pan Y., Deng Q., Chen L., Li J., et al. Clinical characteristics of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 reactivation. *J Infect* 2020;**80**(5):e14–17.
4. Ravioli S., Ochsner H., Lindner G. Reactivation of COVID-19 pneumonia: a report of two cases. *J Infect* 2020 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 7]. doi:[10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.008).
5. Loconsole D., Passerini F., Palmieri V.O., Centrone F., Sallustio A., Pugliese S., et al. Recurrence of COVID-19 after recovery: a case report from Italy. *Infection* 2020:1–3 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 16]. doi:[10.1007/s15010-020-01444-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s15010-020-01444-1).
6. Zhou L., Liu K., Liu H.G. [Cause analysis and treatment strategies of “recurrence” with novel coronavirus pneumonia (COVID-19) patients after discharge from hospital], *Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi Zhonghua Jiehe He Huxi Zazhi. Chin J Tuberc Respir Dis* 2020;**43**(4):281–4 Apr 12.
7. Grifoni A., Weiskopf D., Ramirez S.I., Mateus J., Dan J.M., Moderbacher C.R., et al. Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus in Humans with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. *Cell* 2020;**181**(7):1489–501 e15. doi:[10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015).
8. Zhao J., Yuan Q., Wang H., Liu W., Liao X., Su Y., et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am [Internet]* 2020. Mar 28 [cited 2020 Jun 26]; Available from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7184337/>.
9. Xiao A.T., Tong Y.X., Zhang S. Profile of RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2: a preliminary study from 56 COVID-19 patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020:ciaa460 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 19]. doi:[10.1093/cid/ciaa460](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa460).
10. Ling Y., Xu S.-B., Lin Y.-X., Tian D., Zhu Z.-Q., Dai F.-H., et al. Persistence and clearance of viral RNA in 2019 novel coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2020;**133**(9):1039–43 May 5.

Marie Gousseff¹

Service de Médecine interne, Maladies Infectieuses, hématologie,
Centre Hospitalier Bretagne Atlantique, 20, boulevard Maurice
Guillaudot, 56000 Vannes, France

Pauline Penot¹

Hôpital intercommunal André Grégoire, groupement hospitalier
Grand Paris Nord Est, 56, boulevard de la Boissière, 93100 Montreuil,
France

Laure Gallay¹

Service Médecine Interne, Pr Hot, INMG CNRS UMR5310 INSERM
U1217, Place d'arsonvaal, 69003 Lyon, France

Dominique Batisse¹

Department of Infectious Diseases and Immunology,
Cochin-Hôtel-Dieu Hospital, Publique –Hôpitaux de Paris (APHP),
University of Paris. 1, place parvis Notre Dame, 75014 Paris, France

Nicolas Benech¹

Service des Maladies Infectieuses et Tropicales, Hôpital de La
Croix-Rousse, Hospices Civils de Lyon, 103, Grande Rue de La
Croix-Rousse, 69004 Lyon, France

Kevin Bouiller¹

Department of infectious disease, University Hospital of Besançon,
F-25000 Besançon, France
UMR-CNRS 6249 Chrono-environnement, Université Bourgogne
Franche-Comté, 25000 Besançon, France

Rocco Collarino¹

Service des Maladies infectieuses et tropicales, Assistance publique-
hôpital de Paris, Centre hospitalier universitaire Bicêtre, 78 rue du
général Leclerc, 94270 Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France

Anne Conrad¹

Service des Maladies Infectieuses et Tropicales, Hôpital de La
Croix-Rousse, Hospices Civils de Lyon, 103, Grande Rue de La
Croix-Rousse, 69004 Lyon, France

Dorsaf Slama¹

Department of Infectious Diseases and Immunology,
Cochin-Hôtel-Dieu Hospital, Assistance, Publique –Hôpitaux de Paris
(APHP), University of Paris. 1, place parvis Notre Dame, 75014 Paris,
France

Cédric Joseph¹

Service des Maladies Infectieuses et Tropicales, CHU Amiens-Picardie,
Place Victor Pauchet 80054 Amiens, France

Adrien Lemaignan¹

Service de Médecine Interne et Maladies Infectieuses, CHRU de Tours,
Hôpital Bretonneau, Université de Tours, 2, Boulevard Tonnellé, 37000
Tours, France

François-Xavier Lescure¹

AP-HP, Infectious and Tropical Diseases Department, Bichat-Claude
Bernard University, Hospital, Paris, France
University of Paris, French Institute for Health and Medical Research
(INSERM), IAME, U1137, Team DescID, Paris, France. 46 rue Henri
Huchard, 75018 Paris, France

Bruno Levy¹

Service de Médecine Intensive et Réanimation Brabois, CHRU Nancy,
Pôle Cardio-Médico-Chirurgical, Vandoeuvre-les-Nancy, INSERM
U1116, Faculté de Médecine, Vandoeuvre-les-Nancy, and Université de
Lorraine, France

Matthieu Mahevas¹

Service de Médecine Interne, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire
Henri-Mondor, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Université Paris
Est Créteil, Créteil, France. IMRB - U955 – INSERM Equipe n°2
"Transfusion et maladies du globule rouge" EFS Île-de-France, Hôpital
Henri-Mondor, AP-HP, 51, avenue du Maréchal-de-Lattre-de-Tassigny,
94010 Créteil, France

Bruno Pozzetto¹

GIMAP (EA 3064), University of Saint-Etienne, University of Lyon,
Faculty of Medicine of Saint-Etienne, 42023 cedex 02 Saint-Etienne,
France

Nicolas Vignier¹

Groupe hospitalier Sud Ile de France & INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis
d'Épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP), Sorbonne Université,
Paris, France, 270 avenue Marc Jacquet, 77 000 Melun, France

Benjamin Wyplosz¹

Service des Maladies infectieuses et tropicales, Assistance publique-hôpitaux de Paris, Centre hospitalier universitaire Bicêtre, 78 rue du général Leclerc, 94270 Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France

Dominique Salmon¹

Department of Infectious Diseases and Immunology, Cochin-Hôtel-Dieu Hospital, Assistance, Publique –Hôpitaux de Paris (APHP), University of Paris. 1, place parvis Notre Dame, 75014 Paris, France

Francois Goehringer*¹

Service de Maladies Infectieuses et Tropicales, Centre Régional Universitaire de Nancy, Hôpitaux de Brabois, Rue du Morvan, 54511 Vandoeuvre Lés Nancy, France

Elisabeth Botelho-Nevers¹

Infectious Diseases Department, University Hospital of Saint-Etienne, 42055 cedex 02 Saint-Etienne, GIMAP (EA 3064), France
University of Saint-Etienne, University of Lyon, Faculty of Medicine of Saint-Etienne, 42023 cedex 02 Saint-Etienne, France

*Corresponding authors.

E-mail addresses: marie.gousseff@ch-bretagne-atlantique.fr (M. Gousseff), pauline.penet@ght-gpne.fr (P. Penot), laure.gallay@chu-lyon.fr (L. Gallay), nicolas.benech@chu-lyon.fr (N. Benech), kbouillier@chu-besancon.fr (K. Bouillier), rocco.collarino@aphp.fr (R. Collarino), anne.conrad@chu-lyon.fr (A. Conrad), joseph.cedric@chu-amiens.fr (C. Joseph), adrien.lemaigen@univ-tours.fr (A. Lemaigen), xavier.lescur@aphp.fr (F.-X. Lescure), matthieu.mahevas@aphp.fr (M. Mahevas), bruno.pozzetto@chu-st-etienne.fr (B. Pozzetto), Benjamin.wyplosz@aphp.fr (B. Wyplosz), Dominique.salmon@aphp.fr (D. Salmon), f.goehringer@chru-nancy.fr (F. Goehringer), elisabeth.botelho-nevers@chu-st-etienne.fr (E. Botelho-Nevers)

¹ all the authors contributed equally to this article.

Accepted 28 June 2020

Available online 30 June 2020

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.073>

© 2020 The British Infection Association. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Magnetic resonance imaging of COVID-19 anosmic patients reveals abnormalities of the olfactory bulb: Preliminary prospective study



Dear Editor,

We recently read the paper entitled “Self-reported loss of smell without nasal obstruction to identify COVID-19. The multicenter CORANOSMIA cohort study.¹” Loss of smell without nasal obstruction was commonly found in the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), accounting for more than 50% of Western patients.² The main suspected etiological mechanism consists of the virus spread through the neuroepithelium of the olfactory cleft and a related neuronal cell destruction. However, this mechanism has not been extensively studied through magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) findings on cohort of anosmic COVID-19 patients. In this preliminary study, we investigated the olfactory bulb of COVID-19 patients with or without loss of smell through MRI and we develop a MRI approach to assess the impairment of olfactory bulb.

Adults with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis and self-reported sudden-onset total loss of smell (SOLS) were recruited through the French public call of the COVID-19 Task Force of YO-IFOS (IRB: IJB-0M011–3137). Electronic informed consent was obtained for each patient. The details about the diagnosis procedure were reported in a previous publication.³ The study was conducted according to the ‘Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)’ Statement. Clinical and epidemiological characteristics were electronically collected through an online standardized questionnaire developed with Professional Survey Monkey® (San Mateo, California, USA). The olfactory and gustatory features were investigated through the smell and taste component of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHNES).⁴ Patients benefited from objective olfactory testing (Sniffin’Sticks tests; Medisense, Groningen, Netherlands), which is a validated test allowing categorization of patients into normosmic (16–12), hyposmic (11–9), and anosmic (8–0).³

Imaging studies were conducted on a 3-Tesla MR imaging system (MR750; GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, WI, USA) with a 20-channel head and neck coil following a protocol including, in order to assess the olfactory bulb signal, a 3D-FLAIR sequence and a 3D-T2 sequence centered on the olfactory bulbs (OB). The 3D-FLAIR sequence was acquired in coronal plane with the following parameters: TR/TE, 8000/133 ms; TSE factor 80; bandwidth, 120 Hz/pixel; section thickness, 2 mm; matrix 240 × 240; FOV, 230 × 230 × 20; voxel size, 0.95 × 0.95 × 2 mm; ETL=220 with variable flip angle; acquisition time=4min36sec; imaging option: Fat Sat, T2 prep. Sec-

Table 1

Clinical and epidemiological features of patients.

Characteristics	Patients (N-%)
Age (Mean - SD) - yo	39.0 ± 17.1
Gender (Female/Male)	14/9
Smoker	5 (21.7)
Patients with seasonal allergy	3 (13.0)
Comorbidities	
Hypertension	2 (8.7)
Depression	2 (8.7)
Asthma	2 (8.7)
Hypothyroidism	1 (4.3)
Diabetes	1 (4.3)
Heart problems	1 (4.3)
Neurological diseases	1 (4.3)
Autoimmun disease	1 (4.3)
Hypercholesterolemia	1 (4.3)
General Symptoms (N -%)	
Asthenia	21(91.3)
Headache	18 (78.3)
Cough	17 (73.9)
Fever (>38C)	15 (65.2)
Myalgia	14 (60.9)
Loss of appetite	12 (52.2)
Arthralgia	10 (43.5)
Chest pain	9 (39.1)
Dyspnea	5 (21.7)
Diarrhea	5 (21.7)
Abdominal pain	2 (8.7)
Conjonctivitis	2 (8.7)
Ear, nose and throat Symptomts (N -%)	
Postnasal drip	21 (91.3)
Taste dysfunction	21 (91.3)
Presumed anosmia	19 (82.6)
Nasal obstruction	18 (78.3)
Ear pain	18 (78.3)
Rhinorrhea	17 (73.9)
Face pain/heaviness	16 (69.6)
Throat sputum	12 (52.2)
Sore throat	6 (26.1)
Presumed hyposmia	4 (17.4)
Dysphagia	2 (8.7)

Abbreviations: SD=standard deviation.