

physical distancing guidelines (statewide shutdown of bars and restaurants; expanded social gathering limits enacted on March 16, 2020) and the “Stay Home, Stay Healthy” order announced by Governor Inslee on March 23, 2020.⁶

Testing criteria in Washington have not changed significantly during the study period, and testing remains largely limited to symptomatic persons. Testing volume in the study populations did not increase, likely due to shortages of sample collection materials, and the UW Virology Division has not reached maximum testing capacity since mid-March, so declining SARS-CoV-2 positivity is not attributed to expanded testing. This is not a population-based sample, and the mix of cases seen over time is not constant. The Seattle-area outpatient population analyzed is a subset of the Washington State outpatient population, and most of the samples were collected in the Northwest and South Puget Sound regions of Washington and therefore are not representative of the entire state.

These results suggest that the early and aggressive physical distancing measures enacted in Washington State have influenced the course of the COVID-19 pandemic. Whether adherence to physical distancing will continue and how that affects acquisition trends remain to be determined.

April Kaur Randhawa, PhD

Leigh H. Fisher, PhD

Alexander L. Greninger, MD, PhD

Shuying Sue Li, PhD

Jessica Andriesen, PhD

Lawrence Corey, MD

Keith R. Jerome, MD, PhD

Author Affiliations: Division of Vaccine and Infectious Disease, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington (Randhawa, Fisher, Li, Andriesen, Corey); Department of Laboratory Medicine, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle (Greninger, Jerome).

Corresponding Author: Keith R. Jerome, MD, PhD, Division of Vaccine and Infectious Disease, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, 1100 Fairview Ave N, E5-110, Seattle, WA 98109 (kjerome@fredhutch.org).

Accepted for Publication: April 29, 2020.

Published Online: May 8, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8097

Author Contributions: Drs Corey and Jerome had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Randhawa, Greninger, Jerome.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Randhawa, Fisher, Greninger, Andriesen, Corey, Jerome.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Randhawa, Greninger, Li, Andriesen, Corey, Jerome.

Statistical analysis: Fisher, Li.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Randhawa, Greninger, Andriesen, Corey, Jerome.

Supervision: Randhawa, Greninger, Andriesen, Corey, Jerome.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Greninger reported receiving personal fees from Abbott Molecular. No other disclosures were reported.

Funding/Support: The study was funded by the University of Washington Department of Laboratory Medicine and the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders/sponsors had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Additional Contributions: We thank the following persons affiliated with the University of Washington (UW) Department of Laboratory Medicine: Meei-Li

Huang, PhD, for polymerase chain reaction technical guidance and Patrick Mathias, MD, PhD, Tuan Nguyen, Nathan Breit, and Rick Clayton for data acquisition and informatics support. We thank the following persons affiliated with the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center: Lisa Bunts, BA, Sara Thiebaud, MS, and Emily Silgard, MS, for assistance with data management, Nicole Espy, PhD, and Raphael Gottardo, PhD, for input on the analysis strategy, and Mindy Miner, PhD, for assistance with editing the manuscript. We give special thanks to Geoff Baird, MD, PhD, chair of the UW Department of Laboratory Medicine, and Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center President Tom Lynch, MD, for institutional support of the laboratories and personnel associated with this project.

1. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al; Washington State 2019-nCoV Case Investigation Team. First case of 2019 novel coronavirus in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(10):929-936. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001191

2. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25(3):1-8. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045

3. US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): information for laboratories. Accessed March 1, 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/index.html>

4. Wood SN. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction With R*. 2nd ed. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2017. doi:10.1201/9781315370279

5. Agresti A, Coull BA. Approximate is better than “exact” for interval estimation of binomial proportions. *Am Stat*. 1998;52:119-126.

6. Governor of Washington. Proclamation by the Governor amending proclamation 20-05. Accessed March 25, 2020. <https://www.governor.wa.gov/sites/default/files/proclamations/20-25%20Coronavirus%20Stay%20Safe-Stay%20Healthy%20%28tmp%29%20%28002%29.pdf>

Use of Prone Positioning in Nonintubated Patients With COVID-19 and Hypoxemic Acute Respiratory Failure

Patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) are at risk for acute respiratory distress syndrome.¹ In intubated patients with severe acute respiratory distress syndrome, early and prolonged (at least 12 hours daily) prone positioning (PP) improves oxygenation and decreases mortality.^{2,3} Because intensive care units (ICUs) are overloaded with patients with COVID-19, awake PP may be useful to improve oxygenation and prevent ICU transfers.⁴ The objective of the study was to evaluate the feasibility, efficacy, and tolerance of PP in awake patients with COVID-19 hospitalized outside the ICU.

Methods | This prospective, single-center, before-after study was conducted among awake, nonintubated, spontaneously breathing patients with COVID-19 and hypoxemic acute respiratory failure requiring oxygen supplementation. The patients were admitted to Aix-en-Provence Hospital (France) from March 27 to April 8, 2020.

All consecutive patients with confirmed COVID-19 were screened and considered eligible if they (1) required oxygen supplementation and (2) had chest computed tomography findings suggestive of COVID-19 with posterior lesions. The main exclusion criteria were acute respiratory failure requiring intubation and impaired consciousness. The same oxygen supply (device and fraction of inspired oxygen) was maintained during the study. Arterial blood gases were measured just before PP, during PP, and 6 to 12 hours after resupination.

◀
Editorial page 2265

◀
Related articles
pages 2329 and 2338

Table. Characteristics of Patients and Main Results

Characteristics	Total (N = 24) ^a	PP subgroups		
		<1 h (n = 4)	1 to <3 h (n = 5)	≥3 h (n = 15)
Baseline characteristics				
Age, mean (SD), y	66.1 (10.2)	63.8 (7.8)	61 (7.9)	68.4 (11.1)
Sex, No. (%)				
Women	8 (33)	2 (50)	1 (20)	5 (33)
Men	16 (67)	2 (50)	4 (80)	10 (67)
BMI >30, No. (%)	5 (23)	1 (50)	1 (20)	3 (20)
High blood pressure, No. (%)	6 (26)	1 (25)	2 (50)	3 (20)
SOFA score, mean (SD)	2.8 (0.9)	3.5 (0.7)	2.8 (0.8)	2.7 (1)
Oxygen supplementation, No. (%)				
<4 L/min	16 (67)	2 (50)	3 (60)	11 (73)
≥4 L/min or HFNC	8 (33)	2 (50)	2 (40)	4 (27)
Respiratory rate, mean (SD), breaths/min	18 (2.7)	18.3 (4)	20 (3.6)	17.3 (1.8)
Gas exchange and VAS scores before PP				
Pao ₂ , mean (SD), mm Hg	72.8 (14.2)	79.7 (11.7)	66.4 (8.9)	73.6 (15.9)
Paco ₂ , mean (SD), mm Hg	34.1 (5.3)	39.7 (4.6)	32.4 (3.9)	33.5 (5.4)
VAS, median (IQR) ^b				
Dyspnea	3 (2-5)	3 (1-3)	5 (3-7)	2 (1-5)
Discomfort	0 (0-0)	0 (0-0)	0 (0-0)	0 (0-1)
Gas exchange and VAS scores during PP ^c				
Pao ₂ , mean (SD), mm Hg	91 (27.3)		73 (12.1)	94.9 (28.3)
Paco ₂ , mean (SD), mm Hg	32.8 (4.5)		32 (3)	33 (4.8)
VAS, median (IQR) ^b				
Dyspnea	2 (1-4.5)		7 (2-8)	2 (1-4)
Discomfort	4 (1-5.5)		2 (2-4)	4 (1-6)
Gas exchange and VAS scores after resupination ^c				
Pao ₂ , mean (SD), mm Hg	77.6 (11.5)		77 (2)	77.8 (13)
Paco ₂ , mean (SD), mm Hg	32.3 (5.1)		28.7 (5.9)	33.3 (4.7)
VAS, median (IQR) ^b				
Dyspnea	2.5 (1-5)		5 (4-7)	2 (1-4)
Discomfort	0 (0-1)		0 (0-1)	0 (0-1)

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index (calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared); HFNC, high-flow nasal cannula; IQR, interquartile range; Paco₂, partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide; Pao₂, partial pressure of arterial oxygen; PP, prone positioning; SOFA, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (score range, 0-24); VAS, visual analog scale.

^a Missing data: SOFA score for 2 patients, high blood pressure profile for 1, BMI for 2, respiratory rate for 8, before-PP VAS scores for 1, arterial blood gases before PP for 2, and Paco₂ for 1. VAS scores were missing during PP for 5 and after resupination for 7. During PP, arterial blood gases were missing for 7 patients and after resupination for 9. The 4 patients unable to sustain PP ≥1 were excluded from evaluations after baseline.

^b The VAS was a 10-cm line anchored with no breathlessness or discomfort at 0 cm and maximum possible breathlessness or discomfort at 10 cm; 1 cm represents minimum clinically significant difference.


^c During PP: 1 to 2 hours after patients were placed in PP. After resupination: 6 to 12 hours after resupination.

The main outcome was the proportion of responders (partial pressure of arterial oxygen [Pao₂] increase ≥20% between before and during PP). Secondary outcomes included Pao₂ and partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide (Paco₂) variation (difference in Pao₂ or Paco₂ between before and during PP or after resupination), feasibility (proportion of patients sustaining PP ≥1 hour and ≥3 hours), and proportion of persistent responders (Pao₂ increase ≥20% between before PP and after resupination). Tolerance was monitored with 10-cm visual analog scales for dyspnea and discomfort, anchored with no breathlessness or discomfort at 0 cm and maximum possible breathlessness or discomfort at 10 cm. Adverse events were monitored.

Patients were followed up for 10 days until April 18, 2020. Institutional review board approval was obtained. Written informed consent from patients was required.

Variations of Pao₂ were compared using a Wilcoxon signed-rank test for patients tolerating PP for 3 hours or more with a *P* < .01 (2-sided) to adjust for test multiplicity. Analyses were conducted using Stata version 14.0 (StataCorp).

Results | A total of 88 patients with COVID-19 were admitted during the period. Sixty-three patients did not meet inclusion criteria. Among the 25 eligible, 24 agreed to participate; of those,

Figure. Individual Partial Pressure of Arterial Oxygen (Pao₂) Variation for Patients Who Sustained Prone Positioning (PP) for at Least 3 Hours

During PP indicates the 1 to 2 hours after proning and after PP indicates the 6 to 12 hours after resupination. Responders to PP = Pao₂ increase ≥20% between before and during PP. Persistent responders to PP = Pao₂ increase ≥20% between before PP and after resupination. All the persistent responders are also responders. One patient among the 15 refused arterial blood gas measurement during PP and after resupination. For 2 patients, arterial blood gas data after resupination were missing.

4 (17%) did not tolerate PP for more than 1 hour, 5 (21%) tolerated it for 1 to 3 hours, and 15 (63%) tolerated it for more than 3 hours. Characteristics of the patients and main results are displayed in the **Table**. The median time from admission to first PP was 1 day (interquartile range, 0-1.5 days). Neither sedation nor anxiolytics were used.

Six patients were responders to PP, representing 25% (95% CI, 12%-45%) of the 24 patients included and representing 40% (6/15) (95% CI, 20%-64%) of the patients who sustained PP for 3 hours or more. Three patients were persistent responders. Among patients who sustained PP for 3 hours or more, PaO_2 increased from a mean of 73.6 (SD, 15.9) mm Hg before PP to 94.9 (SD, 28.3) mm Hg during PP (difference, 21.3 [95% CI, 6.3-36.3] mm Hg; $P = .006$) (**Figure**). No significant difference was found between PaO_2 before PP and PaO_2 after resupination ($P = .53$). None of the included patients experienced major complications. Back pain was reported by 10 patients (42%) during PP. At the end of a 10-day follow-up period, 5 patients required invasive mechanical ventilation. Four of them did not sustain PP for 1 hour or more and required intubation within 72 hours.

Discussion | In this study of patients with COVID-19 and hypoxic respiratory failure managed outside the ICU, 63% were able to tolerate PP for more than 3 hours. However, oxygenation increased during PP in only 25% and was not sustained in half of those after resupination. These results are consistent with findings from previous small studies of PP in non-intubated patients.^{5,6} A trial of PP may be a mechanism to select patients who will do well or it may be useful in a subset.

The study had several limitations. The sample was small, a single episode of PP was evaluated, the follow-up was short, clinical outcomes were not assessed, and causality of the observed changes cannot be inferred.

Further studies to identify optimal PP regimens and patients with COVID-19 in whom it may be beneficial are warranted.

Xavier Elharrar, MD
Youssef Trigui, MD
Anne-Marie Dols, MD
François Touchon, MD
Stéphanie Martinez, MD
Eloi Prud'homme, MD
Laurent Papazian, MD, PhD

Author Affiliations: Service des Maladies Respiratoires, Centre Hospitalier d'Aix-en-Provence, Aix-en-Provence, France (Elharrar, Trigui, Touchon, Martinez); Faculté de médecine, Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France (Dols); Médecine Intensive Réanimation, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Marseille, Marseille, France (Prud'homme); Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches sur les Services de Santé et qualité de vie EA 3279, Aix-Marseille Université, Marseille, France (Papazian).

Corresponding Author: Xavier Elharrar, MD, Service des Maladies Respiratoires, Centre Hospitalier d'Aix-en-Provence, Avenue des Tamaris, 13100 Aix-en-Provence, France (xavierelharrar@hotmail.com).

Accepted for Publication: May 1, 2020.

Published Online: May 15, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8255

Author Contributions: Drs Elharrar and Trigui had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Drs Elharrar and Trigui served as co-first authors, each with equal contribution to the manuscript.

Concept and design: Elharrar, Trigui, Prud'homme.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Elharrar, Trigui, Dols, Prud'homme.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Statistical analysis: Dols.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Martinez.

Supervision: Papazian.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Papazian reported receiving personal fees from Air Liquide and Merck Sharp & Dohme, grants from Sedana, and nonfinancial support from Medtronic, Lowenstein, and Hamilton outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Additional Contributions: We thank Alaïs Giraud, MS, Clinical Research Department, Aix-en-Provence Hospital, for her contribution in the protocol submission and generating the data for this study. We thank Laurence Maulin, MD, Laurent Lefebvre, MD, and Pascal Granier, MD, as co-investigators (Centre Hospitalier d'Aix-en-Provence, France). Michael Aubourg, MSc, and Pierre Castel, MIM, provided English editing service. None of these individuals received compensation for their contributions.

1. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, et al; COVID-19 Lombardy ICU Network. Baseline characteristics and outcomes of 1591 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy region, Italy. *JAMA*. Published online April 6, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5394

2. Munshi L, Del Sorbo L, Adhikari NKJ, et al. Prone position for acute respiratory distress syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. 2017;14(supplement 4):S280-S288. doi:10.1513/AnnalsATS.201704-343OT

3. Guérin C, Reignier J, Richard J-C, et al; PROSEVA Study Group. Prone positioning in severe acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med*. 2013; 368(23):2159-2168. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1214103

4. Sun Q, Qiu H, Huang M, Yang Y. Lower mortality of COVID-19 by early recognition and intervention: experience from Jiangsu Province. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2020;10(1):33. doi:10.1186/s13613-020-00650-2

5. Scaravilli V, Grasselli G, Castagna L, et al. Prone positioning improves oxygenation in spontaneously breathing nonintubated patients with hypoxic acute respiratory failure: a retrospective study. *J Crit Care*. 2015;30(6):1390-1394. doi:10.1016/j.jcrc.2015.07.008

6. Ding L, Wang L, Ma W, He H. Efficacy and safety of early prone positioning combined with HFNC or NIV in moderate to severe ARDS: a multi-center prospective cohort study. *Crit Care*. 2020;24(1):28. doi:10.1186/s13054-020-2738-5

Respiratory Parameters in Patients With COVID-19 After Using Noninvasive Ventilation in the Prone Position Outside the Intensive Care Unit

The pandemic of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), with a large number of patients requiring respiratory support, threatens to overload intensive care units (ICUs). Noninvasive ventilation (NIV) use in general wards may be an alternative for some patients but has seldom been described and is not used worldwide.¹ One study described the feasibility of NIV in the prone position²; pronation can recruit dorsal lung regions and drain airway secretions, improving gas exchange and survival in acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS).³ We report respiratory parameters after using this intervention in a case series of patients with COVID-19.

Methods | On April 2, 2020, in San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy, COVID-19 patients with ARDS were treated either in the ICUs (n = 48) or medical wards (n = 202). Noninvasive ventilation was used for 62 patients with mild to



Editorial page 2265



Related articles
pages 2329 and 2336