

Management of new onset anosmia during the COVID pandemic - BRS Consensus Guidelines

Claire Hopkins¹, Mikkel Alanin², Carl Philpott^{3,3}, Philip Harries⁴, Katherine Whitcroft⁵, Ali Qureishi⁶, Shahram Anari⁷, Yujay Ramakrishnan⁸, Anshul Sama⁸, Elgan Davies⁹, Benjamin Stew¹⁰, Simon Gane¹¹, Sean Carrie¹², Iain Hathorn¹³, Raj Bhalla¹⁴, Christine Kelly¹⁵, Nina Hill¹⁶, Duncan Boak¹⁶, and B. Nirmal Kumar¹⁷

¹Guy's Hospital

²Guy's and Saint Thomas' Hospitals NHS Trust

³University of East Anglia

⁴University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust

⁵South Yorkshire Deanery

⁶Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

⁷University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust

⁸Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust

⁹Spire Regency Hospital, Macclesfield

¹⁰University Hospital of Wales Healthcare NHS Trust

¹¹Royal National Throat Nose and Ear Hospital

¹²The Freeman Hospital and University of Newcastle

¹³University of Edinburgh

¹⁴Central Manchester & Manchester Children's Foundation Trust

¹⁵AbScent

¹⁶Fifth Sense

¹⁷WWL NHS FT

May 22, 2020

Abstract

Objectives The primary aim of the study is to provide recommendations for the investigation and management of patients with new onset anosmia during the COVID-19 pandemic **Design** After undertaking a literature review, we used the RAND/UCLA methodology with a multi-step process to reach consensus about treatment options, onward referral imaging. **Setting and participants** An expert panel consistent of 15 members was assembled. A literature review was undertaken prior to the study and evidence was summarised for the panellists. **Main outcome measures** The panel undertook a process of ranking and classifying appropriateness of different investigations and treatment options for new onset anosmia during the COVID-19 pandemic. Using a 9-point Likert scale, panellists scored whether a treatment was: Not recommended, optional, or recommended. **Consensus** was achieved when more than 70% of responses fell into the category defined by the mean. **Results** Consensus was reached on the majority of statements after 2 rounds of ranking. Disagreement meant no recommendation was made regarding one treatment, using Vitamin A Drops. Alpha lipoic acid was not recommended, olfactory training was recommended for all patients with persistent anosmia of more than 2 weeks duration, and oral steroids, steroid rinses and omega 3 supplements may be considered on an individual basis. **Recommendations** have been made regarding the need for referral and investigation have been made. **Conclusion** This study identified the appropriateness of olfactory training, different medical treatment options,

referral guidelines and imaging for patients with COVID-19 related anosmia. The guideline may evolve as our experience of COVID-19 develops.

Management of new onset anosmia during the COVID pandemic - BRS Consensus Guidelines

Running title

BRS Consensus guidelines for COVID anosmia

Abstract Objectives The primary aim of the study is to provide recommendations for the investigation and management of patients with new onset anosmia during the COVID-19 pandemic

Design

After undertaking a literature review, we used the RAND/UCLA methodology with a multi-step process to reach consensus about treatment options, onward referral

imaging.

Setting and participants

An expert panel consistent of 15 members was assembled. A literature review was undertaken prior to the study and evidence was summarised for the panellists.

Main outcome measures

The panel undertook a process of ranking and classifying appropriateness of different investigations and treatment options for new onset anosmia during the COVID-19 pandemic. Using a 9-point Likert scale, panellists scored whether a treatment was: Not recommended, optional, or recommended. Consensus was achieved when more than 70% of responses fell into the category defined by the mean.

Results Consensus was reached on the majority of statements after 2 rounds of ranking. Disagreement meant no recommendation was made regarding one treatment, using Vitamin A Drops. Alpha lipoic acid was not recommended, olfactory training was recommended for all patients with persistent anosmia of more than 2 weeks duration, and oral steroids, steroid rinses and omega 3 supplements may be considered on an individual basis. Recommendations have been made regarding the need for referral and investigation have been made.

Conclusion This study identified the appropriateness of olfactory training, different medical treatment options, referral guidelines and imaging for patients with COVID-19 related anosmia. The guideline may evolve as our experience of COVID-19 develops.

Keywords COVID-19, corona virus, anosmia, olfactory training, RAND/UCLA

Five succinct key points.

1. If the COVID status is unknown, serology should be performed for all patients with new onset smell loss
2. Patients with Isolated loss of smell for less than three months may be managed by their GP.
3. When ENT referral is necessary, remote ENT consultation may be offered instead of a face-to-face consultation depending on duration of symptoms and associated nasal symptoms
4. An MRI brain is not recommended for patients with COVID infection regardless of LOS duration.
5. Olfactory training is recommended to patients with LOS more than 2 weeks.

Introduction

At the time of writing (May 12th 2020), there have been 226,000 confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the UK. Using data available through the COVID Symptom tracker which is monitoring over 2.5 million members of the public, it is estimated that there have been in excess of 2 million cases.

The British Rhinological Society (BRS) and ENTUK were the first to report that loss of smell or taste may be an important symptom. There has been a rapid growth in the evidence base supporting the initial observations made by the BRS/ENTUK that an apparent rise in incidence of anosmia reflected the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic(1-3).

We have undertaken a systematic review, which suggests a prevalence of self-reported loss of sense of smell in 50% of patients. Emerging data suggests a high rate of early recovery, but at 4-6 weeks after onset approximately 10% patients have not experienced any recovery and still self-report severe loss of sense of smell. Applying the prevalence and recovery rates to estimated cases in the UK, there are likely already more than 100,000 new cases of severe loss of sense of smell persisting beyond the first few weeks of COVID infection. We do not yet know the potential for long term recovery, but we anticipate that both GPs and ENT doctors will see an increase in the number of patients presenting for advice.

As there is a high rate of spontaneous recovery reported across all studies within 2 weeks of onset of symptoms therefore we will consider only patients where duration of loss or reduction of sense smell (LOS), with or without loss of sense of taste, is longer than 14 days or more. Furthermore, respiratory deterioration typically occurs between day 7 – 12 after onset of symptoms and this period should be allowed to pass before considering specific treatments, particularly as the safety of treatments in the setting of severe COVID-19 has yet to be fully established for any treatments considered.

Many patients report loss of flavour (due to loss of retronasal olfactory function) as loss of taste. Some reports suggest that true taste disturbance is also present in COVID-19. However, we will not attempt to differentiate or address this in this guidance, which will focus on self-reported loss of sense of smell

The aim of this guidance is to provide evidence-based recommendations for the management of patients with COVID-19 related anosmia, while at the same time trying to optimise use of resources but ensuring those with alternative pathologies are identified in a timely manner. We therefore considered investigation of patients presenting with loss of sense of smell during the COVID pandemic and management of post-COVID loss of sense of smell.

Material and Methods

An expert panel of 15 members was assembled, comprising of members of the BRS Council, members of an ENTUK taskforce charged with developing guidance for outpatient practice in ENT and representatives of the Global Consortium of Chemosensory Research.

A comprehensive literature review has been undertaken, by CH and MA, using Medline, Cochrane databases, and MEDRxIv, and preprint server. Evidence was summarised for the panellists (Appendix 1), and where a systematic review had been performed this was circulated in full. Studies were considered if they included any patients with post-viral olfactory loss, or idiopathic loss. Some treatments identified by the literature review were excluded if the evidence base showed that there were infective, or if the mode of administration could not be supported during the pandemic (for example, repeated intravenous administration), or if regularly face to face contact was required for administration or monitoring (Appendix 2). We used the RAND/UCLA methodology with a multi-step process. Our expert panel undertook a process of ranking and classifying appropriateness of different investigations and treatment options. Using a 9-point -Likert scale, panellists scored whether a treatment was:

Not recommended: should not be undertaken or prescribed based on current evidence base as risks outweigh likely benefits (1 -3),

Optional: could be undertaken or prescribed based on discussion with individual patient based on likely risks versus benefits (4-6),

Recommended: should be undertaken or prescribed in all patients unless there are contraindications as benefits outweigh likely risks (7-9)

Free text comments were encouraged if greater context was required, if question were ambiguous or if anything had been overlooked

Specific combinations of treatment were not considered as the evidence base does not currently have sufficient data to evaluate for any enhanced effectiveness when used in combination. However multiple options could be considered and recommended, and none of the treatments would be considered a contra-indication to use of any others.

Upon receiving the results, the classification of recommendation was based on the mean ranking scores collated from each clinical scenario provided that there was consensus.

Consensus was defined as the requirement for more than 70% of responses to fall into the category defined by the mean, and when the mean score sits in 'recommended', less than 15% of responses fall into not recommended, and vice versa. Where consensus was not reached items were reconsidered in a further round.

Disagreement was declared if more than 30% responses fell in both recommended and not recommended; in this setting no recommendation could be given.

Panellists were given 72 hours to return their answers. The scores at the end of round 1 were analysed and represented to the group, with each individual receiving a copy of their own initial evaluation. The panel was then asked to repeat the scoring for any items where consensus had not been reached. After the second round, any remaining items that had not reached consensus were further reviewed.

Results

Six items reached consensus at the end of round 1. Some questions were amended for the second round in response to comments from panellists; for example, many panellists requested information on COVID status and endoscopy findings in order to make recommendations. Steroid rinses were identified as a missing treatment and added.

All panellists completed both rounds of the Delphi process.

After the second round, consensus had been achieved on most items. There was disagreement on the use of Vit A drops and therefore no recommendations have been made in the guideline.

In 4 areas consensus could not be achieved at the 70% threshold, but was met at 60%. Further discussion lead to consensus regarding imaging. The remaining items related to treatment using oral corticosteroids, steroid drops or rinses and omega 3 supplements. The mean score for these items was 5, and 60 – 67% considered these an option, and less than 15% would not recommend. They have been included as an option but the uncertainty regarding the balance of risk and benefit should be discussed with the patient, and a decision made on an individual basis.

Recommendations

ENT REFERRAL

Isolated loss of smell (LOS)

Patients with COVID infection

1. LOS less than three months:
2. The patient may be managed by their GP.
3. Anosmia advice sheets provided and treatment discussed (smell training and optional treatments outlined below)
4. LOS more than three months:
5. ENT referral.
6. Remote ENT consultation should be offered initially instead of a face-to-face consultation.

Patients with no COVID infection

1. LOS more than 4-6 weeks:
2. ENT referral.
3. Remote ENT consultation may be offered instead of a face-to-face consultation.
4. LOS more than 3 months:
5. ENT referral.
6. A face-to-face ENT consultation should be considered to exclude other pathologies.

Patients with unknown COVID status

If the COVID status is unknown, serology should be performed for all patients with new onset smell loss. If results unavailable, treat the patient as COVID positive if sudden onset loss of sense of smell

Loss of smell (LOS) associated with nasal symptoms

All patients with LOS more than 4-6 weeks associated with nasal symptoms should be referred to ENT for consideration of a face-to-face consultation +/- nasendoscopy to exclude other pathologies.

Endoscopy findings should direct decisions regarding further imaging if possible.

INVESTIGATIONS

COVID status should be established through history/PCR/serology in patients if possible.

Isolated loss of smell (LOS)

A) Patients with COVID infection (regardless of LOS duration)

An MRI scan of brain is not recommended

B) Patients with no COVID infection (LOS more than 3 months)

An MRI scan of brain is recommended if endoscopy is normal

C) Patients with unknown COVID status (LOS more than 3 months)

An MRI scan of brain is recommended if endoscopy is normal

Loss of smell (LOS) associated with nasal symptoms (regardless of COVID status)

Nasal endoscopy should be performed prior to imaging. However given the risks surrounding endoscopy and limited availability, imaging may be requested first in selected cases.

If endoscopy is normal, further imaging is recommended (either MRI or CT).

Unilateral lesions or suspicion of malignancy on endoscopy needs urgent investigation with MRI/CT.

Benign findings (eg nasal polyps) should be treated medically before considering imaging.

Loss of smell (LOS) associated with neurological symptoms (excluding gustatory dysfunction)

All patients with LOS more than 6 weeks with additional neurological symptoms should have an MRI scan of brain regardless of COVID-19 status.

MANAGEMENT

COVID status should be established through history/PCR/serology in patients if possible.

The recommendation is divided into:

- 1) Recommended, 2) Not Recommended, and 3) Optional*.

Olfactory training and support

Olfactory training is *recommended* to patients with LOS more than 2 weeks.

It is *recommended* that anosmia advice is provided to the patients.

It is *recommended* that patients are directed to AbScent and Fifth Sense for further support.

Intranasal corticosteroid sprays

It is *recommended* in patients with LOS more than 2 weeks associated with nasal symptoms.

Intranasal corticosteroid drops or rinses

It is *optional* to recommend intranasal steroid drops or rinses in patients with LOS more than 2 weeks associated with nasal symptoms.

Oral corticosteroids

It is *not recommended* to prescribe oral corticosteroids for a patient with LOS more than 2 weeks with persistent COVID symptoms.

It is *optional* to recommend oral corticosteroids for a patient with LOS more than 2 weeks as an isolated symptom or following resolution of any other COVID symptoms.

Vitamin A Drops

Due to disagreement within the group, it was not possible to make a recommendation regarding the use of Vitamin A drops.

Alpha Lipoic Acid

It is *not recommended* for a patient with LOS more than 2 weeks as an isolated symptom or following resolution of any other COVID symptoms.

Omega 3 supplements

It is *optional* for a patient with LOS more than 2 weeks as an isolated symptom or following resolution of any other COVID symptoms. The flow chart (Figure 1) summarizes key points in relation to treatment, investigations and management of new onset anosmia during the COVID 19 pandemic.

*Denotes items where consensus was achieved at 60% and not the 70% threshold, highlighting ongoing uncertainty regarding usage. We therefore suggest that decisions regarding usage should be made at an individual patient level, considering the risks in view of comorbidities and individual patient preferences

Discussion

Postviral olfactory loss (PVOL) is one of the most common causes of olfactory dysfunction. Pathogens include those viruses causing the common cold comprising influenza-, parainfluenza-, rhino- and coronavirus(4). Olfactory dysfunction can have a significant negative impact on quality of life(5). COVID-19 has been shown to be associated with a high prevalence of loss of sense of smell and taste, and early reports on recovery suggest that while this may be transient in many cases, resolving in 7-14 days, at least 10% will have severe deficits lasting beyond the first 4 – 6 weeks(6). Longer term data is not yet available. Historical reports of spontaneous recovery following post-viral loss likely exclude patients with transient loss due to under-reporting, but instead capture those with loss persisting at least in beyond the first few weeks. Nevertheless, two retrospective studies, including 791 and 262 patients respectively, indicate that between one third to two thirds of patients with PVOL will experience a clinically relevant improvement(5, 7, 8). However, recovery can sometimes take several years. Given the high incidence of COVID-19 it is anticipated that both primary care and ENT specialists will see a surge in patients seeking advice.

The applied RAND/UCLA methodology allowed for timely development of appropriateness criteria for the medical management, referral guidelines, endoscopy and strategies for imaging of patients with new onset anosmia. Indeed, time was the essence in this study as many doctors including general practitioners and ENT surgeons are expected to meet a significant number of patients with post-COVID loss of sense of smell in the near future (8). The flow chart created should assist with overview and appropriate management. This methodology combined the best available evidence with the cooperative judgment of experts in the field. There exists solid evidence for the use of olfactory training in the treatment of PVOL (5–7). Smell training is also recommended by the expert panel in this study for the management of new onset anosmia during the COVID-19 pandemic. Many different medications have been proposed to treat PVOL, including oral corticosteroids, topical corticosteroids, zinc sulfate, alpha lipoic acid, theophylline, caroverine, vitamin A, Ginkgo biloba, sodium citrate and minocycline. However, the evidence to support use of these medical treatments for PVOL is limited and no large randomized controlled trials (RCT) exist. The expert panel only recommended use of INCS in patients with anosmia and concomitant nasal symptoms and made recommendations against the use of alpha lipoic acid.

We were unable to reach consensus at the 70% threshold determined a priori but did achieve consensus at a 60% threshold for 3 treatments; topical steroid rinses, omega-3 supplements and oral corticosteroids (but only if no symptoms of COVID or after full resolution of symptoms). We did agree that these could be considered as optional medical treatments, but after discussion with patients regarding the uncertainty surrounding usage and assessment of risks at an individual level.

Delivery of ENT care will be challenging as we undertake a graduated return to elective practice. In particular, use of nasal endoscopy needs to be carefully considered due to its potential to be an aerosol generating procedure. Waiting times for ENT care will likely significantly increase. For many patients with confirmed COVID-19 infection and anosmia, specialist review and further investigation will not be required; however, serology testing will be required for those who had been unable to access testing at the time of active infection. We have identified those who will benefit from specialist review, and also provided supporting material to assist primary care doctors, who may have had quite limited experience in this area. We plan to develop further educational material for both GP's and ENT surgeons. Patient groups including AbScent and Fifth Sense will play an important role in patient support, we are delighted to be partnering with both groups to provide patient information leaflets (Appendix 3) and further support through a variety of different media.

A strength of the method was to give each panellist an equal voice in the Delphi process, and maintaining anonymity throughout the scoring process. The methodology is also ideally suited to the social distancing requirements of the current pandemic in place of nominal group techniques where face-to-face discussion is required. A limitation is that the guidelines are based on the panellist's interpretation of the best available evidence and may be influenced by their own training and clinical experience. Another limitation may be the group composition as it is generally recommended that the group is multidisciplinary(9); it would have benefited from the inclusion of both primary care doctors and patient representatives.

We look forward to a time when the COVID pandemic will pass – and these guidelines no longer be needed. They have been developed for a time when the prevalence of COVID-19 related loss of smell is high, but they will need to be reconsidered when the relative likelihood of differential diagnoses increase – particularly with regard to indications for further imaging. Although considered with regard to COVID-19 related anosmia, the recommendations on treatments may be applied to all post-viral anosmia, although the risk – benefit analysis may need to be modified. Finally, it should be noted that as our experience of COVID-19 grows, our guideline will likely need to evolve. We hope that the newfound spotlight on loss of sense of smell and taste will drive clinical research and lead to the development of novel treatment options for patients with post-viral loss, and that greater understanding exists for those who do not recover.

References

1. Spinato G, Fabbris C, Polesel J, Cazzador D, Borsetto D, Hopkins C, et al. Alterations in Smell or Taste

in Mildly Symptomatic Outpatients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Jama*. 2020.

3. Lechien JR, Chiesa-Estomba CM, Place S, Van Laethem Y, Cabaraux P, Mat Q, et al. Clinical and Epidemiological Characteristics of 1,420 European Patients with mild-to-moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. *J Intern Med*. 2020.
3. Menni C, Valdes AM, Freidin MB, Sudre CH, Nguyen LH, Drew DA, et al. Real-time tracking of self-reported symptoms to predict potential COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020.
4. Hummel T, Whitcroft KL, Andrews P, Altundag A, Cinghi C, Costanzo RM, et al. Position paper on olfactory dysfunction. *Rhinology*. 2016;56(1):1-30.
5. Cavazzana A, Larsson M, Munch M, Hahner A, Hummel T. Postinfectious olfactory loss: A retrospective study on 791 patients. *Laryngoscope*. 2018;128(1):10-5.
6. Hopkins C, Surda P, Whitehead E, Kumar BN. Early recovery following new onset anosmia during the COVID-19 pandemic - an observational cohort study. *Journal of otolaryngology - head & neck surgery = Le Journal d'oto-rhino-laryngologie et de chirurgie cervico-faciale*. 2020;49(1):26.
7. Reden J, Mueller A, Mueller C, Konstantinidis I, Frasnelli J, Landis BN, et al. Recovery of olfactory function following closed head injury or infections of the upper respiratory tract. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2006;132(3):265-9.
8. Duncan HJ, Seiden AM. Long-term follow-up of olfactory loss secondary to head trauma and upper respiratory tract infection. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 1995;121(10):1183-7.
9. Fraser GM, Pilpel D, Kosecoff J, Brook RH. Effect of panel composition on appropriateness ratings. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 1994;6(3):251-5.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

