

Implementation of Empiric Organism Specific Guidelines for Gram-negative Bacteremia in Conjunction with Rapid Diagnostic Testing

Fidelia Bernice, PharmD; Aliyah Cruz, PharmD Candidate 2022; Kathryn Dzintars, PharmD; Edina Avdic, PharmD, MBA

Department of Pharmacy, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA;

Background

- Gram-negative bacteremia (GNB) is associated with significant morbidity and mortality¹
- The use of rapid diagnostic tests can improve the time to effective antimicrobial therapy in patients with bacteremia²
- The GenMark Dx[®] ePlex[®] Blood Culture Identification Panels (BCIDP) were implemented at The Johns Hopkins Hospital (JHH) for GNB
- The JHH Antimicrobial Stewardship (AS) team created and implemented institution specific guidelines for empiric antibiotic therapy for targeted Gram-negative organisms based on antibiograms, patient clinical status, presence of resistance markers, and existing evidence for optimal organism specific therapy

Objectives

Primary objective:

- To confirm the validity of the institution specific empiric treatment recommendations targeting organisms identified by GenMark Dx[®] ePlex[®] BCIDP

Secondary objectives:

- To assess compliance with the institution specific guidelines
- To determine the impact of GenMark Dx[®] ePlex BCIDP results on antibiotic therapy (escalation, de-escalation) prior to susceptibility results
- To define frequency of GenMark Dx[®] ePlex[®] failure to identify targeted organisms

Methods

Prospective, single-center study

- Inclusion:** Adults with blood cultures positive for Gram-negative rods in which Genmark Dx[®] ePlex[®] BCIDP was performed

Rapid Test Implementation & AS Interventions

- Genmark Dx[®] ePlex[®] BCIDP was implemented by the Medical Microbiology Laboratory at JHH on December 16, 2019
 - Detects and identifies nucleic acids of 21 Gram-negative bacterial genera/species and 6 resistance markers: CTX-M, KPC, OXA, IMP, NDM, VIM
 - Results of the test are reported in the electronic medical record 3-4 hours after blood cultures turn positive
- Guidelines were made available to medical and pharmacy staff at JHH to assist with most appropriate empiric therapy for identified organisms
- From December 16, 2019 to June 30, 2020 infectious diseases (ID) pharmacists prospectively reviewed all positive blood cultures twice daily, Monday – Friday, assessed compliance with guidelines, and intervened as needed

Sample of Institution Specific Guideline Recommendations

Organism	Preferred Therapy	Alternative therapy
<i>E. coli</i>	Clinical stable/biliary source: Ceftriaxone 2 g Q24H	Severe PCN allergy: Aztreonam 2 g IV Q8H
	Critically ill/unstable: Cefepime 2 g IV Q8H	
<i>Enterobacter cloacae complex</i>	Cefepime 2g IV Q8H	Ciprofloxacin 750 mg PO Q12H or 400 mg IV Q8H

Methods, cont.

Organism	Preferred Therapy	Alternative therapy
<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	Clinical stable : Ceftriaxone 2 g Q24H Critically ill : Cefepime 2 g IV Q8H	Ciprofloxacin 750 mg PO Q12H or 400 mg IV Q8H OR Aztreonam 2 g Q8H
<i>K. oxytoca</i>	Clinically stable: Ceftriaxone 2 g IV Q24H OR Ciprofloxacin 750 mg PO Q12H or 400 mg IV Q8H Clinically ill: Cefepime 2 g IV Q8H	Ciprofloxacin 750 mg PO Q12H or 400 mg IV Q8H OR Aztreonam 2 g Q8H
<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	Cefepime 2 g IV Q8H OR Piperacillin/tazobactam 4.5 g IV Q6H ± Gentamicin or Tobramycin if critically ill	Severe PCN allergy: Aztreonam 2 g IV Q8H ± Gentamicin or Tobramycin if critically ill
<i>Citrobacter spp.</i>	Cefepime 2 g IV Q8H	Ciprofloxacin 750 mg PO Q12H or 400 mg IV Q8H
<i>S. maltophilia</i>	TMP/SMX 15 mg/kg/day IV/PO (in divided doses Q6-8H)	Levofloxacin 750 mg IV/PO Q24H
Any organism above with resistance marker(s) listed below		
CTX-M	Meropenem 1 g IV Q8H	Consult ID/AS
KPC, OXA	Ceftazidime/avibactam 2.5 q IV Q8H and Consult ID/AS	Consult ID/AS
IMP, NDM, VIM	Consult ID/AS	Consult ID/AS

Results

Table 1: Blood Cultures

Blood Cultures	N (%)
Genmark Dx [®] ePlex [®] BCIDP was performed	272 (100)
Targeted organisms identified	237/272 (87)
• Number of organisms	251
• Aerobes	244
• Anaerobes	7
Polymicrobial cultures	49/237 (21)
Genmark Dx [®] ePlex [®] negative for all targets	35/272 (13)
• Failure to identify organisms*	6/272 (2)

 **E. coli* (3), *K. oxytoca* (1), *Citrobacter spp.* (1), *Bacteroides fragilis* (1)

Table 2: Organisms Identified

Organism	Total N (%) - 251	Organism	Total N (%) - 251	Organism	Total N (%) - 251
<i>E. coli</i>	92 (37)	<i>S. marcescens</i>	11 (4)	<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	2 (0.8)
<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	55 (22)	<i>P. mirabilis</i>	5 (2)	<i>M. organii</i>	2 (0.8)
<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	24 (10)	<i>Citrobacter spp.</i>	3 (1)	<i>H. influenzae</i>	1 (0.4)
<i>Enterobacter spp.</i>	26 (10)	<i>A. baumannii</i>	3 (1)	<i>B. fragilis</i>	4 (2)
<i>K. oxytoca</i>	17 (7)	<i>S. maltophilia</i>	3 (1)	<i>F. nucleatum</i>	3 (1)

Results, cont.

Table 3: Multidrug Resistant Organisms

Resistance Marker	Organisms, N (%)
Extended spectrum beta-lactamase	41 (100)
• CTX-M	36 (88)
• Non-CTX-M ESBL	5 (12)
Carbapenem resistant organism	3 (100)
• KPC	2 (66)
• Non-KPC CRE	1 (33)

Table 4: Validation of Guideline Recommendations

Susceptibilities	Organisms, N (%)
Susceptible to all preferred guideline recommended therapy	240/251 (95.5)
Susceptible to all alternative guideline recommended therapy	191/204 (93.6)

Table 5: Guideline Compliance

Compliance	N (%)
Compliant	142/237 (60)
Noncompliant	95/237 (40)
• Acceptable deviation from guideline*	39/95 (41)

*Acceptable deviations included neutropenia and resistant organisms present at other sites

Table 6: Impact of Rapid Diagnostic on Antibiotic Therapy

Impact	N (%)
No change	120/237 (51)
Escalation in therapy	48/237 (20)
De-escalation in therapy	32/237 (13)
Initiation of therapy	28/237 (12)
Similar spectrum of therapy with improved susceptibility profile	9/237 (4)

Conclusion

- The preferred therapy recommendations within our institution-specific empiric guidelines for Gram-negative bacteremia provided effective coverage in 95% of cases
- Genmark Dx[®] ePlex[®] BCID identified at least one organism from positive blood cultures in 98% of bacteremia cases

References

- Suljagić V, et al. Nosocomial bloodstream infections in ICU and non-ICU patients. Am J Infect Control. 2005;33(6):333-340. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2005.03.010
- Timbrook T, et al. The effect of molecular rapid diagnostic testing on clinical outcomes in bloodstream infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2017;64(1):15-23. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciw649