Michihiko Goto, MD, MS³; Eli N. Perencevich, MD MS⁴; ¹University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine and Iowa City VA Health Care System, Iowa City, Iowa; ²The University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine, Iowa City, Iowa; ³University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine, Iowa City, Iowa; ⁴University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

Session: P-07. Antimicrobial Stewardship: Program Development and Implementation

Background. Antibiotic stewardship initiatives can leverage metrics that make peer-peer comparisons. A commonly used metric measures how frequently a clinician prescribes antibiotics for acute respiratory infections (ARIs), as defined by diagnostic codes. However, it is unclear if clinicians differ in their use of ARI diagnostic codes. In this study, we evaluated differences in how frequently clinicians code for ARIs and factors that are associated with the use of ARI diagnostic codes in Emergency Department (ED) and Urgent Care (UC) visits across an integrated healthcare system.

Methods. We analyzed a retrospective cohort of all ED and UC patient-visits across 129 Veterans Affairs medical centers during 2016-2018. ARI visits were identified using ICD-10 codes for acute bronchitis, influenza, pharyngitis, sinusitis, and upper respiratory tract infections for clinicians with 100 or more visits. A generalized linear mixed model with a link logit function that accounted for clustering at the clinician and facility-level was used to calculate median odds ratios (OR) and to identify factors associated with increased likelihood of entering an ARI code.

Results. There were 6,016,499 patient-visits, and 519,389 (8.6%) were coded as an ARI (Table 1). The mean rate of ARI diagnoses across all visits was 8.9% (SD 2.5%) at the facility-level and 7.4% (SD 4.5%) at the clinician-level (Table 2). The median OR was 2.19 (95% CI 2.18, 2.22), suggesting there was between-clinician variation in coding for ARI diagnoses. Visits were significantly more likely to be coded as ARIs if seen by an advanced practice provider (OR=2.36, 95% CI 2.19, 2.54), if a fever was recorded (OR=4.20, 95% CI 1.18, 4.29), and if the visit occurred between December-March (OR=1.97, 95% CI 1.196, 1.98). Approximately 2/5th of the variability (41.4%) in assigning an ARI diagnostic code was explained by differences across individual clinicians.

Table 1. Characteris	tics of visits coded as	ARIs and non-ARIs	៖ in Emergency
Departments and Ur	gent Care Clinics acro	ss 129 VA Medical	Centers, 2016-2018

In of other (in other		Total (n=6016499)	ARI visit (n=519389)	Non-ARI visit
Median Age (IQR) (48-70) (45-68) (48-70) Male 5299689 441316 4458373 Immunosuppression 217732 15502 202230 (3.6) (2.9) (3.7) (3.6) (2.9) Respiratory Viral Season 2013958 250163 1763795 Abnormal Temperature (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) Chronic Disease 3326374 277158 3049216 (55.3) (53.4) (555.3) (53.4) (555.3) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) 13049216 Frevider type 58.6) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type 10648791 122976 925815 Advanced practice provider (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) <td>An INC. Mark Mark Security (1997)</td> <td>61</td> <td>59</td> <td>61</td>	An INC. Mark Mark Security (1997)	61	59	61
Male 5299669 441316 4858373 Immunosuppression (88.1) (84.9) (88.4) Immunosuppression 217732 15502 202230 Respiratory Viral Season (3.6) (2.9) (3.7) Respiratory Viral Season (3.5) (48.2) (3.7) Abnormal Temperature 52616 14896 37720 (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) Chronic Disease 3326374 277158 3049216 (55.5) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 (16.7) Emergency Department 5160783 423950 4736833 visits (85.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type 3605553 304572 3300981 Advanced practice provider (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Nidwest (21.6) (22.8) </td <td>Median Age (IQR)</td> <td>(48-70)</td> <td>(45-68)</td> <td>(48-70)</td>	Median Age (IQR)	(48-70)	(45-68)	(48-70)
Male (88.1) (84.9) (88.4) Immunosuppression 217732 15502 202230 (3.6) (2.9) (3.7) Respiratory Viral Season 2013958 250163 1763795 (3.5) (48.2) (32.1) Abnormal Temperature 52616 14896 37720 Chronic Disease (55.3) (53.4) (55.5) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 Emergency Department visits (51.0783 423950 4736833 Visits (65.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type 3605553 304572 3300981 (55.9) (56.6) (60.1) 1362155 91841 1270314 Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) 1301490 118568 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Q11043791 122976 925815 681211 1270314 Q2.6) (17.7) <t< td=""><td>NA-1-</td><td>5299689</td><td>441316</td><td>4858373</td></t<>	NA-1-	5299689	441316	4858373
Immunosuppression 217732 15502 202230 (3,6) (2.9) (3.7) Respiratory Viral Season 2013958 250163 1763795 Abnormal Temperature 52616 14896 37720 (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) (0.7) Chronic Disease 3326374 277158 3049216 (55.3) (53.4) (55.5) (55.3) (66.2) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 (18.2) Emergency Department 5160783 423950 4736833 visits (85.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type Physician (59.9) (58.6) (60.1) Advanced practice provider (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) <	Male	(88.1)	(84.9)	(88.4)
Immunosuppression (3.6) (2.9) (3.7) Respiratory Viral Season 2013958 250163 1763795 (33.5) (48.2) (32.1) Abnormal Temperature 52616 14896 37720 (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) Chronic Disease 3326374 277158 3049216 Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) (36.2) Emergency Department 5160783 423950 4736833 visits (85.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type 3605553 304572 3300981 Advanced practice provider (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Widwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5)		217732	15502	202230
Respiratory Viral Season 2013958 250163 1763795 (33.5) (48.2) (32.1) Abnormal Temperature 52616 14896 37720 (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) Chronic Disease (55.3) (53.4) (55.5) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 Emergency Department visits 5160783 423950 4736833 Visits (85.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type 3605553 304572 3300981 Physician (55.9) (56.6) (60.1) Advanced practice provider (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) 236123	mmunosuppression	(3.6)	(2.9)	(3.7)
Respiratory viral seasori (33.5) (48.2) (32.1) Abnormal Temperature 52616 14896 37720 (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) Chronic Disease 3326374 277158 3049216 (55.3) (55.3) (53.4) (555) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) (86.2) Provider type 5160783 304572 3300981 (59.9) (58.6) (60.1) (64.2) Advanced practice provider (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	Peopiratory Viral Season	2013958	250163	1763795
Abnormal Temperature 52616 (0.9) 14896 (2.9) 37720 (0.7) Chronic Disease 3326374 277158 3049216 (55.3) (53.4) (55.5) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) (85.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type 9 3605553 304572 3300981 (55.9) Advanced practice provider 1048791 122976 925815 (16.3) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (16.8) (12.4) Midwest 745396 64185 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) (21.5)	Respiratory viral Season	(33.5)	(48.2)	(32.1)
Abiomian remperature (0.9) (2.9) (0.7) Chronic Disease 3326374 277158 3049216 (55.3) (53.4) (55.5) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 Emergency Department visits (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) Provider type 5160783 423950 4736833 Provider type 3605553 304572 3300981 (59.9) (56.6) (60.1) (66.1) Advanced practice provider 1048791 122976 925815 Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) 239153	Abnormal Temperature	52616	14896	37720
Chronic Disease 3326374 (55.3) 277158 (53.4) 3049216 (55.5) Obesity 1106994 (18.4) (20.5) (53.4) (55.5) Desity 1106994 (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) (18.2) Emergency Department visits 5160783 (55.9) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type Physician 3605553 (59.9) 304572 3300981 (60.1) Advanced practice provider Clinician-type not labeled (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region Northeast 745396 (12.4) 64185 (12.4) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2652143 237620 2391523	Abnormal Temperature	(0.9)	(2.9)	(0.7)
Otherite Disease (55.3) (53.4) (55.5) Obesity 1106994 106202 1000792 (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) Emergency Department visits 5160783 423950 4736833 Provider type Physician 3605553 304572 3300981 Advanced practice provider (17.4) (22.7) (16.8) (60.1) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) US Census Region Northeast 745396 64185 681211 Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 239153	Chronic Disease	3326374	277158	3049216
Obesity 1106994 (18.4) 106202 (20.5) 1000792 (18.2) Emergency Department visits 5160783 (85.8) 423950 4736833 (86.2) Provider type Physician Advanced practice provider Clinician-type not labeled Northeast 3605553 (59.9) 304572 3300981 (60.1) Clinician-type not labeled Northeast 1362155 91841 1270314 (22.6) (12.4) US Census Region Northeast 745396 64185 681211 (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	Chilonic Disease	(55.3)	(53.4)	(55.5)
Observed (18.4) (20.5) (18.2) Emergency Department visits 5160783 423950 4736833 visits (85.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type Physician C59.9) (58.6) (60.1) (60.1) Advanced practice provider Clinician-type not labeled 1362155 91841 1270314 US Census Region Northeast C11.2, 4) 745396 64185 681211 Midwest (21.6) (22.6) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) 52629143 237620 2391523	Obecity	1106994	106202	1000792
Emergency Department visits 5160783 (85.8) 423950 (81.6) 4736833 (86.2) Provider type Physician Advanced practice provider Clinician-type not labeled 3605553 (59.9) 304572 (58.6) 3300981 (60.1) Clinician-type not labeled Northeast 1362155 (22.6) 91841 122976 (17.7) 925815 (23.7) US Census Region Northeast 745396 (12.4) 64485 (12.4) 681211 (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.6) (17.7) (23.7) South 745396 (21.6) 64185 (22.6) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391533	Obesity	(18.4)	(20.5)	(18.2)
visits (85.8) (81.6) (86.2) Provider type Physician Advanced practice provider Clinician-type not labeled Northeast 3605553 (59.9) 304572 (58.6) 3300981 (60.1) Clinician-type not labeled Midwest (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) VIS Census Region Northeast 745396 (12.4) 64185 (12.4) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.6) South 2629143 237620 2391523	Emergency Department	5160783	423950	4736833
Provider type Physician 3605553 (59.9) 304572 (58.6) 3300981 (60.1) Advanced practice provider Clinician-type not labeled 1048791 1362155 122976 91841 925815 (17.4) US Census Region Northeast 745396 (12.4) 64185 (12.4) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) 745396 (21.6) 64185 (22.8) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	visits	(85.8)	(81.6)	(86.2)
Without type 3605553 304572 3300981 Physician (59.9) (58.6) (60.1) Advanced practice provider 1048791 122976 925815 Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.7) (16.8) VS Census Region 745396 664185 681211 Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 23915/3	Provider type			
(59.9) (58.6) (60.1) Advanced practice provider 1048791 122976 925815 Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 (23.1) Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	Physician	3605553	304572	3300981
Advanced practice provider 1048791 (17.4) 122976 (23.7) 928813 (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled 1362155 1362155 91841 1270314 (22.6) US Census Region Northeast 745396 (12.4) 64185 (12.4) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) 745396 (21.6) 624185 (22.8) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	1 Hybrolati	(59.9)	(58.6)	(60.1)
Clinician-type not labeled (17.4) (23.7) (16.8) Clinician-type not labeled (22.6) 91841 1270314 US Census Region 745396 64185 681211 Northeast 745396 64185 681211 Midwest (21.6) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (215.3) South 2629143 237620 2391523	Advanced practice provider	1048791	122976	925815
Clinician-type not labeled 1362155 91841 1270314 US Census Region (22.6) (17.7) (23.1) Northeast (12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (12.4) (12.4) South 1301490 118568 1182922 Q1.6) (22.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	i aranooa praeneo promaen	(17.4)	(23.7)	(16.8)
US Census Region Northeast 745396 (12.4) 64185 (12.4) 681211 (12.4) Midwest 745396 (12.4) 64185 (12.4) 681211 (12.4) Midwest (21.6) (22.6) (22.8) (22.7) (21.5) (22.8) South 2629143 237620 2391523	Clinician-type not labeled	1362155	91841	1270314
US Census Region Northeast Midwest (21.6) South Northeast (12.4) (12.5) (12.6)		(22.6)	(17.7)	(23.1)
Northeast /4539b (12.4) 64185 (12.4) 68187 (12.4) Midwest (301490) 118566 1182922 Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	US Census Region	7.15000	04405	004044
(12.4) (12.4) (12.4) Midwest 1301490 118568 1182922 (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523	Northeast	745396	64185	681211
Midwest (21.6) (22.8) (21.5) South 2629143 237620 2391523		(12.4)	(12.4)	(12.4)
(21.5) (22.8) (21.5) 2629143 237620 2391523	Midwest	1301490	118568	1182922
South 2029143 23/620 2391523		(21.0)	(22.8)	(21.5)
(42 Z) (42 Z) (42 E)	South	2029145	23/020	2391523
(43.5) (43.5) (43.5)		(43.7)	(43.8)	(43.5)
West (22.3) (10.1) (22.6)	West	(22.3)	(10.1)	(22.6)

Table 2. Frequency at which clinicians used ARI diagnostic codes for Emergency Department and Urgent Care visits across 129 VA medical centers, 2016-2018

Location of visit and type of clinician	Unique clinicians (n) ¹	Mean percentage of visits coded as an ARI (SD)
Emergency Department		
Physician	2292	7.5% (3.5)
Advanced practice provider	409	10.9% (4.4)
Clinician-type not labeled	1974	5.7% (4.4)
Urgent Care Clinics		
Physician	366	10.6% (4.3)
Advanced practice provider	102	12.8% (4.4)
Clinician-type not labeled	364	7.3% (5.2)
All visit and clinician-types	5507	7.4% (4.5)

1. Limited to clinicians with ≥100 patient-visits during the study period.

Conclusion. There was substantial variability in how frequently ED and UC clinicians coded a visit as an ARI, and a large proportion of the variability was explained by differences across clinicians. Unmeasured factors could include different approaches to using diagnostic codes. ARI metrics based on diagnostic codes may need to account for differences in clinicians' coding behavior.

Disclosures. All Authors: No reported disclosures

Carlos A. Solorzano Ramos, MD¹; Erika A. Ruiz Palma, MD¹; Gerardo A. Muñeton Lopez, MD¹; Camilo Gomez Rodriguez, MD¹; Elena V. Castro Solarte, MD, MPH¹; Elkin V. Lemos Luengas, MD, MSc,PhD¹; ¹Subred Integrada de Servicios de Salud Sur Occidente E.S.E, Bogotá, Distrito Capital de Bogota, Colombia

Session: P-07. Antimicrobial Stewardship: Program Development and Implementation

Background. Antimicrobial resistance is a major public health threat internationally but, particularly in Colombia. High and increasing rates of carbapenemases are challenging. Implementing antimicrobial stewardship programs (AMSs) in a large, academic, public network hospitals in Bogotá, Colombia.will help curb inappropriate antibiotic use.

Adherence to AMS Program 2020. Subred Integrada de Servicios de Salud Sur Occidente E.S.E Bogotá, Colombia.



Impact of an Antimicrobial Use Optimization Program in the First Year of Pandemic 2020 in a Large, Academic, Public Network Hospitals in Bogota Colombia

Methods. AMS was established in April 2020 consisting of an administrative champion, Infectious Diseases staff, nurse, General Physician, microbiologist, and pharmacists. Antimicrobial stewardship program interventions included postprescriptive audit and establishment of institutional guidelines. The AMS tracked appropriate drug selection including loading dose, maintenance dose, frequency, route, duration of therapy, de-escalation, and compliance with AMS recommendations. Defined daily dose (DDD) of drugs and health economics evaluations of antimicrobials (April-December 2020). Recommendations are placed in the electronic medical record as a progress note.

Results. From April to December 2020, 1013 patients were evaluated by means of a prospective methodology. Unnecessary 689 days of hospitalization and 4420 days of antibiotic therapy were avoided. Among the top antibiotics discontinued were piperacillin tazobactam for the months of July, August, November and December, while for September and October was meropenem. The intensive care unit was the most frequently intervened service (52%), followed by hospitalization (43%) and the emergency department (5%).Over the course of the year, there was significant adherence to the program, with 100% in July, followed by 93.3% in April, 87% in December, 86.6% in May and June, 83% in November, 80% in September, 73.3% in August and 57% in October. The AMS program was able to save \$47.409US in antibiotics and \$55.529US in hospitalization, and 11% decrease in nephrotoxicity events (14 renal failures were avoided), which also saved additionally \$2.3.503 US for a total of an estimated cost saving for the network public hospitals of \$126.441 US by 2020.

Conclusion. Implementation of a multidisciplinary antibiotic stewardship program in this academic, large, academic, public network hospitals in Bogotá, Colombia demonstrated feasibility and economic benefits even in a Covid19 pandemic situation. **Disclosures.** All Authors: No reported disclosures

117. How Does Antimicrobial Stewardship Provider Role Affect Prospective Audit and Feedback Acceptance by the Attending Physician? Keely Hammond, MD¹; Justin Chen, MD¹; Karen Doucette, MD, MSc (Epi)¹; Stephanie Smith, MD¹; Dima Kabbani, MD¹; Cecilia Lau, RPh²; Serena Bains, RPh²; Jackson J. Stewart, B.Sc.(Pharm), ACPR, APRY-2 (ID)³; Karen G. Fong, BSP²; ¹University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada; ²Alberta Health Services, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada; ³University of Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Session: P-07. Antimicrobial Stewardship: Program Development and Implementation

Background. Antimicrobial stewardship (AMS) teams are commonly multidisciplinary. The effect of AMS provider role on prospective audit and feedback (PAF) acceptance has previously been investigated with mixed results. PAF of restricted antimicrobials (carbapenems, linezolid, daptomycin, and tigecycline) in adult inpatients at our large Canadian academic centre has been performed since 2018. Actionable feedback is communicated via chart note plus one of a phone call, direct message, or in-person discussion with the most responsible physician of the attending team in order to optimize the prescription if deemed necessary. The objective of this study was to assess the effect of AMS provider role on PAF acceptance.

Methods. A 3 year retrospective review of all PAF events was undertaken. All audited prescriptions were included. Logistic regression was used to determine odds ratios for acceptance for individual AMS provider roles of pharmacist, physician, and supervised post-graduate physician trainee.

Results. Out of 1896 prescriptions audited, actionable feedback was provided to the most responsible physician in 731 (39%) cases. 677/731 (93%) of audited antibiotics were carbapenems. The overall acceptance rate was 82% (598/731). Acceptance rate and odds of acceptance based on AMS provider role were as follows: pharmacist alone 171/208 (82%), OR 1.04, 95% CI 0.70-1.59, physician alone 141/160 (88%), OR 1.85, 95% CI 1.12-3.20, pharmacist-physician duo 211/268 (79%), OR 0.73, 95% CI 0.50-1.07, and supervised post-graduate physician trainee 75/95 (79%), OR 0.81, 95% CI 0.104, 1.41.

Conclusion. The overall acceptance rate was high. There was a higher odds of acceptance if an AMS physician was providing PAF alone, highlighting the importance of physician involvement.

Disclosures. Dima Kabbani, MD, AVIR Pharma (Grant/Research Support, Other Financial or Material Support, Speaker)Edesa Biotech (Scientific Research Study Investigator)Merck (Scientific Research Study Investigator)

118. Feasibility of a Proactive Amoxicillin Oral Challenge Program for Inpatients with Penicillin Allergy at the Miami VAMC

Michael J. Piazza, DO⁷; Paola Lichtenberger, MD²; Lauren Bjork, Pharm.D.³; Alex Lazo-Vasquez, MD¹; Minh Hoang, MD⁴; Viviana Temino, MD⁴; ¹University of Miami Hospital / Jackson Memorial, Ocean, New Jersey; ²University of Miami Miller School of Medicine and the Miami VA Healthcare System and University of Miami, Miami, FL; ³Miami Veterans Affairs Healthcare System, Miami, Florida; ⁴Miami VA Medical Center, Miami, Florida

Session: P-07. Antimicrobial Stewardship: Program Development and Implementation

Background. Ninety percent of patients who report penicillin (PCN) allergy are not truly allergic. Penicillin skin testing (PST) followed by oral challenge (OC) with amoxicillin (AMX) can evaluate unconfirmed PCN allergy. PST is taxing and requires trained staff, while OC is an acceptable alternative in patients with low-risk histories, who can safely undergo OC without PST. OC is performed in the outpatient Miami Veterans Affairs Medical Center (MVAMC) setting. Collaboration between Allergy, Antimicrobial Stewardship Program (ASP), and Hospital Medicine identified patients with low-risk histories and offered OC to inpatients.

Methods. A daily report of MVAMC inpatients with PCN allergy was reviewed for appropriateness of OC (Fig 1). Hospice patients and those medically unstable or unable to consent were excluded. Appropriate consenting patients were challenged with AMX 500mg PO and observed for 60 minutes. If no reaction resulted, the PCN allergy label was removed. Epinephrine and diphenhydramine were available in case of adverse reaction. Those who were not OC candidates were offered outpatient PST (Fig 1).

Figure 1. Penicillin allergy history evaluation algorithm



Results. We evaluated 39 inpatients with PCN allergy from 3/10 - 5/27/21. Median age was 68 years; 94.9% were male (Table 1). The most common recorded reaction was unknown (Table 2). Thirteen (33.3%) did not qualify for OC, 7 (17.9%) refused, 2 (5.1%) were receiving a penicillin-derivative, 1 (2.6%) patient's primary team refused consult, 2 (5.1%) patients were discharged prior to OC. Fourteen (38%) patients underwent OC with 0 adverse reactions; 0 patients required epinephrine or diphenhydramine. After OC, 5 patients had changes to their antibiotic regimen as a result of a negative OC. Limitations included 5 patients on beta-blockers, and 5 patients undertex.

Table 1. Demographics of Evaluated Inpatients, N = 39 (%)

Median Age (years)	68	
Interquartile Age (years)	62-74	
Gender	37 male (94.9), 2 female (5.1)	

Note that 1 patient out of the 39, underwent DPC with cefpodoxime 200mg PO instead of amoxicillin for a reported allergy to ceftriaxone.

Table 2. Reported Reactions, N = 41 (%)

Unknown	15 (36.6)
Generalized, non-specific rash	9 (22.0)
Urticaria	7 (17.1)
Swelling, non-specific	1 (2.4)
Angioedema or anaphylaxis	3 (7.3)
Nausea or vomiting	2 (4.9)
Bruising	1 (2.4)
Dyspnea	1 (2.4)
Diaphoresis	1 (2.4)
Syncope	1 (2.4)

Total N exceeds evaluated patient number as one patient reported multiple reactions to receiving penicillin.

Conclusion. Removing unnecessary PCN allergy labels using inpatient OC with AMX is safe and effective for those with low-risk allergy histories. Zero patients undergoing OC developed a reaction, suggesting that OC may be safely performed per our algorithm. Our protocol does not require specialized training and is reproducible in settings without an Allergy specialist. In the 3 months prior to this program there were 0 inpatient consults to evaluate PCN. Future plans include forming a multidisciplinary consult service.

Disclosures. All Authors: No reported disclosures

119. Performance of Infectious Diseases Specialists, Hospitalists, and Generalists in Case-Based Scenarios Illustrating Antimicrobial Stewardship Principles at 16 VA Medical Centers

Christopher J. Graber, MD, MPH¹; Alissa Simon, MA²; Yue Zhang, PhD³; Matthew B. Goetz, MD⁴; Matthew B. Goetz, MD⁴; Makoto M. Jones, MD MS⁵; Jorie M. Butler, PhD³; Ann F. Chou, PhD⁶; Peter A. Glassman, MBBS¹; ¹VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System/UCLA, Los Angeles, California; ²VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System/UCLA, Los Angeles, California; ²VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System/UCLA, Los Angeles, California; ³University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT; ⁴VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System and David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, VA-CDC Practice-Based Research Network, Los Angeles, California; ⁵Salt Lake City VA/University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah; ⁶Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Session: P-07. Antimicrobial Stewardship: Program Development and Implementation

Background. As part of a project to implement and evaluate antimicrobial dashboards at selected VA facilities nationwide, we assessed provider attitudes and knowledge related to antibiotic prescribing among physicians working in inpatient settings at 16 VA facilities.

Methods. The online survey explored attitudes toward antimicrobial use and assessed respondents' management of four clinical scenarios: cellulitis, community-acquired pneumonia (CAP), non-catheter-associated asymptomatic bacteriuria (NC-ASB), and catheter-associated asymptomatic bacteriuria (C-ASB). Responses were scored by assigning +1 for an answer most consistent with guidelines, 0 for a less-guideline-concordant but acceptable answer and -1 for an incorrect answer. Scores were normalized to 100% correct to 100% incorrect across all questions within a scenario, and mean scores were calculated across respondents by specialty; differences in mean score per scenario were tested using ANOVA.

Results. One-hundred-thirty-nine physicians completed the survey (n=19 ID physicians, 62 hospitalists, 58 generalists). Attitudes were similar across the three specialties. There was a significant difference in cellulitis scenario scores (correct responses: ID=67.4%, hospitalists=51.2%, generalists=41.8% correct, p=0.0087). Scores were not significantly different across specialties for CAP (correct responses: ID 63%, hospitalists 55%, generalists 36.2%, p=0.322), though ID trended higher. Lowest scores were observed for C-ASB (ID 39.5% correct, hospitalists 4% incorrect, generalists 8.5% incorrect, p=0.12).

Conclusion. Significant differences in performance on management of cellulitis and low overall scores on C-ASB management point to these conditions as being potentially high-yield targets for antimicrobial stewardship interventions.

Disclosures. Matthew B. Goetz, MD, Nothing to disclose Peter A. Glassman, MBBS, US Pharmacopeia (formerly), PAG; Kaiser Permanente (current employee, spouse) (Advisor or Review Panel member, The above refers to USP (ended in 2020).)

120. Antimicrobial Prescribing Guidance and Communication Among Health Care Professionals in Five Guatemalan Hospitals

Brooke M. Ramay, Pharm D.¹; Clara I. Secaira, Masters in Globalization and Development²; Nuria Chavez, n/a³; Mario Augusto Melgar Toledo, MD⁴; Randall M. Lou-Meda, md⁵; Nancy V. Sandoval, Infectious Disease MSc,MD, MIEPT⁴; Herberth G. Maldonado, MD⁶; ¹Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, Center for Health Studies, Paul G. Allen School for Global Health, Washington State University, Pullman, USA, Guatemala City, Sacatepequez, Guatemala; ²Centro de Estudios en Salud, Guatemala, Solola, Guatemala; ³Hospital Regional de Zacapa, Guatemala, Zacapa, Guatemala; ⁴Hospital Roosevelt, Guatemala City, Totonicapan, Guatemala; ⁵FUNDANIER, Guatemala, Sacatepequez, Guatemala; ⁶Unidad de Cirugía Cardiovascular de Guatemala, Guatemala, Quetzaltenango, Guatemala