### 150. Urinary Tract-Associated Gram-Negative Bacteremia: Impact of Treatment Duration

Jasmin K. Badwal, PharmD; Elizabeth O, Hand, PharmD, BCPS, BCIDP; John M. Lyons, PharmD, BCPS and Kristi A. Traugott, PharmD, BCPS, BCIDP; University Health System, San Antonio, Texas

## Session: 37. Bacteremia, CLABSI, and Endovascular Infections

Thursday, October 3, 2019: 12:15 PM

Background. Gram-negative bloodstream infections are one of the leading causes of death in the United States. A select number of studies have been conducted evaluating various treatment durations; however, none have specifically focused on urinary sources. The purpose of this study was to compare the effect of short vs. long course of antimicrobial therapy on clinical and microbiological outcomes for urinary tract-associated gram-negative bacteremia (GNB).

Methods. This was a single-center, retrospective review from January 2016 to October 2018. Subjects were screened using a report of all positive GNB cultures. Hospitalized patients ≥18 years of age were included if they had a bacteremia from a urinary source and received an intravenous or a highly bioavailable oral agent for  $\geq 7$  days. Patients were excluded due to pregnancy, incarceration, inappropriate definitive therapy, polymicrobial bacteremia, unaddressed source control issues, or death during the treatment course. Short course (SC) was defined as 7-10 days, while long course (LC) was defined as >10 days. The primary composite outcome of treatment failure included both 30-day all-cause mortality and 90-day recurrence. Secondary outcomes included 30-day re-admission, 90-day mortality, resistance development, and C. difficile infection.

A total of 207 patients were included: 45 patients received SC and 162 Results. received LC. Both groups were similar at baseline in terms of comorbidities, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, and vasopressor initiation. No statistically significant difference in the primary composite endpoint was observed: 2/45 (4.4%) SC vs. LC 10/162 (6.2%), P = 0.66. There was also no difference in other secondary outcomes.

Conclusion. Consistent with prior studies, we were unable to find a significant difference in clinical failure rates between SC vs. LC for treatment of urinary tract-associated GNB. Generalizability to more complicated cases including those with inadequate source control may be limited; however, these data add to the body of literature supporting the use of shorter antibiotic durations.

Disclosures. All authors: No reported disclosures.

# 151. Comparing the Clinical Utility of Rapid Diagnostic Tests for Gram-Negative Bloodstream Infection Using a Desirability of Outcomes Ranking

Kimberly C. Claeys, PharmD<sup>1</sup>; Kathryn Schlaffer, MD<sup>2</sup>; Zegbeh Kpadeh-Rogers, PhD<sup>3</sup>; Yunyun Jiang, PhD<sup>4</sup>; Scott R. Evans, PhD<sup>4</sup>; J. Kristie Johnson, PhD, D(ABMM)<sup>5</sup> and Surbhi Leekha, MBBS, MPH<sup>6</sup>; <sup>1</sup>School of Pharmacy, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland; <sup>2</sup>Mercy Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland; <sup>3</sup>University of Maryland Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland; <sup>4</sup>The George Washington University, Rockville, Maryland; <sup>5</sup>Department of Pathology, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland; 6Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland

# Session: 37. Bacteremia, CLABSI, and Endovascular Infections

Thursday, October 3, 2019: 12:15 PM

Background. Rapid diagnostic testing (RDT) technology in bloodstream infections (BSI) has outpaced provider understanding of how to effectively use it. To optimize the use of RDT platforms and antibiotic therapy, decision makers must determine which RDTs to implement at their institutions. A thorough understanding of which platform to choose extends beyond simple analytic measures of sensitivities and specificities and should include a robust analysis of how these RDTs could impact clinical decisions.

Methods. Retrospective study of adult patients with Gram-negative (GN) BSI from at University of Maryland Medical Center. The clinical microbiology laboratory used Verigene® BC-GN in clinical practice. Discarded blood samples were run on BioFire® FilmArray BCID. Final organism identification/susceptibility, antibiotic exposures, and clinical outcomes were reviewed. DOOR was applied to theoretical therapy decisions based on both actual prescribing adherence to institutional algorithm recommendations; 1 being most and 6 being least desirable (Table 1). A partial credit scoring system was applied to DOOR from most (100) to least desirable (0) outcome. Comparisons were made in a paired manner.

Results. 77 patients met inclusion. The median age was 58 (IQR 47, 68), 44.2% were in the ICU, and 75.3% had ID consult within 24 hours of BSI. Organism identification included: E. coli (35.1%), K. pneumoniae (23.4%), P. mirabilis (10.4%), S. marcescens (10.4%), Enterobacter spp. (9.4%), P. aeruginosa (3.9%). The only resistance determinant was CTX-M (11.6%). An antibiotic change occurred in 26.2% of cases, divided between antibiotic escalation and de-escalation. Based on the actual utilization of RDT results, median DOOR was not different between BC-GN and BCID (3 [IQR 3.4] vs. 4 [IQR 3.4], P = 0.44). Using a partial credit scoring system, the mean score was not different between platforms (49.8 [SD 26.8] vs. 47.7 [SD 20.3], P = 0.44). Through pairwise comparisons, BC-GN would have resulted in an optimal outcome of 15.3% (95% CI 4.7% to 19.3%) more often than BCID.

Conclusion. Based on the actual use of RDTs for GN BSI there was no difference in potential clinical outcomes between platforms in this relatively small sample. DOOR is a novel mechanism to quantitate clinical utility and compare RDTs.

Rank	Outcome
1	Escalation to effective therapy
2	De-escalation to effective therapy
3	No change, empiric therapy optimal
4	No change, empiric therapy effective
5	Inappropriate escalation to effective therapy
6	Inappropriate de-escalation or change to ineffective therapy

Disclosures. All authors: No reported disclosures.

## 152. Brevibacterium species: Case Series and Literature Review of an Emerging **Opportunistic Cause of Bloodstream Infections**

FNU Shweta, MBBS; Pooja Gurram, MBBS; Sarwat Khalil, MBBS; Kyle Rodino, PhD and John C. O'Horo, Sr., MD, MPH; Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota

## Session: 37. Bacteremia, CLABSI, and Endovascular Infections Thursday, October 3, 2019: 12:15 PM

Brevibacterium species are non-motile, catalase-positive, obli-Background. gate aerobic gram-positive bacilli. Colonies are yellow to gray-white, non-hemolytic, smooth, 6.5% sodium chloride tolerant. B. fermentans post neurosurgical meningitis was first described in 1969 in an infant. B. casei remains the most commonly isolated species (Table 4). The most commonly reported syndromes are bloodstream infections (BSIs) and endocarditis. Despite these reports, this organism continues to be listed on CDC's NHSN commensal database.

Methods. Isolates of Brevibacterium from clinical samples at Mayo Clinic, Rochester from January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2018 were identified. Charts were reviewed to determine patient demographics, immune status, source of culture, comorbidities, antibiotic susceptibility test (AST), length of stay (LOS) in hospital and intensive care unit (ICU), and mortality. Likelihood ratio (L-R) and Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) of nominal data were calculated using the Chi-square test and Fischer exact test (FET). We defined statistical significance as  $P \le 0.05$ .

Results. We identified 48 isolates from 45 unique patients, 46% were females. Distribution of age, hospital and ICU LOS, and time to culture growth, and AST data are shown in Table 1. 15.5% patients received allogeneic or autologous stem cell (SCT), or solid-organ transplant (SOT) recipients. 89% cultures were from sterile sources and 68.75% were blood cultures. Of these, 63.64% were monomicrobial. 62% of isolates identified to species level were B. casei. 5 patients were treated; an additional 10 received active antibiotics for other indications. Statistically significant variables are reported in Tables 2 and 3. Thirty-day mortality was 13%. This was higher in patients with bacteremia (L-R: 5.3 [P = 0.02]) but FET was not statistically significance (P = 0.15).

Conclusion. Accurate diagnosis of Brevibacterium may require molecular techniques. At our center, SCT or SOT recipient status and recent chemotherapy were associated with bacteremia. In these patients, this organism could represent an opportunistic cause of BSI. AST data suggest that Vancomycin offers a reasonable empiric treatment option. Additional data are needed to further define host populations in whom this organism presents pathogenicity.

#### Table 1: Secondary Variables and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test Results

Parameter	Unit	Median	Interquartile Range
Age	Years	59	51 – 72
Hospital Length of Stay (LOS)	Days	6	4 - 17
Intensive Care Unit LOS	Days	1	0-2.5
Time to Growth	Hours	57	46.25 - 85.5
Antibiotic	Susceptible (%)	Intermediate (%)	Resistant (%)
Antibiotic Vancomycin	Susceptible (%) 7/7 (100)	Intermediate (%) 0	Resistant (%) 0
Antibiotic Vancomycin Penicillin	Susceptible (%)   7/7 (100)   2/7 (28.5)	Intermediate (%) 0 4/7 (57)	Resistant (%) 0 1/7 (14)
Antibiotic Vancomycin Penicillin Ceftriaxone	Susceptible (%)   7/7 (100)   2/7 (28.5)   2/7 (28.5)	Intermediate (%) 0 4/7 (57) 2/7 (28.5)	Resistant (%) 0 1/7 (14) 3/7 (43)
Antibiotic Vancomycin Penicillin Ceftriaxone Meropenem	Susceptible (%)   7/7 (100)   2/7 (28.5)   2/7 (28.5)   6/7 (86)	Intermediate (%)   0   4/7 (57)   2/7 (28.5)   1/7 (14)	Resistant (%) 0 1/7 (14) 3/7 (43) 0

Minimum Inhibitory Concentration calculated and interpreted according to current CLSI Breakpoints

# **Table 2: Likelihood of Bacteremia by Transplant Status**

Count Total % Col % Row %	Other Source of Positive Culture	Blood Culture	Total
	15	23	
No	33.33	51.11	38
Transplant	100.00	76.67	84.44
	39.47	60.53	
	0	7	
Trancolant	0.00	15.56	7
Transpiant	0.00	23.33	15.56
	0.00	100.00	
Total	15	30	45
I I UI AI			
	33.33	66.67	-10
Test	33.33	66.67 Chi	P -
Test	33.33	66.67 Chi Square	P - value
Test Likelihood Rat	33.33 tio	66.67 Chi Square 6.304	P - value 0.0120