

(Research Grant or Support)Merck (Research Grant or Support)Pfizer (Research Grant or Support)

1630. What is Treatment Time Zero Among Hospitalized Patients with Bacteremia?

Aisling Caffrey, PhD¹; Vrishali Lopes, MS²; ¹Rhode Island Infectious Diseases Research Program, Providence, RI; ²PVAMC, Providence, RI

Session: P-71. Treatment of Antimicrobial Resistant Infections

Background. Common operational definitions of antibiotic exposures in infectious diseases research do not accurately reflect actual treatment, as daily changes in clinical presentation (i.e. improvement, worsening) and clinical information (i.e. causative organism, susceptibilities) lead to frequent changes in treatment, both within empiric and definitive treatment periods. Common definitions create periods of 'ignored' exposures, and we've previously shown that antibiotic treatments during 'ignored' periods vary widely. Therefore, we assessed the distribution of important time points for antibiotic treatments for *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia.

Methods. Our retrospective cohort study included hospital admissions in the national Veterans Affairs (VA) Healthcare System with *S. aureus* positive blood cultures from 2010 to 2018. Admissions with inappropriate initial antibiotic therapy for *S. aureus* were excluded. We implemented daily exposure mapping to identify antibiotic exposures and changes in treatment on each day of the admission until discharge, or 30 days post-admission for longer stays, and in relation to the culture final report date.

Results. We identified 21,947 admissions meeting our inclusion criteria. Antibiotic initiation most often occurred on the culture collection date (68.7%) or the day after (22.6%). Median time to the culture final report date from the culture collection date was 4 days (interquartile range [IQR] 3 to 5). Among those with changes in therapy (n=19,392, 88.4%), median time to first change in therapy was 2 days prior to the culture final report date (IQR -3 to -1). The first change in therapy occurred before the culture final report date for 76.3% of admissions and on the culture final report date for 11.9% of admissions. Further changes were common on the culture final report date (49.5%) and the day after the final report date (45.3%).

Conclusion. Changes in antibiotic therapy are common prior to finalization of culture reports. While initial culture results and provider knowledge of these initial results are not date/time-stamped, initial change within a reasonable period from culture collection appears to be more accurate in defining empiric and definitive treatment periods than commonly used operational definitions.

Disclosures. Aisling Caffrey, PhD, Merck (Research Grant or Support)Pfizer (Research Grant or Support)Shionogi (Research Grant or Support)

1631. Mycobacterium septicum: A 6-year Clinical Experience from a Tertiary Hospital and Reference Laboratory

John Raymond U. Go, MD¹; Cristina G. Corsini Campioli, MD²; Omar Abu Saleh, M.B.B.S²; John Wilson, MD¹; Sharon Deml, MT¹; Nancy Wengenack, PhD¹; ¹Mayo Clinic Rochester, Rochester, Minnesota; ²Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota

Session: P-72. Tuberculosis and other Mycobacterial Infections

Background. *Mycobacterium septicum* is a rapidly growing non-tuberculous mycobacterium. It is a ubiquitous organism capable of causing infections in both healthy and immunocompromised individuals. Only a few cases have been reported to date, and standard therapeutic regimens, and optimal treatment duration have not been defined.

Methods. We conducted a retrospective chart review of all patients seen at Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN from July 2014 to March 2020 from whom *Mycobacterium septicum* was isolated in culture by our clinical microbiology laboratory.

Results. There were 12 patients identified with *M. septicum* infection – 7 males and 5 females. The average age was 67 years, with an age range of 48 to 80 years. Seven of 12 isolates obtained were from sputum samples. Only one patient was on immunosuppressive medication. Three cases were considered clinically significant infections for which directed anti-mycobacterial therapy was instituted. In two of these three cases, co-infection with *Mycobacterium avium complex* (MAC) was seen. Underlying structural lung disease was present in the two cases of pulmonary infections. Peritoneal dialysis catheter-related peritonitis was seen in the third case. All the isolates were susceptible to amikacin, ciprofloxacin, imipenem, linezolid, moxifloxacin, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX). The isolates were resistant to clarithromycin and doxycycline.

Patient Characteristics, Associated *M. septicum* Illness, and Therapy Provided

Case #	Age (y)	Sex	Site of Infection	Immunosuppression	Structural Lung Disease	Diagnosis	Therapy	Outcome
1	78F	Female	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
2	78F	Female	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
3	48M	Male	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
4	74M	Male	Peritoneal	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
5	78F	Female	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
6	78F	Female	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
7	80F	Female	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
8	78F	Female	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
9	78F	Female	Shoulder	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
10	78M	Male	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
11	80F	Female	Site not specified	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived
12	78F	Female	Lung	No	No	<i>M. septicum</i>	None	Survived

Immunosuppression: steroids and/or other immunosuppressive agent use

Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profiles of the Mycobacterium septicum Isolates, MIC (mcg/mL) and Interpretation

Isolate	Amikacin	Clarithromycin	Ciprofloxacin	Clarithromycin	Doxycycline	Imipenem	Linezolid	Moxifloxacin	Moxifloxacin	Spiramycin	Tobramycin	TMP-SMX
1	4 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	2 (S)	2 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
2	2 (S)	64 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
3	2 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
4	4 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
5	2 (S)	128 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	2 (S)	2 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
6	2 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
7	2 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
8	2 (S)	64 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
9	4 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
10	2 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
11	4 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)
12	2 (S)	32 (I)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	≤0.12 (S)	4 (S)	4 (S)	≤0.25 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.06 (S)	≤0.25 (S)

% susceptibility	Amikacin	Clarithromycin	Ciprofloxacin	Clarithromycin	Doxycycline	Imipenem	Linezolid	Moxifloxacin	Moxifloxacin	Spiramycin	Tobramycin	TMP-SMX
Mycobacterium septicum (n=12)	100	0	100	0	0	100	100	0	100	N	100	100

S: susceptible, R: resistant, NI: no interpretation, ND: not done, MIC: minimum inhibitory concentration

Patient Demographics and Specimen Source of Mycobacterium septicum Isolates

Characteristic	Number (%)
Patient demographics	
Mean age (range), years	66.9 (48-80)
Male	7 (58.3%)
Female	5 (41.7%)
Specimen source	
Sputum	7 (58.3)
Tissue	
Lymph node	1 (8.3)
Leg	1 (8.3)
Shoulder	1 (8.3)
Calf	1 (8.3)
Peritoneal fluid	1 (8.3)

Conclusion. *M. septicum* is an unusual cause of non-tuberculous mycobacterial infection. The presence of a foreign body may increase the risk of infection. Individuals with underlying structural lung disease are also likely to be at increased risk of developing pulmonary infection. Generalized treatment recommendations are limited by the lack of prospective controlled trials; hence, optimal antibiotic regimen and treatment duration have not been firmly established. Susceptibility testing should be performed to guide treatment selection, but the use of combination therapy with potentially empiric agents like amikacin, ciprofloxacin, imipenem, linezolid, moxifloxacin, and TMP-SMX as demonstrated in this small study, can be considered. A high rate of macrolide resistance was noted in our study.

Disclosures. All Authors: No reported disclosures

1632. Comparing the epidemiology and clinical characteristics of childhood tuberculosis through active and passive case finding

Saki Ikeda, MD¹; Andrea T. Cruz, MD, MPH²; Jeffrey R. Starke, MD³; ¹Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX; ²Pediatrics, Houston, Texas; ³Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas

Session: P-72. Tuberculosis and other Mycobacterial Infections

Background. Childhood tuberculosis can be found via passive case finding (PCF), diagnosing a symptomatic child, and active case finding (ACF), discovering a child through contact tracing. Most high prevalence areas perform PCF, but as ACF is introduced, the clinical and radiologic findings may differ. We compare clinical, radiographic, microbiologic and epidemiological characteristics of children diagnosed through PCF and ACF.

Methods. A retrospective cohort study of all patients diagnosed with TB from 01/01/2012-12/31/2019 at Texas Children's Hospital. ACF is TB in a child who had not previously sought care before identified via contact tracing, immigration screening, or screening for incarceration. Severity of disease was based on location of illness, imaging and bacteriology/histopathology. Associations between PCF/ACF and demographics, disease severity, and microbiology were analyzed.

Results. Of 178 patients, 80 (45%) were diagnosed via ACF. ACF patients were more likely to be US-born (OR: 2.29, [95% Confidence interval (CI): 1.12-4.67]) and younger (mean 6.18 vs 8.84 years, p= 0.016). Only 2.5% of ACF patients had extrapulmonary disease, compared to 45% of the PCF group (p< 0.0001). All 14 severe extrathoracic cases were in the PCF group (10 central nervous system disease, 3 ocular disease, 1 spondylitis). Fewer patients in the ACF group had severe intrathoracic findings (11% vs 39%, p< 0.001): miliary disease (0% vs 10%, p=0.006), cavity (1% vs 9%, p=0.04), and multilobar involvement (7.5% vs 22.4%, p=0.006). ACF patients had more hilar/mediastinal adenopathy (OR: 2.51, [CI: 1.34-3.72], p=0.004). ACF patients were less often cultured (38% vs 89%, p< 0.0001) and had less microbiological confirmation by cultures or PCR (21% vs 52%, p< 0.0001).

Conclusion. Patients in the ACF group were younger, had less severe clinical manifestations, and had almost no extrathoracic disease. Clinicians need to be aware that the common clinical and radiographic presentations in children differ between PCF and ACF.

Disclosures. Jeffrey R. Starke, MD, Otsuka Pharmaceuticals (Other Financial or Material Support, Member, Data Safety Monitoring Board)