



Title	Clinical outcomes of intervention for carbapenems and anti-methicillin-resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> antibiotics by an antimicrobial stewardship team
Author(s)	Kagami, Keisuke; Ishiguro, Nobuhisa; Yamada, Takehiro; Niinuma, Yusuke; Iwasaki, Sumio; Taki, Keisuke; Fukumoto, Tatsuya; Hayasaka, Kasumi; Nishida, Mutsumi; Sugita, Junichi; Teshima, Takanori; Sugawara, Mitsuru; Takekuma, Yoh
Citation	American Journal of Infection Control, 49(12), 1493-1498 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2021.08.011
Issue Date	2021-12
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/87379
Rights	© 2021. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Rights(URL)	http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Type	article (author version)
File Information	Kagami K et al. Am. J. Infect. Control 49, 1493-8, 2021.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

1 Clinical outcomes of intervention for carbapenems and anti-methicillin-resistant
2 *Staphylococcus aureus* antibiotics by an antimicrobial stewardship team

3

4 Keisuke Kagami, Ph.D.^{a,b}, Nobuhisa Ishiguro, M.D., Ph.D.^b, Takehiro Yamada, Ph.D.^{a,b},
5 ¹, Yusuke Niinuma, B.S.^{a,b}, Sumio Iwasaki, B.S.^{b,c}, Keisuke Taki, M.S.^{b,c, 2}, Tatsuya
6 Fukumoto, Ph.D.^{b,c}, Kasumi Hayasaka^{b,c}, Mutsumi Nishida, Ph.D.^c, Junichi Sugita,
7 M.D., Ph.D.^{c,d}, Takanori Teshima, M.D., Ph.D.^{c,d}, Mitsuru Sugawara, Ph.D.^{a,e}, Yoh
8 Takekuma, Ph.D.^{a,*}

9

10 ^aDepartment of Pharmacy, Hokkaido University Hospital; Kita-14-jo, Nishi-5-chome,
11 Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-8648, Japan

12 ^bDepartment of Infection Control and Prevention, Hokkaido University Hospital;
13 Kita-14-jo, Nishi-5-chome, Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-8648, Japan

14 ^cDivision of Laboratory and Transfusion Medicine, Hokkaido University Hospital;
15 Kita-14-jo, Nishi-5-chome, Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-8648, Japan

16 ^dDepartment of Hematology, Faculty of Medicine, Hokkaido University; Kita-15-jo,
17 Nishi-7-chome, Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-8638, Japan

18 ^eLaboratory of Pharmacokinetics, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Hokkaido

1 University; Kita-12-jo, Nishi-6-chome, Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-0812, Japan

2

3 ¹Current institution;

4 Faculty of Pharmacy, Hokkaido University of Science; 7-Jo, 15-4-1 Maeda, Teine,

5 Sapporo 006-8585, Japan

6

7 ²Current institution;

8 Department of Clinical Laboratory, Sapporo Teishinkai Hospital; 3-1, Kita-33-jo,

9 Higashi-1-chome, Higashi-ku, Sapporo 065-0033, Japan

10

11 *Corresponding Author

12 Yoh Takekuma, Ph.D.

13 Department of Pharmacy, Hokkaido University Hospital; Kita-14-jo, Nishi-5-chome,

14 Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-8648, Japan

15 Tel: +81-11-706-5754; Fax: +81-11-706-7616; E-mail:y-kuma@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp

16

17 **Conflict of Interest**

18 All authors have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that

1 could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

2

3

4 **Abstract**

5 *Background:* There are no reports on the effects of interventions, such as
6 discontinuation and change/de-escalation of carbapenems and anti-methicillin-resistant
7 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) antibiotics by an antimicrobial stewardship team
8 focusing on detailed patient outcomes. This study aimed to evaluate these effects.

9 *Methods:* This retrospective cohort study was conducted at a tertiary care hospital from
10 December 2018 to November 2019.

11 *Results:* Favorable clinical responses were obtained in 165/184 cases (89.7%) in the
12 intervention-accepted group, higher than those in the not accepted group (14/19 cases,
13 73.7%; P=0.056). All-cause 30-day mortality was lower in the accepted group than in
14 the not accepted group (1.1% and 10.5%, respectively; P=0.045). The microbiological
15 outcomes were similar between the two groups. Duration of carbapenem and
16 anti-MRSA antibiotic use in the accepted group was significantly lower than that in the
17 not accepted group (median [interquartile range]: 8 days [5-13] versus 14 days [8-15],
18 respectively, P=0.026 for carbapenem; 10 days [5.3-15] versus 15.5 days [13.8-45.3],
19 respectively, P=0.014 for anti-MRSA antibiotic).

1 *Conclusion:* This is the first study to investigate the effects of interventions such as
2 discontinuation and change/de-escalation of antibiotics on detailed outcomes. Our
3 intervention could reduce the duration of carbapenem and anti-MRSA antibiotic use
4 without worsening clinical and microbiological outcomes.

5

6 Keywords: Antimicrobial stewardship team; Carbapenem; Methicillin-resistant
7 *Staphylococcus aureus*; Outcome; Antibiotic use

8

9

10 Highlights

11 Carbapenem and anti-MRSA antibiotic intervention showed 89.7% favorable outcome.

12 Carbapenem and anti-MRSA antibiotic intervention could reduce the antibiotic uses.

13 Discontinuation and de-escalation of antibiotics did not worsen clinical outcomes.

14

15

16

17

18 **Introduction**

19 Increasing antibiotic consumption has become a critical global issue.¹⁻³ The
20 unnecessary and inappropriate use of antibiotics has led to the emergence of resistant
21 bacteria, thereby creating difficulty in treating infections.¹⁻³ Antibiotic resistance extends

1 hospital stay and increases medical costs.³ In addition, unnecessary antibiotic use also
2 increases medical expenditure.²

3 To solve these problems, implementation of antimicrobial stewardship programs
4 (ASP) has been recommended.⁴⁻⁷ The Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA)
5 and Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA) guidelines have
6 recommended “formulary restriction and pre-authorization” and “prospective audit and
7 feedback (PAF)” as strategies of ASP.^{4,5} Several studies have reported that
8 implementation of ASP promotes appropriate antibiotic use,⁸⁻¹⁰ prevents or delays
9 emergence of resistant bacteremia,¹¹⁻¹⁵ and reduces hospital stay^{12,16,17} and medical
10 expenditure.¹⁸⁻²⁰

11 Some studies have demonstrated the efficacy and safety of ASP by evaluating the
12 relationship between antibiotic use and clinical outcomes. For example, ASP, including
13 recommendations for antibiotic discontinuation and change, reduced both antibiotic use
14 and length of hospital stay.⁷ In addition, intervention for meropenem²¹ or broad-spectrum
15 antibiotics²² decreased the use of antibiotics without increasing mortality. However, most
16 studies on ASP have evaluated outcomes by 30-day mortality or length of hospital stay
17 and have not investigated individual detailed clinical and microbiological outcomes.^{7,16,22}

18 To our knowledge, there are no reports on the effects of interventions, such as

1 discontinuation and change/de-escalation of carbapenems and anti-methicillin-resistant
2 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) antibiotics, focusing on individual clinical response and
3 microbiological outcomes. The present study aimed to evaluate the effects of intervention
4 for these antibiotics on the detailed clinical and microbiological outcomes and duration of
5 antibiotic use.

6

7 **Patients and methods**

8

9 *Study Design and intervention*

10 This retrospective cohort study was conducted at a 939-bed tertiary care medical
11 center. The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the institution where
12 the present study was conducted (Institutional Review Board number: 019-0120) and
13 was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The requirement for
14 informed consent was waived because of the retrospective observational nature of the
15 study. This study was conducted using the opt-out method on our hospital website. Data
16 of patients treated with carbapenems and/or anti-MRSA antibiotics between December
17 2018 and November 2019 were obtained for the present study from the medical charts.

18 Antimicrobial stewardship team (AST) pharmacists reviewed all cases where

1 carbapenem and/or anti-MRSA antibiotic were used, with a focus on their doses, duration
2 of use, culture results, infection sites, therapeutic effects, and adverse effects. The
3 reviews were performed from the start of treatment with the target antibiotics on
4 weekdays. The reviewed carbapenems included meropenem, doripenem, and
5 imipenem/cilastatin, which are intravenous carbapenems administered in our hospital.
6 The reviewed anti-MRSA antibiotics included vancomycin, teicoplanin, linezolid,
7 tedizolid, daptomycin, and arbekacin. Oral antibiotics linezolid and tedizolid were also
8 reviewed. Data from patients admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) were excluded
9 from the review because our restriction and review systems were applied to patients in
10 general wards.

11 Inappropriate use of antibiotics found on the pharmacist's review was discussed with
12 AST members. The AST physician contacted prescribing physicians about the
13 inappropriate use and made suggestions, such as discontinuation, change of antibiotic,
14 de-escalation, change in dosage, addition of antibiotics, and/or addition of examination
15 (blood, bacterial, and imaging tests). In addition to these suggestions, we checked the
16 patients' status and/or provided information, such as side effects, to the physician. The
17 status of patients identified in our review was checked by discussions with the
18 prescribing physicians; there were no suggestions. These reviews and interventions, i. e.

1 PAF, were performed every weekday.

2 In our ASP, antibiotic discontinuation was recommended when the course of therapy,
3 defined by guidelines, such as the Sanford guide to antimicrobial therapy,²³ was
4 completed, and further antibiotic treatment was considered unnecessary due to sufficient
5 improvement. De-escalation was recommended based on bacterial information, including
6 minimum inhibitory concentrations, according to the following criteria: (1) severity was
7 clinically improved, (2) other infection sites were excluded, and (3) febrile neutropenia
8 was not continued.²⁴ Changes in antibiotics, such as change in anti-MRSA antibiotics,
9 were recommended based on bacterial information or development of side effects, such
10 as renal failure, thrombocytopenia, or increased levels of creatine kinase.

11

12 *Data collection*

13 The following data during the study period were extracted from the medical charts:
14 age, sex, admission to the intensive care unit (ICU), surgery within 30 days, Sequential
15 Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score, underlying disease, site of infection,
16 concomitant drugs, whole blood cells (WBC), C-reactive protein (CRP), body
17 temperature (BT), length of hospital stay, duration of antibiotic treatment, and bacterial
18 information.

1

2 *Definition of outcome*

3 A favorable clinical response was defined as the resolution or partial resolution of the
4 presenting symptoms and signs of infection. Clinical failure was defined as the
5 persistence or worsening of symptoms and/or signs of infection. The clinical response
6 was evaluated based on leukocytosis, inflammation, fever, and local signs.
7 Microbiological persistence was defined as persistent detection of the same
8 microorganisms and sources during antibiotic therapy. Microbiological recurrence was
9 defined as the detection of the same microorganisms and sources within 30 days after
10 discontinuation of antibiotic therapy. The outcomes were compared between the groups
11 where the AST recommendation was accepted and that was not accepted.

12

13 *Statistical analysis*

14 In the statistical analyses of the characteristics and patient outcomes, categorical
15 variables were compared using Fisher's exact test, and continuous variables were
16 compared using the Mann-Whitney *U* test. Changes in WBC, CRP, and BT data were
17 compared using Wilcoxon signed-rank test. Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$.
18 The calculations were performed using JMP Pro version 14 (SAS Institute Inc., Japan) or

1 GraphPad Prism version 5 (GraphPad Software Inc., San Diego, CA, USA).

2

3 **Results**

4

5 *Intervention*

6 During the study period, the total number of patients treated with carbapenem was
7 673 (Table 1). Among these cases, we performed interventions for 144 cases (21.4%) and
8 made recommendations for 98 cases, of which 89 (90.8%) were accepted. With regard to
9 anti-MRSA antibiotics, the total number of patients was 710. We performed interventions
10 in 195 cases (27.5%). Among them, we made recommendations for 146 cases and 136
11 cases (93.2 %) were accepted.

12

1 Table 1 Intervention for carbapenem and anti-MRSA antibiotic uses by AST.

2

Interventions	Carbapenem use		Anti-MRSA antibiotic use	
	(n=673)		(n=710)	
	Intervention		Accepted	
	n (%)	(%)	n (%)	(%)
Recommendation				
Choice of antibiotic				
Discontinuation of antibiotic	39 (5.8)	92.3	50 (7)	92.0
Change/de-escalation of antibiotic	47 (7)	87.2	34 (4.8)	88.2
Addition of antibiotic	0 (0)	-	13 (1.8)	100
Dose adjustment				
Increase of dosage	6 (0.9)	100	9 (1.3)	77.8
Decrease of dosage	0 (0)	-	5 (0.7)	100
Others				
Recommendation of TDM	- -	-	16 (2.3)	100
Addition of examination	5 (0.7)	100	17 (2.4)	100
Others	1 (0.2)	100	2 (0.3)	100
Checking patients' status	39 (5.8)	-	42 (5.9)	-
Providing information	7 (1)	-	7 (1)	-
Total	144 (21.4)	89/98 (90.8)	195 (27.5)	136/146 (93.2)

3

4 Abbreviations: AST, antimicrobial stewardship team; MRSA, methicillin-resistant

5 *Staphylococcus aureus*; TDM, therapeutic drug monitoring.

6

1 *Population*

2 Table 2 shows characteristics of the patients in which AST recommendation was
3 done during the study period. In the analysis of the effect of our ASP, AST
4 recommendations included the choice of antibiotic and dose adjustment and excluded
5 elements, such as recommendation of TDM or examination, because the recommendation
6 of TDM and examinations were considered to be indirectly associated with clinical
7 outcome. Characteristics of patients between accepted and not accepted groups were
8 almost similar except for the proportion of hematological malignancy, febrile neutropenia,
9 and concomitant therapy.

10

1 Table 2 Characteristics of the patients in which AST recommendation^a was done.

2

Characteristic	Accepted (n=184)	Not accepted (n=19)	P value
Age (year)	62 (43.5-71)	61 (55-65)	0.43
Sex (Men)	106 (57.6)	9 (47.4)	0.468
Admission to ICU within previous 30 days	43 (23.4)	1 (5.3)	0.081
Surgery within previous 30 days	57 (31)	3 (15.8)	0.197
SOFA score	2 (1-4)	4 (1-9)	0.064
Underlying condition			
Hypertension	40 (21.7)	7 (36.8)	0.156
Diabetes mellitus	25 (13.6)	3 (15.8)	0.731
Cardiovascular disease	48 (26.1)	2 (10.5)	0.169
Respiratory failure	17 (9.2)	2 (10.5)	0.694
COPD	2 (1.1)	1 (5.3)	0.257
Chronic renal insufficiency	15 (8.2)	2 (10.5)	0.664
Liver disease	19 (10.3)	3 (15.8)	0.441
Hepatic cirrhosis	7 (3.8)	0 (0)	1
Urogenital disorders	4 (2.2)	0 (0)	1
Cerebrovascular disease	24 (13)	2 (10.5)	1
HIV infection	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	1
Hematological malignancy	20 (10.9)	9 (47.4)	<0.001
Solid malignancy	77 (41.8)	5 (26.3)	0.226
Transplantation (solid)	8 (4.3)	0 (0)	1
Infection			
Intra-abdominal infection	59 (32.1)	4 (21.1)	0.438
Catheter-related blood stream infection	32 (17.4)	3 (15.8)	1
Urinary tract infection	21 (11.4)	3 (15.8)	0.477
Soft tissue infection	19 (10.3)	0 (0)	0.226
Febrile neutropenia	10 (5.4)	5 (26.3)	0.007
Osteomyelitis	13 (7.1)	0 (0)	0.616
Respiratory tract infection	9 (4.9)	3 (15.8)	0.089

Blood stream infection	7 (3.8)	0 (0)	1
Central nervous system infection	5 (2.7)	1 (5.3)	0.45
Others	6 (3.3)	0 (0)	1
Cardiovascular infections	3 (1.6)	0 (0)	1
Concomitant therapy			
Monotherapy	103 (56)	5 (26.3)	0.016
Bi-therapy	49 (26.6)	5 (26.3)	1
Three-therapy	26 (14.1)	7 (36.8)	0.019
Four-therapy	4 (2.2)	2 (10.5)	0.099
Five-therapy	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	1
Six-therapy	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	1
Days from start of carbapenem or anti-MRSA antibiotic to intervention	6 (2-11.8)	6 (4-9)	0.721

1

2 Data are presented as numbers (%) or medians (interquartile ranges).

3 ^a Recommendation includes choice of antibiotic and dose adjustment and excludes others

4 such as recommendation of therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) and addition of

5 examination.

6 Abbreviations: AST, antimicrobial stewardship team; ICU, intensive care unit; SOFA,

7 Sequential Organ Failure Assessment; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease;

8 HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*

9 *aureus*.

1 *Intervention based on target bacteria*

2 Table 3 shows AST recommendations based on target bacteria. In intervention for
3 carbapenem and anti-MRSA antibiotic uses, the most frequently conducted de-escalation
4 was change to cefmetazole for *Escherichia coli* (including extended-spectrum
5 β -lactamase producing type) (7 cases) and change to cefazolin for methicillin-sensitive
6 *Staphylococcus aureus* (4 cases), respectively. In intervention for anti-MRSA biotic use,
7 in addition to de-escalation, change to other anti-MRSA antibiotic or addition of
8 anti-MRSA antibiotic for methicillin-resistant coagulase-negative Staphylococci or
9 *Corynebacterium* species were performed frequently.

1 Table 3 AST recommendation (change/de-escalation and addition of antibiotics) based on target bacteria.

2

Bacteria	n	(%)	Accepted (n=184)								Not accepted (n=19)						
			Changed/de-escalation to (n)									Addition (n)	Changed/de-escalation to (n)				
			AMPC	ABPC	CEZ	CMZ	CTRX	CAZ	CPZ/SBT	CFPM	Anti-MRSA antibiotics		CEZ	CMZ	CTRX	CFPM	Anti-MRSA antibiotics
Intervention for carbapenem use																	
MSSA	2	(6.5)			2												
MSCNS	1	(3.2)											1				
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>	1	(3.2)							1								
<i>Bacteroides fragilis</i>	1	(3.2)				1											
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	1	(3.2)	1														
<i>Enterococcus gallinarum</i>	1	(3.2)								1							
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	10	(32.3)			4	4	1			1							
<i>Escherichia coli</i> (ESBL)	3	(9.7)				3											
<i>Haemophilus influenzae</i> (β-lactamase (-))	1	(3.2)												1			
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	2	(6.5)								1					1		
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> (ESBL)	2	(6.5)				1							1				
<i>Peptostreptococcus</i> species	1	(3.2)				1											
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	5	(16.1)					3	1	1								
Total	31	(100)	1		6	10	1	3	1	4	1		1	1	1	1	

Intervention for anti-MRSA antibiotic use

MSSA	4 (8.7)	4					
MRSA	3 (6.5)			1	1		1
MSCNS	1 (2.2)	1					
MRCNS	20 (43.5)			15	5		
<i>Corynebacterium</i> species	11 (23.9)			5	6		
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	1 (2.2)	1					
<i>Enterococcus faecium</i>	4 (8.7)			3	1		
<i>Enterococcus gallinarum</i>	1 (2.2)			1			
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> (ESBL)	1 (2.2)					1	
Total	46 (100)	1	5	25	13	1	1

1

2 Abbreviations: AST, antimicrobial stewardship team; AMPC, amoxicillin; ABPC, ampicillin; CEZ, cefazolin; CMZ, cefmetazole; CTRX,
 3 ceftriaxone; CAZ, ceftazidime; CPZ/SBT, cefoperazone/sulbactam; CFPM, cefepime; MSSA, methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus*;
 4 MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; MSCNS: methicillin-susceptible coagulase-negative Staphylococci; MRCNS,
 5 methicillin-resistant coagulase-negative Staphylococci; ESBL, extended-spectrum β -lactamase.

6

1 *Changes in WBC, CRP, and BT*

2 In the accepted group, WBC, CRP, and BT were significantly decreased one week
3 after the intervention ($P < 0.001$, respectively) (Table 4). In the not accepted group,
4 although CRP and BT were numerically decreased one week after intervention, there
5 were no significant differences.

6

7

1 Table 4 Changes in WBC, CRP, and BT of the patients in which AST recommendation^a
 2 was done.

3

	At the time of intervention	1 week after intervention	P value
Accepted (n=184)			
WBC (/μL)	7150 (4400-10100)	5800 (4200-8250)	<0.001
CRP (mg/dL)	2.5 (1.1-7.9)	1.1 (0.4-3)	<0.001
BT (°C)	37.1 (36.7-37.5)	36.8 (36.6-37.1)	<0.001
Not accepted (n=19)			
WBC (/μL)	4800 (2275-7975)	6000 (3350-7150)	0.954
CRP (mg/dL)	2.2 (0.9-5.3)	0.8 (0.3-3.5)	0.202
BT (°C)	37.5 (37-37.8)	37.1 (36.8-37.6)	0.338

4

5 Data are presented as medians (interquartile ranges).

6 ^a Recommendation includes choice of antibiotic and dose adjustment and excludes others
 7 such as recommendation of therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) and addition of
 8 examination.

9 Abbreviations: AST, antimicrobial stewardship team; WBC, whole blood cells; CRP,
 10 C-reactive protein; BT, body temperature.

11

12

1 *Outcomes*

2 Favorable clinical responses were obtained in 165 out of 184 cases (89.7%) in the
3 accepted group, which was higher than those in the not accepted group (14/19 cases,
4 73.7%; P=0.056) (Table 5). In addition, all-cause 30-day mortality was lower in the
5 accepted group than in the not accepted group (1.1% and 10.5%, respectively; P=0.045).
6 However, there was no significant difference in the infection-related 30-day mortality
7 between the accepted and not accepted groups (0.5% and 0%, respectively; P=1). The
8 microbiological outcomes were similar between the two groups. The median length of
9 hospital stay in the accepted and not accepted groups was 64 days (interquartile range
10 [IQR] 44-134) and 88 days (IQR 48-171), respectively; P=0.538. Duration of
11 carbapenem and anti-MRSA antibiotic use in the accepted group was significantly lower
12 than that in the not accepted group (median [IQR], 8 days [5-13] versus 14 days [8-15],
13 respectively; P=0.026 for carbapenem and 10 days [5.3-15] versus 15.5 days [13.8-45.3],
14 respectively; P=0.014 for anti-MRSA antibiotic).

15

16

1 Table 5 Outcomes of the patients in which AST recommendation^a was done.

2

Outcome	Accepted (n=184)	Not accepted (n=19)	P value
Clinical and microbiological outcome			
Favorable clinical response	165/184 (89.7)	14/19 (73.7)	0.056
All-cause 30-day mortality	2/184 (1.1)	2/19 (10.5)	0.045
Infection-related 30-day mortality	1/184 (0.5)	0/19 (0)	1
Microbiological persistence	13/58 (22.4)	1/4 (25)	1
Microbiological recurrence	10/72 (13.9)	1/7 (14.3)	1
Length of hospital stay (day)	64 (44-134)	88 (48-171)	0.538
Duration of carbapenem use (day)	8 (5-13)	14 (8-15)	0.026
Duration of anti-MRSA antibiotic use (day)	10 (5.3-15)	15.5 (13.8-45.3)	0.014

3

4 Data are presented as numbers (%) or medians (interquartile ranges).

5 ^a Recommendation includes choice of antibiotic and dose adjustment and excludes others
6 such as recommendation of therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) and addition of
7 examination.

8 Abbreviations: AST, antimicrobial stewardship team; MRSA, methicillin-resistant
9 *Staphylococcus aureus*.

10

11

1 **Discussion**

2 To date, several studies regarding ASP, including recommendations for antibiotic
3 discontinuation, change/de-escalation, addition, and dose adjustment, have been reported.
4 ^{7,16,22,25} However, most of them have focused on antibiotic usage and have not
5 investigated individual detailed clinical and microbiological outcomes other than 30-day
6 mortality or length of hospital stay. To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate
7 the effects of interventions, such as discontinuation and change/de-escalation of
8 carbapenems and anti-MRSA antibiotics, on detailed clinical and microbiological
9 outcomes. Our results showed that our ASP could reduce the duration of carbapenem and
10 anti-MRSA antibiotic use without worsening clinical and microbiological outcomes.

11 In our interventions, frequent recommendations were discontinuation and change of
12 antibiotics (most frequent change for carbapenems was de-escalation), rather than
13 performing TDM, also in interventions for anti-MRSA antibiotics (Table 1). This trend
14 was consistent with other studies in which major recommendations were related to the
15 choice of antibiotics.^{7,22} A previous study investigated the safety and efficacy of
16 de-escalating antibiotics²⁶; *E. coli* was the most frequent pathogen, and
17 second-generation cephalosporins (cefotiam, cefmetazole, and flomoxef) were mostly
18 selected as definitive therapy, a trend consistent with our results (Table 3).

1 Several studies investigating the efficacy of ASP for broad-spectrum antibiotics,
2 including carbapenems, have reported that there was no significant difference in all-cause
3 and infection-related 30-day mortality between intervention and non-intervention groups,
4 although it decreased numerically by intervention.^{12,16,17,21,22} In contrast to these previous
5 studies, the all-cause 30-day mortality was significantly reduced by intervention in our
6 study (Table 5). A total of 4 patients died in two groups in the present study. In the
7 accepted group, a patient died of an underlying disease (solid malignancy) and another
8 patient died due to infection and an underlying disease (hematological malignancy). In
9 the not accepted group, 2 patients died due to an underlying disease (hematological or
10 solid malignancy). In the present study, severity of patients was numerically higher in
11 the not accepted group than in the accepted group (SOFA score 4 and 2, respectively;
12 $P=0.064$; Table 2). This might have been the cause of the higher all-cause mortality in
13 the not accepted group. In addition, there were few deaths in our study, which could
14 have introduced bias. When we analyzed mortality as infection-related, no difference
15 was found between the accepted and not accepted groups, consistent with the results of
16 the previous studies.^{12,16,17,21,22}

17 In the present study, higher favorable clinical responses were obtained by our
18 intervention, although the difference was not significant. In our study, the proportion of

1 hematological malignancy was higher in the intervention-not accepted group (Table 2),
2 which could be a confounding factor. However, even when hematological malignancy
3 was excluded from our population, similar trends were observed; that is, lower all-cause
4 mortality and higher favorable clinical responses were obtained by the intervention (data
5 not shown). Most studies regarding ASP, including recommendations such as antibiotic
6 discontinuation and change/de-escalation, have not investigated detailed clinical and
7 microbiological outcomes.^{12,16,17,21,22} These previous studies evaluated only mortality or
8 length of hospital stay as outcomes. However, our present study also evaluated the
9 clinical response, microbiological persistence and recurrence, and changes in WBC, CRP,
10 and BT. In our ASP, the interventions did not worsen the clinical and microbiological
11 outcomes. Furthermore, when interventions were divided categorically, discontinuation
12 and change (most were de-escalation in the case of carbapenems) also did not worsen the
13 outcomes (data not shown); other categories could not be compared because all were
14 accepted.

15 This study has several limitations. This was a retrospective single-center study that
16 included patients with different characteristics, especially with respect to hematological
17 malignancy, febrile neutropenia, and concomitant therapy. Thus, we cannot exclude the
18 possibility that the outcomes did not deteriorate by discontinuation or de-escalation due

1 to the different backgrounds of the patients. Additionally, the sample size was small, and
2 confounding factors could not be removed by multivariate analysis. These limitations
3 should be considered when interpreting our results.

4 In conclusion, to our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the effects of
5 interventions such as discontinuation and change/de-escalation of carbapenems and
6 anti-MRSA antibiotics on detailed clinical and microbiological outcomes. Our results
7 showed that our ASP could reduce the duration of carbapenem and anti-MRSA antibiotic
8 use without worsening clinical and microbiological outcomes. These results suggest that
9 the review and intervention for these antibiotics by AST is as effective as ASP.

10

11 **Acknowledgment**

12 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
13 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

14

1 **References**

2 1. Cao H, Phe K, Laine GA, Russo HR, Putney KS, Tam VH. An institutional review of
3 antimicrobial stewardship interventions. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist* 2016;6:75–7.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgar.2016.03.006>.

5

6 2. Cosgrove SE. The relationship between antimicrobial resistance and patient
7 outcomes: mortality, length of hospital stay, and health care costs. *Clin Infect Dis*
8 2006;42 Supplement 2:S82–9. <https://doi.org/10.1086/499406>.

9

10 3. Roberts RR, Hota B, Ahmad I, Scott 2nd RD, Foster SD, Abbasi F, et al. Hospital and
11 societal costs of antimicrobial-resistant infections in a Chicago teaching hospital:
12 implications for antibiotic stewardship. *Clin Infect Dis* 2009;49:1175–84.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1086/605630>.

14

15 4. Dellit TH, Owens RC, McGowan JE Jr, Gerding DN, Weinstein RA, Burke JP, et al.
16 Infectious Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology
17 of America guidelines for developing an institutional program to enhance
18 antimicrobial stewardship. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007;44:159–77.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1086/510393>.

1

2 5. Barlam TF, Cosgrove SE, Abbo LM, MacDougall C, Schuetz AN, Septimus EJ, et al.
3 Implementing an antibiotic stewardship program: guidelines by the Infectious
4 Diseases Society of America and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of
5 America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2016;62:e51–77. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciw118>.

6

7 6. MacDougall C, Polk RE. Antimicrobial stewardship programs in health care systems.
8 *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2005;18:638–56.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.18.4.638-656.2005>.

10

11 7. Niwa T, Shinoda Y, Suzuki A, Ohmori T, Yasuda M, Ohta H, et al. Outcome
12 measurement of extensive implementation of antimicrobial stewardship in patients
13 receiving intravenous antibiotics in a Japanese university hospital. *Int J Clin Pract*
14 2012;66:999–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-1241.2012.02999.x>.

15

16 8. Fraser GL, Stogsdill P, Dickens JD Jr, Wennberg DE, Smith RP Jr, Prato BS.
17 Antibiotic optimization. An evaluation of patient safety and economic outcomes.
18 *Arch Intern Med* 1997;157:1689–94. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.157.15.1689>.

1

2 9. Cheng VC, To KK, Li IW, Tang BS, Chan JF, Kwan S, et al. Antimicrobial
3 stewardship program directed at broad-spectrum intravenous antibiotics prescription
4 in a tertiary hospital. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2009;28:1447–56.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-009-0803-8>.

6

7 10. Cook PP, Gooch M. Long-term effects of an antimicrobial stewardship programme at
8 a tertiary-care teaching hospital. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2015;4:262–7.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2014.11.006>.

10

11 11. Bantar C, Sartori B, Vesco E, Heft C, Saúl M, Salamone F, et al. A hospital wide
12 intervention program to optimize the quality of antibiotic use: impact on prescribing
13 practice, antibiotic consumption, cost savings, and bacterial resistance. *Clin Infect*
14 *Dis* 2003;37:180–6. <https://doi.org/10.1086/375818>.

15

16 12. DiazGranados CA. Prospective audit for antimicrobial stewardship in intensive care:
17 impact on resistance and clinical outcomes. *Am J Infect Control* 2012;40:526–9.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2011.07.011>.

1

2 13. Lewis GJ, Fang X, Gooch M, Cook PP. Decreased resistance of *Pseudomonas*
3 *aeruginosa* with restriction of ciprofloxacin in a large teaching hospital's intensive
4 care and intermediate care units. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33:368–73.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1086/664763>.

6

7 14. Philmon C, Smith T, Williamson S, Goodman E. Controlling use of antimicrobials in
8 a community teaching hospital. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2006;27:239–44.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1086/500419>.

10

11 15. White AC Jr, Atmar RL, Wilson J, Cate TR, Stager CE, Greenberg SB. Effects of
12 requiring prior authorization for selected antimicrobials: expenditures,
13 susceptibilities, and clinical outcomes. *Clin Infect Dis* 1997;25:230–9.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1086/514545>.

15

16 16. Liew YX, Lee W, Loh JC, Cai Y, Tang SS, Lim CL, et al. Impact of an antimicrobial
17 stewardship programme on patient safety in Singapore General Hospital. *Int J*
18 *Antimicrob Agents* 2012;40:55–60.

1 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2012.03.004>.

2

3 17. Horikoshi Y, Higuchi H, Suwa J, Isogai M, Shoji T, Ito K. Impact of computerized
4 pre-authorization of broad spectrum antibiotics in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* at a
5 children's hospital in Japan. *J Infect Chemother* 2016;22:532–5.

6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiac.2016.05.001>.

7

8 18. LaRocco A Jr. Concurrent antibiotic review programs—a role for infectious diseases
9 specialists at small community hospitals. *Clin Infect Dis* 2003;37:742–3.

10 <https://doi.org/10.1086/377286>.

11

12 19. Goff DA, Bauer KA, Reed EE, Stevenson KB, Taylor JJ, West JE. Is the
13 “low-hanging fruit” worth picking for antimicrobial stewardship programs? *Clin*
14 *Infect Dis* 2012;55:587–92. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis494>.

15

16 20. Vettese N, Hendershot J, Irvine M, Wimer S, Chamberlain D, Massoud N. Outcomes
17 associated with a thrice-weekly antimicrobial stewardship programme in a 253-bed
18 community hospital. *J Clin Pharm Ther* 2013;38:401–4.

1 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpt.12079>.

2
3 21. García-Rodríguez JF, Bardán-García B, Peña-Rodríguez MF, Álvarez-Díaz H,
4 Mariño-Callejo A. Meropenem antimicrobial stewardship program: clinical,
5 economic, and antibiotic resistance impact. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*
6 2019;38:161–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-018-3408-2>.

7
8 22. Hagiwara D, Sato K, Miyazaki M, Kamada M, Moriwaki N, Nakano T, et al. The
9 impact of earlier intervention by an antimicrobial stewardship team for specific
10 antimicrobials in a single weekly intervention. *Int J Infect Dis* 2018;77:34–9.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2018.09.025>.

12
13 23. Gilbert DN, Chambers HF, Eliopoulos GM, Saag MS, Pavia AT. *The Sanford Guide*
14 *to Antimicrobial Therapy*. 48th ed. Vermont: Antimicrobial Therapy;2018.

15
16 24. Oda S, Aibiki M, Ikeda T, Imaizumi H, Endo S, Ochiai R et al. The Japanese
17 guidelines for the management of sepsis. *J Intensive Care* 2014;2:55.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40560-014-0055-2>.

- 1 25. Niwa T, Shinoda Y, Suzuki A, Ohmori T, Ohta H, Fukao A, et al. Outcome
2 measurement of the review system for appropriate use of antimicrobial injections in
3 all inpatients established by the infection control team. *Iryo Yakugaku*
4 2012;38:273–81. <https://doi.org/10.5649/jjphcs.38.273>.
5
- 6 26. Shime N, Satake S, Fujita N. De-escalation of antimicrobials in the treatment of
7 bacteraemia due to antibiotic-sensitive pathogens in immunocompetent patients.
8 *Infection* 2011;39:319–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s15010-011-0116-6>.
9