Impact of Rapid Diagnostic Technology on Patients with Candidemia Patrick Funderburk, PharmD¹; Amy L. Carr, PharmD, BCIDP¹; Jillian E. Hayes, PharmD, BCIDP²

Patrick Funderburk, PharmD¹; Amy L. Carr, PharmD, BCIDP¹; J ¹AdventHealth Orlando, Orlando, FL ²Duke University Hospital, Durham, NC

Background

- Candidemia is the fourth most common cause of bloodstream infections (BSIs) with mortality rates ranging from 19-40%¹⁻⁵
- Use of rapid diagnostic technology (RDT) for fungal organisms has demonstrated decreased time to antifungal therapy, but has inconsistently impacted clinical outcomes including mortality¹⁻⁶
- At AdventHealth Central Florida Division South (CFD-S), pharmacists provide 24-hour coverage for real-time notification of all positive blood culture results using Genmark ePlex[®] Blood Culture Identification Panels (BCID)⁷

Objective

• To evaluate the clinical impacts of RDT paired with 24/7, pharmacist-driven response in patients with *Candida* bloodstream infection

Methods

- Multicenter, pre/post, retrospective chart review
 - Pre-RDT: June 2019-May 2020
 - Post-RDT: August 2020-July 2021

Inclusion

- Age \geq 18 years
- Positive blood culture with *Candida* spp.
- Received ≥ 72 hours antifungal therapy

Exclusion

- Death or discharge prior to culture positivity
- Receipt of systemic antifungal prophylaxis
- Known candidiasis at time of first culture

Characteristic

Age (years), median (IQR) Weight (kg), median (IQR) Male, n Past medical history, n Diabetes IVDU Solid organ transplant Immunosuppression, n Gastrointestinal perforation, n Hospitalization within the previous APACHEII Score, median (IQR) Central venous catheter for \geq 48 ho Renal Replacement, n CRRT HD Candida Score, median (IQR) Severe sepsis + vasopressors, n Receiving total parental nutrition, n Abdominal Surgery in last 30 days, r Candidemia within the past year, n Systemic antibiotics in previous 30 d

> 1 2 3+

Outcome

Time to effective antifungal (h), med Time to optimal therapy (h), median Time to culture clearance (h), median Duration of therapy (d), median (IQI Length of stay (d), median (IQR) ICU length of stay (d), median (IQR) In-hospital mortality, n 30-day readmission, n

| | Results | | |
|------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| | Pre-RDT (n=100) | Pre-RDT (n=100) Post-RDT (n=100) | |
| | 59.5 (42.5-71.0) | | |
| | 76.15 (59.9-89.7) | 73.5 (62.0-93.1) | |
| | 45 | 55 | |
| | 25 | 31 | |
| | 8 2 | | |
| | 2 | 2 | |
| | 21 | 15 | |
| | 2 | 4 | |
| 90 days, n | 59 | 49 | |
| | 13.5 (8-18.25) | 16.5 (10-22) | |
| urs, n | 69 | 67 | |
| | 24 | 31 | |
| | 5 19 | 16 15 | |
| | 2 (0-2) | 2 (1.75-2.25) | |
| | 48 | 30 | |
| | 17 | 20 | |
| | 13 | 19 | |
| | 8 5 | | |
| ays, n | 65 | 71 | |
| | 33 | 20 | |
| | 20 | 21 | |
| | 12 | 30 | |
| | Pre-RDT (n=100) | Post-RDT (n=100) | p-value |
| lian (IQR) | 39.8 (18.5-66.6) | 38.5 (22.1-53.1) | 0.217 |
| (IQR) | 75.7 (39.8-122.6) | 67.8 (40.9-113.5) | 0.707 |
| n (IQR) | 101.8 (73.4-144.3) | 97.7 (70.0-160.0) | 0.923 |
|) | 12 (8-17) | 13 (7-16) | 0.950 |
| | 22 (14-35.3) | 24 (16-40.3) | 0.156 |
| | 2.5 (0-12.3) | 6 (0-22.3) | 0.033 |
| | 15 | 30 | 0.011 |
| | 30 | 21 | 0.144 |

Advent Health

Discussion

o difference in time to effective antifungal therapy

- Antifungal therapy often initiated at the time of gram stain report
- High background use of empiric antifungals acreased ICU length of stay and in-hospital mortality a the post-RDT group are likely a reflection of higher aseline APACHE II scores

Conclusions

DT paired with 24/7, pharmacist driven response did not result a significant difference in time to effective ntifungal therapy in patients with candidemia urther study regarding optimal use of RDT in fungal nfections is warranted

References

 Iagill et al. N Engl J Med. 2014;370(13):1198-1208.

 assan et al. J Infect. 2009;59(5):360-365.

 Iuderris et al. J Mycol Med. 2020;30(3):101008.

 Iorgan et al. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2005;26(6):540-547.

 arey et al. Clin Infect Dis. 2006;43(1):25-31.

 mbrook et al. Clin Infect Dis. 2017;64(1):15-23.

 lood Culture Identification (BCID) Panels | GenMark Diagnostics

 genmarkdx.com)

sures

ors of this presentation have the following to disclose rning possible financial or personal relationships with hercial entities that may have a direct or indirect interest subject matter of this presentation: thors have nothing to disclose.

ct information:

Hayes – jillian.hayes@duke.edu

