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477. Comparison of Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes Between Community-Acquired and Healthcare-Associated Bacteremia Cases due to Bacteriodes Species


**Results.** Of 3611 bacteremia cases, 266 (7.4%) were due to obligately anaerobic bacteria, such as Clostridium species (n = 97 [36.5%]), Fusobacterium species (15 [7.5%]), and Bacteroides species (65 [24.4%]), of which 31 (47.7%) were HCA and 34 (52.3%) were CA. In 22 (33.8%) cases, >2 blood cultures were positive. B. fragilis was most frequently isolated (n = 25 [38.5%]), then B. thetaiotaomicron (n = 9 [13.8%]), B. vulgatus (n = 5 [7.7%]), B. uniformis (n = 3 [4.6%]), B. distasonis (n = 2 [3.1%]), B. aerocolitis (n = 2 [3.1%]), B. capillosus (n = 1 [1.5%]), and B. ovatus (n = 1 [1.5%]). After introducing MALDI-TOF, the number of unidentified Bacteroides species fell from 12 (18.5%) to 5 (7.7%). Sensitivity to ampicillin/sulbactam, cefmetazole, and clindamycin was 85.2%, 92.6%, and 59.3%, respectively. Most Bacteroides ovatus (15 [7.5%]), and B. fragilis (9 [13.8%]) were similar, except for diabetes, which was more frequent in HCA cases (Table).

**Conclusion.** There was significantly higher 7- and 30-day mortality in HCA than in CA cases (P = 0.03).
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**Background.** Hospital Onset (HO) Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) bacteremia is publicly reported and tied to the Hospital-Acquired Conditions Reduction Program. It reflects a surrogate of risk of infection of MRSA invasive disease in the hospital setting, and reported as a standardized infection ratio that adjusts for admission MRSA prevalence, hospital size and medical school affiliation. However, it may not adequately represent all HO S. aureus bacteremia, which is unaffected by the prevalence of resistance to methicillin.

**Methods.** We compared the rates of NSHIN-defined laboratory ID events for HO methicillin susceptible S. aureus (MSSA) and MRSA bacteremia in 51 hospitals (small, <100 beds, n = 15; medium, 100–300 beds, n = 15; large, >300 beds, n = 21) from a single hospital system over a 12-month period abstracting data from one clinical decision support system. We also compared the rates of HO S. aureus bacteremia based on hospital size.

**Results.** HO MSSA bacteremia events (1.22 per 10,000 patient-days) occurred during calendar year 2016 (MSSA n = 218, 64%; MRSA n = 122, 36%). 14/15 small hospitals did not have any HO S. aureus bacteremia events during the study period. HO MSSA bacteremia rates were 0.58 and 0.77 per 10,000 patient-days for medium size and large-size hospitals respectively (P = 0.094). In contrast, HO MRSA bacteremia rates were 0.71 and 0.47 per 10,000 patient-days for medium-size and large-size hospitals respectively (P = 0.045). There was no correlation between HO MSSA and MRSA bacteremia for large and medium size hospitals (Figure).

**Conclusion.** By measuring only HO MRSA, a significant portion of patients with increased morbidity and mortality are overlooked. HO S. aureus bacteremia may provide a better measure to use to evaluate invasive S. aureus risk in the hospital setting, and would mitigate the MRSA prevalence factor. These findings are important when we evaluate policy related to what is considered a hospital acquired condition.
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**Figure:** Relation between HO MSSA and MRSA Bacteremia for Based on Hospital Size.
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catheters, and mechanical ventilation were present in the previous 2 days among 73%, 20%, and 25% of all HOB events, respectively. Only 10% of all HOB events occurred in a patient without an indwelling device. Only 20% of HOB events resulted in a National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) reported CRADA.

**Conclusion.** Half of HOB events are potentially preventable in this pilot study. HOB may be an indicator for a large number of preventable HAIs not currently measured by NHSN. Larger studies across a variety of hospital settings are needed to assess the generalizability of these results the implications of HOB surveillance for infection prevention practices and patient outcomes.

**Methods.** The project was conducted at a 120-bed hospital within the Central Texas Veterans Healthcare System (CTVHCS). Rooms selected for inclusion were marked with a fluorescent marker in predetermined locations by a member of the research team. When the EMS staff person completed the routine cleaning process a member of the research team recorded the fluorescent score and obtained microbiological samples from the room. The aerobic bacterial colony (ABC) count for pre-cleaning and post-manual cleaning was also categorized into “clean” and “not-clean” categories, where clean was defined as ABC counts <2.5 CFU/cm².

**Results.** A chi-squared test of independence revealed that there was no association between surfaces considered “clean” according to ABC criteria and “clean” according to fluorescent marker score, chi-square = 1.6167, df = 1, P = 0.20. A mixed effects logistic regression model showed that fluorescent clean score was not a significant predictor of a clean surface as defined by the <2.5 CFU/cm² criteria (P = 0.96).

**Conclusion.** While the fluorescent marker has been shown to be useful for determining if a surface has been wiped, our results show that fluorescent marker score may not be a good proxy for assessing surface disinfection. Our results suggest that fluorescent markers only determine if the manual process of wiping has been conducted without taking into account other variables that play a role in disinfecting the surface.
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**Background.** The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommend that hospitals ensure compliance with cleaning and disinfection procedures. Environmental Management Service (EMS) coordinators have used multiple methods to gauge effectiveness of cleaning activities. These methods include visual inspection, Adenosine Triphosphate (ATP) bioluminescence markers, fluorescent markers, and microbiological sampling. Although microbiological sampling is considered the “gold standard,” it is expensive and time consuming; therefore, alternative methods such as fluorescent markers are more commonly used. The purpose of this study was to determine whether fluorescent clean score was associated with a clean surface as determined by microbiological sampling.

**Methods.** A mixed effects logistic regression model showed that fluorescent clean score was not a significant predictor of a clean surface as defined by the <2.5 CFU/cm² criteria (P = 0.96).

**Conclusion.** While the fluorescent marker has been shown to be useful for determining if a surface has been wiped, our results show that fluorescent marker score may not be a good proxy for assessing surface disinfection. Our results suggest that fluorescent markers only determine if the manual process of wiping has been conducted without taking into account other variables that play a role in disinfecting the surface.
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