

study was to assess laxative administration among inpatients tested for CDI in VA hospitals and identify factors associated with guideline discordance. **Methods:** Adults hospitalized in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan VA Medical Centers from January 2019-December 2022 with a CDI test performed during the admission were included. CDI tests included Toxin B gene Polymerase Chain Reaction or Toxin Enzyme Immunoassay. Tests were defined as positive, negative, or cancelled according to the diagnostic protocols of the VA testing laboratories. Laxative use, patient demographics, admission data, and comorbidities were collected from the VA Corporate Data Warehouse. Guideline discordant testing was defined as a diagnostic test for CDI ordered within 48 hours of a recorded laxative dose. Factors associated with discordant testing were analyzed using clustered binomial logistic regression models. Analyses were completed using SAS 9.4. **Results:** There were 7,326 tests ordered for 4,888 patients during the study. Patients were predominantly White (61.8%), male (95.6%), and elderly (mean age=70.0 standard deviation=12.1). Most (59.0%) patients had received at least one dose of laxative in the 48 hours preceding their CDI test. Being Black (Odds Ratio (OR)=0.86 (95%Confidence Interval (95%CI) =0.76,0.98) or Hispanic (OR (95%CI) =0.62(0.48,0.82) vs White) was associated with a decreased likelihood of inappropriate testing due to recent laxative use. Being tested at a rural facility (OR (95%CI) =1.23 (1.07,1.41) vs urban), within a long-term care (LTC) unit (OR (95%CI) =1.67 (1.41,1.97) vs inpatient), or within an intensive care unit (ICU) (OR (95%CI) =1.40 (1.24,1.59)) were all associated with an increased likelihood of being inappropriately tested. Guideline discordant tests were more likely to have negative results (OR (95%CI) =1.25 (1.05,1.49)) compared to guideline concordant tests. Discussion: Laxative administration in the 48 hours preceding CDI testing was common among hospitalized Veterans and associated with a lower likelihood of positive **Results:** This echoes non-VA studies where laxative use was reported at 44%. An increased likelihood of guideline discordant testing in ICU and LTC settings suggests the need for greater diagnostic stewardship interventions. Additionally, further work to determine negative outcomes associated with inappropriate testing are needed.

Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology 2024;4(Suppl. S1):s78-s79
doi:10.1017/ash.2024.211

Presentation Type:

Poster Presentation - Poster Presentation

Subject Category: Diagnostic Stewardship

Survey of VA Laboratory Practices for Carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii and Pseudomonas aeruginosa

Aubrey Sawyer, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine; Cara Ray, Department of Veterans Affairs; James Stacey Klutts, Department of Veterans Affairs; Margaret Fitzpatrick, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Center; Katie Suda, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine; Natalie Hicks, National Infectious Diseases Service (NIDS); Martin Evans, Vha; Makoto Jones, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine; Christopher Pfeiffer, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine and Charlesnika Evans, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine

Background: Carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii (CRAB) and Pseudomonas aeruginosa (CRPA) are drug-resistant pathogens causing high mortality rates with limited treatment options. Understanding the incidence of these organisms and laboratory knowledge of testing protocols is important for controlling their spread in healthcare settings. This project assessed how often Veterans Affairs (VA) healthcare facilities identify CRAB and CRPA and testing practices used. **Method:** An electronic survey was distributed to 126 VA acute care facilities September-October 2023. The survey focused on CRAB and CRPA incidence, testing and identification, and availability of testing resources. Responses were analyzed by complexity of patients treated at VA facilities (High, Medium, Low) using Fisher's exact tests. **Result:** 77 (61.1%) facilities responded, most in urban settings (85.4%). Most respondents were lead or supervisory laboratory

technologists (84.2%) from high complexity facilities (69.0%). Few facilities detected CRAB ≥ once/month (4.4%), with most reporting that they have not seen CRAB at their facility (55.0%). CRPA was detected more frequently: 19% of facilities with isolates ≥ once/month, 29.2% a few times per year, and 26.9% reporting had not seen the organism. No differences in CRAB or CRPA incidence was found by facility complexity. Nearly all facilities, regardless of complexity, utilize the recommended methods of MIC or disk diffusion to identify CRAB or CRPA (91.9%) with remaining facilities reporting that testing is done off-site (7.8%). More high complexity facilities perform on-site testing compared to low complexity facilities (32.0% vs 2.7%, p=0.04). 83% of laboratories test for Carbapenemase production, with one-fourth using off-site reference labs. One-fourth of facilities perform additional antibiotic susceptibility testing for CRAB and CRPA isolates, most of which test for susceptibility to combination antibiotics; no differences between complexities were found. Agreement that sufficient laboratory and equipment resources were available was higher in high complexity than in medium complexity facilities (70.7% vs 33.3%, p=0.01), but not low complexity facilities (43.8%). **Conclusion:** Having timely and accurate testing protocols for CRAB and CRPA are important to quickly control spread and reduce associated mortality. This study shows that most VA protocols follow recommended testing and identification guidelines. Interestingly, there was no difference in CRAB or CRPA incidence for facilities providing higher vs lower complexity of care. While high and low complexity facilities generally reported sufficient resources for CRAB and CRPA evaluation, some medium-complexity labs, who may feel more compelled than low-complexity labs to bring testing in house, reported that additional resources would be required.

Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology 2024;4(Suppl. S1):s79
doi:10.1017/ash.2024.212

Presentation Type:

Poster Presentation - Poster Presentation

Subject Category: Diagnostic Stewardship

A Stepwise Diagnostic Stewardship Approach to Reduce Unnecessary Urine Cultures, Asymptomatic Bacteriuria, and CAUTI Rate

Mina Said, Medicine / Infectious diseases UPMC; Vanessa Kung, Pittsburgh VA Hospital; Abigail Beck, VA Pittsburgh; Deanna Buehrle, VA Pittsburgh Healthcare System; Kristin Nagaro, VA Pittsburgh Healthcare System; Graham Snyder, UPMC/University of Pittsburgh and Elise Martin, VA Pittsburgh Healthcare System

Background: Clinically non-indicated asymptomatic bacteriuria (ASB) identification precipitates higher reported catheter-associated urinary tract infection (CAUTI) rates and urinary tract infection (UTI)-directed antimicrobial overuse. Published diagnostic stewardship interventions to reduce ASB were mostly tested individually and heterogeneously; hence the optimal bundle approach is yet to be defined. **Methods:** We performed a single-center sequential quasi-experimental study involving hospitalized,

Urine Cultures

Urine cultures should only be sent for an approved indication. Inappropriate urine cultures may identify asymptomatic bacteriuria. Asymptomatic bacteriuria is bacteria in the urine without symptoms of a UTI and should not be treated with antibiotics (except pregnancy and urologic surgery). Antibiotics offer no benefit and may cause harm.

Urine Culture order options:
Please select the appropriate indication for ordering a urine culture

Indications for urine cultures will be audited by infection prevention

Urine Culture Only	Analysis with reflex to urine culture
If a urinalysis is needed, please order separately	UTI Symptoms: dysuria, flank pain, suprapubic pain, frequency, urgency, new or worse incontinence
1 Prior to urologic surgery	Unlikely to be UTI: confusion, falls, cloudy urine, smelly urine
2 Pregnancy	1 Septic shock, unknown source
3 Neutropenic fever	2 Sepsis or fever in a patient unable to localize symptoms
4 UTI symptoms with suprapubic catheter or nephrostomy	3 Symptoms of UTI or pyelonephritis
5 Other	4 Fever in a kidney transplant recipient
	5 Fever after endologic procedure/surgery
	6 Fever and known urinary tract obstruction
	7 Genitourinary obstruction or trauma
	8 Gross hematuria
	9 Spinal cord injury patient with neurologic changes
	10 Chronically catheterized with fever or AMS (at time of admission only)
	11 Other

Document indication in chart. Will be audited